



Readings II in Faith & Science

Publication Year: 2003

ID: BK023

*Note: This book is out of print.
This is one article from the book. All the articles are available for
download as pdf's from the ITEST web site. A complete listing of the
articles available from this book is shown at the end of this document.*

Consumption of Natural Resources

ID: BK023-038

**Dr. Gregory W. Pouch
Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois**



Institute for Theological Encounter with Science and Technology

**Cardinal Rigali Center • 20 Archbishop May Drive • Suite 3400-A • St. Louis, Missouri 63119 • USA
314.792.7220 • www.faithscience.org • E-mail: mariannepost@archstl.org**

Consumption of Natural Resources

[*Doctor Gregory Pouch is a geologist currently residing in Bloomington, Illinois. Before his present job at Electronic Mapping he was employed by the Kansas Geological Survey. His special interests include evolution, resources and geologically based research and development.*]

Concern over “consumption” and eventual exhaustion of non-renewable “natural resources” has become accepted dogma in much of Western culture, justifying opposition to development, calls for a return to a “simple” life, and an imperative for “sustainable” development. The argument is: 1) we are consuming this material (iron, copper, coal, water, oil ...) at some rate (usually with potentially-infinite exponential growth thrown into the argument); 2) the supply of this material is finite and is the present reserve; 3) we will therefore run out of this material in the year (Today’s date + 15 to 30 years, depending on the material in question, and occasionally much more). This argument was put forth as an economic argument by Malthus in 1798 (concerning crops) and is widely embraced today. It was wrong in 1798 and continues -- despite its popularity and apparently self-evident nature -- to be wrong.

The classic Malthusian viewpoint is that there is a fixed supply of material being consumed and that this amount imposes an absolute limit to growth. This belief is underpinned by several misconceptions about natural resources and reserves. Much of the problem stems from confusing the terms *resource*, *reserve* and *supply*. *Supply* of a material is the amount on/in the Earth. *Reserves* refers to the amount producible under present economic condition in current facilities. *Resources* is the amount that has been concentrated enough to attract attention and includes not only reserves but also more speculative categories. Supply estimation is based on the composition of meteorites or average concentration in various types of rocks. Resource estimation is a remarkably speculative but enjoyable endeavor, based on knowledge of the overall distribution of geological provinces and current understanding of what kinds and amounts of deposits they are likely to contain. Reserve estimates are based on economic analyses of particular mines or well-fields and include only that material which can be extracted at a profit under present economic conditions (ore). Reserves can be estimated quite accurately, supply and resource are much more speculative.

As an example of the above definitions, consider iron. The supply of iron includes iron in iron ores, iron mineralization (unusually high or convenient concentrations of iron), and iron disseminated in “ordinary” rocks, such as the iron oxides coating sand grains. Iron resources includes iron mineralization and iron ore: rocks chemically indistinguishable from ore that are unprofitable to mine are in this category -- including rock that would be mineable were the price higher, rock that would be mineable if there were better transportation available, and rock that could be mined if labor, equipment, or fuel costs were lower or zoning or tax laws were different -- as well as rocks that have lower concentrations of iron or are more difficult to extract. Reserves includes only rock in operating mines that can be mined at a profit today: a rock that is a reserve one day can become a resource the next and vice versa. Iron mines do not close because there is no ferruginous (iron-bearing) rock left; they close because the owners would (or did) lose money extracting it.

A financial analogy would be that reserves are cash on hand; resources are cash, bank accounts, and accounts receivable; supply is total potential income. Budgeting that limits all future purchases to those that can be met with cash on hand is foolish; social planning that limits development to that which can be accomplished with reserves on hand is foolish as well.

There are several other points to be made on the issue of consumption of natural resources. First, “natural resources” are produced by humans to fulfill the needs and wants of other humans at a profit. We do not get iron from some pile of iron ingots or rolls, but rather from finding, digging, crushing and chemically-treating rocks. Natural resources are not natural: they involve much human effort, by geologists, miners, mine engineers and others. Natural resources are resources only because of the demand and because they can be produced at a profit. Second, most materials are not consumed but transformed. To use the iron example, iron ore is converted from an

oxidized to a metallic state in blast furnaces. At the end of the day, there is still as much iron and oxygen as there was at the beginning, but there is some in different forms. Only the fuels can properly be said to be consumed, other materials can be recycled, now or later, when conditions warrant it. When the economic conditions are right for a junk car to be melted to produce iron, it will probably be recycled. This is why gold and silver have been recycled for thousands of years, but wood generally has not been recycled.

The “time to exhaustion” computed using the above line of reasoning tends to produce remarkably stable numbers. For most of this century, we have been “about to run out of oil in about 15 years. For copper, this number has usually been 20 or 30 years. The cause is, as you probably suspect by now, economic. Exploring for a material costs money today. Due to the time required to develop a mine or an oil field, the profits will not be available until some time in the future, if the enterprise is ever profitable. Mineral exploration will be funded only if the expected return is as high or higher than competing investment opportunities (except for subsidized projects undertaken for security reasons). As the reserves and near-reserves of a material become larger, further exploration for the material becomes less attractive economically.

We have always been using materials (consuming natural resources?) to make our lives better and will until the end of time. This has been true since the Paleolithic Age, when there was not an inexhaustible reserve of flint (i.e., continued expansion of tool making would exhaust the available supply of flint), to today, when there are not inexhaustible reserves of metals, water, land or energy. If you are still not convinced that Malthus was wrong, ask yourself, what have we actually run out of.

There are physical limits to our growth, but those involve the mass of the earth and stars. The limits to worry about, because they are near and we can and must do something about them, are ourselves, our imagination, and our choices.

Questions

It is impossible to avoid using materials: the question is how and for what purposes. Will we use them wisely, or will we turn our backs on them and, in doing so, turn our backs on future generations? Should we consign people to a poverty they wish to avoid in order to preserve materials? People first, or planets first? Should we avoid using earth resources for the sake of the earth, or should we make these decisions based on the effect on humans?

Discuss the differences and distinctions pointed out by the author among the terms “resource,” “reserve” and “supply.” What are the implications of those distinctions from the stance of sustainable development held by many advocates today? Is there a role for the Christian in such a discussion? What would a Christian viewpoint bring to the discussion?

The author, a geologist, states, “The classic Malthusian viewpoint is that there is a fixed supply of material being consumed and that this amount imposes an absolute limit to growth.” How does this view clash with the Christian view of caring for the earth and responsible stewardship?

What is the Christian ethic on the use and development of “natural resources?” Discuss. Does Scripture support this ethic either directly or indirectly? How?

Human beings are consumers as well as conservers. How does a Christian balance these two very human characteristics in the use of natural resources? Give examples from everyday life.

The author’s research on natural resources and the environment seems to contradict stories reported in the major print and electronic media. Is the author understating the problems of use of natural resources? If so, how? Do you agree with the author? Why? Why not?

Readings II in Faith and Science		
ID	Article Title	Author
BK023-001	Table of Contents	
BK023-002	Foreword	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-003	Campus Ministry Involvement	Father Vincent E. Krische
BK023-004	A History of Science and Faith	Father William A. Wallace, OP
BK023-005	Letter of Pope John Paul II	
BK023-006	The Church & Scientists: 1977 Synod of Bishops	
BK023-007	Religion and Science: Must There Be A Conflict?	Father William A. Wallace, OP
BK023-008	The Christian Notion of Freedom	Bishop John Sheets, SJ
BK023-009	The Worldview of Genesis 1-11	Reverend Hugh Beck
BK023-010	Contemporary Biotechnology in The Context of Conflicting Theological Perspectives	Donald Demarco, PhD
BK023-011	What is Science? What is Theology?	Sister Carla Mae Streeter, OP
BK023-012	Science/Religion Not on Speaking Terms in Today's World	David Byers, PhD
BK023-013	Neutrality or Alliance	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-014	Apostleship	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-015	Science Versus Religion: A Conflict of Ideas or a Clash of Wills	Richard Blackwell, PhD
BK023-016	Some Elements of the Faith/Science Apostolate	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-017	Some Historical Items	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-018	And I Will Make You Fishers of Men...	Evelyn Crump, PhD
BK023-019	The Spirituality of The Scientist	Evelyn Crump, PhD
BK023-020	An Intellectual Gap	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-021	Literalness	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-022	Praise	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-023	The Theological Task	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-024	History and Myth: The Inquisition	Robert P. Lockwood
BK023-025	Galileo and The Catholic Church	Robert P. Lockwood
BK023-026	When Faith and Reason Clash: Evolution and The Bible	Alvin Plantinga, PhD
BK023-027	Christianity and Modern Science	Rudolf Brun, PhD
BK023-028	Reflections on the Mission of a Catholic Scientist	Lucien Morren, PhD
BK023-029	Sociology	William Monahan, PhD
BK023-030	Truth for an Artist	Leonard Buckley
BK023-031	Issues of Concern	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-032	Environment and the Believer	Father Albert Fritsch, SJ
BK023-033	What Kind of Salvation?	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-034	Some Environmental Issues	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-035	The Freelands Project	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-036	Altered Perception	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-037	Theologians Visit the Environment	John Kinney, PE, DEE
BK023-038	Consumption of Natural Resources	Gregory Pouch, PhD
BK023-039	Reproductive Biology	Allyson Chavez Larkin, MD
BK023-040	Holistic Sexuality: A Proper Focus for the Scientist	Hanna Klaus, MD, FACOG
BK023-041	Sociobiology: The New Religion	Richard Blackwell, PhD
BK023-042	Animal Research	Father Robert Brungs, SJ

BK023-043	Patenting of Biological Materials	David Saliwanchik, Esq.
BK023-044	The Inner Environment	Robert Z. Greenley, PhD
BK023-045	What are the Possibilities of Human Cloning?	Robert Collier, PhD
BK023-046	Cloning	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-047	Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research Ethics in The Face Of Uncertainty	Father Kevin Fitzgerald, SJ
BK023-048	Time: The Falsest God Of All	Thomas Sheahen, PhD
BK023-049	Six Magic Numbers in Physics	Thomas Sheahen, PhD
BK023-050	On The Domestication Of Science	John Matschiner, PhD
BK023-051	Chance/Chaos Versus A Planned Design in The Universe: Pointers To God?	Robert Z. Greenley, PhD
BK023-052	Nuclear Waste	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-053	Seeming Discovery On Mars	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK023-054	The Information Superhighway	Bishop Mark Hurley
BK023-055	Is Secular Education Adequate for the Pursuit of Truth in Science?	Robert Z. Greenley, PhD