



Report on the consultation on climate justice

The JIM Cluster produced a consultation paper on 'Living in harmony with creation – What is the role of the Synod of Victoria and Tasmania in addressing climate change?'

The paper was promoted through the Synod e-mail to congregations, the JIM Cluster website, the JustUpdate e-mail and the June JustAct newsletter. Uniting Church members and congregations were given until the end of August to provide feedback. The consultation paper included a draft proposal to take to the February 2021 Synod meeting.

The consultation paper offered eight questions to guide reflection, but it was made clear that any feedback would be welcome.

The JIM Cluster offered to attend any forum organised by congregations on the topic. Feedback was invited by written submission, e-mail or phone conversation. The Cluster also hosted two online forums for any Uniting Church members to attend.

The Cluster was involved in three online forums in addition to the two it organised. One was organised by the Manningham Uniting Church, Koonung Heights Uniting Church and The Village Church Mt Eliza. Several congregations in the Port Phillip East Presbytery organised another. The third forum was with the Gippsland Presbytery.

The Cluster also met online with members from the Crossroads Uniting Church in Werribee.

Table of Contents

Report on the consultation on climate justice.....	1
Feedback to the consultation	2
Response from the JIM Cluster.....	7
Action by the Synod in its operations	7
Engage First Nations members of the Synod.....	8
Metallurgical Coal	8
Call for actions by Victoria and Tasmanian Governments.....	9
On the Synod calling a “climate emergency” or “climate crisis”	10
Other issues	10



Feedback to the consultation

The Cluster received 21 written submissions. One person requested their submission be kept confidential.

Suggestion from submissions	Number of submissions making the suggestion
Suggestions on what the Synod itself should do	
Undertake a period of discernment rather than have political asks.	1
Provide more guidance to congregations on what they can do to address climate change.	1
Conduct an education campaign factually describing the effect of increasing carbon dioxide volumes in the atmosphere compared with other greenhouse gases.	1
Raise awareness of climate change amongst Uniting Church members.	1
Set an emission reduction target for the Synod as a whole.	1
The Synod should commit to a target of net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 at the latest, with possible intermediate targets.	2
The Synod should adopt a Synod-wide Climate Action Strategy, including dedicated staff resources.	1
Congregations should be invited to develop their own Climate Action Plans.	2
The Synod should call on and invite all congregations and all Synod-affiliated agencies and bodies to join in setting, adopting and implementing climate action with clear targets and regular review.	1
The Synod should mobilise all potential “volunteer” resources across the Synod to support congregations to declare a climate crisis and develop their own Climate Action Plan.	1
The Synod should provide progress reports on what it has done to reduce its emissions.	2
The Synod should set out its values concerning climate change and what advocacy and pastoral care actions it will take in response.	1
Increase advocacy to governments on climate change.	1
Include questions about energy efficiency/sustainability practices in the Synod annual Community Life Survey to congregations.	1
The Synod should not call on governments to take action but only focus on the steps it can take.	2
The Synod's response to climate change must include the most profound and most personal response that lies in the hearts and minds of people.	1
The Synod should embrace a diversity of theological perspectives in responding to climate change.	5
The Synod should respond to climate change as if there is a climate emergency.	1
Engage with First Nations members of the Uniting Church and respect the voices of First Nations people on climate justice issues.	2
The Synod should partner with other organisations focussed on taking action on climate change, including businesses.	1
The Synod should abandon the use of concepts and terms that are not in current use in the community, such as ‘creation’, ‘stewardship’, Trinitarian language, ‘Spirit’, ‘God making humans in God’s image’, and ‘prophetic role’.	1
The church has the role of being a prophetic voice in our society.	1



The Synod should reiterate previous resolutions of the Synod and Assembly that address climate change.	1
The Synod should encourage its members to support environmental organisations campaigning on climate change issues.	1
The Synod's position on climate change should reference the Synod's Vision and Mission Principle of 'live justly and seek justice for all'.	1
Calls related to government action	
The Australian Government should go beyond just doing its fair share and show leadership on addressing climate change.	2
Set the global average temperature increase target at 2°C as it is no longer possible to limit the increase to 1.5°C.	1
Add in requests to state governments in the proposal.	3
Call on the Victorian Government to have at least 80% of the electricity in the state generated from renewable sources by 2030.	1
Add requests to local governments in the proposal.	1
Call on a 'cradle to the grave' responsibility for emissions on products.	1
Call for the development and implementation of reliable renewable energy.	3
Call for research to find the most effective ways of reaching net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.	1
Call on the Australian Government to support Pacific Island nations with dealing with the impact of climate change.	2
Call for assistance to other nations to deal with climate change.	2
Call for improved planning of communities to encourage active transport and public transport.	1
Request that post-COVID rebuilding of the economy is based on renewable and regenerative practices.	1
Call for protection of areas of diminished habitat for vulnerable species.	1
Call for action to address greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture.	1
Call for further research into regenerative land management, agriculture and soil rehabilitation, including learning from working with Indigenous land managers.	1
Support research and development of a hydrogen industry.	1
Call for action to address greenhouse emissions from transport.	1
Call for a shift to electric vehicles and a charging station network.	1
Call for a rapid exit from native forest harvesting.	1
Call for action to conserve our dwindling water supplies.	1
Call for action to increase the effective absorption of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.	1
Call for partnerships between governments and communities currently dependent on fossil fuels to create meaningful jobs and incomes for all people.	1
Call on the Australian Government to forego the use of any carbon credits from the Kyoto arrangement.	1
Call on governments to implement social and economic behaviours that align with positive, sustainable living, restore the Earth to a better state of health and respect all creation.	1
Call for the costs of transition to a net-zero emission future are borne equitably.	1
Suggestions related to fossil fuels	
Call for removal of subsidies for fossil fuel industries.	1
The call for no new coal mines or expansion of existing mines should only apply to thermal coal.	2
Oppose the expansion of natural gas production.	3



Oppose fracking for natural gas extraction.	1
Call for Australia to minimise its reliance on natural gas.	1
Call on the Victorian Government to reimpose the moratorium on onshore gas development.	1
Do not oppose the expansion of gas supply at this time to ensure electricity grid reliability.	1
Do not oppose natural gas development where it acts as a transition out of fossil fuels.	1
Suggestions around a climate emergency or crisis	
Call for a “climate crisis” response.	2
Ask that individual congregations and Uniting agencies declare a “climate crisis”.	1
Do not support any suspension of democracy to deal with climate change.	1
Call for action on climate change rather than a “climate emergency”.	1
Call a “climate emergency”.	1
Oppose the Synod "calling an emergency" concerning climate change as any broader intention beyond the Synod's actions would be "unfounded arrogance".	1
Other	
The proposal should include statements from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, Culturally and Linguistically Diverse communities, children, youth and young adults.	2
Acknowledge Australia’s First Peoples’ care of the land.	1
There should be consideration of the broader Earth system beyond carbon induced climate change.	1
The Synod should support the precautionary principle when responding to climate change.	1

One of the detailed written submissions made the case that all of Australia's electricity generation can come from renewable sources. The submission pointed out that renewable energy generation is the cheapest form of adding new power generation to the Australian grid, even when the cost of storage systems is added in. The submission pointed to multiple studies that find that the Australian electricity grid can be economically sourced entirely from renewable power generation. The submission identified a report by academics at the Australian National University calculated that Australia could achieve having all its electricity generated by renewable sources by 2032.

An online children and youth survey was organised between eLM and Manningham Uniting Church. The survey attracted ten responses. All ten respondents believed the Synod should declare a climate emergency.

The responses to the other survey questions are given in the table below.

Issue	Number of responses		
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Banning new coal mines		1	9
Ceasing expansion of new coal mines	1	1	8
Banning new coal power stations			10
Net-zero greenhouse gas emissions		1	9



There were a small number of conversations with members of congregations that indicated a desire for the Synod to explore a broader position on environmental issues beyond climate change. Some of those conversations specifically raised the issue of living more simply and sustainably.

The consultation forum with The Village Church Mt Eliza, Koonung Heights Uniting Church and Manningham Uniting Church involved approximately 40 participants. The participants raised the following points:

- The Synod should support a price on pollution to address greenhouse gas emissions;
- There was concern that asking the Australian Government to do its fair share towards limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C was not specific enough;
- The Synod should oppose the use of coal;
- The Synod should call on its congregations and agencies to take action;
- The Synod should periodically measure its emissions;
- Some wanted an emissions reduction target for congregations;
- The Synod should support vehicle emission standards;
- There was concern that language that expresses uncertainty undermines the level of concern about climate change;
- The Synod should support a people's parliament on climate change; and
- Some argued the Synod should not make calls on governments until we have acted ourselves. Others argued that the Synod should call on governments to act while also taking action itself.

A meeting with four members of the Crossroads Uniting Church in Werribee raised the following points:

- The Synod should both call on governments to act as well as acting itself;
- The Synod needs to set a direction for congregations;
- The Synod should set building standards that reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
- They supported having a central Synod body to coordinate actions by the Synod on climate change;
- Climate change cuts across everything;
- There is a need to touch people's emotional side in motivating them to respond to climate change;
- Supported calling for Australian Government to reach a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 50% by 2030; and
- The proposal to Synod should say something about natural gas.

At the JIM Cluster online forum on 21 July, participants raised the following points:

- The Victorian Government should be called on to legislate emission reduction targets;
- The Synod should state there is a climate crisis, rather than a climate emergency. The emergency language promotes a negative response from some First People groups who have a negative experience of the Northern Territory intervention by the Commonwealth Government to what was labelled a child protection emergency;
- However, some participants still preferred the use of "emergency" over "crisis";
- The Australian Government should commit to a 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030;
- The Synod needs to be prophetic;
- The Synod should set itself a target of net-zero emissions by 2030;



- Concern was expressed about the role of political donations by fossil fuel corporations to influence government policy to favour their profit-making interests;
- Change in the diet by individuals can assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions;
- Concern was expressed about the export of fossil fuels;
- Support was expressed for hydrogen produced from renewable energy sources;
- Concern was expressed that the target for the average global temperature of 1.5°C was too high;
- The Synod should support the scientific evidence of the worst impacts of climate change;
- Concern was expressed about the Adani coal mine development in Queensland;
- The Synod should not bank with banks that invest in fossil fuels;
- The Synod should take action itself; and
- The Synod should apply the precautionary principle when responding to climate change.

At the JIM Cluster online forum on 22 July, participants raised the following points:

- There was a need for the Synod to be concerned about the whole of creation and not just the impact of climate change on humanity;
- The Synod should love the Earth as a neighbour;
- There was a need to recognise the diversity of view of congregational members, but be prophetic;
- The Synod should move towards an ecotheological position;
- Another participant stated they preferred a stewardship approach to the environment;
- Concern was expressed about population growth;
- Concern was also expressed about the role of lifestyle in increasing greenhouse gas emissions;
- There is a need to integrate both the scientific and theological perspectives in responding to climate change;
- There is a need to interpret scripture from an ecotheological view;
- The Synod should support a minimising in the use of natural gas;
- Support was expressed for the production of hydrogen as a fuel source from renewable energy;
- Concern was expressed about logging;
- Concern was expressed about fossil fuel exports;
- Concern was expressed about the extinction of species;
- The Synod should take a holistic approach to the environment;
- Support was expressed for a carbon budget approach, where countries are set a limit on the total amount of emissions they can generate;
- Concern was expressed about the “climate emergency” language and the anti-democratic undertones it carries;
- Concern was expressed about the way some First Peoples groups will react to the “emergency” language;
- Preference was expressed for the use of “climate crisis” language;
- Climate change is a Kairos moment;
- The proposal to Synod should say what the Synod should do;
- Pacific Islanders have a sense of urgency in dealing with climate change;
- Synod should assist congregations in taking action on climate change;
- Support should be provided to increase the take up of solar panels on rooves;
- The focus should be on the Victorian Government;
- The State Governments should be commended for the actions they have taken; and
- The proposal to Synod should be holistic, bold and positive.



The forum organised by several congregations in the Port Phillip East Presbytery involved 49 participants. The feedback from participants was:

- The Synod should speak out strongly against a ‘gas-led’ recovery;
- The production of hydrogen is something the Synod should support;
- There is a need to listen to youth voices on the issue of climate justice;
- The Australian and Victorian Government should restrict logging of native forests;
- The Australian Government should set strong emission standards for cars;
- The Australian Government and state governments should encourage investment in solar energy;
- The Synod should put solar panels on the rooves of churches;
- The Synod should set up a Committee to respond to climate change;
- The Synod should engage with government on climate justice issues;
- Individuals should not eat red meat;
- Individuals should become vegan; and
- The Synod should make young people aware that the church cares about climate justice.

The participants were surveyed at the end of the forum:

- 28 participants agreed or strongly agreed that climate change was a severe threat;
- 95% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that Australia should do its fair share to respond to climate change;
- 77% agreed or strongly agreed that there should be no new thermal coal mines and no expansion of existing thermal coal mines. 8% disagreed;
- 87% agreed or strongly agreed that Australian governments should not provide any support for new coal-fired power stations. 5% disagreed;
- 87% agreed or strongly agreed that there should be no new natural gas developments for export. 10% disagreed; and
- 80% agreed or strongly agreed that the Synod should call a ‘climate emergency’. 8% disagreed.

Response from the JIM Cluster

The JIM Cluster was grateful for the feedback provided by those that engaged in the consultation process. The responses indicate a diversity of views on responding to climate change. Some of those views conflict. For example, there were those who think the Synod should seek to influence government policy on climate change and those that do not.

Some of the suggestions made have been included in the proposal to the 2021 Synod meeting. Others are being acted upon without the need for a Synod resolution. Some will continue to be under further consideration and examination for possible future Synod proposals.

It will not be possible to address every suggestion made.

Action by the Synod in its operations

There was strong feedback from the people who responded to the consultation that the Synod should be doing more to address its greenhouse gas emissions. The JIM Cluster does not believe the Synod needs to pass another resolution calling on its various parts to take action to reduce their emissions. Instead, the JIM Cluster established a Synod Climate Action Taskforce to encourage and facilitate further action across all parts of the Synod to reduce emissions.



The JIM Cluster does not support establishing an emissions reduction target for the entire Synod. To do so would then require the emissions of all parts of the Synod to be measured and collected at a central point. The central point would need to follow up all parts of the Synod to gather the required information. That is likely to cause frustration for many congregations, who already feel burdened with information requests from other parts of the Synod. Far from encouraging action, such activity is likely to cause frustration and make some congregations less willing to take action.

Engage First Nations members of the Synod

The JIM Cluster did follow up with Uniting Aboriginal and Islander Christian Congress in Victoria and Tasmania. Both congresses indicated that they did seek any special opportunity to contribute to the Synod's response to climate change. They would feed into the process through the same opportunities as other parts of the Synod.

Metallurgical Coal

In response to the concern that there is a need to expand the production of metallurgical coal, the JIM Cluster notes that much of the steel produced in developed countries is now from recycled scrap.¹ Such steel production can be zero greenhouse gas emissions if it is powered by renewable electricity.² China and developing countries do not have sufficient amounts of scrap to meet their demand for steel. Most of their current production of steel is from high emissions reduction of iron ore using coke produced from metallurgical coal. The removal of oxygen from iron ore to make iron metal produces carbon dioxide.³

Lowest-cost lower-emissions production of iron and steel from iron ore currently is achieved through direct reduction using natural gas. The direct reduction process is well established. The most widely used method is Midrex. Other techniques have advantages in particular circumstances, including where high proportions of hydrogen are injected into the gas mix. Direct reduction using natural gas reduces the ratio of carbon dioxide to iron produced by about half of that in the blast furnace. Approximately 75 million tonnes per annum of iron metal are produced by direct reduction.⁴ That represents approximately 4.4% of global steel production at the moment.⁵ Current global steel production uses around 1 billion tonnes of metallurgical coal a year.⁶ Steelmaking contributes around 7% of global greenhouse emissions.⁷

Increasing the proportion of hydrogen used in direct reduction processes is technically feasible and reduces the use of natural gas. By expanding the use of hydrogen in the direct reduction processes the emissions from producing iron can be reduced to 15% of the emissions from a standard blast-furnace.⁸ Some plants have been able to operate with 100% hydrogen and no greenhouse gas emissions.⁹

Iron metal is converted to steel in an electric arc furnace. Steel can be produced with zero greenhouse gas emissions if:¹⁰

¹ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 115.

² Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 115.

³ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116.

⁴ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116.

⁵ Worldsteel Association, 'Fact Sheet. Steel and raw materials', February 2019, 1.

⁶ Worldsteel Association, 'Fact Sheet. Steel and raw materials', February 2019, 1.

⁷ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116.

⁸ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116.

⁹ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116.

¹⁰ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 116-117.



- hydrogen made by electrolysis using renewable electricity is used to reduce the ore;
- the electric arc that converts iron metal into steel is powered by electricity generated from renewable sources; and
- the relatively small carbon inputs necessary for the process are drawn from biomass.

The alternative is a conventional steel-producing process that has carbon capture and storage associated with it to pump the carbon dioxide produced underground rather than releasing it into the atmosphere. Such an approach has high costs. Such an arrangement may be competitive with the hydrogen route in specific locations adjacent to suitable geosequestration sites.¹¹

Thus, it is technically feasible to replace current steel making processes with lower emissions processes. Continuing to supply metallurgical coal will hold back the rate at which steelmaking will be needed to convert to direct reduction processes with lower carbon dioxide emissions. There will be a cost to replacing existing steel making processes with direct reduction processes. Given the level of concern expressed by members of congregations and churches across the globe, the JIM Cluster believes the economic cost of the conversion must be paid, and the conversion needs to happen as rapidly as possible.

Call for actions by Victoria and Tasmanian Governments

The JIM Cluster has not focussed its attention on the actions of the Victorian and Tasmanian Governments concerning climate change. The Cluster added calls on the Victorian and Tasmanian Governments in the proposal to the Synod meeting.

The Victorian Government had committed to reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions by between 15 and 20% by 2020 based on 2005 emission levels. At this time the Victorian Government has stated that it is on track to reduce Victoria's greenhouse gas emissions by 18% below 2005 levels by the end of 2020.

Victoria's *Climate Change Act 2017* requires the development of five-yearly sector pledges which describe the actions the government will take to reduce Victoria's emissions further. The Act establishes Victoria has a long-term goal of reaching net-zero emissions by 2050. The Victorian Government was supposed to set an interim target for 2025 in March 2020 but delayed setting the target due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It then indefinitely deferred setting a target in August 2020, again due to the pandemic.

The Tasmanian Government has adopted a Climate Change Action Plan to cover the period 2017 to 2021, called Climate Action 21. Renewable energy generation accounts for around 90 per cent of Tasmania's total electricity supply.

Climate Action 21 includes a commitment to establish an aspirational long-term target to achieve net-zero emissions for Tasmania by 2050. The Tasmanian Government proposes to legislate for this target under the *Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008*.

Tasmania's greenhouse gas emissions are only 1.7 tonnes of CO₂-eq per person. Tasmania's emissions have reduced by 95% on 1990 levels.

Tasmania will achieve 100% renewable energy generation by 2022 and has set a target of 200% renewable energy generation by 2040 so that it can export electricity generated from renewable sources.

¹¹ Ross Garnaut, 'Superpower. Australia's low-carbon opportunity', La Trobe University Press, 2019, 117.



On the Synod calling a “climate emergency” or “climate crisis”

There was relatively strong support for the Synod calling a “climate crisis” or “climate emergency” from the consultation feedback. There were people who also expressly opposed making such a declaration.

The current level of action and intended action across the Synod in no way match making such a declaration. The JIM Cluster remains of the view that making such a declaration of crisis or emergency would lack integrity until there was a much greater level of activity across the Synod.

The proposal for the Synod meeting was modified to note the World Council of Churches has called a climate emergency.

Further, behavioural science research on the use of fear as a motivating emotion to drive people to take action on climate change mostly shows that it is not as effective as other emotions. It can even feed denial. In her 2020 book 'How to talk about climate change in a way that makes a difference', Australian social researcher Rebecca Huntley warns:

Reviewing the literature on the effectiveness of fear appeals generally, the consensus seems to be that fear on its own won't do it. Simple fear appeals won't have lasting effects because people become desensitised to them if they're used too much – they need to be ramped up in order to overcome this and can then become too extreme, even laughable, to be credible. In addition, using fear can undermine the listener's trust in the messenger, and that can have unintended effects like denial.

Other issues

The JIM Cluster has included a position on natural gas in the proposal to Synod following feedback from the consultation.

In the view of the JIM Cluster, several suggestions for inclusions in the Synod proposal would only having meaning if backed up by the Synod being willing to campaign on the call in question.

For example, as there is no dedicated plan for any part of the Synod to engage with local governments, an explicit call on local government was not included in the proposal to the Synod. Reference to action by local government was left to the implicit statement in the proposal that all people and governments need to be taking action to address climate change.

Similarly, the suggestion to include a call for increased public transport would be best served if the Synod planned to back up the call with a campaign aimed at increasing the provision of public transport.

On the suggestion to call for government action to increase the uptake of electric vehicles in Australia, the consultation the JIM Cluster previously did with its supporters in congregations suggested there was weak support to campaign for this reform. Thus, the JIM Cluster would prefer to wait to see if congregation members become more interested in taking action in support of government reforms on this issue.

On the suggestion that the Synod call on the Australian Government to support Pacific Island countries to deal with climate change, Synod resolution 07.4.37.4 already called on the Commonwealth Government to assist developing countries. The Synod already has the endorsement to continue to pursue the point.



In the opinion of the JIM Cluster, the suggestions to include calls around the use of reforms in the area of agriculture and land use to reduce greenhouse emissions would require research to understand what explicit ask should be made. The JIM Cluster has not carried out such research. Such an ask might be considered for a future Synod proposal.

Similarly, the JIM Cluster has not had the time to consider if the Synod should take a position on hydrogen production and what that position would be.

The suggestion that the Synod should call for a rapid exit from native forest harvesting would require significant research to determine what the consequences of doing so would be. With the loss of timber from native forest harvesting, what materials would replace the use of the timber? Would the replacement materials result in a greater level of greenhouse gas emissions than the use of the native forest timber? The work the then JIM Unit did for Synod resolution 04.4.4.2 regarding forest management demonstrated that the members of the Synod expect the JIM Cluster to undertake extensive research and consultation before adopting any position that relates to forest management.

On the suggestion that the Synod should call on the Commonwealth Government not to use the carbon credits from the Kyoto Protocol to meet its Paris Agreement target, the JIM Cluster has taken the view that this is a matter of detail that did not need to be included in the proposal to the Synod meeting. It is also an issue that the Synod is unlikely to put effort into campaigning for and is unlikely to inspire congregations in their engagement on climate justice action.

The suggestion of putting a price on pollution to address greenhouse gas emissions is a sound proposal, but an unpopular one in the Australian community. The proposal as it stands would not stop the Synod supporting a price on pollution as part of what is necessary for the Australian Government to take the lead on addressing emissions.

The JIM Cluster is cautious about those that wish to target population growth as the cause of climate change. There is a danger that such framing will allow people in wealthy countries like Australia to blame people in developing countries for climate change. It can mean that people in wealthy countries are not required to change the unsustainable overconsumption of their lifestyles and instead blame those in financial poverty for climate change. There are many reasons why it would be very unhelpful to blame people in poverty in developing countries for climate change. The JIM Cluster will raise three. Firstly, it is wrong. A 2017 report by the Carbon Disclosure Project found 71% of all greenhouse gas emissions globally since 1988 were the result of the activities of 100 fossil fuel corporations.¹² Secondly, it is theologically unsound. The Christian faith encourages people to be in solidarity with those in financial poverty and seek their well-being. Thirdly, using blame framing itself is unhelpful to motivating action on climate change.¹³

The JIM Cluster notes those who put the view that the Synod should revisit its position on the natural environmental and sustainable living more generally, beyond addressing climate change. The JIM Cluster agrees with the idea and will look to work with church members interested in exploring the position the Synod might take.

¹² <https://www.cdp.net/en/articles/media/new-report-shows-just-100-companies-are-source-of-over-70-of-emissions>

¹³ <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200618-climate-change-who-is-to-blame-and-why-does-it-matter>



Dr Mark Zirnsak

Senior Social Justice Advocate

JIM Cluster

November 2020