

*Pollution
and the
Death of
Man*



FRANCIS A.
SCHAEFFER

Afterword by Udo W. Middelman

“In this insightful little book, Schaeffer provides a well-considered theological context for environmental discussions. Christians will differ in particular applications of the principles he expounds, but few will deny that he provides the right framework.”

Fred Zaspel, Executive Editor, Books at a Glance; Pastor, Reformed Baptist Church, Franconia, Pennsylvania

“I first read this book over fifty years ago at university. I was a newly converted Christian and Francis Schaeffer was all the rage. The book spoke to an issue as fresh today as it was then—the ecological crisis facing planet earth. Our culture lacks an understanding of origins, purpose, and destiny, and all three are necessary in order to address the issue of saving planet earth. A doctrine of creation fueled by humanity’s moral responsibility as God’s image bearer and driven by the certainty that the cosmos is going to be renewed and transformed is the only culturally relevant idea to properly address the current crisis. Schaeffer was correct then and remains correct today. A massively prophetic book that speaks to our time. Christians should heed what it says.”

Derek Thomas, Senior Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, South Carolina; Chancellor’s Professor, Reformed Theological Seminary

“This book is a remarkably sane approach to environmental concerns. Man’s alienation from God leads to other alienations and ruptures, including our failure to responsibly exercise dominion in this world. As Schaeffer shows, Christ overcomes these divisions so that Christians are the world’s true environmentalists who take seriously our responsibility to care for God’s creation. How can we, in Christ, exercise godly dominion in this world? This easy-to-digest book is just the answer.”

Mark Jones, Senior Minister, Faith Reformed Presbyterian Church (PCA), Vancouver, British Columbia

*Pollution and the
Death of Man*

*Pollution and the
Death of Man*



FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER
AFTERWORD BY UDO W. MIDDELMANN

 **CROSSWAY**[®]
WHEATON, ILLINOIS

Pollution and the Death of Man

Copyright © 1970 by Francis A. Schaeffer

This edition © 2022 by Crossway

1300 Crescent Street

Wheaton, Illinois 60187

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except as provided for by USA copyright law. Crossway® is a registered trademark in the United States of America. Originally published in the USA under the title:

Pollution and the Death of Man, by Francis A. Schaeffer

Copyright © 1970 by L'Abri Fellowship

This worldwide English edition © 2022 by Crossway (a division of Good News Publishers) with permission of L'Abri Fellowship. All rights reserved.

Cover design: Jordan Singer

First printing with new cover 2022

Printed in the United States of America

Scripture quotations are from the King James Version of the Bible. Public domain.

All emphases in Scripture quotations have been added by the authors.

Trade paperback ISBN: 978-1-4335-7695-9

Library of Congress Number 92-74125

Crossway is a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers.

VP 31 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22
15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

- 1 “What Have They Done to Our Fair Sister?” 9
- 2 Pantheism: Man Is No More Than the Grass 15
- 3 Other Inadequate Answers 31
- 4 The Christian View: Creation 37
- 5 A Substantial Healing 51
- 6 The Christian View: The “Pilot Plant” 63

Afterword 75

Udo W. Middelmann

Appendix A: The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis 93

Lynn White Jr.

Appendix B: Why Worry about Nature? 111

Richard L. Means

Notes 121

Bibliography of Other Books 123

General Index 127

Scripture Index 133

CHAPTER ONE

“What Have They Done to Our Fair Sister?”

SOME TIME AGO WHEN I was in Bermuda for a lecture, I was invited to visit the work of a young man well-known in the area of ecology. His name was David B. Wingate. He was especially known for his efforts to save the cahow bird from extinction. The cahow is a little larger than a pigeon and breeds only on a very few islands near Bermuda, just off the main island. Wingate struggled for many years to increase the number of these birds.

As we went around visiting the nests, we were talking together about the whole problem of ecology. He told me that he was losing ground in his battle, because the chicks were not hatching in the same proportion as before. If they had continued at the previous rate, he would have been well on his way to success. Instead, he found that fewer and fewer were hatching. What was the reason? To find out, he took an embryo chick from the egg and dissected it. Its tissues were found to be filled with DDT. Wingate was convinced that this accounted for the drop in the hatching rate.

The startling thing about this is that the cahow is a sea-feeding bird; it does not feed anywhere near land—only in the middle of

the ocean. So it is obvious that it was not getting its DDT close to shore, but far out in the Atlantic. In other words, the use of DDT on land was polluting the whole area. It was coming down through the rivers, out into the ocean, and causing the death of sea-feeding birds.¹

When Thor Heyerdahl made his famous voyage in the *Kon Tiki*, he was able to use the ocean water quite freely; but he later said when he tried to cross the Atlantic in a papyrus boat, the ocean water was unusable because of the large amount of rubbish.

A man in California very vividly pointed out this serious problem. He erected a tombstone at the ocean-side, and on it he has carved this epitaph:

The ocean born—[he gives hypothetical date]
 The oceans died—A.D. 1979
 The Lord gave; man hath taken away
 Cursed be the name of man.

The simple fact is that if man is not able to solve his ecological problems, then man's resources are going to die. It is quite conceivable that man will be unable to fish the oceans as in the past, and that if the balance of the oceans is changed too much, man will even find himself without enough oxygen to breathe.

So the whole problem of ecology is dumped in this generation's lap. *Ecology* means "the study of the balance of living things in nature." But as the word is currently used, it means also the problem of the destruction man has brought upon nature. It is related to such factors as water pollution, destructive noise levels, and air pollution in the great cities of the world. We have been reading and hearing of this on every side from all over the world.

Near the end of his life, Darwin acknowledged several times in his writings that two things had become dull to him as he got older. The first was his joy in the arts and the second his joy in nature. This is very intriguing. Darwin offered his proposition that nature, including man, is based only on the impersonal plus time plus chance, and he had to acknowledge at the end of his life that it had had these adverse effects on him. I believe that what we are seeing today is the same loss of joy in our total culture as Darwin personally experienced—in the area of the arts and general life, and in the area of nature. The distressing thing about this is that orthodox Christians often really have had no better sense about these things than unbelievers. The death of “joy” in nature is leading to the death of nature itself.

In the 1960s and early 1970s when there was a profound interest in the philosophic basis for life and the problems of life, this sort of anxiety was even being expressed in the area of pop music. The Doors had a song called “Strange Days” in which they asked, “What have they done to the earth . . . to our fair sister?” And they answered: “Ravaged and plundered . . . and dragged her down.”²

At any rate, people everywhere began to discuss what could be done about it. An intriguing article by Lynn White Jr., on “The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis,” was published in *Science* magazine.³ White was a professor of history at the University of California at Los Angeles.

In his article he argued that the crisis in ecology is Christianity’s fault. It is a brilliant article in which he argued that although we no longer are a Christian world, but a post-Christian one, nevertheless we still retain a “Christian mentality” in the area of ecology. He said Christianity presents a bad view of nature, and

so this is carried over into the present-day, post-Christian world. He based his allegations of a “bad view of nature” on the fact that Christianity taught that man had dominion over nature and so man has treated nature in a destructive way. He saw that there is no solution to ecological problems—any more than there is to sociological problems—without a “base.” The base of man’s thinking must change.

In ecology in the 1980s there is not much writing or discussion on the basic philosophies underlying the consideration of ecology. This is parallel to the lack of philosophic pornography, philosophic drug-taking, philosophic films, etc. However, in ecology, as in these other areas, the thought-forms of the 1980s were laid in the earlier period of the 1960s. At that time there was much serious consideration, writing, discussion, and expression concerning the worldviews underlying all these areas.

People are now functioning on the ideas formulated in that earlier period—even though those so functioning do not consciously realize it.

As Christians, we should know the roots in order to know why those who speak and act against Christianity are doing so, and in order to know the strength of the Christian answer in each area. If we do not do this, we have little understanding of what is occurring about us. We also do not know the strength of what, as Christians, we have to say across the whole spectrum of life.

The articles of Lynn White and Richard Means from the later part of the 1960s are, I think, still the classic ones concerning the area of ecology.

Modern man’s viewpoint in the post-Christian world (as I have dealt with in my previous writings) is without any categories and

without any base upon which to build. Lynn White understood the need of a base in the area of ecology. To quote him: “What people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to things around them. Human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and our destiny—that is, by religion.”⁴ Here I believe he is completely right. Men *do* what they *think*. Whatever their worldview is, this is the thing that will spill over into the external world. This is true in every area, in sociology, in psychology, in science and technology, as well as in the area of ecology.

White’s solution was to ask, “Why don’t we go back to St. Francis of Assisi?” He contrasts St. Francis with what he saw as the “orthodox view” of men having the “right” to despoil nature. “The greatest spiritual revolutionary in Western history, Saint Francis, proposed what he thought was an alternative Christian view of nature and man’s relationship to it: he tried to substitute the idea of the equality of all creatures, including man, for the idea of man’s limitless rule of creation.”⁵

Both our present science and our present technology, according to White, are so tainted with orthodox Christian arrogance toward nature that no solution for our problem of ecology can be expected from them alone. He said that technology is not going to solve the problem because it is powered with its view of dominion over nature, which equals limitless exploitation.

Since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not. We must rethink and refeel our nature and destiny. The profoundly religious, but heretical, sense of the primitive Franciscans

for the spiritual autonomy of all parts of nature may point out a direction. I propose Francis as a patron saint for ecologists.⁶

The discussion of this was picked up and carried further and aroused much interest. In the *Saturday Review* of December 2, 1967, Richard L. Means, who was associate professor of sociology at Kalamazoo College in Michigan, quoted White and extended White's concept by essentially asking, Why not begin to find a solution to this in the direction of pantheism? In fact, he tied this call for a solution based upon pantheism into what he called the "cool cats" of the generation in their interest in Zen Buddhism. He is saying here, Wouldn't it be a solution if we just said, We're all of one essence?

So here pantheism is proposed as an answer to our ecological dilemma. But is it an answer at all? That is a question we must now consider.