



Institute For Theological Encounter With Science and Technology

Volume 41 - # 1

Winter 2010 Bulletin

Opening Message

One familiar scripture line (also in the popular hymn “On Eagle’s Wings”) is from Psalm 91: “to His angels he has given a command to guard you in all of your ways; upon their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone.” As children we were taught about guardian angels, but over the decades such images drift far away from everyday consciousness. Until it suddenly comes true.

I was hit by a car last summer. I was riding a bicycle around a resort, where half the vehicles on the island were bicycles. I was cruising along the sidewalk about 15 mph and entered a crosswalk at an intersection (having the right of way), but a car was easing through a right-turn-on-red while the driver was looking the other way. Before I could even grip my brakes, his front grille contacted my left leg.

As a physicist, I know perfectly well what happens when a massive body strikes a lightweight body: the smaller object goes flying. And I did. In another split second I landed on the pavement about 10 feet away. The guy jammed on his brakes, so I didn’t get run over, but I was definitely airborne briefly. Somewhat later, I examined the bicycle and saw that the frame was so badly bent that the back wheel wouldn’t rotate any more. It was a genuine collision, all right.

I did not hit my head on the pavement, but landed on my side and shoulder. I got up promptly, and presently there was a different guy standing there, an EMT who happened to be passing by in the traffic. He looked me over, asked me some questions (to discern head trauma), and concluded I was not seriously hurt. Another couple of minutes and the police arrived, probably in response to someone’s 911 call.

The police asked whether I needed to go to the hospital, and after carefully considering my condition, we concluded I did not. They collected information from the driver, who was clearly shaken. Eventually the police gave me a ride back to my car at the bike shop, and the entire incident was over.

Later still I looked at my clothing – not even scuffed – and realized I had no bruises, not a scratch. Whatever happened surely doesn’t match my understanding of the physics of colliding masses.

In half a year, the image of the moment of collision remains in my memory. The obvious question arises “Why me, Lord? What have I ever done to deserve this protection?” Our church teaches that God’s first answer is always “Nothing – it’s a free gift.” Maybe God’s more detailed answer is “Look, Mr. hot-shot physicist, I’m going to present you with this gift on your own terms, in your very own language of forces and momentum and collisions.” To brush aside this gift with the excuse “just lucky” is impossible for me.

There are always ancillary questions. Why did one co-worker [Smith] recover from cancer while another [Jones] died of cancer? What about that baby girl who was rushed to the hospital with a rare blood condition? And so forth. We humans have never been able to comprehend such issues.

In the hymn “On Eagle’s Wings” the refrain goes “He will raise you up on eagle’s wings ...and hold you in the palm of His hand.” This hymn is often used at funerals, because of the hope it conveys. The metaphor in Psalm 91 about dashing your foot fits in well, because it points to God’s caring for each individual. Our real purpose and destiny is a unity with God that transcends the familiar earthly life governed by the laws of physics.

It’s nice to be reminded of that, even in a totally unexpected way.

Thomas P. Sheahen, PhD

Director: ITEST

In This Issue...

Announcements.....	2
<i>Caritas In Veritate: Pope Benedict XVI On Development by Edward J. O’Boyle, Ph.D.</i>	3
<i>The Third Way by Our Sunday Visitor</i>	10
<i>An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming by The Cornwall Alliance</i>	11
<i>A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming by Dr. Craig Vincent Mitchell, Dr. Roy W. Spencer, & Dr. Cornelis van Kooten</i>	12
<i>COP-15: The Copenhagen Round of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change by E. Cal Beisner</i>	14
<i>“Climategate”: Sad Revelation of Corruption in Climate Science by E. Cal Beisner</i>	15
<i>Cancel Christmas - by Rocky Martino</i>	16

Announcements

Mark your calendars for an upcoming ITEST conference on the “good” and “bad” of Biofoods (tentative title). After much discussion the ITEST Board agreed to hold a one-day conference at the Cardinal Rigali Center in St Louis from **9:00 AM to 4:00 PM, Saturday, September 25, 2010**. We decided to branch out and experiment with a new format for our yearly meeting. It will also allow more people to attend from the surrounding Christian and Catholic churches and parishes in the two state area and will not involve the expense of overnight accommodations at a hotel. Registration fee payable before September 1, 2010. At this point we are trying to make the fee more affordable than usual, perhaps even as low as \$15.00 - \$20.00 for the day. More detailed information will be available in the Spring issue of the Bulletin. We don't intend to ignore our out-of-town participants, but for the last few years most of our attendees have come from what would be considered a comfortable driving distance from St Louis. We do have a special rate for those who might need overnight accommodations at a nearby hotel; more information will follow.

In the Fall issue of the Bulletin we “proclaimed the good news” that ITEST had received a large grant (\$125,000) from the Our Sunday Visitor Institute to fund the first year of the second level of our project, Exploring the World, Discovering God (EWDG), faith/science interfacing modules for Grades 5-8. Since then our program manager, Evelyn Tucker and Administrative Assistant, Cheryl Harness have been working diligently contacting superintendents principals and teachers in dioceses on the east and west coasts, inviting them to join in the Creative Teacher Think Tanks (CTTs) – workshops where the teachers themselves, under the guidance of Ms Tucker, create the interfacing lessons in science and religion. In the Spring issue of the Bulletin we will have more news and photos of the CTTs held in various areas.



Sr. Marianne with students, teacher, Douglas Medeiros and principal, Kathleen Burt at the awarding of the scholarship to Saints Peter and Paul.

During the Christmas vacation Sister Marianne, RSM, visited Saints Peter and Paul School in Fall River, Massachusetts and awarded a \$4,000. check to the principal, Kathleen Burt, for scholarship allocation to students in grades 5-8 who excel in religion and science. This scholarship established by Sister Marianne as a supplementary fund to the Our Sunday Visitor Institute \$125,000. grant, represents donations of ITEST members, colleagues and friends



Fifth-grade student demonstrates a circuit board he constructed for a science project.

totaling \$8,100.00 thus far. Each year ITEST will chose a school to receive this award. Consideration will be given to those schools whose teachers participate in the Creative Teacher Think Tanks and who agree to become pilot schools for the next tier of Exploring the World, Discovering God (EWDG) – project 5-8.

In Memoriam

Ana Ballesteros died October 25, 2009

We also ask your prayers for ITEST members who are ill.
May they feel the restoring hand of the Lord.



Institute For Theological Encounter with Science and Technology
Cardinal Rigali Center • 20 Archbishop May Drive • Suite 3400-A • St. Louis, Missouri 63119 • USA
314.792.7220 • www.faithscience.org • E-mail: mariannepost@archstl.org

ITEST Bulletin - S. Marianne Postiglione, RSM, Editor
ISSN 1073-5976 • Copyright © 2010

Caritas In Veritate: Pope Benedict XVI On Development

Edward J. O'Boyle, Ph.D.

Caritas in Veritate, released to the public on June 29, 2009 and known in English as *Charity in Truth*, is Pope Benedict XVI's first social encyclical. His message is presented in eight parts: introduction, six chapters, and conclusion.

Anyone who has not yet read the encyclical is warned that Benedict uses charity and love interchangeably. Take, for example, the second sentence in his introduction: "Love -- caritas -- is an extraordinary force which leads people to opt for courageous and generous engagement in the field of justice and peace" (§ 1). And this, also from the introduction: "Charity is love received and given" (§ 5). Thus *Caritas in Veritate* could have been rendered as *Love in Truth*. In our remarks we will refer to it as *Caritas in Veritate*.

Our interest in the encyclical is primarily in what the Holy Father says that is relevant to economics and economic development. For that reason, our comments are organized along these lines: fundamentals, implications for economics, implications for globalization and economic development, what's new or re-affirmed, what's ambiguous, questionable, or excluded. Throughout we use the English language version of the encyclical which is accessible at the Vatican website.

In the following, Benedict's message is seen through the prism of the author's own perspective on economics and economic affairs in which the outdated concept of the economic agent as an individual and the underlying philosophical foundations of neo-classical economics in the individualism of the 17-18th century Enlightenment and script stage of human communication are replaced by the concept of the economic agent as a person and the philosophy of personalism both of which are much better suited to the 21st century and the electronic stage of human communication. We refer to this new way of thinking about economics and economic affairs as personalist economics.¹

Fundamentals

We present Benedict's fundamentals in bulleted fashion without comment. Each one is directly quoted from the encyclical. Readers who disagree with the encyclical's message regarding economics and economic development likely will trace that disagreement to these fundamentals. In the following, the fundamentals are not ranked and presented in any order of priority because rank ordering them ultimately is Benedict's prerogative not the author's.

► Without God man neither knows which way to go, nor even understands who he is (§ 78).

► *God's love calls us to move beyond the limited and ephemeral, it gives us the courage to continue seeking and working for the benefit of all*, even if this cannot be achieved immediately and if what we are able to achieve, alongside political authorities and those working in the field of economics, is always less than we might wish (§ 78; emphasis in the original).²

► While in the past it was possible to argue that justice had to come first and gratuitousness could follow afterwards, as a complement, today it is clear that without gratuitousness, there can be no justice in the first place (§ 38).

► In *development programmes*, the principle of the *centrality of the human person*, as the subject primarily responsible for economic development, must be preserved (§ 47; emphasis in the original).

► The exclusion of religion from the public square – and, at the other extreme, religious fundamentalism – hinders an encounter between persons and their collaboration for the progress of humanity (§ 56).

► Hence it is important to call for a renewed reflection on how *rights presuppose duties, if they are not to become mere licence* ... A link has often been noted between claims to a "right to excess," and even to transgression and vice, within affluent societies, and the lack of food, drinkable water, basic instruction and elementary health care in areas of the underdeveloped world and on the outskirts of large metropolitan centres. The link consists of this: individual rights, when detached from a framework of duties which grants them full meaning, can run

Continues on page 4

Edward J. O'Boyle, PhD

A Senior Research Associate affiliated with Mayo Research Institute. He specializes in research that centers attention on persons as economic agents in which he replaces the individual and individualism of mainstream economics which are rooted in the 17-18th century Enlightenment and the script stage of human communication with person and personalism which spring from the electronic stage of human communication. He refers to this different way of thinking about economic affairs as personalist economics. He has published most recently in the *Journal of Markets and Morality*, the *International Journal of Social Economics*, the *Review of Social Economy*, the *Forum for Social Economics*, and the *American Review of Political Economy*. He is a past president of the Association for Social Economics. Contact info Phone: 318-396-5779 - Email: edoboyle@earthlink.net - Web site: www.mayoresearch.org

wild, leading to an escalation of demands which is effectively unlimited and indiscriminate (§ 43).

► *The principle of subsidiarity must remain closely linked to the principle of solidarity and vice versa*, since the former without the latter gives way to social privatism, while the latter without the former gives way to paternalist social assistance that is demeaning to those in need (§ 58; emphasis in the original).

► Yet we must not underestimate the disturbing scenarios that threaten our future, or the powerful new instruments that the “culture of death” has at its disposal. To the tragic and widespread scourge of abortion we may well have to add in the future – indeed it is already surreptitiously present – the systematic eugenic programming of births. At the other end of the spectrum, the pro-euthanasia mindset is making inroads as an equally damaging assertion of control over life that under certain circumstances is deemed no longer worth living (§ 75).

► *Openness to life is at the centre of true development* (§ 28; emphasis in the original).

► Because it is a gift received by everyone, charity in truth is a force that builds community, it brings all people together without imposing barriers or limits (§ 34).

► The right to food, like the right to water, has an important place within the pursuit of other rights, beginning with the fundamental right to life (§ 27).

► It is not by isolation that man establishes his worth, but by placing himself in relation with others and with God (§ 53).

► If there is a lack of respect for the right to life and a natural death, if human conception, gestation and birth are made artificial, if human embryos are sacrificed to research, the conscience of society ends up losing the concept of human ecology and, along with it, that of environmental ecology (§ 51).

► By considering reciprocity as the heart of what it is to be a human being, *subsidiarity is the most effective antidote against any form of all-encompassing welfare state* (§ 57; emphasis added).

Implications for Economics

Our reading of *Caritas in Veritate* yields the following propositions for economics.

► Economic affairs are determined not by the market – supply and demand -- which in the end is only a manner of speaking, but by living, breathing human beings acting in economic affairs. The rational thoroughly self-interested economic man known in neo-classical economics as *homo economicus* is not an accurate representation of the economic agent.

Economy and finance, as instruments, can be used

badly when those at the helm are motivated by purely selfish ends ...Therefore it is not the instrument that must be called to account, but individuals, their moral consequence and their personal and social responsibility (§ 36; see also §§ 45, 53, 78).

► Lack of trust is a serious problem in economic affairs.

Without internal forms of solidarity and mutual trust, the market cannot completely fulfill its proper economic function. And today it is this trust which has ceased to exist, and the loss of trust is a grave loss (§ 35; emphasis in the original).

► Humans inevitably are valued instrumentally in economics (market determined wages do this). In life, however, they must be valued as persons made in the “image of God.”

Much in fact depends on the underlying system of morality. On this subject the Church’s social doctrine can make a specific contribution, since it is based on man’s creation “in the image of God” (Genesis 1:27), a datum which gives rise to the inviolable dignity of the human person and the transcendent value of natural moral norms (§ 45).

► Milton Friedman among others is wrong in arguing that the only purpose of the company is to make profits for its owners. Profits are a means rather than an end and profit maximization is not a universal motivation.

What should be avoided is a speculative *use of financial resources* that yields to the temptation of seeking only short-term profit, without regard for the long-term sustainability of the enterprise, its benefit to the real economy and attention to the advancement, in suitable and appropriate ways, of further economic initiatives in countries in need of development (§ 40; emphasis in the original).

► The subprime mortgage mess brought to light serious abuses underscoring the need for limits on economic agents acting in financial affairs.

The weakest members of society should be helped to defend themselves against usury, just as poor peoples should be helped to derive real benefit from micro-credit, in order to discourage the exploitation that is possible in these two areas (§ 65).

Financiers must rediscover the genuinely ethical foundation of their activity, so as not to abuse the sophisticated instruments which can serve to betray the interests of savers (§ 65).

Continues on page 5

Implications for Globalization and Economic Development

Benedict's *Caritas in Veritate* is in large measure a comment on and extension of Paul VI's 1967 encyclical *Populorum Progressio*. Chapter One of Benedict's encyclical is devoted entirely to message of *Populorum Progressio* which is cited 45 times in a total of 159 endnotes.

► Early on in *Caritas in Veritate* Benedict warns of the extraordinary risks associated with globalization which Paul VI had foreseen in part but not the speed with which it has propelled world economic affairs.

...without the guidance of charity in truth, [globalization] could cause unprecedented damage and create new divisions within the human family" (§ 33).

The processes of globalization, suitably understood and directed, open up the unprecedented possibility of large-scale redistribution of wealth on a world-wide scale; if badly directed, however, they can lead to an increase in poverty and inequality, and could even trigger a global crisis (§ 42).

► Benedict offers two fundamental remedies to meet the challenges posed by what he calls "the *explosion of worldwide interdependence*" (§ 33; emphasis in the original). The first resides in human reason.

[The challenge relates to] *broadening the scope of reason and making it capable of knowing and directing these powerful new forces*, animating them with the perspective of that "civilization of love" which seed God has planted in every people, in every culture (§ 33; emphasis in the original).

The second inheres in human values.

Development is impossible without upright men and women, without financiers and politicians whose consciences are finely tuned to the requirements of the common good. Both professional competence and moral consistency are necessary. When technology is allowed to take over, the result is confusion between ends and means, such that the sole criterion for action in business is thought to be the maximization of profits, in politics the consolidation of power, and in science the findings of research (§ 71; emphasis in the original).

Benedict thereby is directly challenging economics to re-think the way it understands and represents the behavior of the firm in the abstract and the role of the firm in global economic affairs.

► Benedict calls attention to a very serious problem which besets even economically advanced nations and which threatens to undermine their prosperity.

...formerly prosperous nations are presently passing through a phase of uncertainty and in some cases decline, precisely because of their falling birth rates; this has become a crucial problem for highly affluent societies. The decline in births, falling at times beneath the so-called "replacement level," also puts a strain on social welfare systems, increases their cost, eats into the savings and hence the financial resources needed for investment, reduces the availability of labourers, and narrows the "brain pool" upon which nations can draw for their needs (§ 44).

In this regard, he is not alone. In the United States, for example, the Social Security retirement system operates on a pay-as-you-go basis which means that the current generation of retired workers has their benefits paid through the contributions of the current generation of active workers and their employers. The trustees of that system stated most recently that the surplus in the system's trust fund will be depleted entirely by 2037 because there will be too few workers supporting a retired population which is growing rapidly due to medical advances which extend the lives of the elderly and the baby boom generation which started to become eligible for retirement benefits in 2008. The Medicare hospital insurance trust fund will be depleted by 2017 (*Status of the Social Security and Medicare Programs*).

► Conservation and redistribution of energy resources, Benedict states, are critically important to "the care and preservation of the environment" and to the economies of both developing nations and those which are more advanced (§ 49).

The technologically advanced societies can and must lower their domestic energy consumption, either through an evolution in manufacturing methods or through greater ecological sensitivity among their citizens ... What is also needed, though, is a worldwide redistribution of energy resources, so that countries lacking those resources can have access to them (§ 49).

He provides no details as to how the redistribution of energy resources is to be accomplished. However, by stating that the fate of resource-poor countries should not "be left in the hands of whoever is first to claim the spoils" (§ 49) he implies his support for some type of supra-national organization to address the redistribution question and puts himself at odds with advocates of market-based solutions.

► Benedict underscores one other area of great consequence in global economic affairs: the outsourcing of production.

Continues on page 6

... the so-called outsourcing of production can weaken the company's sense of responsibility towards the stakeholders – namely the suppliers, the consumers, the natural environment and broader society – in favour of the shareholders, who are not tied to a specific geographical area and who therefore enjoy extraordinary mobility... Even if the ethical considerations that currently inform debate on the social responsibility of the corporate world are not all acceptable from the perspective of the Church's social doctrine, there is nevertheless a growing conviction that *business management cannot concern itself only with the interests of the proprietors, but must also assume responsibility for all the other stakeholders who contribute to the life of the business*: the workers, the clients, the suppliers of various elements of production, the community of reference (§ 40; emphasis in the original).

Benedict for sure is not alone in calling for businesses to demonstrate greater concern for stakeholders in everyday decision-making. Even so, this admonition will not favor with libertarians and neo-classical economists who insist that the firm's decision-making process rests solely on the property rights of the shareholders and nothing, not even the needs of anyone else whose fortunes are tied to the firm, should impinge on those rights.

What's New, What's Re-affirmed?

► Two assertions in *Caritas in Veritate* appear to be entirely new and unprecedented in the history of public statements from the papacy. The one relates to intellectual property rights in health care, the other to subsidiarity in fiscal affairs. The first contains no details, the second only the barest of details. Both are sure to be controversial.

On the part of rich countries there is excessive zeal for protecting knowledge through an unduly rigid assertion of the right to intellectual property, especially in the field of health care (§ 22).

Presumably this relates to patent rights on pharmaceutical products which due to that protection are priced so that they are unaffordable to those in poor countries who need them the most. Those rights, of course, are property rights and refining and restricting them makes the development of new pharmaceutical products even more problematical.

One possible approach to development aid would be to apply effectively what is known as fiscal subsidiarity, allowing citizens to decide how to allocate a portion of the taxes they pay to the State. Provided it does not degenerate into the promotion of special interests, this can help stimulate forms of welfare solidarity from

below, with obvious benefits in the area of solidarity for development as well (§ 60).

One can see quite readily how the fiscal subsidiarity argument might be used by groups of citizens committed to limiting military expenditures, funding for abortions, and the like. How it would be used by groups committed to enabling the economic development of poor countries is a much more problematical and challenging matter.

► *Caritas in Veritate* re-affirmed two themes which have a long history in Catholic social teaching: charity and the common good. Our comments in the following necessarily are extended due to the linkage between the common good and the principle of subsidiarity and the various meanings given to charity, social charity, and solidarity.

Citing *Gaudium et Spes*, Benedict in *Caritas in Veritate* expresses the common good as follows:

Beside the good of the individual, there is a good that is linked to living in society: the common good. It is the good of "all of us," made up of individuals, families and intermediate groups who together constitute society (§ 7).

Even so, not all human needs are common needs. Since every human being is a unique, one-of-a-kind individual, certain needs strictly speaking are individual needs and wants which are met or satisfied by eyeglasses, shoes, baby formula, engagement rings, botox treatment of facial wrinkles, muscle cars, and the like. To differentiate them from common goods, we refer to them as personal goods.

Accepting subsidiarity as a governing organizational principle, it follows that the common good is served first by private goods and then by public goods as necessary. It is not by definition served by the production of personal goods. By demanding "all that is necessary for the common good,"³ social justice is served at times by public goods but preferentially by private goods.

Two key problems remain. What to do when the economic system does not produce all that is necessary for the common good? What to do when it does not produce all of the necessary personal goods? The first is a problem of production. The second is a problem of distribution.

The production problem requires an ongoing public discourse on the very structure of our economic institutions, especially the role of private enterprises vs. public agencies in the process of production. The solution might lie in public agencies offering private enterprises assistance to produce the goods necessary to serve the common good. Or it might involve public agencies taking on a more aggressive regulatory role. It might

Continues on page 7

extend to direct government control of private enterprises, ownership of those enterprises, or both. Alternatively, it could involve deregulation and privatization in order to free private enterprises from a government sector that has grown too large to be effective. Subsidiarity can be helpful in this discourse. Even so, the discourse can run on for years as it has in the United States regarding the health care system.

In an economy such as the United States which produces goods of all kinds in abundance, an insufficiency of personal goods is not a production problem, it is not a social justice problem. It is instead a distribution problem, a problem of poverty. As so ably demonstrated by the likes of Mother Teresa and her community of nuns, relieving this insufficiency often is prompted by the *theological* virtue of charity “by which we love God above all things for his own sake, and our neighbor as ourselves for the love of God” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, § 822). At the same time, the *natural* virtue of caring infused with the conviction that every human being is precious motivates many others to alleviate the very same insufficiency. Confusion spreads even further when it is not clear what a person means when he/she uses the term social charity. Does that person refer to the theological virtue of charity or the natural virtue of caring?

We turn next to the meaning of solidarity and how it relates to charity. In *Rerum Novarum* (§ 14), Pope Leo XIII referred to the family as “part of the commonwealth” and made clear that Christians are expected to help any family in need as “a duty, not of justice (save in extreme cases), but of Christian charity – a duty not enforced by human law” (§ 22). Here the Holy Father clearly means the theological virtue.

According to Ederer (p.107), the language “social charity” originated in section 88 of *Quadragesimo Anno* wherein Pope Pius XI meant neither the theological virtue nor caring. Rather, the Pontiff’s intent was to identify it with solidarity. To underscore this important point, Ederer (p.114) asserts that the concept of solidarity was developed at length by Pope John Paul II in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*.

In that encyclical John Paul says that there is a “growing awareness of interdependence among individuals and nations,” a transformation which is “acquiring a moral connotation.”

[Solidarity] ...is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people ...it is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, § 38).

...it has been possible to identify many points of contact between solidarity and charity, which is the distinguishing mark of Christ’s disciples. In the light of faith, solidarity seeks to go beyond itself, to take on

the specifically Christian dimension of total gratuity, forgiveness and reconciliation ...One’s neighbor must therefore be loved, even if an enemy, with the same love which the Lord loves him or her ... (§ 40).

In *Centesimus Annus* (§ 10) John Paul identifies solidarity with social charity. In *Caritas in Veritate* Benedict employs “solidarity” frequently and attributes it to John Paul. He never once uses “social charity” and offers the following insight to clarify the difference between justice and solidarity both of which are directed toward the common good.

In the global era, economic activity cannot prescind from gratuitousness, which fosters and disseminates solidarity and responsibility for justice and the common good among different economic players. It is clearly a specific and profound form of economic democracy. Solidarity is first and foremost a sense of responsibility on the part of everyone with regard to everyone, and it cannot therefore be merely delegated to the State. While in the past it was possible to argue that justice had to come first and gratuitousness could follow afterwards, as a complement, today it is clear that without gratuitousness, there can be no justice in the first place... Charity in truth ...requires that shape and structure be given to those types of economic initiative which, without rejecting profit, aim at a higher goal than the mere logic of the exchange of equivalents, of profit as an end in itself (§ 38).

What’s Ambiguous, Questionable, What’s Excluded?

At first reading, parts of *Caritas in Veritate* seem to be either ambiguous or questionable, especially as regards to solidarity, poverty and unemployment, social justice and contributive justice, and pawnbroking.

As stated in the preceding section “social charity” does not appear in the encyclical. Neither does “preferential option for the poor” but Benedict in effect affirms this option by selecting development as the theme of his first social encyclical in which poverty encompasses more than just an insufficiency of materials goods to meet human material needs. To Benedict development means all that is necessary for integral human development.

This dynamic of charity received and given is what gives rise to the Church’s social teaching which is *caritas in veritate in re sociali*: the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s love in society...Development, social well-being, the search for a satisfactory solution to the grave socio-economic problems besetting humanity, all need this truth (§ 5; emphasis in the original).

Continues on page 8

► As to ambiguity, Benedict refers to “international solidarity,” “social solidarity,” and “welfare solidarity” (§ 60) without clarifying how those terms differ from “solidarity” as defined by John Paul. The use of these terms seems to relate somehow to the principle of subsidiarity.

Further, in addressing regulation of the financial sector he refers approvingly to pawnbroking (§ 65) without telling the reader that he means something substantially different than the current practice. It seems that Benedict means a no-interest loan which is secured by an item that is pawned and in which the borrower is expected to make a donation to the church – a practice which apparently originated in Italy in the 15th century (see “Pawnbroking”). Thus pawnbroking in *Caritas in Veritate* means charity.

The emphasis in contributive justice on the duty of the member to the group -- insofar as a person receives benefits from a group that person has a duty to maintain and support the group -- and the duty of the person under social justice to contribute all that is necessary for the common good suggest that social justice and contributive justice are identical. Apparently Benedict embraces this view (§ 35). If indeed he does, we think this is unfortunate because we see social justice as a package deal requiring conformance to the demands not just of contributive justice, but distributive justice and commutative justice as well.⁴

► In one short section of *Caritas in Veritate* (§ 63) Benedict states his intention to address the problem of development in the context of poverty and unemployment. Aside from clearly expressing his purpose, Benedict engages in such generalities as “a global coalition in favour of ‘decent work’,” “essential dignity of every man and woman,” “work that enables the worker to be respected and free from any form of discrimination,” without offering any specifics.

In the following section of *Caritas in Veritate* (§ 64) he seems to place his confidence in unions. But how does one address the problem of workplace injustice in a developed market economy when producers are free to outsource production and work to developing countries with much lower labor standards? Further compounding this problem for unions in developed nations is Benedict’s requirement that technologically advanced societies share their energy resources with other countries (see § 49) when those very resources are the wherewithal for increased production and better wages, hours, and working conditions?

If without charity there is no justice (see § 38), how is it possible to achieve justice in a workplace in an impoverished secular country? If trust no longer exists in market economies (see § 35), how does one achieve justice in an advanced market economy?

Evangelization is the Answer

If “without God man neither knows which way to go, nor even understands who he is” (see § 78), is justice in the workplace finally a problem of evangelization? This indeed is what Benedict asserts at the very end of his encyclical.

Only if we are aware of our calling, as individuals and as a community, to be part of God’s family as his sons and daughters, will we be able to generate a new vision and muster new energy in the service of a truly integral humanism. The greatest service to development, then, is a Christian humanism that enkindles charity and takes its lead from truth, accepting both as a lasting gift from God (§ 78).

Development needs Christians with their arms raised toward God in prayer, Christians moved by the knowledge that truth-filled love, *caritas in veritate*, from which authentic development proceeds, is not produced by us, but given to us. For this reason, even in the most difficult and complex times, besides recognizing what is happening, we must above all else turn to God (§ 79; emphasis in the original).

This is Benedict’s message of hope for the impoverished nations of the world. It was the message of ITEST founder Jesuit Robert Brungs in 2002:

As long as I can remember I have been impressed by the circumstances of the changing of water into wine at Cana ... the first thing that caught my interest years ago was the vast quantity of wine that resulted from Mary’s intervention. The six stone water jars held about 20 to 30 gallons each. The evangelist tells us that the servants filled the jars to the brim with water, as Jesus had told them ... about a 120 to 150 gallons of water. Either this was a heavy-drinking crowd, a big wedding, or God was indeed profligate with all his gift of wine. I prefer the latter explanation: God is indeed profligate with all His gifts (Brungs, p. 2).

Several years earlier and possibly reflecting on the very same Scriptural passage, Brungs argued that the real barrier to economic development is a shortage of human imagination.

I find it hard to believe that God was so miserly that he created a universe of shortage. My intuition is that there is no shortage of God’s gifts; the shortage is our lack of imagination (Brungs, p. 202).

We’ve tried top-down economic development models based on the usual premise of a scarcity of economic resources with only mixed results especially in subSaharan Africa. Perhaps it’s time to find ways to implement Brungs’ bottom-up model based on the unusual premise of a scarcity of human imagination.

Continues on page 9

His premise likely would have won favor with maverick economist Joseph Schumpeter who was described as “the great man who restored the human person as the dynamic factor in the explanation of economic activity”(Waters 1952,p. 19) and who identified the entrepreneur as the key agent in economic affairs whose efforts he famously characterized as “creative destruction.” Known to be favorably impressed with Pius XI’s ideas on social reorganization as set forth in *Quadragesimo Anno* (Waters 1961, pp. 136-137), Schumpeter conceivably might have agreed with *Gaudium et Spes* as quoted by Benedict in *Caritas in Veritate*: “Man is the source, the focus and the aim of all economic and social life” (§25).

Endnotes

1. For more on personalist economics go to www.mayoresearch.org.
2. This repeats the message in Benedict XVI’s 2007 encyclical *Spe Salvi*, § 35.
3. See the Latin text of Pope Pius XI’s *Divini Redemptoris* which translated into English defines social justice as follows: “Now it is of the very essence of social justice to demand from each individual all that is necessary for the common good” (emphasis added). The English text mistakenly defines social justice in these words: “Now it is of the very essence of social justice to demand for each individual all that is necessary for the common good” (emphasis added). The Vatican website is the source of both texts.
4. Distributive justice demands that the head of a group distribute the benefits and burdens of the group among its members in some equal fashion. Commutative justice demands of both parties to exchange things of equal value and to impose equal burdens on one another. For more on all three principles of economic justice, see Chapter Seven of my “Personalist Economics: Putting the Acting Person in the Center of Economic Affairs” available at www.mayoresearch.org/files/TEXTsep222007.pdf.

References

- Benedict XVI. *Caritas in Veritate*, 2009, http://vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html (8 July 2009).
- Benedict XVI. *Spe Salve*, 2007, http://vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20071130_spe_salve_en.html (23 July 2009).
- Brungs, Robert A. *Written in Our Flesh: Eyes Toward Jerusalem*, compiled and edited by Sr. Marianne Postiglione, RSM, St. Louis: ITEST Faith/Science Press, 2008.

- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994.
- Ederer, Rupert. “A Principle for Economics.” *The Catholic Social Science Review* 13 (2008): 107-116.
- John Paul II. *Centesimus Annus*, 1991, http://vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html (10 July 2009).
- John Paul II. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 1987, http://vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis_en.html (10 July 2009).
- Leo XIII. *Rerum Novarum*, 1891, http://vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html (9 July 2009).
- “Pawnbroking,” <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pawnbroker> (15 September 2009).
- Pius XI. *Quadragesimo Anno*, 1931, http://vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html (26 June 2009).
- Pius XI. *Divini Redemptoris*, 1937, Latin text, http://vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19031937_divini-redemptoris_lt.html (30 June 2009).
- Pius XI. *Divini Redemptoris*, 1937, English text, http://vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19031937_divini-redemptoris_en.html (26 June 2009).
- Status of the Social Security and Medicare Programs: A Summary of the 2009 Annual Reports of the Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees*, available at www.ssa.gov/OACT/TRSUM/index.html (accessed September 14, 2009).
- Waters, William R. *Entrepreneurship, dualism, and causality: An appreciation of the work of Joseph A. Schumpeter*, dissertation, Washington DC: Georgetown University, 1952.
- Waters, William R. “Schumpeter’s Contributions and Catholic Social Thought,” *Review of Social Economy*, XIX (1961): 133-141.

“...If justice is the filter, then caring and charity are high grades of oil. They allow economic affairs to be conducted more effectively... to deal effectively with dilemmas, increase performance and raise standards more quickly.”

– Edward J. O’Boyle, Ph.D.
ITEST Conference - September 2003

The Third Way

The following editorial published in the January 3, 2010 issue of the **Our Sunday Visitor** deserves a reading by those who do not yet subscribe to this informative national Catholic weekly paper. Printed with permission from the Editorial Board of **Our Sunday Visitor**, 200 Noll Plaza, Huntington, Indiana 46750.

This may come as a surprise: Pope Benedict XVI has become one of the leading international voices calling for environmental protection. The measures he advocates are challenging but balanced — and likely to work. So why are they falling on deaf ears?

A papal diplomat took the pontiff's proposal last month to the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, where nearly 200 countries were gathered to try to come up with an accord to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

But the meeting fell apart after two weeks of chaos and contentiousness, with walkouts from developing nations, a firestorm of controversy over a leaked backroom agreement between developed nations, a damaging diplomatic flap between China and the United States, and hundreds of protester arrests. And it took place against the backdrop of new revelations of a rift in the scientific community.

The same divides that fracture the secular debate can be found in Church circles as well. In some Catholic circles, there is a kind of eco-theology that is saturated with New Age concepts and seems almost to divinize the earth. It often adopts the language and causes of secular environmentalism. On the other side, there can be a politicized skepticism that seems eager to dismiss every environmental concern and pit consumer and business agendas against any effort to address systemic environmental concerns. Amid all this debate and rancor, Pope Benedict offers a welcome alternative environmental vision. He has developed it in several speeches and messages over the past couple of years, but it reaches a new level of articulateness in his message—released during last month's Copenhagen climate summit—for the Jan. 1, 2010 World Day of Peace.

It is revolutionary primarily for its common sense, but it may also surprise many Catholics who might think the Church is agnostic on this issue.



First, the pontiff takes it for granted that care for the environment is essential and “of immense consequence.” The earth is God’s gift to us, and thus is deserving of our respect.

Second, creation is God’s gift to all mankind. Therefore we must care for it not only for ourselves, but also for future generations and for the poor among us.

Third, while industrialized countries bear a special responsibility for situations of ecological crisis they have caused, developing nations are not exempt from adopting policies that protect the environment.

Fourth, any policy adopted to protect the environment must

respect the inviolability of the dignity of the human person.

Finally and most uncomfortably, the pope urges us to “more sober lifestyles” with reduced energy consumption.

“It is becoming more and more evident that the issue of environmental degradation challenges us to examine our lifestyle and the prevailing models of consumption and production, which are often unsustainable from a social, environmental and even economic point of view,” the pope writes.

North and south, east and west, rich and poor, we are all in this together, the pope tells us. Rich nations cannot expect that their lifestyles and patterns of consumption will not change. Poor nations cannot ignore environmental concerns and the related impact on the health of their own people and of the planet.

Copenhagen may have failed, but the environmental problems we face have not disappeared. Catholics would do well to start 2010 by reading the pope’s World Peace Day message.

For the entire text of the pope’s message see: <http://bit.ly/7Ev231>

*The editorial board chose to reprint this section of the newsletter from the Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation, published by an Evangelical group consisting of theologians, pastors, scientists, economists and lay leaders committed to addressing the challenges of environmental stewardship and economic development for the very poor. The following contains an executive summary of a much longer document formally released recently and reflects the position espoused by E. Cal Beisner, an essayist at our ITEST 2009 conference on **Environmental Stewardship in the Judeo-Christian Tradition**.*

Whether or not you agree that global warming is a fact, you will no doubt find this article thought-provoking, to say the least. It might even inspire you to send us your thoughts and comments.

An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming

The Cornwall Alliance

[Editor's note: On December 3 at an event at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C., the Cornwall Alliance released the two most important documents we have ever produced: An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming (2 pages) and A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming (76 pages), which provides solid justification for the Declaration.--ECB]

Preamble

As governments consider policies to fight alleged man-made global warming, evangelical leaders have a responsibility to be well informed, and then to speak out. *A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming* demonstrates that many of these proposed policies would destroy jobs and impose trillions of dollars in costs to achieve no net benefits. They could be implemented only by enormous and dangerous expansion of government control over private life. Worst of all, by raising energy prices and hindering economic development, they would slow or stop the rise of the world's poor out of poverty and so condemn millions to premature death.

What We Believe

1. We believe Earth and its ecosystems—created by God's intelligent design and infinite power[1] and sustained by His faithful providence[2]—are robust, resilient, self-regulating, and self-correcting, admirably suited for human flourishing, and displaying His glory.[3] Earth's climate system is no exception. Recent global warming is one of many natural cycles of warming and cooling in geologic history.
2. We believe abundant, affordable energy is indispensable to human flourishing, particularly to societies which are rising out of abject poverty and the high rates of disease and premature death that accompany it. With present technologies, fossil and nuclear fuels are indispensable if energy is to be abundant and affordable.
3. We believe mandatory reductions in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, achievable mainly by greatly reduced use of fossil fuels, will greatly increase the price of energy and harm economies.
4. We believe such policies will harm the poor more than others because the poor spend a higher percentage of their income on energy and desperately need economic growth to rise out of poverty and overcome its miseries.

What We Deny

1. We deny that Earth and its ecosystems are the fragile and unstable products of chance, and particularly that Earth's climate system is vulnerable to dangerous alteration because of minuscule changes in atmospheric chemistry. Recent warming was neither abnormally large nor abnormally rapid. There is no convincing scientific evidence that human contribution to greenhouse gases is causing dangerous global warming.[4]
2. We deny that alternative, renewable fuels can, with present or near-term technology, replace fossil and nuclear fuels, either wholly or in significant part, to provide the abundant, affordable energy necessary to sustain prosperous economies or overcome poverty.
3. We deny that carbon dioxide—essential to all plant growth—is a pollutant. Reducing greenhouse gases cannot achieve significant reductions in future global temperatures, and the costs of the policies would far exceed the benefits.
4. We deny that such policies, which amount to a regressive tax, comply with the Biblical requirement of protecting the poor from harm and oppression.

Continues on page 12

A Call to Action

In light of these facts,

1. We call on our fellow Christians to practice creation stewardship out of Biblical conviction, adoration for our Creator, and love for our fellow man—especially the poor.
2. We call on Christian leaders to understand the truth about climate change and embrace Biblical thinking, sound science, and careful economic analysis in creation stewardship.
3. We call on political leaders to adopt policies that protect human liberty, make energy more affordable, and free the poor to rise out of poverty, while abandoning fruitless, indeed harmful policies to control global temperature.

Endorsement

While our signatures express our endorsement only of this Declaration and do not imply agreement with every point in A Renewed Call to Truth, we believe that document provides ample justification for it. We call on scholars and experts to join us in signing this Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming.

Notes

1. Genesis 1
2. Genesis 8:21-22
3. Psalm 19:1-6
4. See, for example, the Petition Project, signed by over 31,000 scientists.

To endorse this Declaration, please go to An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming and complete the endorsement form there. The Cornwall Alliance welcomes endorsements by evangelicals and non-evangelicals and, to ensure no confusion, provides on the form a way for endorsers to self-identify as one or the other.

A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming

Dr. Craig Vincent Mitchell, Dr. Roy W. Spencer, & Dr. Cornelis van Kooten

[Editor's note: A Renewed Call to Truth, released along with An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming, provides ample justification for its claims. The work of three lead chapter authors—theologian Dr. Craig Vincent Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Ethics at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; climatologist Dr. Roy W. Spencer, Principal Research Scientist in Climatology at the University of Alabama, Huntsville, and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer aboard NASA's Aqua Satellite; and economist Dr. Cornelis van Kooten, Professor of Economics and Research Chair in Environmental Studies and Climate, University of Victoria, British Columbia—plus twenty-five distinguished contributing authors and reviewers, drawing from over 200 scholarly sources, the Renewed Call to Truth sets forth the Biblical worldview, theology, and ethics; the sciences of climate, geology, oceanography, biology, and ecology; and the economics of population, environment, energy, and development that must be understood in order to devise sound policy that will benefit all of mankind, especially the poor, while exercising godly, responsible stewardship of the Earth and its ecosystems. Executive summaries of the three chapters (theology, science, and economics) are available online. Below is the Executive Summary of the complete Renewed Call to Truth.--ECB]

Executive Summary

The world is in the grip of an idea: that burning fossil fuels to provide affordable, abundant energy is causing global warming that will be so dangerous that we must stop it by reducing our use of fossil fuels, no matter the cost.

Is that idea true?

We believe not.

Continues on page 13

We believe that idea—we'll call it “global warming alarmism”—fails the tests of theology, science, and economics. It rests on poor theology, with a worldview of the Earth and its climate system contrary to that taught in the Bible. It rests on poor science that confuses theory with observation, computer models with reality, and model results with evidence, all while ignoring the lessons of climate history. It rests on poor economics, failing to do reasonable cost/benefit analysis, ignoring or underestimating the costs of reducing fossil fuel use while exaggerating the benefits. And it bears fruit in unethical policy that would

- destroy millions of jobs.
- cost trillions of dollars in lost economic production.
- slow, stop, or reverse economic growth.
- reduce the standard of living for all but the elite few who are well positioned to benefit from laws that unfairly advantage them at the expense of most businesses and all consumers.
- endanger liberty by putting vast new powers over private, social, and market life in the hands of national and international governments.
- condemn the world's poor to generations of continued misery characterized by rampant disease and premature death.

In return for all these sacrifices, what will the world get? At most a negligible, undetectable reduction in global average temperature a hundred years from now.

Our examination of theology, worldview, and ethics (Chapter One) finds that global warming alarmism wrongly views the Earth and its ecosystems as the fragile product of chance, not the robust, resilient, self-regulating, and self-correcting product of God's wise design and powerful sustaining. It rests on and promotes a view of human beings as threats to Earth's flourishing rather than the bearers of God's image, crowned with glory and honor, and given a mandate to act as stewards over the Earth—filling, subduing, and ruling it for God's glory and mankind's benefit. It either wrongly assumes that the environment can flourish only if humanity forfeits economic advance and prosperity or ignores economic impacts altogether. And in its rush to impose draconian reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, it ignores the destructive impact of that policy on the world's poor.

Our examination of the science of global warming (Chapter Two) finds that global warming alarmism wrongly claims that recent temperature changes have been greater and more rapid than those of the past and therefore

must be manmade, not natural. It exaggerates the influence of manmade greenhouse gases on global temperature and ignores or underestimates the influence of natural cycles. It mistakenly takes the output of computer climate models as evidence when it is only predictions based on hypotheses that must be tested by observation. It falsely claims overwhelming scientific consensus in favor of the hypothesis of dangerous manmade warming (ignoring tens of thousands of scientists who disagree) and then falsely claims that such consensus proves the hypothesis and justifies policies to fight it. It seeks to intimidate or demonize scientific skeptics rather than welcoming their work as of the very essence of scientific inquiry: putting hypotheses to the test rather than blindly embracing them.

Our examination of the economics of global warming alarmism (Chapter Three) finds that it exaggerates the harms from global warming and ignores or underestimates the benefits not only from warming but also from increased atmospheric carbon dioxide. It grossly underestimates the costs and overestimates the benefits of policies meant to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. It exaggerates the technical feasibility and underestimates the costs of alternative fuels to replace fossil fuels in providing the abundant, affordable energy necessary for wealth creation and poverty reduction. It ignores the urgent need to provide cleaner energy to the roughly two billion poor in the world whose use of wood and dung as primary cooking and heating fuels causes millions of premature deaths and hundreds of millions of debilitating respiratory diseases every year. It fails to recognize that the slowed economic development resulting from its own policies will cost many times more human lives than would the warming it is meant to avert.

In light of all these findings, we conclude that

- human activity has negligible influence on global temperature,
- the influence is not dangerous,
- there is no need to mandate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental and energy policy should remove, not build, obstacles to the abundant, affordable energy necessary to lift the world's poor out of poverty and sustain prosperity for all.

We also gladly join others in embracing An Evangelical Declaration on Global Warming.

Continues on page 14

COP-15: The Copenhagen Round of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

E. Cal Beisner

By the time this newsletter wings its way through the Internet to you, I'll be winging my way to Copenhagen as a non-governmental organization representative during the climate treaty negotiations there. Expectations for Conference of the Parties-15 (COP-15) have swung dramatically up and down in recent weeks: it would result in a strong, binding treaty limiting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions worldwide; talks would collapse and no treaty would emerge; non-binding commitments would arise as the basis for negotiating a binding treaty next year in Mexico; or, most recently, with the release of the so-called "Danish text," perhaps back to collapsing talks and no treaty.

Rather than play prognosticator, I thought I would simply share a few general thoughts about the conference.

First, it seems as if organizers, the overwhelming majority of whom are bureaucrats and diplomats, not scientists, are blissfully ignorant of important scientific findings over the last few years that convincingly demonstrate that climate sensitivity (how much warming can be expected from doubled carbon dioxide after feedbacks) is very slight—probably less than one-sixth what the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the 21 computer climate models on which it relies assume. (For discussion, including references to the studies, see chapter 2, "The Science of Global Warming," in the Cornwall Alliance's Renewed Call to Truth.) Consequently, anthropogenic warming will be minuscule and certainly not dangerous. There is simply no indication that treaty promoters have paid any attention to the developing science over the last decade.

Second, I am stunned by the blatant elitism and utter disregard for the world's poor evident in the organizers' blind rush to enact a treaty requiring drastic reductions in GHG emissions. The roughly 2 billion people in the world who have no electricity in their homes and therefore must burn wood and dung as their main cooking and heating fuels and do without all the other conveniences of electricity suffer terribly from their plight—debilitating and often deadly respiratory diseases, many hours every day of lost potential work time devoted to finding and carrying their fuels; absence of light for night-time study and work; lack of refrigeration to prevent food spoilage and resulting hunger and disease; stifling heat in summer and numbing cold in winter; and consequent high rates of infant and child mortality, maternal mortality, premature death, and widespread disease, all of which in turn recycle

their poverty. These people desperately need electricity, and fossil fuels—the culprits blamed for most GHG emissions—are, besides nuclear, by far the cheapest way to bring it to them. It is simply impossible to achieve the GHG emission reductions the alarmists demand while bringing abundant, affordable energy to the world's poor. But the treaty promoters seem either utterly blind or utterly unconcerned. They want their emission reductions, the poor be damned—even though the best scientific studies conclude that temperature reductions from them will be minimal. The exposure of the "Danish text," an alternative treaty drafted secretly by negotiators from wealthy nations in the absence of those from poor nations, which would more strictly bind poorer nations' emissions and shift power away from the UN and toward the World Bank, and to which developing nations' leaders have reacted with thoroughly justified anger, buttresses this concern.

Third, I share the concern of many that the global enforcement structure necessary to give any emissions reduction treaty force would, because we use energy in everything we do from the most public to the most private, necessitate intolerable intrusions on privacy and restrictions on liberty for individuals, businesses, and voluntary associations, and a dangerous concentration of power in the hands of a global bureaucracy almost absolutely unaccountable to citizens of any nation. As a result, it would undermine national sovereignty. Why should that be of concern to Christians? For the same reason it was a concern to America's Founding Fathers, who, with their strong Christian background, understood that because all men are sinners, "Power tends to corrupt," as Lord Acton put it, "and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Our Founders gave us a government with separation and division of powers, checks and balances, and a federal system with a central, national government, state governments, county governments, and municipal governments, with power decentralized and citizens left with the option of leaving a jurisdiction they found intolerable and migrating to one they preferred. But where do you migrate to when the oppressive government is global? We don't have another habitable planet to colonize.

Fourth, the mad rush to emissions reductions seems oblivious to cost/benefit considerations. The best economic analyses consistently find that the benefits to be gained from the trillions of dollars in direct spending and lost

Continues on page 15

production to achieve the emissions cuts will be only a tiny fraction of the investment—i.e., it's all pain, no gain. (See chapter 3, "The Economics of Global Warming Policy," in the Cornwall Alliance's Renewed Call to Truth.)

Fifth and finally, "climategate" (see next item) demands a moratorium on all climate negotiations for as long as it takes to complete a thorough investigation and accounting, by independent forensic accountants and similar experts, to assess just how much this gross misconduct undermines the already dubious case for dangerous anthropogenic warming. I anticipate a serious investigation would take at least a year, probably more. That the COP-15 organizers seem intent on forging ahead with treaty negotiations in the face of this enormous scientific scandal is profound evidence that their agendas are driven not by science but by other motives. What sorts of motives? For some, global wealth redistribution (previously justified by pointing

to colonialism, or the Cold War, or Third World debt burden, and now by alleged "climate justice," the notion that developed nations' use of fossil fuels to build their economies has harmed developing nations, who deserve restitution—forgetting that the harms are speculative, while the increased crop yields caused by rising carbon dioxide levels, and the consequent greater abundance of food at lower prices, are a well-established fact.

One almost despairs of rational decision making at COP-15. It seems that the world is driven by ideology and the exaltation of passion over reason. The nineteenth-century writer Charles Mackay classically described the process in *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds*. "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge," God spoke through the Prophet Hosea (Hosea 4:6). If you're a praying person, now's the time to pray for a restoration of rationality.

"Climategate": Sad Revelation of Corruption in Climate Science

E. Cal Beisner

The exposure of thousands of emails, computer code, and other documents from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia last month demonstrates widespread corruption among leading climate alarmist scientists around the world. The documents show that these scientists have been fabricating, cherry-picking, fudging, hiding, destroying, and otherwise abusing data; intimidating dissenting scientists and journal editors who might publish their work; filtering out dissenting research from the information reviewed by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and by climate change agencies of national and state or provincial governments around the world; and violating Freedom of Information laws and scientific journal policies about data sharing and transparency—hallmarks of proper scientific method. The interdependence of CRU with the other three major surface temperature data institutions (the Global Historical Climate Network of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies) necessarily brings the credibility of their data into question as well.

Google searches just now brought me over 31 million hits on "climategate" and just over 10 million on "global warming." (The cat's out of the bag and won't be put back in.) A number of really excellent articles already have been published on it (a select few linked below), so for now I'll add only this:

- Climategate is a tragic development in the history not just of climate science but of science in general. It will seriously undermine public confidence in science and scientists, though for the most part scientists, especially those in technological fields, are doing marvelous services to humanity and the Earth.
- It will also become ammunition for postmodernists and other cynics, who insist that all truth claims are mere assertions of power—an accusation that fits the antics in climategate to a tee. That, in turn, is sad, because it will further cheapen public discourse on all subjects.
- Climategate is yet another confirmation of a central Biblical doctrine: "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). No one is infallible—not even scientists.
- And all of that means that Christians have all the more reason to practice what the Apostle Paul commands in 1 Thessalonians 5:21: "Test all things, hold fast what is good."

Here, then, are a few of the best articles (among hundreds) I've read on climategate thus far:

- Searchable Confirmed E-mails from the Climate Research Unit
- Scientists Behaving Badly - Steven F. Hayward
- The Climate E-mails and the Politics of Science - Ivan Kenneally

Continues on page 16

- The Smoking Gun At Darwin Zero - Willis Eschenbach
- ClimateGate and the Elitist Roots of Global Warming Alarmism - Roy W. Spencer
- My Top 10 Annoyances in the Climate Change Debate - Roy W. Spencer
- Climategate II: Revenge of the Climate Modelers - Roy W. Spencer
- Three Things You Absolutely Must Know About Climategate - Iain Murray
- Climategate: Follow the Money - Bret Stephens
- The Economics of Climate Change
- Rigging a Climate 'Consensus'
- Global Warming With the Lid Off
- Nothing Personal - Paul Chesser
- Understanding Climategate's Hidden Decline - Marc Sheppard

Meet the Critics: Our Permanent List

Through most of 2009, we have profiled two major scientists, in each newsletter issue, who are critics of belief in dangerous anthropogenic global warming. You'll soon find all 64 profiles at <http://cornwallalliance.org/blog/item/meet-the-critics/>.



CANCEL CHRISTMAS!

by Rocco L. Martino

Even though the Christmas Season has passed it is not too early (or late!) to take a look at this book — which I have read and enjoyed — by an ITEST member and long-time supporter, Rocco L. Martino, otherwise known as “Rocky.” You can find this at his website www.cancelchristmas.us

From the Author: Cancel Christmas! will make you laugh and make you angry. It could happen. Greed, ambition, and the misuse of taxpayer money are nothing new. This book depicts the classic struggle between might and right; and between raw power and thoughtful evaluation. For some the will of the people doesn't matter since ‘people don't count’ as one major character says in the book.

Cancel Christmas! is about character, and the conflicting emotions and forces that permeate human life —greed, fear, love, tradition, duty, and conscience. One reviewer states, “...a timeless tale that speaks volumes to all of us... a modern Christmas Carol.”

I wrote this book because I was angry at the waste in government. The so-called stimulus bill contained thousands of earmarks costing the taxpayers billions to satisfy the desires of members of Congress and not necessarily the desires or needs of the people. An attitude of owning a seat in Congress with continual succession rights seems to permeate the actions of some members. It's about time we understand what is going on. That is one of the reasons I wrote this book.

I also wrote it because I sensed an increase in assaults on morality and religious belief. We are a free country. We should not only be free to say what we wish, to worship as we wish, but equally important to be free of attacks on what we believe. That's the second reason I wrote this book.

The third reason is that I think it's about time civility and morality start returning to our daily lives. Casual sex, bendable ethics, and a me-first attitude are not what made this country great, and a champion of people in all the world. It's about time we return to basics.

Reading this book is an experience in theater. Martino limns his two-dimensional characters with the skill of an artisan bringing them to the third dimension with extraordinary color. They literally dance from the page to the stage. Sister Marianne Postiglione, RSM, ITEST