

Environmentalism

Supplement Contents

<i>Environmentalism</i> by E. Cal Beisner	2
A Biblical Christian View of Man and Nature	2
Eliminating Myths About the Environment.....	2
Overpopulation	3
Resource Depletion	3
Pollution.....	4
Global and Regional Ecological Crises.....	4
Christian Environmentalism by Ray Bohlin	5
What the Greenies Won't Tell You by Michael Bauman.....	8
Resources.....	10

Environmentalism

By E. Calvin Beisner

“God calls us to restore the Earth from the curse, to multiply its resources and their productivity for His glory and our benefit. He does not call us to preserve it just as we find it. To put the call into Biblical terms, God calls us to transform the Earth from a wilderness, which throughout Scripture signifies God’s curse, into a garden, which signifies His blessing.”—E. Calvin Beisner, *Radical Environmentalism’s Assault on Humanity*

1. A Biblical Christian View of Man and Nature

- The Bible has a profoundly high view of mankind and his destiny. Man is created in the very image of God.--Genesis 1:26, Psalm 8:3-8
- The Apostle Paul wrote that the redeeming work of Christ would one day apply to the restoration of the physical universe as well as the salvation of the souls of men.--Romans 8:20-21
- The Bible sees population growth as a blessing, not as a curse.--Genesis 1:28, 9:7, Psalm 127:3-5, Proverbs 14:28, Acts 17:26
- God has given man dominion over the earth.--Genesis 1:26
- God himself made the first fur coat.--Genesis 3:21
- God is using redeemed man to reverse the effects of the curse upon the earth. This means that pristine or untouched nature is not necessarily better than nature improved by the good stewardship of the redeemed.--Romans 8:18-20

2. Eliminating Myths about the Environment-

Facts taken from E. Calvin Beisner’s book *Eliminating Myths about the Environment* unless otherwise noted.

- A. **Overpopulation.** Environmentalists argue that the sheer number of people alive on the planet, or in given locales around the planet, has grown too large, or is in danger of growing too large soon. Here are some often ignored facts about the situation:
1. Less than 2% of the earth’s land mass (excluding Antarctica) is occupied by human settlements. See C.A. Doxiadis and G. Papaioannou, *Ecumenopolis, The Inevitable City of the Future* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), 179; cited in Jacqueline Kasun, *The War Against Population: The Economics and Ideology of World Population Control* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 37, and in E. Calvin Beisner, *Prospects for Growth: A Biblical View of Population, Resources and the Future* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1990), 57.
 2. If the world’s entire population lived in the United States, which contains only about 6 percent of the world’s land, population density would be about 1,470 people per square mile. That’s about half the density of Atlanta, about one-ninth the density of Chicago, and about one forty-fifth the density of Manhattan.
 3. The present estimate of the world’s total population is certainly high because the data reporting agencies of many less developed countries purposely exaggerate population to increase the appearance of poverty and so to increase the international aid for which they qualify. Many countries who overestimate population in this way do so by 31 to 38.4 percent.
 4. “Population controllers play fast and loose with facts and aren’t to be trusted. First they tell us that high population will cause great catastrophes, and then they tell us population is much higher than it really is. Clearly their purpose is to scare people into making decisions they

wouldn't otherwise make—like legalizing abortion on demand, distributing condoms in public high schools, and teaching sex education classes that are justified in part by the alleged need to reduce population growth,” E. Calvin Beisner, *Eliminating Some Myths About the Environment*

B. **Resource Depletion.** Environmentalists argue that because there are so many people, we are using up the world's natural resources. Here are some facts to consider:

1. Resources such as raw materials that people turn into useable resources are actually getting *less scarce*, not more scarce. The only resource becoming more scarce is people. This is because the only practical measurement of scarcity is price—the more scarce something is, the more valuable it becomes. And history tells us that the price human resources—of labor—has been steadily rising relative to the price of non-human resources. This means that people, not mineral and vegetable resources, are becoming increasingly scarce.
2. On the average, people make more resources than they consume. This means that the more people there are, the more resources there will be. It means that resources grow faster than population, not the reverse.
3. As recently as 1850, slightly over half the American population was involved in growing food, meaning that it took a little more than fifty people to feed every 100. Since then, agricultural productivity has increased so dramatically that now only about 2.2 percent of all Americans are employed in *all* agriculture—including forestry, fisheries, and farms—one for every fifty instead of one for every two.
4. Substances such as petroleum became valuable—became a resource and not just a raw material—when people devised practical uses for it. Today it is refined and transformed into an incredible variety of products, including fuels, lubricants, plastics, synthetic fibers, medicines, and fertilizers. In each of these uses, petroleum substitutes for other resources that were more costly and less versatile in terms of final output. Even so, nuclear power now promises to make fossil fuels obsolete, just as fossil fuels made wood and dung and peat moss and whale oil obsolete as fuels
5. Man's creativity and God-given intelligence, aspects of being created in the image of God, has enabled him to turn a natural material as plentiful and inexpensive as sand into one of the most valuable and useful resources ever to appear on the earth. By converting sand into fiber optics and silicon microchips man has been able to multiply the rate at which we exchange information and increase knowledge. And it is knowledge that makes the difference between an average life expectancy of less than thirty years as recently as 1800 compared to a worldwide average of sixty-five years today. Knowledge makes the difference between an economy of hunting and gathering which cannot support more than one or two people per square mile, and the diverse economy of the modern world which supports roughly one hundred people per square mile worldwide, and at a much higher standard of living.
6. “Knowledge expressed in creativity is an element of the image of God in man. It has enabled men to change and improve their environments rather than merely adapting to them. And because the interaction of persons and ideas with each other multiplies knowledge, *population growth spurs knowledge growth, which spurs resource growth*. This is why a Christian view of man and the world—which is also the truly scientific view—rejects environmentalism's fear that we are running out of resources. People made in the image of God produce more resources than they consume,” E. Calvin Beisner, *Eliminating Some Myths About the Environment*

C. **Pollution.** Environmentalists argue that producing goods and services for all the people in the world generates so much pollution that it threatens life and health for human beings, animals, and plants. Here are the facts:

1. Far from making the world more polluted, growing population and growing economies enable us to make the world *less* polluted. A clean, healthful environment is itself a resource, and since resources are made by people, the more people there are, the more we'll be able to make a clean and healthful environment. Economic growth is absolutely essential to this process because it enables people to pay the high cost of preventing pollution and cleaning it up when it occurs. America's experience illustrates this. Contrary to popular belief, the American environment is getting cleaner and safer, not dirtier and more dangerous.
2. Statistically, America's air and water is becoming progressively less polluted and human life expectancy continues to increase. All of this is made possible by a growing economy that enables more and more people to afford to spend more and more money protecting and improving the environment. To put it simply, a healthy, productive, growing economy is the friend of the environment, not its enemy
3. One might think that the temporary increase in pollution accompanying the transition from a subsistence-level agricultural economy to a developed industrial economy is an unmitigated evil that should be avoided at all costs. But that is simply not true. Pollution, after all, is the byproduct of productive activity that *improves* people's lives in other ways, enabling them to afford more and better food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education, transportation, and communication. And the benefits of these improvements far outweigh the costs of the pollution they generate. Even so, as economies transition again from the industrial to the information age, pollution is actually being reduced in them.
4. "The importance of economic growth to environmental improvement makes all the more alarming environmentalism's growing alliance with socialism, which has proven itself to be the quickest way to stop even the strongest economies dead in their tracks," E. Calvin Beisner, *Eliminating Some Myths About the Environment*

D. **Global and Regional Ecological Crises.** Environmentalists argue that the air pollution generated by man's rapidly growing population and economies is causing global warming, ozone depletion, and acid rain. Here are the facts:

1. The scare about global warming is based on scant and unrepresentative initial data. Later data collections from all over the world and from infrared sensor readings from satellites showed *no discernable trend* in global temperatures. Furthermore, the computer models that generated the initial projections of significant global warming were hopelessly simplistic, and they contradicted each other. Even if global warming were to occur, it will come on slowly, over a century or two; its effects probably will be more beneficial than harmful to climates and agriculture; and the cost of adjusting will be spread over generations and readily met without significant difficulty
2. Acid rain is not contributing significantly to the acidity of either the soil or the water. It is caused instead primarily by the decay of forests that haven't been used much for lumber for so long that their trees have grown old, died, and decayed—a natural process that deposits acid in the soil. Resuming well-managed harvests of forests in the region would reduce the acid in surrounding soil, lakes, and streams again, and would also raise the supply and so lower the price of lumber for housing construction. This means that wise intervention could actually improve the natural environment. This demonstrates

beautifully how human action can contribute to restoring the Earth from the curse God put on it because of human sin.

3. The ozone layer normally fluctuates by about 5 percent. Any so-called “trends” of less than 5 percent therefore disappear in this normal fluctuation—and no data support allegations of trends bigger than that. Even so, a 5 percent decrease in the ozone layer, as calculated by some of the more pessimistic scenarios, would increase UV exposure to the same extent as moving about sixty miles south. The ozone belt’s fluctuations do not correlate with worldwide emissions of supposed ozone destroying chemical pollutants. The human contribution to ozone-depleting chemicals is minute compared with nature’s contribution. It would be extremely costly to reduce that human contribution significantly, and there is no guarantee that doing so would have any effect whatever on the ozone layer or on skin cancer prevention.

Final Thoughts

If you were reading attentively, you probably noticed that environmentalism accuses growing populations and growing economies as lying at the root of every one of these supposed problems. To put it simply, environmentalism assumes that meeting the needs of people is destroying the earth. But as we have seen, this is simply not the case.

What is crucial to understand is that environmentalism, with its sub-Biblical view of man, its complete lack of understanding of how human creativity and productivity can increase resource supplies and improve the environment, and its persistent tendency to exaggerate every problem—real or imagined—simply is not a credible worldview or movement.

-- E. Calvin Beisner, *Eliminating Some Myths About the Environment*

Christian Environmentalism

Dr. Ray Bohlin

Permission given by the author. This articles and other can be found on www.probeminstires.com.

The news media is full of stories concerning environmental disasters of one kind or another, from global warming to endangered species to destruction of the rain forests to nuclear accidents. It is not hard to notice that the environmental issue receives very little attention in Christian circles. There are so many other significant issues that occupy our attention that we seem to think of the environment as somebody else's issue. Many Christians are openly skeptical of the reality of any environmental crisis. It is viewed as a liberal issue, or New Age propaganda, or just plain unimportant since this earth will be destroyed after the millennium. What we fail to realize is that Christians have a sacred responsibility to the earth and the creatures within it. The earth is being affected by humans in an unprecedented manner, and we do not know what the short or long term effects will be.

The Seven Degradations of the Earth

Calvin DeWitt, in his book *The Environment and the Christian*, lists seven degradations of the earth. First, land is being converted from wilderness to agricultural use and from agricultural use to urban areas at an ever-increasing rate. Some of these lands cannot be reclaimed at all, at least not in the near future.

Second, as many as three species a day become extinct. Once a species has disappeared, it is gone. Neither the species nor the role it occupied in the ecosystem can be retrieved.

Third, land continues to be degraded by the use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers. Just because DDT is no longer used does not mean that potentially harmful chemicals are not being used in its place.

Fourth, the treatment of hazardous chemicals and wastes continues as an unsolved problem. Hazardous chemicals seep into water sources from previously buried dumping grounds.

Fifth, pollution is rapidly becoming a global problem. Human garbage turns up on the shores of uninhabited South Pacific islands, far from the shipping lanes, and DDT has been found in Antarctic penguins.

Sixth, our atmosphere appears to be changing. Is it warming due to the increase of gases like carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels? Is the ozone layer shrinking due to the use of chemicals contained in refrigerators, air conditioners, spray cans, and fire extinguishers? Though these questions cannot be answered easily, they must be asked.

Seventh, we are losing the experiences of cultures that have lived in harmony with the creation for hundreds or even thousands years. Cultures such as the Mennonites and Amish, as well as those of the rain forests, are crowded out by the expansion of civilization.

Never before have human beings wielded so much power over God's creation. Do we know what we are doing?

The Environmental Ethics of Naturalism and Pantheism

Some people have blamed Western culture's Judeo-Christian heritage for the environmental crisis. These critics point squarely at Genesis 1:26-28, where God commands His new creation, man, to have dominion over the earth and to rule and subdue it. This mandate is seen as a clear license to exploit the earth for man's own purposes. With this kind of philosophy, they ask, how can the earth ever be saved? While I will deal with the inaccuracy of this interpretation a little later in this article, you can see why many of the leaders in the environmental movement are calling for a radical shift away from this Christian position. But what are the alternatives?

The need to survive provides a rationale for environmental concern within an *evolutionary* or *naturalistic world view*. Survival of the human species is the ultimate value. Man cannot continue to survive without a healthy planet. We must act to preserve the earth in order to assure the future of our children.

The evolutionary or naturalistic view of nature is, however, ultimately pragmatic. That is, nature has value only as long as we need it. The value of nature is contingent on the whim of egotistical man. If, as technology increases, we are able to artificially reproduce portions of the ecosystem for our survival needs, then certain aspects of nature lose their significance. We no longer need them to survive. This view is ultimately destructive, because man will possess only that which he needs. The rest of nature can be discarded.

Another alternative is the *pantheistic* or *new age worldview*. Superficially, this view offers some hope. All of nature is equal because all is god and god is all. Nature is respected and valued because it is part of the essence of god. If humans have value, then nature has value.

But while pantheism elevates nature, it simultaneously degrades man and will ultimately degrade nature as well. To the pantheist, man has no more value than a blade of grass. In India the rats and cows consume needed grain and spread disease with the blessings of the pantheists. To restrict the rats and cows would be to restrict god, so man takes second place to the rats and cows. Man is a part of nature, yet it is man that is being restricted. So ultimately, all of nature is degraded.

Pantheism claims that what is, is right. To clean up the environment would mean eliminating the "undesirable" elements. But, since god is all and in all, how can there be any undesirable elements? Pantheism fails because it makes no distinctions between man and nature.

The Christian Environmental Ethic

A true Christian environmental ethic differs from the naturalistic and pantheistic ethics in that it is based on the reality of God as Creator and man as his image-bearer and steward. God is the Creator of nature, not part of nature. He transcends nature (Gen. 1-2; Job 38-41; Ps. 19, 24, and 104; Rom 1:18-20; Col. 1:16-17). All of nature, including man, is equal in its origin. Nature has value in and of itself because God created it. Nature's value is intrinsic; it will not change because the fact of its creation will not change. The rock, the tree, and the cat deserve our respect because God made them to be as they are.

While man is a creature and therefore is identified with the other creatures, he is also created in God's image. It is this image that separates humans from the rest of creation (Gen. 1:26-27; Ps. 139:13-16). God did not bestow His image anywhere else in nature. Therefore, while a cat has value because God created it, it is inappropriate to romanticize the cat as though it had human emotions. All God's creatures glorify Him by their very existence, but only one is able to worship and serve Him by an act of the will.

But a responsibility goes along with bearing the image of God. In its proper sense, man's rule and dominion over the earth is that of a steward or a caretaker, not a reckless exploiter. Man is not sovereign over the lower orders of creation. Ownership is in the hands of the Lord.

God told Adam and Eve to cultivate and keep the garden (Gen. 2:15), and we may certainly use nature for our benefit, but we may only use it as God intends. An effective steward understands that which he oversees, and science can help us discover the intricacies of nature. Technology puts the creation to man's use, but unnecessary waste and pollution degrades it and spoils the creation's ability to give glory to its creator. I think it is helpful to realize that we are to exercise dominion over nature not as though we are entitled to exploit it but as something borrowed or held in trust. Recall that in the parable of the talents in Matthew 25, the steward who merely buried his talent out of fear of losing it was severely chastised. What little he did have was taken away and given to those who already had a great deal. When Christ returns, His earth may well be handed back to Him rusted, corroded, polluted, and ugly. To what degree will you or I be held responsible?

Abuse of Dominion

While God intended us to live in harmony with nature, we have more often than not been at odds with nature. This reality tells us that man has not fulfilled his mandate. The source of our ecological crisis lies in man's fallen nature and the abuse of his dominion. Man is a rebel who has set himself at the center of the universe. Man has exploited created things as though they were nothing in themselves and as though he has an autonomous right to do so. Man's abuse of his dominion becomes clear when we look at the value we place on time and money. Our often uncontrolled greed and haste have led to the deterioration of the environment. We evaluate projects almost exclusively in terms of their potential impact on humans. For instance, builders know that it is faster and more cost effective to bulldoze trees that are growing on the site of a proposed subdivision than it is to build the houses around them. Even if the uprooted trees are replaced with saplings once the houses are constructed, the loss of the mature trees enhances erosion, eliminates a means of absorbing pollutants, producing oxygen, and providing shade, and produces a scar that heals slowly if at all. Building around the trees, while more expensive and time-consuming, minimizes the destructive impact of human society on God's earth. But, because of man's sinful heart, the first option has been utilized more often than not.

Christians we must treat nature as having value in itself, and we must be careful to exercise dominion without being destructive. The Bible contains numerous examples of the care with which we are expected to treat the environment. Leviticus 25:1-12 speaks of the care Israel was to have for the land. Deuteronomy 25:4 and 22:6 indicate the proper care for domestic animals and a respect for wildlife. In Isaiah 5:8-10 the Lord judges those who have misused the land. Job 38:25-28 and Psalm 104:27-30 speak of God's nurture and care for His creation. And Jesus spoke on two occasions of how much the Father cared for even the smallest sparrow (MATT. 6:26, 10:29).

Christian Responsibility

I believe that as Christians, we have a responsibility to the earth that exceeds that of unredeemed people. We are the only ones who are rightly related to the Creator. We should be showing others the way to environmental responsibility.

Christians of all people should not be destroyers. We may cut down a tree to build a house or to make a fire, but not just to cut it down. We have the right to rid our house of ants, but we should not forget to honor the ant in its right habitat. While there is nothing wrong with profit in the marketplace, in some cases we must voluntarily limit our profit in order to protect the environment.

When the church puts belief into practice, our humanity and sense of beauty are restored. But this is not what we see. Concern for the environment is not on the front-burner of most evangelical Christians. The church has failed in its mission of steward of the earth. We have spoken out loudly against the materialism of science as expressed in the issues of abortion, human dignity, evolution, and genetic engineering, but have shown ourselves to be little more than materialists in our technological orientation towards nature.

By failing to fulfill our responsibilities to the earth, we are losing a great evangelistic opportunity. Many in our society are seeking an improved environment, yet they think that most Christians don't care about ecological issues and that most churches offer no opportunity for involvement.

Because the environmental movement has been co-opted by those involved in the New Age Movement, many Christians have begun to confuse interest in the environment with interest in pantheism and have hesitated to get involved. But we cannot allow the enemy to take over leadership in an area that is rightfully ours. As the redeemed of the earth, our motivation to care for the land is even higher than that of the New Ager. Jesus has redeemed all of the effects of the curse, including our relationship with God, our relationship with other people and our relationship with the creation (1 Cor. 15:21-22, Rom. 5:12-21). Though the heavens and the earth will eventually be destroyed, we should still work for healing now.

What the Greenies Won't Tell You

By Dr. Michael Bauman,

I've heard it long enough.

People keep repeating the old saw that our forests, our wildlife, and our rivers are under threat and under siege.

They are not.

The United States is not now, nor ever will be, reduced to protecting its last few patches of green from asphalt and concrete encroachment the way a miser greedily hoards his gold. As Thomas Sowell observed, our National Park Service lands alone are larger than all of England, Scotland, and Northern Ireland combined. The U. S. Forest Service itself controls a land mass larger than all of France, easily the largest nation in Europe. The Fish and Wildlife Service owns more land than all of Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and Portugal together -- and the total number of square miles set apart for these and similar public uses is actually increasing every year.

Neither Greenpeace nor the Sierra Club will ever tell you that by far the largest portion of U. S. land today is forest, and by "forest" I mean forest land excluding the nation-sized expanses mentioned above. By "forest" I mean woodlands outside of, and in addition to, national parks, state parks, city parks, national wilderness areas, wildlife refuges, and recreation lands of all sorts. In fact, forest, grassland, and cropland together make up nearly 80% of all

our nation's land. We have actually set aside twice as much land for wildlife use and wildlife protection than we employ for all urban purposes. We have almost half as many square miles of idle cropland every year in the U. S. as we have urban area. Our pasture land alone is nearly 40% larger than all our so-called urban sprawl. Almost all our one-quarter billion people live on only 2.1% of our land. In fact, our swamps, deserts, and tundra alone are nearly five times larger than all our cities and towns combined. According to E. Calvin Beisner, if all the earth's 5.3 billion inhabitants were magically transplanted onto American soil, our nation would still have a population density 7% less than Taiwan and 24% less than Bangladesh. If the entire population of earth were restricted to Texas alone, that state would have a population density only 30% that of Macau. Our forests and croplands are not under seige.

In short, America is green, and it is getting greener all the time.

But the environmental activists won't tell you that because they know that the widespread dissemination of such information would hit them where it hurts the most -- in the pocketbook. People respond to incentives, and the environmentalists are no exception. The green lobby thrives on private contributions and on massive government subsidies, both of which would be severely restricted if the hard facts ever got a wide audience.

The green lobby will not tell you that global warming is the largest non-event threat since the swine flu. In the last 100 years, the earth's average surface temperature, where it can be measured, has increased only 1/2 a degree. The greens won't tell you that this 1/2 degree increase occurred during the first 50 years of measurement, not the second. They won't tell you that most of this increase has taken place in the extreme North and the extreme South of our planet's habitable regions, rendering those forbidding zones slightly more hospitable. They won't tell you that our small rise in temperature occurs almost entirely at night, making the daily growing period slightly longer. In other words, the greens won't tell you that, at its habitable margins, the earth is now a little more friendly to life and a little more green than it once was. If the green lobby told you that, you'd stop giving them mountains of cash, the green they seem most eager to preserve.

Nor will the green lobby tell you the truth about the alleged hole in the polar ozone layer, which isn't a hole at all, and which might have some immeasurably small effect on the number of cases of melanoma among penguins but has absolutely no effect upon human beings living anywhere human beings normally live.

The greens won't tell you that acid rain has not produced acid lakes in the northeast, where scientists recently discovered that we have had acid lakes for hundreds of years, long before there were car factories in Detroit or steel mills in Pennsylvania, allegedly among the chief culprits in our supposed acidification. Acid lakes have causes; acid rain is not one of them.

What the greens will try to tell you is that people like me, people who prefer human beings to snail darters and to spotted owls, are species bigots, that we prefer the human species to all others. They are right. Unlike the greens, who worked to displace several thousand families in one northwestern state in order to preserve a dozen owls, I prefer to protect the lives and dwellings of people more than those of birds. Yes, and I'd much rather save unborn humans from abortion than baby seals from hunters. But the baby seals apparently have a lot more friends in the green lobby and in the courts than do their human counterparts.

Furthermore, if the self-appointed friends of nature had learned more from nature itself and spent less time trying to identify the issues and species that are most readily fundable, they would have discovered that nature itself is constantly bringing new species into existence while it is constantly banishing others to extinction. I, for one, am glad it does. I am not alarmed that dinosaurs and sabre-toothed tigers no longer stalk the earth. In other words, the green lobby often fights against nature, not for it.

But the charge of species prejudice cuts both ways. Greens themselves do not treat all life forms as equal. Greens discriminate against some species at the expense of others -- and well they should. No member of the green lobby pushes to preserve the AIDS virus, rats, or killer bees against extinction. They decline to do so for the same reason I decline to endorse some of their pet projects: human beings have surpassing worth.

It just seems to me that the only living things assured of protection by the green lobby are those species that are either cute or whose protection seems most popular and therefore most lucrative. Apparently the definition of species prejudice is not the denial that all species are equal, but the belief that the value of various species differs from those they are perceived to have by the Sierra Club.

If the greenies want to save the whales and are willing to invest their time, their money, and their energy in the project, I am behind them. I hope they prosper. But if their efforts make it more difficult for me to protect human life, human freedom, and human property, I won't be behind them. I'll be in their face.

Copyright © 2000 Michael Bauman. All rights reserved. Used by permission. Previously published in *Pilgrim Theology: Taking the Path of Theological Discovery* (Zondervan, 1992).

Resources:

Books:

Lomborg, Bjorn, *The Skeptical Environmentalist* Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Beisner, E. Calvin. *Prospects for Growth: a Biblical View of Population, Resources, and the Future*. Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1990.

DeWitt, Calvin B., Ed. *The Environment and the Christian: What Can We Learn from the New Testament?* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1991.

Schaeffer, Francis. *Pollution and the Death of Man: a Christian View of Ecology*. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale, 1970

Websites:

www.co2andclimate.org/ (CO2 and Climate.org provides sound information about CO2 and climate to educators, students, business and media representatives, community leaders and policymakers alike.

Greening Earth Society sponsors CO2 and Climate.org as an online source of information concerning the impact of the atmosphere's increasing concentration of carbon dioxide (CO2) on earth's climate and the biosphere. Our climate focus expresses scientific skepticism concerning the potential for catastrophic changes in climate due to humanity's emissions of CO2. Our CO2 focus concerns the science of carbon sequestration by terrestrial plant life and the benefits to plant life from carbon dioxide fertilization. Greening Earth Society is a not-for-profit membership organization comprised of rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric utilities, their fuel suppliers, and thousands of individuals.)

www.sepp.org (The Science & Environmental Policy Project was founded in 1990 by atmospheric physicist S. Fred Singer on the premise that sound, credible science must form the basis for health and environmental decisions that affect millions of people and cost tens of billions of dollars every year. A non-profit, 501(c)3 educational group, its mission was to clarify the diverse problems facing the planet and, where necessary, arrive at effective, cost-conscious solutions.)

<http://www.co2science.org/> (The *Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change* was created to disseminate factual reports and sound commentary on new developments in the world-wide scientific quest to determine the climatic and biological consequences of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content ... In addition, to

help students and teachers gain greater insight into the biological aspects of this phenomenon, the Center maintains on-line instructions on how to conduct CO₂ enrichment and depletion experiments in its Global Change Laboratory -located in its Experiments section - which allow interested parties to conduct similar studies in their own homes and classrooms.)

www.stewards.net (The official website Interfaith Council for Environmental Stewardship: Serving Humanity Ecology Through Faith and Reason)