

## **The Dominion Clause And Eco-Stewardship In Genesis 1:26-29: Exploring The Biblical Mandate To The Church As Steward Of The Earth**

**Omaka Kalu Ngele**

### **Abstract**

The dominion clause stated in Gen. 1:26-28 which has been seen by humankind states as Gods mandate to devastate and pillage the earth. The clause “subdue” and “have dominion” in Gen. 1:26-28 rooted in the imago Dei(image of God) theology prominent in the Judeo-Christian tradition. This tended to lend credence to man’s claim of superiority over nature. As a result of this humankind posture of overlord for centuries ago over the entire Oikoumene(the earth that was originally designed by God to house man and other species) has not seen respite through series of vandalization and nefarious activities. The above state of man and nature’s ‘cat and dog, relationship had led some social ethicists to doubt if there is any hope for God’s good earth whose verdict par excellence was given by God of Gen. 1:31.The researcher through historical critical research method with redaction criticism as modern approach to biblical scholarship discovered the essence of the Ecology and the place of humankind as well

as the Church in the stewardship of the earth. The findings made on the subject matter are enough to resolve the quest for new paradigms in Ecology pegging its feet on the Eco-theology of sustainability. This paper through the quest into some traditional stand of the Judeo-Christian faith; seeks a balance from sound biblical exegesis of the dominion clause in Genesis 1:26-28; hence setting the paradigms for the church in understanding Eco-stewardship as her divine mandate.

### **Introduction**

Whatever happens to the Earth created by God has been a focal point over the last part of 20<sup>th</sup> century in the Western Church milieu. Eco-theologian scattered all over the globe tend to see this ideology from different perspectives. This contemporary paradigms on eco-ethological studies led Jay B. Mc Daniels to write a book title Christianity in an Age of Ecology and dialogue, in which he viewed the world as being embodied in God, a concept he called pantheism.<sup>1</sup> There is a strong indication that western Christianity seemed to have declared the last part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century as an Age of Ecology. Thomas Berry in Rasmussen, Earth Community, Earth Ethics commonly, earth prefers another dimensional approach on this age. He describes these epical waves in the language of geological and cultural evolution and offers notion of a new “Ecozoic Era”<sup>2</sup>. O.U. Kalu coming from African perspective reverberates with a balance view that ecological study as a contemporary global dynamics for development should be charted on the spectrum of romatization of primal world view<sup>3</sup>.

However, despite this contemporary ingenuity shown on Ecology in religion perspectives, the devastation, environmental degradation as well as wanton destruction for the entire earth ecosystem and biosphere which include animal, plants and sea

seem less important to mankind. This is as a result of man's claim of superiority over nature in that they were created in God's image and were commissioned to have dominion over other created order rooted in Gen. 1:26-28.

The effort of this work is to take a holistic approach to this broad spectrum of study. To meet this need partially, one brings into focus divers scholars views through bringing together a selected number of published and unpublished materials which tend to portray the extend of insurgency that characterized eco-theology and Environmental Ethics in Judeo-Christian religions rightly harnessing the available potentials. This is expected in the long run to spur the church to go the whole-hog on the theology of Eco-sustainability as she carries out her mission<sup>4</sup>.

The case in point clearly stated, is the discovery of what had stood as a Cox in the wheel of attaining a sustainable environment through a holistic Ethics of ecology. Categorically, the problem all through the centuries is the view of God's good earth by man. This biased view of mankind had been extremely anthropocentric. This arrogant posture of mankind over nature that had lynched the ecology all has its root from the theological overviews of man's superiority over nature-a travesty indeed. This culture of pride and superiority, which is characterized by vandalization, exploitation and wanton destruction of the ecology, was later compounded by the medieval cosmology of man above nature syndrome. Consequently, this insurgence becomes more or less a culture par excellence. It thus becomes, with its enlightenment worldview a vehicle to the crisis inherent in the global present day ecology. This anthropocentric culture that was passed down penetrated into the psyche of world Christianity. The Nigerian Churches as part of the whole took their share of this global phenomenon. No wonder for more than a century and a half no meaningful emphasis on sustainability on the ecology has been on sight in the Nigerian Christian churches.<sup>5</sup>

The crux of the matter in this work, which has more or less become a problem is the dominion factor enshrined in the

Judeo-Christian Tradition. Against this background, Christianity have severally come under attack by liberals as well as rational thinkers who claim that Christianity had given the world a foundation to pillage and devastate God's good earth. Major among the proponents of these hypothesis are Lynn White who set the pace in his book titles "The theological roots of our Ecological crisis"<sup>6</sup> and Emery, a German scholar who wrote and titled his work "End of providence: the merciless result of christianity"<sup>7</sup>, followed by scholar like Drewerman whose work was titled The Deadly step forward on the canalization of the earth and mankind in the inheritance of Christianity<sup>8</sup>. These scholars capitulated on the dominion clause and laid theological siege on Judeo-Christian Tradition. Their postulations are inspirational since they later spurred scholarship on Christian apologist to investigate the truth in their claims, which forms part of the fundamental issues in this work<sup>9</sup>.

The questions that stare the contemporary Christian Churches are:

- ❖ Are these allegations against Judeo-Christian Tradition true? That is to say does the words "dominion" and 'subdue' in Genesis 1:26-28 in their original Hebrews etymology mean plunder, devastate, destroy or exploit; and to what extent has Judaism and Christianity responded to these allegations.
- ❖ What is the ideal relationship between man and nature in God's own ecology?
- ❖ How have world Religions including Christianity responded ethically and theologically to the crises that emanate from the medieval scientific revolution.

The objective of this paper is to enlighten the church on the Ethics of Ecology and Eco-Theology and motivate her to take her stand and be faithful steward of the Earth<sup>9</sup>.

### **A Critical and Hermeneutical Approach to the Text**

An Exegesis on Gen. 1:26-28 that has been a point of controversy for years in the field of Eco-theology is imperative.

In this vein; Dieter Hessel and Rosemary R. Ruether (ed) in a voluminous work titled Christian and Ecology made a collection of Christian scholars and their views of the Ecology relating issues on an apologetic ground<sup>10</sup>.

Theodore Hiebert in Dieter Hessel (ed) did an elaborate theological exegesis on the dominion factor in Judeo-Christian Tradition bringing God's position from Hebrew etymology, throwing a theological balance to effect a correct paradigm and the stand point of things as against the overview of people like Lynn White and others who mistook the "Dominion" and "subdue" clause in Gen. 1:26-28 to be, 'destroy', 'pillage' and 'exploit'. Theodore plants his feet on the priestly view of dominion as amplified when humans created in the image of God were meant to assume a priestly office in Gen. 1:26-28, while human were given a vocation as farmer in Gen. 2:4b-3:24<sup>11</sup>. The above position forms the basis of this work.

Scholar like Mircea Eliade offers a helpful distinction between historical religion's and nature's different notion of time. He maintains that religion focusing on history have a linear view of time, those focusing on nature, a cyclical view.<sup>12</sup> What Stephen Jay would call times arrows and cycles. Gourd (1988)<sup>13</sup> Brueggeman (1977)<sup>14</sup>; Wilkinson (1980)<sup>15</sup>, Hall (1986),<sup>16</sup> coming from Christian dimension seek to discover again the interconnection between spirit and matter and affair that humans are interconnected to the earth, with a special responsibility because of their power and number and that they are interconnected with every thing that exist on a living planet, the earth community. Their stand could further be seen as saying that Christian should find affirmation and challenge from Biblical tradition. Scripture teaches that we humans are unique among living species in that humans are capable of thinking morally about the planet and ourselves. This entails responsibility and stewardship<sup>17</sup>.

In his book Christian Faith and the Environment, Brennan R. Hill took an in-depth thought through "creation motifs in Paul". He drew inference from 1 Cor. 8:5-6 and posits that in

Paul's Theology, Jesus Christ is at the centre of all creation, on the ultimate source and goal of all things. He also related Paul's factual statement in Romans 8:19-23 as Paul's magnificent allusion portraying the whole creation as awaiting the fulfilment of redemption<sup>18</sup>. The work is a rich Christological masterpiece.

A Historian, Lynn White, upon examining the issues on the Judeo-Christian in his book titled Historical Roots of our Ecological crisis, presented the controversial thesis that said that "the Judeo-Christian tradition is in large part, responsible for the apparent difference of western civilization toward care for nature"<sup>19</sup>. Lynn's thesis also which had later been considered as an overstatement by contemporary Christian scholars was really a hard nut for the Judeo-Christian tradition to chew. Thomas L. Hoyt Jr in his article Environmental Justice and Black Theology of Liberating Community tend to take a radical stand on environmental justice and black theology of liberation community. He emphasized on the need to deal with the elements of social environment which include crime, less than minimal education, drugs, violence, residential apartheid, racism in housing and health care delivery. The above-mentioned elements make up issue on Eco-justice<sup>20</sup>

J.Baird Callicott in an article the Challenge of a World Environment Ethic, threw a challenge on Ecological Ethics that depict postmodernism in ecology and mans place. According to him:

An environmental ethic takes into account the impact of human actions directly upon Non-human natural entities and environmental Ethic. An environmental ethics is supported by the evolutionary, Ecological foundational and cosmological dimensions of the presently evolving postmodern scientific worldview from the evolutionary point of view. Homo sapiens is part of nature and are not set apart from it.

We are literally kin to all other forms of life.  
Within them we share the earth<sup>21</sup>.

On Eco-feminism, Rosemary Radford Ruether (ed) in her work Women Healing Earth did an elaborate study of eco-feminism as an integral dimension of global contemporary study on ecology. According to her, “the domination and exploitation of nature and of women are considered similar to nature. The life of the earth has an interface, which because women are considered similar to nature, justifying man’s domination. A healthy balance ecosystem, which includes human and non-human inhabitant, must maintain diversity. Eco-feminism promotes a global environment founded on common interest and respect for diversity, in opposition to all form of domination and violence. The continuation of life on this planet demands a new understanding of humans relationship with their bodies<sup>22</sup>.

The Theological Dimension: Appraisal and Critique of the Dominion Clause in Gen. 1:26-29

In this work the researcher discovered with utter amazement that part of the nature of ecological crisis inherent in the world over the century could be considered theological. Propounded theological theories had for centuries permeated into the people’s mentality and had regulated their view of God’s own ecology and had hindered him from the realization as well as actualization of the place of nature in God’s creation. One wonders why there is an aspect of theology that tend to has construed a cog in the wheel of clearer understanding of human-nature relationship which had shifted from the idea position of things. Theologians tend to differ in their approach to ecology. This divergence view had over the century construed a barrier in evolution of balance and sound eco theology. Beginning from the angel of Judeo-Christian tradition one would assert here that all through the History of these background Religions there have been cases of seemingly theological discrepancies perhaps due to human jurisdiction over divine periscope. Lynn white’s stubborn

thesis which pegged Judeo-Christian religion as construing “the historical root of ecological crisis”.<sup>23</sup> Although this statement has been considered an overstatement, it is a hard nut to be cracked by the Judeo-Christian scholars and apologist. This is because some rational as well as liberal scholars had seen the Judeo-Christian tradition with special reference to the ‘Dominion and “subdue” clause in Gen. 1:26,27 and v. 28 respectively as a major causative factor of ecological crisis.

It is no gainsaying the fact that later development in the history of mankind had lost the essence of the ecology in God’s creation technically known as Oikoumene-the entire inhabited earth which houses, nests and yields sustainable fruits for human continual existence and to glorify God its creation. And this is in contrast to God’s verdict which runs thus: “And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good”. (Gen. 1:31)<sup>23</sup>. Appraisal of the above position juxtaposing it with the nature of crisis that has visited God’s ecology through basically the activities of man reveals that man’s perception in the theological spectrum of nature had been lost.

### **Judaism and Ecological Ethics and Earth Theology**

The question has been, what does Judaism say about nature and ecological crisis inherent in God’s good creation. This question demands a wide range of answers. Nevertheless, although there is an extensive exploration of the Judaism stand on ecological Ethics and the crisis, the researcher intend to focus his attention on how far Judaism has addressed the allegation on the dominion clause with her rich Ecological Theology and Ethics of sustainability. Commenting on Jewish worldview on the ecology Eric Katz posits:

Any discussion of the Jewish view of the nature would, the ecological principles underlying to Natural processes and the obligation to natural must begin with the concert and specific Commandments of

building upon all practicing Jews. He added if not, a so-called worldview of Judaism would be a mere abstracting from the specific rules and principles of Jewish life<sup>25</sup>.

Eric's position was more of suggesting a parameter to ascertain Judaism's worldview. His postulation is good but no single way can the worldview of any particular religion be measured or discussed. Robert Gordis on Judaism and ecology posits that: the true genius of Judaism has always laid in specific term, thus an understanding of Jewish Teachings on the environmental causes is not to be sought in high sounding phrases which oblige Jews to nothing concrete; rather it will be found in specific areas of Jewish law and practice:<sup>26</sup>. Sequel to the above positions, one tend to see a more reliable approach to understanding Judaism and its Ecological ethics and world view in Gordis postulation. This is because he seems to suggest a pragmatic approach to the Jews and environmental crisis. After a discussion of the Hebrew concepts of nature in the Bible, Jeanne kay concludes, in part, that: The Bible views observant of its commandments, rather than specific attitudes towards nature or techniques of resource protection, as the prerequisite of a sound environment <sup>27</sup>. Additional scholastic approach to Judaism and their ecological cosmology is glaring in the allusion made by scholar like E.L Allen who averred:

In the Jewish Tradition nature is neither an abstraction nor an ideal, but rather one of the realms in which humans interact with God. Nature is envisaged as one of the spheres in which God meets man personally and in which he is called up to exercise responsibility. Thus for the man of the bible nature is never seen in abstraction either from God or from the task which he has assigned to man in the world<sup>28</sup>

From the above, it could be deduced that within Judaism the human view of nature and the environment is granted in the specific obligations and activities of Jewish life, the tasks and the commandments that God presented to the Jewish people. Having the above view in mind the researcher would like to substantiate the above claim with the much controversial ‘dominion clause’ in which Judeo-Christian religion is alleged to have given the world the foundation to the crisis inherent in the ecology across the globe with its anthropocentrism. This claim also would be seen from the perspective of ideal and classical Judaism worldview as well as what scholars especially of Jewish origin had said on Judaism and ecology with reference to the alleged “subdue” and “dominion” clause in Gen. 1:26-28. This section is seen on the spectrum of Dominion and Stewardship. Given this fact, an examination of Jewish perspective on nature and the environmental crises must begin with specific texts and commands, and none is more important than Genesis 1:28 in which God commanded humanity to subdue the earth and have dominion of the creatures. This notable passage of the Hebrew Torah appears in almost every discussion of the religious foundations for the ecological crisis. It was used by Lynn White Jr and others like C. Ameri and E. Drewermann whose opinion demonstrate that the Judeo-Christian tradition is fundamentally biased toward the dominion over the earth if not actual domination of the earth by humanity. For instance Drewermann alleged “ that Christianity gave the world the impetus to mercilessly devastate the earth”<sup>29</sup>. It suggests that the earth and all non-human living being in nature belong to the human race, as mere means for the growth (be fruitful and multiply) of humanity. This portrays the erroneous picture of the Judeo-Christian religion as being absolutely anthropocentric rather than being cosmo-centric as is the case of other Asiatic religion such as Hinduism<sup>30</sup>

## An Exegesis of the Dominion Clause in Gen. 1:26-29; Rediscovering the Biblical Mandate of Eco-stewardship or the Church.

The researcher intends to push hard on Lynn White and other's controversial thesis within this limited space and time. But if the Jewish perspective on ecological crisis is to be understood, one must exegetically examine the meaning of the command to "subdue" the earth and 'have dominion' over the creatures stated in Gen 1: 28. To "subdue" in classical Hebrew etymology is rendered 'Ka bas' while the Hebrew word for take dominion 'v' yirdu". A Jewish scholar and distinguished commentator on the Torah, Rashi noted that the Hebrew word for "Dominion" (v'yirdu) comes from the same root as to descend (Yarad). Rashi declared:

When humanity is worthy, we have dominion over the animal kingdom; when we are not, we descend below the level of animals and the animals rule over us" we are preeminent only when we act in keeping with the highest standards of responsibility. Abusing the rest of the creation is a sign of debasement rather than dominion. To cite modern example, if we destroy human life on earth through nuclear accident or war, the cockroaches will, in all likelihood succeed no as the "masters of the plant"<sup>31</sup>

The above position of Rashi spelt clearly the standpoint of stewardship of the earth in the mind of God when he commented on the dominion clause in Gen. 1:26-28. According to Rashi "The pertinent questions here are: Does this passage represent God's gift of title to humanity. Does this passage mean that the earth belong to the human race? Reading between the line one could note here that the Jewish traditional view on the ecology clearly answers in the negative"<sup>32</sup> Norman Lamin writing from

Jewish background speak directly to the case in point from apologetic standpoint. He posits:

The very next line from Genesis, which is usually ignored in the discussions of this passage, restricts humans to a vegetarian diet. Hardly was man given the prerogative of one who has dominion, control, and ownership of all the living creatures in nature from the text- “And God said: Behold, I have given you Every herb yielding seed, which is upon the earth and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree fielding see To you shall it be for food “(Gen. 1:29). The Torah by this limits the human right to subdue and use nature. This command is not title to unbridled domination<sup>32</sup>.

A critical appraisal of Hebrew scholars reveals that throughout history even to the present day, they have gone to extraordinary length to refute any idea that Genesis 1:28 permits the subjugation of nature by humanity. Scholar like M. Evelyn commented:

The Talmud (Yebemot 65b) relates the picture “subdue it” to be the first part of the sentence,” be fruitful and multiply” and then through tortuous piece of logic connecting the act of “subduing” with warfare- a male activity – claims that the passage really means that the propagation for the human race is an obligation of the male<sup>33</sup>.

The above postulation is classical in that it attempted to rediscover the original stand point of the clause in contention. The medieval Jewish commentators Nachmanides and Obadiah

Sforno connect the phrase to the activities of humanity in the use of natural resources not on their destruction or misuse. They see the passage as granting permission to humanity to control their activities of building, agriculture, and mining. Sforno's explanation is even more restrictive as he commented: "And subdue it that you protect yourself with your reason and prevent the animal from entering within your boundaries and you rule over them"<sup>34</sup>.

From the above postulation one can easily deduce that these interpretations recognize that power of humanity to use natural resources, and indeed the necessity of them doing so, but they emphasized limitations in the human role. Dominion here does not mean unrestricted dominion. Commenting on the subject matter "subdue" and "dominion" in Genesis 1:28 David Ehrenfed posited that:

In the Jewish Tradition, humanity is the steward of the natural world, not its owner, Stewardship is a position that acknowledges the importance of The human in the care and maintenance of the natural of the natural world without permitting an unrestricted license... It is considered a middle position, one that is Definitely on the side of the spectrum that arrogate the human use of the natural environment, rather than the opposite extreme of the sacred reverence and noninterference with nature suggestion by Eastern religions such as Janism<sup>35</sup>.

From antiquity, it is most certain that the Jews in their worldview with reference to their widely read Torah have not regarded nature as an endorsement from Yahweh to be exploited, pillaged or destroyed by selfish mankind as had been viewed by some. Viewed from historical milieu the concept has often been

discussed with little attention to the historical context that gave rise to it. Theodore Hiebert drew a contrast from the two creation stories in Genesis 1:1-2:4b and Genesis 2:4-3:24 describing the former account as portraying human present and the later in 2:4-3:25 as portraying human as farmer. Both drawn from Priestly (P) and Yewehistic (J) tradition<sup>36</sup>.

Throwing more light on the priestly traditional role of man in the Genesis account of the creation from the perspective of the historical background of the text in questions, Frank Moore in his work: *The Priestly Houses of Early Israel*, in Canaanite myth and Hebrew epic posits:

During the Persian period, when some believe the Priestly tradition in Genesis reached her final Form, the priesthood assumed her final form, the Priesthood assumed both: religious and political authority in Judah (Zech 6:9-14) Thus the priests, throughout Israel history, where part of its ruling elite, legitimating its political leadership and performing the role of mediators between God and the people in Israelite worship. The distinctive role played by the priest in the social world of ancient Israel is reflected in their conception of the role of the archetypal human in the world of creation as a whole. This is evident in the verbs by which the human role is defined and in the divine image given to human alone<sup>36</sup>. Although the Jewish tradition and cosmology teaching nature and ecology fundamental principles of the Jewish response to nature as *bal Tashchit* which in English means “do not destroy” which is first outlined in Deuteronomy 20:19-20:<sup>37</sup>

In a related development the Jewish was mandated to take the following step to earth stewardship:

When you besiege a city for a long time. You shall not destroy the trees by wielding an axe against them. You may make use of them, but in the field then, they should be besieged by you? Only the trees, which you know, are not tree for food you may destroy and cut down, that you may build siege – work against the city<sup>38</sup>.

In the context of warfare as it is stated above moral rules apply. As Gordis posits “This injunction ran counter to acceptable procedures in ancient war”<sup>39</sup>. Turker is of the opinion that “the principles of bal tashchit forbids the wanton destruction of the earth as policy of warfare”<sup>40</sup>. Lamm commented that “what the Torah prescribed is not the base of the trees to win a battle, which may often be a matter of life and death. It is the destruction of embattled areas, so as to render them useless in order to win the battle”. Turker commented on the bal tashchit in the following words : “The principle here is the prohibition on wanton destruction or vandalism, the destruction of trees from no (or little) redeeming purpose. Lamm also notes that Jewish law extends the law to situation of peacetime as well as war<sup>41</sup>”.

#### Humankind and the Church as Steward of God’s Good Earth

In the text Gen. 1:26-28 from biblical exegetical point of view, the mind of God in His injunction to: his people- Israel stands crystal clear here. Bal Tashchit here implies a command to mankind not to destroy nature. It is worthy to note here that the Jewish worldview shows that God is the owner of the ecology, which includes nature and mankind. Categorically, from this theocentric(God-centered) perception, mankind has been informed through the Jews who are the custodian of human

salvation and redemptive history to preserve nature as God's beautiful creation.

In conclusion of this perspective, one assert here that seeing the Jewish worldview of ecology from anthropocentric (i.e., human centered) or cosmocentric (ecology or nature centered) view point may not be adequate in resolving the long standing dispute among secular environmental philosophers. With regards to the problem, Turker posits:

Should policies of environmental preservation be perused because such policies will benefit humanity, or because such policies are intrinsically biblical to the natural world. Both positions encounter ethical and policy oriented problems. The anthropocentric perspective would permit the use (and destruction) of nature entails for a corresponding greater human benefit, but the non anthropocentric intrinsic value perspective implies, a policy of struck nonintervention in natural processes, one position may lead to the destruction of nature, and the other may lead to worshipful non interference: Thus the dilemma of environmental philosopher<sup>42</sup>.

On the practical term it is worthy to note here that the Theo-centrism of Judaism cosmology on ecology devolves this dilemma mentioned above because it is functionally equivalent to non anthropocentric doctrine of the intrinsic value of nature without endorsing the sacredness of nature entities in them. Thus nature as well (mankind) in Judaism cosmology is valued, and should not be destroyed, exploited and pillaged in form of dominion or subdue because they belong to God. Nature is sacred, not in itself, but because of God's creative process. This worldview is in part derived from the Kabbalistic (subdue

mentality) strand of Jewish thought, as it is expressed clearly in David Shapiro when he averred: The quality of loving kindness of God is the basis of all creation. It is God's steadfast comfort brought this world into being, and his steadfast love have maintains it<sup>43</sup>. Against this background the Jewish worldview of ecology lies.

Finally the researcher shares Gordis position that as stewards of God's earth, human seems as partners in the never-ending task of perfecting the universe. Judaism n her Eco-theology insists that human beings have an obligation not only to conserve the world of nature, but also to enhance it as "co-partner with God in the preservation and stewardship of the creation.

Suggestion: To stem the tide, the researcher projects the following suggestions:

1. Christians should avail herself the opportunity of the knowledge that mankind is the steward of God's good earth as well as ecology and redefine the theology to address the 'Lordship' 'pillage', and 'destroy' the earth mentality culture inherent in the post-modern world.
2. Christian Churches across the globe should diffuse the bipolar politics and suspicion sandwiched by western pandemic fear of domination and Hegemony, meet and build a Centre for research on Ecological Ethics and Eco-theology irrespective of one's denomination.
3. The churches should collaborate with International Religious Movement, Dialogue and partner to forester and create a global ethics for a humane and sustainable society.
4. The Christian church globally should speak and take a radical stand against all forms of injustices and domination of the earth and ecosystem by humankind. The use of Nuclear weapon of any kind upon the earth is against the earth that humankind and the church were meant to be steward of and not to destroy.

5. The Church globally should put up a special media outfit on ecology preservation and environmental sustainability.
6. The Church should as a matter of urgency create a more comprehensive website to provide a global network in the Internet to promote Eco-ethics and Environmental sustainability.

## **References**

1. Daniel J.B. Mc with Roots and Wings Spirituality in an Age of Ecology and Dialogue (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis book, 1995). 78.
2. Thomas B. and Seimive (eds). The University Story: from Primordial Flaring forth to the Ecozoic Era (San Francisco: Harper, 1992),p36
3. Kalu, O.U. Power, Poverty and Prayer (Francust: Peter Land AM MCSN, 2000) 94.
4. Ngele O.K. Eco-Ethics a Challenge to Nigerian Churches in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (2002). An Unpublished BA Thesis presented to Department of Religion, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
5. Ibid
6. Lynn white Jr. “The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis” in Catherine J. M. Halkes, New Creation Roots of our Ecologic Crisis. (Louisville: West Minister John Kanox Press, 1991) p.23
7. Ibid, p. 23
8. Ibid, p. 24

9. Ibid.,p24
10. Dieter Hezel and Ruether R (ed) *Christianity and Ecology* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,2000) p 13
11. Theodore Hiebert “Human vocation; Origins and Transformation in Dieter Hessel and Rosemary R (eds) *Christianity and Ecology* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,2000) p 135
12. Mircea E. (ed) *Encyclopaedia of Religion Vol 6* (New York: Macmillan and Free Press Publication Co. 1959)
13. Ibid, p135
14. Ibid
15. Ibid
16. Ibid
17. Dieter Hezzel *Christianity and Ecology.* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,2000) p 420
18. Hill B.R. *Christian Faith and Environment* (New York: Orbis Books 1998) p. 13
19. Lynn White Jr. “The Historical Roots of our ecologies crises, in David Elleen, *Ecology and Religion* (New York: Elleen Spring, 1974), 27
20. Thomas Hoyt in *Earth Ethics Vol. 1 No. 10* a Publication of Harvard Center of World Religion
21. J. Baird Callicott “ The Challenge of Environmental Ethics in Dieter Hezel and Ruether R (ed) *Christianity and Ecology* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,2000 )p423

22. Reuther R, R Women healing Earth: Third World Women on the Ecology, Feminism, and Religion (Mary knoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1996) 27
23. Ibid.
24. Dieter Hessel and Hadford R. (ed) Christianity and Ecology (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 2000); 3
25. Erick Katx, Judaism and the Ecological crises in Evelyn M. and John Grin (eds) Worldviews and Ecology ( Lewisburg: Bucknell Univ. Press,1993),p. 55
26. Robert Gordis “Judaism and Environment, in Jewish Monthly Journal (September/ November, 1990), 57
27. Jean Kay, “Concepts of Nature in the Hebrew Bible” in Environmental Ethics vol. 10. No. (1998) 326-27
28. Allen E. L., “The Hebrew view of nature” in The Journal of Jewish Studies vol. 2 No. 2 (1971), 100
29. Lynn white, Op. cit, p. 30
30. Rashi Gold and Daniel Fink “Judaism and Ecology: A Theology of creation in Evelyn Turker Earth Ethics A Journal of Harvard Center for the Study of World Religious 1998) vol. 10 No. 1.
30. John Passmore “, Man’s Responsibility for Nature: Ecological Problem and Cresten Tradition: A Philosophical” (New York: Scribvner 1974), 1-40 and Robin A.H Field, the ethics of environmental concern, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983) 2082.
31. Norman Lamin “Ecology and Jewish Law and theology” in Faith and Doubt (New York KTAV, 1971) 164-165.

32. Eelyn Turker M. and John Grim (eds) *Worldviews and Ecology* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1993) p. 57
33. Roberts Gordis “Judaism and Environment”, *Jewish Congress Monthly Journal* (Sept/Nov,1990) p. 58
34. Ibid.
35. David Ehrenfield and Philip J. Bently “Judaism and the Practice of Stewardship in Swetlitz Judaism and Ecology
36. Theodore Hiebert, “The human location: Origins and Transformation in Dieter H. and Rosemary R, *Christianity and Ecology*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), P. 134
37. Frank Moore “The Priestly Houses of Early Israel in Canaanites Myth and Hebrew epic” quoted by Theodore Hiebert in Dieter H. and Rosemary R, *Christianity and Ecology*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), P. 136
38. Ibid P. 126
39. ibid P. 136
40. Evelyn Turker *Earth Ethics: A Journal of Harvard Centre for World Religion* (CSWR) Vol 10, No1. p1-42.
41. P. 63
42. Rashi Gold by Daniel Fink “Judaism and Ecology: A Theology of creation” in Evelyn Turker *Earth Ethics A Journal of Harvard Center for the Study of World Religious* 1998) vol. 10 No. 1.
43. Ibid
44. Ibid.