


the **PLAIN TRUTH**

a magazine of understanding



PRESIDENT NIXON—

"I call for some degree of sacrifice . . . to protect the American dollar."

What Our READERS SAY

Character Drain

"Your article 'Character Drain' is indeed timely. What it fails to point out, however, is that any character building that takes place in the home is seriously undermined by *outside* influences over which the home has little or no control. I am referring specifically to the press (papers, pocketbooks), the movies, TV, radio, etc. It is these influences that mould our people, and unless you can convert the editors, producers, and publishers of these media to the cause of building character as per your article, your chances of succeeding in this effort are unfortunately NIL."

H. E. B.,
Edmonton, Alberta

"Your article 'Character Drain' is most shocking and seems so true. I was thinking how each of us contribute to the situation, no matter how much we try to tell ourselves we don't."

Don G.,
Merrill, Wisconsin

Service with a "Sneer"

"As a man who has traveled the world — and of the age that remembers the smiling days — I have enjoyed immensely your article 'Service With a Sneer'! You have hit the nail on the head dead center, but it's a cry in the wilderness!"

M. W. M.,
Columbus, Ohio

"I just finished your article entitled 'Service With a Sneer.' Although many of your arguments are valid, I think you take too pessimistic a view of what is happening to 'service' today. I eat out a great deal... mostly at lunch... and I very seldom see an unkempt bus boy, an odorous cab driver, or any of your other complaints. Most of the cab drivers in D.C. are black, and 99% of them are courteous and most interesting conversationalists. I do find a great difference between the younger ones and the older ones... the latter are far more polite."

V. Sant,
Washington, D.C.

BREAD — The Broken Staff of Life

"The article 'Bread — The Broken Staff of Life' was one of your better articles in that it's something all can do, whereas some may feel more worldly problems are beyond their command."

"However, by encouraging the purchase of electric grain grinders instead of hand grinders, you remove those who cannot afford that investment from having the chance to improve their health by grinding their own grain and baking their own bread. Actually, hand grinders work just fine; they just need a little more time and some muscle power. But any housewife, her husband, or teen-age son or daughter can grind enough grain for four loaves of bread in 15-20 minutes with a hand grinder. It's also good exercise for the body."

Mr. and Mrs. B. J.,
Cedar Falls, Iowa

"My husband and I want to thank you for the wonderful whole wheat bread recipe in the last PLAIN TRUTH magazine. We are both avid readers and delight in *The PLAIN TRUTH*, but this recipe made a special hit with us. I make all our bread and have found that this is by far the best tasting and most nutritious bread recipe that I have tried! Thank you so much."

Mrs. Erwin B.,
Rolla, Missouri

"I am very much interested in health. And since I enjoy cooking, I was so surprised to read that all those baked goods I've made are of no nutritional value."

"I'm turning over a new leaf, and a new loaf now, while my children are young and their bodies and minds can benefit. Please send me the details of nutritional bread baking."

Mrs. Anita M.,
Bellflower, California

"I have read *The PLAIN TRUTH* for August, 1971 and am concerned with the article entitled, 'Bread — the Broken Staff of Life.' Bread appears to be the whipping boy on the part of numerous writers who are both misinformed and uninformed concerning the merit of bread as a food in the human diet."

William B.,
American Institute of Baking

Suicides

"Although I'm only seventeen years old, I am one of three million who have attempted suicide or who will attempt suicide this year. Things weren't and still aren't going my way, so I thought I should end it all; besides, it seemed like a good way to get back at everyone who doesn't care about me while I'm living."

"I really want help, but I don't know who to go to. I told my minister what I did, but I don't think he knew how to deal with it (he's in his last year at the Seminary). But I don't know how to deal with it either."

"I want love and understanding. That's all most potential suicides need. Thanks for the understanding part."

Susan S.

"The Good Life"

"In the article 'The Good Life', written by Jerry Gentry, he asks, what has caused farm children and farmers, by the millions to leave the way of life of our ancestors and flock to the cities. I would like to tell you what I think is the cause. I speak from experience of one who has

(Continued on inside back cover)

IF YOU would like to share your comments with our readers, direct your letters to *The PLAIN TRUTH*, *What Our Readers Say*, P.O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91109. Space will not allow all comments to be published, but we will do our best to select those that may be of special interest to our readers.

the PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

October 1971

VOL. XXXVI

NO. 10

Published monthly at 300 West Green St., Pasadena, California 91105; Radlett, England; and North Sydney, Australia, by Ambassador College. French, Dutch and German editions published at Radlett, England; Spanish edition at Big Sandy, Texas. © 1971 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

John Susco, Art Editor

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

Photography: Norman A. Smith, Director; Joseph Clayton, Assistant Director; Lyle Christopherson, Howard A. Clark, Frank Clarke, David Conn, Sam Duncan, Jerry J. Gentry, Ian Henderson, John G. Kilburn, John Portune, Eugene Smyda, Dave Verell, Warren Watson.

Art Department: Thomas Haworth, Ron Lepeska, Roy Lepeska, William S. Schuler, Herbert A. Viera, Jr., Monte Wolverton, Robb Woods.

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.

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

New Zealand: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand.


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

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.

Registered in Australia for transmission by post as a book.

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

Personal from



World's Trouble Areas — What Could Happen

MUCH OF my time, this past year, has been spent in the two major trouble areas of the world — the Middle East, and Southeast Asia.

In a very troubled world, I not only have visited the trouble zones, but I have had many personal talks with Heads-of-State, and other top officials in these areas.

I have had private discussions with four presidents, three kings, three prime ministers, two crown princes, numerous top-ranking ministers, cabinet members, including foreign secretaries. Also I have talked with members of parliaments or equivalent lawmaking bodies comparable to the U.S. Senate. And in addition, I have had conferences with presidents and leading professors of universities and colleges.

No one knows, in specific detail, precisely what *will* happen in world events in the next very few weeks, months, or years. But existing conditions are fraught with explosive potential. And based on these pregnant conditions, on recent happenings and trends — based also on what I have learned in discussions with world leaders, as well as understanding of Biblical prophecies — I could outline for our readers a possible chain of events that *could* stand the whole world aghast in wonder and amazement!

I can tell you with confidence that world peace *will* come in our time. But the world is heading into accelerating troubles that apparently must come first.

Our staff of editors and writers, stationed at and traveling constantly to all parts of the world, have been keeping PLAIN TRUTH readers up to the minute on the MEANING of world happenings and trends. More so, I believe, than any other publication in the world.

Two important articles in recent numbers of *The PLAIN TRUTH* describe conditions that could trigger a world-shaking — and totally unexpected — chain reaction that would stagger the imagination. The two articles are “*Europe’s Common Market — Rising World Colossus*” in the May 1971 number, and

In This Issue:

What Our Readers Say	Inside Front Cover
Personal from the Editor	1
America Faces the “Dollar Crisis”	3
Will She Enter the Common Market? BRITAIN’S FATEFUL DECISION	5
The Case For Britain’s Membership	8
The Case Against Britain’s Membership	9
Advance News	11
The Persian Gulf — A “Quiet” Hot Spot	14
Yugoslavia, Italy and the Vatican	18
Glossolalia — The New “Tongues” Movement	20
The Neglected Tragedy of Alcoholism!	25
What You Can Do	31
What’s Keeping You From Real Success?	33
TV Log	37
Radio Log	38
As Arabs and Israelis Struggle For Peace in the Middle East	41



Brack — Black Star

ABOUT OUR COVER

On August 15, U. S. President Nixon shocked international financial centers with the announcement that the U.S. would suspend gold payment to foreigners holding U.S. dollars. In addition, the President imposed a 10% surcharge on all foreign imports entering America, and set the U.S. dollar “afloat” downward in foreign money markets. Meanwhile, in the U.S., public attention was focused on a “wage-price freeze” and announced business incentives.

"Middle East Oil — BLACK GOLD for Europe," in the August 1971 issue.

These articles report existing conditions that portend almost unbelievable possibilities.

As I write — if I may digress a moment — I am high over the Swiss Alps, en route back to Pasadena, California, from Jerusalem. A group of 78 Ambassador College students from our three campuses, two days ago concluded eight weeks of hard work at the archaeological excavations adjoining the temple mount. They were removing 3000 years of debris directly over the areas of the thrones of ancient Kings David and Solomon. Last night the Hebrew University held a banquet in my honor at the new Belgian House building on campus, with our students present.

... And World Tensions Continue

The situations fraught with high tension and unprecedented world violence, are these:

Europe and Japan are dependent on oil from the Middle East. As Paul Kroll stated, in the "BLACK GOLD" article, "Oil makes the world go round. And since oil makes the world go round, a few not-so-powerful nations could literally stop the world." Also, I will add, a certain giant power — the U.S.S.R. — could do this, and stands poised and ready.

A significant fact is that only three or four percent of America's oil requirements come from that area. An attitude in America of disinterest in the Middle East could trigger nuclear war! Europe and Japan cannot take this situation lightly. As Paul Kroll stated: "To Europe and Japan, the thought of a Middle East oil stoppage brings a thousand and one Arabian nightmares."

Japan imports 90% of its oil from the Middle East.

Britain relies on the Middle East and North Africa for 70% of its oil needs.

West Germany close to 90%; Italy almost 95%.

Now realize the impact of these facts: Western Europe's prospects for industrial growth are *directly linked* to a continuing and unimpeded access to Middle East oil!

Europeans are at the mercy of the

oil flow from the Middle East. Coal's share of the energy market has fallen from 56 to 27 percent in ten years. Oil's share has doubled — from 32 to 60 percent. Yet oil *consumption* is three times that of ten years ago.

Now consider the situation discussed by Gene H. Hogberg in his article on Europe's Common Market — "Rising World Colossus."

Momentous, historic events are transforming Western Europe.

With the U.S.S.R. moving warships into the Mediterranean — with the Russians supplying Egypt with arms, and sending officers to train the Egyptian army and air force — with Russia having concluded just recently a treaty with India — with Russia looking on, poised, and hungry to gobble up the Middle East — Europe has had to rely on UNITED STATES POWER to hold the Communists at bay.

The European Concern

But did you read, in the "Common Market" article, what is now happening? European powers are beginning to wonder whether they are safe relying on American power to protect *their* Middle East vital interests, especially since that is not an American vital interest. But there is more.

Recently the United States dollar has been in trouble. European governments were shocked by the revelation that the U. S. suffered a balance-of-payments loss of \$10,700,000,000 in 1970. More dollars flowed out of the United States than flowed in. This, in spite of exports exceeding imports. But in the last few months even that factor has been reversed! Overseas investments, bank transactions, tourist expenditures, foreign aid and overseas military spending caused a massive dollar *drain*.

The U. S. now has only about \$10,000,000,000 in gold to offset total foreign claims of well over \$50,000,000,000. This is merely one of many dire U. S. economic problems of grave concern to the *European Common Market*!

The 1970 overseas fiscal hemorrhage resulted in a \$10,700,000,000 bulge in the dollar holdings of foreign central banks. Seven months ago this dollar "glut" in Western Europe was rapidly

approaching untenable and unmanageable proportions. More dollars are simply not wanted abroad.

America is the world's leading banker nation. And the investors and depositors are seriously wondering how long the bank will remain solvent!

On last February 9, this year — 1971 — the "Six" nations of the Common Market decided to take the plunge and strive against all odds for monetary union. On that date they agreed on a three-stage plan to achieve total economic unity.

And WHY? Because of the sobering events taking place in the United States — in its *desperate* dollar situation. Few Americans have realized the impact of this dollar condition upon Western Europe. NEVER BEFORE has the United States been wallowing in such an ocean of red ink!

Naturally I was unable to finish typing this *Personal* in flight, for we soon landed in England for a stopover at our English campus, where I am now continuing the writing.

And Now — Nixon's New Economic Plan

And on August 15, a two-column top-of-front-page headline in the *Sunday Telegraph* (London), said: "NIXON SPENDS WEEKEND IN FIGHT TO SAVE DOLLAR." New battle lines in the fight for the dollar were being drawn up over the weekend by the President and his four senior economic advisers in a secluded place near Washington.

The situation was becoming desperate. Time was running out. And now, as we go to press, the President's emergency plan is making gains.

Now consider what could well happen!

European nations could decide that it is a matter of life-and-death for them to speed up, in a crash program, their plan for a common currency.

Feeling America is weakening as the giant world economic power, they could lose all confidence in United States power to protect them from Russia making advances into the Middle East and the Mediterranean. This could drive them, in frightened self-defense, to a crash program of political and military

(Continued on inside back cover)



AMERICA FACES "The Dollar Crisis"

FOR 40 YEARS, (1931 to 1971) the American dollar reigned supreme in world trade and finance. From 1945 to 1958, the dollar was considered *better* than gold to most developing economies.

But by 1958 it was becoming evident that the dollar was weakening. The United States, a war-time haven for three fourths of the world's gold, began changing the earmarks of the gold buried in the Federal Reserve Bank in New York City, and in Fort Knox, Kentucky, from "USA" to "France," "Germany" and other nations.

Ten years later, in 1968, claims on U.S. gold were running into the millions of dollars per *day*. More than \$12 billion (half) of the U.S. gold was drained between 1958 and 1968, and much of that came in the last hectic months before March 1968, when the U.S. temporarily closed the gold window.

The "balance of payments" deficit, the net amount of dollars "exported" as claims against our gold, was virtually doubling each year from: \$3 billion per year before 1968; \$6 billion in 1969; \$11 billion in 1970; and a \$25 billion annual rate so far in 1971.

The U.S. was forced to act. On August 15, 1971, President Nixon revealed his new economic plan. One part of the strategy was to cut loose the dollar from gold, in effect letting it "float" in foreign transactions until natural market pressure would decide its best value. The dollar had been overvalued for 10

The inside story of why the richest nation on earth is suffering financial woes.

by Gary Alexander

years, and the action to devalue was about 3 years late, according to many economists.

WHY the "Dollar Glut"?

The "balance of payments deficit" is a term like "unfavorable balance of trade." Everybody assumes it is bad, but they don't know *WHY* — much less what it entails.

What, for example, is the leading factor, or factors, which create a sick currency?

One merely needs to look around at the world he lives in to find the chief culprit causing sick economies. Most economic problems spring from *war*. The "dollar crisis" is no exception. The total balance of payments deficit, 1950-1971, of over \$50 billion, can be accounted for entirely by military aid and foreign aid. The United States has spent over \$100 billion since World War II rebuilding the world through foreign aid — much of it to bolster "friends" against the real or imagined spectre of communism.


In a totally separate action, the U.S. has spent well over \$100 billion in

waging the Vietnam War, and many tens of billions have been expended in other actions of the interminable "Cold War."

These ostensibly benevolent endeavors have done much to endow us with our dollar crisis. Our merchandise trade account has been in the *black* for 78 years. There was no trade deficit in any year of this century — until 1971. Another payments category, our foreign business investments, still contributes to a balance of payments *surplus*, for the time being.

BUT, our military and redevelopment aid to other nations has double-handedly wiped out those trade and investment surpluses, and saddled the U.S. with a balance of payments deficit (that is, *dollars abroad*) of over \$50 billion. The exact amount is difficult to tally, since it has increased about \$2 billion per month this year!

Why is the world upset with an apparently benevolent nation that gives away billions of dollars per year to needy nations, at the expense of internal scarcity and inflation? The United States *could* have been insular and protectionistic in 1945 — but it wasn't. The United States *could* have given Generals Patton and MacArthur full sway to subdue the world in 1945, but instead it



chose to leave Communism alone, and engage it in a Cold War.

For the supposedly benevolent military protection and financial redevelopment of Europe, Japan, and Southeast Asia, America has inherited a weak dollar and hatred abroad. Is a world reaction of disbelief, contempt or hatred at President Nixon's new economic plan fair?

In a way, yes. America has often protected her own interests by providing aid to others.

In another way, world reaction is *not* fair. Much foreign aid has been truly benevolent, with no expectation of receiving anything in return. America of the late 1940's had a "do-good" missionary zeal for spreading American prosperity to other developing lands, as much as was feasible. America, with its nuclear power, could have literally ruled the world. But America chose not to fully exert her power.

The "dollar crisis," then, stems from good intentions, but intentions blunted by mistakes, blunders, and poor "public relations" with the world.

Why a Lagging Economy?

Both inflation and stagnation in the early 1970's find their basis in war — Vietnam in particular. Price stability and booming business reigned in the U. S. from 1961 until the height of the Vietnam War. Labor did *not* "push" inflation upward. Wage increases did *not* rise above productivity increases. But government deficit spending for the Vietnam War DID begin the inflation of the late 1960's which crept up one percentage point each year from 1965 onward, until inflation reached 6 percent in 1969.

After government deficits spurred a "demand pull" inflation (too many dollars "chasing" too few domestic goods), then the wage-price spiral began to take effect. Labor saw the purchasing power of the dollar eroding, then they demanded more money for workers — beyond productivity increases. Although labor did not start the current siege of inflation, they are now the main moving force behind it.

Following the widespread social crises of 1968, and the "silent majority" also turning against the Vietnam War,

a change in priorities of spending, more than anything else, forced the business recession. A pullback from war hurt armaments and airplane manufacturers; a pullback from space hurt the aerospace industry. Anti-pollution campaigns hurt the image of all manufacturing in the public eye (although pollution continued).

Spinoff from these major priority shifts were felt in numerous secondary industries, as the U. S. entered its fifth postwar "recession" in November 1969. (A "recession" is generally defined as a half-year of *declining* "real" G.N.P. — that is the actual *amount* of goods and services declining).

So war and social revolution are once more the ultimate culprit for economic crises — this time stagnation and inflation. And U. S. inflation is one of the main causes of our weak trade balance and "overvalued" dollar. Inflation boosts prices of our exports, thus making them less competitive.

The Future of the Dollar...

It may be many months — well beyond the International Monetary Fund meetings in Washington D.C., ending October 1 — before the future of the dollar, gold, and international finance is settled. But some indications are clear.

The dollar may well be finished as the sole kingpin of international exchange. It is no longer sacred, strong, safe, or sufficient to finance world trade. Strong currencies such as the German mark, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc may become alternate exchange currencies. Europe is in the process of developing a common currency.

If supra-national currencies are not chosen as international monies, then the I.M.F. may act to use SDR's (Special Drawing Rights, or "paper gold"), or the I.M.F. may double or triple the price of *gold* so that the yellow metal can finance world trade once again, or they may create a brand new international currency.

Whatever the new revolution in currencies may bring, it is virtually certain the dollar will be just one of *many* key currencies, not the leader. The 40-year "dollar era" has ended, as the "pound sterling era," the Spanish "peso era" and the Roman *de-*

narii era ended. The European Common Currency appears to be the most likely successor to the dollar in this long line of monetary dynasties. Europe is the only continent with sufficient gold backing. The yen, though strong, has precious little gold behind it (less than one billion; only eight percent of Japan's reserves).

... and What About Gold?

The gold standard is not sacred. It is only about 100 years old in the history of man, a product of evolution as much as any social institution. But in a world of sovereign powers, there must be some standard to finance international trade and domestic currency. Gold has the confidence of more people than any other standard, especially in Europe. It is the monetary *idée fixe* of France, even after De Gaulle. The Swiss currency is backed by about *double* the amount of gold as compared to currency. (America's ratio is over 20 dollar bills to one dollar of gold.)

But gold, if it is to be used as a modern standard, must be modernized. Only one billion dollars' worth of gold is mined each year, and virtually *all* of it goes for jewelry, industrial use, and speculative hoarding. No new gold is being used to finance international trade, which is its main monetary purpose. Many European economists advocate a tripling of gold value to \$100 per ounce, coupled with a stricter supervision of its distribution in central banks.

This "gold revaluation" must take place or gold must be abandoned as a standard. The world trades \$300 *billion* worth of goods per year. The rate of trade increases about 10% annually. But the gold in ALL central banks is less than \$40 billion, and it is not growing. The world has been "half way" on the gold standard since 1931, and it must decide soon whether gold should be all or nothing.

The *best* world monetary system would be a one-world government, with one national treasury, one currency, and one monetary system. In this configuration, nations would trade like U. S. states do now. There is no balance of payments or trade deficit between Il-

(Continued on page 45)

Will She Enter the Common Market?

Britain's Fateful Decision



Ambassador College Photo

Never have the British people faced a more difficult choice — to join or not to join the Common Market. Heated debate fills the nation's famed pubs and its sharply opinionated newspapers. More of the same is expected in Parliament this autumn, before the final decision is reached.

by Gene H. Hogberg

"IF WE LET this opportunity slip, then we must not think that it is going to lie around, waiting for us to pick it up again — because it isn't!"

With those words, Britain's Prime Minister Edward Heath voiced his Government's firm resolve to take the British nation into the rapidly growing power center of Europe's Common Market.

This time, unlike 1963 and 1967, the Common Market has opened the door to London. There is no longer a veto-casting De Gaulle standing in the way. Now it's all up to Parliament. And the historic vote is due later this month.

Why Britain Seeks Membership

Why is Britain, mother of the 31-member Commonwealth, seeking to enter the Common Market — or European Communities, as the six-

nation grouping is officially called?*

There are three basic reasons. First is the declining importance of the Commonwealth itself, both economically and politically. Second is the growing British fear of what a powerful, united Europe would ultimately become without British influence and direction. And lastly, is the desperate need for a new national goal for the British nation, shorn of empire and nearly stripped of the Commonwealth.

During recent years Britain's trade with fellow Commonwealth members has steadily declined. Britain now exports more to the six-nation Common Market than she does to the Commonwealth. Britain, furthermore, is importing less from her traditional trade partners. For highly developed Commonwealth nations such as Canada and Australia, trade with the United States and the rapidly growing Japanese mar-

ket has become and is becoming more important than trade with the Mother Country.

Because of this, as well as constant political frictions within the multi-racial Commonwealth, Britain's political leaders have come to believe that the future of their country lies first with continental Europe, and only secondarily with the worldwide Commonwealth. This shift in orientation, of course, represents a dramatic 180 degree reversal of traditional British foreign policy. The British have never considered themselves "Europeans" in the continental sense of the term. According to an old proverb: "Britain is *in* Europe — but not *of* Europe."

Advocates of membership believe Great Britain would benefit economically by joining the EEC. "A Britain that stays outside Europe's potential market

* France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg are all members of three co-extensive entities — the European Coal and Steel Community, formed in 1951, and the European Economic Community and Euratom, both of which came into existence on January 1, 1958. The most significant of the three is the E.E.C.—or the Common Market — which is still the most commonly used term for the six-nation bloc. But "European Communities" — or "European Community" — is gradually gaining popular acceptance.

of 290 million people will miss this tide, just as it missed the last one," wrote the influential British publication, *The Economist*. Britain's present home market of only 56 million people is not large enough to sustain a healthy rate of industrial growth with Commonwealth trade on the decline.

Of course, the British home market would open up more to the industrious Germans, Italians and other Continentals as well. But government leaders hope this stern challenge will force sluggish British industry and the irascible, unpredictable, strike-ridden British labor force to shape up. The British have a long history of working or fighting hard only when their backs are up against the wall. Perhaps nothing more is needed in the British economy today than a "Spirit of Dunkirk" attitude.

Make Europe Over British Style

The second primary reason for Britain joining the Common Market is her desire to help shape and direct the destiny of Western Europe from the *inside* while there is still time.

The Common Market is not yet fully integrated economically; and political union — the stated goal of the Treaty of Rome — is a distant, not completely defined objective.

Prime Minister Edward Heath told newsmen at a conference in Lancaster House, London, on July 12:

"As far as the political sphere and the defense sphere are concerned, there are no institutions there. There are no undertakings. When we become a member we shall take our part in the development of whatever may come about, and we shall take a very full and wholehearted part. And we shall, therefore, help to develop them in the way which we want to see them come about."

The time is still ripe for Britain to have a say in how the New Europe is to be created.

Many in Britain (and in other nations of Europe) shudder to think of a powerful, politically united Europe without the stabilizing influence of Britain. They know full well that, in the past, dictators have arisen in Germany, France and Italy — leaders whose power-mad schemes took them on

blood-soaked rampages across Europe.

The very idea that such a dictator could this time *begin* with a united Europe instead of conquering his neighbors in order to achieve it is a shuddering thought!

Pro-market British leaders, therefore, hope to forestall any such dangerous union by making sure Britain is on the *inside* where she will be better able to wield influence and give direction. London can no longer play her traditional role of the aloof "holder of the balance of power" in Europe while outside the market. Both France and Germany, linked in a 1963 friendship pact, are on the *inside*.

Implant a Strong Democratic Tradition

It is a well-known fact, furthermore, that Britain has had a very long history rich in parliamentary democracy. Britain is certainly the most experienced nation on earth in this field.

There is a secret fear among even some of the strongest proponents of European unity that, with Britain excluded, democracy would not continue to be a powerful enough force among the Six. Even Professor Walter Hallstein, president of the EEC Commission for its first ten years, told a BBC television audience of the need for the British "to fill the gap of democracy under which we are still suffering."

On economic issues, the British would also like to see some changes made in EEC attitudes and policies. The British are very concerned about the Common Market's basic trade policies toward other nations — specifically the developing countries of the "third world." Britain presently absorbs twenty percent of its imports from developing countries, roughly three times the figure for the EEC.

Under the EEC's Common Agricultural Policy, barriers protect and insulate high-cost European farmers from lower prices prevailing in the world market. Agricultural commodities represent perhaps the greatest potential for the developing countries. Subsidies and other supports to Europe's own farmers represent, therefore, very stiff competition.

The British hope that, even though

bound by the strict confines of the Treaty of Rome, they can nevertheless alter the Common Market's more inward, protectionist orientation on such vital international trade issues.

Lastly, there is the question of Britain's very role in a changing world. The Empire has vanished and the Commonwealth is slipping away fast. The British dilemma was summarized by Patrick O'Donovan in the *London Observer*: "For the first time in centuries we do not know quite who we are. We do not know our place in the hierarchy of the world. We do not know if we are a rich nation or a poor one. We are not even sure if we are happy or not."

A former top-ranking official of the Common Market told this writer privately: "The Commonwealth is gone. Heath knows this." This is a primary reason why Her Majesty's Government is pinning its hopes for a new dynamic, stimulating role for the nation within a burgeoning Europe.

The Three Obstacles

In the eyes of British Anti-Market-ers, the three primary reasons for joining the Common Market are more than balanced off by three serious drawbacks. The most vocal argument against membership is one of simple personal economics.

There is no doubt whatsoever that food prices will rise once Britain enters. Even the Government admits that — although the estimates of its new price levels seem underestimated.

Once in, Britain would be committed to support the high-cost Common Market Agricultural Policy. In coming years, food will become even more expensive when the interim five-year agreement which allows entry of much of New Zealand's present food commodities is concluded or renegotiated downward.

Pro-Market-ers claim the bigger market for British industrial goods inside Europe will more than offset the higher cost of food.

It may. But then it may not. This is a risk the Government is taking. According to British economist Paul Einzig: "The size of the domestic market is undoubtedly an advantage, but it is by

no means everything. What is infinitely more important is that the countries should be governed efficiently and that their populations should work hard."

This the British have not been doing.

"What matters infinitely more than the size of the market," says Dr. Einzig, "is the *character of the people*."

Will There Always Be An England?

Another giant obstacle is the whole murky question of sovereignty. How much independent action will the British have to relinquish now and in the future as the Community draws closer together politically? Will Parliament become little more than a provincial legislature? What about the Royal Family? Will there "always be an England" as we know it?

Asked what sovereign powers Britain would ultimately be forced to relinquish, one British journalist answered bluntly in a BBC debate: "Social affairs, tax affairs, fiscal affairs, industrial affairs, monopoly policy — in fact, most of the things that affect the livelihood and the standard of living of ordinary people." Many Continentals are doubtful Britain would ever make firm commitments toward the stated political objectives of the Treaty of Rome. They fear London would never permit the Market to drift toward federalism, with a strong super-national governing body.

Britons and Continentals alike are very familiar with the famous quote of the Common Market Commission's first President, Professor Hallstein: "We are not in business to promote tariff preferences. We are not in business at all, we are in politics."

Asked recently in London whether he felt the progress toward integration had gone fast enough, Professor Hallstein told PLAIN TRUTH correspondents:

"Never fast enough in my opinion. I'm a militant European and I would like to see it done completely. . . . That means not what one calls economic integration only, but political integration."

Even though Dr. Hallstein believes *the nations in the Community* will never lose their national identity, nor all their sovereignty, the growing "Eurocracy" in Brussels, manufacturing new

rules and regulations by the week, is enough to produce grave suspicions in the minds of many independence-loving Britishers.

Security and the U. S. Relationship

The British Government's "White Paper" on the Common Market (see accompanying box), states that: "The prime objective of our British Government must be to safeguard the security and prosperity of the United Kingdom and its peoples."

This prime objective, the official document affirms, "would be best served

by British accession to the European Communities."

Anti-Market forces violently disagree. They believe it would be extremely risky for Britain to rely for its national defense upon "undependable Western European countries" as one critic puts it.

Compounding the situation would be the severing of the "special relationship" with the United States. This unique bond across the Atlantic helped rescue Britain in two world wars — wars started in Europe among Europeans.

"One of the most deplorable effects

How the British Government Views Common Market Entry

Quotations from the British Government's White Paper on the Common Market

- The prime objective of any British Government must be to safeguard the security and prosperity of the United Kingdom and its peoples.

- The choice for Britain is clear. Either we choose to enter the Community and join in building a strong Europe on the foundations which the Six have laid; or we choose to stand aside from this great enterprise and seek to maintain our interests from the narrow — and narrowing — base we have known in recent years.

- There is no alternative grouping of countries with similar circumstances and interests which could offer us the same opportunities to safeguard our national security and prosperity.

- Nor does the Commonwealth by itself offer us, or indeed wish to offer us, alternative and comparable opportunities to membership of the European Community.

- In the light of the experience of the Six themselves, and their conviction that the creation of the Community materially contributed to their growth, and of the essential similarity of our economies, the Government is confident that membership of the enlarged Community will lead to much improved efficiency and pro-

ductivity in British industry, with a higher rate of investment and a faster growth of real wages.

- The costs of joining the Community — set out in this White Paper — are the price we should have to pay for the economic and political advantages. These advantages will more than outweigh the costs, provided we seize the opportunities of the far wider home market now open to us.

- A decision not to join, when at last we have the power to do so, would be a rejection of an historic opportunity and a reversal of the whole direction of British policy under successive Governments during the last decade.

- In a single generation we should have renounced an imperial past and rejected a European future.

- Her Majesty's Government believes that the terms which have been negotiated are fair and reasonable, and provide this country with an opportunity which may never recur.

- Every historic choice involves challenge as well as opportunity. Her Majesty's Government is convinced that *the right decision for us is to accept the challenge, seize the opportunity and join the European Communities.*

of Britain's adhesion to the Common Market would be that it would weaken further the special relationship between the United States and Britain." Dr. Einzig writes in his recent book, *The Case Against Joining the Common Market*.

In an interview with PLAIN TRUTH correspondents in London, Dr. Einzig laid even greater stress on this key issue.

Asked about the greatest dangers — politically and militarily — of British membership, he answered:

"As it stands the Common Market is an anti-American alliance. President Pompidou [of France] is as anti-American as anybody can be and it's under his guidance that the Common Market is an anti-American alliance; and if it isn't at the present moment it will drift into becoming one because there's *certain to be a trade war*" between the United States and Europe.

"After having been firm allies in both the economic and political sense, Britain might well find herself fighting an economic war with the United States" warned Dr. Einzig. "Should Britain join a French-dominated Common Market, the anti-American attitude of France would increase the bitterness of the fight, and it might go a long way towards influencing American political attitudes towards Europe."

Such a trade war, of course, would result in American troops leaving Europe, placing Europe along with Britain in immediate Soviet peril. Dr. Einzig continued:

"A split in the Western camp between the United States and Western Europe and an encouragement of American isolationism by the EEC that included Britain would be fatal from the point of view of the defenses of Britain and of the entire free world."

Such are the arguments that will reverberate through the halls of Parliament later this month. After 8 years of off-and-on negotiations, plus two rejections, Britain now must reach her momentous decision. Will Britain marry her resources and people to the Common Market? Or will she remain *in* Europe but not *of* Europe?

Whatever decision is made by Britain, it will have far-reaching effects on the future of both Britain and the rest of Western Europe. □

The Case For Britain's Membership

Mr. Norman St. John-Stevas, a Conservative member of Parliament from Chelmsford, was interviewed in London by PLAIN TRUTH staff members. Here are excerpts of that interview.

Q. Mr. St. John-Stevas, why do you believe Britain should join the Common Market?

A. Because I believe in Great Britain and I feel that we have no influence on our own any longer in the world, or very little influence. I think we've got to get together with other like-minded countries in order to defend our interests and influence the world as much as we can for good. Secondly, I believe ultimately in one world. I think we must move towards one system of government for the whole world and I think one should start in those areas where one can find a real regional basis for cooperation. If the European nations with their common religion, their common history, their common culture — if they can't unite and get on together; then really what hope is there for the world at all?

Q. The Anti-Market critics stress Britain has closer ties with the other side of the ocean than they do with Europe. Do you agree with that?


A. I'm quite sure the majority of the British people, if it were possible, would rather merge with America and the British Commonwealth than anyone else. But it's not possible. It's not a political or economic alternative. If, for example, we joined with the United States we'd be completely dominated, so I think we must make the European [commitment].

Q. If membership in the Common Market is desirable, why are so many

British people opposed to it? Why is it such a controversial issue?

A. I think they're afraid; I think they're moving towards the market the whole time, but from speaking all over the country on this subject I

Ambassador College Photo



Norman St. John-Stevas

find there isn't an implacable hostility; there's fear of the consequences. . . . I hate to have to say this to you, particularly to an American public, but we've passed from having a superiority complex to having an inferiority complex, and I've a fear that we won't be able to compete against the continental nations. People know they're in a rut and I think they rather like being in a rut and are rather afraid of getting out of it. So I think this is a psychological attitude. I think once we're in, once the plunge has

been taken, all those attitudes will change. We'll say: "Well, we've taken this step and we've got to get on with it."

Q. Do you think Britain would lose her national identity by becoming a member-state of the Common Market?

A. Oh, no. Look at Scotland. Scotland has been united with England since 1707 in a union infinitely closer than anything contemplated in the Common Market. Well, you'd be a brave man if you went to Edinburgh and said that Scotland had lost her national identity. And we've got a number of races and nations in the United Kingdom anyhow. After all we've been for so long in England ruled by the Scots, infested by the Welsh, and plagued by the Irish. So I mean we're quite used to this situation.

Q. What about Britain's cherished tradition of parliamentary democracy, her outlook on personal freedom and other uniquely British concepts? Would a United Europe change all that?

A. No. I think that's exactly what we have to contribute to a United Europe. One mustn't regard the parliamentary tradition as something which one hoards and guards like a dragon guarding a jewel. This is precisely our dowry, as it were, for a United Europe. We must share this thing. We must strengthen Europe with this particular and very important contribution. After all, we've done it before. We have exported parliamentary democracy all over the world.

Q. France, Germany and Italy have all experimented with other forms of government. Democracy in these countries has vanished in the past 50 years and then reappeared. Could it happen again?

A. Who knows? One never knows about continental nations, but perhaps they have come to realize that democracy is the best form of government in any case. From our point of view I think the important thing is to preserve democracy in Europe. If democracy on the continent goes we suffer anyhow. So it's much better to take a positive view to do all we can to

strengthen it rather than standing outside, raising our hands in horror, and saying "Don't come anywhere near us, we don't want to be contaminated by you."

Q. If Britain does join the Common Market, what would happen to the unique special relationship between the United States and Britain? The United States helped rescue Britain in two world wars — and those wars, incidentally, involved Britain and Common Market member Germany in opposite corners.

A. Well, I think the unique special relationship in the sense of a unique political relationship has grown less and less important as the years have passed. What is important are the cultural ties and the links of language. Those can never be destroyed. It's a historical, cultural relationship, a shared relationship of ideals and language that will always remain. That's why, of

course, poor General De Gaulle was so annoyed, because he knew that that could never be destroyed.

Q. With Britain inside the Community, do you envision a change in the way of life for the British people?

A. Well, it's not so much a change in the way of life, but a new perspective on the way of life. It's rather like the ecumenical movement for union between the churches. Everyone is afraid of losing their own way of life, their own way of religion. In fact, after you've been in the ecumenical movement as I have been for some time you find that nobody loses, everyone gains. You keep those things that are important to you; you gain something else. I think it'll be the same in the Common Market — we'll keep our own way of life, but we'll add certain things to it. Things may be improved — English cooking may get better.

The Case Against Britain's Membership

PLAIN TRUTH correspondents interviewed James McMillan, the Chief Editorial Writer of the Daily Express in London, and an outspoken opponent of British membership in the Common Market. The following are excerpts of that interview.

Q. Mr. McMillan, why do you believe Great Britain should stay out of the Common Market?

A. Because the Common Market is basically an organization continental in scope, continental in its views. Britain is an island with worldwide trading connections which cannot easily be fitted into this continental pattern. It was Churchill who said, "If ever the time comes when we have to choose between Europe and the open sea, we will

always choose the open sea." I think that still pertains today.

Q. Some people claim Britain can only retain her political influence in Europe by working within the Common Market. Is that true?

A. It's a good argument. It is the Foreign Office argument, the official Establishment argument that if we don't go in we will become a poor offshore island with an advanced industrial technology and no captive market to sustain

it — and in the end we will finish up with whisky, tweeds and American tourists. This argument has undoubtedly been sold very effectively to succeeding Prime Ministers.

Q. How great could the influence of the Common Market become as a third power bloc between Russia and the United States?

A. Oh, colossal! You've got three hundred twenty million people in Western Europe. Africa would be Europe's backyard, like South America is to the United States. It would be 95% controlled by Europe and you would have Southern Africa as a white outpost in that continent as well. So together you would have something like six, seven hundred million people with all the resources that they need in the way of oil, minerals, etc. They would be completely self-supporting in temperate food, and they would militarily become inevitably an enormously powerful bloc.

Q. Do you see the necessity for the Common Market raising its own armies and becoming a great military power?

A. I think this is an absolutely inevitable step for two reasons: One is that the United States will tend to pull back — it's quite natural thirty years after the war — and therefore the Western European countries must step in to fill their own defenses. And, second, because Britain and France are nuclear powers, who together can become more than just the sum of the two parts. Then with the military and financial support of Germany, even though Germany wasn't allowed to have any control over nuclear weapons, they would have a nuclear battery equivalent to that enjoyed by the United States and Russia.

Q. But if all you've said so far is true, then wouldn't Britain be wise to jump into Europe now before she's forever left outside?

A. The other side to it though is: Do we want to create a third great military political bloc? I believe that the British, by maintaining this independence which is built into the country — this has been the natural instinct of the nation — while cooperating with the Common Market, of course, on a whole host of

projects — amongst them Concorde, atomic power for peaceful purposes and so on — but while maintaining our independence, we will lead the Market to a better style of international organization than the one that is at present envisaged.

Q. Would the stated political objectives of the Common Market conflict with cherished British ideals of independence and sovereignty?

A. Oh, yes, they would. You see, to prevent any one member of the Common Market from welching on the

Ambassador College Photo



James McMillan

others — I'm talking now of the major members (the reality is Britain, France and Germany, the rest must follow) — to prevent one of these welching on agreed moves, agreed policies, you would have to transfer power to the Commission. The European Commission of Bureaucrats would become, in effect, the government, the voice, the spokesman of Europe.

Q. What would happen to the unique relationship between Britain and the United States with Britain in the Market?

A. It would be finished! The Common Market or European Economic Community is a reaction to the American economic strength, just as it is a reaction to Soviet military strength. Nations don't so much act as react to other's actions, and the Common Market, to have any meaning, must be a political, economic, and military bloc independent of the United States — and in some cases,

even antagonistic to the United States — although I believe that there will be no question of any conflict. But in some economic fields, they will be antagonistic. Therefore there can be no question of Britain's special relationship with the United States being sustained in the Common Market.

Q. In language and law, custom, kinship, sentiment and shared experiences, do the bonds of England stretch across the Channel or across the oceans?

A. Oh, across the oceans every time. Our entire national history has been built across the oceans. The United States is a projection of Britain. We didn't lose the War of Independence. It was a civil war, so how can you lose that? America was built on an Anglo-Saxon foundation. Canada is an Anglo-Saxon foundation — with a large French section of course. New Zealand and Australia are Anglo-Saxon foundations entirely. Southern Africa — well, you've got the Afrikaner there but also a very big English and Scottish section. All our connections are with the rest of the world in sentiment and virtually none are across the channel.

Q. The United States helped Britain in two world wars, and in those wars, Britain and Germany were in opposite corners. There's no doubt about who dominates Common Market affairs today. Is Britain needed inside the Community to balance the growing power of Germany in Europe?

A. This is a very good point, and this is of course, the crunch question. This is what the Foreign Office says is necessary. This is the balance of power which has been an historic British conception ever since the days of Elizabeth I. And this is why the French are inviting us in now — they realize that Germany is too strong economically to be held by France. Therefore she needs Britain to balance her up. And I believe that that is the argument which is prevailing in official circles in Whitehall.

Q. In the past fifty years, democracy in France, Germany, and Italy, has disappeared and surfaced again. Do you see a possibility of that

(Continued on page 13)

advance news

in the wake of today's **WORLD EVENTS**

● **Why Soviets Signed "Friendship" Pact With India**

The Soviet Union scored its second major diplomatic triumph in three months on August 9.

Within 24 hours of his arrival in New Delhi, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko had signed for the U.S.S.R. a new treaty of mutual "Friendship, Peace and Cooperation" with India. Under terms of the treaty — which could profoundly alter the power balance in Asia — each nation would consider an attack on one as an attack on the other.

On May 27, the Soviets concluded a similar 15-year "Friendship and Cooperation Treaty" with Egypt.

The timing of the Soviet diplomatic thrust was both dramatic and deft. India's arch-rival Pakistan has been threatening war over New Delhi's support for East Pakistani rebels. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi appealed to both Moscow and Washington for help. The Kosygin Government responded. The Nixon Government felt it couldn't.

The treaty therefore gives India what she feels she badly needs — a major power ally in any conflict with her Moslem neighbor. Meanwhile India-U. S. relations are at an all-time low. Continued American arms aid to Pakistan has aroused deep bitterness and a sense of betrayal in India. Topping this off is the new thaw between Washington and Communist China — Pakistan's friend and India's number two source of worry.

The Nixon Administration already has informed New Delhi that it cannot count on U. S. support if a clash with Pakistan brings China into the conflict. Washington, which has poured about \$10,000,000,000 worth of aid into India — more than into any nation — has thus been cast in the position of a faithless friend.

To the alert Soviets, the opportunity to develop closer bonds with India — and gain a major ally in its struggle for position against China — could not have been better timed had they engineered it themselves.

Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who signed the treaty in New Delhi, termed the agreement a "very important act." He told newsmen that "we in the Soviet Union attach great significance to it."

The cautiously worded pact says nothing of *direct* Soviet intervention in the event of conflict, but it does indicate that India can rely on a steady flow of Soviet arms.

Russian arms usually also mean Russian advisers — as the Egyptians have found out. There are already a number of Russians in India and most certainly there will be more. Probably, too, there will be an expansion of port privileges for the growing Soviet fleet in the Indian Ocean.

This fact alone makes the pact worthwhile to Kremlin strategists. But the Soviets have also gained another immensely important advantage.

It has largely been overlooked that the treaty is mutual. The Indians are now as committed to helping the Russians against the Chinese as the Russians are to helping the Indians against the Pakistanis. This balances considerably the disparity in numbers between the Russians and the Chinese. There now are 550 million Indians, who have a common and well-armed frontier with China, aligned on the Soviet side of Moscow's dispute with Peking. The treaty calls for consultations to "remove" any threat to peace in event of attack on either party to the treaty.

After he returned to Moscow, Mr. Gromyko admitted that Soviet fear of China was one of the main reasons for concluding the treaty with India. He told the Supreme Soviet that the pact is important "in the light of the situation south of the borders of the Soviet Union."

Moscow and Peking nervously share a 4500-mile-long border, bristling with weapons and guarded on both sides by growing numbers of troops.

India has, in effect, abandoned its traditional policy of "non-alignment" and has been thrust into the middle of big power politics. It is possible that New Delhi in its anxiety to obtain support against Pakistan has downgraded this aspect of the "friendship" treaty. Some Indian critics of the hastily conceived pact believe the government grasped at Soviet help out of sheer anxiety and will regret its wide-ranging commitments to the Soviets in the end.

On his retirement from office, former Netherlands foreign minister to the Soviet Union, G. Beelearts van Blockland, filed a sensational report regarding Soviet foreign policy.

One of the worst things a country can do, he warned, is to sign a treaty of friendship with the Soviets, because friendship according to Soviet ideas includes doing what the Soviets expect of that friend. The closer the "friendship," the more delegations going to and fro, the more Soviet pressure and interference occurs.

Far from being a true "peace" pact in worldwide terms,

the new treaty could open the door to a time of unprecedented calamity in Asia.

● New Balkan Axis in "Powder Keg of Europe"?

A new Communist — but anti-Soviet — bloc in South-eastern Europe? The men in Moscow are deeply concerned over such a possibility.

China's Premier Chou En-lai is reportedly planning a visit to the Balkan capitals of Romania, Yugoslavia and Albania sometime this fall as an assurance of growing Peking support for their maverick governments.

The projected visit was reported by the official Hungarian government newspaper *Magyar Hirlap* which fully supports Moscow in its feud with Peking. In an editorial, it warned ominously against the "extremely dangerous situation" that could be created by a "Tirana-Belgrade-Bucharest axis." Peking's involvement in the strategic Balkan peninsula, it exclaimed, has the overtones of an "anti-Soviet edge."

The Hungarian broadside came on the eve of a nine-day excursion to Romania of a team of Chinese military officials. The Peking Delegation arriving from Albania was treated with exceptional warmth. They were even taken on a cruise of the Black Sea — along the Romanian Coast, but nevertheless, in a sea the Russians have considered their own "private lake."

The Balkan peninsula, gateway to the Adriatic and eastern Mediterranean waters, has been called the "powder keg of Europe." The flames of World War I ignited in what is now Yugoslavia.

The visit of Chou — or possibly another high ranking Chinese official — would come as a result of Romanian President Nicolai Ceausescu's visit to Peking in June. The tough, independent Romanian leader recently talked with Chairman Mao Tse-tung. A Chinese news source described the talks as "full of expressions of the militant unity of the two parties, two countries and two peoples." Ceausescu won a formal Chinese promise to support the Romanian people in their "just struggle" to safeguard their cherished "national independence and state sovereignty."

Until recently, Peking's only true ally in Europe has been tiny, introverted Albania, which has had its own disputes and grudges with neighboring Communist states.

Tensions, however, between Albania and Yugoslavia — which has a sizeable Albanian minority — have been lessening of late.

Romania also has recently greatly improved its relations with Albania which officials in Bucharest describe as now being "extremely good."

To round out the picture of a "new Balkan bloc," Romania and Yugoslavia have developed close consultation with each other in all fields — political, economic and military. Although neither side has said so publicly, there are, reports the *Los Angeles Times*, "strong indications that these two Balkan neighbors have made definite contingency plans for joint action in the event the Soviet Union should launch a military attack against either of them."

● China's Chief Obsession

Japan appears surprised and somewhat confused over charges of militarism and territorial ambition leveled by its big neighbor, Communist China.

The charges have come almost to dominate recent statements emanating from Peking. This was underscored again early in August by none other than Premier Chou En-lai himself. Chou's anxiety over Japan's future role in Asian and world affairs surfaced continually during an unprecedented five-hour interview with James Reston, vice president and columnist of the *New York Times*.

Premier Chou supported his contentions of militarism by showing Reston examples of Japanese films glorifying military duty. Chou also expressed his fears of the small right-wing "private army" groups that have surfaced in Japan. "The militaristic movement has to be nipped soon," he told Reston.

Mr. Chou, obviously worried about the Japanese getting out of hand, was asked why he was so eager to get rid of the United States-Japanese security treaty, which has been a restraining force on Japan, particularly in the nuclear field.

The Premier rejected that as "a forced argument." Despite the treaty, he maintained, "Japan with her present industrial capabilities is fully able to produce all the means of delivery."

"She is able," he said, "to manufacture ground-to-air missiles, ground-to-ground missiles and sea-to-ground missiles. As for bombers, she is all the more capable of manufacturing them. The only thing lacking is the nuclear warhead."

"Japan's output of nuclear power is increasing daily," he added. "The United States supply of enriched uranium to Japan is not enough for her requirement, so she is now importing enriched uranium from other countries. And so, her nuclear weapons can be produced readily."

Chou En-lai also talked about the immense suffering his country went through in World War II at the hands of the Japanese. Memories like these die hard.

In the wake of the wide publicity given Chou's statements, the chief Cabinet secretary in Japan, Noboru Takeshita, said members of the Japanese government "feel extremely regretful" that the Chinese leader assailed Japan so severely.

"We really can't understand Mr. Chou En-lai," said a Foreign Ministry official, a bit plaintively. "We are rather surprised that he is worried and concerned over what he considers Japanese militarism. He seems to link economic expansion and militarism. We never dream of such things as control of Formosa and Korea again."

Japanese officials from Prime Minister Eisaku Sato down have denied there is any basis for such charges of militarism. They point to Japan's "no war" constitution, its stand against nuclear weapons and limitations on its self-defense forces.

But, the bigger Japan becomes economically, the more difficult it will be to convince China of its peaceful intentions.

The Case Against Britain's Membership

(Continued from page 10)

happening in the future? What about the possibility of a strong man taking over the union — in effect starting with a United Europe this time, instead of going to war against his neighbors to achieve it?

A. Well, this could happen. Germany, France, and Italy have all undergone dictatorship in the last fifty years. I would expect, rather, to see the European Commission, the technocrats, becoming the spokesmen and the chief technocrat becoming, in effect, the dictator of Europe. Of course he won't be called that, he won't be named as a President, he won't have any obvious political power. But in the hard realities of politics, he will be the man who, by his strength of personality, will guide the technocrats and the technocrats will guide the Community.

Q. So you would, in effect, have a ruling dictator, or one ruling personage over the entire Common Market?

A. Yes, through the strength of his personality and operating by his knowledge of the corridors of power.

Q. Do you see world trade war as an inevitability?

A. Yes. I think that it's going to be very difficult indeed to avoid it. You may get a trade peace following a trade war — I think you will, obviously — but the European countries led by France are going to insist on dethroning the dollar. Now this is not an excess of anti-Americanism. It's a belief that you cannot allow one country, however powerful, to print the world's money, which in effect is what the dollar is doing at the moment. No country can have this power simply because no country can be trusted not to put its own interests first. With Britain turning toward the Common Market, we're almost certainly going to throw our weight in on the side of the French and Germans who will demand a reorganization of the world monetary system.

Q. Is there a danger from increased German power in Europe?

A. Well, up until now, Germany, the economic giant, has acted like the political pygmy. She's turned all her colossal energy into trade which was once turned into war. Who knows? It would be pure speculation to say that German nationalism will rise again, but obviously it could. And the lure of that would be the reconquest or the reoccupation, the repossession of the East, the lost lands of the East. So long as Russia remains powerful in Eastern Europe and so long as Britain and France secretly back up Russia in keeping Germany divided, which is the practicality of politics, then obviously German national ambitions will not be able to be exercised.

Q. You mentioned once there's a feeling in Britain that Germany is neurotic. Could you explain this?

A. Yes, well, it had a terrible bashing in the last fifty, sixty years. Now they've poured everything into trade. We're not a neurotic people, we're very phlegmatic, too phlegmatic. So we don't get worked up and we don't really think trade's all that marvelous. You know, we prefer the long weekend — this is laziness. The Germans have poured all this colossal energy and their marvelous efficiency into trade. We've lagged. We're good at inventing things but we're not good at exploiting. The hope is that when you're in there in the ring, instead of standing outside saying, "Show me the enemy!" — Well, when you're in the ring you're either going to knock him out or be knocked out. And that's the argument behind it. And it's quite a strong argument, only it's never put forward [that bluntly] because we've been sitting for twenty-five years looking at our navel and getting nowhere fast.

Q. Is there any sort of a national goal that the people of Britain should be working toward?

A. Oh, that's a very good question. The British have lost their national ambition! Our national ambition was a British Empire and I think as you look back on it, it will be seen that it was no mean achievement. Now we've lost the empire. That's something we've got to face up to — we haven't faced up to

yet. And that's, of course, what many people see in Europe. They see this as the new fulcrum whereby we can exercise our influence because most of the smaller countries in Europe will tend to follow us rather than France and Germany, and therefore we will become, in effect, the dominant power — not perhaps economically but in influence — in the new European Community. And that could be — let's be honest — that could be the new national ambition of Britain.

Q. Has there been any improvement in the British labor situation in the past few years?

A. No, no indeed not. That's why we're getting the Industrial Relations Bill. We've been trying to operate the jet age with a horse and buggy labor set-up. And this new bill, I believe, is the start of a deal which will be effective. But certainly the last few years have been appalling. One of the aims, really, of the Foreign Office [in pushing for membership] is the feeling that we can only realize our potential by being made to fight. Now you don't fight your friends. There's a natural affinity with the Americans here, so nobody wants to pick a quarrel. But with France and Germany, roughly the same size as ourselves, roughly the same population, there's no affinity. So therefore you've got to fight more, and attempt to make the British more competent. The British normally are only competent when they're right in a war, and then they do get very competent. But up until then they're pretty bovine.

Q. Instead of joining the Common Market then, what goal do you believe Britain should pursue?

A. As I said earlier on, we must collaborate closely with Europe on technological matters. I think we ought to sustain the European Free Trade Association and the Commonwealth as long as possible and renegotiate with Europe in an effort to achieve the benefits of Common Market membership without the manifold disadvantages, political and economic, which this portends, not only for Britain, but for the world. Now you may say that's idealism carried to imbecility, but it's the best I can offer at this time. □

THE PERSIAN GULF

A "Quiet" Hot Spot?

Iranians and most westerners call it the Persian Gulf. Arabs prefer the term "Arabian Gulf." Yet if present trends continue, we may all someday be calling it the "Russian Gulf." Potential Soviet involvement in the strategic Gulf area could significantly affect the world balance of power.

by Harry Eisenberg

FEW AMERICANS realize where the Persian Gulf is, much less the significance of this vital piece of real estate to their own economy.

For, under the waters and lands of the Persian Gulf lies a vast sea of the "black gold" which in 1970 supplied 28 percent of all the oil used in the world, and furthermore holds a phenomenal 62 percent of all the world's proven petroleum reserves.

A Matter of Economics

While very little Middle Eastern oil actually finds its way to the United States, U. S. firms nonetheless own some 70 percent of the concession in the Gulf area. This pumps a hefty 1.2 to 1.6 billion dollars into the American economy and balance of payments each year. Furthermore, Middle Eastern states use oil revenues to buy some \$500 million worth of American products annually. Considering the present state of the American economy, this is especially significant.

The ten states bordering on the Gulf produce some 12 million barrels a day, providing about half of Western Europe's oil needs, and 90 to 95 percent of Japan's. British petroleum interests in the area net a tidy \$500 million annual profits.

The Soviet Threat

The oil is, of course, carried across the sea by a huge armada of tankers and super tankers, and it is here that Soviet naval power comes in. For, in the event of confrontation or conflict, the oil lifeline could be at the absolute mercy of the dominant naval power in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean.

Apart from submarines, the Soviets have some twenty modern warships already stationed in the Indian Ocean as compared with two older vintage U. S. destroyers and a sea plane tender. And the Russians are planning for more to come.

But Soviet expansionism does not stop with the sea. On land the Russians

continue to attempt to win friends and influence important people. And the British, by voluntarily withdrawing from the Persian Gulf, are making the Soviets' task all the more easy.

The Persian Gulf region contains a number of Arab sheikhdoms which in the last century became British protectorates. That is, their rulers signed treaties granting the British certain economic and military privileges in exchange for a defense and aid guarantee. The treaty signers included the island nation of Bahrein, peninsular Qatar and the seven sheikhdoms of the Trucial Coast. (Name comes from a 19th Century anti-piracy truce negotiated by the British.)

Both Bahrein and the Trucial state of Dubai have modest oil incomes. Far richer are Qatar and the largest (in area) Trucial sheikhdom, Abu Dhabi. In fact, its huge oil production and small population give Abu Dhabi the distinction of having the world's highest per capita income, some \$6,000 annually.

Further north in the Gulf region is the wealthy sheikhdom of Kuwait whose per capita income is now second behind Abu Dhabi. This one-time British protectorate has been fully independent since 1961.

In the North and West are found the

three major local "powers," Iran, Saudi Arabia and Soviet-backed Iraq.

Rounding out the Gulf region is the Sultanate of Oman, a small detached part of which sits astride the strait of Hormuz, the narrow entrance to the Gulf.

Abu Dhabi Offers to Subsidize Britain


When Prime Minister Harold Wilson's government announced in 1968 that Britain could no longer afford to maintain its presence in the Gulf (which it had previously said it would not relinquish), it came as an unexpected shock to the small Gulf states. To whom were they to turn? How could a "state" like Trucial Ajman with an area of 100 square miles and a population that until recently could be seated in its one cinema go it alone as an independent "nation"?

The British proposed a solution — a federation of Arab Emirates to include Bahrein, Qatar and the seven Trucial states. But the sheikhs were unprepared for this. Each one of the rulers was enjoying absolute power at home and some were unwilling to compromise their power to a federal government. Then there was the mistrust and jealousy on the part of the states which lack oil toward those who don't. The small states feared domination by the large ones. This was especially true of Bahrein, whose level of education was superior to and whose population is equal to all the others combined. And on and on it went.

Finally Bahrein and Qatar announced they would go it alone as separate states when the British left. (Bahrein, in fact declared its independence on August 15 and Qatar is expected to follow shortly.) Meanwhile, the Sheikh of Abu Dhabi, Zayed bin Sultan, hoping to maintain some order, offered to foot the entire bill for Britain to remain in the Gulf.

Indeed, many thought the conservative government of Prime Minister Heath would have second thoughts about creating a power vacuum in so crucial an area.

But when Iran and Saudi Arabia, who consider themselves the dominant Gulf powers, expressed displeasure at the possibility of continued British presence,



the lion meekly dropped the idea. Hardly the Britain of Disraeli; but times do change, and as so many have said, the sun *has* set on the British Empire.

Both Iran and Saudi Arabia are convinced they are strong enough to maintain the status quo in the Gulf region. But consider the past history of Soviet pressure on Iran as well as the decline of Arab monarchy, and you quickly realize that Iran and Saudi Arabia will do well to maintain the status quo at home, let alone elsewhere.

Technology Vacuum

Apart from the military vacuum that will be created when Britain departs, there is the equally significant possibility of a technological vacuum developing.

For centuries the Gulf was one of the poorest areas on earth. Living conditions were feudal and there was little promise of improvement. But "black gold" changed all that. Many of the sheikdoms are now bathing in oil money.

Take Abu Dhabi. Its people, Qahtan

Arabs, claim to be descendants of the Biblical patriarch, Joktan. Until recently, their mode of living was probably closer to Joktan's than to their contemporaries in the West. But oil has changed all that. Schools are being built, roads paved, hotels built; electricity, air-conditioning, and more of the same are in demand.

From where will these come? This is significant because all this is possible only with technical aid. In the past, Britain was the main supplier of this vital commodity. But now it is possible that other powers with interests besides economics could move in as major suppliers and exert an important influence.

Current Federation Plans

Perhaps it was realizations such as these that caused the Trucial states to press ahead with plans for a federation even after Bahrein and Qatar dropped out. Differences continued to be voiced but finally on July 18 of this year, an agreement was announced stating that six of the seven sheikhdoms would join the federation.

One state, tiny Ras al Khaima, opted to stay out, but it may be holding out for what it would consider a more favorable agreement.

Meanwhile the six agreed they would be ruled by a Supreme Council consisting of the six individual rulers. The rulers would then choose one of their group to serve as president for a two-year term.

Whether the federation can succeed remains to be seen. In the past such British-backed federations as Malaysia, the West Indies Federation, and Nigeria fell apart because of internal dissension. But in this case, external enemies may prove a greater danger for the new federation.

Although the small Gulf states are just on the verge of achieving independence, they already have their opponents. The leftist government of South Yemen (formerly Aden) looks upon the sheikhs as "lackeys of the British imperialists." It has already set up a "Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arab Gulf." Not that the people of the sheikhdoms necessarily feel they are in need of being "liberated," but the South Yemenis have

nonetheless pledged to spread their brand of revolution.

Although this Communist-backed group has not been active as yet in the Trucial States or further north, they have been conducting guerrilla warfare for some years now in the Dhofar province of Oman (see box). It is from there that they hope to spread their struggle northward.

The Importance of Iraq

The key nation in this matter of revolution, however, is probably Iraq. Far stronger than South Yemen, Iraq's ruling Ba'ath party has promised to export its brand of radical socialism to other Arab states. What Iraq's role will be in the Gulf remains to be seen. There is strong Iraqi-Iranian enmity which has manifested itself in a conflict over navigation rights in the Shatt-el-Arab River dividing the two countries.

For the time being, Iraq is attempting to rally other Arab States to counter Iran's — Moslem but non-Arab — power and influence in the Gulf. Iraqi President al-Bakr recently stated: "...U.S. imperialism and British colonialism are giving funds and arms to the Iranian rulers to implement plans designed to insure imperialist interests in the area and to prevent the Arab population there from attaining their freedom, unity and progress."

This is where the Kremlin comes in. The Soviet Union has given tacit support to Iraq, and the two in a joint statement pledged "full support to the struggle of the Arab people in the Gulf for the sake of guaranteeing their rights to self-determination." At present, there is little evidence of any "struggle" going on in the Gulf region (other than in Oman) and most western nations hope it will remain that way. But nothing is certain in world politics.

Meanwhile, Iran is making its moves. A report from Kuwait stated Iran is attempting to lease a military base on Bahrein.

More significant however, is Iran's claim to three small islands in the Strait of Hormuz. They are Abu Musa, which Britain recognizes as belonging to Trucial Sharjah, and Greater and Lesser Tumbs, presently occupied by Ras al Khaima, the one Trucial Sheikhdom not

committed to the federation. At present, Britain is still responsible for the islands.

Iran claims the islands were illegally taken away at a time of internal weakness, when Britain signed the antipiracy treaties some 80 years ago. The Shah of Iran, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi said recently, "I...conclude that historically the islands belong to us, while geography and strategy make it impera-



Harrison Forman Photo

Iranian oil fractionating tower. Iran is being groomed by U. S. and Britain to help fill the vacuum left when Britain vacates the Persian Gulf area.

tive for us to take them peacefully if possible or by force if such a regrettable necessity arises."

Many observers look for Iran to press its claim while the British still remain in the Gulf. To do so after the British departure might prove more offensive to the entire Arab world.

Only Uncertainty Is Certain

One recent report says that both Britain and the United States are under-

writing a billion-dollar defense program for Iran. Americans are to contribute squadrons of late-model Phantom jets and Britain will come across with hundreds of tanks and some naval units.

According to officials, the buildup will fill the vacuum being created by the British departure. Also, it is to be a counter-move against Soviet strategic plays in the Persian Gulf.

This will make the Iranian Shah a sort of guardian of Persian Gulf security. Whether the other states in the area will take to this with delight remains to be seen. Iran, as mentioned, has some claims on Persian Gulf real estate belonging to other nations. Meanwhile, Iraq is the closest thing to an arch-foe of Iran.

Therefore, whether the buildup of Iran — minus the presence of British or American troops — will lead to greater stability or more instability remains to be seen. With world politics being what it is, stability for so vital a region may be well-nigh impossible.

The stakes are too high here; the prizes are too great. The region is bound to see pressures from both within and without. British power and *physical presence* kept the lid on this volatile area. But the continuing British evacuation has made the Soviets deeply interested in their new chances. And the Soviets' chances do not look bad.


The Soviet role in the Israeli-Arab conflict gives them increased leverage among the Arabs in the Gulf. While the British empire is a rusty relic, the Soviets evidence both qualities necessary for the *growth* of an empire — a sense of purpose and *appetite*.

Meanwhile, America, smarting from a protracted war in Vietnam, has said or done little about ensuring its *physical presence* in the area — outside of some reported military aid. But military aid is not synonymous with presence. Military hardware may be present but physical presence will still be lacking. Thus, a vacuum will still be there. Unless some drastic aboutface occurs, the Persian Gulf power vacuum may also increase. But in world power politics, a vacuum is soon filled. The question is, by whom? □

Britain's "Little Vietnam"

IT HAS ALL the trappings of the Vietnam war. Chinese trained and Soviet-armed guerrillas operating from havens across a border are trying to gain the support of the local population with foreign advisers helping both sides. There is even a monsoon season affecting military operations. And in the end, this war in little-known Dhofar province of the nation of Oman may prove just as significant as Vietnam.

It all began in 1963 as a tribal revolt against the harsh, feudalistic and repressive rule of Omani Sultan Said bin Taimur. The insurgents had taken the name "Dhofar Liberation Front." But following the British withdrawal from Aden and the ascension of a revolutionary regime



in renamed South Yemen, the guerrilla movement took on a more sinister complexion.

The movement was greatly radicalized. Its goal was no longer the "liberation" of merely Dhofar province, but the setting up of radical governments throughout the Gulf region. Hence, the new name, "Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arab Gulf." A safe haven was provided in South Yemen, and that country also offered the guerrillas Soviet and Chinese arms. Chinese advisers came in; and, it is said, some 300 Dhofaris have received training in China.

British Role

Britain suddenly found itself involved in a far off revolutionary struggle. Ties between the Sultanate of Oman and Britain go back to the Eighteenth Century. In exchange for military bases and trade concessions,

Britain had assumed the defense of the Sultan's realm. This was the case when the tribal revolt against the Sultan began in Dhofar. Able to equate dissatisfaction with the Sultan with their leftist cause, pro-Communist elements succeeded in taking over the rebel movement.

The British, realizing they were supporting an unpopular cause, backed the coup of the Sultan's son, Qabus, who ousted his father in 1970. A modernization program was implemented by Qabus to bring his nation from the 15th into the 20th Century. But Qabus is not a Communist, so the revolt goes on.

This revolt would mean little to the rest of the world, perhaps, were it not for geography. For it is Oman that sits astride the South shore of the Strait of Hormuz, through which 1.3 million tons of oil pass daily. And it is for this reason that the Oman conflict is being carefully studied by strategists in Communist capitals as well as in the West.

Britain realizes its significance as well. Although British forces are slated to leave the Gulf region proper by the end of this year, British military advisers will remain in Oman.

Two-Front War

At present, the outcome of the war is uncertain. The rebels show no sign of giving up.

Right now Sultan Qabus is using half of Oman's \$100 million oil revenue on the military effort and the other half on the equally vital social front. Schools are being built, and the country's six miles of paved roads are being extended to 242 miles. The first radio stations have been opened and Muscat harbor is being deepened. Much of this development is taking place in Dhofar. This prompted some but not most of the rebels to give up the revolt.

Prime Minister Tariq recently admitted, "We're starting from below scratch." How successfully the Omanis catch up to modern times may have a great bearing on the outcome of the war. The war, in turn, may determine control of a most vital and significant maritime gate. □

Yugoslavia, Italy and the Vatican— Building the East-West Friendship Bridge

by Carmelo Spiccia

IN MARCH 1971, Yugoslav President Tito scored a double first. He paid his first state visit to Italy and became the first Communist head of state to visit the Vatican.

The invitation to visit Italy had been extended by President Saragat when Tito visited Yugoslavia last year. A planned visit for last December had been cancelled at the last moment by Tito.

Why Renewed Relations?

Observers agree that Italo-Yugoslav relations go beyond the friendship of just good neighbors. They are part of Europe's Ostpolitik — the politics of reaching eastern European neighbors, and the eastern European response reflects the rising *diplomatic* power of Europe. Part of the interest is due to Communist East Europe's desire to be a part of a dynamic, throbbing, lively, and active Europe.

Present Italo-Yugoslav relations, indicative of a new feeling of "Europeanness," have not always been so cordial. In 1941, Italy and Germany invaded Yugoslavia. After one week Yugoslavia collapsed, but guerrilla resistance was organized. German and

fascist detachments unable to crush the guerrilla resistance — led mainly by Tito — resorted to terror tactics. These were in vain. The Yugoslavs resisted, won, and took revenge by filling mountain holes with the corpses of thousands of Italians. Memories still remain painfully vivid on both sides.

A common thorn is the disputed border between the two countries. The whole territorial dispute is compounded by the internal political climate of the two countries.

Naturally it is considered unhealthy for a democratic government to become too friendly with a Communist country. Any sign of friendship with a Communist country carries with it the danger of swelling the ranks of the Italian Communist Party — the second largest party in Italy and well within reach of the reins of power.

Tito also has to tread a delicate line. At home he has to watch the "Left," obviously unhappy with his soft brand of Communism and his "Western oriented" policies. The "Right" criticizes him for being a Communist in the first place.

He also knows the importance of

maintaining relations with Moscow. After all, there was an invasion of Hungary (1956) and an invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968) — countries who became too liberal internally and too friendly with the West externally.

Future Cooperation?

What hope is there then for Italo-Yugoslav cooperation? The common border could facilitate cooperation. Both are European countries with the same heritage of Christian civilization and a certain ethnic similarity.

It's a well known fact that although Yugoslavia claims to be Communist, she has had more tension with the Soviet Union than with any other country. Tito's brand of "national Communism" has been more Western than Eastern. While ties with the Communist bloc are becoming looser, they are becoming stronger with Western Europe. Yugoslavia is not about to be left out of the industrial and commercial boom of the Common Market. In fact, in 1970 she became the first Communist country to have a trade agreement with the European Economic Community.

Indeed, it may be possible that once



In an unprecedented and historical move Pope Paul VI received President Tito of Yugoslavia in an official audience at the Vatican on March 3, 1971.

Keystone Photo

Europe begins to acquire some independent military muscle, Tito will throw his lot with her — a Europe who would and could guarantee Yugoslavia's national independence from Russia and call her bluffs and threats of invasion.

For their part, Italy and Europe are happy to see a strong, prosperous, Western-oriented Yugoslavia.

Yugoslavia — A Christian Nation

The Vatican is not averse to closer ties with a country which for centuries has been part of the European Christian civilization. The Yugoslav population is

over two thirds Christian (25% Roman Catholic, 42% Orthodox Church).

It is not surprising that Tito should be the first Communist head of state to visit the Vatican. The way for this visit had been paved in August 1970, when the two countries established full diplomatic relations. By this act, the Church had achieved recognition as a legal body and won greater freedom of action in dealing with nations.

The Yugoslav state in theory earned the respect of its Catholic subjects. Yugoslavia is the only Communist country to have such relations

with the Holy See except for Cuba.

During his visit, the Pope praised Tito for his efforts towards peace in the world. The Pope also expressed the fact that the Vatican, too, is working for peace and brotherly collaboration between all peoples.

The unattainable dream of Tito has been to make Belgrade the center of a third power block. Perhaps Tito is beginning to realize that although Belgrade could not be that center, his dream may come true in a united Europe. With his visit to Italy, Tito has crossed the Rubicon. □

A "tongues movement" is sweeping the religious world. Once confined to a few "fundamentalist sects," it now finds adherents in almost every denomination, including some of those considered the most staid and tradition bound. It has aroused interest among linguists and psychologists as well as theologians. This article examines the studies of all three groups.

GLOSSOLALIA

The New "Tongues" Movement

by Lester L. Grabbe

"**R**A NA KAB ALE MEEKA DU BIMA," cried a woman.

"Thus saith the Lord, my spirit is moving among ordinary people, breaking forth in revival, not in the temple or tabernacle, but among all my children in this hour," came the interpretation by another.

It was a far-from-unusual occurrence in the meeting of one international, interdenominational organization. The meeting included one of the thousands of *glossolalia* manifestations taking place continually around the Christian world.

Glossolalia — coined from the Greek words meaning "tongue-speech" — was once confined to the scattered, small, usually emotion-charged meetings of various "Pentecostal" groups. But in the last few years the caricature of the "tongues speaker" has been redrawn. One finds enthusiastic believers in the "gift of tongues" among Catholics, Lutherans, Baptists, Presbyterians, Pentecostals, Episcopalians, and others. Laymen and clergy alike participate.

A sizeable portion of the "Jesus people" take part in glossolalia. They

consider it, along with other things, part of the "trip on Jesus."

Neo-Pentecostalism — A New Revival

The phenomenon of speaking in tongues has at least a 2000-year history (some would make it even older). This long-and-bizarre history has had whole books devoted to it. For a brief history of the tongues movement in the Christian church, see the accompanying box.

But the so-called "Neo-Pentecostal" movement is hardly more than a decade old. It began to arise informally perhaps in the mid-50's. But its public manifestation is usually traced to the spring of 1960. At that time the pastor of an Episcopal church in Van Nuys, California, explained to the congregation his experiences with tongues, experiences which had been going on for some time. Not surprisingly, this caused some publicity and eventually the resignation of the minister.

That event put the spotlight on the new movement. Since then glossolalia growth has continued unchecked, causing some stir among the traditional

churches. Some approve of it. Some oppose it. But no one can ignore it.

The movement outside the normal Pentecostal churches has no formal structure. But several magazines, among them *Trinity*, published in Van Nuys, are circulated for their benefit. In addition, an interdenominational organization, the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, serves as an anchor for many. It too has headquarters in the Los Angeles area.

The neo-Pentecostals do not wish to leave their present churches on the whole. They are satisfied with the traditional denominations and have no desire to join the regular Pentecostal groups. For this reason, they want to see glossolalia sanctioned by the hierarchy or governing body of their respective ecclesiastical institutions. In some cases, this has been done tacitly, if not formally.

But there has been opposition as well. The late Bishop Pike, while still in the Episcopal church, issued warnings against the practice. The Roman Catholic church has tended to maintain a neutral attitude for the moment. Most

of the major non-Pentecostal denominations have been more or less divided over the issue, regardless of the "official" policy of their church.

Theologians Divided Over Tongues

The glossolalists naturally point to the Bible as claimed evidence that their experience is valid. But this view is by no means unanimous among theologians.

One of the views taken by some, including many religious people, is that tongues are "ecstatic speech" — the incoherent babblings of someone in an emotional state of "ecstasy." The *New English Bible* uses such expressions as "gift of ecstatic utterance," "language of ecstasy," "tongues of ecstasy," etc., for the Greek word which is translated simply as "tongues" in many other translations.

At the opposite pole, many glossolalists insist that tongues are actual languages — either ancient or exotic — but still human speech. Others do not feel that "tongues" constitute any particular language, though they might not agree that they are "ecstatic speech." Still others see them as "tongues of angels."

Tongues in the Bible

Two passages in the Bible mention "speaking in tongues": Acts 2 and I Corinthians 14. In Acts 2, the Holy Spirit came to the disciples on the day of Pentecost only a few days after Jesus had departed from the earth. When they received the Holy Spirit, the followers of Jesus "began to speak with other tongues."

A surprised crowd of pilgrims — Jews from many different areas — gathered. They were astonished "because that every man heard them speak in his own language." There is almost no doubt or disagreement among commentators over this passage. They practically all agree that the "other tongues" of Acts 2 were genuine human languages. The whole passage read in context leaves no other choice.

But I Corinthians 14 is a different matter. Some feel that there is a difference between the "tongues" of Acts, written by Luke, and the "tongues"

mentioned by Paul in I Corinthians. However, this seems to be based on personal opinion, in most cases, rather than on a linguistic study of the passages involved.

In both cases, the same basic Greek word *glossa* ("language" or "tongue") is used. Elsewhere in the New Testament and in the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, this word always has to do with intelligible human speech. Twice it refers to stammering, but this is an *attempt* to communicate in normal speech.

There is absolutely no indication that

careful analysis of the various passages in the Greek text, concludes that "Paul as well as Luke [author of Acts] viewed tongues as bona fide foreign languages" ("Ecstatic Utterance" [N. E. B.]?, *Journal of Theological Studies* XVII, 1966, pp. 299-307).

J. G. Davies, another New Testament scholar, concurs this opinion: "There seems, therefore, to be no adequate reason for denying that St. Paul understood glossolalia to be speaking in foreign languages. Consequently there is no conflict between his description and the account in Acts 2, which is a



Wide World Photo

A group of neo-Pentecostals during an emotional session of "speaking in tongues." This practice is causing widespread controversy in nearly all major denominations as more and more churchgoers seek a new kind of religious experience.

something different was intended by Paul. As one investigator wrote, "The attempt to make a difference between the tongues of Corinthians and those of Acts is wholly artificial" (E. J. G. Titterton, "The Gift of Tongues," *Faith and Thought* [formerly the *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*] 90, 1958, p. 65).

Similarly Robert H. Gundry, after a

unity" ("Pentecost and Glossolalia," *JTS* III, 1952, pp. 228-31).

But since the tongues of the Bible were actual foreign languages, as a number of New Testament scholars and theologians are convinced, what about the present-day phenomenon? Do tongue speakers of today actually talk in foreign languages? Are they duplicating the Biblical experience, or is the

modern-day manifestation something else again?

Linguistics of Glossolalia

Many tongue speakers feel that they speak in genuine foreign languages. There are numerous stories in circulation to this effect. Most newspaper and newsmagazine accounts include such claims.

The stories vary in specific details, but they generally follow a consistent, stereotyped pattern. A person speaks in tongues at a group gathering. Among the group is someone having a knowledge of some exotic language. He astounds the group (or maybe they expected it all along) by telling them that the glossolalist spoke this particular strange, foreign language "fluently."

These stories are quite common and appear in many accounts of glossolalia, including popular journalistic reports. But in most cases, the story is second-, third-, or fourth-hand. Often, too, no positive identification of the language is actually made. Instead, someone says it "sounds like" such and such or "I thought I heard a few words" of such and such a language.

But professional linguists have investigated modern glossolalia and have found no evidence that it ever consists of actual speech. Dr. William J. Samarin, while professor of linguistics at the Hartford Seminary Foundation, discussed just this point.

After analyzing it with illustrative examples, he concluded that although speaking in a real language "is claimed by Christian charismatists to be part of the tongue-speaking experience, they would be unable to provide a case that would stand up to scientific investigation." (See "The Linguisticity of Glossolalia," *Hartford Quarterly* viii, 1968, pp. 52-55.)

Different From Real Language

Professor Samarin examined recorded samples of glossolalia from a linguistic point of view. It is definitely not gibberish as some have charged. But there are significant differences between certain of its features and those of real intelligible speech.

Professor Samarin concludes: "In the foregoing we have seen that glossas

["tongues"] are not natural languages, and they are unlike natural languages in very significant ways even though features are shared" (p. 65).

Anthropologist Felicitas D. Goodman reported on a specific study of his in the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* (vii, 1969, "Phonetic Analysis of Glossolalia in Four Cultural Settings," pp. 227-39). He listed six specific ways in which glossolalia differs from human language. We will not

Although speaking in a real language "is claimed by Christian charismatists to be part of the tongue-speaking experience, they would be unable to provide a case that would stand up to scientific investigation."

— Dr. William J. Samarin,
Center for Linguistic Studies,
University of Toronto

go into these since they mainly involve technical points of linguistics. But his studies back up those of Dr. Samarin.

Dr. Eugene A. Nida, of the American Bible Society Translations Department, has also studied tapes of glossolalia. Although he has not published his findings formally, he has read unpublished papers in scholarly meetings and has made available certain unpublished findings. He similarly concludes that there are distinct contrasts between glossolalia and real language.

A study of the "interpretation" of "tongues speaking," regarded by many glossolalists as essential, also shows no correlation between the "tongue" and the "interpretation." An experiment was conducted in which a tape of glossolalia was played to several individuals claiming to have the "gift of interpretation." The "interpretations" were general statements in most cases. But even then, there was *no similarity* — the "interpretations" varied widely.

The conclusions of bona fide linguistics after scientific study are unanimous:

the tongue speaking prevalent today does *not* involve any real, natural languages.

Glossolalia Under Psychological Scrutiny

Contrary to the claims of some critics, tongue speaking is not usually the product of schizophrenia. But other studies having to do with more minor types of abnormality have been somewhat contradictory. A study reported in the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* concluded that:

"...[there is] no evidence... that the differences... found indicate abnormality or psychological pathology of any kind... Quite clearly, available evidence requires that an explanation of glossolalia as pathological must be discarded" (V. H. Hine, "Pentecostal Glossolalia," *JSSR* VIII, 1969, pp. 211-26).

But a study conducted by J. N. Lapsley and J. H. Simpson of Princeton Seminary adds another dimension to the picture. In their research among tongue speakers, they noticed the presence of "uncommonly troubled people" who exhibited "more anxiety and personality instability than non-Pentecostals of the same socio-economic background" ("Speaking in Tongues," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* LXIII, 1965, pp. 3-18).

Dr. John P. Kildahl, a practicing psychologist who recently finished a study of the phenomenon under a grant from the National Institutes of Mental Health, said that glossolalists tend to "develop a deeply trusting and submissive relationship to the authority figure who introduces them to the practice of glossolalia. Without this *complete turning oneself over* to the leader, there can be no beginning to speak in tongues." (The results of Dr. Kildahl's researches will be published in a book early next year.)

Whatever one's personal views on the subject, it seems that all must agree on one point — glossolalia demands that a person relinquish some of his mental self-control and turn his mind over to something other than his own conscious will.

From Whence Come Tongues?

Tongue speakers, naturally, claim that their "gift" is the product of the

"Tongues Speaking—" A Strange History

THE UTTERANCE of unintelligible sounds has certainly not been confined to Christianity. The Old Testament, as mentioned, speaks of "wizards who peep and mutter." Tongues seem to have been far from unusual among the pagans of Greece, Rome, and other areas. The Greek historian Herodotus spoke of those who "rave when the god seizes" them (IV, 79). But, as the accompanying article shows, the description of the New Testament phenomenon was unique and not in any way connected with the "tongues" practices.

It was almost a century and a half after the New Testament discussion before anything else was written on the subject. Then, the Catholic writer Iraeneus mentioned that the practice of "tongues speaking" was current in his day, though he did not describe it in detail. Further sporadic references and little else is found among the later writings of the "Church Fathers." In some cases, it is difficult to know what took place, since the writers did not include a detailed account.

The Montanists, composing a second-century, short-lived "heretical" movement, placed great store in tongues speaking. One writer has commented on parallels between this group and the modern "Pentecostal" religions. The practice has always continued privately among the Eastern Orthodox. But, except for a few isolated cases, it seems to have otherwise died out in Western Christianity.

Aside from these few isolated stories of "tongues" among Catholics, it was not until after the Protestant Reformation that the practice is recorded in any great detail. This time it occurred mainly among Protestants. Just at the turn of the 18th century, a brief but intense period of tongues speaking arose among the persecuted Protestant Huguenots in the Cevennes mountains of France. It was almost entirely children who had the "gift"

—so that they became known as the "little prophets of Cevennes."

Another period of glossolalia began about 1830 and existed mainly among the followers of Edward Irving, known as *Irvingites*. This English group continued with the practice for almost half a century, though Irving died not long after the movement began. But it, too, dwindled to nothing by the beginning of the 20th century.

The "Pentecostal" movement grew out of the "Holiness" campaign following the American Civil War. The Holiness movement was a reaction against the rising liberalism in the churches of the time. It affirmed the literal inspiration of the Bible, the need for a personal experience, of conversion, and moral living. But it eventually distinguished itself further by a doctrine of the "baptism of fire."

The name of Charles F. Parham, more than any other, is associated with the founding of Pentecostalism. As a part of the Holiness drive, he opened a Bible college in Kansas. Through a special study by himself and some of his students, he concluded that "speaking in other tongues" was a sign of being baptized with the Holy Spirit. His group sought this "gift" and soon found it. The Pentecostal movement had begun.

The experience of Parham and his students came in the year 1900. By 1906 the movement had established itself in Los Angeles. Here it began to flourish. Its numbers were quickly increased when tongue-speaking immigrants from Armenia joined with them.

As with most religious movements, the unity of the Pentecostals did not last long. Soon there were disagreements over theological and doctrinal questions. These resulted in a division into various denominations soon after 1910. This general state of things continued until the rise of neo-Pentecostalism in the 50's and 60's.

Holy Spirit. As one Pentecostal put it, "The supernatural utterance by the Holy Spirit... Tongues speaking is a sort of miracle..."

But scientists and psychologists, many of them also theologians, tend to take a less spiritual, more sober and earthly approach. Dr. Kildahl feels it comes through an "emotional repression" which allows a fluency which could not be produced by conscious effort.

Anthropologist F. D. Goodman writes that "the glossolalist does indeed behave differently from ordinary-language speakers.... We may now suggest that glossolalia be defined as an event of vocalization uttered while the speaker is in a state of dissociation termed TRANCE" ("Phonetic Analysis of Glossolalia in Four Cultural Settings," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* VIII, 1969, pp. 227-39). He later states even more explicitly that the data of studies give strong evidence that tongue speaking is the product of a "trance" state.

Dr. Kildahl pointed out in his study, "Many references could be cited in order to illustrate the relationship between glossolalia and certain hypnotic states.... It will be noted the [*sic*] hypnosis and glossolalia are introduced in a similar manner." Just as a hypnotic subject must put his "trust" in the hypnotist, so the tongues speaker must place his in the "authority" figure. Hypnosis and tongue speaking are remarkably similar, almost as if the glossolalist had allowed himself to be hypnotized.

Research by Dr. Samarin, now of the Center for Linguistic Studies at the University of Toronto, shows that glossolalia is not at all hard to acquire: "The only necessary, and perhaps sufficient, requirement for becoming a glossolalist seems to be a profound desire on the part of an individual for a new or better religious experience" ("Glossolalia as Learned Behaviour," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 15, 1969, pp. 60-64).

The Thirst for a New Religious Experience

Why the sudden new interest in glossolalia? As Dr. Samarin said in the quote just given, people are looking for a "new and better religious experience."

One high church official, a Pente-

costal himself, stated, "People are turning to glossolalia because churches have become so unspiritual and out of touch with the needs of the people." Many glossolalists — and theologians as well — would agree with him. More and more people are not finding satisfaction in their traditional church with its traditional rites.

Another theologian, this time an

Episcopal dean, said in regard to tongues speaking, "The disease today is nihilism — nothingness. . . . The problem today is lack of power, spirit. The bones are dry and dead. We need a new strengthening of the spirit." Many feel they can find this "strengthening of the spirit" through glossolalia.

The renewed interest in mysticism and the occult is partly a reaction

against our 20th-century world of materialism. Material possessions don't satisfy the spirit. In the words of one psychotherapist, people are seeking some fulfillment or power "to get beyond themselves."

To find this something beyond themselves, quite a number are turning to various promising diversions: mysticism, astrology, the occult, witchcraft, Oriental philosophy, "fringe" religions. Some, who do not want to make a complete break with Christianity, are trying to get their "spiritual kicks" through glossolalia.

While in no way denying the spiritual malnutrition prevalent today, we still must ask: *Are glossolalists finding a true religious experience?* Or is it just an ersatz counterfeit psychological bootstrap which takes its toll on the mind in the future?

We have already shown that modern tongues speaking is not parallel to that of the New Testament — according to both theological and linguistic scholars. Some — many — definitely derive a temporary lift and feeling of euphoria from tongues. But so do many people derive a temporary lift from amphetamines and euphoria from heroin.

Just as the drug taker, the glossolalist must relinquish some of his mind control and willpower. The potential dangers in this should be obvious!

In fact, Dr. Kildahl's study comes to the remarkable conclusion that it "is generally *not* the speaking in tongues that brings the great feelings of euphoria that these people experience; rather, it is the submission to the authority of the leader. The follower feels at peace because he has abandoned himself to the control of somebody else." (Italics his.)

The ancient sage, Solomon, said, "There is nothing new under the sun." Included in that is "tongues speaking." Hundreds of years before Christ, the Biblical prophet Isaiah warned, "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God?"

After a brief analysis of the modern "tongues" movement, that advice remains *good* advice for us today. □

HOW your PLAIN TRUTH subscription has been paid

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

This organization operates in a way none ever did before. These entire worldwide enterprises started very small. The Editor had given a series of lectures in Eugene, Oregon in 1933, on the laws of success in life. Individual failures and collective world troubles have resulted from wrong principles which motivate human society.

This world's approach to life operates on the philosophy of self-centeredness — of getting, acquiring, and of envy, jealousy and hatred. The lectures reversed the approach, showing that the way to *real success* — peace, happiness and abundant well-being — is *the way* of outgoing concern for others equal to that for self — actually the *giving*, serving, cooperating way.

Response was surprising and enthusiastic. A number of lives about-faced. 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, by starting it as a mimeographed "magazine" the way had opened.

The first week in January 1934, *The WORLD TOMORROW* program started on the air. On February 1, that year, *The PLAIN*

TRUTH made its most humble bow. Response was gratifying. It was something *different* — something *right* — something vitally *needed* — something containing vitality and life!


There was no request for contributions. It proclaimed the *giving* way, and had to practice what it advocated. A few small contributors joined in the cause *voluntarily*. Little by little, gradually, listeners and readers became *voluntary* Co-Workers. They *wanted* to have a part in expanding this unique and *needed* Work.

Growth seemed slow. But it was steady and continuous, at the rate of approximately 30% a year. That rate of growth has continued for 36 years. We were advocating *THE WAY* of *GIVING*, not getting. To put a price on our magazine or other literature would have seemed inconsistent. So we never have.

Although you cannot pay for your own subscription, we do gratefully accept contributions, voluntarily given, though we never solicit the public for financial support.

We *believe* in what we are doing, and *THE WAY* it is being done. Our ever-growing family of volunteer Co-Workers believe in it, and gladly *give* of their incomes that we, with them, may *GIVE* these precious success secrets to an ever-widening number of readers, listeners, viewers. These operations today are having a dynamic impact on 150 million people, worldwide.

Our happy Co-Workers join in a sincere THANK YOU for allowing us the pleasure of serving you. It gives us lasting pleasure.



The Neglected Tragedy of **ALCOHOLISM**

Alcoholism is a worldwide problem of enormous dimensions. It wrecks families, ruins health — and kills. There are definite reasons why people become alcoholic. But also, there are specific steps an individual can take to rid himself of this curse.

by William F. Dankenbring

PEOPLE ARE ALARMED at the growing incidence of drug abuse and narcotics addiction. But meanwhile another silent killer receives little publicity as it stalks the lives of MILLIONS, leaving heartbreak and incalculable suffering in its wake. While lurid drug stories capture the headlines, alcoholism devastates the lives of far more millions.

FACTS About Alcoholism

Take a look at a few shocking facts published by the National Council on Alcoholism.

- Drunk drivers are responsible for about half the automobile fatalities in the United States each year — they cause over 25,000 deaths annually on the highways. Excessive intake of alcohol is also responsible for most of the

Ambassador College Photo

deaths due to cirrhosis of the liver.

- One in every 13 employees is an alcoholic. Losses in industry because of alcoholism have been computed at \$6 billion (some say \$7 billion) per year. The total cost, including the human loss to individuals, breakup of families, suffering and heartbreak, is incalculable.

- Every problem drinker adversely affects an average of four other persons in his family, and more than 16 friends and business associates in the community. Therefore, *at least 130 million Americans* are directly or indirectly affected by alcoholism — in addition to the alcoholics!

- Shockingly, the familiar, oft-depicted "skid row" alcoholic represents less than 5% of the total number of alcoholics — the other 95% are still functioning in society, and are found in homes, factories, offices, and communities — the neighbor next door or down the street, if not in your own home!

- *Every third arrest* (or over 2 million arrests annually) in the United States involves public drunkenness.

- More than 95% of short-term prisoners are serving time in jail because of drunkenness or alcoholism.

- One in three suicides involves an alcoholic.

- The blight of alcoholism ranks with heart disease, mental illness and cancer as a national health problem.

A recent issue of *Medical World News* called alcoholism "America's Most Destructive Drug Problem." Alcoholism has been tied in with numerous other diseases. For instance, a study of 341 tuberculosis patients revealed that nearly half of them were alcoholics. Of a group of patients with cancer of the pancreas, 75% were alcoholics, compared to 14% of a matched control group.

CAUSES of Alcoholism

But why such a great tragedy? What leads a person to alcoholism and how can it be avoided?

Declared Dr. Marvin A. Block, former chairman of the committee on alcoholism of the American Medical Association, "Many causes of alcoholism have been enumerated, but these are actually only suspicions of causes. The actual cause of the disorder is not

known." He continues: "Many people would like to blame alcohol for alcoholism, but if this were true, everyone who drinks would become alcoholic. Alcohol cannot be considered the cause of alcoholism any more than gasoline can be considered the cause of automobile accidents" (Block, *Alcoholism: Its Facets and Phases*, p. 40).

Says this world renowned authority on alcoholism, many theories have been advanced — theories about hormone glands, the dietary regimen, and heredity — but none have been proved satisfactorily.

Recent research done by Dr. Halmuth H. Schaefer, professor of clinical psychiatry, and his associates at Loma

SKID ROW

The term "skid row" probably originated in Seattle, Washington at the turn of the century. Yessler Street, which sloped down to Puget Sound, was greased; and logs were skidded down into the water. Along this "skid row" were many taverns, bars, honky tonks, and hotels frequented by men who came to Seattle during the log-shipping season. Yessler Street was the "original" skid row, though most major cities now have their own, including New York's infamous Bowery, and similar areas in Copenhagen, Helsinki, Amsterdam and Paris. Flophouses, cheap restaurants, pawn shops, religious missions characterize the typical "skid row."

Loma University School of Medicine indicates that "alcoholism stems primarily from a conditioned response to anxiety, and therefore is NOT a physiological condition as many believe." Dr. Schaefer observed that contrary to the opinions commonly held, alcoholics are *not* "weak-willed" individuals; rather, they are *self-willed* people who are stubborn enough to do what they want.

What part does heredity play in alcoholism? Experiments by Dr. John Nichols, professor of psychology and social

science at Penn State University, indicate that some inherited physiological constitutions are more susceptible to addiction if exposed to drugs such as morphine and alcohol. However, he pointed out, this does not prove alcoholism is hereditary. He emphasized that whatever it is that is transmitted is not necessarily bad — the addiction-prone animals he tested were also *smarter* than the others and learned mazes more readily.

Psychological Factors

Dr. Nichols agrees that alcoholic addiction is primarily based on psychological factors. Drinking brings pleasure, euphoria, reduces the biological drives of the individual. Some become through habit and desire gradually conditioned to using alcohol to satisfy these basic human drives. Alcoholism, he says, is the result of people using this means to gain the "rewards" — the "payoffs" — which come from drinking excessively.

Drs. Halmuth Schaefer and Mark Sobell of Loma Linda essentially agree, calling alcoholism a psychological ailment, a learned response to stress. Alcoholics have simply learned to find "relief" through reaching for a drink!

Dr. Blythe Sprott, associate professor of health studies at Cal State declared that many physicians emphasize faulty metabolism as a primary culprit in alcoholism, especially a liver dysfunction. But says Dr. Sprott, "Metabolism is certainly involved in alcoholism, it is upset by drinking too much — but metabolic upset does not explain alcoholism." He also believes alcoholism is rooted in social and psychological conditions.

Said one man who had overcome alcohol addiction: "The alcoholic is an immature man or woman who takes the easy way out, alcohol, when he can't cope with reality." His comment strikes close to the heart of the problem of alcoholism!

The basic root cause of alcoholism was pinpointed by Elizabeth Whitney in her book *Living With Alcoholism*. She wrote: "A half century ago it was easy to find medical authority in agreement that alcoholism was hereditary. Scientific investigation has proved this

Alcoholism— A Worldwide Malady

THE TENTACLES of alcoholism spread into virtually every nation on earth, wherever alcoholic beverages are abused. Notice these striking examples:

MEXICO — Mexico's Alcoholics Anonymous estimates that about *one out of every five* Mexicans is an alcoholic! That's 9 million alcoholics out of a total population of about 50 million — one of the highest percentages in the world. Alcoholism has been blamed for causing 30% of all the deaths in Mexico, and 25% of all divorces.


FRANCE — "The technique of drinking," writes French author Roland Barthes, "is a national talent that serves to identify the Frenchman — and to prove simultaneously his power and ability, his control and his sociability." Recent statistics show the annual consumption of pure alcohol for the average French adult is 29.5 quarts, about 70% of this being wine. This means the average consumption of ordinary wine is from 295-315 quarts annually! The overall consumption is *TWICE* that of the average American, and four times that of the average Italian.

Interestingly, with only 1.7% of the world's population, France absorbs one third the world production of wine! Alcoholism ranks as the third major cause of death in France — claiming 22,130 lives in 1969. About 4 million Frenchmen are alcoholics. Though the government has tried to legislate against alcoholism several times, it has met no success. The problem will never be eradicated so long as drinking remains the "pet vice" of the French, costing the nation 7 billion francs annually.

RUSSIA — For years the Soviet Union called alcoholism "a disease of capitalism." Now the Kremlin acknowledges that drunkenness and alcoholism are a major problem in the Soviet Union.

Though official statistics are unavailable, one count put the number of alcoholics at 10 million in

1965. Alcoholism in Russia is held as a factor in 65% of all murders, 71% of all bodily harm, 40% of all absenteeism, 25% of all traffic accidents (despite the fact that there are few automobiles in Russia, comparatively), 90% of all juvenile crime, 84% of all thefts and 54% of all rapes.



Ambassador College Photo

A massive campaign is under way to reduce alcoholism and drunkenness. But even before the Russian revolution, Russians downed vodka in staggering quantities. After 1917 the leaders attempted prohibition, but it failed. Khrushchev raised prices, to no avail. The present massive crackdown on drunkards will probably also fail.

Foreign observers believe Russians drink mostly out of sheer boredom.

Housing shortages, frustrations, lack of recreational activities, the long cold winter months, all contribute to drive the people to drink to forget their worries and problems. Experts see no end to alcoholism in Russia until life becomes much more enjoyable and other pleasures replace drink.

BRITAIN — Estimates of alcoholics in Britain range from 350,000 to over half a million. Renowned as a nation of beer drinkers, alcoholism has reached alarming proportions. It is very likely the third major health problem — a far greater problem than dependence on other drugs. Dependence on it outweighs all other drugs by about 50 times. There is an established trend to younger and younger alcoholics, with already more than 25% under 35. Alcoholism costs the British 250 million pounds a year.

CANADA — Perhaps 300,000 alcoholics (these are conservative figures). Excessive drinking is blamed for 40% of divorce cases and 50% of fatal traffic accidents, as well as 13% of admissions to general hospitals.

AUSTRALIA — Six percent of all drinkers in this country are alcoholics — a shockingly high figure. Australia has the fifth highest proportion of the world's alcoholics.

SOUTH AFRICA — A growing army of alcoholics, over 370,000 strong (five times the number suffering from cancer), threatens the health of this nation. The problem is assuming alarming proportions.

WEST GERMANY — In beer drinking alone, Germans drink an average of about 125 quarts a year per capita, and slightly more hard liquor than the U.S. average. Germany's army of alcoholics numbers around 600,000, one third of them women.

HOLLAND — Although alcoholism is not a major problem here, there is a definite relationship between alcoholism and crime. From 1963-1966, 25% of all lawbreakers committed their crimes while under the influence of alcohol.

incorrect" (p. 4). She adds that ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS are the key. "In recent studies it has been determined that the ways in which parents use alcohol have a profound effect on the drinking behavior of their children" (p. 5).

The basic solution to the problem of alcoholism, then, lies in the realm of changing the way of thinking toward life and toward alcohol itself!

alcoholism in women" (*The Safe Way to Drink*, p. 20).

He also listed lack of interests and hobbies, a dull, unrewarding job, competitive pressure, chronic emotional stress, interpersonal conflicts, and a host of similar factors.

Most heavy drinking occurs during middle age, when many people come to realize their lives haven't measured up

itself. Many people, today, have no great personal goals to strive for; they are not driving themselves to attain some great GOAL; they are not *motivated* or *inspired* by some challenging PURPOSE in life. Rather, to them life has become meaningless, boring, tedious, tiresome, jaded, eroded, devoid of interest, vitality, and MEANING!

The Solution to Alcoholism

The factors in society, the home, and in a person's personality which lead him to *over-indulgence* are the CAUSES of alcoholism! Understanding this basic truth, then, we can see that there are two approaches needed to stamp out alcoholism. PREVENTATIVE steps must be taken by society — and by the individual.

What can society do? The WHOLE APPROACH toward alcohol in our modern, affluent Western world is wrong and contributes to the growing problem.

In other words, equating the use of alcohol with an atmosphere of surreptitious pleasure and delight is nothing more than a Madison Avenue sell job. It is time the "mystique," the "symbol of virility," the *image* of alcohol, were changed from its false glamour to one which is realistic — that of a pleasant, relaxing beverage for social occasions and to be taken with meals — a beverage all right to drink in MODERATION!

Parents should be *educated* to have a balanced view of alcohol themselves, so they can set their children the RIGHT EXAMPLE of proper use. Parental *misuse* is a real factor in causing young people to imitate them and become alcoholics. On the other hand, if parents are tee-totalers, and condemn the use of alcohol, then they run the danger of causing their children to REBEL, and become fanatical drinkers with a totally distorted view of alcohol.

Clearly BALANCE and *moderation* should be primary goals of an EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM for both children and adults.

Rupert Wilkinson, a sociologist who has studied the problem of alcoholism extensively, believes there is a distinct relationship between America's high rate of drinking and the way in which alcoholic drink is distributed, promoted, and generally treated by society. He

Social attitudes toward alcohol emphasize its clandestine and negative aspects. There are, however, enjoyable, beneficial and balanced uses of alcoholic beverages as with a delicious meal.

Ambassador College Photo



Empty Lives

Declared Dr. William Terhune: "Certain conditions and circumstances appear to make people more vulnerable to alcohol. *Poor motivation* is a strong contributor. It is a sad fact that many human beings have no compelling, constructive PURPOSE in school, in work or in any other part of life."

He continued: "Some life situations encourage prolonged frustration and a sense of defeat, accompanied, in turn, by self-pity and anger. *Marital maladjustment* is the greatest single cause of

as they thought they would — when they look back over life and see the great gap between what they aspired toward and what they achieved. Life seems a treadmill, full of endless, repetitive routine. They turn to alcohol to anaesthetize their feelings and the hurt in their lives.

Many elderly people, feeling unneeded and unwanted, lonely and cast off, turn to heavy drinking for solace. A little excess alcohol hits them especially hard and hastens senility.

Thus, part of the cause of alcoholism is, in a sense, our modern way of life

Watch Out for the Drunk Driver

ALCOHOL is the largest single factor leading to highway accidents and fatalities.

According to surveys, drinking and driving are responsible for the slaughter of over 25,000 lives and 800,000 crashes in the United States every year.

Until recently it was assumed that the average citizen, tipping a few drinks and then driving, was the culprit. But studies indicate that the worst offenders are out-and-out alcoholics and habitual problem drinkers.

A study at the University of Michigan Medical School indicated that alcoholics account for 80 percent of all drunken driver arrests.

It's this small group of habitual problem drinkers and alcoholics who drive that are responsible for so many highway accidents and fatalities. One medical examiner estimated that 44 percent of the drivers killed are innocent victims of drunken drivers.

A one-year study conducted in Grand Rapids, Michigan, analyzing the drivers involved in 8,000 crashes, showed that only a few hundred were heavy drinkers but that those few hundred were involved in a large percentage of the crashes.

Other studies show that the amounts of alcohol consumed by those causing crashes are usually far greater than amounts ingested by moderate drinkers. When drunken drivers are removed from wrecks, they often have a blood-alcohol concentration of .25 percent or more.

A concentration of .25 percent means the individual's blood contains 25 hundredths of one percent alcohol by weight. Most people lose mental sharpness after reaching a level of just .05 percent. At .08 percent the vast majority have had too much to drink for safe driving.

It only takes about two highballs, two beers or two glasses of wine on an empty stomach, consumed within an hour, to raise a 160-pound man's blood-alcohol level to .05 percent concentration.

What's the Solution?

But why can a minority of irresponsible drunken drivers cause so much carnage on U.S. highways annually? One reason is due to inefficient laws against drunken driving. They consist of a patchwork of



Ambassador College Photo

regulations shot full of loopholes. Twenty-six of America's 50 states define drunken driving as driving with a blood-alcohol concentration of .15 percent — far too high. Another 17 states use what the Federal Government rates intoxication as .10 percent — but that's still too high. Only Utah set the level at .08 percent. Six states have no legal level to define drunkenness!

Great Britain, on the other hand, now uses the .08 percent level — and highway casualties significantly declined during its first year of enforcement.

What, then, should be done to decrease this serious menace to life and property? First, of course, more stringent laws could be passed, making it illegal to drive with an alcohol content in the blood of perhaps .05 percent or higher. Laws could also be strengthened to require breath tests for suspected drunken drivers. Penalties could be stiffer for those convicted — including the impounding of abusers' automobiles.

What You Can Do

You can also do something personally. First, be more alert to the dangers of driving. Remember that one out of every 50 cars coming at you is being steered by a person on alcohol or narcotics. Be especially alert at night, on weekends and particularly on holidays when more people drink heavily. Look out for the other guy.

According to Dr. William Had-don, former director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, only about nine percent of traffic fatalities in the morning rush hour involve alcohol. Twelve hours later at night, the rate of alcohol involvement rises to 90 percent.

Secondly, you can be a committee of one to insure that YOU, yourself, are not a problem to society as a drunken driver. Don't mix drinking and driving. The mixture is all too often fatal and final.

Studies at Indiana University show that drivers with blood-alcohol levels of .15 percent have 25 times more chance of causing automobile crashes than if they have not been drinking. Even with blood-alcohol levels of just .04 percent there is an increased probability of causing a crash.

Warns the National Safety Council: "Most people have the misguided idea that a few drinks will not affect their driving ability. It is sad that so often they are wrong. Alcohol affects first a person's judgment and social restraint, and then it worsens his control over his muscles."

The National Safety Council further advises that drivers allow at least one hour per average drink to regain the muscular coordination, visual acuity, and good judgment needed to operate a motor vehicle. The Council cautions that black coffee, cold showers, physical exercise, and other "home remedies" do not speed elimination of alcohol from the system.

Keep in mind, that when you give a drunk a pot of coffee to sober him up, all you will have is a wide-awake drunk.

shows conclusively that cultural drinking patterns influence the incidence of drinking problems. Says he, "Alcohol should not symbolize either sexual virility or the attractions of a forbidden fruit. For drinkers this means acceptance of drinking as part of *ordinary everyday life* . . . rather than an exaggerated elixir . . ." (*The Prevention of Drinking Problems: Alcohol Control and Cultural Influences*, pp. 6-7).

If the plague of alcoholism is to be defeated, then society itself needs to be REORIENTED in its approach. Only then can alcoholism be *prevented* before it starts.

But what about individuals who are already alcoholics? What hope is there for them? If *you* have a problem with alcohol, what can you do? What if you have an alcoholic relative?

The Road Back

The consensus of modern opinion of psychiatrists, medical doctors, and laymen alike is that the best overall record in rehabilitating alcoholics is held by Alcoholics Anonymous. Dr. Gitlow told me personally, "I think that the biggest success that we see today has been through the auspices of Alcoholics Anonymous." Alcoholics Anonymous has anywhere from 300,000 to half a million members. Members claim that about 50 percent of those who seek help find the road back to sobriety and sanity.

Declared Dr. Max M. Glatt, a British expert on alcoholism, in an interview with a PLAIN TRUTH representative in England, "I am a great believer in Alcoholics Anonymous. First, they have shown to the world at large that alcoholics are not a bunch of spineless weaklings, but that they are people who can find their way back, and they have done that without professional help, they have done that in the face of skepticism from professional organizations and from the world at large. They therefore have shown that the old notion of gloom and doom attached for so long to alcoholics is quite wrong. They have shown that these often despised people are able to make a comeback from the rock bottom stage without much outside help."

Why is A.A. successful when many other types of treatment have failed?

Why do psychiatrists and doctors often recommend A.A. to the alcoholic?

There is a reason. Alcoholics Anonymous recognizes that to conquer alcoholism, the alcoholic must make a CLEAN BREAK with his former way of life — he must find new ideals, new goals, a new purpose in life!

Alcoholics Anonymous is able to help many alcoholics who have reached "bottom" because the members themselves have gone through the same ordeal, the same suffering. They know what it is like. They have experienced it themselves. They know how hard it is to conquer alcoholism. Therefore, they take the time and effort to provide the alcoholic seeking help with encouragement, friendly assistance and companionship — a helping hand over the difficult times.

Alcoholics Anonymous is not the only group that has successfully treated alcoholism. Other groups have also met with some success. However, *all* truly successful treatment procedures have certain things in common. In all of them, the alcoholic must be brought to admit his problem, and must believe that he can conquer it. He must be motivated. He must be given friendly, compassionate, considerate help. He must not be treated as a lowly scoundrel or despicable bum, but as a fellow human being who needs help desperately. Moral guidance, or therapy, must be included in the program.

If YOU Are an Alcoholic

If you are an alcoholic, you need personal help to conquer the problem. What you must do to overcome the problem will depend largely on how serious your own problem is. If you are at a beginning stage of alcoholism, then recovery is not so difficult, although it will require strong effort on your part, self-discipline, and determination. You will have to set your jaw to stay away from alcohol *completely* — don't touch it — because for YOU it is a serious problem.

You must be decisive. Admit your weakness, and TURN AROUND; change your whole life pattern, if need be, so you can overcome the problem. You may have to change your friendships, possibly even change jobs and move to

a new environment which is more conducive to sobriety and sanity.

Further, you must CONTINUALLY strive to exercise self-discipline and self-control. Use good judgment and NEVER FLIRT with temptation! Be on your guard constantly, and don't give in to the urge to "compromise," to have "just a few drinks."

Dr. R. Kemp, author of *Drinking and Alcoholism*, explained to a member of The PLAIN TRUTH staff, "The real thing you have got to do is to try and persuade alcoholics that they must be able to lead a life completely free of alcohol." He added, "Once you have become an alcoholic, this will remain for the rest of your life. This is an extraordinary fact, but it means of course that they can't at any time *ever dare take another drink*."

This, indeed, does sound severe, but the record speaks for itself — for most alcoholics to take just one drink is deadly.

A single drink sets off a *chain reaction* that leads to another and another until the alcoholic is either smashed, or the liquor runs out. Therefore, most alcoholics must determine to NEVER TOUCH the stuff — and *mean* it.

If you have a severe drinking problem, then you may need to contact a local society which helps alcoholics — a "half-way house," or a local chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous, or a doctor who is skilled and experienced in dealing with alcoholism (most have very little knowledge of this problem, but there are some who are experienced). What course of action you take is completely up to you, of course. But sometimes friendly, right-thinking associations and special help are necessary to give you the impetus and stimulus to surmount your problem. Don't forego any help which you might be in need of — but always remember, YOU are ultimately responsible for your condition, and YOU must be the one who *fights* it and conquers it.

YOU and YOU ALONE can overcome *your* own particular problem. Nobody else can do it for you. There is no magic pill, or potion, which will "cure" you. The cure of alcoholism involves your own personal will, desire, effort, and tenacious, long-lasting, constantly vigilant determination. □

what **you** can do...

TIMELY Tips and Helpful Suggestions for YOU and YOUR FAMILY

● **Frozen and Canned Foods Lose Nutrients**


Recent research further indicates that large portions of vitally needed nutrients, essential for optimum health, are lost due to modern methods of food preservation and processing. Dr. Henry A. Schroeder, Professor of Physiology, Dartmouth Medical School, made the following disclosures in the May, 1971, *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*:

— Frozen vegetables lose on the average from 36.7% to 44.6% of the vitamin B₆ content of fresh, raw vegetables. From 36.8% to 57.1% of pantothenic acid is lost.

— Processed and refined grains lose 51.1% to 93.8% of vitamin B₆ and 37% to 74.1% of the pantothenic acid found in the whole, raw product. Seven vitamins are lost during the refining of flour amounting from 50% to 86.3%.

— Processed meats lose from 50% to 75% of both vitamin B₆ and pantothenic acid.

Keep in mind that these nutrient losses take place *before* the food ever reaches the consumer. More losses are likely to occur during home food preparation before the food is finally eaten. It is obvious from these conclusions that a person will receive more nutrition by buying, preparing and eating foods which are unprocessed.



Ambassador College Photo

FRESH IS BEST — Buying recently harvested produce may be a little more expensive, but will benefit your family in the long run.

— Canned vegetables lost 57.1% to 77.4% of the vitamin B₆ found in fresh vegetables. Losses of pantothenic acid amount from 46.1% to 77.8%.

— Canned fish, meat, and poultry lose 42.6% to 48.9% of vitamin B₆.

● **Dangers of Driving Too Fast**

Driving too fast, or driving too fast for road conditions, is a leading cause of automobile accidents.

Statistically, a driver and his passengers' chances of being killed or seriously injured in an auto accident increase as the rate of speed increases. The National Highway Safety Bureau recently published a 12-month, nationwide survey of the incidence of auto fatalities at various rates of speed. The Bureau found that the death rate per 1,000 accidents was 5 at speeds of 26 to 30 mph; 22 at 46 to 50 mph; 30 at 56 to 60 mph and 121 at speeds over 70 mph.

But many automobile accidents can be eliminated by keeping the following driving tips in mind.

Auto speed safety hinges on two key highway driving principles — observing the "one-car-length-between-you-and-the-car-in-front-of-you" rule for each 10 mph, and compensating speed for adverse weather conditions and night driving. Consider the following information.

SPEED — Even under ideal driving and road conditions it takes the average driver 381 feet — more than the length of a football field — to stop the average car going 70 mph.

LOOSE SNOW — With conventional tires the distance it takes to stop a car going 20 mph on loose snow increases from 45 feet to 82 feet!

ICE — At a speed of only 20 mph, an automobile requires a *full* 217 feet to stop on ice.

FOG — During a fog your visibility may be only 50 feet. Since it takes 45 feet to stop a car going 20 mph, you can't safely drive more than 20 mph. At 30 mph approximately 78 feet is required to stop a car. At that speed you would be unable to stop in time to avoid a dangerous situation.

NIGHT — It takes the average driver in the average car 381 feet to stop at 70 mph. But effective headlight range is between 200 and 300 feet. At 70 mph the average driver would

not see a dangerous situation in time to stop and avoid it.

Be sure to write for our free reprint titled "Death Rides the High Road," for more pertinent information on safe driving techniques that can save your life and the lives of your passengers.

● Save Money — Cut Out "Extras"

There are a number of "extras" an individual can cut out to save money. The money saved can be used to pay off existing bills or build up a monetary buffer to meet unexpected future expenditures. Eliminating the sometimes seemingly small, unimportant "extras" can add up to a substantial savings.

Cutting out cigarettes for instance — a proven health hazard and cause of lung cancer (write for our FREE booklet, *You Can Quit Smoking*) — can save a three-pack-a-day man around \$1.20 a day, \$8.40 a week, \$36.00 a month, \$430.00 a year. Simply saving coffee break money can mean a savings of \$130.00 a year (at fifty cents per day).



Ambassador College Photo

MORE DEBT — Many so-called discounts can put you even deeper into debt through long-term credit payments and high interest rates.

A family can save by not eating out so often. Or it can quit buying expensive three, four or five dollar toys for the children, when less expensive or even homemade toys would be appreciated just as much. Another money-saving practice is to eliminate buying so many processed and packaged "convenience" foods.

Some families have very critical debt problems. To them "cutting out the extras" might mean selling their expensive stereo, color TV set, or boat to make a good start towards paying off mounting bills. Some families have even cut out the tradition of giving Christmas and birthday gifts. They have saved hundreds of dollars which went toward paying off debts.

There are many other steps a family can take to save money and get out of debt. To learn about them, write for our FREE booklet, *Managing Your Personal Finances*.

● Eye Cosmetics and Dangerous Organisms

Cosmetics injuries are becoming more common — mostly among women. The injuries include skin eruptions,

loss of hair, severe allergic reactions, burns, itching, and lacerations. And just recently, the possibility of another cosmetic injury was discovered — the "potential hazard of ocular infection" due to bacteria- and fungi-contaminated eye cosmetics.

This latest disclosure comes from Dr. Louis A. Wilson, an eye specialist at the Medical College of Georgia, following careful study of mascara, eyeliner and eye shadow obtained from 233 women who ranged in age from 18 to 52.

Eye cosmetics can become bacteria and fungi contaminated even though they are uncontaminated when purchased. When a woman uses eye cosmetics she can pick up certain organisms from her own skin with the applicator. After she puts the applicator back into the cosmetic container, these organisms can multiply into dangerous concentrations.

Said Dr. Wilson in the June, 1971, *American Journal of Ophthalmology* about his study, "This study demonstrates that bacteria and fungi may contaminate eye makeup, presenting a potential hazard of ocular infection." The "potential hazard" is the possibility of such organisms invading "minor corneal abrasions, causing an infection with subsequent impairment or loss of vision."

Other notable authorities such as Dr.'s Diehl, Laton, and Vaughn in their book, *Health and Safety For You*, warn against using anything around the eyes. They specify that the use of eyebrow and eyelash dyes, eye lotions and creams is dangerous.

● Potential Harm of Dieting During Pregnancy

According to a report issued by the National Research Council, the current medical practice of restricting pregnant women to a weight gain of only 10 to 14 pounds may be contributing to the high infant mortality rate in the United States.

Surveys of human experiences during World War II, and more recently in lesser developed nations, have indicated that unnecessary restriction of diet during pregnancy may unfavorably affect the growth and development of the fetus.

In addition, laboratory experiments on dogs and other animals show a marked reduction in the size of the offspring when the mother is maintained on an inadequate diet. "Accordingly, the current obstetric practice in the United States that tends to restrict normal weight gain 'is not justified,'" says the National Research Council.

"Weight reduction programs and severe caloric restrictions should not be undertaken during pregnancy, even for obese women, because of the possibility of adverse effects on the fetus' weight and neurological development," reports the Committee on Maternal Nutrition.

The Committee recommends an average weight gain of 24 pounds, within a range of 20 to 25 pounds. Other authorities recommend 15 to 20 pounds. The Committee further says that an adequate diet, not just during pregnancy but from the mother's own birth through growth and reproduction, is of utmost importance for both mother and baby.

What's Keeping YOU From Real SUCCESS?

***There are definite keys that can make
your business, your family, your LIFE, more
successful.***

by Roderick C. Meredith

WHY DO MANY assume that life should be drab, mediocre, uneventful? It's time you ask yourself this question and find out how to achieve lasting success in life.

Roughly speaking, there are three broad areas of success for the average individual.

What Is Success?

First is the satisfaction coming from the continued mutual sharing of love, affection and fellowship with family and friends. Certainly this is an extremely important area of life — and one that will make anyone's life more complete if handled properly.

A second major area for success in life — and one that is often put first — is the area of business, career and financial success. This, of course, involves

much more than making money. For the intelligent person, his interest in and satisfaction from the building of a successful career or business is one of the high points of life.

In this area of life, everyone will certainly acknowledge that there are definite keys which can aid one greatly toward progress and ultimate success.

The third area of life in which success should be achieved is the personal and spiritual sphere. This, of course, may have different meanings to different people.

However, there is no question but that the ability to find out why you are here, where you are going — whether to excel or not and in what direction — are basic questions needing to be understood for true success in the personal and spiritual aspects of everyone's life.

Define Your Goals and Plan to Succeed

It becomes imperative that within the three areas mentioned, and perhaps in others of your own choosing, you define your specific goals.

For instance, in the "family, friends and social" area you may have definite feelings about the type of family and social life which will fit your background, personality and ability, and give you a deep sense of personal satisfaction and fulfillment. If you are a bachelor, you may have in mind a certain type of girl who will best complement you and happily share with you your overall "family-friends" goal.

If you already have a family, perhaps you may realize the need to become a more effective parent and have the

loving, obedient and disciplined children which you realize will make your life, their lives and the lives of others more happy.

In the "business and financial" area, you may genuinely wish to remain in the field in which you find yourself. Your goal may be to become more effective and more successful in this field through developing better attitudes and more successful working methods.

Or, if you are young or just starting out, you may wish to change the field of endeavor in which you are now beginning. This, of course, is not an action to take lightly and should only be done after much thought, wise counsel and advice.

In all these areas of life, however, one thing is certain — you must find out your own basic tendencies, strengths, talents, abilities as well as weaknesses and dislikes. Then you need to choose and chart your own course toward success. Otherwise, you will simply lose by default and be buffeted about by circumstances and the winds of chance to a final destination of mediocrity or abject failure.

So in each of the above areas of success, define your own personal and practical goals.

Do be practical and reasonable and take your own talents, tendencies and weaknesses into account. But on the other hand, insist that your goal be high enough to give you something to reach for and satisfy your own deep-down realization of what success for you should be in each particular area.

Area by area, write these goals down.

Have a purpose — plan for the future. Kindle within yourself a sense of enthusiasm, drive and anticipation of achieving your worthwhile goals.

Then begin to work toward these goals systematically and continually. Think, read and educate yourself toward achieving each of these goals. Don't go overboard or become unbalanced. Use wisdom and common sense. Get the advice and counsel of others whom you respect on how best to achieve the goals you have in mind.

Remember that unless you want events and blind chance to control you, you will have to set your sights and master yourself and your environment.

You will have to define your goals — absolutely determine to succeed — and drive toward achieving your goals with relentless zeal and enthusiasm!

Develop Successful Working Methods

Whether in planning activities in your work or business or in considering the need to spend time in family fun and fellowship or in child rearing, you need to learn to schedule and organize your time.

Nearly every successful person knows this. Very often this is one of the outstanding keys to their success!

Taking into account your individual goals in the three areas of success we have described, learn to plan out an overall schedule for each day, week and month.

Allow yourself enough time in the area of business and career success, including extra reading and self-education assignments. Allow plenty of time for family, friends and fun — especially to really build the right relationship between you and your mate, and with your children as well. Then be sure to plan and schedule enough time for development of personal and spiritual interests.

Many of you will find it extremely profitable to buy a book on the proper use of time in scheduling. There are several such books available which are worthwhile. One of these I personally recommend is, *How to Gain an Extra Hour Every Day*, by Ray Josephs, published by E. P. Dutton Company, Inc.

In scheduling your day, you should certainly allot definite periods of time to consider the big questions of life — why are we, what are we, where are we going and how are we progressing toward the real purpose of human existence.

In your personal work day, learn to write down the things you want to do. This in itself saves much time and effort later on. Many people call these little slips or cards "to do" lists.

Put First Things First

Learn to put first things first. Don't neglect minor issues, but get at the big jobs early in your working day and

allow plenty of time for their accomplishment.

Concentrate on one thing at a time! As you begin on one project, learn to discipline yourself so that other jobs, interruptions and mind-wanderings do not intrude. If at all practical, stick with this one job until you finish it. Put all your energy and mind power into this one thing and complete it with zest.

The late President Eisenhower was a strong believer in one thing at a time.



UPI

BERNARD BARUCH

So was the famous counselor of Presidents, Bernard Baruch, who said: "I find my greatest time saver is to do one thing at a time and stick to it until finished."

If you've got a particularly important job coming up on a certain day and you know that office interruptions — or "child interruptions," if you're a mother — may interfere with its accomplishment, then learn to get up early and get going full blast before these interruptions can interfere.

Or, if your mind and body function better the other way, occasionally work late at night when the office is quiet or the children are already in bed. You will gain time for uninterrupted thoughts and work in this way.

It may sound old-fashioned or difficult, but the really top leaders in business and industry often find themselves doing this sort of thing in order to get the job done.

Another key is to learn to speed up your routine tasks and learn to be more efficient. Again, you may wish to read and think about how to solve this problem. But you will undoubtedly find many ways in which certain of your tasks can be done in less time — and probably much more efficiently.

Learn to organize your desk or work space. You may save a great deal of time and effort simply by learning to have a definite place for everything —

predecessor, the late President John F. Kennedy, and is certainly now exhibited in full measure by President Nixon.


A noted Washington correspondent reported at the time Kennedy was president: "Kennedy is amazing many old-timers in federal government and horrifying others by the speed and drive with which he conducts the presidency.

"It is quite common for the Chief Executive to stride into his office about 9 in the morning, calling to various

This realization — and the guarded use of time that naturally follows from it — is a success key that has been or is being used by nearly every great leader of our time.

We are all millionaires in time. Each of us has just as much time as the early Rockefellers, Morgans or Fords. Each of us, throughout each day, has just as much time as Einstein did.

The question is — how do we use this tremendous gift of time? You can



Kaiser Industries Photo

HENRY J. KAISER

and keeping everything in its place.

A well-organized file cabinet and filing system is of inestimable value to a business or career man. Even in the home, a limited filing system may help the modern wife far more than she realizes.

Making Accomplishment an Exciting Challenge

One of the most important keys to success in business and life is the sense of zest and drive which really successful men and women almost universally have and cultivate in their work and in their lives.

Newspaper and magazine reporters were fascinated by the tremendous drive and zeal which former U. S. President Johnson poured into his job. The former President rose about 6:30 in the morning and went fast and hard all day until 10 or 11 p.m. nearly every night.

The same drive was exhibited by his



Wide World Photo

JOHN F. KENNEDY

staff members as he crosses the threshold. He wants detailed information on a certain situation in government and he wants it in a hurry, at least, before the day is over.

"But what surprises these men even more is that Kennedy is waiting in his office at 7 or 8 at night when the requested report arrives."

Certainly the above description of the late President Kennedy's work day indicates the zest with which he tackled his many responsibilities and the drive he put into their accomplishment. In case after case, this is certainly the "key" to the success of many great leaders. It is certainly true of the present British Prime Minister, and the U. S. President.

Learn the Key of Time

Your life itself is composed of just so much time. Viewing it in this manner, your time is your life.



Wide World Photo

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

only waste the present moment. You cannot waste tomorrow. It is kept fresh and waiting for you. You can turn over a new leaf every hour if you choose.

Day by day, you can learn to use time to tremendous advantage!

Realizing the value of time, learn to get up early and *get right up* when you wake up. Learn to dress quickly in the morning and prepare for the day with zeal.

Organizing the layout of your bathroom and your wardrobe saves a great deal of time. Housewives will find that applying efficiency techniques to their kitchen will save them a great deal of time in getting the family fed and off to work — and for their own activities as well.

Again, the thought of scheduling your time throughout each day, week and month comes into the picture. You certainly don't need to be a schedule

slave, but you do *need* to have a schedule.

The late Henry J. Kaiser was an extremely successful and wealthy man — the leading figure in at least sixty different companies. Referring to his success techniques, an article in *Reader's Digest* stated: "Henry Kaiser is one of the most time-conscious people in the world. Even the five hours he allots himself for sleep are productive. This is what he calls his 'idea period,' and he always has a pad and pencil next to his bed."

To be truly successful in every area of life, you will learn — as other successful people by the millions have — to guard and control the use of your time intelligently and zealously. You will set your mind to use time in an organized and productive manner. And through this very means, you will be enabled not only to accomplish your goals in business and personal areas, but you will have time for the desired and needed fun and fellowship with family and friends as well.

Learn Self-Discipline

There comes a time when — to use the vernacular — you must "put up or shut up." If you really want success, you must be willing to pay the price.

If you would succeed, you must learn to say "no" to yourself. You must learn to turn down invitations, social visits, TV, cards, movies, golf, and other interruptions when these could interfere with accomplishment.

A balanced life with enough sleep, exercise and recreation is absolutely prerequisite to ultimate success. But while you are "on the way up," you must beware of distractions.

As each area of diversion presents itself, you should ask: "Will this use of time and energy help me accomplish my goal in life?"

You must discipline yourself to do the hard jobs first! The unpleasant job that is put off is likely never to get done. So roll up your sleeves and *do it first*.

People who procrastinate and putter around are usually putting off something unpleasant or difficult. They putter over little, inconsequential, easy things so they will not have to face what they subconsciously regard as the "big ob-


stacle" — the real job that needs to get done!

The best way to master this problem is to put the jobs you dislike at the top of each day's schedule. Then, if you roll up your sleeves and wade into them, you will soon be too busy to worry about the difficulty.

Make Yourself Produce

Keep driving yourself until work has become a habit that is stronger than your human inclination to loaf.

A wise proverb tells us: "He that



hath no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down, and without walls" (Prov. 25:28).

Self-control and self-discipline are vital "keys" to real success in any area of life.

You must discipline yourself to get started in the morning. You must discipline yourself to get at your work and really produce instead of puttering with trivials. You must discipline yourself to avoid distractions and to use your time and energy where they will count.

In addition, we should state here that one of the most searching areas of self-discipline is in regard to your own physical health.

If you are run-down or sick, you simply cannot produce and achieve the suc-

cess you wish. Therefore, you must discipline yourself to get enough sleep, enough vigorous exercise suited to your age and condition, eat a balanced diet of wholesome foods — basically lean meats, fish, fresh fruits and vegetables with very limited amounts of bread, sugars, and desserts.

Building and constantly increasing your health and energies is a vital key to success. This will enable you to put renewed zest and drive into your accomplishments and may well make the difference in many critical situations.

Another vital area in the field of self-discipline is learning to finish a job properly. Again, this means avoiding distractions and concentrating completely on the job at hand. It means mentally and spiritually helping to create a "second wind" for yourself so that you complete a task with a final spurt of energy and zest.

As you learn to discipline yourself you will find yourself getting many more things done. You will also find your ability to motivate and inspire others who work with you greatly enhanced.

Understand the Purpose of Life

At the beginning of this article, I mentioned that there were *three* general areas for success. The third, which we have not yet discussed, involves the spiritual aspect of one's life.

This aspect is *least* understood by most. Yet, it is the most necessary for total success.

Today, we exist in an age of gross materialism. Paradoxically, the more we have physically, the less it seems we are happy emotionally and mentally. People have the feeling that something is wrong. But they can't put their finger on the *cause* of their emptiness.

The answer is simple. Physical wealth, goods can only constitute a temporary success because they are in themselves temporary. And today, the world is "more" temporary than it has ever been. Former Associate Editor of *Fortune*, Alvin Toffler in his best selling book, *Future Shock* noted that "man's relationship with things are INCREASINGLY temporary." That is, we are producing more, doing more, traveling more, consuming more — and doing it

TELEVISION LOG

Garner Ted Armstrong

NEW STATIONS:

KFDA-TV — Amarillo, Texas — Channel 10, 1:30 p.m. Sun.
KSEL-TV — Lubbock, Texas — Channel 28, 12 noon Sun.
KMID-TV — Midland, Texas — Channel 2, 4:30 p.m. Sat.

— U. S. STATIONS —

KERO-TV — Bakersfield, Calif. — Channel 23, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
KVOS-TV — Bellingham, Wash. — Channel 12, 3:30 p.m. Sat.
WGR-TV — Buffalo, N. Y. — Channel 2, 12 noon Sun.
WCCB-TV — Charlotte, N. C. — Channel 18, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
KDIN-TV — Des Moines, Ia. — Channel 11, 12 noon Mon.-Thur., 7:30 p.m. Fri.
KJEO — Fresno, Calif. — Channel 47, 10:30 p.m. Sat.
KHBV — Henderson, Nev. — Channel 5, 6:30 p.m. Sun.
KHAW-TV — Hilo, Hawaii — Channel 11, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
KHON-TV — Honolulu, Hawaii — Channel 2, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
KIIN-TV — Iowa City — Channel 12, 12 noon Mon.-Thur., 7:30 p.m. Fri.
KTLA — Los Angeles — Channel 5, 10:30 p.m. Sun.
KWHY-TV — Los Angeles — Channel 22, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WTCN-TV — Minneapolis — Channel 11, 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WSIX-TV — Nashville, Tenn. — Channel 8, 7:30 a.m. Sun.
WDSU-TV — New Orleans, La. — Channel 6, 4 p.m. Sun.
KCND-TV — Pembina, N. Dak. — Channel 12, 5 p.m. Sun.
KOIN-TV — Portland, Ore. — Channel 6, 3:30 p.m. Sun.

WAVY-TV — Portsmouth, Va. — Channel 10, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
KSL-TV — Salt Lake City — Channel 5, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
KHQ-TV — Spokane, Wash. — Channel 6, 10 a.m. Sun.
KTNT-TV — Tacoma, Wash. — Channel 11, 10:30 p.m. Sun.
KTAL-TV — Texarkana-Shreveport — Channel 6, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
KGUN-TV — Tucson, Ariz. — Channel 9, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
KLTV — Tyler, Texas — Channel 7, 5 p.m. Mon., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
KAIL-TV — Wailuku, Hawaii — Channel 7, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
KARD-TV — Wichita, Kans. — Channel 3, 2 p.m. Sun.
WBRE-TV — Wilkes-Barre, Pa. — Channel 28, 6:30 p.m. Sat.

— CANADIAN STATIONS —

KVOS-TV — Bellingham, Wash. — Channel 12, 3:30 p.m. Sat.
WGR-TV — Buffalo, N.Y. — Channel 2, 12 Noon Sun.
CJSS-TV — Cornwall, Ont. — Channel 8, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
CKSO-TV — Elliot Lake, Ont. — Channel 3, 1 p.m. Sat.
CHCH-TV — Hamilton, Ont. — Channel 11, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
CKWS-TV — Kingston, Ont. — Channel 11, 12 noon Sat.
CFCF-TV — Montreal, Que. — Channel 12, 3 p.m. Sun.
CJOH-TV — Ottawa, Ont. — Channel 13, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
CJTV-TV — Port Renfrew, B. C. — Channel 11, 2 p.m. Sun.
KCND-TV — Pembina, N. D. — Channel 12, 5 p.m. Sun.
CKMI-TV — Quebec City, Que. — Channel 5, 7:30 p.m. Tues.
CKCK-TV — Regina, Sask. — Channel 2, 12 noon Sun.
CKSO-TV — Sudbury, Ont. — Channel 5, 1 p.m. Sat.
CKUP-TV — Ucluelet, B.C. — Channel 6, 2 p.m. Sun.
CKLW-TV — Windsor, Ont. — Channel 9, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
CJAY-TV — Winnipeg, Man. — Channel 7, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
CFQC-TV NETWORK — 12 noon Sun.
Saskatoon, Sask. — Channel 8.
Stranraer, Sask. — Channel 3.

CFCN-TV NETWORK — 3 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.
Sundre, Alta. — Channel 7.
Burmis, Alta. — Channel 5.
Oyen, Alta. — Channel 2.
Kimberley, B. C. — Channel 3.
Columbia Valley, B. C. — Channel 6.
Jubilee Mt., B. C. — Channel 8.
CFRN-TV NETWORK — 11:30 a.m. Sun.
Edmonton, Alta. — Channel 3.
Whitecourt, Alta. — Channel 12.
Ashmont, Alta. — Channel 12.
Lac la Biche, Alta. — Channel 6.
CHAN-TV NETWORK — 2 p.m. Sun.
Bowen Island, B.C. — Channel 3.
Brackendale, B.C. — Channel 3.
Burnaby, B.C. — Channel 8.
Chilliwack, B.C. — Channel 11.
Courtenay, B.C. — Channel 13.
Squamish, B.C. — Channel 7.
Vancouver, B.C. — Channel 8.
CHEK-TV NETWORK — 2 p.m. Sun.
Holberg, B.C. — Channel 4.
Kokish, B.C. — Channel 9.
Newcastle Ridge, B.C. — Channel 7.
Nimkish, B.C. — Channel 6.
Port Alice, B.C. — Channel 2.
Port Hardy, B.C. — Channel 3.
Sointula, B.C. — Channel 5.
Victoria, B.C. — Channel 6.
Woss, B.C. — Channel 3.
CHSJ-TV NETWORK — 2:30 p.m. Sat.
Saint John, N.B. — Channel 4.
Edmundston, N.B. — Channel 6.
Moncton, N.B. — Channel 7.
CJCH-TV NETWORK — 12 noon Sun.
Halifax, N.S. — Channel 5.
Annapolis Valley, N.S. — Channel 10.
Digby, N.S. — Channel 6.
CJON-TV NETWORK — 1 p.m. Sun.
St. John's Nfld. — Channel 6.
Argentia, Nfld. — Channel 3.
Bonavista, Nfld. — Channel 10.
Central, Nfld. — Channel 4.
St. Albans, Nfld. — Channel 13.
CKBI-TV 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.

more rapidly. And the very *doing* of it is giving us a greater feeling of insecurity and dissatisfaction.

"The striking signs of confusional breakdown," said Toffler, "we see around us—the spreading use of drugs, the rise of mysticism, the recurrent outbreaks of vandalism and undirected violence, the politics of nihilism and nostalgia, the sick apathy of millions."

We need NEW values — values of the spirit, lasting values that satisfy today,

tomorrow and forever. We need to know WHO we are; why we are; where we are going. In short, we need to know what the purpose of life is — or if there is even any purpose to it.

If there is no purpose in life then we are all doomed to living unfulfilled, frustrating, unhappy lives. But if there is a spiritual purpose for living then we can discover the tangible purpose in life that will ensure true and lasting success.

Everything in this world is due to cause and effect. If you are to discover success — true, lasting success — you must discover the LAWS that guarantee that success. Those general laws are easy to understand and few in number.

If you would like to understand in detail, the laws that will guarantee success in the three areas mentioned in this article, then write for our booklet, the *Seven Laws of Success*. Sent without charge. □

RADIO LOG

The WORLD TOMORROW

—heard daily on more than 300 stations worldwide. A thought-provoking broadcast bringing you the real meaning of today's world news—with advance news of the WORLD TOMORROW!

U. S. STATIONS

— East —

MAJOR STATIONS

- WOR** — New York — 710 kc., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WHN — New York — 1050 kc., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WHAM — Rochester, N. Y. — 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, 6:30 a.m. Sun.)
WBAL — Baltimore — 1090 kc., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
WRVA — Richmond, Va. — 1140 kc., 10 p.m. daily.
WPTF — Raleigh, N. C. — 680 kc., 1:30 & 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WBT — Charlotte, N. C. — 1110 kc., 11:05 p.m. Sun.

LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

- WOKO** — Albany, N. Y. — 1460 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WSAN — Allentown, Pa. — 1470 kc., 6:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:05 p.m. Sat., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WGLI — Babylon, N. Y. — 1290 kc., 6 p.m. daily.
WBMD — Baltimore — 750 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
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.
WZAP — Bristol, Va. — 690 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WWOL — Buffalo, N. Y. — 1120 kc., 4:05 p.m. Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
WCHS — Charleston, W. Va. — 580 kc., 7:00 p.m. daily.
WACE — Chicopee, Mass. — 730 kc., 12 noon daily.

*Asterisk indicates new station.

- WFNC** — Fayetteville, N. C. — 940 kc., 98.1 FM, 1 p.m. daily.
WHP — Harrisburg, Pa. — 580 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WMCS — Machias, Maine — 1400 kc., 8 a.m. Sun.
WFEA — Manchester, N. H. — 1370 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7 a.m. Sun.
WPAQ — Mount Airy, N. C. — 740 kc., 1:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WVOX — New Rochelle, N. Y. — 1460 kc., 93.5 FM, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
WEVD — New York — 1330 kc., 97.9 FM, 10 p.m. daily.
WMCA — New York — 570 kc., 1 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WBNX — New York — 1380 kc., 9:15 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
WHLD — Niagara Falls, N. Y. — 1270 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
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.
WCSH — Portland, Me. — 970 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WJAR — Providence, R. I. — 920 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WTVR — Richmond, Va. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
WWNH — Rochester, N. H. — 930 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
WSCR — Scranton, Pa. — 1320 kc., 12:30 & 6:30 p.m. daily.
WIBX — Utica, N. Y. — 950 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:30 p.m. Sun.
WDEV — Waterbury, Vt. — 550 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.
WBRE — Wilkes-Barre, Pa. — 1340 kc., 98.5 FM, 12:30 p.m. daily.

— Central —

MAJOR STATIONS

- 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 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9 a.m. & 10:30 p.m. Sun., 97.3 FM, 11 p.m. daily.
KSTP — Minneapolis-St. Paul — 1500 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:30 p.m. Sun.
KXEL — Waterloo — 1540 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun., 105.7 FM, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
KRVN — Lexington, Nebr. — 880 kc., 2 p.m. Mon.-Fri., after game 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.

LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

- WSLR** — Akron, Ohio — 1350 kc., 8 p.m. daily.

- WBCK** — Battle Creek, Mich. — 930 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:30 p.m. Sat., Sun.
WBCM — Bay City, Mich. — 1440 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KFYR — Bismarck, N. Dak. — 550 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KFVS — Cape Girardeau, Mo. — 960 kc., 7 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:15 a.m. & 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WMT — Cedar Rapids — 600 kc., 11:30 a.m. 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.)
KCHI — Chillicothe, Mo. — 1010 kc., 1:30 p.m. daily.
WCLU — Cincinnati — 1320 kc., 12 noon daily.
WERE — Cleveland — 1300 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.
KGGF — Coffeyville, Kans. — 690 kc., 6 p.m. daily.
KXXX — Colby, Kans. — 790 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:30 a.m. Sun.
WBNS — Columbus, Ohio — 1460 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
WITY — Danville, Ill. — 980 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
WOC — Davenport, Ia. — 1420 kc., 103.7 FM, 10 p.m. daily.
KWKY — Des Moines, Iowa — 1150 kc., 12:30 p.m., 9:30 p.m. daily.
WEBC — Duluth, Minn. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WDBC — Escanaba, Mich. — 680 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
WGBF — Evansville, Ind. — 1280 kc., 6:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
KFGO — Fargo, N. Dak. — 790 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:10 p.m. Sat. & Sun.
WKMF — Flint, Mich. — 1470 kc., 7 p.m. & 2:30 a.m. daily.
KUPK — Garden City, Kans. — 1050 kc., 97.3 FM, 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:15 p.m. Sun.
WWCA — Gary, Ind. — 1270 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 4 p.m. Sun.
KMMJ — Grand Island, Nebr. — 750 kc., 4 p.m. daily.
WNFL — Green Bay — 1440 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5 p.m. Sun.
WJOB — Hammond, Ind. — 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WIBC — Indianapolis — 1070 kc., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
WJPD — Ishpeming, Mich. — 1240 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KLIK — Jefferson City, Mo. — 950 kc., 1 p.m. daily.
WJOL — Joliet, Ill. — 1340 kc., 9:30 p.m. daily.
KUDL — Kansas City, Mo. — 1380 kc., 5:40 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:30 a.m. & 11 p.m. Sun.
KMBZ — Kansas City, Mo. — 980 kc., 10:05 p.m. daily.
WAKO — Lawrenceville, Ill. — 103.1 FM, 9 p.m. Sun.
WIBA — Madison, Wis. — 1310 kc., 7:05 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 6:05 p.m. Sat., Sun.

(Continued on next page)

WBRJ — Marietta, Ohio — 910 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
KGLO — Mason City, Ia. — 1300 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WYLO — Milwaukee, Wis. — 540 kc., 8 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KQRS — Minneapolis — 1440 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
KBEA — Mission, Kans. — 1480 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KLNG — Omaha, Nebr. — 1490 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WXCL — Peoria, Ill. — 1350 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
KFEQ — St. Joseph, Mo. — 680 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KSOO — Sioux Falls, S. Dak. — 1140 kc., 6:45 p.m. daily.
WSBT — South Bend — 960 kc., 9:06 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 p.m. Sun.
WCOW — Sparta, Wis. — 1290 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KWTO — Springfield, Mo. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WSPD — Toledo, Ohio — 1370 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
WIBW — Topeka, Kans. — 580 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
KCII — Washington, Iowa — 1380 kc., 10 a.m. Sun.
WSAU — Wausau, Wis. — 550 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KFH — Wichita, Kans. — 1330 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
WNAX — Yankton, S. Dak. — 570 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WFMJ — Youngstown, Ohio — 1390 kc., 10:30 p.m. daily.

— South —

MAJOR STATIONS

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.
KRLD — Dallas — 1080 kc., 5 a.m. daily, 9:40 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 p.m. Sat.-Sun.
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.
WWL — New Orleans — 870 kc., 9:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
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., 7 a.m. daily.
KRMG — Tulsa — 740 kc., 10 a.m. Sun.
XEG — Monterrey, México — 1050 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily (CST)
XESM — México, D. F. — 1470 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.

LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

KNIT — Abilene, Tex. — 1280 kc., 8:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
KGNC — Amarillo — 710 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KTBC — Austin — 590 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
KLVI — Beaumont, Tex. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WBRC — Birmingham — 960 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
WFWL — Camden, Tenn. — 1220 kc., 2 p.m. Sun.
KMIL — Cameron, Tex. — 1330 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:45 a.m. Sun.
WCSC — Charleston, S. C. — 1390 kc., 7:15 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 p.m. Sun.
WDEF — Chattanooga — 1370 kc., 92.3 FM, 7:30 p.m. daily.
KCTY — Childress, Tex. — 1510 kc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 12:15 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
KCTA — Corpus Christi, Tex. — 1030 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 4:30 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
WFAA — Dallas — 570 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
WAAX — Gadsden, Ala. — 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 12 noon Sun.
KEES — Gladewater, Tex. — 1430 kc., 12 noon daily.
KBHS — Hot Springs, Ark. — 590 kc., 12:30 p.m., 96.7 FM, 6:30 p.m. daily.
WBIX — Jacksonville, Fla. — 1010 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
WKSC — Kershaw, S. C. — 1300 kc., 1:15 p.m. Sun.
WFIV — Kissimmee, Fla. — 1080 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 12:30 p.m. Sun.
WKXY — Knoxville — 900 kc., 12 noon daily.
WLAP — Lexington, Ky. — 630 kc., 7 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
KFYO — Lubbock, Tex. — 790 kc., 11:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4:30 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.
WGBS — Miami — 710 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
WFAB — Miami — 990 kc., 9 a.m. Sun. (in Spanish).
KWEL — Midland, Tex. — 1600 kc., 5:15 p.m. daily.
WCOV — Montgomery — 1170 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
WVOG — New Orleans, La. — 600 kc., 12:15 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 12 noon Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
KBYE — Oklahoma City — 890 kc., 12:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
WKYX — Paducah, Ky. — 570 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
KTLU — Rusk, Tex. — 1580 kc., 1 p.m. Sun.
KMAC — San Antonio — 630 kc., 7:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
WEAS — Savannah, Ga. — 900 kc., 12 noon daily.
WMEN — Tallahassee — 1330 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
WFLA — Tampa — 970 kc., 7 p.m. daily.

KFMJ — Tulsa — 1050 kc., 12 noon daily.
KTBB — Tyler, Tex. — 600 kc., 12 noon daily.
KWFT — Wichita Falls, Tex. — 620 kc., 8:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 4:30 p.m. Sun.
KSIW — Woodward, Okla. — 1450 kc., 1 p.m. daily.

— Mountain States —

MAJOR STATIONS

KOA — Denver — 850 kc., 9:30 a.m. Sun.
KWSW — 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 — Ciudad Juárez, México — 800 kc., 8 p.m. daily. (MST)

LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

KGGM — Albuquerque — 610 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KIDO — Boise, Idaho — 630 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
KTWO — Casper, Wyo. — 1030 kc., 6:05 p.m. daily.
KLZ — Denver — 560 kc., 106.7 FM, 7:15 p.m. daily.
KCLS — Flagstaff, Ariz. — 600 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
KREX — Grand Junction, Colo. — 1100 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
KMON — Great Falls, Mont. — 560 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun.
KOFI — Kalispell, Mont. — 1180 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KASA — Phoenix — 1540 kc., 12:30 p.m. daily.
KSEI — Pocatello, Idaho — 930 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
KBET — Reno — 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KMOR — Salt Lake City — 1230 kc., 12:15 p.m. daily.
KTUC — Tucson — 1400 kc., 8 p.m. daily.
KTFI — Twin Falls, Idaho — 1270 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.

— West Coast —

MAJOR STATIONS

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., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
KGBS — Los Angeles — 1020 kc., 97.0 FM, 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KFI — Los Angeles — 640 kc., 9 p.m. Sun.

LOCAL-AREA STATIONS

KWIN — Ashland, Ore. — 580 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
KARI — Bellingham, Wash. — 550 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KICO — Calexico, Calif. — 1490 kc., 7:15 a.m. Sun.
KCHJ — Delano, Calif. — 1010 kc., 7:30 a.m. daily.
KUGN — Eugene — 590 kc., 7 p.m. daily.

(Continued on next page)

KBIF — Fresno — 900 kc., 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 4 p.m. Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
CKGF — Grand Forks, B. C. — 1340 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
KAGO — Klamath Falls, Ore. — 1150 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KFOX — Long Beach — 1280 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
KLAC — Los Angeles — 570 kc., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
KYJC — Medford, Ore. — 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
KONA — Pasco, Wash. — 610 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KEX — Portland — 1190 kc., 9 a.m. Sun.
KLIQ — Portland — 1290 kc., 92.3 FM, 7:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 1 p.m. Sun.
KWJJ — Portland — 1080 kc., 8 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 p.m. Sun.
KGAY — Salem, Ore. — 1430 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m. Sun.
KTOM — Salinas, Calif. — 1380 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KACE — San Bernardino-Riverside — 1570 kc., 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.
KKHI — San Francisco — 1550 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 a.m. Sun.
KFRC — San Francisco — 610 kc., 106.1 FM, 7 a.m. Sun.
KVEC — San Luis Obispo, Calif. — 920 kc., 7 p.m. daily.
KBLE — Seattle — 1050 kc., 12 noon daily.
KTW — Seattle — 1250 kc., 102.5 FM, 7:15 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
KVI — Seattle — 570 kc., 8 a.m. Sun.
KHQ — Spokane — 590 kc., 7:05 p.m. daily.
KMO — Tacoma, Wash. — 1360 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
KGRB — W. Covina, Calif. — 900 kc., 12 noon daily.
KMWX — Yakima, Wash. — 1460 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

— 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.
KORL — Honolulu, Hawaii — 650 kc., 7 p.m. daily.

CANADA

CJNR — Blind River, Ont. — 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
CKPC — Brantford, Ont. — 1380 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
CFCN — Calgary, Alta. — 1060 kc., 9 p.m. Sun.-Fri., 8:30 p.m. Sat.
CFCW — Camrose, Alta. — 790 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 2:30 p.m. Sun.

CKDM — Dauphin, Man. — 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
CKNR — Elliot Lake, Ont. — 1340 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
CKGF — Grand Forks, B. C. — 1340 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CJCH — Halifax, N. S. — 920 kc., 10:25 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 p.m. Sun.
CFJC — Kamloops, B. C. — 910 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:30 p.m. Sat., Sun.
CKOV — Kelowna, B. C. — 630 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:30 p.m. Sat., Sun.
CKWS — Kingston, Ont. — 960 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:05 a.m. Sun.
CKTK — Kitimat, B. C. — 1230 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CHYR — Leamington, Ont. — 5:30 a.m. daily at 730 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily at 710 kc.
CFMB — Montreal, Que. — 1410 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.
CFCH — North Bay, Ont. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7 a.m. Sun.
CKOO — Osoyoos, B. C. — 1240 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CKOY — Ottawa, Ont. — 1310 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
CKYL — Peace River, Alta. — 610 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
CKOK — Penticton, B. C. — 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CHEX — Peterborough, Ont. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sat.
CKBI — Prince Albert, Sask. — 900 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8 p.m. Sat., 2 p.m. Sun.
CHTK — Prince Rupert, B. C. — 560 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CKRM — Regina, Sask. — 980 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
CFBC — St. John, N. B. — 930 kc., 98.9 FM, 8:30 p.m. daily.
VOCM — St. John's, Nfld. — 590 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
CHLO — St. Thomas, Ont. — 1570 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 3:30 p.m. Sun.
CFQC — Saskatoon, Sask. — 600 kc., 8:30 p.m. daily.
CKCY — Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. — 920 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.
CJET — Smiths Falls, Ont. — 630 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Thurs. & Sat., 8 p.m. Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
CFTK — Terrace, B. C. — 590 kc., 7:30 p.m. daily.
CJLX — Thunder Bay, Ont. — 800 kc., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:25 p.m. Sun.
CKFH — Toronto, Ont. — 1430 kc., 6 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
CJIB — Vernon, B. C. — 940 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 7:30 p.m. Sat., Sun.
CJVI — Victoria, B. C. — 900 kc., 8:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
CKY — Winnipeg, Man. — 580 kc., 5:30 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 7 a.m. Sun.
CJGX — Yorkton, Sask. — 940 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

In French —

CKBL — Matane, Que. — 1250 kc., 10:45 a.m. Sat., Sun.

CFMB — Montreal — 1410 kc., 5 p.m. Sat., Sun.
CJSA — Ste. Agathe des Monts, Que. — 1230 kc., 6:30 p.m. Mon., Wed., Fri.
In Italian —
CFMB — Montreal — 1410 kc., 8:15 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 & 91 mc. VHF 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:45 p.m. Sun.

In Spanish —

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 —

RADIO BARBADOS — Pine Hill, Barbados — 900 kc., 9:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 11 a.m. Sat. 10:30 a.m. Sun.

BARBADOS REDIFFUSION — Bridgetown, Barbados — 10:20 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 a.m. Sat. & Sun.

ZFB 1 — RADIO BERMUDA — 960 kc., 1:30 p.m. daily.

GUYANA BROADCASTING SERVICE — Georgetown — 560 kc., 10:05 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 1:30 p.m. Sun.

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 GUARDIAN — Trinidad — 10 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:15 p.m. Sun.

RADIO ANTILLES — Montserrat, W. I. — 930 kc., 6:30 p.m. daily.

In French —

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 ANTILLES — Montserrat, W. I. — 930 kc., 8:45 p.m. Mon., Thurs., Sat.

RADIO CARAIBES — St. Lucia, W. I. — 840 kc., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

For a complete worldwide Radio Log write the Editor.

AS ARABS AND ISRAELIS STRUGGLE FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

To examine the key issues standing in the way of Middle East peace, Executive Editor Garner Ted Armstrong and members of our television production team interviewed Arab and Israeli diplomats and political leaders at the United Nations and in the Middle East. Here is their report.

Wide World Photo

THERE IS no question that both Israel and the Arab states fervently desire peace. During interviews and talks with officials on both sides, it was not difficult to detect a series of like sounding desires from both sides for a cessation of hostilities.

Ambassador Toukan, chief representative of Jordan at the United Nations told us: "On behalf of the Arabs, I say that *nobody* would like to resume hostilities."

Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem and other Israelis we talked with expressed the same sentiments on behalf of Israel.

A Common Ground?

In view of the apparent animosity evidenced in the Middle East, we asked: "Do Israelis and Arabs have a deepseated, irreconcilable hatred for one another?"

"I'll speak for the Israelis," said Ezer Weizman, former Israeli Air Force commander. "There's definitely little hatred, very little hatred." Speaking for the Arabs, former Jordanian Defense Minister Anwar Nusseibeh, a lifelong resident of Jerusalem said, "We have nothing against the Jews as Jews, neither racially speaking — we believe that we come from the same roots —



or on the basis of religion because our religion is based on the Jewish tradition."

Both sides claim they can *potentially* live peacefully together in the same corner of the earth. "Personally I think that there is a possibility for co-existence here," said Colonel Joseph Caleff, a spokesman for the Israel Defense Forces. Mr. Nusseibeh echoed this idea when he told us, "There was never any reason why there should be any conflict between us and the Jews."

What of the Future?

Both peoples express even greater optimism for the future. When asked "Do you feel that the majority of the Arab people would really be happier if Israel ceased to exist?" Mr. Nusseibeh replied: "Ceased to exist? I think there is a great future awaiting the Arabs and the Jews in this area once they forget these political divergencies between them. However this is very much in the future."

"In the meantime, we're not asking that the Israelis should cease to exist as a political entity. All we ask is that they should withdraw from the territory which they occupy in order to give us an opportunity to exist. It isn't a case of them not existing. It's a case of our not existing now, as a political entity!"

Weizman, when asked if he foresaw a time when Israel could join with various Arab states in a Middle East Common Market, answered, "Definitely. However," he continued, "it might take 25 years."

But *why* 25 years? Why not now? Mr. Nusseibeh may have given us the answer when he stated: "In spite of the fighting we still see no reason why Arabs and Jews should not be living together, *under the right conditions*."

Unfortunately Israeli and Arab concepts concerning "right conditions" are miles apart. Given 25 years or so it is felt that one side or the other or both *might* sufficiently relent so that an agreement would be achieved.

The differences between the two sides in a nutshell are these: The Arabs (or at least the moderates among them) say that if Israel *first* withdraws from all the territories it occupied in the Six Day War — thereby showing it is not

expansionist-minded — peace will be the result. The Arabs will *then* be prepared to accept Israel's presence.

The Israeli government on the other hand has said that if the Arabs *first* make real peace — then Israel will withdraw from at least some of the occupied area. After all, the Jews say, without a peace settlement, withdrawal to pre-war borders only means a return to conditions as they were before the war — hardly peaceful times.

The Israelis had originally insisted on face to face negotiations between the two sides *first* (which to the Arabs means tacit recognition of Israel). They later agreed to indirect negotiations through U. N. mediator Gunar Jarring as well as a partial withdrawal in the Sinai provided Egyptian troops would not cross the Suez Canal. Egypt rejected this idea, looking upon it as a denial of its sovereignty in an area it considers an integral part of Egypt.

No Trust From Either Side

All this political maneuvering boils down to a simple reality. Neither side trusts the other. Both sides want peace but not at the expense of weakening their position vis-a-vis the other side. And after what has happened to both peoples over the last decades, it is not hard to see why.

On a low hill to the west of Jerusalem are found a series of buildings and monuments making up what is called in Hebrew, Yad Vashem. This is the commemoration authority established by the Jewish people to remember and document the physical suffering and annihilation of one third of all Jews in what Hitler called the "final solution to the Jewish problem."

We had the opportunity to speak, on site, with Gideon Hausner, a member of Israel's Knesset (Parliament) and formerly the Attorney-General of Israel. He was the prosecuting attorney at the trial of Adolf Eichmann. Hausner had some significant observations to make on the impact of the Nazi "final solution" regarding the Jewish people.

"This produced such a deep wound that we have not yet been healed of it — over a generation after the event."

"There are today 20 million more Japanese than there were at the time

of Pearl Harbor. There are 40 million more Russians than on the day when Hitler invaded Russia. There are 15 million more Germans for all their losses. The only nation which still lingers behind even numerically are the Jews. We still count in the whole world 15 million people as compared to 17½ million with which we entered World War II.

"This produced such a deep trauma that it is not and probably will not be overcome, neither in this generation nor in the next generations. We were a victim of brutality, unbridled brutality, with the whole world watching. No one offering asylum, no one lifting a finger to assist us. Israel was not yet in existence, so we had no means of our own to help our brothers in Europe."

"We have learned our lesson from what happened in the 20th century, not in a remote past; in the heart of Europe, not in some dark jungle. All this happened with the world watching on."

"Now, of course, we would like to see at long last some peace coming to our people. However, this must be a peace which would assure us that there will be no further 'final solutions.' Before the Six Day War we heard this on all sides here that the Arabs are going to finish what Hitler left unfinished. Well, it sounded familiar when they spoke about it because we knew it was done once. We won't be able to survive anything similar."

"That is why in all our thinking and political motivation we have to secure ourselves now, physical conditions, territorial conditions. These must not be conducive to further aggressions, tempting people into thinking that it's easy to massacre Jews, and assuming it's easy to put an end to them. That's why we would like to have some sort of a secure existence, something which as a matter of fact every nation in the world has gotten for itself. We are entitled to it too."

These feelings run very deeply in the hearts of Israelis of all walks of life. Almost every week-day Yad Vashem is visited by bus loads of Israeli school children to learn how many of their own relatives came to horrible deaths and to see exhibits of the privations

and tortures which in some cases their own parents faced. Israeli soldiers also study the holocaust period, believing that it is they who stand between their people and yet another holocaust.

The Israelis find it difficult to trust other nations and their peace packages, be they in the form of United Nations "Guarantees," Big Four agreements, or in the proposals of Arab states themselves.

Arabs Equally Distrustful

The Arab peoples also feel betrayed. Promised independence by Britain dur-

Primary Aims of Both Antagonists

This same mistrust prevents the two sides from getting together. Meanwhile, each side continues to work toward the goals it considers most vital.

To the Israelis the most important goal is *security*. Israel must be strong enough to prevent the Arabs from driving them into the sea.

For this reason Israel probably will not give up all the occupied territories. It may gamble some of its strategic positions for the sake of a potential

of the Knesset building in Jerusalem in hopes of achieving good will. At the close of the tour one of the Arabs was not completely satisfied that he had seen everything.

"Where is the map?" he wanted to know.

"What map?" the puzzled Israelis asked.

"You know," he replied, "the map of the greater Israel — from the Nile to the Euphrates."

"But there is no such map," the Israeli guide explained. But this the Arab refused to believe.


Arabs know that in the Bible the God of ancient Israel promised that nation all the land from the Euphrates to the "River of Egypt." This the Arabs believe is the Nile while most Jewish commentators feel it only refers to the Wadi El Arish in eastern Sinai. Of course most Jews do not look upon that Biblical statement as being necessarily prophetic anyway. But Arabs who scrutinize the conditions of modern Israel's birth and subsequent conquests are absolutely convinced Israel is planning to expand even further than at present.

As a condition for peace the Arabs therefore want *all* the occupied territories back. This they say will show that Israel truly desires peace and not expansion. The Arabs believe the Israelis are militarily superior to them and that this is all the security they need. They point to their own defeat in the Six Day War as proof.

Israelis on the other hand are not so sure. They are convinced the Arabs have made sizable gains in closing the military power gap since the war. Russian "advisers" and anti-aircraft weapons are present in greater numbers than before. Besides, Israel does not want to go to war again even if it would mean a *greater* victory than in 1967 because so many of their people were killed in the war and subsequent border skirmishes.

The Second Arab Concern

The second main consideration to the Arabs is solving the problem of the Palestinian refugees, homeless since 1948. This is often referred to by the catch-all phrase, "restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people." To moderate Arabs this means granting all



Ambassador College Photo

Arab refugee camp near the town of Nablus.

ing World War I, the Arabs found themselves divided into British and French mandates after the war. Arabs look upon the state of Israel as a Western creation — in effect, as a bridgehead of Western "imperialism."

Nor do the Arabs trust the Russians. They full well remember the Soviets were among those who supported the establishment of Israel. They also realize the Soviet support they are today receiving is not without ulterior motives. Witness the attempted Communist takeover of the Sudan.

Most Arab states do not even trust one another. This is profusely illustrated by the attempted overthrow of King El Hasan of Morocco; the fighting between Palestinian guerrillas and Jordanians; the subsequent clash between Jordan and Syria; the enmity between Syria and Iraq. If the Arabs cannot trust their own, how can they be expected to trust Israel?

peace but cannot gamble all. For many Israelis, to return to the borders of 1967 means to return to an Israel that was just too tempting a target for President Nasser and his allies back in 1967.

Israelis are convinced that even if a peace agreement were reached, Arabs would not greet the Jews with open arms. "You do not reverse overnight 25 years of anti-Israel teachings that the Arab people have continually been exposed to," reason many Jews.

Therefore, to the Israelis, security remains the primary consideration. As far as they are concerned, good fences do make good neighbors.

The Arab Side

To the Arabs the primary considerations are two-fold. A story that occurred after the Six Day War illustrates one of those.

Israeli officials were taking a group of Arab notables from Gaza on a tour

the refugees the choice of returning to their former homes in Israel or granting compensations for their lost holdings. To the more extreme Arabs it means the abolition of Israel as a viable nation and its replacement with a mixed Arab-Jewish state to be called Palestine.

Israelis often ask why the Arabs after 23 years have not provided homes and jobs for the Palestinian refugees within their borders as Israel has provided for the 600,000 or so Jewish refugees from Arab lands. It is at this point that the Arabs cease to be merely Arabs. The Palestinians, they explain, are *Palestinians*. They are not Syrians, Egyptians, Lebanese or Iraqis. They therefore cannot be settled in those countries.

No Arab state has granted the refugees citizenship except for Jordan which was once part of Palestine. But even in that nation no effort has been made at dispersing and re-settling the refugees among the native Jordanians.

Israel has said it cannot take in sizable numbers of these refugees, many of whom have been taught to hate the Israelis over these many years. They further point out that almost all the Arab states (except Egypt and Lebanon) have far more room for settling the refugees than they do.

On the other hand, the Arabs believe that it is not their responsibility to compensate the Palestinian refugees — even though they are Arabs — for lost land and properties, since it was Israel that took it from them.

And so after 23 years the frustrated refugees remain in their camps unwanted by either the Israelis or their fellow Arabs.

Latest Developments in the Middle East

To date no agreement has been reached. The recent American diplomatic attempts at reaching an interim settlement between Israel and Egypt to reopen the Suez Canal have produced few, if any, meaningful results. Meanwhile the tenuous cease-fire along the canal lingers on.

Egypt's President Sadat has said that if an agreement under which Israel would agree to return all occupied lands is not reached by the end of this year,

the Arabs will have no recourse but to go to war. Sadat apparently is willing to take this course, he has said, even if the cost will be a million Egyptians dead.

In his tough stance he is finding support from his two more militant partners in the new "Federation of Arab Republics" — Libya and Syria. Meeting in Damascus, Syria in August, for the signing of the constitution of the federation, Egypt's President Sadat along with Libya's Colonel Qaddafi and Syria's General Assad announced a return to the tough "no negotiations, no concessions of *occupied* Arab territory and no sacrifice of the rights of the Palestinians," position.

Israel remains vigilant, although of late it has been wracked by a series of internal problems. These include strikes in vital areas such as hospitals and electricity. There have been religious and anti-religious demonstrations and a series of economic problems including price hikes centered around the recent devaluation of the Israeli pound.

What If . . .

The realities of the stand-off situation are forcing many Israelis to assess the possibilities of yet another war.

"You must realize," former Air Force Commander Weizman told us, "that if a battle starts again between us and the Arabs, it's going to be a more severe one, a tougher one, I think a longer one than the Six Day War, and it might again change the looks of the Middle East."

"Severe, tougher, longer," these are unpleasant words which everyone hopes never come to pass. The possibility must however be considered.

The key question not yet discussed is: where do the great powers fit in? In truth both Arabs and Israelis would like to be independent of the big powers but currently find this impossible.

The Arabs feel they must have Soviet aid to keep pace with the Israelis. The Israelis feel they must have Western assistance to keep pace with the Soviet-supplied Arabs.

There is no question on whose side Russia is. There is hardly a defensive weapon (short of nuclear) — no matter how sophisticated — with which the

Soviets have not provided the Arabs. Even some of the weapons which Russia has denied North Vietnam have been added to Egypt's arsenal.

As for the United States, it seems to vacillate between outright support of Israel and a more evenhanded, balance-of-Mideast-power approach.

Then there is the up-and-coming third world power of a United Europe currently in the form of the Common Market. Western Europe is perhaps more concerned with the Middle East than either Russia or the U. S. for two reasons. First, Europe is closer to the Middle East geographically. But a second and far more significant factor today is Western Europe's dependence on the Middle East for some 80 percent of the oil that fuels its vast industrial machine. Soviet meddling in the Mediterranean and the Arab states is seen in Western Europe as a potential grave threat to the flow of Mideast oil.

The exact position the Common Market adopts on the Middle East remains to be seen. But one thing is certain. The Europeans cannot afford to remain uninvolved.

Is Peace Possible?

As war clouds hover over the Middle East and the world at large, the question must be asked, "Can peace come to the Middle East? Is it even possible?"

Most people are optimists at heart and answer the question "yes." It is only the *how* of it that eludes them.

Across the street from the United Nations building in New York the words of an ancient prophet are inscribed on a wall: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." The passage is from the prophet Isaiah.

But the first part of the very same verse, not quoted, explains why man has not yet achieved the peace so beautifully described by the latter part. "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people" (Isa. 2:4).

The Middle East situation desperately needs someone to judge between Jews and Arabs — to judge firmly, equitably and with concern for both. Such a Judge has yet to arrive on the scene. □

AMERICA FACES "The Dollar Crisis"

(Continued from page 4)

Illinois and Michigan, for instance, because the states use the same systems for everything, with one central bank. In such a nation-state system, the questions of gold, currency exchange, and balances (overvalued, undervalued or "floating") would be largely irrelevant.

A worldwide system of the future could be this simple and logical. But proposing such a one-world government today is regrettably out of the question, although it's worth shooting for.

The Future of Europe...

The dollar crisis will undoubtedly speed action toward the attainment of one unified European currency. Without a fixed European currency as a common unit of account, Europe is handicapped financially.

To understand this, imagine you were a French farmer or a German businessman. Ten times in the last four years, currency ratios have changed, and most of these changes took place in Europe. The French farmer doesn't know from year to year whether the German tractor will cost more, or less, due to currency switches (besides the vagaries of inflation, which are also different in each country).

The German businessman doesn't know whether he can sell the tractors, or buy the French farmer's food, if the currencies are constantly switching each year officially, and each day unofficially, as the case of the presently "floating" German mark and Dutch guilder illustrate.

For economic stability on the continent, if for no other reason, the Europeans need a common currency — soon. Europe planned to take ten years to achieve a common currency. But present and future crises may hasten the day of a common Euro-money.

To achieve a one currency system, the Europeans will be forced to forget their present differences. Presently the French are trading the dollar in two tiers, like gold, official and unofficial. The Germans are continuing to float the mark, while the British have set limits for "floating," a term they dislike. In the

Common Market meetings of August 19, the Six (with Britain) largely agreed to *differ*. No concerted plan of action was taken.

Conditions will have to force change, since national sovereignty is still cherished. Those conditions are already here, however. Germany is on the brink of a recession. Italy is erupting with political-social problems again. Inflation and unemployment reign in Great Britain. France is in the best economic condition of any European nation, but agricultural problems and uncertainty may force changes.

Trade is the lifeblood of Europe. A strong currency and stable international trade, without tariffs, is necessary for European survival. Already, the six E.E.C. nations alone ship out twice the exports the U. S. does (although many of these exports are with other E.E.C. nations, not just with *outside* nations). The expanded E.E.C. also leads the United States in automobile output, merchant fleet tonnage, and steel output, three bulwark indicators of international trade.

According to GATT (General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs) rules and the latest Kennedy Round tariff reductions, the Common Market tariffs reached the same low level of U. S. tariffs, about 8.3% on the average, this


A dramatic \$23 billion dollar drain for 1971 (based on an annual rate computation) forced President Nixon to rescind further gold payments for dollars on August 15, 1971. The cumulative balance of payments deficit — computed on the "liquidity basis" of total dollars held by ALL foreigners, not just by foreign central banks — is now at \$60 billion dollars.

(Note: Exact number of dollars abroad is probably less than \$60 billion, since the U. S. has "brought back" about 15 of those billions by making gold payments. Meanwhile European bankers have added back about \$10 billion by a complicated process of money "creation" through high interest rates. Most likely total of all foreign dollars held abroad as I.O.U.'s against U. S. reserves is around \$55 billion.)

1971
\$60 Billion
(First Six Months)

U.S. DOLLAR DRAIN 1950-1971

(In Billions of Dollars)






NIXON'S NEW ECONOMIC PLAN HITS JAPAN —

Toyota (center), Honda (inset), Sony (bottom) — household words in the United States — their products will be more expensive in relationship to American products as a result of President Nixon's 10% surcharge on imported goods, part of new economic policy.

Left — Ambassador College Photo, Center — Toyota Motor Co., Below — Wide World, Inset — Ambassador College Photo



year. A period of free trade was beginning between Europe and the U. S. Then the U. S. threw a 10% surcharge on imported goods above the existing 8.3 percent tariff. On top of the dollar "float" of about 8 percent downward in Germany, this makes German products almost 30 percent more expensive in America than they would be in Germany (disregarding shipping costs).

The German businessman must now face such protectionism — and at the beginning of a German recession. It is hard to believe that Germany and other Europeans would not retaliate — if they could. But due to the present powerful G.N.P. in the U. S., America's businesses in Europe, the primary position of the dollar in trade, and other reasons, Europe dares not retaliate — until those conditions change.

... and Japan

The future of Japan is tied intimately to Europe. When the Common Market countries failed to agree on action last August, for instance, the Japanese also refused to act on the yen. The yen is tied closely to the currencies of Europe.

The Japanese absorbed \$3 billion in U. S. dollars in just the one week following August 15 for the sole purpose of avoiding a revaluation of the yen. The U. S. requested a revaluation by 17 to 25 percent, the largest of postwar revaluations, but the Japanese did not want to revalue even half as much. Finally, reluctantly, on August 27, the Japanese were forced to "float" the yen.

The reason Japan fought revaluation for so long is that revaluation hurts exports. And Japan, like Europe, lives on trade. One third of Japan's exports go to the U. S., and Japan doesn't want to lose its largest market. Japan's export surplus to the U. S. was just over \$1 billion in each of the last 3 years (1968-1970). But the 1971 surplus to date with the U. S. topped \$3 billion annual rate, growing wider. That's the main reason the U. S. built a 10% trade barrier. Japan was the main target.

American businessmen correctly argued that Japan has had a reputation for quotas and restrictions which were much *more protectionist* than even the latest U. S. 10% surcharge. But in recent years Japan has been pursuing a more

liberalized free trade policy. Average Japanese tariff quotas on imports this year are about 11 percent, only 3 percent above the U. S. rate. Japan was also in the process of removing dozens of quotas, while allowing American businessmen more investment opportunities in Japanese companies.

In the last eight years, Japan has removed 71 import quotas, the Common Market has removed 11, but the U. S. has added 60 quotas. Quotas cover 17 percent of American imports, and only 12 percent of Japanese.

Japan has been protectionist, and admits it. But the nation was moving in the right direction when the U. S. socked Japan's exports with the 10% import "tax." Like Europe, Japan cannot effectively retaliate at this time, since she depends too much on the U. S. for raw materials in Alaska and the Pacific Coast, and relies on America to buy increasing billions worth of her products.

But the Japanese may be able to establish markets for their goods in Europe and developing Asia, and can "mine" their raw materials from Asia and Australia. Then Japan's position for retaliation, or "trade war," will be much improved.

On top of these economic developments, the strain between the U. S. and Japan on foreign policy produces a possible scenario of increasing anti-Americanism, "Asia for the Asians" and removal of the U. S. nuclear umbrella in favor of Japan's own nuclear arsenal. Bear in mind that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, affecting Japan, is not yet ratified, and Japan's nuclear capability is well documented.

These developments may all trace their origin back to the sick U. S. dollar. Meanwhile, what is the outlook for the sagging U. S. economy?

Future of the U. S. Economy

Dollar devaluation abroad and the wage-price freeze put America at the economic crossroads. Other nations have devalued, put their houses in order, and prospered, while still others have devalued, only to devalue again and again as the reflection of a chronically sick economy.

(Continued on next page)

The Economics of the "Dollar Crisis"

ON AUGUST 15, President Nixon acted boldly to solve not just one economic crisis, but three concurrent crises. The three had previously occurred separately, and had been treated separately, but by 1971 they formed one huge combined crisis — the worst U. S. economic condition since the Great Depression.

"The time has come for a New Economic Policy," the President said. "Its targets are unemployment, inflation, and international speculation." Never before had all three been so serious at the same time (although each had been worse separately). The two-headed "inflationary recession," or "stagflation" was joined by international crisis, including balance of payments deficits, speculation and loss of faith in the dollar.

Here is a quick rundown of conditions in the three broad economic arenas which led to the President's August 15 announcements.

I. The Business Front

By mid-1971, unemployment had hovered around 6 percent for eight long months, defying the prediction of economists and government spokesmen that it *should* come down, according to past precedents. By August 1971, this represented 5,300,000 unemployed Americans, double the number of jobless at the beginning of 1970.

Unemployment was also severe in Great Britain and Canada, reaching 30-year highs in both countries, as well as in America. The *percentage* of unemployment in all 3 countries had not been topped for ten years.

Industrial production in America was declining at a 10 percent annual rate in July, just when the U. S. *should* have been coming out of a recession. The Dow Jones Industrial Average had skidded 100 points in 3 months. Business investment was still declining, a trend unchanged for two full years. The rate of savings by consumers was highest in recent history.

For some seemingly unexplainable reason, the American economy (and many European economies with it)

appeared unable to recover at, or near, the expected rate.

To speed up the recovery in business, the President asked Congress to increase the investment tax credit of businesses (the amount of money they can immediately take from their income taxes when investing in new equipment), remove the excise tax (about \$200 per car) on automobiles, erect a 10% trade barrier against more competitive foreign goods, subsidize American exports (although this was not announced in President Nixon's speech), and put more money in the consumer's hand with larger income tax benefits to begin January 1, 1972.

II. The Inflation Front

The rise in prices also "should have" stopped or slowed long ago, according to economic theory and past experience. But, since America never experienced simultaneous crises so severely, there was actually no precedent for predicting results. Therefore, at mid-1971, prices were in the midst of a new upswing, after slowing down in early 1971.

Between March and June, the cost-of-living (as measured by the Consumer Price Index) increased at a 6 percent annual rate again (this 6 percent rate prevailed during 1969 and 1970, but had slowed to 2½ percent during the first three months of 1971).

Meanwhile, Britain's inflation was even worse, continuing at a 10% annual pace. Most other European nations and Canada had smaller rates of price increase, from 2 to 4 percent annually, but those increases were still nettlesome to both businessman and consumer.

Fueling this renewed inflation were recent wage contracts of a 42% increase (over 3½ years) for railway workers and a 30% (over 3 years) increase for steel workers. These became the pattern for the many other smaller industry wage settlements. According to "cost push" inflation theories, these wage increases tend to "push" the inflation rate up to the rate of wage increases (this amount is about 1 percent a month). Increased

money supply, often called "loose money," also fueled renewed price increases, according to the theories of "monetarists" such as Chicago's Milton Friedman.

The amount of money "created" by the Federal Reserve Bank system in the first half of 1971 grew by an annual rate of 12.3% "which is in the 100th percentile of all six-month periods since World War II" according to the Federal Reserve Bank of St.



Ambassador College Photo

Louis. "Money supply" means cash and checking accounts. Meanwhile, "time deposits" (savings accounts) grew at a similarly high rate of 13.6%. Each money category stood at about \$225 billion in mid-1971, or a combined total of 45 times the gold supply which theoretically backs the dollar.

Average costs have risen 22 percent since 1967, and double that amount in such oft-used services as medical care, repair and maintenance, homeowning, and insurance rates.

To slow down this wage-price spiral, President Nixon acted to "freeze" all wages and prices for 90 days, and perhaps longer. Economist Milton Friedman noted that such action was "cosmetic," that is, treating the effects and not the cause (the cause being increased money supply and inflationary wage contracts). But the "freeze" will no doubt help much in reducing prices significantly, if some form of "wage-price review board" is established after the 90 days and if the American people lend their voluntary support to these controls.

III. The International Front

Until August 15, 1971, every major world currency, except the dollar, had been devalued at least once since 1945. That is one indication of how strong the dollar actually was during the postwar reconstruction era. Most of those devaluations came during the late 1940's.

Subsequently, a relatively peaceful twenty years of monetary equilibrium (1948 to 1967) was jolted by no less than ten monetary crisis events in the four years since 1967. These crises began with the British devaluation in 1967 and continued through the depreciation of the dollar in 1971.

Each revaluation, devaluation, and float was accompanied by surges of speculative "hot" money flooding in and out of foreign central banks. The last three of these ten "crises" have been attacks on the overvalued dollar. Such speculation was only an effect of the problem, while a severely weak dollar was the ultimate cause of such billion-dollar "betting" in foreign capitals.

Last May, the German mark and Dutch guilder were set "afloat," mainly due to the relative weakness of the dollar. During the three days before the mark floated, the German government had to buy a billion dollars per day, just to keep the mark at its official parity (3.66 to the dollar). Such purchases gave Germany more foreign reserves (gold, dollars, SDR's, and foreign currency) than any other nation including the U. S.

This August, the same speculation occurred with the Japanese yen primarily, and European currencies as well. The Japanese government had to buy up about \$3 billion dollars in one week just to keep the yen at its old parity of 360 yen to the dollar. Such emergency measures couldn't last, so the yen was set afloat on August 27.

The President's actions on the international front included a 10 percent surcharge on most imports entering the U. S., coupled with a downward "float" of the dollar in foreign money markets. Technically, this was *not* a devaluation, since the international price of gold remained at \$35 per ounce. A devaluation, by definition, means an appreciation of the price of gold in terms of the dollar.

For a more complete background on the third arena — the international front — be sure to read the accompanying article on "The Dollar Crisis."

The quickest — but not necessarily the best — way to solve America's balance of payments deficit is to bring her troops home, and to curtail foreign aid. America could pull back from not only Vietnam, but other troop commitments around the world — which are somewhat superfluous in an age of nuclear overkill. America could develop a realistic labor policy, to halt excessive wage increases, and at the same time increase meaningful productive growth so that labor rightfully can *earn* more money to live better.

On the other hand, Americans could violate the wage-price freeze. Americans could continue demanding more money for less work. Americans could revert to isolationist "buy American" restrictionist actions to cure the *effect* (imports) rather than the *cause* (mismanagement, excessive labor demands, and an inflationary standard of living). The choice is before us.

An hour of automaking labor costs \$7 in the U. S., \$3.50 in Germany, and \$1.35 in Japan. The U. S. is still competitive in some fields mainly because of technological superiority, bigger and better machines, far-sighted management, and, until about 3 years ago, productive labor. Since then, however, the world has caught up in technology and machinery. Meanwhile, U. S. wage rates have been more than twice that of productivity increases. The wage-price freeze should increase productivity per wage temporarily, but the chronic disease is still there.

The problem is not all in labor, though. It is hard for the assembly line worker with six children to believe that his \$8,000 per year is enough to live on for such distasteful work, while executives may make 5 to 50 times as much for what the laborer sees as paper-shuffling and martini-hopping. After all, in an assembly line, "productivity" is more in the hands of the foreman, the standards-maker, than the worker who has a quota of work he is not permitted to exceed.

America's Choice

With such diverse causes and effects working together, what one thing can most Americans *do* to solve their economic ills?

The problem ultimately involves our standard of living. We need to change our way of living. Our money must buy more of life's *needs*, and less of life's unhealthy side effects, be they pollution, pornography or too many "pleasures" of the kind that kick back. Nothing is wrong with enjoyment or leisure, but a nation passionately devoted to these ends cannot survive nationally, much less economically.

Economic measures are important. The U.S. President may have taken steps that "buy time" for America's sick economy. But philosophical changes are more important in the long run than the technical economic changes that will be forthcoming in the next few months. A change of thinking is also necessary. The philosophy will have to change from "the way of get" to "the way of self-sacrifice" for the good of the nation.

With few exceptions, Americans have followed the philosophy of sacrifice "only when it's good for me."

The "way of get" has especially prevailed in the last three years of wage demands, recent trade isolationism, and the especially high inflation in the service industries (coupled with less service). Management is also a culprit, as books such as *The White Collar Criminal* so aptly document.

The months ahead will be a test of America's character. The verdict is not in yet. Many are quick to point out that there are certain *inequities* in the wage-price freeze, but there are no valid reasons for wholesale rebellion against the President's Executive Order. "The spirit of sacrifice" connotes that some are "doing without" *more* than others, but that is only a temporary test of character.

Will Americans respond to create a healthy world economy at home and abroad? Through obeying the letter and spirit of the bold new programs, America can succeed. But by following a personal code of "get" for me, now, America will fail before the century is out to be a leading nation in the world community.

America can succeed. It's primarily a matter of will, coupled with sound economic policies. □

Personal

from



(Continued from page 2)

union as well. Such sudden action could frighten Britain into deciding to stay out. But, for their own security, the Europeans could take in four additional countries in Europe — becoming the UNITED BIG TEN!

Thus the "HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE" of 554 to 1814 would be, overnight, resurrected — the gigantic new superpower UNITED STATES OF EUROPE!

This sudden, new WORLD COLOSSUS could have a population of around 300,000,000 — larger than the United States — larger than the U.S.S.R.

The world would stand aghast in wonder and amazement. Overnight, the WORLD'S STRONGEST POWER could suddenly appear!

With *one single currency* — perhaps called "Euromarks" or "Eurofrancs" — they would replace the United States dollar as the kingpin currency of world trade.

They could bankrupt the United States by demanding repayment in gold for the surplus dollars they hold. If the United States refused, the Europeans would be economically powerful enough to implement other drastic measures. For example, Europe could "nationalize" America's huge multinational foreign industries located in Europe, as payment. With such economic traumas, America could go into a tailspin of an economic depression far worse than that which followed 1929.

This *could* be accompanied by a nationwide DROUGHT that has threatened for thirty-five years.

A UNITED EUROPE, quickly developing unprecedented military strength, would protect its unprecedented standard of living.

Visionary idea? NOT AT ALL!

Such a vast European power is in fact just around the corner — NOW!

You live today in a world fraught with absolutely INCREDIBLE explosive possibilities.

Until humans learn that their "GET"

way of life — the way of self-centeredness — of lust, greed, vanity — of unconcern for the welfare of others — of jealousy, envy and hatred — is not leading to peace, to happiness, to prosperity, nor to ANYTHING good and desirable, we shall see VIOLENCE ACCELERATE AND MULTIPLY almost beyond human imagination!

That is, indeed, the very TREND that grips this world RIGHT NOW!

The PLAIN TRUTH, and its publisher, Ambassador College, is a powerful force on earth FOR WORLD PEACE. But that can come only by RIGHT education and right doing! It can come only by humanity awakening to the fact that there is a CAUSE for every result! And the CAUSE of PEACE and all the DESIRED results is to turn to THE WAY of Peace — the way of outgoing concern for the welfare of others — the way of cooperation, serving, helping, sharing, the way of TRUE LOVE — and to the SOURCE of that kind of LOVE! □

What Our Readers Say

(Continued from inside front cover)

been a farmer. The average farmer cannot make a decent living on the farm. The price of wheat is lower now than it has been for several years. The farmers in this part of our State of Washington grow strawberries, corn and peas for the canneries. Well, this year after planting time we have had rain about every other day and the temperature is around 65 and 70 degrees. Some farmers will not make enough to pay for the seed. Taxes on their lands have tripled, and if they need a new piece of machinery they must pay inflated prices. When they cannot make ends meet, they have to sell, usually at a loss."

Mrs. Mabel R.,
Stanwood, Washington

Constructive Criticism

"I believe it is the policy of *The PLAIN TRUTH* to print mostly letters that are complimentary to the magazine. Only occasional letters of mild criticism are published; seldom is there a correspondence of extreme disagreement or controversy. 'What Our Readers Say' appears to be an *untruthful* column that does not live up to the name of your magazine! I realize that the chances of this letter being published are small. However, I honestly would like to read your reactions to my preceding statements."

Alan S.,
Queens, New York

● We normally try to print those letters that contain CONSTRUCTIVE criticisms, whether they agree with us or not. We have a convenient method of handling the occasional illogical tirade — it's called a waste basket.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The PLAIN TRUTH
P. O. Box 111
Pasadena, California 91109

Printed in U.S.A.

★ AMERICA FACES THE "DOLLAR CRISIS"

The inside story of why the richest nation on earth is suffering financial woes. See page 3.

★ WILL BRITAIN ENTER THE COMMON MARKET?

Never have the British people faced a more difficult choice — to join or not to join the Common Market. See page 5.

★ THE CASE FOR BRITAIN'S MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Norman St. John-Stevas, a Conservative member of Parliament from Chelmsford, was interviewed in London by PLAIN TRUTH staff members. See page 8.

★ THE CASE AGAINST BRITAIN'S MEMBERSHIP

PLAIN TRUTH correspondents interviewed James McMillan, the Chief Editorial Writer of the *Daily Express* in London, an outspoken opponent of British membership in the Common Market. See page 9.

★ THE PERSIAN GULF—A "QUIET" HOT SPOT

Potential Soviet involvement in the strategic Gulf area could significantly affect the world balance of power. See page 14.

★ YUGOSLAVIA, ITALY AND THE VATICAN

A new East-West friendship bridge in the making. See page 18.

★ THE NEW "TONGUES" MOVEMENT

A "tongues" movement is sweeping the religious world. Once confined to a few "fundamentalist sects," it now finds adherents in almost every denomination, including some of those considered the most tradition bound. See page 20.

★ THE NEGLECTED TRAGEDY OF ALCOHOLISM!

There are definite reasons why a person becomes an alcoholic. But also, there are specific steps an individual can take to rid himself of this curse. See page 25.

★ WHAT'S KEEPING YOU FROM REAL SUCCESS?

There are definite keys that can make your business, your family, your LIFE, more successful. See page 33.

★ ARABS AND ISRAELIS STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

To examine the key issues standing in the way of Middle East peace, a team of PLAIN TRUTH correspondents interviewed Arab and Israeli diplomats and political leaders at the United Nations and in the Middle East. See page 41.

690720-0453-1 1 P101
MRS ANGELINE BOCK
2038 W RICE ST
CHICAGO IL 60622