

American Evangelicals and Domestic Versus International Climate Policy

Forthcoming at Review of International Organizations

Stephen Chaudoin
University of Pittsburgh

David Thomas Smith
University of Sydney

Johannes Urpelainen[†]
Columbia University

November 11, 2013

*We appreciate the helpful comments from Michael Aklin, Andrew Cheon, Kim Sung Eun, Werner Selle, and Shannon Skotece. We also appreciate the helpful assistance from the authors of the Faith and Global Policy Challenges for their publicly available data, and Evan Lewis in particular for his help during the project. Thanks also to Valerie Schlosberg and Ignacio Arana for efforts in research assistance. We owe special appreciation to the xx and xx for making their extensive data publicly available.

[†]Corresponding author. Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Columbia University. 420 West 118th Streeth, 712 IAB. New York, NY 10027, USA. +1-734-757-734-0161. ju2178@columbia.edu.

Abstract

Because a significant portion of the American electorate identify themselves as evangelical Christians, the evangelical position on climate policy is important to determining the role the United States could play in global climate cooperation. Do evangelicals oppose all climate policies, or are they particularly opposed to certain types of policies? We argue that American evangelicals oppose climate policy due to their distrust of international cooperation and institutions, which has been a prominent feature of evangelical politics since the beginning of the Cold War. Using data from the 2011 Faith and Global Policy Challenges survey and the 2010 Chicago Council Global View survey, we find support for the theory. Evangelicals are equally likely to support domestic climate policy as other Americans, but they are significantly less likely to support international treaties on climate cooperation. The findings suggest that proponents of climate policy could win more evangelicals to their side by focusing on domestic action, instead of multilateral negotiations or international institutions.

Keywords: international cooperation, religion, climate change, climate policy, evangelicalism, public opinion

1 Introduction

In the last decade, evangelical Christians have been a source of both hope and despair for climate activists in the United States. When the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) joined Rick Warren and other religious leaders to endorse the Evangelical Climate Initiative in 2007, there appeared to be a decisive shift in evangelical thinking towards action on climate change. However, in the same year, the powerful Southern Baptist Convention issued a resolution that condemned proposals to regulate CO₂ emissions as “dangerous,” and Focus On The Family’s James Dobson suggested NAE Vice President Richard Cizik should resign if “he cannot be trusted to articulate the views of American evangelicals on climate issues” (Southern Baptist Convention, 2007; Focus on the Family, 2007).

The position of American evangelicals on climate change may be a central factor in global climate policy. Countries like China and India probably will not accept binding emissions commitments without America’s leadership or reciprocation. Within the United States, slightly more than 26% of the adult population belonged to evangelical Protestant denominations in a survey conducted in 2007.¹ Studies which ask individuals whether they are evangelicals typically find somewhat higher levels of evangelical identification (Hackett and Lindsay, 2008). Such a large religious bloc will be politically important, either as help or hindrance, in any American commitment to emissions reductions.

Do evangelicals oppose all types of climate policy? Or, are they opposed to specific *types* of climate policy? We argue that evangelical beliefs have a strong effect on a person’s preferences over the type of climate change policy – domestic versus international – rather than a blanket effect on all climate change policies. American evangelicals are opposed to international climate policy in particular due to their distrust of international cooperation and institutions, which has been a prominent feature of evangelical politics since the beginning of the Cold War.

There are two elements to this aversion. First, many evangelicals have a particularly emphatic, sacralized view of American exceptionalism, and they reject compromises with secular and socialist foreign powers that would endanger the divine covenant on which the United States was built (Lieven, 2004). Second, many evangelicals see international institutions as stepping stones to a single world government, which some associate with the rule of the Antichrist as specified by biblical prophesy. Together, these factors create a formidable suspicion of any climate cooperation regime that might interfere with the sovereignty of the United States. This suspicion may be harder to dislodge than anti-environmentalism, which if anything seems to be declining among evangelicals (Smith and Johnson, 2010). To be sure, not every evangelical holds these beliefs and evangelicals may differ in the degree to which they espouse these views. Some individuals may follow the cues of evangelical elites who hold these beliefs, without necessarily holding those beliefs themselves. We only argue that evangelical identification makes an individual more likely to oppose international climate change policies than domestic ones.

We test this explanation using data from the 2011 “Faith and Global Policy Challenges” (FGPC) survey and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs’ 2010 “Global Views” (GV) survey. The two surveys sampled large numbers of Americans, 1,496 in the FGPC survey and approximately 2,600 in the GV survey, that are representative of the national population across standard covariates. The unique advantage of these surveys is that, in addition to a variety of useful covariates, they contain questions on religious identification and attitudes toward climate policy both at the domestic *and* international level. Given the content of the surveys, we were able to

¹See <http://religions.pewforum.org/affiliations>. Accessed October 29, 2012.

compare the relationship between identifying one's self as evangelical and climate policies at the international and domestic levels.

We find considerable support for the theory that evangelical opposition to action on climate change is driven primarily by an aversion to international cooperation. There is relatively little difference, controlling for other factors, between respondents who identify themselves as evangelicals and non-evangelical respondents on the question of whether the United States should take action to address climate change domestically. However, being an evangelical has a significant and substantively important negative effect on support for the use of international binding agreements to deal with climate change. This phenomenon is distinctly linked to being evangelical. We do not find a similar effect for other groups of Christians. Furthermore, this effect appears to be independent of the high levels of political conservatism found among American evangelicals. Conservatism has a strong effect on opposition to both domestic and international efforts to abate climate change, but the evangelical aversion to international climate agreements is present even controlling for respondent ideology. We also find the same results using controls for unobserved geographic heterogeneity and in alternate specifications of the models.

These findings can inform future studies on the relationship between religion and climate policy. For one, the findings testify to the difference between evangelical and non-evangelical Protestants. While non-evangelical Protestants do not seem to significantly differ from non-religious respondents and Catholics, evangelicals stand out as having a more negative view of climate cooperation. Moreover, the roots of evangelical opposition to climate policy are found in the historical fears of international cooperation that have shaped the positions of evangelical leaders at least since the onset of the Cold War. While American evangelicals are only slightly less supportive of domestic climate policy than other Americans, international efforts are a red flag for them.

Our study is also among the first to analyze the relationship between religion and international cooperation. It is well-established in international relations research that the preferences of domestic actors affect the prospects for cooperation at the international level and the terms of international agreements (Frieden, 1999; Milner, 1997). While religious leaders have historically often emphasized global unity and ecumenical collaboration, self-identified evangelicals hold a hostile view of international cooperation. In previous studies of American public opinion on international cooperation, the religious dimension has frequently been neglected. This study contributes to a growing literature on the role of religious beliefs on foreign policy attitudes in the United States (Guth, 2009; Froese and Mencken, 2009; Rock, 2011). This is an important causal step in the complicated relationship between religion and foreign policy, a relationship scholars are mapping in increasing detail (Rosenson, Oldmixon, and Wald, 2009; Warner and Walker, 2011).

If the advocates of climate policy are to build support for their initiatives among evangelicals, they should downplay the role of treaties and agreements in their campaigning. In the United States, evangelicals are not so much opposed to climate policy as they are opposed to international cooperative efforts. From the evangelical perspective, the road to global action must begin with national efforts that respect American independence and sovereignty. While this does not mean that domestic policy without cooperation is sufficient or that other constituencies in the United States do not support cooperation, strategic communication to the evangelical community should emphasize domestic, not international, action.

2 Evangelicals, Climate Change, and International Cooperation

Religion is important for climate policy and other public issues because it exerts a powerful influence on peoples' world views. Religious beliefs, principles, and rules form the moral basis of a believer's approach to policy (Froese and Bader, 2010). Policies that are inconsistent with a person's deeply held religious beliefs are more likely to be rejected, while policies that accord with a believer's religious system of thought are more readily accepted. In the United States there are notable religious divides on political issues with moral dimensions (Putnam and Campbell, 2012; Haidt, 2012), and religion has often been a critical resource in political mobilization (Zald and McCarthy, 1998).

We focus specifically on evangelical Christians. The term "evangelical," while it has no universally agreed definition, connotes Christians who emphasize the importance of a personal relationship with Jesus Christ as their lord and savior (Rothenberg and Newport, 1984: chapter 2).² Evangelicals are generally theologically and morally conservative, resisting the "modernization" and accommodation with secular culture that characterizes non-evangelical Protestantism. Not all evangelicals are fundamentalists, but evangelicals tend towards a literal interpretation of the Bible. The term "evangelical" is often used interchangeably with "born again Christian" or "conservative Protestant." While many large and small denominations can be classified as evangelical (e.g., Southern Baptists, Pentecostals, Missouri Synod Lutherans), there are also individuals within other Protestant denominations who may identify as evangelicals (Hackett and Lindsay, 2008).

We concentrate on evangelicals for a number of reasons. First, they are a very large group, larger than any other broad religious classification in the United States (i.e., non-evangelical Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Jews etc.). Because of their numbers, they have had a major impact on American politics, especially on issues such as abortion rights and same sex marriage. As scholarship on the so-called "culture wars" has shown, evangelicals have been a particularly potent force when combined with other religious conservatives (Putnam and Campbell, 2012).

Second, for around forty years, evangelicals have frequently mobilized around religious issues. As Shields (2009) has argued, this mobilization has changed the face of American democracy. Prior to the advent of the "Christian right" in the late 1960s, evangelicals were a politically alienated constituency. The re-emergence of issues such as prayer in schools and abortion brought evangelical activists and voters back into American politics after a four-decade retreat following the humiliation of the Scopes "monkey trial" in 1925. Third, a large body of scholarship, discussed below, has been concerned with the differences between evangelicals and other Americans on environmental issues. It is widely accepted that there are relatively few differences

²Rothenberg and Newport identify respondents as evangelicals when they classify themselves as Christians, agree with the statement that Jesus was a unique person and the real son of God, and respond affirmatively either to the question that a person must personally accept Jesus Christ as their savior in order to have eternal salvation, or to the statement that they identify themselves as "a born-again Christian." Rothenberg and Newport explain that they include the question about personal acceptance of Christ in order not to rely completely on self-identification as "born-again," as in 1984 the term "born-again" may not have had familiar connotations for all respondents. The surveys we use both rely completely on self-identification of respondents as "born-again or evangelical" Christians. Because both terms have become so prevalent since the 1980s, self-identification in these terms is now a much more reliable strategy for identifying respondents who believe in the necessity of personal acceptance of Jesus Christ. Rothenberg and Newport's use of self-identification implies that this group is more than a categorical group, but has forged some kind of social identity through shared beliefs (Kellstedt and Smidt, 1991).

between other denominations or religions on environmental issues, as most have embraced some form of environmental consciousness.

We limit the scope of this study to the United States since the mechanisms we propose for religious opposition to climate policy are firmly situated in an American political and cultural context. There are tens of millions of evangelical Christians outside the United States, but we would not expect them to hold the same opinions. While evangelical opposition, as we will argue, is at least partly grounded in theological concerns, those concerns are intertwined with a distinctive “political theology” (Philpott, 2007) about the role of the United States as a Godly and exemplary nation. This political theology is not necessarily portable to evangelicals outside the United States. In any case, we would generally expect non-Americans to think about America’s role in climate policy in different ways from Americans.

In analyzing the relationship between evangelicalism and climate policy, we distinguish between *domestic* and *international* aspects of the problem. We shall argue that evangelical beliefs have different effects on preferences regarding domestic versus international climate change policies. Evangelical beliefs need not contradict the premises of domestic climate policy, but there is tension between modern American evangelical thought and international cooperation on climate policy.

2.1 Evangelism and the Environment

We do not expect evangelicalism to have a negative effect on people’s views of domestic climate policy, holding all other factors equal. Neither evangelical doctrine nor recent practice offers a clear case against climate policy.³ Instead, the evangelical movement contains a variety of views on the issue, with no clear winner.

Scholars often have seen evangelical Protestantism, especially in its fundamentalist varieties, as a repository of “dominion” theology that emphasizes human mastery over nature.⁴ In 1967 Lynn White famously argued that the biblical narrative of creation in Judeo-Christianity is at the heart of the ecological crisis, because in this account “no item in physical creation had any purpose save to serve man’s purposes” (White, 1967). Most subsequent research has found that neither dominion theology nor aversion to environmentalism are prevalent throughout Judeo-Christianity, but they tend to be concentrated in more theologically conservative Protestant denominations (Eckberg and Blocker, 1989, 1996; Guth et al., 1993, 1995; Tarakeshwar et al., 2001). Dominion theology in conservative denominations does not always appear in the form of outward hostility toward the environment or environmentalism. Instead, in comparison to the embrace of environmental issues by other Christian groups, “fundamentalist churches seldom address the issue, or, if they do, express skepticism about religious environmentalism” (Guth et al., 1993: 373). Wolkomir et al. (1997) argue that dominion theology has had little actual effect on environmental attitudes.

More recently, various researchers have identified a strong theological counter-narrative of environmental “stewardship” in both evangelical discourse and Christian thinking more generally (Sherkat and Ellison, 2007; Wardekker, Petersen, and van der Sluijs, 2009; Prelli and Winters, 2009; Dowland and Gasaway, 2010; Wilkinson, 2012). This viewpoint emphasizes God’s owner-

³See, for example, Skotece (2012) on progressive Christian organizations and climate change.

⁴The dominion view is derived from the book of Genesis 1:28: “God blessed them and said to them, ‘Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground’ (NIV).

ship of the earth, and the human responsibility to take care of it.⁵ Even conservative evangelical denominations who have often been suspicious of political environmentalism have issued statements in support of the stewardship idea and calling for a halt to environmental degradation (Sherkat and Ellison, 2007).

Some have argued that where evangelical opposition to climate action or environmentalism exists, it has little to do with theology and everything to do with politics. Sherkat and Ellison (2007) find that political conservatism is the main factor driving a relationship between literal belief in the Bible and opposition to environmental activism. Wilkinson (2012), who identifies climate care as the core issue of the emerging “evangelical center” in politics, writes that opposition from the evangelical right reflects much broader debates in evangelical circles about “the appropriate role of government, the profits and perils of political alliances, and religion’s proper ethical orientation and place in the public sphere.” It is likely that evangelicals would be more supportive of environmental efforts led by religious organizations rather than government agencies, reflecting a general preference for religious rather than governmental collective action in response to social problems (Scheve and Stasavage, 2006).

Another possibility is that, because of a prevailing belief that we are “living in the end times,” evangelicals see little point to devoting resources to solving problems in the distant future. Barker and Bearce (2013) argue that Christians with such “end times” beliefs have shorter sociotropic time horizons, making them less likely to support potentially costly action to save the environment. The authors find that respondents who believe that “Jesus will return to earth some day” (approximately 56% of those surveyed) were significantly less likely to agree with a statement indicating “Global warming is a problem that requires immediate government action...” (Barker and Bearce, 2013). This study is complementary to Barker and Bearce, in that we seek to isolate the effects of religious beliefs on particular types of climate change policy.

2.2 Evangelism and International Cooperation

The American evangelical movement’s core beliefs do however lay the foundation for a clearly negative view of international cooperation on climate policy. The American evangelical movement’s historical opposition to international organizations applies to climate agreements, and so evangelicals can be expected to oppose global efforts to mitigate climate change, especially as they interfere with American sovereignty.

Since the beginning of the Second World War there has been a visible religious divide on the question of American involvement in international organizations. Preston (2012) notes that by 1945 most religious leaders, including some evangelicals, were “internationalists” and supporters of the United Nations, but there was strong and vocal opposition to the United Nations (UN) by Protestant fundamentalists and evangelical conservatives. These Christians feared that “the construction of a global regulatory state” would “herald the birth of a new world order,” and premillennialists believed the UN would fulfil biblical prophesy, paving the way for the Antichrist as world dictator. Alongside this eschatological concern, there were more concrete political objections that the United Nations would become a quasi-world government that would interfere with the American way of life, imposing foreign secularism and socialism (Preston, 2012: 402-3). The fact that Catholics and liberal Protestants supported international institutions was, especially for Southern evangelicals, further evidence that these institutions were a plot “to destroy America’s

⁵One of the key Bible passages in stewardship theology is Psalms 24:1: “The earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it, the world, and all who live in it.”

Christian foundations” (Dochuk, 2010: 105).

In general, evangelical Protestant denominations became more conservative from the 1960s onwards. In the 1950s there had been a powerful liberal strain within evangelicalism, exemplified by Billy Graham, but by the 1960s conservative politics and hard-line theology had come to dominate evangelical Protestantism, relegating liberals to the margins of the movement (Shires, 2007: Ch. 7). In the 1940s and 1950s all major religious denominations had adopted a strong anti-communist stance, but by the 1960s evangelicals suspected that other Christians were abandoning anti-communism internationally and accepting a shrinking role for religion in domestic public life. Evangelicals came to see the global anti-communist crusade as their particular religious responsibility (Herzog, 2011). This period also saw the beginning of a shift by evangelical voters to the increasingly right-wing Republican party, further intensifying their distrust of international institutions and cooperation.

Rock (2011) describes a mix of politics and eschatology that continues to underpin evangelical objections to international institutions. Hal Lindsey, author of the immensely influential *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Lindsey, 1970), reiterated in 2005 that the UN would ultimately be replaced by a world government headed by the Antichrist. This idea is echoed in Tim LaHaye’s widely read *Left Behind* novels and in the sermons of Jerry Falwell. Not all evangelicals believe that the “end times” are imminent, but even those who do not tend to be wary of prioritizing international cooperation. This position, exemplified by one-time Republican Presidential candidate Pat Robertson, is that international cooperation is simply futile because of the greedy and belligerent nature of human beings in a fallen world. Peace will only be achieved when Satan’s final rebellion is crushed and Christ’s reign begins on earth (Rock, 2011: 142-3 and 145-9).⁶

The National Association of Evangelicals and the Southern Baptist Convention have both complained that the United Nations and globalism in general are vehicles for the “New Age Movement,” a dangerous amalgam of pseudo-religious spirituality that will act as a secular replacement for Judeo-Christian faith. The New Age Movement, according to evangelical leaders, promotes the destruction of national sovereignty and the traditional family, and promotes wholesale abortion as a means of population control (Rock, 2011: 143-4). One of the most successful evangelical campaigns against international institutions has been the continuing effort to persuade Congress and the president to withhold funding from international organizations that they claim promote abortion and contraception, including the UN, International Monetary Fund and World Bank (Martin, 1999). During Republican administrations, this has given rise to the Mexico City Policy (known to opponents as the “global gag rule”), which requires any non-governmental organization receiving USAID funding to “neither perform nor actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other nations.”

One area in which evangelical Protestants have been notably “internationalist” in recent decades is the issue of international religious freedom. In the 1970s, evangelical activists joined Jewish and Catholic activists in calling for an end to Cold War detente because of the Soviet Union’s refusal to allow religious dissidents to leave its borders (Preston, 2012). Religious freedom has remained the overriding international human rights issue for evangelicals, and evangelical activists played a key role in the passage of the International Religious Freedom Act through Congress in 1998 (Farr, 2008). The religious freedom agenda in the 1970s helped fuel broader human rights discourse in the United States, and evangelical organizations have since expanded

⁶See also: Barker, Hurwitz, and Nelson (2008) who find that belief in the inerrancy of the Bible is associated with greater preference for militarism in the United States.

their concerns to other areas such as eliminating human trafficking (Weitzer, 2007). However, even this internationally-minded activism retains something of a nationalist flavor. Critics of the International Religious Freedom Act, which requires US embassies to monitor religious freedom in their host countries and produce annual reports on perceived abuses, argue it imposes a distinctly “separationist” and privatistic American conception of religious freedom on countries where configurations of church and state are very different (Smith, 2012).

In summary, a constellation of political and religious factors has fed into an historic distrust of international institutions and international cooperation among conservative Protestants in the United States. Any explanation of the effect of religion on attitudes towards climate change and its solutions must take into account this group’s general aversion towards international efforts that seem to compromise American sovereignty and promote a “secular humanist” or “New Age” agenda.

Hypothesis 1 (Evangelicals and international climate cooperation). *All else equal, being evangelical has a stronger, negative effect on support for international climate change policies than for domestic policies.*

3 Research Design

To analyze the opinions of evangelicals on climate policy, we examine the results from two surveys. The first is the “Faith and Global Policy Challenges” (FGPC) survey, conducted in December of 2011, jointly by the University of Maryland’s Center for International and Security Studies and Program on International Policy Attitudes.⁷ The survey was fielded by Knowledge Networks, which recruits respondents for online surveys. The FGPC surveyed 1,496 American adults and the sample was chosen to be nationally representative across a wide range of standard covariates, with a supplementary oversample of 330 additional Catholic respondents.

The second survey is the Chicago Council on Global Affairs’ June 2010 “Global Views” (GV) survey (Bouton et al., 2011). The GV survey was also conducted online using Knowledge Networks. The survey elicited responses from approximately 2,600 respondents, and the sample was chosen to be nationally representative, with an supplementary oversample of Midwestern respondents.

The FGPC survey was designed to describe how respondents’ religious principles related to their views on a range of pressing global issues. The survey instrument first elicited whether the respondent believed in God and/or whether the respondent felt that there were “spiritual obligations to act in certain ways.” It then asked questions about the respondent’s opinions on issues like climate change, nuclear proliferation, and species loss. Additionally, the survey asked respondents to describe their religion. Respondents who chose one of the Christian denominations were then asked if they considered themselves to be “born-again or evangelical.” Lastly, respondents answered a series of standard demographic questions.

The GV survey was focused on foreign policy attitudes across a wide range of issues, but was not specifically about religious beliefs and their relationship to foreign policy attitudes. In the concluding set of demographic questions, the GV survey instrument asked whether respondents were Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Other, or No Religion. Respondents who selected Christian were then asked whether they were Protestant, Catholic or Other Christian. Protestants were then asked whether they were best described as “Fundamentalist, evangelical, charismatic or Pentacostal” or “Moderate to liberal.”

⁷See Kull et al. (2011) for their report.

Both surveys allow us to classify evangelicals according to the respondents' self-identification but not detailed measurements of respondents' evangelical beliefs (e.g., "belief in the second coming of Christ" as in Barker and Bearce (2013)) or characteristics of their denomination or congregation. Related studies recommend assigning evangelical status on the basis of specific denominational affiliation (Smidt, Kellstedt, and Guth, 2009; Steensland et al., 2000), while others suggest denominational affiliation and self-identification should be used together in studies of politics, as both have independent political effects (Lewis and De Bernardo, 2010).

While we would ideally use all of these characteristics, self-identification does have certain advantages. Most importantly, evangelical self-identification captures large numbers of Protestants who are members of mainline denominations, but who still consider themselves evangelical (Hackett and Lindsay, 2008). The most famous example of a self-identifying evangelical from a mainline denomination is former President George W. Bush, a member of the United Methodist Church. Evangelical media, rather than congregational membership, provides evangelical cues for many self-identifiers (Wilcox, Jelen, and Leege, 1993). This evangelical identification may provide political heuristics in a similar, if not to the same extent, as partisan identification (Lewis and De Bernardo, 2010). Many of the sources we have described that shape evangelical beliefs about the environment and international cooperation come from outside congregational and denominational structures, such as popular novels and statements by umbrella political organizations such as the National Association of Evangelicals. For this reason, we believe evangelical self-identification captures much of, though not all of, the political effect that concerns us. While some have argued that the evangelical phenomenon in the United States goes beyond Protestants and should also include Catholic and Orthodox evangelical identifiers (Hackett and Lindsay, 2008), in this study we follow the conventional use of the term and limit evangelicals to self-identifiers in Protestant denominations.⁸

3.1 Dependent Variables

From the FGPC and GV surveys, we are interested in explaining responses to two types of questions regarding climate change: international and domestic questions. The international questions focus on international efforts to mitigate climate change. They each have a distinctly international component, explicitly mentioning international cooperation or international institutions. Specifically, the FGPC survey stated "As you may know there is some discussion about whether or not it is a good idea for nations to work together to establish legally binding agreements, such as treaties, to address certain international problems." Respondents then selected whether they considered it a "good idea" or "not a good idea" to use binding international agreements to address GHG reductions. Note that the question focuses on legally binding agreements, which is appropriate because climate cooperation would require that the United States reduce emissions more than it otherwise would in the absence of a binding agreement.⁹ $International_{FGPC}$ is coded 1 if the respondent indicated that international agreements were a good idea and 0 otherwise.

The GV survey asked respondents [two] questions about climate change with a distinctly international component. The first asked "Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements: A new international

⁸In the supplementary appendix, we show that our results are also robust to including Catholic and Orthodox respondents who identify as evangelical. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their advice here. The appendix and replication materials are available on this journal's website.

⁹For both the domestic and international questions, respondents could also select "Don't Know" or refuse to answer. We exclude these respondents from our analysis.

treaty to address climate change by reducing green house gas emissions?" $International_{GV1}$ is coded 1 if the respondent indicated that the United States "should participate" and 0 otherwise. The second question asked "Some people say that the world is facing some new problems that require some new international institutions or agencies to deal with them. Do you think that there should or should not be new international institutions to monitor whether countries are meeting their treaty obligations to limit their greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change?" $International_{GV2}$ is coded 1 if the respondent indicated that there "should be" and 0 otherwise.

The domestic questions used from each survey focus on climate change, but focus specifically on domestic costs, benefits and strategies for addressing emissions. Specifically, the FGPC asked "Which comes closer to your opinion: (a) Efforts in the United States to reduce the release of greenhouse gasses will cost too much money and hurt the U.S. economy or (b) The U.S. economy will be more competitive because these efforts will result in more efficient energy use, saving money in the long run?" $Domestic_{FGPC}$ is coded 1 if the respondent chose option (b) and 0 otherwise.

The GV survey asked respondents three domestic questions. Respondents were asked whether they favored or opposed certain options for addressing climate change. Specifically, respondents could support or oppose (1) "Creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power" (2) "Requiring auto-makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up" (3) "Raising taxes on fuels such as coal and oil to encourage individuals and businesses to use less." For each of these three options, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $Domestic_{GV_i}$ is coded 1 if the respondent "strongly supported" or "somewhat supported" that option, and 0 otherwise.¹⁰

Overall, in the FGPC survey, approximately 80% of respondents supported participation in an international treaty, while 73% thought that domestic reductions would increase economic efficiency. This overall difference is likely due to question wording; the domestic question explicitly mentions the costs of reducing emissions for the U.S. economy. In the GV survey, approximately 68% and 62% of respondents supported a GHG treaty and a monitoring body, respectively. Support for alternative energy and auto standards was 83% and 70% respectively. Unsurprisingly, support for fuel taxes was much lower, at 35%.

3.2 Explanatory Variables

Our main explanatory variables describe whether the respondent identifies themselves as Christian and/or as evangelical. This empirical strategy of self-identification captures evangelicals as perceived by the respondents, emphasizing evangelicalism as a movement rather than as a tradition. Since identifying evangelicals presents several challenges and no consensus definition exists, using two surveys with different definitions is important for robustness.

The FGPC survey instrument asked respondents to identify their religion from a list of common religions and particular denominations. *Christian* is a dummy variable coded 1 for those who identified themselves as Baptist, Protestant, Catholic, Mormon, Eastern Orthodox, or Other Christian, and 0 otherwise.

¹⁰The GV survey also asked about nuclear power plants as a way to reduce emissions, but responses to this question were strongly driven by the respondent's feelings on nuclear power, as opposed to addressing climate change. Responses to the nuclear power question were very poorly correlated with responses to the other climate change questions. The pairwise correlation coefficients between nuclear power and the other three questions were 0.11, 0.06, and 0.01 respectively. This makes the nuclear power question incomparable to the international climate change questions.

Those who selected one of the options corresponding to a denomination of Christianity were then asked whether they identified themselves as a “born-again or evangelical Christian.” Unfortunately, the question does not allow us to identify whether respondents consider themselves to be both “born again” and “evangelical” or only one of the two. *Evangelical* is a dummy variable coded 1 for the subset of Christians who answered yes to this question and 0 otherwise. There are 1,255 self-identified Christians in the sample. Of those, 437 (35%) also described themselves as born-again or evangelical. The remaining 818 Christian respondents (65%) are non-Evangelical Christians. The dummy variable *NonEvChr* identifies these respondents.

The GV survey asked a slightly different series of questions. The GV survey first asked the respondent to identify their religious preference, with Christian as an option.¹¹ For the GV survey, *Christian* is coded 1 if the respondent selected this option and 0 otherwise. Respondents who identified themselves as Christian were then asked whether they were Catholic, Protestant, or “Other Christian.” Respondents who selected Protestant were then asked “Which one of these words best describes your kind of Christianity: (1) fundamentalist, evangelical, charismatic, or Pentecostal, or (2) moderate to liberal?”¹² For the GV survey, *Evangelical* is a dummy variable coded 1 for the subset of Protestant Christians who chose the first option, and 0 otherwise. *NonEvChr* identifies respondents who were Christian, but did not select the evangelical option or were not Protestant. In the GV survey, approximately 75% of respondents were Christian, and among those, approximately 21.5% were evangelical.

Note that the two surveys use different approaches to the self-identification of evangelicals. One equates “born again” and “evangelical,” while the other assumes “fundamentalist, evangelical, charismatic, or Pentecostal” to be roughly equivalent. While these two strategies may introduce some measurement error, similar findings relying on the two strategies would be reassuring. Indeed, measurement error in an explanatory variable tends to cause attenuation bias, meaning that any evidence in support of the theory could actually be stronger than reported here.

We also examine a number of additional explanatory variables.¹³ In the FGPC survey, *Conservative* measures respondents’ political views on a 5-point scale, ranging from “Very liberal” (1) to “Very conservative” (5). The GV survey uses a similar 9-point scale. Since conservative voters tend to be skeptical of environmental regulation (McCright and Dunlap, 2003) and evangelicals tend to be conservative (Dochuk, 2010), the inclusion of this variable avoids conflating religion and partisan ideology as explanations.

We also included the respondent’s age in years, employment status, race, income bracket, and marital status.¹⁴ Krosnick et al. (2006) report gender and age differences in Americans’ support for climate policy. Based on a Michigan and Virginia poll, Dietz, Dan, and Shwom (2007) report that whites and poor people are less supportive of climate policy. While the expectation for marital status is unclear, we included it to ensure comparability with previous work. Table 1 shows the summary statistics for each variable.

[Table 1 about here.]

¹¹The other options were “Jewish, Muslim, Other, or No Religion.”

¹²Again, we can only observe that the respondent selected this group.

¹³A more detailed description of all variables is in the appendix.

¹⁴Income bracket was measured on a 19 point scale, with different household incomes. We use the race variable to code a binary indicator for white/Caucasian respondents, *White*. *Married*, *Male*, and *Employed* are binary indicators for whether the respondent was married, male, or employed, respectively.

Table 2 shows the percentage of respondents who expressed support for each type of carbon reduction policies, broken down by religious beliefs. According to these descriptive statistics, evangelicals are less supportive of both domestic and international action, and the difference is often quite large. However, this simple comparison fails to account for confounding variables, such as political ideology.

[Table 2 about here.]

3.3 Statistical Model

Using a probit model, we regressed the *Domestic* and *International* variables on our measures of religion and ideology, as well as other control variables. For each specification, we regressed each dependent variable on three combinations of the explanatory variables: (1) ideology and the Christianity dummy, (2) ideology and the evangelical dummy, and (3) ideology and the dummy variables for evangelicals and non-evangelical Christians. The goal was to analyze how the three explanatory variables affected respondents' support for domestic and international actions to mitigate climate change. The different combinations of dummy variables allow us not only to compare evangelicals with all other respondents, but also to contrast evangelicals and non-evangelical Christians.¹⁵ The regressions with only the Christianity dummy (1), the coefficient on the Christianity variable compares Christians with non-Christians. In regressions with only the evangelical variable (2), the coefficients are interpreted relative to the base category: non-evangelicals who are both Christian and non-Christian. In regressions with both the evangelical variable and the non-evangelical Christian variables (3), the coefficients are interpreted relative to the base category: non-Christians.

4 Results

The results from the first set of estimations on international climate cooperation are shown in Table 3. First, the results are consistent with existing arguments about preferences over climate change policy. Looking at the first row, more conservative respondents are more opposed to both domestic and international abatement efforts. However, being Christian either does not have a statistically significant effect or has a positive effect, depending on the survey question.

Second, we find support for the hypothesis described above. Being evangelical reduces the level of support for international climate policy regardless of whether we compare to all other respondents or non-Christians only, and the coefficient is statistically significant in all but one model (3). Notably, these results hold even though we already control for political ideology. This result is consistent with the pattern in the descriptive statistics.

[Table 3 about here.]

Table 4 shows the results for domestic climate policy. Again, conservatives are less supportive than other respondents and Christianity itself has either no or a positive effect, depending on the question. These findings are consistent with what we had for international climate policy.

As expected, in most models evangelicals are not significantly less supportive of domestic climate policy than other respondents, and the null result holds if we also compare to a baseline

¹⁵The regressions each use robust standard errors which are clustered according to the region the respondent lives in. Both surveys classified the respondent's region according to their state of residence. The four regions were Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

of non-Christians. Although evangelicals had lower levels of support for domestic climate policy in the descriptive statistics, this difference washes away when we conduct multivariate regression with control variables and region fixed effects. The most notable exception is the survey question on carbon taxation in models 10-12. Here, evangelicals have a negative and statistically significant coefficient. This is consistent with research that showing evangelical Protestants in the United States tend to be more economically conservative than other Christians and non-Christians (Barker and Carman, 2000; Hoover et al., 2002; Felson and Kindell, 2007), which may make them particularly averse to policy measures involving increased taxation.

[Table 4 about here.]

To summarize, the comparison of support for domestic and international action shows that evangelicals hold nuanced views about climate policy. Their opposition to international action is consistent, whereas they only have a negative view of domestic action if it is based on carbon taxation.¹⁶

An example of the substantive effects of being evangelical on support for domestic and international policy are shown in Table 5. Table 5 uses the results from the first international question on the GV survey, regarding an international climate change treaty, and the first domestic GV question, regarding alternative fuels. The top set of probabilities is for international efforts, and the bottom set is for domestic efforts. Looking at the top set, across each interval on the ideological spectrum, evangelicals are less supportive of international abatement efforts than both their non-evangelical and non-Christian counterparts. In the GV survey, the mean level of conservativeness in the full sample is 4.25. At that level, the predicted level of support for the international question is approximately 65% for non-Christians, compared to 58% for evangelical Christians and 75% for non-evangelical Christians. The difference between non-Christians and evangelicals (-7%) is approximately as large as a half-point movement along the conservative ideology spectrum.

Looking at the bottom set of probabilities, evangelicals are virtually indistinguishable from their non-Christian counterparts across the ideological spectrum. At the mean level of conservativeness, the predicted support for alternative fuels is approximately 85% for non-Christians, compared to 82% for evangelicals and 88% for non-evangelical Christians. Interestingly, non-evangelical Christians have higher levels of predicted support for international and domestic policies than both their evangelical and non-Christian counterparts.

[Table 5 about here.]

One surprising finding was Christians, when compared to non-Christians, were generally more supportive of climate policies, both domestic and international. In fact, non-evangelical Christians tended to be more supportive of both types of policies than non-Christians, and of course, evangelical Christians. When compared to the base category of non-Christians, Non-evangelical Christians were significantly more supportive of climate policies in two of the three regressions using international questions and in two of the four domestic questions, though they were significantly less supportive of the domestic policy concerning taxes.

¹⁶In general, these results are robust to alternative specifications that allow the disturbances across survey response items to be correlated. Using seemingly unrelated estimation, with both FGPC questions or all five of the GV questions or other combinations, the coefficient on the Evangelical variable is almost always negative and significant for the international questions, but not for the domestic questions.

The control variables did not have consistent or particularly effects, apart of course, from the variable measuring conservative ideology. Older respondents and males were slightly more opposed to most policies, though slightly more supportive of the GV survey's alternative fuel and auto-standards questions. Married respondents were generally less supportive of all climate policies. Higher income respondents were slightly more opposed to international policies and some domestic policies, but slightly more supportive of other domestic policies.

4.1 Robustness and Additional Tests

For robustness, we also estimated models with region fixed effects.¹⁷ Both surveys grouped respondents into one of four regions based on their state of residence: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. The results are shown in Table Table 6. Across the models, the coefficients for variables of interest are similar, if not stronger. Most importantly, the negative coefficient of being evangelical in models predicting support for international action remains negative and statistically significant than the effect of being evangelical on domestic policy. In the case of the international questions, the magnitude of the coefficients on the evangelical variable increase by approximately 60%. In the case of domestic policy, only two of the four coefficients are significant.

[Table 6 about here.]

For another robustness check, we examined if the effects of conservative ideology and being evangelical were moderated by the respondent's media consumption. Media consumption is an important source of information and can influence viewers' political opinions (Iyengar and Kinder, 2010; Bartels, 1993; Morris, 2007). Connolly (2005) has argued that Fox News serves to "fold, bend, blend, emulsify and dissolve into each other" the various disparate elements of American conservatism, such as corporate interests and evangelical beliefs. From this perspective, evangelical aversion to climate action could be heightened by media cues that are politically conservative without being overtly religious. This would present a challenge to our theory that there is a distinctive evangelical aversion to climate action motivated by religious beliefs, and might instead suggest that the evangelical aversion is shaped by the general social and media milieu of political conservatism.

The FGPC survey asked respondents how many times they watched Fox News per week, which translated to a five point scale ranging from "Never" to "About once per week" to "Almost every day."¹⁸ Respondents were fairly evenly distributed along this five point scale, with 23% indicating that they watched Fox News almost every day and 23% indicating that they never watch Fox News. The variable *Fox* codes respondent's answers on this five point scale.

The results are displayed in Table 7. For conservatives, watching Fox News unsurprisingly increases opposition to both domestic and international climate policy. But what about evangelicals? Among people who do not watch Fox News, being evangelical is associated with increased opposition to international climate efforts, though the coefficient misses conventional levels of significance by a small margin. At the same time, the effect on domestic efforts is both smaller and misses significance by a wide margin. The interaction term itself is negative, small, and statistically insignificant, meaning that the importance of being evangelical for opposing international action is at best slightly smaller among Fox News watchers. This null result is consistent with our arguments above. Despite the popularity of Fox News with evangelicals, its discourse

¹⁷These estimates are from fixed effects logit regressions, using STATA 12.

¹⁸The GV survey did not ask a similar question.

on climate change has little specific resonance with them. Fox News reflects a much more secular, business-oriented indifference toward the environment, emphasizing supposed scientific disagreement on the existence and causes of climate change (Feldman et al., 2012). Fox does not venture into the eschatological meanings of international climate cooperation. This null result adds further support to our argument that other channels of conservative hostility to climate action are insufficient to explain the specific attitudes of evangelicals.¹⁹

[Table 7 about here.]

We also examined whether being evangelical increased the respondents' skepticism of climate science. The FGPC survey asked respondents if they thought that the scientists of the world (1) "think the problem is urgent enough and is known enough to take action" (2) "think the problem is not urgent enough, and not enough is yet known to take action" or (3) "views are pretty evenly divided". To measure the respondent's level of climate science skepticism, we coded a binary variable, *Skeptic* which equals one if the respondent chose option 2 and zero otherwise.

We re-estimated the FGPC model specifications above using climate skepticism as the dependent variable. The results are in Table 8. The results suggest that while evangelicals do not oppose domestic climate action, they may even not be particularly skeptical about climate science. Though positive, the coefficient on Evangelical is not significant when compared to other Americans in model 3. It becomes somewhat larger and significant when the comparison group is non-Christians, however.

[Table 8 about here.]

The supplementary appendix contains further tests and robustness checks, as well as the complete wording of all survey questions and demographic characteristics used in the analysis. First, we replicated the four-region fixed effects regressions with a more fine-grained subregional fixed effect specification. Second, we replicated our results using poststratification survey weights that were included with each dataset. For the FGPC survey one set of weights is designed to down-weight the oversampling of Catholics and evangelicals in the original survey and another is designed to make the sample more reflective of the general population in terms of religious variables and other covariates. Using both weights, the original results obtain. Third, we interacted church attendance with being evangelical, similar to our Fox News interactions. Interestingly, active church attendance does not strengthen the effect of being evangelical. This suggests that the effect of being evangelical lies in the respondent's religious beliefs, acquired from a wide range of evangelical sources, rather than in social interactions and networks within the congregational structure. This is further supported by the relationship between respondents' beliefs about Satan and their support for different climate policies. The FGPC survey asked if respondents believed that "Satan is a living being," as would be associated with evangelical beliefs, or that "Satan is a symbol for evil," which corresponds to less evangelical views. In the appendix, we rerun the two main FGPC regressions using a variable coding respondents' answers to the question regarding Satan. As above, we find that believing that Satan is a living being is associated with a lower probability of supporting international reductions, but is not associated with a significantly lower probability of supporting domestic reductions.

¹⁹The p value for the evangelical constituent term in second column is 0.103, just missing statistical significance. However, this variable is significant with slight changes to assumptions about the error terms, like non-clustering or clustering on sub-regions.

5 Conclusion

Although the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was signed in 1992, the following two decades have seen little progress toward a global climate treaty. One possible explanation for the negotiation gridlock is the intransigent position of the United States. If this explanation holds, the fate of the global climate negotiations could to a large extent depend on domestic politics in the United States. Without a change in American domestic politics, it is difficult to imagine that other major emitters like China and Russia would agree on deep emissions reductions. In the unlikely event of a legally binding treaty without the United States, American emissions would continue to contribute to climate change.

Given the considerable political clout of religious groups in the United States, we have sought to shed light on the religious politics of climate policy in the country. Specifically, we used two national surveys from 2011 and 2010 to examine how individuals who identify themselves as evangelicals, and whose numbers add up to approximately one-fourth of the national population, approach climate policy. Since the beginning of the Cold War, evangelicals have been profoundly distrusting of international cooperation. We have shown that individuals who identify themselves as evangelical or identify with evangelical denominations are more severely opposed to international climate policy, compared to domestic policy. Though we can only classify respondents according to self-identification and denominational questions, the respondents we classified as evangelical consistently display this pattern.

Since climate change is a global issue that ultimately requires cooperation (Barrett and Toman, 2010), the finding has strategic implications for climate policy advocates. Even if the United States manages to implement increasingly ambitious domestic climate policies in the future, this is no guarantee of a global treaty. Given that Senate ratifies international treaties by a super-majority, evangelical opposition to climate cooperation could be important. While some evangelical groups have begun to emphasize even international climate change efforts,²⁰ they seem to be a minority among the broader evangelical community. The diversity and evolution of opinions within the evangelical community indicates that a potential avenue for future research would be to examine which subsets within particular religious traditions or movements hold what views and why.

The findings have implications for the sources of possible change in American politics. If climate policy advocates are to increase abatement levels in federal and state policy, the evangelical vote is more likely to be forthcoming if the focus of campaigning is on domestic, instead of international, action. Although climate policy requires a global solution in the long run, the United States is such a large emitter and technological powerhouse that even domestic action could pave the way forward. In pursuing this solution, of course, it would be important to specifically target advocacy focused on domestic action to constituencies who are opposed to international cooperation, such as evangelicals. For other, more internationalist groups, emphasizing the role of the United States in international cooperation may be more effective. Indeed, it could be dangerous to emphasize domestic policy too much, given that a global solution is ultimately required. Our findings suggest that climate policies can be sold more effectively to evangelicals by focusing on the domestic aspects, but at the same time other constituencies in the United States and elsewhere may support international efforts in particular.

Ours is one of the first quantitative studies on the relationship between religion and international cooperation on climate change. As such, it leaves open at least as many questions as it

²⁰See, for example: Konkol, Brian E. "Climate Change, Poverty, Distractions, and Denial." Sojourners Online, <http://sojo.net/blogs/2012/09/14/climate-change-poverty-distractions-and-denial>.

answers. For one, our survey evidence is limited to the United States. Religion may play a rather different role in other countries. Similarly, we have not commented on the role of other religious affiliations, such as Islam or Hinduism. Perhaps most importantly, our study has not examined whether the beliefs of evangelicals actually shape their voting or economic behavior. Our findings certainly highlight the importance of studies that focus on the behavioral and political consequences of religious thought.

From a broader perspective, probably the most important contribution of our study is to begin bridging the gap between the study of international cooperation and religion. There has not been much disagreement on the importance of international cooperation under conditions of complex interdependence for decades (Keohane and Nye, 1977), and religion is widely recognized as an important element of American society (Froese and Bader, 2010). However, the relationship between specific international issues and religious thought is rarely studied. We have shown that religion shapes public opinion on international cooperation in non-obvious ways. This finding provides a rationale for future studies on the role of religion international cooperation, and relations between countries more generally.

References

- Barker, David C, and Christopher Jan Carman. 2000. "The Spirit of Capitalism? Religious Doctrine, Values, and Economic Attitude Constructs." *Political Behavior* 22 (1): 1–27.
- Barker, David C., and David H. Bearce. 2013. "End-Times Theology, the Shadow of the Future, and Public Resistance to Addressing Global Climate Change." *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (2): 267–279.
- Barker, David C., Jon Hurwitz, and Traci L. Nelson. 2008. "Of Crusades and Culture Wars: "Messianic" Militarism and Political Conflict in the United States." *Journal of Politics* 70 (2): 307–322.
- Barrett, Scott, and Michael Toman. 2010. "Contrasting Future Paths for an Evolving Global Climate Regime." *Global Policy* 1 (1): 64–74.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 267–285.
- Bouton, Marshall M., Steven Kull, Benjamin Page, Silvia Veltcheva, and Thomas Wright. 2011. "Global Views 2010: American Public Opinion and Foreign Policy." ICPSR31022-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Connolly, William E. 2005. "The Evangelical-Capitalist Resonance Machine." *Political Theory* 33 (6): 869–886.
- Dietz, Thomas, Amy Dan, and Rachael Shwom. 2007. "Support for Climate Change Policy: Social Psychological and Social Structural Influences." *Rural Sociology* 72 (2): 185–214.
- Dochuk, Darren. 2010. *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Dowland, Seth, and Brantley Gasaway. 2010. "Conservative Christians and Environmentalism, 1970-2005." In *Diversity and Dominion: Dialogues in Ecology, Ethics, and Theology*. Cascade Books pp. 157–165.
- Eckberg, Douglas Lee, and T. Jean Blocker. 1989. "Varieties of Religious Involvement and Environmental Concerns: Testing the Lynn White Thesis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28 (4): 509–517.
- Eckberg, Douglas Leeg, and T. Jean Blocker. 1996. "Christianity, Environmentalism, and the Theoretical Problem of Fundamentalism." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 35 (4): 343–355.
- Farr, Thomas F. 2008. *World of Faith and Freedom: Why International Religious Liberty is Vital to American National Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, Lauren, Edward W. Maibach, Connie Roser-Renouf, and Anthony Leiserowitz. 2012. "Climate on Cable: The Nature and Impact of Global Warming Coverage on Fox News, CNN, and MSNBC." *International Journal of Press/Politics* 17 (1): 3–31.

- Felson, Jacob, and Heather Kindell. 2007. "The Elusive Link Between Conservative Protestantism and Conservative Economics." *Social Science Research* 36 (2): 673–687.
- Focus on the Family. 2007. "Letter to L. Roy Taylor, National Association of Evangelicals." March 1, signed by James Dobson and other Evangelical leaders.
- Frieden, Jeffry A. 1999. "Actors and Preferences in International Relations." In *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, ed. David A. Lake, and Robert Powell. Princeton: Princeton University Press pp. 39–76.
- Froese, Paul, and Christopher Bader. 2010. *America's Four Gods: What We Say About God – & What That Says About Us*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Froese, Paul, and F. Carson Mencken. 2009. "A US Holy War? The Effects of Religion on Iraq War Policy Attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 90 (1): 103–116.
- Guth, James L. 2009. "Religion and American Public Opinion: Foreign Policy Issues." In *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press pp. 243–265.
- Guth, James L., John C. Green, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Corvin E. Smidt. 1995. "Faith and the Environment: Religious Beliefs and Attitudes on Environmental Policy." *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (2): 364–382.
- Guth, James L., Lyman A. Kellstedt, Corvin E. Smidt, and John C. Green. 1993. "Theological Perspectives and Environmentalism among Religious Activists." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32 (4): 373–382.
- Hackett, Conrad, and D. Michael Lindsay. 2008. "Measuring Evangelicalism: Consequences of Different Operationalization Strategies." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47 (3): 499–514.
- Haidt, Jonathan. 2012. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Herzog, Jonathan P. 2011. *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle against Communism in the Early Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hoover, Dennis R., Michael D. Martinez, Samuel H. Reimer, and Kenneth D. Wald. 2002. "Evangelicalism Meets the Continental Divide: Moral and Economic Conservatism in the United States and Canada." *Political Research Quarterly* 55 (2): 351–374.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 2010. *News that Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kellstedt, Lyman, and Corwin Smidt. 1991. "Measuring Fundamentalism: An Analysis of Different Operational Strategies." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30 (3): 259–278.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Krosnick, Jon A., Allyson L. Holbrook, Laura Lowe, and Penny S. Visser. 2006. "The Origins and Consequences of Democratic Citizens' Policy Agendas: A Study of Popular Concern about Global Warming." *Climatic Change* 77 (1): 7–43.
- Kull, Steven, John Steinbruner, Nancy Gallagher, Clay Ramsay, Evan Lewis, Jonas Siegel, Kevin Jones, and Stefan Subias. 2011. "Faith and Global Policy Challenges: How Spiritual Values Shape Views on Poverty, Nuclear Risks, and Environmental Degradation." University of Maryland.
- Lewis, Andrew R., and Dana Huyser De Bernardo. 2010. "Belonging Without Belonging: Utilizing Evangelical Self-Identification to Analyze Political Attitudes and Preferences." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49 (1): 112–126.
- Lieven, Anatol. 2004. *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lindsey, Hal. 1970. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Martin, William. 1999. "The Christian Right and American Foreign Policy." *Foreign Policy* 114: 66–80.
- McCright, Aaron M., and Riley E. Dunlap. 2003. "Defeating Kyoto: The Conservative Movement's Impact on U.S. Climate Change Policy." *Social Problems* 50 (3): 348–373.
- Milner, Helen V. 1997. *Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Morris, J.S. 2007. "Slanted Objectivity? Perceived Media Bias, Cable News Exposure, and Political Attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 88 (3): 707–728.
- Philpott, D. 2007. "Explaining the Political Ambivalence of Religion." *American Political Science Review* 101 (3): 505–525.
- Prelli, Lawrence J., and Terri S. Winters. 2009. "Rhetorical Features of Green Evangelicalism." *Environmental Communication* 3 (2): 224–243.
- Preston, Andrew. 2012. *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy*. New York: Knopf.
- Putnam, Robert D., and David E. Campbell. 2012. *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rock, Stephen R. 2011. *Faith and Foreign Policy: The Views and Influence of US Christians and Christian Organizations*. New York: Continuum.
- Rosenson, Beth A., Elizabeth A. Oldmixon, and Kenneth D. Wald. 2009. "US Senators' Support for Israel Examined Through Sponsorship/Cosponsorship Decisions, 1993–2002: The Influence of Elite and Constituent Factors." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5 (1): 73–91.
- Rothenberg, S., and F. Newport. 1984. *The Evangelical Voter*. Free Congress Research & Education Foundation.

- Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. 2006. "Religion and Preferences for Social Insurance." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1 (3): 255–286.
- Sherkat, Darren E., and Christopher G. Ellison. 2007. "Structuring the Religion-Environment Connection: Identifying Religious Influences on Environmental Concern and Activism." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46 (1): 71–85.
- Shields, Jon A. 2009. *The Democratic Virtues of the Christian Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shires, Preston. 2007. *Hippies of the Religious Right*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Skotece, Shannon. 2012. "Collaboration and Blurred Divisions: Re-Framing the Climate Change Debate." PhD Dissertation.
- Smidt, Corwin, Lyman Kellstedt, and James Guth. 2009. *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Buster G., and Byron Johnson. 2010. "The Liberalization of Young Evangelicals: A Research Note." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49 (2): 351–360.
- Smith, David T. 2012. "How Religious is American Foreign Policy?" *Australian Journal of Political Science* 47 (3): 507–513.
- Southern Baptist Convention. 2007. "SBC Resolution: On Global Warming." Accessed December 6, 2012.
URL: <http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/amResolution.asp?ID=1171>
- Stensland, Brian, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79 (1): 291–318.
- Tarakeshwar, Nalini, Aaron B. Swank, Kenneth I. Pargament, and Annette Mahoney. 2001. "The Sanctification of Nature and Theological Conservatism: A Study of Opposing Religious Correlates Of Environmentalism." *Review of Religious Research* 42 (4): 387–404.
- Wardekker, J. Arjan, Arthur C. Petersen, and Jeroen P. van der Sluijs. 2009. "Ethics and Public Perception of Climate Change: Exploring the Christian Voices in the US Public Debate." *Global Environmental Change* 19 (4): 512–521.
- Warner, Carolyn M., and Stephen Walker. 2011. "Thinking About the Role of Religion in Foreign Policy: A Framework for Analysis." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7 (1): 113–135
- Weitzer, R. 2007. "The Social Construction of Sex Trafficking: Ideology and Institutionalization of a Moral Crusade." *Politics & Society* 35 (3): 447–475.
- White, Lynn T. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (3767): 1203–1207.
- Wilcox, Clyde, Ted G. Jelen, and David C. Leege. 1993. "Religious Group Identifications: Toward a Cognitive Theory of Religious Mobilization." In *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe pp. 72–99.

- Wilkinson, Katharine K. 2012. *Between God and Green: How Evangelicals Are Cultivating a Middle Ground on Climate Change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wolkomir, M., M. Futreal, E. Woodrum, and T. Hoban. 1997. "Denominational Subcultures of Environmentalism." *Review of Religious Research* 38 (4): 325–343.
- Zald, Mayer N., and John D. McCarthy. 1998. "Religious Groups as Crucibles of Social Movements." In *Sacred Companies: Organizational Aspects of Religion and Religious Aspects of Organizations*, ed. Terry Schmitt Rhys H. Williams N. J. Demerath, Peter Dobkin Hall. New York: Oxford University Press pp. 24–49.

Table 1: Summary statistics

Variable	FGPC Survey			GV Survey		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Conservative	3.308	0.927	1472	4.25	1.478	2533
Christian	0.839	0.368	1496	0.743	0.437	2546
Evangelical	0.266	0.442	1496	0.215	0.411	2546
NonEvChr	0.573	0.495	1496	0.518	0.5	2597
Employed	0.545	0.498	1496	0.55	0.498	2597
Age	50.273	16.96	1496	48.711	16.326	2597
White	0.761	0.426	1496	0.759	0.428	2597
Male	0.5	0.5	1496	0.505	0.5	2597
Income	11.963	4.315	1496	11.104	4.448	2597
Married	0.602	0.49	1496	0.537	0.499	2597

Summary statistics for respondents in each survey. Sample size changes for regressions because of respondents who answered “Don’t Know” (or refused to answer) for certain questions and because not all questions were given to all respondents in the GV survey.

Table 2: Percent Support for Domestic and International Reduction, by Religious Beliefs

	Int. <i>FGPC</i>		Dom. <i>FGPC</i>		Int. <i>GV1</i>		Int. <i>GV2</i>		Dom. <i>GV1</i>		Dom. <i>GV2</i>		Dom. <i>GV3</i>	
Full Sample	1456	79.7%	1434	72.8%	1199	68.4%	1225	61.9%	1278	83.3%	1272	70.2%	1274	35.1%
Non-Christians	234	85.9%	233	79.4%	293	74.1%	315	69.8%	338	84.6%	336	75.0%	339	49.6%
Christians	1222	78.5%	1201	71.5%	906	66.7%	910	59.1%	940	82.9%	936	68.4%	935	29.9%
Evangelicals	382	69.9%	373	63.0%	276	46.4%	266	44.4%	271	74.5%	270	58.9%	270	16.7%
Non-evangelicals	840	82.3%	828	75.4%	630	75.6%	644	65.2%	669	86.2%	666	72.3%	665	35.1%

Entries in the table show the percentage of respondents in each category who indicated support for the various climate change policies, for the two surveys analyzed.

Table 3: Effect of Conservativeness and Religion on Support for International GHG Reduction

	Int.FGPC			Int.GV1			Int.GV2		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Conservative	-.417 (.026)***	-.388 (.020)***	-.392 (.018)***	-.421 (.033)***	-.369 (.037)***	-.383 (.039)***	-.355 (.039)***	-.330 (.039)***	-.335 (.039)***
Christian	-.026 (.122)			.158 (.029)***			.043 (.036)		
Evangelical		-.267 (.154)*	-.222 (.220)		-.403 (.082)***	-.187 (.081)**		-.225 (.025)***	-.149 (.045)***
NonEvChr			.053 (.087)			.295 (.018)***			.101 (.030)***
Employed	.045 (.069)	.038 (.076)	.036 (.072)	.003 (.084)	-.024 (.094)	-.025 (.096)	-.048 (.149)	-.069 (.150)	-.075 (.150)
Age	-.004 (.003)	-.004 (.003)	-.004 (.003)	-.0007 (.002)	-.0005 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	-.0002 (.001)	-.0001 (.001)	-.0005 (.001)
White	.158 (.092)*	.153 (.084)*	.152 (.082)*	-.032 (.211)	-.030 (.211)	-.034 (.219)	-.070 (.091)	-.074 (.089)	-.076 (.090)
Male	-.100 (.052)*	-.119 (.048)**	-.118 (.047)**	-.010 (.018)	-.040 (.018)**	-.022 (.021)	-.105 (.072)	-.109 (.072)	-.103 (.071)
Income	-.007 (.012)	-.010 (.011)	-.010 (.011)	-.010 (.007)	-.012 (.007)	-.014 (.007)*	-.017 (.008)**	-.018 (.008)**	-.018 (.008)**
Married	-.167 (.096)*	-.143 (.080)*	-.144 (.080)*	-.096 (.067)	-.075 (.073)	-.075 (.068)	-.143 (.094)	-.134 (.093)	-.135 (.093)
N	1456	1456	1456	1199	1199	1199	1225	1225	1225

Robust standard errors, clustered by region, in parentheses below coefficients. *, **, and *** represent p-values of 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01.

Table 4: Effect of Conservativeness and Religion on Support for Domestic GHG Reduction

	Dom. <i>FGPC</i>			Dom. <i>GV1</i>			Dom. <i>GV2</i>			Dom. <i>GV3</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Conservative	-.529 (.043) ^{***}	-.499 (.034) ^{***}	-.512 (.034) ^{***}	-.234 (.035) ^{***}	-.206 (.038) ^{***}	-.216 (.036) ^{***}	-.288 (.011) ^{***}	-.278 (.022) ^{***}	-.281 (.015) ^{***}	-.297 (.035) ^{***}	-.287 (.035) ^{***}	-.275 (.034) ^{***}
Christian	.105 (.111)			.114 (.091)			.032 (.148)			-.240 (.096) ^{**}		
Evangelical		-.159 (.155)	-.030 (.210)		-.170 (.107)	-.045 (.139)		-.067 (.037) [*]	-.029 (.125)		-.355 (.109) ^{***}	-.489 (.136) ^{***}
NonEvChr			.154 (.089) [*]			.169 (.092) [*]			.051 (.157)			-.183 (.091) ^{**}
Employed	.090 (.114)	.088 (.111)	.083 (.115)	.062 (.110)	.047 (.118)	.045 (.120)	-.025 (.137)	-.030 (.137)	-.031 (.135)	-.017 (.067)	-.038 (.057)	-.034 (.060)
Age	-.004 (.002) [*]	-.003 (.002) [*]	-.004 (.002) [*]	.010 (.001) ^{***}	.011 (.001) ^{***}	.010 (.001) ^{***}	.007 (.005) [*]	.008 (.004) [*]	.007 (.005)	-.003 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	-.003 (.003)
White	-.075 (.126)	-.078 (.128)	-.078 (.130)	.106 (.057) [*]	.110 (.057) [*]	.106 (.058) [*]	.072 (.114)	.072 (.115)	.072 (.115)	-.029 (.056)	-.029 (.063)	-.028 (.060)
Male	-.162 (.071) ^{**}	-.178 (.076) ^{**}	-.173 (.078) ^{**}	.095 (.058) [*]	.090 (.057)	.098 (.057) [*]	.020 (.093)	.018 (.088)	.020 (.092)	.066 (.131)	.078 (.124)	.071 (.127)
Income	.0004 (.002)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.003)	.024 (.003) ^{***}	.023 (.003) ^{***}	.023 (.003) ^{***}	.021 (.012) [*]	.021 (.012) [*]	.021 (.012) [*]	.024 (.012) ^{**}	.022 (.011) [*]	.022 (.011) [*]
Married	-.117 (.055) ^{**}	-.102 (.042) ^{**}	-.101 (.041) ^{**}	-.147 (.080) [*]	-.137 (.084)	-.139 (.082) [*]	-.096 (.092)	-.093 (.092)	-.093 (.092)	-.073 (.138)	-.066 (.131)	-.063 (.129)
N	1434	1434	1434	1278	1278	1278	1272	1272	1272	1274	1274	1274

Robust standard errors clustered by region in parentheses below coefficients. *, **, and *** represent p-values of 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01.

Table 5: Predicted Support for International and Domestic Reduction, Non-Christians, Non-Ev. Christians, and Evangelicals

	Respondent's Conservativeness						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Non-Chr.	0.95 (0.91,0.98)	0.90 (0.84,0.94)	0.81 (0.75,0.87)	0.69 (0.62,0.76)	0.55 (0.46,0.63)	0.40 (0.30,0.50)	0.27 (0.17,0.37)
Non-Ev. Chr.	0.97 (0.95,0.99)	0.94 (0.90,0.97)	0.88 (0.83,0.92)	0.79 (0.73,0.84)	0.66 (0.60,0.73)	0.52 (0.44,0.60)	0.37 (0.28,0.47)
Ev.	0.92 (0.86,0.97)	0.86 (0.78,0.92)	0.76 (0.67,0.83)	0.63 (0.54,0.70)	0.48 (0.40,0.56)	0.33 (0.26,0.41)	0.21 (0.15,0.28)

	Respondent's Conservativeness						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Non-Chr.	0.95 (0.92,0.98)	0.93 (0.89,0.96)	0.89 (0.85,0.94)	0.85 (0.79,0.90)	0.79 (0.72,0.86)	0.72 (0.64,0.81)	0.65 (0.54,0.76)
Non-Ev. Chr.	0.97 (0.94,0.99)	0.95 (0.92,0.97)	0.92 (0.89,0.95)	0.89 (0.84,0.92)	0.84 (0.79,0.88)	0.78 (0.72,0.84)	0.71 (0.62,0.79)
Ev.	0.95 (0.89,0.98)	0.92 (0.86,0.96)	0.89 (0.82,0.93)	0.84 (0.77,0.89)	0.78 (0.72,0.84)	0.71 (0.63,0.77)	0.63 (0.55,0.71)

Predicted probability that each religious group supports international (top) and domestic (bottom) climate change efforts, for each level of Conservatism, with 5 indicating the most conservative. Predictions are generated by estimates using the first international and domestic questions from the GV survey, but without region clustered standard errors. 95% confidence intervals for each estimate included in parentheses. Predictions hold all other continuous variables at sample mean, and binary variables at sample mode.

Table 6: Effect of Conservativeness and Evangelical on Support for International and Domestic GHG Reduction, Regional Fixed Effects

	International			Domestic			
	Int.FGPC (1)	Int.GV1 (2)	Int.GV2 (3)	Dom.FGPC (4)	Dom.GV1 (5)	Dom.GV2 (6)	Dom.GV3 (7)
Conservative	-.703 (.085)***	-.638 (.058)***	-.552 (.052)***	-.864 (.082)***	-.378 (.061)***	-.470 (.052)***	-.477 (.049)***
Evangelical	-.472 (.151)***	-.649 (.164)***	-.370 (.164)**	-.250 (.145)*	-.236 (.186)	-.082 (.161)	-.607 (.190)***
Employed	.068 (.155)	-.032 (.157)	-.119 (.147)	.135 (.144)	.099 (.172)	-.048 (.143)	-.067 (.138)
Age	-.006 (.005)	-.002 (.005)	-.001 (.004)	-.007 (.004)	.018 (.005)***	.012 (.004)***	-.006 (.004)
White	.260 (.168)	-.105 (.175)	-.207 (.165)	-.206 (.161)	.179 (.190)	.107 (.160)	-.054 (.152)
Male	-.210 (.139)	-.077 (.142)	-.202 (.131)	-.305 (.130)**	.177 (.157)	.020 (.131)	.146 (.128)
Income	-.024 (.018)	-.021 (.018)	-.034 (.017)**	-.007 (.017)	.037 (.020)*	.032 (.017)*	.036 (.016)**
Married	-.258 (.159)	-.155 (.154)	-.205 (.144)	-.157 (.146)	-.251 (.176)	-.155 (.145)	-.082 (.140)
N	1456	1199	1225	1434	1278	1272	1274

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficients. *, **, and *** represent p-values of 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01.

Table 7: Effect of Ideology and Evangelical on Support for GHG Reduction, with Fox News Interactions

	Int. <i>FGPC</i>		Dom. <i>FGPC</i>	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Conservative	-.192 (.102)*	-.160 (.098)	-.274 (.081)***	-.243 (.039)***
ConFox	-.063 (.033)*	-.063 (.028)**	-.073 (.014)***	-.077 (.007)***
Fox	.109 (.114)	.094 (.099)	.158 (.080)**	.158 (.074)**
Evangelical		-.365 (.224)†		-.279 (.419)
EvFox		.032 (.055)		.043 (.091)
Employed	.031 (.095)	.029 (.099)	.077 (.115)	.075 (.116)
Age	-.001 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.002)
White	.150 (.090)*	.143 (.085)*	-.075 (.120)	-.079 (.125)
Male	-.068 (.053)	-.089 (.046)*	-.130 (.061)**	-.142 (.075)*
Income	-.006 (.013)	-.010 (.012)	.002 (.004)	.0003 (.002)
Married	-.188 (.093)**	-.167 (.079)**	-.127 (.063)**	-.116 (.052)**
N	1438	1438	1417	1417

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficients. *, **, and *** represent p-values of 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01. †: p -value = 0.103. Column headers indicate the dependent variable used in the regression, either the domestic or international carbon reduction questions from the FGPC survey.

Table 8: Effect of Religion and Evangelical on Climate Change Skepticism

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Conservative	.241 (.049)***	.229 (.053)***	.217 (.068)***	.211 (.067)***
Christian		.135 (.072)*		
Evangelical			.222 (.146)	.287 (.148)*
NonEvChr				.078 (.065)
Employed	-.161 (.056)***	-.165 (.054)***	-.156 (.058)***	-.159 (.056)***
Age	-.005 (.002)***	-.006 (.002)***	-.005 (.002)***	-.005 (.002)***
White	-.040 (.067)	-.039 (.068)	-.034 (.071)	-.033 (.071)
Male	.095 (.081)	.101 (.083)	.112 (.089)	.115 (.089)
Income	.015 (.007)**	.015 (.008)**	.018 (.009)**	.018 (.009)**
Married	.024 (.089)	.021 (.091)	.002 (.099)	.002 (.100)
N	1449	1449	1449	1449

Standard errors in parentheses below coefficients. *, **, and *** represent p-values of 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01. Regressions use the survey question on skepticism over global warming from the FGPC survey as the dependent variable.