

--Jehovah's Witnesses: A Study in Religious Certainty--

"Probably no sect since the early days of the Mormon Church has been as much a thorn in the communal side and as much a victim of communal hate and persecution as Jehovah's Witnesses." So writes Leo Pfeffer in his monumental study entitled "Church, State, and Freedom." And the record is amply clear that the members of the sect have been treated with a severity above and beyond what one might reasonably expect to be occasioned by just a difference in religious opinion. Undoubtedly the worst phase of the record occurred during the early years of the Second World War when witnesses were victims of mob violence and group persecution in over 355 communities in nearly every state of the Union. They were assaulted, tarred and feathered, and railroaded out of towns and also out of states; they were fired on and jailed with or without charge; their meeting halls were burned and in at least one state, Maine, the ugly result was death; they were accused of being fifth-columnists, if not actual Nazi agents despite the fact that in Nazi Germany, at the very same time they were a particular object of Nazi attack and were either being imprisoned or killed. So serious was the situation that Francis Biddle, the then solicitor general, was moved to make official protest and the Department of Justice was ordered to make a thorough investigation.

Since then the amount and degree of severity openly vented against the members of Jehovah's Witnesses have appreciably decreased, but the antagonism toward them has not gone very far below the surface of potential outbreak in another critical situation. For the witnesses are still viewed with a considerable amount of suspicion and dislike. They irritate and aggravate many by their methods, and as is now the case in the Catholic stronghold of Canada, the Province of Quebec, they are confronted with a wide-scale opposition that would curtail the public expression of their message and the distribution of their literature. They are constantly entangled with the law, and not only State Supreme Courts but even the Supreme Court of the United States, have had to wrestle with issues of religious liberty revolving around Jehovah's Witnesses. Moreover, in the eyes of many their refusal to salute the American flag makes them appear unpatriotic, and their sturdy objection to participation in man-made wars invites the accusation that they are draft-dodgers and enemies of national unity and security.

The Jehovah's Witnesses movement therefore warrants some attention not just because it is one of the rather bizarre religious sects in American life and with outreaches throughout the world, but still more because it so dramatically and repeatedly illustrates the problem of adjusting the conflicting interests of social well-being and religious liberty and so fully tests the principle of religious liberty. Who then are the Witnesses, characterized as Jehovah's Witnesses, and what do they believe, and at what points are they thorns in the communal side and what shall we think about them and what shall we do about them?

As regards who are Jehovah's Witnesses, the current leader of the movement, Mr. Nathan H. Knorr has said that the witnesses are those who on earth have testified or are testifying to the name and supremacy of Jehovah. With typical reliance upon the authority of Scripture, he quotes Isaiah "Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and my servant whom I have chosen; that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I have declared and I have saved, and I have showed; and there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and I am God." The first witness was Abel, followed by such witnesses as Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jeremiah, and Christ Jesus who takes preeminence among all the witnesses, and designated others, including the present day witnesses, to continue testimony. This, to put it mildly, lays claim to a rather long and distinguished ancestry, and is undoubtedly meant to be impressive. But it is typical of the Jehovah's Witnesses that they are neither half-hearted in the sweep of their claims nor in the zeal with which they testify.

The organized movement, however, began on a more prosaic level in the state of Pennsylvania, in a more recent year, 1872, and under the very human leadership of a young man named Charles Russell. Russell was not a minister, but as a child he had been raised in the Presbyterian and then in the Congregational Church and he was seemingly tormented by the picture of an endless sizzling hell. For a time he "fell prey to the logic of infidelity", and then he investigated other religious teachings but in none of these did he find satisfaction. So he and a small group began studying the Bible and not only did they come up with the comforting thought that there was no sizzling hell but they recaptured and re-activated the old

doctrines about the second coming of Christ, although in inevitable form, and the millennial reign and the final great battle of Armageddon in which Satan and all of his earthly hosts would be literally wiped out of existence, and the final endless glory ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ for all who had witnessed to Jehovah's supremacy. The movement quickly grew in influence, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ In 1874 the little group published a pamphlet entitled The Object and Manner of the Lord's Return, and 50,000 copies were distributed. Thus started a work of preaching by the printed page that is unrivalled in the sheer quantity, if not quality, of material. In July of 1879 the first issue of the Watchtower magazine appeared. Since that date it has not missed an issue, and it remains the official journal of the Watchtower Society. In 1881 an organization, Zion's Watch Tower Tract Society, was established with headquarters in Allegheny, Pennsylvania. In 1909 the headquarters were moved to Brooklyn, N.Y., and in 1914 the expansion of the work on a world-wide scale led to the creation of the International Bible Students Association in the British Isles. As for Charles Russell, better known now as Pastor Russell, he moved on from success to success. True, his domestic life was far from millennial. After a considerable amount of scandal, his wife was granted a divorce. And there was hardly a time when Pastor Russell was not involved in some litigation. such as when he unsuccessfully sued the Brooklyn Eagle for a hundred thousand dollars. ~~The~~ <sup>The</sup> occasion involved the sale by Pastor Russell of what he claimed was Miracle Wheat, but which the Brooklyn Eagle had charged was only ordinary wheat. Pastor Russell argued that not only was the wheat of proven superiority, but that it was being sold for the benefit of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and not for his own personal profit, and that it was being sold for the rather high price of a dollar a pound in much the same way that ladies at a church social sell atrocious pies for exorbitant prices. Be that as it may, he did not collect a hundred thousand dollars from the Brooklyn Eagle. Still as president and during most of his life the undisputed leader of the movement, Pastor Russell was a colorful figure. He loved to appear before large audiences. He traveled thousands and thousands of miles on speaking tours, and he was tireless in the production and circulation of literature. To him also belongs the credit, if credit is the right word, of introducing the use of the victrola record as a means of carrying

the message to many who could not hear him in person. When he died in 1916 on a journey through Texas, many of his loyal followers refused to accept the leadership of his successor and split off from the main body.

His successor was Judge J.F. Rutherford who was quite a different kind of man but who was able to so impress himself upon the movement that his name is now far more commonly associated with Jehovah's Witnesses than is that of Pastor Russell. Rutherford was not really a judge but rather a lawyer who only now and then acted in the capacity of a judge on a traveling circuit in Missouri. In comparison with Russell, he was cold, distant, and reserved. He avoided public appearances as much as possible, even disliked personal publicity. But he was an able administrator and a prolific writer, and he gave skillful leadership to the movement for more than a quarter of a century. He wrote some eighteen volumes, averaging more than 350 pages per volume; some thirty two booklets of sixty four pages each containing lectures he delivered over the radio; and he really made use of recordings covering some eighty-three topics in separate four and one-half minute speeches. As Rutherford moved to the fore as the undisputed head and spokesman of Jehovah's witnesses, the name and writings of Russell fell more and more into the background. And it was under the leadership of Rutherford and at his suggestion that the name Jehovah's Witnesses was officially adopted in 1931. Prior to that the members had been called "Russellites", "International Bible Students", "Millennial Dawnists" and other less complimentary names. The Judge died in 1942 but it is his name and his voice which are still most actively associated with Jehovah's Witnesses.

His successor was and still remains Mr. Knorr about whom not very much is known. Unlike Russell he shies away from personal publicity and consistently refuses to give personal interviews. And unlike Rutherford, he is reticent about attaching his name to whatever comes out under the Watch Tower imprint. Still he may be judged to be capable, since he served as vice-president, under Judge Rutherford and was left in active direction of the movement by the Judge. So far he has evidenced no marked departure from the policies of his predecessor. As president, he presides over an organization which is hierarchical and highly authoritarian.

"There is "to quote Professor Braden's study of Jehovah's Witnesses" little dem-

ocratic participation in the management or in the formation of policies of the movement as a whole. This is taken care of by a relatively small group of directors of the Society...In general, the membership of the movement seems not to be disturbed by this autocratic concentration of control at headquarters. They seem to accept whatever is handed down as from the Lord..." There have of course been some rumblings and instances of rebellion. One former head counsel of the movement wrote a letter to the Board of Directors criticising certain practices of Judge Rutherford and other officials, and when he <sup>was</sup> dismissed without a hearing and "excommunicated from all meetings and activities of the organization", he sued Rutherford and the board and was awarded \$25,000 damages by the court." Still the concentrated authority and control has not yet been seriously shaken, and with regard to this matter, it is rather interesting to note that although the Witnesses condemn Roman Catholicism as the worst sink of iniquity they are still very much at one with Roman Catholicism in adhering to an authoritarian pattern of structure.

Turning now to some of their beliefs, the basic one, as already indicated, is that which has to do with the second coming of Christ and the establishment of Jehovah's rule and kingdom. There is nothing new in this belief as such. It has been preached and believed in with varying intensity for nearly two thousand years. In this country it was one of the fundamental ideas behind the development of both Mormonism and Adventism. And today, there are numerous groups not allied with Jehovah's Witnesses that hold to this as a kind of backdrop conviction. Where the Witnesses differ from ~~these~~ all or most of these other groups is in keeping this belief squarely in the foreground. They not only believe in the establishment of Jehovah's kingdom but they believe that it is going to be established soon. They believe it so deeply and so seriously that they are moved to do all in their power to offer salvation to others and, by witnessing, to thereby insure for themselves a place in the kingdom of Jehovah God. It is true, that along with many other groups, they have had moments of embarrassment in trying to figure out the time-schedule for the various expected events. Pastor Russell for example made an early calculation, based upon figures derived from or imputed to the Bible, that the second coming of Christ would take place in 1874. The advent was supposed to be invisible, which leaves one wondering how Pastor Russell

or anyone else could be certain whether or not it occurred. Apparently Russell and his followers did not witness sufficient correlative events to warrant a belief that it had occurred, for Russell went over his figures and advanced the date. Judge Rutherford was a little more cautious about being too specific in the naming of dates. H. H. preferred to speak in terms of "soon" and "at hand". But there was no mistaking his conviction that the great events were imminent. One of his most famous slogans was "millions now living will never die" and it was painted on almost all the helpless boulders along the highways of America. For the Judge himself the soon was not soon enough, since he died in 1942 at the age of seventy two. Still, the Witnesses, unlike many other groups, have not <sup>yet</sup> allowed themselves to be discouraged or defeated in their <sup>central</sup> belief by such minor upsets and mistakes in calculation. Another few years is as nothing is the sight of Jehovah and who can mistake the signs of the times, the wars and social upheavals and natural catastrophes, as evidence that the grand climax is soon to occur. So the Witnesses are rather generally agreed that Christ returned invisibly around 1914, that up to that time the earth was under the rule of Satan, that then he was challenged for the first time, that in 1919 (the year incidentally in which Judge Rutherford and some of his associates were released from the federal prison in Atlanta) the Lord redeemed and delivered the faithful ones from Satan's organization... and that the final overthrow of Satan and all his works and all his followers is just around the corner. Right now we are going through a transition period in which the Witnesses have an opportunity to warn the people of the world and to invite them to be saved. In this period Satan is still operating over a vast area. All governments are of his kingdom, and so are most churches, and many schools. Once this transition period is over, then will come Armageddon and then the millenium and then one last testing period in which the unrepentant will be obliterated and then the establishment of Jehovah's Kingdom. To most of us this may still sound like a rather vague and long drawn out affair. But to the Jehovah's Witnesses it is a matter of pressing and all-demanding concern.

It is only on the basis of this central core of belief that one can understand the position that the Witnesses take with regard to the things of the world. Since Satan has ruled the world ~~for so long a time~~ for so long a time and still operates,

it must follow that most of the people in the world and most of the things of the world are of the devil. This puts the Witnesses in a difficult position since they have to live with other people and in the world. They have sought to meet this difficulty by condemning almost all <sup>the</sup> things of the world, governments, business, churches, schools, and by having as little to do <sup>as possible</sup> with some of the things of the world. Thus, for example, they do not vote, and do not run for or hold public office. To do so would be participating in Satan's kingdom.

~~There is much in this that in itself would not generate any particular amount of animosity against Jehovah's Witnesses.~~ After all there are plenty of people who for one reason or another do not vote and do not run for or hold public office. And as far as believing in the second coming and other related events, that is no more ridiculous than a good many other things that are believed in religion and elsewhere. But and large Jehovahs Witnesses could be either ignored or accepted if these were the only matters of consideration. There are however three points at which the W,tnesses have been felt to be thorns in the communal flesh.

One has been their aggressiveness in feeling the need of spreading their message as far and as fast as possible. They are not only certain that they are right, but they consider themselves to be under a divine command to offer the message of salvation down until the last battle. The result in many instances has been that zeal and aggressiveness have overstepped the bounds of good manners, invaded the citizen's quiet and privacy, and disrupted the communal peace. And in the case of the Witnesses the potential irritation and conflict are made all the greater by the sweeping and unrestrained attacks that they make upon all churches, and particularly the Catholic church, both as to their teaching and their ministry. According to Rutherford, "Religion is of the devil". The Witnesses try to clear themselves from inclusion in this charge by indignantly denying that their movement is religious. They are simply announcers of the coming rule of Jehovah, representatives of true Christianity which is the will of Almighty God. They also emphasize that they do not have a professionally trained ministry and that they do not have churches, but Kingdom Hall.s. With this semantic purification of themselves, they charge for example that the Devil built the Roman Catho-

lic Church and that the Pope is really the representative of the "evil"; and the same is true for all the potentates of the Protestant churches-- they are of the "evil", disseminating false teachings, among them the unscriptural doctrine of the trinity, and keeping the people in ignorance of the Bible. This kind of thing is not likely to meet with enthusiastic reception in say the Bible belt or Catholic Quebec.

Y<sup>et</sup> what does one do in the many situations that can and do arise out of this kind of aggressive missionary activity? The situation in Quebec is worth a moment's notice as an example of the conflicting opinion that swirls around this matter. A few months ago a municipal regulation of the city of Quebec was resorted to in an attempt to prevent the Witnesses from distributing their literature in the streets of that city. It was argued by the Premier of the Province, Premier Duplessis who has been carrying on a long war with the Witnesses, as well as by many others, that the outrageous utterances of Jehovah's Witnesses were an insult to the province of Quebec, to its people and their religion. The Witnesses in customary fashion violated the regulation, and the case was finally carried to the Supreme Court of Canada. Last summer that Court by a bare majority of 5 to 4 ruled that the municipal regulation could not be so employed. And it is a matter of no little interest to note that the decisive judgement, which produced the majority, was given by a Roman Catholic judge, Mr. Justice Kerwin who whatever his personal feelings about the Witnesses of Jehovah, based his judgement upon the guarantees of the free exercise of religious professions given by a "Freedom of Worship Act" passed by the Quebec Legislature in 1880. This judgement was widely hailed throughout Canada, even by those who look upon the Witnesses as a rather tiresome and irritating religious sect. Since then, however, Premier Duplessis, not to be outdone if he can help it, has managed to get an amendment to the provincial Freedom of Worship Act passed by the Legislative Assembly of Quebec. The purpose of the amendment is to put a curb on the activities of Jehovah's Witnesses. So another round in the battle is under way. ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ The Toronto Saturday Night has editorially condemned the amendment as a hasty and dangerous piece of legislation. For any hoped for relief from abuse and excess on the part of the Witnesses, even if that were forthcoming, would be



more than outweighed by what could very well be a curbing in any quarter of any sort of criticism or dispassionate appraisal of religious beliefs or theories, including even those of Jehovah's Witnesses.

Here in the United States we have had any number of ~~xxxxx~~ such cases involving Jehovah's Witnesses. One mentioned by Pfeffer is of particular interest because it also illustrates conflicting interests. In April of 1938 Jesse Cantwell, a Witness, stopped two pedestrians on the sidewalk in New Haven and courteously requested and received their permission to play to them a phonograph record. The sound of the record did not disturb the residents of the street, and did not impede traffic, but its contents did arouse the ire of the two listeners. They resisted the temptation to resort to violence, but warned Cantwell to move on, which he did, only to be arrested and convicted of the common law offense of inciting a breach of the peace. The United States Supreme Court, however, reversed the conviction on the basis of the First Amendment's guarantees of the freedom of religion and of speech. The court agreed that the "State of Connecticut has an obvious interest in the preservation of peace and good order within her borders". "No one" the Court said "would have the hardihood to suggest that the principle of freedom of speech sanctions incitement to riot or that religious liberty connotes the privilege to exhort others to physical attack upon those belonging to another sect. When clear and present danger of riot, disorder, interference with traffic upon the public streets or other immediate threat to public safety, peace or order appears, the power of the state to prevent or punish is obvious." But in this case the court held that Cantwell's conduct "raised no such clear and present menace to public peace and order as to render him liable to conviction of the common law offense of inciting breach of the peace. As for his beliefs, the Court said: In the realm of religious faith and in that of political belief, sharp differences arise. In both fields, the tenets of one man may seem the rankest error to his neighbor. To persuade others to his own point of view, the pleader, as we know, resorts to exaggeration, to vilification of men who have been, or are prominent in church or state, and even to false statement. But the people of this nation have ordained in the light of history, that, in spite of the probability of excesses and abuses, these liberties are, in the long view, essential to

enlightened opinion and right conduct on the part of the citizens of a democracy!

A second issue that ~~has~~ generated a good deal of hostility against the Witnesses has been their refusal to have their children ~~in school~~ salute the flag. ~~The~~ refusal to salute the flag, any flag, stems directly from ~~their~~ reliance upon the Bible as being the word of Jehovah and in the second commandment as elsewhere they find what is warrant for them not to indulge in the formalism or ceremony of saluting any flag. According to Judge Rutherford "the salute attributes salvation to the state which the flag represents, thus making the state a mighty one or a god, whereas salvation belongeth alone to Jehovah, and violation of God's commandment would mean ~~their~~ certain destruction." The early Christians were moved by the same commandment and injunctions not to give worship to the idols of Rome. In the eyes of many, however, the refusal of the witnesses to salute the flag was viewed as evidence that they were not loyal. They were bitterly persecuted, with no consideration given to the fact that by forcing them to salute the flag they would not necessarily be made any more loyal, and with no seeming appreciation of the fact that others who saluted the flag might be a good deal less loyal than many of the Witnesses. At least the witnesses were <sup>generally</sup> honest and frank about the reason for their refusal to salute, and did not try to hid hypocrisy under the cloak of patriotism. <sup>flag salute issue</sup> When the ~~case~~ first came before the United States Supreme Court, the Court upheld the flag salute law. The Court speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter, was not unmiñdful of the constitutional guaranty of religious freedom but it gave priority to the state's claim that a flag salute would strengthen national unity. Justice Frankfurter was himself dubious as to the effectiveness of the flag salute as a method of promoting national unity, but it was not for the Court to deny the state the right to be foolish and shortsighted. Three years later in another flag salute case the ~~United States~~ Supreme Court reversed its position. The majority opinion, written by Justice Jackson, concluded with the words: "If there is any fixed star <sup>in</sup> our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein..." And in a concurring opinion, Justice Murphy said: "I am unable to agree that the benefits that may accrue to society from the

compulsory flag salute are sufficiently definite and tangible to justify the invasion of freedom and privacy that is entailed or to compensate for a restraint on the freedom of the individual to be vocal or silent according to his conscience or personal inclination... Any spark of love for country which may be generated in a child or his associates by forcing him to make what is to him an empty gesture and recite words wrung from him contrary to his religious beliefs is overshadowed by the desirability of preserving freedom of conscience to the full. It is in that freedom and the example of persuasion, not in force and compulsion, that the real unity of America lies."

~~The~~ <sup>the</sup> third point, <sup>very</sup> briefly mentioned, that has occasioned a great deal of hard feeling and controversy has been the refusal of the Witnesses to serve in the armed forces. Leaving aside many of the thorny questions associated with the whole matter of conscientious objection to war and the grounds upon which exemption from military service are and should be established, it should be pointed out that Jehovah's Witnesses are not pacifists and were not sent to Federal Prison ~~by the hundreds~~ for that reason. They have no theoretical objection to the use of violence. The Battle of Armageddon which plays so important a role in their system is to be the greatest and most destructive of all battles and they expect to be in the midst of it. No, their refusal to take part in the last war stems fundamentally again from their view that the affairs of the world and of nations are mainly associated with Satan's Kingdom and it is for them to stay ~~away from~~ <sup>away from</sup> ~~it~~. In the words of Rutherford: "If the nations of Christendom or any other nations of earth desire to engage in war and do so, that is their affair, and it is the duty of God's <sup>us</sup> people to remain neutral as to such wars. The war of one nation with another is not the fight of the followers of Christ Jesus. ..."

<sup>the witnesses</sup> ~~They~~ sought exemption from military service not as pacifists, but as ministers. This the government would not allow on the ground that they were not specifically trained as such, and were not fully employed as such, so they were sent to prison. It is to be admitted that the status of witnesses as ministers has always been somewhat ambiguous. Their previous denials, by their own definition, that they are a religious movement; and their general attack upon all churches and ministers; and their claim that all witnesses are ministers-- all this has created

problems of definition and measurable distinction. On this matter of military service, there has as yet been no clear cut decision as in the matter of dropping the flag salute, and it is very doubtful that any such clear decision can be made. However some refinements along this line are being <sup>deliberately</sup> made. In November, for example, the United States Supreme Court reversed the conviction of a witness on the ground that working the major part of his time for Jehovah's witnesses entitled him to ministerial deferment.

My own disagreement with Jehovah's witnesses has undoubtedly been apparent in much that I have said about them. I have certainly not tried to picture them in either prosy hues or martyr robes. They have been unjustly treated and persecuted, particularly during the war years. At the same time they have only been strengthened in the certainty of their conviction and the superiority of their belief. Persecution is what Jehovah has <sup>predicted</sup> ~~promised~~ for them. Their central core <sup>of belief</sup> is ~~is in~~ not to be fulfilled. In my opinion an achronism. Their apocalyptic hopes will ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ their missionary zeal is sometimes decidedly uncomfortable and irritating. But with all this and precisely because of this, they have in recent years, constituted the major test of the principle of religious freedom. And in this regard we are all indebted to them. For in the fight for their own rights, the right of assembly, the right to distribute their literature, the right to a loyalty above the dictates of the state, they have done much to <sup>strengthen</sup> ~~secure~~ such rights for every minority group in America. Ironically enough, it is Jehovah's witnesses with its hoped-for theocracy and an authoritarian structure of its own, <sup>that</sup> has forced a refinement in our thinking about some of the most precious things in our democracy. We can suffer a good deal of irritation and seeming non-sense for that.

**ORDER OF SERVICE**

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1954, at 11 A. M.

Preludes: Bourree  
Air  
Minuet  
from "Water Music" Händel

Hymn No. 93: For The Beauty Of The Earth  
(Dix Tune) F. S. Pierpont

Reading: From "Justice Jackson's Opinion  
in Barnette Flag Salute Case"

Response

Aspiration

Solo: Meditation from Thais Massenet  
Piano - Annette Hughart  
Violin - Ed. Jacobsen

Announcements

Hymn No. 98: Life Of Ages Samuel Johnson  
(Vienna)

Offertory: Allegro Siocco  
(Violin - Piano)

SERMON: "JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES: A STUDY IN  
RELIGIOUS CERTAINTY." Mr. Storm

Hymn No. 106: Seeking Wisdom Henry Moore  
(Duke Street)

Closing words

Postlude: Promenade Prokofieff

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

WEEK'S CALENDAR

- Sunday - 5:30 p.m. - Channing Club
- Monday - 8:00 p.m. - Great Books Discussion
- Wednesday - 10:00 a.m. - ALLIANCE Book Group  
11:00 a.m. - Board Meeting  
12:30 p.m. - Luncheon  
1:15 p.m. - Program  
2:30 p.m. - Business Meeting
- Thursday - 7:30 p.m. - Choral Group
- Friday - 8:00 p.m. - Folk Dance Group
- Saturday - 2:00 p.m. - Orchestra Rehearsal

SERMON SUBJECT: Sunday, March 7 - - - - - "Is  
Humanism Enough? - - - - - Mr. Storm

ADULT DISCUSSION GROUP: Sunday, March 7 - - Topic:  
"Concepts of Immunity in Polio, Typhoid and Other  
Diseases." Speaker: Dr. Dennis Watson, Professor  
of Bacteriology and Immunology, Univ. of Minn.

The subject discussed this morning by Walter W.  
Heller was "Germany's Economic Recovery: Its  
Costs and Benefits."

WOMEN'S ALLIANCE: Wed., Mar. 3. At 1:15 p.m. Mrs.  
Barbara Stuhler, Assistant Director of the World's  
Affair Center, Univ. of Minn., will give a survey  
of the proposed revision of the United Nations  
Charter.