

# Review of: "Ecotheology: missiological perspective in awareness"

Timothy Gorringer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Exeter

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In thinking ecotheologically we need first to consider the relative importance of intellectual, cultural, political and sociological factors. Lynn White's suggestion that Genesis 1.26 stands at the head of the ecological crisis is naive on every level. (1) Though ideas certainly have an impact it credits the study of Genesis with far too much significance. Who read it? What did they read alongside it? (the whole bible). What else were they reading? (2) What was the impact of an economy developing from the 12thc AD onwards, developing trade, especially after developments in marine technology led to European interventions and conquests in many parts of the world(3) White is absolutely naive about hermeneutics, failing to see that Gen 1.26 was read in the light of Gen 2.15, not to mention Mark 10.45.

To premiss ecotheology on Gen 1.26 is therefore not possible. A thorough discussion of theological anthropology is necessary, alongside a consideration of the relative power of Christian ideas. How important were these ideas alongside 16thc humanism? In Montaigne, for example, and even more importantly in Bacon.

Thinking from the Philippines I would (1) by all means look at the biblical sources, which are manifold (2) ask about Philippine traditions of thought about both what it means to be human and the approach to 'nature'(Is there a Philippine word for that?)(3) consider the impact of neoliberalism (see especially Naomi Klein)(4) consider practical ways in which the community called church might be able to make constructive suggestions both in terms of thought and of action within your own situation.

Best wishes