



Catholic Climate Covenantsm

Care for Creation. Care for the Poor.

A Catholic Approach to Climate Change Question and Answer Resource

As you implement and engage others in the *Catholic Climate Covenant: The St. Francis Pledge to Care for Creation and the Poor*, you may wish to review this question and answer resource. We believe it offers a way to respond to frequently asked questions raised in the context of our activities in the Catholic community.

You will find that we have included many powerful quotes from Pope Benedict XVI from his 2010 World Day of Peace Message: *To Cultivate Peace, Protect Creation*. Unless otherwise indicated, the quotes below are from this statement.

Seeing creation as God's gift to humanity helps us understand our vocation and worth as human beings . . . Contemplating the beauty of creation inspires us to recognize the love of the Creator

WDP, (# 2)

What is climate change?

From the bishops' statement on climate change:

“Our enfolding blanket of air, our atmosphere, is both the physical condition for human community and its most compelling symbol. We all breathe the same air. Guarding the integrity of the atmosphere—without which complex life could not have evolved on this planet—seems like common sense. Yet a broad consensus of modern science is that human activity is [is altering] the earth's atmospheric characteristics in serious, perhaps profound ways. For the past century, researchers have been gathering and verifying data that reveal an increase in the global average temperature. . . .

“To deal with the difficulty of making precise measurements and arriving at definite conclusions, the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to seek a clear explanation of the causes and possible impacts of this global climate change.¹⁴ Because of the large number of scientists involved in the IPCC and its process of consultation, its reports are considered widely as offering the most authoritative scientific perspectives on the issue.”

In their Fourth Assessment (www.ipcc.ch), the IPCC has concluded that human activity—namely, the burning of fossil fuels—is indeed altering the climate. This assessment also highlights that the impacts of climate change, more drought, flooding, and other weather extremes will impact poor people and poor countries disproportionately.

Why should we be concerned about climate change?

Climate change will likely impact everyone. Scientists believe that as the climate warms, stronger and more frequent weather events such as severe storms and prolonged droughts will result in greater loss of property and life and accelerate extinctions of plant and animal species. More of us, but especially people living in the poorest neighborhoods in the United States and the poorest countries around the world, could face greater hardship. For those of us with some measure of financial security, we may suffer some economic strain as we cope with climate impacts. For those in the poorest places around the globe, farming marginal land or living in densely packed and desperately poor urban areas, such weather impacts could mean life or death.

But beyond some of these economic and ecological questions, we should be concerned about climate change because our faith calls us to care for Creation and to be stewards of God's gifts on a finite planet.

Faith Questions

Why is climate change an issue for people of faith?

Honoring creation is another way to honor God who created all that is. Because we value our relationship with God and God's creation, climate change is for us a profoundly spiritual, ethical and moral issue. · The human contribution to climate change represents one of the clearest examples of how human activity can be damaging to God's creation. We need to recover spiritual values that respect God's creation. · *Man's inhumanity to man has given rise to numerous threats to peace and . . . development. . . . Yet no less troubling are the threats arising from the neglect – if not downright misuse – of the earth and the natural goods that God has given us (# 1).*

· For those of us in economically developed countries, we must examine the ethic of responsible use of the world's resources. Climate change will demand of us a more responsible lifestyle that uses less of the world's resources so that we can share the gifts of creation more fully with those at the margins of human development. For the sake of God's creation, for the poor and for all of us, we must learn to live more sustainably.

It is all too evident that large numbers of people in different countries and areas of our planet are experiencing increased hardship because of the negligence or refusal of many others to exercise responsible stewardship over the environment (# 7).

· It is a moral issue because while the poor have contributed the least to climate change, they will suffer its worst consequences. [Catholic social teaching](#), based on biblical and Church teaching, calls us to consider first how our actions affect poor and vulnerable people. We have a special obligation to respond to our brothers and sisters in need.

Can we remain indifferent before the problems associated with such realities as climate change, desertification, the deterioration and loss of productivity in vast agricultural areas . . .? Can we disregard the growing phenomenon of “environmental refugees” . . .? Can we remain impassive in the face of actual and potential conflicts involving access to natural resources? (# 4).

It is wise to apply the virtue of prudence to the issue of climate change. Pope Benedict XVI defined this in his 2008 [World Day of Peace Message](#):

“Prudence does not mean failing to accept responsibilities and postponing decisions; it means being committed to making joint decisions after pondering responsibly the road to be taken, decisions aimed at strengthening that covenant between human beings and the environment, which should mirror the creative love of God, from whom we come and

towards whom we are journeying.”

Is climate change a “pro-life” issue?

While climate change may not be considered a “core” pro-life issue such as abortion, euthanasia, physician-assisted suicide, embryonic stem-cell research, unjust war and the death penalty, it may be helpful to see it as consistent with pro-life concerns. Scientists predict millions of people (mostly poor people) will be subjected to deadly droughts, floods, heat-waves and extreme weather events such as tropical storms and hurricanes. In addition, a dramatically altered climate will impact generations yet to be born. Our actions today could reduce or increase this future risk.

Again, Pope Benedict provides a useful framework for linking respect for life with respect for the environment. In a January 2010 address to the diplomatic corps serving Vatican City, he said:

If we wish to build true peace, how can we separate, or even set at odds, the protection of the environment and the protection of human life, including the life of the unborn? It is in man’s respect for himself that his sense of responsibility for creation is shown.

Does caring about environmental issues like climate change show a lack of trust in God's promises (e.g. God’s promise to Noah after the flood)?

God gave us free will. We can choose between right and wrong. Just as we don’t expect God to save us if we drive after drinking too much, neither should we expect God to save us from environmental degradation caused by our own careless actions or inattention to the harm we are creating. Reason demands that we discern what scientists are telling us, investigate the options for minimizing our human contributions to climate change, and creatively explore the long-term changes required.

Our present crises – be they economic, food-related, environmental or social – are ultimately also moral crises, and all of them are interrelated. They require us to rethink the path which we are traveling together” (# 5).

Shouldn’t we concentrate more on our spiritual life rather than being overly concerned about what happens to this earth?

The earth and its fullness are the Lord’s. God created the world and affirmed, “it is very good.” God clearly loves creation. If we love God, then we should care for that which God loves. Caring about the well-being of the earth and God’s creatures, especially members of the human family, is a fundamental response to God’s love.

This question and the preceding one were addressed by [Msgr. Pietro Parolin](#), Vatican Under-Secretary of State, on September 24, 2007. He responded:

In recent times, it has been unsettling to note how some commentators have said that we should actually exploit our world to the full, with little or no heed to the consequences, using a world view supposedly based on faith. We strongly believe that this is a fundamentally reckless approach. At the other extreme, there are those who hold up the earth as the only good, and would characterize humanity as an irredeemable threat to the earth, whose population and activity need to be controlled by various drastic means. We strongly believe that such assertions would place human beings and their needs at the service of an inhuman ecology. I have highlighted these two extreme positions to make my point, but similar, though less extreme attitudes, would also clearly impede any sound global attempts to promote mitigation, adaptation, resilience and the safeguarding of our common future.

Isn't this another attempt by the Church to make us feel guilty (i.e. about climate change and the American way of life)?

Faith is about hope. It is easy to become overwhelmed by the issue of climate change and to worry about what kind of world future generations will inherit. Such worry can either paralyze us or motivate us to change. Christians are a people of hope who, through the Holy Spirit, are called to renew the face of the earth. We must envision a future where we live in a sustainable, co-creative relationship with God's creation. Through prayer, the sacraments and by working interdependently, in communion with others, we can trust the bounty of the earth to be sufficient and sustainable for all.

There is a need to encourage research into, and utilization of, forms of energy with lower impact on the environment (# 9). "The international community has an urgent duty to find institutional means of regulating the exploitation of non-renewable resources, involving poor countries in the process" (# 8). The Church has a responsibility towards creation, and she considers it her duty to exercise that responsibility in public life, in order to protect earth, water and air as gifts of God the Creator meant for everyone, and above all to save mankind from the danger of self-destruction (# 12).

Science Questions

Don't scientists disagree about climate change? T

The bishops, since their 2001 statement, have relied on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as an authority on this issue. The IPCC is made up of thousands of scientists from hundreds of nations and issues reports every few years. Their latest report (2007) says that climate change is occurring and one of the definitive causes is human activity. The [U.S. National Academy of Sciences](#) has issued numerous consensus statements on climate change as well. The debate now focuses more on what to do about climate change and the economic, political, social and cultural costs of proposed actions or of inaction.

How can human activity be the cause of current climate change when there have always been natural variations and cycles in the climate?

Past variations in climate were most often related to changes in the composition of gases in the atmosphere, particularly carbon dioxide (CO₂) just as is the case today. The higher the CO₂ levels, the warmer the atmosphere. There is some uncertainty about what caused those past fluctuations in CO₂ levels. But by and large, they happened over very long periods of time. What is unique about the current situation, is that levels of CO₂ and some other polluting gases are rising in a very short period of time: significant, measurable increases over decades, not over thousands of years. According to NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association) pre-industrial levels of CO₂ were 278 parts per million (ppm). That level did not vary more than 7 ppm during the 800 years between 1000 and 1800 A.D. Atmospheric levels of CO₂ have increased to 390 ppm (2009), an increase of 37% due primarily to human activities. The IPCC projects that levels could reach 450 ppm by 2050 driven by current and future use of fossil fuels, particularly by large developing nations.

Could climate change be a good thing? For instance, would there be less food insecurity since warmer weather and more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere stimulate plant growth?

The scientific analyses of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change, the U.S. Global Climate Research Project and others project a range of impacts from a warmer atmosphere. In some areas, particularly higher latitudes in both hemispheres, it is possible that crop production will be stimulated. However, potential yield increases may be offset by higher temperatures and unpredictable water variability (too much or too little). But from a global perspective, there will be more situations of negative consequences than positive ones pointing to serious threats to food security. The areas where there is likely to be the most negative impacts to agriculture are regions where people are already living with serious malnutrition and low agricultural production: Africa, Southeast Asia, and small island states, especially.

Why worry about climate change now? Isn't it a scientific prediction for the far off future?

People and ecosystems are already suffering from human-induced climate change. The fourth major assessment report of climate science by the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#), released in 2007, documents with greater certainty than ever before that the warming atmosphere is already causing disruptions in climate pattern. Sea levels are rising, displacing people and disrupting agriculture. Droughts in certain regions are becoming more protracted with more people affected. Extreme weather events such as flooding and intense storms are becoming more frequent. These patterns will intensify the longer we delay taking action to reduce the causes of climate change.

The bishops of Alaska held a hearing in June 2007 and heard dramatic testimony from native Alaskans, fisheries and forestry experts, the tourism and oil industries and others about the impacts in their state. True to scientists' predictions, the higher latitudes are currently experiencing much more warming than those closer to the equator with serious implications for all life, including human life.

Political questions – national and international

Some say that by supporting climate change legislation—such as a cap and trade approach—will result in an uneven division of costs and benefits. Who will be the winners and losers if we have climate change legislation?

It is true that if a cap-and-trade program is designed incorrectly, it could certainly harm the poor. Depending on how it is designed, energy companies and others could make millions of dollars each year trading permits, but bear little of the costs of real CO₂ reductions. Designed another way, such legislation could significantly increase costs for energy consumers hitting the poor the hardest. But religious leaders, including John Carr of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops who testified before the [U.S. Senate in June 2007](#), contend that a well-designed program could help reduce greenhouse gas pollution to forestall global warming and ensure that new resources are generated, allocated to protect the poor at home and overseas from the worst consequences of climate change, and provide for workers displaced by restrictions on emissions.

Surely communities of faith have no role in such public policy issues as climate change. What about separation of church and state?

Climate change is a public policy issue because it impacts the common good. Climate change will require an honest examination of society's energy, transportation, and consumption patterns. Some individuals, businesses and politicians will resist an examination and resultant changes because of the benefits they receive now in the current energy configuration. However, we are a community of faith that cannot stand by while vulnerable people and God's creation suffers. We must address climate change because, for us, it is more than a political or scientific or ecological issue. It is a spiritual, ethical and moral issue.

Aren't proposals to address climate change a threat to individual freedoms and the American way of life?

Remedies calling for reduction in CO₂ emissions and energy consumption restrict freedom in the way that speed limits curtail dangerous driving and promote the common good. Adjustments called for by climate change need not be threatening. Many of these changes will have economic benefits and be "win-win" strategies. For instance, we could all save money with efficiency improvements in appliances, homes and cars: they will use less energy. If our public transit were improved significantly we could drive less, traffic congestion would be reduced and air quality improved. Many of the needed changes would be life-enhancing rather than diminishing. And many of them would be good for the environment even if they were not linked to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

But beyond our own comfort level, our faith also teaches us that we must be in solidarity with those suffering at home and around the world. The world's resources are meant for all to share. Those of us in wealthier countries have no more right to these finite resources than the poorest people on earth.

The “common good” has strong roots in the Bible and in Catholic teaching that demonstrate God’s concern with the well-being of all of creation including human life. We are called to discern what it means to be faithful servants in God’s mission for His beloved creation.

Is there any hope for legislative action to address climate change?

Public policy remedies to climate change will remain contentious because they require new ways of thinking, regulating and defining who wins and who loses. But there is progress at the public policy level. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) is an organization of municipal governments that have made a commitment to sustainability. There are over 1,000 municipalities worldwide that are ICLEI members including U.S. cities such as Atlanta, Austin, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New York, Newark, Portland, San Francisco, Seattle and Tucson. (More information on ICLEI available at: <http://www.iclei.org/>). At a U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting, they adopted a strong resolution calling on the federal and state governments to adopt greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

California has become a leader in adopting new energy technologies and demanding more efficiency in their transportation systems and buildings. The Northeastern states have formed a compact known as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative that will help reduce reliance on fossil fuels.

Why should the United States be expected to make changes to address climate change while big developing countries such as China and India are let off the hook?

Emissions of greenhouse gases from large developing nations such as China, India and Brazil are increasing with the growth of their economies. However, there are several points that should be noted:

- There are billions of people still living in desperate poverty in countries like China, India and Brazil – improvement in their lives is dependent on increased economic development;
- The historic per capita emissions of these countries will remain far below that of the US;
- They are taking some steps to tackle climate change – China is currently improving its energy efficiency at a much faster rate than the US; India has one of the largest solar energy programs in the world; Brazil has the largest use of ethanol for motor vehicles of any country;
- Most importantly, without strong U.S. leadership in reducing emissions, our credibility and leverage are compromised.

The Holy Father addressed this question in his 2008 World Day of Peace Message:

In this regard, it is essential to “sense” that the earth is “our common home” and, in our stewardship and service to all, to choose the path of dialogue rather than the path of unilateral decisions. Further international agencies may need to be established in order to confront together the stewardship of this “home” of ours; more important, however, is the *need for ever greater conviction about the need for responsible cooperation. The problems looming on the horizon are complex and time is short.* In order to face this situation effectively, there is a need to act in harmony.

Economic Questions

Wouldn’t the proposals to address climate change have drastically negative economic consequences both for the United States and the global economy?

Adequately addressing the causes of human-induced climate change will mean economic opportunities and challenges. Some sacrifice may be required but the principle of solidarity may demand that those of us with more than our share of earth’s finite resources also demonstrate a greater degree of responsibility for solving the problem and a willingness to look critically at our consumption patterns. In addition:

· There may be far greater negative economic consequences for doing nothing to address climate change. A significant increase in droughts, floods and extreme weather events can cost the US and the global economy much more than the proposed positive actions to address climate change and reduce future risks. · The economy of the United States as well as the economies of many other countries would benefit from some actions to conserve energy and use it much more efficiently. Energy costs would be reduced thus improving economic performance; · Significant new economic growth opportunities are available in energy efficiency industries and in the development of alternate renewable energy sources; · Many leaders in business and industry are now calling for action on climate change because they realize that climate change impacts could adversely affect their businesses.

There will, however, be a need for some adjustment. This is why the U.S. bishops have advocated for targeting resources from climate change legislation to those most impacted including the low-income households who will need assistance with rising energy costs and to displaced workers as our economy moves away from fossil fuels toward alternative energy sources.

Couldn't proposed legislative remedies for climate change make the economic situation of the poor in developing countries even more wretched than it already is?

For the Catholic community, responsible proposals to address climate change must place a high priority on ensuring that the poor do not suffer economically. The Catholic Church has long been committed to reducing poverty and has supported sustainable economic development for the poor at home through organizations like [Catholic Charities USA](#) and the [Catholic Campaign for Human Development](#) and throughout the world through agencies such as [Catholic Relief Services](#). We recognize that developing countries must have the capacity for economic growth so as to meet the needs of their poor. Developed countries should assist the least developed nations with a transition to more sustainable economic development including sharing new energy technology.

But doing nothing about climate change could be even more disastrous for poor people and nations than economic adjustments called for in reducing the use of fossil fuels.

Questions about climate change and the poor

Is the impact of global warming on the poor really going to be so much greater than what they're already dealing with?

The impacts of climate change will be superimposed on a world where already billions of people live in extreme poverty. The Millennium Development Project Task Force headed by Columbia University economist Jeffrey Sachs has recently documented the reality of current worldwide poverty in the [UN Millennium Project Report, 2005](#).

The scientific projections of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change indicate that the impacts on poor countries are going to get worse in the future. In addition, developing countries have more limited resources at their disposal than do the richer nations to take steps to respond to the challenges posed by climate change.

Doesn't the U.S. already give a lot of foreign aid to developing countries? The international target for development assistance from the rich to the poor nations has for many years been 0.7% of Gross National Product (GNP). Only a few of the smaller European countries have reached that level. Most industrialized countries are far from that goal. The United States contributes just 0.15% of its GNP. In addition to massive increases in development assistance, poverty reduction will require significant debt relief for impoverished countries and reorientation of the current distorted international trade rules to allow for greater access by poor countries to the markets of the wealthier nations. For years, the U.S. bishops have urged a significant increase in the amount of relief and development aid to least-developed countries and led efforts for worldwide debt relief for the poorest countries.

If we have many communities and people in our own country in need of assistance and economic aid, why should the United States be concerned with assistance to developing countries?

Developing countries have very limited resources at their disposal—compared to richer nations—to take steps to respond to the challenges posed by climate change. The IPCC report of 2007 offers the following analysis of the implications of climate change for the poor of developing nations:

· The impacts of climate change on poor communities will vary greatly but generally climate change will be superimposed on top of existing vulnerabilities that many developing countries face: access to drinking water, health of poor people, food security, loss of landmass in coastal areas is anticipated, and mass human migrations might be the only solution. · The big challenge is to help developing countries find paths to sustainable economic development that do not replicate the same fossil-fuel dependent model that industrialized countries used with the consequent problem of climate change from high levels of carbon dioxide emissions. · Vastly expanding the capacity of renewable energy sources is a big part of the long-term answer. China and India are making significant progress in this area particularly for the large numbers of poor in rural areas. But much more needs to be done. · The wealthier industrialized countries need to provide much more assistance to help developing countries make the transition to a sustainable low-carbon energy future. It is in everyone's interest regardless where they live.

Energy price increases would come at a time when the cost of all goods, particularly food and basic necessities, would also increase. How would this support the poor and vulnerable?

There are ways to fold in new policy innovations to ensure that it is not harming those living in poverty and the vulnerable populations of the nation who bear the brunt of the costs. Religious leaders and groups believe that protection of the interests of the most vulnerable lies at the heart of policy discussions. In keeping with this, we support policies that are designed to incorporate these interests.

Incorporating and designing policies to protect the poor must address two potential outcomes of climate change policy: energy price increases and shifting job markets. In the face of energy price increases, the bishops recommend:

· Policies that would lower or reimburse energy costs of low-income people such as payroll tax reduction, an electronic benefits transfer card such the type used by the food stamp program for an energy rebate, or income tax credits and increasing LIHEAP program funding. · Policies that could help reduce fossil fuel-based energy use by funding energy efficiency programs such as the Weatherization Assistance Program and assisting in the purchase of energy efficient appliances; removing barriers to renewable energy use, including the higher costs of renewable energy.

In the case of major shifts in the labor market, the bishops call for: · Policies to encourage or fund training programs for employment in weatherization, solar water installation, renewable energy, and other alternative energy careers · Policies to offer transition assistance for dislocated workers and communities.

What can I do?

- Join with us to support *The Catholic Climate Covenant: The St. Francis Pledge to Care for Creation and the Poor*. This new and ambitious effort encourages Catholic individuals, parishes, schools, religious communities, dioceses and other Catholic organizations to commit themselves to a five-point St. Francis Pledge: 1) pray and reflect on the duty to care for God's creation and protect the poor and vulnerable; 2) learn about and educate others on the moral dimensions of climate change; 3) assess our participation-as individuals and organizations-in contributing to climate change; 4) act to change our choices and behaviors contributing to climate change and; and 5) advocate Catholic principles and priorities in climate change discussions and decisions, especially as they impact the poor and vulnerable.

- Learn more about the Covenant by visiting our [website](http://www.catholicclimatecovenant.org): www.catholicclimatecovenant.org