



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 50, Number 11

November 2010

God, the Universe, and Stephen Hawking

by John Lennox

There's no denying that Stephen Hawking is intellectually bold as well as physically heroic. And in his latest book, the renowned physicist mounts an audacious challenge to the traditional religious belief in the divine creation of the universe.

According to Hawking, the laws of physics, not the will of God, provide the real explanation as to how life on Earth came into being. The Big Bang, he argues, was the inevitable consequence of these laws 'because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing.'

Unfortunately, while Hawking's argument is being hailed as controversial and ground-breaking, it is hardly new.

For years, other scientists have made similar claims, maintaining that the awesome, sophisticated creativity of the world around us can be interpreted solely by reference to physical laws such as gravity.

It is a simplistic approach, yet in our secular age it is one that seems to have resonance with a sceptical public.

But, as both a scientist and a Christian, I would say that Hawking's claim is misguided. He asks us to choose between God and the laws of physics, as if they were necessarily in mutual conflict.

But contrary to what Hawking claims, physical laws can never provide a complete explanation of the universe. Laws themselves do not create anything, they are merely a description of what happens under certain conditions.

What Hawking appears to have done is to confuse law with agency. His call on us to choose between God and physics is a bit like someone demanding that we choose between aeronautical engineer Sir Frank Whittle and the laws of physics to explain the jet engine.

That is a confusion of category. The laws of physics can explain how the jet engine works, but someone had to build the thing, put in the fuel and start it up. The jet could not have been created with the laws of physics on their own—but the task of development and creation needed the genius of Whittle as its agent.

Similarly, the laws of physics could never have actually built the universe. Some agency must have been involved.

To use a simple analogy, Isaac Newton's laws of motion in themselves never sent a snooker ball racing across the green baize. That can only be done by people using a snooker cue and the actions of their own arms.

Hawking's argument appears to me even more illogical when he says the existence of gravity means the creation of the universe was inevitable. But how did gravity exist in the first place? Who put it there? And what was the creative force behind its birth?

Similarly, when Hawking argues, in support of his theory of spontaneous creation, that it was only necessary for "the blue touch paper" to be lit to "set the universe going," the question must be: where did this blue touch paper come from? And who lit it, if not God?

Much of the rationale behind Hawking's argument lies in the idea that there is a deep-seated conflict between science and religion. But this is not a discord I recognize.

For me, as a Christian believer, the beauty of the scientific laws only reinforces my faith in an intelligent, divine, creative force at work. The more I understand science, the more I believe in God because of my wonder at the breadth, sophistication, and integrity of his creation.

The very reason science flourished so vigorously in the 16th and 17th centuries was precisely because of the belief that the laws of nature, which were then being discovered and defined, reflected the influence of a divine law-giver.

One of the fundamental themes of Christianity is that the universe was built according to a rational, intelligent design.

Far from being at odds with science, the Christian faith actually makes perfect scientific sense.

Some years ago, the scientist Joseph Needham made an epic study of technological development in China. He wanted to find out why China, for all its early gifts of innovation, had fallen so far behind Europe in the advancement of science.

He reluctantly came to the conclusion that European science had been spurred on by the widespread belief in a rational creative force, known as God, which made all scientific laws comprehensible.

Despite this, Hawking, like so many other critics of religion, wants us to believe we are nothing but a random collection of molecules, the end product of a mindless process.

This, if true, would undermine the very rationality we need to study science. If the brain were really the result of an unguided process, then there is no reason to believe in its capacity to tell us the truth.

We live in an information age. When we see a few letters of the alphabet spelling our name in the sand, our immediate response is to recognize the work of an intelligent agent. How much more likely, then, is an intelligent creator behind the human DNA, the colossal biological database that contains no fewer than 3.5 billion “letters”?

It is fascinating that Hawking, in attacking religion, feels compelled to put so much emphasis on the Big Bang theory. Because, even if the non-believers don't like it, the Big Bang fits in exactly with the Christian narrative of creation.

That is why, before the Big Bang gained currency, so many scientists were keen to dismiss it, since it seemed to support the Bible story. Some clung to Aristotle's view of the ‘eternal universe’ without beginning or end; but this theory, and later variants of it, are now deeply discredited.

But support for the existence of God moves far beyond the realm of science. Within the Christian faith, there is also the powerful evidence that God revealed himself to mankind through Jesus Christ two millennia ago. This is well-documented not just in the scriptures and other testimony but also in a wealth of archaeological findings.

Moreover, the religious experiences of millions of believers cannot lightly be dismissed. I myself and my own family can testify to the uplifting influence faith has had on our lives, something which defies the idea we are nothing more than a random collection of molecules.

Just as strong is the obvious reality that we are moral beings, capable of understanding the difference between

right and wrong. There is no scientific route to such ethics.

Physics cannot inspire our concern for others, or the spirit of altruism that has existed in human societies since the dawn of time.

The existence of a common pool of moral values points to the existence of transcendent force beyond mere scientific laws. Indeed, the message of atheism has always been a curiously depressing one, portraying us as selfish creatures bent on nothing more than survival and self-gratification.

Hawking also thinks that the potential existence of other lifeforms in the universe undermines the traditional religious conviction that we are living on a unique, God-created planet. But there is no proof that other lifeforms are out there, and Hawking certainly does not present any.

It always amuses me that atheists often argue for the existence of extra-terrestrial intelligence beyond earth. Yet they are only too eager to denounce the possibility that we already have a vast, intelligent being out there: God.

Hawking's new fusillade cannot shake the foundations of a faith that is based on evidence.

—*London Mail Online*, September 3, 2010

Hugo Chavez: The Venezuelan Threat

by John R. Thomson

Venezuela's Hugo Chavez has traveled the world extensively in the 11 years of his presidency. In addition to his frequent trips to allied regional leaders in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua, he has exchanged numerous visits with Iranian and Russian counterparts, as well as holding frequent, often clandestine, meetings with senior officials of FARC, the ideologically bereft, self-proclaimed Communist/leftist Colombian narco-trafficking scourge.

Together with Cuba, these relationships are the reasons it is imperative the United States and allied countries in the Western hemisphere and Europe face the real threat that the Chavez regime presents. Treating the Venezuelan despot as a declining threat who is therefore not dangerous is a serious and unnecessary risk to regional peace and stability.

None of his close allies—together with a less-threatening Chinese presence—will readily give up their extensive commitments. To the contrary, there are extensive indica-

tions that the leaders of Cuba, Iran, and Russia are fully cognizant of Venezuela's near catastrophic condition and are therefore prepared to see Chavez removed from office. They are not prepared, however, to see themselves blocked from enjoying the benefits of their Venezuelan involvement.

Venezuela's Ministry of Mines and Energy has long operated a sophisticated laboratory staffed by experienced local technical personnel. Several years ago, Iranian advisors started working at the lab. Today, the entire staff is Iranian, to the chagrin of former Venezuelan employees.

The lab analyzes uranium samples and provides reports to Iranian nuclear program staff. The Caracas laboratory is a small but important part of what has become a major undertaking by Iran in Venezuela: exploration, mining, and refining of Venezuelan uranium for its nuclear program.

On April 24 in Canaima, Bolivar state, in Southern Venezuela, the country's Executive Vice President, Elias Jaua, sat in his official Beechcraft King Air turboprop aircraft with engines running, on the tarmac in front of remote Canaima's tiny air terminal, awaiting the last of eight ministers who had journeyed with him the day before to Southern Venezuela.

Canaima National Park is a spectacular tourist attraction, including among other wonders Angel Falls, the tallest cascade in the world. However, the visit by key members of the Chavez regime was a business matter. Their mission was so important that four armed Russian helicopters and a C-130 military transport were on hand, along with more than a dozen senior military officers in Canaima on temporary duty.

In addition to Jaua's retinue, Gen. Hector Francisco Ruiz, his wife, and three senior army officers were billeted at Waku Lodge with another dozen at a nearby facility. A large room in the lodge had been set up as a tropical command post. Local residents said there were another 100-plus soldiers who had come to Canaima briefly before proceeding to secure the gold and diamond mine at Alto Caura, approximately 62 miles to the West.

Vice President Jaua had formally accepted control of the mine on behalf of the government, in a show of concern about the way in which domestic and foreign "capitalist mafias" were destroying nature and illegally taking the country's wealth. Defense Minister Mata Figuero later announced the arrest of various citizens who he said were responsible for the destruction of four square miles of virgin forest.

According to multiple informants, the mine was seized

and some 4,000 residents expelled, in order for Brazilian and Iranian technicians to establish uranium mining operations in the area. Alto Caura will be the second mine to provide Iran uranium for its nuclear program—the first mine is also in Bolivar state, near the border with Guyana. According to locals, Iranian mining technicians are periodically joined by their Caracas-based wives in Canaima for relaxing weekends.

The mining area is located close to the Caura River, which runs North to the mighty Orinoco River and on to Ciudad Bolivar, where a joint Venezuelan-Iranian tractor factory is situated. The factory actually produces few if any tractors, but serves as a convenient regional-arms warehouse and explosives-manufacturing facility. It appears possible the factory will be expanded to refine uranium ore. From Ciudad Bolivar, the Orinoco flows East to the Atlantic Ocean.

The "tractor" factory is one of four much-touted joint industrial projects, including a "bicycle" factory ironically intended to build "Atomic" brand bikes but that actually refines uranium, and a "cement" factory that warehouses and packs cocaine in bags marked "cement" that are exported to West Africa and transhipped to Europe.

River boats and barges navigate the Caura and Orinoco rivers carrying a variety of legal and illegal exports to waiting ocean-going craft. One reported carrier, the IRISL freight shipping line, a joint Venezuelan-Iranian venture, has a checkered past: In December 2008, authorities at the Turkish port of Mersin seized 22 containers labeled "tractor parts" that were actually filled with weapon-making materials bound for Venezuela.

Although uranium mining and refining is a major undertaking, Iran has numerous other interests, including food processing plants—dairy, tuna, and corn flour—oil exploration, financial services—including money laundering—specialized military training, and electronic intelligence gathering.

It is reliably reported that Iran's Lebanon-based terrorist surrogates, Hezbollah, have focused on "converting" indigenous tribes in Venezuela and Bolivia to Shia Muslim radicalism, including training formerly innocent tribe members in suicide bombing tactics. In Venezuela, the activity is primarily focused in the Guajira sector among the Wayuu people, near the Colombian border.

From its strong base in Venezuela, Iran has established important activities in half a dozen Latin American countries, most notably a range of programs with Brazil and free-wheeling banking in Panama.

There has been much publicity about extensive Rus-

sian arms sales to the Chavez regime. It started with the purchase of 100,000 AK-47 Kalashnikov automatic rifles and licenses to produce the rifle and its ammunition in Venezuela. Besides the Venezuelan military, the arms have been distributed to Chavez's domestic militias as well as to Colombia's FARC narco-terrorists.

Numerous other military deals have followed, marked by extraordinarily liberal terms, including a \$1 billion purchase loan to Venezuela, the wealthiest country per capita in Latin America. If that were not enough, visits by a Russian navy task force and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin—the former to participate in joint naval exercises and the latter to sign numerous previously negotiated agreements—underscore Russia's interest in close relations with the Chavez regime.

The Kalashnikov acquisition has resulted in wide distribution of the world's most popular and effective automatic assault rifle to thousands of Venezuelan citizens, as well as to Colombia FARC narco-terrorists. As recently as June, workers at Petrolera Sinovensa, the joint-venture heavy-crude-oil project of PDVSA and China National Petroleum Corporation, received AK-47 training.

AK-47s supplied to the FARC are just one example of Venezuela's support for the leftist guerilla group that has bedeviled Colombian society for 50 years.

Colombian intelligence has identified 27 FARC training, rest, and medical camps inside Venezuela territory, providing safe havens for hundreds of guerillas and protected staging points for the export of cocaine. In a recent development, members of Iran's elite Quds Force have been training FARC personnel in irregular warfare tactics.

In Apure state, airstrips have for several years flown thousands of tons of cocaine to Central American, Dominican, and Mexican transit points. Much of the air-expressed product starts its journey in FARC camps. They also send drugs on barges down the Orinoco River for shipment to Africa and Europe. Cocaine shipments increasingly embark from established official air and seaports, since the military took control of all such facilities in January, a step that also allows unfettered import of illegal supplies for the FARC.

Cocaine sales, profits from which are shared with high-ranking Venezuelan officials, fund the FARC's activities including arms purchases and bribery of key Colombian officials. They are thus a serious threat to Colombia and its government, the closest U.S. ally in Latin America.

The Cuban, Iranian, and Russian relationships, plus very close regional ties with radical leftist, corrupt Argentine, Bolivian, Ecuadorian, and Nicaraguan regimes, create a revolutionary axis that threatens every other gov-

ernment in the Western hemisphere. However, it seems fashionable in today's Washington to assume that Hugo Chavez's days are numbered and that he and his partners, at home and abroad, are not a serious threat to the United States and other freedom-loving countries.

It can be safely assumed that the Castro brothers, Iran's ruling mullahs, and Russia's Vladimir Putin fully understand that Hugo Chavez is at the least an unstable personality and that he is driving Venezuela towards cataclysm. It can also be assumed that they—together with a more subtle Chinese leadership—will not readily give up their extensive investments in Venezuela.

Looking Ahead

- Cuba will not willingly forgo the economic lifeline that cheap bartered petroleum provides, and profitable participation in the cocaine trade.
- Iran's uranium investments are critical to their nuclear development plans and Caracas has become a center for its illegal financial dealings and large profits are forthcoming from the cocaine trade.
- Russia's foothold in Venezuela is much more than a way to annoy the United States: It has become the regional base for commercial, industrial, and military activities from San Salvador to Buenos Aires.

September Election Outlook

According to the highly respected polling organization Hinterlaces, Hugo Chavez continues to lose popular support. Hinterlaces' most recent national survey found 64% of respondents had little or no confidence in Mr. Chavez, and 68% blamed the president or the people around him for not solving the country's grave problems. Regarding the flagrant scandal of more than 100,000 tons of food found rotting in government warehouses, 72% believe Mr. Chavez is not doing enough to investigate and punish those responsible.

Unfortunately, but understandably, as the September legislative elections approach, there is limited support for the opposition. While 50% of voters now say they will vote for opposition or independent candidates vs. 27% planning to vote for pro-Chavez candidates, only 19% support the opposition parties. In short, although more than 80% in the Hinterlaces survey say they intend to vote, there is little appeal for the faltering, feckless opposition.

It is possible that the economic woes facing Venezuela will soon bring an end to Mr. Chavez's 11 years of misrule. However, his cell system when completed and his armed militias, plus his ties to powerful regimes and alliances with other Latin American governments are significant deterrents. Moreover, a new program to establish self-governing communes—some 200 are already in formation—is de-

signed to effectively replace existing local political entities. What's more, Chavez can be replaced by another, more balanced despot, an option Castro's man in Caracas Ramiro Valdes, has reportedly been exploring.

While repugnant corruption and human rights violations within the boundaries of, say, Zimbabwe might be ignored with the argument that it is a domestic matter for the people of the nation to resolve, aggressive subversion throughout an entire region is something far different.

The situation in Venezuela requires a concerted effort to unite the majority of hemisphere governments that are against Hugo Chavez and his cohorts. Venezuela and its allies should be expelled from regional associations where possible and not invited to future regional and international meetings and summits. Continuing economic pressure should be applied by all governments and embargos placed on transfer of technology to the Venezuelan and other rogue regimes. In short, every step short of outright military action should be considered and implemented.

To underestimate—indeed, pay little or no heed to—the threat and to take virtually no steps to counteract it, is to ignore multiple fires that are burning out of control in the United States' near abroad. The careening career of Hugo Chavez and his allies must be curtailed.

—*Human Events*, August 30, 2010, p. 13f

Castro's Model Doesn't Work

by Paul Haven

Fidel Castro told a visiting American journalist that Cuba's communist economic model doesn't work, a rare comment on domestic affairs from a man who has conspicuously steered clear of local issues since stepping down four years ago.

The fact that things are not working efficiently on this cash-strapped Caribbean island is hardly news. Fidel's brother Raul, the country's president, has said the same thing repeatedly. But the blunt assessment by the father of Cuba's 1959 revolution is sure to raise eyebrows.

Jeffrey Goldberg, a national correspondent for *The Atlantic* magazine, asked if Cuba's economic system

was still worth exporting to other countries, and Castro replied: "The Cuban model doesn't even work for us anymore" Goldberg wrote Wednesday in a post on his *Atlantic* blog.

He said Castro made the comment casually over lunch following a long talk about the Middle East, and did not elaborate. The Cuban government had no immediate comment on Goldberg's account.

Since stepping down from power in 2006, the ex-president has focused almost entirely on international affairs and said very little about Cuba and its politics, perhaps to limit the perception he is stepping on his brother's toes.

Goldberg, who traveled to Cuba at Castro's invitation last week to discuss a recent *Atlantic* article he wrote about Iran's nuclear program, also reported on Tuesday that Castro questioned his own actions during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, including his recommendation to Soviet leaders that they use nuclear weapons against the United States.

Even after the fall of the Soviet Union, Cuba has clung to its communist system.

The state controls well over 90 percent of the economy, paying workers salaries of about \$20 a month in return for free health care and education, and nearly free transportation and housing. At least a portion of every citizen's food needs are sold to them through ration books at heavily subsidized prices.

President Raul Castro and others have instituted a series of limited economic reforms, and have warned Cubans that they need to start working harder and expecting less from the government. But the president has also made it clear he has no desire to depart from Cuba's socialist system or embrace capitalism.

Fidel Castro stepped down temporarily in July 2006 due to a serious illness that nearly killed him.

He resigned permanently two years later, but remains head of the Communist Party. After staying almost entirely out of the spotlight for four years, he re-emerged in July and now speaks frequently about international affairs. He has been warning for weeks of the threat of a nuclear war over Iran.

Castro's interview with Goldberg is the only one he has given to an American journalist since he left office.

—*Associated Press Online*, September 8, 2010

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.

Castro's Model Doesn't Work, Part II

An old joke from the Soviet era had it that “We pretend to work and they pretend to pay us.” Most Cubans stopped pretending to work a long time ago, and this week the Castro regime announced that it will now stop pretending to pay them.

That might be the best way to think about the news, reportedly contained in an August 24 internal document, that Cuba's Communist Party is proposing to lay off more than 500,000 workers by March 2011 because it can no longer afford to maintain its “bloated payrolls.” If nothing else, this is an historic acknowledgement that the revolution has failed—and from its own architects.

But the news may be less momentous than the headlines. Raul Castro, who took over as president from his ailing brother Fidel in 2006, has given numerous speeches bemoaning the low productivity of Cuban workers and the government's fiscal straits. Two hurricanes last year and the global recession have hit revenues from tourism and nickel mining. The government and the country—once, the third richest in Latin America—are as decrepit as the '57 Chevys on Havana's streets.

This is also not the first such bow in the direction of market reform. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of Soviet subsidies, Castro courted foreign investment and allowed Cubans to open small restaurants, ferry foreigners as taxis, and use the U.S. dollar.

But as the state recovered financially and Hugo Chavez appeared as a new source of subsidy, Cuban *perestroika* was put on ice. The limited privileges of small entrepreneurs were withdrawn. Not coincidentally, a crackdown on political dissidents began in 2003.

Now the regime claims it will again allow entrepreneurship. Cubans will be allowed to raise rabbits, among other things. And the state will again welcome foreign investment.

Is Cuba moving in a new direction? Surely it wants the world to think so. But the lack of property rights remains. Foreign investors from the likes of Chile and Spain have learned the hard way that Fidel's inner circle has the ultimate control over profits. That reality will deter foreign investment until it changes.

The lesson of economic reform in China, Vietnam, and other Communist regimes is that they must include the genuine freedom to make and trade goods, earn money, and keep the profits. Cubans can only do that now on the

black market. The dual-currency system, in which they can earn money only in non-convertible pesos but must shop for most items priced in the dollar-linked peso, condemns most Cubans to poverty.

The talk of reform is also an attempt to encourage the U.S. Congress to drop the travel ban on Cuba. We long ago supported dropping the entire embargo on Cuba, but the U.S. ought to at least get something for this concession if the Castros are so eager for it. The deal could include releasing political prisoners, repealing the laws that landed them in jail and allowing foreign investors to directly hire and pay workers. Meanwhile, we doubt Cuba will really change until Fidel finally goes to his eternal punishment.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, September 18/19, 2010, p. A 14

The War of Worldviews

by Bill Muehlenberg

H.G. Wells could write about *The War of the Worlds*, in which Martians and earthlings battled for supremacy. But the real battles today come down to a war of worldviews. Competing worldviews and ideologies are battling it out, and those that prevail will determine the course of history.

Several major players have slugged it out of late. In very general terms, in one corner is the Judeo-Christian worldview, which for many centuries undergirded and nurtured Western civilization. It has had various contenders over the years. Godless, materialistic Communism was a major rival for nearly eight decades.

During the Cold War, the forces of secular totalitarianism sought global hegemony. The spirit and values of the Judeo-Christian West, along with military muscle, were needed to withstand this ferocious opponent, and by the grace of God the Soviet Empire finally was defeated.

Today the free West faces a similar totalist and anti-democratic threat, that of radical Islamism. Millions of Muslims are bent on destroying the West and subjugating the entire world under the iron fist of sharia law. This battle is also being fought on ideological, spiritual, and military levels.

In both these major conflicts, we have had many gullible Westerners promoting the myth of moral equivalence. This was the gravely mistaken notion that somehow the two sides were really just as bad as each other, and the

West really had no right or moral claim to resist its assailants.

One of the earliest thinkers to use both the concept and the phrase was Jeane Kirkpatrick, the US ambassador to the UN during the Reagan administration. She popularized this for example in her 1982 volume, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, and in a 1986 article, “The Myth of Moral Equivalence.”

Those pushing this silly concept would say things like this: “Well, yes, those Commies are not so hot, but we in the West are just as bad. We can’t condemn them because we have plenty of our own faults that need to be corrected. Who are you to say that the West is better than the Soviet bloc?”

This was common fare from many lefties, especially religious lefties, during the height of the Cold War. Indeed, many of these religious leftists were far more critical of the free and democratic West than of the totalitarian dictatorships warring against the West.

In fact, they often found things to praise about the Soviet police state while condemning their own prosperous and free West. The easiest way to cut through all this moronic nonsense was simply to point out what was happening in the real world.

That is, we know that people will vote with their feet. During this period, millions of people risked everything to leave the Communist hell-holes to get into the free and democratic West. And it was all one-way traffic. I am not aware of thousands of people fleeing the West to get into the People’s Paradise of Cuba, the Soviet Union, or North Korea.

This simple fact alone should forever put to rest this ludicrous notion of moral equivalence. The truth is, for all its faults, the West was light-years beyond the Marxist police states in every area: there was rule of law; freedom of speech; freedom of the press; the ability to peacefully remove one government and replace it with another; no political prisoners; no gulags; no one-party dictatorships; etc.

It was disingenuous and just plain malicious to suggest that somehow the free West and Communist tyrannies were in any way morally similar. Indeed, in the end, the entire ugly system fell in a heap, a victim of its own inefficiencies, injustices, and abuses. That, and a strong response from the West at the time, especially by the person of Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, and Pope John Paul II.

Yet sadly today, we seem to have a new case of the poison known as moral equivalence. This time it is the leftists telling us that the free West is no better than the Islamists who wish to destroy it. Yes they blow up innocent people,

but we Westerners are also terrorists. We are no better.

Thus they cannot see the difference between Saddam raping Kuwait, and the West seeking to liberate it. In their jaundiced and morally myopic eyes, the West, especially America, is just as evil as any jihadist, Taliban, or al-Qaida outfit.

We hear this foolishness all the time. Indeed, several raving leftists just today assaulted me with such foolishness. Even if well meaning, these folks don’t seem to have a clue. Their intellectual shallowness seems to be matched by their moral mushiness.

They will argue, for example, that to resist the Islamists by use of force makes us no different than the terrorists. That is about as helpful as claiming that a policeman who uses force to stop a rapist or murderer is the moral equivalent of the criminal.

We certainly got this line of thinking all the time when the West sought to go after Saddam and the Taliban. And we are getting it now in things like the plan to develop a 13-story mosque near Ground Zero. Defenders of this, including New York Mayor Bloomberg and President Obama, opine about how we are an open and free country, and to resist this would make us just like the Islamists.

Critics have rightly pointed out that tolerance can only go so far. Imagine building a large Jewish synagogue in Mecca, or a Christian cathedral in downtown Medina. It would never happen. While the West certainly does offer freedom of religion, there will always have to be limits of various sorts.

In Islamic thinking, the establishment of a mosque is, among other things, a symbol of the advance of Islam. It is an indication of taking territory from the infidels. And it is part of the advancement of sharia compliance, and the eventual establishment of a universal caliphate.

Thus Westerners, while extending religious freedoms to their guests, need also to be aware that not all such guests will reciprocate with the hospitality. Some come to bury the West, just as Marxists insiders sought to undermine the West a few short decades ago.

If Muslims want the right to freely practice their religion in the West—fine. They can, just as long as they extend the same right to other religions, especially Jews and Christians, granting them the same freedoms in Muslim-majority nations. At the moment, of course, this is strictly verboten.

Indeed, to dare even to preach the Christian gospel in many of these countries is to risk facing the death penalty. And for a Muslim to seek to leave his faith in these countries is also punishable by death. Why does the West need to bend over backwards, extending every benefit and

favour to our Muslim guests, while expecting absolutely nothing in return?

Without some give and take here, without some reciprocity, all we are doing is allowing Muslims free reign, including those Muslims who have dedicated their lives to overthrowing the West and replacing it with the totalist Islamic state.

To such people we have no obligations whatsoever. We are not compelled to extend complete tolerance and acceptance to such folks. Indeed, unless we want to commit national suicide, we must resist them. And to do so does not mean we are morally equivalent to our enemies.

It simply means some things are worth defending, and that those who are sworn enemies of the free West should not expect us to welcome them with wide-open arms. To resist the Islamization of the West is not to drag us down

to their level.

There is nothing equivalent about those seeking to defend a free and democratic West—as imperfect as it may be—with those who have said that the West must go, and it must be replaced by the iron rule of sharia. There is nothing morally similar about these two competing ideologies.

This is a war of worldviews, and the battle will continue until one side predominates. Some things are worth fighting for. The Judeo-Christian West, and the freedoms and social goods it has engendered, is one such thing. It is far from perfect, and has many weaknesses. But compared to the dystopia of the Soviet gulag or the Islamist prison, I will go for the West any day of the week.

—*Culture Watch*, August 20, 2010

This updated hardback edition is **Only \$17.95** use coupon code SR2010 for free shipping.

Dr. Fred Schwarz is one of America's great heroes. In his 50 years of work in the United States, he trained a whole generation to recognize the evil and the danger of Communism at home and abroad. He was a major force in building the conservative anti-Communist movement and in supporting Ronald Reagan's goal of defeating the "evil empire."

—Phyllis Schlafly

America is at a crossroads. Nothing could be more important to our Nation's survival as a free republic than the ideas expressed in this book. Its publication brings afresh to a new generation the work of a pioneer scholar, Dr. Fred Schwarz, and his able successor, Dr. David Noebel, in a timely way that could save America from its impending moral and economic collapse. I was first stirred to apologetic action by Dr. Schwarz a half century ago. His messages against the encroachment of Socialism are as needed now as they were then. Every able Christian should carefully ingest and courageously act upon the message of this book.

—Dr. Norm Geisler

*An Australian doctor said, "the three basic tenets of Communism are atheism, evolution, and economic determinism." Then he said, "The three basic tenets of the American Public School system are atheism, evolution, and economic determinism." Four years later Dr. Fred Schwarz wrote his masterpiece **You Can Trust the Communists (to Be Communists)**. The republication of this book could not be more timely as America decides whether to follow its Christian forebearers or once again test the poisonous waters of Marx, Lenin, Mao, Castro, Alinsky, and their swarming collectivist agents and "useful idiots" in their relentless attempt to dethrone God and destroy Capitalism.*

—Dr. Tim LaHaye

To order, call **719.685.9043**
or visit **schwarzreport.org**

SR2010