

Climate Change: The Bell Tolls for Thee

☒ Last week, the worldwide summit on climate change in Denmark encouraged some and terrified others. During the past few years, the debate among many informed people has not just been focused on whether or not the globe is getting warmer, but about how our nation should respond to the perceived international threat.

A few years ago Tony Perkins, president of The Family Research Council, and I decided to tackle the question of climate change and evaluate popular proposals based on two things: 1.) a measurable return on investment and 2.) the value of human life. Our thoughts are catalogued in the book *Personal Faith, Public Policy*. Based on our study, we are very concerned about the direction that our current administration may be seduced into following in the name of saving the planet. Unfortunately for the U.S., there are always wolves dressed in sheep's clothing – supposed “saviors” that may lead us astray.

What was most alarming to Perkins and I was the resurgence of the call for population control as part of the international prescription to prevent global warming. We are concerned that human life will be devalued in order to protect the ecosystem.

As believers,
all of us must make sure that population control is not chosen
as a major way
of balancing out the CO₂ equation. Population control is a
loaded term that
includes not only abortion, contraception and sterilization,
but infanticide
and in some cases the promotion of same-sex relations. In an
almost Orwellian
manner, women from China have testified before the U.S.
Congress of forced
abortions, as late as nine months into the pregnancy. "Big
brother" in China
also forced sterilizations because of the nation's population
control measures.

Last Friday, Laura Ingraham confirmed
my concerns that we in the west could fall prey to wrong-
headed solutions to
population control. She bravely tackled this issue on the
O'Reilly Factor
by interviewing a self-proclaimed Canadian feminist who
extolled the virtues of
the Chinese "one child" policy. When asked how such a policy
would be carried
out, her guest feigned ignorance while insisting that bringing
a child into a
poverty-stricken environment was somehow immoral.

The present call for population control
by secular environmental activists is not unlike the warnings
sounded by Thomas
Malthus in 1798, who said the world's growing population was
growing
exponentially while the earth's food supply could at best be
increased only
arithmetically.

According to Malthus, the population would soon overtax the planet's ability to sustain the human race. He argued for policies that would result in a decreased population among the poor classes. He warned that if both private and public policies to limit population were not enacted and wars did not decrease the population, disease and famine would. He obviously underestimated the creativity of the generations that followed him. The innovative power of those generations fueled the Industrial Revolution and increased the average agricultural yield per acre.

Similar to Malthus, Stanford University professor Paul R. Ehrlich, sounded an alarm about population control in 1968. His book, *The Population Bomb*, predicted millions of people would die of starvation in the 1970s and 1980s without population control. The hysteria created by Ehrlich paved the way for the United Nation's Population Fund, which was established in 1969. Ehrlich believed that those nations who refused to institute his population controls were willing to let citizens of those nations starve to death. He also believed that Indian men who had more than three children should be sterilized by force. Global population control became a major focus of the United Nations as they projected the planet to be overrun with 11.5 billion people. Fortunately for us, Ehrlich was not a prophet. Virtually nothing he wrote came to pass. The UN now admits

that the human race,
which stands at 6.6 billion people, will fall far short of
their projections
and peak at 8.5 billion. Demographers currently say that once
the population
peaks, it will start a long-term decline because of falling
birth rates.

Even though the fertility rate is
declining across the board in Western nations, it is the most
Christian nations
that have the highest birth rates. Declining population may
eventually become a
problem in the west because we have seen children as the
consumers of limited
resources – rather than a reward and heritage from Lord.

While some well-meaning Christians
organized a public a demonstration of solidarity with the
Denmark Climate
Change summit, we must all beware that we don't miss the
forest for the trees.
This past Sunday David Hallman of the World Council of
Churches recruited
churches in Copenhagen to ring their church bells 350 times in
recognition of
the 350 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere goals
set by popular
climatologists. Undoubtedly, these activists see the
devastating
ecological impacts of climate change as a death sentence on
many of the world's
poorest and most marginalized peoples. Unfortunately, though,
they have not
thought that we could use the considerable financial and
scientific resources
of more developed countries to help poorer nations

industrialize and
strategically assist their poorer citizens in moving from
disaster prone
regions to places of safety, obtaining better jobs and more
productive
lives.

We don't need to hear any more bells of
affirmation, we need to sound a meaningful alarm that says,
"Human life is
still important on this planet and that we will carefully,
ethically and
strategically steward the earth!"