

that span the history of the movement. The case made for common themes within libertarianism is compelling. Though the proposed policies change constantly, the authors aptly show the consistent currents in the movement.

The structure of six markers of libertarianism and the general division between the three eras makes sense as presented. However, the emphasis on “Bleeding Heart Libertarianism,” in which both Tomasi and Zwolinski play a significant role, may outweigh the actual impact of the relatively recent movement. A cynical reader might suspect that an underlying purpose of the volume is to solidify the position of their movement as a legitimate heir to the libertarian legacy.

The biggest challenge for readers is keeping lesser-known libertarians straight as they pop in and out of the narrative. A chart of major figures and their key ideas about the six themes would have been a helpful addition. Overall, this is an excellent resource that provides clarity to an incredibly diverse movement. It is a helpful volume that will be useful for decades to come.

—Andrew J. Spencer
*Senior Research Fellow at the Institute
of Faith, Work and Economics
Tysons, Virginia*

Climate Change, Radical Uncertainty and Hope: Theology and Economics in Conversation

Jan Jorrit Hasselaar

Amsterdam University Press, 2023 (180 pages)

Jan Jorrit Hasselaar is the director of the Amsterdam Centre for Religion and Sustainable Development in Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. With a background in economics and theology (19–20), it is understandable that he would apply his training to the wicked problem of anthropogenic climate change (ACC), an issue he accepts as settled fact (16).

Hasselaar frames his study in the following way. He contends that ACC is both an economic problem and a theological problem (9). Both approaches have something to contribute because both address the *oikos*, the household in which we live. But Hasselaar’s use of economics and theology are somewhat unusual. In regard to economics, the author follows Dan Rodrik’s understanding of economics not as a description of social behavior but as a set of models and tools to solve problems (28–29). Likewise with theology, Hasselaar does not focus on the study of God and his divine decrees but on how theology describes the good life (14). Thus, Hasselaar’s engagement with economics and theology is decidedly abstract and at an academic level rather than at an applied one.

After providing a detailed summary of his overall approach, Hasselaar tackles the inadequacies of contemporary economics as a way to answer how society should tackle ACC. He correctly explains that attempts to use social cost benefit analysis have failed to provide a consensus solution because economic models lack the certainty/accuracy needed to guide our decisions. In short, he contends that economics, contrary to classical theories, does not follow “laws.” Indeed, economics cannot follow laws because humans, and their freedom to choose, insert too much complexity and/or unpredictability into the system to be summarized by equations and formulas. Readers should understand that Hasselaar does not deny that economic models can provide insights into many uncertainties. Rather his point is that confidence in the belief that economics can provide an “answer” to how we should approach ACC is misguided because not all kinds of uncertainty are of the same kind. To buttress his claim, the author directs readers to consider the Stern/Nordhaus-controversy that he believes shows the limitations in using economic models to guide policy decisions regarding responses to climate change. Hasselaar has a point. But I would simply argue that Bjorn Lomborg’s perspective would provide a better approach, assuming ACC is even true.

Hasselaar explains that there are at least two kinds of uncertainty. In small contexts, economic decision-making models do a pretty good job in guiding decisions (34). However, in large contexts, the models fail. He calls the uncertainty arising from large contexts “radical uncertainty.” Anthropogenic caused climate change is an example of a large context and thus subject to radical uncertainty because statistical predictive models are inadequate to guide decision making. But uncertainty about how to respond to ACC is not simply due to the vagaries of human freedom, it also stems from other unknowns, such as climate sensitivity, technological advances, and so forth (36).

Theology does not escape criticism either, though I only encountered one. While commending theology’s work in eco-theology (i.e., creation theology, ecofeminism, and so forth), Hasselaar notes that theologians have not wrestled with radical uncertainty, particularly the role that socioeconomic uncertainty plays in how we should respond to ACC (42–44).

In light of the radical uncertainty involved with ACC, how do we find a societally acceptable answer? Is there a model that can guide our decision making that avoids apocalypticism and unjustified optimism? Hasselaar believes a path forward can be developed. He begins by addressing methodological issues. Hasselaar proffers an approach that does not rely on the failed certainty of foundationalism and relativism of nonfoundationalism and instead relies on van Huyssteen’s post-foundational approach to ground a dialogue between economics and theology. A post-foundational approach and its use of transversal reasoning (TR) and openness to objective (scientific) and subjective (theological) thinking enables good-willed participants to find

common ground, build or rebuild trust, and create a new community that transcends the present polarizations (47–55). In short, Hasselaar is arguing for in-depth and open conversation between parties based on a willingness to identify their own biases, to recognize the value of other points of view and to engage with those ideas in a self-reflective way with an eye toward problem solving.

With the method in hand, Hasselaar turns to the ideas that will provide the substance for the dialogues between economics and theology. Here he relies largely on the work of Jonathan Sacks, a Jewish scholar in the United Kingdom to provide the theological approach against which Hasselaar will engage with economic thinkers that he believes are open to TR thinking, specifically Bart Nooteboom, Samuel Bowles, Dan Ariely, John Kay, and Mervyn King. Thus, most of the book is spent on Hasselaar's assessment of how these various conversations share similar and dissimilar ideas. The idea being that the dialogic spiral that results from the dialogues reveals how understanding, similarities, and potential breakthroughs can occur.

Sacks argued that discussion of ACC must be done from a perspective of hope, with hope being understood as confidence in the future that is neither naïve or blind to the challenge. Without hope, one is doomed to despair and inaction. Sacks employed the Exodus account to show readers that it was more than simply an account of God's actions. Sacks argued that the underlying counternarrative was that after God acted, the responsibility shifted to humans to act (77). As God acted in the Exodus, humans responded with hope characterized by *emunah* (i.e., trust), and *chessed* (i.e., love that acknowledges the worth of others, including nonhumans), which led to a change of identity (i.e., how they developed a new "we"). The institutions that helped guide this journey were covenant and Sabbath, which helped "to protect and stimulate relations of *chessed*" (163). With Sack's views in hands, Hasselaar engages in a critical dialogue with ideas from Bart Nooteboom, Samuel Bowles, Dan Ariely, John Kay, and Mervyn King. Readers benefit in two ways, namely, seeing how TR is performed and gaining an understanding of the similarities and differences between Sacks and his literary interlocuters as managed by Hasselaar.

The book has a few weaknesses. The first relates to its dissertation-like format. While Hasselaar's summations were helpful and could assist someone wanting to quickly get the gist of the book (e.g., see the introduction and concluding chapters), their frequency and repetitiveness can be a distraction. This reviewer would have preferred less repetition with more space given to provide concrete (i.e., real world) examples to illustrate how the ideas in the book could be implemented in policy.

Second, Hasselaar apparently was blind to how Christian readers would receive his comment on page 10 that reads: "I do not use the Christian designation Old Testament, because this can be seen as implying that the Old is completed in the New. This would be a wrong and outdated implication." This *faux pas* was an unforced error because he could have easily just said that he will use the term "Hebrew Bible" to refer to

the Old Testament and left the rest unsaid. If one is looking to have an ecumenical document, it helps to avoid stating that a particular religion is wrong.

From a theological and exegetical perspective, repackaging the Exodus narrative as a social liberation narrative sidelines God's demand for allegiance (76–78). The covenant of Exodus was between a suzerain and a vassal not between two equal parties. While Israel had a choice, its choice was to obey and be blessed, or disobey and get punished (cf. Ex. 32; Num. 14:11; 25:1). The freedom that Israel experienced was/is not the freedom of boundless self-determination and self-discovery characteristic sought after by affluent and hedonistic Western societies. Likewise, I was disappointed by the author's failure to consider the possibility that sin (i.e., human disobedience to God's law as related in Deuteronomy) lies behind ACC. The prophets repeatedly argued that Israel's sin led to its environmental problems (Deut. 11:17; 28:22–24; 1 Kings 17:1; Jer. 14:1–6; Amos 4:7–8; Hag. 1:11). Lest readers think that sin is not connected to environmental impacts (except for evil capitalists), consider that contemporary scientists have observed how divorce degrades environments.¹

Despite these weaknesses, Hasselaar does appear to be on to something. Transversal reasoning and different forms of knowledge, such as objective, subjective, and relational (cf. 165), provide an evocative framework through which scientists, economists, and others can have fruitful dialogue with theologians. While one wonders whether these dialogues help us to find truth as opposed to simply pragmatic solutions, there is still value in pragmatism in calming social discord. Theologians engaged with issues concerning public theology will benefit from this book by thinking more deeply about radical uncertainty and how ethical and theological principles could at least help us avoid unacceptable options as we consider policy decisions. Readers interested in dialogic models to help people address wicked problems will find some insights and avenues for further research.

— Stephen M. Vantassel
*Tutor, King's Evangelical Divinity School
 Broadstairs, Kent in England*

¹ Eunice Yu and Jianguo Liu, "Environmental Impacts of Divorce," *PNAS* 104, no. 51 (2007): 20629–34, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707267104>.