
Pro Rege

Volume 13 | Number 3


Article 4

March 1985

Environmental Impact of Being Busy in the Creation

Delmar Vander Zee
Dordt College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Environmental Sciences Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vander Zee, Delmar (1985) "Environmental Impact of Being Busy in the Creation," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 13: No. 3, 12 - 20.
Available at: http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol13/iss3/4

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.



A quarterly faculty publication of
Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa

The Environmental Impact of Being Busy in the Creation

by Delmar Vander Zee
Professor of Biology



Delmar Vander Zee, professor and department coordinator of biology, is a graduate of Dordt College and has been on the staff since 1969. He received masters degrees from Western Michigan University and Iowa State University in biology and bontology respectively and has his Ph.D. from Washington State University in botany-horticulture. His research interests are in the physiology of plant development and prairie re-establishment. This has resulted in several papers published in scientific journals. The past four summers he has served as instructor at the AuSable Institute of Environmental Studies.

Setting

The setting for our work in the world is this: we are the image bearers of God, working with the parts of the creation as ordered by the mandate to the first people (Gen. 1:28, 2:15). Furthermore, we must acknowledge the effects of the fall into sin on our ability to carry out the commands of God. But in spite of sin our task continues, and God's promises to his covenant people are a source of hope and help (Gen. 3:15; 9).

Not only must we see the world as a creation and humans as crowned creatures in this setting, but we must recognize what it means to be created in the image of God. It means

at least the following: the capacity to be conscious of ourselves and the world around us with the unique ability to learn about that world and communicate this knowledge to others. We have the ability to be creative, to be responsible for our actions, and to be loving of our fellow creatures.

From a biblical perspective we believe that we are *given* a task or cultural command, but are also *enabled* to carry out this task by virtue of our unique creaturehood. And, even though our original and continuing sins prevent us from doing our work perfectly, we are also *given* salvation, a new life and a place in this world and the world to come.

Impacts of Human Activity

My intention here is not to give a long list of environmental problems and the grim future that faces the planet. Many other books and articles have done this quite extensively. This was very popular during the decade after the first celebration of Earth Day, April 1970. At that time (and now to some extent) there was much flagellation and accusation as to who were the guilty.

The specific impacts of human activity upon a given ecosystem are legion, many not even properly identified or understood. Some people would argue that until and unless we know the specific causes and effects, that we cannot even say there is a problem. That approach certainly buys time, but it is basically irresponsible. It would not make for good medical practice, and it certainly does not make good environmental stewardship.

So without going into detail it is realistic to list the following broad areas of environmental deterioration:

- 1) the world-wide loss of forest lands,
- 2) the world-wide loss of top soil from our agricultural lands,
- 3) the very rapidly diminishing supplies of fossil fuel energy reserves,
- 4) the world-wide loss of the creatures—both plant and animal, large and small—due to lack of respect for life, especially the life of the helpless or economically uninteresting,
- 5) loss of wetlands and reduced quality of lakes, streams and oceans,
- 6) pollution of air, ground water, and the food chains of *all* creatures by materials foreign to their metabolism,
- 7) Related to 4) above, the general loss or deterioration of community (in a holistic sense, the loss of the creatures from our landscape means a loss of community, although we usually do not include in our thinking and planning of “human communities” other creatures).

The irony in the above observations is that even though we were created to be kings and vicegerents in the creation—to be serving stewards, we have become slaves of our materialism; and in our inability to control our appetites and technology we have become slaves in a deteriorating world environment that is almost foreign to our creaturehood.

Environmental Deterioration and Technology

Is environmental deterioration inevitable, given Gen. 1:28? Or, is acid rain the necessary consequent of our being busy in the world? Lynn White in “The historic roots of our ecological crisis” suggests that the root cause is our religion, and specifically the Judeo-Christian ethic of “having dominion.”

Others have offered that what we see is the consequence of humans, a very intelligent species, expanding their ecological and evolutionary niche.

But, are we busy in God’s creation or in humanity’s “creation”? Is the root problem our technology? After all, do not acid rain, EDBs in the food chain, and toxic waste dumps all have the ring of technology about them? Yes, but in all cases people decide what to make, how to make it and how to use or dispose of it. Technology does not exist alone; it is always a *human-directed activity*. The use of technology can certainly bring about environmental deterioration, but technology can also be used to bring healing to the earth.

The acquiring of knowledge and the making of tools allows humankind to do things that cannot be done otherwise. (Other papers in this series amplify this idea.) Accompanying the power derived from knowledge and tool use should be a great deal of *wisdom* and *loving care* and/or *restraint*. With the tools of the modern age one person can wreak much damage in a short time. The scale is much different than two or three generations ago. For example, one “developer” on a 4-wheel-drive rig can

plow up hundreds of acres of short-grass prairie in Colorado or Montana in a few days,² plant it to wheat and advertise it as a prosperous wheat farm and try to sell it to naive city farmers or western adventure seekers in a get-rich-quick scheme. One person with a team of horses or oxen wouldn't have a chance to try something on such a scale. Even though the power of technology allows this kind of thing to happen, it is a person who makes the decision. Technology and inexpensive energy in the hands of the greedy is not the cause, but certainly the instrument of deterioration.

Technology and inexpensive and easily accessed energy have allowed another factor to have its effect, that is centralization. The technology used in one place is not known or understood in another area where the effects or products of that technology are used.

Centralization results in separating people from the producing of their food and many of the artifacts of their daily life. This has left a gap of ignorance and an uncaring attitude about the real linkages in the system of goods which people depend on and consume. For example, in an age where electricity is used to power much of our work, it is necessary to have electrical transformers. One way (obviously not the best) to insulate these is with chemicals known as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). These transformers are manufactured far from where they are eventually installed. During their manufacturing, and subsequent disposal after use, these very toxic chemicals can get into the food chain. But, who knows about it? And who is responsible for it? As another example, when some suppliers of tomatoes for winter distribution to midwest supermarkets cannot fill orders, they go south of the border into Mexico where DDT is not banned, buy tomatoes, and ship them to U.S. outlets. Since DDT is banned in the U.S. (but not DDT laced food) we might think our food is free of such a contaminant, but not necessarily. In a society where food, fiber, factory goods and pharmaceuticals are mostly centrally manufactured, it is very

hard to know the links in the system, and it is very hard to trace lines of responsibility. It is easy to hide behind the cover of claiming only knowledge and responsibility for one's small fragment of the overall process or distribution system. Again, the culprit is not technology but people not wanting the responsibility or just plain ignorance of how the whole system works. In some cases it is policy to keep workers and the general public ignorant of how the whole system works—this keeps the corporate profits higher.³ In this regard it is noteworthy to consider the thesis that the present age is not so much the age of information but the age of *disinformation*.

Another example comes from the acid rain problem. The U.S. government has persistently distanced itself from the dialogue with Canada on this matter and recently the film, *Acid Rain: Requiem or Recovery*, by the Canadian Film Board was banned for showing in the U.S. Another attempt to lull the public comes from the glossy corporate publication, *Context* by du Pont, which recently made the following claim, reputedly from the Dept. of Energy: "It finds no quantitative relationship between pollutant emissions and rainfall acidity. . . ."⁴ When there is money to be made by not using the technology we have to clean up the environment, it is *disinformation* or the selective use of specialized information that is used to placate the opposition.

Attitudes to Environmental Deterioration

There are several kinds of attitudes that individuals have and which seem to become institutionalized when it comes to environmental issues. I will list some attitudes which you may recognize or even hold(!) and comment on each of these.

- 1) Environmentalists as a named group are considered as unreasonable, special interest people who are antiprogress and perhaps even unAmerican.

2) Caring for the "other kind" is okay so long as the government pays for it or so long as it is good for public relations, or if it doesn't cut into corporate or individual profits.⁵

3) It has to be "cost effective" or have a reasonable "pay back time" in order to be justified (arguments for high efficiency furnaces, solar energy devices, air pollution control devices).

4) "Why don't they figure out a way to 'fix or solve' ---" (acid rain, toxic wastes, contaminated food chains, etc.)

5) Environmental problems are out there, someplace, somewhere, and they are caused by someone else and should be solved and paid for by someone else. (The myth of "away.")

6) The earth is sinful, wearing out like an old garment soon to be discarded; then the Lord will return.⁶

"cost effectiveness" and "payback time." This attitude is basically the double economic standard that we use in deciding whether we are acting as a producer or consumer, neither of which necessarily takes into account the "meta economic" dimension of the question.⁸ The question of whether or not to buy or build something has to be valued by more than its immediate dollar cost and payback time. Do we consider the pay back on a new stereo set? Or do Christians consider the cost effectiveness and payback time of a Christian education for their children? I'm not advocating irresponsible spending; I am suggesting that one should not decide against obedience because of its economic costs. We have to begin seeing that caring for the creatures and their habitats is an act of obedience!

4) "Why don't they solve. . . ?" This is the technological "quick fix" solution which reflects a knee-jerk faith response in technology. A better response would be "Why don't I (or we) do something about ---" This implies knowledge of the problem and the linkages in the system. The problem is not just something out there, I *am* related to the problem.

5) The myth of "away." As hinted above, "away" is a myth. If you understand the planet and how its (eco)systems function, then you will know that there is no such place. Materials *do* cycle. And in our highly centralized economic and industrial system we are linked and related to most environmental problems by virtue of our consumption of material goods.

6) The earth is sinful and wearing out. Believe it or not, this attitude is found among some Christians. I believe it is unbiblical. It is reminiscent of the servant who hid his master's talents. It illustrates an irresponsible environmental ethic derived from a misunderstanding of eschatology. It also does not take seriously the many doxological Psalms and God's covenant signed by the rainbow. (For a more comprehensive commentary on this attitude see T. Sine's *The Mustardseed Conspiracy*, Ch. 4.)⁹

Now a few comments on the above attitudes (ways of life?):

1) Environmentalists as antiprogress. This is essentially a caricature. This attitude may reflect some hyper-conservatism and a latent American civil religion! Environmentalists are certainly not without faults, but certainly the state of the planet would be worse without their efforts. Perhaps a better label is in order, stewards and stewardship, or earthkeepers.

2) Caring for "other kind" is okay if it doesn't cost me. This attitude is basically uncaring and irresponsible. I might add that it is relatively easy to get sympathy for the campaigns to care for the large mammals and birds but not for small fish, rare plants with strange names, or insects. (After all aren't we taught to kill "bugs"?) Why is there not room in our consciousness and awareness and capacity for care for these other kinds? It would seem that our "love and care" is quite selective and biased (see end note 7).

3) Environmental action based only on

The Creatures' Advocate

In a time of special interest groups and lobbies for most anything, and in a time of serious environmental deterioration, one must ask, "Who speaks for the land? Who speaks for the creatures? Who speaks for the waters?" And, "Why?" (One could also substitute the words "prays for" or "cares for" in the place of "speaks for.")

We have become accustomed to assume that if a thing has any economic value, then it will have an advocate. Unfortunately this standard is about the only one in practice when it comes to environmental issues. It clearly stems from the egocentric materialism of our life styles and the dualism yet residing in our religions.

We tend to care for or about something if it is known to benefit us or if it will contribute to our survival. In an age where materialism and utilitarianism are the accepted and practiced norms, it seems quaint to suggest that the creatures are to be cared for because they are God's creatures, and that He commands and expects their care! Biblical Christians must acknowledge that the creatures have intrinsic value (i.e. because they are God's 'creatures). If they have value only in the context of being of some use to us, then much of Scripture has no meaning (Gen. 1, 2, 9, and others). So we must see the redwoods not only in terms of so many board feet of lumber but especially as a unique ecosystem of creatures that literally declares the glory of God. We give witness to our being image-bearers and stewards by refusing to be trapped by an economic, reductionistic attitude with respect to the redwoods (or any other part of creation). So such an attitude not only elevates the redwoods but ourselves as well!

Sometimes one hears arguments for saving the tropical forests because so many plants and animals residing there are yet unnamed, and perhaps some important medicine can be found in the extract of a rare plant of the tropics—maybe even a cure for cancer. Certainly this argument will grab the attention

of a society bent on valuing only utility. But what if there is no known human use for these creatures, now or in the future, then is it proper to destroy them? Arguments based only on utilitarianism are not sufficient. Another utilitarian gimmick is used in raising money to save wetlands. Duck hunters like to hunt waterfowl, and waterfowl need wetlands for habitat, so by appealing to their sports interests, money can be raised to preserve wetlands. (Note the existence of "Ducks Unlimited.") Do not get me wrong; I am not saying that the created order is not useful. It certainly is, but it is also certainly more than a storehouse of goodies to serve our material and recreational interests.

Returning to the earlier question, who speaks for ---? The answer is that all people should. Humankind was placed in a position of being steward over all the creatures. So we are ordained to this task not because of the use we can derive from such caring, but because it is part of our creaturehood to be stewards. (We may be good or bad stewards, wise ones or ignorant ones, but our position in the creation is to be stewards.)

It follows from this that our caring also is not a function of our particular academic interest. Many may have the impression that these problems are good for biologists and ecologists to deal with. One can't expect the lay person (which in this context is anyone who doesn't have a degree in biology) to have much concern for the creatures; after all, we don't know much about the creatures or the ecosystems they inhabit, and we do not come in contact with them much.

If there is any group that is the creatures' advocate, it should be Christians. They are the people who believe in God, in a created order, in a purpose for the creation and for humankind, in sacrificial living, in redemption and renewal of life in this world and in the world to come. So why is it then that L. White lays the blame for the "ecological crisis" at the feet of Western Christianity? Probably because there is no clear distinction between real Christians who have accommodated themselves in a materialistic

culture and non-Christians. (By the way, L. White's analysis is very narrow; environmental deterioration is not limited to lands influenced by Christianity; but the observation that environmental deterioration is not precluded from "Christian countries" is apt.)

In summary, then, we can say that all people, but especially those who go by the name of Christ, should be advocates of the creatures, those who pray for, care for and speak for the creation. It is wrong to ignore our mandate, and it is not a full gospel if we believe that we limit Christian concern only to saving souls or at best feeding hungry people, while by default letting the secular world care about the environment. I might add that even feeding people is not possible without a holistic caring for the food producing system.

The Role of Creation in Revelation

The doctrine of general revelation is not new to Reformed Christians. We are taught and believe that God reveals himself both in the Scriptures and in his created order. We believe that in a limited way, we can know how God operates and acts within his created order by studying and summarizing our estimates of God's laws within the creation. This we have heard argued and discussed many times. What we hear much less of is the doxological function of creation (Ps. 8, 19). We hear much about the need to keep a high view of Scripture, with a proper hermeneutic. We would be loath to break the Scriptures. But do we have the same attitude toward general revelation? Can general revelation also be broken? Is there a hermeneutic for general revelation? How deep and practical is our doctrine of creation?

What is the place of and how is the creation used in the Scripture? At least these six ideas should be considered:

1) It has its origin with God, the creator, with the Son (Logos) and Spirit also present and active (Gen. 1, John 1, Col. 1:16).

2) It is clearly said to have a doxological purpose (Ps. 8, 19).

3) It is used as a referent in many Scriptural teachings:

— consider the sparrows . . . the lilies of the field. . . (Matt. 6)

— the kingdom is like a sower . . . like a mustard seed. . . (Matt. 13)

— as a lamb before its shearers. . . (Is. 53).

4) It is used to directly teach about God and his ways (Job 38 ff).

5) It is revelational to the point of exonerating God's justice (Rom. 1:20 in context).

6) It will be purged and be renewed when the Lord returns (Rev. 21).

Does Matt. 6:28 ("Consider the lilies of the field. . .") make any sense if we do not know any lilies (flowers) of the field? If the flowers of the field are so few as to be unknown or are even extinct, then has revelation been broken? This principle applies, I believe, to all the Scripture that directly uses some aspect of the creation as the referent. Yes, in the sense of general revelation and in the specific Scriptural reference, the revelation of God is diminished whenever a part of the creation is lost or obscured.

Although both testaments of Scripture speak of the creation as the work of God, some of the richest teaching comes from the Old Testament. I think modern Christianity spends too much time with the new Testament without the rich context of the Old. For example, we are used to hearing and reading John 3:16 ("For God so loved the world. . .") as meaning, "For God so loved mankind. . ."—which is certainly true, but God's love for the cosmos (his creation) as well as for his people led him to save his crowned creatures who believe. But if we stop there and do not consider the rest of the created order, then II Chron. 7:14 does not fit. For here it says that

If my people, who are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and

pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.

Note that it says, "will heal their land." Salvation is not just for people! The holism of God's covenant and the richness of the Old Testament is broken if we separate God's promises to his stewards from his promises to that which is to be stewarded. In this same context, not only were people to take a sabbath rest but also his creatures and the land (Ex. 20, Lev. 25).

Another powerful Scripture is the word in Job 38-42 where God answered Job. Notice what the answer is—it is a compendium of the creation. It is probably the most comprehensive biblical statement of the ways of the creator with his creatures. When Job was facing catastrophe and physical debilitation, he got this answer:

Where were you when I laid the earth's foundation? Tell me if you understand. . . . Have you ever given orders to the morning or shown the dawn its place? . . . Have you entered the storehouses of the snow or seen the storehouses of the hail? . . . Do you hunt the prey for the lioness? . . . Do you know when the mountain goats give birth? . . . Do you give the horse his strength or clothe his neck with a flowing mane? . . . Does the eagle soar at your command? . . .

Why such an answer? So that Job would unmistakably know who God *is*! God gave Job an oral exam, a "comprehensive" if you will, on "natural history," on God's creation, on God's creatures, on God's ways of dealing with his creation. This Scripture in Job can be seen as curious or maybe quaint but nevertheless an interesting interlude where God successfully humiliates Job by asking hard questions about eagles, horses, hail, and frost. But this book is a powerful

revelation of the struggle of a man of God with the power of Satan, and through it all the continuing caring covenant of God. After Job received much poor advice from his "friends," God speaks. . . . We don't study this book enough for these passages where God displays his power and majesty as Creator and Sustainer.

Let's go back to some of these questions and Job's response. Did God ask these questions merely to humiliate Job? They certainly had that effect, but more important, the questions revealed to Job and to us unmistakably who God is. This was/is a catechism on the doctrine of creation.

Why did Job have so few answers in the end? Was it because he did not know the answers? Job, the herdsman—do you think he did not know about gestation and birth? The farmer of great lands—did he not know about day and night, rain and hail? Do you think he did not know the soaring eagle? Of course he did; he knew these creatures *and their God!* Hence his relative silence in the face of the creator; he was silent not only because God was asking the questions but because God was(is) the answer!

Consequences for the Christian Community

We have reviewed that there are many fundamental environmental problems, that technology can be instrumental in deterioration or in healing, but that the chief reasons for environmental deterioration is a dearth of knowledge and love for the creation, with instead, a fixation of western culture on materialism, utilitarianism, and individualism. What can Christians do, and especially Christians at Dordt?

Our task at Dordt is the academic—Christian education and research. So that is where we focus. First of all, we have to get our perspectives in order—in line with Scripture—what I would call a practical theology of creation. We have to incarnate our often quoted belief that all things cohere and have meaning in Christ. Creation is not just something that happened at the beginning.

The creation is being sustained by God today and it should be stewarded by his crowned creatures. We also have to give substance to the idea of being pro-environment and pro-stewardship. But here becomes evident that inherent potential defect in academia, i.e. we talk and think and write but often do not act. Action comes and occurs via our students, as they take up their calling (vocation) elsewhere; but we can act here also. In fact we do act. And what we "do" is probably speaking more loudly than what we "say."

Earlier I commented on what being in God's image means. Another aspect of that image is meaningful here. We are imaging God by representing his care as responsible stewards. The world sees God through us, not only in how we deal ethically with each other and our private possessions but also in how we deal with the creatures.

We can and should be models, not only personally but corporately as an institution, of caring stewardship. We should be a model of holism and environmental healing not only in our statement of purpose but also in our curriculum and by the way we steward our campus, buildings, parking lots, and agriculture stewardship center. Yet, unless the long-range planning committee considers the whole campus environment—even the creatures—it is not doing its work responsibly as Christian stewards.

Outwardly this may seem radical, impractical, and unworkable, but Christianly it is not. It does highlight a basic problem with holistic stewardly living. We increasingly have to be willing to break out of our habits of working individually or in our speciality; it is so hard to work communally, to really respect the sensitivities and insights of others. We are so used to living fragmented, disjointed lives. We mind our *own* business. But echoing an earlier question—who speaks for the whole campus environment? You see, now we aren't talking about redwoods, or wetlands for whooping cranes; we are talking about the *land* over which Dordt is called

to be a steward. Now I'm using land in a holistic, community sense. Does the way we design (steward) our curriculum, or buildings, manicure our grounds, build parking lots, farm the agriculture stewardship center "speak" consistently with our stated principles? (And, are our stated principles in line with Scripture?)

What is the impression/image/message that visitors/students get when they visit/attend Dordt? i.e. What are we teaching by what we do? Do they see an affirmation of American middle-class values or do they see a community (in its broadest sense) attempting to bring "substantial healing" to more than strictly academic areas. In this context I am reminded of the Old Testament story of the children of Israel who were instructed by the Lord to bring stones from the Jordan and make a testament-monument (Josh. 4) which was to be a teaching aid:

... In the future, when your children ask you, "What do these stones mean"? tell them that the flow of the Jordan was cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord. . . . These stones are to be a memorial to the people of Israel forever.

We have been delivered and given a new life; we claim a special place in God's kingdom, and we claim to be stewards. Where are our distinctive "memorials" that will elicit from our student-children such questions as "What do you mean by these ---?"

Let me conclude with some commendations and suggestions.

First of all, we need a commitment to environmental holism and then must get busy with the curriculum and with other concrete ways of working out this commitment—with land use practices at the agriculture stewardship center and on campus; yes, even time and staff for research into these matters! We need to show that even our buildings and grounds, parking lots, and the use of raw materials on campus are

dedicated *Soli Deo Gloria*.

There are on Dordt's campus many exciting potentials being discussed and some started. The Environmental Studies curriculum is presently being refined for approval and implementation. This is an important *first step* for the curriculum. A second step is more consciously to integrate the study of the creation from whatever specialty we inhabit. There is a special challenge here for Course-14 of the general educational requirements, an upper level course being designed to address holistic discipleship. The Agriculture Stewardship Center represents a tremendous potential. There are many fine things being done there, but in all frankness, it is too much a model of what Wendell Berry calls "orthodox" agriculture.¹¹ It needs to become a model of agriculture which will really grasp the attention of those who pass by or visit so that it points to another way of tending the soil, one that is sustainable in the long term and one that has room for other creatures.

Dordt has made some very impressive progress in conserving energy via classroom insulation and thermostat monitoring. There has been a beginning on campus in establishing small landscapes for some of our native prairie creatures. More could be done. There is presently a request before the Long Range Planning Committee to make room for wetland creatures. These will be of service to a few courses that deal with the analysis of the biotic, ecologic, and aesthetic aspects of the creation but more important is the visible witness that such things will make on campus.

We must consciously continue to develop a "whole college experience" that will train young people for leadership in bringing the good news of healing to all of God's creatures, for God so loved the cosmos. . . .

Endnotes

¹White, L. "The historic roots of our ecologic crisis," *Science* 155: 1203-1207, 1967.

²Grieves, R.T., "Carving out a new dust bowl," *Time*, June 27:27, 1983.

³Vandenbosch, R. *The Pesticide Conspiracy*. Doubleday, N.Y., 1978. See Ch. 7 (pp. 73-79) titled "Stick it to Cesar—the sociology of pest control." Vandenbosch cites many problems in the larger pesticide industry, including coercion in high places of the EPA where the DDT industrial lobby, in a clear conflict of interest, effectively forced the unnecessary spraying of the by-then-banned-DDT onto hundreds of thousands of acres of forest land for control of the tussock moth whose populations were already crashing because of natural causes.

⁴Mosher, L. "Clean air in the 1980's," *DuPont Context* 10:1-8, 1981.

⁵Cahn, R. *Footprints on the planet, a search for an environmental ethic*. Universe Books, 1978. Cahn masterfully documents the attitudes and practices of many agencies and corporations with respect to environmental matters.

⁶Camping, H. "Ecology and the believer," *The Banner*, Aug. 25:13, 1972.

⁷There are many campaigns and "public" avenues which "promote" knowledge and sympathy for large animals. Many TV programs promote the safari image (Wild Kingdom), or add an anthropomorphic flavor to cute creatures (Disney's Bambi). These may have their place; but if this is the main contact of urbanites to the real world of the creatures, it is certainly unbalanced.

⁸Schaucher, E.F. *Small is beautiful—economics as if people mattered*. Perennial Library, Harper & Row, 1973. In commenting on the fragmentary judgment of modern economics he says, "If an activity has been branded as uneconomic, its right to exist is not merely questioned but energetically denied. Anything that is found to be an impediment to economic growth is a shameful thing, and if people cling to it, they are thought of as either saboteurs or fools. Call a thing immoral or ugly, soul-destroying or a degradation of man, a peril to the peace of the world or to the well-being of future generations; as long as you have not shown it to be 'uneconomic' you have not really questioned its right to exist, grow, and prosper."

⁹Sine, T. *The mustard seed conspiracy*. Word Books, 1981. In Ch. 4 (pp. 69-89) he discusses the problem of an improper view of the end times contributing to a world-flight mentality.

¹⁰Schaeffer, F., *Pollution and the death of man—the Christian view of ecology*. Tyndale, 1970 Schaeffer used this idea as a challenge to churches and Christian groups to be an environmental witness.

¹¹Berry, W. *The unsettling of America—culture and agriculture*. Avon, 1977. This book is a very serious and probing work that seeks to analyze land, agriculture and life styles at a depth that goes beyond superficial, economic or short term problems.

¹²All scriptural quotes from the NIV.