

ELR

NEWS & ANALYSIS

Evangelicals, Climate Change, and Consumption

by David A. Skeel Jr.

Before 2006, some American evangelicals were indifferent about environmental issues, but many were hostile, denouncing “environmental wackos” and the quasi-religious language of the environmental movement. But the release of a startlingly pro-environmental document called *Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action* two years ago signaled the sudden emergence of a sizeable group of evangelical environmentalists.¹ Signed by many prominent evangelicals, the call to action prompted a swift backlash from other leaders, who defended the long-standing evangelical skepticism of the environmental movement.² Since then, the evangelical community has been deeply divided. Although there are hints of fissures on other social issues, none is as stark as the new debate over climate change in particular and environmentalism more generally.

So goes an increasingly common account of evangelicals’ uneasy relationship with environmentalism. As a description of the present, the storyline is roughly accurate: evangelicals are indeed divided. But today’s evangelical environmentalists are not a new breed. Difficult as it is to imagine now, evangelicals once seemed poised to become a potent ally to the early environmental movement. In the late 1960s, leading evangelical intellectual and pastor Francis Schaeffer gave a series of talks at the flagship evangelical college, Wheaton College in Wheaton, Illinois, insisting that the biblical views of creation and of men and women as God’s stewards should make evangelicals avid environmentalists. Evangelical churches, he argued, should take the lead in countering the environmentally degrading tendencies of modern culture.³

Schaeffer was not alone in his passion about environmental issues. An evangelical who subscribed to *Christianity*

Today, the leading evangelical magazine, regularly would have seen articles on environmental issues in the early 1970s. Although occasionally skeptical about environmentalism, the vast majority echoed Schaeffer’s call to action. In the late 1970s, the stream of environmental articles dropped off steeply. It was as if a moment had come and gone. A second, more complicated surge of interest came a decade later, in the early 1990s, but it too faded quickly from the pages of *Christianity Today*. Interestingly, although the current debate has been covered extensively in the general media, environmental issues have not figured nearly so prominently in *Christianity Today* as during either of the earlier waves of attention.

Recovering this history may help to bring the current stances of evangelicals toward environmental issues into sharper focus. My methods in this Article will not be exhaustive—I draw principally on Schaeffer and a 40-year analysis of the coverage in *Christianity Today*. But the history is quite suggestive, and it provides a starting point for thinking about why the early enthusiasm never fully took hold, why so high a percentage of evangelicals remain unmoved about environmental issues, and whether the new surge in evangelical environmentalism will endure. It is in addressing the last of these questions that the theme of this symposium—consumption—will take center stage.

I. A Brief Historical Tour

The recent history of evangelicals’ attitudes toward the environment began with an article by Lynn White Jr. in *Science* magazine in 1967.⁴ Then, as now, *Science* would not be described as an enthusiastic promoter of evangelicalism, and White’s article was not full of praise. In White’s view, Christianity was the source of the world’s environmental woes. “Christianity,” he argued, “in absolute contrast to [other religions], not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God’s will that man exploit nature for his proper ends.”⁵ Christianity “bears a huge burden of guilt,” he concluded, for the “disastrous ecologic backlash” lurking on the horizon.⁶

The year after White’s article appeared, Schaeffer gave a series of talks at Wheaton College.⁷ Schaeffer was a Presby-

David A. Skeel Jr. is the S. Samuel Arsht Professor of Corporate Law, University of Pennsylvania.

1. EVANGELICAL CLIMATE INITIATIVE, *CLIMATE CHANGE: AN EVANGELICAL CALL TO ACTION* (2006), <http://pub.christiansandclimate.org/pub/statement-booklet.pdf> (last visited Sept. 29, 2008).
2. The Interfaith Stewardship Alliance, which had been founded in 2005, countered with an open letter questioning the call to action. An Open Letter to the Signers of *Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action* and Others Concerned About Global Warming, http://www.cornwallalliance.org/docs/Open_Letter.pdf (last visited Sept. 29, 2008).
3. I am not the first to point to Schaeffer’s early activism. Two excellent recent articles, each of which gives a useful, detailed chronology of recent evangelical environmentalism, also note Schaeffer’s role. John Copeland Nagle, *The Evangelical Debate Over Climate Change*, U. ST. THOMAS L.J. (forthcoming 2008) and J. Aaron Simmons, *Evangelical Environmentalism: Oxymoron or Opportunity?* (unpublished manuscript, on file with author).

4. Lynn White Jr., *The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis*, 155 *SCIENCE* 1203 (1967).

5. *Id.* at 1205.

6. *Id.* at 1206.

7. See, e.g., Andrew Higgins, *Split Over Global Warming Widens Among Evangelicals*, *WALL ST. J.*, Sept. 28, 2007, at A1.

terian pastor, educated at the conservative Westminster Seminary outside of Philadelphia, who had established a Christian retreat center called L'Abri in a Swiss chateau in 1955.⁸ By the late 1960s, Schaeffer and L'Abri were famous among evangelicals for challenging the counterculture to consider Christianity, and for inviting all new comers to free-wheeling debates about existentialism, art, belief, and other issues. In his lectures, later published as *Pollution and the Death of Man*, Schaeffer confronted White's indictment head on. Rather than refuting White's criticisms, however, Schaeffer embraced them, arguing that White's "brilliant article" had correctly diagnosed a devastating problem.⁹ He also agreed that "there is no solution to ecological problems—any more than to sociological problems—without a 'base.' The base of man's thinking must change."¹⁰ His only quarrel was with White's solution. Whereas White called for "the equality of all creatures" and a subsequent commentator endorsed pantheism, Schaeffer insisted that the answer lay in a proper understanding of the Christian doctrine of creation.¹¹ He argued that the creation was originally good and will be restored, and our task is to serve as stewards on God's behalf. The Christian Church therefore belongs at the forefront of the environmental movement. Schaeffer analogized the Christian Church to a "pilot plant." Just as businesses often use a small-scale "pilot plant" to test whether a "full-scale plant can work," the Church "ought to be a pilot plant concerning the healing of man and himself, of man and man, and man and nature," demonstrating by "individual attitudes and the Christian community's attitude" how to care for the environment.¹²

Judging from the coverage in *Christianity Today*, many evangelicals had ears to hear.¹³ The early 1970s saw a flurry of articles on the environment. On the second day of the new decade, the editors predicted that the environment would be the big issue of the next 10 years. "Watch this one in the seventies," they wrote, "it will be very big, and the churches will be at the forefront of the action."¹⁴ The editors wrote about environmental issues four more times in 1970; this was followed by a cover story and two more editorials in 1971, then several editorials or articles a year in 1972, 1973, and 1974.

The coverage during this period had three recurring qualities. First, both the editors and the authors of articles run by the magazine consistently characterized the environment as a legitimate crisis that warranted immediate, bold action. "Most issues are just that," Carl Reidel said in the 1971 cover article, "with informed people lined up on both sides.

But in ecology there is no significant difference of opinion on the truth that we are headed toward the obliteration of life."¹⁵ Three years later, in an article entitled *A Message to Polluters From the Bible*, another writer warned that "[h]eading off this crisis is an immense task, involving all of us. It will probably demand some drastic rethinking."¹⁶

Second, the coverage—especially that of the editors themselves—reflected a wariness of the secular environmental movement. The principal concern was a perception that the emerging movement was advocating a form of pantheism. "Unfortunately," the editors wrote,

at least a few persons appear to have gone beyond legitimate concern for our environment to pervert the science of ecology into what might be called *ecologism*. These people are uninhibited in their opposition to orthodox Christianity . . . , and to replace it they urge what is essentially old-fashioned paganism.¹⁷

Another editorial complained that "[n]on-biblical theologizers have thrust before us a view of man that makes him a part, rather than lord, of the created order."¹⁸ Schaeffer had highlighted this tendency too, as we have seen, but he treated it more as an opportunity than as a threat. In part, this is a reflection of Schaeffer himself—unlike many evangelicals, Schaeffer sympathized with the 1960s counterculture. But an intervening event also seems to have contributed to the editors' discomfort: the first Earth Day, in April 1970. Not only was White's article "the first major article" in *The Environmental Handbook*, which was specially published for Earth Day, but condemnation of Christianity and the endorsement of more exotic alternatives was a running theme in the handbook.¹⁹

Third, both the articles and editorials repeatedly emphasized individual and church behavior—consumption decisions—as the first step toward addressing the perceived crisis. In one editorial, the editors complained that only 50 of 15,000 pollution kits sent by Chrysler Corporation to its dealers had been sold, despite costing only \$20 and significantly reducing emissions. "This is an issue in which Christians have the chance to lead the way," they wrote. "Those unwilling to help set the pace in serving the environment say in effect that they lack respect for the works of God's hands."²⁰ After listing the changes in lifestyle that would be needed to protect the environment ("[w]e will have to do without some disposables and other conveniences. . . . We may need to buy economy cars and use bicycles and mass transit systems."), another author concluded that "we need

8. Schaeffer and Carl Henry, who edited *Christianity Today* from 1956 to 1968, were two of the leading proponents of the view that evangelicals should engage the culture.

9. FRANCIS A. SCHAEFFER, POLLUTION AND THE DEATH OF MAN: THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ECOLOGY 12 (1970).

10. *Id.* at 13.

11. *Id.* In an article published in the popular press later the same year, Richard Means seconded White's judgments and called for a new pantheism. Richard Means, *Why Worry About Nature?* SATURDAY REV., Dec. 2, 1967. Both articles are reprinted as appendices to Schaeffer's book.

12. SCHAEFFER, *supra* note 9, at 82.

13. Founded by Billy Graham and several others in 1956, *Christianity Today* was and remains the leading magazine of mainstream evangelicalism.

14. Editorial, *Ecology*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Jan. 2, 1970, at 38.

15. Carl H. Reidel, *Christianity and the Environmental Crisis*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 23, 1971, at 4 (interview).

16. Martin LaBar, *A Message to Polluters From the Bible*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, July 26, 1974, at 8, 9.

17. Editorial, *Ecologism: A New Paganism?*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 10, 1970, at 33.

18. Editorial, *De-Polluting Ecology Theology*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May 8, 1970, at 25, 26. The editors also criticized a "twin-pollutant," that some environmental leaders "demand[] the total overhaul of our social and economic systems." *Id.*

19. *Ecologism: A New Paganism?*, *supra* note 17, at 33.

20. Editorial, *Who Cares for Earth?*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Sept. 10, 1971, at 31. Four years later, the editors asked: "Could not pastors devote at least one sermon to these issues in the spring, challenging parishioners to draw up lists of saving ideas and to commit to making these a part of their lives?" Editorial, *Waste as a Wrong*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 11, 1975, at 26, 27.

to practice *thrift*. Every Christian ought to be an example of careful consumption.”²¹

Starting in the mid-1970s, the number of articles on environmental issues plummeted, a trend that continued for the next 15 years. In many of these years, not a single editorial, article, or even news item on environmental issues was featured. The most noteworthy article was *No Return to Eden*, a lengthy analysis of the debate over nuclear power published in 1980.²² The article characterized the debate as pitting two secular humanist perspectives—industrialism and romantic environmentalism—against one another. Evangelicals should “be neither naively optimistic of human scientific progress [like the industrialists],” the author advised, “nor [like romantic environmentalists] condemning of it as radically unfruitful.”²³ A “Christian environmentalism,” he concluded, would call for “regulation in which continual watchfulness is applied to all our organizations, especially those that are commercial.”²⁴ As that article reflects, the environment was intertwined with other issues, such as nuclear power, during that period.

The second major wave of articles on the environment came in the early 1990s. The trend was foreshadowed by increasing coverage in the magazine’s news section of the activities of Christian environmentalists in the late 1980s.²⁵ The wave crested in 1992 and 1993, the years that brought President William J. Clinton and Vice President Al Gore to the White House, with no less than six stories and articles on environmental issues each year. As with the first wave in the early 1970s, the second wave of articles consistently endorsed environmentalism. “The garden that is Earth, which God put in our care,” the editors wrote in 1992, “is ailing . . . from abuse and neglect. The time has come for evangelicals to confront the environmental crisis.”²⁶ The coverage also acknowledged the perceived tension between environmentalism and orthodox Christianity. “Many withdraw from environmentalism as an infectious carrier of New Age ideas,”²⁷ as one cover story put it, before urging evangelicals to look beyond this strand of environmentalism.

The second wave differed from the first in three important respects. First, although *Christianity Today*’s editors were persuaded the crisis was real, their frequent allusions to skepticism about the science suggest that at least some of the magazine’s readers were not so sure. In interviewing then-Senator Gore, for instance, they asked: “How do you

respond to critics who charge that the evidence for ecological disaster is exaggerated or even wrong?”²⁸ Second, governmental action figured much more prominently as the likely response to environmental concerns than in the 1970s. This was usually implicit, as in an editorial stating that “[p]roblems that were once local have become global” and in an article arguing that Christians should join environmental advocacy groups.²⁹ Finally, abortion entered the discussion. The title of a news story reporting on several environmental groups’ defense of abortion as necessary to curb global population growth asked, for instance, whether “there [is] room for pro-life environmentalists?”³⁰

After this second flurry of excitement, the environment once again simply dropped off the map again for more than a decade. After occasional coverage in the late 1990s, the magazine did not run a single article on the issue from 2000 through 2004. In August 2005, Andy Crouch broke the silence with a column arguing that the evidence of human influence on climate change is clear and that evangelicals should support prompt action to address it. Environmental issues showed up twice in 2006 after the release of *Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action*, first in a news story on the initiative and then in a news story covering the critical response by another group of evangelicals. Despite the active debate among evangelicals and the frequent coverage in the popular media, environmental issues were absent in 2007 and have appeared just once so far in 2008.³¹

Why so little coverage in the past several years? The most likely explanation is the sharp divide within the evangelical world. As a publication that hews to evangelicalism’s center, *Christianity Today* has tread cautiously during the current debate.³²

II. Why the Resistance?

The coverage in *Christianity Today* seems to ebb and flow with the prominence of environmentalism in American culture more generally. The first wave came at the start of modern environmental movement with the advent of Earth Day in 1970; the second with rising concerns about global environmental catastrophe and the perception this would be a fo-

21. LaBar, *supra* note 16, at 9.

22. Peter Wilkes, *No Return to Eden: The Debate Over Nuclear Power*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 4, 1980, at 26.

23. *Id.* at 28. Interestingly, the next major article with an environmental theme, which did not appear until five years later, adopted something close to the romantic environmentalist perspective, criticizing the effects of large-scale corporate farming. Paul Brand, *A Handful of Mud*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 19, 1985, at 25.

24. Wilkes, *supra* note 22, at 28.

25. The articles generally focused on Cal DeWitt, who founded Au Sable Institute in 1979 and has long been the leading evangelical environmentalist. See, e.g., Randy Frame, *News: Planetary Justice*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Nov. 10, 1988, at 74 (quoting and accompanied by interview of DeWitt); Kristi G. Streiffert, *News: The Earth Is Groaning and Christians Are Listening*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Sept. 22, 1989, at 38 (quoting DeWitt throughout).

26. Editorial, *It’s Not Easy Being Green*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May 18, 1992, at 14. The editors concluded by announcing that they “plan[ned] to devote more of our pages to covering the environmental crisis.”

27. *Id.*

28. David Neff, *Preserving God’s “Very Good” Earth*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Sept. 14, 1992, at 26, 27 (interview of then-Senator Gore) [hereinafter, *Gore Interview*].

29. Editorial, *It’s Not Easy Being Green*, *supra* note 26, at 14; Loren Wilkinson, *Eco-Myths: Myth 3: There Is Nothing Christians Can Do*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Apr. 4, 1994, at 31, 33.

30. Kim A. Lawson, *News: Is There Room for Pro-Life Environmentalists?*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Sept. 24, 1990, at 46. See also *Gore Interview*, *supra* note 28, at 28 (asking Vice President Gore to respond to the concern of pro-life evangelicals that “population-stabilization programs end up endorsing abortion as a form of birth control”).

31. David Neff, *Second Coming Ecology*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, July 2008, at 34. Although there were no articles on the environment in the magazine in 2007, a list of the top-10 stories of 2006 included the campaign to oust Richard Czik from his post as vice president of the National Association of Evangelicals, in large part because of his promotion of evangelical environmentalism. Editors, *Top-Ten Stories of 2006*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Jan. 2007. There have also been several articles on the *Christianity Today* website over the past decade.

32. Although the magazine’s editors are environmentalists, many readers are not. Crouch has noted, for instance, that his 2005 column “produced more letters than the magazine received for the other five years’ of columns combined. All but one were strenuously opposed to this position.” Andy Crouch, *Whose Religious Environmentalism?*, BOOKS & CULTURE, Mar./Apr. 2007, at 32.

cus of the first term of Clinton's presidency. The recent, more muted coverage has attended the escalating debate over climate change.

While evangelicals have tuned in to environmental issues at the same time as the rest of the country, their conclusions are quite different. According to recent polls, only 37% of evangelicals believe that the earth is getting warmer due to human activity, as compared to 62% of secular Americans; and only one-third view climate change as an important issue.³³ The brief historical overview we have just considered suggests four reasons that evangelicals have resisted the environmental movement.³⁴

The first is theological. Ever since White equated Christianity with environmental degradation and invited environmentalist alternatives, many evangelicals have perceived a conflict between environmentalism and orthodox Christianity. Environmentalism is seen as a pantheistic substitute for and parody of true religion. A theological perspective known as dispensationalism further distances some evangelicals from environmentalism.³⁵ In its extreme form, as exemplified by the 1970s best seller *The Late, Great Planet Earth* and by the *Left Behind* series of novels, this theology holds that the world will be destroyed at the Final Judgment and thus is relatively unimportant.³⁶

Evangelicals also are much more skeptical than other Americans of the scientific claims made by the environmental movement. In part, this is a spillover from another debate—the century-long skirmish between religion and science over evolutionary theory. Evangelicals are far less likely than other Americans to believe in evolution,³⁷ and this skepticism of a claim that is widely held within the scientific community makes many evangelicals less amenable to scientific claims about climate change and other environmental issues. This general skepticism is reinforced by a perception that environmentalists have frequently cried wolf, predicting (in an odd secular analogue to the *Left Behind* novels) immanent catastrophes that never materialized. As a letter to the editor in *Christianity Today* put it:

Paul Ehrlich wrote nearly 40 years ago about the “Population Bomb” and impending worldwide doom (population estimates continue to drop worldwide). There was the fuel crisis of the 1970s with alarmists claiming we would run out of fuel in 10 to 15 years. Now we have claims that the Earth is on the verge of a meltdown because of human activity.³⁸

The third is evangelicals' long-standing hostility to governmental activism on most social issues. Although evangelicals were at the forefront of efforts to devise governmental solutions to social problems throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, they abandoned this strategy from roughly 1925 until the rise of the Religious Right in the 1970s.³⁹ Since then, evangelicals have called for government intervention on issues like abortion and gay rights, but have resisted government programs for addressing poverty and other social concerns. This tendency was reinforced by evangelicals' increasingly close ties to the Republican party and its free market policies in the 1980s and 1990s. The environmental movement, by contrast, seemed to be dominated by liberal intellectuals rather than ordinary middle class Americans,⁴⁰ and it emphasized large-scale governmental intervention.

Finally, environmentalism periodically has come into conflict with evangelicals' campaign against abortion. As we have seen, abortion became a flashpoint in the 1990s, when environmental groups defended abortion as a means of population control.⁴¹ More important than the direct conflict, however, was the extent to which the evangelicals' commitment to the pro-life movement, which began in the 1970s, consumed the attention of many evangelicals at the expense of other issues. Schaeffer's son Frank has written, for instance, that Schaeffer's role as a leading evangelical opponent of abortion ended his own emphasis on environmentalism. Frank's general assessment of his father has been disputed, but Schaeffer does seem to have gone silent on environmental issues once he became a leading evangelical spokesman for the pro-life movement.⁴²

III. Looking Forward

The fate of the two earlier waves suggests that the new evangelical environmentalists face an uphill climb. But several of the historical explanations for evangelical skepticism seem to be declining in importance. Many evangelicals, especially younger ones, are more concerned about poverty and less hostile to social reform than their predecessors. This is most evident with poverty and disease in Africa, which has become a ministry focus of Rick Warren and

33. See Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, *Many Americans Uneasy With Mix of Religion and Politics*, Aug. 24, 2006, available at <http://people-press.org/report/?pageid=1083> (37% of white evangelicals believe human activity has caused global warming) [hereinafter Pew Report]; Barna Group, *Born Again Christians Remain Skeptical, Divided About Global Warming*, Sept. 17, 2007, available at <http://www.barna.org/FlexPage.aspx?Page=BarnaUpdateID-279> (33% of evangelicals view climate change as a “major” problem).

34. For a somewhat similar list, though with different emphases, see Nagle, *supra* note 3.

35. See generally James L. Guth et al., *Faith and the Environment: Religious Beliefs and Attitudes on Environmental Policy*, 39 AM. J. POL. SCI. 364 (1995) (finding that “Biblical literalism and End Times thinking” is a significant predictor of conservative views on the environment).

36. HAL LINDSEY & CAROLE C. CARLSON, *THE LATE, GREAT PLANET EARTH* (1970). Traditional dispensationalism may have peaked in the 1970s, with the publication of the Ryrie Study Bible in 1978. Many of the leading theologians at Dallas Seminary, the traditional center of dispensationalist learning, are now progressive dispensationalists, a perspective that does not place so great an emphasis on the End Times. See generally Darrell L. Bock, *Charting Dispensationalism*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Sept. 12, 1994, at 26 (describing the emergence of progressive dispensationalism).

37. See, e.g., Pew Report, *supra* note 33 (51% of all Americans and 83% of secularists, but only 28% of white evangelicals, believe that humans and other living things have evolved over time).

38. Michael Kruse, *Readers Write*, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Oct. 2005, at 14-15 (replying to Crouch column).

39. See, e.g., MARK A. NOLL, *THE SCANDAL OF THE EVANGELICAL MIND* 165 (1994).

40. The perception that environmentalists are disproportionately liberal intellectuals appears to be accurate. Dana Fisher has found, for instance, that 75% of environmental activists have college degrees and nearly one-third have graduate education. See Dana R. Fisher, *Who Are Climate Change Activists in America?*, 38 ELR 10864 (Dec. 2008).

41. See *supra* note 30 and accompanying text.

42. See, e.g., Higgins, *supra* note 7 (suggesting that “Mr. Schaeffer's call to arms over the environment was soon drowned out by another cause he championed: the war on abortion,” and quoting Schaeffer's recollection that “[s]uddenly, abortion was a litmus test for everything”).

other prominent evangelicals.⁴³ The increasing numbers of young evangelicals who spend time in these ministries are likely to view poverty and social issues as a high priority when they come home. They are less likely to reject governmental solutions to social problems than their parents, and they may well identify less closely with the Republican party.

Given the deepening evangelical concern about poverty, pairing traditional governmental solutions with an emphasis on the danger that climate change could exacerbate poverty in the developing world is one plausible strategy for evangelicals who wish to bring more fellow evangelicals into the fold. It resonates, for instance, with evangelicals' intense focus on individual lives. But the effects of environmental degradation on particular individuals are much more diffuse and speculative than with poverty. The distance from individual lives, together with the continuing emphasis on massive governmental intervention, significantly limits the upside of this approach.

A few leading secular environmental scholars have recently encouraged environmentalists to focus not just on direct governmental intervention, but also on the consumption decisions of individual Americans. After pointing out that individual consumption is responsible for nearly a third of the emissions associated with climate change in the United States, for instance, Mike Vandenberg and Anne Steinemann have proposed a more subtle governmental role.⁴⁴ "[G]overnment may be able to push [awareness of the importance of] carbon neutrality past a tipping point," they argue, "by collecting and disseminating the information necessary to link carbon neutrality to the widely held abstract norm of personal responsibility."⁴⁵

A somewhat similar approach might prove more persuasive among evangelicals than calls for intrusive governmental intervention. In a sense, this would hearken back to the first wave of evangelical environmentalism, when individual consumption was the central theme. Perhaps drawing on funding for faith-based initiatives, evangelical non-profit organizations could develop seminars on consumption to present in churches and other community settings. Informational seminars are common in evangelical churches; indeed, a few evangelical environmentalists have already begun to use this approach.⁴⁶ It is impossible to predict whether informational seminars and word-of-mouth strategies would increase evangelical concern about the environment.⁴⁷ But these are the kinds of strategies that seem most promising.

43. These developments are discussed in David A. Skeel Jr., *The Unbearable Lightness of Christian Legal Scholarship*, 57 EMORY L.J. 1471 (2008).

44. Michael P. Vandenberg & Anne C. Steinemann, *The Carbon-Neutral Individual*, 82 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1673, 1677 (2007) (citing evidence that individuals are responsible for 32% of U.S. annual emissions).

45. *Id.* at 1739.

46. See, e.g., Andy Crouch, *Serving God and the Planet*, BOOKS & CULTURE, May/June 2007 (describing efforts of Matthew Sleeth, a doctor and author who "is now in great demand as a speaker to churches and colleges").

47. For an interesting argument that secular environmentalists should adopt sermon-like strategies to promote environmentalism, see Albert Lin, *Evangelizing Climate Change* (unpublished manuscript, on file with author). If this approach were aimed at evangelicals, one danger is that it might be perceived as using religious methods without the religion, and thus as further evidence that environmentalism is a substitute for religion.

Environmental Coverage in *Christianity Today*, 1967-2008

Year	Editorials	Articles	News Stories	Total
1967	0	0	0	0
1968	0	0	0	0
1969	0	0	0	0
1970	5	2	0	7
1971	2	1	0	3 ^a
1972	2	1	0	3 ^b
1973	2	1	0	3 ^c
1974	1	1	0	2
1975	1	1	0	2
1976	1	1	0	2
1977	0	0	0	0
1978	0	0	0	0
1979	0	0	1	1
1980	0	3	0	3
1981	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0 ^d
1983	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0
1985	0	1 ^e	0	1
1986	0	0	0	0
1987	0	1	0	0
1988	1	1	1	3
1989	0	0	1	2
1990	0	2	1	3
1991	0	2	2	4
1992	1	2	3	6 ^f
1993	0	3	3	6
1994	0	2 ^g	0	2
1995	1	0	0	1
1996	0	0	1	1
1997	0	0	0	0
1998	0	1	1	2
1999	0	1	0	1
2000	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0
2005	0	1	0	1
2006	0	0	2	2
2007	0	0	0	0
2008 ^h	0	1	0	1

^a Two book reviews dealing with environmental issues also were published in 1971.

^b Two book reviews dealing with environmental issues also were published in 1972.

^c Two additional articles focused on the energy crisis.

^d Two short book reviews dealing with environmental issues were published in 1982.

^e This article also included a postscript with references to the Bible.

^f A book review dealing with environmental issues also was published in 1992.

^g The environmental coverage in 1994 consisted of a cover story comprised of four separate articles discussing "myths" of the environmental movement, which are counted as two articles here.

^h Through November 2008.