



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 51, Number 11



Dr. David Noebel

November 2011

“The more I study science the more I am impressed with the thought that this world and universe have a definite design—and a design suggests a designer. It may be possible to have design without a designer, picture without an artist, but my mind is unable to conceive of such a situation. Evidences of design are everywhere about us. . . . The greatest aspect of design visible to us is in the ordered movement of the stars and planets in this solar system and in other solar systems extending on and on through space—a design almost incomprehensibly large. At the other extreme we find all matter composed of invisible atoms, each of which in turn is a solar system almost inconceivably small, with electrons swinging in orbits around the atomic nuclei somewhat as planets circle about the sun. And everywhere in between these extremes we find evidence of design. . . . And so it goes—everywhere there is design. Everything is conforming to definite forces acting upon it, is obeying natural laws applicable to its particular state. Whence come these natural laws? There we find the Creator.”

—Paul Amos Moody
Introduction to Evolution, p. 497–498

The Design Argument

by Harris Ratnayake

In 400 BC, Socrates asked if we should admire the fact that the mouth is placed so near the nose and eyes as to prevent the unnoticed passage of inedible foods. He also asked whether this disposition of parts should be the work of chance, or was it the work of some master plan.

Since Socrates, the design argument has been a powerful tool to prove the existence of God. C.S. Lewis presented a recent argument in *God in the Dock*: “An egg which came from no bird is no more ‘natural’ than a bird which had existed from all eternity. And since the egg-bird-egg sequence leads us to no plausible beginning, is it not reasonable to look for the real origin somewhere outside this sequence altogether? You have to go outside the sequence of engines, into the world of men, to find the real originator of the rocket. Is it not equally reasonable to look outside Nature for the real Originator of the natural order?”

The design argument has been modified as mankind’s knowledge increased. In 1802, William Paley delivered the theist’s fundamental thesis:

Suppose, a man hits his foot against a stone as he is walking and asks, How did the stone come into being? The answer could be that the stone was always there or it was placed there by the forces of nature. But on the other hand, if the man finds a watch and asks the same question, the response he gave for the stone won’t suffice. Why not? Because, Paley said, when you look closer you find that the multiple parts that comprise the watch were assembled for a purpose.

Paley’s argument was accepted until the time of Charles Darwin, who introduced natural selection. Darwin’s observation was that species adapt to change in the natural environment. Those species unable to adapt to the change eventually become extinct. This gave naturalists new ammunition in denouncing the design argument. They said a designer is not required since mutation and natural selection can perform the same job as an intelligent designer.

For example, in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*, Richard Dawkins argues that Darwin’s theory of natural selection can explain the existence of all life. Natural selection, according to Dawkins is an unconscious, automatic, blind, yet essentially nonrandom process. It has no mind and no mind’s eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no

sight. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, Dawkins concluded it is a “blind watchmaker.”

However, 150 years after Darwin, scientific findings have not explained the fundamental criticisms originally leveled against his theory. The theory requires numerous intermediate forms between species, genera, families, etc., but paleontology has not demonstrated this. In addition, we have found that even the simplest living cell is the product of extreme complexity and organization. Also, the immense difficulty in making the simplest of a replicating biological system is a formidable task even with all our human ingenuity and state-of-the-art scientific apparatuses. Let alone producing the amazing array of living beings we see today.

The design arguments won't go away. Even famous evolutionists and atheists must repeatedly remind us that we must not entertain design in the study of biology. For example, Dawkins says that biology is the study of complicated things that give the *appearance* (emphasis added) of having been designed and Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the double helix, says that biologists must constantly remember that what they see is not designed but is evolved.

Order is apparent in the universe, from the tiniest cell to the vast galaxies; from the universal constants to the laws of physics; from animal instincts to human senses. The discoveries of modern biochemistry and cell biology demonstrate that the most infinitesimal biological unit, the cell, is endowed with a tremendous amount of order, an amount that dwarfs the order found in a supercomputer. In the February 1998 issue of the journal *Cell*, Bruce Alberts, president of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote that “the entire cell can be viewed as a factory that contains an elaborate network of interlocking assembly lines, each of which is composed of large protein machines.” He referred to these cells as machines because just like the human inventions, these protein assemblies contain highly coordinated moving parts.

The universal constants cannot differ by even 1 percent without the collapse of the universe. Coulomb's law describes the forces that exist between charged particles, and Newton's law of gravity explains forces between any two bodies. These forces are inversely proportional to the square of the distance. It is not only the whole number 2 that is significant in these equations but the individual values themselves are important for the universe to exist. For example, if the mass of the proton was greater by 1/1000th of its current value, the formation of hydrogen gas is impossible. More on this later.

There are only two possibilities for this order. Either it was put there by an outside source or it is inherent in the universe. Modern-day design theorists argue that scientific discoveries of the last 200 years have clearly shown that order seen in the universe, specifically in biological systems, has not risen from natural forces inherent in the universe.

Two prominent scientists who have argued this case are biochemist Michael Behe and mathematician William Dembski. In *Darwin's Black Box*, Behe argues that as science probes deeper into biological systems it becomes evident that all living things are comprised of highly complex machines. Says Behe: “The cumulative results show with piercing clarity that life is based on machines—machines made of molecules! Molecular machines haul cargo from one place in the cell to another along highways made of other molecules, while still others act as cable, ropes, and pulleys to hold the cell in shape. Machines turn cellular switches on and off, sometimes killing the cell or causing it to grow. Solar-powered machines capture the energy of photons and store it in chemicals. Electrical machines allow current to flow through nerves. Manufacturing machines build other molecular machines, as well as themselves. Cells swim using machines, copy themselves with machinery, and ingest food with machinery. In short, highly sophisticated molecular machines control every cellular process. Thus the details of life are finely calibrated, and the machinery of life enormously complex.”

Biological units, Behe says, have numerous systems that can't be assembled in the step-by-step manner suggested by Darwin. Among his examples are bacterial flagellum, the blood clotting system, and the immune system. Just as a mouse trap cannot function without its basic components (platform, hammer, spring, catch, and holding bar) present at the same time, systems such as flagellum can't function unless several of its components are present at once. That's a feat that defies the law of probability if it were to evolve randomly. Behe calls this phenomenon “irreducible complexity,” meaning these biological systems cannot be reduced to a series of steps that would be built by adding one component at a time.

Similarly, Chandra Wickramasinghe, who testified in the Arkansas trial on Creation in 1981, illustrates the impossibility of forming the basic unit of life, the cell, by natural means. He said the probability of forming a cell from chemicals is 10 to the 40,000th power (the total atoms in the universe is estimated to be less than 10 to the 80th power). When asked how he accounted for life on earth, Wickramasinghe, a Buddhist (who are non-theists, if not

atheists) answered that life from another planet must have somehow seeded life on earth.

The counter argument that naturalists bring forth is the following: The chance of anything happening is an extremely rare event but something has to happen and it just so happened that what happened is what we are experiencing. This argument is valid only if natural systems favor that which happened as an equivalent probability to any other event. For example, suppose there is an explosion within a room full of chairs. There are a number of possible ways in which the chairs inside the room will be arranged (or disarranged). If we create similar explosions on different days we will get different arrangements each time, but each such arrangement will have about an equal chance of forming.

If you arrive shortly after the explosion and see chairs neatly stacked on top of each other you will never conclude that the explosion caused it. You'll deduce that someone came after the explosion and arranged it that way. The reason is that the probability of a random explosion causing such an arrangement is billions of times smaller than the other arrangements. While there are many other arrangements that are extremely unlikely, such as chairs facing each other in pairs, the chance of any of those arrangements occurring is billions of times smaller than the random arrangements. Of course, you can think of arrangements where the probability is only a hundred times smaller than the random arrangements. These arrangements will occasionally happen during an explosion. If you come into the room and see only two chairs neatly stacked you cannot be certain whether it was caused by the explosion. But when the chance of something happening naturally is millions or billions of times smaller, we can conclude that it has been designed.

In fact, this is what sciences of criminal investigations, such as forensic medicine and insider trading, are based on. Investigators want to know whether the events occurred naturally or whether they were caused by humans. The criteria hinge on the chance of this event occurring naturally. If the chance is extremely small investigators will conclude that a human caused the event.

The arrangement of stones at Stonehenge, in Wiltshire, England, is another example of how we discern patterns and conclude intelligent design. The unusual arrangement of these mammoth upright stones could have been formed by the action of erosion, hurricanes, or tidal waves but no serious investigator pointed to these methods for this precise arrangement. The reason is the clear patterns that are evident from the arrangement, strongly suggesting

that intelligent beings are behind it.

In the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) scientists look for radio signals from outer space that have patterns different from the random radio signals that come from distant stars. If radio astronomers receive a series of electromagnetic radiation signals in the form of prime numbers (2, 5, 7, 11, etc.), they will strongly suspect the signal was sent by an intelligent source from space.

How do we discern whether a particular arrangement of matter is the result of a natural process or the result of an intelligent source? The answer is the probability of forming patterns. A random arrangement of a set of objects could be either. It is not possible to conclude that any arrangement results from natural forces since any arrangement (as long as it is physically possible) can be made by an intelligent source. For example, a random arrangement of a set of numbers can be made by a natural process or it could be made by an intelligent being. As the arrangement shows increasing specificity (such as a sequence of 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), we will gain confidence that the arrangement is designed. At what point do you rule in favor of design? There is no hard answer. You may look at a particular arrangement and decide its pattern is not specific enough to be designed, but someone else may conclude otherwise. However, there is a point at which you must have blind faith in nature if you always think nature has overcome the odds and made these highly organized living things that humans cannot make despite our giant leaps in technology.

In *Intelligent Design*, mathematician William Dembski said he had calculated what he believes is the point at which we can confidently say that the system is designed. The reliable criterion for detecting design is what he called “specified complexity” or “complex specified information.” He says that if the chance of such specified information occurring has a probability of 10^{-150} we can conclude that design is involved. Of course, depending on the situation, we will use less stringent criteria. For example, if a magician selects, out of 25 boxes, the only box containing an object—a probability of 0.04—we will immediately conclude that trickery instead of chance was used to determine the correct box. Dembski’s probability of 10^{-150} is an outside limit, which he calls “universal probability bound.”

The design argument also focuses on the elegance, simplicity, and near perfection of patterns found in natural systems. As mentioned previously, Coulomb’s law, that describes the forces that exist between charged particles, and Newton’s law of gravitational attraction deal with

forces that are inversely proportional to the square of the distance.

$$\frac{F=cQ_1Q_2}{D^2} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{F=KG_1G_2}{D^2}$$

The superscript 2 in these equations is exactly 2. It is not 2.1 or 2.05.

Another simple and famous equation involving the number 2 is Albert Einstein's $E=mc^2$. Most of the key equations that describe the universe exhibit this simplicity and can be written on a single sheet of paper.

DNA is another example of simplicity and elegance. It holds the secret of inheritance and contains a code that determines the profile of each organism. While now a household name, the discovery of the structure of DNA and how it is used in inheritance occurred after the birth of nearly a third of the US population. DNA has given fodder to theists to reformulate the design argument since it is not just another molecule in living things. It is a molecule that carries enough information to create human beings who subsequently can discover this DNA and its code! DNA's code is more complex than any human code. Nancy Pearcey and Charles Thaxton, in *The Soul of Science*, said to construct a code, we need more than a material medium, chemical paper, and ink. We also need a linguistic convention—a dictionary to link meaning to symbols, and rules of grammar to link symbols into meaningful sequences. We don't find this anywhere in the natural world. The only system similar to this is in the world of human language. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that the DNA code originated from a cause similar to that of human intelligence. In addition, the capacity of DNA to store information eclipses the capacity of any human system. DNA codes have been discovered that contain at least two codes. There is a virus where mRNA—the messenger that carries the DNA code to ribosomes to make proteins—starts from one end of the DNA to read one message and then starts one letter down to read a different message. This is equivalent to reading a book the normal way and then re-reading the book by shifting every letter to the left to get an entirely different book!

Critics often dismiss proof of God by the “god of the gaps” argument. They point out that our ancestors lacked

knowledge of how things worked or why things happened and attributed it to a god. However, as natural causes were discovered, this god of the gaps was becoming smaller and smaller. Thus critics argued that in due time naturalists will discover the cause of things like the DNA code. The argument from design, however, is completely different from filling the unknown with a “god of the gaps.” The modern design argument rests not on what is unknown but on what is known. What is known about the natural world is that it doesn't make functional complex systems but instead breaks down these systems. When we see complex functional systems in nature we can always find an intelligent source behind it. Therefore, it is most reasonable to conclude that the amazingly complex living systems have an amazingly intelligent source behind it. The god of the gaps argument may work for a question such as, “How does the mind arise from the brain?” Or, “How do golden plovers fly over the ocean to Hawaii from Alaska in the winter and then find their way back in the spring?” But it does not work for what we already know through studying nature.

Another example of design is the connection between mathematics—a purely human construct—and the real world. An example is the Fibonacci numbers, a pattern discovered by the Italian Leonardo Fibonacci around AD 1200. Each number is the sum of the two preceding numbers in the series (1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, 89, 144, etc.). This has an incredible connection to the real world. First, when the larger of any two adjacent numbers is divided by the smaller number the ratio approaches 1.618. This ratio is called the “Divine Proportion” or the “Golden Ratio.” Renowned artists used this ratio in designing their works because it offers a mesmerizing view.

The value Pi is another example. It is defined as the ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter and appears in mathematical formulas that have nothing to do with circles and diameters. Why this connection between mathematics and the real world? Could it be that the God who designed the world also created humans in a way to understand this world?

The famous mathematician and philosopher, Bertrand Russell, was asked the following question: If God were to ask you when you die why you didn't believe in Him, what would you say? Russell replied that his response to God

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009), has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.

would be, “You didn’t give me enough evidence.” I have a feeling that God would have a response for Russell.

For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.—Romans Chapter 1, Verse 20

—Mr. Ratnayake received a Master of Science in Biochemistry from the University of Minnesota, St. Paul in 1976. Undergraduate degrees include a Bachelor of Science with honors in Biochemistry from the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (1973), and a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry and Mathematics from the University of Ceylon, Colombo (1969).

Eight Myths of Wealth and Poverty

by Jay W. Richards

In the 20th-century battle between communism and capitalism, capitalism won. Biblical truth and biblical believers helped it win. Except for preachers of the misguided “prosperity gospel,” however, many of us who follow Christ still worry about capitalism. Some of our qualms stem from our everyday experience of greedy bosses and the rampant consumerism we see around us, or from our frustration that poverty continues to exist even in the United States. Some of our concern comes from fraud in companies like Enron. And some comes from the biases of media and academia, where there is still deep hostility toward free-market ideas.

But in my experience, most of the problems Americans (including Christians) have with capitalism these days derive from believing eight myths about this remarkable, though imperfect, system. Explaining them fully requires a book-length treatment like the one I’ve written, *Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem*. But it’s possible to summarize and refute the myths quite succinctly, which this essay will do.

Every morally reflective person has probably asked

himself, or been asked, such worrisome questions as these:

- Can’t we build a just society?
- What does God require of those seeking to follow Him?
- Doesn’t capitalism foster unfair competition?
- If I become rich, won’t someone else become poor?
- Isn’t capitalism based on greed?
- Aren’t money-lending and interest contrary to Scripture?
- Doesn’t capitalism lead to an ugly consumerist culture?
- Isn’t our modern lifestyle causing us to take more than our fair share and use up all the natural resources?

These are eight good questions. To get the right answers, you have to see through the myths surrounding each one. So here goes:

1. The Nirvana Myth

The first fallacy is that of comparing capitalism with an unrealizable ideal. It’s not simply the belief that good will triumph in the end or that the kingdom of God is already present—though not yet fully realized—in history. It’s the delusion that we can build utopia on our own if we try hard enough. It makes every real society look intolerably wicked, since no real society can measure up to utopia. Without this myth, the popular but deadly communist experiments of the past century could never have gotten off the ground.

When we ask whether we can build a just society, we need to keep the question nailed to solid ground: Just, *compared to what?* It doesn’t do anyone any good to tear down a society that is “unjust” compared to the kingdom of God, if that society is *more* just than any of the ones that will replace it. And when we do compare capitalism with the live alternatives, capitalism wins hands down.

2. The Piety Myth

Spiritually, you’re better off a little mixed up about economics than indifferent to human suffering. Economically, though, only what you *do* is important, whatever your reason. As the French philosopher Etienne Gilson famously said, “Piety is no substitute for technique.” In the piety myth, we mistakenly focus on our good intentions rather than on the real and often unintended consequences of an act or policy. Well-meaning people have supported all manner of bad policy—price and rent controls that create shortages, high minimum wage laws that harm the poorest of the poor, foreign aid that funds dictators—for

noble motives. The motives didn't change the results.

"The art of economics," said economic journalist Henry Hazlitt, "consists in looking not merely at the immediate but at the longer effects of any act or policy; it consists in tracing the consequences of that policy not merely for one group but for all." If we want not just a heart for the poor, but also a mind for the poor, we first have to learn the art of economics. God requires more of us than simply meaning well.

3. The Zero-Sum Myth

There are three kinds of games: win-lose, lose-lose, and win-win. Win-lose games, like basketball, are sometimes called zero-sum games. When the Celtics and the Bulls compete, if the Celtics are up, then the Bulls are down, and vice versa. The scales balance. It's a zero-sum.

Besides lose-lose games, which most of us avoid, there are positive-sum or win-win games. In these games, some players may end up at least the same if not better off than they were at the beginning.

Millions of people think that the free trade in capitalism is a dog-eat-dog competition, where winners always create losers. This is the zero-sum myth, which leads many to think that the government should somehow redistribute wealth. While some competition is a part of *any* economy, of course, an exchange that is free on both sides, in which no one is forced or tricked into participating, is a win-win game. When I pay my barber \$18 for a haircut, I value the haircut more than that amount of money. My barber values the money more than the time and effort it took her to cut my hair. We're both better off. Competition and choice have enhanced fairness. Win-win.

4. The Materialist Myth

A similar myth leads people to think of the economy as some fixed amount of material stuff—money in safes or gold bars in a vault. Since two firms competing for one customer can't both get the customer's money, we might think the whole economy looks that way—that wealth itself isn't created, but merely transferred from one party to another.

A common image of this materialist myth is a pie. If

one person gets too big a slice, someone else will get just a sliver. To serve it fairly, you have to slice equal pieces. But this isn't how a free economy works. Over the long run, the total amount of wealth in free economies *grows*. We can create wealth that wasn't there before. The "pie" doesn't stay the same size. Under capitalism, someone can get wealthy not merely by having someone else's wealth transferred to their account, but by creating new wealth, not only for themselves, but also for others. This person's betterment needn't come at the price of that one's impoverishment; rather the rising tide can lift all boats.

5. The Greed Myth

Foes of capitalism, and even some of its friends, often claim that it is based on greed. Author and philosopher Ayn Rand even claimed that selfishness is a virtue. But greed, according to the Christian tradition, is one of the seven deadly sins. If capitalism is based on it, then Christians can't be capitalists.

In truth, Adam Smith and other capitalist thinkers did not believe this greed myth. Rather, Smith argued that capitalism, unlike static and command economies, can channel even greedy motives into socially beneficial outcomes. "In spite of their natural selfishness and rapacity," Smith wrote, business people "are led by an invisible hand . . . and thus without intending it, without knowing it, advance the interest of the society. . . ."

Rather than inspire miserliness, capitalism encourages enterprise. Entrepreneurs, even greedy ones, succeed by delaying their own gratification, by investing their wealth in creative but risky ventures that may or may not pan out. Before they profit, they must first create.

In a fallen world, we should want an economic system that not only channels greed into productive purposes, but unleashes human ingenuity, creativity, and willingness to risk as well. Capitalism does that.

6. The Usury Myth

In several places, the Bible condemns charging interest on money. In Exodus 22:25, for instance, God tells the Hebrews: "If you lend money to my people, to the poor among you, you shall not deal with them as a creditor; you shall not exact interest from them" So for centuries Christians,

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at www.schwarzreport.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

along with pretty much every traditional culture, forbade charging interest on money loans.

But the West eventually developed banking systems that allowed banks to lend money that had been deposited. They charged interest because the loans were risky and prevented the bank from using the money for other purposes. The banks also paid interest to the depositors for the risk they assumed. This system allowed wealth to be created much more quickly than it had been before. Christians eventually realized that such loans were different from an ancient Hebrew charging interest to his poor kinsman on money that wasn't doing anything anyway. The sin of usury involves exploiting someone in their poverty, like loan sharks do, and doesn't describe modern business loans.

Still, some Christians continue to treat banking, and any work with money, as if it were inherently evil. That's the usury myth. The *love* of money may be the root of all evil, as we read in I Timothy 6:10, but money itself is not evil.

7. The Artsy Myth

Many Christians hear “capitalism” and they think “ugly.” They assume that capitalism leads to the “commodification of everything,” as social critic Jim Wallis puts it—which turns “all values into market values, gutting the world of genuine love, caring, compassion, connection, and commitment for what will sell, for example, on a television show.”

The problem here is not with capitalism per se but with consumerism. To equate the two is to fall for what I call the artsy myth, confusing aesthetic judgments with economic arguments. Consumerism is a form of gluttony, even idolatry, in which we make indulgence and possessions our highest loyalty. But the sorry symptoms of consumerism aren't unique to capitalism. Rather, they derive mostly from the materialist worldview that seems to be everywhere.

Thinkers as diverse as Karl Marx and Max Weber have understood that what sets capitalism apart is not consumption but deferred gratification. Consumption is part of every human life and economic system. However capitalism requires that not all wealth be consumed, but that some be saved, risked, and invested. So mindless consumerism is, in the long run, contrary to genuine capitalism.

8. The Freeze-Frame Myth

This myth involves believing that things will always stay the same. For instance, many of us worry that since

there's a finite amount of oil, at some point we will run out if we keep consuming it at current rates.

That's true, but it still won't happen. Supply, demand, and human creativity will see to that. Long before oil becomes really scarce, oil prices will rise so high that it will no longer be an economical form of energy. That high price will encourage inventors and entrepreneurs to seek out new forms of energy to replace oil. This is what has happened historically with every resource. We will always need energy, of course, but we won't always use the same source of energy.

Also, we should remember that few resources are resources without human input. Oil was just an irritating pollutant until we realized it contained lots of energy, figured out how to refine and store it, and invented machines that could use it. We don't just use resources; using the raw materials God has created, we create new resources.

In fact, over time, the matter in a material resource matters less than the mind that transforms it—manure into fertilizer, oil into gasoline and kerosene, sand into computer chips and fiber-optic cables, light into lasers. As economist Julian Simon once said, man is the “ultimate resource.” This is perhaps the greatest truth of economics, resulting in an ever-expanding fair share for the whole human family, so long as freedom is allowed to flourish.

So these are the eight myths we need to see through for a clear picture of wealth and poverty. The fallacies underlying each of them, along with the correctives for each, are easy to get. But they're easy to forget.

Learn and hold onto them, however, and you'll not only avoid policies that do more harm than good, you'll also understand why a good Christian can be a good capitalist.

It's an oft-neglected truth that the creation of wealth has as much to do with spirit as with matter. You can't find economic freedom or cultural mores on a map or put them in a safe. They're intangible, immaterial, *spiritual*. That's not to suggest that the wealthy are spiritual and the poor are unspiritual. It simply points to what Christians should know if anyone does: Things spiritual are the great drivers of wealth creation in human society.

Shouldn't Christians champion the one economic system that allows abundant wealth to be created: capitalism?

—Jay Richards, *Centennial Review*, March 2010, p. 1–4



THE NAKED TRUTH THE NAKED COMMUNIST—REVISITED

James C. Bowers, Sc. D.

This book is an analysis of a specific section in the book, *The Naked Communist* by W. Cleon Skousen, published in 1958. The section to be evaluated is entitled, “Current Communist Goals.” From his FBI background, Mr. Skousen lists what he considered to be the top 45 Goals of the Communists as of 1958. The progress and status of each of these Goals as of 2011 is carefully documented. Prepare to be shocked!



EDITED and FOREWORD by Dr. David A. Noebel

HELP OTHERS UNDERSTAND! Give copies of
THE NAKED TRUTH

to Friends, Neighbors, Relatives, Clergymen, Teachers, or anyone who *still* doesn't get it.

Do your part! To order, go to schwarzreport.org or call 719-685-9043.

SPECIAL QUANTITY PRICES

1 copy: \$12 5 copies: \$40 12 copies: \$84

48 copies: \$240 96 copies: \$384

Prices include shipping and any applicable taxes.

SCHWARZ REPORT PRESS

P.O. Box 129

Manitou Springs, CO 80829

This is a must read and a great gift to anyone this season.—David Noebel