

June 2004



The

JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

How countless are Your works, LORD! In wisdom You have made them all; the earth is full of Your creatures. Here is the sea, vast and wide, teeming with creatures beyond number—living things both large and small.

Psalm 104: 24, 25

From The President's Desk

One of my favorite editorial writers is Joel Belz, publisher of World magazine. His February 28, 2004 editorial “Leaving out the Lord” is right on target and is reproduced below. While we always seek to marshal as many different kinds of arguments that we can on a variety of issues, we must not forget when it comes to the Creative order of God, that God’s statement of fact is the final word. God’s creation of male and female (Mark 10:6) from the beginning of creation certainly tells us where He is coming from. If we were smart we’d come from the same position since, and I know that this will come as a shock, God is smarter than Barney Frank and Richard Rorty.

“ ‘Let the people vote!’ proclaimed dozens of placards outside the Massachusetts legislature last week. ‘Let the People Decide!’ But if that’s the best argument backers of historically traditional marriage can come up with, we might as well roll up our posters and go home.

“Inside the capitol building in downtown Boston, lawmakers were stumbling toward a stalemate as they debated amending the state constitution to outlaw homosexual marriage. An activist court—this time the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts-had launched this disorderly muddle a few weeks earlier, ordering the legislature to end all discrimination against homosexuals on the issue of marriage. The court gave the legislature a May 17 deadline for doing so. So the point of the placards was to tell the uppity judges to buzz off

and let the people of Massachusetts have their way. After all, polls in the state—even polls conducted by liberal newspapers like the *The Boston Globe*—suggested public opinion is against homosexual marriage by as much as a 2-1 margin.

“But to argue against homosexual marriage on the basis of poll results is to rest our case on slippery footing indeed. Are we ready, if the polls in some other state show an opposite result, to live with those consequences? Or are we ready, if the poll takers a few months from now re-word their sometimes clever questions and get an opposite result even in Massachusetts, to live with those results?”

“Make no mistake about it: The polls will change. And they will not change in our direction.

“I have, in this space, several times expressed vigorous support for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would define marriage exclusively as an institution between one man and one woman. I still think such a measure is both important and urgent. But I have to tell you also that I think it is already too late.

“It is too late because even most Americans who want to restrict ‘marriage’ to heterosexual couples do so for the wrong reasons. If you don’t hear them basing their argument on poll results, you’ll hear them instead pointing to the ‘experience of five or six millennia of human experience.’ Well and good, since both are true. But both arguments were also used half a century ago to defend blatant racism—and both arguments were so badly discredited in that context that we should be embarrassed to use them now.

“Traditionalists also play the ‘children’ card, asking appropriately whether society is ready on a regular basis to have two men raise a child without a mother, or two women a child without a father figure. It’s a valid argument—but it falls short and gains no traction for an obvious reason: We are a society already saturated with single parents regularly depriving their children of another parent of the opposite sex. Such a phenomenon no longer shocks us.

“Meanwhile, defenders of homosexual marriage drench the media with pleas about their own ‘rights’ and the ‘rights’ of ‘their’ children—opportunistically aware that they’re doing so in a generational context where ‘rights’ constitute the final argument in almost any discussion.

“There is, in the end, only one sound defense of heterosexual marriage. The only ultimate argument is that restricting marriage to one man and one woman is part of God’s creation order, the pattern He planned for the good and the glory of the human race. Apart from that admittedly quaint rationale, every other *raison d’être* collapses in contradiction and embarrassment.

“We may not like to admit it, but when you leave God’s design out of the argument, there’s really no overwhelming reason any longer to limit marriage to a man and a woman. Apart

from His sovereign word, experimentation, reconfiguration, and realignment of virtually every kind are in order. Why not?

“It is as if God were saying to us all: ‘I know you’d rather leave Me out of this discussion. I know you traditionalists and conservatives would like to be able to settle this based on secular arguments. I know it embarrasses you to have to come back and make reference to Me and My standards in such a secular setting.’

“ ‘So,’ God seems to be saying, ‘go for it. See how far you can take it. See how persuasive you can be. Try it. See how many typical Americans you can convince based only on logic, history, tradition, and poll numbers.’

“To win the marriage argument, you need either to have secular arguments that work, or a population that is ready to listen to God Himself. We’ve got neither, and that’s why I think we’ve already lost the debate.”

Month In Review

Q “O LORD, our Lord, how magnificent is Your name throughout the earth! You have covered the heavens with Your majesty. Because of Your adversaries, You have established a stronghold from the mouths of children and nursing infants, to silence the enemy and the avenger. When I observe Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, the moon and the stars, which You set in place, what is man that You remember him, the son of man that You look after him? You made him little less than God and crowned him with glory and honor. You made him lord over the works of Your hands; You put everything under his feet: all the sheep and oxen, as well as animals in the world, birds of the sky, and fish of the sea passing through the currents of the seas. O LORD, our Lord, how magnificent is Your name throughout the earth!

—Psalm 8:1-9

Q “Am I a soldier of the cross, a follower of the Lamb? And shall I fear to own His cause or blush to speak His name?

“Must I be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease, while others fought to win the prize and sailed thru bloody seas?

“Are there no foes for me to face? Must I not stem the flood? Is this vile world a friend to grace, to help me on to God.

“Sure I must fight if I would reign: Increase my courage, Lord; I’ll bear the toil, endure the pain, supported by Thy word.”

—Issac Watts

Q “We live in the most absurd age. I met a girl the other day who had been teaching in an infant school (boys and girls up to the age of six) where these infants are taught the theory of evolution. Or rather the Headmistress’s version of it. Simple people like ourselves had an idea that Darwin said that life developed from simple organisms up to the higher plants and animals, finally to the monkey group, and from the monkey group to man. The infants seem to be taught however that ‘in the beginning was the Ape,’ from whom all other life developed, including such dainties as the Brontosaurus and the Iguanodon. Whether the plants were supposed to be descendants of the apes I didn’t gather. And then people talk about the credulity of the Middle Ages! Apropos of this, can you tell me who said, ‘Before you begin these studies, I should warn you that you need much more faith in science than in theology.’ It was Huxley of Clifford or one of the nineteenth century scientists I think. Another good remark I read long ago in one of E. Nesbitt’s fairy tales—‘Grown ups know that children can believe almost anything; that’s why they tell you that the earth is round and smooth like an orange when you can see perfectly well for yourself that it’s flat and lumpy.’”

—C.S. Lewis, Letters of C.S. Lewis (1927)

Q “The Bergsonian critique of orthodox Darwinism is not easy to answer. More disquieting still is Professor D.M.S. Watson’s defence. ‘Evolution itself,’ he wrote, ‘is accepted by zoologists not because it has been observed to occur or...can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.’ Has it come to that? Does the whole vast structure of modern naturalism depend not on positive evidence but simply on an a priori metaphysical prejudice? Was it devised not to get in facts but to keep out God?”

—C.S. Lewis, The Weight of Glory

Q “You remember the old puzzle as to whether the owl came from the egg or the egg from the owl. The modern acquiescence or universal evolution is a kind of optical illusion, produced by attending exclusively to the owl’s emergence from the egg. We are taught from childhood to notice how the perfect oak grows from the acorn and to forget that the acorn itself was dropped by a perfect oak. We are reminded constantly that the adult human being was an embryo, never that the life of the embryo came from two adult human beings. We love to notice that the express engine of today is the descendant of the ‘Rocket’; we do not equally remember that the ‘Rocket’ springs not from some even more rudimentary engine, but from something much more perfect and complicated than itself—namely, a man of genius. The obviousness or naturalness which most people seem to find in the idea of emergent evolution thus seems to be a pure hallucination.”

—C.S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory*

Q “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 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?”

—C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q “If Darwin’s writings were scrutinized by today’s standards, he probably would not be published. No one has ever shown that one species can change into another. Yet Darwin wrote that bears, who prefer to keep their heads above water, could evolve into whales that can dive many fathoms beneath the water’s surface, sustain themselves permanently out at sea, withstand incredible hypothermia, migrate thousands of miles each year, and successfully give birth underwater. Not to mention such factors as growing blubber, shrinking four extremities, shedding all hair, growing fins, and developing a subsonic communication system.”

—Geoffrey Simmons, M.D., *What Darwin Didn’t Know*, p. 303

Q “Darwin knew little of genetics, hardly anything about human physiology, and nothing of conception. He could not tell the difference between a kidney cell and a liver cell, nor did he know they existed. His writings included inflammatory, sexist, and bigoted comments [e.g., *Preservation of favored races*]. He rarely gave credit to any scientific source. No such scientific article would be accepted for publication nowadays.

“Darwin subscribed to Lamarck’s theory of pangenesis, which essentially states that a lizard with its tail cut off could have offspring without tails (if that were a benefit to the species), or that a pregnant mother with a recent tan might give birth to a baby with a tan. (And tans may protect skin.)”

—Geoffrey Simmons, M.D., *What Darwin Didn’t Know*, p. 302

Q “According to Richard Milton, who wrote *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, the chances of forming protein and self-replicating DNA randomly are as likely as ‘winning the state lottery by finding the winning ticket in the street, and then continuing to win the lottery every week for a thousand years by finding the winning ticket in the street each time’ (in other terms, one chance in 1065).

“The human body develops from an ovum the size of a dot, yet this speck of biological

material contains vast encyclopedias of information—huge dictionaries defining every molecule and convoluted recipes to make every chemical moiety, or component. Conception sets in motion domino-like changes in this speck so that it becomes a human being—a multi-trillion cell organism with 200 different kinds of cells that make five million different proteins. In this organism, sometimes a billion or more neurons know where to set up shop, how to interact with thousands of neighboring neurons in a meaningful way, and yet be flexible enough to learn and change throughout a person’s life is beyond calculation. It’s beyond understanding.

“Try to imagine an animal that lacks a way to find food, a means to ingest it, or a mechanism to eliminate wastes. These processes are critical for sustaining life, yet many of us view them as being relatively simple, like filling one’s gas tank at a service station, burning the fuel, and leaving a few exhaust fumes. It would have taken millions, if not billions, of fortuitous genetic mutations to create teeth, saliva, a tongue, a liver, a pancreas, a gallbladder, and a complex gastrointestinal conveyor belt that includes acid to digest the food, bases to neutralize the acid, antibodies to kill worrisome bacteria, antitoxins to neutralize toxins, and hundreds of different enzymes that steadily break food down. Everything has to be done in tandem or parallel and in very special ways—or none of it can work. Each step is dependent on previous steps; each step complements the others before it.

“The ability to talk had to have anticipated conversation. Our new species would have had to have the correct anatomy for communication and a frontal cortex to process language. Without ears we wouldn’t know what another human being is saying. Without mental filtering devices we would be driven crazy by every sound around us. How did we end up with a naked face, which enhances possibilities for language, when a muzzle is best suited for seizing food?

—Geoffrey Simmons, M.D., *What Darwin Didn’t Know*, p. 307,308

Q “Arthur Miller’s play *The Crucible* is about the Salem witch trials. Even at the start of the play, the evidence for Salem being a hotbed of witchcraft is not good. But as the play unfolds, it becomes clear to the judges overseeing the witch trials that the evidence was utterly fabricated and bogus. Unfortunately, by this time several people have already been executed for witchcraft. What are the judges to do? At a key point in the play, the judges decide that they had better keep the executions going since otherwise their credibility will be shot.

“A similar inertia drives Darwinism. The evidence for Darwinism was never any good—even in Darwin’s day. But with advances in contemporary science, Darwinism becomes utterly insupportable. What are Darwinists to do? Rather than admit that their theory is at fault (and thus lose credibility), they keep the propaganda mills running overtime, inflating Darwinism’s paltry successes and charging critics like Geoffrey Simmons with being ‘unscientific’ and ‘religiously motivated’ and with committing the ‘intellectual sin’ of merely

picking holes in evolutionary theory.

—William A. Dembski, Ph.D., Foreword, Geoffrey Simmons, *What Darwin Didn't Know*, p. 9

Q “The interior of the human body is a much busier place than New York City, London, Mexico City, Tokyo, and Bombay combined. Ten to seventy-five trillion cells participate in more than a quadrillion purposeful chemical interactions each day that help us walk, breathe, think, sleep, procreate, see, hear, smell, feel, digest food, eliminate waste, write, read, talk, make red cells, remove dead cells, fight infections, behave, misbehave, absorb nutrients, transport oxygen, eliminate carbon dioxide, maintain balance, carry on dialogue, understand instructions, argue, and make complex decisions, just to name a few common activities. In addition, each of these processes has dozens—and sometimes hundreds—of smaller, interacting steps, checks, counterchecks, balances, and regulatory mechanisms. And further, all of these steps have smaller chemical substeps. In many ways the human body functions like an extremely well-organized blizzard of invisible chemical responses and rapidly-changing electrical impulses. The human brain is a convoluted continent swept by microscopic electrical hurricanes and chemical tidal waves that somehow make sense out of reality on a microsecond-by-microsecond basis. Darwin didn't have a clue how these mechanisms truly worked. For the most part, he didn't know they even existed.”

—Geoffrey Simmons, M.D., *What Darwin Didn't Know*, p. 16

Q “An Austin group that does not require its members to believe in a supreme being won another round Friday in its legal fight to be recognized by the state as a religious organization.

“The Texas Supreme Court refused to consider state Comptroller Carole Keeton Strayhorn's appeal to bar the Ethical Society of Austin from qualifying for property and sales tax exemptions for religious groups.

“Ms. Strayhorn said she would appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

“ ‘Groups like the Ethical Society of Austin are not religiously based,’ she said.

“ ‘This fight is about more than one organization trying to avoid paying their fair share. It's about protecting the groups in Texas who truly deserve to be tax exempt,’ she said.

“As is customary, the Texas court did not issue an opinion supporting its decision to not consider the case. Trial and lower appeals courts have ruled against Ms. Strayhorn.

“The ethical group's latest victory is largely symbolic but one its lawyer says is important for freedom of religion.

“The group owns no property and pays very few state taxes. As of Friday, it was listed as a corporation in ‘good standing’ with Ms. Strayhorn’s office.

“ ‘The case reaffirms that religious protection in the United States extends not just to large, well-recognized religions but to people of all faith’, said Pete Kennedy, an American Civil Liberties lawyer representing the Ethical Society.

Ms. Strayhorn, a Republican, said granting the ethical group religious status will prompt ‘any wannabe cult who dresses up and parades down Sixth Street on Halloween’ to apply.

“The case began in June 1997 when the Ethical Society, which meets Sundays at an art museum, was granted tax-exempt status by former Comptroller John Sharp.

“A day later, after reading about the decision in the newspaper, Mr. Sharp, a Democrat, undid it, claiming it was improperly granted by his staff. Ms. Strayhorn became the defendant in the case when she took over the office in 1998.

“The Ethical Society of Austin, affiliated with a movement that traces its roots to 1876, describes itself as ‘a humanistic religious organization’ whose goal is to search for the good in human life.”

—The Dallas Morning News, April 24, 2004, p. 3A

Q “David Horowitz thinks anybody who cares about the future should confront the fact U.S. colleges and universities are the fountainhead of financing for the radical movement in America. He has personally taken up the challenge to do something about this.

“Mr. Horowitz was a left-wing campus activist in the 1960s but says men too radical even for him and Ramparts, the magazine he edited in the 1960s, now hold tenure at major universities. During the 1970s, these hard-core leftists achieved critical mass on university faculties, took control of hiring committees and saw that only leftists were hired.

“Now there are literally tens of thousands of ‘hard-line Marxists’ in academic sinecures. They have made universities ‘a subsidiary of the political left and the Democratic Party.’

“These hard-core leftists have no shame about using the classroom podium for political speechmaking. They may be teaching a course in biology or Shakespeare, but that doesn’t inhibit them from launching into tirades against American policies or in favor of the communists in El Salvador, or assigning students to write a paper on why President George W. Bush is a war criminal.

“These radical leftists have redefined the mission of universities. Instead of the pursuit of knowledge and truth, universities today see themselves as agencies for social change. Mr. Horowitz says the change they see is fundamentally anti-American.

“The amount of money universities have to carry out their left-wing mission is mind-boggling. Whereas conservative and pro-American intellectual sources, such as the Heritage Foundation and the American Enterprise Institute and conservative journals may have budgets of a few million dollars, universities have billions of dollars. A great portion is taxpayer money obtained through research grants and student financed tuition. In addition, the leftists control most student-activity assessments.

“Many people have decried the bias of universities, but Mr. Horowitz has a plan to turn it around.

“First, expose how bad the situation is, and second, challenge them directly by using the liberals’ credo of diversity against them by calling for intellectual diversity.

“For years, the universities have sanctimoniously proclaimed the value of diversity, but they define diversity to mean only giving space to radical left-wingers and feminists. Mr. Horowitz’s Center for the Study of Popular Culture made a survey of 32 colleges and universities and reported that the overall ratio of Democrats to Republicans is 10:1.

“At Cornell University, which is typical, 95 percent of the faculty who are registered to vote are Democrats. Of the faculty in the government department, only 1 of 23 members is a registered Republican.

“At almost every American university, conservative professors are drastically outnumbered. Rep. Jack Kingston, Georgia Republican, says, ‘Most students probably graduate without ever having a class taught by a professor with a conservative viewpoint.’

“Mr. Kingston and Rep. Walter B. Jones, North Carolina Republican, have introduced a bill to promote the most important diversity of all, the diversity of ideas. Their bill calls on colleges to end discrimination against hiring conservative faculty and against students.”

—Phyllis Schlafly, *The Washington Times*, January 24, 2004, p. A11

Q “On November 18, 2001, an article in the *Washington Post* stated, ‘A split is emerging between two wings of the Republican Party—libertarians who consider Muslims the party’s greatest immigrant asset and conservatives who conceive of the war exactly the way Bush tried to avoid, as a cosmic one between Islam and the West. The emerging spokesmen for the latter group are Paul Weyrich and William S. Lind of the Free Congress Foundation.’

“For once, the Washington Post got it right. We do believe Islam is at war with the Christian West, and we are proud to be considered spokesmen for that view. Islam has made war on Christendom and Christians since it first swept out of Arabia to conquer much of the Christian Mediterranean world. As recently as 1683, the armies of Islam were besieging Vienna. After about 300 years on the strategic defensive, Islam has recently resumed the strategic offensive. It is now expanding outward in every direction: down both coasts of Africa, east throughout the South China Sea toward Australia, north into both eastern and western Europe, and west into the United States, where the fastest-growing religion is Islam. As has been true throughout its history, the expansion of Islam is not peaceful. More Christians are being martyred today than at the height of the Roman persecutions, and most of them are dying at the hands of Islam. Christendom is again in peril.

“There are two principal reasons why Islam is once again a deadly threat to the West. The first is the nature of Islam itself. The second is the rise of Fourth Generation warfare, the type of conflict we believe is likely to predominate in the 21st century.

“Islam is quite simply, a religion of war. While there are lax Islamics, there is no such thing as peaceful or tolerant Islam. Islam divides the world into two portions: the Dar al Islam, the world of Islam, and the Dar al Harb, the world of war. In Islamic thought, peace is only possible within the world of Islam. The non-Islamic world is a battlefield, where Islamics are required by their faith to war against the unbelievers.

“As one British Islamic web site puts it, ‘(historically) the Islamic world was all one single territory, and there were no borders except those adjacent to the disbelieving states, and even those borders were not permanent. They were only temporary borders waiting to be stormed while the necessary means were being prepared to continue the conquest of disbelieving countries and transform them into an Islamic homeland (Dar al Islam) ruled by Islam.’

“The two principal sources of Islamic belief, the Koran and the Hadith, ooze war and blood. A book entitled *The Quranic Concept of War*, written by a Pakistani general, S. K. Malik, identifies three stages of teaching about war in the Koran: ‘The Muslim migration to Medina brought in its wake events and decisions of far-reaching significance and consequence for them. While in Mecca, they had neither been proclaimed an Ummah (a people or community) nor were they granted the permission to take up arms against their oppressors. In Medina, a divine revelation proclaimed them an “Ummah” and granted them the permission to take up arms against their oppressors. The permission was soon afterwards converted into a divine command making war a religious obligation for the faithful.’

“The Koran makes clear the Islamic attitude toward non-Islamics and the obligation of Moslem to make war (jihad) on them:

*From Sura 9:1-6:...fight and slay the pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them,

beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war).

*Sura 9:29-31: Fight those who believe not in God nor the last day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by God and his Apostle (Mohammed), nor acknowledge the religion of truth (Islam), (even if they are) of the people of the Book (Christians and Jews), until they pay the jizya (poll tax on non-Islamics) with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.

*Sura 5:36-38: The punishment of those who wage war against God and His Apostle, and strive with might and main for mischief through the land is execution, or crucifixion, or the cutting off of hands and feet from opposite sides, or exile from the land.

“The Hadith, the collection of sayings and acts of Mohammed, strokes the fire of jihad, including in some ways directly relevant to the events of September 11:

*4:44: A man came to Muhammad and said, ‘Instruct me as to such a deed as equals Jihad (in reward).’ He replied, ‘I do not find such a deed.’

*4:50: Muhammad said, ‘A single endeavor (of fighting) in Allah’s cause in the forenoon or in the afternoon is better than the world and whatever is in it.’

*4:72: Muhammad said, ‘Nobody who enters Paradise likes to go back to the world even if he got everything on the earth, except a Mujahid (one who fights in jihad) who wishes to return to the world so that he may be martyred ten times because of the dignity he receives (from Allah).’

*4:73: Muhammad said, ‘Know that Paradise is under the shade of swords.’

*4:220: Muhammad said, ‘...I have been made victorious with terror...’

*4:256: As-Sa’b bin Jaththama said, ‘The Prophet...was asked whether it was permissible to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The prophet replied, “They (the women and children) are from them (the pagans).”’

*4:267, 269: Muhammad said, ‘War is deceit.’

“Given these instructions, it is not surprising that the history of Islam has been a history of violence against non-Islamics. It started with Mohammed himself. Not only did he personally wage war, he repeatedly called for ‘hits’ on anyone he did not like, in the manner of a Mafia don.”

—Paul M. Weyrich, William S. Lind, *Why Islam is a Threat to America and The West*, p. 1-3

Q “Fred Singer established the Science & Environment Policy Project (SEPP) in 1990 after becoming fed up with what he calls ‘the distorted science’ surrounding the question of atmospheric ozone depletion. Singer is a scientist. His undergraduate degree is in electrical engineering and he has a doctorate in physics from Princeton University. He has spent a lifetime in scientific research and development. So it is not surprising that bad science gets Singer excited and arouses his concern.

“The ozone debate has receded and no longer is in the headlines. ‘It may come back, who knows?’ Singer tells INSIGHT. His chief interest now, when it comes to distorted science, is global warming.

“Two things concern Singer about global warming. First is the questionable science that says global warming is taking place and it’s a bad thing. The second is that the global-warming people argue government and society must now greatly expand the government’s authority to enforce policies that will put an end to global warming or at least hold it in check.

“ ‘There are, of course, many areas in science that are disputed, but because they have no policy significance, they don’t really make the papers,’ Singers says. ‘As far as policy significance goes, global warming is still the top one.’ That’s because the policies the global-warming folks advocate are often draconian, even though there’s no solid evidence, according to Singer, that global warming is taking place or that it will be a disaster for mankind.

“Singer has held prestigious scientific positions, such as director of the Center of Atmospheric and Space Physics at the University of Maryland and distinguished research professor at the Institute for Space Science and Technology in Gainesville, Fla. He’s also published widely both in scientific journals and in the popular press. And Singer’s list of scientific accomplishments is impressive.

“In 1956, for example, he designed the sensing instruments for the MOUSE (Minimal Orbital Unmanned Satellite), including the first instrument for measuring stratospheric ozone.

“Among Singer’s other achievements are the design of the high-altitude FARSIDE rocket to search for geomagnetically trapped radiation. Currently, in addition to being SEPP’s president, he is a distinguished research professor at George Mason University and professor emeritus of environmental science at the University of Virginia.”

—INSIGHT magazine, April 27, 2004, p. 43

Q “Some holidays, such as Veteran’s Day and Memorial Day, are a time for reflection. Others, like July 4 and Thanksgiving, are a time for celebration. This year, we ought to add

Earth Day to the list of days to celebrate—but only if we rename it Growth Day.

“As in ‘economic growth.’ Believe it or not, nothing’s better at cleaning up the environment and keeping it clean.

“Many on the radical left dispute this, of course. Indeed, they fault the industrialized nations for allegedly endangering our planet. Yet the opposite is true. That’s why the major environmentalist movements are all based in Western countries, where people are wealthy enough to be concerned about the world around them—and have the wherewithal to protest it. Our own country provides a perfect example.

“Almost all the settlers who arrived here hundreds of years ago were subsistence farmers. They cleared hundreds of millions of acres of trees. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, ‘A single household could consume 20 to 40 cords of wood annually.’ Economic growth changed all that.

“First, we progressed from wood to coal. This allowed us to begin replacing millions of trees. Plus, coal was more efficient and easier to transport than wood, so it took less to produce more energy.

“But even coal is fairly dirty, and of course digging it out of the ground affects the environment. So the country moved on to natural gas. It was safer, easier to get and cleaner burning.

“The economic growth made possible in part by these new fuel sources allowed people to leave their farms and make a living in manufacturing and service industries. That translated into higher incomes. Today, the United States has a per capita income of \$37,600. Our crops literally feed the world even though fewer than three out of every 100 Americans are farmers.

“If we want the rest of the world to be as clean as we are, we should shun the guerilla tactics of the radical environmental activists. What’s needed are the free-market ideas that have fueled our economic growth and led to prosperity. Studies show that air and water pollution start plummeting once per capita income in a country reaches more than \$3,500 a year.

“In the meantime, of course, Americans are still giving environmentalists plenty to complain about, because we drive gasoline-powered cars. But with technology improving our vehicles all the time, they’re not really the disaster some claim.

“Our environment has improved markedly over the last three decades, even as the population rose 30 percent, the number of licensed vehicles jumped 87 percent, and vehicle miles traveled increased more than 125 percent.

“Consider, too, the jobs generated by cars. They include everything from high-paying manufacturing, repair and sales jobs to entry-level gas station attendant positions. Plus, by allowing us to get around quickly and easily, cars enabled people to move out of crowded cities into suburbs, where they’re in closer contact with nature.

“And let’s not forget what autos replaced: horses. Back in the days when horse-drawn carriages were the main means of transportation, our streets were filled with manure. This waste was itself a dangerous form of pollution.

“Horses required tons of hay, which meant thousands of acres of farmland were needed to grow food for animal use, not human consumption. The invention of the car actually helped clean our streets, clear our air and free land for more productive use.

“People are more likely to be concerned about the environment when they have the time to appreciate nature. That’s a luxury still not enjoyed in poor nations, where too many people eke out a living through subsistence farming.

“The best way to clean up our planet and keep it clean is to generate worldwide economic growth and lift everyone to the same level of prosperity Americans take for granted. Let’s get started today, the new international Growth Day.”

—Ed Feulner, The [Colorado Springs] Gazette, April 22, 2004, p. M7