

# THE PLEASANT VIEW PLUMB LINE

## COWS, KIDS, AND CO<sub>2</sub>

The fundamental fallacy of the modern environment movement in its inherent denial of supernaturalism and metaphysical reality. Rather than acknowledging that the entire Universe was created by the transcendent God of the Bible, Who both prepared and perpetuates the Earth for human habitation (Genesis 1:1-2:19; 8:22; Hebrews 11:3), the environmental movement posits an eternal Universe that must be protected and preserved by humans in order for life to continue. The future of the Earth is viewed as dependent on mankind. If man damages the fragile environment, he is hastening its imminent demise.

It was one thing for those young people who embraced this perspective to march in the streets in the 1960s and promote their wacky ideas. But now that they have moved into powerful political positions, their ideas permeate policy and literally wreak havoc on people's lives. First it was the "deadly" ozone-depleting hairspray aerosols. Then it was the evil internal combustion engine. Two recent instances demonstrate the absurd extent to which environmentalists are willing to go.

A 400-page United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization report has identified rapidly growing herds of cattle as the greatest threat to the environment (Lean, 2006). We are told that the 1.5 billion cattle of the Earth are responsible for 18% of the greenhouse gases that cause global warming—more than cars, planes, and all other forms of transportation combined. More than a third of the greenhouse gas, methane (which warms the world 20 times faster than carbon dioxide), is emitted by cows and their manure. And its not just methane, since cattle also produce more than 100 other polluting gases, including more than two-thirds of the world's emissions of ammonia—one of the main causes of acid rain (Lean, 2006). That's right, gaseous expulsions by cows do more to damage the planet than cars. The environmentalists are beside themselves.

But its doesn't stop there. While it is common for environmentalists to blame mankind as the prime perpetrator of environmental destruciton, now one environmentalist insists that, more specifically, **children** are significant culprits in the human assault on the natural order. Parents, we are told, should limit their offsrping to no more than two children in order to reduce carbon dioxide output. The report published by the environmentalist group, Optimum Population Trust, insists that the greatest thing one could do to help the future of the planet would be to have one less child (Templeton, 2007).

The arrogance of measly man thinking he can control the forces of nature by his paltry thinking with the created order—as if he eve had the knowledge and wisdom to do so. Ultimately, this feeble, faltering faux pas manifests willful ignroance and a lack of faith in the Creator. The environmentalists need a healthy dose of spiritual reality—the same one Job received when he thought it necessary to question God's superintendence of the Universe:

"Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?  
No gird up your loins like a man, and I will ask you, and you  
instruct Me! Where were you when I laid the foundation of the  
earth? Tell Me, if you have understanding, who set its  
measurements, **since you know?**...You know, for you were born  
then, and the number of your days is great!...Will the faultfinder  
contend with the Almighty? Let him who reproves God answer  
it...**Then I will also confess to you, that your own right hand can  
save you** (Job 38:2-5,21; 40:2,14, emp. added).

If there is no God and evolution is true, then humans are no more valuable than

"...then said the  
Lord, Behold, I  
will set a plumb  
line in the midst  
of my people Is-  
rael..." (Amos 7:8)

**COMMON SENSE CHRISTIANITY:**  
**WE'RE ALL ONE**

Text: \_\_\_\_\_

I. A \_\_\_\_\_ on Favoritism

Notes:

II. A \_\_\_\_\_ of Favoritism

Notes:

III. A \_\_\_\_\_ of Favoritism

Notes:

---

**LOVE NOT THE WORLD**

Text: \_\_\_\_\_

I. Because of What \_\_\_\_\_

Notes:

II. Because of What \_\_\_\_\_

Notes:

III. Because of What \_\_\_\_\_

Notes:

rocks, cockroaches—and, yes, cows. So if we **really** want to get serious about saving the planet, simply kill all the cows and kids. When humans eliminate God from their thinking and jettison the biblical worldview, insanity begins to sound sensible. That’s the real “inconvenient truth.”

**Sources:**

- Lean, Geoffrey (2006), “Cow ‘Emissions’ More Damaging to Planet than CO2 from Cars,” *The Independent*, December 10 [On-line, URL: <http://news.independent.co.uk/environment/artciel2062484.ece>].
- Templeton, Sarah-Kate (2007), “Children ‘Bad for Planet,’” *The Australian*, May 7, [On-line], URL: <http://www.news.com.au/story/0,23599,21684156-5009760,00.html#>.

-Dave Miller, Ph.D.

**FREE TO PREACH**

Our report this month is taken from the active life of our beloved Rue Porter. In March 1954 while Uncle Rue was traveling in his work he came upon a Roman Catholic Bishop in a railroad depot and visited with him for about twenty minutes. The Bishop told Rue of his work and when brother Porter told him that he was a preacher too, the Bishop asked, “But where are your clergyman’s clothes?”

Rue said that he was one of those men who opens his Bible and asks people to believe what it says and that he did not rely on garb to distinguish him from other men of like faith. The Bishop cupped his hands over his mouth, and coming near to Rue, half whispered, “I wish I could do that. We are all under orders. We are told what to say, and we say it. We are told where to go, and we go there. We are told how long we may stay, and when to move, and we do it. I wish I were as free to preach what I find in the Bible as you.” Rue then told the man, “A man of your knowledge should have the courage to preach what he knows to be true in spite of orders from Rome or anywhere else other than Christ.” Again the Bishop said, “I wish I could do that, but my hands are tied.”

Rue Porter’s hands were never tied. From the very first he had been free to preach the Gospel of Christ. Yes, he was free! Free in Christ to preach the gospel of Christ to as many as possible in one’s lifetime. I, for one, am happy that he was free and that he was committed to the Lord enough to traverse these United States in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

-Don Deffenbaugh

**THE DAY HA-MAN BECAME A HUNG-MAN**

At the end of Galatians 6:7 by inspiration, Paul provided a universal principle that all mankind would do good to remember within the course of their lives: *“for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”* What Paul had been discussing in the first six verses was various ways individuals should treat each other, and he summarizes his point by stating this principle, essentially saying that doing good will grant us good, but doing evil will grant us evil. And it is interesting how that life will seemingly always work out to where that fact comes to light. Truly our lives are known by our fruits because we do reap what we sow. It is with that in mind that attention is turned back to Esther’s biographical book.

Usually when one mentions the book of Esther the thoughts that come to mind revolve around the faith of Esther, the providence of God, and the blessing enjoyed by the Jewish people still in captivity. What often is overlooked is the character of a man named Haman. Haman was a close and trusted associate of king Ahasuerus, one who was eventually promoted to a seat above that of all the princes in Persia (Esther 3:1). And with such a promotion, Haman expected all of the honor and recognition that would accompany it. So when *“all the king’s servants, that were in the king’s gate, bowed, and revered Haman”* (Esther 3:2a) it must have thrilled his heart. One thing we learn about Haman through Esther’s mention of him is that he was a very self-centered individual. He truly believed he was due all of the reverence shown toward him by his brethren. Thus, when Mordecai, a natural-born Jew, refused to bow in honor of Haman it enraged him. How could a lowly Jew be so disrespectful to not show Haman all of the glory he believed he deserved? Thus, it was from that day that Haman began to despise Mordecai and to plot against his very life and the lives of his brethren.

In Haman is seen the epitome of **wrong thinking**. Every problem Haman faced from chapters three to seven came from a wrongly established mindset. He viewed himself to be an exalted and extraordinary individual. Where this frame of mind began we do not know. But the fact that it existed is all too evident. How else could a man have written about him that *“when Haman saw that Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence, then was Haman full of wrath”* (Esther 3:5), and not know that he was a prideful man. Such a pride, though, represents wrong thinking for this reason: *“For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself”* (Galatians 6:3). What inherent attribute did Haman possess that made him worthy of the reverence he expected? None. Therefore the fact that he viewed himself in such an exalted way is evidence that he, as Paul said, deceived himself. He had wrong thinking, and that caused him to make wrong decisions.

In Haman, also, is seen the epitome of **wrathful thinking**. Verse five stated that Mordecai’s lack of reverence made Haman “full of wrath.” And then as you continue in the chapter you see where that wrath led him. He immediately began a plot to not only punish Mordecai, but the entirety of the Jewish remnant in Persia. Such actions could only be spurred by a burning, hot hatred and spite for the alleged wrong done to him. However, among the evil works of the flesh is named wrath (Galatians 5:20). Wrath is pictured throughout the Bible in the most negative of ways for this reason: *“the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God”* (James 1:20). But as wrong as his thinking was, there was in actuality little hope that his thinking would not also be filled with wrath, which was a detriment to Haman, as will soon be seen.

However, in Haman is also seen the epitome of **wishful thinking**. How could Haman believe he could use the mighty king of Persia as his puppet of revenge and get away with it? Yes, Ahasuerus went along with the plot at the beginning, but after certain events came to pass and he realized the fullness of Haman’s plan, it is said that he then became full of wrath (7:7). Haman would have fit well into a 21st century setting where everybody believes they can do anything without any accountability for their actions. Such reflected wishful thinking on Haman’s part, and such continues to reflect wishful thinking upon the part of our contemporaries. But it, too, was that wishful thinking that brought destruction to the life of Haman in the end.

Therefore in the course of events, Haman took the step to, in his hatred and wrath, build gallows upon which he planned to have Mordecai hung for his refusal to give him reverence. But because of his wrong, wrathful, and wishful thinking, Haman came to reap what he had sown. The king learned of all that had transpired and the sad irony is read in Esther 7:10: *“So they hanged Mordecai on the gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai.”* On this day Ha-man became a hung-man, and for what reason? He had a problem with his thinking. Truly in the life of Haman is Solomon’s point brought to light, *“as he thinketh in his heart, so is he”* (Proverbs 23:7).

-Andy Brewer