

Beyond Net Zero Evangelism: A Biblical View of Climate Change

Marc Grenier

Abstract

The present essay employs a biblical theological perspective and a strong empirical approach to assess and evaluate net zero policy debates on climate change. It begins by providing trenchant preliminary commentaries to provide a framework for discussion and exegeses. Some of the central background historical, scientific, and theological issues involved in those debates are then reviewed, comparing and contrasting the implicated worldviews of each position on climate change along the way. After arguing that theological discussions about climate change rarely if ever acknowledge a theomorphic component to climate, the essay concludes with sobering final thoughts. It seems that politicians, scholars, clergy, environmentalists, mass media pundits, and several other professional groups appear to be exploiting climate change panic and hysteria not just to tinker with the Earth's climate system but also to advance hidden political and ideological agendas to pressure for sweeping social, political, and economic changes to modern society.

Preliminary Remarks

It goes without saying that any discussion about CO2 emissions in contemporary times is intimately connected with general concerns about the causes and effects of climate change in general and global warming in particular. ¹

¹ According to the latest information from the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), *weather* refers to short-term natural

Understandably, these issues are thoroughly infused by ideology, philosophical assumptions, and religious beliefs, and politically charged by mass media and other modern institutions largely commandeered by various organized interest groups to advance their own viewpoints. What's more, each of these organized groups attains varying degrees of success within different nations, resulting in a great variety of views about the nature and causes of climate change both within and across countries.

These discussions are usually not characterized by independent, cold, hard dispassionate objective analysis and assessment of the pertinent scientific data about climate change. Most participants in those discussions hold strong

events that occur at a specific time in a specific geographic area such as wind velocity, precipitation, thunderstorms, lightning, fog, snow blizzards, typhoons, and the like. By contrast, **climate** describes the average weather in a particular geographic area over a much longer period of time and includes a host of variables such as average temperature in different seasons, rate of precipitation, sunshine, even risk of extreme weather. The traditional period of time used to determine the climate of a geographic area is 30 years. When the climate of a given area changes significantly during that time, the WMO describes this as **climate change**. More specifically, climate change refers to any systematic statistical change in any or all of the variables used to determine climate such as barometric pressure, wind, temperature, rain, and other climate variables over several decades or even much longer. Climate changes can be caused by '**natural external forcings**' such as changes in solar emissions or other *solar* variables of various kinds (sunspot activity, irradiance, magnetic cycles, etc.) or changes in the *Earth's orbit*, **OR** they can also be caused by '**natural internal processes**' of the *climate system* itself. Climate change can also be caused by **anthropogenic** or human-induced activities such as production of *chlorofluorocarbons* (CFCs) that comes from use of chemical compounds for refrigeration, solvents, and spray can propellants, and *carbon dioxide* (CO₂) emissions coming mainly from burning fossil fuels and deforestation as well as *nitrous oxide* emissions mainly resulting from farming practices and commercial production of organic fertilizer. There are many other variables that also affect climate changes such as volcanic eruptions, patterns of changing water temperature in the Pacific Ocean (El Nino and La Nina), and so forth. To make matters worse for understanding climate and climate change, any and all of these variables and factors can interact with each other making it a veritable gamble to make absolute causal statements (WMO, 2022).

personal views about climate change and what actions should be taken, if any, on the basis of second-hand information passed down to them through various social institutions such as government, education and especially mass media. These social institutions play a vital part in delineating the parameters of the discussion and defining what should be perceived as problematic issues by social members including many if not most professional scholars and theologians themselves.

Indeed, given the esoteric nature of atmospheric and climate science, it is probably not an exaggeration to say that many of the participants in climate change discussions at both the interpersonal and professional levels outside of the relevant sciences probably know very little if anything about the history and intricate details of the science of climate change itself beyond what has been fed to them through various mass media, and that includes clergy across communions and denominations as well as theologians in academia.

From a Christian point of view, then, let alone an authentic professional scholarly perspective, it makes little sense to proselytize or evangelize or even theologize on a topic one knows relatively little or nothing about, scientifically speaking, and that includes speakers at major theological conferences. That would be like, for example, a physician walking into an operating room of a hospital to operate on a patient's heart without knowing what are the various parts and functions of the heart itself and how the heart functions in relationship to other organs in the human body. Would you want that doctor operating on your mother? Would you trust that doctor's opinion about the best course of action to take? Probably not. Analogously, discussions about climate change tend to take place in this sort of way, relying instead mostly on unquestioned popular, cultural, and political misconceptions, and that is where the actual science of climate change tends to be misrepresented (Koonin, 2021, p. 167).

All this having been said, of course, here it makes little sense to provide a thorough detailed history of the climate change debates and controversies in the scientific literature which, arguably, should be a minimal prerequisite for participation in international discussions of any kind relating to climate change. For the most part, the restricted parameters of this essay don't leave room for much more than just descriptive overviews, brief summaries, and exploratory analyses and exegeses.²

Therefore, several hotly debated controversial issues in historical and contemporary climate science highly relevant to theological exegeses must be sharply attenuated or glossed over entirely. It is unfortunate that many of the claims made by media pundits, politicians, ideologues, and other professional and scholarly voices about the 'facts' on climate change simply lack strict scientific credibility. Many of these 'facts' have not been settled by consistent, credible, and unquestioned scientific evidence. Therefore, they remain scientifically unsubstantiated.

In fact, many of the core questions about these long-cherished 'facts' have either been **falsified** by scientific evidence (Koonin, 2021; Marohasy, 2020; Wrightstone, 2021; Sangster, 2018; Koonin, 2021; Spencer, 2012; Alexander, 2012) or revealed as **fraudulent** (Menton, 2021; Steyn, 2015; Corsi, 2022; Montford, 2012; Bastardi, 2018; Ball, 2014). For anyone who has actually engaged the empirical research on climate change

² Readers are welcomed to peruse the extensive bibliography at the end of this essay for a wide overview of some of most cited and popular literature on climate change from a variety of lay, professional, scientific, and theological corners, both pro and con, some of which are up-to-date summaries of the scientific facts on climate change. Many of these citations are written by extremely reputable professionals inside and outside the field of climate science with impeccable academic credentials (MIT, Harvard, and so forth), some of these written by top-rated climate scientists in the world.

to make an objective determination of causes and effects, the conclusions are by no means clear and settled.

It is evident that questions about the way the climate responds to anthropogenic influence broadly speaking have not been answered definitely with scientific certainty, nor what those impacts will be in the future. Although experts generally agree that the Earth is warming up, a process known as ***global warming***,³ just exactly how much of this warming is scientifically proven to be attributable to anthropomorphic activity is unsettled, to say the least.

Introduction

In the words of the World Meteorological Association at the U.N. in reference to global warming:

“How much of this (global warming) has been directly attributed to or caused by human activity – the effects of which are extremely difficult to assess – is not clear”. (WMO, 2022)

³ There is no real controversy surrounding the meaning of the term, ‘***global warming***’. It is commonly scientifically defined as the long-term heating of the surface of the planet usually assumed to be due to the Industrial Revolution, but accurate recordkeeping of temperature could only begin in 1880. So, typically, the argument is that from 1880 to 1980, surface temperatures of the Earth have increased significantly, and the last few recent decades have been the hottest of all previous periods. But this argument gets very problematic when we take a closer look at the statistical used to support the claims of global warming. It is highly significant that in hundreds of independent simulations and several independent audits the 29 different statistical models that are still being used by the U.N.’s IPCC assessment reports to measure and predict ‘global warming’, much less any of the other climate variables, perform extremely badly in estimating the rate of warming during the early 20th century and even function more poorly since 1950. In fact, these composite statistical models performed and still perform so badly that they are variously described as deeply flawed (Koonin, 2021), fraudulent (Corsi, 2022), invalid (Sangster, 2018), false (Alexander, 2012), phony (Bastardi, 2020), corrupt (Bell, 2011), myth (Bunker, 2018), illusion (Pryor, 2020), invalid (Seeley, 2022), useless (Wrightstone, 2017), among many other pejorative descriptions.

Just to add more confusion to the mix, nagging inconsistencies in historical climate data don't exactly inspire full scientific confidence. Two brief examples will suffice to illustrate this point. High CO₂ levels have not always been consistently related to global warming. It's well-known that several past 'ice ages' of the Earth have been characterized by CO₂ levels five times higher or more than current levels. As another example, it's difficult to view *Greenhouse* gas emissions as the primary cause of increasing global temperatures when these temperatures decreased from 1940 to 1970 when those emissions were undeniably very high during that period.⁴

⁴ The primary energy source for the Earth's climate system is the sun, of course. Some of that sunshine is deflected back into outer space by ice and clouds, for example, while the earth's surface and atmosphere absorb the rest a lot of which gets re-emitted as heat. In turn, the atmosphere re-radiates heat which partly escapes into outer space. This balance of incoming and outgoing solar energy will continue unless an event occurs to disturb it such as changes in the intensity of solar energy. We can see that Earth's average surface temperature would be many degrees colder if all of its surface heat passed through the atmosphere into outer space. Earth's atmosphere contains gases that ensure this is unlikely to take place. These atmospheric gases, such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide function to make the surface much warmer by absorbing and re-emitting heat energy in every direction including downwards into the Earth itself. Life on Earth as we know it could not have existed without this built-in 'Greenhouse effect' to our planet. This is precisely where '**Greenhouse**' story begins. In 1827, French scientists Jean-Baptiste Fourier noticed a similarity between what happens under the glass of a greenhouse for plants and the absorption of heat in the atmosphere. In other words, the '**Greenhouse effect**' refers to the process by which Earth's atmosphere absorbs and retains some of the solar radiation it receives to heat the planet. The first person to use the term in this sense was Swedish meteorologist Nils Gustaf Ekholm in 1901 (see bibliography). However, this term itself only operates as a very weak metaphor at the surface level. Yes, both a greenhouse for plants and the Earth's atmosphere permit solar energy to go through. That's where the analogy ends because the mechanisms are very different. A greenhouse maintains its warm air inside by preventing that heated air from escaping to the outside. In other words, a greenhouse for plants works by stopping convection from taking place. That's not what happens in the Earth's atmosphere. By contrast, the Earth's atmosphere maintains heat by preventing only some wavelengths of the sun's infra-red radiation from escaping. But actually, that atmosphere is made up of many layers of air, each one of which absorbs infra-red radiation from the layer below it and then re-emitting it upwards and downwards. Now, this means

Further, since the tremendously complicated statistical models that are currently being used to understand and predict climate have been scientifically proven to be deeply and irremediably flawed (McLean, 2018; Koonin, 2021; Seeley, 2021), then the continued use of such models by the U.N. and governments around the world to justify massive expenditures on political programs, runaway government regulations and taxes, and bullish economic intervention immediately becomes suspect as political agenda, not science.

As well, the “impact of human influences on the climate...is too uncertain (and very likely too small)” (Koonin, 2021, pp. 253-4) to justify the uncertain benefits of these massive expenditures on projects and programs to play God with the atmosphere through Star Wars-type geoengineering, let alone the expected downsides of doing so for the world’s poor, something all God-fearing Christians should be concerned about.

In this climate (no pun intended) of fully admitted and recognized scientific uncertainty about how the various features of the Earth’s climate system function and interact with each other as well as with variables outside of the climate system itself, and what the causal effects are from each variable, it is surely risky business from a scholarly point of view to make firm pronouncements about what should or should not be done in terms of political actions, policies, and programs.

What’s more, it becomes questionable and suspect at best to employ theological reflection in the service of supporting perceived ‘solutions’ like net zero, geoengineering, or the like under such scientifically unsound conditions. To support

that how much heat the Earth loses is mainly a function of the highest layer of air because that’s where the infrared radiation finally escapes into outer space. Not really like a greenhouse, strictly speaking (Royal Society, 2020).

'solutions' to a perceived problem the nature and causes of which is undetermined, unsettled, and "unclear" by scientific standards would be to use evangelism for the worst of all possible reasons. Hence, perhaps it would be wiser, safer, and much more prudent to move theological reflection and discourse on climate change beyond net zero evangelism into authentic biblical exegesis.

With these preliminary commentaries and introductory ideas in mind, the present essay will attempt to focus attention on providing some essential elements of what would constitute such an authentic biblical perspective on climate change, and along the way try to assess the net zero policy debate from within this theological context. Before outlining some of those core features, a brief review of net zero is in order.

The Net Zero Debate

Put simply, 'net zero' (a.k.a. carbon neutrality) means not adding more carbon into the atmosphere than what is removed from it in order to achieve a balance. Generally, the aim is to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere, particularly carbon dioxide (CO₂), to as close to zero as possible. Scientifically speaking, balancing the emissions of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere with the removal of the same amount of carbon dioxide is achieved mainly in two ways. First, through various means such as carbon offsetting (reducing or avoiding greenhouse gas emissions in one place to make up for producing emissions elsewhere) OR by completely eliminating carbon emissions from modern society.

Net Zero and related environmental policies and debates emerged as world leaders became increasingly aware of serious climate changes taking place on the planet whose negative impact constituted a perceived global emergency resonating beyond national boundaries. Consequently, these world leaders assembled at the U.N. Climate Change

Conference in Paris on December 12, 2015 to reach a historic achievement, The Paris Agreement. This agreement set long-term goals as a guide for all nations to follow: decrease global greenhouse emissions to achieve a global temperature of no more than 2 degrees Celsius, preferably 1.5; five-year progress reviews of all nations' commitments; provide financial assistance to developing nations to offset climate change effects.

All of these actions and policies were taken in response to a number of scientific studies which argued that the severest effects of climate change could be avoided in order to sustain human life on Earth only if surface temperatures of the Earth were limited to 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial temperature levels. At the time around the Paris Agreement, some studies had shown that the Earth was already 1.1 degrees warmer than the late 19th century, with Greenhouse gas emissions continuing to rise. The Paris Agreement suggested that in order to actually achieve no more than a 1.5 degrees Celsius global temperature, a 45% reduction of Greenhouse emissions had to be achieved by 2030 and a genuine 'net zero' achieved by 2050.

However, beyond the fact of the invalid composite statistical models that are used to calculate global surface temperatures (Koonin, 2021; McLean, 2018; Bell, 2011), there are still many other fundamental issues yet to be scientifically resolved about the nature, functioning, effects, and causes of Earth's climate system. To talk about 'solutions' in the context of such unsettled questions is literally a contradiction in terms. No one should be stigmatized as a 'denier' or 'heretic' or other pejorative epithets for holding a position on climate change that many top climatologists, Ivy-league-trained scholars, and eminent professional scientists themselves hold.

No matter how distasteful or upsetting this fact may be to evangelistic environmentalists and frenetic liberal-leaning ideologues and pundits, it makes a fool's game out of any

profound or idealistic policy decisions on climate change that may in the end destabilize current societal systems to the detriment of all social groups, not to mention unravel the climate system itself! As many eminent scientists have made clear, there are a veritable panoply of factors (social, political, cultural, scientific, technical, economic...) that confound and complicate even a simplistic human understanding of the Earth's climate system, let alone the climate change that takes place within it.

The combination of these complicating factors makes it a chimera to think that climate can be understood with 100% scientific certainty quickly enough to be addressed in accord with the Paris Agreement standards. In other words, it is extremely unlikely if not implausible that member nations can in principle fulfill U.N. requirements for gas emissions (Koonin, 2021, p. 209).

In fact, that is exactly what has occurred, with the first and fourth largest Greenhouse emitters, China and India, on track to have higher emissions in 2030 than they have at present, and the fifth highest emitter, Russia, not even bothering to pledge emission reductions at all (Leahy, 2019). And even though the U.S. pulled out of the Paris Agreement, CO2 emissions have actually dropped significantly compared to most countries remaining within the Agreement (Kusnetz, 2020).

A Biblical Perspective

After careful consideration of so many absolutely essential preliminary issues in order to provide a proper background and comparative context for the present essay, we are now prepared to address what a biblical perspective of climate and climate change might look like. First, we need to re-familiarize ourselves with its essential components cum perspective. Although there are many different religious orders and hundreds of thousands more different Christian

denominations, it's safe to say that they probably do share some common core features (DeLockery, 2021; Mulvihill, 2019; Graham, 2018; Smith, 2015; Ryken, 2006).

It goes without saying that everyone practices or applies some kind of worldview in their everyday lives to help them make sense of the world around them. That is, people employ a set or system of basic beliefs, values, and assumptions about the nature of the world and the role of humanity in it. It is the lens through which individuals and groups perceive, interpret, and interact with the world and other human beings.

As can be appreciated, there are many different worldviews – secular, scientific, postmodern, and so forth. But a specifically Biblical (or Christian) worldview is unique among them in most of its central elements. An absolutely indispensable condition of partaking in this worldview authentically is looking at the world primarily through the eyes of those people who were divinely inspired to put together both the Old and New Testaments in the Bible, not through secular, postmodern, or scholarly eyes.

First and foremost, people with a Biblical worldview look at the world and process all information about it through the filter of God's Word as reflected in the Holy Bible (Pearcey, 2008; Smith, 2015; Schaeffer, 2001). In that Bible, the essential core principles of what that worship might look like are laid out. Christians are compelled to honor and worship one Creator God the Father who created humanity, the cosmos, and the Earth and everything in it. (Gen 1, 2; Col 1:15-16; John 1:3; Isaiah 45:18). God created Earth specifically for humankind and has promised to hold it together for that purpose (Gen 8: 22).

In the meantime, human beings are called to do two things: (a) to be good stewards or caretakers of God's creation (Gen 1: 27-9; 2: 15; 9: 1-7); and (b) to love, obey, and worship the one Creator God the Father with all our mind, body, and soul (Dt 6:

4-5; Mark 12: 29-31), specified by Jesus as “the greatest commandment in the Law” (Matt 22: 36-37). We are not to worship something else like, for example: the Greek primordial divinity Gaia, or ‘Mother Earth’; or a fervent belief in naturalism that claims nothing exists beyond the natural world; or a diehard evolutionism that explains everything in terms of the universal presence of evolution (Darwinian or not). All of these extra-Biblical belief systems contain worldviews which tend to downplay if not entirely deny the significance of spiritual or supernatural explanations for events and objects by relying almost exclusively on scientific laws and human reason, especially in modern times.

That is one of the main reasons why discussions about climate change tend to be characterized by heated controversy and debate; the different participants are often times coming from worldviews which are antagonistic to each other. In other words, discussions about climate change are at least in part deeply-rooted worldview conflicts. This notion of worldview conflict needs to be kept in mind as we pursue how climate change fits into a biblical worldview of climate.

A Biblical View of the Climate

So, then, in a Biblical perspective Scripture or the Holy Bible taken as a whole provides the primary foundation of and framework within which to think about climate and climate change, not mainly scholarly nor cultural theories, documents, or perspectives. Overall, the argument is that the Creator God the Father personally designed the Earth and its environment to be stable, broadly speaking. This means that within the Biblical perspective, the climate of the Earth was not designed to be chaotic or subject to extreme fluctuations that would threaten the continued survival of humanity and all other living things (Holdridge, 2019; Coverley, 2019, 2017).

That doesn’t mean that climate changes don’t fit into a biblical perspective. There might be seasonal, solar, or other natural

cycles or episodes that cause temperatures to fluctuate suddenly over extended periods of time such as what happened during the Roman Warm Period (RWP) of AD 1 - 400 or the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) of AD 950-1250 or the Little Ice Age (LIA) of AD 1300-1870, but nothing life-threatening (Mararitelli et al, 2020; Buntgen et al, 2016; McCormick et al, 2012; Wang et al., 2013; Fagan, 2000; Hughes and Diaz, 1994; Bell, 200. Pp. 49-79).

There are at least 47 Biblical verses which proclaim the Creator God's sovereignty over the weather (Job 28:25-7; Matt 8: 26-7; Mark 4: 39-41; Luke 8: 24-5; Psalm 135:7/147:8/148.8; Jeremiah 10: 13; Prov 3: 19-20; Lev 26: 4; Dt 11: 10-15/28: 12/33: 13-14; Gen 8: 22/ 9: 14-16; Acts 14: 17; Ex 14: 21; and many more). This omnipotent sovereignty is also suggested in many other places in Scripture where God ordained weather judgments (Job 37: 13) or blessings upon people. Punishment occurred when Hebrew idolatry invited God's wrath in terms of crop failures (Lev 26; Dt 28) or seven years each of both famine and abundance in the case of Joseph in ancient Egypt (Gen 41).

From the New Testament, Jesus made clear just exactly who was in control of the weather many times such as when He stilled the waters and calmed the storm while crossing Lake Galilee (Mark 4: 35-41; Matt 8: 23-27; Luke 8: 22-25).

Simply A Matter of Science?

Clearly then, the Biblical view of climate and climate change is not simply a matter of science or following scientific laws or protecting 'Mother Earth' or identifying evolutionary cycles of the planet or imposing by force totalitarian regulations upon all members of society in the name of climate hysteria. From a strictly Biblical point of view, then, there is a sovereign overruling theomorphic component to climate and climate change that is rarely acknowledged and addressed in

contemporary discussions even by self-professed God-fearing Christians themselves!

When this happens, that is, when the Creator God the Father is either taken out of the climate change debate or exploited to advance political interests, discussions about climate fall prey to extra-Biblical worldviews and get pushed or driven by emotional alarmism, humanistic philosophies, and secular scholarly theoretical perspectives largely at odds with a Biblical worldview based on creation doctrine.

Consequently, the people participating in such discussions start to develop a kind of modern quasi-Babel mentality (Gen 11) constituted by intentional disobedience of Biblical principles and values, a proud defiance against the will of God, and inappropriate unbridled ambition to be like God (Oster, 2004; Harland, 1998; Gowan, 1988). In other words, they start to think they are free to tinker with and control the climate, and force everyone else to accept this way of looking at and solving their view of the climate change ‘problem’ (Oster, 2004; Harland, 1998; Gowan, 1988).

By the same token, anthropogenic contributions to ecological problems need to be addressed directly, if sound scientific studies show that to be the case definitively as it was done in the past with modifying car exhaust systems to minimize air pollution, instituting regulations to prevent careless handling of nuclear waste, and building new disposal sites to reduce illegal dumping of toxic waste materials at unauthorized sites or in unauthorized ways.

Evidently, many past ecological problems have been remedied when people cared and Christians upheld their Biblical mandate to be vigilant in their care for the environment. Surely, then, it cannot be sensibly and convincingly argued that Christians didn’t in the past and don’t at present care about the health of the environment.

Like many Christians who take their Biblically-ordained stewardship of the planet very seriously both in theory and action, many non-Christians also have legitimate concerns about the natural environment. However, many other people have hidden political agendas behind their ‘save the planet’ alarmism (Newman, 2021). Several studies have shown that many environmental organizations and their leaders are very open about using climate hysteria to support radical changes in the social, political, and economic organization of modern society, even including U.N. IPCC officials (Newman, 2021; Bell, 2011; Batten, 2022; Isles, 2019; Spencer, 2012).⁵

Given the proven use of climate alarmism to push radical political agendas, perhaps it is understandable why many people find it prudent not to participate in activist environmental organizational activities. Under such circumstances, arguably the wisest spiritual course of action for authentic Biblical Christians to take is to rely on the Holy Bible for guidance. Although often for very different reasons, many leading climate scientists have also recently come to question the climate hysteria of modern times.

⁵ For example, in 2010 the German economist and IPCC official, Ottmar Edenhofer, was quoted as stating during an interview in The New Zurich Times: “But one must say clearly that ***we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy***. Obviously, the owners of oil and coal will not be too enthusiastic about this. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole” (Quoted IN New Zurich Times, November 14, 2010). Stuart Basden, an activist leader and founder of an extremely radical environmentalist organization with stated aims of systematic change, Extinction Rebellion, was quoted in 2019 as saying: “And I’m here to say that XR ***isn’t about the climate***. You see, the climate’s breakdown is a symptom of a toxic system that has infected the ways we relate to each other as humans and to all life” (Quoted in medium.com, January 10, 2019). Many more examples such as these can be proffered to illustrate that hidden political agendas are an integral part of extra-Biblical discussions about the climate and climate change in contemporary environmental organizations and other institutions professing environmental concerns (Lomborg, 2021; Shellenberger, 2020; Koonin, 2021; Bunker, 2018; Wrightstone, 2017; Batten, 2022).

Scientific Disagreement

Strictly on scientific grounds, many preeminent climate scientists have come to question both climate hysteria and the alleged scientific consensus on climate change. Montford (2012) showed fraud and bias in the original Cook (2013) paper first to make such 'consensus' claims. This paper analyzed the abstracts (not the entire texts) of almost 12,000 papers published in scientific journals in the 20-year-period 1991-2011 looking for how many of them expressed agreement with the human-induced global warming view. The result was that 97% of those papers containing an opinion agreed with this view. A host of activist environmentalist groups (for example, Organizing for Action, Skeptical Science, and so forth) were quick to jump on the bandwagon.

However, later it became known that some of the Cook paper authors were themselves members of activist environmental groups including groups with state charters to promote public conformity with the humans-cause-global warming view. Further, when follow-up studies carefully examined the raw data of the Cook paper, it was surprisingly discovered that only a total of between 41 and 64 scientific papers could reasonably be categorized as supporting the anthropogenic global warming position (Legates et al, 2015). When Matkin (2016) examined papers published in peer-reviewed scientific journals, more than 500 of them expressed serious doubt about the alleged scientific 'consensus' on human-caused climate change.

Climate scientists vehemently disagreeing with the U.N.'s climate-emergency perspective expressed in all of its IPCC Assessment Reports go a lot further. In September 2019, more than 500 top climate scientists and other experts went on record in a registered letter to declare there is no do-or-die climate emergency. They pleaded with the U.N. to help them organize meetings and discussions with prominent scientists on both sides of the climate change controversy (Crok, 2019).

At the very least, it is clear that the varying positions on the central causes of climate change in general and global warming in particular even within the top ranks of climate science itself indicate that extreme caution needs to be exerted before people start advocating activist political actions and public policies.

Some Sobering Final Thoughts

“Be of sober spirit, be on the alert. Your adversary, the devil, prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour”. (1 Peter 5: 8)

All people should be concerned and act responsibly towards the environment, to be sure. As Bible-ordained stewards, Christians arguably hold a special responsibility to do so. The Christian aim should be to apply Biblical values and principles to assess and evaluate environmental claims and decision-making processes in a sound, objective, and sober-minded manner based on Biblical guidance, taking nothing for granted at face value.

In the heated emotions of contemporary discussions, debates, and controversies about climate and climate change, it is easy to lose Biblical perspective and fall prey to false prophets and false teachers who secretly introduce destructive heresies and exploit sensuality with false words (2 Peter: 1-3) which operate to undermine the Bible by making it irrelevant or inapplicable to modern times. The rampant politicization and corruption of a great deal of climate science noted above and in footnotes should put all God-fearing Christians ‘on the alert’ in the manner suggested by St. Peter in the above Biblical quote.

It has been demonstrated here and backed by a plethora of reputable references and sources that many politicians at all levels, professionals, scholars, environmentalists, activists of every ilk, and even scientists themselves have not been shy about using climate and environmental hysteria (scaring

people techniques) as part of a hidden political agenda to pressure for sweeping social, political, and economic changes to modern society. While certainly caring for the environment in real, concrete behaviors in a Bible-centered way, Christians need to be aware of the presence of this kind of radical climate activism to advance political interests.

So, then, as Christians cum Christians, perhaps our first task as good Bible-ordained caretakers of all creation should be to avoid falling prey to any environmental hysteria in order to maintain our perspectival Bible-centeredness. Beyond this central issue, Christians should maintain a broader focus on all aspects of God's creation, not only climate change whether real or perceived.

There are many other environmental factors that may need to be addressed that also demand time, energy, and resources such as lead pollution in lakes and ponds, sea pollution, deforestation, air pollution by jets, and so forth. Inordinate hysterical focus on climate change pulls resources away from other environmental concerns, not to mention dire social concerns such as poverty.

Sources

- Alexander, R.B. 2012. *Global Warming False Alarm: The Bad Science Behind the United Nation's Assertion that Man-made CO2 Causes Global Warming*. Second Edition.
- Boone, NC: Canterbury House Publishing, Ltd. Antal, J. 2018. *Climate Change, Climate World: How People of Faith Must Work for Change*. Washington, D.C.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ball, J. 2010. *Global Warming and the Risen Lord: Christian Discipleship and Climate Change*. Pennsylvania: Evangelical Environmental Network.
- Ball, T. 2016. *Human-Caused Global Warming: The Biggest Deception in Human History*. Victoria, BC: Tell Well Talent Pub.
- Ball, T. 2014. *The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science*. Apache Junction, AZ: Stairway Press.
- Bastardi, J. 2018. *The Climate Chronicles: Inconvenient Revelations You Won't Hear from Al Gore – And Others*. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace IPP.
- Bastardi, J. et al. 2020. *The Weaponization of Weather in the Phony Climate War*. Columbus, OH: Gatekeeper Press.

- Batten, D. 2022. "Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) – A Biblical and Scientific Approach to Climate Change. Updated". IN Creation Ministries, August 17.
- Bell, L. 2011. *Climate of Corruption: Politics and Power Behind the Global Warming Hoax*. Austin, TX: Greenleaf Book Group Publishing.
- Berry, E. 2020. *Climate Miracle: There Is No Climate Crisis, Nature Controls Climate*. Independent Pub.
- Bradford, D.T. 2020. *Spiritual Life on a Burning Planet: A Christian Response to Climate Change*. Eugene, OR : Wipf & Stock.
- Bunker, B. 2018. *The Mythology of Global Warming: Climate Change Fiction Vs. Scientific Facts*. Abbeville, SC: Moonshine Cove Publishing.
- Buntgen, U. et al. 2016. "Cooling and societal change during the Late Antique Little Ice Age from 536 to around 660 A.D.". IN *Nature Geoscience* 9: 231-36.
- Conradie, E.M and H.P. Koster. eds. 2022. *Christian Theology and Climate Change*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Cook, J. et al. 2013. "Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature". IN *Environmental Research Letters* 8 (2): 1-8.
- Corsi, J.E. 2022. *The Truth About Energy, Global Warming, and Climate Change: Exposing Climate Lies in an Age of Disinformation*. Nashville: Post Hill Press.
- Coverley, D.M. 2019. *The Bible Explains the "Climate Change Controversy"*. Seattle, WA: Kindle Direct Publishing.
- Coverley, D.M. 2017. *Global Warming or God's Warning*. Bloomington, IN: West Bow Press. Crockford, S.J.
- Coverley, D.M. 2016. *Polar Bears Facts and Myths: A Science Survey for All Ages*. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace IPP.
- Crok, M. 2019. "Prominent scientists warn UN Secretary-General Guterres". IN *Climate Intelligence Foundation News*, September 23.
- Delgado, S. 2017. *Love in a Time of Climate Change: Honoring Creation, Establishing Justice*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- DeLockery, M. 2021. *The Essence of the Christian Worldview*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Ekholm, N.G. 1901. "On the Variations of the Climate of the Geological and Historical Past and their Causes". IN *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 27 (117):19.
- Evans, D. 2010. *Is the Western Climate Establishment Corrupt?* IN *Lavoisier.com*, October 30, pp. 1-45.
- Fagan, B. 2000. *The Little Ice Age*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fensin, A. 2015a. *Liars and Deniers: Climate Change Truth That Anyone Can Understand*. Burlington, NJ: Burlington National, Inc.
- Fensin, A. 2015b. *13 Facts That Prove Humans Don't Cause Global Warming*. Burlington, NJ: Burlington National, Inc.
- Gore, A. 2007. *An Inconvenient Truth: The Crisis of Global Warming*. New York: Viking Books.

- Gowan, D. 1988. *Genesis 1-11: From Eden to Babel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Graham, F. 2018. "A Biblical worldview and today's culture". IN *Decision Magazine*, March 18.
- Gray, V. 2014. *The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of Climate Change 2001*. Essex, UK: Multi-Science Publishing Co.
- Harland, P.J. 1998. "Vertical or Horizontal: The Sin of Babel". IN *Vetus-Testamentum XLVIII* (4): 515-26.
- Hayhoe, K. 2022. *Saving Us: A Climate Scientist's Case for Hope and Healing in a Divided World*. New York: Atria/One Signal Publishers.
- Hescox, E.P. and P. Douglas. 2016. *Caring for Creation: The Evangelical's Guide to Climate Change and a Healthy Environment*. Bloomington: Bethany House Publishers.
- Holdridge, D.W. 2019. *Climate Change and the Bible*. Meadville, PA: Christian Faith Publishing, Inc.
- Hughes, M. and H.F. Diaz. 1994. "Was there a 'medieval warm period', and if so, where and when?" IN *Climatic Change* 26 (2-3): 109-42.
- Idso, C. 2016. "Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming: The NIPCCC Report on Scientific Consensus". Arlington Heights, IL: Heartland Institute.
- Isles, M. 2019. "Climate Change Part I – The Truth of it". Australian Christian Lobby, November 1.
- Koonin, S.E. 2021. *Unsettled: What Climate Science Tells Us, What It Doesn't, and Why It Matters*. Dallas, TX: Ben Bella Books.
- Kusnetz, N. 2020. "U.S. Emissions Dropped in 2019: Here's Why in 6 Charts". IN *Inside Climate News*, January 7.
- Leahy, S. 2019. "Most countries aren't hitting 2030 climate goals, and everyone will pay the price". IN *National Geographic*, November 6.
- Legates, D.R. et al. 2015. "Climate consensus and 'misinformation' ". IN *Science & Education* 24: 299-318.
- Lomborg, B. 2021. *False Alarm: How Climate Change Panic Costs Us Trillions, Hurts the Poor, and Fails to Fix the Planet*. Updated edition. New York: Basic Books.
- Mann, M. 2012. *The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Mararitelli, G. et al. 2020. "Persistent warm Mediterranean surface waters during the Roman Period". IN *Nature Research Scientific Reports* 10 (June): 10431.
- Marohasy, J. ed. 2020. *Climate Change: The Facts 2020*. Melbourne: Institute of Public Affairs.
- Matkin, J.G. 2016. "Consensus crumbles – global warming is mostly natural – climate is too chaotic to model". IN jamesmatkin.com at academia.edu.
- McCormick, M. et al. "Climate Change during and after the Roman Empire". IN *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 43 (2): 169-220.
- McLean, J. 2018. *An Audit of the Creation and Content of the HadCRUT4 Temperature Dataset*. Waterford, UK: Robert Boyle Publishing

- McGee, S. 2021. *Climate Change: Reasons to Worry Less*. Independent Pub.
- Menton, F. 2019. "Michael Mann 'Hockey Stick' Update: Now Definitely Established to be Fraud". IN *Manhattan Contrarian*, August 26.
- Miller, R.W. ed. 2010. *God, Creation, and Climate Change: A Catholic Response to the Environmental Crisis*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Montford, A.W. 2012. *Hiding the Decline: A History of the Climategate Affair*. Las Vegas, NV: CreateSpace.
- Moore, P. 2021. *Fake Invisible Catastrophes and Threats of Doom: You Will Perish in Flames*. B.C., Canada: Eco Sense Environmental Inc.
- Morano, M. 2018. *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.
- Morano, M. 2010. *Climate Depot Special Report Presented to U.S. Senate: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims Scientists Continue to Debunk Fading "Consensus" in 2008 & 2009 & 2010*. Arlington Heights, IL: Heartland Institute.
- Mosher, S. and T.W. Fuller. 2010. *Climategate: The Crutape Letters*. San Francisco: CreateSpace.
- Mulvihill, J. 2019. *Biblical Worldview*. Vinton, VA: Renewanation.
- Nest, M. et al. 2020. "Corruption and Climate Finance: Implications for Climate Change Interventions". IN U4 Anti-Corruption Research Center, Brief, pp. 1-19.
- Newman, L. 2021. *The Climate Change Hoax: Pathway to Socialism*. Gold Canyon, AZ: Silver Millennium Publications.
- Northcott, M.S. 2013. *A Political Theology of Climate Change*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Oster, G. 2004. "Downstream from Babel: Lessons in Obedience for Contemporary Leaders". IN *Inner Resources for Leaders*, pp. 1-11
- Pearcey, N. 2008. *Total Truth*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.
- Plimer, I. 2009. *Heaven and Earth: Global Warming, the Missing Science*. Lanham, MD: Taylor Trade Publishing.
- Poole, K. 2020. *Christianity in a Time of Climate Change*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Pope Francis. 2015. *Encyclical on Climate Change and Inequality: On Care for Our Common Home*. Brooklyn: Melville House.
- Pryor, E.R. 2020. *The Climate Change Illusion: And the Real Causes of Global Warming*. Vero Beach, FL: Hanway House Publishers.
- Ramsey, E. 2020. *Christian Views on Climate Change: Destruction of the Earth*. Independent Pub.
- Royal Society. 2020. *Climate Change: Evidence and Causes – Update 2020. An overview from the Royal Society and the US National Academy of Sciences*. London: The Royal Society.
- Ryken, P.G. 2006. *What is the Christian Worldview?* Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing.
- Sangster, M.J. 2019. *The Real Inconvenient Truth: It's Warming but it's Not CO2*. Independent Pub.

- Schade, L.D. 2015. *Creation-Crisis Preaching: Ecology, Theology, and the Pulpit*. Des Peres, MO: Chalice Press.
- Schade, L.D. and M. Bullitt-Jones. eds. *Rooted & Rising: Voices of Courage in a Time of Climate Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Schaeffer, F. 2001. *True Spirituality*. Carol Stream, IL : Tyndale.
- Seeley, E.J. 2022. *Fatal Flaws: How the Assumptions, Materials, and Methods Invalidate the Theory of Global Warming*. Columbus, OH: Gatekeeper Press.
- Shellenberger, M. 2020. *Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All*. New York: Harper.
- Singer, S.F. 2021. *Hot Talk, Cold Science: Global Warming's Unfinished Debate*. Oakland, CA: Independent Institute
- Smith, C.F. 2015. *Developing a Biblical Worldview: Seeing Things God's Way*. Nashville, TN: B & H Academic.
- Smith, C.P. 2021. *The Climate Change Hoax Argument: The History and Science that Expose a Major International Deception*. Independent Pub.
- Spencer, N. 2007. *Christianity, Climate Change and Sustainable Living*. London: SPCK Publishing.
- Spencer, R.W. 2012. *The Great Global Warming Blunder: How Mother Nature Fooled the World's Top Climate Scientists*. New York and London: Encounter Books.
- Steyn, M. 2009. ed. *A Disgrace to the Profession*. Volume 1. Woodsville, NH: Stockade Books.
- Tyson, P. 2022. *Theology and Climate Change*. Milton Park, UK: Routledge.
- United Nations, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). First (1990), Second (1995), Third (2001), Fourth (2007), Fifth (2014), and Sixth (2021/2022) Assessment Reports.
- U.S. Senate. 2008. *Environment and Public Works Committee. Minority Staff Report: More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims*.
- Veldman, R.G. 2019. *The Gospel of Climate Skepticism: Why Evangelical Christians Oppose Action on Climate Change*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Wang, T. et al. 2013. "Seasonal climate change across the Roman Warm Period". IN *Quaternary International* 308-309: 230-41.
- Waters, B. 2016. *Just Capitalism: A Christian Ethic of Economic Globalization*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Wrightstone, G. 2017. *Inconvenient Facts: The Science that Al Gore Doesn't Want You to Know*. San Antonio, TX: Silver Crown Productions.