

Ph.D., is professor of biology and chairman of the department. Assisting him are Donald F. Blake, Ph.D.; John F. Stout, Ph.D.; Carl A. Forss, Ph.D.; and Albert E. Grable, Ph.D. Parasitology, ecology and taxonomy are their research areas.

The Department of Chemistry, which offers both B.A. and B.S. degrees with majors in chemistry, is located in Bowers Hall, which is equipped with a lecture hall, classrooms, library, four general laboratories, and one instrumental laboratory. Carl T. Jones, Ph.D., is professor of chemistry and chairman of the department. He is assisted by James R. Chambers, Ph.D., and Clarence E. Chinn, Ph.D. These men are doing research on fatty acids in blood, organic syn-

thesis of phosphorus compounds, and liquid extractions with radioactive tracers, respectively.

The Physics Department, which offers both a B.A. and a B.S. degree with a major in physics, shares Kretschmar Hall, completed in 1964, with mathematics and engineering departments. Claude C. Barnett, Ph.D., is professor of physics and chairman of the department and is assisted by Donald E. Hall, Ph.D., and Joseph W. Hutcherson, Ph.D. These men are conducting research on relativity and bioluminescence, plasma astrophysics (theoretical), and continuation of vacuum ultraviolet spectroscopy started at Oakridge Institute of Nuclear Studies.

THAT WHICH HAS BEEN CREATED SHOULD BE CONSERVED

HAROLD ARMSTRONG*

To read the daily newspaper is to become exposed to the need for conservation. The earth, plants, and animals have all been misused by many men. Such actions are of particular concern to the creationist because of faith in the Creator and loyalty to His Word. Many specific instructions are given in both the Old and New Testament pertaining to treatment of the earth, of plants and of animals. By analogical studies of God's Word, we can know of God's evident wish to preserve the different and the unique, and we can know that we should not pervert the earth from its own nature.

In Revelation 11:18 we find these remarkable words: "(O Lord God Almighty, the time is come that Thou . . .) shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth." What does this mean? There is a similar portion in Daniel 7:23: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces."

To a reader in St. John's time, let alone in Daniel's, these words must have been incomprehensible. How could men destroy the earth? But now we can (almost) say of this what was once said for a happier reason: "Today is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." (St. Luke 4:21)

There is much talk nowadays of conservation. The danger is that while the talk is going on, a combination of greed and short-sightedness could actually "destroy the earth" as a place to live. The point to be made here is that creationists might very well take a special interest in conservation.

Conservation Is Needed

To be convinced of the need for conservation, we have merely to read the newspapers. The Great Lakes, we read, are rapidly being polluted, Fish are dying, swimming-places are being

spoiled, cities using water from the lakes have to use more and more chemical treatment, which leave the water less and less palatable.

Indeed, it sometimes seems that the very existence of the lakes is in danger. A year or two ago, too much water was being removed through the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Chicago Drainage Canal, and the level of the lakes was going down. This danger seems now to have been arrested, at least for the present; but if more water is taken out than flows in, there can be only one result.

Moreover, erosion of the surrounding land is causing much sediment to wash into the lakes; In the not too distant future, Lake St. Clair, for instance, seems to be in danger of actually filling in.

If we look to the west, we see the same kind of thing. Many men can still remember what happened on the prairies in the years right after 1930; dust storms were most common because the land had been overworked. Happily these conditions have not been repeated lately, at least not in so big a way; but the threat is still there. Yet farther west, in California, for instance, we see the whole face of the country being changed—and not for the better—by too much concentrated building in formerly highly productive orchard and farm lands.

Nor have plants and animals fared any better than the earth itself. In Kingston, fine old elm trees are dying off—victims of a plague intro-

*Harold Armstrong is a faculty member of the Queens College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

duced to this continent some years ago. Outside the city, trees are being butchered by the thousands as roads are widened. In California, again, grading and the construction of roads (in particular) threaten to destroy many native species of plant; the fine work of the California Native Plant Society is perhaps about the only thing being done to ensure continued existence of many plants.

As for animals, we know what happened to the passenger pigeon. Other kinds of birds, we hear, also are threatened with extinction, for reasons such as the destruction of forests and the indiscriminate use of poisonous sprays. In Africa and India, many of the animals for which those parts are famous have declined in numbers, until they too are threatened with extinction.

And even life in the sea is not safe; too much hunting has endangered the continued existence of many kinds of whale. And I could go on and on—but why take up the space? Everyone knows about these things. For that reason, too, because these facts are well known, I have not given references.

Why Special Creationist Concern?

So much for the facts. But why, it may be asked, is this a matter of special concern to creationists? The answer is simple, a creationist is a creationist, not out of devotion to any abstract notion of creation, but out of faith in the Creator, who cannot lie (Hebrews 6:18), and out of loyalty to His word. Now where action is called for, faith without action is not very profitable (St. James 2: 17). So let us inquire whether God has said anything about our care of the world.

In Genesis 1:28 God said to our parents ". . . subdue it (the earth), and have dominion over the fish . . . and every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Now the word translated "subdue" is rendered "keep under . . . (for bondsmen) . . . "i.e. "make servants of" in 2 Chronicles 28:10, and "have dominion" is applied to Christ in His Messianic reign in Psalm 72:8. (For surely this Psalm looks beyond Solomon, although it may well apply to him also.)

So here is the relation between us and the earth; it is to stand to us in the relation of a slave to his master, or of a subject to his king. Does that entitle us to abuse it? Certainly not! On the duties of masters we have only to read Exodus 21:2; Deuteronomy 15:12; and Ephesians 6:9. The duties of kings—of rulers—are treated also in Deuteronomy 17:16-20; Proverbs 31:4,5; Ecclesiastes 5:8; and Daniel 4:22-25.

God's covenant with Noah after the Flood (Genesis 9:1-7) does not change this; the notion of "in one's hands" in verse 2 is often applied to mean in one's care, as in Ecclesiastes 9:1 (and may I, for the sake of its eloquence, mention Wisdom 3:1)

So the conclusion is that God put us to rule (under Him) over His creation, and that thus we are His stewards, accountable to Him. We may use the products of the earth to maintain ourselves in a reasonable style, as a king may collect reasonable taxes from his people, and as a steward may maintain himself in a fitting style from the proceeds of the estate. But if we go beyond that we are no longer kings, but tyrants; no longer stewards, but embezzlers.

Specific Instructions Given

As well as this general principle, has God given us any more specific instructions? He has. Concerning our dealings with animals we may consider Exodus 23:4; Leviticus 19:19 and 22:28; and Deuteronomy 25:4; 22:6, 7, and 10. Even trees come in for some thought in Deuteronomy 20:19, 20; and the earth (or land) itself in such passages as Exodus 23:11.

Although it is somewhat apart from the main topic, commandments pertaining to animals are noteworthy. We may use them, but we are to do it humanely, and, it would seem, are to interfere as little as possible with their nature. Alas, how many practices are common today which would never stand up to God's standards here!

A case in point is the method, which is now becoming common for keeping chickens in which they pass their whole lives (if it can be called life) in cages hardly bigger than themselves. Is this natural? Is artificial insemination not an affront to the animals on which it is practiced? I mention these practices because, while common, they are not so obvious; great and obvious cruelties need not be mentioned here. But God knows about them, and perhaps in these cases it may be said, as it is of the fatherless, ". . . their redeemer is mighty, and He shall plead their cause with thee." (Proverbs 23:11.)

To return, though, to the earth, and conservation, what can we say about it? There is not so much in Scripture in the way of explicit direction about this matter, although there is the commandment already mentioned, in Deuteronomy 20:19, 20.

But may we proceed here by analogy? For if we are to see the analogy between murder and hatred, as in St. Matthew 5:21, 22, or between feeding oxen and maintaining ministers of the Gospel as in 1 Corinthians 9:9, 10; may we not see comparison between proper treatment of animals (which, as has been already mentioned, comes up in a number of places in Scripture) and proper treatment of the earth itself.

If, then, we follow this analogy, where does it lead us? Well, first of all, there is God's evident wish to preserve that which is different, which is unique. In human affairs, this shows

up in the provisions to ensure that a name “. . . be not put out of Israel” (Deuteronomy 25:6 and thereabouts). As it pertains to animals (or, rather, birds), the law of Deuteronomy 22:6, 7, seems to have the same purpose.

If, then, we follow the analogy, we shall respect the unique and remarkable features of the earth. We shall not dam up, and spoil forever, a beautiful canyon, in order to get a few more kilowatts for brighter neon signs. We shall not cut down redwoods, going back maybe to the Flood (see *The Genesis Flood*, p. 392) in order to have a few more barbecue tables. Nor shall we destroy the whole race of whales for selfish reasons.

Secondly, we should not pervert the earth from its own nature. Sometimes it may not be too clear just what this nature is, but it certainly is not to be scraped flat and buried in asphalt. Nor should we take away the trees and leave the land to wash away, nor should we pollute the lakes with sewage. (This last point, incidentally, is already dealt with in Deuteronomy 23:12-15).

It may be said that, if we were to try to follow these principles, we should not have enough food. But would God's answer not be, as it was in another connection, “. . . all the land shall yield her fruit, and ye shall eat your fill. . . . I will command my blessing upon you, and it will bring forth fruit. . . .” (Leviticus 25: 19-21.) In any event, it would seem that, in the long run, almost any course is likelier to keep us fed than our present course of ravaging the ultimate source of all our food.

What can we do about the matter? Well, we may conserve the earth and its resources, and refrain from destroying them, wherever we have the power to act. We may persuade and urge

others, so far as it lies in us, to do likewise.

For we are God's witnesses-his spokesmen-and, while our main business is with the Gospel, yet we may well also proclaim God's will on temporal matters. In so doing, we should be following a line of distinguished predecessors, such as Joseph, Daniel, Mordecai, and Nehemiah; and we might even get a hearing for the Gospel if, in temporal matters, people could say “we saw certainly that the Lord was with thee. . . .” (Genesis 26:28). And finally, we can lend our encouragement and support to groups working for conservation.

What Success Expected?

There is one more point that could be made here. What kind of success do we expect for our efforts? Our success, in a sense, will likely be something less than complete, for the suffering of the earth, in which truly “. . . the whole creation groaneth . . .” (Romans 8:22) will probably not be healed until the “times of the restitution of all things.” (Acts 3:21.)

In fact, in this, as in many other things, the best that we can do is probably, so to speak, just first aid. The complete cure must wait until Christ returns, when “. . . the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose . . .” (Isaiah 35:1). Yet meanwhile we are to do what we can.

It is even so with the Gospel itself: we are to be witnesses; yet “. . . when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?” (St. Luke 18:8.)

Likewise in temporal matters, let us cleave to God's will, remembering that “. . . the righteous, and the wise, and their works, are in the hand of God. . . .” (Ecclesiastes 9:1) and that “. . . if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God. . . .” (2 Corinthians 5:1).

COMMENTS ON SCIENTIFIC NEWS AND VIEWS

HAROLD ARMSTRONG*

A thoroughgoing Flood geology must provide an explanation of how sediments, mud and sand hardened into sedimentary rocks at the end of the Flood, in a fairly short time (surely no more than, at most, a hundred years).

One of the best ways of showing that something is possible is to show that it actually happens, or has happened. Thus it would be of interest to find a case in which materials harden into stone.

Now an artificial stone, called “Angelstone” is in fairly common use. It is made by Angelstone,

*Harold Armstrong is a faculty member of the Queens College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

Limited, at Preston, Ontario. According to the company Manual RAIC.AIA FILE NO. 8,

. . . a unique process for manufacturing fine quality stone was developed. Natural silicious sands are ground and combined with stable oxide pigments and active chemical constituents, then subjected to intense pressure, heat, and autoclave curing. The surfaces of the particles interact with one another—they are not just surrounded by cement paste as in ordinary concrete. The techniques used parallel those of nature herself and the resulting sandstones closely resemble the quarried product.

The “Angelstone” does, indeed, (to one who