

the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

JANUARY 1978

6




**WHY
AMERICA
IS IN
GLOBAL
RETREAT**


16



**HAPPY
NEW
YEAR!?**



10



**DEPRESSION:
OVERCOMING THE
GRAY
MENACE**

**FEEDING
THE
WORLD:
WHOSE
RESPONSIBILITY?**

24

the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

Vol. XLIII, No. 1

January 1978

ARTICLES

Is God Fair?	2
The Real Jesus: The Struggle With Satan	4
Why America Is in Global Retreat	6
Depression: Overcoming the Gray Menace	10
What Does It Mean To Turn the Other Cheek?	14
Happy New Year!?	16
Alternatives to Growth: Living Within Our Limits	19
The Potter Wasp's Unusual Hanging Act	22
Feeding the World—Whose Responsibility?	25
When Were the New Testament Books Written?	28
The Quest for Immortality	30
A New Look at an Old Commandment	32

FEATURES

Personal from Herbert W. Armstrong	1
In Brief	35
Questions and Answers	36
TV Log	38
Garner Ted Armstrong Speaks Out!	40
Why Not?	42
Letters: Orchids and Onions	45

Cover credits: Doug Bevins (lower left);
Mark Godfrey—Magnum (lower right).

The Plain Truth is published monthly (except combined August-September and October-November issues) by Ambassador Publishing Company, Pasadena, California 91123. Copyright © 1977 Ambassador College. All rights reserved. Second-class postage paid at Pasadena, CA, and at additional mailing offices. PRINTED IN U.S.A. AND ENGLAND.
United States: P. O. Box 111, Pasadena, California 91123
Canada: P. O. Box 44, Station A, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2M2.
Mexico: Institución Ambassador, Apartado Postal 5-595, México 5, D.F.
Colombia: Apartado Aéreo 11430, Bogotá 1, D.E.
United Kingdom, Europe, Africa: P. O. Box 111, St. Albans, Herts., AL2 3TR England
Rhodesia: P. O. Box U.A.30, Union Ave., Salisbury

South Africa, Mauritius and Malawi: P. O. Box 1060, Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa 2000
Australia, India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia: G.P.O. Box 345, Sydney NSW 2001, Australia
New Zealand and Pacific Isles: P. O. Box 2709, Auckland 1, New Zealand
The Philippines: P. O. Box 2603, Manila 2801
West Indies: P. O. Box 6063, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936
Switzerland: Case Postale 10, 91, rue de la Servette, CH-1211, Geneva 7.
Scandinavia: Box 2513 Solli, Oslo 2 Norway

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

The Plain Truth — SUPPORTED BY YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS

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

Editor-in-Chief: HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Editor: GARNER TED ARMSTRONG

Assistant to the Editor: Robert L. Kuhn
Senior Editors: C. Wayne Cole, David Jon Hill, Raymond F. McNair, Roderick C. Meredith

Managing Editor: Brian W. Knowles

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

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

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

Women's Consultant: Carole Ritter

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

Copy Editors: Ron Beideck, Peter Moore, Clayton Steep
Publishing Coordinator: Roger G. Lippross

News Editor: Gene H. Hogberg

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

Art Director: Greg S. Smith

Art Staff: Randall Cole, Ronald Grove

Photography: Photo Services Director: Warren Watson; Staff: David Armstrong, Charles Buschmann, Ken Evans, Joyce Hedlund, Alfred Hennig

Photo Files: Manager: Alan Leiter; Linda Lulkoski

Circulation Manager: E. J. Martin; Staff: Mark Armstrong, Gordon Muir, Boyd Leeson

Business Manager: Raymond L. Wright

Director of Pastoral Administration: Ronald L. Dart

International Division: Leslie McCullough

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

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

Founder, President and Publisher:
HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

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

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



Personal from...

The Beautiful Analogy of Human Reproduction

Some of the teachings in the Bible are a little hard for the average thinking mind to understand. James tells us to count it all joy when trials, ordeals, reverses beset us. Troubles a joy? That's pretty hard to accept, isn't it? And, for the average person, a lot harder to put into practice.

Few find any pleasure, let alone joy, in the obstacles and troubles they encounter. Yet this biblical teaching says we ought so to count them. There is a reason, although few understand it.

In one of the Psalms you'll read that the righteous are going to have to bear *many* afflictions. But, it promises, the Eternal will deliver us out of them all—if we believe and trust Him!

Again, it is through much tribulation that we must enter the Kingdom of God. Why? There's a reason!

Now consider another biblical teaching hard for some to understand.

About a year ago I wrote an article, now available in booklet form, *What Do You Mean—Born Again?* In the fifth chapter of Ephesians you find a husband-wife relationship pictured as corresponding to Christ and the Church. Scriptural teaching assures us that, at His coming, Christ is going to *marry* the Church. Also, the Scriptures teach that the Church will, at His coming, be *born* of God, by a resurrection of all who have died, and the instantaneous conversion from mortal to immortal of those then living (I Cor. 15:50-53).

So one man reasons: Could a full-grown man marry an infant girl baby, just born? If those in the Church are to be just then born of God, how can they marry Christ before they grow up?

This, too, seems difficult for some to comprehend. Yet the answer to James' teaching—the understanding of what James really means—is also the answer to this seeming inconsistency.

There is a third seeming inconsistency, hard for some to understand. About a year and a half ago in this column I explained how, contrary to the thinking of many, a Christian may—and too often does—actually commit sin *after* he is converted. He *should not*, of course.

But too often he does, and yet he still remains a Christian. The true explanation of James' teaching, first mentioned above, is also the explanation of this experience.

So let's understand!

Why were we born in the first place? What is the real purpose of human life? God Almighty the Creator is reproducing Himself! As truly as we mortal humans have been given power to reproduce ourselves—to bring forth progeny in our own image, born with our very nature—even so the Great God is bringing forth sons in His image, born with His very divine nature!

The very purpose of our existence is that we be begotten as God's children, and become born of Him.

And human reproduction is the very type of spiritual reproduction. What God created at the time described in the first chapter of Genesis was a physical creation. You'll find nothing spiritual there. In physical man, made of the dust of the ground, God created the material with which He may mold, shape, form, and create the spiritual being. He pictures us as the clay, Himself as the Potter—forming us into the spiritual image of His designing.

Now human reproduction, I say, pictures spiritual reproduction. Each human, since Adam and Eve, started from a tiny egg, called an ovum, the size of a pinpoint. It was produced in the body of the mother. The egg is incomplete, of itself. It has a life of only about 48 hours, according to some authorities. Unless fertilized by the life-giving sperm cell from the human father within that limited lifetime, it dies.

Each human, spiritually speaking, is like an egg. The average human lifetime is said to be 70 years. Adam was created incomplete, and each of us was born incomplete—that is, we were made to need the Holy Spirit of God. And unless, within our limited lifespan of some 70 years, we are begotten of God—by His Spirit which is His *immortal divine* LIFE, entering to impart eternal life to us—we shall die—and that shall be the end—except that God has appointed a resurrection of all who have lived, and, for those (Continued on page 43)

Is God Fair ?

by Herbert W. Armstrong

Look at the world today! War, famine, pestilence! Poverty, inequality, hunger, want! Sickness, disease, suffering, death! Crime, graft, dishonesty, corruption! Insanity, degeneration, decay! Unhappiness, fear, wretchedness and woe!

How, so many are asking, can a supreme, all-powerful God of love permit such human woe? Why is He permitting civilization itself to crumble?

Is God Fair?

Listen! Some men are saying, "God isn't fair!"—or "Is there a God, after all?" But what do you suppose men would say if God took away their right to think and do as they please? For God could never stop this awful carnage without *forcing* men to act according to His will—denying them a free will of their own!

It is men's ways, so contrary to God's ways, that have brought on

this unhappy state. And they have brought on all the world's sorrows and anguish in spite of the pleadings of God. He says, "Your ways are not my ways" (Isa. 55:8).

God's ways, had they been followed, would have led inevitably to peace, happiness, prosperity and joy. God always has revealed to men His ways. Always He has pleaded with the human family.

Suppose God had taken the only alternative. Suppose He had forced men, against their wills, to have lived according to His laws?

Can't you almost hear the defiant, rebellious, stiff-necked human race indignantly screaming at the Almighty: "You can't cram your religion down my throat!" For it is a matter of religion. Can't we see that had God followed that course, more than ever men would have shouted, "God isn't fair!"

For six thousand years men have lived in defiance of God's laws. Had

God denied them this right to be wrong, men would have accused God of injustice, demanding freedom to follow their own ways.

God's plan has for its purpose the creating of perfect CHARACTER in beings that are separate entities from God, yet members of the very family of God. Character cannot be created automatically by fiat—it must be developed through *experience!*

Nor could character be instilled without free moral agency. To achieve this great purpose—that of producing the supreme pinnacle of all God's creation, sons of God having perfect character—man has to be convinced, of his own free will, that God's laws are just, and that His ways are the only right ways for man! Man must turn to them, voluntarily! This lesson could be learned only by EXPERIENCE!

In the beginning, Satan appeared to contest the wisdom of God's law.

This law is, simply, love for God and love for neighbor, as defined in the ten broad principles of the Ten Commandments. A fundamental, spiritual, eternal law. The philosophy Christ taught is that it is more blessed to give than to receive. But Satan argued for the GETTING way. Competition, he argued, is the life-blood of activity. Self-desire provides incentive to endeavor. Vanity spurs to action. And so, in Satan's philosophy, self-desire, competition, strife, provide the root-principle for accomplishment. The way of getting is the way of progress and advancement.

Had not God permitted this selfish way to be tried, tested, and demonstrated, God's creatures could argue throughout eternity that they had been denied the better way.

The Devil's Week

And so God turned over to Satan the first six days of one week, consisting of seven one-thousand-year days, in which to demonstrate the falsity of this way—the way of greed.

During the first six days of this week of seven thousand years Satan was permitted to retain dominion over all the earth. "Six days," God said, "thou shalt labour, and do all thy work"—his work of deception and hate—"but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." Six thousand-year days have been permitted Satan for his labor of deception. Even then his dominion has been limited to the power of influence and suggestion. Never has God permitted even Satan arbitrarily to force men against their wills.

And so for nearly six thousand years men have been left free to accept the self-seeking competitive philosophy of Satan, or to follow the golden rule of God. And for six thousand years Satan has labored. And mankind has fallen for his delusion!

Satan's philosophy is the philosophy of the world today. On it our present civilization has been built. A civilization men love and cherish, and for which they patriotically sacrifice their lives! A civilization developed on desire for self-gain,

competition, strife! In its success is determined by how much a man has been able to get, not on how well he has served.

God has never left men in ignorance of the true way of life. Always He has made known the true values—the way of His spiritual law of love! Continually God has pleaded, with patience and in love. He pleaded through Noah in the days before the Flood. He set up a nation of His own on earth that pledged to follow His laws, dedicated voluntarily to God's ways of life. But ancient Israel turned from God's ways,

For six thousand years
men have lived in
defiance of God's laws.
Had God denied them
this right to be wrong,
men would have accused
God of injustice,
demanding freedom to
follow their own ways.

and persecuted and killed God's prophets!

God sent His only begotten Son to point men back to the true paths. And Him, too, men rejected and killed.

During these six thousand years since Adam, men continually have spurned God's love, rejected His law, turned a deaf ear to His prophets and His true ministers. They have built a world after the false philosophy of Satan, replete with its pagan customs, traditions and beliefs. Today people are hopelessly engulfed in these false ways, but, being deceived, realize it not at all!

Satan is revealed as the "god of this world" (II Cor. 4:4). The original inspired Greek should properly be translated, "the god of this age." And this worldly civilization worships its God. The appalling fact unrealized by the world is that Satan, not the Eternal, is its god! The Creator God "is not the author

of confusion," we read in I Corinthians 14:33. Its real author is Satan, the world's god! And so he has his many denominations and sects, all striving in a babylon of confusion!

The Devil's Work

Today the people of organized religion refuse to hear the law of the Lord (Isa. 30:8-11). They demand that their ministers preach the soft and smooth things—the deceits! They have turned away from the truth, and are accepting and believing fables (II Tim. 4:2-4).

Yes, Satan has *organized* religion. He himself appears, not as a devil with horns and a tail, bearing a pitchfork, but "is transformed into an *angel of light*" (II Cor. 11:14). His ministers are transformed as the ministers of righteousness, appearing as the apostles of Christ! (Verses 13, 15.) But they are preaching "*another Jesus*" (verse 4), in the power of "*another spirit*," and deceiving men with "*another gospel*" than the true gospel of the Kingdom which Christ brought and Paul and all the apostles preached! (Gal. 1:6-7.)

Satan's congregations go in for much *form*. "Having a *form* of godliness, but denying the *POWER* thereof: from such turn away," plainly warns God's Word! (II Tim. 3:5.) The present worldly order—its competitive principle, its customs and traditions, its political systems—are upheld by false churches within every land! Truly, all nations are deceived! (Rev. 12:9; 17:2; 18:3.)


Jesus Christ appeared 1900 years ago as a messenger bearing a message from God. He brought to an unhappy world steeped in false ways the "*good news of the KINGDOM OF GOD*." A Kingdom now, soon, to replace these crumbling governments on earth!

That Kingdom today is near at hand—even at the doors! (Luke 21:31.)

Thank God, we are near the end of the six working days allotted to Satan's dominion. God's thousand-year Sabbath day is just about to dawn!

There is a saying that it is darkest just before the dawn. Now we see on

(Continued on page 42)



THE STRUGGLE WITH SATAN

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." Thus begins the account of a cosmic battle of wills unique in all the history of the world.

by Garner Ted Armstrong

Jesus spoke at great length, in private, to His disciples about His encounter with Satan. The accounts of both Matthew and Luke, together with Mark's one paragraph establishing the time of the event (just before the beginning of His ministry and just after His baptism), prove that Christ discussed this monumental struggle with them in detail. Obviously, there were important lessons to be learned.

In this struggle, Jesus was qualifying to take over rulership of all the governments of the world—and He had to defeat the present world ruler at his own game, according to his own rules, on his own battlefield. It was to be the supreme battle, and the enemy had all the weapons.

Battle of the Ages

Previously named Lucifer ("shining star of the dawn," or "light-bringer"), this great being had formerly been an archangel and a personality extremely close to the God family. Jesus said, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke 10:18). Jesus was there, and took part in an earlier battle with Lucifer (Isa. 14: Ezek. 28) which had literally convulsed the heavens, rent the earth, exploded stars and planets, and filled space with the

junk of a gargantuan, titanic battle.

Anyone who wants to take the Bible literally as an actual communication to man from outer space—from God—would see the results of Satan's rebellion and battle against God in the panorama of universal destruction that is evident in the bleak, crater-pocked face of the moon, the desolate, lifeless waste of Mars, the impenetrable Venusian atmosphere, the billions of asteroids, meteors, and comets, all the space dust and gas. The whole universe bears testimony to this primal war in space that defies human imagination.

Satan had been confined to the earth—been "chained" by God's decree in a state called "hell" (Greek *tartaroo*) in II Peter 2:4—but was allowed to hold sway over the earth. Satan was a prince reigning over total destruction when that Person who was later to become God in the flesh came upon the scene as outlined in the first chapter of Genesis.

Once, the earth had teemed with billions of creatures. The atmosphere was completely different from today—almost universally tropical, with no polar ice caps, and with abundant, thick, luxuriant foliage providing both food and shelter for billions of creatures. Lucifer was originally given the earth as his re-

sponsibility, but the Bible says he tried to use earth as a base for his attempt to overthrow God from His throne. He failed, and, as John wrote, his "tail" (cometlike?) drew a third part of the "stars of heaven" (a common biblical symbol for angels) and "cast them to the earth" (read Rev. 12:3-9).

The total destruction of the earth's surface was the result, and the massive burial of whole continents teeming with plant and animal life—multiple billions of creatures—resulted in the storage of fossil energy for the use of man countless thousands of years yet in the future.

If scientists believe the earth to be 4½ billion years old, there is no quarrel with Scripture—even 10 billion years does not contradict the biblical record.

Of Cherubs, Serpents, and Dragons

John's twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse (meaning "to reveal," not "to destroy") is a quick summary of the whole time period which includes the conception of God's plan for His Church, Satan's rebellion and earth's destruction, Satan's attempt to destroy Christ through Herod's decree to kill all the children, and Satan's personal encounter with Jesus in the wilderness.

“And another portent appeared in heaven; behold, a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns, and seven diadems upon his heads. His tail swept down a third of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman who was about to bear a child, that he might devour her child when she brought it forth; she brought forth a male child, one who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron, but her child was caught up to God and to his throne” (Rev. 12:3-5, RSV).

Jesus knew what Satan looked like—both in an earlier, beautiful state, and in a later, more grotesque and ugly condition. He is called a “serpent” and a “dragon,” as well as “the cherub that covereth” in the Bible.

When the prophet Ezekiel saw the strange creatures covering God’s throne (Ezek. 1) he knew that they were cherubs. Most people believe cherubs appear as naked babes with cupid’s bows and arrows. Few realize that cherubs appeared to men in ancient times; that some of them were known from the time of Adam until Noah as the guardians of the garden of Eden. When God placed two cherubim with “flaming swords” there to guard the way to the tree of life, they *remained* there from that day until the destruction of Eden in the Flood. Remember, that means about one-sixth of all recorded history—a considerable time!

Cherubim were able to manifest themselves as lions, oxen, men, and eagles—or as an aggregate of all four. These huge spirit creatures were preserved in stone as the “winged bulls of Bashan” on ancient Assyrian kings’ palaces. In 1975 a wooden bull with a man’s head overlaid in gold was recovered from ruins of a great ancient Syrian civilization believed to be contemporaneous with ancient Sumeria. Search the great museums of Britain, France, Germany, and Egypt, and you will see hundreds of examples of the worship of “the host of the heavens” as gods in the form of men with eagles’ heads (common in the inscriptions of ancient Egypt, and in Egyptian tombs), winged bulls featuring the heads of men

and lions’ claws, and other assorted mixtures of these four.

The tales of the children of Noah, all of whom had seen those cherubim, repeated down through time gave rise to the mythologies about winged dragons, flying serpents whose mouths breathed fire, which guarded mysterious castles filled with fabulously valuable treasures at the top of craggy mountains. Giants and their mythical treasures, St. George and the Dragon, the winged flying serpent which was worshiped by the Incas and Aztecs (Quetzalcoatl, meaning “flying serpent”)—these are all mythological tales endlessly repeated and embellished, stemming from human encounters with cherubim.

When God told Moses to decorate the interior of the tabernacle in the wilderness with “cherubim,” Moses didn’t ask God, “What do they look like?” He knew, especially since he had come from a background of the royal courts of Egypt.

The Real Satan

Jesus knew exactly what to expect when He encountered Satan. He knew Satan didn’t appear as a funny, mischievous man in a weird red body stocking complete with pointed ears, a spear-tipped tail, and a trident in hand. He knew Satan could appear as a man, or as a cherub, or as a winged flying serpent.

What *is* a “dragon,” after all, but a “winged flying serpent”? When the devil appeared to Adam and Eve, they weren’t at all startled to see a strange-looking creature having serpentine, dragon-like form (but probably standing upright, like a tyrannosaurus) speak to them in audible voice, for they had no standard of comparison. The fact that God, using serpents as a *type* of Satan, cursed the serpent and *from that time* decreed he was to crawl on his belly in the dust of the earth strongly indicates there were serpentine creatures that stood upright prior to that time.

Jesus knew that He was meeting one of the most powerful spirit beings in the universe; He knew that He would have to stand the test of the most appealing, magnetic, powerful personality on earth; that He was going to match wits with one of the

vilest, most subtle, most clever, most cunning, and superbly (if pervertedly) intelligent creatures in the universe! He knew that humanly, of Himself, He didn’t have the strength and will to overcome a spirit being of such power. He would need super-human strength, spiritual strength from a righteous source, and the very help of the Father Himself, as well as the power of friendly angels, in order to prevail.

That’s why He fasted for so long! The Bible says Christ “learned by the things which He *suffered*,” and Christ intended to come to prove that weaknesses can be overcome with enough help from God!

The Confrontation Begins

Read the account of Jesus’ confrontation with Satan just prior to the beginning of His ministry. The story is revealed in the fourth chapter of the book of Matthew. “Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil” (Matt. 4:1).

When Jesus was “led up of the Spirit” it is obvious that He had been, by His “sixth sense” of awareness of the spirit world, in such close communication with His heavenly Father through prayer that He knew that it was time for this great confrontation—the supreme battle of wills between the fallen archangel Lucifer and the One who was coming to unseat this Satan and qualify to be the world ruler. (Perhaps Christ had received either a very vivid dream, a vision, or even heard an audible voice from an angel. Or He might have just “sensed” it was time.)

Jesus, with His brilliant mind and the outpouring of God’s Holy Spirit “without measure,” no doubt knew the Scriptures as no man before or since! He was, after all, the “Word personified,” as it were, and so was very thoroughly aware of the biblical examples of fasting just prior to a great crisis or a great event. He knew that Moses had fasted 40 days and 40 nights prior to receiving the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai. He knew about Elijah’s 40 days and 40 nights of fasting, and knew this would also be required of Him in order to utterly divest Himself of any reliance whatsoever upon


(Continued on page 41)

A common denominator to world ills is the declining power and prestige of the United States.

by Gene H. Hogberg

Climate of Fear and Appeasement

WHY AMERICA IS IN GLOBAL RETREAT



In 1945, the United States emerged from the war as the strongest military and economic power in the world. She had more than half the gross national product of the non-Communist world, and the monopoly of atomic weapons."

How times have changed! Yet it was only a little over three decades ago when the above situation prevailed—as recounted by Mr. Lee Kwan Yew, prime minister of Singapore, in a world-overview speech delivered to his fellow heads of government at the annual Commonwealth Conference in London on June 8, 1977.

While American power, prestige and influence has skidded remarkably, the prime minister stressed, the Communist world has been emboldened in its aims. A huge chunk of Southeast Asia has fallen into the totalitarian orbit, with a sleepy resignation to the new reality there on the part of the United States and the rest of the Western world.

Despite the new concept being floated in Washington that we are now living in "a new world," the same old East-West struggle goes on, asserted the prime minister. He added: "Marxist-Leninist dogma asserts that the Western capitalist system is doomed for the dustbin of history. But the Soviet Union sets out to help history all the time. Every issue which offers a chance to weaken the West, whether it is blacks versus whites in southern Africa, or the Arabs and their oil versus Israel in the Middle East, is exploited to the utmost. Of course, their greatest triumph was in Vietnam, where American self-confidence took a beating."

Common Denominator: American Weakness

Mr. Lee's analysis is not a rosy one, but is nevertheless very realistic. And a factor common to nearly all of the crises affecting the free world is the "unrelieved retreat" on the part of the United States from its once high pinnacle of world power and prestige.

Whether it desired it or not, the U.S. was thrust into the position of the leader of the free world in 1945. Washington subsequently pro-

ceeded to construct a global system of alliances to contain the advances of Communism.

For a while it worked. A serious Communist challenge was rolled back from Greece in 1948 due to aggressive action on the part of the Truman Administration.

But slowly America's resolve began to erode. Communist aggression was thwarted but not defeated in 1953 in Korea—where it still lurks today as an unvanquished foe. Nothing was done to assist the Hungarian uprising against Communist rule in 1956. The scene was repeated in much the same fashion in Czechoslovakia twelve years later.

The 1961 Bay of Pigs attempt to rid Cuba of Communist rule was one of the most bungled operations in American history, redeemed only in part by President Kennedy's firm stance toward Moscow in the Cuban missile crisis the following year.

Yet America still had pride in its power—until Vietnam.

After the decade-long agony in Vietnam during which Lyndon Johnson continually emphasized that "it is our will which is being tested," it was America's will which was found wanting. An expenditure of \$300 billion and 55,000 lives all proved to be in vain. Vietnam was lost.

Quickly, in domino fashion (proving the theory after all), went Cambodia and Laos, both of them falling to two of the cruelest, most oppressive regimes in recent times.

Vietnam Syndrome

The Vietnam experience has hung like a stifling cloud over American foreign policy ever since. Every foreign policy problem, it seems, is viewed as a potential Vietnam, whether it is indeed or not.

The United States, along with major Western allies, was on the verge of a major victory against Soviet and Cuban-backed forces in the Angolan civil war in 1975 until the U.S. Congress—fearful of "another Vietnam"—got cold feet and backed off. The Communist-supported side won by default.

Ever since the Angolan fiasco, U.S. policy in Africa has been a colossal failure. The so-called Kissinger Formula for Rhodesia never

got off the ground simply because the prestige of the United States (along with that of Britain) was so low that no party respected the power of the U.S. to carry it through to success.

Early in 1977 Zaire almost fell to the Communists in a naked attempt at invasion launched from neighboring Angola. France and Morocco saved the day for the West while the U.S. Congress again showed nothing but timidity in the face of an overt Communist challenge. Zaire's President Mobutu said of the fumbling U.S. response to his request for aid: "I must confess we are bitterly disappointed by America's attitude. Neto [Angola's Marxist president] is a pawn of the Cubans and Russians, but you won't face up to the threat. It is your weakness versus their willpower and strength."

And now in Asia new policies are being set in motion by the present Administration—the troop pullout scheme in Korea and the eventual recognition of Communist China at the expense of Taiwan—which can only guarantee a tragic end to any U.S. influence in the Far East.

Eruption of violence in either of these two strategic areas as a result of misguided U.S. policy shifts will have grave repercussions in Japan as well as Western Europe—both of which would consider Washington a faithless ally.

See No Evil . . .

Coupled with the tragic collapse of U.S. willpower is the denial, in high quarters, of the reality of the Soviet military buildup.

In a brutally frank article entitled "The Culture of Appeasement" (October 1977 issue of *Harper's*) author Norman Podhoretz writes: "While the number of strategic nuclear missiles in the Soviet arsenal increases, while Soviet warships now appear for the first time in distant waters which no Russian navy ever thought necessary or desirable to patrol, while Soviet conventional forces are strengthened and multiplied on the

Western front, while Soviet probes are made into Africa through Cuban surrogates with the evident intention of enabling the Russians to control sea lanes vital to the commerce of the entire West, and while Communist parties move closer and closer to power in Italy and France—while all this goes on, elaborate exercises in statistical manipulation and sophisticated rationalization are undertaken to explain it all away as unreal or as insignificant or as understandable or as unthreatening."

Those who attempt to warn the American public of the growing might of its main adversary, adds Podhoretz, are "rewarded for their pains with accusations of hysteria, paranoia, servility toward the Pentagon, and worse."

And why not? None other than President Carter has exclaimed that Americans today are ready to shed their previous "inordinate fear of Communism."

To which Podhoretz counters: "Or is it perhaps the opposite which is true? Have we, that is, been

plunged by Vietnam into a so great a fear of Communism that we can no longer summon the will to resist it?"

In his most perceptive analysis, author Podhoretz compares the climate in the United States today to the feverish period of appeasement which prevailed in Britain in the 1930s, which blinded the British people to the grim realities of Adolf Hitler's terminal threat to their very existence.

Case in Point: Panama

Nowhere is the plummeting world role of the United States more in evidence than in the Panama Canal issue.

The new treaties relinquishing U.S. sovereign rights to the waterway are being sold on one condition and one condition only: If America doesn't give the Canal away—and kick in a few extra billion in outright extortion (masquerading as foreign aid)—Panama will riot. And America apparently is no longer willing to defend its own territorial rights—against a country, to boot, which has no standing army, and

The Vietnam experience shattered America's pride and confidence. Every foreign policy problem is viewed as a potential Vietnam whether it is or not. First it was Angola; now it's Panama.

whose 7,000-man National Guard is at any given moment outnumbered by 9,300 superbly trained U.S. troops permanently stationed in the Canal Zone (to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of reinforcements available).

"The sheer absurdity of Panama's defiant threats of violence," writes Canal historian Harold Lord Varney, "staggeres the imagination. Not since Swift's Lilliput has so little challenged so much."

New treaty advocates, opined the *Wall Street Journal*, appear to have a "trembling fear of the Panamanian Wehrmacht," and reason that "if we don't ratify the treaty Panama will Vietnam us. . . . But if we do ratify the treaty, all those otherwise excitable guerrillas and saboteurs will absorb themselves in siestas and macrame until the year 2000."

As newspaper columnist Patrick J. Buchanan asked recently: "When will we stop lying to ourselves?" Behind the new treaties lies "weakness posturing as maturity, appeasement masking as moral superiority."

Attempting to counter the prevailing climate of fear and appeasement, a newspaper ad was recently placed by a task-force group opposed to the new Panama arrangement. It read in part: "What prevents most things and most people from being assaulted is the will to defend against those assaults. Would Panama's dictator really want to face the military might of the United States if our leaders clearly made known our determination to protect our national interest?"

"The ramifications of such weakness," the ad continued, "literally could destroy America. If we cannot defend American property for which we paid both in human lives and gold, what can we defend? If we cannot be proud of our engineering, commercial, medical, peace-keeping and other laudatory accomplish-

ments in the Canal Zone, in what can we find pride?"

Pride Broken

Pride? Yes, pride. That is the fundamental issue at stake. The pride of America's power has been broken "bone by bone" over the years since 1945, to the point where the patient is almost an impotent cripple. And the back was broken in Vietnam!

Again, because of the Vietnam syndrome, America's leaders today are forced to revise the entire history of U.S. involvement in the Panama Canal enterprise in order to justify an ignominious withdrawal.

U.S. chief negotiator Ellsworth Bunker asserts that "what we're interested in is use of the Canal, not its ownership." How more ignorant of history could he and others who have said the same thing possibly be? Ownership was *the key* to those Americans who dreamed of, designed and built the Canal in the first place.

In the current best-selling book about the Canal, *The Path Between the Seas*, author David McCullough makes specific note of how President Theodore Roosevelt, under whose leadership the Canal project began, looked upon the enterprise. "It was very well for others to talk of it as the dream of Columbus, to call it a giant step in the march of civilization, or to picture . . . its immeasurable value to world commerce," he writes.

"Roosevelt was promoting neither a commercial venture nor a universal utility. To him, first, last, and always, the Canal was the vital—the indispensable—path to a global destiny for the United States of America. He had a vision of his country as the commanding power on two oceans, and these joined by a Canal built, owned, operated, policed, and fortified by his country. The Canal was to be the first step to American supremacy at sea. All other benefits

resulting, important or admirable as they might be, were to him secondary."

"Unrelieved Retreat"

The America of only seven decades ago doesn't exist any longer. The America of 1945—sitting atop the very pinnacle of world power—also no longer exists. The leadership of contemporary America is as far removed from both turn-of-the-century and World-War-II U.S.A. as could possibly be.

As Patrick Buchanan said in his *New York Times* column: "No rhetoric can disguise the reality . . . What Teddy Roosevelt acquired, the American government cannot even hold.

"Sixty years ago, this country would have responded to hints of riot and sabotage not with negotiations. General Torrijos would have been fortunate to make it to the foothills or the jungle before his successor was sworn in—with a U.S. marine holding the Bible.

"Let us be honest with ourselves and not cloak this weakness in a suit of virtue. We are giving up the Canal because the U.S. leadership no longer has the vision, dynamism and will to ask of the American people the sacrifices needed to maintain our position in the world.

"The America of Capt. A. T. Mahan, Adm. Dewey and Teddy Roosevelt is gone. . . . Carthage is in full retreat before the rising military power of Rome."

Buchanan's brutally perceptive analysis reminds one of the passage in the book of Isaiah: "For, behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, is taking away . . . the mighty man and the soldier, the judge and the prophet, the diviner and the elder, the captain of fifty and the man of rank. . . . And I will make boys their princes, and babes shall rule over them" (Isa. 3:1-4, RSV).

But why has this erosion in Amer-

“U.S. leadership no longer has the vision, dynamism
and will to ask of the American people the sacrifices needed to maintain our
position in the world.”—*Patrick J. Buchanan*

ican power taken place? Why has the most powerful single nation in modern history skidded so far in only a generation's time? The answer is not difficult to ascertain. It lies within American society as it exists today. America no longer has a national purpose. U.S. society is divided into every possible self-seeking pressure group imaginable. America has become soft and flabby, unwilling and unable to stand up to the challenge of sterner societies.

Yet there is a deeper, more fundamental reason for America's internal malaise and international travails. Simply put, Americans have cut themselves adrift of their own historical moorings. Young Americans are, as recent polls have shown, abysmally ignorant of world affairs. Their knowledge of their own nation's past is nearly as bad. After three decades of unprecedented prosperity (coupled with a frightening national indebtedness), Americans as a whole have forgotten their forefathers' humble beginnings and long upward struggle toward national greatness.

Our religious leaders, too, in their quest of the “social gospel” (or, conversely, super-emotional religion), have left off teaching that the laws of God are absolute moral principles for all men to live by. Knowledge of the God who so richly blessed the American people has all but vanished.

Yet this “unknown God” would say to our nation today: “Hear the word of the Lord, O people of Israel. The Lord has filed a lawsuit against you listing the following charges: There is no faithfulness, no kindness, *no knowledge of God in your land*. You swear and lie and kill and steal and commit adultery. There is violence everywhere, with one murder after another.”

What better description of American society today, where urban

crime has reached epidemic proportions? God's judgment continues: “My people are destroyed because they don't know me, and it is all your fault, you priests, for you yourselves refuse to know me; therefore I refuse to recognize you as my priests. Since you have forgotten my laws, I will ‘forget’ to bless your children” (Hosea 4:1-2, 6-7, *The Living Bible*).

Warnings Overlooked

America's political and religious leaders have ignored warnings by their counterparts in America's early days. One such warning was given in a sermon preached at Plymouth, Massachusetts, December 22, 1773, by a minister named Charles Turner:

“We trust in the God of all grace, that North America rise unto the noblest structure the sun has ever beheld; and which shall be a pattern and source of instruction and happiness to the rest of mankind.

“If God will grant that North America shall exceed Rome in its highest perfection, as much as our ancestry and our advantages exceed theirs, our highest expectations will be answered.”

Yet, this minister warned, “Is it impossible that there should once be a people wise enough to withstand the temptations of affluence? . . . If you are found so immersed in worldly mindedness and sensuality, so dead to a sense of the importance of liberty, and so void of all religious and virtuous principles, as to be now ripe for squandering away the inheritance which we procured for you, we must beg leave to consider it as one of the most astonishing of all events!”

Will this 200-year-old warning be heeded?

Where Our Greatness Came From

Early in the year of America's first centennial celebration, January 5,

1876, a minister in Boston, Massachusetts, told his parishioners: “Not by the might of our power, or the wisdom of our counsel, has this nation been built, or its resources developed. Has there been wisdom on our counsels? It was by the inspiration of the Almighty. Has wealth increased? God gave us power to get wealth” (Deut. 8:18).

(Both of the above accounts are found in the book *The Christian History of the American Revolution; Consider and Ponder*, published in San Francisco in 1976 by the Foundation for American Christian Education.)

How many ministers in America speak this way today?

Too few.

God has graciously allowed Americans to enjoy two centuries of national blessings afforded to few people in history. Now, it would appear, is the time of reckoning. God's message to America now is undoubtedly the same as that which He delivered to ancient Israel: “The children I raised and cared for so long and tenderly have turned against me. . . . They have cut themselves off from my help” (Isa. 1:2, 4, *The Living Bible*).

The fact is, it is God—because of mounting national sins—who has broken the pride of America's power (Lev. 26:19). This is the root cause why the U.S. stands not tall, but in timidity, before its adversaries both large and small.

Unless there is a massive moral and spiritual turnaround and repentance, what will be the end result of America's skid into oblivion? “Therefore I will send you into exile far away because you neither know nor care that I have done so much for you” (Isa. 5:13).

The editors of *The Plain Truth* have been trumpeting this warning for over 40 years. It is time that our people took greater heed. □

Fifteen percent of all Americans aged 18 to 74 suffer symptoms of serious depression. Depression has been called the "common cold" of mental illness, and some have even gone so far as to label it the "social disease of the seventies." Here's how you can take steps to avoid experiencing this debilitating condition.

by Carole Ritter

These days a lot of us walk around in a gray haze. We're restless, bored, half-there—nothing turns us on. We're bone tired most of the day, but wake up at three in the morning and can't go back to sleep. Or we go to bed early, get up late, and take a nap in the afternoon. Some of us have crying spells for no particular reason except we feel like it. Others of us lose interest in food, or find comfort in overeating, overdrinking, or popping whatever kind of pill alleviates the angst.

These out-of-the-ordinary behavior patterns are often signs of depression—a malady so often unrecognized and yet so common that it probably affects all of us at one time or another.

Women the Victims

If you're a woman, you're twice as likely to find yourself depressed as your male counterpart. Experts have a good idea why this is so, and the reasons aren't what you might expect.

For instance, some have speculated that a woman's hormonal balance may predispose her toward gloomy feelings at certain times in her life. But studies linking depression with female

hormonal activity have so far proven inconclusive.

Dr. Gerald Klerman, one of the world's leading experts on the causes and cures of depression, believes that "the basic problems of many women are essentially the same as those that lead to depression in both men and women of all ages. Depression takes hold when wishes and reality don't meet expectations" (Angela Stephens, "Women and Depression," *Coronet*, September 1972). Victims feel hopeless and helpless; life has lost its sparkle.

Most sociologists concur that the "second-class" social standing of many women has depressing psychological consequences. Klerman and Dr. Myrna Weissman of Yale explain that such social inequities "lead to legal and economic helplessness, dependency on others, chronically low esteem, low aspirations and ultimately clinical depression." Such disadvantaged social standing is also a factor in the depression experienced by certain minorities who find themselves in the same one-down situation.

A well-known American nightclub comedian has built his entire routine around the line, "I just don't get no respect." If

DEPRESSION

OVERCOMING THE GRAY MENACE



Illustration by Doug Bevans

a lot of women were to verbalize their innermost feelings, they might echo that saying. For while many realize that motherhood and child rearing is the most important vocation in the world, others seem to tacitly relegate that occupation to the bottom of the heap. In our society the absence of financial remuneration—in the form of a paycheck—is often associated with the relative unimportance of the activity. Unsalaries housewives often “don’t get no respect” in spite of the nobility of their occupation.

A Loss of Self-Respect

Many women feel that they are “out of a job”—useless to society because they no longer perform a truly respected function. As Dr. Willard Gaylin writes, such a loss of self-respect is extremely depressing: “Since self-love and self-respect are such essential ingredients of human functioning, their absence threatens our survival. When individuals feel unloved, unwanted, and unworthy they may slip into depression, that most dangerous of psychological states” (“Caring Makes the Difference,” *Psychology Today*, August 1976).

Gaylin goes on to say that “depression can be precipitated by the loss or removal of *anything* that we overvalue in terms of our own security. To the degree that our sense of worth or security is dependent on love, money, social position, power or drugs—to that extent we will be threatened by its loss. When our reliance is so preponderant, the absence becomes so threatening that we despair of our survival. That is the despair we call depression.”

Woman’s formerly vital-to-survival role as homemaker has diminished in status in recent decades, and the diminution of a respected female role or social position has brought on a widespread tendency toward despair for many. In a rapidly changing society such as ours, many women are caught in a terrible bind, and even those who aren’t obviously affected may feel a certain uneasiness as to where they stand.

Dr. Phyllis Chesler, author of *Women and Madness*, says she believes “women [receive disapproval] whether they fully accept . . . or vio-

Many mothers desperately need to be told that they are performing a function necessary to the survival of our society.

lently reject . . . their traditional place in society.”

She describes their role as being “self-sacrificing, altruistic—but with an altruism borne of low self-esteem—eternally guilty. . . . Women are ‘crazy’ whether they act out their devalued female role or reject their sex roles. If a woman fully acts out the housewife role, she is considered ‘silly’ and often slumps into a deep depression and many attempt suicide.” But Dr. Chesler also notes that women who drastically reject that basic role are considered aggressive, threatening and less than feminine.

Respecting Human Dignity

Willard Gaylin further describes the female plight: “A society that treats any serious segment of its population, whether blacks, women, or youth, with distaste or disrespect, runs the risk of convincing that group of its own inadequacy. . . . When we feel ‘not acceptable’ into the symbolic family of a majority society, when we are made to feel like some alien ‘other,’ we tend to see those privileged and secure representatives of that society, if not the society itself, as alien and hostile. This deprivation may be tolerable if there is some pathway to privilege and approval, regardless of how tortuous and difficult. When the path is barred, however, or so obscured that it seems not present, despair can ensue. . . . It can lead to the destruction of self via drugs or the destruction of others through the rage of impotence and frustration” (*op. cit.*).

Dr. Jessie Bernard, American sociologist, a leading expert in the field of family relations, and author of the book *The Future of Marriage*, adds her observation: “The charac-

teristic illness of married women today is depression. It has become almost their natural state.”

But as we have read, it’s not just “being a housewife” that brings about depression in women. It’s doing a job that “don’t get no respect.”

A lot of mothers desperately need encouragement—need to know that even though they’re doing a job that our society frequently fails to appreciate, they are performing a function necessary to the stability and even the survival of that society.

Assert Yourself

But how can a woman (or anybody who is depressed) banish the feelings of inadequacy she is bound to have at one time or another?

One new strategy for self-respect that has been written and talked about a great deal lately is *assertion* or assertiveness therapy. (Assertiveness does *not* mean aggressiveness.) A plethora of books and magazine articles dealing with the subject is available (see the article on page 14 in this issue, “What Does It Mean To Turn the Other Cheek?”).

Dr. Herbert Fensterheim, assistant professor of psychiatry at New York Medical College, defines assertion as being open, direct, honest and *appropriate* about what you feel and think. He says that “when you don’t assert yourself, you eventually lose control of your life, tend to get moody, depressed, and are given to outbursts of anger.”

Many women in our society have been conditioned to be unassertive, chameleonlike, manipulative, and generally dishonest with themselves and others in expressing what they feel about how they are treated. To use a minority analogy, they “shuffle” around those who have greater power or social position. They may feel anger at having to act this way to cope, but such anger is carefully hidden and perhaps never exposed.

That anger boils and bubbles underneath until it emerges as a psychosomatic symptom of some sort, or depression. (For more on how emotions can affect your health, write for the free booklet *Principles of Healthful Living*.) Dr. Helen A. DeRosis and Victoria Pellegrino

write that "anger... is one of the most important features of depression that has to be dealt with. All depressions are loaded with angry feelings, and unless they are relieved in one way or another, it is almost impossible to overcome feeling depressed" (*The Book of Hope*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1976, p. 40).

They suggest that a depressed person be honest with herself, realize she is angry, and express that anger in a safe and appropriate way. In other words, *do* something about what she feels instead of stewing over it or suppressing it or ignoring it.

How to Cope

If you are depressed, there are several other things besides releasing negative emotions that can help you cope with a bout of depression. First, if you feel listless or paralyzed, force yourself to get up and move. Exercise at least once a day. Get out of the house if at all possible.

Find somebody you can trust, and open up to them—talk about what's troubling you. Let your family and friends know you are not up to par, and don't overextend yourself socially. It helps to see people, but usually it's better to keep visits short and uncomplicated.

Set one or more short-range goals and plan how you're going to achieve them. Or find some activity you like and do it on a regular basis so you have something to look forward to.

If you are a homemaker, realize that you have an important and honorable role in society. There is nothing intrinsically "second class" about a domestic role in life! Homemaking is a vitally important profession in any human society, and it also often provides unique opportunities in the form of relatively abundant leisure time which can be put to pleasant use.

And above all, remember that depressions are not permanent. They do go away. Dr. Aaron T. Beck, director of the Mood Clinic at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, has worked with depressed people for 20 years. He says that "the real tragedy of depression is not that it is hopeless, but that it isn't. Not at all. So little of all the

Learning to Speak Up

The authors of *The Book of Hope* give excellent suggestions for what they call the "self-effacing" or "love-addicted" personality who compulsively pleases everyone but herself in order to gain approval. Such unhealthy behavior (catering to others at the expense of her own real needs) can lead to depression, and needs to be recognized and overcome. Here are those suggestions:

1) Your problem is that you will not assert yourself. So try small experiments in speaking up. Give your opinion whether you agree or disagree. If you are afraid to state your opinion, try asking a pertinent question. You can try this out first with people you know well.

2) Remember that you are "allowed" to express your feelings—even when you are annoyed. This is your right. You don't have to say to someone who has upset you, "You're a mean person." You can say, "I felt badly when you said that to me."

3) Practice giving an order or stating a wish without sounding apologetic. Practice until you have what you want to say down pat. You can actually write down what you want to say, look at it and read it several times. Or you can say what you have to say out loud and repeat it at least five times. You will find that when you are confronting the person with whom you have to deal, the things you want to say will come out of your mouth with much less difficulty. If

you don't succeed in this the first few times, keep trying it because it is extraordinarily useful if you can get it to work.

4) Practice asking for favors, if this is difficult for you. Don't sound apologetic and don't convey your guilt, even if you feel it. Follow the suggestion above about practice.

5) When you feel someone has put you down, speak up. Ask in your most courteous fashion if they have indeed done what you think they have. Make it a true question. ("Were you trying to put me down?") Even if it doesn't embarrass the other person, he or she will at least realize that you're not such a pushover and will be less likely to try it again.

6) When someone asks for something, instead of automatically saying yes, tell them to wait while you put down the phone. Or say you'll think about it and let them know the next day. Ask yourself: Do I want to do what is asked of me? Don't automatically or compulsively comply. Having taken the time, try to prepare in your mind what your reason is for not wanting to do the favor, and then present that in as reasonable a way as you can. People aren't always ready to jump on you when you refuse them something.

(Excerpt from *The Book of Hope*, by Helen A. DeRosis and Victoria Y. Pellegrino, 1976. Reprinted with permission of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.)

suffering is necessary. The great majority of patients, if they don't commit suicide, will come out of it, at least until the next crisis. You'll get complete recovery from an episode 70% to 95% of the time. Among kids, 95%. . . . And apart from that, therapy can help."

Depression may be a "gray menace" but it can be conquered on an individual basis. And someday a healthy society that values individual dignity and respects the worth of

each member of the family unit will replace today's dehumanizing, depression-producing system. □

ADDITIONAL READING

Helen A. DeRosis and Victoria Y. Pellegrino, *The Book of Hope*, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.

Dorothy Jongeward and Dru Scott, *Women as Winners*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1976.

Principles of Healthful Living (booklet) (For your free copy write to the address nearest you. See inside front cover.)

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO TURN THE OTHER CHEEK?

Can a Christian stand up for his rights? Can he defend himself verbally? Can he be assertive? Or should he always "turn the other cheek"? Here is what the Bible really says about assertive behavior.

by David L. Antion

Phyllis is twenty pounds overweight and painfully aware of it. All night long her husband has been making joking remarks to other partygoers about what she and the Goodyear blimp have in common. His remarks hurt her deeply, and she feels like crying inside. But on the outside she laughs at his gibes along with everyone else. After all, he is only being clever, and she is getting a bit tubby, isn't she?

On the way home she develops a splitting headache, takes two aspirin and goes to bed without giving him so much as a good-night kiss. In the morning she pretends to sleep in, and he goes to work without "wak-

ing" her. She spends the day under a cloud of depression, cleaning out the refrigerator for consolation.

A Common Experience

Like Phyllis, a lot of us suffer humiliating experiences which hurt us deeply and perhaps leave permanent scars. There are few of us who haven't come away from a situation wishing we had stood up for our rights—told people that they couldn't walk all over us like that.

But we didn't. Instead we walked away feeling aggravated, resentful, angry or perhaps more than a little depressed.

Many of us lack the nerve to say no to door-to-door salesmen, out-of-line neighbors who ask to borrow prized possessions, or friends who offer us responsibilities in local clubs when we're already over-committed. We might have trouble telling someone to roll up the car window when our sinuses are aching, or even asking for somebody at the other end of the table to pass the butter.

And a lot of times we're trapped because of this, caught up in a situation of somebody else's devising. Because we're forced to act against our will, we feel a great deal of anger and resentment. But again, we're very hesitant to express it, so it comes out as a feeling of hopelessness and helplessness, anger or depression.

Some women especially feel that they have no rights. Having been indoctrinated with the idea that they must at all costs please everyone—husband, children, parents, mother-in-law, next-door neighbor and the entirety of the local PTA—they feel bombarded with conflicting demands that can't possibly be reconciled or fulfilled. They feel that they are helpless pawns—nonpersons who don't have the right to say what *they* want to do in a given situation.

But Isn't Martyrdom Christian?

But you might wonder, "Isn't that a truly Christian way to behave? After all, aren't we supposed to turn the other cheek, suffer and take wrong,

let people walk all over us?" Let's examine this question in detail.

There are three basic styles of behavior, which experts have classified as *passive*, *aggressive* and *assertive*.

When Phyllis allowed her husband to make cutting remarks without speaking up in her own defense, she was behaving *passively*—allowing another to take away her rights by default. Social scientists have found that chronic passive behavior begets all kinds of emotional difficulties, and leads to generally poor mental health.

Had she behaved *aggressively*, she might have turned the evening into something of a "who's-afraid-of-Virginia Woolf" situation, letting others at the party know in a subtle or not-so-subtle way that her husband was no prize either—that he let an important deal slip through his fingers last week, that he can't bowl worth a hoot, and besides, he's not all that great a lover. She would return measure for measure and then some, making the poor fellow wish he'd never bothered to crawl out from under his rock and show his face.

Sometimes a person who's been passive in a certain situation will finally "blow his cork"—he's taken all he can take, and now he's going to let them have it. And he behaves in an aggressive manner, stomping all over other people's rights in vengeful retaliation.

Aggressive behavior is not generally socially acceptable. Nor is it usually Christian. "Returning evil for evil" is negative, impolite and hurtful, and those who behave aggressively as a matter of course cannot be classified as truly mentally healthy, either.

The third and most attractive form of behavior is *assertiveness*. Had Phyllis behaved assertively she might have remained silent at the party. But on the way home, or perhaps even the next night after her husband had returned from work and had time to relax, she would have approached him in a kind but firm manner. She would have said she accepts his wish that she lose

weight. She too is painfully aware she has a problem and is doing her best to eliminate it. But she does not like the way he keeps after her constantly, embarrassing her in public and ridiculing her in front of their friends. In fact, his behavior causes her to feel hurt, attacked, put down and depressed, and this is frustrating to her—it causes her to eat all the more.

She would say all this nicely and privately, without accusing or belittling him—but she would say her piece and say it firmly. She would let him know that she does not like that kind of treatment and that it will inevitably lead to future conflicts.

Was Christ Assertive?

But again, the question arises: Is assertive behavior a truly Christian way to act?

After all, didn't Jesus humbly and meekly allow Himself to be crucified and killed without standing up for His rights? The Bible shows us that Jesus Christ really did behave in an assertive manner. He did stand up for His rights, not allowing a pack of accusers to murder Him *before* His time came to voluntarily give His life for mankind (see Luke 4:28-30). And even when it was time for Him to die, He asserted His full legal right in not giving out information about His disciples. When the high priest asked Him about His followers and His doctrine, He answered: "I didn't do anything in secret—why question me? Ask those who heard me. Surely they know what I said." Then one of the officials nearby struck Him in the face. "Is that the way to answer the high priest?" he demanded. Jesus then said: "If I said something wrong, speak up about it. But if I spoke the truth, why did you hit me?" (John 18:19-23.) So Christ Himself wasn't intimidated into giving up His rights by a bullying official. He "went as a lamb to the slaughter," but He went of His own accord, not because some petty Palestinian officials had the legal right to make Him do so (see John 10:17-18).

Christ constantly asserted His

rights as the Son of God, healing on the Sabbath in spite of picky pharisaical regulations, and driving the moneychangers out of His Father's house, the Temple.

The apostle Paul also behaved assertively. When confronted by an annoying case of demon possession, he ordered the evil spirit to leave him and his party alone (Acts 16:16-40). And when this led to their being thrown into jail, uncondemned but beaten in spite of their legal immunity to such treatment as Roman citizens, Paul asserted his full rights. He demanded that the magistrates apologize and personally escort him out of prison. When politely asked to leave town, he just as politely ignored the request and entered into Lydia's house, visiting and comforting the brethren until he was good and ready to depart.

On another occasion Paul escaped a beating by again asking the officials if it were legal to scourge an uncondemned Roman citizen (Acts 22:22-29). (And to falsely claim you were a Roman citizen was punishable by the death penalty, so they knew he meant business.)

Turning the Other Cheek?

So it would seem that neither Christ nor the apostle Paul "turned the other cheek" in the sense that some interpret Jesus' words in Matthew 5. What, then, does this phrase really mean?

Matthew 5:38-41, part of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, reads: "You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to him who begs from you, and do not refuse him who would borrow from you" (RSV). Here Christ is reacting to the *lex talionis* (law of retaliation) of the Old Testament, which stated that revenge was to be appropriate—"an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," no more and no less (see

Exodus 21:23-24 and Deuteronomy 19:21). This law limited the amount of revenge one could take on another. In other words, if a man knocked out your tooth you couldn't break his neck for it. But now Christ is saying "vengeance is God's"; that a Christian should forgive rather than exact a specific legal penalty from one who wrongs him. In other words, taking *aggressive* action against someone who wrongs you is not in keeping with New Testament Christian principles. We are not to return evil for evil (Rom. 12:17); rather we are to forgive our enemies.

Here Christ is actually advocating assertive behavior—being in control of the situation. If someone takes you to court and demands your inner garment, give him *two* garments—your outer one as well. (Old Testament law forbade a creditor to keep this cloak or outer garment overnight—Exodus 22:25-26.) If a Roman courier conscripts you into carrying his mail pouch one mile, show him that you are doing it of your own free will. Go an extra mile.

We are not to participate in aggressive retaliation, but Christ here urges that we take control of our lives—that we use the options available to us. ("So you think you have control over my life because you took my shirt. Well, I'll show you that you don't—here's my coat, too, which I'm going to let you take." Or, "Come on—I want to carry it another mile. It's my choice and I want to do it.")

So if your enemy hungers, feed him. But if he just walks up to you and grabs your chicken-salad sandwich, you are not feeding him voluntarily. You are not "turning the other cheek" or "going the extra mile," because you had *no choice* in the matter.

The apostle Paul admonished the Corinthians to react assertively rather than submit to false teachers (II Cor. 11:1-21). He wrote: "For you bear it if a man makes slaves of you, or preys upon you, or takes advantage of you, or puts on airs, or

(Continued on page 41)



HAPPYNE

by Jon Hill

Here we are again with another new year. Festivity. Resolutions. Predictions. Income tax around the corner. What will happen—let's say over the next ten years? Nobody knows the future for sure, but there are some good guesses that can be made putting together present trends and biblical prophecy.

There are a bevy of New Year's Days every year. Nearly every culture has its own. The Western world calls this 1978 A.D. (for "the year of our Lord," going back to an arbitrary year picked by a monk centuries ago to begin counting years anew from the birth of Christ).

The Hebrew calendar shows a different year (5738 from creation) which began last September 13—and with typical flair, the Jews will also have a second New Year in the spring which begins their religious year. (Have you ever wondered why the last four months of our Roman calendar have names that mean "seventh," "eighth," "ninth" and "tenth month" when we label them 9, 10, 11 and 12?)

The Moslems are working somewhere in the thirteen hundreds according to their calendar, and the

Chinese will probably be ready to launch a new "Tet Offensive" when their New Year rolls around this spring!

Religious Background

Most New Years find their origin in some religion. Since mankind has been an observer and worshiper of sun, moon and stars from time immemorial, and since those celestial objects are the keys to our calendar and to time, it is only natural that priests of one sort or another would be involved in setting up New Years. The most popular time of year chosen by myriad pagans from ancient days has been the winter solstice. Worshiping the sun as their main deity, they naturally regarded the lengthening days of late December (which means "tenth month") as a sure sign that their sun-god had been born anew and therefore a New Year had begun. The reckoning captured the imagination of the Christian world and we have happily followed this pagan practice—as we do so many others—without question. So, for us, when the month named after the pagan god Janus begins, it's "Happy New Year!"

I wonder what the real God of creation thinks about all this confusion?

Good News—Bad News

With every New Year comes the anticipation of what the future holds.

I'm sure you've heard dozens of "good-news-bad-news" jokes (which tend to lean to the bad), but let me tell you one anyway: It seems that this Indian chief was addressing his small band just before a hard winter set in. He told them he had good news and bad news. The bad news was that all they had stored up to eat during the winter months was smoked skunk. The good news was that they had *plenty* of it!

When you cast a wary eye to the future of our poor old world, that joke seems to set the tone: Even the good news doesn't look too good! Thankfully the God of your Bible does have genuine good news just over the horizon, but between now and then there seems to be a lot of bad news.

Let's take an educated guess as to what the immediate future holds over the next decade, and compare it with the God-promised good news of His Kingdom on earth.

Let's be practical and look at the everyday items that make up our lives, and then get the whole overview.

Food

Everybody has to eat. Yet about two-thirds of mankind goes to bed hungry every night! All this next year about twenty thousand people will die of starvation *every day!* And the number will undoubtedly rise in the years ahead.

But you are not one of those—yet.



WY YEAR!?

However, food eats up an increasing portion of your entire budget and will continue to do so with no apparent end in sight. "A loaf of bread for \$20, or three pounds of barley flour, but there is no olive oil or wine," predicts the Bible in Revelation 6:6 (*The Living Bible*). In other words, basic foods will be supercostly, and luxuries will not even be available. *When we will come to that point I don't know, but \$1.00-a-loaf bread is already on your grocer's shelves!*

As if the world didn't have enough *genuine* crises—we live in an age of a crisis of crises—artificial crises are now being added to our burden. Powers who control the source of basic commodities have decided to follow in the footsteps of the diamond merchants of long ago. Supply and demand usually dictate cost. Therefore, corner the supply, create an artificial scarcity, and up the price!


Back to bread as an example. Remember last year when the price of wheat was so high—with dire prospects of a meager harvest—that the bakers were forced to increase the cost of a loaf of bread substantially? Yes, of course you do. But now that the price of wheat has dropped so low it has our farmers in revolt, has the price of bread gone down? No.

How about sugar? Coffee? Oil? Cocoa? Milk? Butter? (For that matter, the low-priced spread now costs much more than the high-priced

spread did just five years ago.) What about eggs? And, perish the thought, meat?

Of course we could purchase that cheaper, high-fiber bread that has fewer calories and more fiber—cellulose, they call it (you and I call it *sawdust!*).

Contrast this to the way it will be in God's Kingdom: "Say there! Is



The God of your Bible
does have genuine
good news just over the
horizon, but between
now and then there
seems to be a
lot of bad news.

anyone thirsty? Come and drink—even if you have no money! Come, take your choice of wine and milk—it's all free! Why spend your money on foodstuffs that don't give you strength? Why pay for groceries that don't do you any good? [Does that sound like sawdust-bread and the swarm of artificial-junk-nonfood-

stuffs in our marketplace?] Listen and I'll tell you where to get good food that fattens up the soul!" (Isa. 55:1-2, *The Living Bible*.) Go ahead, read the rest of the chapter for yourself; it's a good one. In fact, read the whole Book!

But, what to do? Well, more people than ever are planting their own gardens; natural foods are all the rage; "go to the ant, thou slug-gard" and all that.

Beware if you live off the supermarket shelves, because the farmers are fed up with their slice of the price of food. The largest single industry in America, and probably the world, is tired of being maligned, looked down on and cheated. They are threatening to just quit growing anything for us (they'll put in a garden for themselves, of course) and see how we like to fast!

Can you imagine the food riots that would erupt; the farms looted and pillaged by starving city citizens? Can't happen? Better not bet on it! The farmers are organizing, and they mean business!

Shelter

The spiraling cost of real estate makes home owners feel good and prospective buyers feel bad. The average cost of a new house, now running quickly from \$40,000 to \$50,000, is forcing people to live like sardines in high-rise apartment house complexes, condominiums and townhouses. Tensions rise with

the rents. The market price is determined by the buyer-seller ratio. Cost of materials and labor is outpacing the rest of the economy, and even do-it-yourselfers are glum. What if the bubble bursts, and there are no buyers? Sources I have indicated agricultural land is the best investment. Anything that will grow food will be increasingly valuable.

The contrast of God's Kingdom and its economy is amazing: Abundant harvests with the planter following in the footsteps of the reaper (Amos 9:13). Every man with his own land (under his *own* fig tree). No heavy taxation for defense because "nations will not learn war anymore" and we will "beat our swords into plowshares" (Isa. 2:1-4). That's the motto of the "United(?) Nations," by the way—but no way the UN will ever bring it about.

Jobs

High unemployment is a nagging headache for most Western economies. Of course you could move to China—I understand there is no unemployment there!

Candidate Carter promised surcease of the unemployed. President Carter will find a frustratingly high unemployment percentage fits into the paradox of jobs going begging in these next years.

Did you hear about the 61-year-old man who applied for 24 jobs out of the local paper—and got *hired* for 20 of them in one week's time? Many people don't want jobs—they just want paychecks. And if they can get them from the government (whatever that is), then why should they work for a living? Mark it down in your little red (for deficit) book: higher unemployment, more jobs going begging, higher taxes for those who do work to pay for those who don't—and won't.

Contrast God's unemployment plan which is too simple to be considered in today's complex world. Paul spelled it out in the New Testament: "This should be your ambition: to live a quiet life, minding your own business and doing your own work, just as we told you before. As a result, people who are not Christians will trust and respect you, and you will not need to depend on others for enough money to pay

your bills. . . . Stay away from any Christian who spends his days in laziness and does not follow the ideal of hard work we set up for you. For you well know that you ought to follow our example: you never saw us loafing; we never accepted food from anyone without buying it; we worked hard day and night for the money we needed to live on, in order that we would not be a burden to any of you. It wasn't that we didn't have the right to ask you to feed us, but we wanted to show you, firsthand, how you should work for your living. Even while we were still there with you we gave you this rule: *'He who does not work shall not eat'*" (I Thess. 4:11-12; II Thess. 3:7-10, *The Living Bible*).

The other side of the coin is that a servant *is* worthy of his hire, and for those who work doubly hard, they get double pay! And, of course, there is ample biblical legislation to care for the *genuine* needy!

God says He wishes above all things that we should prosper and be in good health—that He wants His people to live off the fatness of the land. And, after all, He is the one who put all the riches in the earth!

The only thing God demands is that we don't make the pursuit of physical things uppermost in our minds. "So don't worry at all [a better translation might be "don't be *overly* concerned"] about having enough food and clothing. Why be like the heathen? [Now that's a thought to apply even to the calendar!] For they take pride in all these *things* and are deeply concerned about them. But your heavenly Father already knows perfectly well that you need them, and he will give them to you *if you give him first place in your life and live as he wants you to*. So don't be anxious about tomorrow. God will take care of your tomorrow too. Live one day at a time [or, "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof"]" (Matt. 6:31-34, *The Living Bible*).

Beyond that, God promises us a share in His eternal life and possession of the universe—and *that* is a lot to possess.

Government

"He is governed best who is governed least," a wise man once said.

God's plan for mankind is to bring us into His Kingdom as His own sons, living, acting, thinking as He does. Totally *self-governing*—as He is!

But what about today's human governments? More bad news. Government begets government. In England one out of every four is working for the government. Here in the United States we are a little behind, with only one out of five—but give us time—it won't take us much longer to catch up!


Candidate Carter promised us government reform. President Carter established the first new government department in 11 years, and it is going to cost you and me twenty *billion* dollars the first year! If you thought the cost of government was high before, you will soon realize that it was only "peanuts" compared with what's coming!

You had better memorize Psalm 23, because we are headed through the "valley of the shadow of death." The giant of the West is curling up into a ball of isolationism, shrinking in fear from the mice that roar!

Way back in Genesis God promised us "the gates of our enemies," and together with the British Empire we possessed most of them in the last century. But we've been busy giving them away! (Write for our free booklet *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy*.)

God promises to take back all the good things He gave us: "I will no longer give her rich harvests of grain in its season, or wine at the time of the grape harvest. Now I will expose her nakedness in public for all her lovers [biblical language for "allies"] to see, and no one will be able to rescue her from my hand" (Hosea 2:9-10, *The Living Bible*).

God uses even stronger language in Ezekiel 16 (and you'll have to admit it does seem to fit!): "Prostitutes charge for their services—men pay with many gifts. But not you, you give *them* gifts, bribing them to come to you! So you are different from other prostitutes. But you had to pay them, for no one wanted
(Continued on page 34)



LIVING WITHIN OUR LIMITS

by D. Paul Graunke

The lifeblood of the modern economy is fossil fuel, particularly oil. Prosperity depends on plenty of it, and the cheaper the better. There is plenty of oil right now, a glut on the world market, in fact. But it is no longer cheap, thanks to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil cartel.

And, if the experts are right, oil one day will become scarce and even more expensive because we live on a finite earth with finite resources, which we are exhausting at an ever increasing rate.

Current estimates place the ultimately recoverable reserves of oil at about two trillion barrels. They may be less than that, maybe only 1.6 trillion barrels. Or they may be more than that, maybe as high as 3.7 trillion barrels by some estimates. But even if the latter figure turns out to be correct, the world economies have such a voracious and growing appetite for oil that demand will outstrip supply early in the next century. If reserves are lower, the day of reckoning will come even sooner, perhaps as early as 1985 if the growth in demand for oil doesn't slacken.

So the question is not *if* we run out of oil, but *when* we run out of oil, what will we do? How can we make the transition to an economic system that can thrive without

oil and within the limits of all the resources available on this finite spaceship called earth?

Four hundred business, academic, and government leaders from throughout the United States and overseas gathered 35 miles north of Houston during the first week in October to ponder these questions. The occasion was the Alternatives to Growth Conference.


The conference took place against the background of several critical developments in the area of energy:

September 23: A report reveals that U.S. demand for petroleum products in the previous four-week period rose at a record rate, with oil imports providing more than 48 percent of the total. Imports of crude oil averaged nearly 6.5 million barrels a day, 36.2 percent of the nation's total petroleum demand of 17.86 million barrels daily. Imports of refined petroleum products accounted for another 2.12 million barrels a day.

October 6: Members of the International Energy Agency, formed after the Arab oil embargo in 1974 by 19 major oil-importing nations, agree to limit oil imports to 26 million barrels a day by 1985, about 8 million barrels a day less than the imports anticipated if energy conservation plans were not implemented. IEA nations currently import 22 million barrels of oil per day, with the U.S. accounting for one-third of that figure.

“There is widespread agreement—close to 100%—that the kind of growth rate we saw in the past 25 years [roughly 5% per year] will not continue.”

—Herman Kahn, Hudson Institute



Photos by D. Paul Graunke

U.S. Energy Secretary James R. Schlesinger said that the 26-million-barrel-per-day goal depended on the United States reducing its oil imports to 6 million barrels a day.

IEA members were critical of the United States for its failure to curb oil imports. While most member nations had increased their oil imports only a small amount between 1972 and 1976 (some had decreased their imports), U.S. imports of oil increased by 51 percent. Canadian Energy Minister Alastair Gillespie, chairman of the IEA, observed that if the U.S. doesn't set an example by adopting an energy program, other importing nations will abandon efforts to cut their oil imports. Mr. Schlesinger pledged that the U.S. could meet its goals to cut imports if President Carter's energy program is adopted. But . . .

October 10: The U.S. Senate ends a two-week filibuster against a bill to deregulate the price of newly discovered natural gas sold across state lines. The gas-deregulation bill passes as the Senate continues its piecemeal dismantling of the key elements of President Carter's energy program.

Club of Rome Report

While politicians and diplomats wrangled over *current* energy problems, the 400 delegates to the Alternatives to Growth Conference pondered future energy, population, food, and economic problems. One of the sponsoring organizations for the conference was the Club of Rome, an informal association of 100 individuals in

more than 30 countries. The Club of Rome is best known for *The Limits of Growth*, a controversial report published in 1972. Using a computer to project present growth trends, a team of scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology concluded in the report that “if present growth trends in world population, industrialization, pollution, food production and resource depletion continue unchanged, the limits of growth on this planet will be reached sometime within the next one hundred years. The most probable result will be a rather sudden and uncontrollable decline in both population and industrial capacity.”

Man Versus Machine


This pessimistic projection made headlines around the world and touched off a great debate over mankind's future and the value of computer-based forecasting. That debate continued at the conference when Herman Kahn, much publicized head of the Hudson Institute and proponent of growth-as-usual, matched wits and statistics with a computer and its oracle, Dr. Barry Hughes of Case Western Reserve University (Cleveland, Ohio). The computer was programmed with a new analysis system known as the Assessment of Policies Tool (APT). This system was developed by Dr. Hughes in association with Dr. Mihajlo Mesarovic and Dr. Edward Pestel (who coauthored the second report of the Club of Rome, entitled *Mankind at the Turning Point*).

Kahn defended the generally optimistic predictions of his 1976 book, *The Next 200 Years*. These included higher estimates of reserves of essential resources such as oil and projections of far greater food production than those made in the Club of Rome reports. Kahn maintained that world population and economic growth will eventually slow down naturally, resulting in a world of plenty for most societies.

Hughes agreed with Kahn that a “doomsday” crash of civilization need not be inevitable. But he contended that the transition period in the next 50 years would be far more traumatic than Kahn predicts.

As the computer flashed rapid-fire readouts on a movie screen, Dr. Hughes rebutted several of Kahn's

Barry Hughes (left) and **Herman Kahn** (right) debate the future at the Alternatives to Growth Conference.



specific conclusions. Kahn had stated in his book that "it doesn't seem likely that oil prices will stay very high for more than five or ten years, and possibly much less; they might easily return to something like three to seven dollars [per barrel] in the Persian Gulf long before the new coal infrastructure has been amortized."

But the computer's evaluation of the future yielded just the opposite prediction. Assuming that prices are dictated by a free market, the computer concluded that oil prices will climb steadily throughout the end of the century to a level about 50 percent higher than current prices (in terms of 1975 dollars). After the turn of the century, prices will climb even faster as supplies are exhausted. By 2025, the projected price would be nearly \$60 a barrel in terms of 1975 dollars.

The computer also calculated that Kahn's projections for food production and per-capita income would require such vast sums of capital investment and transfer of wealth from developed to presently undeveloped nations as to be, in Hughes' judgment, unrealistic.

Kahn would not recant: "According to my model, when Cortez stepped ashore with 500 men to face two million Aztecs, the Aztecs won. . . . There's only one model that will answer all questions equally well, and it's called God." Kahn argued that no one knows what the actual reserves of oil and other resources are, or what technologies might be devised in the future to solve what may now seem to be insurmountable problems. His faith remained unshaken in the unknown and man's ingenuity and resourcefulness—factors no computer can take into account.

And there the debate remained deadlocked: faith against the known facts.


After the conference had ended, President Carter renewed his call for Americans to consider the energy crisis the "moral equivalent of war." But most Americans have treated the situation as if it were the moral equivalent of peace. They are guzzling oil at a record rate. This year the United States is on its way to a record \$30 billion deficit in its balance of payments, largely because of its unrestrained appetite for oil.

Many European nations and Japan have had notable success in conserving energy and reducing the growth rate of oil consumption. But even these nations are still heavily dependent on oil.

No Consensus

If conferences (such as the one near Houston) and groups (such as the Club of Rome) have accomplished anything, it has been to make government leaders and the general public more aware of the space and resource limits of the earth. But it was abundantly clear from the conference and the headlines in the papers that little has been done to prepare any one nation, let alone the world, to sustain itself within those limits. As Aurelio Peccei, founder of the Club of Rome, confessed: "We don't know how to translate our new awareness into action."

Developed nations are still committed to high-growth policies. Undeveloped and developing nations want to go the route of the Western developed nations. They



"We don't know how to translate our new awareness into action. . . . It is much later than we think. But we can do more than we are doing. . . . We don't see the light at the end of the tunnel. We have a few tools, but the wisdom hasn't yet emerged."

—Aurelio Peccei, founder Club of Rome

want a bigger piece of the pie, Western style, even though that style is fast becoming unsustainable and obsolete. Several Third World representatives at the conference *demand*ed that developed nations help them with massive amounts of aid and capital investment. They *insisted* that it was their right to achieve economic parity with developed nations and that it was the duty of developed nations to help, even sacrifice, to make it possible.

The world is running out of time, oil, food, and—one sensed from the conference—patience to deal with the problem of a world that is pressing on the natural limits of growth. If the conference was in any way a microcosm of the world, mankind has a long way to go in finding the wisdom and the consensus needed to meet the future with success.

Dr. Peccei was asked what progress had been made toward an economy that could be sustained within the limits of the earth's resources since the publication of the Club of Rome's first report five years ago. He could point to no substantive progress. And now, in 1977, "It is much later than we think," he said. "But we can do much more than we are doing. . . . We don't see the light at the end of the tunnel. We have a few tools, but the wisdom hasn't emerged." □

THE POTTER WASP'S UNUSUAL HANGING ACT



Carson Baldwin, Jr.—Animals Animals

Most mothers in the animal world are, as you would suspect, very solicitous of the future welfare of their offspring. However, it's not every day that you'll find one who will dangle her progeny in midair a few inches away from certain destruction. But that's exactly what the female potter wasp makes a life-long career of doing.

To start the next generation off on the right foot, the mother wasp





builds a small urn from mortar where she places several paralyzed caterpillars. Traditional waspish wisdom would then call for her to deposit her egg in close proximity to the caterpillars so that her newly hatched larva would have no trouble finding its next meal. But in this case the caterpillars are only partially paralyzed and their constant twitchings and thrashings would pose a serious threat to the larva. So mama wasp, having plenty of insight into these matters, attaches her egg to the end of a silken thread that dangles from the ceiling of her little mud enclosure.

But in solving one problem, the wasp creates another. Suspended in midair above the caterpillars, the larva has no way to safely get to its food supply. Almost, that is.

Again the potter wasp shows remarkable foresight. When her tiny larval offspring hatches, the egg case doesn't break open like a normal egg, but it unwinds to form a miniature spiral staircase leading down to the caterpillars.

At first the small wasp larva can only sally down its silken steps and take a few tentative bites out of its wriggling hosts. But after a few days it has grown to the point where it can abandon the safety of its perch, dispatch its victim, and spend the rest of its larval days blissfully munching on the remains of the carcasses.

According to conventional evolutionary litany, the potter wasp should probably have solved the problem simply by *fully* paralyzing the caterpillars. After all, *other* wasps do this. Why not the potter? Why go to all this trouble for a single wasp egg? And how does a wasp somehow come up with unwinding eggshells that turn into spiral staircases—along with an "understanding" of how to suspend them?

Certainly the potter wasp's strange behavior has to leave evolutionary theory hanging in midair along with its offspring. And maybe it's trying to tell us something about a Creator who obviously has a lot of architectural expertise along with a pretty ingenious imagination. □



As increasing population makes larger demands on world food reserves, millions of lives hang in the balance. Will there be enough food to avert widespread famine? Where will the food come from? Will affluent nations be required to lower their standard of living to supply massive shipments of grain? Whose responsibility is it to feed a hungry world?

by Robert A. Ginskey

FEEDING THE WORLD

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

One-fifth of the human race faces possible starvation or severe malnutrition. In many parts of the world, 30 to 50 percent of the children die before age five, millions of them because they simply cannot get enough food. Many survive but with permanent damage to their minds and bodies.

"No tragedy is more wounding than the look of despair in the eyes of a starving child," stated former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger at the 1974 World Food Conference in Rome. "Therefore, today, we must proclaim a bold objective—that within a decade no child will go to bed hungry, that no family will fear for its next day's bread, and that no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition."

But Kissinger's lofty proclamation was strikingly lacking in specific pledges of American food assistance for the starving nations of the world—an omission that highlights one of the most profound and agonizing moral questions of our day: Whose responsibility is it to feed the world? Are Americans, with their bountiful crops, morally obligated to supply sustenance to those less fortunate?

Without question, the American people have repeatedly responded to the needs of the starving peoples of our planet. In the past ten years, they have provided 84 percent of all food aid given by the developed countries. Millions of tons of grain and billions of dollars in assistance have flowed from the U.S. to the hungry peoples of the world.

Yet, what aid the U.S. has given—however generous—has not been enough to satisfy many international food officials.

"The United States must assume principal responsibility for preventing future world food disasters," asserts Dr. Sartaj Aziz, deputy director of the World Food Council. But the U.S., according to Aziz, has unjustifiably liquidated its food reserves. Furthermore, says Aziz, "the overconsumption of food in the rich countries is at least one factor in the relative scarcity of supplies for the poor."

Food, Politics, and Confrontation

Third-World spokesmen also warn darkly of "retaliations and confrontations" if the developed world does not provide more agricultural and technological assistance.

Dr. Gelia Castillo, a rural sociolo-

gist at the University of the Philippines, says the world's affluent have little need for solutions to widespread hunger and malnutrition and often stand in the way of change. "I have no illusions that the rich of the earth, whether in the developed or the developing countries, would substantially and deliberately alter their life-styles so that the lower 40 percent might have a better lot in life," observes Castillo. "If they do change, that is probably because they are convinced that it is to their best self-interest."

And what might that self-interest be? Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos has called on the world's rich nations to share their wealth with the Third World or face the alternatives of "war or death." Marcos stated that unless the world's resources are shared equitably, "it would not be a question of whether but how soon the ever growing number of the world's poor would challenge the ever diminishing number of rich for a just sharing of these resources.

"The rich nations of the world have no realistic alternative," warned Marcos, "other than to cooperate with the Third World if they want to avoid confrontation."

But with oil prices becoming an increasing burden to the U.S. economy as well as to other developed countries, a powerful impetus has been generated to *trade* excess food for vitally needed energy supplies. With the mounting worldwide demand for food, the era of massive *free* food aid may be over. "We'd be fools not to parlay our agricultural abundance for whatever trade concessions we can get," said one observer. "The Arabs may have the crude, but we have the food."

Lifeboat Ethics

To a number of thinkers, especially Garrett Hardin, a human ecologist at the University of California, Santa Barbara, a future food crunch should be handled in much the same way those on a lifeboat would handle themselves in a disaster. "Each rich nation amounts to a lifeboat full of comparatively rich people," says Hardin. "The poor of the world are in other, much more crowded lifeboats. Continuously, so to speak, the poor fall out of their lifeboats and swim for awhile in the water outside, hoping to be admitted to a rich lifeboat, or in some other way to benefit from the goodies on board. What should the passengers on a rich lifeboat do?"

Hardin's point is that if the passengers in the rich lifeboat take on the poor swimmers, their boat will eventually become overcrowded and swamped and they will all lose their lives. Logically, therefore, they should not admit any more people into their boat. By analogy, the "lifeboat theorists" believe that if the rich countries undertake massive grain sharing with the poor, their own economies will suffer and, conceivably, they could even so draw down their own food supplies as to make *themselves* vulnerable to famine.

Critics say such an approach is morally repugnant, but Hardin and his associates claim that this approach is not as hardhearted as it initially sounds: In fact, they argue that it is a deeply moral, even altruistic course of action.

Hardin maintains that if the United States were to sacrifice its own standard of living to send massive shipments of food to India, it

would only mean that so many more people would be kept alive and would eventually procreate and make the task of feeding them that much greater. Eventually, the time would come when it would be physically impossible for the U.S. to feed them all, and, at that time, many more people would end up starving to death than would have if the United States had never sent food in the first place. "Every life saved this year diminishes the quality of life for subsequent generations," Hardin maintains.

The main criticism of the lifeboat approach comes from those who disagree with the lifeboat analogy itself.

Some charge that the lifeboat approach *assumes* the worst possible thing will happen: No means will eventually be found to feed the extra people which current aid would keep alive.

Furthermore, they fear that lifeboat ethics would become a self-fulfilling prophecy. If the rich nations do not *try* to help the poor nations develop their own agricultural resources, millions of people will be condemned to death, when a decent effort on the part of the "have" nations in that area could have prevented it. Critics also maintain that Hardin errs when he says that the rich nations would be swamped if they were to "take on" the poor. They contend that there is a great deal more "fat" and surplus in the rich nations than Hardin would allow for, and that while the rich nations might not enjoy "first-class berths," their lifeboat wouldn't exactly be swamped. As one critic put it: "Before you start pitching people out of lifeboats, you could at least get rid of the golf clubs."

Nuclear Blackmail

Finally, critics point out that whole nations simply do not starve quietly. Some nations might even attempt nuclear blackmail to prevent the rich nations from withholding aid. In such a case, it might be more profitable—even from the standpoint of the rich nations' own self-interest—to make an all-out effort in food aid and agricultural development in the Third World.

"India was only the first of many

poor nations to decide, given the near-certainty of famine, that nuclear weapons are a better investment for survival than tractors and fertilizer," says former Pentagon-think-tank researcher Lowell Ponte. "If poor nations have nuclear capability," concludes Ponte, "they will use such weapons openly against their neighbors, or terrorists [will] threaten the United States to demand a share of a shrinking world food supply."

Fortunately, present U.S. food policy is not being dictated by viable threats of nuclear blackmail. But the hotly debated moral question of food reserves and food aid continues unabated.

Triage

Another approach to the food crisis is "triage," a term taken from the World War I method of sorting wounded soldiers into various categories for treatment with scarce medical supplies. According to triage, wounded soldiers were grouped into three categories: those who would survive even if they didn't receive any medical help, those who might survive if they received medical help, and those who would die no matter how much medical help was lavished on them.

As it applies to the food crisis, triage means that some countries would purposely be denied aid because they would "survive" anyway, and others would be denied aid because they would be considered beyond help. The triage idea was adapted to the world food shortage by William and Paul Paddock in their 1967 book *Famine 1975!*

The book assumed continual population growth in the poor nations and, eventually, a "time of famine" when this growth would overwhelm available food sources. At such a point, the Paddocks argued, the U.S. and other agricultural-surplus countries should "ration" food aid on the basis of how much ultimate good it would do. They even made practical suggestions: Pakistan and Tunisia were judged good candidates for survival *if* they were given aid; Libya and Gambia would probably get along without it; and India and Haiti were deemed beyond hope.

The Inevitable Cataclysm

Believe it or not, world-scope famines were predicted over 1,940 years ago by Jesus Christ, the greatest prophet, forecaster, and newscaster who ever lived. His disciples asked Him: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" (Matt. 24:3.) After warning of false Christs and world wars, Christ mentioned a *third* signpost: "...and there shall be famines" (verse 7).

Some 60 years later, Christ further elaborated on this description when He gave the apostle John the prophecies concerning the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse in the sixth chapter of the book of Revelation. Again the same basic sequence of events is described. Following the white horse representing false Christs and the red horse of war comes the black horse of famine: "And I beheld, and lo a

black horse; and he that sat on him had a pair of balances in his hand. And I heard a voice in the midst of the four beasts say, A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny; and see thou hurt not the oil and the wine" (Rev. 6:5-6).

Jesus Christ placed His end-time prophecies in an era when all human life was capable of being exterminated by nuclear war (Matt. 24:22). Clearly, these prophecies of worldwide famine are for the near future.

This great famine will reduce the rich few to the lot of the poor majority. Eventually it will spread to all peoples and nations, until mankind surrenders to God's laws, which can provide plenty and joy for all. Until then, God will allow man to reap what he sows, permitting mankind to learn the bitter lesson that sin brings pain and ultimately death.

After man learns this lesson, God will again teach him the principles which will bring about a world of plenty.

Christ's ultimate intervention will set off a chain of events that will finally bring a halt to the continuous rounds of famine and hunger the human race has experienced down through history. Satan the devil will be put away (Rev. 20:1-2), and with him will go the centuries-old system of greed and exploitation that has left many a broken, hungry, and destitute person in its wake. The "dispossessed masses" will become a thing of the past, as every individual will have a chance to own agriculturally productive real estate (Micah 4:4).

If you would like to know more, then write for our free booklet *The Black Horse*. It discusses in greater detail Christ's prophecy of future famines and also describes their ultimate solutions.

But William Paddock now agrees with Hardin: "When we wrote that book [*Famine 1975!*], we were still very much in favor of foreign aid," observes Paddock. "We only wanted it better targeted. But now I feel we should cut down on aid because of what has happened since about 1970. I don't see any difference between me and Hardin; I think Garrett Hardin is completely right in his interpretation."

Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, is equally pessimistic. "Cruel as it may sound, if the developed and affluent nations do not intend the colossal, all-out effort commensurate with this task, then it may be wiser to 'let nature take its course,'" advises Handler.

Need vs. Greed

"I can't agree with the lifeboat strategy of total abandonment, or the triage strategy of selective abandonment for today's world," counters outspoken climatologist

Stephen Schneider in his recent book *The Genesis Strategy*. "Rather," says Schneider, "we should redouble our efforts, perhaps through a Global Survival Compromise, to take advantage of the precious little time that may remain and use it to improve that real world situation."

What is Schneider's Global Survival Compromise? Essentially, he contends that the rich countries of the world must control their excessive consumption, recognize the desperate need of the poor countries, and supply them with massive aid—food, technology, capital investment—in the hope that their populations can be controlled and that future catastrophe can thus be averted.

"I hold few illusions that the nations of the world will easily band together politically through some type of Global Survival Compromise and act in time to prevent a few terrible human disasters," laments Schneider, "[but] individual

efforts to reduce the danger can indeed make a difference and, thus, we should not be discouraged individually from trying simply because others do not promptly join us. In the end, though, only our collective labors will yield any real chance of total success."

Needless to say, Schneider's Global Survival Compromise stands in sharp contrast to the more pessimistic approaches of lifeboat ethics and triage.

Of Ethics and Conscience

Yet whatever one's long-term evaluation of man's ability to conquer famine and starvation, the stark reality of present-day suffering should not be overlooked.

The Bible is filled with admonitions to give bread to the hungry (Ezek. 18:7, 16), and assist those in need (Isa. 58:7). Indeed, even one's enemies are to be treated with compassion. "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be

(Continued on page 34)

WHEN WERE THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS WRITTEN?

by Lawson Briggs

Less than two centuries ago the scholarly current first began to run toward a new and different view of the New Testament. The New Testament books were written, said the new views, neither when—nor by whom—the Church and tradition had long supposed and incorporated into the very titles of the books in the Authorized and other versions.

By 1850, the Tübingen school of biblical criticism prevailed. F. C. Baur, dominating the scholarly scene, questioned the authorship of every book except Revelation and four of the epistles of Paul. All the rest, including Acts and Mark, were placed well into the second century, far removed from the events they described—and from apostolicity!

Once again, by 1900, the scheme had been modified. Harnack, for example, placed only Jude, James and II Peter in the second century. But views at that time were extremely varied and scholarly disagreements volatile.

“By 1950 the gap between radical and conservative had narrowed considerably, and we find a remarkable degree of consensus.” Thus John A. T. Robinson, in the introduction to his most recent book, delineates the progress of New Testament dating in a survey by fifty-year periods.

Robinson Strikes Again

In *Redating the New Testament*, the controversial Cambridge dean, former Anglican bishop, British theologian and author (*Honest to God*, *The Human Face of God*, etc.) has demonstrated once again that he can be just as challenging and provocative as ever. But this time there is no challenge of the virgin birth, no espousal of “the new morality,” no denial of biblical absolutes.

Instead, building on the basis of his numerous earlier articles and a

vast knowledge of the writings of others, he finds reasons sufficient to now persuade him to date the original writing of every New Testament book to times earlier by far than are generally accepted—even before the culmination of the Jewish-Roman conflict (A.D. 66-70) and the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple which occurred in A.D. 70. Indeed, he finds the major clue for his unusually early dating in these very events, and in the fantastic significance—as it seems to him—of the New Testament’s complete failure to mention or to otherwise betray any evidence of the fall of Jerusalem or its results, in spite of its necessarily tremendous impact on the early Church. Most scholars date the books (with the exception of some of Paul’s epistles) *after* that climactic event. Kümmel’s theory—the standard dating at present—puts most of the New Testament writings between A.D. 80 and 110.

Robinson, though he has the highest respect for fellow scholars, has a lot to say about the inadequacies of presently accepted scholarly techniques. There is, for example, his statement concerning the “manifold tyranny of unexamined assumptions. . . . Different schools of critics take these over from their predecessors, and of course individual commentators and writers of introductions take them over from each other. Fashions and critical orthodoxies are established which it becomes as hard to go against in this field as in any other. . . . Some of this is sheer scholarly laziness” (p. 345).

Once having become accepted among scholars, ideas and chronologies tend to become embedded in academic concrete.

Continuing, Robinson explains: “Each new student enters a field already marked out for him by date-

lines which modesty as well as sloth prompt him to accept, and having accepted to preserve. The mere fact that ‘New Testament introduction’ tends to occupy his earliest and most inexperienced years has a formative effect, for good or for ill, on all his subsequent work” (p. 350).

Early in the book Robinson explains the reason for his own investigation: “In fact, ever since the form critics assumed the basic solutions of the source critics (particularly with regard to the synoptic problem), and the redaction critics assumed the work of the form critics, the chronology of the New Testament documents has scarcely been subjected to fresh examination. . . . It is only when one pauses to do this that one realizes how thin is the foundation for some of the textbook answers and how circular the arguments for many of the relative datings. Disturb the position of one major piece and the pattern starts disconcertingly to dissolve” (p. 9).

He speaks of the “remnants of Tübingen presuppositions” from which scholarship has had great difficulty shaking itself free, and of the “lingering influence of an older criticism, too thoroughly bent upon negative results” (p. 164).

And what were those influences and presuppositions? *A priori* assumptions and guesses regarding the length of time necessary for the evolutionary development of Christian ecclesiastical thought (and/or the documented congregational problems and needs), which are supposed, sometimes erroneously, to be evidenced in the books in question.

“*A priori* arguments from Christology to chronology,” he points out, “and indeed from any ‘development’ to the time required for it, are almost wholly unreliable” (p.

85). He argues that every situation or doctrine evidenced in the New Testament could and did come to the fore in the approximate period 15 to 40 years after the crucifixion of Jesus.

But do not suppose that Robinson's purpose is in any way bent toward critical or academic iconoclasm. Far from it. His is not a negative purpose, nor is *Redating* a negative book.

Positive Contribution

Throughout, in closely reasoned point-by-point treatment, Robinson presents a basis or a justification for his dating of each book, and challenges the reader, scholarly or otherwise, to prove him wrong. He does not claim to be infallible, but is convinced that in the main he is on the right track in lowering New Testament dates.

This is not the place to reexamine his evidence (nor to judge it), but merely to point to its support for the position that the New Testament is, after all, exactly what it should be: the record written by apostles and a few other teachers in the very first generation of Christians.

It may come as a shock to some lay Christians today to find him dating the book of Revelation (and indeed all the writings of John) pre-A.D. 70. Robinson notes that "the consensus of the textbooks, which inform the student within fairly agreed limits when any given book of the New Testament was written, rests upon much slighter foundations than he probably supposes" and, "surprising to discover . . . only one book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, is dated in early Christian writings" (p. 337). Nevertheless, he takes issue with the reliability of even that one sole exception. He dates the book of Revelation's backdrop of persecution of Christians (as well as its scenes of an existing Temple) not in the reign of Emperor Domitian (whose supposed persecutions he gives reasons to doubt), but in the then recent reign of Nero in the mid-60s (whose persecutions of Christians are not in dispute). This was, after all, he points out, following Hort, "the general ten-

dency of criticism' for most of the nineteenth century" (p. 224).

An "objection has sometimes been brought against a date in the 60s from the fact that Laodicea, almost totally destroyed in the earthquake of 60-61, is addressed as an affluent church. But the city took pride in having rebuilt itself without waiting for help from imperial funds, and by the end of the decade might well have boasted, 'How well I have done! I have everything I want in the world' (Rev. 3:17). Ironically Moffatt holds that it is irrelevant to connect this with the reconstruction after the earthquake because by the 90s 'the incident is too far back!' This is an instance of how arbitrary [and circular!] dating procedures so often are" (p. 230).

Other Books

The epistles of John, Robinson believes, reflect the same period of budding heresy and takeovers by false teachers that is evidenced in the letters of Paul in the late 50s and beginning of the 60s. The same can be said for Jude and II Peter. The deviation of the grammar and writing style from I Peter to II Peter and II Peter's stylistic resemblance to Jude, Robinson accounts for by suggesting that Jude wrote II Peter at Peter's direction and for his signature. The "first" letter implied in II Peter 3:1 was not I Peter but Jude. I Peter is placed at the onset of the Neronian persecution, spring 65.

The book of James was written very early, in the 40s, before there was a strict differentiation of Judaism from the Christian Church, which otherwise would have been reflected in this piece of typical Jewish-teaching literature.

Robinson accounts for the alleged differences of language between the different writings of John on the grounds of the elapse of a decade—critical in the life of the Church—between the epistles and Revelation. John's Gospel, an even earlier book, retained in John's final editing the marks of its original uncanonical composition in the late 30s or 40s.

The other Gospels shared a similar early origin, in forms which

were written and rewritten in the 40s and 50s. But Robinson completely rejects the necessity of having them written by the ecclesiastical "community," as has been the usual scholarly view in this generation. As to their resemblances and common sources, he says: "Though practically no one would question the fact of literary inter-relationship between the synoptists, it is less clear than it was fifty years ago that the first three Gospels can be set in a simple chronological series or that we know what the order of the sequence is. Equally it is much less evident than it once seemed that John is dependent upon, and for that reason later than, the synoptists" (pp. 338-339).

The book of Acts dates itself by the otherwise unanswerable question of why it ends as it does, with no climax, no special event, as if left unfinished to be continued as later events occurred. Robinson's verdict: Acts was written no later than A.D. 62. Acts then gives us the clues for constructing the framework of Paul's life and letters, which, Robinson accepts, were all written by Paul (not claiming the unsigned book of Hebrews, which, however, he believes was quite obviously written at a time when the Jewish Temple services it describes were in full swing).

Final Thought

Throughout his monumental work, Robinson insists he is not alone in seeing the evidence for various earlier datings than has been the recent custom. In comment and footnotes he carefully documents a recent trend back toward conservative views, and an increasing tendency toward agreement with the kind of dating he now espouses.

Whatever the final verdict—and it is clear that scholarly debate has been reopened—the "book, somewhat paradoxically, seems certain to prove a powerful intellectual support for orthodox Christianity" (*National Review*, April 1, 1977).

Whatever the degree of acceptance on certain individual datings, the case Robinson presents is worth reading. □

The Quest

by John R. Schroeder



No living being naturally wants to die. But the stark fact of death is with us whether we like it or not. No human being has yet avoided death. And all living things begin to die as soon as they are born. There is no apparent escape.

The Vanity of Human Pursuits

Throughout history man has been painfully aware of his own mortality. He has sought to escape it in a variety of ways. Ponce de León searched for the fabled fountain of youth. The Greeks perpetuated the philosophical concept of the immortality of the soul—that man's righteous soul would finally divest itself of its evil body at the moment of death.

More practical minds sought to preserve themselves through "immortal" works of art, magnificently constructed edifices bearing their names, or classic books which they authored. The ancient psalmist well expressed this proclivity of man: "Their inner thought is, that their houses are forever, and their dwelling places to all generations; they have called their lands after their own names" (Ps. 49:11, *New American Standard Bible*).

But none of the trappings of human civilization are truly immortal. The Alexandrian library of ancient Egypt burned to the ground. Palestine is the graveyard of several civilizations. The hulks of Crusader fortresses dot the Mediterranean coast in modern Israel. The ruins of several Roman *tiattas* (theaters) have been unearthed by archaeologists in the Holy Land.

So even the most enduring ele-

ments of civilization must eventually perish—even if it takes millions of years. The best of buildings will ultimately decay into nothingness.

Everything that the eye can see—whether organic or inorganic—is aging or decaying to one degree or another. There is no arguing with that fact. It is a basic law of the physical universe. Thinking people recognize there is no apparent practical solution to the cycle of birth, babyhood, youth, middle age, old age and death. So they seek to preserve themselves through future generations—their sons, daughters, grandsons and granddaughters. But this has no practical value in preserving their personal beings. Moreover, there is no guarantee that the earth will always sustain the conditions necessary for organic life. The dominating fact of the last half of the twentieth century is humanity's newfound ability to totally destroy all life by a host of terrible means.

All avenues of escape seem effectively sealed. Averting our own personal mortality seems impossible. The physical universe offers no hope for survival. All seems hopeless in the ultimate sense. We seem doomed to oblivion.

Even modern man has dimly recognized that no natural force offers any practical solution to his problem. Explanations born of faith and fantasy are far more appealing than the certainties of science.

But is each generation born only to die in a never-ceasing stream of time? Are all but a lucky few limited to the biblical threescore and ten—and the lucky only to that plus a few more years? One thing is certain: Physical knowledge has not provided the answer to these questions.

An ever-increasing amount of understanding about the physical world in which we live has not significantly dented the mysteries of immortality. We, on the average, may live a few years longer than our progenitors, but we are no closer to preventing death than they were. Any particular individual's final demise cannot be long delayed.

Nothing seen by the human eye can solve our problem. Nothing confined within the limits of space and time can help us in the long run.

The Bible itself affirms these truths. The apostle Paul spoke of *spiritual survival* made possible only from a spiritual source. He was not discouraged by the prospect of perishing physically because he possessed a source of knowledge unobtainable by the natural mind.

Notice an excerpt from one of his letters to the Church of God in Corinth: "So we do not lose heart. Though *our outer nature is wasting away*, our inner nature is being renewed every day. For this slight momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison, because we look not to the things that are seen but to the things that are unseen; for *the things that are seen are transient*, but the things that are unseen are eternal" (II Cor. 4:16-18, RSV).

Jesus on Immortality

Jesus did not disagree with Paul. He told some who trusted in human tradition and their vaunted national heroes for salvation: "Your fathers ate the manna [bread from heaven] in the wilderness, *and they died*" (John 6:49, RSV). Jesus had to explain to them: "It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail; the

For Immortality



Ponce de León in search of fountain of youth.

Culver

words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (verse 63, RSV).

Man has always been pre-occupied with the *physical* aspects of religious worship. The woman at the well pointed out to Christ that her ancestors had worshiped God at Mount Gerizim in Samaria. She erroneously thought that Jesus strictly enjoined worship only at the Temple in Jerusalem. He corrected her misassumption: "Jesus said to her, 'Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain [Gerizim] nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. . . . But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father *in spirit and truth*, for such the Father seeks to worship

him. *God is spirit*, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth'" (John 4:21-24, RSV).

Jesus later explained that the seeds of this permanent spirit life may be sown in the flesh *now*. He said: "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but *has passed from death to life*" (John 5:24, RSV).

Permanent spirit life residing in the flesh cannot be tested by the five senses of man. It is an ingredient that is totally spiritual—yet totally real. It is the germ of immortality. It is the Holy Spirit of God.

It cannot be bought with money. It is truly priceless. God offers it free

of charge through Jesus Christ. "Ho, every one who thirsts, come to the waters; and he who has no money, come, buy and eat! Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (Isa. 55:1). □

RECOMMENDED READING

Those interested in pursuing a further study of the religio-philosophical aspects of immortality may write for the following free brochures:

Why Were You Born?

Just What Do You Mean—Born Again?

When a Man From Space Visited Earth

How You Can Be Imbued With the Power of God

See the inside front cover for the address of our office nearest you.

A NEW LOOK AT AN OLD COMMANDMENT

For centuries religionists have tried to divorce the fourth commandment from the other nine in the Decalogue, contending that the Sabbath is mere ritual. They haven't understood the moral and ethical reasons why God devised it in the first place.

by Jeff Calkins

In any given weekend in the United States, the freeways from the cities to the countryside will be clogged with cars and campers. The cities pour forth their teeming masses, yearning to breathe free—and cleaner—air. Though people have just gotten off work, they are, ironically, frantically *working* in order to get away from work!

Some families wryly proclaim that instead of fighting bumper-to-bumper traffic in a national park they will stay home and rest during their weekend vacation.

The weekend throngs are enslaved to the world of work. They may have “leisure,” but they don’t use it leisurely: the frantic weekend hardly disturbs the rhythm of the workweek.

Which is where we broach the question of the fourth commandment. “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . in it thou shalt not do any work” (Ex. 20:8-9). Of all the Ten Commandments, it is the one which has come under the most fire. Theologians delicately excise it from our religious consciousness by asserting that the Sabbath was a specific institution given to the ancient Jews in order to keep them, as God’s nation, symbolically separate. In this way of looking at it, the Sabbath has nothing intrinsically to do with one’s relationship to God or man; it is merely a hangover from bygone days, a sort of spiritual Edsel, God’s own version of planned obsolescence.

Most people see the eminent logic of the commandments against murder, stealing and lying. Some nonreligious people even believe that coveting and adultery are wrong.

And most *religious* people see the logic of the commandments about worshipping the one true God, not idols, and not taking His name in vain. But the Sabbath gets left out. It is not kept because most people—including theologians—don’t see the logic behind it. They don’t see how keeping a period of time “holy” could possibly be important to God.

The Beat of a Different Drum

But the Sabbath is a means by which God protects His investment in human beings. If God had made the Sabbath *only* because we need the weekly rest (and, of course, we do), He wouldn’t have made a *specific* period of time holy. “Any ol’ time” would do.

The Sabbath is justified because it protects and enhances man’s relationship to God. It exists to keep us in a proper frame of mind. We live in a grubby, material world of everyday things. We only see material things. There is, as we face each day, a built-in bias towards materialism. It isn’t hard at all to avoid anything spiritual. And unless we take some time to consider, to *think* upon a realm other than the material, most of us might plod through our lives oblivious to the major facts of the universe.

There is no reason for a Sabbath—a day of rest to consider God and His creation—without a God. We need time to think about that God—because, even though God really exists, the natural tendency is to go through life as if He *didn’t* exist.

Most men, wrote Thoreau, live lives of “quiet desperation,” like so many bees in a hive, squandering their lives in a furious race to get to

the end, never considering *why* they are alive in the first place.

The Sabbath marches to the beat of a different drum. Or, more properly, *strolls*. It presents us with an opportunity to consider the *whys* of life, not just the *hows*. It represents a chance to get one’s head on straight; a time to achieve a philosophical orientation in life; to know *where* one should aim in life.

The Eternal Treadmill

Our routinized, modern “work” gives us a strong push to materialism, and subtly tells us that the only reality is grubby, mundane, earthly and perceptible. If it completely inundates our life, it cuts us off from God. Paul condemned ancient thinkers who did not like to keep God in their knowledge (Rom. 1:28), and David noted that it is the *evil* who say in their hearts that God doesn’t see them (Ps. 10:11)—in other words, that God doesn’t really exist.

We can often get so bound up in our work—or our various recreational activities that we do in order to rest up for more work—that we forget what work is all about in the first place. An individual can spend his life in a corporate treadmill, if he’s an ambitious type, a contestant in what is properly called a “rat race,” and never ask himself why he’s doing it.

It is only as we stand off, ponder the universe and our existence, consider God, His laws and His creation, and place ourselves consciously in the context of the whole universe, that we can be fully human. That is one way in which the Sabbath was made *for man*

(Mark 2:27). It is not a binding force to enclose us in even *more* mundaneness, but a liberating force for freeing our minds and bodies from ordinary humdrum existence.

In our daily lives, we are often barely conscious of what we do. We get up, we eat breakfast, we go to work, we get on with the household chores, we do our work, we eat lunch, we do our work, we continue the same things, often by rote. In one way of looking at it, we might as well be robots, preprogrammed to a certain way of doing things. The part of us that is uniquely human, our intellectual consciousness, may not even come into play. Even if we work "with our brains," we still may never be *self-conscious* in the sense of acutely realizing our unique position in the universe—in the whole of God's creation. The Sabbath gives us time to consider ourselves in relation to the around.

Man Who Is Born to Work

A rather jaded French writer expressed a modern attitude toward life: "Work is less boring than pleasure." He was noting the desperation of life without God: without work, such a life would be boring, meaningless and absurd.

That is the problem with the general weekend frenzy in modern Western society. Individuals find no meaning or variety in their work so they seek it in various pleasures and pursuits. But meaning, a solid basis for one's life which ties all of its diverse elements together, cannot be found solely in physical things. Again, the Sabbath—an observed Sabbath—is needed to remind us of this fact.

The same meaninglessness is also the problem with the traditional ersatz sabbath that most of Christendom has produced, the religious observance of Sunday. The *authority* for worshiping on Sunday derives from tradition and history, not the Scriptures. (Some scrupulously celebrate Sunday as a commemoration of the resurrection, but this neither Christ nor the apostles anywhere commanded. We are, however, enjoined to observe the annual anniversary of His sacrificial

death for our sins. Write for our free booklet *How Often Should We Partake of the Lord's Supper?*)

Anything deriving its authority mainly from tradition and history is sufficiently fuzzy, and allows for enough spiritual "fudging" so that the net effect of Sunday observance is simply to make it another day of the week, one on which to play golf or mow one's lawn. The Sabbath, unlike Sunday, is firm; the source of its authority clear.

The Greeks had a myth about Sisyphus who was condemned to continually roll a large stone up a hill, the stone always rolling back down the hill just as he was about to get it to the top. Modern man, without the genuine Sabbath, is like that: continually working, immersed in material life, but never quite attaining his goal of lasting happiness because material things are temporary.

The Sabbath is classless. Everyone—no matter what he does the other six days of the week—has basically the same leisure time for reflection and contemplation as the richest man of property. For one seventh of the week, everyone is commanded to take leisure time necessary to think things over.

The Sabbath confers upon its keepers a "superfluity" of time: time, the most precious resource of man, is being used for something other than material, utilitarian functions—a luxury that is normally only within the province of the rich.

It is no accident that totalitarian governments make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for their subjects to keep the Sabbath. Those governments recognize no other reality than the material, and no higher authority than themselves. They claim, in effect, the prerogatives of God. They dare not let any subject recognize the existence of God by keeping the day which marks Him as Creator.

Totalitarian governments constitute the extreme form of a world of "total work." Everyone under their control is a cog in the materialist wheel, reduced to a mere function, subordinated for the good of a material commonweal. But the Sabbath is an institution which shows

that man is God's creation, made by Him for a purpose. A totalitarian government can tolerate no space of time which isn't subordinated to the work of serving the state.

The Celebration of the Universe

The Sabbath is, in effect, a celebration of the end of God's work and the prospect of man's becoming God, just the same way that God celebrated His accomplished work by resting on the seventh day when He had completed the basic creation of the physical universe and physical life on earth.

The atheist existentialist philosophers have been content to tell us that human life is absurd, that all of man's life is merely a preparation for death. And, given the materialistic premises of these writers, life *is* absurd. But God intends to make man into His image spiritually as He has already made him in His image physically. The weekly rest on the seventh day is a "celebration" of this fact.

Thus the Sabbath commandment embodies a principle as profoundly *moral* as any other of the Ten Commandments—it affects the deepest part of our being, what we believe about the origin and purpose of the universe in our heart of hearts. It is, in a sense, the commandment which God gave to keep us right internally, to keep our priorities and perspectives right in the way we look at reality.

God intends for us to become like Him. And to do that, we need the "leisure time" which the Sabbath provides to *think* about our lives—or to "examine ourselves," as the apostle Paul put it. God made the Sabbath to give us just such an opportunity. □

RECOMMENDED READING

The Worldwide Church of God offers the following publications concerning the Sabbath day:

Which Day Is the Christian Sabbath?

The Sabbath and the Ten Commandments

The Sabbath Was Made for Man

To obtain your copies free of charge, simply request them by title. (International addresses are on the inside front cover.)

NEW YEAR!?

(Continued from page 18)

you" (verses 33, 34, *The Living Bible*).

Privacy

Our Founding Fathers would turn over in their graves if they could see the mess we are in today. Our "rights" have disappeared under the banner of maintaining them. The apostle John in the book of Revelation and writer George Orwell in his book *1984* both foresaw the problem: buying and selling, having and not having a job totally controlled by government.

You may end up under another government with another number—and as I bring it up let me say ahead of time that I am NOT saying that the "number in their right hands and in their foreheads" is the Social Security number—BUT, let's just see what now is, and what is possible in John's and Orwell's vision of our next few years!

"Social Security"—what a wonderful sound! And when it was inaugurated we were all promised our number would never be used for anything but Social Security! Do you know your number? What do you use it for?

The computer is an invention of the rank of writing and the wheel: It has completely revolutionized our society. Don't misunderstand me. Computers are not bad, but they have been put to some uncomfortable uses.

Names are okay, but computers prefer numbers. The one number you have which is unique to you is your Social Security number. Once you have that unique number it is convenient for government and business to keep track of as many things about you as possible with reference to that one number. So the promise of its single use goes by the wayside, as so many other promises, and you and I become increasingly naked and have our privacy invaded to the last jot and tittle—or should I say bit and bite! For the fun of it, why not figure out how many uses your number is now being put to? You might start by counting the credit cards you carry—each com-

pany asked for your number before issuing you their little plastic rectangle.

Credit rating? Driver's license? Bank account? Gun registration? Crop allotments? Timber harvest? The amount of water in your well? The checks you write? The life-style you lead; the things you buy? Did you know, by the way, that every check you have ever written is microfilmed and on file—and available to government and business alike?

Need cash? What for? Paper money is only redeemable in more paper money! Besides, it's what money can buy that is important, not the money itself. Checking accounts help create more money. Credit cards do too. But they can be doctored, stolen, misused. Wouldn't it be nice if they offered to just tattoo your unique number on the back of your hand—invisibly, of course—and all you had to do was pass it under a small machine to buy and sell, to pay and get paid? No one could steal it; nobody else could use your number!

Can't happen? Don't bet on it!

Thy Kingdom Come!

There will be no privacy in God's Kingdom either. He knows not only all the facts about us, but even our every thought. He knows our heart and our very intent. That's fine! As long as GOD is governing I won't mind that invasion of privacy—but with human beings in control to such an extent, I get uneasy. How about you? With corruption rampant, terrorism spreading worldwide, nuclear holocaust around the corner, society in a moral sinkhole, the family disintegrating, famine, pollution and pestilence staring the human race in the face, I can only pray: "Thy Kingdom come!"

That will be the really good news!

Happy New Year! □

RECOMMENDED READING

What is the kingdom of God? Is it the church? Is it something "set up in the hearts of men"? Is it "the good within you"? Is it "the millennium"? Each of these is widely taught—yet none is right! The shocking truth is made plain in the booklet *Just What Do You Mean . . . Kingdom of God?* Be sure to request your free copy (address of our office nearest you is on inside front cover).

FEEDING WORLD

(Continued from page 27)

thirsty, give him water to drink" (Prov. 25:21).

In the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:29-37), Jesus emphasized that all men are our neighbors and that Christians, like the Samaritan, should come to the aid of those who are hungry and destitute.

The apostle James proclaimed that true religion is inextricably tied to ministering to the poor, the fatherless and the widow (James 1:27). "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone" (James 2:15-17).

And in one of the most convicting and conscience-pricking accounts in all of Scripture (Matt. 25:34-40), Christ speaks of a future time when He will say to the righteous: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom. . . . For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? . . . And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

For America and other nations which claim to derive most of their fundamental moral principles from the Bible and the Judeo-Christian ethic, there is no question that we have at least some responsibility to show compassion for the poor and destitute, and to help feed the world's hungry. But how much aid, in what form, and for how long are knotty and soul-searching questions—questions which can only be answered by our deepest and most personal convictions. □

BEHIND SADAT'S HISTORIC TRIP

by Stanley R. Rader

Tokyo, November 22, 1977: Here in Japan interest was extremely high concerning Anwar Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem. All of the Japanese television and radio stations, as well as the newspapers, carried extensive accounts of the events surrounding Mr. Sadat's journey. Most of you, I am certain, were also fixed to your television sets as the miracle of satellite communication brought these unprecedented affairs into your living rooms.

For our many Japanese friends, and for me, it was especially rewarding. Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong and I have together brought many Japanese congressmen for the first time to both Egypt and Israel since the October 1973 war, and through our combined efforts we have worked to promote better understanding in Japan of the problems of the Middle East.

As a result, some of our Japanese congressmen friends became so involved that several of them were placed on the Arab black list for what the Arab nations considered to be a pro-Israel position. This was not the case, and the congressmen were subsequently removed from the black list.

Only this past summer, in August, the Ambassador International Cultural Foundation (AICF) sponsored yet another visit by prominent members of the Japanese Diet to Israel, as well as to Yugoslavia and Poland. On these various occasions we have managed to bring the Japanese into very close contact with all of the leading officials of the Egyptian

and the Israeli governments, as we have been found by our friends in Egypt and Israel to be working always for world peace in a nonpolitical and nonpartisan manner.

Last month in this column I predicted that Mr. Begin would be the man who could alone of all the Israelis on the scene today, because of his political posture in the past, make the kind of move, including concessions, in order to bring about peace in the Middle East. Immediately after the October 1973 war, Mr. Armstrong and I made some ten different trips into Egypt, and we reported how very much impressed we were with President Sadat and what we thought was a genuine desire on his part to bring about an amicable settlement of all the issues between his country and Israel.

Mr. Armstrong and I did what we could on every subsequent trip to Israel to advise our Israeli friends of what we thought was the totally sincere commitment for peace that President Sadat evinced when he received us. We delivered similar sentiments of a sincere desire for no further bloodshed and for mutual cooperation in the near future communicated to us by others in the Egyptian government, as well as university and industrial leaders.

In other columns in the past this writer has suggested that the problems of the Middle East are going to have to be solved by the people of that region, and that a settlement imposed upon them from the outside—whether it be imposed by the United States unilaterally, by the U.S.S.R. unilaterally, or by the United States and

the U.S.S.R. working together—will not produce a lasting peace. I have repeatedly said there were men of good will in all of the countries of that region and that, behind the scenes, they were working for a real peace.

President Sadat's announcement that he would go to Jerusalem, and even speak to the Knesset, his subsequent fulfillment of that promise, his de facto recognition of the state of Israel—all of these things are dramatic, but should not be construed as mere artifice or showmanship or political maneuvering. They should, instead, be viewed as a culmination of the determined efforts of Mr. Sadat and his closest colleagues on the one hand, and Mr. Begin, his colleagues and his immediate predecessors on the other hand. It is clear that many months of effort on the part of many people were involved.

We have also seen more evidence of the radical approach being manifested by those in other parts of the Arab world who do not want peace or stability in the area. But, again, those who are concerned more about mankind and civilization as we know it today will do everything they can to resist and to otherwise thwart a further radicalization of the area. It is inconceivable to this writer that the government of Saudi Arabia, for example, will not give President Sadat its blessing regardless of what public protestations may be heard.

Within a few days I am planning to return to Cairo and to Israel with several members of the Japanese Diet to gain further insight into the events that will continue to unfold between now and the time of the Geneva Conference. In the meantime, I am sure that the hope extends around the world that this initial, courageous first step on the part of some very concerned world leaders will become eventually a giant stride forward for mankind. □

Q&A

Q u e s t i o n s

a n d

A n s w e r s

Q "I recently read in an official publication of the Church of England that character formation is the purpose of human life on this earth, and I know that also to be your teaching. I want to believe it, as it seems to make sense, but nowhere in the Bible have I ever found this stated. I have read the Bible for many years."

John R.,
London, England

A Probably the reason you have not found character mentioned in the Bible is that the word itself is never used in the Authorized King James Version. The Greek word *charakter*, from which our word comes, does occur in the New Testament once, and is translated "express image" in Hebrews 1:3. Here the word has undergone considerable development from its original etymological meaning of "something cut [or] incised." However it does not yet have the exact meaning of our English word in this context.

But the quality or attribute of character is often dealt with in the Bible. It is, indeed, one of the main themes of the Bible. In Romans 5:3-4, the Revised Standard Version translates as "character" the Greek word *dokime*, which is referring to the state of having been proven by testing. "More than that [rejoicing in hope of sharing the glory of God], we rejoice in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, and endurance produces *character*, and *character* produces hope [confidence]."

Ephesians 4:11-14, without specifically using the word, speaks of character and character development as the purpose for which Christ gave ministerial gifts and of-

fices to the Church: "... until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; so that we may no longer be ... carried about with every wind of doctrine. ..."

Peter also shows that character building is essential for us to become partakers of the divine nature. "For this very reason make every effort to supplement your faith with virtue, and virtue with knowledge, and knowledge with self-control, and self-control with steadfastness, and steadfastness with godliness, and godliness with brotherly affection, and brotherly affection with love" (II Pet. 1:5-8).

The same sort of growth was demanded even of Christ Himself when He was a human being. Hebrews 5:8-9 reads: "Although he was a Son, he *learned obedience* through what he suffered; and *being made perfect* he became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him."

Q "Today's English Version of the Bible says in Acts 20:7, 'on Saturday evening we gathered together,' which is directly contrary to what the Authorized Version says. So may I ask, did those disciples meet on the first day or the last day of the week? Will you please explain?"

Robert M.,
Louisville, Kentucky

A The literal Greek wording of this passage is "on the first day of the week." However, because in today's English language the phrase "first day of the week" is commonly regarded as referring to Sunday, the Today's English Ver-

sion translators evidently felt it necessary to specify that the disciples' meeting was on Saturday evening rather than on Sunday morning.

In both Old and New Testament times, days were begun at evening (roughly at sunset) and ended at the following evening. However, Roman practice was to count days from midnight to midnight, and this became the system of the modern world. When names for the days were adopted, Sunday of course meant a midnight-to-midnight period. It is obvious the Acts 20:7 meeting did not take place on Sunday morning, since in that very unusual circumstance Paul preached till midnight. (Write for our free booklet *Which Day Is the Christian Sabbath?*)

Q "If Jesus Christ of Nazareth was seen alive after His resurrection, what was He doing? Where did He go? What happened to Him thereafter? He seems to have just vanished!"

Bill S.,
Ripton, Vermont

A The accounts of Christ's repeated appearances after His resurrection are related at the end of each of the four Gospels (Matt. 28, Mark 16, Luke 24, John 20-21) and in Acts 1:1-12 and I Corinthians 15:4-8. A good harmony of the Gospels will help clarify the chronological order of these events. Briefly summarizing, Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene; to another group of women; to two men going to Emmaus; to Simon Peter; to ten of the apostles, then to all eleven of them; to the apostles again beside the Sea of Galilee; to 500 people on a mountain in Galilee; and to the disciples once

more—repeatedly materializing and dematerializing before their eyes. Then finally He did “vanish” in a different way (Acts 1:9-11). The disciples literally saw Him go up into the clouds and disappear from their sight on His way to heaven. So far as the Bible enlightens us, He has not since reappeared to anyone with the exception of the apostle Paul (I Cor. 15:8-9).

The Bible does not give us complete details of all the events that occurred while He was on the earth for 40 days after the resurrection (Acts 1:3). The biblical writers were concerned with producing a theological account of His life, rather than a biographical portrait. Therefore, they give us only glimpses and highlights, omitting a fuller account which they felt was unnecessary for their purpose.

Q “If you have any information on John 4:22, affirming that ‘salvation is of [or from] the Jews,’ I would appreciate it greatly.”

David N.,
Dallas, Texas

A When Jesus uttered those words, He was speaking not in terms of the Jews being the exclusive universal carriers of the true religion, but simply of the fact that the Jews possessed it while the Samaritans (one of whom Jesus was addressing here) did not. The Samaritans had their own community and religious center near Mt. Gerizim, a rival to Jerusalem. Their schism from the Jews may date from as early as the time of Ezra, in the fifth century B.C., when the principle had been enunciated that only Jews at Jerusalem would officially carry out the work of God in that age (see Ezra 4:1-3). Knowledge of God would thus come from the Jews, and the Samaritans would not really know God. Hence Jesus' words: “You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews.” With this Paul concurred (Rom. 9:4-5): “They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the prom-

ises; to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ.”

Since, as in the example of Cornelius, the Roman, “God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him” (Acts 10:34-35), individual non-Jews could worship God. God was seeking that kind of worshiper, as Jesus went on to say. Jesus the Messiah—the Christ—would save them. But to fulfill God's promises to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, etc., the Messiah and His salvation had to come from the Jews of the official messianic line: “For I tell you that Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God's truthfulness, in order to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs, and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy” (Rom. 15:8-9).

Now—in our age—where or by what race of people God is worshiped is immaterial. Christ stated in the same context that “the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth” (John 4:23).

Q “The apostle Paul wrote in Romans 5:12 that ‘sin came into the world through one man [Adam] and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned.’ Is it true then that we are all born sinners? If so, and since Jesus died to save us from our sins, does this mean our children born after our conversion are free from the impact of sin?”

Naushad S.,
Berbice, Guyana

A Notice that in Romans 5:12 there are two distinct points made: 1) To Adam belonged the first sin and the first death; and 2) death spread to all *because all others have sinned too*—not just because Adam sinned. This principle is expounded in considerable detail in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel; everyone is guilty in God's sight for only his or her own sin.

If Adam had sinned but his children had not, they would not have

come under the penalty of eternal death. If we today had not sinned, we would not be guilty. But the Bible states unequivocally that “*all* have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23). “Original sin” is not inherited—sin cannot be passed from parent to child. Likewise the children of converted parents cannot inherit their parents' “state of grace.” When they sin, it is due to their own human tendency to go astray (influenced by their environment), not because they were “born sinners.” Whether they were born before or after their parents' conversion has nothing to do with their decisions to sin or obey, or with their own need for personal salvation.

Q “You seem to keep hinting in your publications that the ‘born-again’ people haven't really been born again—yet. Just what do you mean?”

L.R.,

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

A The actual biblical meaning of being “born again” (Greek, “born from above”) or “born of God” (see John 3:3-8) is quite unique. So far, that kind of birth has occurred only to one individual, Jesus Christ, who is described *since His resurrection* as “the first-born from the dead” (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). Paul wrote that Christ was “designated Son of God in power [He had again become fully God] . . . by his resurrection from the dead” (Rom. 1:4).

Perhaps one of the best passages for explaining the meaning of being born again is Luke 20:35-36: “Those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age [the time of the Kingdom of God] and to the resurrection from the dead . . . cannot die any more, because they are equal to angels and are *sons* of God, being sons of the resurrection.” When they too have been resurrected to eternal life in the family of God, they will then have been born again. Write for the free booklet *Just What Do You Mean—Born Again?* for a further explanation of this important question. □

THE GARNER TED ARMSTRONG TELECAST

U.S. STATIONS

Eastern Time

ALBANY — Channel 10, WTEN-TV, 8:00 a.m. Sun.
ATLANTA — Channel 17, WTCG-TV, 7:30 a.m. Sun.
BALTIMORE — Channel 45, WBFF-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
CHARLESTON — Channel 2, WCBD-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
CHARLOTTE — Channel 36 WRET-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
CHEBOYGAN — Channel 4, WTOM-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
CINCINNATI — Channel 5, WLWT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
CLEVELAND/LORRAINE — Channel 43, WUAB-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBIA — Channel 19, WNOK-TV, 8:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBUS — Channel 38, WYEA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
DAYTON — Channel 7, WHIO-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
ELMIRA — Channel 36, WENY-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
ERIE — Channel 35, WSEE-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
FLINT — Channel 12, WJRT-TV, 8:00 a.m. Sun.
GREENVILLE, N.C. — Channel 9, WNCT-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
GREENVILLE, S.C. — Channel 4, WFBC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
HARRISBURG — Channel 21, WHP-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
HUNTINGTON, W.V. — Channel 13, WOWK-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
INDIANAPOLIS — Channel 4, WTTV-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat.
JOHNSON CITY — Channel 11, WJHL-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
LOUISVILLE — Channel 11, WHAS-TV, 8:30 a.m. Sun.
NEW YORK — Channel 9, WOR-TV, check local listing
PHILADELPHIA — Channel 17, WPHL-TV, 11:00 p.m. Sun.
PORTLAND — Channel 8, WMTW-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
PORTSMOUTH — Channel 10, WAVY-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.

PRESQUE ISLE — Channel 8, WAGM-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
PROVIDENCE — Channel 12, WPRI-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
SALISBURY — Channel 16, WBOC-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***SOMERSET** — Channel 8, COMEX-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
SOUTH BEND — Channel 22, WSBT-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
TAMPA — Channel 10, WLCY-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
TRAVERSE CITY — Channel 7, WPBN-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
***WILMINGTON** — Channel 6, WECT-TV, 12:00 a.m. Sun.

Central Time

ABILENE — Channel 12, KTXS-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
***AMARILLO** — Channel 10, KFDA-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
BATON ROUGE — Channel 33, WRBT-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
BEAUMONT — Channel 12, KBMT-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
BIRMINGHAM — Channel 6, WBRC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
BISMARCK — Channel 5, KFVR-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
CHICAGO — Channel 44, WSNS-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun.
COLUMBIA — Channel 17, KCBJ-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
COLUMBUS — Channel 4, WCBI-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
CORPUS CHRISTI — Channel 3, KIII-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
EL DORADO — Channel 10, KTVE-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
FT. WORTH — Channel 11, KTVT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.
GREEN BAY — Channel 2, WBAY-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
GREENWOOD — Channel 6, WABG-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
HOUSTON — Channel 39, KHTV-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sat.
HUNTSVILLE — Channel 48, WYUR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
KANSAS CITY — Channel 4, WDAF-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
LUBBOCK — Channel 11, KCBD-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sat.
MERIDIAN — Channel 11, WTOK-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
MINNEAPOLIS — Channel 4, WCCO-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.
MINOT — Channel 10, KMOT-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
NEW ORLEANS — Channel 4, WWL-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
OMAHA — Channel 6, WOWT-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sat.
PEORIA — Channel 19, WRAU-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
RAPID CITY — Channel 7, KEVN-TV, 10 a.m. Sun.
SELMA — Channel 8, WSLA-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SHREVEPORT — Channel 6, KTAL-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SIoux CITY — Channel 14, KMEG-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.

SPRINGFIELD, IL. — Channel 20, WICS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
TOPEKA — Channel 27, KTSB-TV, 12:00 noon Sat.
WICHITA — Channel 3, KARD-TV, 4:30 p.m. Sun.
***WICHITA FALLS** — Channel 6, KAUZ-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
WILLISTON — Channel 8, KUMV-TV, 12 noon Sat.

Mountain Time

BOISE — Channel 6, KIVI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
CLOVIS — Channel 12, KFDW-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
FARMINGTON — Channel 12, KIVA-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sun.
POCATELLO — Channel 6, KPVI-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
ROSWELL — Channel 10, KBIM-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sun.
SALT LAKE CITY — Channel 5, KSL-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
TUCSON — Channel 9, KGUN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

Pacific Time

ANCHORAGE — Channel 13, KIMO-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
FAIRBANKS — Channel 11, KTVF-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***HAYWARD** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sat. & Sun.
LOS ANGELES — Channel 9, KHJ-TV, 9:30 p.m. Sun.
***OAKLAND** — Channel 11, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
PORTLAND — Channel 12, KPTV-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sat.
SAN FRANCISCO (Oakland) — Channel 2, KTVU-TV, 10:30 a.m. Sat.
***SAN FRANCISCO** — Channel 21, ASAD-TV, 10:00 a.m. Sat. & Sun.
***SAN LEANDRO** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
***SAN LORENZO** — Channel 16, ASAD-TV, 5:30 p.m., Sat. & Sun.
STOCKTON — Channel 13, KOVR-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
***TACOMA** — Channel 10, CTEN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun., 3:30 p.m. Mon. & 7:00 p.m. Sat.

CANADIAN STATIONS

Newfoundland Time


SAINT JOHN'S — Channel 6, CJON-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

Atlantic Time

HALIFAX — Channel 5, CJCH-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.
MONCTON, N.B. — Channel 2, CKCW-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.
SYDNEY — Channel 4, CJCB-TV, 2:00 p.m. Sun.

Garner Ted Armstrong makes the news make sense.

These are only a few of the stations that carry the *Garner Ted Armstrong* program. But you won't want to miss out on his fascinating commentary—so send for your free copy of the up-to-date radio and television log. Just write to the address nearest you (see inside front cover).



Eastern Time

BARRIE — Channel 3, CKVR-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
KINGSTON — Channel 11, CKWS-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
MONTREAL — Channel 12, CFCF-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
NORTH BAY — Channel 4, CHNB-TV, 1 p.m. Sun.
OTTAWA — Channel 6, CHRO-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.
PETERBOROUGH — Channel 12, CHEX-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat.
QUEBEC CITY — Channel 5, CKMI-TV, 12:00 noon Sun.
SAULT STE. MARIE — Channel 2, CJIC-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sat.
SUDBURY — Channel 9, CKNC-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.
THUNDER BAY — Channel 4, CHFD-TV, 1:30 p.m. Sun.
TIMMINS — Channel 6, CFCL-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

Central Time

BRANDON — Channel 5, CKX-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sun.
REGINA — Channel 2, CKCK-TV, 12 noon Sun.
SASKATOON — Channel 8, CFQC-TV, 12 noon Sun.
^{*}**SWIFT CURRENT** — Channel 5, CJFB-TV, 9:00 a.m. Sun.
WINNIPEG — Channel 7, CKY-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 3, CKOS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 8, CKSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 7, CFSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.
YORKTON — Channel 6, CHSS-TV, 12 noon Sun.

Mountain Time

CALGARY — Channel 4, CFCN-TV, 1:00 p.m. Sun.

EDMONTON — Channel 3, CFRN-TV, 11:00 a.m. Sun.
LLOYDMINSTER — Channel 2, CKSA-TV, 9:30 a.m. Sun.

Pacific Time

DAWSON CREEK — Channel 5, CJDC-TV, 5:30 p.m. Sun.
VANCOUVER — Channel 8, CHAN-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
VICTORIA — Channel 6, CHEK-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
WHITEHORSE — Channels 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, WHTV-TV, 7:00 p.m. Sun.

Please check your local listing for possible time or day changes.

* denotes new stations or changes.



Garner Ted Armstrong

**SPEAKS
OUT!**

Sadat's Bold Gamble Prophesied?

Anwar Sadat is making history. Could he also unknowingly be fulfilling Bible prophecy?

In his dramatic visit to Israel in mid-November, which included face-to-face meetings with Israeli Prime Minister Begin and an address before the Knesset (Israeli Parliament), the President of Egypt launched a bold new bid for peace in the Middle East.

It was a journey Sadat knew he absolutely had to undertake, regardless of the odds. It is known that he was convinced that another war was imminent, with catastrophic results for his country almost a certainty given Israel's clear military superiority.

Intelligence reports at his disposal showed that a "Round Five" of the Middle East war would be different this time; that another stalemate was out of the question; that unlike 1973, the government now in power in Israel would likely pay no heed to American and Russian calls for a cease-fire but would order their generals to march straight into Cairo itself.

Sadat also knew that a full-fledged Geneva conference, getting Israel and all the Arab states together to discuss all of their differences, was doomed to failure—with war as a consequence—unless a dramatic breakthrough occurred first.

Egypt, plagued with grave human, social and economic woes, simply cannot afford another war. So it was clearly time for Sadat to try an entirely new approach and to do the seemingly impossible: go to Israel on a personal mission to break the ice in the 29-year-old conflict. So far it has worked.

Sadat has not allowed the momentum to subside. He has since convened his own "pre-Geneva" meeting in Cairo, which has been bitterly condemned by the radical Arab states. Undaunted, Sadat is pushing forward—even if that means a separate peace agreement between only his country and Israel, although this is officially denied.

Without a doubt, more is yet to occur. The nation of Jordan is sitting on the fence, probably wanting to join the Egypt-Israel rapprochement, but afraid to do so at the moment because of reaction on the part of the radical Arab states who are fuming at Sadat's policy. Another key question is which way oil-rich Saudi Arabia—the treasury of the Arab world—will go. The Saudis have taken a cautious public stance toward Sadat's peace offensive, but have privately affirmed their support.

But let's look back at recent history for a moment and then do some speculating.

Never in our wildest dreams—following the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the subsequent Arab oil embargo and the skyrocketing price for Arab oil—could we have imagined a potential alliance between Israel and Egypt, and possibly other Arab states. Would it not be startling if the Saudi Arabians, sitting astride about 50 percent of the oil reserves of the world, threw their weight and energy to such a multilateral arrangement which would combine the technical genius, creativity, expertise and technology of the Israeli nation with the almost limitless manpower reserves of Egypt?

Where do these dramatic developments fit in the unfolding of Bible prophecy? The eleventh chapter of Daniel says the "king of the north" (a United States of Europe fulfilling the final end-time resurrection of the Roman Empire) will go down into the Middle East and "he shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown" (verse 41)—an obvious reference to the Holy Land, meaning modern-day Israel, the region of Palestine, and neighboring Arab countries, including Egypt (which "shall not escape"—verse 42).

But why would a central European power, perhaps threatened with a cut-off of vital oil supplies, also overrun two comparatively "oil-less" states who were also—until recent events—intractable enemies? This could much more logically be expected to happen if Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and other of the "many countries" were somehow allied together. In the context of Sadat's move, bringing about if not an immediate peace or treaty at least the beginning of a rapprochement between Israeli and Egyptian leadership, it is easier to see how such a prophecy could be fulfilled.

The Middle East is the focal point of Bible prophecy. Jerusalem is the place from which the Bible looks outward at all the rest of the world—economically, politically, militarily, and prophetically. As never before, we are seeing electrifying events leaping to life in the headlines of world newspapers which should help us understand some of the most important prophecies in the Bible! □

THE REAL JESUS

(Continued from page 5)

any material crutch, upon any remote temptation to depend upon a false feeling of "self-reliance." In this weakened state, after having spent countless hours in deep and soul-searching prayer, He would be equipped to withstand the worst temptations Satan the devil could throw at Him.

Not by Bread Alone

The account in Matthew says, "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred." The word "hungred" in context implies much more than just "hungry," the way it may appear to us. It is very doubtful that any living human being today could have the willpower and self-control, together with the physical stamina and strength, to endure a full 40-day and 40-night fast.

Jesus was nearly at the point of death: He had almost starved by the time Satan the devil came to Him and hurled every conceivable temptation His way. After the initial temptation of trying to get Jesus to obey his whims by converting stones into bread, Jesus made one of His most important pronouncements (and a statement that is almost universally misunderstood by millions of professing Christians today who would rather live by *some*, and *not every* word of God). Jesus said to Satan, "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Ministering Angels

Then Satan began to probe to find if there was any ego there, any vanity, selfishness, or desire for power or self-importance. Finally Jesus gave a command, and the devil was forced to obey! "Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (verse 10).

Now read the next verse! "Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, *angels* came and ministered unto him." What does "ministering" mean? What would you do if a per-

son who was very dearly beloved to you were discovered in an emaciated, starving state, in a condition of almost complete physical and mental exhaustion?

Remember, these "angels" did not appear like little pink-cheeked bare babies with bows and arrows, but as mature, kindly, competent, and swiftly efficient men!

From the times the One who became Jesus Christ of Nazareth—who was the God of the Old Testament—appeared to human beings Himself (He wrestled in the dust of the earth with Jacob, sat in the shade of Abraham's tent on the plains of Mamre, talked to Moses from a cloud on Mount Sinai) and from the other accounts in the Old Testament of angelic appearances, you can learn that angels always appeared to human beings *as men!* The two men who were the objects of the perverse lusts of the citizens of Sodom, and who had to drag Lot and his family out of the city just prior to its destruction, were *angels*, manifesting themselves as strong, human *men*.

Jesus was no doubt slumped to the ground or seated with His head in His hands following this exhausting encounter when a strong arm encircled His shoulder and a deep resonant voice said, "Here, take a sip of this."

When you "minister" to a person in this state of exhaustion, you will no doubt provide warmth in the form of blankets and a place to lie down, and give sparing amounts of something appropriate like beef broth or some other richly nutritious and easily digestible food.

When needed, angels, who were always around Jesus in unseen spirit form, would manifest themselves as human beings, and give Jesus even the necessary physical sustenance and protection. He was constantly attuned to that "other dimension" of the heavenly presence of His Father and the righteous angels.

So in the greatest spiritual battle ever fought, a battle that was absolutely necessary in the plan of God, the captain of our salvation qualified to take over rulership of this earth from the devil himself.

(Another excerpt from *The Real Jesus* will be coming next month.) □

OTHER CHEEK?

(Continued from page 15)

strikes you in the face" (verse 20, RSV). The implication is very plain—they ought not to have put up with such people who took advantage of them. They had the right to assert themselves. Instead, they were passive and submissive, encouraging aggressive behavior on the part of those false teachers.

Laying Down Your Life

So Christ's example is one of *voluntary* sacrifice. He said: "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13, RSV). That's the essence of Christianity. But is it love if a person murders you and takes away your life when you didn't want to give it? A person shows true Christian love when he doesn't have to do it, but freely and willingly *chooses* to share what he has with someone who is in need. He gives "not grudgingly, or of necessity," but because he wants to.


And if someone wrongs him, he takes an assertive stand. If that person doesn't comply with his wishes, he has nonetheless maintained his dignity, and he can believe in faith that in spite of the outcome, "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom. 8:28).

Some people say that Christianity contributes to neurosis—that it causes people to "turn the other cheek" in a nonassertive manner, building up a reservoir of frustration that ultimately leads to aggressive behavior. But as we have seen, this kind of "turning the other cheek" is not true Christianity at all—it's a false understanding of what Jesus meant and what God requires.

No, true Christianity calls for freedom—for standing fast in that liberty that Christ has given us. As assertive Christians, we can by our own voluntary choice give up our rights, and lay down our possessions, our time, or even our lives in service to others. We have been given freedom of choice and the right to behave assertively. □

WHY NOT?

by Jon Hill



WHY NOT KEEP A RESOLUTION?

Making resolutions—especially at this time of year—is easy. It's keeping them that is the problem.

It doesn't have to be New Year's Eve. Every day is a new day. And make an easy one. Don't be so hard on yourself and set such standards you will never accomplish anything. Don't try to change yourself overnight. Think small—but above all ACT! One small change could change your whole life!

How about: "I resolve to read the Bible a little bit every day." Begin with Genesis, that's the first page, and it even means "beginning."

How about: "I resolve not to watch television more than three hours a day." That ought to be easier than you think—and think of the time it will free up for *doing* something you've wanted to for so long. At least resolve not to believe 90 plus percent of what you see on the thing.

How about: "I resolve to eat natural foods and get off the junk food kick!" It's cheaper, tastes better, makes you healthier and cuts down on doctor bills.

How about: "I resolve to tell my wife (husband) I love her (him) at least once a month—and give the kids a hug (while they're not watching TV)!"

We've got some little booklets that would help on these and many other resolutions. The titles: *Read the Book*, *Managing Your Personal Finances*, *Your Marriage Can Be Happy*, and *Principles of Healthful Living*. Resolve to write for *one* or all; they're free. Why not?

Is God Fair?

(Continued from page 3)

every hand the final fruitage of men's ways. Written in unerasable blood, in human misery, anguish and despair is the six-thousand-year record of experience!

Even now men will not heed this horrible lesson—not until they are forced to see it!

But, as Satan's sixth "working day" closes, God is about to step in and supernaturally interfere!

The coming seventh millennium—typified by the Feast of Tabernacles—shall see Satan restrained. Christ will return to rule the earth with all the power of God. God's new order for the next thousand years will restore peace, happiness, and joy.

Then men may look back over this present world, and compare! Never will God force a single human being, against his own will, into salvation and eternal life.

But, with the seven-thousand-year record of experience set plainly before seeing eyes, do you think anyone will want to return to these ways we seem now to love? Not many, you may be sure of that! Yet some, even then, will rebel.

Finally the world shall acknowledge, of its own free volition, that God's ways are right. Christ, says the scripture, "learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8-9.) Even He who never did wrong! "And being made perfect"—through experience—"he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."

Some day we shall look upon God's plan with breathtaking admiration and awe! The suffering of this present time shall have faded completely from mind. The lessons of experience we shall have with us for eternity! Finally humanity shall accept God's ways of life, knowing that they are right ways. The happiness and joy we shall then experience cannot be conceived by our minds today! Through all eternity we shall worship and praise the Eternal God for His wisdom, His mercy, His love!

Do you think anyone, then, will look back and say, "God isn't fair"? □

Personal from...

(Continued from page 1)

who reject His gift of eternal life, the final second death in the lake of fire.

But, in the case of the human ovum, once fertilized as a begotten human, the egg—now called an embryo—is kept within the body of the mother, and is nourished and fed material food through her and protected by her. And there it must grow, being fed physically through the mother, large enough to be born. After a number of weeks, the embryo is called a fetus, and at birth it is a human baby.

In like manner, the Bible calls the Church the “mother of us all.” That is, the mother of Christians—those begotten of God. It is the function of the Church to protect and feed, spiritually, on the spiritual food of God’s Word, those begotten children of God, so that we may grow spiritually, in the divine character, ready to be born.

Surely this is a wonderful comparison. Yet types and antitypes are not always alike in every detail.

When a physical baby is born, it is not ready for marriage. When the spiritual child of God is born he will be fully mature for the spiritual marriage. How can this be? This is what one thinking man could not see.

The unborn human fetus is only growing physically. At birth the human baby knows nothing. He is helpless. He must be taught. He must learn. He is born merely with a mind *capable* of learning, knowing, thinking. He is not yet of mature size physically or mentally. Many do marry who are still entirely immature spiritually and/or emotionally. But we do assume that one has reasonable maturity physically and mentally before marriage. In the human, this development takes place in the human state after the human birth.

Therefore, the human baby is not ready for marriage at birth.

But the spirit-born are different!

Just as the fertilized ovum—the embryo which becomes the fetus—must grow physically from material food, so the Spirit-begotten child of

God must grow spiritually before he can be born. But there is a difference!

The fetus does not attain to complete physical maturity before birth, and has no mental maturity. But, in the spiritual rebirth, one must attain reasonable spiritual maturity before he is spirit-born.

Now what is spiritual growth? Just as the physical embryo-fetus must grow physically large enough to be born, so the Spirit-begotten Christian must grow spiritually or he will never be born of God. But spiritual growth is CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT.

The Spirit-begotten starts out with a MIND from the beginning. God *is* perfect character—divine, spiritual character. God is also love. And perfect spiritual character is the way of love! Such character is the attainment of the ability, in a separate independent entity of free moral agency, to be able to discern right from wrong—the true values from the false—truth from error—the right way from the wrong, and then to make the right choice or decision, even against self-desire, impulse or temptation; plus the will and self-discipline to resist the wrong and to do the right.

No human, with human nature, has the power—alone by himself—to do this. But God has made available the spiritual power and help man lacks. Man must desire to know—must hunger and thirst for truth; man must make his own decision, exercise his own will, even against the pulls of his nature. But without the help of God—without spiritual power from God—man is utterly unable.

That is why truly converted Christians sometimes actually do sin. They are like the apostle Paul, as he describes himself in Romans 7. With his mind he wanted to go the way of God’s law, yet he found himself unable. Another law warred within him against the good resolutions of his mind. But the sequel to Romans 7 is Romans 8—the Holy Spirit chapter. Who, Paul cried out, could save him from this body of death he struggled against in vain? The answer is, God, through His Holy Spirit.

A true Christian doesn’t want to

sin—should not. But sometimes he finds himself caught in the vise of habit, or overwhelmed by temptation or by circumstances from which he is unable to free himself. Surely, had such a one been continually praying, keeping himself close to God, and detached from the world or its lures or the temptations of the flesh, he probably would have had sufficient divine help to have prevented the sinning. But only Jesus Christ ever did keep that close to God!

God looks on the heart. In such a case, the Christian does not sin maliciously, with malice aforethought. He is merely caught in the vortex of a temptation which sucks him helplessly down into the sin. Then he is terribly sorry. He is disgusted with himself. He repents. He goes to work to overcome. He may not succeed, due to human weakness, at once. But he remains determined and finally does, with God’s help, overcome completely. Many a true Christian has had such a struggle over a particular human weakness and temptation, and after even several setbacks, finally, through God’s power, won the victory and fought his way free.

God looks on the heart. God forgives in such cases. The living Christ, our High Priest, has compassion, is filled with mercy—as long as the attitude is right, the *desire* of the inner man is to conquer the flesh and overcome the temptation and be free from it entirely. In the end, it is God who gives the victory. But, in such a struggle, the Christian develops character.

Now character, I have said many times, is something God does not create automatically. It is developed through experience. The development of that character is the very purpose of our being alive. Also the development of that character, unlike the purely physical growth of the unborn baby, actually is growing toward spiritual maturity, right now in the begettal stage prior to spirit birth—in this present mortal human life.

Notice how the “mother of us all,” the Church, is to protect and feed those in it, until they reach spiritual maturity. In I Corinthians 12 you’ll read how God gives spiri-

tual gifts for various administrations, or functions of service. In Ephesians 4:11-14, Christ has given special spiritual abilities or talents to certain ones in a chain of authority under Him in the Church—and notice for what purpose:

“And his [Christ’s] gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the equipment of the saints, for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ [the Church], UNTIL we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (RSV).

In other words, to full spiritual maturity!

Now why should we count the troubles and problems and temptations that beset us as all joy?

Simply because we cannot hurdle these obstacles successfully in our own power. They drive us to seek help from God. To go to God for the wisdom to know what to do, and the power to be able to do it, requires faith. This is a living faith. It is alive. It is active.

When we meet such trials, we often do not know what to do. We lack the wisdom to make the right decision. So open your Bible to the first chapter of James. Notice verse 5.

If you lack wisdom, in such trials, go to God for it! But ask in faith—no wavering—no doubting. Be sure God will not fail, but will give you this wisdom. Depend upon Him for it. If you waver, you are like a wave in the ocean—tossed back and forth—going nowhere! So, instead of wavering, be steadfast. And if you don’t get the answer immediately from God, have patience. Don’t give up. Trust Him.

Now notice verses 2-3: “Count it all joy, my brethren, when you meet various trials, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness” (Revised Standard Version). These trials force you to your knees. You must have faith to meet them. They test your faith. They develop spiritual character!

In the King James Version, it says the trying of your faith produces patience. It produces that kind of pa-

tience that is steadfastness. That is character!

Sure, it may be unpleasant for a while. But, Paul assures us that if we suffer with Christ, we shall reign with Him—and the glory to be revealed in us is so incomparably greater than anything we now are, that this promised future for eternity is something to rejoice over!

Yes, count it all joy! Even if unpleasant. It is maturing you, now, for the marriage to Christ. The Church of God shall be born into the Kingdom of God! The Kingdom of God will not be composed of spiritual know-nothings and infants.

When we are born again—born of God—resurrected in spirit bodies, those bodies will not be small, like a human physical infant which must grow to full physical size. We shall look as we do now, so far as form and shape and features are concerned. But the resurrected body will be a different body—composed of spirit instead of flesh and blood (I Cor. 15:35-44).

The original twelve apostles were Christ’s witnesses. That is, they were actual eyewitnesses that Jesus rose from the dead—that the living resurrected Christ was the same Jesus who had been crucified. They were with Him forty days after His resurrection. But nobody will be foolish enough to suggest that when Christ was born very Son of God by the resurrection (Romans 1:4) that He was resurrected in a tiny infant’s body composed of spirit. He was resurrected full grown, as He had been when crucified. How did the apostles know He was the same Jesus? Because they knew what Jesus had looked like—and in His born-again, resurrected body He looked the same, except He now was composed of spirit instead of matter!

The resurrected Christ was perfect—He was very God! But He did not grow up into perfection after He was resurrected. It was during His human lifetime, setting us the example, that He was made perfect, as you read in Hebrews 2:10 and 5:8-9.

Thus it is plain that we must develop spiritual character, growing to spiritual adulthood, during this life—not after our resurrection in glory! This is the spiritual growth, of which the physical growth of the un-

born child, from tiny embryo to a size and weight of some six to eight pounds at birth, is a type. The physical growth of the unborn human is a growth of physical size and weight. The spiritual growth of the begotten but yet unborn spiritual child of God is a growth in spiritual character, not of physical volume, size or weight. The human baby merely grows large enough to be born prior to birth—not to physical or mental maturity. But he does grow. And this physical growth is the type of the spiritual growth by feeding on the Word of God, and prayer, and Christian fellowship, and participation in the Work of God in the life of the begotten child of God.

The difference is merely the difference between matter and spirit. One is a material growth. Material growth is measured by volume, size, weight. The other is spiritual growth, measured by character development.

Jesus was born very Son of God by His resurrection (Romans 1:4). He was born fully mature. He was born in a spirit body, which was manifested to His apostles in the same apparent size and shape as when He died. When He appears on earth the second time, in His spirit glorified body, we shall be resurrected, or instantaneously changed, to a body that will be like Him (I John 3:2)—full grown—adult! □

No, you haven't been born again—

Just what do you mean—

BORN AGAIN?

—and this free booklet tells you why. To receive your copy of “Just What Do You Mean . . . Born Again?” write to the address of our office nearest you (see inside front cover).

orchids

L E T T E R S

& onions

Beginning with Begin

In your remarkably fair analysis of Menachem Begin ("Beginning with Begin," by Dr. Charles V. Dorothy, in the August-September *Plain Truth*), I found three areas that require amplification, else they provide your readers with the false impression that Begin and the Irgun were vicious and capricious in their actions. First, the two British soldiers were not tortured, as Dr. Dorothy wrote; they were hung. The British, in an attempt to destroy the Jewish underground, instituted a policy of mandatory execution for any captured underground Jewish soldiers, irrespective of what they did and without a trial. The Irgun wanted its captured men to be treated as prisoners of war according to the Geneva Convention. The British refused and hung seven Irgunists.

The Irgun then threatened to hang British soldiers in reprisal to prevent the further unnecessary killing of Jews. When the British captured two more Irgun members, the Irgun captured two British sergeants and offered to exchange the sergeants for the underground fighters. The British refused and hung the two Jews. The Irgun then hung the two British soldiers. After that, the British never again hung another Jewish underground fighter.

Second, the Irgun blew up the southern wing of the King David Hotel because this was where the British headquarters was located. The fact that innocent people died is sad; but one must blame the British for ignoring the 25-minute warning (a warning which they never gave the Jews) and for not evacuating the building.

Third, contrary to what Dr. Dorothy reported, the villagers of Deir Yassin were forewarned by a sound truck, because numerous villagers fled. Because of this forewarning the Arab fighters knew what to expect, and as a result the Irgun suffered a 40 percent casualty rate. There was not a single proven case of rape; there was no killing after the

fighting ended; and there were no mutilations of dead bodies. Each of these allegations is an unsubstantiated Arab accusation used for propaganda purposes. That civilians died is sad. But it never would have happened if the Arabs had not engaged in open warfare against the Jews after the U.N. partition resolution.

Sheldon F. Gottlieb,
Fort Wayne,
Indiana

Sex Education

As acting director of the Jefferson County Right to Life, I take exception to several statements in your August-September issue. In the interview with Elizabeth Calleton of Pasadena Planned Parenthood, she stated that Right to Life groups are opposed to abortion, opposed to birth control and opposed to sex education.

Yes, we are opposed to abortion. However, the policy of National Right to Life and all other Right to Life groups regarding birth control has always been that this is private morality, and we take no stand either for or against contraception. We are opposed to Planned Parenthood putting young children on "the pill" without parental knowledge because we feel that this infringes on the parents' rights to know how their children are being dealt with. In no way can this be interpreted as "opposing contraception." Regarding sex education, I am aware of some members who have investigated the problem in their own schools and found

that the books being used were actually books promoting humanism, homosexuality and abortion.

Perhaps you should ask Ms. Calleton why the VD rate and the illegitimate pregnancy rate increases so rapidly when Planned Parenthood becomes firmly entrenched in any area. Perhaps it has something to do with their movie *About Sex* which is shown at their teen clinics nationwide. This film was labeled pornographic by the Arizona Legislature.

Patricia H. Reff,
Acting Director,
Jefferson County Right to Life,
Watertown, New York

The Canal Controversy

I have just been rereading "Canal Zone Handover?" and feel more than ever incensed at the irresponsible attitude of the U.S. government in the surrender of the Canal Zone. What possible reasoning is there for giving away a commercial enterprise which benefits so many just to satisfy the ambition of one dictator who admits he doesn't know how he can restrain left-wing students who supposedly are under his control? Could these same uncontrolled left-wingers decide to sell the canal to the highest bidder? The U.S. did not take the land — we bought it both from Panama and various individuals. Please send a copy of the July 1977 *Plain Truth* to President Carter and mark it for his special attention.

Maria Sawyer,
Port Medway, Nova Scotia

LITERATURE REQUEST/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please check:

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

Name _____

Address _____

City/State _____ Zip _____

Clip and mail
with address
label to:

The Plain Truth
Pasadena, CA
91123

TRUE OR FALSE ?

- Jesus was an only child
- He was born on Christmas eve
- He was a poor vagabond
- He had long hair
- He came to save the whole world at that time
- He died of a broken heart
- He was crucified on Good Friday and resurrected on Easter Sunday morning

All of the above statements are false. Shocking? Surprising? Goes against everything you've always been taught about Christ? Well, it's true—most of what professing Christianity believes about Jesus Christ of Nazareth just isn't in your Bible! But at last someone has dared to ignore tradi-

tion and myth—to uncover the facts and present them to the world just the way they are in the gospel accounts in your New Testament. If you'd like to know the truth about your Savior—the way He really was—read *The Real Jesus* by Garner Ted Armstrong. It's at a leading bookstore near you.

