

in contrast to the Roman Catholic view emphasizing the Spirit's relationship to the ecclesiastical body; but in his presentation he may inadvertently have left the reader with the impression that Calvin's ecclesiological outlook and practice were somewhat less formal than they actually were.

Possibly the greatest drawback in Richard's publication stems from his effort to cover so broad a scope in rather limited space. For one thing, the brevity with which the author has dealt with such movements as the *Devotio Moderna* and Renaissance humanism leaves a question as to the adequacy and even accuracy of the treatment, as I have noted in my discussion in the previous number of *AUSS*.

In addition, although brief synopses are given of the views of various pre-Calvin writers, including certain humanists, scholastic theologians, and particularly John Major, there are some rather unusual omissions in regard to the possible backgrounds and sources for Calvin's "spirituality." First of all, Is it not possible that Calvin, like Luther, may have derived a good deal of his "spirituality" from Scripture itself (allowing for the intermediaries too, of course)? And second, Could not the intermediaries have included the earlier Protestant Reformers? (Luther and Zwingli seem to be given scant, if any, attention as possible formative elements for Calvin's "spirituality," and even Bucer receives only brief and passing notice!) Important as are the backgrounds with which Richard has dealt in his analysis of Calvin's thought (and the reviewer would surely not minimize the vital importance of this aspect of Richard's presentation), a serious question can still be raised as to the adequacy of a treatment which fails to explore the avenues mentioned above.

Indeed, in this connection, one even becomes rather puzzled at times by certain of Richard's remarks, such as, "It was Luther's doctrine of the justification of the sinner that had previously led to a denial of any spirituality in the doctrine of the Reformation" (p. 105). While the difference in emphasis of Luther and Calvin on "justification" and "sanctification" must certainly be recognized, were these two reformers really *that far apart*?

A fair amount of Richard's "Conclusion" deals in a practical way with the meaning of Calvin's type of spirituality for contemporary times (especially addressed to Roman Catholics, but certainly *apropos* also for other church groups). "What is required," he says, "are new Church structures able to sustain the authentic religious experience of the individual believer" (p. 186). With this kind of assessment of Calvin's relevance to the present-day situation one would certainly be inclined to agree.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Stivers, Robert L. *The Sustainable Society: Ethics and Economic Growth*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. 240 pp. Paperback, \$5.25.

Increasing pollution and the depletion of resources call into question the axiom that growth is good. Technologically developed nations measure success by their gross national product. This idea shapes their values and lifestyle. The desire to live better and enjoy the fruits of technological advances is

part of the fabric of modern mentality. The author is not opposed to growth as such but measures it by two criteria: environmental soundness and contribution to human welfare. Undifferentiated growth which concerns itself with neither of these is condemned, but differentiated growth or selective growth is advocated which takes the two criteria into consideration.

The author has been very objective in setting forth the views of the advocates of growth and their critics. When economic growth becomes the primary social goal, the needs of people and of nature are neglected. Growth must not be the ultimate goal but the means of fulfilling men's needs by equitable distribution of its benefits and by preserving a livable environment for them. The debate between undifferentiated growth and differentiated growth is academic if the futurists are correct in asserting that there are limits to growth because there are limits to the world's natural resources. But some are more sanguine; they feel that technological advances will be able to cope with the problems of the future, create new resources, increase the food supply, and clean up the environment. These advocates of growth see no reason to be alarmed and press on, full steam ahead. The author sides with the futurists and opts for differentiated growth.

To be successful this strategy involves, however, a global view, immediate action, worldwide cooperation, a long-range perspective, and balanced economic development among the world's regions dealing with economic, environmental, and population problems with serious political implications. It cannot succeed if some nations cooperate and others do not. This means that there must be willing cooperation or else coercion. Besides, a new world view is demanded which has an appreciation for nature, a renouncing of the religion of growth, a reassessment of our attitudes toward work, consumption, and abundance, cooperation instead of conflict, emphasis on quality, ends, values, and concern for future generations. No less than the radical conversion of mankind is demanded. Immediate personal gains must be sacrificed for future benefits for all, selfishness must be changed to unselfishness, war by the strong nations as a means of obtaining resources must be given up for cooperation and sharing with the have-nots.

According to the author, in the face of these obstacles, while no optimism is called for neither is pessimism but a realism that trusts in God's love for hope. Men have been willing to make sacrifices in times of war and "persons will undergo great discomfort, frustration, and discontinuity quite willingly if a crisis is perceived and there is a sense of working toward some meaningful end" (p. 219). Ultimately our hope rests on God as Redeemer. We believe that "God's love and our response will provide the resources to overcome the forces of destruction even in the most threatening situations" (p. 222).

The author throughout has been quite fair in presenting opposing views and has not withheld anything in portraying the bleak future regarding the limits to growth and all the concomitant problems in dealing with the possibility of developing a sustainable society. He has done this so well that for me a realistic assessment can only be a pessimistic one. Here and there and from time to time there may be some cooperation and long-range strategies, but these will appear to be band-aid treatment when major surgery is called for. Selfish man will not even in the face of extinction alter his basic nature. It remains to be seen whether a sustainable society can be realized.