

ical Christians seek to recover the earliest doctrines of Christianity, its historical basis, its radical ethical spirit, and its revolutionary consciousness.

"We fault theological liberalism which neglects man's need of personal transformation, and while holding to a pollyanna view of humanity, perverts the historical content of the Christian faith. . . . We dedicate ourselves to no ideology, government, or system, but to active obedience to our Lord and His Kingdom, and to sacrificial service to the people for whom He died.

"Our faith must be distinctively Post-American, because the offense of established religion is the proclamation and practice of a caricature of Christianity so enculturated, domesticated, and lifeless that our generation easily rejects it as ethically insensitive, hypocritical, and irrelevant to the needs of our times. . . . We believe that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is a

liberating force which has radical consequences. However, for the true nature of the Christian faith to be realized, it must break the chains of American culture and be proclaimed to all peoples. . . .

"The People's Christian Coalition is an alliance of people working together to create radical Christian consciousness, commitment, and action in our times. . . . We are a grassroots coalition calling for people committed to the radical Christian message that is distinctively Post-American, that changes men's lives and generates an active commitment to social justice which serves as the basis for social liberation. Let us work together. Serve the Lord. Serve the people."

A free issue of the Coalition's newspaper, *The Post-American*, appropriately enough, may be obtained by writing to P.O. Box 132, Deerfield, Ill. 60015.

PAMPHILUS

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

faith more than hope, but the two cannot be separated. In our secularized age most of us stammer when we speak of these things; I am very conscious of doing it. Perhaps, even as we stammer, we may come to see what is central and what is peripheral in such affirmations of faith.

American Giantitis

To the Editors: Every once in a while one begins to see signs of reason prevailing over human madness, only to be thrown again into despair by an article such as Richard Neuhaus's "The American Giant" (*Worldview*, May). As if he had learned nothing from the incisive criticisms of his book *In Defense of People*, Neuhaus again goes after the environmental movement with his mindless polemic: "Certain aspects of the ecology movement manifest the most insidious form of our current moral regression. . . . Prophets of eco-catastrophe such as Paul Ehrlich and Garrett Hardin tell us that the reason for world poverty is that there are too many poor people. It is not our selfishness but their fertility that is to blame."

The truth is that Garrett Hardin

in particular, a distinguished scientist, has had the courage to spell out some very unpleasant unrealities. If Neuhaus doesn't think that the population explosion is the world's Number One problem, that is his problem. Those of us who recognize the facts know that the time has come when we have to get over our compunctions, parading under the banner of moralism, and make some hard decisions about who is going to survive. Is it more "moral" to let the decision be made by chance of nature or famine? Morality is rather the courage to decide who is more and who is less important to the future of the human race. Those who are ready to act courageously must not be frightened when they are called racists just because they recognize that some people are better endowed (genetically, biologically, culturally) than others.

Neuhaus talks about the need for "American generosity" toward the Third World. I think most Americans are rightly weary of generosity. Whether it is our "defense of freedom" in Indochina or our feeding the multitudes in Bangladesh, the fact is that the U.S. is interfering and probably making things worse instead of better. As Hardin and others have argued, what we need is a new ecological ethic that recognizes that "feeding the hungry" is

an act of misguided mercy that can finally lead to global suicide.

Hardin has wisely forewarned us: "Every day we [Americans] are a smaller minority. We are increasing at only one per cent a year; the rest of the world increases twice as fast. . . . How can we help a foreign country to escape overpopulation? Clearly, the worst thing we can do is send food. The child who is saved today becomes a breeder tomorrow. We send food out of compassion; but if we desired to increase the misery in an overpopulated nation, could we find a more effective way for doing so? Atomic bombs would be kinder. For a few moments the misery would be acute, but it would soon come to an end for most of the people, leaving a very few survivors to suffer thereafter."

People like Neuhaus would no doubt consider this approach self-centered, but in fact only by being more self-centered will we be able to save this imperiled planet. Saving the planet is, I insist, a task that is both moral and generous to future generations. . . .

If *Worldview* is supposed to bring ethical judgment to bear on public policy, it will have to do a lot better than the kind of shallow moralizing represented by Neuhaus's article.

Martha Kramer

Des Moines, Iowa