

A Critique of Jürgen Moltmann's Green Theology.

Celia Deane-Drummond

What Hope for Creation?

Jürgen Moltmann became famous for his brilliantly perceptive studies on the tasks of theology, first: to answer a despairing world with a *Theology of Hope*, and second: to answer a world which could no longer believe in God's existence in the midst of evil with *The Crucified God*.¹ While the first book stressed the resurrection of the crucified one as the basis for our hope, the second stressed the reality of Christ's death in concrete solidarity with our suffering.

As we might expect, the dominant question of theology then was in relation to the future of humanity, and the fashion in German theological discussions was a focus on history, rather than a concern with creation as such.² However, even at this stage, Moltmann's vision showed tendencies to look beyond that of a narrow understanding of our humanity, so that he aimed to include creation as a whole within the orbit of both the suffering and future hope in Christ.³ His novelty at this stage was to reject all ideas of a search for a return to an ideal paradisaical state, the so-called 'myth of eternal return'.⁴ Such views had become part of the traditional cosmological interpretation of our world which had been challenged by post-enlightenment science. Once humankind perceived its relationship with the world as one of mastery over nature, the 'cosmological' proof of God from creation was no longer convincing.⁵ Moltmann does not want us to regain our sense of security by returning to a facile cosmology, but insists that we put our hope in the God of the Future, who promises a new creation as witnessed by the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Moltmann distinguishes carefully between the future, as coming from the present, or *futurum*, and that coming from ahead, or *adventus*. Together they make up an inclusive holistic future, the *Zukunft* in which God both challenges our present structures, and re-creates them in the light of future possibilities.⁶ The basis for both the discontinuity and continuity in the relationship between the present and the future is in the resurrection and cross of Christ, which remains a core idea in Moltmann's eschatological discussions.⁷

Moltmann is well aware of the temptation to escape from reality into the wilderness, as a reaction against the imprisoning effects of our scientific technological culture:

'It has become a thick web with no way out. For this reason, although it offers no alternative in itself, it is as a whole ambivalent: it can be understood as home and also as alien, as a dwelling and also as a prison, as heaven and also as hell'.⁸

Instead, both our solidarity with the suffering creation and the experience of joy in the risen Christ makes us *both more* sensitive to the present evil, and yet gives us hope to work for such changes.⁹

Both the *eschatological* medium in which theology takes place and the *Christological* criterion for theology remain core ideas for Moltmann as he comes to reflect on his particular theology of creation. My purpose in the first part of this discussion is to show how Moltmann has 're-imagined' theological understanding of both God *and* creation in a way which takes seriously the ecologically-aware climate of our culture. I will offer a theological critique of his views in the second section, especially in so far as how adequate his theology engages both with Christian tradition and with the 'green' cultural climate.

Re-Imaging God

(a) *As Social Inter-Relationships.*

Moltmann believes that one of the reasons for our sense of powerlessness amidst the present ecological crisis is that we have failed to come to an adequate understanding of God. We have understood the God of the Bible as a monarch who rules over his subjects, and who demands their obedience. This encourages us to think of ourselves in a similar way in relation to creation, so that the seeds of manipulation and control are built into the very way we understand the Creator of the world. Moltmann wants to retain the distinction between God and creation, but *re-image* God so that his primary characteristic is his sociality, rather than his unity. He argues against Karl Barth here, who also portrays God in trinitarian terms, but his stress is on God's sovereignty and unity of subject before he moves onto God's unity in relationships. Moltmann deliberately diffuses a sense of God's sovereignty in monarchical terms by beginning with the unity of God in trinitarian relationships.¹⁰

The idea of the social Trinity has always been stronger in the

Eastern Orthodox tradition through the notion of *perichoresis*. Stated simply, the concept stresses the mutual indwelling of the Father, Son and Spirit in each other. The double characteristic of indwelling and inter-relationship gives his portrayal of the Trinity a thoroughly ecological dimension. He insists that it is more *biblical* to think of the social Trinity first:

'If the biblical testimony is chosen as point of departure, then we shall have to start from the three Persons of the history of Christ. If philosophical logic is made the starting point, then the enquirer proceeds from the One God'.¹¹

A further characteristic of God as Trinity, which Moltmann extends in *God in Creation*, is that of divine withdrawal. Once more he seems to be trying to reinforce his belief that the primary characteristic of God is loving humility, rather than a will to power. Hence God's first act of creation is not so much the creation of the world external to himself, but the making of space for such creativity within himself by an inner shrinkage or withdrawal. The term *zimzum* which Moltmann adopts for this process comes from Jewish kabbalistic thought influenced by Isaac Luria.¹² Moltmann believes that he is making *zimzum* thoroughly Christian by couching it in kenotic categories, so that it is indirectly linked with the self-emptying of Christ on the cross:

'God's creative love is grounded in his humble, self-humiliating love. The self-restricting love is the beginning of that self-emptying of God which Philippians 2 sees as the mystery of the Messiah. Even in order to create heaven and earth, God emptied himself of his all-plenishing omnipotence, and as Creator took upon himself the form of a servant'.¹³

I have serious misgivings about the validity of Moltmann's approach here which I will take up again later.

(b) *As Spirit in Creation.*

Moltmann gives emphasis to the immanence of God's Spirit in creation. He rejects a crude form of *pantheism* through his belief in *creatio ex nihilo*. However, he does allow for a pan-en-theism; that is an understanding of the world in God, and sustained by God's Spirit. He becomes rather strident in the way he envisages the Spirit to be at work in creation :

'The whole creation is a fabric, woven and shot through by the efficacies of the Spirit. Through his Spirit God is also present in the very structures of matter . . . the whole cosmos must be described as corresponding to God—as in accord with him because it is effected through God the Spirit, and exists in God the Spirit, it also moves and evolves in the energies and powers of the divine Spirit'.¹⁴

The difference between the Spirit of creation and the Spirit of redemption is that while the first comes from the Father's creative will, the second comes from the hope in the new creation born from Christ's resurrection. Once the work of the Spirit becomes that of redemption its role within the trinitarian life is that of subject, who looks to the glorification of God through the Son.¹⁵ The future hope for the whole cosmos is implicit in the resurrection hope, and in the light of such hope humanity gives praise and honour to God on behalf of all creation.¹⁶

Moltmann's understanding of the cosmic Spirit differs from the New Age interpretation as he roots his position firmly in the cross and resurrection of Christ. Nonetheless, he does align his understanding of the cosmic Spirit with a current hypothesis of a self-organizing universe. All 'forms of organization and modes of communication as open systems' can be given the name Spirit.¹⁷ The Spirit pervades body and soul, conscious and subconscious, social and cultural systems, and binds us to the natural environment. This last idea brings Moltmann in touch with the *Gaia* hypothesis:

Through the spirit, human societies as part-systems are bound up with the ecosystem 'earth' (*Gaia*); for human societies live in and from the recurring cycles of earth and sun, air and water, day and night, summer and winter. So human beings are participants and subsystems of the cosmic life system, and of the divine Spirit that lives in it'.¹⁸

Moltmann seems to be largely unaware of the theological implications of using the *Gaia* hypothesis, an issue which I will take up again later.

(c) *As Son, in Cosmic Dimensions.*

The idea of the cosmic Christ is much more important for Moltmann's Christology after *God in Creation*. At the same time he insists on the earthiness of Christ's historical life, which brings both nature and history into the orbit of salvation history.¹⁹

Moltmann draws on Colossians 1:20 ff. to support his claim for a

cosmic Christology. The cosmic scope of redemption makes cosmic Christology, ecological Christology, and for him:

'The rediscovery of cosmic Christology will have to begin with ecological Christology if cosmic Christology is to be of therapeutic relevance for the nature which is today suffering under the irrationality of human beings'.²⁰

Re-Imaging Creation.

(a) *As Interdependent Community.*

Moltmann's earlier work tended to portray our relationship with creation primarily as that of stewardship in a way that is fairly typical of reformed theology. If anything his stress on the importance of humanity working out its role in history tended to leave the impression that nature was less important.²¹ Here he does not reject nature as such, but brings it into his discussion of anthropology. The newer departure that I raised above is that he is now more concerned to make his Christology thoroughly ecological in a way that relates Christ and creation without necessarily always going via anthropology.

Moltmann's positive evaluation of the natural world becomes more striking in *God in Creation*. He lays more emphasis on friendship with nature, and humanity's inter-relationship with nature. Both human and nonhuman creation are called to co-exist in equilibrium, and 'the home of the natural environment is just such a network of tranquillized social relationships. Human society must be adapted to the natural environment'.²² The 'peace' with nature reflects the harmony in the divine community of the Trinity. Hence Moltmann describes both the human community and its relationship with the environment as 'perichoretic'.²³ Moltmann has subtly shifted his anthropology. He now begins with the presupposition that human beings are *imago mundi*, and ends with the hope that we become *gloria Dei* in the *imago Trinitatis*.²⁴ These ideas reinforce the solidarity between human and non-human creation, and bring the whole cosmos into the future hope for the world. While Moltmann keeps the idea of stewardship, it becomes just one aspect of our relationship with creation, rather than the dominant strand.

Christ is the liberator of the imprisoning 'vicious' circle of collective dependencies that we have set up in the economic, political and industrial spheres; and the individual loss of hope and apathy towards the whole system.²⁵ For Moltmann the hope for right relationships between humanity and nature comes through the cross and resurrection of Christ. The Christian community reflects the image of

Christ, and the power of the resurrection working in these communities through the Holy Spirit is the sign that healing and reconciliation has begun already, 'reaching, at least in tendency, over the whole breadth of creation in its present wretchedness. That is why the energies of new life in the Spirit are as manifold and motley as creation itself'.²⁶

b) *As Beloved by God.*

Moltmann looks forward, then, to the new creation, the time of the eternal sabbath, where humanity's destiny will be to become *gloria Dei*. In the sabbath God comes to make his home in creation, where the very possibility of sin no longer exists.²⁷ The theme of the sabbath stresses the enjoyment that God takes in creation, now his stress is less on the action of God as his coming to rest in Being.²⁸ Similarly all creation enters into the sabbath by participating in God and sharing his glory. Yet creation does not become God, but through participation enters God's eternal life. It is unthinkable for Moltmann that God could have eternal pleasure without his creatures, or that humankind could be saved cut off from the natural world.²⁹ The direction of cosmic Christology is towards the glory of God, so that the lordship of Christ means the glorification of God.³⁰

The more practical consequences for these ideas is that we learn to re-image our natural environment. Instead of viewing it as a resource which we manage, it becomes our mutual companion in relationship with the Creator. The whole of creation is beloved of God, hence any lack of respect for nature is an offence against God:

'We can talk about the special dignity of human beings on the presupposition that the dignity of all other beings as creatures is recognized—not otherwise. As images of the Creator, human beings love all their fellow-creatures with the Creator's love. If they do not, they are not the image of the Creator and Lover of the Living. They are his caricature'.³¹

The suffering of creation is shared by the Creator who endures its conflicts and contradictions, by the Son who suffers the pain of redemption and by God's Spirit who suffers 'the birth-pangs of the new creation'.³² Hence the love of God for creation is a suffering love, but such sufferings are apocalyptic and 'are not fortuitous sufferings. They are necessary'.³³ I will challenge Moltmann's concept of the necessary suffering of creation later. The new creation which emerges from God's sufferings has no more bondage to decay or death, but participates with humanity in God, in an eternal sabbath feast.

How Green is Moltmann?

Now that I have given a brief resume of the 'greening' of Moltmann's theology, I will try and ask just how 'green' has his theology become, and whether it is an adequate response to the challenge which we face in formulating theology that is both relevant to our 'green' culture, yet true to its task as theology.³⁴

1 Moltmann's ecological ideas stem from a popular understanding of ecology as that which embodies both interdependence and indwelling. The latter idea of indwelling is less widely appreciated when the term 'ecology' is used, though I get the impression that the biological understanding of ecological niche or home has more or less filtered into popular consciousness. Moltmann intends his theology to exist in 'symbiotic' relationship with science. However, his theological extension of the ideas of inter-connectedness and indwelling move him too far from the biological rootedness of these concepts. From a biologist's perspective Moltmann's interpretation is not so much dialogue, as a borrowing of language.³⁵

2 While this re-imagining of God is an important corrective to false ideas of God as tyrant over creation, I detect a certain difficulty with Moltmann's overall concentration on reformulating our perception of God in a way which leaves his discussion of both humanity and nature rather poorly developed. This tends to weaken the link between ecology and theology which he is trying to foster.

3 Moltmann's use of the kabbalistic idea of *zimzum* takes us into highly speculative theology. I have grave reservations about Moltmann's whole idea of an 'inner shrinkage' in God. Not only does this presuppose that we think of God in spatial terms, but this ignores traditional church teaching altogether. It is worth citing Molnar's sharp criticism of Moltmann over this issue:

'Whereas the traditional doctrine of the Trinity was a development of thought corresponding to a differentiation between the Father and the Son which took place before creation in time, in Moltmann's thinking the differentiation arises from, and is seen as necessary in the light of, the Jewish mystical assertion that God must have, before all worlds, included nothingness as well as creation in His very being'.³⁶

Hence Moltmann is highly selective in his use of traditional ideas about the Trinity.

4 A further difficulty with his idea of divine withdrawal is whether it is a true incorporation of the Jewish concept at all. It seems to be a

guise for bringing the historical event of the cross into the heart of the Triune God in a way which weakens any distinction between the immanent and economic Trinity. In this respect Moltmann's speculations have highlighted his failure to recognise the need to set limits in drawing analogous relationships between God and creation.

5 If anything it seems to me that he exaggerates what we can say about God in 'green' terminology, so that we are left with an ambiguous understanding of the relationship between God and the world. In his later work he goes further to suggest that world ecological suffering is necessary for the final process of consummation. However, this view would encourage us to face suffering with resignation, instead of challenging its root cause. The latter mandate to challenge the structure of society is clearly Moltmann's thesis in *Theology of Hope*.

6 I suspect that Moltmann's affection for the *Gaia* hypothesis betrays a similar tendency to his use of ecological ideas, namely an alignment with popular thought which can give confusing messages. The *Gaia* hypothesis is particularly attractive to those seeking a 'deeper green' approach; but while Moltmann picks up the strand of interdependence, he does not distance himself adequately from the philosophical basis of these ideas. *Gaia* philosophy is not really compatible with his views expressed clearly in *The Way of Jesus Christ*, where he once more puts creation firmly into the orbit of the history of Christ. My criticism here is that Moltmann does not always seem to be sufficiently aware of the impression that he gives in using such sources, and it gives his own theology rather a hazy outline. While he says a little too much about the inner workings of the social Trinity, he says rather too little about his own presuppositions.

7 I welcome Moltmann's interpretation of humanity in terms of relatedness with other creatures. The lasting impression I get from Moltmann's theology is that he helps to foster new attitudes and new directions for our human community life in a way which does seek to serve and love creation. While he may not have faced up to the problem of how we reformulate science in the light of this new thinking, he does at least point us in the direction of a future hope. However, Moltmann's thought lacks clarity in showing us how our friendship with non-human creation is to be distinguished from human friendship, and how the friendship of God with humankind is different from that directed towards all his creatures.

8 Another area which I find particularly interesting is Moltmann's spirituality, which is moulded by his reflection on the significance of the death and resurrection of Christ. It seems to me that even though *God in Creation* and *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God* stressed the work of

the Holy Spirit and the life of the Trinity, underlying all these discussions is his strong sense of Christology as the paradigm for all theological reflection that is rightly called Christian theology.

I find here both strengths and potential difficulties. I admire the way he has avoided the reaction against redemptive history which is often part of more creation-centred spirituality. However, the way nature and history and the whole cosmos come together in Christ, who leads the world to expect a future where God is 'all in all', amounts to an almost utopian synthesis. Even less convincing is Moltmann's speculative effort to outline details of his vision for the future. I find a tension here, set up by Moltmann's particular Christology. On the one hand we have a portrait of the earthly Christ, in all his full-blooded humanity, while on the other hand we are encouraged to think about the trinitarian life of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in a way that makes it difficult to relate the person of the Son with the human Christ. This difficulty becomes more acute once Moltmann moves on to outline a cosmic Christology. How can we identify with the cosmic Christ who seemingly suffers in and through the whole creation? A significant shift in Moltmann's position is the 'greening' of his Christology, but it is not really adequate for a green theology of creation, or fully convincing.

9 A final question is really how realistic he is about theology giving guidelines for scientific research. If theology really does become 'green' in its interpretation of creation and our place in it, this would force a radical shift in the whole structure of scientific investigations as conducted in the Western world. While it would be possible to continue to do scientific research, Moltmann does not really appreciate the difficulty in following through the implications of a radical kinship with and friendship with our natural world. The pressure towards efficiency, results, and management of resources, makes the very suggestion of Christ's involvement with the sufferings of creation incompatible with science. Are we left with the choice of either abandoning science as we know it, or abandoning a Christology which suffers with the ambiguities in creation? I am not convinced by Moltmann's suggestion that Christ can somehow re-volve evolution, and presumably our own ambiguous scientific efforts. The issue is just too complex to be resolved through cosmic Christology. I fear that Moltmann may have left us here with as many problems as he solves.

Conclusions.

Moltmann makes bold moves towards bringing ecological language into his understanding of God. His imaginative recovery of the perichoretic

tradition taken from Eastern Orthodoxy serve his intention to re-image God in terms of trinitarian relationships. The term 'ecological' has connotations of both interrelatedness and indwelling and the notion of perichoresis uses both these strands.

One aspect of Moltmann's eclectic approach which is less successful is his attempt to root the indwelling of creation in God, or panentheism, through a prior divine shrinkage or withdrawal taken from Jewish mysticism. This whole concept of inner shrinkage in God presupposes that we think of God in spatial terms in a way that is unjustified according to either Catholic tradition or Eastern Orthodoxy. His view has serious theological consequences. By drawing into his discussion of the Godhead what amounts to a rather dubious kenotic interpretation of Philippians 2, creation becomes reduced to redemption and the immanent Trinity reduced to the economic Trinity.

Moltmann is anxious to stress the immanence of God in creation through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. His trinitarian emphasis avoids pantheism, though his use of the *Gaia* hypothesis is confusing. He seems to identify the work of the Holy Spirit with the self-organizing universe in a way which goes outside the limits accepted for drawing analogies between God and the world. The problem here is the same as above, namely a failure in the recognition of the need to set such limits.

Moltmann is more successful in his awareness of the profound change in attitude in the human community required if we are to prevent a massive ecological collapse. He draws analogies between the perichoretic relationships within the Trinity and that within the human community and creation. His idea of both God's friendship with creation and our friendship with nature shows his affinity with Franciscan spirituality. However, he does not address the question of how far such friendship with creation is permissible. In other words he does not delineate the distinction between God's love for creatures and his love for us, except as a reference to our image bearing. Since this includes the idea of *imago mundi*, it is not clear how Moltmann would envisage such differences. It is also not clear how our friendship with creatures differs from that within the human community.

Moltmann paints a portrait of the future which assumes a path through suffering, and eventual liberation from death for all creation. John McDade's criticism of Moltmann, namely that he assumes that mortality is the ultimate evil, is pertinent here, especially in this context of the future of creation.³⁷ Moltmann does not really address in a way that is practical and imaginable the future of creation as we know it.

Finally Moltmann's approach amounts to a greening of his Christology. While he speaks of the work of the Holy Spirit, it is the

Spirit of redemption in Christ that he is most concerned to emphasise. While a green Christology is an essential ingredient in developing a green theology, it is still subject to the same dangers as earlier approaches. These are the stress on redemption, rather than creation, and an anthropological focus at the expense of a broader vision of the whole of creation. While the cosmic Christ does forestall some of these difficulties, such ideas have the unfortunate tendency to make Christ seem remote from our human condition. The idea that Christ is somehow directly involved in the suffering of creation brings Moltmann into another area of speculative theology that creates as many problems as it solves. Nonetheless if theology has a message for this fragile ecologically damaged earth it has to include a stance which hopes in God and looks to Christ as one who will make all things new.

All books and articles are by Jürgen Moltmann unless stated otherwise.

- 1 *Theology of Hope*; translated by J.W. Leitch, London, SCM, 1967; hereafter referred to as TH; *God in Creation*; translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1985, hereafter referred to as GC.
- 2 H.C. Reventlow, *Problems of Old Testament Theology in the Twentieth Century*; translated by J.Bowden, London, SCM, 1985, pp. 140–145.
- 3 See, for example TH, pp. 136ff. and *The Future of Creation*; translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1979, pp. 128–132; hereafter referred to as FC.
- 4 *The Experiment Hope*; translated by M.D.Meeks, ed., London, SCM, 1975, pp. 17–18.
- 5 *Hope and Planning*; translated by M.Clarkson, New York, Harper and Row, 1971, pp. 5–6; hereafter referred to as HP.
- 6 E.Bloch, *The Principle of Hope*; translated by N. Plaice, S.Plaice and P. Knight, Oxford, Blackwell, 1986; for a discussion of *adventus* and *futurum* see FC, pp. 29–31.
- 7 *Experiences of God*; translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1980, p. 20.
- 8 *Man*; translated by J.Sturdy, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1974, p. 35.
- 9 FC, pp. 98–124.
- 10 *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*; translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1980, pp. 139–144; hereafter referred to as TKG. For a severe critique of Moltmann's understanding of the Trinity see, for example, P.Molnar, 'The Function of the Trinity in Moltmann's Ecological Doctrine of Creation', *Theological Studies*, 51 (4), 1990, 673–697.
- 11 TKG, p. 149.
- 12 GC, pp. 86–93; G. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, The New York Times Book Co, Quadrangle, 1974, pp. 128–144.
- 13 GC, p. 88.
- 14 GC, p. 212.
- 15 For Moltmann's understanding of the changing subjectivity among the persons of the Trinity see TKG, pp. 70–94; 124–128.
- 16 GC, p. 69–71.
- 17 E Jantsch, *The Self-Organising Universe*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1980; GC, p. 17.
- 18 GC, p. 18.; D. Sagan and L. Margulis, 'Gaia and Philosophy', in L.S. Rouner, ed. *On Nature*, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1984, pp. 60–75. They define *Gaia* in the following way: "Gaia" is a theory of the atmosphere and surface sediments of

- the planet earth taken as a whole. The *Gaia* hypothesis in its most general form states that the temperature and composition of the Earth's atmosphere are actively regulated by the sum of life on the planet—the *biota*. The regulation of the Earth's surface by the *biota* and for the *biota* has been in continuous existence since the earliest appearance of widespread life', p.60.; see also J.E.Lovelock, *Gaia*, Oxford, 1979. For a detailed critique of the *Gaia* hypothesis see, C. Deane-Drummond, 'God and Gaia: Myth or Reality', *Theology*, July/Aug, 1992, 277–285.
- 19 I am well aware of ambiguity in using terms such as 'nature'; for a discussion, and useful definition of nature understood as both the totality of processes and the context within which human activity takes place, see G.D. Kaufman, *The Theological Imagination*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1981, p. 213.
 - 20 *The Way of Jesus Christ*, translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1990, p. 194; hereafter referred to as WJC.
 - 21 A good example of Moltmann's earlier anthropology is 'Man and the Son of Man', in *Essays on the Unity of Mankind*, J.R. Nelson, ed., Leiden, Brill, 1971, pp. 203–224. His prime concern here was to outline our significance as human beings, and 'He stands in solidarity with creation, yet is set over it through his relationship as God's counterpart. Man is thus placed in an eccentric position . . . As God's image he is the "crown of creation" when he is really "man"', p. 212. I take issue with W.C. French who suggests that Moltmann's *God in Creation* is a 'grand reversal of theological direction and sensibility, a seismic shift from a focus on history, eschatology and "openness to the future", to one on nature, creation and respect for "dwelling" within the present', p. 79 W.C. French, 'Returning to Creation; Moltmann's Eschatology Naturalized', *Journal of Religion*, 68, 1988, 78–86.
 - 22 GC, p. 46; see also *Creating a Just Future*; translated by J. Bowden, London, SCM, 1989, pp. 66–71, 87–101.
 - 23 GC, pp. 258–259.
 - 24 *Ibid.*, pp. 186ff; 216ff.
 - 25 FC, p. 110.
 - 26 *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*; translated by M.Kohl, London, SCM, 1977, pp. 295–296; hereafter referred to as CPS.
 - 27 *Religion, Revolution and the Future*; translated by M.D Meeks, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969, pp. 23–24.
 - 28 GC, pp. 281–283.
 - 29 *Ibid.*, pp 276–280; see also CPS, p. 60: 'he does not desire to be glorified without his liberated creation'.
 - 30 WJC, pp. 195–196.
 - 31 'Human Rights, the Rights of Humanity and Rights of Nature'; translated by M.Kohl in *Concilium*, 2, 1990, *The Ethics of World Religions and Human Rights*; H. Küng and J. Moltmann, eds., London, Concilium, 1990, pp. 132–133.
 - 32 WJC, p. 179.
 - 33 *Ibid.*, p. 153.
 - 34 I am not going to digress into justifying the basic task of theology in engagement with contemporary culture. A useful summary of Moltmann's position is 'The Challenge of Religion in the '80's', in *Theologians in Transition*, J.M. Wall, ed., New York, Crossroad, 1981, pp. 107–112.
 - 35 Moltmann's apparently limited engagement with scientific ideas partly explains J. Polkinghorne's review of *God in Creation* entitled 'Creation Without the Scientists'; *Expository Times*, 97 (9), 1986, 285.
 - 36 P. Molnar, 'The Function of the Trinity in Moltmann's Ecological Doctrine of Creation', *Theological Studies*, 51(4), 1990, p. 686.
 - 37 J.McDade, 'Creation and Salvation: Green Faith and Christian Themes', *The Month*, Nov. 1990, 433–441.