

and we wish merely to quote Green and Goldberger who said, "... the macromolecule-to-cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulating that cells arose on this planet."⁴

Conclusion

Kenyon and Steinman have presented in rather comprehensive fashion the thinking and laboratory endeavors of evolutionists on the origin of life. Since the origin of life was not observed by man nor can this event be repeated, the origin

of life is not subject to scientific investigation if the usual criteria for scientific studies are accepted. And, if as we believe to be certain, life was the result of a direct creative act of God, no valid scientific inquiries whatever can be brought to bear on its origin.

References

- ¹Davidson, C. F. 1965. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 53:1194.
²Brinkman, R. T. 1969. J. Geophys. Res. 74:5355.
³Hull, D. E. 1960. Nature. 186:693.
⁴Green, D. E. and R. F. Goldberger. 1967. Molecular insights into the living process. Academic Press, N. Y. p. 407.

ECOLOGY: THE ABOLITION OF MAN?

JOHN W. ROBBINS*

What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
 and the son of man, that thou visitest him?
 For thou hast made him a little lower than
 the angels, and hast crowned him with glory
 and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion
 over the works of thy hands; thou hast put
 all things under his feet: All sheep and oxen,
 yea, and the beasts of the field; The fowl
 of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever
 passeth through the paths of the seas.

Psalm VIII; Genesis I

Conservationism as an effective socialist political movement has existed since the turn of the century, but it did not come into its own until the late 1960's, rechristened "ecology."¹ Ecology bears the same relation to conservationism that Marxism bears to socialism: both ecology and Marxism claim to furnish a "scientific" basis for their antecedent movements, and both claims are equally specious.

It was the monist Ernst Haeckel, known to the readers of the *Creation Research Society Quarterly* as a principal proponent of the "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" argument, who in 1869

Ye are of more value than many sparrows.

Jesus of Nazareth, Matthew X, 31

I see around me no danger of Deism but much of an immoral, naive and sentimental pantheism. I have often found that it was in fact the chief obstacle to conversion.

C. S. Lewis, Rejoinder to Dr. Pittenger

coined the word "oecology." For Haeckel, an individual is the product of cooperation between organismal heredity and its environment, this cooperation or relationship being called "oecology."

Haeckel viewed oecology as one of the ten "general laws of Biology, upon which this comprehensive law of development [i.e., evolution] is firmly based."² An author in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* has written:

Haeckel's oecology was more or less forgotten in the activity that resulted from publications of Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection in 1859. This is a strange turn of events, since Darwin's theory was primarily an ecological theory of evolution, stressing the environment as a selection agent over long periods of time.³

Ecology as Ideology

Today "ecology" is used as an argument for socialism, just as in the past it has been used as an argument for the doctrine of evolution. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University has written in *The Population Bomb*: "We must move from an economic system based on growth, production,

†EDITOR'S NOTE: Although the concepts presented in this paper by Mr. Robbins are somewhat political in nature, we entered the arena of politics as soon as we began to discuss ecology. Mr. Robbins purports to answer certain suppose political implications of Dr. John Klotz's paper, "Creationism an Our Ecological Crisis," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 8(1):13-15ff; June, 1971.

This article by Mr. Robbins is followed by a reply from Dr. Klotz so that the reader has the benefit of both viewpoints on a highly controversial issue—controversial even among creationists.

*John W. Robbins is a Ph.D. candidate in the field of political philosophy. He resides at 329 East University Parkway, Baltimore, Md. 21218.

consumption and waste to one that emphasizes stability, quality of capital goods, recycling of resources." Ehrlich, one of the national figures in the ecology movement, helped organize Zero Population Growth⁴, a group which advocates (a) legalized abortion (abortion is justifiable homicide if one can thereby "save the environment"); (b) a maximum of two children per family; (c) government "support" of birth control; (d) tax incentives for smaller families.

Ehrlich writes, "Even if we prevented all unwanted children . . . we would still have a severe population problem." Ergo, "we" (meaning Ehrlich and his fellow planners) must "prevent" wanted children: which means, an elite must have power over the life and death of human beings to save the environment.

The socialists of old advocated the nationalization of the means of production; the ecologists⁵ advocate nationalization of the means of reproduction. Indeed, as Ayn Rand notes, pollution is not really the issue at all: power is the goal of the ecologists:

Their immediate, but not ultimate goal, is the destruction of the last remnants of freedom, that is, of capitalism in our mixed economy, and the establishment of a global dictatorship in order to protect our natural environment. This means: to enslave mankind in order to protect weeds, birds and reptiles. Their ultimate goal is the destruction of man's mind, and its product, technology.⁶

The ecologists, to put it quite simply and unmistakably, do not wish to have dominion over the earth and subdue it: they wish to have dominion over men and subdue them.

Ecology as Pseudo-science

I reproduce here an extended quotation from the January 26, 1970, issue of *Newsweek* magazine⁷ as a typical example of the conclusions of the "science" of ecology.

. . . some scientists like to play with the notion that global disaster may result if environmental pollution continues unchecked. According to one scenario, the planet is already well advanced toward a phenomenon called "the greenhouse effect." Concentrations of carbon dioxide are building up in the atmosphere, it is said, as the world's vegetation, which feeds on CO₂, is progressively chopped down. Hanging in the atmosphere, it forms a barrier trapping the planet's heat. As a result, the greenhouse theorists contend, the world is threatened with a rise in average temperature which, if it reached 4 or 5 degrees, could melt the polar ice caps, raise sea level by as much as 300 feet and cause

a worldwide flood. Other scientists [sic] see an opposite peril: that the polar ice will expand, sending glaciers down to the temperate zone once again. This theory assumes that the earth's cloud cover will continue to thicken as more dust, fumes and water vapor are belched into the atmosphere by industrial smokestacks and jet planes. Screened from the sun's heat, the planet will cool, the water vapor will fall and freeze, and a new Ice Age will be born.

This genre of "scientific" thinking is adequately described by Mark Twain⁸: "There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact."

It would indeed be quite surprising if the ecologists were in possession of any facts. The readers of *C. R. S. Quarterly* read both an article on ecology and a new book announcement of *Ecology Crisis* by Dr. John W. Klotz in the June, 1971, issue. Dr. Klotz tries to reconcile Christianity and ecology.⁹ In so doing he demurs from White's ascription of guilt to Christianity (see below) for our "ecology crisis," but accepts Moncrief's attack¹⁰ on capitalism:

. . . the American development of a society made up of small landowners in which decisions to degrade [sic] the environment are made by millions of landowners¹¹ and not by a few (*nota bene*) [is] much more responsible for our problems than any set of religious beliefs.

Ergo, we must substitute an elite for small landowners to protect our environment. The Communists call such a process collectivization.

Both Moncrief and Dr. Klotz ignore (or fail to understand) the fact that a given socioeconomic system is not self-existent, but is the product of ideas, the order of private property being the logical consequent of Christianity. To imply that the social order is not such a consequent (which implication is in the ascription of "guilt" to capitalism but not to Christianity) is to endorse a crude Marxian materialism.

Perhaps both Moncrief and Klotz wish to say (and it is certainly implicit in what they have said) that Christianity and private property are incompatible. If that be their position, then Moncrief and Klotz have failed to understand Christianity or capitalism or both.

Dr. Klotz, as all ecologists do, speaks of an "ecology crisis," of "serious problems" in "our deteriorating environment" caused by people who "exploit the environment, waste our (*nota bene*, the collective possessive) resources and cheat future generations of their legacy."¹² The socialists were once wont to say that the greedy capitalists exploited the workers; when it became

manifestly obvious that they didn't, the socialists changed the tune: the capitalists now exploit Mother Nature.

Words like "exploit," "waste," "cheat" are nothing but pejoratives whose usefulness in a rational discussion is zero and the use of which prohibits rational discussion. Dr. Klotz writes that "Man can hardly claim to own anything,"¹³ a statement which confuses theological, political, juristic, and economic concepts of ownership, and treats the abstract noun "man" as equivalent to "men." The argument for the elimination of small landowners rests on such an equation—and this to be done in the name of God, who owns everything. It is not apparent to me what merit there is in introducing another definition of ownership to an issue already totally confused, unless one wished to use such an equivocation to undermine any Christian opposition to the elitist control (in the name of God) of the land.

Furthermore, there is no "ecology crisis." The entire thesis of the ecologists is the unproved asseveration that local pollution is threatening global catastrophe. Not one bit of evidence has been offered in support of (let alone proof of) such a thesis. Talk about an "ecology crisis" is sheer irresponsibility.

Air pollution: The National Science Foundation has reported¹⁴ that the oxygen content of the air is exactly what it was in 1910: 20.95%. In the years 1930-31 the Public Health Service took particulate measurements in 14 of the largest U.S. cities; the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1957 began monitoring the air in 55 cities. In those 25 intervening years particulate contamination had fallen to less than 25% of the 1930-31 level.¹⁵ By 1969 the H.E.W. figures indicated that the contamination had declined to less than 20% of the 1930-31 level, which the ecologists like to view as a "clean-air" era, being the Great Depression.¹⁶

In two-thirds of U.S. cities tested (20 out of 30) during the period 1964-1969, the sulphur dioxide contamination of the air declined (17 cities) or remained the same (3 cities).¹⁷ The SO₂ contamination rose in New York City, for example, where the ecologists have prevented Consolidated Edison from using pollution-free nuclear power, forcing Con Ed to provide power from overworked (hence, blackouts), SO₂ producing, coal-burning plants.

Water pollution: The "mercury contamination" of our waters was much greater in years past than it is now: "Fish caught 44 years ago and just analyzed contain twice as much mercury as any fish processed this year." (1971)¹⁸ In 1793 an epidemic killed 20% of the residents of Philadelphia, which did not happen to be suffering from industrial wastes in the water.¹⁹ The ecologists confuse aesthetic quality and purity: not

everything that "looks good" is good to drink; nor is everything that "looks bad" bad to drink.

Pesticides: Nobel Prize winner Dr. Norman E. Borlaug says:

I have dedicated myself to finding better methods of feeding the world's starving populations. Without DDT and other important agricultural chemicals, our goals are simply unattainable, and starvation and world chaos will result. . . . Science without common sense is worthless and environmentalists are not using common sense when they examine DDT and its effects on wildlife in this country. . . . There has not been one shred of reliable evidence that DDT has put any species of wildlife in danger. . . . The argument that pesticides are upsetting the balance of nature is utter nonsense.²⁰

Dr. Lloyd E. Rozeboom, Professor of Medical Entomology at The Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, has further documented that statement.²¹ Lack of space prevents me from quoting from his article, so I will generalize by saying that not only have the ecologists forced residents of New York City to breathe dirtier air, they have caused a massive resurgence of malaria in Ceylon, for instance, through a ban on the use of DDT. "Estimates of the number of subsequent cases [of malaria] are as high as two-million."²²

Industrialization: If indeed it were true that heavy and concentrated industrialization is inimicable to human life, one would expect to find the life expectancy declining in the most advanced countries. In the U.S. the life expectancy in 1900 was 47.3 years; in 1968, 70.2 years.²³

In pre-industrial times the life expectancy was 30-35 years. In England the population quadrupled during the 19th century (11 to 44 millions) not only when the pollution would have been worst, but when (allegedly) the capitalists were grinding the workers into the dust. Those who would destroy industry must destroy nearly all human life on this planet.

Ecology as Religion

If we are to understand the ecology movement, it is necessary to recognize its philosophical roots. In *The Four Changes*, Clifford Humphrey writes:

It seems evident that there are throughout the world certain social and religious forces which have worked through history toward an ecologically and culturally enlightened state of affairs. Let these be encouraged: Gnostics, hip Marxists, Teilhard de Chardin Catholics, Druids, Taoists, Biologists, Witches, Yogins, Bhikkus, Quakers, Sufis, Tibetans, Zens, Shamans, Bushmen, American Indians, Polynesians, Anarchists, Alchemists . . . the

list is long. All primitive cultures, all communal and ashram movements.²⁴

No doubt the reader has noticed the omission of scriptural Christianity from the list, for the ecology movement and Christianity are diametrically opposed. "Christian ecology" is as much a contradiction in terms as "Christian existentialist" or "Christian Marxist."

Writing in *The Environmental Handbook*, Lynn White of U.C.L.A. explores the "Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis":

What we do about ecology depends on our ideas of the man-nature relationship. More science and more technology are not going to get us out of the present ecologic crisis until we find a new religion, or rethink our old one. The beatniks, who are the basic revolutionaries of our time, show a sound instinct in their affinity for Zen Buddhism. . . .

Hence we shall continue to have a worsening ecologic crisis until we reject the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man.²⁵

Ecology or "environmentalism" is obviously a form of nature-worship. The continual use of the pagan concept "Mother Nature" by the ecologists is indicative of their substitution of "Mother Nature" for "God the Father." "Christian ecologists" who try to reconcile pantheism with transcendental monotheism always piously refer to nature as "the creation of God."

But if one reads them closely, one will find that man, the king of the earth, the most divine of terrestrial creation, is regarded as unnatural, as subnatural. Redwood trees are "God's creation"; man is not. If one reads the ecologists, one will immediately sense this hatred for man: man disrupts the "natural order of things"; man is "a messy animal," as a *Newsweek* writer put it.

Ecologists regard man as radically evil, not because he has sinned against God, but because he has and is now sinning against another god: Nature. But perhaps more importantly, they regard man as an intruder in the universe, an intruder who cannot be tolerated, for he upsets "Nature's ecological balance" (in theological terms, he disobeys God's commands). Man is metaphysically unimportant.

The ecologists agree with their fellow pantheists of the East that man is able "to enter the water and leave no ripple." No doctrine could be more opposed to Christianity.

Conclusion

I find it quite incredible that Christians should be concerned about "pollution" of the environment in 1972. Mass murderers like the Communists who, at this moment, are martyring Christians for their faith, appear to me to be a

much more ominous and diabolical threat than any amount of pollution.

I find it quite difficult to believe that human beings, and *a fortiori*, Christians, are entirely sane when they choose to crusade in behalf of birds and fish and ignore the terror and slaughter of human beings that surrounds us and is abetted by "our" government.

We are enjoined as Christians to "remember them that are in bonds" (Hebrews 13:3) and not "to love thy flora and thy fauna," for human beings are of more value than many sparrows.

References

¹Today the central government owns 40% of the land in the United States.

²Haeckel, Ernest. 1876. *History of creation*. Volume II. Henry S. King and Co., London, p. 353ff.

³Encyclopedia britannica. 1965. Volume 7, p. 913.

⁴See Rousas J. Rushdoony. 1968. *The myth of over-population*. Craig Press, Nutley, New Jersey.

⁵Rhymes with "astrologers." See "Ecology as Pseudoscience" in next section.

⁶In an appearance May 2, 1971 on NBC's COMMENT! Transcript of the program may be purchased from Merkle Press, Inc., Box 4556, Washington, D. C. 20017, for 10¢.

⁷Cited in Ayn Rand. 1971. *The new left: The anti-industrial revolution*. Signet, New York, pp. 135-136.

⁸Twain, Mark. 1961. *Life on the Mississippi*. Chap. xxvii, p. 120. New American Library, New York.

⁹I wish to forestall any criticism about my use of the word "ecology." Perhaps a science of ecology can be developed, but there is none at present. Science books are not entitled *Ecology Crisis*; political tracts are. Compare White's use of the word in the quotation I present from him in "Ecology as Religion."

¹⁰*Creation Research Society Quarterly*, June 1971, p. 14.

¹¹For the matter of private property and land use, see C. E. M. Hardin. 1952. *The politics of agriculture: soil conservation and the struggle for power in rural America*. Glencoe, Illinois; Friedrich von Hayek. 1960. *The constitution of liberty*, p. 366ff. Chicago, University of Chicago Press; Rousas J. Rushdoony. 1964. *This independent republic*, pp. 48-49. Craig Press, New Jersey; Ludwig von Mises. 1966. *Human action*, pp. 637ff. and 654ff. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago.

¹²*C.R.S. Quarterly, Ibid.*, p. 15. The ecologists' concern is for anything except existing human beings. If irrational and inanimate nature is not most important, non-existent human beings are. Existing human beings are to be sacrificed so "future generations" can have their "legacy," whatever that is.

¹³*Loc. cit.*, p. 15.

¹⁴Shepard, Thomas R., Jr. *The disaster lobby*, *The Freeman*, August, 1971, pp. 477-487.

¹⁵Boehme, Lillian R. *Propaganda and poison air*, *The Review of the News*, August 25, 1971, p. 27.

¹⁶*Ibid.* Since they advocate homicide to protect the environment, it is quite reasonable to them that they should advocate depressions to maintain clean air.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁸Shepard. *Op. cit.*, p. 479.

¹⁹Shepard, *Ibid.*, p. 473.

²⁰*The Review of the News*, October 20, 1971, pp. 14-15.

²¹Rozeboom, Lloyd E. 1971. DDT: the life-saving poison, *The Johns Hopkins Magazine*, Spring, 1971, pp. 28-32.

²²*Ibid.* p. 31.

²³Rand, *Op. cit.*

²⁴As cited by Gary Allen. 1970. Ecology: government control of the environment, *American Opinion*, May, 1970, p. 10.

²⁵*The Environmental Handbook*, pp. 24-25, as cited by Allen, *Ibid.*, p. 6.

A REPLY BY DR. KLOTZ*

I am somewhat bewildered by Mr. Robbins' reaction to my paper. I do not view either the conservation movement or the present environmental movement as a "socialist political movement" or for that matter any kind of political movement. The environmentalists I am acquainted with are largely biologists, and one of their complaints is that they are not sufficiently political in their orientation: they fear that it is for this reason that they have been ineffective.

Mr. Robbins is of course correct in what he says about the origin of the term "ecology": it was coined by Ernst Haeckel. But I would not want to think that we cannot use it for that reason or that it is in some way tainted as a result of a sort of "guilt by association."

As I have indicated, I do not agree with Mr. Robbins that ecology must be identified with a particular political system, and I certainly do not agree that Christianity must be allied with a particular economic system. If capitalism is indeed the logical consequence of Christianity as Mr. Robbins seems to imply, then I wonder why God did not set up a capitalistic system under the Old Testament theocracy.

I believe that Christianity can operate under any economic system, and I do not believe that capitalism is its logical consequence; in fact, I do not think that any economic system is its logical consequence.

Capitalism Is Effective System

I personally believe that capitalism is the most effective economic system and probably the most effective system so far as the cure of our environmental ills is concerned. Abelson points out that the U.S.S.R. is suffering from a shortage of caviar because of oil pollution in the Caspian Sea and the Volga River. He also quotes from *Izvestia* which criticizes the failure of a factory to install purification installations:

The Voskresensky Chemical Combine managed not to spend one kopeck on this construction, although the money had been allocated. They explained how, waving their arms, the

design organization did not turn over the drawings on schedule. But why did the combine director, Comrade Doktorov, instead of trying to obtain the designs, begin to fuss about to have himself relieved of all these unnecessary headaches, the installation of all kinds of filters and sediment traps?" (Abelson, Philip H., "Shortage of Caviar," *Science*, 168 (1970):199)

In the same journal, Goldman says, "Comparing pollution in the United States and in the U.S.S.R. is something like a game. Any depressing story that can be told about an incident in the United States can be matched by a horror story from the U.S.S.R." (Goldman, Marshall I. "The Convergence of Environmental disruption," *Science*, 170 (1970:37-42)

The Soviets like to claim to be first, and he goes on to point out that the Soviets have a right to claim at least one "first," for the first river to catch fire was the Iset in the Ukraine which ignited when a careless smoker threw his cigarette into the water in 1965. It was not until July, 1969, that a river caught fire in the United States, the Cuyahoga, which ignited under similar circumstances.

Also Goldman points out that while there are some advantages to the Soviet system so far as control of pollution is concerned (they do not put ethyl lead into any of their gasolines and have not permitted as much emphasis on consumer goods so there is less waste to discard), there are some reasons for polluting which seem to be peculiar to a country such as the Soviet Union. Officials are judged almost entirely by how much they are able to increase their region's economic growth, and are not likely to be promoted if they decide to act as impartial referees between contending factions on questions of pollution. There is almost a political as well as an economic imperative to devour idle resources.

Moreover industrialization has come relatively recently to the U.S.S.R. and the Russians continue to emphasize increases in productivity. Pollution control, however, generally appears to be non-productive. In addition, until July, 1967, all raw materials in the ground were treated as free goods: as a result there were very low re-

*John W. Klotz, Ph.D., Academic Dean, Concordia Senior College, Fort Wayne, Indiana.