



Ecology, Feminism, and Theology

MARY ANN HINSDALE

College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts

Twenty years ago “earth day” was ridiculed as a “hippie fad.” Today, one can read almost daily in the newspaper accounts of air and water pollution, acid rain, global warming, destruction of the rain forests, and disposal problems concerning toxic waste. Indeed, environmental destruction is no longer confined to the “accidents” of an irresponsible technological society, but has even become a military strategy (witness the napalming of Vietnamese jungles and the deliberate oil spills in the Persian Gulf war).

Both the ecology and the feminist movements represent social movements which, over the last thirty years, have been intent on addressing the environmental crisis. Though not specifically “religious,” both movements, especially as they have intersected in the “ecofeminist” movement, offer some challenging perspectives for reflecting on traditional Christian doctrines of creation and redemption. If, as some have claimed, it is Christianity’s anthropocentric bias which is responsible for the consequent subjection and domination of nature, and that it therefore deserves a major share of the blame for today’s ecological crisis,¹ perhaps Christian theology ought to re-examine the foundation of these doctrines. This article will summarize some of the major insights from contemporary ecological and feminist theory and suggest what might be helpful in them for articulating a theology which is both faithful to the Christian gospel and responsive to the critical needs of our world at the end of the twentieth century.

¹Lynn White’s essay is probably the most often quoted critique of Christian theology’s anti-environmental stance: “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis,” *Science* 155 (1967) 1203-07.

I. DEFINING ECOLOGY

Etymologically, “ecology” refers to the study of the *oikos*, or the home. As a science, it is concerned with the study of the interrelationships of organisms in their home or environment. As a philosophy, it is concerned with “the loving pursuit and realization of the wisdom of dwelling in harmony with one’s place.”² There are a variety of philosophical approaches to ecology, but one can distinguish generally between the *reformist* approaches, which seek an environmental ethic, and more *radical* critiques, which raise questions concerning the very philosophical foundations of Western industrial society and seek to develop new visions, new ecologically-informed ways of understanding that include practical living.

The differences between these two approaches can be observed in the use of the terms “environmentalism” and “ecology,” which are not synonymous. In 1972, the Norwegian philosopher, Arne Naess, wrote of “deep” and “shallow” ecology to bring further precision to this distinction. Environmentalists accept the anthropocentric view that nature exists solely to serve

human ends and purposes. Such an instrumentalist view of humans as separate from their environment, and of conservation based not on nature's own sake but on its value to humans, Naess called "shallow ecology."³

"Deep ecology," on the other hand, professes two "ultimate norms": 1) *self-realization*, which goes beyond the modern Western self, defined as an isolated ego striving for hedonistic gratification, to an identification which includes the nonhuman world; and 2) *biocentric equality*, which holds that "all organisms and entities in the ecosphere, parts of the interrelated whole, are equal in intrinsic worth."⁴

Thus, for example, animal rights—insofar as it is merely an ethical extension of human rights to nonhumans—along with other reformist positions such as "resource conservation" and "limits to growth," established along ethical hierarchies, are ultimately considered anthropocentric and "shallow."⁵ While deep ecologists use such vocabulary as "rights" and "obligations," their use differs from the technical philosophical theories attached to them by the supposition of an ecological egalitarianism, which is "an intuition" experienced, not "an ethical theory to be defended by rational argument."⁶ For Naess, the essence of deep ecology is:

²Donald Edward Davis, *ECophilosophy. A Field Guide to the Literature* (San Pedro: R. and R. Miles, 1989) xii. Carolyn Merchant ("Earthcare. Women and the Environmental Movement." *Environment* 23/5 [June, 1981] 7) notes that the first to link the home and environment was Ellen Swallow, the first woman student at MIT. As an instructor in sanitary chemistry and nutrition, she developed in 1892 a science of environmental quality, which she called "ecology," concerned with industrial health, water and air quality, transportation, and nutrition. See also, Robert Clark, *Ellen Swallow: The Woman Who Founded Ecology* (Chicago: Follett, 1973).

³Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements: A Summary," *Inquiry* 16 (1973) 95-100. See also George Sessions, "The Deep Ecology Movement: A Review," *Environmental Review* 11 (1987) 116; and Warwick Fox, "Deep Ecology: A New Philosophy of Our Time?" *The Ecologist* 14 (1984) 104-200.

⁴Bill Devall and George Sessions, *Deep Ecology* (Salt Lake City: Gribbs Smith, 1985) 67.

⁵Sessions, "Deep Ecology Movement," 116.

⁶A. Naess, "Intuition, Intrinsic Value and Deep Ecology. A Reply to Warwick Fox," *The Ecologist* 14 (1984) 201-03. For a statement of the eight principles of "deep ecology," see the 1984 summary of George Sessions and Arne Naess in Duvall and Sessions, *Deep Ecology*, 70. For a Christian critique of these principles, see John B. Cobb and H. Daly, eds. *For the Common Good* (Boston: Beacon, 1990).

to keep asking more searching questions about human life, society, and Nature as in the Western philosophical tradition of Socrates...“we ask why and how, where others do not. For instance, ecology as a science does not ask what kind of a society would be the best for maintaining a particular ecosystem—that is considered a question for value theory, for politics, for ethics.” Thus deep ecology goes beyond the so-called factual scientific level to the level of self and Earth wisdom.⁷

II. THE FEMINIST CRITIQUE

Feminism is also characterized by a spectrum of positions. Although feminist philosopher Rosemarie Tong discusses no fewer than seven varieties (liberal, Marxist, radical, psychoanalytic, socialist, existentialist, and postmodern), philosopher Alison Jaggar prefers simply four: liberal, Marxist, radical and socialist.⁸ Feminist theologians have also come to

recognize the pluralism within feminism and have sometimes used the designations of “reformist” or “radical” to refer to them.⁹ Though some have recently backed away from the tensions such categorization has caused,¹⁰ the definite differences among feminist scholars in religion, for example in the distinction between feminist theologians and *theologians* (goddess feminists), do make some kind of designation seem appropriate. One that is becoming more widely used is the distinction between “biblical” and “post-biblical” feminists. “Biblical” feminists are those who do not find the *essential* message of the Bible to be oppressive, but nevertheless engage in interpretation which aims at critiquing oppressive texts, recovering, and even reconstructing them.¹¹ “Post-biblical” feminists are those who reject the Bible and Christianity and Judaism as inherently incompatible with women’s achievement of full personhood.

Neither Tong nor Jaggard discusses religious feminism. This is regrettable because both biblical and post-biblical feminists often show little awareness that different conceptions of human nature, epistemology and political theory also characterize their positions.¹² For example, until recently few biblical feminists who focused on women being able to receive “equal rights” (or “equal rites”) in the church were conscious that their feminism takes a *liberal* political stance. Likewise, post-biblical feminists dealing with the goddess and women’s spirituality failed to recognize that their *radical* feminist stance, with its essentialist and universalizing tendencies, often perpetuated a “false consciousness” concerning “women’s experience”—too often only the experience of “white, middle-class, heterosexual”

⁷Duvall and Sessions, *Deep Ecology*, 65. For an account of the mechanistic world view of modern science, which sanctioned the exploitation of nature, unrestrained commercial expansion, and a new socio-economic order that subordinated women, see Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature. Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980).

⁸Rosemarie Tong, *Feminist Thought. A Comprehensive Introduction* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989); Alison Jaggard, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1988).

⁹See Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow, eds., *Womanspirit Rising* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979) 1-16. For a discussion of the variety of feminist positions and their import for church, see Marcia Bunge, “Feminism in Different Voices: Resources for the Church,” *Word and World* 8/4 (1988) 321-26.

¹⁰E.g., Judith Plaskow and Carol Christ, *Weaving the Visions. New Patterns in Feminist Spirituality* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989).

¹¹Probably the most advanced discussion of feminist biblical hermeneutics is that of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in her works *In Memory of Her* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) and *Bread Not Stone* (Boston: Beacon, 1984).

¹²Rosemary Ruether, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Carter Heyward are notable exceptions.

women. The realization that both biblical and post-biblical feminism needs to acknowledge what feminist philosophers call “standpoint consciousness” is becoming a more sound characteristic of religious feminist scholarship.¹³

III. THE ECOFEMINIST MOVEMENT

Feminists have extended their critique of domination on the basis of sex to include domination of nature as well. Françoise d’Eaubonne, coining the word *eco-feminisme* to describe this more holistic understanding of liberation, argued in 1974 that when the fate of the human species and of the planet is at stake, “no male-led ‘revolution’ will counteract the horrors of

overpopulation and destruction of natural resources.”¹⁴ Ecofeminism as a movement, the strength of which is that “it did not emerge solely in the halls of academia, or the mind of one person or even one culture,”¹⁵ gained impetus when the meltdown at Three Mile Island prompted women in the United States to come together *en masse* to explore the connections between feminism, ecology, and militarism and to share their visions for life on earth.¹⁶ For ecofeminism the key category of analysis is “nature,” particularly the interrelated dominations of nature and of women. Though it is not a religious movement *per se*, it is interesting that ecofeminists often cite the thought of a theologian, Rosemary Ruether, as foundational for their own:

Women must see that there can be no liberation for them and no solution to the ecological crisis within a society whose fundamental model of relationships continues to be one of domination. They must unite the demands of the women’s movement with those of the ecological movement to envision a radical reshaping of the basic socioeconomic relations and the underlying values of this society.¹⁷

Though just as within feminism, there are differences in ecofeminism, all ecofeminists *agree* that there are important connections between the oppression of nature (naturism) and the oppression of women (sexism). They are likewise in harmony in viewing the patriarchal conceptual framework, which gives rise to value-hierarchical thinking, as responsible for a logic of domination. Furthermore, since the connections between the oppression of women and nature are basically conceptual, they believe what is necessary is a reconceptualization. Finally, ecofeminists in general agree that familiar ecological principles, derived from Barry Commoner’s “laws of ecology,” ground their critique of the patriarchal framework:

- life is an interconnected web, not a hierarchy
- all parts of the ecosystem have equal value
- there is no free lunch

¹³See Mary Potter-Engel and Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, eds., *Lift Every Voice: Constructing Christian Theologies From the Underside* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989).

¹⁴Françoise d’Eaubonne, *Le Feminisme où la mort* (Paris: Pierre Horay, 1974) 213-52; cited in Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology. The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978) 9.

¹⁵Judith Plant, *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1989) 257.

¹⁶Leonie Caldecott and Stephanie Leland, eds., *Reclaim the Earth: Women Speak Out for Life on Earth* (London: The Women’s Press, 1983) 6. For other chronicles of ecofeminist events and projects during the 1980s, see Ynestra King, *What Is Ecofeminism?* (New York: Ecofeminist Resources, 1989) esp. “Ecological Feminism,” 38-43; and Merchant, “Earthcare,” 6-13; 38-40.

¹⁷Rosemary Ruether, *New Women, New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation* (New York: Seabury, 1975) 204.

- nature knows best
- healthy systems maintain diversity
- unity in diversity¹⁸

What ecofeminists *disagree* about is the nature of the connections between women and

nature and whether such connections are potentially liberating or reinforcing of the inferior and subordinate position of women. Here ecofeminists are conscious that the “standpoint consciousness” which categorizes feminist theory—liberal, radical, or socialist—will also affect one’s position concerning the domination of nature/women.¹⁹

Liberal feminism, sometimes called “equal rights” feminism, “idealizes a society in which autonomous individuals are provided maximal freedom to pursue their own interests.”²⁰ The liberation of women requires the elimination of those legal and social constraints that prevent women from exercising their right of self-determination. Though such questioning of “natural” roles or destinies has worked *for* women and other dehumanized peoples, Ynestra King argues that liberal feminism, with its individualist, rationalist, utilitarian bias, is the least able appropriately to address ecology, because it is by and large a white middle-class movement, concerned with the extension of male power and privilege to women like themselves, not the fate of women as a whole.²¹ To the extent that they address ecological concerns, liberal feminists will be ‘environmentalists’ rather than ecologists, “basing any claims to moral consideration for nonhumans either on the alleged rights or interests of humans, or on the consequences of such consideration for human well-being.”²² Ecofeminists like King and Warren believe that liberal feminism leads women into absurdly unsisterly positions, like supporting the draft and maintaining women’s contract credibility in surrogate motherhood cases (which denies the natural mother any right to her child). In short, with regard to a view of nature and women’s connectedness to it, liberal feminism’s position involves the rationalization and, ultimately, the domination of nature.²³

Radical feminism embraces the view that the biologically based ideology of women being closer to nature is the root cause of domination of women by men. Concerned with the essential embodiedness of human nature, radical (or “cultural”) feminism finds the woman/nature connection potentially emancipatory, taking women’s bodies (particularly the childbearing and childrearing functions) into the political arena. Such feminists celebrate the life experience of the female ghetto and emphasize “women’s ways of knowing” which involves intuition, caring, feelings, spiritual or mystical experiences, and the integration of these experiences into feminist theory and epistemology. Some radical/cultural feminists advocate a separate women’s culture.

¹⁸See Ynestra King, “The Ecology of Feminism and Feminism of Ecology,” in *What Is Ecofeminism?*, 26-27; and Merchant, “Earthcare,” 10-11.

¹⁹For this view, see Karen J. Warren, “Feminism and Ecology: Making the Connections,” *Environmental Ethics* 9 (1989) 3-20; and Carolyn Merchant, “Ecofeminism and Feminist Theory,” in *Reweaving the World. The Emergence of Ecofeminism*, ed. Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1990).

²⁰Warren, “Feminism and Ecology,” 8.

²¹King, *What Is Ecofeminism?*, 119.

²²Warren, “Feminism and Ecology,” 9.

²³King, *What Is Ecofeminism?*, 119-20.

Ecofeminism has been most often associated with radical feminism, though recently a critique of radical/cultural feminism has emerged from within ecofeminism. There is concern that the eclectic potpourri of beliefs and practices which comprise what is known as the “feminist spirituality movement” tends to mystify women’s experience and pays little attention to the historical and material features of women’s oppression. Radical feminism tends to ignore race

and class issues and fails to see the extent to which women's oppression is grounded in concrete diverse social structures. It also perpetuates dualistic, hierarchical thinking, since it comes down in favor of one side of the nature/culture dualism.

The truth is that nature is itself. It is neither male human nor female human. That should be obvious. But unfortunately it is not. The ground we walk upon is not "Mother Earth"; it is living soil with a chemistry and biology of its own which we must come to understand and respect.²⁴

Socialist feminism is the attempt to integrate the insights of traditional Marxist feminism with those of radical feminism by making domination by class and gender fundamental to women's oppression. Socialist feminists point out how the economic system and the sex/gender system are reinforced in historically specific ways. Differences between men and women are social constructions, not biologically given. Capitalism is a result of patriarchy; women's liberation requires the end of both.²⁵

What is problematic for ecofeminists, however, is that while "socialist feminists have articulated a strong economic and class analysis,...they have not sufficiently addressed the domination of nature....Socialist feminists have addressed...domination between persons, but they have not seriously attended to the domination of either nonhuman nature or inner nature."²⁶ Neither have the socialist feminists recognized (as the radical feminists have) that there is a female political imagination which manifests itself in the political practice of a feminism of difference. They "forget that no revolution in human history has succeeded without a strong cultural foundation and a utopian vision emerging from the life experience of the revolutionary subjects."²⁷

IV. ECOFEMINIST SOLUTIONS

In summary, then, ecofeminists believe that socialist feminists and radical (nature) feminists each have something the other needs. Socialists emphasize history and disregard nature and biology; radical feminists emphasize nature and disregard history and social structures. Ecofeminists, however, are about the "organic forging of a genuinely antidualistic, or dialectical, theory and praxis" which seeks to enter history, to interpret the historical significance of *the fact* that women have been positioned at the dividing line where the organic emerges into the social. "The domination of nature originates in society and therefore must be resolved in

²⁴Elizabeth Dodson Gray, "The Nature of Our Cultural Assumptions," *Daughters of Sarah* (May/June, 1990) 9.

²⁵Warren, "Feminism and Ecology," 16-17.

²⁶King, *What Is Ecofeminism?*, 128.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 129.

society. Therefore, the embodied woman as social historical agent, rather than product of natural law is the subject of ecofeminism."²⁸

Ecofeminists are thus convinced that practice does not wait for theory; it comes out of the imperatives of history. They believe that women are the revolutionary bearers of an antidualistic

potential that does not sever the woman/nature connection, but uses it as a vantage point for creating a different kind of culture and politics that would integrate intuitive, spiritual, and rational knowledge so as to transform the nature/culture distinction and to envision and create a free ecological society. The best summary of the movement's current thinking is Karen Warren's program of "transformative feminism."²⁹ Such a responsible ecological perspective central to feminist theory and practice would:

- 1) recognize and make explicit the interconnections between all systems of oppression;
- 2) provide a central theoretical place for the diversity of women's experience, even if this meant abandoning the project of attempting to formulate one overarching feminist theory;
- 3) reject the logic of domination and the patriarchal conceptual framework and address the conceptual and structural interconnections among all forms of domination, by making connections with the revolution of insurgent people;
- 4) rethink what it means to be human (which involves a rethinking of the notion of the self, such that we see ourselves as co-members of an ecological community and yet different from other members of it);
- 5) recast traditional ethical concerns to make a central place for values such as care, friendship, and reciprocity in relationships;
- 6) challenge patriarchal bias in technology research, while promoting the use of appropriate technology.

What do these insights imply for theology and the church? With reference to the Christian tradition in particular, which has historically been accused—with good reason—of bearing a major part of the responsibility for the domination and ruination of nature, what are the implications for a renewed Christian understanding of creation and redemption?

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR A THEOLOGY OF CREATION

This examination of the deep ecology and ecofeminist movements suggests several possible themes by which Christian theology might rethink its teaching on creation and redemption.

1. First, both deep ecology and ecofeminism would urge a reinterpretation of the divine command to "subdue the earth" in Genesis 1:26-28³⁰ which goes beyond contemporary theological solutions in terms of "stewardship"—a position which remains essentially anthropocentric—and stresses an *ecocentric* interdependence.³¹ In its notion of "self-realization," deep ecology stresses the fundamental interdependence of humans not only with traditionally accepted aspects of "the self"

²⁸Ibid., 129-34.

²⁹Warren, "Ecology and Feminism," 17-20.

³⁰See for this Jürgen Moltmann's remarks in his essay in this issue and in *God in Creation* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985) 29-33.

³¹Many deep ecologists now use the term *ecocentrism* in order to dispel the notion that biocentrism was limited only to living beings.

(family and loved ones), but with the environment as whole. Both deep ecology and ecofeminism argue that, if human beings *are* nature, then to use the theological vocabulary of “the order of creation” for purposes of differentiation is basically “anthropocentric” and perpetuates value-hierarchical thinking.

Of course, the phrase “the order of creation” is also used in another sense, to indicate the material world which first had to “be there” in order that redemption might be accomplished. The early church insisted on the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* in order to combat the dangerous consequences of maintaining the eternity of matter. Here the main question is not simply one of cosmology, but of soteriology: the creation created by God gives matter an authentic ontological place in the world as something “good.” Yet the fundamental distinction remains between the Creator and the created. According to ecofeminism and deep ecology, humanity and nature may indeed be one. Neither, however, is “divine.”

2. Deep ecology’s stress on biocentrism is not only problematic for Christianity.³² Ecofeminists also see problems in maintaining absolutely *no* differentiation between conscious human nature and non-sentient nature. To say there are “no boundaries,” among life forms, and thus, no intrinsic differences, could result in saying there is no difference between a virus and a human being who is invaded by this virus. To avoid such problems, ecofeminists suggest thinking about interdependence using the category of *relationship*. Process theologians are developing theologies of nature along this line which enable one to recognize the goodness of creation in such a way that one may recognize degrees of intrinsic value relative to the experiential richness and self-concern of an organism.³³

3. Since they are not primarily religious movements, it is not clear whether deep ecology or ecofeminism would regard Christianity’s distinction between creator/creature as fostering relationships of domination.³⁴ In fact, although ecofeminism especially decries the interlocking oppressions (sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism, and naturism), it offers no account for their existence. No theory of “the Fall” or of the existence of “evil” explains from where such oppressions come. If the answer is that they are created by humans, the implication is that humans are somehow more responsible for domination (more than the animals, the forests, rocks, or soil). But in a web of interrelated beings, why are humans more responsible? Perhaps ecofeminism can also learn something from Christian theology.

Matthew Fox, for one, has given us a contemporary recovery of two competing traditions within Christianity: the Fall/Redemption and Creation-centered traditions. The one is an inheritance from Augustine; the other from Irenaeus. In Fox’s categories, ecofeminism stresses an Irenaean approach. Nature is not “fallen” but in process of growth; it is becoming. The deutero-Pauline theology on which Irenaeus drew does not stress redemption as a buying back, but as a coming to fullness (*pleroma*), a “bringing together in harmony” (*anakephalaiosis*). The question

³²See the remarks by John Cobb in John B. Cobb and Herman Daly, *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future* (Boston: Beacon, 1989).

³³See, for example, Jay McDaniel’s discussion in *Of God and Pelicans. A Theology of Reverence for Life* (Louisville: John Knox, 1989) 51-84.

³⁴Radical feminism, such as that espoused by Mary Daly, has long seen the male Father/God as the primordial instance of patriarchal dualism and domination.

remains whether ecofeminism attends sufficiently to the reality of evil and destruction—often rampant in nature. Still its posture seems more consonant with an Irenaean theology of redemption.³⁵

Other possibilities for a renewed Christian doctrine of nature in harmony with ecofeminist insights would be to recover the biblical notions of jubilee and sophia or the Jewish notion of *shabbat*, all of which emphasize the integrity and celebration of creation.³⁶ After all, the biblical tradition makes it clear that the crown of creation is *not*, as is frequently misunderstood, the human being, but the sabbath.³⁷

4. It is probably no accident that where ecofeminist and deep ecological ideas are finding most resonance in contemporary theology is among theologians who are engaged in a complete rethinking, not only of specific doctrines which seem to have relevance for ecology—the doctrines of God, creation, and redemption—but of the whole perspective from which one does theology. The most creative attempts in this regard are emerging from process and feminist theologians such as John Cobb, Jay McDaniel, Sallie McFague, Lois Daly, and Grace Jantzen.³⁸

These theologians are not interested merely in fashioning a new “theology of” creation or redemption, but are concerned to offer a perspective from which all theological topics should ultimately be rethought. They cause us to ask whether it is time to speak of “the hermeneutical privilege of nature/the earth” much as we have learned to speak of the “preferential option” or hermeneutical privilege of the poor from liberation theologies? John Cobb observes that fashioning a more ecological “theology of nature” must not simply be

a new way of speaking of “doctrines of”.... We are not trying only to spell out what traditional theology implies about nature. Instead, we want to see the whole of theology influenced and reconceived in light of what we are learning about nature.³⁹

From this brief sketch, it is quite apparent that both deep ecology and ecofeminism present challenges and opportunities for theology, especially the traditional doctrines of creation and redemption and the articulation of a more adequate theology of nature. To undertake such a dialogue will not only be exciting, but crucial to the survival of both nature and theology.

³⁵See Matthew Fox, *Original Blessing* (Sante Fe, NM: Bear and Co., 1983).

³⁶On “jubilee” see Sharon H. Ringe, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee. Images for Ethics and Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); Karen Lebacqz, *Justice in an Unjust World* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987), 122-60; and Arthur Waskow, “Both the Land and Society Need Rest,” *Compass* (July 1990) 51 and also “From Compassion to Jubilee,” *Tikkun* 5 (1990) 78-81.

³⁷Moltmann, *God in Creation*, 31.

³⁸In addition to works already mentioned see the World Council of Churches sub-unit on Church and Society report, edited by Charles Birch, William Eakin, and Jay McDaniel, *Liberating Life: Contemporary Approaches to Ecological Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990).

³⁹John Cobb, “The Role of Theology of Nature,” in Birch, Eakin, McDaniel, *Liberating Life*, 263.