

How does Christianity compare with Environmentalism?

By Tim Bloedow

Apr 22, 2008 — The Christian Heritage Party seems to be the only federal political party that is standing firm against the pantheistic agenda of the modern Environmentalist Movement. The pressure to concede to this agenda, though, is fierce—especially on the issue of "Climate Change".

Many Christians have already conceded a lot of ground. I just saw a commercial on CNN with black activist Al Sharpton and Christian TV evangelist Pat Robertson uniting their voices from the left and the right to call the American federal government to be more aggressive at dealing with Climate Change.

I have recently written a book that should be available in a few months that deals head-on with the key components of the Environmentalist Movement's underlying theology and how they compete with a Christian worldview. Following is a small excerpt from this book:

Sometimes you will hear someone say that conservatives should be environmentalists because Environmentalism is largely about conservation. On the surface, this seems like a reasonable proposition, but a careful consideration of the argument reveals that it does not stand up to scrutiny.

Conservationist principles have been developed and practised throughout history by many people, including farmers, hunters, foresters and even pet owners; anyone who is involved with managing and domesticating animals. Conservationist principles are rooted in scientific research and generations of experience. A far more accurate term to define the environmentalist approach to the environment is "Preservationism".

Preservationism takes conservation a step too far. Preservationism is utopian and absolutist—it advocates for preservation **at any cost**. The preservation of animal and plant life cannot be treated as simply one of many variables in man's pursuit of his own goals. Rather, preservation is the *ultimate* goal, with all other goals made to serve this primary focus.

Preservationism also denies the fallen nature of a sin-filled world. It assumes that animals and vegetation are better off when man leaves them alone.

Conservationists, on the other hand, reflect a spirit that is consistent with the Christian recognition of pervasive corruption and the contribution that Dominion-mandated people can have to redeem the natural order from this corruption. Due to this approach, men have learned to cull animal populations so that they don't exceed the carrying capacity of their habitat; they have discovered remedies to animal diseases; they have improved the quality of life for many animals through domestication.

A conservationist has no problem including hunting—the culling of the deer population, for example—as part of a strategy both to prevent extinction and to keep the population from expanding beyond the capacity of its habitat to provide sufficient food.

A preservationist, on the other hand, shudders at the idea of killing "Bambi". He would prefer that the deer population follow its "natural" course—even if it over-extends its habitat, resulting in a substantial "natural" population collapse.

This same mentality, when applied to forests, resists historic and proven principles of forest management, including the cleaning up of dead trees and branches and the planting of new trees to replace those that are harvested.

Human sacrifice seems to be a price these preservationists are willing to pay to preserve messy forests. North America continues to see forest fires that are far larger and more dangerous than they have to be—sometimes destroying people's homes—because the fires have much more fuel to feed them in forests that have not been cleared of dead wood. This was the case, in 2007 in the California neighbourhood of Lake Tahoe. Regretfully, leftwing extremists in civil government continue to fuel this utopianism and idolatry by subsidizing the rebuilding of such homes instead of using these incidents to expose the folly of pantheistic Environmentalism. Insurance companies should start putting a "Pantheism clause" in their home insurance policies.

The preservationist wing of Environmentalism also insists that old-growth and "bio-diversity" forests are inherently superior—both morally and biologically—to new-growth and monoculture forests (where only one type of tree is planted in a particular area). Judging by the competing scientific views on this subject that I have read, these preservationist claims seem to be more reflective of faith than science.

In fact, the correct answer to those conflicting views probably depends in large part on what the purpose of the forest is. If the purpose is to grow trees that will again be harvested, then there tends to be sufficient benefits to a monoculture forest to offset any possible problems. Of course, this kind of analysis is anathema to a preservationist, because utilitarian considerations that treat trees simply as a resource for human industry are an inherent violation of the preservationist ethic. As one writer put it: "According to conservationism, scarce and precious resources should be conserved and used wisely. According to preservation ethics, we should not think of wilderness as merely a resource. Wilderness commands reverence in a way mere resources do not."

*Mr. Bloedow's views align closely with those of the CHP; the Biblical 'cultural mandate' commands us to protect the environment, while developing it for the benefit of humanity. Alas, modern 'Environmentalism' goes overboard and "worships the creation rather than the Creator." It has become a new religion, with Al Gore and David Suzuki as its priests, and Kyoto as its sacrament. Yet the hysteria over so-called "global warming"—0.6 degrees in the last century—looks more like an attempt to create a global panic over a "global problem" that will require a global authority to "solve" it. Meanwhile, carbon tax plans, cap-and-trade schemes, and treaties like the Kyoto Accord will hurt Western economies and divert resources that could be used to combat **real** pollution and solve **real** problems, like the urgent need for clean drinking water in the Third World.*

—Ron Gray