Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

Christian Attitudes to Nature and the Ecological Crisis

Brian Ferguson
Patrick J. Roche

Introduction

The threat to the environment from rampant industrialisation under capitalism and, until recently, marxist socialism is probably the major crisis of our time. The urgency of the problem of ecological deterioration was emphasised in a 1990 United Nations report which concluded that 'the next ten years may decide the future of the earth as a habitation for humans.'[1] Jürgen Moltmann in his major study of the ecological issue, *God in Creation*, considered that the 'environmental crisis... is so comprehensive and so irreversible that it cannot unjustly be described as apocalyptic ... the beginning of a life and death struggle for creation on this earth.'[2] The environmental threat has generated extensive debate about causes and solutions. For many participants the roots of the crisis are to be found in the Judaic-Christian tradition and its influence on western culture. This contemporary ecological critique of the western Christian tradition (what H. Paul Santmire has called the 'critical ecological wisdom'[3]) was given its most influential articulation by Lynn White in a lecture delivered to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1966: 'to discuss religion and ecology in history is largely to discuss the Lynn White article.'[4]

Ecological critique of the Christian tradition

White's basic thesis is that 'human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny - that is, by religion.'[5] The Judaic-Christian doctrine of creation (*creatio ex nihilo*) involves the understanding of the world as radically distinct from God and consequently (in contrast to pagan animism) desacralises nature. This desacralisation of nature was reinforced by the theological understanding of man (using the word generically) as made in the image of God (*imago dei*): 'man shares, in great measure, God's transcendence of nature.'[6] White presents this

notion of transcendence as involving 'man's effective monopoly of spirit in this world.'[7] But this means that 'the spirits in natural objects (pagan animism)... evaporated.'[8] The desacralisation of nature reduced the world to the status of mere 'physical fact'[9] and 'by destroying pagan animism, Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects.'[10] This exploitative potential was reinforced, in an activist sense, by the anthropocentric dimension ('Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen'[11]) of the understanding of man as made in the image of God: 'Christianity in absolute contrast to ancient paganism and Asia's religions (except perhaps, Zoroastrianism) not merely established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends.'[12] The '*imago dei*' doctrine is understood by White to incorporate a 'man-nature dualism' which legitimised a notion of human supremacy and a consequent utilitarian attitude to the rest of the created order - what White refers to as 'the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man.'[13] White's argument is, in summary, that the '*creatio ex nihilo*' and '*imago dei*' doctrines radically desacralised nature and legitimised the 'idea of man's limitless rule of creation.'[14]

White also argued that Christianity in its western Latin form provided the intellectual matrix for the development of the means of exploitation - science and technology. White stressed the distinctively occidential character ('so certain that it seems stupid to verbalise it'[15]) of science and technology and considered that this development was functionally related to 'larger intellectual patterns'[16] arising from the victory of Christianity over paganism - the 'greatest psychic revolution in the history of our culture.'[17] But a difference in the 'tonality of piety and thought'[18] meant that theological reflection and attitude in the Latin west was more congenial to the development of science and technology than in the Greek east. The eastern sacramental understanding of nature was 'essentially artistic.'[19] But in the Latin west, White presents the development of natural science by the twelfth/thirteenth century as an effort to 'understand God's mind by discovering how creation

operates.'[20] This provided a religious motivation for scientific endeavour: 'from the thirteenth century onwards, up to and including Leibniz and Newton, every major scientist, in effect, explained his motivations in religious terms ...modern western science was cast in a matrix of Christian theology.'[21]

The implication of White's general thesis is clear. The ecological threat has resulted from a dominative attitude to nature rooted in the Judaic-Christian tradition which has 'tinctured' science and technology with 'orthodox Christian arrogance towards nature.'[22] This means that a solution to the ecological problem requires a fundamental religious re-orientation: 'since the roots of our troubles are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious ... we must rethink and refeel our nature and destiny.'[23] But the culpability of the Christian tradition means that the moral perspective required to re-order man's relation to nature must be found elsewhere.

The pervasive acceptance of the type of ecological critique developed by White has stimulated the contemporary quest for a new environmental ethic. This has been developed in a theologically radical fashion within, for example, the 'deep ecology' movement. The concept of 'deep ecology' is associated with the Norwegian philosopher, Arne Naess[24] and its central perspective is the understanding that there is no ontological divide (contrary to traditional Christian belief) between the human and the non-human worlds. Deep ecologists are attracted to panpsychic or pantheistic conceptions of the world. There are similarities between the cosmological perspective of 'deep ecology' and the cosmologies embodied in the mystical traditions of Zen Buddhism and Taoism or the 'new physics' suggested by, for example, David Bohm and Fitjof Capra[25]. These cosmological perspectives incorporate a 'seamless web' view of the structure of reality that is firmly coupled to what Naess has called 'biospherical egalitarianism'[26] - that is, the idea that all members of the biosphere are of equal and intrinsic worth.

'Deep ecology' is a holistic and non-anthropocentric understanding that regards human beings as just one element among others in the web of life and rejects the ascription of only instrumental value to the non-human world. The movement represents a major trend in contemporary environmental thought. Its influence is, for example, apparent in the concept of Gaia associated with the work of the British scientist James Lovelock, author of *Gaia: A New look at life on Earth.* Gaia - from the name the ancient Greeks gave to their goddess of the earth - was the term used by Lovelock to refer to the biosphere which he regarded as a single self-regulating organism. The Gaia hypothesis views human life as just one dispensable life form within the total biotic community and has been very influential in the attempt to formulate the kind of metaphysical structure that a new environmental ethic is felt by many to require.[27]

The essential thrust of the contemporary ecological critique of Christianity is, as classically stated by White, that the Christian tradition teaches a despotic and utilitarian attitude which is significantly to blame (if not the main cause) for the exploitative and destructive approach to nature that has resulted in the ecological crisis of today. This is obviously a critique which cannot be ignored by adherents of the Christian tradition. An adequate Christian response would not merely require exculpation but a positive demonstration of the relevance of traditional Christian belief as a moral guide for the resolution of the ecological threat. The failure to adequately respond would contribute to the further marginalisation of the Christian perspective by a proliferation of theologically exotic and religiously regressive world-views. The task for adherents of traditional belief is to show that the biblical understanding of creation and man's relationship to it has been inadequately grasped (if not misrepresented) by its critics and that the resources of Scripture and the Judaic-Christian tradition are sufficient for the development of a contemporary ecological ethic.

Creation

White is correct to stress that in contrast to 'Graeco-Roman mythology' and the 'intellectuals of the ancient West' Christianity

'inherited from Judaism not only a concept of time as nonrepetitive and linear but also a striking story of creation.'[28] In contrast to other views on the relationship of God to the world, as where God is understood to create out of pre-existing material (*ex materia*, as in dualism) or divine substance (*ex deo*, as in pantheistic monism), the classical Judaic-Christian doctrine of creation affirms that the world has been created by God out of nothing (*ex nihilo*). Judaic-Christian theology confesses God to be the transcendent and sovereign Lord of all existence: 'the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof' (Psalm 24). Biblical terminology does not have the connotation of the Latin or Greek uses of the word 'nature'. The Latin '*natura*' and the Greek '*phusis*' suggest, as emphasised by Berkhoff, something 'centred in itself, with an immanent origin and growth; dependence on the creator God cannot be expressed by them.'[29] A.R. Peacocke has drawn attention to the fact that the New Testament uses the word 'creation' (Rom.8:19f; Col.1:15; 2 Peter 3:4) which connotes dependence and it is this presupposition that also pervades the Old Testament even though the word 'creation' is not actually employed - the Old Testament uses other expressions such as 'heaven and earth'; 'all that lives'; and 'the earth' (Gen.1:1; Ps.145:16; Ps. 24:1).[30] The natural world, in biblical understanding, is never an independent or self-subsistent entity; it is always the creation of God.

T.S. Derr in *Ecology and Human Need* has stressed that the doctrine of creation does indeed (as emphasised by White) involve the 'de-divinisation' (to use the current jargon) of nature: 'to say that nature is the creation of a God who is himself non-nature is to say that nature is quite other than God, that it is not simply the external aspect of divine reality.'[31] Lawrence Osborn in *Stewards of Creation* interprets Genesis 1:2 as demoting the primordial chaos from its status of matrix of the gods to that of created raw material for the categories of existence. He also understands God's blessing of creation as a denial of the divinity of nature; fertility is not a capacity of an autonomous nature but remains the gift of God the creator.[32] J.A. Baker, in his discussion of attitudes to nature, suggests that this biblical demythologising of the material world involved the erosion of 'numinous dread' of nature and the

emergence of an understanding of the world as something which in principle should manifest the order and rationality of the creator[33] and thus be open to investigation and use. But this does not mean that the doctrine of creation involves a merely utilitarian valuation of nature in relation to human objectives. The Biblical doctrine of creation (as traditionally understood) implies that nature is not divine and is not to be worshipped - such worship is idolatry - but the world nevertheless has a value which is derivative from the fact of creation and not just because of its usefulness to humans: 'the Judaic-Christian tradition affirms, in the case of both man and nature, a derived dignity, and accords each a respect commensurate with its source in God ... it is the relationship in which creation stands to its Creator which confers upon its value.'[34]

The understanding that the world has a significance derivative from the fact of creation is at the very least implicit in biblical passages which emphasise the 'goodness' of the created order and its sacramental and aesthetic character. The formula, 'and God saw that it was good,' repeated throughout the first chapter of Genesis conveys a sense of divine satisfaction that permeates the creation narrative: 'the formula marks out each work as one corresponding to the divine intention, perfect as far as its nature is required and permitted, complete, and the object of the Creator's approving regard and satisfaction.'[35] This affirmation, in the first chapter of Genesis, of the 'goodness' of the world is echoed throughout the Scriptures in numerous passages which convey what J.A. Baker has described as 'an affectionate and admiring approach'[36] to nature - passages that celebrate the beauty of creation (Gen.2:9; Job 38-41; Eccl 3:11) or express an understanding of the world as (to quote Calvin's classic statement) the 'theatre of God's glory' (Ps. 19:1; Is.6:3). The suggestion of a significance independent of human purpose is reinforced by biblical teaching on God's immanence, in the sense of providential activity, within the world - and in particular by passages which speak of the way in which the Creator delights in his good creation and continues to actively care for it, even down to the most seemingly insignificant creature (Job 38-41; Ps.104; Matt. 6: 28-30; 10:29). The implication of this teaching is that the understanding of the world as 'good' (where the Hebrew

'*tob*' draws attention to an object's quality and fitness for its purpose) is not exhausted by an anthropocentric utilitarianism: 'nature is not to be evaluated simply in terms of man's needs and interests; and to think that it is, is a mark of folly... God created the greater part of the world for its own sake, and wisdom consists in recognising this and the limitations which this imposes on us.'[38]

Dominion

But how, then, is biblical teaching concerning man's dominion over nature to be understood? Modern biblical scholarship has recovered what T.S. Derr has called the 'earthiness'[38] of the biblical view. Man in biblical perspective is an integral part of nature - a biological being. Nowhere is this more explicitly stated than when man is said to be created from the 'dust of the earth' (Genesis 2:7) or, following the curse (Genesis 3:17) that at death he would return to the dust (Genesis 3:19). But the creation narratives also present man as placed in a unique relation to God and to the non-human world. Man was made in the 'image of God' (Genesis 1: 26-27). The precise meaning of this phrase[39] has been extensively debated but, however the image concept is interpreted, it is the basis of the 'dominion' (Genesis 1:28) that is entrusted to man over the earth and the other creatures. The question of how this 'dominion' given to man is to be understood is central to the debate over Christian attitudes to nature. Critics of the Judaic-Christian tradition associate dominion with ruthless exploitation. The ecologist Ian McHarg refers to Genesis 1: 26-28 as 'three horrifying lines' and a 'text of compound horror' which has cultivated and legitimised an exploitative and destructive attitude to nature: 'if you want to find one text .. which will guarantee that the relationship of man to nature can only be destructive ... which can explain all of the destruction and all of the despoilation accomplished by western man for at least 2,000 years, then you do not have to look any further than this ghastly calamitous text.'[40]

The key terms used in the text to which McHarg refers are 'have dominion' or 'rule' (Heb., רָדָה , Gen.1:26,28) and 'subdue'

(Heb., כָּבַשׁ, Gen.1:28). But James Barr has pointed out that while 'have dominion' may be used in a strong physical sense (in fact only in Joel 3:13) it was most often used merely for ruling in general - even expressing peaceful ruling as in the reference to Solomon in 1 Kings 4:24.[41] The word is not at all necessarily a strong one. The word 'subdue' (Genesis 1:28) is, however, suggestive of violent physical movement like trampling down. But Barr notes that the word is used in Genesis 1:28 only with reference to the earth ('fill the earth and subdue it') and not to animals - he doubts whether more is intended than what is required for the basic needs of settlement and agriculture corresponding to the 'working' (Genesis 2:5) and 'tilling' (Genesis 2:15) of the ground.[42] John Black in *The Dominion of Man* makes the same point with respect to Genesis 2:15 ('and the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it') - Black interprets 'dress' as meaning to 'till' or to 'manage' for both pleasure and use and he interprets 'keep' as 'protect'.[43] Thus Black concludes that in the Hebrew view one of the reasons for man's presence on earth was that he should look after it on God's behalf and preserve it not only as a source of food but also for pleasure. The same understanding is expressed by Jürgen Moltmann in God and Creation: 'human mastery over the earth is intended to resemble the cultivating and protective work of a gardener... nothing is said about predatory exploitation.'[44]

These considerations clearly do not justify the view that the Scriptures (and in particular the Genesis creation narratives) teach an adversarial view of mankind's relation to the environment. On the contrary, there is considerable consensus among commentators that the Biblical notion of 'dominion' can best be understood in terms of the concept of kingship in antiquity. Barr suggests that Genesis 1 presents a paradise picture - similar to that which Isaiah 11 refers to a future time - of harmony in the animal world and peace between man and animal. But within this context the depiction of man's 'dominion' contains no 'markedly exploitive aspect ... it approximates to the well known oriental idea of the shepherd king'[45] - an ancient idea of kingship which has been explicated by C.Westerman:

> As lord of his realm, the king is responsible not only for the realm; he is the one who bears and mediates blessings for the realm entrusted to him. Man would fail in his royal office of dominion over the earth were he to exploit the earth's resources to the detriment of the land, plant life, animals, rivers and seas ... What is decisive is the responsibility of man for the preservation of what has been entrusted to him; and he can show this responsibility by exercising his royal office of mediator of prosperity and well-being, like the kings of the ancient world.[46]

Peacocke has added force to this understanding of dominion by stressing that man's relation to the non-human world must be understood as a caring dominion exercised under the authority of the Creator. The meaning of the Genesis presentation of man in relation to the environment may be understood in terms of man as a viceregent, steward, manager or trustee so that kingship is not an unconstrained metaphor: 'man is called to tend the earth and its creatures in responsibility to its Creator.'[47] Black has pointed out that a sense of responsibility and accountability of man to God for the management of the earth is found in both the Old and New Testaments (the Genesis account of creation stresses man's role as God's steward of the earth as do Jesus' parables of stewardship in Matt. 21: 33-41; Matt. 24: 48-51; Matt. 25: 14-28) and is a central insight of the Judaic-Christian tradition and consequently of the western intellectual heritage.[48]

But the notion of dominion also involves the understanding of man as a co-creator with God. Unlike God who creates out of nothing, man creates or works only within the framework and limits of the natural order as given by God. Man must therefore honour the integrity of that order: 'responsible human creativity takes into account the balances and harmonies of the natural world .'[49] Hence, for example, the Old Testament laws that set limitations on the way the land is to be used in agriculture (Exodus 23:10; Leviticus 19:23-25) and the treatment of domestic animals to prevent exploitation (Exodus 20: 8-11; 23:12; Deuteronomy 25:4). In this secondary role in creation, humility is appropriate to man - a

humility underscored by his accountability to the Creator. D. J. Hall has commented that while the earth is clearly the Lord's (Psalm 24), there is also a sense in which it is given to man - but with 'strings attached'[50]. The conditions of the gift are 'man's responsible treatment of the earth, and his gratitude to the Giver'[51] - a gratitude which in the biblical sense is the exact antithesis of the attitude that sees nature as something to be mastered and exploited for human ends.

The dominion which the Genesis narratives confer on man is not a license for the unbridled exploitation and subjugation of nature that critics have claimed. Biblical domination has nothing to do with the ruthless exercise of power, nor has it anything in common with the plunder of nature on the basis that nature exists merely to satisfy human need. Exponents of the 'critical ecological wisdom' who interpret the biblical perspective in these terms are (as D.J. Hall has forcefully pointed out) 'at the level of biblical exegesis... quite innocent of any real sophistication of thought.'[57]

Fall

The ecological critique of the Judaic-Christian tradition is based on an exegetically defective hermeneutic of the biblical notion of human dominion. The relevance of Scripture to an understanding of the ecological crisis derives rather from the biblical anthropology of man as a fallen being: 'man does have a position of control over nature which is approved by God but the tyrannical use of this position is a failure deriving from human sin not from God's intention in creation.'[53] Classical Christian theology has identified sin in the biblical tradition as essentially involving disobedience. The fall is understood in terms of man's arrogant desire for autonomy and rebellion against the authority and benevolence of the Creator. The havoc caused by this attempted reversal of status has traditionally been understood as affecting not only man's spiritual relationship with God and his personal and social relationships but also his relationship with the natural environment. D. J. Hall has rightly drawn attention to the fact that the effect of sin on the natural order has been obscured in Christian

theology by an emphasis on sin's primary aspect as man's rebellion against the Creator[54]. But the ecological crisis of our time has occasioned a hermeneutical focus on the original biblical insight that sin has disrupted man's relationship with nature: 'the disobedience of Adam consisted in his rejection of the divine boundaries placed upon his dominion of the earth. It was thus a rebellion against the good order of creation established by God in Genesis 1.'[55]

Renewal

But the understanding that creation is affected by the fall raises the question of the extent to which the world of nature is included in the consummation of God's purposes in salvation. On this issue the biblical/classical theological tradition has been understood to be ambivalent. H. Paul Santmire has pointed out in *The Travail of Nature* that there exists in the tradition a view of salvation which extends to the natural order alongside and in tension with a purely spiritual understanding of redemption. Santmire considers that, in particular, the gospel of John and the book of Hebrews present a vision of a final fulfilment which is totally spiritual in contrast to the 'earth-affirming' character of the majority of Old and New Testament writings.[56] However K. Innes has suggested that the emphasis in these two books may be accounted for by their distinctive perspectives - they are concerned with deliverance through Christ from the sin and imperfection of the present age rather than the future of the earth as such.[57] The role of nature in God's salvific purpose is also discounted by the belief that the present order of creation is destined not for renewal but for complete destruction to be replaced by a totally new creation. This belief is sometimes justified on the basis of 2 Peter 3: 10-13 interpreted as teaching that the new heaven and earth will be preceeded by a cosmic dissolution of the existing order. This interpretation is disputed. For example, R. J. Bauckham suggests that this and other similar passages 'emphasise the radical discontinuity between the old and the new, but it is neverthelss clear that they intend to describe a renewal and not an abolition of creation.'[58] The weight of biblical evidence seems to point to the

view that redemption - the redemption secured by Christ - is to be understood not only in personal, human terms but as also including the renewal of the whole creation as the final goal: 'redemption in the continuity of the two Testaments ... assumes the redemption (*Shalom*) of the whole creation.'[59]

There are a number of passages in the Old Testament which anticipate a renewal of creation. Psalm 96: 11-13 and 98:1-9 speak of the joy of all created things at the coming of the Lord to judge. Isaiah 11:1-9 pictures the future messianic age in terms reminiscent of the Garden of Eden - a world where predatory relationships among animals are transformed and where man and animals live in peace and harmony. The promise of 'new heavens and a new earth' is first found in the Scriptures in Isaiah 65:17-25 and 66:22. Texts such as these hold out the promise of a future for a redeemed material creation. The same vision is developed further in the New Testament. Jesus speaks, in Matthew 19: 28, of the 'regeneration' or 'renewal' of the world in terms that 'effectively conveys the Jewish eschatological hope of new heavens and a new earth in the messianic age.'[60] The apostle Peter speaks in similar terms in Acts 3:21 where he refers to the 'restitution of all things'. Ephesians 1:10 and Colossians 1:20 are key texts on the theme of the renewal of nature. Paul's thought in these passages is shaped by the cosmic significance of Christ's work - the apostle looks forward to the day of final renewal when 'all things', including the world of nature, will be brought under the lordship of Christ. The biblical vision of a renewed creation in a new heaven and a new earth reaches a climax in the final chapters of the book of Revelation and in particular with God's majestic declaration: 'Behold, I make all things new' (Revelation 21:5).

A particularly important passage in relation to this whole question of the renewal of nature is Romans 8: 19-22. The point of note here is that although 'creation' has been subjected to 'frustration' and 'futility' as a result of human disobedience , Paul also emphasizes that hope is not excluded from creation. On the contrary, it was subjected 'in hope'. The present disjointedness of creation is a 'groaning in travail', birth pangs that will ultimately

give way to joy and fulfilment. The natural order is waiting in eager expectation for a consummation which will bring an end to its 'bondage to decay'. It seems clear that Paul here sees Christ's redemptive activity as effecting not just the reconciliation of humanity with God but through that also the restoration of the entire created order. The non-human part of creation is not merely a dispensable backdrop to the human drama of salvation history but is itself able to share in the 'glorious liberty' which Paul envisages for redeemed mankind. This interpretation of the passage does not necessarily mean that nature has to be understood as being fallen in itself. It may be understood simply in the sense that nature's fulfilment is inextricably bound up with the destiny of man. Thus C. E. B. Cranfield who takes this view writes that creation is cheated of its true fulfilment so long as man, the chief actor in the great drama of God's praise, fails to contribute his rational part.[61] The ecological implications of this biblical promise of the renewal of nature are well stated by Cranfield in his discussion of Romans 8:19-21 and creation's subjection 'in hope' and its destined liberation:

> this clearly has an important bearing on the Christian's relation to the sub-human creation and — more generally — on the whole subject of 'the environment' about which there is now such widely felt concern. It is of course true that the debt of love which we owe our fellow man includes the obligation not to spoil or destroy their environment but to cherish it for their sake. We have an obligation to the sub-human creation for man's sake, for the sake of our living fellow men and also for the sake of those not yet born. Of this truth we must not for a moment lose sight. But these verses indicate that this truth is by no means the whole truth of the matter and that to value the sub-human creation solely as man's habitat, man's environment, man's amenities — even if we do think of 'man's' as meaning 'our neighbour', rather than 'our own' — is to be guilty of idolatry. If the sub-human creation is part of God's creation, if to it also he is faithful, and if he is going to bring it also (as well as believing men) to a goal which is worthy of himself, then it too has a dignity of its own and an inalienable, since divinely-appointed, right to be treated by us with reverence and sensitiveness. And our

> duty to it is not only a part of our duty to love our neighbour as ourselves, but also an integral part of our duty to love God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength. Since God has not created the sub-human creation solely for man's use and comfort but also with the intention of bringing it in the end to that liberty of which verse 21 speaks, true love to him must involve not only loving our fellow man as ourselves but also treating with respect and with a proper sense of responsibility his humbler creation, whether animate or inanimate.'[62]

From all this it seems clear that the fate of nature is inseparably bound up with the fate of humanity. Since the whole of creation is affected then the whole creation will also be reclaimed in Christ - as Peter Gregorios has remarked, 'humanity is redeemed with the created order, not from it.'[63] In connection with this Moltmann has observed that the new creation in the New Testament corresponds to the original creation in the Old, but as a mirror image to it. Creation in the beginning, the 'protological' creation starts with nature and ends with human beings, the 'eschatological' creation reverses the order and starts with the liberation of human beings and ends with the redemption of nature: 'human beings and nature have their own destinies on their own particular levels but in their enslavement and their liberty they share a common destiny.'[64]

Conclusion

This exploration of biblical themes on man and nature clearly justifies the conclusion that in Scripture nature is not understood merely as a resource that man has a right to exploit ruthlessly for his own ends. Contrary to the 'critical ecological wisdom', classically represented by Lynn White, such an attitude is, as Attfield has observed, 'foreign to the Christianity of the Bible.'[65] Peacocke has correctly stressed that biblical ideas of nature and man's relationship to his environment 'provide a strong motivation, to those who hold them, towards action based on desirable ecological values.'[66] This is due to the fact that the biblical understanding of

creation, dominion, fall and renewal means that the 'dignity of nature is honoured all round the circle of Christian teaching.'[67]

Notes

1. Quoted by Jonathan Dimbleby, *World leaders Debate*, BBC 2, 22 May 1990.
2. Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation*, London, SCM, 1985, p.xi.
3. H. Paul Santmire, *The Travail of Nature*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1985, p.11.
4. D. Spring and E. Spring (eds), *Ecology and Religion in History*, London, Harper and Row, 1974, p.3.
5. Lynn White, 'The historic roots of our ecologic crisis', *Science*, Vol.155, No.3767, 10 March 1967, p.1206.
6. Ibid, p.1205
7. Ibid, p.1205
8. Ibid, p.1205
9. Ibid, p.1205
10. Ibid, p.1205
11. Ibid, p.1205
12. Ibid, p.1205
13. Ibid, p.1207
14. Ibid, p.1207
15. Ibid, p.1204
16. Ibid, p.1204
17. Ibid, p.1205
18. Ibid, p.1206
19. Ibid, p.1206
20. Ibid, p.1206
21. Ibid, p.1206
22. Ibid, p.1207
23. Ibid, p.1206
24. See for example, Arne Naess 'The deep ecology movement: some philosophical aspects', *Philosophical Enquiry*, No. 8, 1986 and 'A defense of the deep ecology movement,' *Environmental Ethics* Vol. 6, No.3, 1984 See also B. Devall and G. Sessions, *Deep Ecology*, Salt Lake City, Peregrine Smith, 1985.

25. See, David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980. See also Fitjof Capra, *The Tao of Physics*, London, Fontana, 1976.
26. Arne Naess, 'The deep ecology movement: some philosophical aspects', *Philosophical Enquiry*, No.8, 1986, p.16.
27. See, for example, R. Elliott and A. Gare, (eds), *Environmental Philosophy*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, 1983.
28. Lynn White, op.cit., p.1206
29. H. Berkhof, 'God in nature and history,' *Faith and Order Studies*, 1964-67, Paper No.50, World Council of Churches, Geneva, p.14.
30. A.R. Peacocke, *Creation and the World of Science*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1979, p.366.
31. T.S. Derr, *Ecology and Human Need,* Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1979, p.19.
32. Lawrence Osborn, *Stewards of Creation*, Oxford, Latimer House, 1990., pp.28-29.
33. J.A. Baker, 'Biblical attitudes to nature' in H.Montefiore, (ed), *Man and Nature*, London, Collins, 1975, pp.100-101.
34. G. Fackre, 'Ecology and Theology, in Ian G. Barbour, (ed), *Western Man and Environmental Ethics*, Reading, Mass., Addison Wesley, 1973, pp.118.
35. S.R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, London, Methuen, 1904, p.5. See also H.P. Santmire, op.cit., p.198.
36. J.A. Baker, op.cit., p.101.
37. Ibid, p.101-102.
38. T.S. Derr, op.cit., p.21.
39. See David Clines, 'The image of God in man,' *Tyndale Bulletin* No. 19, 1968.
40. Quoted in J.R. Stott, *Issues Facing Christianity Today*, Basingstoke, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1984, p.117. See also Ian McHarg, 'The place of nature in the city of man,' in Ian G. Barbour (ed), *Western Man and Environmental Ethics*, Reading, Mass. Addison Wesley, 1973, p.171-86.
41. James Barr, 'Man and nature - the ecological controversy and the Old Testament,' *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 55, 1972, pp.19-20.

42. Ibid, p.20
43. J. Black, *The Dominion of Man*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1970, pp.48-49.
44. Jürgen Moltmann, op.cit.,p.30.
45. J. Barr, op.cit., p.22.
46. C. Westermann, *Creation*, London, SPCK, 1974, pp.52-53.
47. A.R. Peacocke, op.cit., p.283.
48. J. Black, op.cit., pp.48-57.
49. G. Fackre, op.cit., pp.122-23.
50. D.J. Hall, *Lighten our Darkness*, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1976, pp. 84-85.
51. Ibid, p.85.
52. Ibid, p.216.
53. J.A. Baker, op.cit., p.101.
54. D.J. Hall, op.cit., p.95.
55. L. Osborn, op.cit., p.46.
56. H. Paul Santmire, op.cit., pp.210-15.
57. K. Innes, *Caring for the Earth*, Nottingham, Grove, 1987, p.16.
58. R.J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Milton Keynes, Word, 1983, p.326.
59. D.J. Hall, *Imaging God*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1986, p.171.
60. R.T. France, *Matthew*, Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1985, p.287.
61. C.E.B. Cranfield, 'Some observations on Romans 8: 19-21', in R. Banks (ed.) *Reconciliation and Hope*, p.227.
62. Ibid, p. 230.
63. P. Gregorios, 'New Testament foundations for understanding the creation,' in W. Granberg-Michaelson, (ed.) *Tending the Garden*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987, p.87.
64. J. Moltmann, op.cit., p.68.
65. R. Attfield, *The Ethics of Environmental Concern*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1983, p.31.
66. A.R. Peacocke, op.cit., p.292.
67. G. Fackre, op.cit., p.124.