

Awake!

How to Cope with

WORSENING FOOD SHORTAGES

ALSO

Do I Have to Believe Evolution?

CONTENTS

18 First Movie for Dumbies

25 Getting Down to Business

27 Too Many To Love

How to Get Rich Quick

Moving Along Too Slowly

You Abbvie a Deal

SEPTEMBER 22, 1974



THE REASON FOR THIS MAGAZINE

News sources that are able to keep you awake to the vital issues of our times must be unfettered by censorship and selfish interests. "Awake!" has no fetters. It recognizes facts, faces facts, is free to publish facts. It is not bound by political ties; it is unhampered by traditional creeds. This magazine keeps itself free, that it may speak freely to you. But it does not abuse its freedom. It maintains integrity to truth.

The viewpoint of "Awake!" is not narrow, but is international. "Awake!" has its own correspondents in scores of nations. Its articles are read in many lands, in many languages, by millions of persons.

In every issue "Awake!" presents vital topics on which you should be informed. It features penetrating articles on social conditions and offers sound counsel for meeting the problems of everyday life. Current news from every continent passes in quick review. Attention is focused on activities in the fields of government and commerce about which you should know. Straightforward discussions of religious issues alert you to matters of vital concern. Customs and people in many lands, the marvels of creation, practical sciences and points of human interest are all embraced in its coverage. "Awake!" provides wholesome, instructive reading for every member of the family.

"Awake!" pledges itself to righteous principles, to exposing hidden foes and subtle dangers, to championing freedom for all, to comforting mourners and strengthening those disheartened by the failures of a delinquent world, reflecting sure hope for the establishment of God's righteous new order in this generation.

Get acquainted with "Awake!" Keep awake by reading "Awake!"

PUBLISHED SEMIMONTHLY BY
WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, INC.
117 Adams Street Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, U.S.A.
N. H. KNORR, President GRANT SUITER, Secretary

Average printing each issue: 8,275,000

Now published in 31 languages

Five cents a copy

Yearly subscription rates for semi-monthly editions in local currency
Offices America, U.S., 117 Adams Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201 \$1.50
Australia, 11 Beresford Rd., Strathfield, N.S.W. 2135 \$1.50
Canada, 150 Bridgeland Ave., Toronto, Ont. M6A 1Z5 \$1.50
England, Watch Tower House, The Ridgeway, London NW7 1RN 90p
New Zealand, 6-A Western Springs Rd., Auckland 3 \$1.50
Philippines, P.O. Box 2044, Manila D-406 P8
South Africa, Private Bag 2, P.O. Elandsfontein 1406 R1.10
(Monthly editions cost half the above rates.)
Remittances for subscriptions should be sent to the office in your country. Otherwise send your remittance to Brooklyn. Notice of expiration is sent at least two issues before subscription expires.

Semimonthly—Afrikaans, Cebuano, Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Iloko, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Zulu.
Monthly—Chinese, Cinyanja, Hiligaynon, Indonesian, Malayalam, Melanesian-Pidgin, Polish, Sesotho, Tamil, Ukrainian, Xhosa, Yoruba.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS should reach us thirty days before your moving date. Give us your old and new address (if possible, your old address label). Write Watchtower, 117 Adams Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201, U.S.A.

Second-class postage paid at Brooklyn, N.Y. and at additional mailing offices. Printed in U.S.A.

The Bible translation regularly used in "Awake!" is the "New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures." When other translations are used, this is clearly marked.

CONTENTS

How to Cope with Worsening Food Shortages	3	Italy Votes for Divorce	13
An Apple a Day?	7	Cutting Down on Your Telephone Bills	16
Home First Aid—How Prepared Are You?	8	Do I Have to Believe Evolution?	17
What Is the Greatest Gain of All?	9	What Is the Bible's View? Did Jesus Die on a Cross?	27
He Obtained Something of Far Greater Value	12	Watching the World	29

Awake!

"It is already the hour for you to awake."
—Romans 13:11

Volume LV

September 22, 1974

Number 18

How to Cope with

WORSENING FOOD SHORTAGES

FORECASTS are alarming. The Milwaukee *Journal* reported: "As the northern hemisphere enters the growing season of 1974, millions of the world's people are on the brink of starvation. . . . The food situation is now the focus of international attention. Some see calamitous times ahead, not only for the world's abjectly poor, but for the rest of the world."—April 7, 1974.

Already the effects of shortages are being felt, even in wealthier nations. Food prices have skyrocketed. This means that millions of families cannot afford to buy regularly the foods that they once ate.

Have you as yet been forced to change your diet? What will you do when you are no longer able to afford foods you presently eat, or when these foods simply are not available? There are alternatives to consider, and these may even improve your health.

Blessing to Many

Nutritionists feel that the curtailing of regular food supplies may actually be a

blessing, at least in certain prosperous countries where most people eat too much. In the United States, for example, up to 45 percent of the population are 20 percent or more overweight. Food shortages may force some of these people to eat less, as well as less of the kinds of food that are damaging to their health.

Dr. Jean Mayer, professor of nutrition at Harvard University, commented on this, saying: "The simple fact is that we Americans have—for quite a time—been eating too much of the wrong things. The price pinch might just force people to do what all our efforts at nutrition education have not quite succeeded in getting them to do. Most of all, that means eating less meat, and less fat on the meat we do eat."

The amount of meat Americans eat is considered a dietary disaster by certain nutritionists. In 1973 Americans averaged 119 pounds per person in consumption of beef alone, not to mention other meats!

However, too much of this nutrition-rich food is evidently dangerous. "That big marbled steak should be left for hard-working guys who are not a risk for heart disease—a danger faced by half the American population," warns Dr. George Briggs, professor of nutritional science at the University of California.

Eating less meat would evidently benefit healthwise, not only Americans but millions of persons elsewhere by making more grain available to them. The reason for this is that many pounds of grain are fed to an animal to produce a pound of meat. And so in China, where comparatively little meat is eaten but grains are consumed in some direct form, less food is required per person.

One way, then, to cope with worsening food shortages is to eat less meat. To give an idea of how this could stretch the food supply, Dr. Mayer estimated: "The same amount of food that is feeding 210 million Americans would feed 1.5 billion Chinese on an average Chinese diet."

To a limited extent, rising prices are



THE AMOUNT OF FOOD USED TO FEED
ONE AMERICAN WOULD FEED MORE
THAN SEVEN CHINESE

beginning to force some people to obtain food alternatives. Britons, for example, reportedly eat less meat now than they did twenty years ago when meat was rationed. Such an alteration in eating habits is apparently beneficial for many persons.

On the other hand, adequate nutrition is needed for good health. What foods can be obtained to assure that one's nutrition needs are filled?


Less Expensive but Nutritious

Actually, many less expensive foods have greater nutrition than more expensive ones. And eating smaller amounts of nutritious foods is better for us than eating a lot of modern-day "junk" foods, which are often more expensive as well.

It would be worth your while to study the nutritional value of various foods. This information is given in some cookbooks. If you have no such literature, it can usually be obtained from a library. Knowledge of the nutritional value of particular foods not only will help you to prepare healthful, low-cost meals, but will make cooking more interesting.

One quickly learns that proteins are vital to health. Meat and other animal products such as eggs and milk are an important source of protein. But legumes, including peas and beans, are also an excellent source, and are usually less expensive. "An adult could live very well on these proteins alone," says Dr. Mayer. However, he advises that children should also have some animal protein. And some nutritionists say that adults should too.

From a cookbook one may learn many



appetizing ways to prepare legumes. Loaves, patties, soups, stews and salads can all be prepared from them. Soybean, for instance, is produced in so many forms—soybean curd, dried soybean, green soybean, soy milk, soybean oils, soybean flour, and so forth. And there are numerous recipes for using these to best advantage. Also, brown rice is rich in important vitamin B, and it can be used as a replacement for macaroni and spaghetti.

Many families may still desire to have high-protein meat. Organ meats, such as liver, kidney, brains, heart, tongue, and so forth, are often less expensive, and yet are every bit as nutritious. And there are appetizing ways in which these meats can be prepared. Heart, for example, is sometimes an excellent beef buy. Its firmness and mild beef flavor make it ideal for use in casseroles or it can be sliced for sandwiches. Also, fish may well be less expensive than other meats, and it is an excellent source of complete protein.

The popular iceberg head lettuce, commonly used in green salads, may similarly be replaced by less expensive yet even more nutritive substitutes. For example, chopped white or red cabbage may serve this purpose. And, prepared with the right dressing, it can be just as tasty.

Butter is often very expensive. But there are nutritive alternative bread spreads, including margarine, cashew butter, coconut butter, peanut butter, soya butter, orange honey, mint honey, and so on. Recipes for these spreads for bread can be found in cookbooks. Perhaps one will find it economical to make them.

Bread is another food staple, and especially are the whole-grain, heavier breads nourishing. Many families stock up on it at outlet stores, and thus save 25 to 50 percent by buying in this way. The bread can then be kept in a freezer to preserve its freshness.


Getting More Out of Food

A wise food preparer will endeavor to preserve the most nutrition possible in the food. Fruit or vegetables should not be soaked in water for more than a minute or so. This avoids loss of vitamins and minerals.

When produce is obtained, it is good to wash it as soon as possible in very cold water. What will be used for the next meal can be kept in covered dishes, and what will not be used for even a longer time may be quickly dried and stored in plastic bags, tightly shut to exclude air. Salads should be prepared just before serving, and kept covered until eaten. Prepare only enough for one meal.

Peeling fruit and vegetables robs them of much nutrition. But, unfortunately, because pesticides have become so widespread, you may have to peel some commercially produced food as a health precaution, even though it means throwing good nutrition into the garbage. However, some persons use a brush with stiff bristles to remove dirt and poisons.

It is wise to use as little water as possible in cooking and to save every drop of the juices for use in soups and gravies, storing it in a tightly covered glass jar. Dr. Endel Karmas, professor of food science at



After cooking vegetables, a wise food preparer saves the juices for use in soups and gravies



Dandelions can be used to make salad, wine and a coffee substitute

Rutgers University, explains what often happens:

"Families usually eat their peas or frozen vegetables without the juice the vegetables are cooked in. They are throwing away all the minerals and some vitamins in the food. The minerals and water soluble vitamins in processed food leach out into the water—that is, they drain out the food in the liquid."

Also, a good cook is careful not to over-cook vegetables, thus destroying their nutrition. Some persons avoid re-cooking leftovers, but, to preserve their nutrition, serve them cold. There are many appetizing ways that this can be done. Burning or charring meat should also be avoided, since this destroys valuable vitamins and minerals.

Gathering Food for the Table

At times a variety of fine foods can be gathered from the countryside. Literature on the subject can be very helpful in identifying various weeds that are nutritious eating. The dandelion is such a "weed." Its young leaves can be used as salad. It beats all other common salad greens as regards vitamin A content, and it is rich in calcium, phosphorus, iron, sodium and

potassium. The flowers are sometimes used for wine making. The root may be sliced and used in salad, or it can be dried, roasted and ground and used as a coffee substitute.

The nettle is another very nutritious "weed." Its tender sprouts contain large amounts of vitamins A and C, and some vitamin B. They are also rich in potassium, calcium, phosphorus and iron, and contain protein and glucose as well. The young shoots, which appear in the spring, may be used as spinach, mixed with salad greens, or boiled to make soup. They may also be frozen raw for later use, or dried and milled into flour.

Pigweed, or lamb's-quarters, as it is also called, is said to be a perfect spinach substitute. The young leaves may be prepared in the same way as spinach, or it can be used in salad. Besides the many edible wild green plants, there are different kinds of edible mushrooms, nuts and berries that can often be gathered in the countryside.

Emergency Situations

Should predicted famines strike, it may be important to know the things around us that can be safely and beneficially eaten.

Some persons stranded in a wilderness have been known to starve to death while all around them was a pantry full of life-sustaining food. The big question, though, is, What can be eaten?

What can help a person is to watch what the birds and animals eat. As a rule, what they eat you can eat. But not in every instance. So if you are in doubt as to whether something is poisonous or not, chew a little bit and hold it in your mouth. When there is a burning, nauseating or bitter taste, spit it out. A poisonous plant tasted in this manner is not likely to be deadly to you.


Eskimos have plundered mouse nests of their winter supply of roots, nuts and greens to add some vegetables to their diet. They knew they could rely on the mice to gather edible food. They carefully replaced with fish what they took, so that the mice could survive and gather vegetables for the next winter.

Almost all sorts of grass and clover are edible, although the stomach will have to get used to it gradually. Trees and bushes can also provide good food. Their fresh buds and shoots may be edible. The inner bark or sapwood of various trees, too, can be valuable for food. People have dried and cut it into pieces and ground it for use in porridge and bread. Lichen and moss are also edible. Western explorers of the Arctic regions are said to have survived by eating these. The common cattail can serve as food in a variety of ways.

Almost all animals, if they are healthy, can serve as food for humans. Many people are hesitant about eating certain animals, such as bears, wolverines, dogs, foxes, cats, snakes and squirrels, voles, marmots and other rodents. However, some of these are considered delicacies in certain places.

Practically all birds are also edible, including crows, magpies, gulls and swans. Their eggs also may be gathered as emergency food. In addition, there are insects. Grasshoppers, ants and termites have long served as food for some peoples.

Many birds and other animals live on larvae, caterpillars and worms, and humans are able to do so if necessary. There



is actually a rich assortment of life-sustaining food among these tiny but numerous creeping things around us. It might sound repulsive to eat them, but they are not only nutritious, they are sometimes delicious as well. Snails, for instance, are considered a real delicacy on a gourmet's table.

There is really much we can do to cope with the worsening food shortages. We can cut down on meat consumption if it is a major part of our diet. We can gain a knowledge of nutritional values of foods, and eat those best for us. We can also learn how to preserve the food's nutrition while preparing and cooking

The cattail has been called the "supermarket of the swamps and marshes." A cooked vegetable can be made from its bloomed spikes, pancake flour from its pollen, a potato substitute from its starchy rootstock and a food somewhat like a cucumber from its peeled stalk

it. And we can become acquainted with plants and animals around us that we may eat if present food shortages become full-scale famines.

An Apple a Day?

● Is there truth in the old adage, "An apple a day will keep the doctor away"? Reporting on a study involving students at Michigan State University, The National Health Federation Newsletter says that "the 650 students involved in the project who ate an apple a day 'suffered significantly fewer headaches, nervous disorders and insomnia than did the 650 students serving as 'controls' who ate no apples.'"

HOME FIRST AID

-How Prepared Are You?

WOULD you know what to do if one of your loved ones were injured? There are many situations where prompt action can prevent much pain and even save a life. Listed below are some first-aid procedures that you can take. Check your preparedness:

✓ **CUTS**—If someone receives a serious cut, immediately press a thick pad of clean cloth over it, holding it down with your palm. If blood soaks through this cloth, do not remove it (that would disturb helpful blood clots that may have formed) but put additional layers of clean cloth on top of the old and continue the direct hand pressure even more firmly. Elevating a wounded arm, leg or neck (raising it above the level of the victim's heart) helps to reduce blood pressure in the injured area and slows the loss of blood. Tourniquets are no longer recommended, as they can cause severe damage to tissues.

✓ **BURNS**—For a burn that turns the skin red (a first- or second-degree burn) submerge the burned area in cold running water (not ice water) or apply clean cloths that have been wrung out in ice water. Do not be in a hurry to take the burned area out of the water; it is recommended that it be left there for an hour or more. Then blot it dry gently and cover it with a clean cloth as a protective bandage. On a severe burn, avoid using an antiseptic preparation, ointment or salve, or home remedy. If the burn is one that chars or blackens the skin (a third-degree burn), do not put water or anything else on it; it is usually best to get the victim to the hospital as soon as possible.

An alkali burn to the eye (caused by drain cleaner, strong laundry or dishwater detergent or other cleaning solution) is extremely dangerous, as eye tissues may be destroyed and thus sight can be lost. As with other eye burns,

flood the eye thoroughly with water for fifteen minutes. This is best done by having the victim turn his head to the side; then, holding the lids of the eye open, pour the water from the inner corner of the eye outward. After this you should remove any loose particles of dry chemicals left on the eye by lifting them off carefully with the corner of a clean handkerchief.

✓ **POISONS**—Unfortunately in most homes there are many poisons that a small child may be able to eat or drink. Some of these are gasoline, paint, detergents and cleaning solutions. What should you do if you find that your child has swallowed one of these? Unless the child is having convulsions or is unconscious, the first thing to do is to give him water or milk to dilute the poison. Now you must decide whether to induce vomiting or not. With certain strong poisons this *should not* be done, as they will cause further burns to the already burned air and food passages. Some of these are strong acid (as toilet-bowl cleaner), strong alkali (as drain cleaner) or any petroleum product (as furniture polish).

When vomiting is desirable, you can induce it by tickling the back of the child's throat or by giving him a nauseating fluid such as milk of magnesia and water or mustard and water.



✓ **SPRAINS AND STRAINS**—A sprain is an injury to the soft tissue around a joint, whereas a strain results from overexerting a muscle, for example, stretching or tearing a back muscle by improperly lifting something.

Usually a sprain occurs to the ankles, fingers, wrists or knees. The area swells and is painful if any motion is attempted. In the case of a knee or ankle sprain, first aid requires that you get the victim off his feet and wrap the injured area in a pillow and elevate it. (It is good to keep the injured part raised for at least twenty-four hours.) In all cases it is recommended to apply cold wet packs or to place a small bag of crushed ice on the afflicted area (keeping a cloth between the ice and the arm or the leg). Do not soak the limb in either hot water or ice water.

The best treatment for a back strain is bed rest, heat and a board under the mattress for firm support. Heat and warm wet applications are helpful on other strains.

An often-forgotten "first" in first aid is giving a few well-selected words of encouragement and comfort. Keeping your injured loved one calm is often one of the best aids you can provide until you can get to a doctor.

WHAT IS THE GREATEST GAIN OF ALL?



NOT many years ago it was a common thing for married men in the southern provinces of China to leave their families behind, knowing full well that they would not see their wives and children again for ten, twenty or more years. They would travel to a foreign country and there work day and night like slaves, living frugally and saving as much as possible for the time when they would return home. Their great goal was to retire. This meant buying a piece of land so that they could enjoy its produce during the remaining years of their life. They considered gaining that goal to be a great achievement.

What about those persons who did not go abroad seeking fortunes, but who stayed behind in their own country? They too pursued a similar goal in life. They worked very hard, often seven days a week, ten to twelve hours a day, making money and laying it away in the hope of retiring and living comfortably until they died.

In the end, were these people who made wealth their chief goal in life happy and contented? They had spent tremendous amounts of time and energy in their effort. As family members they had very little time to be together and do things together, and, hence, little attention was devoted to building up a warm and loving family relationship. Often their health was damaged from working excessively long hours, year in and year out, without prop-

er rest. Frequently they suffered from deficiencies in their diet, owing to their frugality. As a result, by the time they had gained enough wealth to acquire the desired material comforts, they no longer had the health or ability to enjoy the luxuries that their money could buy.

Such frantic pursuit of material riches is by no means a thing of the past. Today, in Hong Kong, many young people study extremely hard in schools, often to the detriment of their health, in order to get good grades and graduate with honors. Even after completing their basic education, and after they go to work for a living, many still go to night schools in order to improve their education. No, not so much for the sake of gaining knowledge itself, but in order to get a better-paying job.

This passionate pursuit of material wealth as a grand prize is a concept that penetrates the thinking and activity of a great many Chinese people. This, in turn, influences their view of such matters as family relationships. For example, the rearing of children is viewed by them somewhat like taking out an insurance policy. The parents provide the young children with the necessities of life and education, so that when they are grown up they, in turn, can pay back their debt by supporting their parents, even though the parents are fully able to work.

In one case a boy asked his parents: "Didn't you raise me for love?" They re-

plied: "No, for money!" In another instance, a tourist was told while traveling through the Orient, "You Americans have social security to take care of you in your old age, but we have children!"

Let no one think that this pursuit of materialism is something that afflicts only people in the Orient. Not by any means! It is a malady that has spread around the globe and plagues most of earth's population in one way or another. Millions of persons make money their god, their object of worship, and thus become victims of a false religion that enslaves its devotees. As the saying goes: "Mammon is the largest slaveholder in the world."

Is It Worth the Cost?

No question but that people pay heavily when they desperately strive to accumulate material riches. This raises the question: Is it worth it? Do these people gain a truly great goal, or do they actually miss out on the real purpose of living? Are they, in fact, cheated through a false concept of what the greatest gain of all really is? "He is a great simpleton," someone once wrote, "who imagines that the chief power of wealth is to supply wants. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it creates more wants than it supplies."

There is a Chinese saying, 'Birds will die for food, but men will die for money.' Since ancient times, how often men have risked their lives, or even paid with their lives, in seeking material wealth! Many try to get rich quick by engaging in illegal or dangerous activities, resulting in their being caught by law-enforcement agents or even being killed. Others work like slaves to accumulate wealth, ruining their health and leaving little or no time to spend with their loved ones. Many young people feel, not without justification, that overemphasis on materialism within the family weakens the love of parents for

their children as well as respect of the children for their parents.

So it must be concluded that a materialistic view of life, with the pursuit of wealth as the chief goal, is both unreasonable and impractical. In contrast to the unbalanced view that so many people display toward the pursuit of material wealth, the teaching of God's Word the Bible on the matter is altogether sound and satisfying. If followed, it can contribute much toward achieving improved family relationships and personal happiness in one's life.

The Bible's Balanced View

Contrary to what many people think, the Bible does not condemn the possession of material wealth. Some of God's faithful and approved servants in the past, such as Abraham and Job, were men of great wealth. The Bible acknowledges that money can serve a useful purpose, "for a protection," in the present system of things.—Eccl. 7:12.

At the same time God's Word condemns a greedy "love of money," saying that some of those "reaching out for this love . . . have been led astray from the faith." And besides that, they "have stabbed themselves all over with many pains." Hence, the emphatic warning: "Those who are determined to be rich fall into temptation and a snare and many senseless and hurtful desires, which plunge men into destruction and ruin."—1 Tim. 6:9, 10.

Instead of pointing to material wealth as the greatest gain, the Bible counsels: "To be sure, it is a means of great gain, this godly devotion along with self-sufficiency. For we have brought nothing into the world, and neither can we carry anything out. So, having sustenance and covering, we shall be content with these things." (1 Tim. 6:6-8) Or, as this same writer, the apostle Paul, puts it in another

letter: "Let your manner of life be free of the love of money, while you are content with the present things. For he has said: 'I will by no means leave you nor by any means forsake you.'"—Heb. 13:5.

Jesus pointedly asked: "Really, what does a man benefit himself if he gains the whole world but loses his own self or suffers damage?" (Luke 9:25) As any sensible person can readily see, life is far more valuable than material possessions, since without life he cannot enjoy anything at all. Life is a gift from the great Creator, Jehovah. Lovingly, he has made definite arrangements for all those who love and worship him to gain everlasting life under righteous conditions. So, to receive this wonderful gift of eternal life in God's righteous new system of things—is this not truly the greatest gain, the most precious gift, that man can ever aspire to get?

With this proper evaluation of matters one will not fail to 'pay back God's things to God,' namely, the worship and devotion that his creatures owe him, and thus prove that they are worthy of the precious gift of life from the great Source of life.—Matt. 22:21; Ps. 36:9.

Furthermore, Jesus declared: "This means everlasting life, their taking in knowledge of you, the only true God, and of the one whom you sent forth, Jesus Christ." (John 17:3) This clearly shows the importance of taking in knowledge from God's Word the Bible. One of the most important things the Bible teaches us to do is to 'work with our hands, so as to be walking decently as regards people outside and not be needing anything.' God certainly hates people who are lazy and who refuse to work.—1 Thess. 4:11, 12; Prov. 6:6-11; 21:25.

NEXT ISSUE—SPECIAL! Does God Care?

Furthermore, the Bible shows family members their proper place in the home, how they can live in peace and harmony, treating one another with genuine love and respect. (Col. 3:18-21) God's Word also shows us how to deal with the many problems that beset mankind everywhere, such as the moral delinquency that is sweeping the world. So in all matters the Bible helps us to keep a balanced view, putting spiritual interests first in our lives. By making our prime concern the maintaining of proper relationship with our heavenly Father we have a real purpose in life—to serve our great Creator Jehovah and do good to our fellowmen.

We can all profit from Jesus' counsel set out in his Sermon on the Mount when he said: "Stop storing up for yourselves treasures upon the earth . . . Rather, store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust consumes, and where thieves do not break in and steal." And whether we are rich or poor we can all benefit greatly from the Bible's admonition to those wealthy in a material way: "Give orders to those who are rich in the present system of things not to be high-minded, and to rest their hope, not on uncertain riches, but on God, who furnishes us all things richly for our enjoyment; to work at good, to be rich in fine works, to be liberal, ready to share, safely treasuring up for themselves a fine foundation for the future, in order that they may get a firm hold on the real life."—Matt. 6:19, 20; 1 Tim. 6:17-19.

Getting "a firm hold on the real life" by meeting the requirements set down by the Creator of life—this indeed is the greatest gain that can be obtained!

He Obtained Something of Far Greater Value

MANY people today put much emphasis on education, particularly university training, since they view it as being able to furnish the answers to man's problems as well as a key to economic security. While secular education definitely has value, is it the way to make life really meaningful? Or, is something else needed? That something of greater value is needed may be seen from the expressions of those who once pursued a course of higher learning.

At a district assembly of Jehovah's witnesses in Laurel, Maryland, an educated man acknowledged: "I have devoted most of my thirty-one years of life in a vain pursuit of worldly psychology and learning. But it was from a relatively uneducated man and from a simply written 192-page book that, in just six months, I gained true wisdom and an understanding of life's purpose."

Concerning his educational background, he relates: "When I entered college at Fairfield (Jesuit) University in Connecticut, I was already sick of business, with its greed and cut-throat policies, and I decided to follow academic courses, majoring in psychology. It was here that what little Catholic faith I had was soon wrecked in my theology classes, which were conducted by a Jesuit priest. He did not tolerate questions relating to understanding the Bible, and his final exam consisted of multiple-choice type questions covering such trivia as: 'How much did the cross weigh? How far was it from the walls of Jerusalem to Golgotha?' There was widespread cheating in the classes, as the professor had used the same questions year after year, and they had been passed around among the students before the exam.

"Following my undergraduate studies at Fairfield, I attended the graduate school of the University of Florida in Gainesville, where I obtained my Masters and later my Ph.D. in psychology and became involved in basic research in brain function. By this time I found that my ten years of training in psychology was more or less useless from a practical standpoint of making a living, as there were at least ten psychologists in my specialty for every open job. I became somewhat embittered and, as a protest, let my hair and beard grow long and unkempt. My wife

and I discussed moving to some faraway island to get away from 'the establishment.' But because of my work in the University of Florida, I was awarded a fellowship by the National Institute of Health, to continue my studies with some of the top brain scientists in the world.

"In our experiments we would destroy an area of a monkey's brain and then compare this animal's abilities with that of a normal, undamaged monkey. In these experiments it was relatively easy to learn which brain cells control elementary functions such as eyesight, hearing, or muscle activity. And, in fact, this had already been well established by other researchers. But I was working in the area of the thinking processes, and it is quite something else to try to determine anything relative to memory, conscience, judgment or thinking ability.

"Then, one day a most unexpected event occurred, one that was to result in a total change in my life. I happened to be in an area where the experimental animals were kept and overheard a Bible discussion between one of the animal keepers and his co-worker. I couldn't resist entering into the conversation and tried to dismiss the Bible as of no authority. But I found that . . . the animal keeper's Bible-based reasoning was clear, simple and logical. I learned that he had only recently become one of Jehovah's witnesses. Although I had a vague bit of information or misinformation about Jehovah's witnesses, I had never before talked with one. I found myself wanting to believe as he did."

As to the final result, he continues: "Now my wife and I rejoice to engage in preaching with other witnesses of Jehovah. After all my years of fruitless research for knowledge and wisdom, I can, with the apostle Paul, express my feelings according to Romans 11:33: 'Oh the depth of God's riches and wisdom and knowledge! How unsearchable his judgments are and past tracing out his ways are! For "who has come to know Jehovah's mind, or who has become his counselor?"'"

Truly, an accurate knowledge of God's Word and the living in harmony therewith are of far greater value than the best education the world can offer.

'I KNEW that it was raining, but I did not think it would be such a flood.' That was the comment of Italian Cardinal Poletti after millions of Italians had delivered a resounding defeat to the Roman Catholic Church. They had voted against the Church in connection with Italy's divorce law.

Divorce had been permitted by law since December 1, 1970. At that time the Church could not muster enough support within the government to keep the law from being passed. Hence, the Church now campaigned for a special vote of the Italian people to repeal the law.

By appealing directly to the Italian people, the Church felt that the 'silent majority' of Italians would be loyal to the Church and would vote against divorce. Thus the Church worked for, and obtained, the required number of signatures (500,000) for the government to authorize the vote.

This special vote (a referendum) was held on May 12 and 13. More than 32,000,000 Italians went to the polls. Did most of them support the Church? No! On the contrary, nearly 60 percent of them—over 19,000,000—voted to keep the divorce law! That was about 6,000,000 more than those voting to repeal the law.

The result shocked and stunned Church authorities. It also proved dismaying to government officials who had supported the Church's position.

Yet the result of the referendum goes beyond a simple choice for or against divorce. The fact that such a large majority

of Italians voted against the Church is much more significant. Many feel it is a foretaste of things to come. Why is this so? A brief examination of the relationship between the Italian government and the Roman Catholic Church helps one to understand why.

The Concordat and What It Allowed

Before the divorce law of 1970, matters related to marriage were handled in harmony with the terms of the agreement signed between the Church and the State in 1929. This pact (or concordat) was made between the Mussolini government and Vatican State. It gave the Church many special advantages in return for its support of that government.

Under the terms of the Concordat, the Catholic clergy received financial assistance from the State. The Catholic religion and no other was to be taught in public schools. And the Church was exempt from taxation. Such special privileges gave the Church a place of dominance, enabling it to exercise great influence over the people.

As regards marriage, the Concordat supported the Church's views. While the agreement allowed for the recognition of civil marriages, it gave the Catholic Church the sole prerogative as to ending marriages. And the Church's position was that only death could dissolve a marriage. This ignored the position that Jesus Christ himself took on this matter. He allowed for divorce under certain circumstances.
—Matt. 19:9.

However, there was a "loophole" in the Church's claim that there could be no divorce. It allowed "annulments" of mar-

riage. In other words, while there could be no divorce, the Church could assert that, for various reasons, the marriage had been entered into under circumstances not approved by the Church. Hence, the marriage could be declared nonexistent. This enabled a person whose marriage was "annulled" to remarry.

The financial cost of this procedure was high. Because of this, it was possible for only a small number of people to have their marriages annulled. Usually these were stage and screen actors, political leaders, industrialists, and other wealthy persons. Poor people could not afford it, so they did not bother. Those who left their mates without obtaining annulments often took up living with someone else, in adultery. Some estimates say that about 5 million persons lived in this state of concubinage. But by doing so it was impossible for a father to recognize legally as his own the children born from such a union. This resulted in the loss of certain benefits.

Realizing that there were many irregularities in connection with marriage and divorce, over the years various members of Italy's Parliament tried to get bills passed that would allow divorce. But none were ever accepted, until December 1, 1970. On that date a bill presented by deputies Fortuna and Baslini became law. At last, divorce was permitted in Italy if marriage partners had been separated for at least five years. If one of the parties opposed the divorce, then after six or seven years of separation the other party could apply for one. Special provisions were contained in the law to help the children and the wife.

The Referendum

The 1970 law did not pass without opposition. And this opposition persisted. It

came both from within the government and outside it—especially from the Roman Catholic Church. This opposition culminated when ant离婚 forces won the right to have the referendum held.

The referendum was opposed by many political leaders. They feared that it would result in a political crisis by breaking up the delicate balance of party alliances that had been achieved after much strenuous effort. But despite this fear, the anti-divorce forces pushed ahead.

One result was that a clear division was indeed produced among political parties. The majority party (Christian Democrats) favored abolishing the divorce law. The other leading parties (Communist and Socialist) favored keeping the divorce law.

While this polarization was taking place in the political field, what was happening inside the Roman Catholic Church?

Attitude of the Church

The official position of the Church was expressed in February by the Italian conference of bishops. They flatly stated their support of the ant离婚 forces.

Notification of this official view was sent by the bishops to all priests to have it read in the local churches. One interpretation of their view came from Monsignor Gae-tano Bonicelli, who declared that "Catholics, or better still those who profess to be such, who vote for maintaining the law on divorce, will not be able to consider themselves as 'Catholics.' "

Yet, within the Church itself opposition soon arose. In some cities, such as Milan, there were parish priests who chose not even to read the notification in their churches. Other priests spoke out sharply against the Church's view. Forty-four Venetian priests, in a document to the bishops and priests of their region, expressed their intention to cast their votes for re-

taining the divorce law. Still other priests tried to soften the official view by stating that the vote was a matter of personal conscience.

Many Catholic laymen reacted adversely to the Church's tactics. In Mantova a group of Catholics left the church during the celebration of the Mass when the clergyman began reading the bishops' notification on the referendum. In other cities, there were demonstrations against the Church's stand. Such events within the ranks of the Church caused a Catholic woman to say: "This referendum, rather than dividing Catholics from the enemies of Catholicism, is tearing apart, and perhaps beyond repair, the world of the Church. Do those who are sponsoring the referendum realize this?"

In his document *My Kingdom Is Not of This World*, Benedictine abbot Giovanni Battista Franzoni declared that, contrary to the Church's claim about marriage being indissoluble, the Church had in fact admitted divorce with its famous "Pauline privilege." According to this practice, a convert to Catholicism who was already validly married could under certain circumstances shed his 'non-Christian' mate and remarry in the Church. But even the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* admits of this "Pauline privilege": "The term is based on the supposition that St. Paul grants this privilege in 1 Cor 7.12-15, but it is rather a privilege granted by the Church through a broader interpretation of the Pauline text than this in itself allows."

Thus the Church's position aroused growing opposition among Catholics. This was admitted by an article published on April 25 in the Vatican newspaper *L'Ossevatore Romano*. It said: "Educated Catholics and even young priests, some not so young, contested and refused openly the instructions imparted by the Italian Epis-

copate." The possibility of religious warfare appeared on the horizon, one priest warning: "If we are not careful, all of us risk finding ourselves in the eye of a typhoon."

Of course, opposition also abounded outside the Church. The Socialist daily *Avanti!* charged the Church with "heavy interference in the internal matters of the Italian State." And, as expected, *L'Unita*, a Communist paper, called the "mobilization of the clergy" an "inadmissible interference in the civil sphere."

All these events led up to the awaited days of May 12 and 13. Then the referendum was held—and the blow descended.

Crushing Defeat

To the dismay of the Church, and other antidivorce forces, the people of Italy voted overwhelmingly to continue the divorce law. The result was a crushing defeat for the Church. Pope Paul VI expressed the general feeling of Church leaders by saying of the vote result: "This amazes and gives us pain."

The victory did something else. It opened the way for other popular referendums. And the parties in favor of divorce are in fact obtaining signatures so that the Italian people may express themselves on other issues. One of these concerns the very Concordat between the Church and the Italian State and the privileged status such confers on the Vatican.

The Church had counted on the support of a so-called 'silent majority' of Catholics. But that 'silent majority' turned out to be only a minority. Thus, the Church badly miscalculated the Italian mood. For this she paid a heavy price—a humiliating defeat by the very people she has claimed as her own. And it has opened the way for more trouble in the very near future.

CUTTING DOWN On Your TELEPHONE BILLS



PEDRO was a very good-hearted father who lived with his wife and several grown children in a section of Queens, New York. For the convenience of his family he had several telephones in his large eleven-room frame house. For years he was in the habit of paying a telephone bill that ran from \$40 to more than \$60 a month. When he would ask who was using the telephone so much, nobody seemed to know. But one day he got a bright idea—he put locks on the phones. Now his telephone bills are one half to one third of what they used to be.

Having strict rules and enforcing them is another way of cutting down on telephone bills where a family of more than two is concerned. Teen-agers often like to visit for as much as an hour at a time over the phone. Father can rule that if they want to visit for any length of time, they do it in person; and if their friends are a long distance away, let them communicate by means of letters. Of course, an alternative would be to let the youngsters pay for their calls.

You can also greatly cut down on your telephone bills if you give thought ahead of time to what you want to say. Begin by giving your name and come directly to the point. In fact, it might be wise to make a few notes as to the points you want to cover and then check them off as you do. In this way you can get to the business of your call with the least waste of time, not forget anything and yet not seem to be abrupt or hurried.

Giving thought to the type of call you wish to make can also help you to cut down on your telephone bills. If you ask the operator to make a long-distance call instead of dialing direct, it will cost you more. Collect and credit-card calls also cost more. Long-distance person-to-person calls in the United States cost almost

double what station-to-station calls cost. In Great Britain there is a flat charge of ten pence for person-to-person calls.

Most of all, you can cut down on your telephone bills (without making fewer calls) by choosing the most economical time to make your calls. In the United States, prime time is from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. A reduced rate applies from 5 to 11 p.m., Mondays through Fridays and from 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays. The lowest rate is from 11 p.m. to 8 a.m. any day of the week. During this time you can make a phone call between New York city and Los Angeles or San Francisco for only 35 cents for the first minute, 20 cents for each additional minute. Britain has a somewhat similar setup, having peak time, standard rate and a lowest rate. However, everything there goes by seconds, ranging from a high of a penny for eight seconds to a low of 72 seconds for a penny.


For telephone subscribers there is also the opportunity of cutting down on your telephone bills by choosing the most economical type of service. In some states of the United States there is a flat rate for an unlimited number of calls, and a cheaper rate for 30 calls, with extra calls at so much per call. Depending upon how much you have need of the telephone, you can figure out which type of service will be most economical for you. You might use it so little as to be able to get by with a two-party or four-party service line.

If you are interested in saving wherever you can, then you will also want to ignore all the advertising as to fancy additions. There are such items as "Bell Chime," "Tone Ringer," "Trimline" and "Princess" that cost anywhere from \$1.35 to \$2.05 each month, unless you want to pay for the extra service in a lump sum, the cost then running from \$49 to \$107.

And, finally, since telephone personnel are imperfect even as their machines are, they are as likely to make mistakes as you yourself are. It is therefore wise to check your telephone bill carefully to see that it contains no overcharges. Make it a habit to list all long-distance calls and compare your list with that of the company. At times cheats may use your number and run up very high long-distance charges. Do not hesitate to protest such charges.

Your telephone is a great convenience and most likely a necessity in today's world. But by exercising care you may be able to keep it from becoming a costly luxury.

Do I Have to Believe **EVOLUTION?**



IN RECENT years some states and school boards in the United States have raised objections to evolution being taught as a fact in public schools. One of these states is California.

The California State Board of Education decides what is to be included in public school textbooks. But it receives recommendations from groups of experts in various fields. One of these groups is the State Advisory Committee of Science Education. It submitted a framework

for science instruction in the state's public schools.

The Advisory Committee recommended that the subject of evolution should be taught as a fact, not as just a theory. However, the Board of Education did not agree. It ordered that evolution be taught as a theory instead of a fact. It also directed that in textbooks creation be mentioned as another explanation

of the origin of life that had some scientific backing.

The science committee reacted explosively, saying, in effect: "There's no question that evolution is a fact. We see examples of it every day. No responsible person questions it. It's as much a fact as gravity and atoms!" A committee member even likened belief in creation to belief in superstitions such as astrology, or that the moon is made of green cheese, or that storks bring babies.

However, there are many people who do question the validity of the evolution teaching. One such individual who had never considered the "proofs" offered for evolution as final decided to interview people who believe in evolution. Following

are his observations, along with actual conversations he had in a survey conducted with evolution believers.

Why Do Many Believe It?

"I believe evolution," a distinguished gentleman told me, "because science has thoroughly investigated the subject and is unanimous in its acceptance of it as fact."

"You place great trust in scientists," I observed.

"Their record testifies to their reliability, don't you think?" he replied.

His reason for believing evolution was echoed many times during my survey. I discovered that most believers of evolution are believers because they have been told that all intelligent people are believers.

An obviously well-educated woman in her forties challenged me with this question: "What are your qualifications to dispute the findings of professional scientists?"

"First," I answered, "let me say that they dispute among themselves. They argue over *when* it happened, *why* it happened, *how* it happened, *how fast* it happened, and even *if* it happened at all!"

"Now," I continued, "to answer your question about my qualifications. What are the qualifications of a judge who sits on a case involving medical issues in which he is untrained? If he is intelligent and objective, he listens to the arguments of experts pro and con, and then decides on the basis of *their* testimony. How else can a person make a decision on various fields of knowledge in this age of specialization?"

"But the subject of evolution is so technical," she protested.

I answered: "Theodosius Dobzhansky [an evolutionary scientist] says that much of the work of scientists is beyond the comprehension of average laymen, but that evolution is not. He says it's a matter of elementary biology. And George Gaylord Simpson [another prominent evolutionist] contends that it's immoral to have blind faith, whether in a religious doctrine or in a scientific theory. He also says that it's man's responsibility to test the findings of specialists and then decide, and that a person doesn't have to be a research biologist to evaluate the evidence on evolution."

"Too many people," I concluded, "merely accept the opinions of others and repeat their ideas like parrots rather than taking time to examine the facts."

When she did not comment, I added: "You'd be amazed at how many people who believe evolution know practically nothing about it."

Intimidation and "Brainwashing"

Before I conducted my house-to-house survey of people who believe in evolution, I read some twenty books written by evolutionists. Even before that, however, for many years since my university days, I had endeavored to keep abreast of scientific developments in this field. But now I specifically examined recent writings of prominent evolutionists.

In doing so I was struck by the type of "browbeating" or "brainwashing" they used. This is typified by the following brief summary from twelve books by eleven different evolutionists:

'Evolution is universally accepted by scientists competent to judge. It is recognized by all responsible scientists. All reputable biologists agree that it is an established fact. No informed mind today denies that man descended from the fish. It is no longer a matter of doubt.'

"The evidence is overwhelming. No further proof is required by anyone who is free from old illusions and prejudices."

That is the consensus of all these evolutionary writers. But when claims are so sweeping, so dogmatic, they become suspect. It seemed to me that evolutionists are trying to scare off opposition and inquiry by using a barrage of intimidating rhetoric.

But why should someone who questions a theory be labeled incompetent, uninformed, a 'prisoner of old illusions and prejudices'? Would scientists who really have the facts stoop to such unscientific, unreasonable tactics?

True, this "psychological warfare," this "brainwashing," does make converts to the evolution belief. But nearly all those converts are usually defenseless when confronted by those who resist the arm twisting and ask for proof.

No Answers

For instance, I asked an intelligent woman in an exclusive neighborhood: "Why do you believe evolution?"

"Because I see it all the time," she said, and gestured toward her yard. But when I tried to find out some details, her face began to flush, so I tactfully withdrew.

At another door the elderly man who answered my ring said that we adapt to our surroundings, and that these adaptations accumulate over many generations and finally result in new types of living things.

"That isn't the accepted thought today," I said. "Your suntan is not passed on to your baby, nor are bulging biceps you've developed by weight lifting, nor a knowledge of electronics you've acquired through study and experience. Many years ago the evolutionist Lamarck thought this way. So did Darwin. But evolutionists today know that such acquired character-

istics are not passed on by means of heredity."

"Then how else could evolution happen?" he countered.

"That's for you to say," I replied.

Time and again, I found the same thing to be true. Those who said they believed evolution were totally unable to give reasons, proofs, facts to back up their belief. The main reason for their belief was that scientists believed it and taught it.

No Help From the Fossil Record

On the campus of a large university, a student cited the "fossil record" as proof for evolution. He said that it "traces [for example] the evolution of modern horses from eohippus. Progressive fossils show how it lost toes, lengthened wrists and ankles, evolved new teeth for grazing, and increased in size."

"You must know," I replied, "that to give this neat picture, evolutionists have to leave out many of the fossils. They pick only the ones that support their theory, and assume that these are connected to each other."

"They only simplify it to avoid confusion," the student said.

I replied: "To avoid confusion they conceal the evidence, and in simplifying they oversimplify to the point of falsification."

Indeed, that is just what Simpson says, that 'the oversimplification of the horse fossil record amounts to falsification.' And naturalist I. Sanderson writes:

"This pleasantly neat evolutionary picture of orderly progression in tooth structures,

loss of toes, increase in size, and wrist and ankle elongation has now unfortunately come under grave suspicion.

"So many side-branches have been brought to light, so many intermediary forms are completely lacking that we can now only say that the classic description is no more than a guide to the probable steps by which the modern horse evolved."

However, the fossil record is still evolution's "star witness." As Simpson tells us, "The most direct sort of evidence on the truth of evolution must, after all, be provided by the fossil record."

Silent on Life's Origin

However, fossil evidence fails completely to tell us that life evolved the way scientists claim. The facts, the proofs, are missing.

The problem is not new for evolutionists. More than a century ago, the problem existed for Charles Darwin, the "father" of modern evolution. He disposed of the problem in the closing sentence of his *Origin of Species* by attributing life's origin to God, saying that life was "originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or one."

Decades passed. But the evidence refused to be forthcoming. Later, A. C. Seward admitted that the fossil record "tells us nothing of the origin of life." And to this very day, the situation is the same. True, at times there are sensational announcements by journalists hungry for a headline that the creation of life in the laboratory is imminent. But even if that happened, it would only show that there had to be a Creator, that life does not come into existence by itself.

The fact is that the fossil record remains totally silent about the supposed evolution of microscopic life. A college textbook acknowledges: "We still know little of protozoan [one-celled] evolution."

A "Burst" of Complex Life Forms

The fossil record's first testimony that carries any conviction is in what geologists call the Cambrian layers of rock. Before that time the record of the rocks shows unaltered beds for untold ages. But in those older layers, any supposed fossils are rare. Indeed, their validity is hotly disputed among scientists themselves.

But with the Cambrian rocks, fossils burst forth in sudden profusion, in wide variety, highly specialized and very complex. Silent for so long, for most of the record in fact, their star witness, the fossil record, suddenly becomes a chatterbox! I have to ask myself: "Did it have laryngitis all that time previously, or was it that it had nothing to tell?" I think of the words of Simpson, who refers to this sudden "explosion" of myriads of fossils as "this major mystery of the history of life."

But let us even grant evolutionists the "spontaneous generation" of life that they cannot establish in the fossil record, nor duplicate in laboratories. Grant them that first speck of life that they cannot trace. Grant them also the fantastic advances from that first microscopic life to the sudden bursting forth of thousands upon thousands of highly specialized forms of life in the Cambrian rocks. With all that granted to them, can they look at the fossil record and at least get some answers on how later forms of life supposedly evolved?

When land plants came into being, the fossil record was not silent but was chattering about them. Yet, the fossil record reveals absolutely no "primitive" types as their ancestors. As one authority suggested, evolution believers must simply believe that those supposed ancestors had existed.

Also, there are no fossils of "primitive" insects. Insects appear suddenly in the fossil record, highly developed, and in great numbers, truly a "burst" of insect life in

complicated forms. Yet we are told that they must have been evolving for tens of millions of years before then. But what is the basis for saying that?

There is no basis for that assumption—none. No fossils of all those assumed preliminary stages are to be found. As the 1974 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* confirms: "The fossil record does not give any information on the origin of insects." And the only reason that such a long time is given in the development of insects is that the evolution theory demands it. So evolutionists obligingly supply it.

The Vertebrates

Does the star witness, the fossil record, tell us any more about the arrival of the vertebrates? These are the animals having a backbone or spinal column.

No, the fossil record is again strangely silent—strangely, that is, from evolution's viewpoint. For instance, the fish just appeared. Evolutionists cannot even agree on which ancestor produced it. According to their own reasoning, from the first supposed fish to the first actual fish fossil there is a gap of about one hundred million years. Why a hundred million? Because it was decided that evolution needs that much time to "evolve" something with a backbone.

But in all that time, what ancestor fossils have been found for the vertebrates? Again, the 1974 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* answers: "Fossil remains, however, give no information on the origin of the vertebrates." They simply appeared, suddenly, in great variety, and in very complex forms.

However, let us overlook the one-hundred-million-year silence. From fish came amphibians, they say. But, once again, the fossil record is not talking on this crucial point. Even the tempting

lungfish is dismissed as being no link between fish and amphibians.

Next, according to evolution, came the reptiles, which lay eggs. What does the star witness say about their ancestors? In the book *The Reptiles*, we read: "One of the frustrating features of the fossil record of vertebrate history is that it shows so little about the evolution of reptiles during their earliest days, when the shelled egg was developing." And speaking of eggs, after reading such admissions as to the total lack of evidence, I have to conclude that it is evolution that has 'laid an egg' here.

The fossil record is still silent when, according to evolutionists, millions of years later some reptiles became mammals and others turned into birds. Simpson admits that for both mammals and birds the fossil record is 'scanty' for 75,000,000 years, when the big changes were said to be taking place.

Finally, a quick sampling of the fossil record's testimony on the evolution of mammals, including man: "Fossils, unfortunately, reveal very little about the creatures which we consider the first true mammals." (*The Mammals*, p. 37) "Un-



As to the emergence of the apes, evolutionists say that 'the fossil record is hopelessly incomplete'

fortunately, the fossil record which would enable us to trace the emergence of the apes is still hopelessly incomplete. . . . Unfortunately, the early stages of man's evolutionary progress along his own individual line remain a total mystery." (*The Primates*, pp. 15, 177) "Even this relatively recent history [apelike creatures to man] is shot through with uncertainties; authorities are often at odds, both about fundamentals and about details."

—*Mankind Evolving*, p. 168.

The Record Is Against Evolution

Without question, the claimed evolution of all these major groups of living things is filled with incredible gaps. Time and again the story is the same: the fossil record is silent on ancestors. In a few cases, this might be understandable. But is it not more than a coincidence when this silence happens in the case of every major category of living things?

Even Darwin long ago lamented the gaps in the fossil record. In fact, he said it was good grounds for rejecting his theory. But he defended his position by impeaching his own star witness. He claimed that the fossil record had been altered, was incomplete, and that many living organisms simply did not leave fossils, particularly those without hard parts. Many evolutionists today rely on the same excuses.

Yet, the truth is that there are many beds of unaltered rock. And there are many fossils of 'soft parts,' including skin, worms, jellyfish and feathers. Also, why is the fossil record so full in regard to "completed" life forms, and so empty on the "evolving" stages?

I am compelled to conclude that few sets of facts argue so eloquently *against* evolution as the fossil record.

Do Mutations Explain Evolution?

Mutations are claimed as evidence for evolution. But are they really? The case for them was energetically argued by an acquaintance of mine.

But before reporting our discussion, I want to mention a practice of his that is similar to the 'only-the-stupid-don't believe-evolution' approach. He is a biology major fresh out of college. His speech is heavily saturated with such foreboding words as homozygous, heterozygous, translocations, inversions, haploid, diploid, polyplid, mitosis, meiosis, deoxyribonucleic acid, and the like.

It was obvious that he reaped satisfaction from the use of such 'fifty-cent' words, using them as a sort of mental bullying. However, vocabularies of intimidation do not prove a theory. If anything, they make it more suspect.

Helpful—or Harmful?

"Mutations cause changes in the genetic material governing heredity," he told me, adding: "Natural selection preserves the advantageous ones, and as they accumulate over many generations new species evolve."

"But," I said, "mutations are blind, random, accidental changes in the genetic material. Can such undirected changes improve highly complex structures of amazingly intricate design?"

He answered: "It's true that most mutations are harmful, but rarely one is beneficial." Then he used an illustration found in some evolutionary writings, saying: "It's like pelting your car with rocks. Most of the time you'll do damage, but

the millionth rock might hit the carburetor just right and improve the adjustment. That's how mutations work."

I wondered if I would like to be hit by a million rocks just to get one questionable improvement in my body. So I told him: "Of course, by the time the millionth stone 'improved' the carburetor, the 999,999 preceding ones would have smashed the radiator, cracked the battery, knocked loose the wiring, broken the spark plugs, shattered the windshield, broken the instruments on the dashboard and crumpled the body and gas tank." The next million stones would likely smash the carburetor too!

"No," he countered, "that's where natural selection comes in. It would eliminate the damaging mutations."

"Evolutionists would like to think so," I said, "but they know better. Most mutations are recessive and accumulate in a genetic pool. They repeatedly crop up in future generations to maim or kill the organisms. It is this accumulating genetic load that many geneticists think causes degeneration, old age and death. Indeed, they fear it is pushing man toward a biological 'twilight.'"

"The fact is," I continued, "several pages are used in some books to list the inheritable diseases and deformities caused by the mutations that natural selection fails to eliminate. Some of them are diabetes, anemias, color blindness, hemophilia, deaf-mutism, albinism, clubfoot, harelip, dwarfism, glaucoma, mental retardation . . ."

"But . . ."

I stopped him. "Before you speak, one more point on your stoning-the-car analogy."

Nothing New, but Only Variations

I continued: "Even if we allow that a rock might accidentally adjust the carburetor, it would never make a new one.

It would never turn a two-barreled carburetor into a four-barreled one, or change it over to fuel injection. Mutations can vary the old, but they can't create the new. Now, what were you going to say?"

"That there are examples of good mutations. You can actually observe evolution taking place."


He gave three cases. One was the peppered moth. He said there is a dark variety of this moth that is increasing in industrial cities. The darker form rests on smoke-blackened tree trunks and so is not as visible to birds. Another case was that some mutated flies are resistant to DDT and survive when all other flies are killed. And, finally, he mentioned some bacteria that have mutants that are resistant to antibiotics, and from these few survivors resistant populations spring up.

But the peppered moth in its darker form is increasing not only in cities but also in the rurals, where tree trunks are not blackened by industrial smoke. The dark variety is simply hardier, better able to survive under present conditions. And it is still a moth.

The mutated flies and bacteria survived, true. But they are not as fertile and do not live as long as those without the mutations. The mutants are genetic "cripples," "freaks," as it were. While some peculiarity in their systems enabled them to survive, were they improved? Did a new type of life emerge?

A deaf person can survive the noise of a big city airport while his normal-hearing neighbors move out. A man with amputated feet has no fear of athlete's foot, while normal persons take precautions. But the deaf and the amputee are not improved organisms. Neither are the mutant flies and bacteria.

My friend is not observing evolution when he sees such mutations. He is only observing variation within a family of liv-



Evolutionists liken mutations to the effect of pelting your car with rocks; the millionth rock might hit the carburetor and improve the adjustment

ing things. That is all the woman sees who said she believes evolution because 'it happens out in her yard.' That is all the head of the State Advisory Committee of Science Education in California sees when he claims evolution is a fact because 'you see examples of it every day.'

Variation Limited

It is irresponsible to assume that the variation of a moth's color proves that men evolved from fish. This is simply more evolutionary loose talk. There is constant variation among living things, but the variations do not change what the organisms are.

Will the bush rose ever change into an oak tree simply because there are so many varieties of roses? No, it stays a rose.

Human high jumpers once jumped six feet, but now clear seven. Does this mean they will continue to improve until future generations will high-jump seven miles?

Runners improved until they ran the mile in less than four minutes. Does that prove that in time they will be able to run it in less than four seconds?

No one would contend that such improvement could continue to be made. And certainly, whatever limited improvements were made, the athletes would not have turned into different creatures. Neither does it follow that because flies are resistant to poison they will continue varying until they become eagles. Nor will moths continue varying in color until they eventually become pterodactyls.

There is a limit to things. There is a limit to speed. There is a limit to cold. And if we accept what the fossil record is shouting out, there is a limit to variation. Living things vary, but always stay within their kinds. They do not change into something else.

More Fallacies

Another conversation of interest took place after a demonstration I attended at a university. The demonstration involved the radiocarbon clock, and the professor conducting it mentioned the length of time that man had been on the earth and referred to evolution.

When the professor was asked what the basis was for his belief in evolution he

said, "Well, they can line up skulls from fish down to man and the resemblance of the neighbors in this lineup is striking. The resemblance can hardly be chance, but indicates that one came from the others."

"Did they really?" I asked, since to me this seemed like a fallacy, a false, misleading notion.

He looked puzzled, not understanding my question. So I elaborated: "Did the animals in this lineup actually evolve in this sequence? I have seen this series of skulls in different museums offered as proof for evolution, but it is usually indicated that this is not an actual sequence that took place."

"Oh, yes, that's right," the professor said. "This is only an illustration of the resemblance between different groups."

Resemblance No Proof

I then asked: "Then wouldn't this illustrate that resemblance, rather than proving evolution, doesn't necessarily indicate descent at all?"

He smiled. I was his guest, and he was a gracious host.

"To me it seems," I continued, "that evolutionists are very capricious. They will use resemblance as proof of evolution when it fits their fancy, but will dismiss it when it rubs the wrong way. For example, the octopus has an eye that amazingly resembles the human eye. Yet, no evolutionist claims that they are related."

"Further," I added, "fish and insects are unrelated, yet there are types of both that have similar luminous organs. Unrelated lampreys, mosquitoes and leeches have similar anticoagulants to keep their victims' blood from clotting. Unrelated bats and dolphins have similar sonar systems. Unrelated fish and insects have bifocal eyes for vision both in air and under water."

I continued: "Unrelated organisms have

in common mechanisms and instincts for hibernation, migration, playing dead, poisonous stingers or fangs, and jet propulsion. To accept evolution, we would have to believe that these amazing things, so difficult for blind chance to accomplish even once, were accomplished independently many times by blind and random mutations in the many unrelated organisms that possess them. The odds against these things happening once are astronomical. But evolutionists assert that they happened over and over again, and by chance. Mathematics, without question, turns thumbs down on odds like these!"

"You are steamed up," the professor said. We both laughed.

"I don't object to discussing evolution as a theory," I replied. "What galls me is the evolutionist's dogmatism, his arrogance and tyranny of authority, his smearing others as ignorant if they don't swallow his line."

"Scientists are only human," he replied. "They have their private interpretations, and often they go farther than the facts justify."

Not True Science, but Science Fiction

His words reminded me of the admission by Dunn and Dobzhansky in *Heredity, Race and Society*: "Scientists, like all other men, often succumb to the temptation to prove some particular view or to reinforce some preconceived ideas."

Sullivan, in *The Limitations of Science*, said that scientists do not "invariably tell the truth, or try to, even about their science. They have been known to lie, but they did not lie in order to serve science but, usually, [their own] religious or anti-religious prejudices."

Evolutionists also have the knack of quickly dismissing crucial problems with their airy speculations. Without proof, amazing transformations of one complex

form of life into another are referred to as fact, in the style of the writer of fairy tales.

With the wave of a wand, the evolutionist makes a scale become a feather, or a hair. A fin becomes a leg, which somehow vanishes in a snake, but then turns into a wing on a bird, a hoof on a horse, a claw on a cat, a hand on a man. Such "explanations" are science fiction at its fictionest.

Nitrogenous wastes, once eliminated as ammonia by fish, are eliminated as urea in amphibians, but then changed to uric acid in reptiles, then back to urea in mammals. Mammals supposedly modified their sweat glands into becoming breasts that produced milk, and bore live young that by another chance coincidence developed, at the very same time, the instinctive wisdom to suck at the breasts!

At times, I felt that such explanations were not given in all seriousness. They must be joking, I thought. But they are serious! They are not joking! They accept science fiction as true science.

It is little wonder that their books are filled with 'could-have-beens,' 'might-have-beens,' 'may-have-beens,' which, after a while and after much repetition, become 'must-have-beens.' Possibilities become probabilities, which then become certainties. Assumptions evolve into dogmas. Speculations become conclusions. High-sounding language evolves into "evidence."

All of this is traitorous to the true scientific method. But by means of this brainwashing, blind faith in evolution evolves. With it evolves the arrogant authoritarianism required to sustain what they cannot prove. Sweeping proclamations are used as a club against unbelievers, perhaps even reassuring the evolution priesthood, those who are its promoters.

But such science fiction is not at all reassuring to many parents with children in


school. At home these parents may teach their children creation, while at school the teachers teach evolution. One thing is certain: Someone is lying!

If in school evolution were taught as a theory only, and creation acknowledged as an alternate that has scientific backing, then the contradiction in the child's mind might be eased. But evolutionists fight tooth and nail the introduction of any idea but their own. Supposedly enlightened scientists and educators, evolutionists, try to crush thoughts that do not support their preconceived ideas. Where once they insisted on the right to teach the theory of evolution, they now try to deny anything else being taught.

Evolutionists also refuse to face up to their dilemma, which is a serious one: the fossil record shows evolution to be an inadequate explanation for the sudden appearance of complex life forms. But special creation fits the record precisely, yet is unacceptable to evolutionists emotionally. They simply cannot stomach the thought that they could be wrong, that there could be a Creator, a Power higher than their own brains, One who brought forth living things in His own way.

So, instead of being fair-minded, evolutionists generally try to impeach the fossil record. They resort to name-calling and insults against those who cannot swallow their tales. And they liken belief in creation to storks bringing babies. Like a religious hierarchy in the "Dark Ages," they declare *ex cathedra* (with authority) that evolution is a fact, and excommunicate into the outer darkness of ignorance any who will not embrace their faith.

Evolution is to its promoters a sacred cow. But sacred cows have a way of being brought low by the advance of truth. Like a hammer, truth eventually smashes the altars on which false ideas have been enshrined.—*Contributed.*



DID JESUS DIE ON A CROSS?

WAS it a mistake? Had church leaders erred? Such questions might well have occurred to residents of Cartagena, Spain, not long ago. Why? Because of a Holy Week poster that depicted Jesus Christ impaled, not on a cross, but upon an upright stake that lacked a crossbeam.

For centuries, professing Christians have been taught that Jesus Christ was put to death on a cross. Among many, crucifixes—representations of Jesus nailed to a cross—have special importance. Yet, is it possible that Christ did not die on a cross?

Crosses of various kinds have been common from early times. Says *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*: "From its simplicity of form, the cross has been used both as a religious symbol and as an ornament, from the dawn of man's civilization. Various objects, dating from periods long anterior to the Christian era, have been found, marked with crosses of different designs, in almost every part of the old

world." (Eleventh Edition, Vol. VII, p. 506) Hence, the cross does not have what some might term a "Christian" origin. Of course, that does not mean that Jesus did not die on a cross.

Some people have been executed by being impaled on crosses. However, the Romans often put individuals to death on posts having no crossbars. Could that have happened in Jesus' case?

If a contemporary artist had stood before the dying Jesus on Golgotha, he might have left us an authentic portrayal of that highly significant event. But no artwork of this kind is in existence, and certainly later tradition is not conclusive. Nevertheless, we do have the recorded words of an eyewitness. Who was he?

As Jesus looked down from that implement of torture and death, he saw "the disciple whom he loved," the apostle John. To him Jesus committed the care of his mother, Mary. (John 19:25-30) So, John was there. He knew whether Jesus died on a cross.

To designate the instrument of Christ's death, John used the Greek word *stauros'*, rendered "torture stake" in the *New World Translation*. (John 19:17, 19, 25) In classical Greek, *stauros'* denotes the same thing that it does in the common Greek of the Christian Scriptures—primarily an upright stake or pole with no crossbar. Interestingly, John Denham Parsons wrote in the book *The Non-Christian Cross*: "There is not a single sentence in any of the numerous writings forming the New Testament, which, in the original Greek, bears even indirect evidence to the effect that the stauros used in the case of Jesus was other than an ordinary stauros; much less to the effect that it consisted, not of one piece of timber, but of two pieces nailed together in the form of a cross."

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible states, with reference to *stauros'*: "Literally an upright stake, pale, or pole . . . As an instrument of execution, the cross was a stake sunk vertically in the ground. Often, but by no means always, a horizontal piece was attached to the vertical portion." Another reference work says: "The Greek word for cross, *stauros'*, properly signified a *stake*, an upright pole, or piece of paling, on which anything

might be hung, or which might be used in impaling [fencing in] a piece of ground. . . . Even amongst the Romans the *crux* (from which our *cross* is derived) appears to have been originally an upright pole, and this always remained the more prominent part."—*The Imperial Bible-Dictionary*.

In the book *The Cross and Crucifixion*, by Hermann Fulda, it is said: "Jesus died on a simple death-stake: In support of this there speak (a) the then customary usage of this means of execution in the Orient, (b) indirectly the history itself of Jesus' sufferings and (c) many expressions of the early church fathers." Fulda also points out that some of the oldest illustrations of Jesus impaled depict him on a simple pole.

The Christian apostle Paul says: "Christ by purchase released us from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse instead of us, because it is written: 'Accursed is every man hanged upon a stake.'" (Gal. 3:13) His quotation was from Deuteronomy, which mentions placing the corpse of an executed person on a "stake," then adds: "His dead body should not stay all night on the stake; but you should by all means bury him on that day, because something accursed of God is the one hung up; and you must not defile your soil."—Deut. 21:22, 23.


Was this "stake" a cross? No. In fact, the Hebrews had no word for the traditional cross. To designate such an implement, they used "warp and woof," alluding to yarns running lengthwise in a fabric and others going across it on a loom. At Deuteronomy 21:22, 23, the Hebrew word translated "stake" is '*ets*', meaning primarily a tree or wood, specifically a wooden post. Executional crosses were not used by the Hebrews. The Aramaic word '*a'*', corresponding to the Hebrew term '*ets*', appears at Ezra 6:11, where it is said regarding violators of a Persian king's de-

cree: "A *timber* will be pulled out of his house and he will be impaled upon it." Obviously, a single *timber* would have no crossbeam.

In rendering Deuteronomy 21:22, 23 ("stake") and Ezra 6:11 ("timber"), translators of the *Septuagint Version* employed the Greek word *xy'lōn*, the same term that Paul used at Galatians 3:13. It was also the one employed by Peter, when he said Jesus "bore our sins in his own body upon the stake." (1 Pet. 2:24) In fact, *xy'lōn* is used several other times to refer to the "stake" on which Jesus was impaled. (Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:29) This Greek word has the basic meaning of "wood." There is nothing to imply that in the case of Jesus' impalement it meant a stake with a crossbeam.

So, the evidence indicates that Jesus did not die on the traditional cross. Hence, Jehovah's witnesses, who once had a representation of the cross on the front cover of their journal *The Watchtower*, no longer use such a symbol. Nor do they give the stake veneration. Surely, the instrument of Jesus' suffering and death no more merits such reverence than would the gallows on which a beloved one might have died unjustly. Moreover, God's Word prohibits such veneration, for it says, "flee from idolatry" and "guard yourselves from idols."—1 Cor. 10:14; 1 John 5:21.

Does this mean that Jehovah's witnesses care little about the death of Jesus Christ? No. They know that by means of it God provided the ransom that releases believing mankind from bondage to sin and death. (1 Tim. 2:5, 6) These matters often are discussed at their meetings. And, like the early Christians, annually they commemorate Jesus' death during celebration of the Lord's evening meal. (1 Cor. 11:23-26) At all of such gatherings in the local Kingdom Hall you will find a hearty welcome.



Famine Idea

◆ During the ongoing debate about whether the U.S. should establish its own federal emergency grain reserve, Senator Hubert Humphrey has drawn on ancient wisdom to support his argument. "Frequently pointing to the biblical story of Joseph convincing the phar[ao]hs of Egypt to store grain for lean years," reports *The Wall Street Journal*, "the Senator says his legislation would provide for government acquisitions . . . of stocks in times of excess production." However, the mid-August U.S. Department of Agriculture estimate indicates very little excess grain in 1974.

Starvation Ethics

◆ Authorities are now beginning to adjust their "ethics" for world famine conditions. The subject is treated in a forthcoming study from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It discusses at length *triage*, a French word that once applied only to sorting battle casualties: those who could be saved were given immediate medical attention, while those who would probably die anyway were denied help. Now, says the study, "national triage" must be considered where food is concerned. With such a policy, limited relief supplies would

be directed only to nations able to use them effectively. Less fortunate nations? They would be allowed to starve.

U.S. Presidency Firsts

◆ On August 9, 1974, Vice-President Gerald R. Ford became the 38th president of the United States. Since he had been appointed to his former office, he became the first president in the republic's 200-year history not to be elected by popular vote to the executive branch of the government. On his taking office, the New York *Daily News* headlined: "President Ford Pledges: TRUTH, PEACE AND SECURITY." Another first preceded Ford's inauguration when

Richard M. Nixon became the nation's only chief executive ever to resign from office.

Ecclesiastical Politics

◆ Jesuit priest and U.S. presidential speech writer John McLaughlin observed, in a recent interview, that the exercise of politics within the Church 'makes the civil kind seem like child's play.' He says that "the rawest, most vulgar display of power I have experienced has been ecclesiastical."

"An Act of Creation"

◆ "We find no vestige of a beginning," wrote James Hutton, the father of modern

geology, about the age of the earth. That was in the eighteenth century. But, as it often does, science has changed. Robert Jastrow, director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies, writes in *Natural History* magazine that modern instruments and study "have produced a description of the history of the world that, like the Book of Genesis, begins suddenly, sharply, with an act of creation."—August-September 1974, pp. 80, 82.

Dialysis and Transfusions

◆ Recent medical reports indicate that the practices of priming dialysis machines with blood, as well as transfusing chronic dialysis patients to combat anemia, are dangerous and unnecessary. European kidney specialists, writing in the internationally respected journal *Nephron*, state that with "efficient hemodialysis," proper diet and supplements, "a much more successful treatment of anemia in terminal [kidney] failure is now possible. Blood transfusions are unnecessary and because of their known disadvantages should be banned from routine treatment of dialysis anemia." Dialysis artificially removes certain impurities in the blood when the kidneys are unable to do so.

Taking the Fear Out

◆ In another effort to stem the decline of the Church, Italian bishops are trying a new approach (for them) in religious instruction. For experimental use, they recently adopted the second in a series of five new catechisms for different age groups. The Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera* reports that the new catechism no longer uses the feeling of terror from the "flames of hell and the demons (hell is spoken of only once as 'an everlasting punishment')" to encourage obedience.

Sea Greed

◆ With high aspirations, the U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea convened in Caracas, hoping to create a way to manage ocean resources for the benefit of all mankind. How are these noble aspirations faring? "Greed Takes Over as Nations Divide the Oceans," headlines the Los Angeles Times. "The nations of the world, acting like individual property owners, are trying to grab as much as they can of unclaimed property." They are no longer content with the old three-mile limit that leaves most of the seas open to all.

\$10-Billion "Indigestion"

◆ Though many nations cannot find enough money to pay for oil imports, some oil-exporting countries have an opposite problem. Venezuela's \$10-billion windfall from increased prices this year could give the country "economic indigestion," says the Minister of Development. Authorities fear rapid inflation from pumping too much money into an unprepared economy. "The \$10 billion will crush us," declared former oil minister Juan Pablo Perez Alfonso. "After five years of this, we'll be in a worse state than ever. . . . Everyone will be thinking how to put his hand in the bag."

Is Technology the Answer?

◆ Over the years, the public has grown to believe that technology can solve all society's problems. But "we overpromoted what science could accomplish," says the director of an RCA laboratory. "Now we're paying for all those high expectations." The director of General Electric's research center in Schenectady, New York, agrees: "Fifteen years ago, technology was changing faster than society was . . . Today, social expectations are changing faster

than technology. And that creates a problem for us."

Churches and Prostitutes

◆ Despite pressure, Methodist bishop R. Marvin Stuart refused to censure or remove the minister of San Francisco's Glide Memorial Church, where U.S. prostitutes held their first national convention. The minister had welcomed them, saying, "You are helping to change the world and make a new community for mankind." Meanwhile, a Southampton Church of England vicar and a lay evangelist "captain" are backing a campaign for state-registered brothels. "People have to realize that prostitution is a fact of life and here to stay," says the vicar. The evangelist captain agrees: "It would help if prostitutes were allowed to install a red light outside, which they could switch off when they were busy."

A Clergyman's View

◆ When the St. Paul, Minnesota, city council heard public testimony on a proposed homosexual rights ordinance, one woman quoted from the Bible. Someone objected: "Don't give me all this holy-moly stuff about the Bible." Who said that? Baptist minister William D. Young, chaplain for the St. Paul Area Council of Churches. His view prevailed. The ordinance was passed by a vote of five to one.

Literature in Evangelizing

◆ At a recent Southern Baptist pastor's conference in Texas, one pastor, H. L. Fickett, Jr., of First Baptist Church, Van Nuys, California, "called for increased use of literature in evangelizing. He used the Jehovah's Witnesses as an example," reports the Associated Press, as he noted the huge volume of magazines they produce to back up their evangelizing work. During 1973 the Witnesses distributed to the public world wide about 235

million magazines and nearly 22 million books.

"Articulate Group"

◆ A current public school textbook, *American Government in the 20th Century*, describes the role of the Supreme Court in protecting religious liberty. It notes that "Jehovah's Witnesses are a highly organized and very articulate group, whose beliefs and actions have exposed them to criticism and even hostility on the part of some people. . . . Strict followers of the Bible, the Witnesses refuse to salute the flag or render military service in 'the world's wars' . . . The remarkable feature of . . . cases involving Jehovah's Witnesses is that most of them were decided by the Supreme Court during World War II, when popular feeling ran high against those who did not fully support the war effort."

"Unpleasant Shock"

◆ Modern medical technology has more than met its match in the fruits of immorality. Noting that "venereal disease is showing an alarming increase everywhere," *World Health* magazine says that this "breakdown in the control of venereal infection . . . came as an unpleasant shock to the health authorities." Why? "Because not many years ago there was a general assumption that new methods of treatment would lead to the rapid reduction . . . of the two most widespread and damaging sicknesses" resulting from promiscuous sex habits. But man's moral decay has been far more "rapid" than medicine's advances.

Economic Necessity?

◆ Motorcycle sales in the U.S. have grown at a 32-percent annual rate since the energy crisis. Is it all for economy? The publisher of *Cycle Sport* magazine says: "The real reason these older guys started

buying bikes this year . . . is they now had an excuse from the sad state of the economy to do what they wanted to do in the first place. . . . Suddenly, they can ride to work on a cycle and get away with it." However, traffic deaths of cyclists are running almost a third ahead of last year, though overall highway deaths declined sharply. New riders with six months' or less experience account for two thirds of the motorcycle deaths.

Charity for Whom?

◆ What happens to the money that many well-intentioned people donate to religious and other charities? The Baltimore *Sunday Sun* recently "found striking differences among 20 large charities soliciting in Maryland." But it noted that the amount spent for "fund raising" reached a "high of over 85 percent for the . . .

Pallottine Missionaries." The Pallottine group conducts a countrywide mailing campaign from its mission office in the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

Highway Robbery

◆ Using methods reminiscent of the old West in the United States, motor-vehicle thieves are making their mark in Nigeria. The *Daily Times* of Lagos reports that 3,000 vehicles were stolen in the city in the past three years and a number in other areas. "Apart from kidnapping and murdering occupants of cars, thieves also seize cars at gunpoint. They also dope unsuspecting drivers with 'doctored' drinks, so as to steal the vehicles" after the drivers pass out. The report notes that "armed robbery, especially on our highways, is likely to be with us for some time to come."

Are They in School?

◆ "Parents think their children are safely in the care of teachers," says a senior Scotland Yard official. But he says the great upsurge in juvenile crime in London is because "these little blighters get attendance marks at school by booking in, and then buzz off." He blames teachers "who do not care."

Appearance Counts

◆ Writing to the Boerne, Texas, *Star*, a Mrs. Otto Rahm commented on the poor appearance of most young men who wear long hair. However, she wrote, "two young men came to my door from Kingdom Hall [of Jehovah's witnesses], and it was a real pleasure to talk to these clean shaven, short hair, neatly dressed young people, and I wish that more young people would follow their example."

