


the **PLAIN TRUTH**

a magazine of understanding



The 60's—
a paradoxical decade

What our READERS SAY

"I am a regular reader of your PLAIN TRUTH and I find the articles very interesting and educative. As a research technician I found your articles on evolution most educative. The theory of evolution about which I have been indoctrinated has been since, put completely out of gear. I would be very much obliged if you could provide me with more reading matter on this subject."

C. W.,
Division of Entomology, C.A.R.I.,
Gannoruwa, Peradeniya, Ceylon

"We got the biggest laughs over your outdated and completely irrelevant ideas of piety, chastity, and morality. Speaking as an intelligent and sensible college sophomore, who is aware of the joy and enlightenment that is the twentieth century, I really find it incredible that there can exist such intellectual perverts as you people, who seem to be living still in the up-tight Victorian age. I really feel sorry for you people, who will probably die frustrated old virgins, and not even know what you've missed in living while you've been cooped up with your musty old moralities, dusty old saints, and outdated ideals."

Miss Nancy S.,
Santa Barbara, California

• *Do we detect a note of too much protest, Nancy? WHAT "frustrated old virgins...dusty old saints..."? Could you possibly have mistaken all us happily married folks with large families for someone else?*

"I enjoy *The PLAIN TRUTH* very much. Reading it makes me evaluate my own opinions and philosophies. Thanks to your issue which dealt with marijuana, I was able to stop using the drug before it led to anything bigger. Thanks to your issue dealing with divorce, my parents reunited and now have a happy relationship. And, thanks to your issue on happy families, my family is now together more often."

Mr. J. G.
Rockaway, N. J.

"Please discontinue sending *The PLAIN TRUTH*. I don't consider it the truth. You criticise people for being closed-minded, but no one is as closed-minded as you people. I am still searching, but you have obviously not provided me with any answers. I think I will stick with LSD and 'grass' and try to liberate my mind rather than trap it with your philosophy."

Stan H.,
Peace Corps Volunteer,
St. Georges, Grenada W.I.

• *You should read the next letter.*

"I am going on 22 years old and have been on drugs off and on for two years. But thanks to you and God I have now begun to live again. I have tried almost everything, speed, LSD, as well as STP and grass and I found nothing more than heartache and fear. I still live with the knowledge that the acid can come back on me."

Maria D.,
Sarasota, Florida

"Please keep *The PLAIN TRUTH* coming, for it is the best of 41 monthly publications which I receive."

G. R. J.
Dawson Springs, Ky.

"I am a staunch Hindu and hold firm views about my religion...*The PLAIN TRUTH* is the very first magazine that I have read that has something to do with a religion in which I don't believe (I do respect it). My frank opinion about it is that it is an eye-opening publication and I wish it every success."

Suresh G. K.,
Navarangpura, India

"Give a resounding 'horse laugh' to writer Paul W. Kroll! In his article in *The PLAIN TRUTH* for November 1969, page 28, column 3, 6th paragraph, he makes the observation that if eohippus were alive he would turn over in his grave! My contention is that if eohippus were alive he wouldn't be in his grave. Which only goes to

(Continued on page 47)

the PLAIN TRUTH a magazine of understanding

January, 1970

VOL. XXXV

NO. 1

Circulation: 2,136,000 Copies

Published monthly at 300 West Green St., Pasadena, California, 91105; Watford, England; and North Sydney, Australia, by Ambassador College. French edition published monthly at Pasadena, California; Dutch and German editions at Watford, England; Spanish edition at Big Sandy, Texas. © 1970 Ambassador College. All rights reserved.

EDITOR
HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Garner Ted Armstrong

SENIOR EDITORS
Herman L. Hoeh
Roderick C. Meredith

MANAGING EDITOR
Arthur A. Ferdig

Associate Editors

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

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

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

James W. Robinson, Copy Editor

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

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

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

Albert J. Portune, Business Manager

Circulation Managers: U. S. A.: John H. Wilson; U. K.: Charles F. Hunting; Canada: Dean Wilson; Australia: Gene R. Hughes; Philippines: Guy L. Ames; South Africa: Gordon R. Terblanche; Latin America: Louis Gutierrez.

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

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

Canada: P.O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver 1, B. C.

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

United Kingdom and Europe: P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., England.

South Africa: P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg.

Australia: P. O. Box 345, North Sydney, NSW 2060, Australia.

New Zealand and Southeast Asia: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand.

The Philippines: P. O. Box 1111, Makati, Rizal D-708.

Registered in Australia for transmission by post as a book.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE paid at Pasadena, California, and at additional mailing offices.

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

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

Personal from the Editor

THE PAST TWO MONTHS, IN my *Personal* talk with our readers, I have written of how others report the news, describe the world's ills—but *The PLAIN TRUTH* makes plain the *meaning*, reveals the *causes*, tells how these evils will be solved!

Of course, in order to give you the SOLUTIONS, we also must state the problems.

In the December number I closed my talk saying that in this January issue I should like to explain WHY the truly great minds in the world cannot solve the most important and vexing human problems.

THINK of this seemingly incredible paradox!

The mind of man is so stupendously brilliant—of such immense capacity—that it can solve the factors of time, space, inertia, gravity, force and energy, and devise the instrumentalities to send men to the moon and back! Yet this same brilliant human mind, in all its complexity, intricacy, and ability, *cannot solve man's own problems here on earth!*

The leaders in science, technology, industry, government, education, do have minds marvelous and capable almost beyond belief.

What a MYSTERY!

Human minds SO GREAT, and yet—SO HELPLESS! They do not know THE WAY TO PEACE! To happiness! To universal abundant well-being!

Compared to animal brain, the human mind is *infinitely* greater, unbelievably more capable! The gap between animal brain and human mind is incredibly VAST!

But WHY must the human mind be SO HELPLESS?

There is a REASON! The reason is, man does not understand WHAT HE IS! He doesn't understand WHY he is! He doesn't understand WHAT the human mind is! He doesn't understand the

reason for the stupendous gap between animal brain and human mind!

Man, unlike animals, is confronted with emotional, moral and spiritual problems. These he doesn't understand, and in six thousand years has proved unable to solve!

The ANSWER is wrapped up in the mystery of WHAT makes the difference between animal brain and human mind.

In the November, 1969 PLAIN TRUTH, in my *Personal* talk, I explained how I, myself, came to understand the CAUSE of all the world's ills, and the source of that understanding. But now I want to explain why the truly great minds DO NOT UNDERSTAND!

Recently a brilliant young scientist, Dr. Robert Kuhn, joined the Ambassador College faculty, Pasadena campus. Entirely independent of my own study into the question, Dr. Kuhn, by scientific research in the human brain as compared to animal brain, had proved, scientifically, precisely what I had discovered by revelation.

Can anything be more important than to know WHAT YOU ARE—what your mind is—and WHY it is so vastly greater than animal brain?

Subject to my finding time available for the project, Dr. Kuhn and I plan to collaborate in production of a book on this subject.

Now I want to give you a glimpse into his scientific discoveries, in the field of physical science.

First, let me give you a brief run-down on Dr. Kuhn. Although a comparatively young man, he has studied at New York University, University of Rochester, Johns Hopkins University, Johns Hopkins Medical School, University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), Yeshiva University and Ambassador College. He received an A.B. degree in Human Biology (Phi Beta Kappa) from John Hopkins University,

(Continued on page 44)

In This Issue:

What Our Readers

Say Inside Front Cover

Personal from the Editor 1

The Incredible Paradox
of the 60's 2

Will the Real School
Please Stand Up? 16

The Day the Dinosaurs Died . . 22

Radio Log 30

Freedom of the Press
Threatened? 33

Report on the Philippines—
A Search For "Freedom" . . 38

TV Log 47

Advance News Reports
Come Alive Today 48





Wide World and NASA Photos

OUR COVER

The SIXTIES were, indeed, history's most paradoxical decade. We saw unparalleled technological achievements on the one hand, highlighted by man's first steps on the moon; but in sharp contrast, we saw mounting problems of humanity that now pose a menacing threat to the very existence of life. Our cover, a composite of two striking contemporary photos, illustrates just one aspect of this incredible paradox. Hunger and space-age technology coexisting in the Twentieth Century. Experience has shown that neither dollars nor additional scientific achievement will close the gap. The real solution will depend upon the change of a very basic but complicated ingredient—human nature.

THE INCREDIBLE PARADOX OF THE 60's...





The decade of the Sixties changed all of us. No matter where we live, the world events of the past 10 years created a different world — and promise a vastly different future.

THE SIXTIES, the *incredible* Sixties are past. It was a different kind of decade, an ironic decade — in many ways a paradox. Knowledge and technological achievement soared to unprecedented heights. World troubles and despair sank to unprecedented lows. And the basic problems confronting humanity remained unsolved.

Who Would Have Believed It?

Who would have believed that a little orbiting Soviet “ball” called Sputnik I in October, 1957, would result in an almost “Ho-hum” attitude from mankind toward the second manned landing on the moon of Apollo 12 in November, 1969?

In 1961, how many really believed that President Kennedy’s commissioned goal of placing an American on the moon before 1970 actually would be reached? Yet man has twice landed, walked on and returned from the surface of the moon without a major problem.

Vietnam Was Irrelevant

Recall 1960 — Vietnam was as relevant to the lives of Americans as Afghanistan. Laos was the biggest Southeast Asian trouble spot then. Yet by the end of the decade, the mighty United States was split, divided and confused from fighting a war into which it had poured nearly \$100 billion along with the sacrifice of 40,000 American lives. At the end of the Sixties the war is far from concluded, and South Vietnam’s security far from secure!

In 1960, no one had heard of “Black Power.” Who could have possibly foreseen that hundreds of cities in the United States were destined to become charred battlegrounds of riots, burning, looting, killing and racial fratricide? This too was the Sixties.

In 1960, the term “political assassination” would have forced us to think back to Abraham Lincoln and John Wilkes Booth. But during the incredible decade, the deaths of John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King, Medgar Evers and others were vivid examples of the brutal assassinations of major leaders in the United States.

Around the world, other leaders fell before the assassins’ gun or sword: Hendrik F. Verwoerd, South Africa’s Prime Minister; Tom Mboya of Kenya; General Raphael Trujillo, dictator of the Dominican Republic, and others.

Pollution and Population

Turning the calendar into 1960 we were told the tools of technology would provide most of mankind’s physical needs and wants. But now, a scant decade later, the whole world stands threatened with destruction from the by-products of that very same advanced technology, resulting in the wanton pollution of our air, water, and land.

Marching arm and arm with global pollution through the Sixties was the ugly specter of the population explosion and impending world famines.

Now, say demographers, the last half

THE 60's

of the Seventies promises to see the greatest growth in worldwide population in the history of man.

Vast Sections Rejecting What the Decade Produced

Who in 1960 could have looked ahead and seen the most energetic segment of society — the youth — disillusioned, turned-off, rejecting, destroying, demonstrating against the "establishment"?

Who could have guessed that mankind not only would have failed to solve a single major problem of human society, but would have added, by the end of the decade, scores of new problems not even imagined at the end of the Fifties?

That's why the Sixties were the INCREDIBLE DECADE!

Technology's Age

The computer. Aerospace. Micro-circuits. The Sixties were technology's Golden Era.

By the early years of the decade, second-generation computers were able to perform 10 times as many calculations in one second as the first-generation computers of the 50's. From 1965 onward, a third generation of computers could solve 1 million calculations per second, or 100 times as many as second-generation computers.

The Space Race between the two super powers — impossible in the pre-computer era — gripped our attention. Which power, which ideology would prove superior in the battle for world prestige?

By the end of 1968, there had been 928 unmanned satellites shot into space. The U. S. had put up 575 of them (544 in earth orbit), and the Soviets 337 (314 in earth orbit). Totals for 1969 will up the figure to around 1,000. Today over 350 are still in orbit, accompanied by thousands of pieces of other space "junk" — burnt-out rockets and parts of satellites.

And it all began with Sputnik I in the fall of 1957.

It was the decade of exploring other planets — unmanned of course. Instrumented fly-by missions peeked at Venus and Mars. The lunar surface was photographed from nearly every angle. Even the moon's mysterious back side did not escape the prying of Russian cameras.

Instrumented Ranger and Surveyor landings on the moon revealed to U. S. space engineers details of the lunar surfaces necessary to prepare manned landings.

Mariner 4, in 1965, and Mariners 6 and 7, in 1969, telecast back to earth the stark features of the desolate landscape of Mars.

Man began to realize how unique, how fantastically beautiful was the earth — a lone, beautiful jewel in the darkness of space.

But by the end of the decade, with the Apollo 12 moon mission safely completed, humanity even started to take "moonwalks" for granted.

The space race intensified improvements in the field of electrical miniaturization, in new metal alloys, new plastics, and new heat resistant materials. Many of these applications are only starting to reach the common man in goods and products.

There were other technological changes and developments.

It was the decade that saw commercial jetliners take over the skies and push passenger railroads into a losing proposition, at least in the United States. The new age of passenger jumbo jets emerged at the end of 1969.

During the sixties, the automobile began to dominate the urban transportation scene in the Western world, much to the dismay of city traffic planners.

Technology was indeed king in the Sixties. But as the decade drew to a close, it was patently clear that technological advances had been obtained at a tremendous cost to the earth's environment.

The Seventies open with clarion-call warnings by worried ecologists that

mankind faces extinction from pollution unless runaway technology is held in check.

The Arms Race

The world became much more of an armed camp during the Sixties, both in conventional and nuclear weapons.

During the decade, more than 40 nations were involved in wars. Much of the fighting was done with surplus American arms. Just since 1962, the U. S. sold arms worth over thirteen billion dollars!

During the Sixties, U. S. nuclear weapons tripled. To what degree the Soviets expanded their nuclear capacity is not known precisely. Most experts, however, believe the decade ended with the United States and the Soviet Union in rough nuclear balance.

During the early Sixties, both the Americans and Soviets exploded nuclear devices of awesome megatonnage. As a direct result, U. N. Secretary General U Thant declared that radiation poisons were "present in the bones of every atomic-age child."

In July, 1963, the U. S., Britain and the Soviet Union signed an agreement banning all but underground nuclear tests. But in October, 1964, Red China again unsettled nerves with its first atomic bomb blast. Peking continued its testing unperturbed until it had set off five by December, 1966. Then, seven months later, the Chinese exploded their first hydrogen bomb.

Later, in August, 1968, France became the fifth nation to explode a hydrogen bomb. Nuclear scientists emphasized that it was very possible for at least forty nations to join the "nuclear club." The worldwide arms race was entering a new, far more dangerous phase.

The fear of the rapid spread of nuclear weapons in the Seventies spurred Soviet and U. S. interest in a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT).

History, however, shows all disarmament treaties to be bitter disappointments. Look for more members in the Nuclear Club during the coming

decade, despite all efforts to the contrary.

Population Bomb

World population in 1960 was about 3 billion people; and though we faintly realized that much of humanity lacked the necessities of life, the threatening population bomb was then like a barely discernible warning wisp of smoke.

In 1964, Dr. Raymond Ewell, research chemist and economist, warned that the population explosion, combined with environmental pollution, presented "the biggest, most nearly insoluble problem that has ever faced the human race."

But it was not until severe drought afflicted India in 1966, that the frightening reality of runaway population and the threat of widespread famine were impressed on people's minds. That year the United States assembled the world's largest peacetime armada — 600 ships — to carry grain to the starving population of India.

From the mid-60's onward came a plethora of warnings of overpopulation in the underdeveloped nations and of mass starvation and impending food wars to strike, probably in the mid-70's, in major portions of Africa, Asia, the Indian sub-continent and Latin America.

Books such as *Famine, 1975 — Who Will Survive?*; *The Hungry Planet*; and *The Population Bomb* attempted to awaken a largely apathetic Western society.

But by the end of the decade (with world population at 3.6 billion) there was only much talk, many meetings, and little action — and certainly no government in the world was on any crash program to head off the calamity.

A U.N. document in late 1969 revealed that the greatest population growth the world has ever encountered will take place in the second half of the 1970's. Other studies show that food supplies will have to be doubled by 1980 and tripled by the end of the century. Conversely, yearly food increases



Wide World Photos



Myriad warnings of impending massive famines and food shortages, as a result of a world population explosion, received increasing publicity during the decade. But by the decade's end, there was only much talk and little action to avert the disaster predicted to strike heavily in the mid-70's. Many areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America will be the first to feel the effects of the population bomb.

THE 60's

appear to be leveling off, not skyrocketing ahead as needed.

Clearly the world is on a collision course. According to former U. S. Ambassador to India Chester Bowles, the approaching world famine threatens to be "the most colossal catastrophe in history."

Global Pollution

The past decade witnessed the emergence of the new "chemical man."

Today we and our children have Strontium 90 in our bones. Our body fat is laced with DDT and similar pesticides. Lead circulates in our blood, largely as the result of the combustion of leaded gasoline. We are subjected to a vast array of chemicals and gases in our air, water and food.

The problem is greatly compounded in the technologically oriented Western world. Some 70 percent of Americans live in urban areas, subject to the increasingly complex, and seemingly insoluble, urban morass.

What are we doing to our environment — all in the name of progress?

The National Wildlife Federation issued a report card on the condition of the American environment a few months ago:

Air: Very bad. *Water:* Bad. *Soil, forests, wildlife:* Fair.

No report card was issued on the state of the oceans. But other experts tell us that they too are, at best, in only fair condition. Man foolishly thought the oceans would be the miracle solvent for all of his wanton pollution. The last dumping ground. But it hasn't worked that way. DDT has entered every level of the aquatic food chain. Says one expert on the plight of the oceans, "The handwriting on the wall could hardly be written in larger script."

Ecologists, biologists, other scientists, even well-known and knowledgeable celebrities in other fields, are on the anti-pollution bandwagon as never before.

There was no such concerted movement in the late 50's or early 60's.

The message of these experts is unmistakable. Either man controls his exploding population, his crowding into cities, his ecologically damaging agricultural practices and his virtually uncontrolled industrial activities, or he faces global disaster through total extinction of our planetary environment!

Clearly it is time to act on pollution, not merely talk. But the Seventies do not look optimistic in this regard at this point. Educating and arousing a largely apathetic public is difficult. Getting political leaders to jump aboard the anti-pollution bandwagon is not easy. Powerful self-interest groups and lobbies stand in the way.

Humanity stands at the brink. The big question for the Seventies is: Will our world be rescued from total destruction? Will the pollution crisis be solved before it's too late?

A United Europe?

The greatest thrust toward European unity began with the 1957 signing of the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Economic Community. Its members: France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.

Today the EEC, or Common Market, is the world's No. 1 trading power. During its first 10 years, 1958-1967, it doubled its trade with the rest of the world and increased trade among member nations 250 percent, from \$6.8 billion to \$24 billion. The Community's annual exports are now running around \$25 billion higher than United States' exports.

A momentous goal, with the achievement of a full customs union within the EEC, was reached July 1, 1968. Tariffs were abolished on manufactured products traded among EEC members.

Now that De Gaulle is out of the way there is more optimism on the Common Market's future, including expansion plans. Negotiations on the applications of Britain, Denmark, Norway and Ireland into the Community are again under way.

Other nations, too, are seen by some



experts as possible candidates for membership: Spain, Australia, perhaps even Portugal and Yugoslavia.

There is a growing feeling among leading European politicians that a united Europe is a positive must, so that the Continent can once again exert its influence in world affairs. The Seventies could very likely see the fulfillment of Europe's dream — a giant third power force of tremendous economic strength, possessing its own nuclear defense capability.

West Germany

"Germany will never rise again!" So thought many in 1945 as Hitler's Reich lay prostrate. But from the dust and ashes of World War II, West Germany rose to her feet in the Fifties via the *Wirtschaftswunder* — Economic Miracle — and in the Sixties solidified her position as the number-one economic powerhouse of Europe.

During the Sixties, the Deutsche Mark became one of the world's hardest currencies. The German economy



Koshollek — Milwaukee Journal



All types of environmental pollution threatened ecological upsets on a world-wide scale. Above photo shows paper mill waste in Wisconsin River. Left, successive views of Boston, Massachusetts show progressively worsening smog.

Massachusetts
Audubon Society Photos

recorded a continuous balance of payments surplus of several billion dollars a year during the latter part of the decade.

In the military field, West Germany's rearmament program progressed to where the Federal Republic now possesses the second most powerful force in the NATO alliance, after the U. S.

The new coalition government headed by Socialist Willy Brandt is boldly exploring new relationships with the Soviet Union and other East European communist regimes.

There is even talk of a new non-aggression pact between Bonn and Moscow, very likely encompassing most of East and West Europe.

The future: Look for Germany to start "calling the tune" in Europe and exert her powerful influence even more within Europe's booming Common Market.

Japan — Giant of Asia Awakening

Japan's astounding economic success surpassed even the "Economic Miracle" of West Germany. With a growth rate running around 10 percent a year and even more in 1969, Japan experienced a phenomenal growth rate during the Sixties.

By the end of the decade, Japan ranked second only to the United States in the non-Communist world in her Gross National Product, surpassing even West Germany.

During the Sixties, Japan cast off her previous image of producer of cheap goods, and acquired prestige as one of the world's most efficient, technologically based competitors. Her giant industrial concerns nailed down first place in the world in shipbuilding, motorcycles and radios; second in oil refining, television sets, cameras and watches; third in steel and electric power.

While Japan's national "Self Defense Forces" remained relatively small by the end of 1969, there has been increased support, especially among influential industrialists, for developing a stronger and more independent military posture. Even the idea of eventually acquiring

THE 60's

nuclear weapons is no longer an "un-thinkable" thought.

After the newly concluded agreement with the United States to return Okinawa to Japanese control in 1972, Japan shows every sign of assuming far more political and military influence in Asia during the Seventies.

Demise of Britain

The Sixties witnessed the demise of the greatest empire the world has ever known. As 1969 drew to a close, the final trappings of British colonial possessions were to be found in only a few small, widely scattered enclaves and island groups.

It is difficult for young Britons today to realize that only 30 to 40 years ago, Britain was the leading world power.

Yet few in Britain seemed very concerned over the wholesale abandonment of the nation's historic world role. Even the official shutdown in 1966 of the British Colonial Office occurred without tears or fanfare.

Sir Charles Jeffries, who during 40 years rose to top administrative posts before his retirement, said: "When I joined the office . . . in 1917, I scarcely imagined that I should live to write its obituary notice. In those days it seemed to be about the most permanent institution in the world, dealing as it did, with an empire on which the sun never set and was not likely to set in any foreseeable future."

Britain's political and economic misfortunes earned her the title of the "Sick Man of Europe." The British pound had to be rescued several times by loans from the central banks of Europe and the International Monetary Fund amounting to several billion dollars. Much of the debt still has to be repaid.

Because of economic retrenchment and budget cutting, British military power and influence dropped drastically during the decade. Britain discovered she no longer dominated the Commonwealth, nor could she protect it. Neither

could she count on its members to stand by her side in case of war.

In January, 1968, Britain announced withdrawal of all troops "east of Suez" by the end of 1971. No longer could Britain go it alone in maintaining a modern defense system.

"Swinging London" was typical of the mood in Britain during the decade. Despite recurrent national economic impasses, the average Briton had more money to spend on himself, on his own pleasures. The fate of the nation seemed inconsequential. Gambling became the mania. And, as in the rest of the Western world, morals plummeted. Vice and pornography became rampant.

Britain's fate in the Seventies: Not good, unless there is a renewal of stalwart British character, and a recognition of the need for a sacrificing "spirit of Dunkirk." Says Paul Einzig in his book, *Decline and Fall, Britain's Crisis in the Sixties*: "If the debasement of British character is allowed to continue too long, the point of no return might be passed at some stage."

There is not, says Einzig, very much time left.

Vietnam

The 1960's saw the gradual development of what has turned out to be the most divisive war in American history since the Civil War. Early in the decade the big trouble spot in Southeast Asia was Laos, where neutralist, right-wing and Communist forces clashed in tragicomic action. Some feared deep U.S. involvement in Laos.

Washington, meanwhile, had also pledged to aid South Vietnam against attacks by Communist Viet Cong rebels. As the Reds stepped up their activity and North Vietnam proclaimed its intention to assist the Viet Cong rebels in the south, the United States gradually increased its military aid to the Diem regime and began sending "combat support troops" — troops, often individuals, acting in advisory capacity.

American battle deaths in early 1963 totalled only 30. Since that "mustard seed" beginning, the Vietnam war has involved more than 540,000 American troops at its peak, has cost the American



government around \$100 billion, and has resulted in over 40,000 American deaths and 300,000 total U.S. casualties!

Early in the war, most of the American populace supported the government's efforts in Vietnam. But by the end of 1969, a growing vocal minority of Americans began to express their dissent by large rallies, marches, demonstrations, and "Vietnam Moratorium Day" protests.

Outlook for the 1970's:

Minority groups will place heavy pressure on Washington to get out of Vietnam faster. American troop withdrawals will continue as the war is "Vietnamized."

Growing American "neo-isolationism" in the United States will restrict the future use of American power in tinderbox situations that could flare up in



A U. S. infantryman shouts encouragement as a line of his comrades return the fire of Viet Cong snipers. Basically unheard-of as the decade started, Vietnam was, by 1969, a major cause of divisiveness and confusion in the U. S.

Associated Press Radiophoto from Saigon

other parts of the world. This, despite the fact of increasing danger of more brush-fire wars, "Vietnams," or even a heating up of the situation in Korea.

Communism

1960 opened with a new Communist headache on America's own doorstep. The Castro regime came into power in 1959, by revolution, and U. S.-Cuban relations quickly worsened.

In May, 1960, the U-2 spy plane shot down over Russia, with Francis Gary Powers in command, exploded the scheduled Khrushchev-Eisenhower summit meeting. President Eisenhower assumed the blame.

In April, 1961, U. S.-supplied Cuban exiles attempted an invasion of Cuba, resulting in the infamous "Bay of Pigs" fiasco. Failure of the venture was a blow to U. S. prestige because of deep CIA

involvement. Other U. S. agencies were accused of being involved.

The East-West crisis deepened in August, 1961, when the East German authorities sealed off East Berlin with a 5-foot high concrete wall along most of the 25-mile border between East and West Berlin.

In late 1961, the first big cracks of the widening Soviet-China rift started to show.

1962 was the year of the big scare.

In October, the U. S. and Russia came close to war after U. S. reconnaissance photos discovered jet bombers and Soviet missile bases being set up in Cuba. The U. S. put a naval blockade into effect against arms shipments to Cuba, and President Kennedy warned the Soviets that any nuclear missile attack on any Western Hemisphere nation from Cuba would be considered an attack on the U. S., "requiring a full

retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union." The Soviets backed down and removed the missiles.

In October, 1964, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was stripped of power as top leader of the Soviet Government and banished to political obscurity. Communist leadership was assumed by Leonid Brezhnev and Aleksei Kosygin.

By mid-1966, Communist China was in the throes of a disruptive emotional binge called the "Cultural Revolution."

The cultural revolution met with increasing resistance and ended in severe confrontations with peasant militias. By 1967, China was fragmented by struggles between pro-Mao and anti-Mao forces.

The world was jolted in August, 1968, when the Russians invaded Czechoslovakia in order to halt the Western-leaning liberalization policy of the Alexander Dubcek regime.

Beginning in March, 1969, Soviet and Red Chinese troops clashed at various spots along their common border in the Far East. Both sides beefed up border bastions. China became especially concerned that her nuclear facilities in Sinkiang province might be destroyed.

It is clear that Soviet advances toward Western Europe in general, and West Germany in particular, in late 1969, were obvious manifestations of Kremlin attempts to patch up its Western front in order to maintain a free hand for dealing with the Chinese.

Look for much closer ties between East and West Europe during the Seventies — possibly a pseudo-peace which could crack at any moment.

Democracy's Problems

The Sixties were a decade of disillusionment for those having faith in the democratic process as a stabilizing political force in the world.

The years 1960-1969 saw a vast number of dictatorships and military governments seize power through *coups d'etat* around the world — bloody and bloodless. Many of the succumbing nations were the hopeful newly independent states carved out of the great colonial empires.

An example was Africa. In 1942

THE 60's

there were 4 independent nations in Africa. By the end of 1969 there were 43. By 1969, ten of Black Africa's 36 nations — comprising 47 percent of Black Africa's population — were under military rule with no elections yet in sight.

The fratricidal war between Nigeria and Biafra, near the end of the decade, has blurred the memory of Africa's first horror story of the Sixties: the Congo.

The very first days, after Belgium granted independence to the Congo in July, 1960, were marked by civil strife and violence. Mutinous soldiers went on a rampage of looting and raping of whites.

In Latin America, dissatisfaction with the rate of economic and social progress was expressed in many countries during the Sixties by a rise in governmental upheavals. There were actually fewer democratically elected governments in power in 1969 than 1961.

There is insufficient space in this article to list all the coups, strife, and political upheavals that occurred around the world during the decade. They number in the hundreds.

No, democracy certainly didn't blossom forth during the Sixties; and the Seventies promise the same international problems.

The Middle East

The eyes of the world were continually drawn to the Middle East during the Sixties. Periodic threats of war between the nation of Israel and her Arab neighbors finally erupted in the famous Six Day War in June, 1967.

Once again, Israel, as in 1948 and 1956, proved she could more than hold her own against fantastic odds. But few comprehend the tremendous price both sides have been paying since the June War.

During the War, Israel suffered 2,800 casualties, including 800 deaths. Since then, another 1,800 casualties have been inflicted, 500 of them fatal. Arab forces, too, have suffered heavy losses.

It is, as Egypt's Gamal Nasser has

said, a deliberate war of attrition. However, the Arab camp remains divided, and all attempts to form a united front against Israel have, thus far, met with failure.

It is plain that Israel, with a population of under three million, cannot keep up the deteriorating situation indefinitely. Even economically, the drain is tremendous.

The question is, who can the Israelis turn to? Not to the Soviets who are openly pro-Arab. Not to the United States, whose policy, while sentimentally pro-Israel, is ambivalent, based on maintaining the status quo.

Watch the Seventies. Israel could begin to build up firmer ties with Western Europe, especially with West Germany and the other nations of the Common Market.


Tel Aviv is striving for a preferential trade agreement with the Common Market. Prospects look good for reduced tariffs for Israeli exports to the EEC. Israeli officials are aiming for ultimate association status within the EEC, such as Greece and Turkey currently enjoy.

Decline of Religion

Despite certain highly publicized events, it was not religion's decade. Church membership rolls grew numerically, but the buffetings by the tides of moral, social and economic changes made them more meaningless than ever.

The whole world of organized Christianity, Catholic and Protestant, saw its influence and respect plummet. Traditions, values, beliefs, doctrines were increasingly viewed by growing segments of the population in the Western world as "outmoded," "sterile" and "irrelevant" in modern society.

The decade began with a flurry of calls for Christian unity. The first big major boost was when, in 1962, Pope



Wide World Photo

Above, the membership of the U.N. grew quickly during the decade, but the world's "last chance" for peace was basically ineffective in stopping major conflicts among nations.


John XXIII opened the 21st Ecumenical Council, officially designated as Vatican II, with a call for Christian unity.

Meanwhile various Protestant denominations began merger procedures.

A Gallup poll conducted in 1969 revealed that almost 70 percent of Americans thought religion was "losing" its influence on American life. Twelve years earlier, in 1957, only 14 percent held such a view. This was "one of the most dramatic reversals in opinion in the history of polling," said George Gallup.

The decade saw the "sins" of its generation increasingly justified by theologians and ministers promoting "situation ethics" and "the New Morality." In fact, the word "sin" became basically meaningless and undefined.

Lying, cheating, stealing, adultery, pre-marital sex, homosexuality and similar acts were increasingly viewed as



Wide World Photo

Above, the always-simmering Middle East became a more ominous threat to world peace after the 6-day Arab-Israeli war in 1967. Events in the Mideast will become major headline-makers in the 70's.

Left, Soviet-Red-Chinese relations continued to worsen throughout the decade, resulting in major border clashes and casualties. Here Soviet troops pay last respects to comrade border guards killed during a clash with Communist Chinese troops.

Tass from Sovfoto

"not necessarily wrong" given the proper situation.

In the mid-sixties, another theological bombshell struck, with the proclamation that "God is Dead!"

The decade began with hope for meaningful changes in Catholic tradition with the opening of the Ecumenical Council, but ended with the Church increasingly fragmented with dissident priests and theologians seeking radical changes from past traditions. The authority of the papacy was severely questioned after Pope Paul VI, in 1968, proclaimed the encyclical condemning all methods of birth control except the rhythm method.

The spiritual vacuum, left by the decline of traditional religion, ushered in new forms of unconventional religious ritual with increasing interest in "mystical" experiences, jazz or contemporary dancing. Astrology also blossomed into full form and was practiced in various degrees by scores of millions. Others sought satisfaction in cults of mysticism, including types of witchcraft.

Look for a further decline in traditional religious customs and beliefs in the Seventies. Also watch for a crisis point to be reached within the Roman Catholic Church between the Papacy

THE 60's

and dissenting liberals. The split cannot go on much longer.

Permissive Society

The Sixties gave birth to the "New Morality" and "Situation Ethics." At the end of the decade, these two trends came to mean "Do your own thing." And that could be anything from smoking marijuana to taking off your clothes in public.

It was the decade when famous rock music groups became more well known than presidents and prime ministers. Long hair for men and boys became fashionable. It was the era when the Generation Gap widened into a chasm. The word "hippie" entered our lexicons.

It was also the age of the "Sexual Revolution." In fashion, the trend progressed from mini-skirts to micro-skirts. Other developments were see-through blouses, "topless" bars, and now even "bottomless" bars. "Unisex" fashions added to the malady.

In the late Sixties, raw pornography became almost as easy to buy in the United States as a newspaper. Denmark abolished its remaining legal restrictions against pornography. A movement was under way to do the same in Britain.

Stage and theater moved in pace with — or perhaps a step or two ahead of — the skidding moral climate. Nudity on stage or in film became accepted fare. In 1969, films and plays with simulated scenes of the sex act clashed with the courts.

Expect the Seventies to be freer yet, with all legal restrictions on "what goes" in books, magazines, or the theater swept by the board.

Family Breakdown

The family unit in Western society was seriously shaken in the Sixties.

Working women, changing sex roles, freer attitudes toward pre-marital and extra-marital sex, the "Pill," all weakened the traditional family structure.

And while people were marrying more, they were enjoying it less!

The happily married couple increasingly was looked upon as an "odddity." Divorce had come to be considered by many as a part of the living process, a "maturing" experience.

Many were "maturing."

And for every divorce, psychologists told us there were several married couples who wanted to get a divorce but wouldn't because of children, religious beliefs or social stigma. Nowhere was the divorce problem more striking than among those husbands and wives seeking to shed mates after 15, 20, and 25 years of marriage.

The Sixties produced myriads of "new marriage" proponents — psychologists, ministers, and sociologists — with propositions of "trial" or "temporary" marriages. Marriage, the public was increasingly told, was a dying institution, "obsolete," and "not suitable for human nature" or present social trends. Indicative of the new thinking were numerous revelations of student "arrangements" practiced on some U. S. college and university campuses.

But with the new "sexual freedoms" the decade also produced alarming increases in venereal disease and illegitimacy rates.

The price for the New Morality, overall, was far less satisfaction in marriage and family life.


Education in Chaos

On the education scene, the 1960's began quietly, without turmoil or fanfare. University campuses only made local headlines when a few students staged a "panty raid."

But in the mid-Sixties things began to change.

In 1964, the Berkeley campus of the University of California initiated a student Free Speech movement which quickly degenerated into a Filthy Speech movement and then into a Free Sex movement. Demands for student reform quickly spread to other campuses across the United States.

In 1968, the student revolution hit the campuses with a sudden, savage fury which caught the public by surprise. Student turmoil struck several eastern



U. S. colleges. A leftist student protest at Columbia turned into a bloody upheaval marked by clashes with police. Students rioted in France and almost toppled the De Gaulle government from power. Students demonstrated in Belgium, in Japan. Student and worker strikes flared up in Italy. "Rudy the Red" Dutschke upset the calm in West Germany.

The big year in the U. S. was 1969. Many student protests polarized around racial issues, especially the institution of "Black Studies" programs. San Francisco State College was embroiled in severe student and teacher strikes. Demonstrations flared at such prestigious universities as Duke, University of Chicago, Harvard, and Cornell.

Before the year was over, more than 230 American college campuses had been disrupted by demonstrations, protests, strikes or riots.

Projection for the 70's — more of the same, it seems. The poles of thought between students and "the establishment" are more divided than ever. Prospects for increased upsets in junior colleges, high schools and junior high schools are frightening.


Heyday for Criminals

During the decade, crime rates skyrocketed in all categories in most Western countries, especially in the U. S. The race riots, the political assassinations, the mass murders, the sniper killings of



Demonstrations, sit-ins, building take-overs, and clashes with police drastically changed the campus scene in the U. S. and around the world. Radical student minorities increasingly shook up major educational institutions with startling demands. The Berkeley campus, shown here, has become a symbol of dissent.

Ambassador College Photos



innocent passers-by, the terror on the streets — all were signs of a deeply disturbed society.

Americans were hit daily with a barrage of violence that made crime and the issue of law and order a top concern, even a political issue. Britons were shocked with outbursts of violent crimes in London and other big cities.

During the decade, landmark court decisions seemed to give the criminals all the breaks. There were examples of public apathy and lack of concern for others in distress. It was the decade when people said "I don't want to get involved."

It was the decade when airplane hijackings became as common as apple pie.

And the world was shocked, but soon forgot the terrors of political assassination.

The outlook on crime for the Seventies is a grim one. The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence issued a warning in late 1969, that within a few years America's major cities will be "fortresses" and "places of terror" unless the nation launches a full-scale war on its urban problems.

Racial Strife

The Sixties were a decade of turmoil for race relations worldwide, but the United States apparently suffered the most severe racial unrest.

"Sitdown" demonstrations by black Americans at lunch counters in the southern United States began in 1960.

1961 was the year of the "Freedom Riders." These bi-racial groups encountered much opposition in America's South. During 1962 and 1963, there were several well-publicized attempts on the part of Negro students to attend previously segregated universities in the South. Medgar Evers, NAACP leader, was murdered in Mississippi.

The Civil Rights movement picked

Fear in the streets and skyrocketing Crime became a major concern for millions. Robert F. Kennedy fell victim in one of the many political assassinations that marred the sixties.

THE 60's

up steam in 1963. Over 200,000 demonstrators marched on the White House in the nation's biggest demonstration to date for civil liberties.

In 1964, another element began to enter the racial situation — that of Negro violence and rioting in the ghettos of America's big cities. Racial violence swept ghetto sections of New York City, Rochester and Philadelphia.

In 1965 racial tensions in the United States exploded in the disastrous Watts riot in Los Angeles, California. The ugly scene was repeated nationwide in 1966 and 1967.

In April, 1968, a sniper's bullet felled Martin Luther King in Memphis, Tennessee. Angry outbursts erupted in 125 cities in 29 states and the District of Columbia. Property damage soared into the scores of millions of dollars.

In 1969 there was a quieting of racial tensions — at least on city streets. But the race issue moved indoors onto college and university campuses and was behind much of the turmoil in education.

Outlook for the 1970's: According to Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, undersecretary of the United Nations, racial problems promise very serious trouble for the future of not only the United States but of the entire world. "I am fearful about the future," he says, "... because race is a major if not dominant factor in international affairs."

Natural Disasters

Some of the worst calamities in history left their imprint on a puzzled humanity during the Sixties.

In February, 1960, two earthquakes struck Agadir, Morocco, setting off a tidal wave and fire which destroyed most of the city, killing from 10,000 to 12,000 people.

In June, 1960, an awesome series of temblors devastated a vast coastal area of Chile, killing 5,700, changing geography and spawning tidal waves which swept the Pacific, killing over 200 in Hawaii, Okinawa and Japan.

There were many other major quakes during the decade. Hundreds were killed and hundreds of thousands were made homeless by earthquakes around the world.

Hurricane patterns changed during the decade, spreading devastation over wide areas. Hurricanes caused billions of dollars of damage in the U. S. alone.

Unheard-of tornado activity also ripped the U. S. in areas rarely touched before. In April, 1965, 37 tornadoes on Palm Sunday smashed through Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana and Ohio killing 271, injuring 5,000. Major tornadoes also struck the Midwest in successive years from 1966 through 1969.

The Sixties saw numerous other natural disasters.

Several droughts afflicted various sections of the world. A five-year drought parched the northeastern U. S., causing water to be rationed in New York City.

Cyclones and tidal waves periodically smashed into the Far East, especially East Pakistan, killing 5,000 to over 10,000 at a time. Flash floods hit the Barcelona area in Spain (September, 1962), killing hundreds; and Italy, Hong Kong, and South America suffered from floods at various times.


In October, 1963, an avalanche of earth and rock caused the Vaiont Dam to burst, destroying Longarone, Italy, and nearby hamlets, killing an estimated 1,800.

Volcanoes still suddenly erupted, taking a deadly toll in lives: Agung volcano (March, 1963) on Bali killed an estimated 1,500; Mt. Taal in the Philippines (September, 1965) killed over 180.

When viewed in retrospect, nature was far from quiet in the Sixties. We can safely expect the same for the next decade. And in addition, experts on the environment are saying that global pollution, especially of the atmosphere, may have far-reaching, deleterious effects on world weather patterns.

Rebuilt Man?

In the world of medicine the greatest breakthrough was in the field of organ and tissue transplants — both human and artificial.



Wide World Photo

Use of the plastic artificial heart, was one of medicine's major achievements during the decade, along with heart transplants and other types of sophisticated surgery.

On December 3, 1967, Dr. Christiaan Barnard, in South Africa, made the world's first human heart transplant into the chest of Louis Washkansky. He lived 18 days and died. But a new era in medicine was born.

Around 150 or so heart transplants took place during the decade. Only a score or so patients are still alive, the vast majority failed to survive six months. The body's natural immunity rejection response continued to baffle doctors. The longest-surviving heart transplant recipient, Dr. Philip Blai-berg, died 19½ months after his operation.

During the decade some 250,000 people had plastic veins, heart valves and other plastic substitutes inserted into their bodies. Heart "pacemakers" containing built-in batteries, or with wires connected to batteries outside the body, became quite common.

With such achievements as human kidney transplants, cornea transplants and other forms of sophisticated surgery, it was hoped the Era of Rebuilt Man would soon become a reality. However, heart transplants opened up a whole new controversial field of moral, ethical, legal, medical and psychological problems still in debate.



Wide World Photo

PREPARE FOR THE SHOCKING SEVENTIES

During the decade of the Sixties, crises of global or national impact shook and ruffled our sense of well-being with sporadic but increased frequency: Vietnam, inflation, the Bomb, the population explosion, skyrocketing crime, the youth rebellion, big city squalor, mounting pollution, racial unrest, the depersonalization of society, the radical change in moral and sex attitudes, the assault on every institution — governmental, family, church and school.


By the end of the Sixties more people were disturbed, anxious and apprehensive than at any other time in history. But, for the most part, these crises often seemed distant, far off, unreal and unrelated to the lives of multiple hundreds of millions of people. It was still relatively easy to escape into the world of individual personal cares and pleasures, even to the point of denying there were major crises to be concerned with. Mil-

lions in the Sixties only mildly felt their lives affected by the rapidly changing times, the screaming newspaper headlines.

But the Seventies will be different!

The Seventies will be shocking! The stark reality of humanity's problems will burst forth into full bloom before the eyes of everyone — inescapable, unrelenting, undeniable! The Seventies will shock a largely complacent humanity with earth-shaking events that have only recently surged into our lives, and with many events we haven't yet imagined!

No longer will one crisis fall into insignificance as another catches our attention or hits the headlines. Major crises will become compounded upon major crises, refusing to die out! National and world events will increasingly affect all of us, personally, and alter our ways of life, our attitudes, our health and our future happiness!



Ambassador College Photo

Above, Hurricane Camille, with its near-200-m.p.h. winds in 1969, was only one of several devastating hurricanes that struck the U. S.

Left, major earthquakes continued to shatter widely scattered areas around the world.

Many problems will become so intense there will be attempts at crash programs to halt them. But the chances of solving them will remain slim unless there is a radical changing of human attitudes and values — a highly unlikely (but not impossible) prospect in a world of multi-billion-dollar-vested interests.

There will be increasing calls for "peace," but real peace will still elude humanity.

Despite the optimistic predictions, science, technology, governments and institutions will all fall short of solving humanity's problems because the basic cause — human nature — will remain undealt with and unchanged.

Mankind will be warned of his dangers — from many authoritative voices, but if the past is any indication of the future, they will go largely unheeded.

During the Seventies it could be decided whether mankind will survive or not! It will be shown whether or not humanity can face up to its mistakes and make the necessary sacrifices and changes required for survival! □

The *REAL* educational impact on children is not taking place in our classrooms. For two decades now, a more powerful influence has been subtly shaping the minds and values of an entire generation. What is that force? How is it affecting us? What should you be doing about it? This article reveals today's *REAL* school.

by Vern L. Farrow

Will the REAL SCHOOL please stand

HOW WOULD you measure *educational impact*? Would you judge it in terms of hours expended by the learner? Would you consider the effect on attitudes and behavior? Would you evaluate the influence on tastes in music, art, literature, styles, language, recreation, and even diet?

Most people would agree that all of these are important and valid indicators. Considered together, they should certainly measure the degree to which children are being impressed by and changed by any educational agent.

Then what if we apply these criteria to the various educational influences in the lives of children today — school, family, church, peer group, mass media, and community? Which of these would you guess to be the greatest educational force in our contemporary society?

The Wrong Answer

Now your first reaction is predictable. No doubt the answer that flashed into your mind was “the schools” — of course. But that's just *reflex* — a traditional *reflex*. That was the answer twenty years ago. That is the pat answer our society teaches, but times have changed. Unfortunately that answer is out of date and out of touch with the reality of the Seventies. It just isn't

true anymore and it's time we began to admit it.

Oh yes, we still go through the motions. We continue to gather tens of millions of children into classrooms daily all across the land just as we have for the past century and a half. We continue to teach a curriculum, which has never quite gotten in step with the times, by methods to match. But imperceptibly, almost without our awareness, our classrooms have lost their influence.

Another more powerful educational force has emerged in the past twenty years which has finally relegated the schools to a poor second place in the competition for children's minds. That force is *commercial television*. All pervasive — all persuasive — uncontrolled TV!

The focus of *real* education has shifted. In 95% of America's homes today, the influence of the “Little Red Schoolhouse” has been all but canceled out by a glowing TV tube in the corner of the living room!

Yes, by any measure, whether magnetic appeal, amount of exposure, or power to change behavior, commercial television now wields the major educational impact in the land!

Do you take exception to that? Does that sound like a sensational exaggeration? Well if you think this is over-

dramatizing the situation, then ponder these statistics.

More TV Than School

Incredible as it sounds, by the time the average American child reaches adolescence he will have viewed about 22,000 hours of television. That's equal to more than two and one-half years of 24-hour-a-day viewing! But, during those same formative years, he will have spent less than 11,000 hours in a school classroom. It's hard to believe, but it's true — twice as much time spent in tele-viewing as in schooling!

Now consider this. Nearly 12 million children between the ages of three and five years do not attend any form of school. Yet, according to the Nielsen Television Index, these preschoolers watch television an average of 54.1 hours each week. No school for these tots, but they are already spending nearly 64% of their waking time passively staring at the great electronic “schoolmarm”!

This means that by the time one of these preschool children finally enters *kindergarten* he has spent more time in front of a television set than an average student in a liberal arts program spends in the classroom throughout his entire four years of college attendance! Think of it! Infants being influenced by TV

up?

for the same duration of time it would take to graduate from college! Fantastic!

But that's not all. According to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, *all* surveys indicate that *children and adolescents* spend on an average anywhere from one fourth to one half of the waking day before a television screen. *Only sleeping time surpasses television as the top time-consumer.*

Did you really get the significance of that statement? Up to one half of their conscious lives irretrievably gone, without intellectual interaction — slump-shouldered, slack-jawed, and spellbound in living color!

Even if the content were entirely edifying, wouldn't that much exposure still be unbalanced?

And, that raises some crucial questions we need to ask. "Just what are children watching during these interminable hours?" "What is filling their minds?" In short, "What is the TV curriculum?"

Ugliness — Inanity — Noise and Violence

If any single facet of our national life has been thoroughly surveyed, polled, and researched in recent years, it has been the content of commercial tele-



vision programming. And, what has been reported over and over again leaves little ground for optimism.

Government agencies, educators, broadcasting associations, and journalists are consistently appalled by the exploitive misuse of this most powerful medium.

Listen to these shocking reports from reputable sources and bear in mind that this is the curriculum of children in 95% of America's homes — day in and day out. In the words of Dr. Victor B. Cline, a researcher at the University of Utah, here is what the first TV generation has been weaned on. He has estimated that, "...on the average, between kindergarten and 14 years of age, a child witnesses the violent destruction of 13,000 human beings on television."

Imagine absorbing that much mayhem by the eighth or ninth grade. Why, even the most hard-bitten combat soldier would never have begun to participate in such slaughter! And, consider this, Dr. Cline didn't include children younger than five years old, *yet we know they are watching*. If he had extended his figures by even three years the total would be more like 17,300 episodes of violent death viewed before early adolescence.

Then, from the television industry itself comes a report by the National Association for Better Broadcasting describing the TV curriculum as, "...a mass of indiscriminate entertainment dominated by some 40 animated series, which in turn are dominated by ugliness, noise, and violence."

Anyone who has watched Popeye, Batman, or Tom and Jerry can well sympathize with the Association's distress at the ear-shattering, overwhelming avalanche of punching, zapping, cutting asunder, burning, exploding, head-smashing, brain-jellying, utter annihilation which is portrayed in such "comic" programs.

Again, in another important survey, staff members of the *Christian Science Monitor* watched seventy-five hours of evening programs in the first week of the 1968-69 TV season. Their findings were appalling. During the period of viewing, they recorded 254 incidents of

violence — seventy-one murders, suicides, and killings of various kinds plus threats of like treatment. That's better than three such incidents every hour! At that rate our living rooms have become a grotesque killing ground where the screaming never dies out and the blood never dries.

Well, so it goes, report after report like a broken, blood-spattered record.

TV Curriculum

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. summed up the situation in his powerful commentary entitled *Violence: America in the Sixties*. "The children of the electronic age," he wrote, "sit hypnotized by the parade of killings, beatings, gunfights, knifings, maimings, and brawls which flash incessantly across the tiny screen..." (p. 54).

And this, my friends, *is* the TV curriculum — make no mistake about it. It is most interesting that Robert Lewis Shayon, TV and Radio editor for *Saturday Review* recently made a similar reference. In his words, "Violence, internal and external, is the young generation's hang-up... This is the way our world is; TV tells us so — *TV is the true curriculum of our society*" (January 11, 1969, p. 103, emphasis ours throughout).

Whether we like it or not, the TV script writers and Madison Avenue ad men have literally become the nation's de facto curriculum makers! And, it is quite clear that their curriculum no longer teaches A for apple, B for baby, and C for cat — not anymore! Today it's A for arson and assassination, B for bullying and brutality, and C for crudity and crassness!

Depending on the channel you choose, the "Three R's" have become russlin, rasslin, and rawhide; or rock, racket, and ribaldry — all of which adds up to rubbish!

And make no mistake, it's having a tremendous effect on young people in every way from their posture to their personal habits to their very outlook and purpose in life.

"But," you may be asking, "is it necessarily a bad effect?" "Don't *they* say watching TV is not harmful for children?" "In fact, don't *they* say that

watching violence *helps* children get it out of their system?" "And anyway, don't *they* say that only *criminal types* go out and do what they see on TV?" "And don't *they* say..."

Whoa! Hold it! Wait a minute! Who are *THEY*? And where did you hear what *THEY* said? Are you sure your sources are reliable? Let's take a hard look at *who* has been saying *what* and then maybe we can draw some conclusions about the TV curriculum.

Everyone Is An Expert!

If all the books, pamphlets, dissertations, articles, broadsides, and other miscellaneous documents written about television during the past twenty years were gathered together in one place, they would no doubt fill a large living room. They might not even leave space for the TV set. And, if you were to ask the authors of this mighty pile of literature, you would find that each one considers himself an unquestioned authority on the subject.

The situation is not unlike that in the field of education, where virtually every citizen thinks of himself as thoroughly competent to deliver expert opinion merely because he is a product of the system. You have probably heard (or made) the remark, "I can tell you *all* about our schools because I went to one once!" Well, much the same thing is true with television. Being an owner-viewer or maybe only a viewer of TV seems to qualify anyone's observations regarding the medium as authoritative.

Some of these "expert" observations are no doubt based upon sober reflection and research. However, far too many are sheer expressions of personal bias. Unfortunately, the latter type, lacking in scientific objectivity, most often appear in the popular press. And, these tend to form much of the existing mythology regarding TV. If you think about it, you will have to admit that most of what you believe about television was acquired in this way.

With this in mind, let's scotch the hearsay and challenge the so-called experts. Let's bury some of these misleading fairy tales right now and get things straight. Let's consider the three questions most often raised, because

they represent three basic myths of television.

Debunking the Myths

Myth # 1: That research proves the present viewing habits of children and adolescents are not harmful to their development.

Contributing to this myth are men of considerable stature. Indeed, widely recognized authorities have fostered this belief. A typical example is a statement by Dr. Wilber Schramm, one of the most highly regarded experts in the field. He is Professor of Communications and Journalism and Director of the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford University. Discussing TV research, he recently wrote in a booklet entitled *Children and Television*, "I can tell you, as a research scholar, that not one of these studies has been able to show much effect. The latest and largest, the British study of television and children, has just been completed; and the conclusion is that television, so far as results show, is, of itself, neither very good nor very bad in changing the development of children."

Myth # 1 Debunked: As is the case with other controversial issues such as the dangers of cigarettes, marijuana, or cholesterol, there are many who refuse to accept any cause-and-effect relationship between the endless hours of television viewing and the frightening deterioration in juvenile behavior. They grasp at any straw which appears to support their position. This is the case here.

The foregoing statement by Dr. Schramm is always quoted as if it vindicated television from any harmful influence. *Yet, he didn't say that.* What he did say was that studies showed TV to be "neither very good nor very bad" in its effect on children.

Now by any logic this can only mean that TV *is to some extent bad*. Just what *very bad* might mean is a moot question. But if it's only *slightly bad*, is that acceptable? Is that an endorsement? Is that grounds for claiming no harm? Certainly not!

Let's pose the identical situation in a different context. What if it were a medicine or food he was discussing, something you were allowing your child

to eat — then what would your reaction be? Would you give him medicine or a meal that was bad for him even if it was only *slightly* bad? Nonsense! And, don't think for a minute that what a youngster takes into his mind is less important than what goes into his bloodstream. No. Not by any stretch of the imagination. What enters his mind either builds or destroys character and that is really what is at issue here. We're concerned with the *educational impact* of TV.

But another very important question which must be considered in evaluating Dr. Schramm's statement is whether it is valid to judge the effects of American TV on the basis of British research findings? The answer has to be *no* for several reasons. First, television coverage is by no means as universal in Britain. Certainly nothing like 95% of British homes are equipped with TV. Therefore, they have not begun to reach the saturation that has occurred in the U. S.

Second, British television is largely state owned and controlled. There is no proliferation of channels, and consequently programming is not influenced by commercial competition which depends so heavily on the portrayal of violence for "crowd-catching," ratings, and profits.

Third, British TV is forbidden to show acts of brutality and violence of the kind that are commonplace on U. S. television. For this reason, children in Britain have not had comparable exposure to such a glut of mayhem.

And, fourth, British TV broadcasts only during limited hours and is therefore not available to children 24 hours a day as in the U. S. On this basis alone, the exposure is bound to be significantly less.

Obviously the research data are not comparable and should not have been thrown together. But such was the case, and many have been misled while the myth is perpetuated.

No, it would require some form of self-delusion or loss of contact with reality to refuse to recognize the harm which has accrued to this TV-saturated generation. As Walter Lippmann has written, "A continual exposure of a generation to the commercial ex-

ploitation of the enjoyment of violence and cruelty is one way to corrode the foundations of a civilized society" (in Schlesinger, *Violence: America in the Sixties*, p. 60). That corrosion has happened! Our first TV-educated generation is now manning the barricades on college campuses across the land!

But let the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence lay **Myth # 1** to rest once and for all. On September 23, 1969, that group, which was impelled by former President Johnson, issued its long-awaited and exhaustive report. Remember now, the sources of information upon which the Commission based its conclusions were all available research studies and expert testimony presented by both sides in the controversy. Here is what the report said in part. "The preponderance of available research evidence strongly suggests... that violence in television programs *can and does* have adverse effects upon audiences — *particularly child audiences*.

"Television," the Commission continued, "enters powerfully into the learning process of children and teaches them a set of moral and social values about violence which are inconsistent with the standards of a civilized society..." That's pretty straightforward and what it clearly means is that present programming policies and viewing habits *are harmful* — that serious moral and social damage is being done *NOW* — and that we probably should have changed those practices *YESTERDAY*!

Myth # 2: That by viewing violent and aggressive behavior on television, a child's own aggressive tendencies and impulses are "drained off" or satisfied vicariously with the result that he then is less likely to "act out" his belligerent feelings in real life.

Haven't you heard that claim made over and over again? Well, this myth is based upon an application of the Freudian psychoanalytic theory of "catharsis." The underlying belief is that unless aggression is gotten out of one's system by some means, it will supposedly be stored up only to come out later in intolerant attitudes, hatreds, prejudices, and hostile behaviors. Furthermore, it is claimed, failure to release

feelings of hostility in childhood can cause neurotic difficulties in later life.

It can readily be seen why defenders of violence in TV programming resort to this argument, for if it is true, or as long as people believe it's true, then murder is medicine and trauma is therapy!

This belief is so ingrained in educational and psychological thinking as to have virtually become a modern-day superstition. Child psychology books are full of it and again, important authorities subscribe to it, thus keeping the myth alive.

Here are just two examples of high-powered experts endorsing the "catharsis" position. Dr. D. McLean, superintendent of Parramatta Psychiatric Hospital, NSW, Australia, told an audience at Sydney University recently that violent television programs could be a positive help in lowering man's natural aggressive potential. He stated that, "This type of programme does fulfill [satisfy] some of man's aggressive instincts" (*The Australian*, July 1, 1968).

Another Briton, Lord Hill, the outspoken chairman of BBC, while addressing 500 educators at a conference of the Association of Assistant Masters in Southampton, England, flatly stated that, "Television violence may reduce real life violence" (*Daily Express*, January 2, 1969).

Myth # 2 Debunked: To cling to the "catharsis" argument in 1970 is almost pathetically archaic in view of the volume of solid research evidence available to disprove it. Since 1962 at least four comprehensive and independent studies have clearly demonstrated that long exposure to television aggression generates a corresponding impulse in a child — yes, even a *normal* child.

Perhaps the most interesting if not most conclusive study was done by Alfred Bandura and associates. Briefly, what they did was to expose one group of children to real-life episodes of physical aggression (striking, punching, kicking, etc.); another group to the same aggressive episodes in motion pictures; and a third group to aggression shown in movie cartoons.

Following the exposure the children

were observed in a situation where they were free to behave aggressively and what do you think happened? You guessed it! They copied the belligerent behavior they had observed with great relish, vigor, and enthusiasm *without any coaching*. Common sense is again confirmed!

Just to summarize the findings for you, here are the points to remember in the words of the researchers: "The results of the . . . study provide strong evidence that exposure to filmed aggression heightens aggressive reactions in children . . . the available data suggest that, of the three experimental conditions, *exposure to humans on film* (or TV) *portraying aggression was the most influential* in eliciting and shaping aggressive behavior." And finally, "The view that the social learning of aggression through exposure to aggressive film content is confined to deviant children finds little support in our data." In other words, these were *normal children* who were stimulated to violent behavior (*Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 66, 1963, pp. 3-11).

Yes, children *do* imitate the aggressive acts and they *do* try out techniques they see in TV programs about thugs, burglars, rioters, and even hero figures who settle every disagreement with violence.

Let's stop flying in the face of reason and lay this "catharsis" myth to rest, never to be mentioned again. The argument that violence on viewed television produces a beneficial effect must be totally discounted as scientifically unsound.

Myth # 3: That criminal behavior which seems to be triggered by viewing television violence only occurs in persons who are psychologically "*predisposed*" to commit such acts in the first place.

Support for this myth comes mainly from "expert" opinion. But, the argument that there is no research proving an indisputable cause and effect connection between criminal behavior and televising is often thrown in for good measure.

Understandably, this theory enjoys great favor with TV producers and writers because it whitewashes them of any responsibility. They would have you

believe that if anything evil is done as a consequence of viewing their programs, the person committing the act wanted to do it anyway — he was *predisposed* to do the foul deed regardless. Therefore, at most, the program only acted as a trigger-mechanism for an already distorted mind.

Myth # 3 Debunked: Now this raises a troublesome dilemma for the supporters of this myth, namely, *How is such a predisposition acquired?* We can't account for it as an inborn or inherited trait — no respectable psychologist would agree to that. Today we are *environmentalists*. We explain all behavior in terms of the past personal and social experiences of an individual's life. Remember, the byword is, "Nobody is born bad — society made him what he is!" That being the case, then any *predisposition* to violence must be accounted for by an individual's own experiences with violence.

Carrying the logic a step further we ask, "What is the greatest source of exposure to violence for infants, children and youth today?" Answer: TELEVISION!

The inescapable conclusion has to be that *television itself* is the heaviest contributor to *antisocial predispositions* in our society today! Violence in television programming conditions the mind, teaches the techniques, and then precipitates the action. To summarize simply, "Violence breeds violence."

No, it is not the deviates alone, as we saw in Bandura's study, who are stimulated to brutal behavior by TV, but normal children as well.

In his book, *Television and the American Character — A Psychiatrist Looks at Television*, Dr. Eugene David Glynn offered this sobering speculation regarding the long-run effect of unrestricted televising. "Those traits," he said, "that *sick* adults now satisfy by television can be presumed to be those traits which children exposed to television . . . all through the character-forming years may be expected to develop." There is the predisposition that television is teaching — a predisposition to *mental illness*. Is it happening in your home?

Far from blaming others, TV produc-

ers and writers who have pandered to violence are themselves largely responsible for the brutalization of the first TV generation.

And so, the "*predisposition*" myth bites the dust along with the "*catharsis*" idiocy and the "*no harm*" nonsense.

These three phoney, pseudo-scientific-sounding arguments have lulled the public into complacency too long. They are utterly untrue and completely discredited. They should no longer clutter our minds or deter our determination to take charge of our children's education by controlling *the television curriculum*.

You're the School Board

In a "Walter Mitty" sort of way, nearly every parent has subconsciously wanted to run the schools. We've all dreamed about what we would do if we were on the school board. We would straighten this out and change that and things would be a whole lot different in short order. But, few of us ever get the chance.

Well, *now* is your chance! You're the PRESIDENT of the school board! Yes, you're not only president of the school board, but you're also the principal of that one-room school in your own living room!

You can decide on school hours. *You* can select the curriculum. *You* can lay down the rules for classroom behavior. *You* can monitor the electronic "schoolmarm" and evaluate her teaching any time. In short, *you* can decide how *your* school will be run. But remember, as president of the board and principal, you are also responsible to enforce all these decisions. YOU MUST TAKE CHARGE of the TV curriculum!

Here's How

First, understand the *absolute fact* that early childhood experiences make indelible impressions. They lay the foundation for character and personality development. This is a very old truth. As far back as the 5th century B.C. we have Plato's observation that, "...the young are not able to distinguish what is and what is not allegory, but whatever opinions are taken into the mind at that age [two to seven] are wont to prove

indelible and unalterable" (*The Republic*, Book II).

Then Aristotle came along at about the same time and left us some advice about what to do. He said, "On this account, we ought to make all base things unfamiliar to the young, and especially those that involve either depravity or malignity." His dogmatic recommendation was to "...banish indecent talk... for light talk about anything disgraceful soon passes into action... banish the seeing of either pictures or representations that are indecent..." (*Politics*, Book VII).

Well, that's pretty up-to-date talk for the "ancients." And the interesting thing is that nothing has changed in the past 2500 years. Modern behavioral research agrees. Character development is still determined the same way in 1970.

The lesson here is to eliminate violence, lawlessness, indecency, and pornography in all forms from your child's TV curriculum. And it's simple. It only takes the *moral determination* to twist a dial or flick a switch.

Second, young children want to respect the school principal and they will imitate his example. But *you're* the principal now, remember? That means your personal TV viewing habits must be discriminating and selective. It's a "monkey see, monkey do" situation and you are being watched. Don't expect what you are unwilling to do yourself.

Third, effective learning requires interaction between teacher and pupil; and here is one great weakness of the TV curriculum. There will be no interaction in your school unless you make an effort to supply it yourself. The electronic "schoolmarm" talks, *but she never listens!* You will need to make yourself available as much as possible to interpret, explain, clarify, correct wrong ideas, criticize certain content, relate new facts to past experiences, etc. Only in this way can you effectively control what is being learned.

Fourth, every school takes recesses and yours should too. As a matter of fact, the recesses in your school should be considerably longer than the class sessions. A single program at a time is probably a good general rule and then a recess to engage in some other activity.

Your school should be teaching balance in all things — so encourage a wide variety of physical and intellectual interests. And remember, the principal is first of all a *leader*. That means you must get involved in other activities yourself.

Fifth, establish and enforce some school policies regarding behavior in your classroom. Here are some to start with: (1) Good posture is important to good health, so there should be appropriate furniture handy and no sprawling or hunch-backed, slack-jawed, semi-conscious viewing permitted. (2) A program which has been selected as worthy of watching should receive undivided attention for the duration. (3) Horseplay or other behavior which interferes with the enjoyment of others is out and should carry a penalty. (4) The dining room is for eating and except for an occasional snack there should be no eating in the classroom. The sessions should be short enough so no one is likely to starve anyway. (5) And, of course, school hours must be strictly observed.

Sixth, the TV curriculum should only be a small part of a youngster's education. Each should also be learning lessons through chores, responsibilities, and other obligations. When required, these must take priority over televieing without any quibbling.

And finally, all schools take vacations for rest and a change of pace. Why not try closing your one-room school for vacation a day or two once in a while. Just unplug the set and ignore it. You may discover you were in a rut. You may also rediscover the joys of family conversation and companionship which the TV curriculum *cannot* provide.

Accentuate the Positive

Yes, the *real* school, the *real* curriculum, the *real* educational force today is commercial television. And, unfortunately, it is teaching mostly rubbish!

But remember, nobody is requiring COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE in *this* school. You still have freedom of choice. You can still take it or leave it, so it's up to you. Be selective and accentuate the *positive* in TV programming. The mind you save may be your own — or your child's. □

In the dim past of antiquity, giant dinosaurs roamed the earth. Suddenly — the dinosaur's strange world came to a cataclysmic end. This mystery of the "great dying" has been a century-long puzzle to the best minds in paleontology. Its true meaning gives us a much-needed understanding of this earth's history.

by Paul Kroll

IT WAS a bright and beautiful era in that distant past — seventy million years ago, say paleontologists. Strange creatures were roaming this earth. Dinosaurs dominated the land. Pterosaurs (flying reptiles) flitted through the skies. The oceans were alive with giant marine reptiles called ichthyosaurs and mosasaurs.

The landscape of the earth was totally different then. "We might," as one author put it, "well imagine ourselves upon another planet."

None of the mammals with which we are ordinarily familiar existed. There were no dogs, no horses, no cattle, no cats, no man walked upon the earth to view this strange creation.

Few of the common insects with which we are familiar, such as butterflies and bees, are known to have existed.

Two Different Worlds

Plant life in this Age of Reptiles would seem strange to us. Cycads, ferns, fern-like plants, dominated the landscape. The flowering plants and common trees simply were not in existence. There were no oak trees, no maples, no tomato vines, no orange trees, no marigolds, no sweet peas.

It was a world without the variety of mammals we see today, few if any fish with true scales, no array of feathered fowl, no grains, no fruits, no vegetables for man.

Then a series of strange and terrible disasters wrought havoc on this earth.

The flying reptiles were completely exterminated. The great dinosaurs van-

The day the DINOSAURS

ished completely, leaving only a few small scattered dinosaur-like creatures for man's world today. The great reptiles of the sea became a thing of the past. The strange plant life of that time long ago was also destroyed. It was replaced in great measure by the modern plants of today — plants upon which man and mammal alike depend for their survival.

With an alarming abruptness, that entire world perished. *The dinosaurs were exterminated!* We do have reptiles with us today, but they "occupy a humble, almost insignificant position," as one author put it. Almost without exception they are crawling, sprawling creatures.

Today's snakes, lizards, turtles or crocodiles are hardly chips off the old block.

But why did the dinosaurs perish — and HOW? Geologists admit they don't know! It is a mystery they have not solved, even after one hundred years of sleuthing.

Yet, the fact that these ruling reptiles perished violently and in astronomical numbers is clear. That they left no descendants is also irrefutable.

The Ultimate Disaster

Dinosaur expert Dr. Edwin Colbert admits, "There can be no doubt about it. All of the dinosaurs, along with various other . . . reptiles, became extinct.

"...NOT ONE OF THEM SURVIVED, as is amply proved by the fact that during almost a century and a half of paleontological exploration, the wide world over, no trace of a dinosaur bone or tooth has ever been found in any

post-Cretaceous rocks, not even in the earliest of them.

"The proof of the geologic record on this score is IRREFUTABLE" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin H. Colbert, p. 249).

This series of extinctions is one of the most confusing puzzles in the history of paleontology. The greatest scientists scratch their heads in amazement at what occurred.

None claims to have the full answer.

For example, Carl O. Dunbar, in his well-known textbook, *Historical Geology*, is simply awed by this wholesale extinction of life.

A Time of Crisis

"It is difficult to account for the SIMULTANEOUS EXTINCTION of great tribes of animals so diverse in relationships and in habitats of life" (*Historical Geology*, Carl Dunbar, pp. 345, 348).

The expert Edwin H. Colbert speaks frankly of this problem:

"The great extinction that wiped out ALL of the dinosaurs, large and small, in all parts of the world, and at the same time brought to an end various other lines of reptilian evolution, was one of the OUTSTANDING EVENTS in the history of life and in the history of the earth . . . it was an event that has DEFIED ALL ATTEMPTS at a satisfactory explanation" (*The Age of Reptiles*, p. 191).

Suddenly — New Forms of Life

This sudden extinction of reptilian life was certainly a mysterious event. But equally puzzling to scientists was the sudden appearance of entirely new

DIED

forms of life, totally unrelated to the reptiles.

It is this utter and complete change that confuses paleontologists who seek to find an evolutionary answer for the existence of all life.

Musing about this problem, geologist Carl Dunbar quotes George Gaylord Simpson, one of the most respected men in paleontology:

"It is as if the *curtain were rung down SUDDENLY* on a stage where all the leading roles were taken by reptiles, especially dinosaurs, in great numbers and bewildering variety, and *rose again IMMEDIATELY* to reveal the same setting but an ENTIRELY NEW CAST in which the dinosaurs do not appear at all, other reptiles are mere supernumeraries [unimportant, bit-part actors] and the leading parts are all played by MAMMALS'" (*Historical Geology*, Carl O. Dunbar, p. 426).

Evolution in Crisis

Why is this sudden change in the character of life so devastating to the evolutionary concept?

Because evolution demands *slow* change over *long* periods of time. But here the fossil record shows *QUICK* change in an obviously *SHORT* period of time.

Evolution demands *numerous intermediate* living things which can be hooked together in an attempt to show an evolutionary sequence. However, the fossil record reveals a *PROFOUND CHANGE* from reptilian hosts to mammals — and *WITHOUT* any proven intermediaries.


Scientists are thus faced with two unanswered puzzles: How were the dinosaurs destroyed, and what killed them off so quickly? And second, what is the meaning of this abrupt change in the type of life on this earth?

The Reasons Given


Not one of the theories propounded for dinosaur extinction is accepted by all paleontologists. Paleontologist Edwin Colbert's decisive verdict on the ultimate cause of the dinosaur disaster is that, "This is one of the big questions of paleontology for which as yet *NO SATISFACTORY ANSWER* has been set forward" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin H. Colbert, pp. 250-251).

Briefly, let's examine a few of the theories. What about climatic change?

Perhaps it got too cold for the dinosaurs. According to evolutionary time scales, it would take many millions of



Courtesy American Museum of Natural History



MEAT-EATING DINOSAUR — Photo shows the dinosaur, *Allosaurus fragilis*, mounted as if feeding upon a brontosaurus skeleton. This allosaurus skeleton from the Morrison beds of Colorado is about thirty feet long.

Courtesy American Museum of Natural History

brought about the disappearance of ALL dinosaurs" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin H. Colbert, pp. 255, 256).

Poorly Constructed — or Something?

Could it be that dinosaurs were badly constructed? No! Dinosaurs were WELL CONSTRUCTED! And can we, in all honesty, postulate that ALL the varied dinosaurs and other forms of life in the land, in the seas, and in the air were ALL "badly constructed"?

Another quaint theory has certain so-called, primitive "mammals" having a yen for dinosaur eggs — eating the huge reptiles literally off the face of the earth.

Impossible!

The living Nile monitor, for example, avidly hunts and devours eggs of the Nile crocodile. But it has not succeeded in exterminating its larger relative.

But more important, the fossil record shows that true mammals of the type and variety of today did NOT ARISE until *after* the dinosaurs were extinct. This explanation, as the others, simply doesn't hold water.

The idea of "racial senescence" is an old theory — and that is all it is, a theory! Few competent paleontologists would accept the idea that dinosaurs just grew old and tired as a race or species!

Remember, extremely varied reptilian forms living worldwide, ALL DIED at

once. Even if the senility idea were plausible, would all the varied forms of life which became extinct — *all* reach this so called senility state TOGETHER?

So much for one half of the ideas.

What About Catastrophes?

The other half of the categories usually cited involve some form of "local" CATASTROPHE. However, to do the job of extinguishing the reptilian hordes, these catastrophes would have to be *worldwide* in extent.

Why?

Because we find dinosaur graveyards in all parts of the world. But such catastrophes would need to account for MORE than just the dinosaurs' mysterious obliteration.

The great crisis in the history of life at that time also destroyed the great MARINE reptiles — the ichthyosaurs, plesiosaurs, and the mosasaurs. These ALL DIED simultaneously with the dinosaurs — even though they lived in the seas.

Other types of life in the sea, and in the air as well, also totally perished. The great winged dragons, the pterosaurs, had the amazing wingspread of 23 to 25 feet. The final remains of these flying reptiles are found along with the dinosaurs. Their fate was the same.

But scientists are unwilling to accept sudden catastrophes if they are *worldwide* in extent.

"An obvious and all too easy explanation is the *catastrophic one*. Did some great event take place that wiped out these reptiles?" Colbert asks.

His answer?

"There is NO PLACE for *worldwide catastrophes* in the world of the past or of the present IF the principle of *uniformitarianism* [the idea that existing processes acting in the same manner as at present are sufficient to account for all geological changes] has any validity" (*The Age of Reptiles*, Edwin Colbert, pp. 203, 204).

Universal Catastrophes Rejected

And that's just the problem! Scattered local catastrophes are accepted. But worldwide catastrophe is denied consideration. The theory that all geological processes have continued at basically the same rate as we see them oc-

years for the earth's climate to change. Surely, if evolution were a fact, these reptiles could adapt themselves to it.

Perhaps it got too hot for the dinosaurs?

"It is an ingenious idea, but there is no geological evidence to support the concept of temperature increases at the close of the Cretaceous period" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin H. Colbert, p. 254).

What about food problems?

The fossil record shows that the plants eaten by the dinosaurs were still very much available to them at the time of the Great Extinction. Perhaps some could have been extinguished IF the food supply in a certain area or of a certain kind were not available. But this idea cannot account for the extinction of ALL dinosaurs EVERYWHERE.

Perhaps great disease epidemics swept the earth at that time? This solution is also rejected by most scientists — and for good reasons. Most epidemics are *very specific*, attacking only one species of animal or are relatively limited in their effects, killing off only a portion of that species.

One paleontologist candidly confesses that "it is stretching credulity far beyond the bounds of reason to suppose that a series of epidemics could have

THE EVIDENCE OF CATASTROPHE — Inside the Dinosaur Quarry Visitor Center in Dinosaur National Monument, Utah. The quarry face — loaded with dinosaur bones — actually forms the north wall of the building. Over 300 dinosaur skeletons were removed from 1909 to 1924. This location is merely one of many — all showing definite signs of quick burial under catastrophic conditions.

Ambassador College Photo

curing today is a vital pillar in the structure of modern geology.

But, have all geologic processes continued at the same rate? Is this concept true? WHY have worldwide catastrophes been rejected by scientists? WHY should the "obvious and all too easy explanation" of a universal catastrophe have NO PLACE in modern science?

The plain and obvious answer is that evolution needs time — VAST amounts of time — to make its theory seem tenable.


Scientists realize that a major catastrophe could do in a few days or weeks what natural processes might require many thousands or even millions of years to accomplish. A catastrophe enormously speeds up and goes far beyond the pace of the natural processes of erosion and burial. That is why any catastrophic approach is shunned and avoided by scientists who have assumed that all life is due to a slow evolutionary process.

"We may assume," Nicholas Hotton, a paleontologist tells us, "that it [the extinction] resulted from reasonably well-understood processes of climatic change and biological competition... we are fairly sure that it was gradual, NOT CATASTROPHIC" (*Dinosaurs*, Nicholas Hotton III, p. 174).

Yet paleontologists acknowledge that other means could not destroy these creatures. They admit that climatic change, epidemics, change of food supply and other such ideas cannot possibly account for the worldwide extinction of land, air, and sea life at the close of the Age of Reptiles.

If a catastrophe is to be involved to explain the extinction of the dinosaurs — it would have to be a WORLDWIDE occurrence!

European paleontologist Björn Kurtén admits this precise point:



"The catastrophe would have had to be almost UNIVERSAL IN PROPORTIONS as we know that dinosaurs were present in most or all continents" (*The Age of Dinosaurs*, Björn Kurtén, p. 236).

Worldwide catastrophe seems to be the only logical path to pursue in looking for an explanation for this mysterious extinction.

Yet, the typical paleontologist simply does not want to face this possibility.

Catastrophes — Logical Explanations

"It seems logical," admits Colbert, "to look for some great change that took place... thereby bringing to an end the multitudes of dinosaurs and other reptiles that then populated the earth.

"This is not to imply that there was of necessity a great WORLDWIDE CATASTROPHE, which by the violence of its expression suddenly wiped out the dinosaurs. Catastrophes are the mainstays of people who have very little knowledge of the natural world, for them the invocation of a catastrophe is an easy way to explain great events" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 253).

Yet, if a worldwide catastrophe explains what happened, why NOT postulate — and prove it? What is wrong with an easy or simple explanation? After all, paleontologists have been

struggling for an answer to this "great dying" for many decades.

Keep Admissions in Mind

"So far no logical way has been found to connect the known cause of the extinction of individual species with these worldwide Great Deaths. Some other cause, operating on a WORLDWIDE basis, would seem to be called for" (*The Day of the Dinosaur*, L. Sprague de Camp and Catherine Crook de Camp, pp. 200, 201).

How can we solve this puzzle of dinosaur extinction? First, we must look for a worldwide cause. Second, that cause must be so catastrophic that no dinosaur any place on earth could survive. The evidence in this mystery is the fossil record.

Dinosaur Hunting in New Mexico

Let's take a few examples of where dinosaur bones have been found and see how catastrophic their burial really was.

In 1947, an expedition from the American Museum of Natural History discovered an amazing concentration of *Coelophysis* dinosaur bones in northwestern New Mexico.

The explorers began to probe a certain section of land with scratchers and awls, the usual method of preliminary investigation of a possible bone site. It

became quickly apparent that the investigators had run upon a most amazing find.

The workers cut a large scallop into the hillside. "As the layer was exposed it revealed a most REMARKABLE DINOSAURIAN GRAVEYARD in which there were literally scores of skeletons one on top of another and INTERLACED WITH one another. It would appear that some local catastrophe had overtaken these dinosaurs, so that they all died together and were buried together" (*Men and Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 141).

In what condition were they found?

"They were found in the GREATEST PROFUSION, piled on top of one another, with heads and tails and feet and legs often inextricably mixed in a jackstraw puzzle of bones."

Overwhelmed by Catastrophe

Some of the skeletons were *absolutely complete*. Even the tiniest bones survived. These finds are rated as among the most perfect dinosaur skeletons ever discovered.

"They represent a range of ages, from very small animals to those obviously fully adult. All of this rich material, coming from a single quarry that was perhaps thirty feet square, certainly indicates the remains of animals belonging to a single species that may have been *OVERWHELMED BY SOME LOCAL CATASTROPHE AND BURIED TOGETHER*" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 61).

The fact that these fossils were perfectly preserved shows they had to be buried IMMEDIATELY — before predators and weathering destroyed the skeletons.

The composition of the fossils shows a complete range of a single species, as one might find a herd of some wild animal. It is obvious that a CATASTROPHE buried those animals.

Just a "Local" Catastrophe?

But, was it only a "local catastrophe"? This might be a logical deduction if such graveyards were found nowhere else. However, the reverse is true. No matter where we look, almost invariably we see indication of violent burial for dinosaurs.

In fact, whenever we see fossils of

anything from marine invertebrates to mammals — this sudden, and violent type of burial is clearly evident.

The dinosaurs are merely an outstanding case of this.

For example, there is a rich bed of fossil dinosaurs in Alberta, Canada. Here is one of the most RICHLY fossiliferous regions in the world for dinosaur bones.

How are these bones found?

"Innumerable bones and many fine skeletons of dinosaurs and other associated reptiles have been quarried from these badlands, particularly in the fifteen-mile stretch of the river to the east of Steveville, a stretch that is a veritable DINOSAURIAN GRAVEYARD" (*The Age of Reptiles*, Edwin Colbert, p. 169).

Dinosaur Graveyards

Another example comes from a 1934 discovery.

Barnum Brown, famous dinosaur discoverer, was collecting bones in Montana. He heard of large bones on the ranch owned by a man named Barker Howe, who lived at the foot of the Big-horn Mountains in Wyoming.

Edwin Colbert tells us in what condition Brown found the bones as he began to work the area of the Howe Ranch.

"The concentration of the fossils was remarkable; they were piled in LIKE LOGS IN A JAM" (*Men and Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 173).

If this were an isolated case, it might perhaps be explained as a fluke of nature or a "local" catastrophe. But this example is just one of many.

Such destruction, such mixing up, such concentration could only come by catastrophe!

A Profusion of Skeletons

In another case, somewhat earlier, bone diggers were making exploratory excursions into the Medicine Bow anticline, a ridge that contains what are called Morrison sediments — somewhat north of Como Bluff, Wyoming. The Morrison formation is known as a tremendous source of dinosaur fossils throughout Western North America.

In the general area north of Como Bluff, on June 12, 1898, the famous

Bone Cabin quarry was located. It was named after an old shepherd who had built a cabin out of dinosaur bones he found in the area.

Here is what the bone diggers found.

"At this spot the fossil hunters found a hillside literally covered with large fragments of dinosaur bones that had weathered out of the sediments composing the ridge... the party went to work, digging down into the surface of the hill, and as they dug, more and more bones came to light. In short, it was a veritable MINE OF DINOSAUR BONES" (*Men and Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 151).

Another author gives us more details into what was actually discovered.

"In the Bone-Cabin Quarry... we came across a veritable Noah's-ark deposit, a perfect museum of all the animals of the period.

"Here are the largest of the giant dinosaurs *closely mingled* with the remains of the smaller but powerful carnivorous dinosaurs which preyed upon them, also those of the slow and heavy moving armored dinosaurs of the period, as well as of the lightest and most bird-like of the dinosaurs.

"Finely rounded, complete limbs from eight to ten feet in length are found, especially those of the carnivorous dinosaurs, *perfect even to the sharply pointed and recurved tips of their toes*" (*Dinosaurs*, W. D. Matthew, pp. 136, 138).

Again, immediate burial was necessary for such perfect preservation. It is as if a complete biota — an entire range of animals — were buried together by water-borne mud.

Digging Dinosaurs in Africa

One of the most important paleontological expeditions was the 1909-1914 one to what was then German East Africa, now Tanzania.

"The site contained an ENORMOUS NUMBER of fossils — far more than could be carried off by one expedition. As in most of such sites, the greater part of the remains were fragmentary... there was much speculation as to how the remains of so many dinosaurs came to be CONCENTRATED in beds otherwise *rather poor* in fossil remains. Some Ger-

man scientists suggested that the animals had been overwhelmed by a *natural catastrophe*" (*The Day of the Dinosaur*, L. Sprague de Camp and Catherine Crook de Camp, p. 250).

Why, of course!

That is the obvious explanation. Here is another example of VIOLENT burial. When you find fossils the world over — in Africa, in North America, in Europe — all looking as though they had been "overwhelmed by a catastrophe," that is the logical conclusion.

There was a WORLDWIDE CATASTROPHE that buried these dragons of the ancient past and preserved them as a record of what occurred in those distant times. Sudden death and immediate burial was the fate of that ancient world.

Dinosaurs in Belgium

Back in 1878 a remarkable concentration of *Iguanodon* (I-gwan-o-don) skeletons were discovered one thousand feet below the ground in a Belgian coal mine.

Coal miners in the coal town of Bernissart were developing a new gallery at the 1,046-foot depth. Suddenly the miners hit upon large fossil bones.

A second tunnel was driven parallel to the first at 1,157 feet. Again, bones were struck.

"Thus it could be seen that the FOSIL BONEYARD was evidently one of *gigantic proportions*, especially notable because of its vertical extension through more than a hundred feet of rock" (*Men and Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 58).

The bones were not contained within the regular beds of the coal seams — but were deposited in UNstratified clays that cut *through* the layered coal. It appeared that a deep pit or fissure had extended through the coal-bearing layers.

How is the profusion of bones explained?

"Careful work . . . would SEEM to indicate that within the coal mine of Bernissart there was preserved an ancient ravine — a narrow, deep gully . . . into which, within a comparatively short span of years, many iguanodons had slipped and fallen and died, to be buried in deep deposits of mud brought in by *flooding waters* after a HEAVY

RAIN" (*Men and Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, p. 58).

This, of course, is often the explanation. But even then after "careful work" it only *seemed* like a *possible* indication that these iguanodons had slipped and fallen.

But here we have heavy rains mentioned, flooding waters, deposits of mud. Is it not more logical to have a sudden inundation bury these hapless dinosaurs? Do we not here have another positive proof of some catastrophe obliterating the dinosaurs?

Digging for Eggs


In 1922, a convoy of automobiles was making its way across the desert plains

pedition made an electrifying discovery of more than seventy unhatched dinosaur eggs! Also, thousands of fragments of eggshells were discovered. This in addition to skeletons that represent all stages of growth from newly hatched baby dinosaurs to full grown adults. Since then, Russian and Chinese workers have found more of the eight-inch-long eggs.

So remarkable was this series of dinosaur eggs, that a few of them even show traces of EMBRYONIC BONE! Most, however, were completely filled with sand.

The Puzzle of Fossil Eggs

Dinosaur eggs have also been discovered in Mongolia, France, Montana,



ANCIENT EGGS — These eggs of the dinosaur, *Protoceratops*, were discovered in Outer Mongolia. Paleontologists puzzle about how they were preserved.

Courtesy American Museum of Natural History

and Brazil. In Portugal an egg was discovered in rocks classified by geologists as Jurassic along with bones of dinosaurs. Others have been unearthed in East Africa.

But how, you might ask, could FULLY PRESERVED dinosaur eggs be discovered the world over? If you are puzzled by this, so are the paleontologists.

"Some of the dinosaur eggs never hatched. What prevented their development as they lay buried in their sandy crypts is a PUZZLE, all we know is that

of Outer Mongolia. They stopped at the sudden sight of spectacular cliffs that shot up from the desert floor.

The cars were filled with scientists sent by the American Museum of Natural History. Part of the Central Asiatic Expeditions, these men were engaged in a large natural history survey of the Gobi Desert.

This 1922 American Museum Ex-

no little dinosaurs came out of the eggs... in a few of the Mongolian eggs... are traces of *fossilized embryonic* bone, and indication that development had at least gone on for some time before the hatching of the eggs was INTERRUPTED" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, pp. 216, 217).

What "interrupted" the hatching? The answer is very revealing and explains *how* the dinosaurs were killed.

Conditions of Burial

Briefly, let's notice the conditions under which the dinosaur eggs of Mongolia were preserved. One of the actual discoverers wrote this interesting account.

"Our real thrill came on the second day, when George Olsen reported... that he was sure he had found fossil eggs...."

"These eggs were in a GREAT DEPOSIT FULL OF DINOSAUR SKELETONS and containing, so far as we could discover, no remains of other animals or of birds... the deposit was unbelievably rich. Seventy-five skulls and skeletons were discovered, SOME OF THEM ABSOLUTELY PERFECT. Obviously the Flaming Cliffs were a region of *great concentration* of dinosaurs during the breeding season" (*On the Trail of Ancient Man*, Roy Chapman Andrews, pp. 228-231).

How does one explain all this — on the basis of slow evolutionary burial over thousands of years?

One must account for several factors. First, there was a *great profusion* of dinosaur bones here — as though another one of those "local" catastrophes overwhelmed them. The specimens were in a very fine state of preservation. The words "absolutely perfect" were used of some of the bones. The burial must have been *fairly rapid*.

Then there is the problem of dinosaur eggs. What stopped the embryo from developing? A small sandstorm wouldn't. The large dinosaurs would not have been trapped in such a storm. Yet, a catastrophic burial and accompanying temperature change *WOULD HALT* the development of the embryo.

The only answer is obvious.

Remember, the author told us there

was a "*great concentration* of dinosaurs." Catastrophes of various dimensions overwhelmed, killed and buried the dinosaurs and the eggs. The embryos ceased to develop, most of the eggs were smashed — but a few being already buried in sand, survived. They survived as a witness that a catastrophe indeed did occur in the region of Mongolia as part of a worldwide pattern of violence and destruction.

The Remarkable Dinosaur Footprints

Another intriguing type of dinosaur fossil — if we can call it that — is the footprint.

Such tracks are worldwide in extent. They are found in western North America and in New England. In the latter, the tracks have been commercially quarried and sold to tourists.

Dinosaur tracks are also found in South America, especially Argentina. England also has them. And so has Basutoland, down in the southern part of Africa. In this out-of-the-way place, dinosaur tracks are quite abundant.

The dinosaur hunters have also found tracks in such diverse places as Morocco, Portugal and Australia. Canada has not been neglected either. Dinosaur footprints are also found in British Columbia.

As is quite clear, dinosaur tracks are rather common occurrences the world over. What many of these tracks seem to reveal is even more intriguing. Are they giving us a glimpse of the final moments in the lives of these great beasts — just before they were extinguished by a worldwide catastrophe?

Tracks Made in Water

Let's begin with the tracks in the Glen Rose Formation near the towns of Glen Rose and Bandera, Texas.

"These great tracks must have been *made in shallow water*," says Edwin Colbert, "for there are no traces of tail marks, which means that the tail was *floating* instead of dragging on the ground. Yet, the water was not deep enough to have reached the bellies of the animals that made them" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, pp. 187, 188).

Next, let us skip to the Connecticut Valley in New England. The thousands of dinosaur tracks tell us a fascinating story. They reveal the activity of the dinosaurs in that ominous and distant past.

"Most of the tracks and trackways show us dinosaurs on *the move*, either walking or running. Some of them show that their makers came to sudden stops; some of them show how they slipped in the mud.

"At least one set of tracks, of *Anomoepus* show the dinosaur resting with all four feet and the belly on the ground. Many of the footprints are SUPERIMPOSED UPON RIPPLE MARKS, showing that the dinosaurs wandered across the mud flats following the retreat of shallow waters; perhaps tidal waters or perhaps high waters caused by heavy rainstorms" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, pp. 185, 187).

An amazing story indeed!

What It All Means

But what do we see here? Let's add more factual material.

"Most dinosaur footprints would SEEM to have been made on mud flats, along the shores of lakes. The tracks are *commonly associated with RIPPLE MARKS AND RAINDROP IMPRESSIONS*, all preserved in stony immobility, yet in such vivid records of *waves and storms* of the distant past there are seldom bony remains to be found" (*Dinosaurs*, Edwin Colbert, pp. 181, 183).

Why are tracks commonly associated with ripple marks, rain, waves, storms, floods, mud? Are these areas former lake bottoms — or land inundated by water due to a convulsing earth?

Other footprints were made across surfaces broken into polygonal shapes — indications of mud cracks made by HEAT. This heat — whatever its source — would have baked the footprints into stony immobility.

And why aren't tracks and bones found together? Could intense heat have cremated the dinosaurs and preserved their footprints? Or was it because the dinosaurs themselves were FLOATED and

carried away by the same rising waters that preserved their tracks?

Read the following! You be the judge.

Swimming or Floating Away — Which?

Sets of tracks often show several individuals of various sizes.

"Their tracks are deeply impressed and include drag-marks of the heavy tails. The tracks of the smaller individuals are shallower and show no tail drag-marks, as though the youngsters were HALF-AFLOAT as the herd made its way through the shallows.

"Another set of tracks, of a single individual, start off deeply impressed, as though the animal were UNSUPPORTED by water, and *become less and less well-marked*.

"They are finally reduced to the MEREST SCRATCHES, at greater intervals, in what was the bottom of the lake, showing that a big sauropod had ambled into the water, which had supported more and more of his weight as he got in deeper, until finally he was cruising along in a leisurely manner" — or was he FRANTICALLY STRUGGLING to touch bottom, as water rose higher and higher?

And was this dinosaur — along with thousands — CARRIED AWAY by the currents to far distant locations, to be buried in one of the innumerable fossil graveyards around the world?

Someone might ask, "But how were the tracks preserved in spite of the increasing waters?" The answer depends on the area. One example is illustrated by footprints found in Arizona.

Dinosaur Footprints in Arizona

In June, 1952, William Lee Stokes, well-known geologist was studying uranium deposits in Apache County, Arizona. He discovered a remarkable series of pterodactyl footprints in the Morrison formation.

These tracks clearly reveal how the tracks were preserved.

"The track-bearing unit is a 2- to 4-inch thick stratum of medium-grained, brownish gray sandstone... it is *ripple* marked on the upper surface...

"From the position of the tracks... and the apparently unsteady gait of the pterodactyl, it is inferred that the creature was walking... in *moist to very moist sand*.

"Above the tracks is a thin stratum of mudstone which covers and fills them. Evidently the conditions were such that the water ROSE VERY SLIGHTLY and under relatively quiet conditions deposited a mud layer which preserved the tracks from destruction" (*Journal of Paleontology*, Vol. 31, No. 5, September, 1957, "Pterodactyl Tracks from the Morrison Formation," William Lee Stokes, p. 952).

Back to Connecticut

Richard Swann Lull summarized the conditions under which the tracks and trackways in New England were laid down.

This description reads like a scenario of DISASTER — in spite of the fact that he would interpret fossils in an EVOLUTIONARY context.

Here is a portion of his description:

"There were laid down in a gradually deepening trough in the older rocks the GREAT ACCUMULATIONS OF GRAVELS, sands, and clays, interbedded with vast lava sheets [the source of intense heat?], which constitute the sediments of the Newark systems...

"Of the organic remains, those of vegetable origin consist of the impressions and casts of trunks of trees... being of such size as to indicate a STREAM OF NO MEAN TRANSPORTING POWER... here and there the vegetal remains were of sufficient abundance to lead to the production of black bituminous shale bands, formed during periods of *accumulation of waters*" (*Triassic Life of the Connecticut Valley*, Richard Swann Lull, p. 24).

Ancient Connecticut is clearly pictured as a disaster area! The cataclysm of water and lava was of such a magnitude as to *literally* erase life off the face of the old New England landscape.

Face to Face With Disasters

Everywhere paleontologists look they are faced with this certainty — DISASTER wiped out the dinosaurs. These

disasters were worldwide. No sector of this globe escaped the tragedy.

Neither is there evidence of transition from reptiles to mammals. Then, where did the living things of this present age come from?

How did mammals come into existence? What about plant life? Modern fish? And man, himself?

The geological record reveals a profound break between the reptilian life that was obliterated and the modern life of today.

The new forms of life on this planet — the mammals, the insects, the plants,



Ambassador College Photo
Dinosaur footprint embedded in stone.

the fishes, the birds, man — are different in most respects from the old.

There is no evolutionary connection between the two. This is proof positive that mammals DID NOT EVOLVE from reptiles. Between these two worlds is the geologic evidence that a worldwide catastrophe of astronomical — of inexplicable magnitude — ravaged our planet.

But how — and WHY?

If you are interested in further information, write for our FREE reprint "Dinosaurs Before Adam?"

It discusses these and related questions — and gives the surprising answers. Get your free copy by writing to the address nearest you. See the staff box on the inside front cover for the proper address. □

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

MAJOR STATIONS

East

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

Central States

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

South

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

*Asterisk indicates new station or time change.

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

Mountain States

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

West Coast

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

LEADING LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

East

WBMD — Baltimore — 750 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WRCP — Philadelphia — 1540 kc., 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
WPIT — Pittsburgh — 730 kc., 101.5 FM, 12 noon Mon.-Fri., 1:30 p.m. Sat., 11 a.m. Sun.
WEDO — Pittsburgh — 810 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WHP — Harrisburg, Pa. — 580 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WSAN — Allentown, Pa. — 1470 kc., 6:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:05 p.m. Sat., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WSCR — Scranton, Pa. — 1320 kc., 12:30 & 6:30 p.m. daily.
WBRE — Wilkes-Barre Pa. — 1340 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:30 p.m. daily.
WCHS — Charleston, W. Va. — 580 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily.
WCAW — Charleston, W. Va. — 680 kc., 12 noon daily.
WWHY — Huntington, W. Va. — 1470 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
WTVR — Richmond, Va. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
WCYB — Bristol, Va. — 690 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WPAQ — Mount Airy, N. C. — 740 kc., 1:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WFNC — Fayetteville, N. C. — 940 kc., 98.1 FM, 1 p.m. daily.
WNCT — Greenville, N. C. — 1070 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
WVNJ — Newark, N. J. — 620 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WAAT — Trenton, N. J. — 1300 kc., 6 a.m. daily, 12 noon Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WEVD — New York — 1330 kc., 97.9 FM, 10 p.m. daily.
WVOX — New Rochelle, N. Y. — 1460 kc., 93.5 FM, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
WBNX — New York — 1380 kc., 9:15 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
WOKO — Albany, N. Y. — 1460 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WIBX — Utica, N. Y. — 950 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.

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

Central

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

(Continued on next page)

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

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

South

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

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

WCSC — Charleston, S. C. — 1390 kc., 7:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 p.m. Sun.
 WKSC — Kershaw, S. C. — 1300 kc., 1:15 p.m. Sun.
 WLAP — Lexington, Ky. — 630 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 WKYX — Paducah, Ky. — 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.

Mountain States

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

West Coast

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

(Continued on next page)

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

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

Alaska & Hawaii

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

CANADA

VOCM — St. John's, Nfld. — 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CJCH — Halifax, N.S. — 920 kc., 10:25 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 p.m. Sun.
 CFBC — St. John, N.B. — 930 kc., 8:30 p.m., 98.9 FM, 7 p.m. daily.
 CFMB — Montreal, Que. — 1410 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKOY — Ottawa, Ont. — 1310 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
 CJET — Smith Falls, Ont. — 630 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 CKWS — Kingston, Ont. — 960 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
 CHEX — Peterborough, Ont. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sat.
 CKFH — Toronto, Ont. — 1430 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.

CHIN — Toronto, Ont. — 1540 kc., 12:00 p.m. daily.
 CKPC — Brantford, Ont. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
 CHLO — St. Thomas, Ont. — 680 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:30 p.m. Sun.
 CHYR — Leamington, Ont. — 5:30 a.m. daily at 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily at 710 kc.
 CFCH — North Bay, Ont. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7 a.m. Sun.
 CKSO — Sudbury, Ont. — 790 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKCY — Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. — 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CJNR — Blind River, Ont. — 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJNR — Elliot Lake, Ont. — 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJLX — Fort William, Ont. — 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:25 p.m. Sun.
 CKY — Winnipeg, Man. — 580 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7 a.m. Sun.
 CKDM — Dauphin, Man. — 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CKRM — Regina, Sask. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 CHAB — Moose Jaw, Sask. — 800 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:05 p.m. Sun.
 CJGX — Yorkton, Sask. — 940 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
 CFQC — Saskatoon, Sask. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
 CKBI — Prince Albert, Sask. — 900 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
 CFCW — Camrose, Alta. — 790 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJDV — Drumheller, Alta. — 910 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 CHEC — Lethbridge, Alta. — 1090 kc., AM, 100.9 FM, 9 p.m. daily.
 CKYL — Peace River, Alta. — 610 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJVI — Victoria, B.C. — 900 kc., 8:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
 CKLG — Vancouver, B.C. — 730 kc., 99.3 FM, 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 a.m. Sun. AM, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri. FM.
 CKOK — Penticton, B.C. — 800 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CKOO — Oliver, B.C. — 1240 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 CJAT — Trail, B.C. — 610 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:30 p.m. Sat. & Sun.
 CHTK — Prince Rupert, B.C. — 560 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 CKTK — Kitimat, B.C. — 1230 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
 CFTK — Terrace, B.C. — 590 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.

In French —

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

In Italian —

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

EUROPE

In English —

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

In Spanish

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

ASIA

Guam

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

Okinawa

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

CARIBBEAN AND LATIN AMERICA

In English —

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

In French —

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

For a complete worldwide Radio Log, write the Editor.

Freedom of the press THREATENED?

Has the precious freedom of the press been seriously threatened? Is government censorship imminent? News media, particularly the major T.V. networks, reacted sharply to President Nixon's recent nationally televised speech. The administration's reactions to news commentaries, in particular the now sensationalized speeches of the Vice-President, have created a bigger furor than anything in recent memory. Read in this informative article just what did happen, and what it could portend.

by Garner Ted Armstrong

“... AN UGLY era of the most fearsome suppression and intimidation!” said Thomas D. Hoving, Chairman of the National Citizens Committee for broadcasting, of Vice-President Agnew's criticism of television news coverage. But if the Vice-President reacted sharply to “instant analysis” of President Nixon's nationwide address on the Vietnam war — assailing news media in a succession of speeches — the news media, too, reacted with their own sharpness.

It all began with Mr. Richard Nixon's address during prime TV time early in November — and his appeal for the “silent majority” to back his position on the handling of the situation in Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon explained that “for the United States, this first defeat (if America suddenly withdrew) in our nation's history would result in a collapse of

American leadership, not only in Asia but throughout the world.”

He pleaded for unity from “... you, the silent majority of my fellow Americans” and said, “let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let's understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that. . . .”

Following the address, Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler said there was a highly positive, favorable response for the most part — and the White House reported its switchboard was jammed with calls from all over the country reacting to President Nixon's statement.

Immediately following the President's address, news media reported on it — analyzed it — and perhaps even speculated about what it meant.

It was noted the White House seemed particularly disturbed over a contradiction, at least twice, from a correspondent who took issue with Mr. Nixon's explanation of the correspon-

dence with Ho Chi Minh. Apparently, the reference was to CBS's Marvin Kalb. Mr. Nixon had termed the attitude of Ho “intransigent,” and Kalb said the letter “... contained some of the softest, most accommodating language found in a Communist document concerning the war in Vietnam in recent years,” thus directly contradicting the President.

Vice-President Agnew observed that another commentator had “challenged the President's abilities as a politician” (apparently meaning ABC's Bill Lawrence), and noted that still another had claimed the President was “following the Pentagon line,” meaning Bill Downs of ABC, apparently.

Mr. Agnew, carried live by the major TV networks in an early evening hour, was heard to pointedly criticize the commentators and producers who seemingly control the nation's foremost network news hours — and included in his statements publishers and editors of leading East Coast newspapers and magazines. The Vice-President quoted that these

"elite" few controlled a tremendous amount of the information flowing to much of the nation.

A Powerful Few

"A small group of men," said the Vice-President, "numbering perhaps no more than a dozen anchor men, commentators and executive producers, settle upon the film and commentary that is to reach the public. They decide what forty to fifty million Americans will learn of the day's events in the nation and in the world."

Mr. Agnew then referred to the newscasters as the "small und unelected elite," using vast power, "unchecked," which had "served to distort traditional rhythms of 'normality' . . . our national search for internal peace and stability." He specifically pointed out "Gresham's Law," which he said "seems to be operating in the network news. Bad news drives out good. Concurrence can no longer compete with dissent. One minute of Eldridge Cleaver is worth ten minutes of Roy Wilkins. . . ."

Then, Mr. Agnew stated, "I'm not asking for government censorship or any other kind of censorship."

But the news media were quick to point out Mr. Agnew's remarks concerning Federal licensing of the networks and broadcasting stations — and called Mr. Agnew's remarks, even though he plainly stated he was not calling for government censorship, "intimidation!"

Perhaps much of the fright was over personal telephone calls received by top executives of the leading networks by the newly appointed head of the Federal Communications Commission, Dean Burch, which, it was noted, was unprecedented. The new Chairman of the FCC had requested scripts of the news commentary concerning the Presidential address.

Further, Mr. Agnew had expressed indignation over the "instant analysis" of President Nixon's November 3 speech on the Vietnam war.

"President Nixon delivered the most important address of his administration," the Vice-President said. "His hope was to rally the American people

to see the conflict through to a lasting and just peace in the Pacific." But in the newscasts immediately following the remarks of the President, said Mr. Agnew, "His words and policies were subjected to instant analysis and querulous criticism."

What was especially irritating to some of the newscasters was Mr. Agnew's reference to the power of personality in reporting — that a "raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast can raise doubts in a million minds about the veracity of a public official or the wisdom of a government policy."

Emotional Reaction

Then came the storm of protest in newspapers, magazines, and over television. Mr. Agnew's words were termed a "disgraceful attack." One leading weekly news magazine said the "tone was still truculent, occasionally intemperate and bullying," when describing a later speech of Mr. Agnew.

Worry was expressed that the nation was headed toward "an ugly era of the most fearsome suppression and intimidation."

Then came statements, published in the press, by leaders representing practically every political viewpoint in the country.

Pierre Salinger, who was White House Press Secretary under President John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, called Mr. Agnew's remarks "one of the most dangerous speeches ever given by a high public official."

In his criticisms of critics who criticized Mr. Nixon's speech, in which he called for unity, Mr. Agnew was criticized for having delivered "an attack with the ultimate aim of dividing this country on Vietnam," in the words of Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts. Perhaps some were wondering how to find a subtle appeal for division in Mr. Agnew's strong words about unity, but such were the analyses of some leaders.

The networks' leading officials editorialized too.

President of NBC, Julian Goodman,

termed Mr. Agnew's address "an appeal to prejudice," and said "evidently he would prefer a different kind of . . . reporting . . . one that would be subservient to whatever political group was in authority at the time."

The President of ABC, Leonard H. Goldenson, however, expressed confidence "in the ultimate judgment of the American public."

But CBS President Frank Stanton was not quite so mild. He said the Vice-President's speech was "an unprecedented attempt to intimidate a news media."

And so raged the furor.

But regardless as to the anguish the Vice-President may have caused the news media, it is true, nevertheless, they began to look at themselves.

Some Were Not Angry

Av Westin, Executive Producer of the ABC Evening News, said, "My politics are more conservative than Vice-President Agnew would have people believe, but that doesn't matter. My job is to keep my politics and those of others off the air. You can't always be objective because you bring your experiences into things . . . so you try to be fair. We are on guard. We're not infallible. We try."


And in this statement perhaps the American people can find some common sense and balance.

Notwithstanding indignation over the charges concerning "a raised eyebrow," or "an inflection of the voice raising doubts in the minds of millions" — it is true that such casual innuendoes can do just that.

As a broadcaster, and a writer, I am very much aware of the powerful potential of radio, television and the printed word.

There is a significant difference between my type of broadcasting, telecasting and writing and that of the network newscasters, however.

I invite people to write in for literature. In so doing, many tens of thousands express opinions over what they have heard. Further, I meet many thousands of my listeners each year — something I sincerely doubt the network newscasters do — and I meet dozens as



A. P. Photo

Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew's recent criticisms of the news media, especially in the area of television, forced broadcasting officials to take a much-needed look at American news reporting.

I travel about, not only in this country, but in other parts of the world. Therefore, I am continually aware of the moods and feelings of my audience. I receive some few critical letters and calls from time to time. Although it may be surprising to those critics, I do *read* those letters, and *listen* to my critics.

I also learn from them.

While I do not have to agree with my critics — I can at least always ponder the fact that they, too, are a part of my audience. It was, after all, either the material I presented, my tone of voice, mannerisms of speech, or method of presentation which created the criticism in their own mind. If they merely disagree with factual, statistical information I report, that is one thing. But if I find a sincere person taking issue with a

certain mannerism, I always consider the criticism, and very often have adjusted my style of delivery, not as a compromise in order to please people, but merely to improve a broadcasting style which is intended, after all, to reach the largest number of human beings and to insure that the material I present on *The World Tomorrow* is received by open minds, people who are not turned away from the truth they hear on our program merely because of bad voice personality.

Personality and Polarity

Perhaps the newscasters of our nation could profit by more contact with their own "public."

Perhaps they really do *not* realize just how much a raised eye-brow, an inflection in the voice, a dramatic pause, slight tone of sarcasm, subdued chuckle, or a tongue-in-cheek manner can do to shape and form opinion.

If not — it's time they were informed.

Network newsmen are some of the best "known" personalities of the United States — and would be instantly recognized practically anywhere in the country. While they would be recognized, and many millions of their listeners and viewers would feel they actually "know" these men, they do not in truth "know" them, any more than the average theatergoer truly knows a movie star.

But it is the lot of the leading newscasters to appear before multiple millions of Americans far oftener than their civic leaders, or, for that matter, practically any other figure outside their own home.

The familiar tone of the favorite newscaster becomes an integral part of family life. It's as much a part of comfortable evening life for millions of Americans as the sound of their children at play, the familiar view of their own living or family room, or the crackle of logs in the fireplace. The face, mannerisms, and voice tones of a favorite newscaster can be a personal, comfortable, intimate and vicarious relationship.

And, just as millions read daily papers without the slightest notion of the particular political polarity of that paper, so millions avidly follow the reporting of the news by certain favored newscasters, with absolutely no knowledge whatever of these men as individuals.

I doubt whether one in many hundreds could tell you whether the men they watch are married, divorced, Republican or Democrat, left or right, war veteran or conscientious objectors, or whether they really are, as in some cases it may be suspected, wearing a toupee.

But millions feel they "know" these men, nevertheless. How many times have I met a listener who told me, "I feel as though I know you?"

Let's face it. When you share the fantastically emotional experience of a presidential assassination, and three days of painful ceremony through the choked voice and personal involvement of a well-known newscaster; when you, too, shake your head with incredulity with Cronkite, watching the breathtaking success of a lunar landing and

men gamboling on the moon; when you laugh at the twinkle in the newscaster's eye as he adds the one little humorous incident in the news before closing — *you feel you know these men.*

But you do not know them, at all.

And you do not know the personalities who daily inform you through newspapers, magazines, and radio. You may read any number of articles in a newspaper, forming opinions through them, quoting them, talking of them to friends and associates, perhaps even making speeches of your own from them — not realizing the extent to which your own opinions are urged upon you through the methods of writing, as well as the fact reported.

"We try . . ." said Av Westin. "You can't always be objective because you bring your experiences into things — so you try to be fair."

Even computers are not more "objective" than the sum total of information fed into them. And while many a TV viewer has noted the monotonous, lifeless type of delivery effected by some few newsmen, it should be pointed out that many deliberately attempt to keep their voices evenly paced to avoid appearance of personal involvement with the news they report — especially in "neutral news."

Neutral Commentary?

Any time the matter-of-fact reporting of the news becomes analysis, or "commentary," it is much more than just machine-like, impersonal recital of events. Human beings, no matter how hard they try to be objective, can, like computers, repeat only what is "fed into them." This means they do not repeat only the current events of which they speak, but the sum total of their own personalities can shape and mold those events — while not to the point of distortion, certainly, in many cases to the point of mild interpretation or subtly suggested conclusions urged upon the listeners.

After all, that's exactly why some newscasters make good, and why others do not. It is the reason why some newscasters have top ratings, can draw huge salaries, and others continue to monoto-

nously inform people of "neutral news."

The personality, tone of voice, and appearance of newsmen on television is what creates ratings — not just the reading of the news.

Substantially, the major networks report the same news, using the same wire services — and all three are nearly always represented at major newsworthy happenings.

If people were desirous only of receiving the news, they could do so by call-in tape recordings, or actually be listening to radio stations where the news was truly computerized.

Ever wonder what time it was, and dial the code number on your telephone to find out? No voice personality there — just continual, monotonous repetition as the seconds tick by.

But if people were desirous only of receiving the harsh, cold facts, in the most impersonal tone possible, there would be no reason for special followings for particular newscasters. It is the way the news is presented by this or that personality that makes the difference.

And nothing is wrong with all this — but realizing the truth of the matter, it is difficult to understand the indignant retorts from newsmen over Mr. Agnew's statements concerning the "raised eyebrow" or the "inflection of the voice."

After all, raised eyebrows and special voice inflections from a favorite newscaster can and *do* help "interpret" the news to millions. This is not to allege there is either something dangerous or even mildly harmful because this is so — but knowing it is so, it would seem newsmen and their chiefs would not react with such alarm when a leading member of the administration speculates aloud whether this personal "power" should not be openly discussed.

And it was discussed — as a direct result of Mr. Agnew's speeches.

Personally I did not know anything about any of the men whose pictures were published, together with biographical sketch, in *Time* magazine. But having seen the brief sketch — learning the ages, marital status, and brief professional background of these men — I find I have a slightly more informative

insight into leading newscasters' personalities that are on the air during prime television hours.

A free government should be freely subject to criticism by its people; and the government has the right to criticize trends in private life just as freely. Only by such give-and-take of opinion can a free system survive. Disagreement is possible without being defamatory or "disagreeable," however.

Above Criticism?

By virtue of their existence, the national networks of radio and television are the critics of government. But are they, then, above criticism? The private citizens of the United States freely criticize their government, and one another. Only rarely does one hear of private citizens criticizing the way their news is handled.

Could it be some newsmen and their producers have somehow become "cloistered"? Have they, like professionals in some select fields, become a little too remote from the people they serve? Occupying the position of "teachers" of events, perhaps some have forgotten the need for teachers to be taught, to listen to their students once in a while, and to continually reappraise and upgrade their own education.

Mr. Agnew did state plainly he was *not* calling for government censorship. Instead of taking him precisely at his word (and his word was a matter of public record spoken before a large audience and repeated instantly in the press around the United States), many chose to directly contradict Mr. Agnew's statement by alleging he was, in practical fact, calling for censorship and was using a bullying tone, intimidation, and threatening that perhaps our nation was on the way toward an "ugly age" of the most "fearsome suppression" of the news.

But while some were worrying about the terrifying specter of "managed news," others got busy and did precisely as Vice President Agnew suggested — took a look at themselves.

The President of ABC News, Elmer W. Lower, recently reported the results of a survey conducted by Professor Irving E. Fang of the University of Min-

nesota's School of Journalism and Mass Communications.

According to the report, there had been examination of the news portions of all ABC evening newscasts between January 1 and November 27, 1969. The news program's monitors consumed 95 hours, 3 minutes, and were broken down into 16 categories for the survey.

It was found that a total of 12 hours and 39 minutes would have been considered "favorable" to supporters of the administration, and to the administration itself. 10 hours and 18 minutes would have been considered unfavorable to the administration, and would have been "displeasing" to a supporter of Mr. Nixon. Neutral news was stated to have consumed 8 hours, 18 minutes. Other categories made up the balance.

The ABC President said he thought it was a "good idea" to take a look at news broadcasting, and, following the report, he said, "Our reporting has been fair and impartial — the kind of journalism which is the obligation of newsmen protected by the free press guarantee we enjoy under the first amendment. I think it fair to predict that we will continue to enjoy those first amendment protections."

But newsmen, like Volkswagens, "are only human" after all. They can and do make mistakes, and they are capable of their own personal feelings.

Any individual who is engaged in the business of informing other people — large numbers of people — of daily events, is wielding a certain power. It is true that, with raised eyebrows, dramatic pauses, or certain voice inflections, opinions can be created.

And the raised eyebrows of the printed word are perhaps even more subtle.

They, too, exist.

A Case in Point

For example, when Astronaut Edwin Aldrin recently cited two cases of newspaper distortions concerning him, his remarks were given a rather strange label by a newspaper reporter.

According to the reporter, Astronaut Aldrin had mentioned a misleading headline run by a Chicago newspaper

which read, "Aldrin Reveals Lunar Sickness," during a press conference following the flight of the Apollo mission. As the famous Astronaut continued talking to newsmen after the formal portion of the press conference was over, he explained how he had actually become sick while flying in an airplane during a *simulated* lunar mission. Hearing of this, a newspaper reporter had dubbed it "lunar sickness." He then spoke of another time when his uncle joked with a fellow passenger returning aboard a commercial airliner from the Cape after watching a space launch. His uncle told the passenger, who it happens was a reporter, that some scientists thought lunar rocks would burst into flames when exposed to oxygen — this in jest. "Well, this turned into a headline which said, 'Aldrin Fears Lunar Rock,'" said the Astronaut. Fair enough. He merely mentioned the two instances where, even though the substance of the articles could possibly have cleared up the matter, the headlines were apparently misleading.

And the title of the article reporting these remarks of Aldrin?

"ALDRIN LAUDS APOLLO 12, ATTACKS NEWS MEDIA."

"Attacks?" Well, not exactly — he did, however, mention two cases of misleading statements printed by newsmen.

But newspapers, too, must recognize the need for continual criticism. A daily newspaper wields a considerable influence over its readers.

Comfortable, personal, familiar — the daily paper had played the part of "window to the world" long before the advent of television. It's still the way millions prefer to get their news. It's difficult to listen to TV over a quick breakfast in a downtown office building coffee shop — not so with the favorite newspaper.

The same comments concerning news commentators can apply to columnists, sports writers, or editors. Sometimes, they create a following.

And that's power!

I, personally, must be continually aware of the power of the press, and of radio, AND of television! I fully expect there will be some criticism. Sometimes

I agree with my critics, and sometimes I don't. But I always read what they have to say, and try to listen to any who are obviously sincere, reasonable, and who have learned how to disagree without being "disagreeable." I turn a very deaf ear to persecution.

Of course I am not merely reporting the news, but giving an in-depth and overall analysis of the trends in current human events, not only from the combined sources of our round-the-world newsgathering capabilities, but through the knowledge of Biblically prophesied events from now on into the foreseeable future. There is no particular force, or power, which urges me to be "objective" other than my own deep convictions. The preaching of various religious doctrines can hardly be called "objective" by anyone — and people expect preachers to preach, politicians to politic, and newsmen to report the news.

Still, I am very much aware of the sobering responsibility on the shoulders of any individual who is engaged in passing on information, urging concepts and conclusions, helping to form opinions and convictions, in other human beings.

Something WAS Accomplished!


Now that the smoke of battle has cleared, and perhaps some of the early fears of "an ugly age," of "fearsome suppression" and "intimidation" have partly subsided, it is clear that Mr. Agnew's remarks did accomplish something.

They made newsmen, telecasters, and broadcasting officials, as well as the American public, take a good look at their news media.

Only when the American people quit doing this will any of us need to fear any "ugly age of fearsome suppression," or big-brother type dictatorial management of the news.

For all their protests, the major news media did precisely as the Vice-President suggested, even if in anger, and seemingly on the defensive.

And when all is said and done, the entirety of the American public is better off as a result. □



Ferdinand E. Marcos has been re-elected as President of the Philippines, and as such becomes the first Filipino President to win a second full term in the highest office of the land.

Emerging from World War II as his nation's most decorated soldier (27 medals from the Philippines and the U. S.), President Marcos has dedicated most of his life to the service of his country. After the war he became involved in politics, serving four terms in Congress and in 1959 was elected to the Senate.

He became President of the Philippines in 1966, at the age of 48. An energetic leader, he

pushed through programs of road building, land reform and public construction. A successful state visit to the U. S. in 1966 gave him such favorable publicity he was able, later that year, to host a Summit Conference in Manila for the leaders of seven nations involved in the Vietnam war.

Political foes have accused him of graft and corruption, but the people of the Philippines, enjoying greater prosperity than ever, voted him back into office. The next four years will see many changes in this nation of 37 million, but President Marcos appears confident that he is the man to make all the changes work for the betterment of his nation.

A Report on the Philippines...

A Search for "FREEDOM"

Although an ancient people, as a young democratic nation the Filipinos are in trouble. This is the story of just one of the many new nations that have been established since World War II, and the manifold problems it has encountered as it strives to be free of dependence on others.

by Arthur W. Docken

Manila, Philippines

IN THE past year and a half the Filipinos have been shaken by earthquakes, blasted by volcanoes, tossed by typhoons, scorched by drought, emaciated by famine, washed out by floods, robbed by pirate raids, terrorized by guerilla war with Communists, and thrilled by a charming Filipina who won the Miss Universe contest. But all of these events have been overshadowed by the most traumatic experience of them all — a Filipino Presidential election!

Elections are always attended by violence here. Jealousies, hurt regional pride, and strong personal emotions erupt in ambushes on dark highways or submachine gun assassinations in full view of the astonished, if not totally surprised, populace. So expected is this violence, jokes and cartoons often make the whole thing sound like something out of a musical comedy. In general the Filipinos accept this situation with something close to good humor and patience. But even the most easy-going citizen is beginning to be alarmed.

Some felt this election was not as bloody as past elections (the number dead was probably in the "dozens"),

but what was lacking in physical violence was amply counterbalanced by the vitriolic charges and counter-charges by the candidates. Finally the polls were closed and the choice made. The harsh verbal exchanges, the almost libelous accusations will hopefully be forgotten and things will return to normal.

Normal?

But what is normal for this small island nation of 37 million population? Unfortunately there are no criteria by which to gauge normalcy. By most Western standards the Filipinos have never known "normalcy." What Occidentals consider necessity, the average Asian looks upon in wonderment as pure luxury. A continuing quiet, peaceful existence is unknown by the majority.

The President of the Philippines now hopes to bring a higher standard of living to this stepchild of the Pacific. But the problems are greater than ever before, and idealistic goals tend to tarnish in the light of analysis. However, events taking place in this obscure corner of the world may possibly influence thinking of world leaders for years to come. The reasons are becoming increasingly more apparent.

From Magellan to MacArthur

Before 1521, anonymity and 400 miles of the South China Sea allowed for relative peace among the Malays, Indonesians, Negritos, and other Asians who had migrated to the islands.

Except for an occasional aggressive intruder, and the introduction of Mohammedanism into Mindanao in the 1300's, the scattered farming tribes were free to live and work as they pleased.

On March 16, 1521, Ferdinand Magellan reached the Philippines, and was subsequently attacked and killed by the natives — just as they had killed many other invaders of their peaceful oasis. But this time it was different. Magellan's men completed their round-the-world trip and informed their king of these beautiful islands in the Pacific. The wave of Westerners began.

In 1564, Spain arrived with armies of "the cross and the sword," conquered and colonized the islands, and named them Philippines in honor of Philip II, the Hapsburg king of Spain.

For 334 years, the Spanish governed the divided tribes, enforced Roman Catholicism, established trade, cultivated plantations, established schools,

A Search for "FREEDOM"

and literally built their island economy from nothing.

But the Filipino was not happy. He was generally treated as an ignorant savage and oppressed with high tribute and religious, social, and economic abuses. As the centuries went by, the Filipinos began to show a common desire for political independence. They were captive in their own land, seeing all their islands' wealth being shipped away, yet unarmed and helpless to stop it.

On May 1, 1898, during the short Spanish-American War, Commodore George Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet stationed in Manila Bay and encouraged the Filipinos to intensify their war with the Spanish colonial government. On June 12, 1898 Emilio Aguinaldo proclaimed Philippine independence under his dictatorial presidency. But after Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States for \$20,000,000 a tragic and unfortunate series of events by Americans forced the revolutionaries to continue their fight for freedom — this time against the Yankee!

In 1902 the Filipino-American war ended in a crushing defeat for the freedom-hungry Filipinos.

In 1934 the U. S. allowed the Philippines a Commonwealth government, and promised total independence in 1946. But then came World War II, and the Filipinos once again became subjugated to tyrannical rule — this time by the military government of Japan.

Finally, in 1944, General MacArthur "returned" to the Philippines. Two years later, on July 4, 1946, an independent Republic of the Philippines became a reality. Independence at last, after over 400 years of foreign rule!

Independence

What is the state of the nation today?

Unfortunately, after twenty-three years of independence the nation is still not "independent." This painful reality is recognized by most Filipinos. Their dependence on American and other foreign aid became a festering political

issue in the recent presidential campaign. Some Filipinos wish the Americans still ruled them; some wish the Americans had never ruled them. Some wish all foreigners would leave. Some wish for an Asian "Big Brother" to help shoulder the domestic and economic problems.

The government realistically realizes help must come from somewhere. After 400 years of subjection to foreign powers and only 23 years of independence, they just do not yet have what it takes to keep themselves standing on their own economic feet.

What is holding back this nation of dynamic peoples, this victor in World War II, this only Christian nation of the Far East? The Philippines seemingly has everything going for it, yet progress is painfully slow.

Why?

The reasons are manifold.

A House Divided

Filipinos are still in many ways divided groups of fiercely proud peoples. There are over eighty different dialects spoken and the population is of mixed ethnic background. The Cebuanos are suspicious of Ilocano; the Moros (Muslims named after the Moors of Spain) are suspicious of the Christians, and vice versa.

People living on the plains treat mountain tribesmen with disdain. Regional and ethnic pride prevents any serious compromise of religious, tribal or ethnic values.

This lack of cohesive force has much to do with the instability of the nation. Not as serious as it once was perhaps, but still a very real factor that needs correction before the nation can forge ahead.

The DEPENDENT Economy

In spite of millions of dollars' foreign aid and investments, the economy is slow moving. Wealth is controlled by 5 percent of the people. These powerful old families also often influence the economy and the government. As in most poor countries there is great contrast between the standard of living of the wealthy and "peasant" classes.

Ten percent of the country's families enjoy 40 percent of the wealth, leaving

only sixty percent to be distributed to the hungry 90 percent.

A recent Senate study of the Philippine economy showed the standard of living had changed little for the average citizen. "The typical home (of the 1960 census) was made of light materials, without electric power, lighted with kerosene lamps, using wood as cooking fuel, drawing water from open wells and force pumps, and without toilet facilities. The 1967 survey of households shows very little change" (*Manila Chronicle*, May 17, 1969).

The same report showed that while wage rates for skilled labor had increased 25 percent from 1955 to 1967, prices had soared by 57.6 percent in the same period of time. As a result, real wages were only about 79 percent of what they had been twelve years previously, leaving most worse off than ever before. A rapidly inflated economy is not a healthy economy. The average Filipino cannot afford basic needs, let alone such "luxuries" as refrigerators, autos, toilets. Today, more people than ever before do enjoy these things. Generally, the professional is able to live better; but for the average person, the farmer, laborer, teacher, white collar worker, these things are still an "impossible dream."

Obviously, then, domestic capital is scarce! A large share of all Philippines industry is foreign owned. The mortality rate of Filipino businesses is very high, while foreign concerns thrive. Filipinos do not like to watch their native resources leave the islands to serve another nation. They don't like it, but they lack the business acumen to fight it.

In the last ten years, the Filipinos have had only two years with a favorable balance of trade. The Philippine peso is dwindling in value on the world market, as the balance of payments deficit climbs toward one *billion* dollars!

It's a vicious cycle. As the Filipinos go further in debt and their own businesses fail, they call in foreign capital. The more foreign capital grows, the more dependent the Filipinos become. Economically, independence is still not a reality.

Education

Another major problem is the lack of technical know-how in many areas. Fili-

pinos want to learn and they do learn well. About fifty percent speak English and most business and government functions are conducted in English. Over 70 percent are literate and families will sacrifice to get their children through school. All too often, however, after they have gained an education (many on government scholarships), they emigrate to nations paying higher wages — never to return. Wages are so low that most Filipinos are sympathetic when doctors, nurses, teachers, engineers, lawyers and other highly trained and skilled personnel move to the United States, Canada, Europe and other countries in large numbers. This “brain-drain” is close to disastrous for a young nation that needs more of the educated class. Without this priceless, stable leadership, the nation is suffering. Crime is rampant and youth are floundering.

Population and Labor

There is no shortage of laborers, however. The Philippines has one of the highest birth rates in the world — 3.5 percent per year. In comparison to the present 37 million, the population will be 53.4 million by 1980 if the rate continues! This fantastic growth results in more mouths to feed but also in a highly competitive labor force, where a man will work for almost any wage just to have some income in order to feed his family. Birth control could be one answer, but this is contrary to their religion (over 90 percent are Roman Catholic). Wages remain low and the economy suffers. In most areas the average family income is less than \$600 a year!

The Agricultural Squeeze

Another result of population growth is the untimely cutting of forests, resulting in widespread soil erosion and drastically reduced farm yields.

Bureau of Soils Director Anastacio Simon pointed out that more than two thirds of the nation's farmland is eroded in various stages. “Land areas in at least 25 provinces have been eroded as much as 50 percent — an act which explains the occurrence of floods that annually create losses in life and properties” (*Manila Chronicle*, August 19, 1969).

Other factors — locusts, rodents,



Ambassador College Photo

Efforts are being made to clean up the many impoverished slum areas in and around Manila, but progress is painfully slow.

drought, tropical typhoons, the high cost of mechanical equipment and the oppressive feudal tenant farming system — contribute to make agriculture just another example of dependence on others, not the yearned-for independence. Despite the high potential of her rich soil, the Philippines must *import* over \$100 million in food each year.

Who Will Help?

We could discuss dozens of other problems — the governmental graft and corruption, the alarming rise in crime, the lack of health and hygiene, the sensationalism in the press, rats and rodents, disease epidemics, debt, bureaucracy. But the big question is “Who will help?”

Are the Filipinos destined to flounder their way to a crime-ridden anarchy or despotic dictatorship? Are they destined to be wooed by a Communist power which would commandeer its economy, then its people? Or will the Philippines continue much as it does today, threatened by some outsiders, economically “milked” by others, yet “independent”?

The answer appears to be found with

one of three potential “Big Brothers” — The United States, Japan, or the Communist Bloc.

The United States?

Filipinos have in the past looked to the U. S. for leadership, but analyze that leader today — seemingly afraid of any fourth- or fifth-rate nation that cares to walk off with its ships, planes or anything else they like. A nation that developed the greatest fighting force in history and the A Bomb to destroy the aggressors of World War II, now unable — or unwilling — to win the war in Vietnam. Is this a leader to follow? Would the U. S. fight for Filipino independence again?

The former image that Filipinos had of Americans was that of a brave big brother that loved his little brown brother of Asia and wasn't afraid to fight for him. Today the American image has become that of a longhaired, sexless, pot-impregnated effeminate. Why should it surprise the Yankee when some nations revolt against American degeneracy and presence in their

A Search for "FREEDOM"

nation? The Filipinos have violent elections, but are quick to point out they have never assassinated a President — a pointed reference to America's own violent history.

The news media in the Philippines publish more and more stories originating in the Communist Bloc. The New China News Agency was recently quoted blaming the "widespread poverty and economic deterioration in the Philippines on 'ruthless exploitation' by the United States" (*Philippine Daily Star*, August 8, 1969).

"Izvestia said many 'progressive' circles in the Philippines are complaining about American military presence in their country and raising their voices louder and louder in the defense of national independence" (*Manila Times*, November 3, 1969).

Many people believe it. Who can blame them? Businessmen, performers and politicians have traveled to Russia and her satellite countries in past months, bringing back glowing reports of the warm welcome they received and explain how trade with those countries would profit the Philippines. The Communist Bloc countries showed an interest in, and a willingness to do trade with the Philippines. Sincere or not, this is the impression they give, and foreign trade is what the Philippines needs.

Communist Influence

Communist influence is being felt in other areas as well. In central Luzon the Huks (short for Hukbalahap), an outlaw group, have widespread influence and power. Communist propaganda and arms have been found in their hideouts, and they have been known to use terrorist tactics on citizens of some small towns.

However, the majority of Filipinos are not interested in Communism. They are 90 percent Roman Catholic and enjoy what freedom they have. The Filipino government is democratic, based on that of the U.S. Officially the gov-



Ambassador College Photos

Foreign capital dominates industry in the Philippines. The United States and Japan are two of the biggest investors.

ernment is not favorable to Communism. Laws against trade with communist countries exist, but their days may be numbered. President Marcos said in May 1969, "Regional cooperation is the salvation for this part of the world." He added that "... the Philippines is looking towards Eastern Europe for possible new friends."

"He mentioned Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, but indicated there was no definite plan at present to establish diplomatic relations with them... 'we hope to reach a decision this year' on what further steps would be taken regarding the Eastern European countries" (*Manila Times*, May 3, 1969). In a televised interview just before the election he said he would allow a Marxist/Leninist-oriented political party as long as it did not advocate the violent overthrow of government!

Japan

What about the influence of Japan?

In the above interview, President Marcos looked to Japan for more leadership in this area. He said that "... Japan should take more responsibility for the security of Asia, including a stronger military role!" (*Manila Times*, May 3, 1969.)



During the occupation, Japan treated Filipinos worse than any other nation ever had before. Yet, they are looking to Japan as the strong military leader of Asia!

The Japanese foreign ministry is planning to step up financial aid to Southeast Asian countries and a ministerial conference will take place soon in Tokyo to discuss Southeast Asian development.

This should be expected. President Nixon during his recent visit here told the Filipinos that the U.S. was ready to pull back and let them fight their own battles. The U.S. would probably help, but many question the desirability of help of the kind given to Vietnam. U.S. aid to Asia is expected to be cut drastically, immediately. The Philippines is an important American ally but the traditional ties of friendship are loosening.

Many Filipinos feel that it was because of U.S. presence here that Japan invaded the Philippines in World War II. They expect World War III will break out someday, and they don't want Americans to bring Japanese wrath (or Chinese aggression) upon them again.

It appears, one way or another, the Philippines is going to eventually sever

its present relationship with the U. S. and go into at least economic partnership with Japan or China — probably the former — with increased trade with the Communist Bloc. It really has little choice. The Philippines cannot go on alone. They are economically close to bankruptcy, and militarily incapable of prolonged defense in case of war. If the U. S. withdraws its armed forces from the Philippines, this nation will be virtually defenseless.

True Independence

In spite of the freedom their Constitution proclaims, most Filipinos are not free — free from want, hunger, disease, fear, or foreign domination. These are the freedoms they want, this is true independence.

There is a way to attain these freedoms. True Christianity has the answer. "If ye continue [obey and follow] in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31, 32). The truth that sets men free from the ravages of poverty is not found in the Philippine Constitution or the Communist Manifesto. If you would like to learn more about how you can gain true freedom, send for our *free* booklets *Why Were You Born?* and *The Wonderful World Tomorrow — What It Will Be Like* and the monthly magazine *TOMORROW'S WORLD*. These publications cost you nothing, but they will show how you and the Filipino will eventually attain freedom, true prosperity and happiness — within this century!

The Philippines is in greater danger today than in any period of its history. The next four years will see tremendous changes in this small nation. It has a wonderful future, but there are traumatic times ahead. Unless the Philippines solves its very real and complex problems soon, she will once again come under external powers and foreign control.

Right now world leaders are watching which way the Philippines will turn. She needs a strong economic partner to follow. Where will that vitally needed leadership come from — East or West? We won't have to wait long for the answer. □

HOW your PLAIN TRUTH subscription has been paid

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Personal from the Editor

(Continued from page 1)

a Ph.D. degree in Anatomy-Brain Research (neurophysiology) from the UCLA Department of Anatomy and Brain Research Institute, and a second A.B. degree from Ambassador College. He has conducted research programs in molecular biology and cerebro-cortical electrophysiology. On the faculty of Ambassador College he is presently investigating the inter-relationship between science, theology and the survival of mankind.

I give you, here, a condensed partial report of his studies in the relative difference between animal brain and human mind. It is, I realize, rather technical and scientific for a magazine of general mass circulation like *The PLAIN TRUTH*. Therefore it is not complete. I do not want to bore the reader with excessive technical material. But I do want to give evidence that the results of my own researches into this MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION are sound, and in harmony with the latest scientific research.

WHY is this so important?

Because it EXPLAINS WHY the human mind can invent the computer, devise means of space travel, do marvelous exploits in the physical and material realm — YET IS SO ABYSMALLY IMPOTENT when it comes to solving his own problems here on earth.

Further, it explains WHY man has these problems.

Can anything be MORE IMPORTANT? Or more interesting? Or more FASCINATING?

Following is Dr. Robert Kuhn's report, in part, condensed. His full report will appear in our book.

"Man thinks. At least he thinks that he thinks. But he knows. And he knows that he knows. Man is indeed unique: No other physical being is creatively self-conscious, nor can any other ponder the transcendental questions of life, death and ultimate purpose.

"It is now imperative to seriously revive those old — yet still unsolved — questions: What is man? Where has man come from? Where is he going? What is man's purpose? How should he live? Our very survival lies in credible answers to these fundamental questions.

"For the crux of the inquiry, we must resurrect the endlessly rehashed 'mind-body problem'. What is the relationship between man's mental activities and his physical brain? *What is "mind" — is it different from brain?*

"Materialism postulates that matter is the only reality. Consequently, *the mind would be just the brain. And nothing more.* 'Mind' is viewed as an epiphenomenon, simply the totality (*Gestalt*) of physiological brain function. The materialist believes that the term 'mind' itself is unnecessary and confusing, and was invented to superstitiously explain what man could not yet physically comprehend. The scientist, who by definition is concerned exclusively with the physical, epitomizes the materialist.

"So the lines of combat are clearly drawn: the materialistic scientists, dressed in their laboratory smocks, are barricaded behind their esoteric theories on one side; the spiritualistic religionists, clothed in their preaching frocks, are entrenched behind their philosophical reasonings on the opposite side. In the historic struggle between religion and science, the materialism-mind controversy remains the classic confrontation. In our 'sophisticated' society of wishy-washy noncommitment, each side is usually courteous toward the other — at least in public. This uneasy truce is often expressed in popular articles: 'Can a Scientist Believe in God?' or 'A Theologian Looks at Modern Science'. Is man wholly physical — or does he have a higher purpose? In our nightmarish age, this question is vital.

"Now, at this same critical juncture in history, there has emerged a science which can unravel the mystery and direct us toward the sorely needed solution. Just as the 1960's witnessed enormous strides in molecular

biology, we are now entering *the age of brain research*. Brain research is presently evolving into a multi-disciplined study where scientists from two dozen or so diverse fields — from physics to physiology, biochemistry to psychiatry — combine forces for a frontal attack upon the basic mechanisms of thought.

"'The brain is a computer,' cries the materialist, pointing out parallel concepts in cybernetics and neurophysiology. Information in the brain is simply the presence or absence of an electro-chemical discharge. This 'presence-absence' is precisely the same as the 'yes-no,' 'flip-flop' of a computer. True enough, the brain is enormously more sophisticated in potential pathways and micro-circuitry. (There are upwards of 10,000 to 50,000 independent nerve cells in every cubic millimeter of cerebral cortex — 10 to 15 billion altogether; each nerve cell is able to receive simultaneous information from thousands of cells, integrating and then funneling this new information to many other cells; consequently, the permutations and combinations of circuitry and sequences becomes astronomical.)

"BUT IS HUMAN MIND ENTIRELY THE SAME AS ANIMAL BRAIN?

"*That's the crucial question.* And to find the answer, we submit this fundamental issue to the unbiased arbitration of brain research.

"Representative mammalian brains can be weighed and, in descending order, they are: Whale, elephant, dolphin, man, gorilla, chimpanzee, and rat. Comparative anatomical studies reveal a uniformity of distinct brain structures: Each structure is present in every brain, though their relative sizes vary. There is *no* qualitative difference among *all* the mammalian brains.

"Mentally, of course, man is unquestionably supreme. That's obvious. But he *doesn't* have the largest brain! And that's suprising.

"However, physiologists can explain this apparent paradox. They realize that only the cerebral cortex is

responsible for conscious intelligence. (The *cerebral cortex* is the thin, 4 mm., outermost layer of the brain — it is convoluted [folded and furrowed] in order to compact a large surface area into a small volume.) Further investigations reveal two general categories of cortex: 'Specific cortex' subserving direct sensation (visual, auditory, somesthetic) and movements; and 'unspecific-cortex' ('or association-cortex') which has no direct connection with the external environment. Unspecific cortex is composed of two areas: 'Posterior-unspecific-cortex,' involved in sensory associations and problem solving; and 'frontal-unspecific-cortex,' from which thinking in the sphere of time, social awareness and the 'will' originate. Unspecific cortex, then, is the key to *human* thought. Man has large unspecific cortical areas — especially the frontal regions. Consequently, man *should* be *somewhat* more advanced than mere brain size suggested.

"But here again there is a problem: man's cerebral cortex, even his frontal unspecific region, is not as large as the whale's. So maybe the *relative* proportion of unspecific cortex is critical. Perhaps too much *specific* cortex 'clutters up' the brain — much as numerous local radio stations will limit the range of a super-power radio station — thereby not allowing the *unspecific* cortical areas the 'un-jammed freedom' necessary for the generation of abstract, cognitive and symbolic thought. If this is indeed true, the *ratio* (percentage) of unspecific cortex to total cortex is the critical factor.

"Our *physiological* conclusions can now be finalized: Man's brain is the most advanced; chimpanzee (large *ratio* of unspecific cortex) and whale, dolphin and elephant (large *amounts* of unspecific cortex) are *all* a *very close* second.

"Consequently, with respect to individual and collective behavior, on the bases of all physical evidence, a die-hard materialist would smugly expect the *same close* relative positions to exist between the 'mental abilities' of

man, chimp, whale, dolphin and elephant as does already exist between their respective brains. Such a naïve gentleman would be visibly shaken by a study of comparative psychology. The mental attainment of human beings would seem to be *utterly impossible* as judged by his self-deluded jangle of pompous ideas.

"Anybody who is even the least bit aware of his environment will surely recognize that man is unique. Man is vastly different — producing automobiles and astronauts, bridges and brushes, symphonies and soliloquies, catastrophes and calamities. Man communicates symbolically, he inquires about himself, he delves into his origin, he writes his history, he builds upon his predecessors and he passes on to his descendants. None of these characteristics are remotely shown by chimp, whale or any other animal.

"The materialist stands stupefied. He *cannot* account for the cavernous gulf between human mind and animal instinct. The brains are not *that* different — anatomically, biochemically, or electrically.

"There is no *physical* explanation.

"And that frightens the materialist — because his whole life-style is now open to question.

"He knows that there is only one solution to the problem: A unique NON-*physical* component must exist in the human mind — an essence which transforms the human brain into the human mind.

"Non-physical! There is no other choice. Naturally, the existence of *anything* non-physical is very depressing to many scientists, since it acknowledges a reality *above* their own — now limited — fields of endeavor. Nevertheless, to retain even a shred of their much-professed 'intellectual honesty,' every scientist will have to admit that the human mind contains a NON-physical component.

"Considering the cosmological significance of such an intimate non-physical power, we should clearly understand the logical sequence of prerequisite propositions which culminate in this conclusion:

1. Man does not have the most massive brain, nor the largest cerebral cortex, nor even the greatest unspecific cortical areas. Therefore, brain size cannot be the sole explanation for 'mind' — or else whale, elephant and dolphin would dominate the world.
2. Mammalian brains are qualitatively identical; there are no unique sections in man's brain, every structure is easily found in other brains.
3. Proportionally, man has the largest unspecific cortex. This critical percentage (unspecific cortex/total cortex x 100) is about 60 percent in man, 40 percent in chimp, and less than 10 percent in rat. About the same relative positions among man, chimp and rat also hold with respect to the micro-anatomical organization of cerebro-cortical nerve cells and the intricate waveform patterns of cerebro-cortical electrical activity. The trend is clear: Chimp brain is *enormously* more complex than rat brain, while in comparison, human brain is only *faintly* more complex than chimp brain. Human and chimp brains are similar, rat brain far behind.
4. *Consequently, on the basis of all physical data, chimp should be mentally 'superior' to rat to a far greater degree than man is mentally superior to chimp.* The chimp/rat 'species-IQ' ratio should be significantly above the man/chimp ratio. We would therefore expect the product of brain function (the mental output of man, chimp and rat) — the psychological accomplishments of the individuals and the sociological attainments of the species — to closely follow the relative positions of their respective brains and be somewhat similar for man and chimp, while much different for chimp and rat. As a result, *based on their physical brains alone*, humans should 'think' only a *bit* better than chimp, while chimp should 'think' *substantially* better than rat.
5. However, precisely the *opposite* is true. Chimp and rats 'think' very similarly. Both can learn complex

problems involving long sequences of moves; both have similar group activities, maturational processes, etc. True enough, chimp behavior is more intricate and less stereotyped. Nonetheless, chimps and rats differ only *quantitatively* — not qualitatively.

6. But who could honestly say that man differs only *quantitatively* from chimp? Who but man possesses the awareness of ecstasy the ecstasy of love, the love of beauty, the beauty of accomplishment, the accomplishment of inspiration, the inspiration of creativity, the creativity of wisdom, the wisdom of humility, the humility of humor, and the humor of himself? Man stands apart — a distinct creation.
7. We can now formulate our conclusion.
 - (a) Man's brain is similar to animal brain, merely continuing the gradual increase in complexity evidenced by *all* mammals from rat to chimpanzee.
 - (b) All brain research — anatomy, biochemistry, electrophysiology — staunchly proclaims that the human brain is *just barely* superior to chimp brain, whereas chimp brain is *substantially* superior to rat brain.
 - (c) Consequently, *if* the human mind is *entirely* the product of the human brain, then the human mind can be no more than *just barely* superior to chimp brain, whereas chimp brain must be *substantially* superior to rat brain.
 - (d) But chimps and rats have qualitatively the *same* compulsive 'thought' patterns.
 - (e) And the self-conscious human mind is supreme beyond measure — unequivocally distinct and irrevocably dissociated from the stereotyped behavior of chimp.
 - (f) Obviously, the *slim* superiority of the physical human brain cannot account for this yawning chasm between the uniquely unrestrained human mind

and the instinctively automatic animal brain.

- (g) *Therefore, a non-physical addition must unite with and augment the human brain, converting it into the human mind.*

"Now *please don't* lose points 7f and 7g amidst the verbosity and the rhetoric! The human brain *cannot* explain the human mind — plain and simple. There *must* be a non-physical ingredient, beyond our microscopes, test tubes, electrodes and computers.

"Evolutionary theorists enjoy pointing out the overt similarities between human and ape brains in order to corroborate their belief that both evolved from the same primeval source. It is extremely ironic that what they have actually stumbled upon is the most significant scientific observation in history, irrefutably attesting to the necessary existence of a non-physical essence in the human mind. Without this non-physical factor, man could be nothing more than a 'super-chimp,' more intelligent than a 'normal' chimp to the *same limited* degree that a 'normal' chimp is more intelligent than a slightly less complex mammal.

"Can there be any doubt? The human mind infinitely outclasses animal brain. But why? How is the human mind generated? If the *human brain* exhibited a credible *physiological* explanation — a structure, function or capacity not seen in animal brain — wouldn't materialistic scientists have immediately publicized the data to support their contention that the human mind is 100% physical? Of course they *would have* — but they have *not* — *because they cannot*.

"Think about it.

"To the truly open-minded individual, it is fruitless to physically rationalize the uniqueness of the human mind.

"There must be a non-physical essence — a '*spirit*' — in man."

In Dr. Kuhn's report, he next refers to the possible arguments the materialist has left, examines and refutes the arguments. This phase of his report is even more technical, and would be

tedious and probably incomprehensible to the reader untrained in these branches of the physical sciences. Space does not allow their presentation here.

But I feel that what I have given, in condensed form, should prove interesting not only, but also conclusive to the unprejudiced mind.

I have touched briefly and superficially on this subject heretofore in these columns. Revelation makes plain what this new science finally discovers, *the fact* of the presence of SPIRIT in man. But that spirit, peculiar to humans, is emphatically NOT an immortal soul. Biblical revelation decisively refutes the pagan belief in an "immortal soul," reveals the "soul" as the living, breathing MAN composed wholly and solely of physical material substance from the ground. The soul, therefore, is revealed as being composed of matter — *not* spirit. Twice it is written, "the soul that sinneth, it shall DIE."

Rather this spirit is IN the soul which is wholly mortal.

The function of this human spirit is to impart the power of intellect to the human brain. It is not a spirit being, but spirit essence. This spirit, of itself, cannot see, hear, feel, think or know. Of itself it has no consciousness independent of the brain.

It is the physical brain that sees, through the eye. It hears through the ear. It is the BRAIN that KNOWS — that, empowered by the human spirit, thinks, reasons, comes to conscious understanding. The knowledge is in the brain, not the spirit independent of the brain.

The spirit in man, I repeat, merely imparts the power of intellect — the power to THINK, to REASON, to make decisions — to the physical brain. This human spirit has no consciousness of itself, independent of the brain.

There is not space here to give you all the Biblical FACTS. They will appear in the forthcoming book, which will be offered gratis as a public service. I warn you, however, it will be an eye-opening book, and with the FACTS will shatter many errors which have received a considerable public acceptance.

The BIG POINT is this:

The presence of this SPIRIT content in man presents man with an emotional,

moral and spiritual nature. It confronts him with SPIRITUAL PROBLEMS which he CANNOT UNDERSTAND.

And WHY can't even the great minds understand?

Because the human MIND is LIMITED to knowledge of the physical and material. Knowledge can enter the mind, naturally, only through the eye, ear, sense of smell, touch or feel, and taste. The spirit does not see, as stated above. The physical brain sees, through the eye.

Man, due to this spirit within him, finds himself confronted by *spiritual problems*. But he is incapable of spiritual KNOWLEDGE. For he cannot SEE spirit. Nor hear, nor taste, nor smell nor feel spirit.

And where does *this* lead us?

The human MIND was made INCOMPLETE — and for a very great reason — by an all-wise Creator. Man was made to NEED another Spirit! *Not a human spirit* — but the Spirit of the living God! *This* has been available to him for many centuries — but man has spurned it. Only by the addition of this Holy Spirit of the living God can the human mind comprehend spiritual knowledge and spiritual REALITY! And he must receive it by revelation, which the educated of this world have rejected.

I have said that ALL human ills and woes and sufferings have come from transgressing of the inexorable law of LOVE — the way of outgoing concern — of selflessness — of giving and sharing — of serving and helping. That Law is summed up, in principle, in the Ten Commandments. But that inexorable living Law is a SPIRITUAL Law, against which the carnal mind is hostile!

Every ill and woe and evil suffered by man has come through transgression of that WAY — that Law!

Many of my readers will not understand this. Some will resent it — I hope not YOU! But, accept, reject, love or hate, or simply wonder — IT IS THE TRUTH, which, in due time not now far off, ALL will come to understand!

This is going to be a very important book. It will be announced in *The PLAIN TRUTH* when available. But, knowing how difficult it is for me to

crowd such writing into my very busy schedule, I cannot promise when that will be. I will do my best. Please be patient. □

What our READERS SAY

(Continued from inside front cover)

show that writers as well as scientists, may make absurd statements; perhaps neither should be taken seriously."

G. E. S

Walker, Iowa

"I write this letter mainly out of curiosity; I often wonder if you make up the letters printed in your column, 'What Our Readers Say,' and I wish to see if this letter will be printed."

Julie A,

Manteca, California

• *Guess what, Julie.*

"In your December 1969 article entitled 'Why Today's Youth Is Disenchanted,' Raymond F. McNair states, '... hippies away from home often have to go hungry, dress shabbily, sleep in cold, dirty, hard places. They don't have the money to buy the necessities of life.' Just the other day I was reading about a man who lived 20 centuries ago, who, in many ways, resembled these members of the 'cult of hippiedom.' This bearded long-haired, individualistic non-conformist often went hungry, dressed shabbily and slept in cold, dirty, hard places. In the three years before He was crucified this hippie type NEVER had the money to buy the necessities of life. Need I tell you His name?"

Brian R.,

Hinsdale, Illinois

• *Yes Brian, who was he? Whoever this character was, he should have taken a lesson from Jesus Christ, who kept His hair cut short (1 Cor. 11:14); ate plenty of wholesome food (Mark 6:41-44); often lived in a home at Capernaum (Mark 2:1); conformed to the laws of God (John 15:10); had sufficient money (John 13:29); and wore clothing of such good quality that soldiers cast lots for it (John 19:23-24). Besides all this, Jesus Christ rose from the dead after HE was crucified.*

TELEVISION

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

- *WGR — Buffalo, N. Y. — Channel 2, 12 noon Sun.
- KWHY — Los Angeles — Channel 22, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
- KTLLA — Los Angeles — Channel 5, 10:30 p.m. Sun.
- KERO — Bakersfield, Calif. — Channel 23, 6 p.m. Sun.
- KJEO — Fresno, Calif. — Channel 47, 10:30 p.m. Sat.
- KNTV — San Jose, Calif. — Channel 11, 1 p.m. Sun.
- KLTC — Henderson, Nev. — Channel 5, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
- *KSL — Salt Lake City — Channel 5, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
- KHQ — Spokane, Wash. — Channel 6, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
- KVOS — Bellingham, Wash. — Channel 12, 3:30 p.m. Sat.
- KOIN — Portland, Ore. — Channel 6, 5 p.m. Sun.
- KCND — Pembina, N. Dak. — Channel 12, 5 p.m. Sun.
- KLTV — Tyler, Texas — Channel 7, 5 p.m. Mon., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
- KTAL — Texarkana-Shreveport — Channel 6, 4 p.m. Sun.
- WSIX — Nashville, Tenn. — Channel 8, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
- WCAE — St. John, Ind. — Channels 50 and 72, 8 p.m. Wed.
- WTCN — Minneapolis — Channel 11, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
- CFCF — Montreal, Que. — Channel 12, 4 p.m. Sun.
- CKMI — Quebec City, Que. — Channel 5, 7:30 p.m. Mon.
- CFQC — Saskatoon, Sask. — Channel 8, 12 noon Sun.
- CKBI NETWORK — 4 p.m. Sat.
- Prince Albert, Sask. — Channel 5.
- Alticane, Sask. — Channel 10.
- North Battleford, Sask. — Channel 7.
- Nipawin, Sask. — Channel 2.
- Greenwater, Sask. — Channel 4.
- Big River, Sask. — Channel 9.
- CFRN NETWORK — 11:30 a.m. Sun.
- Edmonton, Alta. — Channel 3.
- Whitcourt, Alta. — Channel 12.
- Ashmont, Alta. — Channel 12.
- CFCN NETWORK — 2 p.m. Sun.
- Calgary, Alta. — Channel 4.
- Drumheller/Hand Hills, Alta. — Channel 12.
- Banff, Alta. — Channel 8.
- Brooks, Alta. — Channel 9.
- Lake Louise, Alta. — Channel 6.
- Lethbridge, Alta. — Channel 13.
- Drumheller, Alta. — Channel 10.
- Kimberley, B.C. — Channel 3.
- Columbia Valley, B.C. — Channel 6.
- Jubilee Mt., B.C. — Channel 8.

* Asterisk indicates new station or time change.



ADVANCE NEWS REPORTS

Come alive TODAY!

IN A SUDDEN move, the Soviet Union has agreed to talk with West Germany over a mutual renunciation of the use of force. The talks were proposed by West Germany's new Chancellor, Willy Brandt.

Political observers saw the negotiations, begun in Moscow on December 8, as opening up a whole "new era" in relations between West and Communist East Europe.

Some analysts viewed the talks, however, with a degree of skepticism. To the French, especially, the haunting specter of another Rapallo Treaty was inescapable. Secret provisions in the 1922 Rapallo Treaty permitted the German Army to design, build and test weapons on Russian soil.

Washington is reportedly annoyed with West Germany's leaders for allegedly failing to consult with the U. S. about Bonn's current initiations toward the Soviet Union and other East European nations.

Relations Improving

The new overtures to Russia are the spearhead of a vigorous Eastern European policy launched by Chancellor Brandt. The Kremlin, quite obviously, prefers to deal with the new Socialist government now at the helm in Bonn, than the Christian Democrats previously in power.

Significantly, on the day the Moscow talks began, a massive Russian order for West German steel pipes was announced in Düsseldorf. Under the 1.5 billion mark (408 million dollar) deal — the biggest single order ever placed with the West German steel industry — the pipes will be used by the Soviets to conduct natural gas from the

icy tracts of Northern Siberia into the heart of Central Europe.

Bonn Inks Nuclear Pact

It is obvious that the Kremlin's sudden readiness to talk results largely from another recent incident.

On November 28, West German Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Helmut Allardt, signed the nuclear nonproliferation treaty on behalf of the Bonn Government. The pact, which has now been signed by 93 countries, is intended to prevent the further spread of atomic and hydrogen weapons to non-nuclear states.

To West German eyes, the treaty undoubtedly is of far more important political consequence now.

Said Ambassador Allardt at the signing ceremony: "The signature was performed in the hope that it will give new impetus to our relations not only with the Soviet Union but with other eastern neighbors."

In the past, Germany's continued stalling on signing the treaty has barred any improvement in ties between Bonn and the Communist nations.

In a related move, Chancellor Brandt has taken the first step toward improving relations with Poland. In Warsaw on November 24, West Germany's trade mission chief handed the Polish government a note proposing talks to improve relations between the two governments.

Economic Links Growing

It is in the economic sphere where the firmest East-West links are being forged.

West Germany and other nations within the booming Common Market

rapidly are increasing economic ties with its Communist neighbors.

Romania's economy is moving more and more toward the West. Imports from the Common Market are up a whopping 87 percent in just 3 years.

In Hungary, recent moves were initiated in the foreign trade ministry to increase economic contacts with the West.

Yugoslavia and the Common Market are nearing completion of a trade agreement which would be the first pact between the Six and an East European country.

Talks are also being arranged between the Common Market and its Soviet-led East European counterpart, Comecon.

The pipeline project between West Germany and the Soviet Union is the biggest single trade development of all. It represents the second-largest deal ever undertaken by Moscow with a Western European nation.

Two things must be kept in mind in all of this: First, the economic needs of the Soviet Union and the whole Communist camp are great. Unless Moscow gives in a little, she risks a worsening relationship with her satellites, especially Poland, Hungary and Romania.

Secondly, the Soviets clearly are aiming at patching up differences with their Western neighbors in order to prepare for any renewed trouble with Red China in the East.

* * * * *

Apollo 12 — Who Watched?

Another space spectacular for the United States.

One of the outstanding achievements

of Apollo 12 was, as Sir Bernard Lovell, Britain's top space scientist put it, the "precision and accuracy" of the landing. The lunar module was guided by command pilot Charles Conrad to approximately 600 feet from the target of the mission — the unmanned Surveyor 3 craft which landed on the moon about 2½ years ago. Parts of Surveyor 3 were brought back by Conrad and companion Alan Bean.

The key assignment of Apollo 12 was to set up a long-term scientific station on the moon. A nuclear-powered package of instruments was left behind to measure the moon's magnetic field, "moonquakes," and the moon's atmosphere and ionosphere. Also deposited on the lunar surface was a spectrometer for charting strength, speed and direction of solar wind. The "atomic battery" of the nuclear generator could keep the experimental complex operating for as long as five years.

Worldwide reaction to this latest space venture was generally one of disinterest, despite widespread television coverage of the mission.

Now the United States is planning for Apollo 13. Each shot in the Apollo series calls for increasingly more difficult and complex tasks. Apollo 13 is tentatively scheduled for a March 12 blastoff and a pinpoint landing attempt in a shallow crater surrounded by rugged mountains.

Beyond Apollo 13 there are plans for an eight-day stay in Apollo 16 and use of a "dune buggy" on Apollo 17 in 1971. This lunar roving vehicle will allow astronauts to travel 20 miles or more from the lunar module.

* * * * *

Okinawa's Future Decided

Okinawa and other U. S.-held islands in the Ryukyu chain are to be returned to Japanese control in 1972.

This is the outcome of the history-making discussions between President Nixon and Premier Sato of Japan in Washington on November 19-21.

Premier Sato hailed the agreement as bringing the post-war relationship between victor and vanquished to a close.

In a speech before the National Press Club, Sato promised that Japan will make a contribution to peace in Asia as an equal partner with the U. S.

Some key American officials, however, have expressed grave reservations over reversion of the geographically strategic island chain.

Okinawa is the keystone for the defense of free Asian nations against Communist aggression. Sometimes referred to as a "stationary aircraft carrier," the U. S. air bases on Okinawa enjoy a strategic central location from which American aircraft can reach any Asian nation with which the U. S. has a security agreement.

U. S. strategists claim they would be hard pressed to replace the 200 military installations on Okinawa.

Although the United States is scheduled to continue operating the Okinawa bases after reversion, it will relinquish the right to store nuclear weapons on them. In addition, Japan will assume the right to stop the use of Okinawa for conducting warfare. The bases on Okinawa will operate under the same restrictions as U. S. bases on the main Japanese islands.

The importance of such a "veto" possibility is underlined by the role of Okinawa as a major staging area for bombing missions to Vietnam. In order to allay such fears, Premier Sato has given assurances that Japan will not hinder the U. S. military effort in Vietnam after reversion, should the war last that long.

No one, however, can accurately predict what the attitude of the Japanese government will be in the future. Even now the Sato government is under strong anti-U. S. pressure from left-wing student demonstrators and workers. The goal of these blocs is the elimination of all U. S. bases from Japanese soil.

Another key factor in reversion is Japan's promise to assume a larger share of the responsibility for the defense of Asia. This has the encouragement of Washington. Premier Sato has promised to double the defense budget after 1972. Japan at present has a small but efficient "Self-Defense Force."

Leading Japanese industrialists have

been calling for large buildup in the military posture, especially in the naval SDF. They see a need to protect the nation's far-flung trade and shipping interests.

In a recent speech in Matsue, Japan, Premier Sato referred to eventual complete reversal of U. S. and Japanese roles in Asia.

"Regarding the problem of Asian security," he said, "it is Japan that is gradually going to play the leading role while the U. S. will be cooperating from the sidelines."

The year 1970 will be a crucial one in



AP Wirephoto

Japan's Prime Minister Eisaku Sato converses with President Nixon during conference in Washington on Okinawa issue.

U. S.-Japanese relations. The Security Treaty under which the U. S. guarantees Japanese security with nuclear weapons if necessary, is up for renewal. Powerful pressure groups in Japan want the treaty scrapped, others want significant changes.

A recent public opinion poll showed four out of five Japanese favored "defending the country by themselves." In another more significant poll, 45 percent of those questioned felt that Japan someday would acquire nuclear weapons. This was an "unthinkable" thought just a few years ago.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The PLAIN TRUTH
P. O. Box 111
Pasadena, California 91109

Printed in U.S.A.

★ THE INCREDIBLE PARADOX OF THE 60's

The decade of the Sixties changed all of us. No matter where we live, the world events of the past 10 years created a vastly different world — and promise a vastly different future. See page 2.

★ WILL THE REAL SCHOOL PLEASE STAND UP?

The REAL educational impact on children is not taking place in our classrooms. For two decades now, a more powerful influence has been subtly shaping the minds and values of an entire generation. What is that force? How is it affecting us? What should you be doing about it? This article reveals today's REAL school. See page 16.

★ THE DAY THE DINOSAURS DIED

In the dim past of antiquity, giant dinosaurs roamed the earth. Suddenly — the dinosaur's strange world came to a cataclysmic end. This mystery of the "great dying" has been a century-long puzzle to the best minds in paleontology. Its true meaning gives us a much-needed understanding of this earth's history. See page 22.

★ FREEDOM OF THE PRESS THREATENED?

Has the precious freedom of the press been seriously threatened? Is government censorship imminent? News media, particularly the major T.V. networks, reacted sharply to President Nixon's recent nationally televised speech. The administration's reactions to news commentaries, in particular the now sensationalized speeches of the Vice-President, have created a bigger furor than anything in recent memory. Read in this informative article just what did happen, and what it could portend. See page 33.

★ REPORT ON THE PHILIPPINES — A SEARCH FOR "FREEDOM"

Although an ancient people, as a young democratic nation the Filipinos are in trouble. This is the story of just one of the many new nations that have been established since World War II, and the manifold problems it has encountered as it strives to be free of dependence on others. See page 38.

671 005-3721-1 1 P10
JACK M LANE
5932 YARMOUTH AVE
ENCINO CA 91316