


the
PLAIN TRUTH
a of understanding



**THE CONTINUING
CRISIS IN THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH**

**THE PHILIPPINES—
A NATION IN TURMOIL**

**AN INSIDE LOOK
AT WORLD
POWER CHANGES**

**DROUGHT-STRICKEN
AFRICA**

a. menager

the
PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding

Vol. XXXVIII No. 10

Circulation: 2,980,436


November 1973

ARTICLES

The Continuing Crisis in the Catholic Church	2
The Philippines — A Nation in Crisis	8
An Inside Look at World Power Changes	13
How You Live Your Life Is the Only Religion	17
Europe: Catastrophe and Revival — Part II: Charlemagne — The First European	20
In the Grip of Starvation	34

FEATURES

Personal from the Editor	1
Advance News	7
What You Can Do	39
What Our Readers Say	40
Radio-TV Log	41



ABOUT OUR COVER

Pope Paul VI, head of the world's largest sect in Christendom, is beset by many pressing, complex problems. Characterizing himself as a man immensely alone in the face of a godless society, he wrestles with momentous issues within the Catholic Church and finds little consolation from the fact that Catholic states have no common policy or goal.

Allen Merager — Plain Truth Art

How your subscription has been paid

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

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

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

Executive Editor: Herman L. Hoeh

Senior Editors: David Jon Hill, Raymond F. McNair

Managing Editor: Arthur A. Ferdig

Art Director: Allen Merager

Associate Editors: William F. Dankenbring, Jerry J. Gentry, Gene H. Hogberg, Paul W. Kroil

Contributing Editors: Robert Boraker, Robert L. Kuhn, Ernest L. Martin, Gerhard O. Marx, Patrick A. Parnell, Richard C. Peterson, Richard H. Sedliacik, Paul S. Royer, P. M. Traunstein, Charles F. Vinson, Eugene M. Walter, William R. Whitehart

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

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

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

Art Department: Monte Wolverton, *Layout:* Ron Lepaska, *Graphics*

Photo Editor: David Conn; *Photographers:* Alan Beardsmore, Gary George, Ian Henderson, Mike Hendrickson, Alfred Hennig; *Photo Library:* Al Leiter

Copy Editors: Betty Lau, Jim E. Lea

Business Manager, Albert J. Portune

Director of Publishing, C. Wayne Cole

Circulation Manager, David Jon Hill

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

Published monthly (except combined July-August issue) by Ambassador College Press, Pasadena, California; St. Albans, England; and by Ambasciol Press Pty., Ltd., North Sydney, Australia. French, Dutch and German editions published at St. Albans, England; Spanish and French Canadian editions at Pasadena, California. ©1973 Ambassador College. All rights reserved.

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE paid at Pasadena, California, and at additional mailing offices. Entered as SECOND CLASS matter at Manila Post Office on March 16, 1967. Registered in Australia for transmission by post as a book.

Personal from



Alarming Rise in Divorce Poses Major Threat to U. S. and Western World

THE ALARMING rise in the divorce rate is now a major threat to the continued existence of the United States and other Western nations. The tragic breakdown in family life is inscribing the handwriting on the wall of our nations.

Just how important is marriage and family life? Some psychiatrists are now saying that the marriage system is on the way out. Will marriage totally disappear during century 21?

How — when — did the institution of marriage first start?

If man is merely the highest of the animal kingdom, when, in the evolutionary development from some ape-like animal into man, did the marriage institution start? Animals do not marry, though some species mate. But marriage and family life are peculiar to the human race.

Look at the present situation. In the twelve months ending February 1973, increase in divorces in the United States was 8.7 percent over the preceding twelve months. For every 100 marriages, there now are 31 divorces. Divorce is at an all-time high. At the present rate of increase, it soon will have invaded every third home in the United States. In some areas it already has!

In a healthy and happy society, education must begin in the home! It must put major emphasis on the necessity for family life. Yet in our

Western world — particularly in Britain and America — the family system is breaking down. Few parents have themselves been taught how to start education in the home. Few have adequate knowledge or ability to teach their below-school-age children.

The most tragically serious need in education today is in-the-home education on the basic importance of the happy family structure in our society.

Minority group studies made in the United States throw significant light on the vital importance of a tight family structure in any society. Although the specific conditions analyzed in these studies are peculiar to the United States — not Britain, continental Europe or elsewhere — they show emphatically that a happy family life is the very foundation of a stable society in any country.

The studies involve four minority groups in the United States. All four have suffered discrimination and prejudice. Three of these groups have attained status and, in general, have emerged from the former discrimination. These are the American-born Japanese and Chinese, and the Jews. With the Japanese and Chinese there was also the color barrier.

These three groups gained status and recognition, not by police and military enforcement of laws, not by

marches, demonstrations, threats and violence, but by self-improvement and achievement. In the United States, status is attained through the educational and occupational structure.

But the studies show that much, if not most, of the foundation for this achievement is a strong family system. These three groups generally marry within their own ethnic groups and maintain a tight family relationship. In all three groups, there is also family thrift — with the parents willing to make great sacrifices for the education and advancement of the next generation. The very hallmark of Jewish life is the close family relationship. Parents take great pride in every evidence of advancement, superiority and accomplishment by their children.

Compare these three minority groups with the white American majority, where the divorce rate is taking an alarming rise, and families increasingly are falling apart.

Astonishing Facts

The 1960 census showed some significant facts. More than half the children of American-born Japanese and Chinese families, between the ages of 18 and 24, were college educated. A B'nai B'rith study shows that more than 70% of the children of Jewish families in these ages were in a college or university. Yet,

(Continued on page 30)

Controversy and criticism continue to swirl around Pope Paul VI. Even his closest advisers ask: "What does the future hold for the Catholic Church?" Here is a glimpse into that future.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH today is a house divided. "Rome must do something, or the Church in each country will go its own way and the Pope will become a figure only for the tourists, or a kind of Dalai Lama." So warns theologian Piet Schoonenberg.

The time-honored phrase, "Rome has spoken, the case is closed," has been rendered virtually meaningless among 20th century Catholics.

The result is a growing crisis of confidence and authority facing Pope Paul and Church leaders. This crisis has led to an important change in Vatican thinking.

A Church in Need

The Catholic Church finds itself in need of a political institution to assist in stopping the spread of liberalism sweeping through it. But the Church in Europe is not alone in suffering from division. Europe itself is suffering from division — political, social and religious. Little wonder that the Vatican and Europe are therefore moving closer together in a common need for security and self-preservation.

For the first time in 155 years, the Vatican papal state has decided to make its voice heard on an international political platform. Leaders of the Roman Catholic Church have felt for many years that it was not the duty of the Church to interfere in the political quarrels of the world. But times have changed. Rome and Europe need each other for mutual survival.

Pope Paul's unofficial foreign

minister, Msgr. Agostino Casaroli, was directed to head the four-man delegation to the European Security Conference at Helsinki. Not since 1818 has such an event occurred.

But why, we ask, has the press overlooked its significance?

How the Floodgates of Dissent Were Opened

More than ten years ago the late Pope John XXIII was painfully aware of the divisive forces that were building up in the Church. To heal the wounds then afflicting Catholicism, Pope John called the Second Vatican Council. Its purpose was first to settle the Catholic Church's own internal problems. "Then after performing that dutiful work, after removing whatever on a human level could hamper a speedier progress," stated Pope John, "we will display the Church in all its splendor, without spot and without wrinkle, and we will tell all sepa-



The continuing crisis in the

CATHOLIC

by Paul Knedel

--	--	--



CHURCH

Illustration by Garry Haggerty



rated from us: 'See, brothers, this is the Church of Christ.'

The dream of Pope John XXIII to open windows to the world and send a wave of fresh air into a troubled church was looked on by many even then as a great gamble. John had one concern. The Catholic Church was in a state of deterioration and was not considered relevant to the 20th century. An "event" was needed.

Pope John expected Vatican II to update the Church and fill the 2,500 bishops at Rome with a new zeal.

Instead, the free exchange of views and ideas of bishops from all over the world proved disastrous. At the end of Vatican II, the bishops returned home, continuing to question and to launch further inquiries. Instead of providing a religious experience and bond of unity, the council opened a Pandora's box of controversy. Infallibility, celibacy, and birth control were all opened to renewed question.

The hope that God would show his face and renew the Catholic Church never materialized. John waited in vain. The divine event did not occur. He had gambled and lost.

John had tried to "force the hand of the spirit" and had failed. Instead of a wave of fresh air, a gale of dissent swept in and exposed problems that had been lying dormant. It soon became evident that the outpouring of the spirit Pope John was counting on for the success of Vatican II was a miscalculation.

Worldwide Turmoil

Even former Catholic strongholds have been severely affected. Although the major issues vary from country to country, general unrest and malaise are common to all.

In the United States, the Catholic Church has undergone great upheavals, and to one writer in the Vatican weekly, *L'Osservatore Della Domenica*, it seemed on the verge of collapse. In a recent article, Italian

theologian Ballista Mondin said that a number of people have told him the Catholic Church in America would be "totally wiped out" within the next twenty years.

Catholic publications in the United States were denounced for their complicity in the matter. As theologian Mondin stated, "Instead of tending to the bleeding wounds of their church, they willingly lend themselves to those journalistic fabrications which are typical of our time." The publication went on to say that Catholic authors have embarked on a wave of criticism "often graver and more offensive than even Protestant authors would dare to make."

In France, the number of adults converting to the Catholic faith has fallen by 50 percent in two years. In this nation where 84 percent of the population is officially considered to be Catholic, the conclusion among some Catholic officials is that France is experiencing "a tidal wave of unbelief." In the past ten years, enrollment in French seminaries has dropped dramatically, signaling no let up in the dwindling number of priests.

A constant source of tension is the expanding rift between the Dutch Church and Rome. The virgin birth, the authority of the Pope, and the right to marry are questions which have drawn the Church in Holland into the most potentially dramatic conflict with the Vatican since Martin Luther. In Rome, it has become commonplace to use the words "heresy" and "schism" in referring to Dutch Catholicism.

The struggle for "social justice" has Latin America in a bitter controversy. In the forefront of this movement are many priests who are calling for "power to the people." It is widely reported that at least one third of the churchmen in Latin America are in one way or another involved in protest movements. The "guerrilla priest," one who leads the fight for social reform, is not un-

heard of in many areas of South America. In Argentina, more than 500 priests reportedly belong to a "Third World Movement."

Although the Catholic Church has publicly favored many of the changes demanded by the reformist priests, it has done little to implement them.

In Brazil, the world's largest Catholic country, the problems confronting the Church range from a limited clergy to a rise of spiritism, voodoo and Pentecostalism. Brazil's military junta has jailed priests, nuns, and lay members for involvement in what they term subversive groups.

Even in Spain the demand is growing for an immediate end to the ties between church and state. The Spanish hierarchy has spoken out against political and social injustice in this most Catholic country.

Enter Pope Paul

The present Pope inherited a fragmenting Church when he was elected in June 1963. The trend in the Catholic Church at the death of John was clearly a move away from conservatism. Paul VI indicated at the time his intention of reigning in Pope John's spirit, and for a while, his policies did have a liberal flavor.

He praised John for putting more power into the hands of the bishops of the world and less into the Roman Curia. But in 1967, after a few years as Pope, he unaccountably shifted direction and moved back into the conservative camp. It was then that many of the present internal troubles came fully into the open.

The decision on birth control brought home to Paul that his brand of conservatism would invite rebellion. But the alternatives seemed unacceptable. A hard line approach would bring the loss of major portions of the Catholic population and destroy progress made toward non-Catholics. Conversely, a liberal ap-



BISHOPS from all over the world gathered for Vatican II — but the hoped-for unity did not develop.

Ernst Herb — Plain Truth

proach would invite local conservative schisms and open the Church to greater divisions.

Paul's solution, at least for the moment, has been a holding action. He will not alienate the reasonably progressive nor stifle the protests of the conservatives. This has prompted some to charge that he is the leader of a "do nothing" hierarchy on crucial issues of the day.

Sociologist and priest Andrew M. Greeley said of the present situation "that very many priests would agree that they feel the ship is adrift without any firm hand on the tiller."

Meanwhile, a group of 33 progressive Roman Catholics has attacked the leadership of the Church

and called on all Catholics to resist the misuse of authority by the hierarchy.

Is It the Devil's Fault?

Pope Paul has blamed the devil for the problems that have beset the Church since Vatican II. Addressing a mass in Saint Peter's Basilica, the Pope said: "We believed that after the Council there would be a day of sunshine in the history of the church. Instead we have found new storms. How has this come about? I will confide a thought to you: It is an enemy power, the devil. . ."

He suggested that Satan had entered the Church through some "fissure to stifle the fruits of the Vatican

Ecumenical Council." In making his pronouncement, the Pope asked his listeners not to treat his words as "superstitious or unreal."

The onslaught that followed was immediate and critical. The secular press of Italy lampooned him, progressive Roman Catholics were embarrassed, and many wrote off the papal announcement as one more tragic faux pas. Seldom has a pronouncement from Rome brought such ridicule and disdain upon a modern Pope. Catholic theologian and secular press alike have poked fun at him with titles of articles such as "The Devil You Say" and "Speak of the Devil."

In the face of these retorts, Pope

Paul a short time later said that at times he feels "immensely alone" in the face of a godless society. Describing himself as a "witness who shouts in the desert," Pope Paul nevertheless is increasingly leery of making papal pronouncements. He speaks in such a low-key effort that many of his statements, even though significant, receive very little recognition.

No United Europe Without the Catholic Church

One way to bring about a united church is to plunge it into a cause that is bigger than itself. That cause could be the unification of Europe. Despite its internal difficulties, the Vatican maintains a vital interest in Europe.

According to Malachi Martin's book *Three Popes and the Cardinal*, a unified Europe with Germany at the center has been uppermost in the minds of those high up in the Vatican. Europe is still considered the center of the world by Rome, but a permanently divided Germany has proven a stumbling block to the kind of unity Rome desires.

With deep internal dissent still raging, the Catholic Church is not, at the moment, in a position to enter fully the realm of global politics. Historically, however, Rome has been involved in the affairs of various nations and is not a stranger to the political arena. As Pope Paul said in *L'Osservatore Romano*, July 20, 1972, "The Church has the right to pass moral judgments, even on matters touching the political order. . . ."

Europe is searching for a central authority, one that can be looked upon as neutral. Ancient prejudices run deep among the nationalities of Europe, and a German is not likely to allow a Frenchman to rule over him or vice versa. But the office at Rome could accomplish an otherwise seemingly impossible task.

The simplest and perhaps the

only way to bring about a United States of Europe is by the binding tie of religion. With the majority of the present nine nations of the European Community being Catholic, such a union is a real possibility. Once formed, this great third force in the world could rival both the United States and Russia in world power politics.

Europe is moving ponderously toward full economic union. A common currency is expected by 1980. With the international monetary situation in disarray, some observers feel that Europe's timetable will be significantly speeded up.

Dr. Otto Von Habsburg, son of Austria's last emperor, said in a speech presented at London in 1970, "... we must admit that this decade will be quite a decisive one in the future of this Continent. We could even say that at the end of this decade it will be already clear whether this Europe will play the role to which it is obviously called in the world of tomorrow, a role of peace, of understanding and of progress. Or whether on the contrary we accept to live as we have lived in the past 25 years, divided between zones of influence, without our own determination in politics and economics, and that of course *might really mean a great danger for the rest of humanity.*"

Under what banner could Europe unite? Dr. Von Habsburg, in his book *The Social Order of Tomorrow*, states: "Now we do possess a European symbol which belongs to all nations equally. This is the Crown of the Holy Roman Empire, which embodies the tradition of Charlemagne, the ruler of a united occident. This may sound romantic and unrealistic. But one must keep in mind that the Crown represents not merely the sovereignty of the monarch, but also the ties between authority and the people. . . ."

And what of the importance of religion in the formation of a

United Europe? According to Dr. Von Habsburg, the fact that some northern European nations are Protestant and that there has been a decline of religion in these nations in recent years does not portend great difficulty for them in being integrated into a greater Europe. He says, "The ecumenic spirit has gained a great deal of ground, even much more in the last 14 years since this book was published. Of course religion has been in the wane in certain areas. I personally am rather dubious whether this wane will last very long. I rather expect in the future a reverse influence. That is to say, I expect that within the foreseeable future the influence of religion will become much greater than it has been in the past."

Big Events in the 1970's

If the Catholic Church is to play a major role in the new Europe, powerful and unusual events must take place in the 1970's. A revitalized Pope Paul or a strong successor will be needed to effect this change. To allow the continuing dissidence within the church will bring it to ruin.

Encounter With History

One thing is certain. The Catholic Church is down but not out. Rome is determined to play an important part in the history of the world.

Will it be, as Dr. Von Habsburg indicates, that the crown of Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Empire will again have a part to play in Europe?

Big events are shaping up in Europe, Rome, and the Middle East. Momentous decisions and actions in these areas are foretold in Bible prophecy and will affect the entire world in a way that will astound even seasoned observers.

Future issues of *The PLAIN TRUTH* will keep our readers not only abreast of but also in advance of these events. □

advance news

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

● **Americans Display Ignorance of European Affairs**

Common Market? Over half of the Americans questioned in a poll earlier this year confessed they had neither heard nor read about the nine-nation commercial bloc in Western Europe, otherwise known as the European Community.

The shocking disclosure — to Europeans at least — was contained in the resulting tally of a Gallup poll commissioned by the European Community Information Service (ECIS) office in Washington, D.C.

Fifty-five percent of the nationwide sampling — 1,030 Americans aged 18 and older — replied that the concept of the Common Market was new to them.

In addition, only 5 percent of those who said they were acquainted with the Community knew that the Community's population was greater than that of the United States, that it exports more than the United States, and that its industrial production is growing at a faster rate.

The poll's results clearly showed that today's Americans have been largely unaware of the historic events that have occurred in Western Europe in the last quarter century. They apparently have paid little attention to the heroic attempt to heal the French-German enmity after two world wars and to forge a union of the original six European nations. Enlargement of the Market less than a year ago to include Britain, Ireland and Denmark also went largely unheeded. Little wonder Europeans have complained of late that Americans have treated them with benign neglect.

● **Europe's Nuclear Dilemma**

Pressure is mounting in the U. S. Senate for a drastic reduction in the American troop commitment to NATO. There is now some question whether the Administration, its power crippled by Watergate, will be able to honor its NATO pledge in full force.

A unilateral reduction of U. S. troop strength in Western Europe would intensify already existing European doubts as to the reliability of the protective U. S.

nuclear umbrella over the Continent. American troops and conventional weapons in Europe are viewed by many Europeans as "benign hostages" insuring that the United States would back up its nuclear commitment.

Already, growing cordiality between the United States and the Soviet Union, spotlighted by the Nixon-Brezhnev agreement in June to work together to prevent nuclear war, has raised European fears of "desertion" by the United States and a "new Yalta." All of Europe, claim some, is in danger of becoming "one big Finland," totally at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

Viewed in the light of the continuing building of Soviet conventional military strength in Eastern Europe, nervous West Europeans — especially West Germans — are facing a serious dilemma. At the present time, there simply is no alternative to the assurance of U. S. nuclear protection for Western Europe's defense posture. An Anglo-French nuclear "umbrella," built on existing British and French nuclear mini-forces, would hardly provide an adequate substitute at this point.

In July, West German Chancellor Willy Brandt rejected proposals for the creation of an independently manned and controlled West European nuclear deterrent to replace the present U. S. umbrella. "I cannot imagine," Brandt said, "that one could create a European nuclear force without having a European government to control it." Such a United European government is not yet on the horizon.

The changes taking place could leave West Germany, the most vulnerable West European state, with only one eventual alternative: to work out a "modus vivendi" or working arrangement with the Soviet Union to gain breathing room to strengthen its own defenses. And such a development could be the most dangerous of all, ironically, to both the Soviet Union and the West. As one leading U. S. news weekly put it:

"Without heavy U. S. support to lean on, West Germany would be confronted with the pressures to take such politically sensitive steps as enlarging the 467,000-man Bundeswehr and perhaps going nuclear. The German issue would again become the central question in Europe."



A POLITICAL TREND of deep significance is sweeping Southeast Asia.

Nation after nation in this corner of the world is shedding the traditionally democratic legacies of former colonial masters. Their leaders have opted instead for various forms of authoritarianism — the same governmental style in vogue throughout Asia in the days before democracy first took hold. Thailand, South Korea, South Vietnam and Singapore are examples of nations which, under severe pressure both internally and externally, have retained democratic government in name but not necessarily in practice.

The Philippines is another such nation. Once hailed as the “show window of democracy in Asia,” this collection of more than 7,100 tropical islands in the South China Sea has confronted a series of mounting crises with a declaration of martial law and a new constitution significantly altered from the one implemented thirty-eight years ago under watchful Western eyes.

Marcos' Move

Philippines' President Ferdinand E. Marcos, having eluded a reported seven attempts upon his life during the opening months of 1972, determined by September 22 of that year

that only martial law would stem the critically rising tide of political and social chaos washing over his nation.

President Marcos attributed the causes of the chaos to the continuing threat of Vietnam-style communist insurgency and to steadily mounting social and economic ills which threatened to undermine the very foundation of Philippine society.

For decades, the Filipinos have been faced with various challenges to their established way of life. In the fifties and early sixties, the critical issue was the spread of internal problems created by the *Hukbala-*



SOLDIERS, above, on parade, celebrating the Philippine Independence Day, June 12. President Marcos (inset).

Romeo Vitug

THE PHILIPPINES

a nation in crisis

You think only leaders of the big nations grapple with complex problems? Then consider the smaller nations and the challenges they face. Here is an inside look at one such nation in crisis — the Philippines.

by Richard C. Peterson

haps, commonly known as Huks. In times past, this makeshift, communist-inspired army of over 10,000 continually terrorized the countryside, especially Luzon, the Philippines' largest island.

Today the Huks have dwindled in numbers and influence, but in their place has risen the Maoist-oriented *Bagong Hukbong Bayan*, or New People's Army (NPA). The NPA is schooled in Maoist thought and practice with many of its leaders Peking-trained in revolutionary science. For years the revolutionaries have been slowly gaining ground in central and northern Luzon, from their apparent base in Isabela Province. Numbering only a few thousand in actual numbers, their base of popular support prior to Marcos' declaration of martial law was reportedly in excess of 500,000 persons in over twenty of the nation's sixty-seven provinces.

When martial law was imposed last fall, President Marcos declared: "We've prevented another Vietnam in the Philippines." He asserted that his action against the guerrilla movement would prevent, in the Philippines, that which had already occurred in Vietnam.

However, many concerned observers nevertheless draw disturbing parallels between the Philippines of the seventies and the Vietnam of the early sixties. They stress the initially socialist nature of the NPA — "socialist as Ho Chi Minh was socialist." They see danger in its continuing success in garnering local support among extremely poor peasants who understand little about "isms" but much about impoverished life-styles. These observers are concerned with the forming of "revolutionary committees" in eighteen or more Philippine provinces. They also point out an obvious parallel with Vietnam: the presence of U.S. military advisors against the backdrop of a huge \$2 billion-plus U.S. economic investment in these islands.

Southeast Asian "Jihad"?

Thus far the communist insurgency of the NPA has been essentially localized in the northern Philippine provinces. But in the southern region of Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago, another even more bitter and explosive struggle is taking place.

President Marcos went before the nation on April 24 this year to announce that almost one million persons had fled their homes in the face of brutal fighting between groups of Philippine Moslems and Christians in these southern provinces. Reaching back to Spanish rule in the 16th century, skirmishes between these opposing forces have accounted for well over three thousand dead over the last five years. Add to that the innumerable other losses in injured and in property on both sides.

Often paralleling Northern Ireland in its ugly violence, this bitter animosity between Moslems and Christians caused mobilization of opposing rebel forces estimated at 14,000 to 16,000 troops. Taking the bizarre nickname of *ilagas* or "rats," Christians formed vigilante bands to fight marauding Moslem groups known as "barracudas."

Though officials in Manila stress that the Moslem-Christian infighting does not constitute a jihad, or Moslem "holy war," the dangers involved are serious. Among the 3.5 million Moslems heavily clustered in Mindanao's Cotabato Province and much of the Sulu Archipelago, there is talk of secession from the Philippine nation. Certain Moslems have dreamed of a link up with neighboring Sabah, a Moslem semi-autonomous state in Malaysian Borneo, thus forming a new nation out of Sabah, Mindanao and the Sulu island chain.

Since the declaration of martial law, there has been a steady stream of Moslems moving across the Sulu Sea to Sabah. Senior officials in Malaysia privately estimate the number at ten to twenty thousand.

The Manila government has voiced concern over indications of influence from other nations. Rebel leaders are reportedly being trained by Maoist elements, and Libya's Colonel Muammar Qaddafi has warned that Libya will be forced to "assume her responsibility" if the asserted "extermination" campaigns against Filipino Moslems continue. Also, it has been reported that financial and other aid has already been supplied to the Moslem secessionists from Middle East sources.

Oil a Factor

One of the world's "geocultural" ironies is that here in Southeast Asia, as in the Middle East, Islamic peoples are sitting atop significant reserves of oil. Tests by leading oil companies have demonstrated the existence of commercial quantities of petroleum in the Sulu Sea region. Drilling has already begun in selected areas, with more offshore and land-based facilities foreseen in the near future.


Though the full potential of the region as a source of oil is not yet known, it is clear that nature's "black gold" could well become a rallying point of secessionist efforts.

Neighboring Moslem states such as Brunei and Indonesia also have important underground petroleum reserves.

Mounting Social Ills

Added to the dual threat of communist intervention and Moslem-secession, Philippine leaders have had to fight against a veritable kaleidoscope of domestic ills.

Leading Philippine businessman-economist Sixto Roxas, speaking to a gathering earlier this year at Malacañang, the Philippines' Presidential Palace, summed up much of the Philippine dilemma when he said: "The limits of our agricultural-land frontiers have been reached. Our population [nearly 40 million] is double what it was thirty years ago, and is expected to double again in



Moslem children, victims of acute malnutrition, at a refugee center outside Cotabato City (upper left). At the Hilton Hotel, young people with degrees are employed for blue-collar jobs (lower left). Highly educated men and women have difficulty finding jobs. Land oil explorations in Iloilo are conducted by the Soriano companies under the Philippine Oil Development Corporation (near left).

Romeo Vitug

the next twenty-five years. The mass of our people suffer in poverty while conscious that a happier life-style not only is possible but has actually been achieved by societies that were managed more efficiently. If we had [only] a hundred more years to achieve . . . self-discipline . . . [but] we do not have a hundred years — it is doubtful whether we have even ten — to provide a larger means of satisfaction to our growing population and avert the whirlwind that forms around a vacuum of unsatisfied demands and betrayed hopes and aspirations.”

A Wealth of Potential, But . . .

The Philippines is potentially one of the wealthiest, most productive nations in all of Southeast Asia. But paradoxically, these islands have posed a continuing dilemma to those who have striven to get the unpredictable, often sluggish Filipino economy moving forward.

Many ponderous obstacles have stood in the way of would-be reformers. Among them has been the oligarchy or land-owning class. A mere four percent of the Philippine population, these immensely wealthy and powerful families have traditionally controlled over 90 percent of the nation's wealth. At the same time, the great majority of the population struggles with poverty,

realizing a family income of perhaps \$200 per year. The firmly entrenched land barons have resisted past efforts to distribute their wealth and extensive holdings more evenly among the population. In spite of this often formidable political resistance, President Marcos is banking heavily upon his new martial law measures to supply the vitally needed changes in this area.

The particular nature of the Filipinos themselves has often proven to be a hindrance to meaningful change. A people accustomed to domination by outside powers, the Filipinos have developed what in many ways amounts to a national inferiority complex — and a corresponding willingness to take life as it comes.

Though both agricultural and industrial potential is great, the Filipino economy remains seriously inefficient. Inflation is skyrocketing, presently running over 20 percent per year. Food costs are soaring as well, due in part to recent weather upsets and other natural disasters.

Filipinos as a group are among the best educated peoples of Southeast Asia. But tragically, there is often very little opportunity to put a hard-won education to proper use. Unemployment runs above 10 percent, with underemployment far higher. Many university graduates

often consider themselves privileged to be able to work as houseboys or barmen in Manila's tourist hotels.

Further compounding the problems is the fact that the Philippines has one of the world's highest birth rates, some 3.4 percent annually. This will produce, at current rates, a population of approximately 50 million by the end of this decade and a soaring eighty million by the year 2000.

Political Reform

Marcos' centralization of governmental authority has curtailed much, though not all, of the rampant corruption and violence which for so many years made Filipino politics famous (or infamous) the world over. Efforts toward reducing the role of political nepotism and favoritism have already met with at least partial success.

The gun-toting violence which menaced almost every aspect of Philippine society has been sharply reduced by Marcos' widely publicized call for the handing in of privately owned weapons, plus an enforced midnight-to-four a.m. curfew.

Future — A Question Mark

The future of the Philippines stands very much in doubt. Many voice optimism; others are not so

sure. Said one Manila source: "The key to the future is the success or failure of the President's crackdown on crime and corruption and achievement of his promised social and economic reforms. If he fails, anything could happen."

A local politician in Luzon's Isabela Province sees it this way: "Before the proclamation of martial law he [Marcos] was the most popular president. But if he succeeds in what he promises, he will be the greatest president."

The Real Issue

What is at stake is not merely the success or failure of one man or of one political or governmental system. Martial law is admittedly only a stopgap designed to give critical wounds time to heal. Some of Marcos' reforms show encouraging signs of benefiting the Filipino people, while the outcome of other reforms is yet uncertain. However, the Philippines remains a nation that urgently needs help.

From where, however, will that help come? *This* is the real issue.

Needed: Positive Action

It is vitally imperative that the government of a nation realize its awesome responsibilities for the welfare of its people. It is equally imperative that the people of any nation, both individually and collectively, come to grips with their responsibility to take effective steps to better their own circumstances.

People cannot sit back and expect government to do everything for them. The words of former U.S. President John F. Kennedy are apt: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." This vital principle is applicable to all societies.

Filipinos, regardless of personal, financial or other circumstances, are waking up to the need to take positive action at the family and individual levels. Children must be taught through both admonishment

and parental example that thievery and violence bear bitter fruits and result in martial law — and that the ages-old principle of "love thy neighbor as thyself" is timely and valid in today's turmoil.

Filipinos, as well as people of all nations, should be willing to *pray for their leaders* and to give constructive support to the projects and efforts of those in governmental positions. One need not subscribe to a particular political philosophy to be willing to give support to programs intended to develop a peaceful, progressive society.

The Final Solution

Filipinos *can* do much to improve their quality of life now. But no honest observer can say that the solutions to all problems lie now within their grasp.

President Marcos is one of many world leaders who are proponents of a strong, worldwide organization designed and structured to promote the welfare of all peoples. But he realizes, as do most in high office, that the only such organization now on the world scene, the United Nations, has shown itself unable to play such a vital role in world affairs. The U.N.'s lead may be followed by some small nations, but the world's big nations — those most directly setting the course of world events — tend to act unilaterally, often with only self-centered goals in mind. The U.N. wields little authority or power over the major nations.

But a powerful organization is desperately needed. How, then, will it be established?

The Surprising Answer

It may seem incredible to those who think of the book embossed with the words "*Holy Bible*" as just a poetic source of inspiration, but it is a book primarily about government — **WORLD** government! It is not about the type of world government aspired to by atheistic commu-

nists, nor by the warring nations of World War II. Also, perhaps surprisingly, it concerns a government significantly different from that proposed by the many well-intended international "peace-promoting" organizations of both past and present.

Notice these words of the prophet Isaiah about the world government that will save men and nations from today's terrible problems: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain [a biblical term meaning government] of the Lord's [the Eternal God's] house shall be established in the top of the mountains [above the chief nations], and shall be exalted above the hills [lesser nations]; and *all nations* shall flow unto it And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isaiah 2:1, 4).

Isaiah also wrote that "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the *government* shall be upon his shoulder. . . . Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end" (Isaiah 9:6-7).

The focal point of Bible prophecy is that a mighty world-ruling government *is* to become reality!

Jesus Christ is revealed in Bible prophecy as a returning king (Revelation 19:11-15) — returning first to correct warring nations, opposing groups and individuals within nations and then to establish a world government based upon the mighty principles of peace and equity for *all* mankind.


The Filipinos will then know the true meaning of peace. They will experience it individually and collectively. They will become as prosperous as the wealthiest nations today — and a lot happier — when they learn to fully obey the revealed will of Jesus Christ.

So, too, will all men. □

AN INSIDE LOOK AT WORLD POWER CHANGES

A CONVERSATION WITH KLAUS MEHNERT

KLAUS MEHNERT, 67, author, journalist, radio commentator and educator, is recognized as the foremost expert on Soviet and Chinese affairs today. Born in Moscow of German parents, Dr. Mehnert has lived and traveled in both Russia and China for many years and speaks both languages. He has observed the two communist giants for nearly half a century and is the author of numerous books about them, including "Soviet Man and His World" (1960), "Peking and Moscow" (1963), and "China Returns" (1971). Dr. Mehnert has held professorships of modern history and political science at several American, Chinese and European universities and is currently teaching for two semesters at Columbia University in New York.



Plain Truth

The world is presently experiencing a time of détente. Concerned world leaders are traveling more than ever before. Summit talks abound. The present state of "non-war" in the world is based heavily on the personalities and views of men at the top of five great power centers — the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan, China and Western Europe. The shape that the world will take after the present world leaders depart from office is the big question. New faces could bring surprising changes. Recently, PLAIN TRUTH staff members visited with noted world affairs expert Dr. Klaus Mehnert and discussed with him the changing relationships among the world's great powers today.

QUESTION — PLAIN TRUTH: Numerous political analysts say that President Nixon and his chief foreign policy adviser, Dr. Kissinger, are attempting to recreate a classical balance of power situation. In it, the United States would apparently play the role of the "balancer." Is this possible in this day and age?

ANSWER — MEHNERT: In the classical concept of the balance of power, England, sitting on its island, watched the two main camps in Europe. England decided which one to support, often the weaker one against the stronger one, to restore again the balance of power so that the continental European powers could neutralize themselves.

Today, if you take only the Soviet Union and China, plus the United States, you have a similar situation. The United States is in the position of Great Britain, watching the Chinese and the Russians neutralizing themselves through their hostility. The U. S. thus plays a kind of balance of power game. I think to that extent you can compare it. But it will only last as long as Peking and Moscow are hostile to each other.

Q. But if the Soviets and Chinese bury the hatchet...?

A. Once they should improve their relations, then the special position that the United States now has will disappear. At the moment, the U.S.A. has good relations with China and good relations with the Soviet Union, while the Soviet Union and China have no good relations. That puts Washington in the driver's seat, so to speak. This will not necessarily remain forever.

Q. After World War II, the Rus-

sians developed nuclear weapons. There were two superpowers. We had a bipolar world. Over the years, three additional power centers have emerged. Japan and Western Europe certainly are giant economic powers, and China, by virtue of its size, can be considered another power center. How do you view the world's power balance now?

A. My picture is that we have two triangles, and the only power participating in both triangles is the United States. First there is the big triangle – the United States, China and Russia. Then there is the smaller triangle consisting of the United States, Japan and Europe. This latter triangle I consider very important, because this is a triangle in which we can – if we agree – do something. We cannot influence Peking. We cannot influence Moscow. But Washington, Brussels and Tokyo are more or less free in their decisions. If we manage to create out of this relationship a functioning triangle, then it would not be so dangerous if the Red Giants moved closer together again within the big triangle. But misunderstandings, as the “Nixon shock,” would have to be avoided and the economic issues between the three, which are very serious, would have to be solved or at least mitigated.

I would consider the Sino-Soviet quarrel not as a permanent phenomenon, but as something that is a phase and will pass. Therefore the small triangle (Japan, Europe, U.S.A.) should be developed in the meantime, with all its combined energy.


Q. How long have you been actively involved in studying the relationships of Russia and China – especially China – with the rest of the world?

A. To name a precise date, it was in 1926 when I made up my mind – together with my professor at the University of Berlin – to work for a Ph.D. degree with a dissertation that dealt with Russian, Chinese and

Japanese relations. So that would make it 47 years.

In 1929, that is 3 years after the start of that research, I visited the Soviet Union for the first time as well as China and Manchuria (a part of China at that time). That was 44 years ago. I have lived over these 44 years more than 5 years in Russia and more than 5 years in

“The enormous numbers of Japanese businessmen with portfolios all over Southeast Asia make people think of a Japanese economic invasion.”



Plain Truth

China. I traveled over large parts of China, but during the longest stretch I lived in Shanghai.

Q. With this perspective of history, what do you feel is the real reason for the conflict that now exists along the Sino-Soviet border?

A. My personal thesis is that there would be no conflict on the border if the Russians and the Chinese agreed on essentials. The Germans and the French fought each other for a thousand years and every inch of that border seemed terribly important and was soaked with blood. But now the Germans and the French agree on essentials, on building a European community. The border has therefore entirely lost its significance.

As long as Sino-Soviet tension is as strong as it is now, there will be fights even for ridiculously small islands on which nobody lives. But if they should agree on essentials, then I think that there, also, the border issue would lose its bitterness.

Q. In view of the great chasm or difference of opinion between Mao

and his interpretation of communism on the one hand and the Soviet brand of communism on the other, do you see in the future any healing of that dialectical breach?

A. I see one event coming up sooner or later, the death of Mao. The ideological hostility is, to a good deal, based upon the person and views of Mao. Whether

Maoism, which is very much anti-Soviet communism, will continue after Mao is a question nobody can answer. I assume that it will continue. But I would also think that it would be less hostile to the Soviet Union. I imagine an improvement of Sino-Soviet relations in the period after Mao.

Q. Mao is, of course, getting quite old. Premier Chou En-lai is also advanced in years – as well as most of the top leadership in Peking. Do you think Mao has indelibly stamped his ideology on the Chinese today? Or could there be a major shift in China's foreign policy after their passing?

A. My imagination into the future only just reaches as long as Mao and Chou En-lai act on the world stage. Particularly Chou En-lai, who is responsible for the day-by-day political decisions – whether to have Nixon invited or not, or whether or not to get into the United Nations. All this is, I think, not a major concern of Mao, but the daily work of Chou En-lai. Once

both of these two top men are gone, I am unable to see clearly what will happen.

I assume that when they pass from the scene, some kind of collective leadership would take over. I would also assume that that collective leadership will for some time carry the flag of Mao. But the question is: How long will that be the case? Will other forces which have been pushed back by Mao in the last years assert themselves? Will they say, "Why should we continue to have bad relations with the country with which we have the longest border in the world — the Soviet Union? Wouldn't it be better to improve our relations?"

Q. Are the Soviets anxious for a détente with China?

A. The Russians are very anxious to improve relations with the Chinese if only they would accept Moscow's leadership in the communist world. But the Chinese, I'm sure, will never return to the subservient position of the "little brother" vis-à-vis the "big brother," as it had been up to about 1957. That makes the reconciliation difficult.

There will continue to be two power centers in the communist world with divergent views on many issues. Maybe not quite as divergent as now, but the return to one center of the communist world — this I cannot envision. It will be a two-center communist world, with additional centers perhaps developing gradually elsewhere.

Q. Would you say that China today ought to be classified and looked upon by the Western world as a superpower, or is she really in many respects still an underdeveloped nation?

A. The Chinese classify the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers, and always say that it [China] is not a superpower. In their vocabulary, the term "superpower" is bad. It means something like a highway robber who exploits other

people. That is, they don't consider themselves to be in that category. It really is a semantic question, a question of words.

If we use the word "superpower" without any negative or positive qualifications to it, then I would rank China in this group. In talking with them, I wouldn't use the word "superpower" because of the connotations that it has for them. But if you use another term, they would say, "Yes, indeed we are 750 or 800 million people, and our country is united as never before, and our ideological influence in the world is a fact," and so on. They do not deny that, as far as power is concerned, they are in a class with the United States and the Soviet Union.

Q. Why did the Chinese open their doors to President Nixon?

A. My answer is very simple. It is the fear of the Soviet Union. That is something that I confronted very often while I was in China two years ago. They would speak of one million Soviet soldiers with all the most modern equipment of destruction along their border encircling them. They would speak of the Soviet buildup of relations with other countries all around the periphery of China.

The fear of the Soviet Union grew particularly after the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the U.S.S.R. The Chinese said that on the same basis, they [the U.S.S.R.] could invade us, if they take upon themselves the right to invade a country that has a different type of communism. Maoism is much more different from Moscow communism than Dubcek's "communism with a human face," as he called it, ever was. So the fear of some Soviet military action, whether an invasion, or whether destruction by air strikes on Chinese industry, was and is very strong.

To break out of this encirclement, the only sensible thing was to go to the other superpower [the U.S.A.]. That was the purpose of the rap-

prochement between Peking and Washington.

Q. Do you think this rapprochement between the United States and China will lead toward a real thaw in their mutual relationship, or is it merely superficial?

A. It is being taken seriously by both sides. By the Chinese, because this neutralizes to a certain extent the Soviet threat which they fear. And on the part of the United States, because it gives Washington more and better possibilities in world affairs if it has good relations with China.

I don't think that this will make America Maoist, nor do I think that it will make China capitalist. There are no indications of such developments in either of the two countries. So there will be two fundamentally different systems, different ideologies, different values. But there would probably be more than just coexistence (which only means that they don't shoot at each other). It might be a political play in which Washington and Peking consider each other's interests in order to offset the Russians.

Q. But not a significant economic interplay?

A. I don't expect much economically. I know that many Americans think in terms of... 750 million Chinese customers. But Mao is not thinking in terms of developing the economy as priority number one. Priority number one for him is the "new man" as Mao wants him to emerge, and for this I don't believe he feels that super-industrialization along Soviet lines is necessary or desirable.

Perhaps trade will pick up, but the whole foreign trade cake of China is small, and more nations want to participate in it as more of them establish relations with China. So even if the cake grows, I still don't see any spectacular growth for U.S.-Chinese economic relations.

Q. Dr. Mehnert, you recently re-

turned from a trip to Japan. What do you believe is the current Japanese thinking on relations with the United States, China and the Soviet Union?

A. Ever since July 15, 1971, when Nixon announced without prior warning to Tokyo that he would travel to Peking, the Japanese have been in a quandary. They are not sure where they stand. Up until then, their whole foreign policy was based on the fact that the United States took care of foreign affairs, and they completely trusted and followed the American lead. They had almost no foreign policy of their own, certainly none that was in any contrast to the policy of the United States.

They relied on the American military umbrella and concentrated, as the world knows only too well, on economic development and trade and economic expansion. But the statement of the President on the evening of July 15, 1971 changed all of this.

It had been agreed earlier that neither of the two countries would do anything with regard to China without previously informing or consulting the other. And this was not done. So the Japanese Prime Minister lost face, and if the Prime Minister loses face, the nation loses face.

Q. What are the alternatives for Japan?

A. The Japanese live where the dynamic influences of the three world powers — the Soviet Union, China and the United States — meet. Theoretically, of course, after having been close to the United States for a long time, they could now move closer to the Soviet Union or China.

The Soviet Union is trying very hard to win over Japan. They have offered the oil of Siberia and the gas of the Soviet Far East if the Japanese will furnish the pipes. The Russians would thus supply the oil and gas which the Japanese can pick up nearby on the Pacific coast of the Soviet Union. The Japanese are in

great need of oil and have to get it mainly from the Middle East. That is from very far way.

It would be a considerable advantage for them to obtain their energy needs from nearby Siberia.

But if they do it, then these pipes would run through territories which the Chinese say the Russians stole from them, so that would be considered an unfriendly act by the Chinese. It is difficult for Japan to move close to the Soviet Union without thereby endangering its relationship with China.

Q. What about closer ties, then, with China, rather than the Soviet Union?

A. I think that is, at the moment, the general trend in Japan. There is a tendency to think very much and very highly of China now. Also, there is the feeling that Japan had mistreated China during the Second World War and that one has to make up for this, as well as the indebtedness of Japan to the great heritage that Japan has received from China. So I think the Japanese interest in China is probably at its post-war peak at the moment.

Q. The Japanese still do not enjoy very good public relations with many of their trading partners in Southeast Asia because of what happened in the Second World War. What are they doing to overcome this?

A. It's more difficult for them to overcome this than I had expected, and it may well be that they can't overcome it very well. The Japanese have created a great deal of apprehension in these countries that they might want to achieve by economic means what they failed to accomplish during the war by military means. The tremendous economic advantages that Japan opens to these countries are not as readily appreciated by them as I had expected.

The enormous numbers of Japanese businessmen with portfolios all over Southeast Asia make people think of a Japanese economic in-

vasion. I find the negative reaction in these countries overdone, but that's the way it is.

Q. The United States has, for a number of years now, been slowly encouraging the conventional military buildup of Japan and its so-called "self-defense" forces. There has not been too much negative reaction within the U. S. to such a program, but some Japanese have shown apprehension.

A. I came back from Japan with the impression that there would not be a great Japanese military buildup, nothing that will bring the Japanese in the foreseeable future into the big league. What will happen someday, I don't know. But as of now, they are thinking of only defending their islands and even that only against conventional attack on a limited scale.

I do not believe they intend to build up a defense force that would even prevent, for example, the Russians from attacking Japan. They are thinking in terms of making it tough for the invader after he gets in, that is, by guerrilla warfare. But I am satisfied that they neither think of an atomic buildup nor of a big navy. For example, some of the people who are concerned in the military planning in Tokyo were asked in my presence what they would do if something happened in the Indian Ocean or some power hostile to them cut their oil supply lines. Would they fight? The answer was "no." They would tell all their ships to go into the nearest ports and stay, or they would use Liberian flag vessels.

We are living in an era where people are more inclined to think in terms of détente than in terms of fighting. We are witnessing détentés between the U.S.A. and China, between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., between Germany and the U.S.S.R., as well as Eastern Europe, and the Japanese are quite pleased that they have their détente with China. I hope all this will last. □

HOW YOU LIVE YOUR LIFE IS THE ONLY RELIGION

Organized religious rituals and dogmas have become irrelevant to millions. Time-honored moral codes are being questioned. What were claimed to be the moral demands of a God are now often looked upon as the whims of men. In such an age of confusion, how should we live our lives?

by Paul W. Kroll

LISTEN, FOR a moment, to our world of contradictory opinions: "Gay is good." "Marriage is sacred." "Stay single and swing." "Occupation housewife is my goal." "Why get married and ruin a good relationship?" "Premarital sex with love is fine." "Sex is only for married people."

"Abortion on demand." "Abortion is murder." "Marijuana should be legalized." "Marijuana leads to heroin addiction." "Drinking is a sin." "Getting drunk on the weekend is fun." "Drink in moderation."

"I'm Catholic." "I'm Protestant." "I'm Buddhist." "Religion is the opiate of the people." "I think God is a myth." "I'm not sure God exists." "The American way of life is best." "Communism has the answer to all problems." "God save the Queen."

Crisis of Confusion

In the midst of such moral, theological and political confusion, many people, like one college student, have adopted a new slogan: "How I live my life is the only religion." If your beliefs are right — and that is a real problem — then how you live your life is the only religion, even if it contradicts established thinking.

But we still have a problem. What *standard* can we use to determine how we should live our lives? Certainly we don't want everyone doing

his own thing! We don't want murderers, gangsters and thieves doing their own thing on *us*.

If we are to accept the statement that "how you live your life is the only religion," we must have some kind of standard for outlawing behavior that can hurt people. But what authority is to lay down the right pattern for our lives and why?

Should we go back to the so-called good old days when the Puritan ethic was supposed to have reigned supreme? It is questionable, of course, whether the old days were really that good or whether most people really were that puritanical.

Let's take a quick look at what has happened to our world of religion, the one social unit that claims to have a moral and legal package of standards.

The State of Religion

Religious institutions have become marginal in Western society. For the overwhelming majority of people, churchgoing, or the lack of it, is simply irrelevant to the manner in which they order their lives. Churches have become social institutions; men's conceptions of God and morality have become based on existing social conditions. Modern man has made over his churches and his God in his own image. The incredible multiplicity of churches and sects is directly related to social, cultural, educational and ideological

standing — not necessarily to personal *commitment* in regard to how one lives his life.

Religious thinking and practice have lost any great moral significance. (This assumes they possessed this quality in the past.) A person may even say he believes in God — and he may. But seldom is human life motivated by any basic standard outside the individual. People may help other people, but it is because *they* want to. The idea of any permanent moral code is not generally accepted. Churchgoing is meaningless in terms of identifying the moral conduct of parishioners. There may be absolutely no connection between the philosophical and moral demands of a particular church (indeed, it may have no obvious ones) and the actions of the individual.

Professions of belief in God can be meaningless in a secular society. When one says, "I believe in God," he implies that he follows the moral tenets of that God. But this is not necessarily so in a secular society. The society and not the professed deity often determines a particular line of behavior.

In past centuries, religions tried, with varying success, to be the arbiters of moral behavior. Often, they only succeeded in oppressing people. Today, religious institutions have steadily become mirror images of the practices of the times. Gradu-

ally, hesitatingly — but consistently — they have been forced to endorse changes. Neither approach — old-style dogmatism or present-day confusion — seems really to have helped humanity.

Few Accept Divine Guidance

It appears strange, however, to see the relics of religion still hanging on in our ceremonies and institutions.

In Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury crowns the sovereign *Defensor Fidei* — Defender of the Faith. He or she is a monarch only *dei gratia*, by the grace of God. In the United States, the President, with his hand on a Bible, is installed with an oath administered by the Chief Justice. But few citizens really take their oaths seriously in the ultimate theological significance. As theologian Harvey Cox has written, “No one rules by divine right in secular society.”

Churchgoing can also be seen as a personal, not truly religious, desire. American theologian Will Herberg has pointed out that going to church (at least in the United States) is simply one of the values of American life. Churchgoing is like apple pie and hamburgers; it's American.

Some people say, “Go to the church of your choice.” It really doesn't matter which church you go to, just as long as you go. And if it doesn't matter which church you go to, it obviously makes little difference what the moral or theological tenets of that church are. This is in contrast to the European approach where church adherence still implies a degree of belief and practice. And perhaps that explains why church attendance in Europe is so low.

But when we come down to the nitty-gritty of human experience, few people agree on what kind of life a human should lead. For example, in one German study reported in the *Spiegel*, both Catholic and evangelical Christians were mostly of the opinion that virginity

before marriage was not necessary (70%). But who is right — the 70% majority, or the 30% minority?

In another survey, females were studied at four universities in four nations. Approximately 68% of the Canadians, 78% of the Norwegians, 83% of the Germans and 86% of the English girls approved of premarital sex if the individuals involved “had a relationship of love, protectiveness, loyalty, and trust” and were “chronologically and emotionally mature.”

However, under other circumstances, such as a no-love relationship, a greater number of girls might frown on premarital sex. Then boys might look at the situation differently; so might parents. Who is to decide whether premarital sex is right or wrong? Or does it really make any difference? Sex, after all, is basic to human life. We need to know what's right if there is anything to be known.

If how you live your life is the only religion, is abstinence or participation in premarital sex “religious”?

Opinions, Opinions, Opinions

Such disagreement on how to live one's life permeates most important areas.

In one Gallup International poll, 40% of the Americans favored and 50% opposed a law which would permit a woman to go to a doctor to end a pregnancy at any time during the first three months. Who is right? Should abortion under these circumstances be allowed or not?

Another controversial issue has been marijuana. Canadians were asked in one poll, “It has been suggested that jail sentences for the possession of marijuana should be eliminated in favor of fines. Would you approve of this or not?”

Approximately 41% of the Canadians approved and 45% disapproved, with 14% undecided. Who is right — those who approve or disapprove? If we are seeking to

discover how to live our lives, where is the standard by which to pattern them?

What Standard?

If there is any sure guide for human living, it must relate to survival and happiness in this life; it must not merely be a stick used to punish posthumously, on the other side of the grave. We need a more sure morality than one which merely says, “Do because I say so!” or “Society says so!”

Are we, then, facing a blank moral wall? Is humanity left to itself, with each person doing whatever seems right?

The long-time reader of *The PLAIN TRUTH* knows that this magazine recognizes that there is a guidebook which tells humans how to order their lives. Thankfully, man still has that one option open. We can still ask ourselves if a supreme being who has created human beings exists. Naturally, if such a being exists, then logically, would he not have given a sort of instruction manual — a code of ethics — to his creation? Part of that manual certainly would include laws and regulations to govern human conduct so that the greatest good for the most people would be the happy effect.

In the Christian world, that supreme being is called “God.” And, incredibly enough, most people still claim to believe in him — in spite of a world which has become secular and materialistic.

In the United States, 97 out of 100 persons claim to believe in God, according to Gallup International in a poll published in 1969. Other similar polls and studies show that in some areas, professed belief in the concept of God can range as high as 99.5% of those polled.

Paradoxically, Americans are among the most “God-believing” peoples, at least in their easy “yes” answer to the question. When Gallup International compared Americans with citizens of eleven other

nations on the question, "Do you believe in God?" here is what was found:

	Yes%	No%	Don't Know%
Greece	96	2	2
Australia	87	7	6
Austria	85	10	5
Switzerland	84	11	5
Finland	83	7	10
West Germany	81	10	9
Netherlands	79	13	8
Great Britain	77	11	12
France	73	21	6
Norway	73	12	15
Sweden	60	26	14

Even in Sweden, the majority of people claim to believe in the existence of God. In most Western nations, the overwhelming majority of citizens hold this belief.

Back to Basics

Let us take as a starting point this astonishing fact: 97% of all Americans and a majority of Danes, West Germans, Finns, Swiss, Austrians and Greeks say they believe in the existence of God. Could it be that if God does exist, he might have revealed a standard of conduct and a way of life?

Since most readers of this article would say they believe in God, we should be able to take this fact for granted. There is one problem. The word "God," like "capitalist" and "communist," means many different things to people. Believers in Islam, Buddhism, Shintoism, Hinduism and Christianity all have different concepts of "God."

We need, for a moment, to forget all these ideas. This article, from now on, will no longer be talking about the *traditional* God concept of Christianity. Probably, many would be better off to use a totally new term, but that would confuse the matter more.

Let's look at the situation from a different viewpoint. Divorce the concept of God and the idea of some moral standard from any traditional religious body, Christian or other-

wise, and consider the Bible as a possible source containing this vital wisdom.

There are, of course, many claims in this book that it does contain the revealed thoughts of a supreme being. For example, in the Old Testament book of Deuteronomy, we find the following words:

"If you will obey the Lord your God by diligently observing all his commandments which I lay upon you this day, then the Lord your God will raise you high above all nations of the earth, and all these blessings shall come to you and light upon you, because you obey the Lord your God:

"A blessing on you in the city; a blessing on you in the country.

"A blessing on the fruit of your body, the fruit of your land and of your cattle, the offspring of your herds and of your lambing flocks. . . .

"May the Lord grant you a blessing in your granaries and in all your labours; may the Lord your God bless you in the land which he is giving you. . . .

"May the Lord open the heavens for you, his rich treasure house, to give rain upon your land at the proper time and bless everything to which you turn your hand. . . ." (Deuteronomy 28:1-12, *The New English Bible*).

Now those are really fabulous promises. Livable cities and livable farms. No stillbirths. Plenty of cattle to be turned into juicy steaks. Wheat surpluses to knock out your eye. Human needs and desires satisfied.

A Practical Code of Conduct

The commands or morality of this God were practical — related to the day-to-day needs of the citizens. "If you obey. . ." then happiness is yours. This God provided an answer for the question: How can I know that a certain way of life will bring me the happiness I desire? The proof was in the eating, so to speak.

If the citizen obeyed — followed the moral and social code of this God — life would be abundant and happy. If the code was not obeyed, then other consequences, very undesirable consequences, would follow.

This God offered the choice of following his way of life or rejecting it in favor of a personal code of conduct. But he did stress the consequences: "I summon heaven and earth to witness against you this day: I offer you the choice of life or death, blessing or curse. Choose life and then you and your descendants will live; love the Lord your God, obey him and hold fast to him. . . ." (Deuteronomy 30:19-20, NEB).

In a world where many religions, social groups and moral lobbyists are clamoring for the loyalty of individuals, it is vital that each person check for himself. Could the Bible, after all, be the word of a supreme being who really did create man?

We are merely asking a rhetorical question so that every reader can think this out *for himself*. As is obvious, this magazine recognizes that such a God does exist and that he makes many positive promises to the individual.

If modern science has laid *man-made* religion and superstition to rest, it has been a boon to mankind.

It is now time to logically and with open eyes search for what modern science cannot provide — the clear and simple word for our day from a supreme being — a word that each one of us should base our conduct upon and by which we should live our lives. □

There is a way of life which, if followed, will produce happiness and peace of mind. It is explained in a logical, step-by-step manner in the *Ambassador College Correspondence Course*. The course is FREE of charge with absolutely no obligation. We invite you to write to the Correspondence Course in care of our regional office nearest you (see back cover for addresses).



Part 2

CHARLEMAGNE

THE FIRST EUROPEAN

by Paul William Kroll

In A.D. 800, Charlemagne was crowned Roman emperor of a new Europe. Some historians view this crowning as perhaps the most important single event ever to occur in Europe. In this second installment, we examine the vital importance of Charlemagne's crowning to European history.

THE GREAT and powerful Roman Empire was dead at age 1000 plus. And how men bewailed its disappearance!

World leaders, when they beheld the splendor and glory of Rome, assumed it would rule as long as men existed. But in 476, the last vestige of the empire in the West, the office of emperor, was abolished.

Roman Rule Destroyed

Rome had already been sacked several times. Italy had been ravaged and subjugated. The Roman

provinces located in Africa, the Mediterranean area and Western Europe were lost to Germanic barbarians.

The eastern half of the empire was powerless to help, though in one mighty reflex action, like the spasmodic jerk of a dying man, the eastern empire under Justinian re-established imperial authority in Italy and North Africa. But the victory was ephemeral; it was wiped out in less than two decades throughout most of Italy.

This mighty, world-ruling empire, with its strutting legions, was through. Theologians had identified the Roman Empire with the fourth kingdom of Daniel: "... the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things ... it [shall] break in pieces and bruise" (Daniel 2:40). The empire was also that "fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and

brake in pieces..." (Daniel 7:7).

But now the mighty political and military complex was dead. *Or was it?* One leg, admittedly shriveled, still stood in the East. The other leg, in the West, had been temporarily revived by Emperor Justinian. And even though his exploits were soon canceled out by a new barbarian horde, the Lombards, Roman civilization and ideals were far from dead in the West.

Out of the ashes of a destroyed Europe, a new military and political power was ready to restore peace and stability to Western Europe. That power was to be found among the Germanic peoples called Franks.

They answered the call of the Roman papacy, the only stabilizing influence left in much of what had been the Western Roman Empire. The papacy and the Franks joined forces to create a Roman-Christian civilization of startling magnitude. Though it would be over three hun-



dred years after Rome's fall before that restoration would be fully accomplished, the power of the Franks was already growing less than ten years after Rome's collapse in A.D. 476.

Years 482-511: The Frankish Kingdom. Clovis, or Chlodovech, becomes leader of those Frankish tribes which acknowledged the supremacy of his father. He is only fifteen, but within five years, his forces will defeat Syagrius, the ruler of the kingdom of Soissons. Syagrius is the last independent Roman ruler in Gaul.

Clovis' great expansion throughout Gaul brings him face to face with the Visigoths. The Visigothic king, alarmed by the increasing power of Clovis' kingdom, warns him to proceed no further.

Clovis is still a pagan; he is acknowledged neither by the emperor in Byzantium nor the Roman pontiff. Clovis then takes a crucial step. He and his army are solemnly baptized and received into the Catholic church at Rheims on Christmas day, 496. This unique event marks a turning point in the history of European civilization and transforms the political and religious relationships in Europe.

Clovis no doubt sees the political advantages of his baptism. He will be the only Catholic Germanic king in Gaul. In fact, he will be the only one in *all* of Western Europe. All the others are Arian. As a Catholic, he gains the support of the episcopate.

Clovis is now the champion of Roman Catholicism against Arianism. In 507, he disregards the threat of the Visigothic king, boldly taking on the whole Visigothic empire in southern Gaul and northern Spain. Clovis even effects an alliance with the eastern emperor against the Ostrogoths in Italy.

But after Clovis' death, his Merovingian dynasty disintegrates. The bishops of Gaul who have provided the greatest support are very disappointed by the decline; the bishop

at Rome has lost his temporal sword. Clovis has led his Franks in a prodigious campaign of expansion across the Rhine and as far as the Alps and Pyrenees. But his successors are unable to follow up the thrust during the next two centuries.

Years 714-741: The Frankish Kingdom. In 714, Charles Martel becomes ruler of the Franks. He begins the reunification of his people. His reunification will culminate in the reestablishment of a Western European empire under his grandson, Charlemagne.

The situation is desperate throughout Europe. A new political and religious power threatens to exterminate Christianity and the culture of Europe. This new power conquers under the banner of Allah — Islam.

As early as 638, Jerusalem falls to Arab armies. Within three decades, the forces of Islam sweep away Syria, Persia, Egypt and North Africa. In 711, the Visigoths are driven from Spain. By 717, Arab armies are assaulting Constantinople. The Arabs are masters of the Mediterranean Sea, and they take Sicily and Crete and harass Italy. The fate of Asia Minor is in doubt. Moslem armies make forays into south-central France after 717.

The need for a strong European power to withstand the Moslem onslaught is vital. There is only one: the *regnum Francorum*.

By 732, Charles Martel has united various principalities in Gaul. He forms a powerful and united army which defeats the Arabs near Poitiers in 732. Charles "the Hammer" is now the hero of Western Christianity, a proven fighter who can offer protection to the weak.

Just prior to and during the era of Charles Martel, the Anglo-Saxon Wynfrid, or St. Boniface, is accomplishing much of his missionary work. One historian will call Boniface one of the "truly outstanding creators of the first Europe." St. Boniface is also "the chief fomentor of the alliance between the papacy

and the Carolingian family." Another Anglo-Saxon, Alcuin, will be a dominant force during the reign of Charlemagne. English leaders will have a great part in solidifying a revived Roman Empire.

Years 741-768: The Frankish Kingdom. In 741, Pepin the Short falls heir to the power of his father, Charles Martel. He further cements the kingdom together and paves the way for a greater working relationship with the papacy.

Pepin holds the office of Mayor of the Palace under the ancient line of Merovingian kings established by Clovis. Seeing how ineffectual the line is, Pepin sees his opportunity. He wants to depose the Merovingians and establish his own family.

Casting about for some justification, Pepin writes to Pope Zacharias in 751. In so many words, Pepin asks, "Would it be sinful to depose the Merovingian king and take the Frankish throne?" Zacharias, an old political hand, sees the opportunity. The papacy has awaited this moment for a century and a half. It can only give Pepin the answer he wants.

An ancient chronicler documents the words and position of Zacharias: "In the exercise of his Apostolic authority, he [Zacharias] replied that it seemed to him better, and indeed necessary, that he who held and wielded the power in the kingdom should be called king, and be king, rather than he who falsely bore that title. And the pope, therefore, commanded the King of the Franks and his people that Pepin, who held the power of a King, be seated on the throne and be called king."

The Anglo-Saxon St. Boniface, as the papal representative in France, anoints Pepin with oil and then crowns him king of the Franks in 752. This symbolic act is critical. It confirms a sacerdotal mission on the Frankish monarchy. The king of the Franks now accepts a universal commission. He is to unite all

the Western nations under the dome of a Christian-Germanic civilization.

Pepin and his descendants have become kings at the instance of Rome. It is the papacy which provides the legitimizing justification. The Carolingians are to be ritually anointed in a way in which no Merovingian king ever was.

When Pepin is anointed king, he is obligated to help the papacy. His call comes when the Lombards are once again trying to subdue Italy. On November 15, 753, the new Pope Stephen II sets out across the Alps to Pepin's winter camp. He anoints and crowns Pepin *rex gratia Dei* early in 754 and blesses Pepin's son and heir, Charles.

Under pain of excommunication, the Pope forbids the Franks to ever choose a king from a family other than that of Pepin. Pepin, of course, has his part of the bargain to fulfill: render Pope Stephen such military assistance as might be required in the future. This he does to some degree. Twice the Lombards assault Rome, and twice Pepin storms across the Alps into Italy. He defeats the Lombards with ease and captures Ravenna and several coastal cities.

With the capture of Ravenna in 751, the Lombards had obliterated the governmental symbol of the eastern empire of Italy. Ravenna had been the seat of the Exarchate, a Byzantine viceroyalty representing the Italian "province" of the empire. When Pepin hands Ravenna to the Pope instead of to the eastern emperor, he tacitly acknowledges the supremacy of the Pope in Italy.

Years 768-799: Prelude to Restoration. On the death of Pepin the Short in 768, his son Charles inherits the throne. His long rulership will last until 814. Due to his exploits, he is soon called Charlemagne (Charles the Great).

Under Charlemagne and his two predecessors, Pepin the Short (741-

THE FRANKS REVIVE A ROMAN-EUROPEAN EMPIRE

Maps — Ron Lepeska


The old Roman Empire in the West lay at death's door in A.D. 476. It was temporarily revived in the sixth century by Justinian, the emperor in the East. The empire in the West languished again, following the death of Justinian in A.D. 565. Meanwhile, a new power center was developing in Europe, even as the old Eastern Roman Empire was dying of political sickness and military wounds.

That new power center in Western Europe comprised most of modern France and much of West Germany.

It was the kingdom of the Germanic Franks. In A.D. 496, Clovis, the ruler of the Franks, was baptized along with his fellow Franks. They became the first barbarians in Western Europe to adopt Catholicism. Thereafter, the Franks looked to the Church for support in their expansionist policies, and the papacy began to rely on Frankish kings for protection. It was a true political marriage of convenience.

The Franks continued to expand their domains until that central moment of importance in A.D. 800

(Continued on page 25)



768) and Charles Martel (714-741), the Frankish state has greatly expanded in size. Its rulers are successful conquerors, patrons of the arts and learning, champions of the Church and protectors of the weak. As a result, they are increasingly looked to as stabilizing and protective forces in Western Europe.

Meanwhile, Byzantium finds its role as a world power constantly shrinking. Though still recognized as the eastern successor of the old Roman Empire, it is in deep political trouble. Byzantium becomes more of a Greek kingdom than a universal Roman empire.

The papacy seeks to exclude the Byzantines from the Italian peninsula and to establish the pope as their successor. The attempt to legalize this concept is seen in an extraordinary document, the forged Donation of Constantine. The falsification takes place between 750 and 760.

In 774, Charlemagne overthrows the Lombard kingdom after its two hundred years in power. Charles has united Italy for the first time in centuries. He is now the only true sovereign in the West and commands its most formidable military machine.

By 796, Pope Leo III (795-816) begins dating his edicts, not from the beginning of his reign or that of the Byzantine emperor, but from that of Charles. The ruler of Byzantium is willing to recognize Charles' presence in Italy. Charles' name even begins to appear regularly in the liturgy of the Roman Church. Up until this time, such a practice had been reserved solely for Roman emperors.

Year 799: The Crisis of Pope Leo at Rome. In 799, an event occurs which will result in the crowning of Charlemagne as *imperator Romanorum* — Roman emperor. On April 25, 799, Pope Leo III is participating in a procession from the Lateran to the Church of San Lorenzo in Lucina. He is assaulted and beaten ter-

ribly by a band of conspirators; the gang tries to gouge out his eyes and cut out his tongue. He is then imprisoned and accused of adultery and perjury.

Leo barely survives the ordeal, escapes from prison and calls out to Charles, who is fighting the Saxons. Charlemagne invites the Pope to come to Paderborn in the heart of Saxony to explain his case. This he does. The image of a pope humbly asking Charles for assistance produces a powerful impression. Angilbert, a court poet writes, "King Charles, supreme in the world and the mightiest of Europe." On two occasions, the poet uses the words "the great Augustus" when referring to Charles.

In the autumn of 799, Charles arranges for the Pope to return to his capital, protected by Frankish troops. Charles will follow in order to determine the guilt or innocence of the Pope himself. The Pope is not exonerated until the convening of a court of inquiry over which Charles presides. Leo is publicly restored to grace on December 23, after three weeks of inquest.

The Pope's humbling claim of innocence is given in the following words: "I Leo, pontiff of the Holy Roman Church, without being judged or compelled by anyone, but by an act of spontaneous will, purify and purge myself in your presence . . . and I declare that I have not perpetrated or ordered to be perpetrated the criminal and sinful acts which have been charged against me. . . ."

The Pope, obviously, is making his independence clear. But the relationship of Charles to the Pope is clearly seen: Leo must accept the intervention of the Frankish monarch, even in his own private life.

Perhaps by coincidence, a delegation arrives at Rome from Jerusalem, bringing Charles a banner and the keys to the Holy Sepulchre of the Church of the Calvary and to the Holy City itself. This is done on

behalf of the patriarch of Jerusalem. Significantly, on the same day, Charlemagne has received the homage of both the leader of Western Christianity and the Christians of the East.

Year 800, Christmas: Charlemagne Crowned Emperor. The stage is set for the final act in the drama: the imperial coronation. It will be the quintessence of political legitimacy. Though Charles might wield imperial power, he is still a barbarian king. This is all to be changed on December 24, A.D. 800 when Charles is crowned Roman emperor.

Charles has come to St. Peter's for the Christmas festival celebration. He kneels in prayer just before the celebration of Mass at the "confession" of the prince of the apostles. As he raises himself, Pope Leo quickly approaches and places a crown on his head. The throng, in a rehearsed tone, shouts three times, "To Charles Augustus, crowned by God, great and peaceful emperor of the Romans, life and victory." Charles is now *imperator et augustus*.

The ceremony will be portrayed in the *Liber pontificalis*, under the biography of Pope Leo III: "The gracious and venerable pontiff who with his own hands crowned him [Charles] with a very precious crown. Then all the faithful people of Rome . . . cried with one accord in a loud voice: To Charles, the most pious Augustus . . . and he was constituted by all to be Emperor of the Romans."

The Pope prostrates himself before the new Augustus. This ceremony is required by the ancient imperial protocol inaugurated under Diocletian. Nevertheless, it is quite clear: the kingdoms of this earth belong to the bishop of Rome; they are *his* to give.

The record of the event is scanty. Later, Einhard in his *Life of Charlemagne* will write: "He accepted the title of emperor and augustus. But

at first he was so much opposed that he affirmed that, even though it was an important feast day, he would not have entered the church that day if he had known in advance the plan of the pope." This statement will cause confusion among historians of later centuries.

Some feel the papacy simply engineered the coronation with Charlemagne's probable approval. One historian, F. L. Ganshop, will claim that Leo III has probably played a crooked game. The play *Leo III and Charlemagne* has been written and is edited at the last moment by Leo. By crowning Charlemagne himself, in front of Lombard and Frankish witnesses, Leo has given the impression that it is he who invests Charlemagne with the imperial crown. "There lies, in my opinion," historian Ganshop will say, "the reason for the great displeasure shown by Charlemagne, the reason for which he hesitated during several months to adorn himself with the imperial title . . . the one which had appeared in the acclamations: *imperator Romanorum*."

This view sees the papacy as having learned a bitter lesson. As an institution, the Church is powerless; it needs a strong protector and defender. The Catholic church had gained its preeminence while the old Roman Empire was yet strong. But in another sense, the strength of the empire had severely limited the power of the Church.

In the ninth century, circumstances are such that the papacy can both extricate itself from the limitations of the imperial framework and find a worthy protector and defender. The Frankish kings are to be the tool. But the papacy is soon to find that exchanging the Byzantines for the Franks might be a bad bargain.

Year 800: Life at Charlemagne's Court. Charlemagne wants to build a second Rome at Aix-la-Chapelle. It is also clear that the king plans to

MAPS CONTINUED

when Charlemagne, greatest of the Frankish kings, was crowned as a new, European-style Roman emperor. The old Roman Empire's sickness and wounds were temporarily eliminated, and the empire


was resurrected to a position of power in Western Europe.

The Frankish realm continued to expand until about A.D. 830, when hidden signs of disintegration became evident. In A.D. 843, the

(Continued on page 27)



Disintegration of Charlemagne's empire into nation-states and principalities complete — about A.D. 890.



The partition of 843, drawn up by a commission of nobles to settle disputes and equalize the divisions.

subsume the authority of the Pope under his own. For example, a letter from Charlemagne simply admonishes the Pope as if he were a subject. "Follow constantly the rules established by the holy fathers," Charlemagne cautions the Pope, "so that your life may in every way give the example of holiness. Let only pious exhortations come forth from your mouth and let your light shine before all men."

The messenger who bears this letter, Angilbert, is instructed by Charlemagne, "Admonish the pope that he ought to live honestly and especially that he ought to observe the holy canons." Leo III wonders if he has gotten a pig in a poke. Charlemagne is gnawing at the vitals of the papal plan to exalt the papacy above the authority of the secular rulers.

Still, the coronation in A.D. 800 can be seen as, in great part, a papal coup. The horse may be unbroken and wild; but the papacy is determined to be the rider and stay on the mount.

Other historians feel that Charlemagne has taken advantage of Leo's weak position. Several other schools, each distinct, have arisen in which different weights and roles are assigned to each of the participants.

The problem of how Charlemagne feels about being Roman emperor is complex. We know that for a time he will not use the term at all. There is the previously quoted statement that Charlemagne is unhappy at being made emperor. Whether it is the manner in which the act is accomplished or the act itself is not clear.

When he conquered the Lombards in 774, he took the title: *Rex Francorum et Longobardorum atque Patricius Romanorum* — King of the Franks and Lombards and Patrician of the Romans. Obviously, his Roman patriciate is of secondary importance. There is some justification

for thinking Charlemagne does not want to become Roman emperor. We know that in 803, he stamps *Renovatio Romani Imperii* on his seal — "renewal of the Roman Empire." However, in 813 he will stamp *Renovatio Regni Francorum* — "renewal of the kingdom of the Franks" on his seal.

Whatever the truth, Charlemagne is already appropriating all the prerogatives previously held by the emperor in his relations with the papacy. Charlemagne and his court are playacting the part of imperial Rome. Charles has collected scholars from many lands whose common interest is the revival of Latin literature and learning.

Charles and his closest friends share a form of humorous intercourse, giving each other nicknames. Charles is referred to as "David" or "Augustus." Just prior to the coronation of A.D. 800, Angilbert composes a poem entitled "Charles the Great and Pope Leo." Charles is spoken of as having established a "forum and sacred senate" and a "second Rome."

Einhard, a member of the court, will write a *Life of Charles the Great*, a crazy quilt of quotations from Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*. The verses of Alcuin, Angilbert and Theodulf of Orleans are full of phrases pilfered from Virgil and Ovid.

All are close advisers of Charles and important figures in his court circle of intellectuals. They look to a true revival of Roman culture under Charlemagne. For example, in June 799, Alcuin writes to Charlemagne, "Up to now three persons have been at the summit of the worldly hierarchy. . . . What has happened to the actual holder of that See [referring to Leo's beating] you have taken care to make known to me."

Of the emperor at Byzantium, the second great personage, Alcuin says, ". . . the impious fashion in which the head of that empire has been deposed . . . has been spread every-

where." He then cites Charles, the third member of the triumvirate, as one who "triumphs above the other two dignities, eclipses them in wisdom and surpasses them. It is now you alone on whom rests the churches of Christ."

It is obvious that Charlemagne certainly does not want anyone to think he owes his empire to a pope — and especially one who has supplicated Charles for help. Charles is a military man who has won his own empire. Perhaps that is why on September 11, 813, Charlemagne will crown his son Louis emperor at Aachen *himself*.

Year 800: The Legal Implications of Empire. Centuries later, historian James Bryce will call the coronation of Charles "not only the central event of the Middle Ages" but also "one of those very few events of which, taking them singly, it may be said that if they had not happened, the history of the world would have been different." Although few scholars will give such outstanding weight to this event, most agree that something profound has occurred throughout the last half century of the 700's, culminating in the coronation of Charlemagne in A.D. 800.

By virtue of Charlemagne's military conquests and the coronation ceremony, a renewal of an ancient political institution has taken place. It is *Renovatio Romani Imperii* — a renewal or restoration of the Roman Empire.

Politically, this becomes a problem for both Charles and Leo. There can only be one Roman Empire. It can have a western and an eastern branch, but the empire must be one. Legally, the emperor at Byzantium had inherited the supreme title when the empire in the West ended in A.D. 476.

What is the Pope to do? As part of the imperial play, he will simply transfer the empire from East to West. The coronation becomes known as the "Translation of the

Empire.” Clearly, what Charles and Leo are after deals with the right of electing the ruler of the Roman Empire — and a single empire which embraces both East and West.

Since 797, a woman, Empress Irene, having dethroned the legal emperor, has been on the throne in Constantinople. The fact that a woman is on the throne of a secular empire is unthinkable at both Byzantium and Rome. It provides, along with other circumstances, a method to rationalize the legitimacy of Charles as emperor. In theory, then, Charles accepts the crown for a vacant imperial throne, and he becomes the heir to the throne of Irene’s legitimate predecessor, Constantine VI.

The chronicler of the *Annales Laureshamenses* will write, “Because the name of emperor had now ceased to exist in the land of the Greeks, and because they had a woman emperor, it was seen, both by the apostolic Leo himself, and all the holy fathers who were present . . . that they ought to name as emperor Charles himself, king of the Franks, who now held Rome itself, where the Caesars were always accustomed to have their residence, and [who now held] the rest of the places which they held in Italy, Gaul and Germany.”

Charles is held to be the legitimate successor of Leo IV, Heraclius, Justinian, Arcadius and the eastern line of emperors and not of Romulus Augustulus. In the annals of the time and succeeding centuries, the name of Constantine VI, the sixty-seventh in order from Augustus, is followed without a break by that of Charles, the sixty-eighth.

Charles apparently seeks other means to legitimize his rule as Roman emperor. One account claims he has dispatched an embassy to Constantinople to ask for the hand of Irene in marriage. But the proceedings never get very far.


A Byzantine general named Nice-

MAPS CONTINUED

Frankish empire was officially divided up at the Treaty of Verdun. The fragmentation continued and was completed by A.D. 890. Thus, the first revival of Europe since Justinian, under the banner of a

resurrected Roman Empire, was shattered.

Please see the accompanying maps for a sequence of what occurred in Europe throughout these important four centuries.




The partition of 870, a four-fold division based on revenues and personal property of the sovereigns.



Charlemagne’s Kingdom: first revival since Justinian of the Western Roman Empire — greatest territorial limits about A.D. 825.

MAP SOURCES: Though a number of sources were consulted, the information for the maps was gleaned from three primary ones: The Penguin Atlas of Medieval History, Colin McEvedy, London: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1961; The Civilization of

Charlemagne, Jacques Boussard, translated from the French by Frances Partridge, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968; Medieval History, 2nd edition, Norman F. Cantor, London: Macmillan Co., 1969.



THE CORONATION of Charlemagne by the Pope, from a painting by F. Kaulbach.

The Bettmann Archive

phorus deposes Irene and banishes her to the Isle of Lesbos. Charles then opens negotiations with Nicephorus, hoping for recognition as co-emperor in the West. Recognition finally comes in 812 during the reign of Emperor Michael I. The empire of Charlemagne is now officially recognized in Byzantium. Charles is now addressed by Byzantine ambassadors as "Emperor" and "Augustus," though clearly not a Roman emperor.

However the ceremony might be interpreted and whatever Charles' approach to his new title, he holds the political and military position of Western emperor. His direct domain and sphere of influence is equal in almost every way to those held by the old emperors in the West — and the provinces are much better protected!

It was said to Pepin, "He who held and wielded power in the kingdom should be called king, and be

king, rather than he who falsely bore that title." From the point of view of Western European power politics, Charlemagne is emperor in fact, and the eastern emperor bears the title falsely over the West.

Year 843: Disintegration Becomes Official. Charles the Great dies in 814. Although his dynasty will endure another one hundred seventy-five years, disintegration of the empire begins almost immediately. In fact, the empire Charles creates almost literally goes to the grave with him.

Although some further expansion takes place under Charles' son Louis, disintegration becomes formalized in the next generation. The Treaty of Verdun in 843 marks the official termination of a unity in grave trouble for a number of years.

The Verdun treaty divides the empire into more or less equal parts for each of the three grandsons of

Charlemagne. Lothar keeps the title and dignity of emperor. He also has a more important share than his two brothers. Lotharingia, the middle kingdom, includes Aix-la-Chapelle, capital of the empire, and Rome, capital of Christianity. Louis receives *Francia Orientalis* (the German realm); Charles, *Francia Occidentalis* (the French realm).

A language barrier is already evident. In the 842 Oath of Strasbourg, the kings of the eastern and western parts of the Carolingian empire subscribe to what are recognizable French and German dialects. The middle kingdom collapses almost immediately, leaving a hodgepodge of petty principalities from Flanders to Lombardy.

Years 843-911: Disintegration Continues. At the Treaty of Meerssen in 870, the remnant of the kingdom is divided in a four-way split. By 887, the Carolingian line has lost imperial title west of the Rhine. But



CHARLES MARTEL defeats forces of Islam at Tours, France in A.D. 732.

Culver Pictures

during the worst time of disintegration, the idea of a united Christian-Germanic empire of the West is still alive.

After the last of the Carolingians dies in 911, the dukes in the eastern realm choose Conrad I, Duke of Franconia to be their king. The immediate concern is survival. From the west, the Scandinavians are a threat; from the east, the Magyars and the Slavs.

During the chaotic disintegration of the Carolingian empire, a cloak of deep pessimism falls over the Church. The Frankish church is especially disturbed. They have dreamed of seeing the political unity of Christian Europe. The dream is shattered as the empire breaks apart.

The papacy experiences the same disintegration. Many of the popes become the playthings of political factions at Rome. John VIII (872-882) is imprisoned by the Duke of

Spoletto. The body of former Pope Formosus (891-896) is exhumed. It is dressed in pontifical garb and charged with treason. The body is then dragged through the streets of Rome, with the mob cheering on. Pope Stephen (896-897) is overthrown by a revolution, imprisoned and strangled. John XII (955-963) drinks, swears, fights with the sword, gambles and wenches. The Palace of the Lateran is turned into a house of prostitution.

Meanwhile, chaos reigns in Rome. The mobs and nobility are always ready to pillage, burn, rob and kill. In Italy, robber baron potentates lord it over their domains.

The continuing power of Islam adds to the confusion. As early as 827, Saracens invade Italy. Moslem pirates raid the coast of Italy up to the Tiber. In 846, a raiding party sacks St. Peter's and St. Paul's. Christian Europe understands all too well that the Islamic peoples

have risen to power on the banner of religion, a religion that views non-Islamic peoples as infidels. The concept, however, is greatly overplayed for its propaganda purposes.

From the north, marauding Magyars raid as far south as Rome. To observers, it seems like a replay of the fifth century when Roman civilization was on the verge of extinction.

As the year 1000 slowly approaches, there are dire predictions that the end of the world will soon occur. Western civilization is ready to be snuffed out. But two institutions — a powerful, renewed German empire and a revived papacy — are beginning to rise to the occasion.

For the papacy, there is only one way out. The pope must call in a strong but pious foreign prince to unite Europe. Who that prince is we shall see in the next episode of this incredible European drama. □

Personal from



(Continued from page 1)

barely more than 20% of the children of the white American majority in the same age group were being college educated!

But when we consider the fourth minority group, the facts are more significant. Family cohesion is lowest of all among United States blacks. A Department of Labor report titled "The Negro Family — The Case for National Action," stated that, roughly, one black family in four is fatherless. And *that*, despite the rising divorce rate among U. S. whites, was approximately three times the white total! More than half of all black children 18 and under have lived at least part of their lives in broken homes. And what were the percentages of blacks in a college or university? In October 1963, only 5.2% of the males and 4.1% of the females!

Great strides in college and university enrollments have occurred in the last decade. Yet, as recent as 1971, only 18% of all U. S. blacks from age 18 to 24 were attending college, while 22% of all U. S. whites were in attendance.

Now back to the question, **WHY** marriage? Is there any real reason for it? Is there **MEANING** in it, of which most are unaware?

Today, educational institutions in general indoctrinate students with the theory of evolution. Evolution is based on the postulated non-existence of God.

It is the atheists' attempt to explain the presence of a creation without a Creator. Disbelief in God, plus a spirit of rebellion against his laws, has led some to question the marriage institution altogether. There have been predictions that marriage is on the way out — soon to be a relic of the past.

To them, marriage has no moral or spiritual authority. No laws bind one to it, except those of the state. No moral codes prevent its dissolution. They cannot account for its origin. They see no **PURPOSE** in it — no real reason for it.

Animals do not marry. Marriage is not necessary for reproduction. Animals have **NO HOME** and **FAMILY** life. So when, why and how did an animal becoming man decide to start the marriage custom?

The old repressive morality taught that the *only* purpose of sex was reproduction. But if that be true, **NO MARRIAGE WOULD BE NECESSARY**. Animals are male and female. They reproduce, but they don't have married **FAMILY** life.

So, why marriage? Those who do not believe in God can see no authority for marriage — no purpose — no meaning!

So a sick and unbelieving world invents its "new morality," which is promiscuous immorality. And the sin of **DIVORCE** and **REMARRIAGE** accompanies it!

But when we come to understand the **PURPOSE** for human life on this planet, we begin to understand the reason for marriage. And it is much more than merely reproduction.

Is there, after all, purpose to human life? Were we actually *put here* on earth for a purpose? Suppose God does exist, after all. Personally, I have proved it to my own satisfaction. I refer you to our free booklets *Does God Exist?* and *Seven Proofs God Exists*.

Even the disbeliever ought to check on the biblical statements that explain the **PURPOSE** and **MEANING** for man — and *you* judge whether it makes sense.

Why Man?

God is the eternally living Great Designer, Creator, Lawgiver, Source of all basic knowledge, Giver of life, peace, happiness, joy and abundance. He is the **GIVER** of every

good and perfect gift — including eternal life.

But, now — **WHY MAN?**

Is there a reason why God put mankind on the earth? I have found that God never does things without a purpose!

God, through human life upon the earth, says that he actually is **REPRODUCING HIS OWN KIND!**

God designed and made cattle after the cattle kind (Genesis 1:24). He made horses after the horse kind, dogs after the dog kind, chimps after the chimp kind. But God said: "Let us make man in **OUR** image, after **OUR** likeness . . ." (verse 26) — after the **GOD** kind!

Man was made to have a close and special relationship with God his Creator. Converted man has actual fellowship with God (I John 1:3). Animals have no such relationship!

God's **PURPOSE** is for men to come to *know* the true values of life from the false — to know the **WAY** that causes all **GOOD** — that men come to repent of every false way and choose that right and living way, that they may receive the Holy Spirit of God, thus being begotten as children of God, and finally, at the time of the resurrection, be **BORN INTO** the supreme, divine family — the **GOD FAMILY** — which family is the Kingdom of God! To understand, you need our free booklet, *Just What Do You Mean . . . Kingdom of God?*

Animals have no such potential.

Man, now, is composed of material flesh from the ground. He is formed and shaped like God — but composed of matter. God is composed of spirit! God formed man from the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7). That material dust *became* a living **SOUL**. So the soul is composed of matter! But when man finally becomes born of God, he shall be composed of spirit. Jesus said, "That which is born of the flesh is **FLESH**; and that which is born of the Spirit is **SPIRIT**" (John 3:6). Then, at

the time of the resurrection, God "shall change our vile body [of corruptible flesh], that it may be fashioned like unto his [Christ's] glorious [spirit-composed] body" (Philippians 3:21). To fully understand, you need our free booklet *Just What Do You Mean... Born Again?*

Then what?

Then there shall be a marriage! But *how?* What kind?

God's purpose involved the raising up of his Church. It is God's Church, named after the Father of the God family — named the Church of God. Every one who is a repentant, obedient believer and an overcomer, upon receiving God's Holy Spirit, is baptized *by* God's Spirit — BY GOD HIMSELF — into his Church. The Church, spoken of as a woman, is the affianced bride of the living, glorified Christ.

At the time of resurrection and Christ's coming in supreme power and glory, the Church of God, its members being changed to spirit and made immortal, shall *enter into* the Kingdom of God.

At that time, Christ shall marry his Church (Ephesians 5:22-33). At that time, it is written, "The Lord omnipotent reigneth... the marriage of the Lamb is come, and *his wife* hath made herself ready" (Revelation 19:6-7). And verse 8 shows the wife to be "the saints."

But why, prior to the marriage, is the Church called "*his wife*"? Because God married Israel at Mt. Sinai (Jeremiah 3:14). The making of the Old Covenant (Exodus 24:6-8) was the marriage ceremony, setting up Israel as not only wife and Church, but also as a KINGDOM — the kingdom of Israel.

The LORD (YHWH) of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New Testament. When Christ was crucified, Israel's husband died, paying the penalty for Israel's sins.

But the Church *is* Israel, spiritually begotten. Gentile converts are no longer foreigners to Israel (Eph-

esians 2:11-19). Israel is pictured as the natural olive tree and Gentiles as wild olive trees (Romans 11). But because of unbelief, the natural olive tree branches were broken off, and Gentile converts, as branches of wild olive trees, were grafted onto the natural olive tree of Israel (verse 17). And natural-born Israelites, by repentance, belief and conversion, are grafted back onto the Israelite tree. The Church is pictured as *converted Israel* — or *spiritual Israel* (Romans 11:23). The New Testament Church is Israel, spiritually!

Since Israel's husband died, she is freed from her Old Testament marriage and is *free to remarry*. Christ's death paid the penalty of her sins

The most tragically serious need in education today is in-the-home education on the basic importance of the happy family structure in our society.

(spiritual harlotries) as a church or nation, as well as those of the individuals.

So the Church — *spiritual Israel* — becomes the affianced bride, to MARRY Christ. And when this divine marriage takes place, Christ will be marrying HIS WIFE!

There is another reason why the Church, *prior* to the wedding ceremony, is called "*his wife*." A betrothed woman, in Scripture, is called her fiancé's WIFE, though the marriage *has not yet been* BOUND — prior to the marriage ceremony (Matthew 1:18-20, 24). This was ancient Jewish practice. There was a betrothal ceremony, called the *eros-sin* ceremony. The betrothed or espoused woman remained in her father's house until the wedding cer-

emony, called the *kiddushin* ceremony. At this *kiddushin* or wedding ceremony, the marriage was bound. Then the husband took his wife to his own house.

Marriage Covenant Is the Gospel

Jesus came as *the messenger of the covenant* (Malachi 3:1). He was the messenger bringing us the message of the New Covenant, which is the marriage covenant which will establish the Church in the Kingdom of God. Just as Moses was the mediator of the Old Covenant, so is Christ of the New Covenant. The gospel is that MESSAGE! And just as the marriage at Sinai *set up* the Kingdom of Israel, so the marriage of the Church to Christ will *set up* the Kingdom of God! So, *that* marriage is the gospel!

The gospel Jesus brought is the GOOD NEWS of the coming Kingdom of God.

This is a most important truth which has not been fully recognized. Let's be sure we understand it!

The Kingdom of God *is* the FAMILY OF GOD! The Kingdom of Israel was the "children of Israel" — as they are called repeatedly in the Old Testament — which actually was the FAMILY of Israel or Jacob, which became one of the kingdoms — governments or nations — of the world. In precisely the same manner, the Kingdom of God will be the FAMILY (spirit-born children) of God! It will be the one and only world-ruling kingdom — government — ruling over all nations.

And what will the Kingdom of God include? It will include those saints spiritually born of God the Father *and married to God the Son!*

The GOSPEL of Jesus Christ is the GOOD NEWS of this Kingdom of God. That kingdom includes those (the Church) MARRIED to Christ!

So what does that mean?

It simply becomes axiomatic that when one becomes converted and is

put by God's Spirit into the Church, he also automatically has become *betrothed* to the marriage with the living Christ!

And what of *that* marriage? Will it be subject to divorce and remarriage? You know that answer is A THOUSAND TIMES *NO!* That marriage *can never be broken!*

The betrothed wife **MUST BE FAITHFUL** in her betrothal! In the experience of Joseph, the betrothed — yet unmarried — husband of Mary, mother of Jesus, he, supposing she had been unfaithful, was minded to put her away *before* the **BOUND MARRIAGE**. If one of us, spiritually betrothed to the living Christ, becomes unfaithful through physical divorce and remarriage in this Christian life, would not our espoused spiritual husband, Christ, **PUT US AWAY?** This sin of unfaithfulness cuts us off from God. Unless our sin is repented of and forgiven, we will never make it into God's kingdom!

What is God's command to us, in this regard? It is: "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man *as long as he liveth?* For the woman which hath an husband *is bound* by the law to her husband as long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law . . ." (Romans 7:1-3).

The marriage institution was ordained for man by God *at the creation of man* (Genesis 2:24). Human marriage was given as a **TYPE** of the spiritual marriage of the spiritual "woman" — the Church — to Christ in the Kingdom of God. That marriage to Christ will *not* be subject to divorce and remarriage. Therefore neither can the human marriage be subject to divorce and remarriage in God's sight. God's law forbids it. No

law in the Bible allows it. Any such law would do violence to the human type of the divine.

To be **UNFAITHFUL**, now, to the betrothed relationship to Christ would, as we shall show by the Scriptures, result in Christ "putting us away" — *before* that marriage! Why? Because sin "puts us away."

Marriage is a God-plane relationship. Even though a physical union, it is a **DIVINE INSTITUTION**, ordained of God. God had great purpose and meaning in giving it to man. God's Church, called to preach Christ's gospel of the kingdom (to be established over the earth *by* the **MARRIAGE COVENANT** with Christ — which is the *New Covenant*) cannot pollute that very gospel by approving divorce and remarriage!

The True Meaning of Marriage

Remember, in this exposition, we are viewing the subject *as God views it*.

I repeat: Though marriage is a physical union, it is a *divine* institution. God does nothing without a *reason* — a definite **PURPOSE!** To understand the "why" of the laws of God respecting the marriage institution, we need to know still more about the reason God had in mind for establishing marriage.

The living Christ already is crowned with glory and honor (Hebrews 2:9). He is the firstborn of many brethren — meaning we who have his Spirit (Romans 8:29). Christ is the captain of our salvation (Hebrews 2:10). That is, he is the pioneer, who has gone on ahead, leading the way, *as the husband, preparing the dwelling place for his wife* (John 14:2). Jesus rose from the dead. He is alive and he is divine — as we shall be. He has been glorified. His eyes are as flames of fire, and his face is as bright as the sun in full strength (Revelation 1:14-16). That's what we may inherit!

Are you really comprehending this colossal truth? *Are you?*

And we, if we repent, believe with

living faith, and accept Jesus Christ as personal Saviour *and betrothed husband*, can receive God's gift of the Holy Spirit. That gift imparts to us the very *life*, essence, nature, mind and power of God! It begets us, now, as God's own (yet unborn) sons! And if we grow spiritually (II Peter 3:18), overcome and endure, we shall, at Christ's coming, be *changed* from mortal flesh to immortal spirit (I Corinthians 15:44-54). We, collectively, shall be the **BRIDE OF CHRIST!**

And that is the supreme heritage of human **MAN!**

Man, now lower than angels, has a destiny far higher!

So grasp this stupendous truth if you can!

For here is the greatest good news you can ever know! That good news is the gospel. And that very gospel involves *faithfulness* in any marriage relationship now, for it is preparation for the spiritual marriage to Christ for all eternity.

Man, and man *only*, of all life forms God has created, can be born into the very God family — the Kingdom of God! And as a most vital part of it, he will enter an eternal, unbreakable, never-to-be-divorced **MARRIAGE** relationship.

To prepare us for that, God has made us mortal — human — and ordained the marriage and family relationship *in this life!*

WHY?

God has never given animals this marriage and family relationship! Angels never marry nor are given in marriage (Matthew 22:30). Angels have never enjoyed **FAMILY** status! The marriage and family relationship is a God-plane relationship — higher than even an angel-plane relationship. And God bestowed it on **MAN** because man is being now prepared for the marriage and family relationship **FOREVER** in the God family!

Think of it! Of all life forms, whether plant, animal, human or angel, in all that God created, **MAN**

ALONE was created for marriage and family life!

In the Kingdom of God — in the God family — there will be a marriage and family relationship — *but no divorce!*

God is consistent!

Could we be preparing for that kind of marriage forever by divorcing and remarrying now?

What a supreme, matchless, awe-inspiring potential!

You are, if converted with God's Holy Spirit dwelling in you, the *heir* of God, and *co-heir* with Christ, to enjoy eternally this unbreakable

**God, through
human life upon
the earth, says that
he actually is
REPRODUCING
HIS OWN KIND!**

marriage and family relationship in God's kingdom! Even now if you are a begotten child of God, you are betrothed to marry Christ!

God *is* the divine FAMILY! The family relationship demands a husband-and-wife relationship. And that demands *faithfulness* to the matrimonial bond. Human marriage, again I repeat, is the TYPE of the divine marriage setting up God's kingdom on earth.

God, I repeat, *is consistent!* He does not ordain faithfulness forever in the marriage to Christ, and then PREPARE US for that marriage by ordaining unfaithfulness, with divorce and remarriage during this preparatory period.

The pivotal reason for the marriage relationship in this human life is to prepare us, by FAITHFULNESS now, for that eternally faithful marriage state then and to constantly remind us of our sacred relationship to Christ, as espoused to the NEVER-ending marriage to him!

How much sense would it make

to teach us to be ETERNALLY faithful then, by ruling that we may be UNFAITHFUL now, divorcing and remarrying? God has given no such law!

One of the most important purposes in our human lives, now, is that we learn the sanctity, the sacredness, the permanency of the marriage bond!

Of course, God has not willed that every human must marry. That is made very clear in I Corinthians 7. The apostle Paul was not married. Yet, I am persuaded that I, like he, have the mind of Christ, and, after all, it was God who said, "It is not good that the man should be alone" (Genesis 2:18). However, it would be far better to live alone than to be yoked to what might be called a "hell-on-earth" situation.

Everyone should take marriage so seriously that a wrong marriage is not made in the first place. And if this truth were known by all, there would be few mismated marriages. On the other hand, if this truth were more thoroughly realized, married partners would TRY HARDER to make marriages happy. Our booklet says: "Your marriage *can* be happy."

But, whether married or single, all need to learn that marriage is the type of a coming divine marriage to Christ. And a type cannot be the type unless consistent with the anti-type.

I repeat, God's laws regarding marriage — which is a DIVINE INSTITUTION — could not be consistent if they provided for divorce and remarriage now, when it shall NOT be allowed then!

Marriage "For This Cause"

In Ephesians 5:31 we read: "For this cause [because of the coming divine marriage of the Church to Christ]" "that he might present it to himself a glorious church . . ." (verse 27). For this reason God ordained the marriage institution for humans,

now! That is the REASON humans are given this God-plane relationship which has been given to NO OTHER species — whether animal or angel. That is God's purpose in granting humans marriage, now. It is a type! And God's laws DO make the human type consistent with the divine antitype.

I think we ought to reflect on what a WONDERFUL privilege God bestowed on us in giving us the God-plane marriage and family relationship! And why? To prepare us for the never-ending joy and ecstasy of our spiritual marriage bliss FOR ETERNITY in the Kingdom of God — in the God family!


And this is real. It is the Creator's purpose. And all humans are going to know, in God's due time, that HIS PURPOSE STANDS!

But most don't know it, now. Most are not willing to know it! My commission is not to compel any to know it. It is merely to state it — to ANNOUNCE IT. Whether readers and hearers believe, it is *their* decision, not mine.

And of course, in this world, today, the divorce rate will continue to mount. More and more families will be broken up. The evils in today's world will continue to accelerate. Writers and speakers will continue to reassure us that this is a good and wonderful world, after all. And all because people are BLIND to the causes and will not see them until the great God intervenes, reveals himself to a deceived and unbelieving world, and by divine power saves us from ourselves — else humanity *would* destroy itself — utterly.

And THEN — the wonderful world tomorrow will be ushered in — a world of PEACE, of happiness, joy and abundance.

Incidentally, please write for our free booklets: *The Wonderful World Tomorrow — What It Will Be Like* and *Your Marriage Can Be Happy*. □



IN THE GRIP OF STARVATION...

Photography by Alain Noguez — SYGMA



Starving women and children look for cattle pellets, dropped by plane, to use for human food in one of the worst droughts since biblical times. The frightful drought is afflicting an estimated 25 to 30 million people living in six nations of French-speaking West Africa. Of that number, some ten million are already weakened by hunger and malnutrition, and many of them face death unless aid comes quickly.

Six nations are involved: Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta. Of these, Niger is by far the worst off. The drought in the Sahel, as the French call these

lands on the southern rim of the Sahara, began five years ago. It became critical only this year as water wells began to dry up.

The searing drought has wiped out half of the livestock in most of the affected countries. Addeke H. Boerma, Dutch director of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) states that "in some areas there now appears serious risk of imminent human famine and virtual extinction of herds vital to nomad populations."

According to another FAO official, it would take "a minimum of five years to rebuild the area's


economy to the point it was at two years ago, assuming even that the crisis were to end tomorrow." Even before the drought began, these six nations were among the world's least developed.

Aid Too Late?


The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the U. S. Agency for International Development (AID) and various other agencies have mounted a vast international relief effort to get food into the drought-stricken area. The United States has greatly increased its normal annual aid to the area, providing some 156,000 tons of



A few hours away from Europe, a catastrophe grips six nations of sub-Saharan Africa. These dramatic photos by Alain Nagues tell the story of searing drought and crop failure — the search for cattle pellets dropped by plane as food for humans — the ritual washing of a 23-year-old victim of cholera — a starving child at its mother's breasts — the last muddy seepage in a well — and limited relief from the grain-producing nations of the world.







grain. France, West Germany, China, the Soviet Union, Canada and other nations, working through the FAO, are supplying some 400,000 tons of grain to the hungry millions in the region.


Further relief efforts will depend, to a large degree, upon the size of this year's early fall harvest in the sub-Sahara region, which is, in turn, dependent on the mid-summer rainy season.

Dwindling Global Surpluses

How much grain can be supplied to the Sahel — and any subsequent food-short areas elsewhere in the world — depends upon one other key factor. Because of huge grain shipments to the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other countries, U. S. government-held surpluses have all but disappeared. Soaring domestic food costs have further limited grain exports, at least on a temporary basis.

Yet the fact remains that not only Africa but also the whole world faces a growing shortage of food-stuffs, due partly to rapidly rising demands and partly to bad harvests in many areas. Most disturbing of all is the fact that the big exporter countries such as the United States, Canada and Australia now are less able than at any time in the past decade to meet emergency worldwide needs. In these areas of traditional abundance, "it all depends upon the weather," as one food expert puts it.

The world must also face the possibility that a severe drought could grip a densely populated region such as the Indian subcontinent — as happened in 1966 — rather than a sparsely inhabited desert region where the population is more or less accustomed to a meager subsistence. If that were to happen, the consequences would be absolutely staggering. □



what you can do...

timely tips and helpful suggestions for you and your family

● **Conserve Energy, Save on Heating and Cooling Costs Too!**

Whether you live in the northern hemisphere where winter is just around the corner, or in the southern hemisphere where the warm summer months are just ahead, now is the time to prepare your home for cold and/or warm weather. By following a few household tips, you may be able to lower your heating costs as much as 36 percent in winter, or at the same time, be readying your home for cooler summer comfort. And you will help do your part to conserve energy.

INSULATION: Insulating your home with ceiling insulation will lower your heating and/or cooling costs considerably. Professional installation of ceiling insulation in an already existing home can be done easily, with relatively little expense. A minimum recommendation is a 4-inch batt (usually a fiber glass pad with paper backing) or 6 inches of poured insulation.

WINDOWS: Don't forget the windows. Glass window panes lose heat, or allow heat in, nearly 14 times faster than a plaster wall. Drapes are a wise investment. During cold weather, they can be drawn together to form a barrier, holding warm air in. During hot summer days, they can be drawn together to keep heat and hot sun rays out. For those who live in areas where the winter is excessively cold, storm windows or double glazing is a must. This added protection will cut in half the amount of heat that is needlessly lost through regular thickness glass windows. Some people simply tack a sheet of clear plastic over each window for an inexpensive, but reasonably effective, insulation.

WEATHER STRIPPING: Adding weather stripping around windows and doors where needed makes a big difference in the amount of warm air escaping or entering a house. This alone may cut heating costs from 15 to 30 percent during cold weather and keep temperatures appreciably cooler during hot weather. A gap of $\frac{1}{4}$ inch at the base of a normal 36-inch door is equal to having a 9-square-inch hole in the side of your home. Need more be said?

CAULKING: Small leaks around lighting and plumbing fixtures as well as small openings in walls,

ceilings and floors should be caulked. Also caulk frames of all windows and doors.

● **"The Teeth Are Okay, But the Gums Gotta Go"**

A person can have perfectly sound, decay-free teeth, but still lose them and be in need of dentures! Why? Pyorrhea, or more modernly, periodontal disease. Pyorrhea, not tooth decay, is the number one cause for the loss of teeth by people over thirty-five.

Pyorrhea is a disease around the tooth, affecting the tooth's surrounding supportive tissue. It causes the tooth's supportive tissue to be slowly absorbed into the bloodstream, and if unchecked, it eventually leaves the tooth unsupported and unable to be retained in place. Though pyorrhea may be caused by a number of reasons, it is most commonly caused by calculus, or tartar, which collects on the necks of teeth and works its way down the teeth into gum crevices.

Pyorrhea is relatively painless at the outset, when in a form called gingivitis. Often only a chronic, annoying discomfort, rather than the sharp pain of the later stages, it sometimes goes without detection until too late. Tissue that is destroyed by pyorrhea cannot be regenerated. The only thing that can be done is to arrest the disease to stop further destruction and preserve the remaining supportive tissue. For this reason, the best cure is prevention.

Good oral hygiene and a well-balanced diet, including plenty of fruit and raw vegetables (carrots, celery, lettuce, etc.), are a prevention must. A balanced diet helps build and maintain healthy teeth, and fruits and raw vegetables not only provide wholesome nutrition, but also act as "cleaning" foods to help keep teeth clean.

Brushing the teeth regularly (baking soda is as effective as any toothpaste), and using dental floss in areas untouched by a toothbrush, to keep plaque or calculus to a minimum is also important. If gums bleed slightly when brushed, this may be a sign of an excessive buildup of calculus or tartar.

— Patrick A. Parnell

What Our Readers Say

Coming World Oil Crisis

Your magazine is extraordinarily interesting as it covers such a multitude of subjects. I just turned in the article pertaining to the world oil crisis to my environment class at Fullerton College, as it covered a complex situation in the most succinct manner.

Jane M.,
Anaheim, California

What Happens After Death?

I have just finished reading an article by William Whitehart, "What Happens After Death?" I am interested and would like to have the free articles offered. I have been searching the Bible for about three years now for the real truth. Much of what was contained in this article I have found and marked in my Bible, but my search is surely most incomplete. I have read the Bible all my life, and of course read all these things, but in the last year I have been reading and really seeing. Needless to say, I am perplexed, upset, and most confused.

Mrs. L. L.,
St. Louis, Missouri

Factory Farming

Thank you most sincerely for sending 35 copies of *Famine! Can We Survive?*... for use as class references in our Social Studies programme. Your generosity in providing these publications free of charge is very much appreciated.

A. D. L.,
Auckland, New Zealand

The Unknown Book

I was really interested in the March issue, especially the article "The Book Almost Nobody Knows." It gave me a starting point from which to jump into the Bible, so thanks. Since this is the first time I've ever written, I have several favors to ask. Send me the booklets *The Real Jesus* and *Read the Book*; and if possible, enroll me in the *Ambassador College Correspondence Course* on the scriptures. I'm 17, and I must admit I'm very confused and disoriented when it comes to God and religion. So your magazine is well received by my family and me....

Debra A. J.,
Yamhill, Oregon

• The booklets you requested, Debra, have been sent.

What You Can Do

I've read the article in March's issue about "Smoking and Pregnancy." I smoke at least a pack a day and have tried and tried to stop. I am now pregnant, and I would desperately like to stop. Please send me a copy of *You Can Quit Smoking* as soon as possible. I would also like to subscribe to *The PLAIN TRUTH*....

Rebecca W.,
Pitcairn, Pennsylvania

General Comments

I should be much obliged if you would send me a copy of your book *The Missing Dimension in Sex*. I am a teacher in the senior department of Christian Brothers' College, and I feel that a better background knowledge of married life would assist me in understanding their problems and preparing them for life.

J. C. N.,
Welkom, O.F.S.,
Republic of South Africa

Photography and Art

I must write to tell you what a beautiful photo [you had] on page 23 of the February *PLAIN TRUTH*. A more poignant picture of a young child with an eager, searching, trusting mind I have never seen. A young mind just searching for truth from a loving parent.

Too bad all children in this world can't be taught God's word of truth.

W. S. W.,
Hawthorne, California

The color work in your magazine is beautiful. I know because I was a color corrector for many years on the largest newspaper in St. Louis, Missouri. You do wonderful color preparation.

I hope I get your magazine for the rest of my life.

Pete H.,
North Hollywood, California

A photographer friend of mine started taking *The PLAIN TRUTH* just because of the picture quality in the magazine!

Lowell S. B.,
La Habra, California

Abortion

I have to agree with the Supreme Court's decision on abortion, not because I condone abortion, but because the court has taken this very moral, very controversial, very personal issue and given it to the people, rather than continue to have it manipulated by the state. The court willingly conceded that at this time it "... is not in a position to speculate as to the answer," by which they admit that they are not knowledgeable enough to pass judgment on the morality, legality, justice, of abortion "when those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus." You, yourself said that "religion is hopelessly divided on doctrines and on what is truth." You also said that "Governments are no solution. Governments may pass laws and sometimes enforce them, but they are neither teachers nor custodians of morals, short of crimes." And to me this is the way it should be. The government should not be the keeper of our mind, or morals, or religion, but merely our freedom.

Dennis D.,
Tooele, Utah

What right have you or anyone to say if a woman HAS to have a baby? She and only

she should be able to make the decision. Why should she have to suffer having a baby she doesn't want? And the baby wouldn't be loved or cared for once it was born.

If ever I were pregnant, I would rather die than have a baby. I would probably have a mental breakdown. Of course I'm only speaking for myself, but I'm sure that there are others who would suffer mental stress over such an unfortunate mishap.

Rita N.,
St. Petersburg, Florida

I would like very much to receive your magazine. I borrowed your last one from a friend and found it a blessing! I was using it for a reference for a college report and ended up reading the whole magazine. The article on abortion was the best one I had for the whole report. It was just what I was looking for and couldn't find in any other book. Please hurry the information on how to get a subscription, if you can, because I am going to be a counselor at camp in Georgia.

Patty B.,
Ft. Myers, Florida

Yes, I say abortion is murder. . . . Murder is murder, I don't care what name they call it. . . . There is one doctor in Portland who quit being a doctor because he didn't approve of abortion. He said the same as I have been telling; life is at conception.

Dollie W.,
Gresham, Oregon

It is about time that the human male is also held responsible for his part in starting the reproduction of human life. The way it is and always has been, the human males use some women as sex punching bags, walk away free, and the women have to take the rap for their misconduct, classed as a bum, plus spreading venereal disease. . . .

August S.,
San Francisco, California

I am a Catholic and am so glad someone has finally taken the religious stand about abortion. In my book, abortion is definitely murder, and in your article you made this very clear and especially in quotes from the Bible. We must live by God's word, and he says, "Thou shalt not murder." Thank you again.


Audrey G.,
Franklin, Louisiana

If everyone would read your article on abortion, there would be a drastic fall in the rate of abortions, and more than that, if all young men and women, unmarried, would read this, there would be less illegitimate pregnancies for fear of what would happen if this were to happen. Thank you for helping me find out that I am correct in feeling it is a sin to kill someone who hasn't even had a chance to live and look for Christian happiness yet.

Mary C.,
Piney Flats, Tennessee

Garner Ted Armstrong

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



U. S. TV STATIONS

East

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

Central

GREEN BAY, WIS. — Channel 2, WBAY-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SIoux FALLS, S.D. — Channel 11, KELO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
KEARNEY, NEB. — Channel 13, KHOL-TV, 8 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 4 p.m. Sun.
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA — Channel 9, KCRG-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
KANSAS CITY — Channel 4, WDAF-TV, 12:30 p.m. Sat., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
WICHITA, KAN. — Channel 3, KARD-TV, 11 a.m. Sun., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
ST. LOUIS, MO. — Channel 11, KPLR-TV, 7 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sat.
SPRINGFIELD, MO. — Channel 27, KMTC-TV, 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 9:30 p.m. Sun.
AKRON, OH. — Channel 23, WAKR-TV, 5:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 1:00 p.m. Sat.
DAYTON, OHIO — Channel 7, WHIO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
STEBENVILLE, OHIO — Channel 9, WSTV-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 p.m. Sun.
TOLEDO, OHIO — Channel 13, WSPD-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
CHICAGO — Channel 32, WFLD-TV, 10 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
ROCK ISLAND, ILL. — Channel 4, WHBF-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
FT. WAYNE, IND. — Channel 15, WANE-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

South

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

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

Mountain States

DENVER, COLO. — Channel 4, KOA-TV, 11:30 a.m. Sat., 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Channel 7, KOAT-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

West Coast

SEATTLE — Channel 7, KIRO-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SPOKANE, WASH. — Channel 6, KHQ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
PORTLAND, ORE. — Channel 6, KOIN-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
FRESNO, CALIF. — Channel 24, KMJ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 2:00 p.m. Sat.
LOS ANGELES — Channel 9, KHJ-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
OAKLAND — Channel 2, KTVU-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri., 1:00 p.m. Sat.
SAN DIEGO — Channel 10, KGTV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
SAN JOSE — Channel 11, KNTV-TV, 7:00 a.m. Mon.-Fri.
STOCKTON, CALIF. — Channel 13, KOVR-TV, 6:30 a.m. Mon.-Fri.

U. S. RADIO STATIONS

East

WHAM — Rochester, N. Y. — 1180 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m. Sun.

WWVA — Wheeling, W. Va. — 1170 kc., 98.7 FM, 5 a.m. and 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 10:30 a.m., 8:30 & 11:30 p.m. Sun.
WRVA — Richmond, Va. — 1140 kc., 10 p.m. daily.

Central

WCKY — Cincinnati — 1530 kc., 5:05 a.m. daily, 1:05 a.m. Tues.-Sun., 12:05 a.m. Mon.
KXEL — Waterloo — 1540 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 8 p.m. Sun., 105.7 FM, 11:30 a.m. Sun.
WWWE — Cleveland — 1100 kc., 11:15 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 11:30 p.m. Sat., 11:00 p.m. Sun.

South

WLAC — Nashville — 1510 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 6:30 a.m. & 7:00 p.m. Sun.
KRLD — Dallas — 1080 kc., 5 a.m. & 11 p.m. daily, (92.5 FM 5 a.m. daily).
KTRH — Houston — 740 kc., 7:30 p.m. Sun.-Fri.
WOAI — San Antonio — 1200 kc., 5 a.m. Mon.-Sat., 10:05 p.m. Sun.
WWL — New Orleans — 870 kc., 8:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat.
KAAY — Little Rock — 1090 kc., 5:15 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Mon.-Sat., 9:30 a.m., 7:30 p.m. Sun.
WHAS — Louisville, Ky. — 840 kc., 11:30 p.m. Mon.-Fri., 8:00 p.m. Sun.

Mountain States

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

West Coast

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

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO *THE PLAIN TRUTH* OFFICE NEAREST YOU.

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

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

UPCOMING ARTICLES

WHY THE WORLD NEEDS CHRISTMAS

Behind the modern observance of an ancient pagan holiday — now clothed in religious respectability — is an urgent need within every human being.



DON'T LET IT HAPPEN TO YOUR CHILD

The ultimate bulwark against drug abuse is the family. It's time we understood its crucial role in protecting children from drugs.



IS THERE LIFE OUT THERE?

What are the chances we may someday communicate with extraterrestrial beings?



BONN AND MOSCOW— OLD ENEMIES JOIN HANDS

Growing cooperation between two former enemies raises ominous questions about Europe's future.

