Climate’s Salvation?
Why and How American Evangelicals Are Engaging with Climate Change
by Katherine K. Wilkinson
Current debates from Capitol Hill to Copenhagen suggest political will to tackle climate change is in short supply. The public engagement that might undergird it is also thin. Yet action stirs in a seemingly unexpected realm: In November 2009, preceeding negotiations for a global agreement to succeed the Kyoto Protocol, two American evangelical pastors, Tri Robinson and Ken Wilson, traveled to the United Kingdom to launch an action plan to combat climate change. (See sidebar on this page) They were joined by leaders from different faith traditions around the world, all with similar commitments to action, who filled the grand halls of Windsor Castle with a colorful mélange of religious vestments and reverberations of prayer and song. Co-hosting the interfaith gathering with Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon addressed the delegates: “The world’s faith communities occupy a unique position in discussions on the fate of our planet and accelerating impacts of climate change,” particularly given inescapable moral dimensions of the issue. Noting stagnation among policymakers, he urged, “You can inspire, you can provoke, you can challenge your political leaders, through your wisdom, through your power, through your followers.”

Ban and Philip are two among a growing ensemble of scholars and practitioners who increasingly raise the prospect that religion could shift the debate and propel action on climate change; Robinson, Wilson, and their diverse compatriots are among the religious leaders heeding the call to engagement. For them, the vantage point of religion endows the issue with particular meaning, suggests specific courses of action in response, and animates their voices in the cacophonous, evolving chorus on climate change, of which they are an increasingly noteworthy but often little understood part. In the United States, in particular, this religious climate advocacy is swelling, and American evangelical leaders are playing a central role.

In addition to giving American evangelicalism a presence at the Windsor gathering, Robinson and Wilson are both signatories to the Evangelical Climate Initiative (ECI)—arguably the most substantive example of American evangelicals’ engagement with the issue to date. In February 2006, a group of 86 senior evangelical leaders, including such high-profile individuals as megachurch pastor and author Rick Warren, launched the ECI with its defining statement, “Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action.” To the surprise of many, a full-page ad in The New York Times stated, “Our commitment to Jesus Christ compels us to solve the global warming crisis,” and headlines announced, “Evangelical leaders join global warming initiative.” The ECI seeks to reframe the issue in evangelical terms, to spread its message in the public square, and to promote action to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change impacts.

Now more than 260 in number, signatories to the “Call to Action” wield significant public voice and political influence, serving as prominent leaders within a growing and mobilized religious community that comprises 25 to 30 percent of the U.S. population. They are part of an expanding group of moderate evangelicals who are broadening the evangelical right’s agenda of “personal morality” issues to include social justice and creation care concerns, specifically climate change. (Like many religious adherents, these leaders employ language of “creation care” rather than “environmentalism” because it expresses the theological basis of their concern for the Earth as God’s creation.) In so doing, they are challenging that issue’s traditional secular and lib-

Who Are American Evangelicals?

As used in this article, the term “evangelical” refers broadly to theologically conservative Protestants, including fundamentalists, evangelicals, Pentecostals, and charismatics. “Conservative” in this case refers to a theological rather than a political orientation, as a full spectrum of political orientations exists among evangelicals. (See sidebar on page 49) American evangelicalism traces its roots back to the Protestant Reformation, but in the 18th century, its varied strains of influence—pietism, revivalism, Puritanism, and Wesleyanism—metamorphosed into a uniquely American religion during revivals of the Great Awakening and under the influence of Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, and George Whitefield.

Numerous scholars have sought to identify the factors that unite the diverse religious tradition that is evangelicalism, but D. W. Bebbington’s “quadrilateral of priorities” receives the most support. He outlines four pillars of evangelical belief: (1) conversionism, an emphasis on being “born again,” or having an individual life-changing experience of God’s grace; (2) activism, a requisite concern for sharing the “good news” and offering others a chance to “save”; (3) biblicism, the authoritative role given to scripture and paramount centrality of the Bible; and (4) crucicentrism, a stress on the crucifixion of Christ as the core of belief and sole source of salvation. Historian Mark Noll notes, “These evangelical traits have never by themselves yielded cohesive, institutionally compact, or clearly demarcated groups of Christians. But they do serve to identify a large family of churches and religious enterprises.” The multifaceted definitions of “evangelical” point to the tradition’s complexity and patchwork nature but also denote a phenomenon that contrasts with other traditions and communities.
eral boundaries. (See sidebar on page 49) Their voices might be persuasive among policymakers with whom other environmental advocates hold less sway and among a segment of the American public that mainstream environmentalism has historically failed to engage but nonetheless has contributions to make as consumers and citizens.10 As such, the ECI signatories’ potential to shift partisan divides and to engender political will and public engagement is considerable, meriting further exploration of evangelical climate care, including its historical evolution, advocacy, and challenges.

A History of Evangelical Climate Care

The ECI did not arise suddenly or ex nihilo. Rather, it was born out of a 40-year evolution of American evangelicals’ engagement with environmental issues.11 Initial evangelical attention to environmental concerns began in the late 1960s as a response to Lynn White’s influential and controversial article, “The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis,” which blamed environmental degradation on the biblical doctrine of “dominion”12 drawn from Genesis 1:28:

“God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground.’”13

White’s indictment prompted evangelicals to come to Christianity’s defense, primarily by reinterpreting Genesis as a call to responsible stewardship. Rather than using God’s creation profligately, human beings should tend it carefully, as Genesis 2:15 suggests: “The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it.”14 During the 1980s evangelical scholars extended this response, developing a robust body of ecotheology that laid foundations for subsequent engagement beyond the ivory tower.15

Creation care leaders transformed these ecotheological precepts into advocacy in the early 1990s, founding the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN) and establishing “An Evangelical Declaration on the Care of Creation,” which laid out a framework for and commitment to action.16 The 1995–1996 Republican congressional assault on the Endangered Species Act thrust the burgeoning movement onto the national policy stage, as members worked to defend what they called “the Noah’s Ark of our day.”17 As the decade came to a close, the group began to turn its focus to climate change. Simultaneously, creation care inched inward from the periphery of the evangelical agenda and gained traction in the center of the community.

In 2002, a forum at the University of Oxford facilitated conversations between preeminent climatologist and British evangelical Sir John Houghton and then Vice President of Governmental Affairs for the United States-based National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) Richard Cizik. There, Cizik experienced what he calls a personal “conversion” on climate change.18 Later that year, Jim Ball of the EEN conducted a high-profile “What Would Jesus Drive?” campaign, driving a hybrid car through the heart of the Bible Belt. The tour proved a resounding media success.

In 2004, capitalizing on energy derived from the Oxford gathering, the EEN and two flagship evangelical organizations, Christianity Today and the NAE, co-hosted a creation care conference for American evangelical leaders. Houghton again served as the key climate science messenger, and the resulting “Sandy Cove Covenant” included the goal of reaching a “consensus statement” on climate change.

American Evangelicals and Politics

In recent decades, of all the factions within American evangelicalism, the evangelical right has most visibly exerted its political power, particularly in partnership with the Republican Party. But we would be remiss to think all evangelical leaders deploy their influence to politically conservative ends—exclusively or at all. An evangelical left and center accompany and often counterpoise the evangelical right; increasingly, a growing group of “freestyle” evangelicals display “political bivocality.”19 They may continue to hold traditional evangelical stances, disapproving of abortion and homosexuality, but also advocate for conventionally progressive causes. Such evangelicals may have unique access to and sway with policymakers, and can bring fresh perspectives and advocacy to enduring issues, deploying their influence and resources in potentially transformative ways.

Evangelical leaders’ influence is also intimately tied to their constituency—a robust and increasing body of believers. As with their leaders, the relationship of the evangelical public to the political right varies, and a full spectrum of political orientations exists among those who adhere to conservative theology. Recent Pew data indicates that among the evangelical public, 50 percent identify as or lean Republican, 9 percent identify as independent, and 34 percent identify as or lean Democratic; similarly, 52 percent describe themselves as conservative, 30 percent as moderate, and 11 percent as liberal.20 (In both cases, 7 percent of respondents did not know or refused to answer.) While these numbers suggest that evangelicals trend more Republican and more conservative than their mainline Protestant and Catholic counterparts, they are by no means monolithic in their political beliefs.
them indicates a religious or transcendent dimension, expressed in evangelical terms. In other words, for them climate change intersects with their deepest beliefs and identity as Christians, both of which help the ECI network cohere.

Constructing Climate Change

The ECI’s “Call to Action” is the gravitational core of the group and illustrates its particular construction of climate change. A manifesto for action on the issue, the document weaves together science, theology, ethics, and policy to define the problem, touching on its anthropogenic causes, global consequences, normative dimensions, and appropriate responses. The four-
In fleshing out these statements, the document’s appeals to science and policy are conventional, drawing on consensus science from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and promoting cap-and-trade as the key legislative solution. Its unique contribution lies in the way it couches the material phenomenon of climate change in a religious framework and gives it meaning by drawing on biblical texts; although the argument begins with science, theology provides the fundamental grounding of the “Call to Action” and the ECI’s advocacy.

Three key themes run through this theology:

**Creation Care**

Genesis 1 offers an account of the creation process and concludes with its maker’s assessment, in Genesis 1:31: “God saw all that he had made, and it was very good.” This passage suggests the Earth has intrinsic value as the created product of a creator God. According to Psalm 24:1, “The Earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it,” so damage to any aspect is an offense. On the other hand, these texts indicate that caring for creation and its inhabitants fulfills human beings’ God-given role as stewards and is an act of loving and honoring God. The message for evangelicals is that anthropogenic environmental degradation is sinful, and nature is more than a mere resource for human use.

**Neighbor Care**

As asserted in the Gospel of Matthew, concerns about justice complement creation care. Prompted by a query, in Matthew 22:39 Jesus cites the second commandment: “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Later in the Gospel, he goes on to express the gravity of this precept in Matthew 25:40: “I tell you in truth, whatever you did for the least of these brothers of mine, you did for me.” Caring for one’s neighbor—particularly the most vulnerable—is a central Christian responsibility and another key precept of evangelical ecotheology. Given the unjust effects of environmental degradation on the poor, the concept of neighbor care endows caring for creation with a humanitarian dimension; environmental concerns become part of a holistic Christian vision of the sanctity of life.

**Eschatology**

Eschatology is theology concerned with “the last things” or end of the world. Though evangelicals agree about the general trajectory of the biblical narrative, they can hold quite different convictions about the “end times,” which shape their perspectives on the future and thus attribution of meaning to the present. The Book of Revelation, the major biblical basis for these eschatological views, leaves open questions about how the Earth will fare in the end of days, with some passages depicting the destruction of creation and others suggesting its transformation from old to new. Drawing on the Book of Colossians and its emphasis on all things—“things in heaven and on earth”—as part of Christ’s redeeming work, the ECI’s theology advocates continuity rather than disjunction between the material present and the future. This eschatology of renewal envisions the redemption of creation rather than its destruction, thereby giving the Earth another layer of value.

Through these theological concepts, the ECI engages contested questions of values and ethics, establishing a distinctive way of looking at climate change that is inseparable from those concerns. By locating climate change within an ongoing religious narrative of creation and its care, the “Call to Action” casts Christians as actors who have agency to write the next chapter through their actions. The biblical story casts engagement with climate change with deep import and purpose, and the religious context gives ECI leaders a sense of divine direction and hope as they pursue their advocacy. They talk about being “called” or “told” by God, fulfilling a divine “commission” or “mandate,” and finding a deep source of optimism in “doing God’s work” and knowing they are ultimately in partnership with God. In their eyes, this theological dimension and the purpose and hope it provides distinguish evangelical creation care from secular environmentalism. Their advocacy aims to go beyond arresting environmental degradation; they endeavor to further Christ’s redeeming work.

**Negotiating the Evangelical Right**

The ECI’s emphasis on climate has roused pointed opposition from the evangelical right. Led by E. Calvin Beisner and the Cornwall Alliance, with support from James Dobson (of Focus on the Family), Richard Land (of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention), and others, this group has repeatedly attempted to censure Cizik, counter the ECI’s efforts to sway policymakers, and keep climate change off the evangelical agenda. Echoing arguments of the secular, conservative anti-environmental countermovement, they dispute mainstream science, suggest that mitigation measures would inflict vast economic damage, and reject regulatory solutions, instead favoring unhampered free markets to fuel economic growth that could finance adaptation to “natural” climate change. These leaders also maintain the dominionist theology rejected by the ECI.

Claims that climate change is dividing the evangelical community suggest that the underlying driver of these arguments might be political. The ECI could irreparably undermine the political power of the evangelical right, which for three decades so successfully
purported itself as speaking for American evangelicalism in its entirety and wielded the weight of that constituency. Indeed, many of the ECI signatories aim to break away from the old guard evangelical right and its political collaborator, the GOP. They lament the evangelical–Republican alliance that they say has often trumped religious purpose and subordinated Christian responsibility to party politics. These leaders hope to decouple evangelicalism from politics, taking a “biblical” approach instead.

Climate change, then, is part of a new evangelical politics that is less partisan, extends beyond a narrow Christian agenda, and takes a more global view (see sidebar on page 49). This revised approach—a divergent trajectory of evangelical engagement in the public sphere—engenders different styles and modes of advocacy and makes ECI leaders more open to collaboration and alliance-building. They need not agree with their collaborators on all issues, but they can work constructively together on areas of mutual concern, in the interest of achieving a common purpose. For example, Cizik, Wilson, and Joel Hunter, senior pastor of Northland Church near Orlando, Florida, have partnered with scientists at Harvard’s Center for Health and the Global Environment to establish joint advocacy ventures: Evangelicals and Scientists United to Protect Creation, Creation Care for Pastors, and the Friendship Collaborative among them. By breaking down the stereotypes and boundaries of what is and what is not “evangelical,” these leaders hope to renew the integrity of their religion and increase its credibility in broader society.

Although climate change is a faultline in contemporary evangelicalism, as the ECI’s advocacy proceeds, the evangelical right’s influence appears to be waning, as more leaders shift their stance on climate change. For instance, in 2006 Pat Robertson declared himself “a convert” on climate change on The 700 Club and in 2008 appeared in advertisements with liberal Baptist minister and civil rights activist Al Sharpton for Al Gore’s Alliance for Climate Protection.

**Engaging People in the Pews**

Perhaps a more significant challenge that ECI leaders face is to genuinely engage the evangelical public in climate care and to spread the movement from a primarily grassroots phenomenon into the grassroots. Quantitative surveys indicate that evangelicals’ opinions about climate change echo those of the U.S. population as a whole—high awareness, low concern. But the surveys also suggest that evangelicals’ belief in the reality and human cause of concern regarding, and support for combating climate change lags behind that of the public at large. Still, evangelicals are by no means monolithic in their opinions on the topic or a stridently opposed bloc; rather, they encompass a full spectrum of opinions.

Focus group data on evangelical churchgoers offers further insight into the opinion drivers at work and helps gauge acceptance of or resistance to the ECI. Results show that the theological emphasis on creation care and neighbor care generally resonated with participants. They widely consented to and often endorsed the notion of biblical calls to care for the Earth and for the poor. On the specific matter of climate change, however, a gulf between many churchgoers and the ECI signatories remained.

Three driving factors—(1) scientific skepticism, (2) conservative political ideology, and (3) individualism in concert with antistructuralism—have produced dissent and conflict on the issue. First, with roots in the evolution–creation debate, a general culture of scientific skepticism exists in many evangelical circles and hangs heavy over evangelical discussions of climate change. Distrust of scientists and a “populist anti-science sentiment” transfer easily from the former issue to the latter. In addition, many participants subscribed to the conservative political movement’s notion of the “non-problematicity” of climate change, arguing that “the evidentiary basis of global warming is weak and even wrong.”

Second, and again echoing the conservative political movement, participants expressed skepticism about the role of regulation in and the economic damage that would result from climate mitigation. Concerns grounded in free-market ideology and distrust of government seemed further heightened by skepticism about Democratic support for climate change solutions. Participants described attending to the issue as “political” and raised uncertainty about the agenda behind efforts to promote ameliorative action. For some, Gore epitomized the link between partisan politics and climate change and the liberal trappings of environmentalism.

Third, many churchgoers’ perspectives seem shaded by questions of scale. In general, participants expressed very different attitudes toward both problems and solutions that are direct, immediate, small-scale, or individualized and those that are indirect, distant, large-scale, or structural. As with evangelical perspectives on racism—seen as a problem “of individuals and individuals only”—theologically grounded (1) accountable freewill individualism, (2) relationalism, and (3) anti-structuralism worked against a systemic understanding of the complex causes and possible solutions to climate change. These religious perspectives suggest that (1) individuals act independently of structures and institutions with personal accountability for their own actions; (2) immediate, interpersonal relationships are of utmost importance; and (3) emphasis on social structures undermines the individual and personal responsibility. Perspectives that resist structural thinking and emphasize individualism inhibit understanding of an immensely complex, multilevel problem like climate change.

In sum, despite resonance of creation care and neighbor care, among this portion of the American public, engagement with climate change is beleaguered by ongoing scientific uncertainty, partisan political baggage, and resistance to systemic thinking. Interestingly, theological notions often blamed for Christian anti-environmentalism were absent from focus group discussions: eschatology, dominion readings of Genesis, and associations of environmentalism with paganism. These factors complicate and impede religion’s ability to foster public engagement on the issue.
In light of the urgency involved in efforts to ameliorate climate change, ECI leaders are grappling with the dual concerns of engendering political will and engaging the evangelical public. A grassroots constituency is necessary both to shore up evangelical leaders’ impact on climate politics and to exert direct influence as citizens on elected officials. At the same time and paradoxically, generating necessary engagement among churchgoers could be impossible while maintaining an emphasis on climate change and regulatory solutions. Hence, the leaders face a strategic quandary that pits climate policy aims against broader creation care goals—a conflict between immediate impact and deeper but more distant shifts. Their human agency is running up against both biophysical and sociocultural reality, challenging what they can feasibly achieve.

Thus, the present moment is a dynamic one for evangelical climate advocacy. While the events of recent years indicate a sea change among evangelical leaders, the full extent of its impact remains to be seen, as engagement among churchgoing constituents lags and, consequently, advocacy approaches remain under development. How they decide to resolve strategic tensions will significantly shape the future of evangelical climate care. So, too, will the evolution of broader dynamics in American evangelicalism, particularly given younger evangelicals’ increasing interest in creation care, and the growth of the evangelical center, which has creation care squarely within its agenda.

Moreover, while evangelical churchgoers are not a lynchpin of public support at present, that reality does not render efforts to engage them irrelevant. The path of climate change amelioration extends far beyond this congressional session and will likely be long and difficult. Greater engagement among this quarter or more of the U.S. public might be important to walking the path successfully, and creation care leaders persist in their commitment to stimulating public concern and action.

In any case, the ECI and its signatories bring a rather unique voice to evolving conversations about climate change, with their particular way of describing the issue—its causes, consequences, and...
solutions. They reframe climate change with an evangelical lens and biblical language, giving it meaning as a matter of both private faith and public life with inescapably ethical dimensions. In so doing, the ECI leaders inject their theology and morality into the climate debates, which are typically dominated by the language of science and policy. Such constructions of climate change may prove essential to evangelical efforts to move policymakers and the public to ameliorative action.46

Secular practitioners, scientists, and scholars, especially those looking to coordinate or collaborate with evangelical efforts, would benefit from understanding creation care as an increasingly influential perspective and area of advocacy, where alliances are feasible, and where significant disagreements persist. Those outside the movement would do well to remember that beyond engendering action on climate change, the ultimate goal for ECI leaders and other creation care advocates is being faithful to and serving God. Also of note to observers is the fact that evangelical attention to adaptation is growing. As an idea, leaders view it as a way to move past skepticism about the anthropogenic nature of climate change and uncertainty about strategies for mitigation, while resonating with evangelicals’ more established history of engagement in relief and development work.47 Evangelicals are likely to continue to play an important role in this area. Moreover, given the limited body of literature on the topic, opportunities for further research are significant.

Conclusion

Ultimately, evangelical climate advocacy challenges existing binaries in thought and action related to environmental concerns. Pervasive dichotomous thinking restricts us to such categories as liberal/conservative, secular/religious, human/environment, and material/spiritual, which limit the way we conceive of issues and respond to them. But, clearly, religion and environment are not inimical, nor are scientists and evangelicals or political liberals and theological conservatives on definitively opposing sides. Synergies between them are apparent and increasingly intersect on the issue of climate change. The very existence of evangelical climate care invites reconsideration of such binaries, lest they limit us to half-truths and half-solutions.
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