

the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding



1974

the
PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

Vol. XXXIX No. 2

Circulation: 2,959,636

February 1974

WHY THIS ANNIVERSARY SPECIAL ISSUE

Exactly 40 years ago this month, the first issue of the Plain Truth appeared. Our readers through the years have been kept informed of the rush of world events. In no other area of the world do the manifold, conflicting arms of humanity focus so acutely as in the Middle East; Arabs and Israelis, oil producers and oil consumers, the capitalist West and the communist East all plead their individual cases. In this special issue we bring our readers the points of view of the peoples and nations involved and show where the world stands now in the aftermath of the fourth Middle East war.

ARTICLES

Three Weeks That Shook the West!	2
The Fight for Oil	8
Can the U.N. Bring Peace to the Middle East?	14
The October War: What Should Have Been Learned	18
Jerusalem, Jerusalem! City of Peace, Center of Confrontation	22
The Arabs' Stake in the Middle East	30
"Peace Must Come!" Say Palestinian Arabs and Israelis	34
Japan's Stake in the Middle East	38


FEATURES

Personal from the Editor	1
What Our Readers Say	40
Radio-TV Log	41

ABOUT OUR COVER

Through the unique characteristics of hand illustration, as well as his own sensitive technique, nationally famous artist Ren Wicks here portrays the potentially devastating effect of recent Mideast happenings.

Illustration by Ren Wicks



How your subscription has been paid

Your already-paid subscription is made possible by the contributions of those who, voluntarily, have become co-workers in support of this worldwide work. Ambassador College, as a separate corporation, is associated with the Worldwide Church of God, and a portion of the financial needs of the work is supplied by that Church. The publishers have nothing to sell and, although contributions are gratefully welcomed, no solicitation is ever made to the public for financial support.

Chairman of the Board and Editor-in-Chief
Herbert W. Armstrong

Vice Chairman and Associate Editor-in-Chief
Garner Ted Armstrong

Executive Editor: Herman L. Hoeh

Senior Editors: David Jon Hill, Raymond F. McNair

Managing Editor: Arthur A. Fordig

Art Director: Allen Metzger

Associate Editors: William F. Dankenbring, Gene H. Hogberg, Paul W. Krill

Contributing Editors: Robert Boraker, Jerry J. Gentry, Robert L. Kuhn, Gerhard O. Marx, Patrick A. Parnell, Richard C. Peterson, Richard H. Sedlack, Paul S. Royer, P. M. Trautman, Charles F. Vinson, Eugene M. Walter, William R. Whitehart

Regional Editors: Bonn: John Karlson; Brussels: Ray Kosanke; Geneva: Colin Wilkins; Johannesburg: Robert Fahey; London: Roderick C. Meredith; Manila: Colin Adams; Mexico City: Enrique Ruiz; Sydney: Dennis Luker; Vancouver: Dean Wilson; Washington, D.C.: Dexter H. Faulkner

Foreign Language Editors: Dutch: Roy McCarthy; French: Dibar K. Aparicio; German: Frank Schnee; Spanish: Charles V. Dorothy

Research Staff: Jeff Calkins, Chris L. Carpenter, Werner Jehens, Paul Knodel, Jeff Moss, David Price, Rodney Repp, Donald D. Schroeder, Marc Stahl, Keith Stump, Henry Stucke

Art Department: Monte Webberton, Design Coordinator, Ron Lepeska, Staff Artist

Photo Editor: David Conn, *Photographers:* Gary George, Ian Henderson, Mike Hendrickson, Alfred Hennig, *Photo Library:* Al Leitter

Copy Editor: Betty Lau, Jim E. Lea

Business Manager: Frank Brown

Director of Publishing: C. Wayne Cole

Circulation Manager: David Jon Hill

Regional Circulation Managers: U.K., India, Middle East, West Africa: Charles F. Harting; Canada: George Patrickson; Latin America: J. Alec Serrate; Australia and Southeast Asia: Gene R. Hughes; South Africa: Russell S. Johnson; New Zealand: Graeme Marshall

Published monthly by Ambassador College Press, 360 W. Green St., Pasadena, Calif. 91123; St. Albans, England; and by Ambascioli Press Pty., Ltd., North Sydney, Australia. French, Dutch and German editions published at St. Albans, England; Spanish and French Canadian editions at Pasadena, California. ©1974 Ambassador College. All rights reserved.

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.

RIGHT NOW we are entering a series of major world crises that are affecting us all. No question about it, now! These serious troubles erupting all over the world are leading rapidly into the final SUPREME CRISIS at the END of this world.

The energy crisis is seriously affecting almost every nation on earth. *The PLAIN TRUTH* has been warning our readers of this for years.

The Middle East war and the crisis following the "cease-fire" was a *most significant* indication of the fast-approaching END of this age! Biblical prophecy shows events from here to the end will center around Jerusalem and the Middle East! It's no "Wolf! Wolf!" cry. People seldom if ever heed a warning, but I want to make the immediate present situation clear to our readers, whether heeded or not.

There's a great deal more to this Middle East crisis than most conceive. It has involved oil. It has involved the threat of a nuclear World War III, triggered by U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. intervention. Few have any idea at all of *how close* we came to the war that could have erased all humanity from this earth. Let me explain that.

For years, the Soviet Union has been seeking its opportunity to move its military forces into the Middle East and the Mediterranean. They have had submarines in the Mediterranean for some time. Only U.S. forces and military (nuclear) bases ringing the Middle East have prevented it. Why do you suppose the Russians have been supplying Egypt and other Arab nations with planes, tanks, and war materials? Not because they love the Arabs. Not because they hate the Israelis. But because they expect to cash in on the investment by taking over the entire Middle East!

This calls to mind an incident in June 1944, shortly before the end of World War II. It was 8:30 one Sunday morning. I was just going on the air in a radio station in Portland, Oregon. The Russian army was on a big offensive, within a couple hours

Personal from



NOW! SERIES OF CRISES SIGNAL AGE-END! WHAT IT ALL MEANS!

or so of taking a strategic point on the eastern front that probably would have forced the final surrender of Germany. The news flash of the war's end was expected over the teletype at the radio station. I asked station personnel to watch the teletype, and if that news flash came while I was on the air, to bring it to me and let me announce it during my program.

But that news flash did not come that morning, nor the next morning, nor for the next several weeks. The Russian forces had halted right where they were. They did not want the war to end until their forces had taken over several other Eastern European countries — since known as the satellite countries. The Russians planted that Russian military boot on all those satellite countries — and they have never removed it. Those who know Russian communism know that where the Kremlin plants the Russian military boot, *it never removes it* — unless, or until a stronger power forces it to move.

The chiefs at the Kremlin saw, in the recent "cease-fire" that was not yet ceasing, an opportunity to put the Russian armies in the Middle East. They quickly proposed that the United States and the U.S.S.R. *jointly* send their armies into the Middle East, to "enforce the cease-

fire." They knew, of course, that the United States would not send U.S. forces there. But inviting the joint force gave the plausible excuse to send their own forces in, anyway. By inviting the *joint* movement with U.S. forces, they reasoned their move would not turn world opinion against them. But, once there, they would simply have annexed the Middle East. The Russian boot would stay planted there.

President Nixon, with all news media and Congress on his back, nevertheless recognized the real significance of this communist military strategy. He wrestled with this extreme crisis until 3 a.m. Then he called an immediate alert of *all* U.S. military forces — army, navy, air force — the total military power of the nation, scattered all over the world — to make them ready on one second's notice to unleash America's nuclear might that could have destroyed every Russian city.

Then, after Moscow knew of the alert, President Nixon announced that the United States rejected the Kremlin suggestion of joint U.S.-Soviet military "enforcement" of the cease-fire, and also that the United States would not allow *any* nuclear power to enter the Mideast area.

The Kremlin got the message. It
(Continued on page 27)

EUROPEANS IRKED BY U.S. COMPLAINT

Criticism Over Mideast Puts New Strain on Alliance

By ALVIN SHUSTER

LONDON, Oct. 23—European officials are expressing surprise and irritation over Washington's criticism of the Arab side of the Middle East conflict.

The official position was several steps down the path from the

What 'Year of Europe'?

What the United States had envisioned as the Year of Europe, a period of imaginative unification and reform—a new partnership with which partners

Dilemma for Europe in Middle East

Mid-East conflict shows Europe is third rate not a third force

THREE WEEKS THAT

the Middle East crisis is also a European crisis, that the fighting on the Suez Canal adversely affect the Continent and that the struggle for Israel is a struggle to defend a Western

need admitted

Oil crisis jolts Europe's unifiers

The fourth Middle East conflict ripped a new hole in the fabric of the Atlantic alliance. For the first time, Europeans are thinking seriously about who should control their future security.

by Gene H. Hogberg

A "SWORD OF DAMOCLES," dripping with oil, hangs ominously over the nations of Western Europe. At any moment it could descend, severing with one swift stroke the remaining arteries which carry the industrial lifeblood of the Middle East to Europe's heartland.

Arab oil producers, akin to the

old rhyme, are "keeping a list and checking it twice, going to find out who's naughty and nice." Each month they conduct a careful review of European attitudes and intentions. Only those nations publicly sympathetic to their cause are allowed continued undiminished access to the energy riches cavered beneath the arid Arab sands.

Kissinger to Confront Hostile Europe on Visit

Leaders Angry at U.S. Policy Decisions That Are Made Without Prior Consultation

BY TOM LAMBERT
Times Staff Writer

SHOOK THE WEST!

Herr Brandt sets goal for Europe of single sovereign government

From Roger Barthold

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Oil squeeze to put Europe's unity to test

By John Allan May
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

NEW YORK TIMES, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1972

French Ask European Defense Set-Up

By FLORA LEWIS
Special to The New York Times

PARIS, Nov. 21—Foreign Minister Michel Jobert called today for Western Europe to build up its own defense against new danger of tactical

Move Reflects an Interest in a Concerted Effort Independent of U.S.

Germany with what was then a new and halting allied defense effort. The other axis in possible restraints against what would have been considered excessive German rearmament that could

Gasoline and oil rationing...
In regard to investment, some practical questions will arise, as the relative values of capital...
new Mapin Sands International

Soul Searching

Beyond the as yet unsettled economic picture, round four of the Mideast war has brought two very important political developments into the sharpest possible focus.

One is the obvious inability of the West Europeans to direct or even essentially influence events in a part

of the world so vitally essential to their economic well-being. The other is the damage the war has inflicted upon the Atlantic alliance, already in rather sad shape due to the postponement of Mr. Nixon's "Year of Europe," which some suggested had been dropped due to "lack of mutual interest." America's support of Israel (professions of U.S.

neutrality in the Mideast notwithstanding) runs counter to Europe's dependence upon the Arab world's oil supply.

The two closely related factors have led to serious soul-searching on the part of European leaders of all political persuasion. They are seriously reexamining their nations' relationship with America, as well

as their future security in a world increasingly dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disconcerting fact remains that Europeans stood helplessly on the sidelines while the two superpowers brought the world to the nuclear brink right in their own backyard. They watched mutely as Washington first poured billions of dollars of aid into the Israeli camp and then, with its nuclear arsenal poised, withstood Soviet attempts to militarily intervene in the Middle East with "peace-keeping" forces.

Neither Chancellor Brandt of West Germany nor President Pompidou of France nor Britain's Prime Minister Heath were consulted by the United States prior to the worldwide alert of U.S. forces. Some observers believe Washington felt no compunction to inform allies who had a few days earlier denied it assistance in bringing aid to beleaguered Israeli forces.

Intensifying the chilly trans-Atlantic atmosphere, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger flew to Moscow and engineered a strictly Soviet-American cease-fire resolution that was rammed through the U.N. Security Council. The initial reaction in Europe, of course, was one of relief, but upon further reflection, continentals felt that their particular interests had not been taken into account one whit.

The "Brutal Truth"

Europe's grandstand view of the lightning fast chain of events in the Mideast produced much bitter hand-wringing in the press.

In an editorial in the French newsweekly *L'Express*, Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber lamented the fact that "these three weeks of October" 1973 revealed "the powerlessness, the silence and the absence of Europe." According to West Germany's *Hamburger Abendblatt*, "the latest war in the Middle East has brought to light the whole brutal truth. Europe as a whole is politically powerless."

The politicians were not long in



West German Chancellor Willy BRANDT asserts unification is now "a question of survival" for Western Europe.



British Prime Minister HEATH fumed over allegations by American officials that Europeans were "uncooperative" in the Mideast crisis.



U.S. Secretary of State Henry KISSINGER warns Western Europeans of the "gradual erosion" taking place within the Atlantic alliance.

echoing the same sentiments as the journalists.

French Foreign Minister Michel Jobert charged before the French National Assembly that the United States and the Soviet Union were trying to dominate the world. He accused the two superpowers of "brutally brushing aside Europe" and treating it "like a non-person."

France's Premier Pompidou also had some stern remarks to make. The war in the Middle East, he said, had exposed the weakness of Europe in a way that even the blindest person could not fail to see.

In addition, the conduct of the superpowers in the conflict showed how tenuous détente between the two really was — and how quickly it could break down to the detriment of the whole world.

The American and Soviet dominated Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and the Vienna conference on troop reductions, in which the European Community countries had practically no say, were yet more proof, in Pompidou's eyes, of Europe's powerlessness. Worse yet, at the Middle East peace conference, held in Geneva in the very heart of Europe, no Western European nations had been invited.

At the same time, the ambitious timetable of a European union by 1980, agreed upon at the Paris Common Market summit of October 1972, remains very much a nebulous goal.

The Vatican, too, felt compelled to add its voice to the chorus of lament. Pope Paul VI told a leading European parliamentarian that the recent international crisis showed once again the "necessity" for European union. The search for European union should combine both "boldness and realism," Pope Paul said. "You know the profound interest which the Holy See has long felt for the progress of European unity."

Must Have a European Government: Brandt

It remained for West Germany's Willy Brandt, however, to make the most urgent plea for Europe to

move off dead center. In a November 13 speech before the weak and ineffectual European Parliament in Strasbourg, France, Chancellor Brandt went far beyond the customary appeal for a vague, undefined "European union." The dramatic developments on the international scene of recent weeks, said Brandt, "demonstrated the inability of the European states to serve as a factor of peace and stabilization in the world as long as they are unable to act as one."

"The unification of Europe," he continued, "is not merely a question of the quality of our existence. It is a question of survival. . . ."

The answer to Europe's dilemma, said Brandt in no uncertain terms, was the creation of "sensibly organized European government." The individual European states, he added, must "transfer to that government those sovereign rights which in the future can only be effectively exercised together."

What sovereign rights should be transferred to such a central government? Among other areas, said Brandt, economic and monetary rights, definitely "foreign affairs and . . . security," meaning, of course, military defense.

Brandt's plea — Britain's *Sunday Telegraph* called the speech "historic" — undoubtedly discomfited some Europeans who feel that the time is still not ripe to consider the creation of such supranational authority within the Community. Brandt, nevertheless, was uncompromising in his call for effective, not superficial, unity. "A choir of contradictory European voices is of no help to anybody. . . . We can, and we will, create Europe." The goal of a European union, he stressed, remains "our unshakable aim. We want to achieve that goal before 1980."

Independent European Defense Urged

It remains to be seen over the next few months whether other European leaders view the Middle East



French Premier Georges POMPIDOU tells fellow Europeans their security should no longer rest on tenuous detente between the United States and the Soviet Union.



President NIXON'S "Year of Europe" never came about. Western Europeans are suspicious of the Nixon-Kissinger plan to infuse new life into the Atlantic alliance.



France's Foreign Minister Michel JOBERT charged that both the U.S. and the Soviets were guilty of "brutally brushing aside Europe" during the October Mideast war.

crisis in the same perspective of urgency as Herr Brandt. But it is interesting to note that only eight days after his speech, parliamentary leaders from Britain, France, West Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries urged their respective governments to establish a joint advisory body to advise in the establishment of a common European nuclear defense force. Such a force would be completely independent of American direction. The parliamentarians, who were gathered in Paris for a meeting of the Western European Union, carefully avoided technical details but suggested that the presently independent British and French forces would form the logical nucleus of such a defense.

France's outspoken Foreign Minister Jobert took center stage at the Paris meeting. He called for a "strong and resolute" European defense. He said that Europe must henceforth "make its voice heard in all events that affect security and take its share of responsibility for managing crises."

The American-Soviet détente, he stressed, was only "a fragile equilibrium," extremely dangerous and unstable. Instead, he argued, Europe must be able to play a direct role in the Middle East as elsewhere and maintain its own direct relations with Japan, China and Latin America in establishing world order.

Mr. Jobert rejected charges that France was contradictory in wanting American troops to remain in Europe while arguing for a "more independent" European defense.

NATO remains as indispensable to the security of the United States as it is to Europe, he said. Loyalty to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance, however, "is not incompatible with Europe's need to take responsibility for its own defense."

French Opposition Fading?

Despite the increased number of appeals for common action in the midst of crisis, European unity is not yet around the corner. Leaders

in Paris and Bonn still hold fundamentally different views on the structure of the trans-Atlantic relationship and the building of Europe itself. To the French, Europe must assert its own personality, independent of the United States.


The West Germans, on the other hand, have continually stressed that a united Europe must retain close ties with the United States while at the same time develop into a strong, united European pillar of the alliance.

Nevertheless, it is significant for the long-term equation that calls for political and ultimately military unity are now coming from one rather unexpected corner — France.

The phrase "the Eight and France" has been an apt description for the deep philosophical division within the Community. The major French stumbling block has always been their dead-set opposition to the development of a supranational authority for the original six, now nine, Community members. The French have traditionally viewed "European union" in the old Gaullist perspective of a "Europe of the Fatherlands." This represents not a true "united Europe" but rather a collection of sovereign nation-states acting in concert on issues of mutual interest. But this view, as Brandt told his Strasbourg audience, is out of date: "The classical nation-state belongs to yesterday."

Foreign Minister Jobert's recent remarks are symptomatic of a cracking of France's historic antipathy to supranationality. He is not alone.

In the past few months, other influential Frenchmen have been speaking out in a very un-French manner. Ex-Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann has called for the direct election of representatives to the European Parliament in Strasbourg. And former premier, Chaban-Delmas, told the recent Gaullist party convention in Nantes that "no European policy can exist if it is not based on a separate and autonomous [European] defense system — even within an alliance."



French news magazine editor Jean Jacques SERVAN-SCHREIBER lamented that the fourth Mideast war revealed the "powerlessness, the silence and the absence of Europe."

"The latest war in the Middle East has brought to light the whole brutal truth. Europe as a whole is politically powerless."

— the Hamburger Abendblatt



Former French Premier Jacques CHABAN-DELMAS believes Western Europe must eventually possess its own defense system, even if it must be within a large alliance.

At first, Schumann's and Chaban-Delmas' words were dismissed as only the criticisms of politicians out of office — until Foreign Minister Jobert began saying virtually the same thing.

Topping off the new French mood was a significant article which appeared in late October in the French economics magazine, *Entreprise*. The authors of the article, who are known to reflect official French thinking, put forth a new "Program for Europe," as a journalistic "trial balloon."

According to the article, the French government is now willing to support direct elections to the European Parliament, push ahead on the idea of a political union — and is even willing to eventually accept the concept of a European foreign minister and defense minister.

The West German news weekly *der Spiegel* called the French change of mind "a sensation." It stressed that the change had come so quickly that "hardly anyone had noticed it, and if they had they wouldn't have believed it: that it was possible that France's antagonism toward European integration could be changed."


Waiting for a Leader?

European unity, it has often been said by the Europeans themselves, "progresses from crisis to crisis."

The Mideast war could provide the greatest impetus ever to the eventual emergence of a strong Europe, united economically, politically and even militarily.

But despite the undeniable need for unity, despite the snail-like budging on entrenched national interests, it looks now more than ever before that European unity will have to wait for a charismatic leader to emerge on the scene — a man who can, with magnetic leadership, bridge over Europe's nearly unbridgeable differences and make Europe's voice at last "one" on the world scene.

As the *Hamburger Abendblatt* lamented: "What Europe lacks is a supreme political leadership." □



Who Will Inherit
THE
WORLD
TOMORROW

....or Will There Be a World LEFT to Inherit?

Nuclear war. Famine. Over-population. Pollution. These are some of the perils which threaten our planet. Then there are the personal problems which we all must face.

Are we living in what could be "the end of the world"? Are we doomed to live in a world threatened by crime, famine, war, and other dangers? There are solutions, and you need to know what they are.

In the public interest, Ambassador College and the Worldwide Church of God are conducting

"We happen to live in the most dangerous time in the history of the human race."

— John F. Kennedy



"Unless some effective world super-government can be brought quickly into action, the prospects for peace and human progress are dark and doubtful."

— Winston Churchill



"We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system our Armageddon will be at our door."

— Douglas MacArthur



a series of personal appearance campaigns beginning in the United States and Canada and ultimately reaching many of the major countries of the world.

In these campaigns Herbert W. Armstrong, Garner Ted Armstrong and other leading evangelists of the Worldwide Church of God will be speaking on today's world problems.

They will show what you can do to make your future a happy one. But they will do it from a point of view you may not have thought of before.


Come hear the Good News personally proclaimed in these cities:

St. Louis, Mo.	Jan. 25, 26, 27	Garner Ted Armstrong	Knoxville, Tenn.	Feb. 22, 23	Sherwin McMichael
Raleigh, N.C.	Jan. 27, 28	David Jon Hill	Dayton, Ohio	Feb. 22, 23	David L. Antion
Kingsport, Tenn.	Feb. 1, 2	C. Wayne Cole	Cincinnati, Ohio	Mar. 1, 2, 3	Garner Ted Armstrong
Saigon, S. Vietnam	Feb. 21, 22, 23, 24	Herbert W. Armstrong	Wichita, Kansas	Mar. 8, 10	Albert J. Portune

Other campaigns will be announced as they are confirmed. Watch for coming announcements.

THE FIGHT FOR OIL

by William F. Dankenbring *Oil is the largest international industry. It is the commodity which makes the wheels of our technological society go round. How did the industrial nations become so involved in the Middle East oil power play? And is it too late for the big oil-consuming nations to extricate themselves?*



LET'S UNDERSTAND the stakes in the Middle East. In the course of a single day, about \$200,000,000 worth of oil, at current price levels, is extracted from oil fields in the Mideast. Roughly 24 million barrels of crude oil are pumped out daily. This is enough to meet the growing needs of all of Western Europe, Japan, Australia, South Africa, and most of Asia, excluding China and the Soviet Union. One hundred years ago, much of the region was little more than wind-blown desert, the bleak landscape interrupted only by an occasional oasis of palm trees and water. But with the discovery of "black gold," the Arab nations, Iran and the Gulf states bordering the Arabian sea began to amass fabulous wealth, and, finally, power. Today, the very life-style of the Arab peoples and of all the industrial nations has been totally altered. How did the world ever become so dependent on oil?

The Saga of Oil

The story began in 1859 when Edwin L. Drake set up the United States' first oil derrick on a farm near Titusville, Pennsylvania and struck oil at a depth of about 69 feet. "Drake's Folly," as his neighbors had called it, was no longer a laughing matter. The oil rush was on and countless small companies

went into the business. Then John D. Rockefeller entered the scene and began to consolidate the oil business into a one-man monopoly under his company, Standard Oil. He was a hard fighting competitor who put many rivals out of business, picked up the pieces, and went on to become the richest man in America. Although Rockefeller's monopoly was eventually broken up by the U. S. Supreme Court, his gigantic firm spawned a number of major oil companies including Standard Oil of New Jersey and Standard Oil of California.

During the succeeding years, companies like Gulf, Mobil, Texaco, and Shell entered the fiercely competitive and extremely lucrative business. Meanwhile, as industry surged ahead and the automobile and airplane became integral parts of modern society, the need for petroleum and petroleum derivatives climbed steadily. Oil became the name of the game, the key to industrial success.

The first oil producers in the Middle East were the Armenians and Tatars, who one hundred years ago exploited the reserves lying beneath the Caucasus, the western shores of the Caspian Sea. The great oil fields of Baku, in Azerbaïdzhan, after the dawn of the twentieth century, became a Soviet monopoly. Says Leonard Mosley, "The area was all but awash with oil. . . . If one rowed five miles into the Caspian and threw a tow of lighted rope overboard, the sea would catch fire from the gas bubbling up from the

sea bed." From the 1870's, the oil rush was in full swing. Leading the way was a young Swede, Robert Nobel, who bought a strip of land for £1,000 and, with his three brothers, soon operated the biggest and most successful field in Baku.

The working conditions in the oil industry, in the meantime, were horrifying. Resentment among the Armenians was rife, and revolution was in the air.

"The startling fact is that world consumption within the next twelve years is now expected to exceed total world consumption of oil throughout history up to the present time."

**— James E. Akins,
Foreign Service Officer**

In 1905, a bloody massacre resulted when hundreds of Armenians were murdered and their women were carried off into slavery by rampaging Tatars, later joined by Cossack troops. The oil fields and storage tanks were sabotaged.

Enter the Americans

At this time, rich fields had been discovered in California, Texas, and Oklahoma. However, Americans de-

cid-ed to enter the Middle East in search of oil after the 1908 discovery of oil at Masjid-i-Sulaiman. They wisely put their finger on Mesopotamia and obtained concessions from Turkey, which then ruled the region.

British and Dutch interests were becoming active in the region also. The Middle East, particularly Turkey, was the scene of bribes, counter-bribes, and under-the-table diplomacy as oil tycoons fought each other for advantages. The avenues to success were via the covert bribe, knowing the frame of mind of the pasha, and knowing the precise amount of baksheesh to pay each official in the governmental pecking order. Arm-twisting, stratagems, secret maneuvers, and national backing all played their part in the original opening up of the Middle Eastern oil fields.

At the close of World War I, with the demise of the Central Powers — Germany and Turkey — Britain and France set about to carve up the Middle East. The Turkish Petroleum Company was now British; France assumed mandates over Lebanon and Syria and a quarter of the oil interest in Iraq.

The United States was excluded from the secret bargaining, and when the news leaked out, U. S. oil companies became furious. Then ensued a period of plotting, backbiting, lying and deceit. But it didn't matter. The United States gradually became the dominant foreign interest in Saudi Arabia, through back-

ing Ibn Saud as the legitimate ruler. With his sword and military prowess, Ibn Saud became ruler over a vast chunk of Arabian real estate. In 1930, American interests obtained concessions in Bahrain, and, on May 29, 1933, the concession agreement was signed that brought American money and know-how into the Persian Gulf. Since the mid-1930's, the United States has been dominant in the oil regions of the Middle East.

The Recent Crisis

James E. Akins, State Department senior expert on energy, points out in *Foreign Affairs* that proven oil reserves in the non-communist world amount to roughly 500 billion barrels, of which at least 300 billion are in Iran and Arab countries. However, all Arab countries do not have vast reserves of oil. Jordan, Lebanon, Tunisia, Morocco, and Yemen have very little.

The proven reserves of Saudi Arabia are often listed as 150 billion barrels, but one company with extensive experience there estimates that proven reserves are over twice that amount and that probable reserves could even double that

figure. What does this astounding economic fact mean to the United States and the Western world?

King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, formerly one of the staunchest friends of the United States in the Arab world, a proponent of moderation and a man who is the mortal enemy of Communism, has repeat-

edly said the Arabs should not use oil as a political weapon and claimed that he himself would not. In 1972, however, other Arab leaders issued fifteen different threats that they would use oil as a weapon against their "enemies," of whom they singled out the United States as number one.

During the October war, King Faisal was put on a veritable hot seat by the United States, since it clearly and convincingly supported Israel with arms and supplies during the fighting. King Faisal had been imploring the United States to moderate and modify its pro-Israeli foreign policy for years. When the war broke out, his efforts seemed to be for naught. As a loyal Arab, he felt compelled to cut off oil production to the United States, and thereby prove his allegiance to the Arab cause.

The Arab world knows that it has the developed Western nations and Japan over an oil barrel. Since production has been cut, prices have soared, thus compensating the oil-rich Arab countries, to a large extent, for the drop in production. In an



KING FAISAL of Saudi Arabia led Arab oil boycott against the West.

Keystone

EDWIN L. DRAKE, in top hat (right), conceived the idea of drilling for oil. On August 27, 1859, near Titusville, Pennsylvania, he struck oil using the rig in the background. Below right: Qatar oil field of Dukhay of the Qatar Petroleum Company. Qatar and her neighbors on the Arabian peninsula possess the world's largest known oil reserves.

*Top, Drake Well Museum
Bottom, Ch. Simovietri — Sygma*

OPEC communiqué issued in late December, Arabian sea oil producers announced that, beginning January 1, the price of crude oil would more than double (from \$5.11 to \$11.65 a barrel). This move increased the price to more than four times what it had been one year previously — \$2.59 a barrel. All this bodes an ill wind for the Western oil-dependent nations, especially Western Europe and Japan.

Burgeoning Demand

The United States, which possesses six percent of the earth's people, consumes over 30 percent of the earth's energy resources. The average American consumes in seven days as much as most other people in the world will consume in an entire year. Thus the United States is also in a vulnerable position, as growing energy needs outstrip limited supply.


In 1970, the United States used 710 million tons of oil or about 15 million barrels daily. By 1980, demand is expected to be between 20 and 25 million barrels a day. Oil from the north slope of Alaska may produce roughly 2,000,000 barrels



PROVEN OIL RESERVES BY END OF 1973

Proven oil reserves differ from *estimated*, or *potential* reserves. Both are loose figures, but the former is more accurate in that it is based on evidence from exploratory drilling or production activities of various regions. Many world areas have never had exploratory drilling but are suspected of containing oil, but in unknown quantities. The Middle Eastern and North African "proven" oil reserves are estimated around 400 billion barrels, potential reserves over 600 billion. The world's estimated recoverable reserves could be over two trillion barrels. If world oil production and consumption continue at the present rate, "proven" reserves will hardly last another 40 years.

Oil reserves indicated in billions of barrels.



Source: Oil and Gas Journal. Graph by Ron Lepelko

daily, once the hotly contested Alaskan pipeline is built, but even that, coupled with the production from offshore oil deposits, will not be able to meet foreseeable needs. Until new sources of energy are found and developed, it is difficult to imagine how the United States could fill its own energy requirements without importing much more oil, principally from the Middle East.

David Freeman, a former energy expert for the Nixon administration, even before the current crisis, put the issue in perspective: "Our rates of consumption are so large that we can see the bottom of the barrel."

This does not mean that oil reserves are still not plentiful. Vast new oil fields are being surveyed and charted. The fact is, Iran alone plans to more than double her 1970 production of 191 million tons during the next decade. Until recently, Saudi Arabia had even more grandiose plans and was shooting for 20 million barrels a day by 1980, or one billion tons a year!

The real oil problem is not oil potential, but oil politics.

Leonard Mosley, author of *Power Play: Oil in the Middle East*, puts it bluntly: "What most worries Western strategists when they contemplate the part the Middle East is destined to play in the world fuel situation is neither the expense nor the shortage of oil, but the increasing tendency of Arab militants to attempt to use oil as a political weapon" (page 414).

With insight, he says: "Petroleum has become as much the *drug of Western civilization as cigarettes and alcohol*, and the addicts will go on paying. But are their governments prepared to pay the political price which may one day be demanded of them?"

These facts worry the nation of Israel in particular. Since the oil boycott and the implementation of oil as a political weapon par excellence, a period of moody uncertainty has pervaded modern Israel. Israelis are worried whether the United States, like Europe, will begin to compromise and vacillate in its heretofore strong support for Israel. Will the United States, when it comes face to face with the energy crisis, caused in part by Arab oil boycotts, waver in its support, back down, and begin to tilt in favor of the Arab states?

It is indeed an Israeli cause for concern. Officially, Washington shows no inclination to deviate from its policy of supporting Israel, along the general lines adopted by the United Nations — that is, supporting Israeli national sovereignty and security in the face of external threats. Washington, however, does not endorse any claims of Israeli conquest or incorporation of conquered territory, including the Sinai peninsula and the Golan Heights. To do so would be tantamount to committing suicide insofar as Arab oil or American investments in the Arab nations are concerned.

No matter which way the United

States turns, it faces a dilemma. If it turns its back on Israel, it abdicates its moral obligations to an ally. If it turns its back on friendly Arab states and ignores their claims, views, and feelings, then it not only could see Arab oil exports permanently stopped, but also the further loss of U. S. investments in the area and the very real threat of greater Soviet penetration there.

Gloomy Prospects for the Future


As long as the Arab oil flow is withheld or reduced, the Western world faces the possibility of recession. Even though other forms of energy, including coal, atomic, solar, and geothermal, are being researched and expanded, oil remains number one.

Now that the oil producing nations are beginning to wield political strength, the rest of the world seems to have only the option to cooperate or to get out. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, with more than half of the total known world reserves of oil, are not about to compromise. They know they hold the trump cards.

The fight for oil will continue. But it could stop just short of World War III, if nations were to find ways to work together in harmony when seeking and using available oil supplies. But human nature being what it is, if the distrust, bickering, and dog-eat-dog attitude continues, the fight for oil will escalate into World War III. When that happens, there will be no winners — only losers. □

"Petroleum has become as much the drug of Western civilization as cigarettes and alcohol, and the addicts will go on paying. But are their governments prepared to pay the political price which may one day be demanded of them?"

— Leonard Mosley







CAN THE U.N. BRING PEACE TO THE MIDDLE EAST?

Achieving a Middle East cease-fire was difficult. Creating a permanent peace will be even more so. Can the United Nations meet the challenge?

by Keith W. Stump

SINCE THE creation of the state of Israel by the United Nations in late 1947, the world organization has been frequently involved in efforts to quell hostilities and ease tensions between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

Scores of speeches have been delivered. Numerous resolutions have been passed. But a permanent settlement to the Middle East problem has eluded the United Nations for a quarter century.

The U.N. Acts

In the early morning hours of October 22 — seventeen days after the outbreak of the fourth Middle East war — the United Nations Security Council adopted a joint U.S.-Soviet sponsored resolution (Resolution #338) calling for a Middle East cease-fire within 12 hours of its passage. The Security Council vote was an overwhelming 14 to 0, with the People's Republic of China — charging "big power collusion" — refusing to vote.

Later the same day, both Egypt

Ch. Simoniotti — Sygma

ONLY A WORD AWAY FROM PEACE?

U.N. Security Council Resolution #242

Emphasizing further their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. Affirms that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

- (i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;
- (ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. Affirms further the necessity

- a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;
- b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee

contracte de la Charte, l'Article 2 de la Charte,

1. Affirme que l'accomplissement des principes de la Charte exige l'instauration d'une paix juste et durable au Moyen-Orient qui devrait comprendre l'application des deux principes suivants:

- i) Retrait des forces armées israéliennes des territoires occupés lors du récent conflit;
- ii) Cessation de toutes assertions de belligérance ou de tous états de belligérance et respect et reconnaissance de la souveraineté, de l'intégrité territoriale et de l'indépendance politique de chaque Etat de la région et de leur droit de vivre en paix à l'intérieur de frontières sûres et reconnues à l'abri de menaces ou d'actes de force;

2. Affirme en outre la nécessité

- a) De garantir la liberté de navigation sur les voies d'eau internationales de la région;
- a) De réaliser un juste règlement du problème des réfugiés;
- c) De garantir l'inviolabilité territoriale et l'indépendance politique de chaque Etat de la région, par la délimitation de zones démi-

Unanimously passed by the United Nations Security Council in November 1967, Resolution #242 was meant to provide guidelines for devising a peace formula to end the 1967 Middle East conflict. However, because of its deliberately ambiguous provisions, the resolution was never implemented. The official English translation (left) calls for Israeli withdrawal "from territories" occupied during the Six-Day War.

The French text (right) reads "from *the* territories," since in French it is impossible to omit the definite article. Israel contends that withdrawal from *all* occupied territories is not therefore necessarily indicated, while the Arabs insist that it is. Despite over six years of Arab-Israeli disagreement on the resolution's true meaning, Resolution #242 remains, by broad diplomatic agreement, the ambiguous foundation upon which a permanent peace is to be built.

and Israel announced their acceptance of the cease-fire resolution.

Heavy fighting, however, resumed the next morning — à la Vietnam — with each side accusing the other of violating the cease-fire.

The Security Council hurriedly passed a second U.S.-Soviet sponsored resolution (Resolution #339), reconfirming its previous call for a cease-fire and urging that "all forces be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective." The resolution further requested that U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim take measures to immediately dispatch U.N. observers to supervise the observance of the cease-fire.

However, still further violations of the truce occurred along the Suez Canal before the U.N. observers could place themselves on the cease-fire lines.

At this point, the Soviet Union threatened to unilaterally dispatch troops to the Middle East to end the fighting. President Nixon responded in the early morning of October 25 by placing U.S. strategic forces — including the nuclear strike force — on precautionary alert throughout the world. It was the first time such an alert had been called since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

Tensions were running high. The October war had pushed the two superpowers toward the brink of nuclear warfare.

At that moment, the United Nations began to demonstrate its role. To defuse the Soviet-American confrontation, eight non-aligned nations on the U.N. Security Council introduced still another Middle East resolution — Resolution #340. Under it, the Security Council would demand that "immediate and complete cease-fire be observed" and would "set up immediately under its authority a United Nations emergency force" which would not include troops of either the United States or the Soviet Union.

The United States accepted the resolution, the Soviet Union followed suit, and Peking — in defe-

rence to the majority — withheld its veto.

The crisis began to wind down.

Resolution #340 had defused the U.S.-Soviet confrontation by eliminating its cause — the threat of military intervention by a superpower, namely the Soviet Union. Further, it resulted in a period of relative calm, thus giving U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger "breathing time" in which to travel to the Middle East to strengthen the shaky cease-fire and seek a formula for beginning full-scale peace negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis.

The world, in general, has expressed satisfaction with the United Nations over its role in the resolution of the crisis. The much maligned and neglected United Nations had demonstrated that de-



spite its shortcomings, weaknesses, and past failures, it was still a viable mechanism which could be used effectively in time of crisis.

The Road to Permanent Peace?

There have, however, been numerous Arab-Israeli cease-fires in the past. None have lasted. After all the speeches and resolutions were said and done, the basic problems still remained.

The first of the three cease-fire resolutions passed during last October's crisis — Resolution #338 — called, in its second paragraph, for the Arabs and Israelis "to start immediately after the cease-fire the implementation of Security Council Resolution #242 in all of its parts."

What was Resolution #242?

Resolution #242 was proposed by Britain and unanimously passed by the U.N. Security Council on November 22, 1967 — five months after the June Six-Day War of that year. It called, in essence, for Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied during that war, in exchange for Arab recognition of Israel's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence. Though agreed to at that time by both Israel and Egypt, it has never been implemented.

The problem lies with its wording.

The official English translation of Resolution #242 calls for "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." The Russian text agrees with the English, reading "from territories." But the French text reads "from *the* territories," since in the French language it is impossible to omit the definite article. Consequently, the French, like the Arabs, insist that Israel withdraw from *all* territories it acquired during the Six-Day War.


The Israelis, on the other hand, contend that Resolution #242 deliberately does not state "all" territories occupied or even "the" territories. Israel stresses that in order to live within "secure boundaries" (which Resolution #242 also guarantees her) she cannot possibly return all occupied territories.

Despite its purposely vague and ambiguous provisions, Resolution #242 remains, by broad agreement, the controversial foundation upon which the new peace is supposed to be built. But if the Arabs cannot be persuaded to alter their demands for total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, or if the Israelis cannot be convinced that total withdrawal is compatible with national security, a renewal of hostilities will be the tragic result. And if the superpowers should fail to agree on a course of action in another round, the result would be much different than that witnessed last October. The peace and stability of the entire world would be jeopardized. □



Thomas Hopper — Woodfin Camp & Assoc

THE OCTOBER WAR




Marvin Newman — Woodfin Camp & Assoc

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN LEARNED

by Patrick A. Parnell

SEE NEXT PAGE →



SOPHISTICATED WEAPONS make modern war total war. All suffer, whether civilian or military. Top: Bombed-out civilian buildings in Damascus. Middle: Israeli soldiers taken captive near Damascus. Right: A modern Soviet-built SAM missile. Bottom: A captured Syrian soldier.

Both above, Bruno Barbey — Magnum
Both below, Ch. Szwarcpietri — Sigma



TO THE major world powers, the October war was a testing place for the latest sophisticated weaponry, a theater for witnessing the movement of large forces in live battle conditions. If anything, what has been learned is how to make war more lethal next time.

Scarcely had the fighting stopped when military men were enmeshed in analyzing and reanalyzing troop deployments and positions to see what each side could have done differently. New weapons gadgetry, seen for the first time, were studied for flaws and weaknesses by developer nations to improve effective killing power. Likewise, opposition forces studied them in order to develop anti-systems.

How ironic that the very cradle of the world's great religions should become an arena for learning war and for testing the world's newest military hardware.

The Cost

For the combatants, the fourth confrontation had an added lesson — how costly war is, not just in terms of life and death reality, but economically.

Both sides suffered heavily. Accurate Arab statistics are yet unpublished, but from known Israeli figures, we could probably estimate the Arabs' war costs to be as high as the Israelis'. It is estimated that the total cost of the war to Israel was in the neighborhood of 4 billion dollars. That's two thirds of Israel's annual GNP. Overall, the war is expected to reduce Israel's living standard some 10 percent.

Cold, isolated statistics, however, can't convey to those untouched directly by war the severe heartache, upheaval and psychological trauma suffered on both sides. Statistics are woefully inadequate in picturing the emotional pain and bereavement experienced by wives, husbands, sons, daughters, relatives and friends over their killed and maimed loved ones. The unhappiness and misery of the thousands of

people uprooted from towns and villages, many losing their homes and worldly belongings because of war, can't be fully described by words.

The Coming Big One

To realists, the next Arab-Israeli war is not a matter of "if" but "when." Billions of dollars worth of Soviet military aid to the Arabs and U.S. military aid to the Israelis insure it.

Isn't it ironic how nations throughout history almost invariably talk peace, while at the same time they are planning to arm themselves for the next war?

Thankfully, nuclear weapons haven't yet been used in the Arab-Israeli confrontations, although the major powers have them. This should make us think.

What weapon has man invented that has never been used to kill? What peace, peace treaty or pact has been lasting? In the nearly 6,000

years of recorded human history, approximately 8,000 peace treaties have been negotiated. Not one has brought permanent peace.

Unless we learn from our past mistakes, it will be just a matter of time before some mistake, some accident or some misunderstanding, perhaps involving trade or oil, comes to a head and ignites a really big war — a nuclear disaster! It's time nations learned what should have been learned from the latest conflict — and from all wars.

The obvious is that mankind has not known real peace and does not know the way to it. If he did, we would have it.

It seems clear that another way, other than through human reasoning and intellect alone — which haven't brought peace in the past — needs to be tried?

Peace, humanly speaking, appears difficult and complex, but it is spiritually simple. Mankind cannot know or find peace apart from the

Creator God who originally gave life and who alone knows what is best for man and how man ought to live to have peace.

Man has not had lasting peace throughout his entire history because the God of peace, the God of the Arabs, the God of the Israelis, indeed, the Creator God of all peoples, is neither open-mindedly consulted nor asked for help and guidance in solving human problems and differences. Until that time comes, there will be no peace!

To many, this way to peace may sound overly simple, superficial, naïve, perhaps trite, maybe even superstitious — but nevertheless it is the truth.

Thankfully, God isn't going to wait till the nations come to him. It would be too late if he did. He is going to step in and force man to have peace. At that time, as one ancient prophet said, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." □



Coming! PEACE in the MIDEAST

World leaders are frightened over the reality of another Mideast war. Prospects for a permanent and lasting peace seem so uncertain, at best.

Is Peace Possible?

Will the Middle East crisis erupt again? Bible prophecy answers: the Mideast will again experience the ravages of war. But the Bible prophecies also foretell an era of unparalleled

peace and prosperity in the world tomorrow. That fascinating story — and how the ravages of war will be brought to an end — is contained in the full-color, 96-page booklet titled *The Wonderful World Tomorrow — What It Will Be Like*. Despite today's harrowing headlines, there is hope.

Request your free copy of this booklet and understand why.

**THE WONDERFUL
WORLD TOMORROW**
What It Will Be Like





JERUSALEM,

RICH IN history, drenched in tradition, sanctified by religion and stained with blood, Jerusalem remains forever young, forever old.

Here David and Solomon reigned, Jesus of Nazareth walked, the apostles preached; here Mohammed is believed by Moslems to have ascended to heaven; here the

Saracens, Turks, and Crusaders fought; here the Israelis have exuberantly returned.

There is not one square inch of Jerusalem which has not witnessed the fusion of human creativity and conflict. Jerusalem has beheld both the zenith and the nadir of human emotion and achievement.

It is indeed the supreme paradox.

The city with peace in its name (*shalom* — *shalom* in modern Hebrew and *salaam* in Arabic — means “peace”), the city which symbolizes peace and understanding to three great religions, today represents the *least* peace and the *least* understanding.

Far above the controversies that have characterized the Middle East



JERUSALEM!

from time immemorial, the intensely emotional issue of Jerusalem stands supreme. It is again a focal point of world attention. What does this all mean?

Jewish Resolve

"We have waited 2,000 years to come back to Jerusalem. We have been praying three times a day for

CITY OF PEACE CENTER OF CONFRONTATION

by Robert L. Kuhn

Top row, left to right: John Kilburn — Black Star, Ted Spiegel — Black Star, Ernst Herb — Plain Truth, Marvin Newman — Woodfin Camp & Assoc., Ernst Herb — Plain Truth, Ernst Herb — Plain Truth. Bottom row, left to right: Ted Spiegel — Black Star, Ernst Herb — Plain Truth, Ted Spiegel — Black Star

the Lord to bring us back to Jerusalem. Now that he has — we won't give it back." So said Gideon Hausner, the former attorney general of Israel, with an intensity of emotion able to shake the skeptic.

He continues, "Why should we give Jerusalem back? Were others better custodians of the holy places than we are? Are we inferior to the Turks? To the British administration? To Jordan? To go back centuries, to the Egyptians? There were waves of states coming and going to rule this Holy City. Did any one of them account itself better than we? This double standard that things are allowed to others, but somehow are not fitting for Jews — well, this will not repeat itself anymore. Not when we have something to say about it."

The Israelis are a fiercely determined people. In 1948, approximately 1,200 Jews died in a losing battle for the Old City of Jerusalem. The city was divided — and Israelis did not have access to their holiest religious shrine — the Western Wall of the Temple Mount. Some nineteen years later, in 1967, Israel sacrificed more of her young men for Jerusalem — but this time to return, to unite the city under independent Jewish control for the first time in about 2,000 years.

Jerusalem symbolizes much more than Judaism as a religion. It almost epitomizes the Jewish people as a people. Coming out of more than 70 nations, with vast differences in culture, language, and tradition, the Jewish people somehow achieve cultural, historical, and religious unity through Jerusalem.

Jewish resolve regarding Jerusalem is founded on 2,000 years of wandering in a wilderness of persecutions, inquisitions and pogroms. Genocide is not a hypothetical word to the Jewish people. It was in the twentieth century that nearly six million Jews were systematically exterminated in the gas chambers and death camps of Nazi Germany at Auschwitz, Dachau, Belsen, Buchenwald — names that will live in infamy. To the rest of the world it

may be history — to the Israelis it's a burning reality.

Arabs also have a vested interest in Jerusalem.

Arab Resolve

To the Arab peoples, Jerusalem is one of their holiest places. They see the Israelis as the bridgehead of Western civilization — an irritant in the Arab body — imposing a foreign way of life on peaceful Arab people.

As a general rule, the Arabs are not anti-Jewish except for the fanatical few (who all too often attract the mass media). Arab intellectuals often point out that Jews were never treated better than during the great flourishing of Arab civilizations during the Middle Ages when Arabs and Jews lived and worked together to bring the world a pinnacle of culture, education, medicine, and science. Jews have in the past been welcome in most Arab countries — as long as they are citizens, not conquerors.

Arabs are anti-Zionist. They cannot understand the logic of requiring Arabs to pay the price — in land and in blood — for the evils perpetrated on Jews by Europeans: Germans, Russians, Poles, Hungarians, etc.

Arabs say they are a patient, peaceful people. They have lived in Jerusalem for well over a thousand years. It is theirs, and they have weathered many short-lived Western storms to prove it. The crusaders, they point out, were successful — for a time — in capturing Jerusalem in the name of the Christian religion — but they were eventually driven out by the people of the land.

Geopolitics

In addition, other peoples' interests converge in this area. Located between the land masses of Europe, Asia, and Africa, Jerusalem and the Middle East have been fought over by invaders from time immemorial. Here lies the crossroads of mankind: the gateway to Africa, the passage to the Indian Ocean, the southern and eastern flank of the Mediterra-

nean, the bridge to Europe. The Middle East has always been a critical point between the great empires of East and West.

Today, the world's superpowers are intimately involved: the Soviet Union in its historic geopolitical push southward, the United States in its moral commitment to Israel, and Europe and Japan in protection of their vitally needed oil supplies.

Ovinnikov, the Soviet Union's Middle East expert at the United Nations, explained his country's position: "Of course the Soviet Union supports the Arab countries, but there is a big difference between the support provided by the United States to Israel. We are supporting *victims* of aggression The United States is supporting the *perpetrators* of the aggression."

But to Ezer Weizman, former Israeli minister of transportation and former commanding officer of the Israeli Air Force, this is a rather silly comment: "What always amuses me is that here we are, two and a half million people surrounded by forty or fifty million Arabs, with North Africa against us, with India and Pakistan against us, with the whole Moslem world against us — and we are branded as the aggressors. Quite a compliment for two and a half million people!"

Jerusalem Itself

But what kind of city is Jerusalem? Who are its people? What are its problems? How does Jerusalem compare with the typical Western city?

We asked Mr. Teddy Kollek, the dynamic mayor of the city, and he replied: "Jerusalem is a poor city. It is an immigrant city. Out of the 210,000 Jews who live in the city, 120,000 are recent immigrants from Arab or Oriental countries who came here without means and without applicable skills.

"I, as the mayor of the city, am always astonished to see the surprised faces of our American visitors when they learn that there are no policemen outside my house, and I

can go around unprotected through the Jewish and the Arab parts of the city without any hesitation any time of day or night."

Commented the Minister of Development and Tourism, Mr. Moshe Kol: "When I came to Cleveland, the mayor of Cleveland gave me the key to the city and said: 'When I walked in Jerusalem with Mayor Teddy Kollek, we needed no guard! But in Cleveland, you cannot walk without a guard.'"

But to Edward Ghorra, Lebanon's permanent representative to the U.N., this is all quite irrelevant to the ultimate status of Jerusalem: "I really don't know about all these details, but it is not important — whether you have a robbery on the street doesn't justify the robbery of the whole city of Jerusalem, which is so dear and sacred to the Arab people, Christian and Moslem alike."

Mayor Kollek recognizes the deep yearnings of the Arab peoples: "Arabs in Jerusalem are good patriots, and they would like to see their part of the city again under Arab sovereignty. They have a little dilemma, you know; they have in fact a better life today; they have more freedom of expression today — there is no censorship. We have two Arab newspapers, whereas under the Jordanians for the last year before the 1967 war, the Arab newspapers were closed down because the Jerusalemites were a little too independent and didn't exactly hold the line that the people from the capital in Amman told them to. So Arabs today have in Jerusalem freer expression and a slightly better life, as well as freedom of movement — this to be weighed against being occupied by a foreign people. So it isn't easy for them to make up their mind — and we shall have to find ways of giving them a lot more independence within the city, which one day they will accept."

What about Israel's rapid practical annexation of the old city — new apartment buildings, the linking together of electrical networks, sewer systems, bus lines?

To the former Jordanian representative to the United Nations, Mr. Baha Ud-Din Toukan, it is a very serious violation of international law: "Why did they do it? They shouldn't have done it. I mean, it is occupied territory. Never in history has occupied territory been annexed and changed, overnight."

How does Mayor Kollek answer the Arab charges that much of the construction is an attempt to make a new Jewish city in former Jordanian territory?

"This is a complicated business, and it's, of course, charged with a lot of feeling. You see, the city was one Jerusalem for 4,000 years. It was divided into a Jordanian and Israeli territory only for nineteen years."

"The people have different political ambitions, but they have learned to live together. Now, mind you, we have a different pattern than American cities. We have no ideal of a 'melting pot.' We feel that communities can live together, side by side, guarding their own traditions, their own cultural content and their own way of life. I'm not speaking only of Arabs and Jews. We have Christian communities who have been living there for 1,500 years."

Said Ambassador Ghorra of Lebanon: "There have been two resolutions of the General Assembly in 1968, three resolutions by the Security Council in 1968 and 1969 which have declared annexation null and void and all the measures taken by Israel as null and void. These resolutions have called on Israel to rescind all the measures that it has taken. Israel so far has done nothing."

Concluded Mayor Kollek: "If you look at the city as a whole, it has had a Jewish majority for the last 120 years, so we are not suddenly turning it into a Jewish majority or a Jewish city."

The Holy Places

Jerusalem is considered holy by Islam and Christianity as well as by Judaism. Mayor Kollek had this to say about the holy places: "We have

always said that we would like the holy places, the Christian holy places, to be run by the Christian world, and we are willing to give them the status that foreign embassies have. The problem is that the Christians — and this doesn't sit well for me, as a Jew, to say — but the Christians among themselves — Catholics, Greek Orthodox, Armenians, Protestants — do not get together to form one ecumenical body in order to decide how they would like to run the holy places."

Commented Ambassador Ghorra: "I don't want to argue with what they say. I would like to say that their claim to be custodian to the holy places doesn't have any historical background. This is something that they have arrogated to themselves after the occupation of the Old City of Jerusalem. The real custodian of the holy places in old Jerusalem is the Arabs."

But Gideon Hausner says: "The only time — the only time — when we had no access to the Wailing Wall, to our synagogue there, to our shrines, were the twenty years of Arab occupation. And not a single Jew could enter there unless he came on a foreign passport that didn't disclose the fact that he was Jewish."

Internationalization

While most of the world advocates internationalizing Jerusalem, perhaps under the shield of the United Nations, the Israelis are fiercely determined to resist it.

Mayor Kollek has remarked: "I really can't understand it. Suddenly everybody is very conscientious about Jerusalem. Let me be, as I understand it, slightly aggressive on this. The Christian world has great difficulties in getting accustomed to the fact this is again a Jewish city."

Israelis are bitter that while there is much world outcry to internationalize Jerusalem today, between 1948 and 1967, when Jordan controlled old Jerusalem, one never heard much about it.

Gabriel Stein, Professor of Physi-

cal Chemistry at Hebrew University and Chairman of the Central Committee of the Independent Liberal Party, analyzed it bluntly: "I think that this has to do with a very basic psychological attitude of the world towards the Jews. I cannot otherwise understand, for example, the attitude of the Vatican. The Vatican was absolutely silent or even condoning whatever went on in Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967. The Jews had no access to their holy places. The armistice agreement was not kept; Jewish holy places were being destroyed indiscriminately; the whole Jewish quarter in the Old City was destroyed. The attitude towards the Christian churches was not a particularly friendly one, yet the Vatican was absolutely quiet. The minute the Jews came in, the attitude of the Vatican changed completely. I think this has very, very deep-seated psychological components, having little to do with political reality."

The growing cordiality between the Vatican and the Arab countries prompts divergent opinions.

Lebanon's Ambassador Ghorra says: "The common concern of the Vatican and of the Arab countries about the fate of Jerusalem is growing. And this concern from His Holiness the Pope, from the Vatican in general, has been voiced on many occasions."

Israel's Gabriel Stein comments: "If it [Vatican-Arab relations] should take on an undercurrent of being an alliance against Israel and the Jews, it becomes a political involvement then, and, of course, it has *very dangerous implications* for us."

According to Israel's Ezer Weizman: "I wish the Vatican could play a role in persuading the Arabs to approach our way of thinking, but I'm afraid that the Vatican will most likely just stick to the Christian problem — and we will most likely have a confrontation over Jerusalem."

"A confrontation over Jerusalem"? "Very dangerous implica-

tions"? With three of the world's major religions — as well as the world's superpowers — in the thick of it, there are some very foreboding overtones in all of this.

What would be the ultimate significance of a religious, political, and military showdown in Jerusalem?

An Unforeseen Event?

"I continue to be an optimist in the face of a perfect basis for the most pessimistic prognosis because I keep looking for some as yet *unforeseen event* that will change the present progress of relations among the big powers in the world, a change that is absolutely necessary if we're not to face catastrophe within a short period of twenty to

"... I keep looking for some as yet unforeseen event that will change the present progress of relations among the big powers . . . a change that is absolutely necessary if we're not to face catastrophe. . . ."
— Dr. Albert Sabin

thirty years!" A doomsday prophet speaking? No — it's Dr. Albert Sabin, developer of the Sabin polio vaccine and director of Israel's prestigious Weizmann Institute of Science.

Surprisingly enough, the very record which gives the ancient origins and histories of the Jerusalem of old also describes such an "unforeseen event" which will, *in the future*, envelop and totally alter the Jerusalem of today. The book is the Bible — and the unforeseen event is the establishment of the government of God.

The Clearest Prophecy

Of all biblical prophecies, the one most obviously stated and most fre-

quently repeated is this establishment of God's rule over the nations. And the focus of this most momentous event is Jerusalem. Just before, during, and forever after the time when the Creator of the earth sets his hand to control the earth, the city of Jerusalem will be center-stage for this the greatest act in all history.

Prophecies of massive armies gathered in the valley of Jehoshaphat, just east of Jerusalem (Joel 3), military conflict in and around the city (Zechariah 14:2, Daniel 11, Matthew 24, Luke 21), religious confusion of worldwide proportions in the city (Revelation 11) — all go to emphasize that the focal point of world attention will be riveted on Jerusalem.

The Creator of all mankind will, at the last minute, save all mankind from destroying itself (Matthew 24:22) — and the site of this ultimately historic direct intervention from God will be Jerusalem (Zechariah 14:4, 12; Acts 1:11-12, Joel 3, Ezekiel 38-39).

Finally, Jerusalem will become the capital of the world — a united world, a peaceful world, a happy world, a world under God (Zechariah 14:8-21), a world in which both Egypt (Isaiah 19:21) and Israel shall obey God and be happily and permanently at peace with each other (Isaiah 19:23-25).

"And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Micah 4:2). □

The Mideast is the focal point of dozens of biblical prophecies. A summary outline of these astounding prophecies is offered free to our readers in the article "The Middle East in Prophecy." Write for your copy today.

MIDDLE EAST IN BIBLICAL PROPHECY



(Continued from page 1)

is the only language they understand. For them to carry out their plan would have plunged them instantly into nuclear war with the U.S.A., and with all U.S. forces on instant alert, the U.S. would probably get in the first blow. Russia backed down.

Then, of course, the Russians accused Mr. Nixon of calling the alert for the purpose of attracting public attention away from the accusations being hurled at him in the Watergate syndrome. Some of the American public believed it. But I want our readers to know what really *did* happen.

So, you see, this Middle East war and effort to get a cease-fire critically involved the world's two giant powers and even threatened an immediate outbreak of nuclear war.

Another repercussion was that America's European allies blamed Mr. Nixon for calling the military alert before consulting them. To have done so might have defeated Mr. Nixon's strategy of stopping the Russian move of its military forces into the Middle East.

The NATO crisis threatens relations between the United States and Europe. It could trigger a European crash program to produce a "United States of Europe" — a political-military union of Europe into one great super world power — possibly stronger than either the United States or Russia. As this series of crises erupted over the world, Japan faced a critical national situation occasioned by King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. Essentially, he said: "Adopt anti-Israel policy, or no oil." Japan capitulated.

The new North Vietnam offensive against South Vietnam was another fire-brand crisis.

In the United States, we have had "Watergate." Almost the entire news media have done everything in their power to put President Rich-

ard Nixon out of the Presidency. They have tried him, *without a scrap of actual proof*, but with every possible question and inference of guilt. They have influenced many millions. They have featured with great emphasis every possible *question* as to doubts and every *opinion* as to alleged presidential guilt, while minimizing back on page 17 or 33 every item in the President's favor.

The same thing happened to President Abraham Lincoln. It was after his assassination that he came to be acknowledged as one of America's greatest presidents.

I cannot, here, express any opinion one way or the other as to Mr. Nixon's innocence or guilt — further than to say, it is *supposed* to be American custom, in common decency, to consider a man innocent until proven guilty. And maybe, yes, just *MAYBE*, history will record the picture somewhat like it did in the case of President Lincoln.

Today, as I write in Tokyo, I had a 25-minute personal audience with His Imperial Majesty Emperor Hirohito of Japan. One of the last things he said to me was, next time I see President Nixon, would I kindly give the President the Emperor's warmest personal regards — this in connection with words of appreciation expressed by both of us for the friendly and close relations between our two peoples and their governments.

Still further in this series of world crises, as I write, the Japanese economy has suddenly gone into a serious crisis within the past weeks. They are saying here, "The Japanese miracle is over!"

On this present trip I flew into Bangladesh, just fresh out of its war some two years. I had personal meetings with both the president and the prime minister. The president said, "Mr. Armstrong, I know of your experience, your meetings with many government heads, the wisdom that comes with age and experience. I want to ask your counsel and advice. We need any help you can give us." This was not the

first time government heads have appealed to me for counsel and help.

President Chowdhury asked if I had had the opportunity to see much of his country, I had only had time for about an hour's drive by car around Dacca, the capital, and its outskirts.

"I would like to know what is your appraisal of what you have seen of Bangladesh," he said.

I hesitated. He said, "Don't hesitate. I want your honest opinion."

"Well," I said reluctantly, "after driving around far enough to know I had seen enough that was representative of the country, I simply had to utter an involuntary prayer, in shocked dismay, 'Oh Eternal God, Thy Kingdom come! and deliver this miserable country from its wretchedness!' I'm sorry — I have to be frank — but your country has impressed me as being the most impoverished of any I've seen, and I've seen indescribable impoverishment."

When he asked my help and counsel, I told him I would give the problem much thought and any suggestions or help I could.

I had noticed, I said, that despite the wretched economic plight that was so evident, I had seen in general an optimistic and hopeful expression on people's faces. I felt every effort should be made to give the people encouragement and hope — but of course the immediate need is food, and then shelter and basic needs of life. He said they knew they had oil and natural gas, and they are working on both — but need financing. It is just possible I may have business contacts that could put them in touch with financing for development of oil production.

Earlier I had conferred with the prime minister and executive leader Sheik Mujibur Rahman, the "strong man" of the country. He told me what had happened before and during the war in 1971.

From March 15, 1971, through December of that year, three million people were killed, six million homes were destroyed, and more than one-and-a-half million farm

families were left without tools or animals to work their farms. The transportation and communication systems of the country were totally destroyed, roads were damaged, bridges were knocked out, and inland waterways were blocked. Ten million refugees fled to India, many starving, many dying of cholera. Hardly a family was unaffected.

He told me how that within hours before the Pakistani army surrendered, their units had systematically killed thousands of the better educated so sorely needed now by the government and the people. In a nation with only 20% literacy, the loss of those thousands of educated was a sore tragedy.

Prime Minister Mujibur Rahman, a big man — rough, practical and competent, a natural leader — also described the basic and dire needs of Bangladesh. First, of course, is FOOD! A dire need is education, especially with so many thousands of the educated minority killed at war's end.

With such extreme poverty, following so devastating a war, thousands starving, Bangladesh also is a country of *natural* disadvantages — very crowded, 1,100 people to the square mile, a swampy terrain prone to floods and cyclones, famine an ever-present danger. Their problems are *beyond human ability to solve*.

For a country in such an unbelievably pitiful plight, perhaps it is a good thing the world is fast approaching the SUPREME CRISIS of this age of human civilization — and that God's Kingdom will soon come.

But Why? What's the Cause?

Stop and think! Why should we find such conditions among humans? Even the illiterate, unable to read or write, have human minds. Their minds, too — had the people been born of a heredity influenced by proper education, and had they been able to develop their minds — might have been as capable as those who solved the problems of space travel.

Why illiteracy? *Why* human poverty? *Why* do we have a world with

half of its millions living in ignorance, extreme poverty, wretchedness, filth and squalor?

Human minds are capable of producing the computer — of going to the moon and back. Yet we can't solve our problems here on earth.

Why?

I had to ask *WHY!*

And forty-seven years ago, I learned *why!* Forty-seven years ago I experienced the shock of my life. I was literally *stunned* to learn what science has been unable to reveal, what no religion teaches, what governments do not understand, the CAUSE of all this trouble in the world, the SOLUTION, the WAY that would bring us world PEACE, universal prosperity, happiness and joy.

I was literally dumbfounded to learn — and believe it or not, in the Bible — what neither the Christian religion or any other teaches: the CAUSE of all this vast mountain of human woe — and also the CAUSE that *would* and *should* produce actual utopia! I was incredulous to learn that ALL nations — ALL religions — are *deceived!* The plain truth is made clear and plain in that misunderstood, maligned and misinterpreted book! And I did not discover some new interpretation. I found it needs NO interpretation. It interprets itself. It is the inspired, revealed word of our Maker and our Creator. And I learned he says plainly what he means, and he means what he says! I didn't find some new religion — I merely found plain truth!

I found plainly revealed the MISSING DIMENSION in knowledge.

Our Maker revealed to our first parents this basic knowledge — but they did not believe him! He revealed not only *what* we humans *are*, but *why* — for what *purpose* we were put here on earth, and *how* to achieve it. He revealed the WAY to peace, happiness, abundance. But our first parents disbelieved, disobeyed, went *the other way*. And humanity has been going that wrong way ever since.

It's axiomatic. For every effect, there has to be a CAUSE. There has

to be a CAUSE for all of the world's evils. If we are to have peace, happiness and abundance, something will have to cause it.

When our first parents disbelieved and rejected that knowledge, our Creator caused it to be written in his inspired Word to us — the Holy Bible. There he *reveals* what man *cannot* discover by himself — *cannot* know, except by revelation from God. And just as our first parents disbelieved and disobeyed, so has all humanity — their children — disbelieved, rejected and gone the other way.

What God revealed to Adam and Eve and plainly reveals for those willing to see and believe is the way that will CAUSE every GOOD result.

Actually, what it amounts to is this: There are only the *two* basic ways of life. I simplify it by calling one the way of "GIVE," the other the way of "GET." Our Maker is a God of love — and "love" is always outgoing. Toward other humans, it is outgoing concern for others equal to self-concern. It is the God-centered way. Since God is the source of all good, it means contact with, belief in, dependence on, and obedience to him from whom all blessings must flow. It means love, first toward God, and second to fellow men. Toward men it means cooperation, giving, serving, helping, sharing.

Man has not lived that way! Man has caused evils.

Man has lived the "GET" way, the way of SELF-centeredness, of concern only for self and what is allied with self. It is the way of competition and strife. It is the way of lust, greed, vanity, jealousy, envy, hatred.

This WRONG WAY has CAUSED every wail of human woe. It has caused all our problems and evils.

What's Ahead, Now!

Sir Winston Churchill said before the American Congress, "There is a PURPOSE being worked out here below." That PURPOSE involves a seven-thousand-year duration. God has allotted the first six thousand years to allow man to believe and

obey or disbelieve and disobey — that is, to go the way of "GIVE" or the way of "GET." He has decreed that man must choose. Man has chosen the way of "get." Now the six thousand years are just about up.

And man's self-centered way of life is now bringing crises of many kinds which are accelerating all over the world. The prophecies of God's revealed Word to man show this. They show that we are right now coming to the SUPREME CRISIS at the close of this age — a time of world trouble "such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened [the evils cut short], there should no flesh be saved [alive]; but for the elect's sake [those few who do believe and obey] those days shall be shortened" (Matthew 24:21-22).

This 24th chapter of Matthew records how Jesus' disciples asked, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world" — that is, this age? The only sign he

gave by which we should KNOW when this 6,000-year age would end is in verse 14: "And this gospel of the kingdom [of God] shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

And now, for the first time in 18½ centuries, that gospel of the Kingdom of God is being proclaimed to all the world by this very work of God. Recently I, personally, have been privileged to proclaim it to leaders at the top of many nations around the world.

That message announces that God will, now, soon intervene in world affairs and bring an *enforced* world peace and 1,000 years of happiness and abundance worldwide.

And God "shall send Jesus Christ... whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things" (Acts 3:20). Christ will soon return, in the supreme power and glory of the great God, and the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of




A CLOSE-UP of Prince Mikasa and Herbert W. Armstrong.

his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever (Revelation 11:15). Men and armies will resist. They will fight back. But by supernatural power men will be forced to have peace, happiness, abundance! □

PRINCE MIKASA, brother of the Emperor of Japan, offers a toast to Herbert W. Armstrong at banquet in Mr. Armstrong's honor in Tokyo, September 26. Fifty-eight distinguished guests, including members of the Cabinet, the Diet (Japan's Congress or Parliament), presidents of the two largest universities, and their wives, attended. Mr. Armstrong proclaimed to this distinguished gathering the good news (gospel) of the Kingdom of God. From left to right, Ambassador Mekasha of Ethiopia, Princess Mikasa, Mr. Stanley R. Rader, Mr. Armstrong, Prince Mikasa, Mrs. Mekasha.





the Arabs' stake in the Middle East

by Richard C. Peterson

Amman, Jordan

MOST OF US who live in the urbanized Western nations have a very casual relationship with the land upon which we live — if we have any land at all! In the United States, for instance, the average homeowner moves from one property to another about every five years. Similar patterns are now evident in many population centers of Europe. Normally, the Western man's selection of a home is not regarded as a permanent decision. A home is viewed from the start as something to be easily disposed of as one moves up or down the economic ladder.

Not So in the Middle East!

In the Middle East, however, land carries a much broader significance. The roots of the majority of the people who call these arid hills and plains their home run deep.

To families in this area of the world, the land is tightly interwoven into almost every facet of their daily lives. For many, of course, the often parched, barren earth of the Middle East is the source of their very means to survival. Even the most affluent urban Arab shares this in common with the poorest rural *fellah*. The very essence of their national identity, the roots of their religion, culture and unifying sense of shared destiny are firmly embedded in the very soil of this timeless land.

"One's Own Land"

For these and other social and economic reasons, the factor of land is of central importance to the often ethnically diverse peoples today known collectively as Arabs.

As an example, land held by individual families has frequently been in those families through many generations. Parents and other close relatives may well be buried within its boundaries. To those living today, it is regarded an honor to bequeath, in turn, this normally modest but richly treasured inheritance to their children, and those after them.

One Arab put it this way in explaining the complex, heartfelt desire "to live on one's own land": "We buried our dead there fifty years ago, two hundred years ago. I do not understand how anyone can say we should accept land in some other place [as compensation] when we are tied to this land. We have a spiritual tie. Our souls are bound to this land. Our traditions are bound to this land."

Because of this intensely emotional, unifying, identity-supplying bond the Arab has with his land, it is inevitable that the *struggle* for land — specifically the land of Palestine — lies at the core of the ex-

plosive drama now unfolding between the Arab peoples and their Israeli neighbors.

Who "Owns" Palestine?

Until this present century, Arabs were the primary residents of Palestine. Sweeping into the Levant in the seventh century A.D. during the initial outward spread of Islam from the Arabian peninsula, the Arabs proceeded to settle and develop a loose-knit society while vigorously converting the neighboring communities to their newly found faith. As Islam swelled across North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean, widely diverse peoples became united — first by the common thread of religion, today by the additional thrust of Arab nationalism.

Even though Arabic-speaking peoples — Moslem and Christian — have comprised the bulk of Palestine's population since the Jews' *diaspora* began in the second century A.D., the area has never been completely devoid of Jewish residents. The Jews in Palestine have waxed and waned according to the political and military climate through the centuries, moving in and out of the region as necessity required.

The attraction of Palestine for the Jews through the centuries has basically been religious. But in the middle to late 1800's, new political aspirations were being expressed by a long-dispersed people seeking a secure national homeland.

However, a Jewish return *en masse* to Zion, or Palestine, whether on religious grounds of divine grant or on legal claims of prior ownership, has provided an insurmountable obstacle to Arabs seeking an essentially Arabic society in the Middle East. The result has been today's enmity between nationalistic Israelis and equally nationalistic Arabs.

The Saudi Arabian ambassador to the U.N., Jamil Baroody, summed up the Arabic view during the October Middle East flareup: "Zionism [the Israeli political desire to establish a national homeland in

Palestine] was predicated on the premise that God gave Palestine to the Jews. And time and time again I have said that God was not in the real estate business." Israelis view it quite differently.

The Rallying Point

For an Arab "nation" traditionally torn by rifts and infighting from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, the "Palestinian question" has proved in many ways a successful — and convenient — rallying point. The more idealistic among the Arabs still cherish the dream of a future *Nahda*, or Arabic renaissance, uniting the massive lands of the Middle East and southern Mediterranean coasts under common banners of language, culture and religion. There is simply no room for a state of Israel in the midst of this idealistic vision. Thus the localized issue of the Palestinian problem has blossomed into a widespread, fervent marshalling of pan-Arabic emotions throughout the Arab world.

Also entering the picture is the intense religious attachment of the Arabs to Palestine. Though most in the Western world might assume the Holy Land to be important only to Christians and Jews, the area of Palestine and especially Jerusalem is of major significance to Moslems as well. Some of Islam's most sacred shrines are in Jerusalem, and the impact of having those holy places under the control of non-Islamic peoples has added greatly to the entire Middle East dilemma.

Who Is to Decide?

Thus, to Arabs as well as to Israelis, the enigmatic question of "Who will decide?" remains pivotal.

After all, *who* will finally determine the boundaries of nations and peoples so that all can live at peace? *Who* really owns the earth and *who* really determines the destinies of the Arab and Israeli peoples? Statesmen and diplomats seem to have forgotten the answer — if they ever knew. □

**SEE MAPS ON
FOLLOWING PAGES**

The Palestinian Question A.D. 30-Present

No area on earth is more strategically located than the Holy Land. Throughout its history, the country has been exposed to political pressures from all directions. For the past 19 centuries, it has been subject to one or another of the great empires ruling the West. Only briefly, under the dynasty of

David and later the Hasmonaeans, has the country been independent of foreign rule. Today, the Holy Land is the focal point of a dual struggle between Arab and Israeli, and between the Soviet Union and the West. Indirectly, all nations are involved through the United Nations peace-keeping force.



Herodian Kingdom in the Time of Jesus

The Herodian family were vassal kings under the early Roman Empire. In the first century B.C., Rome conquered Syria, Judaea and Egypt and, after 40 B.C., allotted Judaea and Galilee to Herod. After the death of Mark Antony, Herod's realm was expanded to include Samaria and the major part of Coelesyria. The map depicts the realm of Herod Agrippa I (A.D. 37-44). The Jewish revolt of A.D. 66-70 occurred under the rule of Herod Agrippa II.



Byzantine Empire

Roman rule over Palestine continued after the sundering of the empire into western and eastern (Byzantine) divisions. With the exception of the brief Persian rule of Chosroes II (A.D. 611-628), Byzantine rule over Palestine continued until 636. In that year, Emperor Heraclius was defeated by Caliph Omar at the battle of the Yarmuk River near the Sea of Galilee. This year marked the beginning of Omayyad rule and 13 centuries of Islamic culture in Palestine.




Moslem Expansion

The Moslem Empire reached its greatest extent under the Omayyad dynasty. Their rule extended from Spain in the West to Turkestan in the East. In A.D. 750, the Omayyads were deposed by the Abassids, and the capital was moved from Damascus to Baghdad. In 936, Egypt declared its independence under a line of caliphs who descended from Fatima, daughter of the prophet Mohammed. The Fatimids took over Palestine and founded El Kahira (Cairo) the same year.



Crusader

The rule of the Fatimids over most of the Holy Land extended to the coming of the Crusaders in 1099. The Crusader principalities in Syria and Palestine maintained their authority until 1187, at which time the whole region, except for certain cities on the Lebanese coast, fell before the new Ayyubid rulers of Egypt. Crusader dominion was revived over parts of the Holy Land in 1192. The Crusader dominion was finally ended in 1291 by the Mamelukes, descendants of mercenary troops who at first served and then overthrew the Ayyubids.



Ottoman Empire

The Mamelukes continued to rule over Syria, Palestine and Egypt until the expansion of the Ottoman Turks. In 1516, the Ottoman Sultan Selim I crushed the Mamelukes and added Syria and Palestine to his dominion. Egypt was taken in 1517. The Turks continued to govern Palestine until World War I. Jerusalem was surrendered by the Turks to the British General Sir Edmund Allenby on December 9, 1917.




British Mandate

The Council of the League of Nations gave Britain a mandate to administer Palestine on July 24, 1922. The document which underlay the British regime, the Balfour Declaration of 1917, was marked with such ambiguity that Britain's rule ended in a sordid and precipitate withdrawal in 1948. The British found it impossible to "establish in Palestine a national homeland for the Jewish people," and at the same time do nothing that would "prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities."



Israel and Occupied Territory

On May 14, 1948, the faded remnants of British mandate rule were superseded by proclamation of the state of Israel. The first Middle East war immediately ensued. The disputed borders which came from that war existed until the third Mideast war of 1967. Territories occupied by Israel in that war have been a source of contention in the United Nations ever since.



“Peace must come!”

SAY PALESTINIAN ARABS AND ISRAELIS

by Christopher J. Patton

Decades of war have taken their toll. Both Arabs and Israelis have had enough. Both want peace — but do they think it will come? The Plain Truth took a survey to find out.

Jerusalem

WHILE GOVERNMENT leaders are trying to hammer out a stable peace in the Middle East, the people wait — and hope.

The problems involved with making peace between warring peoples are always difficult. The problems involved with making peace between the Arabs and the Israelis are almost beyond description.

All want peace; the religious pray for it. Yet its attainment has thus far proved elusive?

Justice for Both Sides

The majority of people here are realistic. They don't expect immediate results from negotiations or war. When asked what Arabs and Israelis should do to make peace, a young Palestinian Arab, home on vacation from a Swedish university, wisely said, "To come to conclusions based on justice for both sides." He felt that justice could be determined by means of U.N. resolutions agreed to by the superpowers. He saw no other alternative "because the real power is shared by the United States and the Soviet Union. If I want to say the truth, the war is not between Arabs and Israelis. It's between these two great forces. If they want peace, they can force both sides to settle this problem because both of them have an interest in this land."

In fact, the interest of most of the world has been drawn to the Middle East by the currently successful employment of "oil politics" by the Arabs. For them, the implementation of "justice for both sides" as they see it, will come about if they can prod the world community, especially the United States, into forcing Israel to accept what they consider a just solution: returning Arab lands and granting independence to the Palestinian people.

Oil Politics

The head of a taxi agency in East Jerusalem gives the reason behind the use of oil as a prod: "This is a very important thing. We are now very lucky because we feel that all the European countries and America herself will now begin to understand... that there is an Arab people and something they call Palestine and people called Palestinians. Before, they didn't care. This I think is very good."

He didn't think that the withholding of oil would make the Europeans or Americans mad at the Arabs because "we are a very friendly people with all people in the whole world." When asked if he thought the governments might get angry with the Arabs, he replied, "I think so, but I don't know. The Middle East and especially the Arab countries are very rich in petrol. I think America and Europe need our petrol. In any case, we want to be friendly with all countries."

An East Jerusalem souvenir salesman named Esa Wayway put it more succinctly: "We're interested that peace come. We don't cut off the oil [as an action] against the American people, but for political reasons and to make America stop helping Israel to make war. The American people are not our enemy."

The Israelis, of course, view "oil politics" in a different light. They fear that any peace agreement reached under the pressure of "oil politics" will not lead to "real peace" but rather to another war.

Peggy Schlossberg, a Tel Aviv housewife who works in Jerusalem as a violinist in the Israel Broadcasting Orchestra, gives the Israeli view:

Q: Do you think the Arab oil boycott has complicated the chances for peace?

A: Yes, it puts, in a way, Europe against us. They [the Arabs] will use it every time against Europe or against anybody as a form of blackmail. They might give back the oil

tomorrow or resume deliveries. And then anytime there's anything that bothers them or they want to upset anybody, they'll just turn it off.

Q: Do you think this will bring Europe more directly into conflict with Israel?

A: I don't think they'll be very happy about us. They're not happy about us now. They'll be less happy about us in the future.

Joseph, an Orthodox graduate student of history, added what he thought the Europeans and other countries should do: "I think the Europeans must, if they don't want to be blackmailed more and more, send in troops and take by force the oil fields. If they don't do it now, it'll be too late." Other Israelis thought the Europeans might like to take over the oil fields but didn't think they'd have the power to do it.

A new immigrant from Argentina and now a Jerusalem store manager, Mr. Newelman, sums it up: "The people of Israel must have security. Some think there's security in peace agreements. I think this is impossible... because oil is the last word in this war."

Secure Borders?

So much of the talk revolving around a peace agreement centers on the question of land and boundary lines. Egypt, Syria, Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs want their lands back. Israel wants "secure borders," which to many Israelis means physical possession of certain key, geographical positions. In reality, the problem is not one of borders, but one of trust.

The Arabs don't trust Zionism. They interpret Zionist aims as the expansion of the state of Israel to include all land originally promised to Abraham in the Hebrew Bible, that is, from the Nile to the Euphrates.

The Israelis don't trust Arab pronouncements proclaiming their desire for peace. Remembered all too fully are the threats of destruction and annihilation — mostly of the

past, but occasionally voiced today by extremists.

Both sides want peace — but on their own terms.

The Palestinian Arabs live with an uncertain future. For that reason, most local Arabs questioned did not want to give their names, and a number didn't want to answer any questions at all. The following interview is typical of the Palestinian view. The man interviewed is the headmaster of a school.

Q: Do you think there will be peace between the Israelis and the Arabs?

A: Under the present conditions, I don't see that there will be a lasting peace, because the two sides have different ways. Lasting peace will come when everyone is ready to give to others, for the two sides to approach each other.

Q: What should be done for the Palestinians?

A: In my opinion, a lasting settlement for the Palestinians is to give them the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Jerusalem, under their own government. Not for Jordan or Egypt — just for the Palestinians. Also, to help them to make their government recognized worldwide, stable and efficient.

Q: What should be done with the Israelis? Where should they live?

A: First of all, the Israelis must give up, not all the lands, but most of the lands captured in 1967 — at least. If the Arabs will give the Israelis the right to live here with their own land and government, there will be cooperation between the Arabs and the Israelis in many forms.

Q: Would you agree to a period of U.N. administration of a Palestinian state as a transition?

A: Yes, for a little while.

Q: This might include the internationalization of Jerusalem. Would you favor that?

A: Yes. It's better for everyone to have his part of the city.

The only important variation between the above interview and the position taken by a minority of Palestinians questioned is that the latter would press for Israel to return

to the 1948 lines. An even smaller minority would like to see Israel totally destroyed as a political entity, but most holding this view live outside of Palestine.

If Shmuel Gazit, an Orthodox soldier who fought with the Israeli tank corps in the Golan during the last war could believe that schoolmaster, there might be a chance for peace. However, he has a totally different story.

Q: Do you think there will be peace?

A: I want peace, but the Arabs don't want it. I've seen what they did to my friends.

Q: Is it Arab leaders or the people who don't want peace?

A: I know what the soldiers did. When I came to the Golan Sunday after Yom Kippur, I found my friends cut with knives [at this point, he gestured, indicating mutilation of the body]. It's not the leaders. It's the soldiers who want to kill us.

Q: Do you think Israel should give up any territories in a peace agreement?

A: If the Arab wants a little — he wants all. If one of them says: "If Israel gives back, I make peace. They don't mean it. The Arabs want Israel. I tell you one thing. Anyone who wants to make peace by giving something — fine. Everyone wants peace, but give me one Arab, one in all the world, who wants peace [by giving something]. I live in Jerusalem. I've worked with Arabs in Old Jerusalem. I know.

Q: What kind of work?

A: I am a teacher. I teach their teachers Hebrew. So, I asked them what they wanted. I said, "I won't kill you. Tell me the truth. What do you want?" They replied, "I don't want you here, that's all." They said that they all want peace, but without me.

Q: Not in Israel at all?

A: They want all of Israel. They don't want that I be here. If I'd be in Germany... ah, it's good.

Battle-hardened soldiers aren't the only ones who are pessimistic about the chances for a "real

peace." Peggy Schlossberg doesn't think peace can come from the negotiations. She foresees an almost endless struggle of unfortunate sadness.

Q: What effect will this past war have on Israel's future strength?

A: We must have a larger standing army. Life isn't going to be the same anymore. It's going to be terribly expensive and terribly hard. I would like to feel that something good will come of it, but I'm rather cynical and skeptical. Is anybody hopeful?

Q: What do you think would be necessary for peace to come?

A: Oh... I don't know. Do you think they really want to have peace with us? I think we would like to have peace with them. I don't really think they want to have peace with us. That's the point.

Q: Do you mean the leaders or the people?

A: Well look, let's face it. The people themselves would tomorrow get together and be friends, obviously — any people. It's always the leaders... I wish that everybody could have peace, but how can they?

The majority of Israelis are willing to give back at least some of the territories in a peace agreement. Indeed, the heavy losses incurred during the recent war, together with the mounting international pressure, have forced a growing number of Israelis to reevaluate the old guarantees of huge buffer zones manned by Israel Defense Forces.

These Israelis are contemplating the likelihood that Israel will be forced to withdraw from most of the territories. Therefore, in order to replace the security given by holding these militarily strategic areas, they are looking for guarantees more palatable to the international community, and yet, just as sure. Even so, this new diplomatic strategy is still based on an innate distrust of Arab intentions.

Wanted: Friendliness

Musa el-Basty, a Palestinian high school graduate accepted to a New Jersey college, agrees with Peggy on

the importance of friendship between peoples.

Q: What would it take to bring peace to the Middle East?

A: First of all, peace in any part of the world depends on justice. If there is justice, there is peace. If there is no justice, there is no peace. If each one likes the other, then they will be all right together — even if they're black or white, Moslem or Jew, Christian or anything else. [Musa is a Moslem, but is "not so religious."] If there is no friendship, it means there is no peace, because each one wants to take what he believes is his. That's why friendship is the most important condition for peace.

Q: What can be done to eliminate the bitterness between these peoples?

A: It's not easy. Why? Because when they are young, they are taught that so and so is his enemy, that side his friend. When they grow up, this idea is ingrained in them. It takes time to live together and to get to know each other. That is the way to change people for the better.

Q: Then it's a matter of education?

A: Yes.

Q: What should be included in a practical solution to the problem?

A: The problem is, you know, a land problem. It happens everywhere, but not as big as this problem here. In this case, it's very big. People are pushed out of their homes and other people live in them. It's not a piece of land like a desert or a mountain where nobody lives. It would be easier if it was. But homes and many families are involved. It's a very difficult feeling, you know, when I am outside of my home and someone else is in it. [Many Jews who have suffered a similar experience would agree.] If he divides my home to me and to him, it would be better. All people should live together, even if we are Moslem, Christian or Jew.

But How?

Who is to determine what justice is? The decision admittedly must be made by a third party respected by

both sides and not by the Arabs and Israelis themselves. For this reason, some consider the U.N. likely to be the fairest judge. However, U.N. decisions are not formulated according to moral considerations but according to political ones. Consequently, it has been unable to bring peace to the world in the 28 years of its existence. Although the U.N. does provide some valuable services to mankind through its branch agencies, it has failed its central purpose.

World leaders say negotiations are the only way to a just peace, but in the same breath, they talk of "negotiation from a position of strength." This attitude automatically precludes the chances for an impartial decision.

International politics aside, the root cause of any war lies in the nature of the warring parties themselves. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not; ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war, yet ye have not..." wrote James, the brother of Jesus, nine centuries ago (James 4:1-2).

Unfortunately, as the Palestinian headmaster observed, the Israelis and the Arabs have "different ways." "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" (Amos 3:3.) Peace is impossible to attain unless people can reach genuine agreement. What will it take before both Arab and Israeli replace their mutual distrust with the outgoing concern typified by the selfless love of true friends?

A Needed Change

Joel Horowitz, a soldier who served in Jerusalem during the 1967 war, was asked if he thought peace would come. He replied: "Something can take place, but under the present circumstances, nothing will change. If men's minds would change as a result of war, perhaps..."

A change in the human attitude toward the Creator God and his law

is the first requirement for lasting peace. War is proof that none of the peoples in the Middle East are genuinely obeying God, for "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him" (Proverbs 16:7).

Joel Horowitz observed that it wouldn't be easy to change the human mind. It would take some drastic action. In fact, man by himself cannot change his nature. It takes the personal intervention of God. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people and I will be your God" (Ezekiel 36:26-28).

Notice that God includes the solution to the question of territory along with how he is going to make it possible for man to obey him and live in peace. God has already set aside for Palestinian Arabs, Jews and every other people their own "national home." After all, he is the only one in the position to decide where the diverse human families should live: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein" (Psalm 24:1).

Throughout history, God has given man the opportunity to obey him and live in peace. Mankind has done neither. So what will God do for mankind?

"Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth" (Psalm 46:8-10).

Yes, peace will come to the Middle East. But it will take God to bring it. □



Dexter Faulkner — Plain Truth

JAPAN'S STAKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The economic survival of Japan is at stake. Will a new world role be forced on Japan to meet the need for Middle East oil?

PEACE IN the Middle East is a crucial concern to the Japanese. With dedication and resourcefulness, the Japanese have set astounding records in industrial production and economic growth. These accomplishments are now thrown into jeopardy by an unstable Middle East.

Needed — More Than an Energetic People

Japan's greatest natural resource may be her energetic people. But it is another form of energy that Japan must have in order to maintain her record of achievement and her national existence!

That is oil.

Most of the citizens of Japan are painfully aware that over 80 percent of the oil which powers the nation's steel, textile and manufacturing industries, fuels its transportation, and heats, cools and lights its cities, comes from the Persian or Arabian Gulf. Forty-three percent comes from Arab nations that instituted production cutbacks of 25 percent to "nonfriendly" nations, the category in which Japan was placed in 1973. Fortunately for Japan, only Iran, a non-Arab oil supplier in the region (Iran now supplies about 37 percent of Japan's oil needs), did not slash scheduled production.

The resultant fuel shortage could not have come at a worse time, warned Kazutaka Kikawada, chairman of the board of trustees of the Japan Committee for Economic Development. (Japan was already experiencing soaring inflation and material shortages ranging from asphalt to zinc!)

No other advanced nation is so vulnerable to an oil crisis. This island nation of 105 million people must import fully 99 percent of its oil supply. With oil consumption

growing at a rate of around 17 percent a year, Japan has been unable to accumulate more than a one- to two-month reserve.

On top of that, Japan is dependent on politically vulnerable American and European oil companies operating in the Middle East for supplying the bulk of her oil needs.

Japan's Worldwide Search for Oil

Only recently have Japanese companies successfully pursued independent oil development.

The spectacular Japanese search for additional supplies extends around the globe. Exploration and development projects are in operation in Alaska, Canada, Peru, Colombia, Zaire, Nigeria, Australia, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and South Vietnam.

Japan expects to triple its oil imports from the People's Republic of China to 3 million tons this year. It also hopes to participate in the development of Siberia's oil and gas deposits in return for supplies of crude oil and natural gas.

Yet despite her most desperate efforts, Japan must continue to depend on the Middle East for approximately 85 percent of its oil for at least five more years, according to Yasuhiro Nakasone, who is the head of MITI, Japan's powerful Ministry of International Trade and Industry.

Oil's Turbulent Wave

Any cutback in supplies immediately restricts the Japanese economy. Less than adequate oil means less than adequate power. A full two thirds of all power sources in Japan are generated by petroleum. Fully 77 percent of Japan's total electric power production is generated by oil-burning steam plants.

In addition, petroleum is the raw material component for the vast petrochemical industry, which produces plastics, textiles, tires, soaps and detergents, medicines, fertilizer and insecticides.

Cutbacks in production mean less

output for export. And Japan must export in order to pay for ever costlier Middle East oil imports. Japan expects to pay an extra \$2 billion to cover the higher price of oil by the close of the fiscal year, ending March 31.

Caught in the Middle

Japan is caught in the middle of a political, economic and military crossfire reverberating over the Middle East. Oil has placed a new emphasis on international "power" politics.

Saudi Arabian Oil Minister Ahmed Zaki al-Yamani announced from the Vienna headquarters of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) that "countries which are affected by oil reductions will be exempted on condition that they assist the Arabs in a very significant way in forcing the Israelis to withdraw from Arab territory." While Japan's leaders are not anti-Israel, they are of necessity very pro-oil.

Japan responded in November with declarations indicating a tilt in policy more favorable to the Arabs. This gained Japan exemption from the next 5 percent cut as planned under the oil embargo policy. It still left her supplies subject to review month by month and without any guarantee against further cuts.

The initial oil squeeze caught Japan in the untenable position of trying to satisfy her Arab suppliers of energy on the one hand, and the United States, her biggest customer, chief trade partner and military ally on the other.

The result is forcing Japan to adopt a new world role. She no longer can afford to be Uncle Sam's smiling Asian shadow. Japan will now have to decide just what changes in foreign policy will do the most to insure continuous movement of vital raw materials to her shores!

The task facing her is nearly insurmountable. The United States can offer little more than con-



Eiji Miyazawa — Black Star

JAPAN'S PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRY has grown to an enormous size from its inception in 1957. About 3,000 diverse items are now derived from oil products.

dolences. Resorting to a military arms buildup to protect her far-flung commercial enterprises, even if attempted, will not resolve her problems.

Yet to survive as an industrial nation, Japan must solve this dilemma.

A realistic evaluation brings us face to face with the reality that the energetic, ingenious Japanese — even with the most carefully devised national diplomacy — cannot solve this problem alone.

Japan needs a deliverer. And the ironic thing is, she needs the *same* deliverer that the Jews and Arabs need. And will have!

That Deliverer has promised to set up world government and to decide national boundaries. He has promised to ensure prosperity for all. That Deliverer and his announcement of the coming world-ruling kingdom or government of God has been proclaimed in the pages of this magazine for forty years!

You may already possess his unique government handbook. It's called the Bible. Request our booklet describing it, entitled *Read the Book*. It will be sent free of charge upon request.

— Rodney Repp

what our readers say

11 Years, and Still No Bill

I feel it is high time I should put across what I really feel about your literature. I got your first copy of *The PLAIN TRUTH* magazine in 1962. By receiving the copies which followed, I thought you were going to invoice me to meet the remittance for the copies. To my surprise up to now, I am still receiving *The PLAIN TRUTH* copies freely. It is so informative I did not believe that it could be free. Thanks a lot to those individuals, organizations and firms making voluntary donations from all over the world, who enable *The PLAIN TRUTH* magazine to continue to be produced and circulated to all parts of the world.

Lazarus S. M. C.,
Choma, Zambia

Unfair to Women?

La PURE VERITE [the French edition of *The PLAIN TRUTH*] is a remarkable magazine which helps me a great deal, but why doesn't one ever see any feminine by-lines in it? Are you misogynists?

E. N.
Mazet-Saint-Voy, France

• Have you read "Is God Unfair to Women?" in our January issue?

Report on Crime

If by chance a man was salvageable before imprisonment, his chances are far less afterwards. Society needs to be informed and not misinformed by rhetoric of the system which consistently shows a failure rate of 65-85 percent through reeducation. It is articles and reporting such as your magazine does which can prevent these problems to those who care for all men.

Richard L.,
Sandstone, Minnesota

I'm writing you in regard to your article on "The Making and Unmaking of a Youthful Criminal." . . . I think that your reports and coverage of all subjects have left us more informed, enlightened, and compassionate, as parents, citizens, and as human beings. You show your apparent deep devotion in the work you do to inform and report to us, as the public. Your time and efforts put forth in the public service of broadcasting and in print are greatly appreciated by us as well as others. You do a magnificent job.

Karyl E. N.,
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

What a Beautiful Job!

I just got my new *PLAIN TRUTH* concerning the year of Europe. What a beautiful job *The PLAIN TRUTH* did on the cover and the whole magazine. We are anxious to read it; we need to be informed about Europe, which takes us beyond the scenes. Thank you for the finest looking magazine yet.

Mr. and Mrs. Lynn B.,
Denver, Colorado

I received your October issue of *The PLAIN TRUTH* yesterday. As a special issue, it is a jewel in that its theme of Europe-U. S. relations — always an important topic — has been slighted by our news media to favor our recent political scandals and other internal problems of inflation and price control. It is a real comfort to be able to read a magazine which deals so authoritatively with the "whole" picture regardless of the topic.

J. T. M.,
Paramount, California

Permit me to congratulate you on the current issue. I have not read, in any of the news magazines or prestigious publications that feature international reporting and analysis, anything that compares with the depth, insight, and completeness of the steadily eroding American relations with present-day Europe. In addition, may I also extend my congratulations to your art director for the layout, illustration, and artistic merit of this issue.

Irving C.,
Rego Park, New York

Urban Ills Can Be Cured

For several years I have been the recipient of *The PLAIN TRUTH* magazine, but the June 1973 issue was of special significance because your article "Urban Ills Can Be Cured — Here's How!" included the city of Columbia, Maryland. It is in this city and with the Rouse Company that one of our sons is employed in the legal department; therefore, we have been there and we can verify everything in that article.

The important thing is that I wish to receive a copy of the magazine — *The PLAIN TRUTH* — June 1973, because we sent my copy to our son there in Columbia. If it is at all possible to grant this wish, your kindness will be greatly appreciated.

Furthermore, we have watched Columbia, Maryland, grow since 1970 and we hope to visit our son there again this summer, because it is so very restful in that beautiful atmosphere.

Mrs. Carolyn M.,
Saint Louis, Missouri

Just What Is the Plain Truth?

It seems to me that the presentation and especially the form of your articles are much more adapted to a readership having an Anglo-Saxon mentality. I think they are more pragmatic and mercantile than French.

C. B.,
Chateauroux, France

I should like to express my thanks and appreciation for including me in your *PLAIN TRUTH* mailing list. I find your articles interesting, stimulating, and very much to the point. Indeed, I am using them as material for discussion with my students at Falkirk Technical College where I teach. I

am taking the liberty of placing the copies which you send on the bookshelf in my classroom where I put publications not provided by our college library. I have noticed that *The PLAIN TRUTH* is much read by students; from time to time, it disappears from the shelf and turns up on a table in the Staff Common Room. I retrieve it after it has been read. It is obviously of interest to many members of our college.

A. I. B.,
Glasgow, Scotland

I think most of your articles are good. I regret to sometimes find in them chauvinism, reaction and paternalism which are not always justified by biblical texts, but rather by Anglo-Saxon tradition

J. H.,
Longjumeau, France

I must congratulate you on the important topics you deal with — they are so relevant to the topsy-turvy world of today. Keep up with the good work of spreading your little seed of goodwill and godliness. It will yield a rewarding harvest some day.

Mary N. S.,
County Kerry, Irish Republic

I wish to thank you for the copies of *The PLAIN TRUTH* magazine. I have lent the magazine to several friends of mine. We have organized an exclusive circle called "The Plain Truth Circle" in which all your articles and comments are fully discussed and analysed. This opens our minds and keeps us in touch with what is going on (and what has gone on) in this troubled world.

Carlos P. de C.,
Amadora, Portugal

It is not an exaggeration to say that there is a vast difference between *The PLAIN TRUTH* and other magazines. This difference lies in the careful selection of articles published in *The PLAIN TRUTH*. For me it is not simply a magazine. It is a textbook that provides its readers with that sort of knowledge that is not to be found in any other publication. It is the philosophy of life expressed in the plain and simple language that no one will fail to understand. The contents thereof could not possibly be valued in money.

M. S. A. K.,
Hyderabad, India

Please do not send any more *PLAIN TRUTH* magazines. Though some of the articles are very good, there were too many articles on sex.


Mrs. L. F. N.,
Tuscumbia, Alabama

I have been introduced to your magazine *The PLAIN TRUTH* by my friend, a medical practitioner. He has been placing some of your articles, published in the magazine, before his patients for their perusal in the waiting room. I, too, would like to follow the practice which would surely enlighten the readers and further go to fortify their faith in Almighty God.

Dr. Praful C. V.,
Umrah, India

Garner Ted Armstrong

Heard daily worldwide. A thought-provoking broadcast bringing you the real meaning of today's world news—with advance news of the WORLD TOMORROW!



U. S. TV STATIONS

East

WASHINGTON, D.C. — Channel 7, WMAL-TV, 10 a.m. Sun., 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 NEW YORK — Channel 9, WOR-TV, 8 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10 p.m. Sun.
 BUFFALO, N. Y. — Channel 2, WGR-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SCHENECTADY-ALBANY, N. Y. — Channel 6, WRGB-TV, 6:25 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 PORTLAND, ME. — Channel 13, WGAN-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 WILKES-BARRE, PA. — Channel 28, WBRE-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

Central

GREEN BAY, WIS. — Channel 2, WBAY-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SIOUX FALLS, S.D. — Channel 11, KELO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KEARNEY, NEB. — Channel 13, KHOL-TV, 8 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 4 p.m. Sun.
 CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA — Channel 9, KCRG-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 KANSAS CITY — Channel 4, WDAF-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 WICHITA, KAN. — Channel 3, KARD-TV, 11 a.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ST. LOUIS, MO. — Channel 11, KPLR-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sat.
 DAYTON, OHIO — Channel 7, WHIO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 STEUBENVILLE, OHIO — Channel 9, WSTV-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
 TOLEDO, OHIO — Channel 13, WSPD-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 CHICAGO — Channel 32, WFLD-TV, 10 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ROCK ISLAND, ILL. — Channel 4, WHBF-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FT. WAYNE, IND. — Channel 15, WANE-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

South

CHARLOTTE, N. C. — Channel 9, WSOC-TV, 12 p.m. Sun., 6:15 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 LYNCHBURG, VA. — Channel 13, WLVA-TV, 9:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 RICHMOND, VA. — Channel 8, WXEX-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

PORTSMOUTH, VA. — Channel 10, WAVY-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 1:00 p.m. Sun.
 NASHVILLE — Channel 8, WSIX-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 TULSA, OKLA. — Channel 8, KTUL-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
 AMARILLO, TEX. — Channel 10, KFDA-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 2:30 p.m. Sat.
 FORT WORTH-DALLAS — Channel 11, KTVT, 11 p.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 HOUSTON — Channel 39, KHIV-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 NEW ORLEANS — Channel 6, WDSU-TV, 5:45 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 3:00 p.m. Sat.
 MOBILE, ALA. — Channel 10, WALA-TV, 6:25 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ATLANTA, GA. — Channel 11, WQXI-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 TAMPA, FLA. — Channel 8, WFLA-TV, 6:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

Mountain States

TUCSON, ARIZ. — Channel 9, KGUN-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 1:00 p.m. Sat.
 DENVER, COLO. — Channel 4, KOA-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sat., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Channel 7, KOAT-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

West Coast

SEATTLE — Channel 7, KIRO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SPOKANE, WASH. — Channel 6, KHQ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 2:00 p.m. Sun.
 PORTLAND, ORE. — Channel 6, KOIN-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 FRESNO, CALIF. — Channel 24, KMJ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 2:00 p.m. Sat.
 LOS ANGELES — Channel 9, KHJ-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 OAKLAND — Channel 2, KTVU-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sat.
 SAN DIEGO — Channel 10, KGTV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 SAN JOSE — Channel 11, KNTV-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
 STOCKTON, CALIF. — Channel 13, KOVR-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

U. S. RADIO STATIONS

East

WHAM — Rochester, N. Y. — 1180 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sun.
 WRCP — Philadelphia, Pa. — 1540 kc., Mon.-Sat. 12 noon, Sun. 10:30 a.m.

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 & 11:30 p.m. Sun.
 WRVA — Richmond, Va. — 1140 kc., 10 p.m. daily.

Central

WCKY — Cincinnati — 1530 kc., 5:05 a.m. daily, 1:05 a.m. Tues.-Sun., 12:05 a.m. Mon.
 KXEL — Waterloo — 1540 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun., 105.7 FM, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
 WWWE — Cleveland — 1100 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 11:00 p.m. Sun.

South

WLAC — Nashville — 1510 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 a.m. & 7:00 p.m. Sun.
 KRLD — Dallas — 1080 kc., 5 a.m. & 11 p.m. daily, (92.5 FM 5 a.m. daily).
 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.
 WWL — New Orleans — 870 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
 KAAV — Little Rock — 1090 kc., 5:15 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 WHAS — Louisville, Ky. — 840 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8:00 p.m. Sun.

Mountain States

KOA — Denver — 850 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
 KSL — Salt Lake City — 1160 kc., 5:06 a.m., 11:10 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 5:00 a.m. & 11:25 p.m. Sun.
 KOB — Albuquerque, N. M. — 770 kc., 11:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m. Sun.

West Coast

KIRO — Seattle — 710 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat.
 KWJJ — Portland — 1080 kc., 8:00 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.
 KRAK — Sacramento — 1140 kc., 9 p.m. daily.
 KLAC — Los Angeles — 570 kc., 10:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8:30 a.m. Sun.
 KFRE — Fresno — 940 kc., 9 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 10 a.m. Sun.

ABOVE IS A PARTIAL LISTING OF STATIONS. FOR A COMPLETE LIST WRITE TO THE EDITOR.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE PLAIN TRUTH OFFICE NEAREST YOU

- *United States:* P. O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91123
- *Canada:* P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver 1, B.C.
- *México:* Institución Embajador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D. F.
- *Colombia:* Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.
- *United Kingdom, Europe, India, Africa and the West Indies:* P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., England
- *South Africa, Mauritius and Malawi:* P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg
- *Rhodesia:* P. O. Box A94, Avondale, Salisbury
- *Australia and Southeast Asia:* G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia
- *New Zealand and Pacific Isles:* P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand
- *The Philippines:* P. O. Box 1111, Makati, Rizal D-708

720621-0503-9 31 P024

MRS DAVID A BRAUN
5656 S INDIANA AVE
CUDAHY WI 53110

BE SURE TO NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY of any change in your address. Please include your old mailing label and your new address. **IMPORTANT!** The publisher assumes no responsibility for return of unsolicited art work, photographs or manuscripts.

Printed in U.S.A.

UPCOMING ARTICLES

RUSSIA'S REAL PURPOSE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Soviet foreign policy is opportunistic, but the overall goal remains the same: the ultimate triumph of Russian communism.



...TILL DIVORCE DO US PART

Divorce has become the accepted solution to an unhappy marriage. But is divorce the right solution?



NUCLEAR ENERGY AND ALTERNATIVES

Proven oil reserves will near exhaustion in 40 years. Crash programs to develop new energy sources are imperative if civilization, as we know it, is to survive.



THE MAN WHO DIED TO MAKE MEN FREE

What kind of man was Jesus of Nazareth? Did he really die for the sins of mankind? Was he resurrected?

