A limited but popular reading of Lynn White Jr’s landmark article, “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis,” purports that Christianity is the most anthropocentric of religions and almost irredeemably responsible for the ecological crisis. But while White does argue that “Christianity made it possible to exploit nature,” he nevertheless encourages us to “ponder the greatest radical in Christian history since Christ: Saint Francis of Assisi” because Francis “tried to depose man from his monarchy over creation and set up a democracy of all God’s creatures.” White closed his article by suggesting Francis be named the patron saint of ecology. In 1979, Pope John Paul II declared St. Francis to be the patron saint for ecologists, later noting, “As a friend of the poor who was loved by God’s creatures, Saint Francis...gives us striking witness that when we are at peace with God we are better able to devote ourselves to building up that peace with all creation which is inseparable from peace among all peoples.”

Highlighting such developments, this article will demonstrate how, despite Christianity’s uneven environmental record, it is nevertheless possible to construct an integrated worldview critically sourced from Catholic Social Teaching (CST), ecotheologians, and Catholic green initiatives in order to offer positive responses to the challenges facing the Earth community due to anthropogenic climate change. Furthermore, it will explore how these efforts to address the ecological crisis have met with both support and resistance from the Catholic Church’s hierarchy.

The authors will employ a peace studies perspective to navigate this terrain since it provides a means to qualify and support the task of fostering right relationships among humans and the rest of creation. More specifically, a peace studies perspective, in striving to foster creative rather than destructive conflict, allows us to consider what elements will contribute to a truly sustainable peace that emancipates all humans and supports right relationships within the larger Earth community. Recalling Pope Paul VI’s assertion that “If You Want Peace, Work

3 In this article, “Catholic” will principally refer to the Roman Catholic tradition.
for Justice,” this perspective will help us craft a differentiated climate justice lens that will bring into focus multiple layers of inequity associated with climate change.

**A Peace Studies Perspective**

John Galtung, the Norwegian sociologist who founded the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in 1959, argued that defining peace as merely the absence of war (a negative peace) discounts the role of structural inequality as a marked form of violence in societies. According to his analysis, a positive peace enjoys “the absence of structural violence,” thereby permitting the realization of “social justice, which is a positively defined condition (egalitarian distribution of power and resources).”

Building on such foundations, peace studies examines and seeks to foster the conditions that are required for the attainment of a truly sustainable peace, inclusive of transforming inequalities that prevent people from reaching their potential. Thus, peace studies calls for not just the cessation of personal or direct violence (murder or war) but the redress of structural or indirect violence (unequal or oppressive applications of power and the distribution of resources in ways that are avoidable and that limit potentialities), thereby causing undue harm, suffering, or premature death to others. It holds that without social justice and the reform of existing oppressive structures, people will not realize their full potential and there can be no sustainable or authentic peace.

**A Climate Justice Lens**

It is now commonly recognized that human activities are causing shifts in the composition of Earth’s atmosphere. From a peace studies perspective, this human influence is also a space where social solidarity can effect positive change. The need for such solidarist change is highlighted by the concept of climate justice. Generally, ethical responses to climate change hold that it is necessary to: a) share benefits and burdens equitably; b) protect the right to integral development; c) ensure that decisions concerning climate change will be guided by transparency, accountability, and informed participation; and d) promote and protect gender equality and equity.

Below, each of these ethical responses to climate change will be considered from a peace studies perspective and further reviewed with reference to CST. A peace studies perspective, when joined with CST principles and pronouncements, can buttress these climate justice assertions while retaining the ability to note the sometimes uneven record in the case of CST.

**a) Share benefits and burdens equitably**

Peace studies recognizes that the persistence of social, economic, racial, political, gender, and ecological inequities establish the context for the emergence of unjust conditions and conflict between peoples. As climate change becomes more pronounced and difficult to adequately address, so too do these inequities. Moral principles of equity and distributive justice, when applied to anthropogenic climate change, serve to emphasize that those who have most benefited and continue to benefit from the production of greenhouse gases (GHGs), primarily in industrialized and post-industrialized nations, have done so at the expense of less economically developed nations.

---

and people from economically marginalized classes, who are now bearing a disproportionate share of the burdens of the climate change caused by those emissions. Both a peace studies perspective and a climate justice lens help reveal that the former are obligated to share the wealth that they have gained at the expense of the latter. Further, they lead us to conclude that this sharing should include the technology and information that can be used to mitigate and adapt to the harmful effects of climate change. They also help demonstrate how economically wealthy countries are obliged to radically reduce their production of GHGs and rectify the problems they have created. Thus, in ethical terms, those who have caused the problem are responsible for stopping their problematic behavior and repairing the harm that has been done. It follows that the benefits and burdens associated with climate change and its mitigation must be allocated in a more equitable and fair fashion. Such conclusions are supported by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that commits signatories to protect the planet for present and future inhabitants “on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the economically richer parties to the agreement should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof.” To deliberately continue the inequitable distribution of the wealth and burdens associated with the production of GHGs and to continue to ignore the suffering associated with this unequal and often oppressive use of power and distribution of resources perpetuates a form of structural violence that precludes a truly sustainable peace.

In his 1990 World Day for Peace Message, John Paul II asserted that “it must also be said that the proper ecological balance will not be found without directly addressing the structural forms of poverty that exist throughout the world.” Further, he argued that since “the earth is ultimately a common heritage, the fruits of which are for the benefit of all, […] it is manifestly unjust that a privileged few should continue to accumulate excess goods, squandering available resources,” while others suffer. Such “greed and selfishness—both individual and collective…” ignores our planetary “mutual interdependence.” He also derided the “political obstacles” and “economic interests” that “impede international cooperation and long-term effective action.” Noting the obligation of each nation-state to protect the atmosphere and biosphere, John Paul II declared that “the right to a safe environment is ever more insistently presented today as a right that must be included in an updated Charter of Human Rights.”

b) Protect the right to integral development

Peace studies scholar-practitioners argue that without the reform of oppressive structures that foster social, economic, political, racial, gender, and ecological injustice, individuals and societies cannot realize their full potential and lead dignified lives. The growing gap between economically rich and poor persons, both between nations and within nation-states, especially threatens the fundamental and inalienable rights of the most vulnerable “to life, liberty and personal security” as guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Climate change increasingly exacerbates this gap, serving to remind us that planetary problems require planetary-level solutions, including just and sustainable development that shares green technologies so that the least advantaged participate in meeting their basic needs while also mitigating and adapting to climate change. From both a peace studies and a
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Catholic moral perspective, efforts to solve the climate crisis may not come at the expense of already marginalized persons who are the least responsible for the problem.

Since the planet has a limited carrying capacity for atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), those who have utilized more than their fair share of that capacity to drive their industrial advancement and who otherwise support high levels of consumption may not now deny less economically well-off persons their fair share of that capacity. Climate justice requires that those who have taken more than their fair share reduce their production of greenhouse gases (GHGs) and compensate those who have been disadvantaged by such over-utilization. Accordingly, new “Greenhouse Development Rights” are being recognized, which are crafted “to overcome the malnutrition, high infant mortality, abbreviated education, and a disproportionate expenditure on food that characterize [the] impoverished state” of those burdened by climate change. Substantive peace is only possible if structural injustices are minimized, wide emancipation is achieved, and authentic human flourishing is realized. In this light, climate justice and sustainable development are essential elements for any enduring peace.

Roman Catholics have had a long tradition of supporting social justice to promote the flourishing of all peoples. For instance, Saint Basil the Great (329–379 CE) was an early advocate for the just distribution of resources so that all might flourish. More recently, Pope Leo XIII, in his notable encyclical Rerum Novarum, called for the fair distribution of wealth and the means for people to flourish. Following the Second Vatican Council, Pope Paul VI argued that the “progressive development of peoples is an object of deep interest and concern to the Church.”

Accordingly, CST argues that “each person must have access to the level of well-being necessary for his full development. The right to the common use of goods is the first principle of the whole ethical and social order and the characteristic principle of Christian social doctrine.” Only when all people have access to the resources they need to realize their full potential can a just society flourish. As such, the “progress of some [can] no longer be an obstacle to the development of others, nor a pretext for their enslavement.” Increasingly, CST has also affirmed that “true development cannot take place when the environment within which a person lives is abused.” Similarly, it emphasizes that integral development cannot be realized without concurrently striving for justice and peace.

c) Ensure that the decisions concerning climate change will be guided by transparency, accountability, and informed participation

Since those people who are most vulnerable to the effects of anthropogenic climate change have too often been excluded or marginalized from decisions concerning climate change, it is imperative that such decision-making processes not only include all stakeholders but ensure that all stakeholders have the information they require to

18 From a peace studies perspective, a lack of integral development is also a form of violence. See Galtung, 169.
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make free and informed decisions. To promote fairness and minimize corruption in the decision-making processes, especially for those with limited resources and power, the processes must be transparent and the decision-makers must be held accountable for their decisions in proportion to their power and resources. Values such as transparency, accountability, and informed consent are supported by an internationally affirmed human rights framework that already establishes minimum thresholds for equality, justice, and human dignity. A peace studies perspective serves to highlight how these guarantees of basic human rights can underpin efforts for climate justice and sustainable peace. Without such transparency and accountability, the legitimacy of authority and institutions is proportionately diminished and a key requirement for positive peace is not attained.

CST has repeatedly addressed the need for participation of the most vulnerable and marginalized people and nation-states. For instance, its statements on the principle of subsidiarity argue that decision-making should occur, to the extent possible, in an empowering and socially beneficial manner at the most local or “lowest” level of authority. The principle of subsidiarity can help to protect the more vulnerable from abusive or oppressive actions by those with farther reaching or higher-level authority, requiring the latter to aid the former in participating in solutions that promote their flourishing. The peaceful transformation of conflict is advanced when the principle of subsidiarity is followed since it gives voice and spheres for action to those who have suffered most due to the decisions of those with greater power, as is the case with climate change.

d) Promote and protect gender equality and equity

The adverse effects of climate change undoubtedly reduce freedoms and choices, and since women already have fewer freedoms and choices than men, climate change is having a greater impact on them. Furthermore, since women are statistically more likely to be poor and less mobile, to have less access to education, and to enjoy less political and economic power, they will be more vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. "The nature of that vulnerability varies widely, but climate change will magnify existing patterns of inequality, including gender inequality." Women’s first-hand experiences of the injustices of climate change inform their analysis of the problems and the solutions which they might offer when they participate in climate change institutions.

By advocating for the healing of inequities, a peace studies perspective adds its voice to the chorus demanding an end to gender inequality. While CST also denounces gender inequities, its record in this regard is often criticized since episcopal and papal statements about women's equality tend to locate proper roles for women relative to men. It does not proclaim a similar qualified equality for men, seemingly exposing an assumption that men are the measure of equality.

27 O’Hara and Abelsohn, 36-37.
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particular inequalities experienced by women, its position is more likely to reflect the concerns brought into view by a peace studies perspective and climate justice lens.\textsuperscript{34}

**Catholic Tensions with Ecological Perspectives**

While there is a demonstrable synergy between a peace studies perspective on climate justice and CST, there are also areas of tension, as noted above. This disconnect is also evident when one examines CST statements on humanity's relationship with the rest of creation. These tensions can become especially pointed when that relationship is considered in light of the pressing concerns of the ecological crisis as manifested in anthropogenic climate change. Using strongly anthropocentric language that may promote a context for Earth exploitation, John Paul II extolled “a specific dominion by man over the earth,” wherein humanity would “subdue the earth,” claiming “all the resources that the earth (and indirectly the visible world) contains and which, through the conscious activity of man, can be discovered and used for his ends.”\textsuperscript{35} CST somewhat tempers this position by asserting that “[a]ll of creation in fact has value and is ‘good’ in the sight of God, who is its author. Man must discover and respect its value.”\textsuperscript{36}

In addressing this issue, the International Theological Commission noted that “since man’s place as ruler is in fact a participation in the divine governance of creation, we speak of it…as a form of stewardship.”\textsuperscript{37} In the same document humans were deemed to be “at the summit of visible creation.”\textsuperscript{38} Subsequently, Pope Benedict XVI declared that humans “legitimately exercise a responsible stewardship over nature, in order to protect it.”\textsuperscript{39} Such stewardship presumes that Earth requires human supervision even though Earth flourished for billions of years prior to the very late emergence of humans in the epic of evolution; it also presumes that humans possess the wisdom required to be proper stewards of creation.\textsuperscript{40} And while the stewardship model calls for humans to protect Earth, one can argue that at this point in geological history the Earth community is actually in greater need of protection from humanity, given, for example, the effects of anthropogenic climate change on ecological systems.

More recently, Benedict seemed to adopt a somewhat less anthropocentric perspective. He asserted that there is an inherent wisdom in creation as established by God, and humans are called to act responsibly as stewards of Earth within the order of that wisdom.\textsuperscript{41} This approach seemingly echoes the recognition that humans have emerged from within and remain wholly dependent upon Earth's evolutionary processes and ecosystems.\textsuperscript{42} However, despite a growing appreciation for this more biocentric and ecocentric position among environmentalists and theologians, Benedict is resolutely opposed to those worldviews because “such notions end up abolishing the distinctiveness and superior role of human beings. They also open the way to a new pantheism tinged with neo-paganism, which would see the source of man’s salvation in nature alone, understood in purely naturalistic terms.”\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{34} See, for example, *Compendium*, no.145.
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Yet, within the Roman Catholic tradition, it is possible to identify other voices that are sympathetic to a more biocentric/ecocentric position without equating those positions with a loss of human dignity or the triumph of pantheism or neo-paganism. John Mizzoni recalls that “Francis of Assisi—famous as patron saint of ecology—recognised intrinsic value in all living things and believed that humans ought to respect those values; thus, he held a biocentric position.” Bonaventure respected the intrinsic value of every aspect of God’s good creation, appreciating that all entities in the natural world are part of an integrated relationship. Similarly, the inviolable nature of human dignity is at the heart of Franciscan views of personhood. Thus, structures or actions that do not enhance those relationships and do not respect human dignity will not foster peace and justice. Accordingly, biocentrism or eco-centrism, particularly as understood in the Franciscan tradition, can support a contemporary peace studies perspective on climate justice.

Praxis and Catholic Actions for Climate Justice

Both CST and peace studies value the translation of authentic principles into praxis. When it comes to climate justice, the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church is better known for its proclamation rather than its practical leadership. However, a praxis of climate justice has been incarnated by certain Catholic groups who have become witnesses to substantive peace and justice for our Earth community.

One example of such ground level Catholic action is the Franciscan Care for Creation (C4C) program that is run by the Franciscan Action Network. Inspired by the “green” spirituality of Saint Francis and Saint Clare of Assisi, who are increasingly recognized as co-founders of the Franciscan tradition, C4C seeks to educate for action by providing both information about ecological issues and ways that Christians can express their faith through living in proper relationship with God, other peoples, and the rest of the natural world. C4C programs model and encourage substantive changes in lifestyle as well as civic engagement with policy makers on issues like food security, climate change, pollution, and water quality.

Catholic nuns in particular have been very involved in ecojustice education and activism. These “Green Sisters” commit to lives of simple living in service to people living in poverty, the Earth, and God in the spirit of “engaged monasticism.” Along with Catholic lay people who share their concern for climate justice, Green Sisters are known for forming multiple alliances that often reach beyond those who hold Catholic identities to other Christian denominations, ecologically concerned people from other religious traditions, and secular environmental activists. Such ecumenical, inter-religious, and cross-cultural coalitions have helped to vitalize greener expressions of faith geared toward social and ecological flourishing in this time of Earth crisis. Sometimes such activism and broad coalitions seem inspired by CST, while in other cases, people like the Green Sisters appear to selectively
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48 For example, Nothwehr notes when faced with contemporary socio-ecological challenges that “there is much to learn from Clare’s simple, respectful, and courteous ways of relating to God and all of God’s creation.” From Dawn M. Nothwehr, *Ecological Footprints: An Essential Franciscan Guide for Faith and Sustainable Living* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 57.
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employ CST to calm fears concerning the Catholicity of their work for climate justice. They recognize the value of an intra-denominational conversation made significant by the 1.2 billion people who share their faith. However, they concurrently affirm the need to build broad coalitions of responsible discourse and action that also engage the other 6 billion people with whom they share a common ecological crisis, a common planet, and a common fate.

**An Integrated Catholic Response to Anthropogenic Climate Change**

Once climate justice is understood to include issues of inter-human equity and human-nature relationships, it becomes a topic for Catholic moral thought and responsible ethical action. Since the climate crisis is one part of a larger ecological crisis or Earth crisis, and since the same forms of structural violence that threaten any sustainable peace and justice for humans are also contributing to the anthropogenic causes of climate change and the larger ecological crisis, an integrated peace studies perspective strengthens calls to action based on climate justice arguments and CST.

The all-encompassing nature of the climate crises makes crafting an adequate response to the call for climate justice a daunting task. Indeed, from within an integral worldview, it represents a multifaceted moral challenge, as captured poignantly by the Franciscan theological ethicist, Dawn M. Nothwehr:

> It was through St. Francis’s actual encounter and embrace of a leper that he found his salvation and his true Christian identity. I believe that we are being called to make a similar embrace today. Just as through embracing the leper Francis learned the truth about that person, which enabled him to reverence the dignity of lepers and love them into life, we need to embrace the truth concerning our suffering planet Earth so that we can radically change our treatment of God’s creation. We must stop abusing the delicate atmosphere and all the complex earth systems that are damaged when we continue to pour greenhouse gases (GHGs) into them with impunity. Just as Francis’s entire life was changed by his embrace of the leper, so too must our lives be converted. Our conversion needs to be internal and spiritual, shifting our disposition and attitude, as well as external and moral, changing our behaviors and practices in daily life. We already know what needs to change. The question is, when will you and I make this embrace?[^52]

A peace studies perspective amplifies this challenge in accord with Catholic efforts to keep human dignity at the forefront when seeking to transform our human institutions. Here, Catholic reflections on responsible green action can contribute positively to a wider ecojustice approach that tries to keep social justice and ecological health closely coupled while working out solutions to complex problems.

The urgent need to effectively address the ecological crisis compels us to forge a planetary response to a planetary emergency. When previously unknown levels of environmental destruction result in unprecedented levels of human suffering, effective action is demanded. “We are more aware of this than ever, but we behave as if we were blind, deaf and insensible. [Our s]elfishness is no longer merely immoral, it is becoming suicidal.”[^53]

However, an integrated peace studies perspective would note that it is not just an act of suicide that we are committing as we use up the Earth’s resources and shift climatic patterns. It is also an act of homicide. When we know that that structural violence not only prevents peace but costs lives, and when we know that climate change is now iden-

tified as a significant cause of death—approximately 400,000 people a year—it follows that anthropogenic climate change is a socio-politically induced form of homicide. Those who live on the periphery of both global and local societies far too often bear a vastly disproportionate burden created by military-industrial models of consumption and their manifestations in climate and ecological crises. For example, of the estimated 400,000 people who die annually due to climate change related factors, 98 percent live in the least economically developed countries.

In this sense, the former Catholic Bishop, Dom Hélder Câmara, was correct to speak of poverty as a horrible form of violence akin to a bomb. It is understandable, therefore, that in continuing Câmara’s legacy of praxis-based work with people living in poverty from North Eastern Brazil, ecofeminist liberation theologian and Catholic nun, Ivone Gebara, actively connects the suffering of those living in poverty with the suffering of the Earth community. A peace studies perspective helps to reveal how the links among ecology, poverty, unjust power structures, and violence are all around us and are most burdensome for the most vulnerable. Yet the spiritual tradition of the Psalms that articulated the cries of poor and oppressed persons also confidently predicted their future relief, pointing to the insight that “social justice is interrelated with the well-being of Earth.” This vision of the future thus represents an ancient clarion of hope that can offer similar green hope to communities suffering in our time.

Despite such hope for integral justice, we are presently left with profound eco-social inequalities as market morality is considered normative. Environmental harms are distributed unequally in the present context, raising important ecojustice issues about the health and well-being of both people and the planet. A peace studies perspective helps us to realize that in addition to issues of biocide, suicide, and homicide, climate change is also connected to cultural genocide as members of societies whose cultures are intimately connected to specific bioregions are forced to migrate as their traditional lands are degraded or submerged below rising sea levels. For example, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commission notes that efforts to address racial violence and social and economic injustices are further complicated by ecological injustices and cultural genocide: “Dispossession and a loss of access to traditional lands, waters, and natural resources may be described as cultural genocide; a loss of our ancestral, spiritual, totemic and language connections to lands and associated areas.” Their report also details a disquieting list of “issues that Indigenous people in Australia will face…exacerbated by climatic changes.”

A peace studies perspective on structural violence further notes that the impacts of climate change are not isolated to racialized minorities like Indigenous peoples; they are also descriptive of the suffering already being perpetrated on ecosystems. Any integrated ethical response cannot merely focus on human problems in isolation but must also address underlying ecological issues as well because “we cannot have well people on a sick planet.” Since humans are profoundly connected to and dependent upon the ecosystems within which they reside, the health and recovery of people are not possible without the health and recovery of the Earth community.
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Similarly, a concern for fostering both social justice and ecosystem health must include other-than-human life forms. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change lends support to this moral vision of connectivity by demonstrating that “[t]here is new and stronger evidence of observed impacts of climate change on unique and vulnerable systems (such as polar and high mountain communities and ecosystems), with increasing levels of adverse impacts as temperatures increase further...Increasing vulnerability of indigenous communities in the Arctic and small island communities to warming is projected.”63

These negative effects on the larger life community and their intimate link to the plight of marginalized human communities are further reasons for both speaking of climate change as a moral crisis and employing an integrated peace studies perspective to discern layers of structural violence active in that crisis. Thus, in the spirit of Latin American liberation theologians who called for a preferential option for the poor in order to overcome social injustices (and thereby amplified the voice of CST), Canadian Catholic Bishops now speak of a preferential option for Earth made poorer by human abuse.64 This deeper insight, when coupled with an active hope, not only links climate and ecojustice with social, economic, and political justice but also could foster attitudes and practices that lead to a greener, more sustainable future.65 When brought into sharper focus by both a peace studies perspective and a climate justice lens, Catholic Social Teaching, informed by ecological Catholic moral thought and incarnated in responsible action, can positively contribute to interrelated efforts to build substantive peace and ensure that the world flourishes as home to a diverse community of life.
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