

践行圣经关爱大地使命双周讯息刊（总第一期）
（2019年6月2日）



这是天父世界，
 小鸟展翅飞鸣，
清晨明亮，好花美丽，
 证明天理精深。

这是天父世界，
 祂爱普及万千；
风吹之草将祂表现，
 天父充满世间。

编者语

当历史的车轮前进到 20 世纪时，生态危机史无前例地给人类和整个地球带来巨大的破坏和危险，而且呈现持续恶化的趋势，这促使科学家们极力调查危机的现状和寻找潜在的解决方案。瓦奇尔那格欧在 1997 年指出危机的关键原因是人类的过度行为所至。¹ 许多学者相信：自从工业革命以来人类带来的生态危机根扎于西方的人类中心的思想方式。基督教会和基督徒怎样回应这些问题？是熟视无睹？是简单否定各种环保组织、环保理念和行动？是仅仅感叹环境恶化、口头批评破坏大地的行为？还是回到圣经，体察天父上帝对于大地自然的心意，遵行祂的教导来关爱大地？圣经主要讲了四种关系：上帝与人的关系，人与人的关系，上帝与自然的关系，人与自然的关系；在今天的人与自然的关系极度疏离和破裂的时代，我们谦卑学习圣经中有关的教导尤为紧迫；圣经教导上帝的儿女要效法基督，所以在看待人与自然的关系时，也要从领悟上帝与自然的关系，去得到启迪。

生态学（ecology）是由德国生物学家海克尔（Ernst Haeckel, 1834-1919）在 1866 年提出的，它是一门研究生物体和环境（包括其它生物）之间的关系的科学，生态（eco）的字源来自希腊文的“家”（oikos）。上世纪开始凸显的环境破坏和生态危机，使人们高度重视生态学的研究和应用。然而，有识之士认识到“生态问题并非单纯是一个自然科学/技术的问题，背后更牵涉社会/政治的意识形态、人的心灵与价值取向以及生活方式等问题。”² 内斯（Arne Naess）在七十年代初期提出了“深层生态学（deep ecology）”的理念，引出了对于上述更广范畴的关注和研究，如生态哲学、生态伦理学等，同时，也对各种文化传统的生态思想进行挖掘，以服务于今天的大地关怀和环境保护。

上世纪七十年代，基督教生态神学（ecological theology）渐渐兴起，它是“一种以人与其它形式的生命及共处的环境（或简单地说人与自然）的关系为主题的神学论述。”³ 它有系统地从圣经神学、系统神学、历史神学以及实践神学等诸方面来学习和领会上帝对于人与自然的关系的心意。

20 世纪下半叶以来，世界基督教神学与宣教运动越来越重视整全福音观和大地护理观。2010 年在开普敦举行的世界福音派教会会议上，制定了《开普敦承诺》（The Cape Town Commitment）。它提出“要像保罗那样，从宇宙性和真理的视角，传讲并教导符合圣经的整全福音……这不仅是在提供针对个人的救赎……更是为了完成上帝在基督里为整个宇宙所定的计划。”整全福音使命是基督为主是中心（the Lord of Christ），包括福音（evangelism），教导（teaching），同情（compassion），公义（justice），大地护理（creation care）五个方面。基于圣经的教导，面临地球生态环境的日益恶化和人类对自然的贪婪攫取，普世教会开始注意大地护理；许多教会开始更主动地参与各种关爱自然和保护环境的活动，并把世界贫穷和气候变化联系起来关切；许多基督徒个人开始操练一种简朴和生态的生活方式；普世宣教中加入绿色宣教的元素；基督教神学教育和学者更加注重生态神学的研究。华人教会虽然起步较晚，但已有越来越多的华人基督徒认识到大地护理的重要，也体察天父对人与大自然的爱，“何况这尼尼微大城，其中不能分辨左手右手的有十二万多人，并有许多牲畜。我岂能不爱惜呢？”（约拿书 4：11）主耶稣的看病、赶鬼和直接传讲救赎福音三者是紧密联系没有分割的，他也讲述天父对于自然生灵的爱；整全福音的五个方面是相互联系和促进的，教会和基督徒也需要面对时代，探索彼此间的配搭结合。

¹ World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 8.

² 赖品超、林宏星，《儒耶对话与生态关怀》（北京：宗教文化出版社，2006 年版），第 43 页。

³ 同上。

上帝的普遍启示和护理，以及所赐的道德律遍及大地之上和所有文化之中，中华文化中有许多生态科技观，它在生态哲学和伦理学上也有许多良善的传统遗产，如认识自然、顺应自然、尊重自然的思想；这些都可以帮助今天的社会和人类关爱自然和参与环保。

笔者在 2014 到 2016 年间在天道神学院学习时开始接触并学习生态神学，后与一些老师、牧者、弟兄姊妹和亲朋好友交流这方面的内容。笔者今年和一些弟兄姊妹在这方面有更多的交流，大家建立了一个祷告群，为践行圣经关爱大地来祷告，大家对生态神学和关爱大地、生态环保有学习和开放的心怀。但我们都知道自己是何等的卑微弱小和软弱，向前行那怕是最微小的一步，都需要真诚求天父来带领和加力，“万军之耶和华说，不是倚靠势力，不是倚靠才能，乃是倚靠我的灵，方能成事。”（撒迦利亚书 4: 6b）我们经过祷告，都认同办一个每月双周讯息刊，宗旨是践行圣经，学习生态神学，关切自然生态环境，宣传参与大地护理，关注祖国中国和所居住国加拿大的生态和保护情况。今天，这个小小的刊物的第一期出现了，愿一切荣耀都归给独一的上帝，也感谢践行圣经关爱大地祷告群的各位朋友的祷告支持和具体参与，感谢那些花时间和我们交流和给我们支持的各位弟兄姊妹和朋友。请大家为我们和刊物的编发来祷告。

近期祷告事项（6月2日-6月15日）：

第一，求主让我们和自己的家人和朋友一起走进大地，体会大自然与我们的亲近，学习多一些认识花鸟树木，更深爱护大自然。

第二，求主让我们操练一种简朴和生态的生活方式。

第三，求主让我们学习本期所提到的圣经，思想其中的生态神学意义。

第四，为本刊的第二期编辑祷告，求主赐给笔者有健康的身体，在编辑遇到技术困难时，有懂电脑文件编辑技术的朋友可以帮助自己。

一、圣经的话语和生态神学观

导读：

从本期开始，我们会花一段时间来比较详细地学习圣经学者 Richard Bauckham 的 *The Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation* (Waco, TE: Baylor University Press, 2010) 一书。作者是著名的英国圣公会神学、历史神学新约圣经学者，剑桥 Ridley Hall 的高级学者。其 *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* 一书获 Christianity Today 图书奖。他也出版研究德国神学家 Jürgen Moltmann 的著作，致力于圣经的有关生态内容的研究。本书就是他的最新的关于圣经和生态的著作。

该书从研读创世记一章和创世记其它有关章节开始。(1) 基督教传统对于人与自然的关系，集中在两面，一是人是大地的主管(创 1: 28)，二是上帝通过大自然和人的构造对人类的一般启示。(2) 基督教学者对于人与自然的关系，有三种不同的观点，一是以人为中心，二是以生态为中心观，三是以上帝为中心观。该书支持以上帝为中心观；同时，认为大地管家观模式有相当大的限制，圣经关于人与自然关系的论述远远超过此模式。(3) 创世纪 1: 28 和其中的“治理”和“管理”两字的解释尤为重要，基督教传统中许多神学家认为：这表明人对自然的统治(dominion)和表现了大地管家模式，并认为圣经表明了一种人与自然关系中的以人为中心观。而该书在解经基础上对此提出批评和改进意见。(4) 本期摘要“Chapter 1: Stewardship in Question”之最后一部分，即作者在研经后的综合反思。

ideally should be, is less usually admitted. The fully harmonious whole that God pronounced 'very good' still awaits its realisation. Here and now we must reckon with a world that is much better than it could be (as the world after the Flood was much better than the unrestrictedly violent one before the Flood), but in which some concessions to violence have to be made. They are, as we have seen, strictly limited concessions. How much of our actual production and consumption of meat is really compatible with the carefully conditional concession of Genesis 9:3-4?

On the other hand, the original ideals of creation are not irrelevant, partly because, in the light of the whole biblical narrative, we know that God has not by any means abandoned them. In chapters 4 and 5 we shall discuss the ecotopias the Bible envisages for the future, when the promise of Genesis 1 and 2 will be fulfilled and even surpassed. Especially in the light of the salvation that is already ours in Jesus Christ, we should not opt simply for the realism of Genesis 9 rather than the idealism of Genesis 1-2. Here and now, both are relevant.

STEWARDSHIP AND DOMINION IN ISRAEL'S LAND LAW

In the Mosaic law we can see that the Torah as a whole does not endorse a simple option for the realism of Genesis 9 rather than the idealism of Genesis 1. Both are reflected. The way that Israel is to live in and from the holy land, by means of agriculture, models the way humans are to fill and to subdue the Earth according to Genesis 1. Very explicitly, Israel is a tenant and steward of the land that belongs to God, with the right to live from the land but also the responsibility to care for it.⁵⁹

This is a large topic, and we must be content with some particularly interesting examples. The laws authorise Israel's use and enhancement of the land, but they also impose strict limits, especially in the form of the sabbatical institutions: the weekly sabbath, the sabbatical year, every seven years, and the jubilee year (the sabbath of sabbaths), every fifty years. These laws are not just about good farming practice,⁶⁰ but about keeping the economic

drive in human life within its place and not letting it dominate the whole of life. They also give Israel occasion to remember that the land is God's, given to them in trust; not a commodity but a gift, and a gift given to the whole community, not to the acquisitive alone.

In Israel's land legislation, both the human right to subdue the Earth and the human dominion over other living creatures are exercised as much in restraint as in active use. Particularly striking is the concern for wild animals. In the sabbatical year, fields, vineyards and orchards are to be left to rest and lie fallow, 'so that the poor of your people may eat; and what they leave the wild animals may eat' (Exod. 23:11 NRSV; similarly Lev. 25:7). Thus, even within the cultivated part of the land, wild animals are expected to be able to live. This is an application of the principle we have seen implied in Genesis 1:29-30: that both humans and other land animals have a right to the produce of the Earth and humans, in their production and consumption of food, must recognise that they share the Earth with other species and have no exclusive right to its resources.

This provision for the wild animals to live even where Israelites farmed the land could be seen as a kind of symbol of respect for wilderness, reminding both ancient Israel and later readers of Scripture that dominion includes letting wild nature be itself. There is value that should be respected and preserved in the wild as well as in the humanly cultivated.

The time has come to attempt a synthesis of what we have learned about the human place in creation, according to Genesis 1 and its interpretation elsewhere in the Pentateuch, with a view to its contemporary significance for God's people today.

SYNTHESIS: (1) HUMAN SOLIDARITY WITH THE REST OF CREATION

While the Genesis creation narratives do distinguish humans from other creatures, giving them a unique place within creation, they also place humans unambiguously within creation. Humans are not demi-gods with creative power, set like God above creation,

but creatures among other creatures, dependent, like other creatures, on the material world of which they are part, and immersed in a web of reciprocal relationships with other creatures. The unique tasks and roles of humans, given them in Genesis 1:26 and 28, are bound to be misunderstood and abused unless the fundamental solidarity of humans with the rest of creation is recognised as their context. *“管理” “管轄” 被人误解为“人中心”*

SYNTHESIS: (2) RESPONSIBLE USE OF THE EARTH'S RESOURCES

All living creatures need to make use of other creatures, animate or inanimate, in order to live and to flourish. Humanity is different only in the extent, diversity and ingenuity of its use of other creatures. Since, properly speaking, all creation belongs to God its Creator and to God alone, creatures can make use of other creatures only by divine permission. The creation narrative in Genesis 1 makes this explicit when God declares that he has given every green plant for food to all the animals that live on land (1:30). The task of subduing the Earth that God grants humans is, primarily, the human equivalent. However, for humans, this task can be understood as stewardship in the sense of responsible care for the Earth that God himself still owns and has entrusted to humans for their sustenance and delight. Adam's farming of the Earth in Eden included preserving it, and Israel's use of the land was limited so that it would not be exhausted.

Contemporary, environmentally sensitive interpreters of Genesis tend to gloss over the human right to use the resources of creation. But this is a serious mistake. Human use of the Earth and its creatures is part of the fundamental interdependence of the whole creation. It is a necessary feature of human life and accounts for much human activity. Contemporary interpreters are rightly wary of justifying the unrestricted exploitation of the Earth and its creatures which has had such disastrous results in the twentieth century, and which was justified in the past by use of these texts in Genesis 1. But it is better to stress how the Bible limits human use of other creatures than to eliminate this theme from the text.

altogether. God's original purpose for humanity does entitle us to make limited use of other creatures for human life and flourishing. As Stephen Clark puts it: 'we are allowed our modest use of parts of nature explicitly upon condition that we leave it at peace, that we not take all of it.'⁶¹

I have distinguished, in Genesis 1:26 and 28, the subduing of the Earth from the dominion over other living creatures. The latter would seem to be a matter of caring responsibility, rather than use. Are humans therefore not given by God the right to use other living creatures in any way? With regard to eating meat, there is clearly a change between the original mandate and its reformulation after the Flood (Gen. 9:3), although, as we have seen, the right to kill for food is a concession and one that has restrictive conditions attached to it. But animals were useful to humans in the Old Testament period in ways that do not entail killing: donkeys, camels and horses for transport, oxen for ploughing and grinding, sheep for wool, dogs as watch dogs, sea shells for ornament, the skins, horns and feathers of animals that die naturally for clothing, tools, and so forth. Genesis does portray at least some of such uses before the Flood (Gen. 4:2-4 and 20-21; cf. 3:21), and it is notable that in Genesis 1:24-25 domestic animals are already distinguished from wild animals at the time of their creation, as though the role of domestic animals in human society was God's intention from the beginning.⁶² Whether we see the human right to use other living creatures for their own life and flourishing as part of the task of subduing the Earth (does the agriculture envisaged in Genesis 1:28 include roles for domestic animals, such as oxen?) or as an aspect of the dominion over other living creatures, may not be very important. In some respects, the two categories converge. But we should bear in mind that Genesis does often distinguish animate from inanimate nature, and that distinction should surely be observed in the ways we make use of other creatures. We should recall also that the use of other living creatures is not itself something unique to humans; many other living creatures do it. The distinctively human task is to keep that use within a larger role of caring responsibility for other creatures.

SYNTHESIS: (3) IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

In Genesis 1, God marks out humanity from other living creatures by creating them in his own image and by granting them dominion over others. What it means to be made in the image of God has been much debated by exegetes and theologians.⁶³ Attempts to draw a hard distinction between human nature and animals have often been hung on this text, but scientific research makes it increasingly difficult to identify any absolute difference.⁶⁴ In the text itself the image of God is closely related to the dominion over other creatures, and this is the best clue to its meaning. The image must be whatever it is that gives us power unlike that of any other creatures. But the image must also be whatever it is about humans that makes it possible for us to exercise that power in a responsible and caring way. We do not need to say that we are the only creatures with moral values⁶⁵ or that we are the only creatures conscious of God.⁶⁶ The point is that we have that kind of awareness of God and that kind of moral sense that enable us to feel and to exercise responsibility in creation on such a large scale. It cannot be that other creatures in no way reflect their Creator, but that we have a particularly broad participation in God's governance of creation and need therefore also to reflect God's care for his whole creation on this Earth.

The close relationship between the image of God and the dominion means that the latter is an exercise of rule on behalf of God, not instead of God. Only humanity in relationship with God, knowing its own dependence on God, can exercise dominion as God's image.⁶⁷ Conversely, humanity's inveterate aspiration to replace God, to be gods, has been expressed, especially in the modern period, through domination of nature. By the project of total control of the natural world, modern humans have sought the means of making themselves gods, subject to none, supreme over all. Christians have been surprisingly slow to appreciate the connection between the modern world's rejection of God and the ecologically disastrous modern project of technological conquest of nature. That humans are made in the image of God, to exercise

dominion on God's behalf, not in God's stead, is one important theological antidote to this modern mistake.

SYNTHESIS: (4) RULING LIKE GOD

Many interpreters have rightly seen in Genesis 1:26 the implication that the human dominion is some sort of reflection of God's rule, and therefore that in some sense the Bible's portrayal of God's rule should be the model for humanity's.⁶⁸ Reflecting it must surely begin with learning to value it in the ways God does. Then we can appreciate that God rules for the good of all his creatures. It is his compassionate and salvific care for all creatures. For example, Psalm 145 recalls the classic biblical statement of the character of God (from Exod. 34:6) and uses it to characterise God's rule, not only over humanity, but over all creatures:

The LORD is gracious and merciful,
slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.
The LORD is good to all,
and his compassion is over all that he has made. (Ps. 145:8-9 NRSV)

This kind of rule is surely what the human dominion is intended by God to be: a form of caring responsibility for God's creatures.

However, because modern humanity has been so prone to forget this, we should add that human dominion is unlike God's rule in very significant other respects: it is restricted, it is exercised within rather than over creation, it may not aspire to divine omnipotence, and, perhaps above all, it is exercised in relation to fellow-creatures.

SYNTHESIS: (5) RULING FELLOW-CREATURES - HIERARCHY QUALIFIED BY COMMUNITY

As we have seen, our creatureliness is more fundamental than our distinctiveness among creatures. Our creation in the image of God and the unique dominion given to us do not abolish our fundamental community with other creatures. The vertical does not cancel the horizontal.

人与兽的关系
是平等的
还是不平等的

Indeed, the horizontal relationship with fellow-creatures is vital to the proper understanding of the vertical relationship of authority over others. Since Genesis 1 presents this authority as a kind of kingly rule, it is relevant to recall the only kind of human rule over other humans that the Old Testament approves. The book of Deuteronomy permits Israel to have a king, but interprets this kingship in a way designed to subvert all ordinary notions of rule (17:14-20). If Israel must have a king, then the king must be a brother. He is a brother set over his brothers and sisters, but still a brother, and forbidden any of the ways in which rulers exalt themselves over and entrench their power over their subjects. His rule becomes tyranny the moment he forgets that the horizontal relationship of brother/sisterhood is primary, kingship secondary.⁶⁹ Similarly, the human rule over other creatures will be tyrannous unless it is placed in the context of our more fundamental community with other creatures.

SYNTHESIS: (6) RULING WITHIN THE ORDER OF CREATION - SHARING THE EARTH

上帝的order
对人的要求
是有限的

Genesis 1 presents a picture of a carefully ordered creation. The order is already established before the creation of humans. It does not need humans to put it in order. The human dominion is not granted so that humans may violate the already given order of creation and remake creation to their own design. It is taken for granted that the God-given order of the world must be respected by the human exercise of limited dominion within it.

We have observed how Genesis 1:29-30 implies that human use of the Earth is not to compete with its use by other living creatures. They also have a right of use. This is a massive restriction of human rights to the Earth's resources and chimes well with contemporary concerns. A similar point is made in Genesis 9:8-17, where God's covenant is made not only with Noah and his descendants but also with 'every living creature of all flesh' (v 15). It is for the sake of them all that God promises never again to destroy the Earth in a universal deluge. The Earth is home for them all and they all have a stake in that covenant. Even within the

sphere of human agriculture Israel's land laws recognise that some provision for wild creatures must be left.

SYNTHESIS: (7) PRESERVING CREATION

Ruling - understood as caring responsibility for - other creatures can include saving them from destruction. If biblical warrant for saving species from extinction is required, surely it is in the story of Noah and the Flood. But we should also note, with Rowan Williams, that 'the story is clearly about how the saving of the human future is inseparable from securing a future for all living things'.⁷⁰ That it was so important to save other living creatures along with humanity testifies to the interconnectedness and interdependence of the creation of which humans are a part.

SUMMARY

Does God's mandate to humans at creation encourage us to become controllers and managers of the whole of creation on this planet? No. It ascribes to God's gift the unique degree of power within creation that realistically our species has, and we should neither underestimate nor exaggerate that if we are to exercise it responsibly, as the mandate requires.

Granted our limited place within the God-given order of creation, the power we do have is to be exercised with loving care for the rest of creation. Our right to use the Earth's resources for human life and flourishing is strictly limited by the responsibility to conserve and by the rights of the other living creatures who share the Earth with us.

A role of caring responsibility for other living creatures, our 'dominion', is not a role that sets us above creation but a specific role that humans have within creation. It is rightly practised only when we recognise it to be dominion over fellow-creatures.

There are indications in the Torah that we should not consider the special human role within creation only in terms of intervention and change, but also in terms of restraint and letting be.

NOT
but

The human relationship to the rest of creation, as intended by God according to the biblical material we have studied in this

AA
皆有可能

chapter, cannot be easily summed up by a single term such as stewardship. It includes, most fundamentally and profoundly, being one creature among others. It requires at every point respect for the God-given order of creation. It is differentiated - entailing a major difference in how humans relate to living creatures and to inanimate nature. It includes a limited right to use of the Earth's resources for human life and flourishing. It calls for a caring responsibility for other creatures that reflects but does not usurp God's own care for his creation.

HUMAN ENHANCEMENT OF CREATION

I have left this topic until the last section of this chapter because the necessary discussion arises less directly out of exegesis than other issues we have discussed in this chapter. Interpretations of the Genesis dominion have traditionally given much prominence to human culture - in the broad sense of what humans make out of nature by transforming it into something humanly made. The most obvious example within Genesis, which we have discussed, is agriculture. It is clear that when Adam tills the soil he is collaborating with nature to make out of it what it would not make of itself without him. Without Adam's irrigation the fruit trees in the Garden of Eden would not grow. This is a kind of human enhancement of creation, and it is evidently a role that God intended within the order of creation. Often it has been regarded as 'improvement' of wild nature,⁷¹ but, as we shall see, 'enhancement' is a better term.

Genesis 4:17-22 narrates the origins of other human cultural practices: building cities, making musical instruments, and forging metal tools, including weapons.⁷² These are celebrated, but at the same time ambiguous:⁷³ they occur among the descendants of Cain, not in the line of Seth, while the invention of metal weapons enables Lamech's excess of violent revenge (4:23-24). In view of the importance of the escalation of violence in the Genesis account of early humanity, we must take very seriously the fact that the story of the origins of culture ends on this note, but it does

not mean that culture itself is denigrated. Rather its potential for evil as well as good is highlighted. It is all too easily abused.

By 'enhancement' of creation I mean what humans do when they modify nature in ways that are not destructive but productive. This can be done in largely non-intrusive ways, as, for example, in art. In all kinds of art, humans make something different of nature from what it is purely in itself. We do not in the process replace nature in itself but add something else to it. A landscape painting does not replace the landscape itself, nor does it devalue the landscape itself, as though the landscape had no value until Constable painted it, but the painting does add something of fresh and different value. It is not a matter of benefiting other creatures, but it adds something to the created world. In that sense, it is an enhancement of creation. 'Improvement' would not be the right word, because it is not implied that the value of the landscape is increased by the painting. The painting is something, indebted to the landscape, that humans have added to the sum of value in creation.

A more, but still only gently intrusive example, with which most environmentalists have no problem, is gardening. A garden is a humanly modified version of nature. Few of us now feel, as the seventeenth-century pioneers of stewardship ideas did, that gardens are much preferable to wild nature. We value wild nature for itself, while also enjoying gardens as having different value. This is an example of a principle we can apply also to much more radically transforming things that humans do with nature: building homes and cities, crafting and manufacturing goods. Of course, the greater the extent to which the natural creation is transformed by these human creations the greater the danger that they will prove destructive of nature. Such remaking of nature without proper regard for the integrity and order of creation is not enhancement but loss.

The key is to add but not to replace. Humanly modified nature is not better, but different. We are not improving nature, but we are fashioning something with fresh value. Can wild nature not look after itself perfectly well without our intervention? Yes, of course,

二、中华生态文化和祖国生态保护

“老子的自然生态观和关爱大地”

导读：

当历史的车轮前进到 20 世纪时，生态危机史无前例地给整个地球和人类带来巨大的破坏和危险：一是环境变化：温室效应引起的全球变暖和对地球生态形成巨大威胁；二是对于海洋的日益增长的威胁和水资源的质量的大幅度下降；三是森林砍伐和土地退化；四是人类的快速增长和物种消失；五是人心的贪婪残酷，榨取自然，虐待其它生灵，行为令人发指。六是全球性的追求高浪费、奢侈的生活方式，缺乏爱护自然环境的生活方式和习惯。正像圣经所指出：“我们知道一切受造之物，一同叹息劳苦，直到如今。”（罗马书 8：22）社会有识之士，无不为之痛心震撼，而竭力生态观的研究，推动生态环保，保护人类的共同家园。而《老子》中的自然道家生态观，得到各国学者的高度重视，澳大利亚环境哲学家 Richard Sylvan 和 David Bennett 认为：“道家思想是一种生态学的取向，其中蕴含着深层的生态意识，它为‘顺应自然’的生活方式提供了实践基础。”笔者简要分享《老子》自然生态观其中的二点，体会其对今天人类追求关爱大地的价值观的意义。

（文章作者：权陈。原载：《号角月报加东版》2019 年 6 月刊）

全文查看以下链接：

<http://www.heraldmonthly.ca/newspaper/web/articleView.php?date=201906&id=6557>

三、生态环境现状及生态保护（政策、组织、行动等）

各从其类……上帝看着是好的。（创世记 1）

《最大的一次生物大灭绝，种级灭绝率可能达到了 95%》

（转发文章提供者：陈黎）

全文查看以下链接：

<http://tiny.cc/6wak7y>

四、基督教和教会参与关爱自然的行动

导读：一个关怀大地的加拿大的基督教环保管家组织。

https://arocha.ca/?gclid=Cj0KCQjwxMjnBRctARIsAGwWnBMu4RXiTbUTbaUzfGGWjK_MRvYR9OtYXZuvLxM58inVRdjMmHVOHLYaAs7UEALw_wcB

五、个人热爱和保护生态环境的分享

导读：没有对于大自然的熟悉和亲近，就难以热爱它，保护它。今天生活在都市和水泥群中的人，对大自然太陌生了，华人和下一代尤其如此，我们的孩子认识几种在家边飞行的鸟，生长的树呢？

简朴和生态的生活方式之一：到大自然中去，亲近自然





“今天陪我的一位老师去林德海滨自然保护区，我把这里成为多伦多的“鸟儿天堂”。这里的野鸟不怕人，可以飞到你的手上觅食，是动物与人和睦相处。”（图片和文字提供者：石华）

编辑：权陈

祷告伙伴：践行圣经关爱大地祷告群

