2

Alternative Discourses

Beginners in the study of economics are often introduced to a list of questions all societies must answer. These might include some or all of the following: What should we produce with our scarce resources? How should these goods be produced—using which methods of production, or "technologies"? Where should these goods be produced—in which locations within a particular country and in which regions of the world? Who benefits from the outcomes of these economic processes—that is, how should the output be distributed among members of society? Soon the novices come to understand that there is another, overarching question: Who says? Who has the power to decide such matters?

The ways in which societies answer these questions have a profound influence on the environment: on the local and global ecosystems that ultimately support life. The theologians and ethicists whose views we shall be considering in this chapter are all concerned, to varying degrees, with the impact of modern economic systems on the environment. They see environmental damage as arising from

the ways in which these systems try to solve the problems listed above: the what, how, where, for whom, and who says questions. But they differ in the ways in which they arrive at their particular environmental concerns. Furthermore, they often explore the ideological roots of the economic choices made.

In this chapter we will be considering a range of theological commentary on environmental topics. Although the range is wide, the scope of this review is limited in two ways. First, the views to be considered all reflect the Western Christian tradition in a broad sense. That is to say, their authors include some who have reacted against Christianity in favor of neo-paganism, or who have come to see spiritual significance in nature without reference to a divinity; others who are comfortably within the broad sweep of mainstream Christian orthodoxy; and others again who claim a Bible-based evangelical faith. The second limitation is that the review is not intended to cover all issues raised by environmental theology but only those aspects that relate to economic analysis or policy.

In the first part of this chapter, I will try to classify the different views in terms of the particular economic issues on which each writer or group focuses and the environmental implications that follow. In this process I hope to present the material in ways the authors themselves would recognize as an accurate summary of their own ideas. In the later part of the chapter, I shall briefly outline my disagreements with at least some of the views and indicate my own position on these issues. Much of the remainder of the book will be taken up defending this position in depth.

A Spectrum of Viewpoints and Critiques

A useful starting point for any discussion of these different viewpoints is an influential article, "The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis,"

published in 1967 by Lynn White Jr., to which many of the contending parties refer, either in support of White's views or in criticism of them.

Lynn White's Critique of Christian Attitudes to Nature

In this article, published in *Science*, Lynn White accuses the authors of the biblical creation account of fostering an anthropocentric and exploitative attitude to nature.[1] This account, of course, has traditionally been accepted (often literally, but at least metaphorically) by Jews, Christians, and (with amendments) Muslims; White, however, stresses its influence as mediated in particular through Western Christianity, and he considers that this influence has continued to be powerful even among those who would regard themselves as nonbelievers.[2]

White is not making these criticisms from an atheistic or anti–Christian perspective; in an aside, he describes himself as a "churchman," albeit a "troubled" one, and he concludes by recommending St. Francis of Assisi as a "patron saint for ecologists."[3] His target is the particular belief, which he ascribes to mainstream Christians, that nonhuman nature exists only for the sake of humans.

White argues that Christianity has inherited two ideas from Judaism that are of crucial importance in the ecological context. First, there is a linear and progressive view of history, which is seen as moving toward an ultimate goal. By contrast, other ancient societies, whether in European classical antiquity or in China or India, had

1. Lynn White Jr., "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," *Science* 155 (March 10, 1967): 1203–7. This article was reprinted in *The Care of Creation: Focusing Concern and Action*, ed. R. J. Berry (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), 31–42. The page references that follow are to the latter source.
2. "Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen." Ibid., 38.
3. Ibid., 40, 42.

generally taken a cyclical, less teleological view of history. Second, there is the role assigned to humankind in the Genesis story (or stories) of creation.

According to Genesis, God created humans in God's own image and gave them "dominion" over the nonhuman world. Paganism attributed guardian spirits both to other animals and to groves of trees, sacred rivers, and mountains. These beliefs protected nature from overexploitation. But in Judaism, and subsequently in Christianity, respect for the sacredness of natural creation was seen as idolatrous. There was no longer any religious inhibition that might prevent the development of science and technology so as to use natural resources on a huge scale. And the further belief in linear progress encouraged such exploitation. From these arguments, White claims, it follows that "we shall continue to have a worsening ecologic crisis until we reject the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man."[4]

In terms of our classificatory criteria, White focuses particularly on the interaction of ideology and technology. Thus, an ideology that denies the sacredness of nature allows us to apply science to determine the most efficient ways to derive output from natural inputs, with little concern for the ecological impact.

A common response to White's criticisms, particularly though not exclusively from evangelical commentators, has been to claim that the Genesis story allocates to humans the role of careful steward, rather than crass exploiter, of creation. This argument too has been questioned, as we shall see later. But many others have accepted the main thrust of White's argument while developing it in various ways.

White's theory appears to be based on a particular direction of causation from ideas to behavior: "What people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to

4. Ibid., 42.

things around them."[5] But this, while no doubt true as far as it goes, begs a fundamental question: how do people come to think what they think? An influential answer, emphasized by but not confined to Marxists, is that what people think about themselves depends on the material conditions of their lives and the social relationships that flow from these conditions. On this view, those who dominate the economic system also dominate the belief system: "The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas."[6]

This perspective on economic power and its implications for ideology is apparent in a number of the other approaches to religion and our relations with the environment, to which we now turn.

The Ecofeminist Critique

Ecofeminists are very much concerned with issues of power and ideology. Ecofeminism includes a wide range of theological opinion, from relatively orthodox Christianity to pantheism and neo-pagan spirituality. Here, as noted earlier, I shall focus only on ecofeminist views on the relationship of economy and environment. Even with this limitation, these views are diverse, touching on many of the economic issues listed at the beginning of this chapter. While many contributors have a common desire to see the remodeling of economic and social systems around matriarchal structures, others who share some ecofeminist sympathies may be prepared to pursue a more limited agenda.[7]

Since at least the 1980s, many feminist writers have been taking a strong interest in environmental issues. They would probably agree

5. Ibid., 37.
6. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, ed. and intro. C. J. Arthur (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974), 64.
7. Celia Deane-Drummond, *Eco-Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2008), 146.

with White that the mindset encouraged by the Judeo-Christian account of creation is indeed seriously implicated in crimes against the environment. But they ask where this attitude came from and whose interests it reflects. They find the answer in the general theory of patriarchy.

Patriarchal Religion and the Environment

In some feminist interpretations of theology, the Fall is seen as a "fall into patriarchy."[8] The roots of this idea lie in nineteenth-century anthropology, in particular the work of Johann Jakob Bachofen and Lewis Morgan; these ideas were subsequently taken up by Frederick Engels, Marx's collaborator, whose work served as an important source for the feminist movement of the 1970s.[9] Morgan developed a three-stage theory of social development: *savagery*, by which he meant the hunter-gatherer communities of the old stone age; *barbarism*, associated with the development of pastoralism, animal husbandry, and the cultivation of edible plants; and *civilization*, involving the creation of a permanent surplus over subsistence needs. These changes initially took place in areas especially suited to agricultural activity, such as the plains around the great rivers of China, India, and the Middle East, and occurred over a period of several thousand years between 15,000 and 10,000 B.C.E., though in

8. The phrase is used by Rosemary Radford Ruether in *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992), ch. 6. However, she later suggests that it is "more misleading than helpful" to describe the change in social relationships associated with the spread of agriculture as a "fall" (257).
9. Johann Jakob Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht* (Stuttgart: Verlag von Krais & Hoffman, 1861); Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1877); Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 4th ed., trans. Ernest Untermann (1891; Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1908).

some parts of the world, of course, hunter-gatherer societies have continued to exist until modern times.

Building on Morgan's system, Engels characterized the social relations of the hunter-gatherer communities as "primitive communism," with rough equality among members of the group, whether male or female; sexual relations within the group were also thought to be nonexclusive. But during the stage of barbarism that followed, as pastoralism and cultivation developed, a change took place. Instead of gender relations based on group marriage, women became attached to a particular male. Engels suggested that this occurred when people became aware of the connection between individual acts of intercourse and subsequent pregnancy. Further, as productive assets multiplied (for example, as formerly wild herds of sheep and cattle became domesticated), questions about who was to take possession of them and how they were to be transferred from generation to generation emerged. The eventual solution was that the property would be passed down through the male line. Deprived of matrilineal right, women themselves became in effect the property of their husbands.

The institution of monogamy, with the close policing of women's sexuality, was designed to ensure that the children born in a man's family were genuinely his heirs. The consequent restrictions on women's freedom built conflict into the relationships between men and women: "The first class antagonism appearing in history coincides with the development of the antagonism of man and wife in monogamy, and the first class oppression with that of the female by the male sex."[10] To Engels and most other Marxists, patriarchal oppression, even if it is the first, is still just one aspect of the class conflict that has divided, and continues to divide, society—the

10. Engels, *Origin of the Family,* 79.

conflict, that is, between those who create the economic surplus and those who take control of it. But to many feminists, patriarchy seems not just the earliest but also the fundamental and ongoing source of social conflict and the destruction of the earth's resources, a point of particular relevance here.

The feminist critique of patriarchal theology claims that religion was at first "matriarchal," or at least "woman centered"—that is, it was devoted to the worship of a maternal Earth Goddess, to whom the Greeks subsequently gave the name "Gaia."[11] If patriarchal men have made God in their own image, it seems matriarchal women did something similar before them; the Goddess was seen as the giver and nurturer of life, just as women give birth to and care for children. This nurturing, so it is argued, did not simply apply to social relationships but extended to the relationship between human beings and the natural environment. As patriarchy took over, the dominant value system changed from one of nurturing to one of manipulation and exploitation.

Feminists point to creation myths in support of this argument. Ruether notes that the Babylonian creation myth, derived from earlier Sumerian sources, involves the overthrow of the dominant mother goddess, Tiamat, by the male Ea; Ea's son Marduk subsequently slays Tiamat and constructs the cosmos from her dead body while fashioning humans from the blood of her (subordinate male) consort. Ruether interprets this myth as reflecting a move not only from matriarchy to patriarchy but also from "reproductive" to "artisan" models of creation, which in turn she takes as implying "a deeper confidence in the appropriation of 'matter' by the new ruling class." Since in the myth humans are created to be slaves to the gods,

11. The name was applied by James Lovelock to his controversial views on the self-regulation of earth systems: see James Lovelock, *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

it also mirrors the hierarchical distribution of power in the growing city-states of the Middle East.[12]

Turning to the Hebrew creation myth, feminists would agree with White that it stresses, and appears to justify, man's domination over other creatures. But they are particularly interested in the version of the creation story in Genesis 2 and 3 in which Eve is created from Adam's spare rib; the implication of inferiority is reinforced when Adam is assigned to rule over Eve because of her role in tempting him to eat the forbidden fruit. The Old Testament creation story thus implies a hierarchy: God, the angels, man, woman, animals, vegetable life, and inanimate matter.

Christianity, of course, is not simply an offshoot of Judaism; its development included a (sometimes uneasy) attempt to link Athens with Jerusalem in a synthesis of Greek philosophy with Jewish ideas about God's action in history. Ruether argues that the Hellenistic strand has been influenced by the dualistic cosmology found in Plato, particularly in the *Timaeus* and the *Phaedrus*, which sees the time-bound and mutable material world as an imperfect manifestation of the eternal and changeless world of ideas.[13] True, by insisting on the doctrine of the incarnation orthodox Christianity could never go as far as Gnostic versions of the gospel in rejecting the material world. Nevertheless, the antimaterialist strand in Christianity has arguably encouraged a downplaying of the importance of the nonhuman created world and a suspicious and even confrontational attitude to its attractions; it is often seen as something to be subdued rather than accepted on its own terms. Feminists consider the fault line in Western culture, and in Christianity in particular, to lie not between the human and the nonhuman but rather within the human category: between men who are identified with "reason and spirit" and women

12. Ruether, *Gaia and God*, 16–19.
13. Ibid., 122–24.

who are identified "with the body and with nature" and hence liable to subjugation.[14]

"Patriarchal Science" and the Environment

For some ecofeminists, though not all, the dualism inherent in patriarchy and its downgrading of both women and nature casts doubt on the validity of the modern scientific approach.

The criticisms made of Western science by feminist authors such as Vandana Shiva, Evelyn Fox Keller, Carolyn Merchant, and Sandra Harding are wide-ranging.[15] As it developed from the seventeenth century onward, modern science, they allege, was produced "almost entirely by white middle-class males" bent on dominating "nature" as men dominated women.[16] Early scientists, in describing their relationship with nature, used the metaphors of torture (to compel nature to give up "her" secrets) and of rape (forcing her to yield to exploitation).[17] For all its claims to universality and objectivity, such science has from its foundation been "western, bourgeois and masculine."[18]

Shiva's analysis is particularly interesting in this context. Unlike some postmodern critics of Western science, Shiva cannot be faulted for attacking from a position of ignorance; she has an undergraduate

14. Sallie McFague, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 14–15.
15. Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive*: *Women, Ecology and Development* (London: Zed, 1989); Evelyn Fox Keller, *Reflections on Gender and Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980); Sandra Harding, *The Science Question in Feminism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); Harding, "Why Physics Is a Bad Model for Physics," in *The End of Science? Attack and Defense*, ed. Richard Q. Elvee (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992).
16. Keller, *Reflections*, 7.
17. Examples of this use of language are given in Shiva, *Staying Alive*, 16–18.
18. Harding, *The Science Question*, 8.

degree in physics, and her PhD was on the foundations of quantum mechanics. Her particular target is what she calls "maldevelopment": the application of modern science and technology to force the pace of change in traditional societies. In so doing, Shiva claims, scientists and technologists have neglected the expertise of women in these societies and "excluded ecological and holistic ways of knowing,"[19] instead destroying traditional cultures and perpetuating the subjugation of women, by violence when necessary. Thus, science stands condemned as "reductionist and mechanistic." It reduces knowledge to what can be discovered by its own narrow methods, and these methods themselves treat nature as a machine that can be taken apart and studied piece by piece in controlled laboratory experiments rather than as an organic and living system that must be studied as a whole.

It is easy, of course, to find examples of ecological disasters caused by attempts to exploit nature using modern science and driven by the profit motive: every major oil spill, exploding chemical plant, or devastated forest habitat could be listed on a lengthening charge sheet. But the feminist critics of science make a more fundamental allegation. Shiva explicitly dismisses the notion that the fault lies not with science per se but with the misuse of its findings.[20] In her view, it is the reductionist scientific method itself, deeply rooted in the violence of patriarchy and serving the interests of bourgeois commerce and industry, that by its neglect of feminine and holistic ways of knowing has led to ecological crisis.

19. Shiva, *Staying Alive*, 14–15.
20. Ibid., 26ff.

Alternatives to Patriarchy

So what sort of social and economic changes would ecofeminists like to bring about, and how would these affect the environmental problem? The answers depend on the particular version of ecofeminism.

The more radical authors have seen the environmental crisis as so deeply rooted in male psychology that only a very drastic reduction of the male role can put matters right. In 1982, Sally Miller Gearhart produced a manifesto titled "The Future—If There Is One—Is Female" in which she proposed, as an essential part of any solution to the environmental problem, not only that the dominant culture should become female but that "the proportion of men must be reduced to and maintained at approximately ten per cent of the human race." This suggestion won the support of Mary Daly, one of the best-known radical feminist theologians; Daly expected some such reduction to be brought about through the "decontamination" of the earth as the outcome of an evolutionary process.[21]

Other feminists have taken a more inclusive view of men's role, even if this role is not to be a dominant one. Heide Goettner-Abendroth, organizer of two world congresses on matriarchal studies, envisages rebuilding society on principles developed from the women-centered societies depicted in "mother goddess" literature.[22] Whereas prehistoric matriarchal clans were based on kinship

21. Daly supports the suggestion in Susan Bridle, "No Man's Land: An Interview with Mary Daly," *Enlightenment*, Fall–Winter 1999, http://www.scribd.com/doc/6146237/No-Mans-Land-Mary-Daly-Susan-Bridle. Daly's own critique of patriarchal culture is to be found in *Gyn/ecology* (Boston: Beacon, 1978).

22. Heide Goettner-Abendroth, "Modern Matriarchal Studies: Definitions, Scope and Topicality," trans. Jutta Ried and Karen P. Smith, Societies of Peace, 2nd World Congress on Matriarchal Studies, http://www.second-congress-matriarchal-studies.com/goettnerabendroth.html. The use of the term *matriarchy* to describe a system that is in fact intended to be strongly democratic has been queried by other feminists on the grounds that it suggests "rule by women" as a mirror image of patriarchy's "rule by men"; this, however, is far from the intention of those who use the term.

relations, those of the future will be based on "affinity groups" of people who are "siblings by choice," brought together by shared spiritual attitudes. Decisions will be made by consensus, which Goettner-Abendroth describes as "the genuine democratic principle." While men will be "fully integrated" in these societies, women will "guide the economy" (as they allegedly did in the matriarchal societies of ancient times).

So how would such a society resolve the basic economic problems listed at the beginning of this chapter? What sort of goods would be produced, by what methods, where, and for whose benefit? These societies would turn their backs on large-scale industry, with all its adverse environmental effects, in favor of self-sufficient, small-scale, local or at most regional economic communities. The emphasis on self-sufficiency necessarily implies that trade over a distance would be much more limited than in the present global world order. Although the communities would not necessarily be engaged solely in agriculture, this sector would make a relatively more significant contribution to output and employment than in industrial societies at present.

The preference for small-scale and egalitarian forms of economic organization, and for devolution of decision-making power to local levels, is common among ecofeminists and indeed many other ecotheologians, as we shall see. But this does not necessarily imply a neglect of global issues. Some feminists have seen the way forward as involving cooperation with antiglobalization and environmentalist groups; while giving due weight to feminist insights and concerns, these authors do not necessarily see the establishment of matriarchy as the ultimate goal.

Ruether argues vigorously for "integrating ecofeminism, globalization and world religions," in the words of the title of her 2005 book.[23] In her final chapter, she instances social movements

such as the Zapatista revolt in Mexico, the anti–World Trade Organization (WTO) demonstrations that began in Seattle in 1999, and the World Social Forum (WSF) gatherings of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs); these movements, she believes, point the way forward toward an alternative world and away from "corporate globalization." They seek this through direct action against the major components of the present global system, which Ruether identifies as "transnational corporations, the Bretton Woods institutions (the IMF, World Bank, and the WTO), and the American military."[24] Among several examples of direct action, she cites the burning of genetically engineered crops in India and Brazil. The ultimate object of such social action, she believes, should be to replace the dominant power structures with "locally accountable, democratically governed, and environmentally sustainable forms of human society."[25]

Ruether recognizes that it is not enough to attack institutions without also attacking the ideologies that support them. In particular, she singles out neoliberal economics and "the ideology of messianic nationalism that dictates the vision of American world empire."[26] The second of these issues, though no doubt important, is beyond the scope of this book, but the role of neoliberal economics will be further considered in later chapters.

Meanwhile, we look at some alternative views that, while often drawing on or overlapping with feminist ideas, also bring in a broader range of cultural and economic issues.

23. Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Integrating Ecofeminism, Globalization and World Religions* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield , 2005), ch. 4.
24. Ibid., 160.
25. Ibid., 164.
26. Ibid., 166–68.

The Deep Ecology Critique: Anthroprocentrism versus Ecocentrism

Like the ecofeminists, deep ecologists would agree with Lynn White's criticisms of anthropocentrism, whether or not this is taken to have Judeo-Christian origins. Thus Arne Naess, who coined the term *deep ecology*, has criticized the biblical concept of stewardship as based on "the idea of superiority which underlies the thought that we exist to watch over nature like a highly respected middleman between the Creator and the Creation."[27] The deep ecology movement has perhaps carried this criticism as far as it can go.

Economists, as we saw at the beginning of the chapter, are concerned with the question of how resources are used in the interests of members of society. They take it for granted that *human* desires and preferences will determine these interests. Naess is arguing for a shift from the anthropocentric to the ecocentric. His use of the term *deep ecology* is intended to differentiate his concerns from those of "shallow" ecologists, who, while willing to "fight against pollution and resource depletion," do so in the interests of "the health and affluence of people in the developed countries" rather than in the interests of the ecosystem as a whole.[28]

Perhaps the most fundamental change in perspective for which Naess in particular has argued concerns the notion of self-realization. Naess's use of the term is to be distinguished from more popular notions of self-fulfillment, such as the idea of expressing identity through conspicuous display of the right sort of branded products. By contrast, in Naess's version, self-realization implies acceptance of the ineradicable links between the individual self, other human

27. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*, trans. David Rothenberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 187.
28. Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long Range Ecology Movements," *Inquiry* 16 (1973): 95–100.

and animal selves, and inanimate nature, and it requires active engagement in the relationships implied by these links. From this perspective, "altruism becomes unnecessary. . . . [W]e must see the vital needs of ecosystems and other species as our own needs; there is thus no conflict of interest."[29]

The principles of the movement were helpfully summarized by Arne Naess and George Sessions in an eight-point platform; sympathizers were encouraged to work out their own formulations.[30] These principles included the notion that nonhuman life has *intrinsic* value, independent of its usefulness to humans; biodiversity should not be reduced "except to satisfy vital needs"; humans are interfering excessively, and increasingly, with the nonhuman world, and their own numbers need to undergo a "substantial" decrease; and, finally, major changes in economic, technological, and ideological structures are required, changes deep ecologists are obliged to attempt to bring about.

Interpreting this last requirement in terms of our classification criteria would imply very similar changes to those sought by the ecofeminists: changes in the types of goods produced, the methods used in producing them, the location of production, the distribution of the products, and the nature of economic power. Thus Naess envisages greater self-sufficiency in production and consumption (such as home-baked bread and recycling), reduction in energy use, reliance on local sourcing and local materials, and the use of "soft" technology—that is, a shift away from mass production toward craftsmanship.[31] Income differentials would be low in Naess's model, but he goes beyond many who support egalitarianism by asking for justice "not only with regard to human beings but also for animals,

29. The quotation here is from the introduction to Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* by the translator David Rothenberg, 9–10.
30. The platform is reproduced and discussed in *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 29–32.
31. Ibid., 92–100.

plants and landscapes."[32] Power would be devolved to local communities.[33] The main difference from the proposals of the ecofeminists is the lack of emphasis on the importance of gender relations.

Some of the arguments of the deep ecologists are of course shared with shallower ecologists. For instance, both groups insist that the ecosystem is a delicate web of complex interrelationships within and between both its animate and inanimate elements. Humans, themselves firmly embedded in the animate sector, are both arrogant and foolish if they imagine that they can either isolate themselves from the system or hope to control it. Both also contend that in attempting to manipulate nonhuman elements of the system for their own convenience, human beings have in many ways, some obvious and some more obscure, caused a great deal of damage.

Although there is a strong spiritual element in Naess's desire to achieve self-realization through identification with nature (he uses the phrase "nature mysticism" in this context), he does not explicitly adopt a theological perspective.[34] Some Christian writers who share his strong sense of the sacredness of the created world would no doubt prefer a theocentric (or, if influenced by feminists, theacentric) system of values to either an anthropocentric or an ecocentric one. Among such writers, those who are perhaps closest to the deep ecologists would include Sallie McFague, for whom the world (indeed, the entire universe) is "the body of God," and "creation spiritualists," such as Matthew Fox, who also emphasize the embodiment of the divine in the cosmos.[35] These views are seen by

32. Ibid., 173.
33. Ibid., 144–46.
34. Ibid., 176
35. McFague, *Body of God*; McFague, *A New Climate for Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), esp. 112–19. On "creation spiritualists," see, for example, Deane-Drummond, *Eco-Theology*, ch. 3.

more mainstream Christian theologians as uncomfortably close to pantheism, though the authors themselves deny this. Fox claims that his view is based not on pantheism (the belief that God *is* everything) but on "panentheism" (the belief that God is *in* everything and everything is in God); in similar vein, McFague argues that God is not identical with everything but rather is the *source* of everything (hence transcendent) while simultaneously being embodied in everything (hence immanent).[36]

While these writers reject a purely instrumentalist approach to creation, they do not all give the same attention to the implications of their views for social structures and economic justice; Celia Deane-Drummond criticizes the creation spiritualist school, in particular, for neglecting this.[37] Here she is not referring to McFague, who has written at some length on what she sees as the inadequacies of market capitalism and the overindividualistic approach to welfare in mainstream economics.[38] These criticisms follow from the metaphor of the body, and her argument here is reminiscent of the apostle Paul's use of the metaphor (1 Cor. 12); if each part of creation, even the humblest, contributes to the well-being of the whole, it makes no sense for that part's well-being to be neglected in the supposed interest of any other part. Whether and to what extent such criticisms of economics are justified, however, is a matter we will pursue later.

Some theologians have sought to provide a perspective that draws both on Scripture and on the created world as sources of divine guidance on environmental issues, and to such arguments we now turn.

36. McFague, *A New Climate*, 76–77.
37. Deane–Drummond, *Eco-Theology*, 43.
38. Deane–Drummond treats McFague as an eco-feminist writer (ibid., 150–53).