EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 17

Volume 17 • Number 2 • April 1993

Evangelical Review of Theology

Articles and book reviews original and selected from publications worldwide for an international readership for the purpose of discerning the obedience of faith

EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS

Published by
PATERNOSTER PERIODICALS

generations to come', 'harmony between human beings and between humanity and nature', 'survival', and 'security'. This language raises a profound theological issue. It is not that 'revealed religion' (to use Newman's phrase), rejects these goals for humanity and the rest of creation (see Isaiah 65:17–25, Romans 8:22–25 and Revelation 21:1–4ff), or that Christian and non-Christian do not struggle with the same human and other material in order to attain them. The great question is whether humanity can achieve the goals by autonomous human effort (as at Babel, Genesis 11:1–9) or in dependence upon God (as with Abraham, Moses, and others in the biblical record). To adopt those profound categories emphasized by Martin Luther, can the future be secured by building *securitas* by human effort, or can the work only be accomplished in *certitudo*? Some of the international texts of our time look suspiciously like the former.

———————————

Dr. Neil W. Summerton is the Head of the Water Directorate in the Department of the Environment in the United Kingdom. p. 241

Ethics and Management on U.S. Public Lands: Connections, Conflicts, and Crises

Fred Van Dyke

On 24 September 1991, John Mumma, former forester of the U.S. Forest Service's Northern Region, testified before the Congressional Subcommittee on Civil Service in Washington, D.C. In the same subcommittee hearing, Lorraine Mintzmyer, former Director of the National Park Service's Rocky Mountain Region, also testified. Both stated that they were being forcibly reassigned because of political pressure coming from outside their agencies. Mumma claimed, in his case, that this pressure was exerted because he did not meet timber harvest quotas in his region. Mintzmyer stated that her reassignment was motivated as a result of her role in developing a scientifically based management document for the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, and then, when the document was rewritten under political pressure, for refusing to tell the public that the revision was scientifically based.[1] Mumma, who had been described by some environmental groups as a reformer, said that description was inaccurate. He told the subcommittee, 'All I tried to do was perform my job as a civil servant and to carry out the policies of the executive branch in accordance with federal law'.[2] But referring to laws like that of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Forest Management Act, and the Endangered Species Act, Mumma stated that he had failed to meet his quotas 'only because to do so would have required me to violate federal law'.[3]

[1] High Country News Staff, 'Two say politics rule their agencies'. *High Country News*, 7 October 1991.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*

Mintzmyer's reassignment came in the wake of her work in preparing the Greater Yellowstone Vision Document which, she claimed, angered Republican appointees in the Department of Interior and the White House. When the vision document had been almost completely rewritten, and all of its major policy decisions revised—and even reversed—under political pressure, Mintzmyer resisted. 'Stating that the vision document as it presently stands', Mintzmyer told the subcommittee, 'is the result of efforts by the Park Service or the Forest p. 242 Service, based on scientific considerations and the professional opinions of those agencies is, in my opinion, not accurate'.[4]

Supervisors, political appointees, and elected officials implicated in the Mumma-Mintzmyer testimony denied that political pressure played any role in their removals and reassignments. But such reassignments did occur, coincident with the production of documents and implementation of decisions that angered traditional western commodity interests. Circumstances make the testimony of Mumma and Mintzmyer extremely believable. And the testimonies given reflect different, but related, issues in environmental ethics. In the first case, Mumma describes a situation in which a management objective can be achieved only by breaking environmental law. Mintzmyer testifies that a federal agency, the National Park Service, is asked to misrepresent deliberately the source and nature of information contained in a critical management document, a document intended to form the basis of management practice in the nation's oldest and most popular National Park and in seven national forests surrounding it.

What is unusual in the case of Mintzmyer and Mumma is the high level of the people making such accusations. As a regional forester, Mumma reported directly to Forest Service Chief, Dale Robertson. As a regional director of the Park Service, Mintzmyer reported directly to National Park Service Director, James Ridenour. People this advanced (and entrenched), in agency bureaucracies are normally not notorious troublemakers. And they do not value their careers lightly. The fact that senior level executives were willing to resist agency directives to the degree that they did should concern us, and lead us to probe more deeply into how natural resources are actually being managed.

The cases of Mintzmyer and Mumma are unusual only because they occupy high level positions. But such cases are typical of many government employees who are routinely reassigned, transferred, or dismissed when personal determination to uphold environmental law is considered politically inappropriate. In his review of many such cases in the *Audubon* article, 'When A Whistle Blows in the Forest', Paul Schneider documents notable cases within the Forest Service in which individual careers were effectively terminated for activities such as protecting archaeological sites, finding endangered plants in proposed timber sales, or reducing timber harvests to benefit wildlife or watershed values. Even more disturbing than the individual incidents documented by Schneider are the perceptions of the Forest Service's priorities by its own employees. When asked to choose from p. 243 among twenty attributes which they felt would be most rewarded by the Forest Service, agency personnel ranked loyalty to the Forest Service, meeting targets, and promoting a good image of the Forest Service as the three most rewarded worker attributes. The three attributes which were considered least rewarded were a sense of care for future generations, the preservation of healthy ecosystems, and a strong professional identity.[5]

A DEEPER CRISIS

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Paul Schneider, 'When A Whistle Blows in the Forest'. *Audubon* 94 (January/ February 1992): 42–49.

Forest Service workers are not some sort of alien nation, but a subset of the American population at large. As such, they both represent that population's values and are influenced by them. As public values shift away from the traditional forest commodity interests of timber, minerals, and grazing, and toward non-commodity interests of wildlife, recreation, and aesthetics, tension grows between management directives that benefit commodities and environmental laws designed to protect long-term ecosystem health. That tension is becoming reflected increasingly in the growth of organizations within the Forest Service itself like Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics and Inner Voices, which advocates greater attention to long-term environmental stewardship.

There have been other recent examples of environmental lawbreaking in Forest Service management activities. In 1985 and 1990, timber was logged in two wilderness areas in Oregon despite a ban on such activities imposed by the Wilderness Act of 1964. In the management of wilderness itself, the House Committee on Appropriations was distressed to discover that only 63% of the Forest Service's appropriated budget for wilderness was actually spent on wilderness management between 1988 and 1990, and only a little over half of the funds provided for wilderness management in fiscal 1990 were actually used for wilderness.

The Forest Service generates much of its own revenue from timber sales, but the timber sales themselves are not always cost effective. Michael Lipske reported in 1990 that, according to Congressional estimates, the Forest Service lost as much as $350 million dollars in its Tongas National Forest timber sales in Alaska.[6] Resource economist p. 244 Randall O'Toole estimates that timber sales on the seven forests surrounding Yellowstone National Park lost about $12.2 million in 1988.[7] Yet, cost ineffective timber sales continue, notes O'Toole, because, 'Timber sales, whether they make or lose money, produce many jobs—and therefore votes—in a state or congressional district'.[8] This situation is aggravated by the fact that forest managers may keep legally an unlimited share of gross timber receipts for forest management activities in the timber sale area, and are under no obligation to return an equal share to the U.S. Treasury. the source of funds for timber sale arrangement and preparation.[9] This situation has resulted in such absurd activities as logging forests in critical grizzly bear habitat to raise funds to improve grizzly bear habitat, a situation which actually occurred in the Gallatin National Forest in Montana.[10]

Another major U.S. federal agency, the National Park Service, has come under increasing criticism for the long-term loss of mammal species in National Parks, less than one percent of a billion dollar budget spent on basic research studies, and the fact that the parks are not managed by scientific professionals, but by a core of nonprofessional policemen, the park rangers.[11]

The Path to Reform

---

[6] Michael Lipske, 'Who Runs America's Forests?' *National Wildlife* 28 (October/ November 1990): 24–34.

[7] Randall O'Toole, 'Recreation Fees and the National Forests', in Robert B. Keiter and Mark S. Boyce, eds., *The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: Redefining America's Wilderness Heritage* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1991): 41–48.

[8] *Ibid.*, 43.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Schneider.

[11] Alston Chase, *Playing God in Yellowstone* (San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1987).

In the wake of the scandal surrounding the Mumma-Mintzmyer hearings, journalist Ed Marston, editor of the western environmental paper, *High Country News*, wrote an editorial entitled, 'Will the Bush Administration Choose Reform?'[12] The last word of the title is the most portentous, because nothing short of reform is needed in American resource management agencies to make them effective in accomplishing their mission. As the true picture of how resources are actually being managed in this country becomes clearer, it is apparent that the word 'corruption' would be appropriate. As Marston puts it, 'The West's commodity producers—unwilling or unable to adapt to the p. 245 nation's new land ethic—appear determined to continue to conduct their economic activities outside the law. They have chosen outlaw status'.[13] The effect of such behavior is to dissolve values into power. But to exercise power in contradiction to value is not morally legitimate power. It is coercion. In the absence of a normative public ethic, we have arrived at the situation in which politics, as Alisdair McIntyre put it, 'becomes civil war carried on by other means'.[14]

Theologians distinguish between two types of evil, personal and structural.[15] The former is a familiar subject of many sermons, the problem of personal sin and moral choice. Evil at the personal level is remedied by personal behavior. It requires repentance, restitution, and subsequent consecration to God to turn from evil to good. As Paul told the church at Ephesus, 'Let him who steals steal no longer, but rather let him labor, performing with his own hands what is good, in order that he may have something to share with him who has need' (Eph. 4:28).

But evil, in a fallen world, can reach beyond personal levels. It can come to be incorporated, and even rewarded, in the operation of a system or organization. Evil at the structural level cannot be effectively thwarted by remedies at the personal level. It is the system itself which must be altered.

There are many who have proposed such alterations. Randall O'Toole, seeing the structural evils of the Forest Service as primarily economic, proposes an economic solution. Charge fees for recreational use of national forest lands, and then allow managers to keep the funds generated from such fees for use on their forests or districts.[16] O'Toole's plan is laudable in many respects, but, standing alone, it is incomplete. His answer equates maximum revenue generation with moral excellence. And neither the Mumma nor the Mintzymer cases were generated solely out of economic motives. Alston Chase, one of the most published critics of the National Park Service in general and of Yellowstone Park in particular, proposes sweeping changes in the National Park Service budget, its employee evaluation system, and an increasing role for external review.[17] Like O'Toole's proposed reforms, Chase's proposals, if implemented, would probably have many p. 246 salutary effects. But they do not address the deeper questions of the moral legitimacy of many Park Service policies.

Not only the economic and management structure, but the entire legal structure of American property law must change if there is to be real reform in resource management.

---

[12] Ed. Marston, 'Will the Bush Administration Choose Reform?' *High Country News*, 7 October. 1991.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Alasdair Macintyre, *After Virtue* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981): 236.

[15] Steven V. Monsma, *Pursuing Justice in A Sinful World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984).

[16] O'Toole.

[17] Chase.

Joseph Sax, Professor at the University of California Berkeley School of Law, states that 'A fundamental purpose of the traditional system of property law has been to destroy the functioning of natural resource systems'.[18] Sax is correct, for exclosure and exclusion, the foundation of private property laws, water rights laws, homesteading laws, swamp drainage laws, and multitudes of other laws are essential to private control of land productivity, but anathema to ecological health of natural systems and communities. Such traditional property law, upon which longstanding resource commodity interests on public lands are based, now runs into increasing conflict with more recent legislation aimed at protecting ecologic health in the public interest. As recent environmentally protective legislation like the Endangered Species Act and the National Environment Policy Act continues to erode the legal power of the grazing, mining, logging, and other commodity interests, these interests must resort to the use of direct political power, and must often use such power outside the law. But whenever any group uses political power without legal foundation, the result is not democracy but a dictatorship of politically powerful outlaws. The outcome of such conflict is corruption of the natural resource management system, the loss of public trust, and the illegal degradation of legally protected resources.

It is clear that reform is needed in both structures of management and structures of law. But, by themselves, the reforms generated in these areas alone would still be incomplete. A further and greater need is the development and provision of an environmental ethic by which both individuals and agencies are judged. And until that ethic is both well formulated and well articulated, neither personal nor structural evil in natural resource management can be attacked effectively.

The late Aldo Leopold foresaw the dangers of an inadequate basis for environmental ethics, and warned what would happen to those who tried to build a comprehensive program of conservation upon them. p. 247

> No important change in ethics was ever accomplished without an internal change in our intellectual emphasis, loyalties, affections, and convictions. The proof that conservation has not yet touched these foundations of conduct lies in the fact that philosophy and religion have not yet heard of it. In our attempt to make conservation easy we have made it trivial. When the logic of history hungers for bread and we hand out a stone, we are at pains to explain how much the stone resembles bread.[19]

I echoed these statements more specifically, if less poetically, in an article published in 1985. 'The present environmental movement', I wrote, 'is moving toward a crisis of unresolvable value conflicts because of the inadequate foundation of secular environmental ethics'.[20] Events have since strengthened the veracity of these views. No public ethic in resource management can be established unless it is informed by biblical values.[21]

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND PROPHETIC WITNESS

---

[18] Joseph L. Sax, 'Ecosystems and Property Rights in Greater Yellowstone: The Legal System in Transition', in Robert B. Keiter and Mark S. Boyce, eds., *The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: Redefining America's Wilderness Heritage* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1991): 77.

[19] Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac* (New York: Sierra Club/Ballantine Books, 1966), 246.

[20] Fred G. Van Dyke, 'Beyond Sand County: A Biblical Perspective on Environmental Ethics'. *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 37 (1985): 40–48.

[21] John R. Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984): 21.

Theologian Carl F. H. Henry has said, 'it is only as each Christian generation permeates its environment with biblical moral sensitivities that unregenerate society is restrained from acting on its deep-seated prejudices and is encouraged to judge itself by Christian ideals—even where it is unwilling to embrace those ideals as an explicit intellectual commitment'.[22] In the cases of Mumma and Mintzmyer, and in the cases of hundreds of other government employees at lower levels, we come to see all too clearly what those 'deep-seated prejudices' really are, and how they express themselves. They are the prejudices of self-interest. And they are comfortably at home even in our noblest national effort, the protection of the environment. The expression of such prejudices is simple and direct. If the law is contrary to your desires, break it. If the truth does not support your position, lie. And if anyone stands in your way, have them removed.

We are left at this point with a sobering realization. The most basic reform of all, and one which only the church can provide, is the provision of a meaningful environmental ethic by which both p. 248 individuals and agencies are judged, and which has the strength to bring personal evil to repentance and structural evil to reform. This reform must take place at three levels. Personally, it must produce a new kind of resource manager, a steward, who has self-consciously internalized and learned to practice a biblical ethic of resource management. Corporately, the church must make a priority of training such stewards in its colleges through graduate degree programs, and provide, in those colleges, supportive communities that give plausibility to the biblical ethics of stewardship. Socially, the stewards, once established professionally, must join with the church in public involvement and debate over resource management decisions to make biblical principles part of the public discussion of resource values, the basis on which management decisions are made, and the criteria by which right and wrong conduct in resource management is judged.

ELEMENTS OF A BIBLICAL ENVIRONMENTAL ETHIC

The first five words of scripture, 'In the beginning God created …' plunge us into a stream of radical departure from the thinking of modern environmental ethics. A transcendent God, a God truly independent of and separate from what is created, calls a cosmos into being from nothing, neither detracting from nor adding to God's self in that creation. And the order, complexity, and harmony that God designs into the world are reflections of God's own nature, not self-sustaining attributes of the cosmos itself.

As God creates, God imparts value to God's creatures. 'God saw that it was good'. The divine pronouncement of value is made repeatedly of every particular creature, and independently of human utility, opinion, or even human existence. Human beings do not add to or detract from the value of creatures by their judgments about them, or their estimates of the utility of created things. They enter God's creation as creatures themselves, with that value already established as part of creation's order.

To value, God adds blessing. 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters of the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth' (Gen. 1:22).[23] So God would see the value of creation multiply, and God's role expands from Creator to Sustainer. 'They all wait for Thee', said the psalmist, 'to give them their food in due season' (Psalm 104:27).

---

[22] James R. Newby and Elizabeth S. Newby, *Between Peril and Promise* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1984): 84–85.

[23] All translations are from the *New American Standard Bible*.

Human beings, as creatures themselves, share this value and blessing with all other creatures that God has made. In these ways, we p. 249 are like them. But human uniqueness is focused in a unique charge. 'Fill the earth and subdue it, and rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky, and over every living thing that moves on the earth'. (Gen. 1:28).

Human uniqueness is further defined in receiving a unique relationship to God. 'Let us make man in our image', says God, 'after our likeness….' The image of God is not an image of physical appearance. It is rather an image of two dimensions: character and function.

The dimension of human nature and character as an aspect of being made in the image of God has historically received careful attention in the church. In human traits of intellect, creativity, love, loyalty, and moral discernment, we see qualities in people reflective of qualities ascribed to God in the Bible, though imperfectly expressed. A less attended, and less understood, dimension of our image in God is the dimension of function. It is this dimension that is especially critical to understanding our role in the care of God's creation and to building a genuinely biblical environmental ethic.

Ancient peoples worshipped multitudes of gods. They represented these gods by images. This was the common practice of every culture surrounding the ancient Israelites to whom God spoke the words of Genesis. Image worshippers of these ancient cultures did not generally believe that the image they worshipped was the god itself, but rather served as a representation of the god, and as a channel and focus through which the god could speak and act, revealing that god's power and attributes. But Jehovah is unique among all ancient gods in expressly forbidding the worship by images. 'You shall not make for yourselves an idol or any likeness of what is in heaven above or on the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth'.

Such a commandment is not merely the prohibition of the worship of false gods. It is also a prohibition of the worship of the true God by images. For no image of God can be found in all creation, save one. 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness….' Understanding this, we can begin to see the sense of what follows. 'Let them (the image) rule over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the sky, and over all the earth'. What else would, or could, the image of God do? In understanding this, we come to see that statements in Genesis are not expressions of primitive, unsophisticated Hebrew arrogance toward God's creation, but statements of deep understanding of the essential nature of being human.

The key to effective stewardship is to understand the rightful expression of this human nature to rule and subdue. We see, in Jesus p. 250 Christ, God's expression of God's self in human form. And we see God express this self as a ruler. 'For a child will be born to us', wrote Isaiah, 'a Son will be given to us; and the government will rest on His shoulders; and His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Prince of Peace. There will be no end to the increase of His government, or of peace, on the throne of David and over His kingdom' (Is. 9:6–7).

Jesus taught, by word and deed, that ruling was expressed by service. 'You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them', He told His disciples. '… It is not to be so among you, but whoever wishes to be great among you shall be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be your slave …' (Matt. 20:25–27). Jesus exemplified these words with a powerful object lesson on the eve of his own death by washing his disciples' feet. When he had finished, he said, 'Do you know what I have done to you? You call me teacher and Lord and you are right, for so I am. If I then, the Lord and Teacher, washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another;s feet. For I gave you an example that you should do also as I did to you' (John 13:12–15).

Given Jesus' example and teaching, God's command to God's image to rule and subdue clearly cannot mean to exercise despotic authority over creation. Rather the conclusion (uncomfortable, unpopular, but inescapable), is that to rule creation means to serve the needs of other living creatures, even at the expense of our own.

After Adam and Eve are given the command to rule and subdue, they are given three tasks; cultivating, keeping, and naming. Cultivating implies change, growth, and development, but all of a constructive and beneficent nature. It means to assist something in achieving its highest inherent tendencies. Keeping means to preserve, protect, and maintain. And the fact that the words cultivate and keep are used in the same command to Adam with neither apology nor explanation from God can only mean that, to an unfallen man in an unfallen world, neither God nor Adam saw cultivating and keeping as conflicting activities. To subdue Eden apparently meant to retain the goodness and beauty that God gave it while at the same time actively managing (cultiv ating) it to enhance and manifest the qualities still latent within it.

Naming implies knowing, an act requiring an intimate and particular knowledge of what something is. It is difficult to name sparrows if you think they are only little brown birds. But to any professional ornithologist or serious bird watcher the differences between vesper, swamp, chipping, field, song, fox, and dozens of other sparrow species are readily apparent. So naming implies a knowledge of p. 251 and—in Adam's case, a rightful exercise of—authority over God's creatures. Together, these acts represent what ruling and subduing mean. This is what stewardship means.

A right understanding of these things is critical both to developing an environmental ethic for ourselves and for expressing it to others. It is in this understanding that we begin to answer the call to accept our rightful place in creation, and to establish an ethic that can guide reform in the practice of resource management. The inconsistencies of secular systems of environmental ethics are that they demean human management of natural systems while at the same time demanding it. We are called, at one moment, to simply view ourselves as another planetary species, and, in the next, to make life-saving, world-changing decisions to preserve all the others. If the first premise is true, then the second is nothing but arrogant presumption.

Stewards can embrace an active role toward God's creation with both humility and enthusiasm. Humility is required because stewards recognize their own creatureliness, sinfulness, and limitations, and because they know their personal accountability to an almighty God. Nevertheless, they can act enthusiastically because the same God has given them a unique place and authority in the created order: to serve and, if necessary, to save his fellow creatures.

PERSONAL ETHICS: THE CAREERIST VERSUS THE STEWARD

Most people who enter the field of resource management undoubtedly choose their careers with high motives. They intend to protect the environment, maintain the health of ecosystems, save endangered species, and educate the public. Unfortunately, their instructors have taught them that following these ideals is not going to cost anybody anything, least of all their own advancement. They are the ones Leopold spoke of when he said, 'In our attempt to make conservation easy, we have made it trivial'.

Praise and advancement will be attractively offered, and often not unrelated to right actions. But, as years go by, and promotions and earnings accumulate, a strange and sinister thing begins to happen. The career itself, with its attendant praise and advancement, begins to become more important than the reasons for which the career was chosen. And then, almost unconsciously, persons begin to protect not the resource,

and not God's creation, but their careers. They become, in time, not stewards, but careerists. And the careerist can be persuaded, with the right combination of reason and reward, to p. 252 willingly rationalize, support, and, ultimately, initiate decisions which do God's creatures and God's creation much harm, but which do one's career great good. So evil achieves one of its greatest and most complete triumphs, the ability to get men and women who are not yet very bad people to do very bad things. And such evil, once entrenched, becomes a part of the very fabric of organizations, governments, and societies.

Against the careerist God presents to human beings the role of the steward whose tasks are to cultivate, keep, and name (know and understand) to the glory of God and the good of creation and creatures. God presents the steward as one made in God's own image, and who in that image has authority to rule and subdue. And then God defines, by word and example, authority and rulership as service to one's subjects, placing their needs ahead of one's own. The church must first make clear the contrast between the careerist and the steward, and say that the first path is wrong and the second is right. Only in this way are the 'deep-seated prejudices' of self-interest—present even in the noble effort of saving the environment—fully exposed, and restrained from controlling that effort and rendering it worthless.

Second, the church must teach, train, and produce stewards. It is not enough for the church merely to make judgments about who is and and who is not a steward. It must fashion people of personal integrity who actually are and function as stewards. To do this, the church must recognize that, since it is preparing such people to combat corporate, structural evil, it must make the training of such people a corporate mission. Specifically, this requires the church to do two things. It must first state that the work of the steward for God's creation is a mission in God's service, and therefore receives, unhesitatingly, the joyful support and prayer of the church. Then it must commit its educational resources, namely its colleges, to train stewards capable of working professionally in resource management. At present, what Christian colleges are doing is giving degrees in biology to people who are both unequipped and unprepared to function as professional biologists, and then assuming that the state university will remedy this deficiency in graduate school. What Christian colleges must do instead is to strengthen undergraduate programs in biology and ecology and initiate graduate programs in resource management. The present practice of assuming that graduate training at the state university is adequate training for stewardship is false. To attempt to produce stewards under a system that dogmatically enforces a dualism between facts and values is to produce what C. S. Lewis rightly called 'men without p. 253 chests'.[24] That was his perceptive description of individuals in which there was no connection between intellectual fact (the head) and fleshly passion and self-interest (the belly). In such education, 'the world of facts', wrote Lewis, 'without one trace of value, and the world of feelings, without one trace of truth or falsehood, justice or injustice, confront one another, and no rapprochement is possible'.[25]

This dualism of facts and values manifests itself in a very real way in the debate over appropriate uses of public lands. With no normative ethic to guide him, the resource manager must treat every value judgment simply as the assertion of a private interest. From this standpoint he then becomes not a steward applying moral excellence to the

[24] C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1947): 34.

[25] *Ibid.*, 30–31.

decisions and dilemmas of resource management, but merely a manipulator of public input appeasing various interest groups.[26]

The church must recognize that in training stewards, its colleges are more than schools. They are communities. As such, they must provide the personal support and plausibility structure for an entirely new approach to resource management, an approach that will appear deviant and threatening to the resource management establishment, of which the state universities are a part. The plausibility of ideas depends on the social support they receive.[27] And, as sociologist Peter Berger rightly perceives, we obtain our notions of the world from others. These notions continue to be plausible to us to the extent that they continue to be affirmed by others with whom we relate. Without such communities it is ridiculous, indeed, it is hypocrisy, to tell the church to develop a Christian environmental policy when its colleges still cannot produce a single environmental policy maker.

We must consider secularism a false and inadequate education for stewards if we really believe that there is more to stewardship than careerism, and if we really believe that the present crisis in environmental ethics will not be solved by technical skill, but by the production of a new kind of person who manages resources in an entirely new way. And if we do not believe that, any further discussion of the church's role in environmental ethics is pointless. p. 254

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY: POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

Ron Sider was one of the first evangelical scholars in this half of the twentieth century to insist that the church must act corporately and politically if it is to attack structural evil.[28] To make the stewards it produces effective, the church must state publicly and corporately what a biblical ethic of environmental stewardship is, and then make such an ethic part of the public discussion of environmental values and decisions. This is an appropriate prophetic witness of the church, carrying both a proclamation of biblical truth and a judgment against evil. In the United States, national environmental laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act not merely encourage but demand federal agencies to solicit public comment and review. This comment and review must be thoughtful and intelligent to receive serious consideration, but it can address basic questions of value and ethics. For example, it is common for Native American tribal governments to make specific recommendations to agencies like the Forest Service during the NEPA process about specific land use plans and management actions. These recommendations are based on the tribe's religious beliefs. The Forest Service takes such comments seriously, and will modify both action and policy if the arguments are sufficiently persuasive. But I have yet to see a church or denomination corporately enter this public process to present valid biblical concepts that would have far-reaching effects on the management of natural resources in the United States.

The reason the church does not do this is because it believes the propaganda of its enemies, namely, that Christian faith may be personally enthralling but is socially irrelevant. If there is any hope for reform of natural resource management in the United States, the church must realize that this privatization of faith is an unacceptable,

---

[26] Neuhaus, 146.

[27] Peter Berger, *A Rumor of Angels* (Garden City, NY: Archer Books, 1970).

[28] Ronald J.Sider, *Rich Christians in An Age of Hunger* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977).

introspective pietism that must be abandoned. Faith is always deeply personal, but it is never merely personal. As John Richard Neuhaus states in *The Naked Public Square*, the American public square of discussion and debate on public policy cannot remain naked of Christian meaning and purpose indefinitely. If it is not clothed with meaning beyond mere social pragmatism, it will eventually cease to function altogether, or it will be clothed with spiritual, but non-Christian, p. 255 meaning from other sources.[29] And then, as Jesus said, the last condition will be worse than the first.

And the church's opportunity to influence public values in resource management will not last forever. As Alexander Pope expressed it, 'Vice is a monster of so frightful mien, as to be hated needs but to be seen; Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face, we first endure, then pity, then embrace'.

The risk in the present monstrous scandals of resource management in the United States is that they may become habitual. And if, as John Richard Neuhaus puts it, 'The monstrous becomes habitual … we cannot afford but to be on friendly terms with our habits'.[30] Such practices, whether carried on privately as corruption or exposed publicaly as scandals, may become the norm in American resource management policy. And then there will be no hope.

In presenting biblical ideas to be part of the public discussion on resource management, the church also must present the standard for ethics in resource management (and in resource managers). Such presentation will immediately reveal the need for reform. And as such revelation unfolds, the church must state what the path to environmental reform is, in both agencies and individuals. It is impossible to do this by simply setting up a denominational task force, writing a position statement, and then going on to something else. To be an effective prophetic witness, the church must have a standing body of individuals actively involved with ongoing resource management decisions, persistently presenting biblical positions in every public forum and their relation to resource management actions. In this context, it is appropriate for christians to act corporately across denominational lines by forming and joining environmental advocacy groups which are explicitly Christian. This is not to say that Christians should withdraw from environmental groups that are not exclusively Christian. But it must be recognized that non-Christian groups can never truly address issues at the deepest ethical levels, nor can they provide the basis for reform at such levels.

The strategies the church must follow, both to provide a biblical ethic to society and to guide reform in resource management, require a costly commitment. They require recognition of the care of creation as a priority. They require public participation with unsympathetic and, at times, hostile audiences. They require investment of time and money. But for all that, they are, in the words of George McDonald, something p. 256 that is not to be more, nor less, nor other, than done. There can be no lasting environmental ethic, and no meaningful reform, without them. Even the church's greatest critics recognize that reform is needed, and that environmental reform will not be achieved simply by more knowledge and better management technique. Historian Lynn White, Jr. wrote in 1967, 'More science and more technology are not going to get us out of the present ecologic crisis'.[31] A generation later, science's most well-known spokesman, Carl

---

[29] Neuhaus.

[30] *Ibid.*, 151.

[31] Lynn White, Jr., 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis'. *Science* 155 (1967): 1207.

Sagan, is found calling for an alliance between religion and science to save the planet.[32] Such invitations do not fully comprehend that for which they are asking, but let us not for that reason hesitate to accept them. Time will not make the church's involvement more welcome. The present crisis makes it necessary. If there would be true 'environmental law', it cannot consist merely of rules supported by force. The authority of true environmental law must be moral, not merely coercive. It must persuade, not merely punish. And the ultimate authority on which it stands must reflect genuine righteousness, not merely brute strength. It is the church that must both guide the way to such reform and invest it with lasting content.

———————————

Dr. Fred Van Dyke teaches at Northwestern College in Orange City, Iowa. p. 257

IV
Case Studies in Christian Environmental Stewardship

Forgiven Christians can take an honest, even courageous look at what the church is doing and has done in the world, for good and ill. The following section provides some examples of both. Bishop Wayan Mastra explains in lyrical terms the harmony between humanity and nature in his native Bali, and the gentle forms of evangelism that take place in that setting. In contrast, Calvin Redekop and his colleague, Wilmar Stahl, document the unfortunate changes in the ecological practices of the native tribes of the Paraguayan Chaco resulting from their evangelization by the Mennonites. The irony here is that the Mennonites have traditionally been innovators and leaders in the conservation of the land. Finally, Chris Seaton closes the volume on a positive note. Considering the evangelization of youth in Great Britain, he describes the zeal with which they have embraced Christian environmental stewardship. The next generation of Christians may signal a new spirit of faithfulness to the Creator by their care for the creation. p. 259

Environment and the Christian Faith: A Holistic Approach from Bali

Wayan Mastra

[32] Carl Sagan, 'Guest Comment: Preserving and Cherishing the Earth—An Appeal for Joint Commitment in Science and Religion'. *American Journal of Physics* 58 (1990): 615.