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Abstract

Religious environmental organizations (REOs) are emerging religious actors in broader environmental and resistance movements that frame and respond to environmental issues in religious or moral terms. However, religious environmental framing across different audiences and settings in the context of climate movements remain under-explored. Examining how REOs construct and tailor climate change messaging to religious audiences in the Trans Mountain resistance, this study adopted a framing approach and conducted content and frame analyses on 15 semi-structured interviews, 107 movement texts, and 709 social media texts from seven REOs. This study argues that REOs constructed stewardship, bio-region, and interconnectedness frames that converged on reconciliation-based messaging of justice. Crystallization of this message was deeply embedded in the unsettling encounters and critical self-reflexivity of religious settlers related to ongoing and historical injustices and connections between colonialism and the religious institutions with which they associate. Given this background, REOs sought to ground their messages in education, advocacy, and activism in the wider web of resistance. Additionally, REOs adopted messaging strategies to communicate the urgency of climate change in a broader discourse of responsibilities of religious communities to reconciliation. This study offers four contributions to religious environmentalism, settler colonial studies, and climate change communication literature. First, it clarifies conceptual usages of religious environmental frames, explains the interaction of frame components underlining frame construction, and conceptualizes frame bridging processes towards justice. Second, self-reflexivity of religious actors in reconciliation-based messaging offers preliminary conceptualization of religious settler consciousness as an important pathway towards decolonized solidarity efforts in Indigenous-settler contexts. Third, the role and network formation of religious actors that distinguish the religious environmental movement highlight the movement’s potential alignment with and support for Indigenous-led climate movements. And last, in communicating climate change to religious audiences, message tailoring calls for greater attention to audience-centric approaches in light of opportunities and challenges. Empirically, this study documents REOs in forming a distinctive religious environmental movement specifically out of the Pacific Northwest of Canada and its intersection with Indigenous-led resistances to expanding fossil fuel infrastructures.
Lay Summary

REOs are one set of emerging actors involved in environmental movements and politics that frame their understanding and responses to environmental issues in religious or moral terms. What is less known is how REOs apply these frames across different audiences and settings in Indigenous-led climate movements. Drawing on interviews with REO members, as well as documents and social media texts in the Trans Mountain resistance, this study finds that beyond the stewardship, bio-region and interconnectedness frames, REOs converged on the justice frame, making the theme of reconciliation central to its messaging. Members of REOs indicated how this messaging strategy facilitated self-reflexivity, launching them into political engagement among other actors. Despite tailoring climate change messages through audience segmentation, messaging styles, and authoritative members to religious communities, REOs also faced challenges from religious institutions and encountered value conflicts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 Significance and overview of study

An existential threat to life on earth, climate change demands urgent and widespread actions from all segments of society (IPCC, 2018; Adger et al., 2012). However, climate change actions have historically been minimal among non-Indigenous religious communities especially in the North American context (Callison, 2014; Carvalho, van Wessel, & Maeseele, 2017; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2017). Religious responses to climate change represent a larger, under-engaged constituency that could nonetheless prove and offer a powerful response to the climate crisis if adequately engaged (Hulme, 2017; Veldman, Szasz, & Haluza-DeLay, 2014). Understanding how religious actors align messaging with their overall strategies and actions and convey messaging on climate change to religious audiences is of immense importance yet remains under-explored. Recent emergence of religious participation in place-based resistances particularly in Indigenous-led resistances against large-scale fossil fuel infrastructure (D’Arcy et al., 2014; Estes, 2019; Grossman, 2017; LaDuke & Cruz, 2016; Spice, 2018), raise further questions into how religious actors strategize their messaging in and intersect with Indigenous-led climate change resistance efforts. Such studies are urgently needed to understand the contributions, possibilities, and challenges associated with religious responses in Indigenous-led movements as a pathway to address climate change.

Within this context, this study seeks to examine how religious environmental organizations (REOs) construct and tailor climate change messaging to religious audiences. Adopting the framing approach on a single case study of the Trans Mountain pipeline resistance, this study conducted content and textual analyses on 15 semi-structured interviews, 107 movement documents, and 709 social media texts from seven REOs. The Trans Mountain case offers a rare opportunity to examine the messaging strategies of REOs as one set of religious actors. The case provides an additional
opportunity to analyze how REO messaging strategies may intersect with the politics of Indigenous-led climate change movements.

This thesis argues that REOs constructed stewardship, bio-region, and interconnectedness frames that converged on reconciliation-based messaging of justice. Crystallization of this message was deeply embedded in the unsettling encounters and critical self-reflexivity of religious settlers related to ongoing and historical injustices and connections between colonialism and the religious institutions with which they associate. Given this background, REOs sought to ground their messages in education, advocacy, and activism in the wider web of resistance. Additionally, REOs adopted messaging strategies to communicate the urgency of climate change in a broader discourse of responsibilities of religious communities to reconciliation.

This study offers four contributions to religious environmentalism, settler colonial studies, and climate change communication literature. First, it clarifies conceptual usages of religious environmental frames, explains the interaction of frame components underlining frame construction, and conceptualizes frame bridging processes towards justice. Second, self-reflexivity of religious actors in reconciliation-based messaging offers preliminary conceptualization of religious settler consciousness as an important pathway towards decolonized solidarity efforts in Indigenous-settler contexts. Third, the role and network formation of religious actors that distinguish the religious environmental movement highlight the movement’s potential alignment with and support for Indigenous-led climate movements. And last, in communicating climate change to religious audiences, message tailoring calls for greater attention to audience-centric approaches in light of opportunities and challenges.

The remainder of Chapter 1 reviews major issues and gaps in the literature and discusses the background and key positions within the case study. Chapter 2 outlines the study method and Chapters 3 to 5 discuss the results. Chapter 3 describes and explains the application of religious frames on climate change messaging, convergences on justice-based messaging on reconciliation, and self-reflexivity of religious settlers on the meanings of reconciliation. Chapter 4 examines the
strategies and tactics, as well as overlapping roles and positions of REOs to situate REOs within the broader resistance. Chapter 5 examines the challenges, strategies, and opportunities in tailoring messaging to religious audiences. Chapter 6 synthesizes cross-cutting themes before turning to the contributions, limitations, and areas of future research.

1.2 Literature review

This study weaves together literature on construction of climate change, religious environmentalism, settler colonialism and decolonization, and climate change communication to highlight the research gaps and the implications of religious environmental participation in Indigenous-led climate change resistances.

1.2.1 Socio-cultural constructions and religious interpretations of climate change

How to respond to climate change in human terms requires a “more-than-science” approach to account for the array of interpretations for how people come to be sensitized to the effects of climate change. Since the popularization of climate change in the public sphere, progress on climate action has relied primary on scientific framing based on reputable and scientifically authoritative sources such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The strength of climate science establishes biophysical dimensions of climate change as a fundamental basis to inform climate change policy (IPCC, 2018). However, this assumption that climate science alone for determining how climate change is understood underestimates the ways climate change is interpreted and negotiated in social

---

1 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) offers the following definition of climate change:
the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g. by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forcings solar cycles, volcanic eruptions and persistent anthropogenic activities in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use. (IPCC, 2018, p. 544)

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) distinguishes the human dimensions of climate change by stressing climate change as the “change of attributing directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere in which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods” (IPCC, 2018, p. 544).
and cultural settings (Brace & Geoghegan, 2011; Callison, 2014; Hulme, 2009). In particular, climate science has been criticized for being insufficient in and of itself to account for the necessary changes in the ways different societies and communities respond to climate change. Questions of power and politics of knowledge over the ubiquitous use of climate science as the basis for climate knowledge illustrate the possibilities to expand on human conceptions of climate (Fair, 2018; Klenk & Meehan, 2015). As numerous scholars have argued (Castree et al., 2014; Klenk & Meehan, 2015; Victor, 2015), omitting the knowledge politics of climate change would under-account the ways other societies and people groups come to understand climate change beyond avenues other than climate science (Callison, 2014; Castree et al., 2014; Goldman, Turner, & Daly, 2018; Hulme, 2009; Klenk & Meehan, 2015; Victor, 2015).

Rather than strictly focusing on framing climate change on the mediation of biophysical processes and impacts as the sole basis for human responses, an emerging literature refocuses on the adaptive and meaning-making processes in collective and individual experiences from the impacts and responses to climate change (Callison, 2014; Goldman et al., 2018; Hulme, 2009; Tschakert et al., 2017). In other words, human experiences and activities act as receptors and mediators for understanding how climate change takes place. Such pathways have been notably taken up in social or cultural forms that enable societies, communities, and diverse cultural groups to specify heightened responses to climate risks and impacts (Adger et al., 2012; Hulme, 2009), such as the Inuit in Canada, journalists, U.S. Christian evangelicals, scientists, and policymakers (Callison, 2014). Climate events heighten feelings of hopelessness and helplessness of farmers who depend on farm productivity or threaten traditional hunting activities and personal identities of Canadian Inuit communities (Callison, 2014; Tschakert et al., 2017). In a religious setting, the prominent leaders of the Evangelical Climate Initiative advocate for morally responsible responses to climate change which links religious behaviour with heightening or lessening the impacts on the poor who are most at risk of climate change (Callison, 2014). Journalists reporting on climate change have to translate evolving developments of climate science, but also rethink their professional norms in how climate
change can be presented beyond the perception of false balance (Brüggemann & Engesser, 2017; Callison, 2014). Climate change goes much deeper than a scientific problem for society (Callison, 2014; Hulme, 2009). Climate change is taken up as a social constellation of negotiating different bodies of knowledge, value systems, and code of ethics before it translates into climate action.

This emerging trend to validate multiple bodies of climate knowledges opens up the repertories of religious and spiritual dimensions as a pathway for religious responses to climate change (Fair, 2018; Hulme, 2009; Jenkins, Berry & Krieder, 2018; Veldman et al., 2014). A fundamental depiction is the use of religious language that invoke supernatural and spiritual notions that help explain or guide religiously motivated behaviour. Historically, weather extremes as presented in religious texts represent some form of harmony or distortion in relationships among humans, nature, and the divine (Hulme, 2009, pp. 13-14). In Scoville-Simonds (2018), Christian Protestant and Catholic narratives contrasted in their conceptualization of changing climatic conditions. Whereas in Fair (2018), Tuvaluan climate narratives based on the story of Noah’s ark were interpreted as salvation, preparation, from and liberation of climate impacts. Such cases serve as examples that depart from U.S.-centric cases of the Christian right and climate scepticism (Veldman, 2019; Wilkinson, 2012) reflect the multiple ways religion could be a mediating variable to climate change. The above illustrations demonstrate that the relationship between impacts of climate change and religious responses is far from linear. A more nuanced approach is needed not only to understand the biophysical processes, but also ways to identify and explain the shifting social-cultural processes and dynamics that derive from biophysical changes (Fair, 2018; Hulme, 2009; Scoville-Simmonds, 2018). In turn, demonstrating the multifurcated ways religious communities interpret climate change events, and the processes that accompany these responses (Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2017) could offer access points to prove the potential and limitations of religious responses to the climate crisis.

Validating these perceptions of climate change may offer new pathways to explain religious attitudes and responses, or lack thereof to climate change. Interrogating how religious communities interpret climate change, and under what religious frames they project to guide their practices to
climate change (Callison, 2014; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2009) could open up the complex ways that religious beliefs may or may not align with climate change belief and action.

1.2.2 The greening-of-religion debate

Can religion play a potential role in overcoming the scientific language, facilitating rapid responses to climate change? Mapping out the socio-cultural dimensions of climate change opens up greater access to how climate change is variegated in religion (Bauman et al., 2017; Jenkins et al., 2018; Veldman et al., 2014). An emerging body of scholars from scientific and religious backgrounds have raised the potential of religion as an important voice in narrating the meanings of climate change for action (Callison, 2014; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2014; Veldman et al., 2014; Wilkinson, 2012). Despite such promises, social science examination of the role of religious traditions in responding to environmental issues, particularly climate change, is incomplete without more serious treatment of the normative literature on the relationship between ecology or nature. The theoretical issues arising from this literature fundamentally inform the significance of religious re-orientation and responses to climate change.

The debate of religion and relationship with climate change stem from a long-standing debate on the religious roots of the current environmental crisis, starting with Lynn White Jr’s article published in *Science* in 1967. Titled “The Roots of the Ecologic Crisis”, White’s central claim in the article is that Western Christianity has a pivotal role in fostering environmentally destructive attitudes (LeVasseur & Peterson, 2017, p. 2). Despite subsequent research that scrutinize the assumptions behind White’s claim (LeVasseur & Peterson, 2017, p. 10), his main point stands to pinpoint the underlying anthropocentric undertone in Western Christianity. With the rise of modern science and prevailing narrative of the dominion over nature paving the way for the objectification of nature in western societies (Berry, 2016; Merchant, 2013), Lynn White’s article raises the lack of concern for ecology in Western Christianity, setting off the debate over the greening-of-religions to recover the place of nature in religious traditions (LaVasseur & Peterson, 2017). The debate provoked far-
reaching responses from theologians and religious studies scholars, to scientists and anthropologists (LaVasseur & Peterson, 2017), spurring debates on the place of nature in religious traditions (Taylor, 2016) which eventually prompted scholarly exploration that led to the formation of the field of religion and ecology (Bauman et al., 2017; Grim & Tucker, 2014). While pioneers of the field of religion and ecology such as Gottlieb (2006) and Grim and Tucker (2014) shed much hope for the compatibility of religion and ecology by recovering hermeneutics, teachings, and practices of major world religions, other religious studies (Albanese, 1990; Jenkins, 2017, p. 25; Taylor, 2010, 2016; Tomalin, 2009) and ecofeminist scholars (Merchant, 2013) for example, have warranted more cautious approaches to studying this relationship. One major critique of the field of religion and ecology stems from the embedded assumptions that religions have a positive role to play in responding to the environmental crisis. Coined in Taylor (2011) and elaborated upon in Taylor (2016), the greening-of-religion hypothesis suggests that “as religious people (or some subset of them) become more aware of negative environmental impacts from human behaviours, they are more transforming their traditions in more environmentally friendly directions” (Taylor, 2011, p. 254). Taylor’s critique stems from the lack of treatment of nature-based religions, oversimplification of the complex relationship between religion and ecology, and cautious interpretations over the lack of sufficient empirical evidence to determine how and in what ways religious environmentalism has effected the necessary change for the greening of religions.

This focus on the sufficiency to demonstrate whether religions are greening has prompted calls for empirically grounded approaches to assess and demonstrate how religious traditions might respond to environmental and climate change (Ellingson, 2016; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Veldman et al., 2014). The emergence of empirical approaches generally falls under the Durkheimian approach, which seeks to observe and explain religion by understanding how religion functions in society and providing description and explanation to the ways religions respond to environmental degradation or
climate change (Bauman et al., 2017, pp. 15-16). Approaching the relationship of religion and climate change from social science perspectives, Veldman and colleagues (2014, p. 4) call for particular attention to how such religious responses can be sociologically conceptualized in three ways: as systems of meaning including cosmologies that make epistemic and ontological claims about the nature of reality and sources of knowledge that are not verifiable solely by science, asocial functions (e.g. produce social cohesion and ritualize life stages), and collective actors operating at multiple scales (e.g. institutions, congregations, temples, mosques and faith-based organizations). Such conceptualizations provide additional vocabulary to explain how religion engages on climate change in its social roles and structures, clarifying the conceptual tools to analyze the usefulness of religious responses to climate change.

The greening-of-religion debate attests to the complex relationship between religious environmentalism and climate change. The response of religious environmentalism especially in the pervasiveness of Christianity in the North American context speaks to the theoretical neglect and practical apparatuses in light of the debates among the communities of religious studies scholarship for the last several decades. Examining religious responses through these lenses inform the work that is conducted particularly among Christian traditions to compensate for the neglect of the environment in interpretations, rituals, and practices. Nevertheless, the broader implication stemming from these debates also applies in clarifying how religious traditions beyond Christianity also stand to shape and are being shaped by human-nature relations. Connecting this debate to how respective religious traditions intertwines with social context could be key to explaining the mixed efforts of some religious traditions in addressing climate change.

2 Bauman, Bohannon, and O’Brien (2017) points out that religion, a term loaded in western history and baggage, has been more recently critiqued and expanded to understand religion within each context including how it is taken up in Indigenous religions. As there is no one unified definition to religion per say in approaching climate change (Bauman et al., 2017, p. 19), what becomes important in this debate is the selection and interpretation of religion to understand its relationship to climate change.
1.2.3 Religious environmental movement as response to climate change

Despite the broad academic debate surrounding the greening of religious traditions, religious environmental movements represent one major area of mounting religious responses to climate change. The religious environmental movements is an upsurge of religious interest that repositions environmental issues in religious and moral terms (Ellingson, Woodley, & Paik, 2012; Grim & Tucker, 2014; Kearns, 2011; Smith & Pulver, 2009; Wilkinson, 2012). Environmental issues directly reflect human behavior and underlying values that are of spiritual and moral significance, giving rise to re-conceptualizations of relations between humans and the environment (Scoville-Simonds, 2018; Veldman et al., 2014). These works have attempted to demonstrate to what extent and how specific religious actors, under what conditions and in what sets of relationships may articulate ecologically-attuned perspectives of religious traditions, while challenging and even rejecting anthropocentric propositions arising from dominant interpretations (Bauman et al., 2017; Grim & Tucker, 2014; Veldman et al., 2014).

While initial studies on religious environmentalism focused predominantly on Christianity due to the U.S.-centric bias in the rise of the field of religion and ecology (Jenkins et al., 2018), there has been growth in the study of other religious traditions (Veldman et al., 2014). In assessing religious responses in the Global North and South, Veldman and colleagues (2014, p. 309-312) conclude that religions respond to climate change in four distinctive ways: cosmologies and worldviews in motivating climate-responsive behavior, reach and institutional authority with audiences, institutional and economic resources of religions, and social connectivity and collective

---

3 A core assumption in the literature on religious environmentalism is its treatment of Indigenous spirituality on par with other “world religions” in religious studies scholarship (Grim and Tucker, 2014). However, such false equivalency of Indigenous spirituality is a simplification of Indigenous spirituality, knowledges, culture and practices (Jenkins et al., 2018). As Jenkins and colleagues (2018, p. 15) state, “‘religion’ may be a distortive category to describe the biocultural ways of indigenous peoples” as religion not only discriminates against indigenous ways of life by separating “supernatural” and “scientific” ideas, but also religion “was used as a category in the colonial period to delineate ‘primitive’ from advanced cultures, and thereby legitimate colonialism”. It is important therefore to take a historically contextualized account of the complex discussions and associations between religious traditions and Indigenous spirituality and Indigenous peoples. Within religious studies circles, Jenkins (2017, pp. 25-26) notes there is awareness that colonial assumptions of the world religions approach are one of the reasons why indigenous communities reject the category of religion.
action. The composition of responses include interfaith and ecumenical coalitions, statements from religious figures of authority and grassroots efforts (Schuld et al., 2017; Veldman et al., 2014; Witt, 2017) as well as independent religious voices of authority (Cloud, 2016; Lyon, 2018), communities or congregations (Bomberg & Hague, 2018; Kidwell et al., 2018; Veldman, 2016) and faith-based or religious environmental organizations (Baugh, 2017; Ellingson et al., 2012; Ellingson, 2016; Glaab, 2017; Kearns, 1996; Kerber, 2014; L. Johnston, 2013; Nicinska, 2013; Nita, 2016; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Smith & Pulver, 2009). Race, ethnicity, gender, and class in religious environmental movements has been studied to a limited extent (Baugh, 2017; Tomalin, 2009).

The religious environmental movement has been hermeneutically diverse in how it approaches climate change. Other non-world religions and animistic traditions have sought for harmony and interrelatedness with the rest of nature (Taylor, 2010). Although a number of moderate and mainline traditions have begun to reconcile scientific findings into religiously-motivated responses (Taylor et al., 2016; Veldman et al., 2014), as noted by Sherkat and Ellison (2007), participation in conservative denominations is associated with lower involvement in worldly political concerns, which may lead them to call into question the seriousness of environmental problems and dismiss the importance of environmental activism. Other scholars have explained how conservative traditions associate environmental degradation with divine judgment, human moral corruption, sign of end times, and disassociation from earthly concerns, as documented in the formation of the Christian climate skeptic group Cornwall Alliance (Wilkinson, 2012; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015). However, religious resources and inerrant beliefs derived from the scriptures have been suggested to counteract these readings so as to heighten stewardship orientations (Sherkat & Ellison, 2007). Climate care Christian evangelicals represent an important exception where conservative principles of loving one’s neighbour align with viewing climate action to protect the world’s vulnerable populations from climate change impacts (Callison, 2014; Wilkinson, 2012). As such, it is important to avoid assuming theologically conservative traditions and their interpretations of divine judgment simply translate to hermeneutical justification or indifference to environmental degradation.
Despite the emergence of the religious environmental movement, assessments of the state of religious responses to climate change paint a more sobering picture. Taylor, Van Wieren, and Zaeha (2016) and Veldman and colleagues (2014) have been quick to point out that the literature is far from agreement to suggest rapid greening or major climate responses from religious traditions. Veldman and colleagues (2014)’s assessment of the evidence for religious responses to climate change suggests that “only relatively recently have the world’s religions made the effort to seriously engage with environmental issues” (p. 313). However, the authors also admit the major gaps in social sciences scholarship to measure the extent of religious responses to climate change. A subsequent review by Taylor and colleagues (2016) have reached a similar conclusion, finding that the literature to date has been insufficient to demonstrate whether there is greening of religions. Although there is evidence to suggest that some of the world’s religious traditions are becoming deeply concerned about and prioritizing responses to climate change, their review pushes back against the notion that Asian religions such as Buddhism and Shintoism are essentially greener than Abrahamic religions (Taylor et al., 2016, pp. 330-335). Notably, they also find that Indigenous religions offer more nature-based cosmologies and value systems. They suggest that further research is needed to demonstrate under what circumstances, and with which communicative strategies, religious or other individuals may be able to effectively mobilize religious individuals or groups.

The brief survey of the religious environmental movement in response to climate change highlights the importance of demonstrating how meanings and actions of religious responses to climate change are assessed. Empirical investigations into these questions by identifying key actors that have gained traction in religious environmental movements may help demonstrate how and why specific religious actors operationalize responses to climate change.
1.2.4 Conceptualizing REOs in religious environmental movements

Religious environmental organizations (REOs) have emerged as one set among other actors within religious environmental movements (Baugh, 2017; Ellingson, 2016; J. Johnston, 2013; Kearns, 1996 and 2011; Nita, 2016; Niscinka, 2013; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Smith & Pulver, 2009). This section traces the definitions and operationalizations of REOs and their framing strategies, before situating these concepts in current debates of broader environmental movements, religious institutions, and political ideology and religious identity. Overall, within the primarily U.S.-centric literature of REOs, there is an emerging pattern suggesting the rise of religious environmental movements across multiple scales and contexts. The extant literature suggests that REOs deploy religious environmental frames in the intersection of the religious environmental movement and broader environmental movements. The overview of debates suggests more research is needed into REOs in the religious environmental movement and its intersections with the wider movements of climate change politics.

1.2.4.1 Religious environmental organizations

REOs are groups that engage in re-interpretations and re-constructions of respective religious traditions by framing environmental issues in spiritual or religious terms (Baugh, 2017; Ellingson, 2016; Ellingson et al., 2012; Kearns, 2011; Nita, 2016; Niscinka, 2013; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Smith & Pulver, 2009). The goal of REOs is to promote to members of their community that ecological awareness and activity are integral to their religious identity (Ellingson, 2016). Functionally, REOs advocate for and model after a variety of pro-environmental behaviors, ranging from raising public awareness through education, cultivating spiritual expressions and lifestyle changes, organizing or community building, to engaging in social, political or institutional advocacy and participating in direct action, such as protest and civil disobedience (Ellingson, 2016; Ellingson et al., 2012; Kidwell et al., 2018; Nita, 2016). REOs vary in size, composition, structure, and institutional affiliation (Ellingson, 2016; Nita, 2016), and are active across multiple scales, engaging
at international, national, sub-national, and local levels (Ellingson, 2012; Glaab, 2017; Kearns, 1996). Prominent REOs include the World Council of Churches, National Religious Partnership for the Environment, and Evangelical Environmental Network (Ellingson, 2012; Glaab, 2017; Kearns, 1996; Nita, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012). REOs may be place-based, focusing on local environmental issues, serving as liaisons between other organizations in the religious environmental movement (Ellingson, 2012), and operating outside religiously institutionalized spaces and assimilate themselves in mainstream environmental movements (Lysack, 2014; Nita, 2016; Smith and Pulver, 2009, p. 149).

1.2.4.2 Religious environmental framing

How religious actors frame environmental issues in religious terms has been attributed to doctrinal or spiritual-based conceptualizations from interpretations of religious texts to daily rituals and practices. Early religious environmental scholarship has sought to pinpoint these characterizations. Kearns (1996) first identified and Shibley and Wiggins (1997) subsequently replicated stewardship, eco-justice and eco-spirituality as three types of religious environmental ethics. Stewardship emphasizes a scriptural mandate for humans to take care of earth. Eco-justice focuses on combining environmental concerns and religious rationales regarding inequality and marginalized, powerless populations in society. Eco-spirituality focuses on re-orienting humans to view themselves as part of the larger, panentheistic cosmic order (Ellingson, 2012, p. 268; Kearns, 1996, p. 57). These frames may be combined in different ways (Shibley & Higgins, 1997) useful to advance REO efforts and goals. Kearns (1996, p. 65) further argues that such ethics emerged because the secular environmental movement abandoned moral language and vision in favor of technocratic approaches to addressing environmental problems.

Following along this line of argument in discerning and promoting an ethical framework to view nature parallel to their secular counterparts, Smith and Pulver (2009) conduct a study based on 42 interviews with Christian and Jewish REOs in the U.S. and find that REOs tailor their environmental advocacy strategies along the lines of ethics-based and issue-based environmentalisms.
Issue-based environmentalism is focused on and calls for action on an environmental issue, notably climate change. Whereas, ethics-based environmentalism seeks broad attitudinal and lifestyle changes and provides individuals with a framework from which to view their responsibility to others and the world. At the forefront, REOs believe these strategies are natural extensions of all faith-based work (Smith & Pulver, 2009, p. 169). Most recently, in examining the effects of concerns over climate change among Christians after reading stewardship or dominion messages, Shin and Preston (2020) find that stewardship messages may significantly increase in expressing concern over climate change. The sparse studies on religious environmental framing suggest that framing climate change involves contesting notions of maintaining ecological balance in material sense while incorporating spiritual and cosmological dimensions. An integrative outlook could position REOs in adopting framing strategies that align their worldviews and beliefs with their actions.

1.2.4.3 Positioning religious environmental organizations between religious and other environmental movements

More recent literature has highlighted the complementarity and fluidity of REOs as a religious actor both within and moving beyond the religious environmental movement. Ellingson and colleagues (2012) examine inter-organizational ties of 63 REOs in the U.S. and find that REOs with shared environmental interests and theological frames are likely to connect religious groups. However, they state that some REOs are more cautious with cooperation as the perception by conservative Christians that environmental issues are liberal issues, particularly initiatives with groups that do not share the same religious worldview, frame, and affiliation. Examining three Christian REOs in the Transitions Town Movement in the U.K., Nita (2016) departs from Ellingson and colleagues (2012) in finding that members of the religious environmental movement, feeling marginalized within their own faith community in adopting environmental practices, may choose to actively participate in the secular environmental movement. Despite this level of participation, Nita (2016, p. 242) contends that active
participants in secular environmental movements does not suggest merely abandoning religious
identities but rather finding alternative ways to live out their faith. Similarly, Glaab (2017) highlights
the emerging activities of REOs at the level of global advocacy at the United Nations Framework
Convention on Climate Change. These developments suggest the scope of religious climate action is
diverse, intersecting local and global developments on climate justice and advocacy. Religious
identity remains central for religious actors but they may choose to negotiate their positions within or
outside of religious environmental movements.

1.2.4.4 Religious environmental organizations and religious institutions

How the religious environmental movement has introduced environmentally sensitive interpretations,
teachings and practices into the lexicon of religious communities has raised questions regarding the
relationships between REOs and their affiliated religious institutions in introducing religious

More recent literature has pointed out the need for systematic approaches to understand how
and why REOs are politically galvanized and constrained in religious environmental framing within
the larger set of relationships between REOs and affiliated institutions. Ellingson (2016) coins the
notion of embeddedness to explain how REOs are guided by heuristics and informal rules and norms
which govern how they navigate their relationships with affiliated religious institutions. REOs with a
higher degree of autonomy are less likely to feel pressured to present more political risky messages
that entail activism compared to REOs that are extended arms of groups representing the views of
mainstream religious organizations. Ellingson (2016) further claim that these levels of embeddedness
also gauge certain logics of appropriateness within the religious setting, which guide or constrain an
REO’s ability to extend too far beyond the norms of its tradition. For instance, the Evangelical
Environmental Network caters their message towards the Biblical teachings that uphold the sanctity
of life to advance arguments for creation care, which emphasize the mandate to care for creation in
God’s garden as mandated in the Book of Genesis (Wilkinson, 2012). Because the REO is heavily
reliant on one expression of that tradition, that constrains how they mobilize support and collect resources from other non-evangelical bases of support. In contrast, because interfaith and ecumenical REOs have diverse bases of support, they may be able to draw upon more generalizable language that mobilize and reflect the range of religious groups. As such, interfaith and ecumenical REOs are constrained to develop actions that are indicative of represented religious traditions. These findings supplement earlier claims that REO framing (L. Johnston, 2013; Niscinska, 2013) are formulated along the lines of in-group identities and communities.

1.2.4.5 Religious identity and political ideology

As a socio-political expression that intersect competing interests, ideologies, and structures of power, REOs in the religious environmental movement have to navigate along the lines of religious identity and political ideology (Taylor et al., 2016; Wilkinson, 2012). These issues have been most studied among conservative Christian communities where climate change, when raised as an issue of imposing scientific authority, may conjure up debates on science and religion (Arbuckle, 2017; Taylor et al., 2016), including entangled debates over evolution and creation (Ecklund et al., 2017; Wilkinson, 2012), literal and inerrant beliefs and interpretations that clearly demarcate religious sphere and the liberal or secular spheres of environmentalism (Nita, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012; Zahela & Szasz, 2015), and arrogance of human nature in significantly harming nature (Carr et al., 2012). Conservative strands among other major world religions such as Islam, have recorded anecdotal cases of maintaining similar divides between the religious sphere and perceived fear of environmentalism and liberal values (Nita, 2016, p. 153; Taylor, 2016, p. 315). In contrast, liberal religious groups tend to be more open to hybridity in scriptural interpretation and actions, assimilating insights from different sources into their own tradition (Taylor et al., 2016, p. 353). As such, they are also more likely to engage in variants of religiously-discerned activism such as non-violent direct action and re-interpretation of their tradition to uphold the importance of human life in the face of injustices from global capitalism, colonialism, and fossil fuel extraction (Slessarev-Jamir, 2011; Witt, 2017). Despite
these polarizing depictions, it is important to recognize there are broad swaths of adherents who fall in between the spectrum of theological and political conservative and liberal interpretations (Taylor et al., 2016, p. 311). Parsing out the political dimensions that are embedded in religious identity is essential to examining the message constructions in the religious environmental movement.

1.2.4.6 Religious environmental movement in Canada

Evidence of the formation of the religious environmental movement in Canada4 comprises loose strands of movement building across different communities. To date, several studies have begun to explore the relationship between religious responses to climate change in the Canadian context (Haluza-DeLay, 2008; Johnson, 2014; Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018; Moyer & Scharper, 2019).

Haluza-DeLay (2008) and Lysack (2014) provide auto-ethnographical accounts of respective engagements with and efforts of religious environmental education and activism at the national level. Lysack (2014) in particular highlights that there is an emerging contingent of national religious bodies in stating public positions and signing interfaith statements on climate change, such as the Canadian Interfaith Call for Leadership and Action on Climate Change. However, Lysack also notes several barriers to engagement, notably shrinking membership and staff capacity, apathy among the clergy, lack of environmental advocacy, and the rigid and hierarchical models of leadership within faith communities. Johnson (2014) provides a case study of engagements in the Canadian North and the extent of Christian Pentecostalism in rejecting understandings of climate change while Moyer (2018) assesses 16 faith-based organizations that engage on social and environmental justice in wide-ranging responses, such as education, theological reflection, advocacy, congregational resourcing,

4 While Indigenous traditions have been studied alongside other religious traditions (Grim & Tucker, 2014), the conceptualization of religious environmental movement emerged out of the gap in religious considerations and practices to environmental issues. This subset of studies should be analytically separate from Indigenous Studies scholarship for purposes of clarity, respect for Indigenous traditions and their biocultural ontologies in their own right, and acknowledgement of the unequal representation of religious traditions in settler colonial contexts. Other religious studies scholars such as Jenkins (2017, p. 25-26) comments that the colonial assumptions of the world religions approach embedded in religion and ecology may explain why indigenous communities reject the category of religion.
agriculture and food and conservation. Moyer finds that older faith-based organizations begin their activities focusing on social justice before expanding to environmental justice, compared to newer faith-based organizations who begin work immediately on environmental issues. Together, these faith-based organizations have built networks of partnerships between REOs with various religious, non-profit, institutional, business, and government bodies. Building on this initial exploration, Moyer and Scharper (2019) identify five major environmental worldview strands present in these faith-based organizations as scriptural/theological; traditions, values and virtues; the new cosmology, nature experience/revelation; and ritual. Despite these developments, elaboration into the specific and localized emergences and challenges faced by REOs across traditions remains to be explored. This exploration would improve expand on the trajectory and scope of religious environmentalism in relation to broader climate movements in Canada and other Indigenous-settler contexts.

1.2.5 Settler colonialism and Indigenous-religious settler reconciliation

The emergence of religious claims to address climate change through reconciliation on the grounds of environmental justice prompts further conceptualization of the pathways, challenges, and limitations associated in Indigenous-settler reconciliation. Unpacking these issues are especially pertinent in the context of Canada where religious institutions under settler state directives displaced and dispossessed Indigenous peoples from their lands, traditional knowledge, and customs (Davis, Denis, & Sinclair, 2017; Denis & Bailey, 2016; Newcomb, 2008; TRC, 2015a; Reid, 2010). This section leaves open the question under what circumstances and to what extent Indigenous and religious settler reconciliation be a viable pathway for religious actors in making claims surrounding justice. If religious actors recognize the settler colonial processes in the places they inhabit, then it is worth asking to what extent their perspectives, positionalities, and responsibilities resonate over the course of their participation in Indigenous resistance.
1.2.5.1 Settler colonialism and decolonization

Examining Indigenous-settler reconciliation within Indigenous-settler relations requires unpacking settler colonialism and significance of decolonization in relation to climate change. To begin, settler colonialism as a multidimensional term is “shaped by and shaping interactive relations of coloniality, racism, gender, sexuality and desire, capitalism and ableism” (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, & Corntassel, 2014, p. 2) which is specified through its approach to place, culture and relations of power and reflected in the ways settler states govern its subjects (Snelgrove et al., 2014). The set of power relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples are made and reproduced for sustained understandings of temporal and spatial forms of settler colonialism (Snelgrove et al., 2014, p. 5). Settlers thus can refer to anyone with the intention to make a new home and derive source of capital on appropriated Indigenous lands and “[insist] on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain” (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 5). In re-ordering human-land relations, settler colonialism disrupts and destroys Indigenous epistemological, ontological and cosmological relationships to land (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 5). This prerogative in settler colonial states recognizes that climate change, as much as it objectifies anthropogenic climate change, is constructed upon settler colonial political relations with Indigenous peoples and its transformations of political relations with the land (Whyte, 2016a, p. 3). The responsibility of settler colonialism as the base of climate change also threatens Indigenous cultures and self-determinations, limiting the ability of Indigenous peoples to adapt to climate change (Whyte, 2016a, p. 7). Political reconciliation as one crux of Indigenous-settler reconciliation, is not only about recognizing the political histories of settler colonialism and its impact on Indigenous peoples, but also pinpointing the displacement of political and spiritual relations between Indigenous peoples and to the land as a result of resource development that simultaneously excludes Indigenous peoples and exacerbates anthropogenic climate change (Whyte, 2016a, 2018b).

Any calls for reconciliation must therefore acknowledge, reject, and dismantle settler colonialism in the settler’s path towards decolonization (TRC, 2015a; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Simpson, 2017; Snelgrove et al., 2014). Settler decolonization is not a point of arrival or a mere metaphor...
(Davis et al., 2017; Regan, 2010; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Rather, it is an act of “dwelling in discomfort” and an active form of listening, interrogating their own relationships through self-reflexivity including their identities, cultures, and histories with the land they stand on (Davis, Denis, & Sinclair, 2017, p. 395; Land, 2015; Morris, 2017). At the same time, it is unfair to expect Indigenous peoples to teach settlers everything that is needed to know about Indigenous peoples (Davis et al., 2017, pp. 406-407; Denis & Bailey, 2016; Maddison et al., 2016). Rather, it is the responsibility of settlers to proactively learn about Indigenous history and stories including supporting Indigenous-led initiatives, and be prepared to take risks and also learn from mistakes (Davis et al., 2017; McAdam, 2016). Connecting with host Nations of the territory one stands on offers a direct way to learn about the stories, experiences, and impact of colonialization on their communities and lands (McAdam, 2016, p. 144) without overburdening those communities (Davis et al., 2017, p. 407).

Often evoked in political projects of decolonization is the settler’s demonstration of solidarity with Indigenous peoples (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012, Tuck & Yang, 2012). Expressions of solidarity may imply a relationship among individuals or groups, an obligation or a sense of duty over what is just or equitable in relation to human rights or commitment to struggles against oppression, and a set of actions or duties between those in the solidary relationship (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012, p. 50). Yet, solidarity may risk obscuring dynamics of colonization through solidarity relations without actual commitment to a decolonization and anti-oppressive praxis (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012). Decolonizing solidarity as the process of unsettling one’s social location also challenges settler claims of allyship without earning that claimed identity through commitment in actual practices and place-based relationships (Davis et al., 2017, pp. 406-407; Snelgrove et al., 2014). The significance of Indigenous peoples to recognize such solidarities subverts the logic of the privileged position of settlers who can choose to act in solidarity (Curnow & Helferty, 2018, p. 153; Land, 2015; Morris, 2017).

But fundamentally, settler decolonization entails a process of self-interrogation of settler colonialism (Davis et al., 2017; Regan, 2010; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Self-interrogation squarely calls
into question the settler consciousness (Davis et al., 2017; Regan, 2010). Settler consciousness may refer to narratives, practices, and collective identities based in the foundation of national historical myths, such as Canada’s peacemaker narrative (Regan, 2010). However, even efforts of good intentions that belie critical self-reflexive settler consciousness may perpetuate and deepen paternalistic colonial relationships and in turn inflict greater harm (Davis et al., 2017, p. 402). Confronting and interrogating these myths may offer a beginning towards but is in no way synonymous or sufficient as the sole activity towards decolonization (Davis et al., 2017; Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 19).

In interrogating settler colonialism, Davis and colleagues (2017, p. 402) offers four points to initiate reforming and transforming settler consciousness. Transformation seeks to create narratives, processes, and practices for accountability and responsibilities of settlers as beneficiaries of historical and ongoing colonization; name and upset the status quo and challenging power dynamics that perpetuate settler colonialism; build just and decolonized relationships with Indigenous peoples, the land, and all beings; and dedicate a lifelong commitment to this process at individual, family, community, and national levels. Without linking critical self-reflexive consciousness with understanding the history of Indigenous-settler relations and the perpetuation of paternalistic colonial relationships to well-intended deeds on “reconciliation”, working in any faucet of Indigenous-settler relations, whether it is in “reconciliation” or decolonization efforts may prove counterproductive (Davis et al. 2017, pp. 401-402; Land, 2015, p. 165).

1.2.5.2 Religious settler consciousness and actions

Carving out religious identities in the “religious settler”’s add a distinct layer of complexity to the working definition of settler consciousness. Distinguishing the religious dimensions of settlers

Authors in the edited volume by Heinrichs (2016) respectively coin religious settlers and organized bodies of religious settlers on Indigenous lands as “Settler Christians” and “Settler Church”. Such conceptualizations could conceivably be
emphasizes the concurrent cosmologies, relationships, and ethics that could conflict or intersect with Indigenous ontologies. At the same time, religious identities connote historical realities that become self-evident in settler’s self-awareness of one’s social location in light of settler colonial structures from Indigenous struggles. Religious settlers may find that well-intentioned efforts towards reconciliation (e.g. participating in Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings) aside from statements require calls to and participation in the broader struggle for decolonization, Indigenous rights, and sovereignty (Denis & Bailey, 2016; Heinrichs, 2016). Recognizing one’s social and spiritual self-location in the space of political-ecological-cosmological relation in settler colonial contexts is to decolonize oneself on the history and stories of the land that one stands on.

In Canada, attempts by religious bodies at reconciliation (Anglican Church of Canada et al., 2016; Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2016; TRC, 2015b) have been born under the legacy and impacts of terra nullius (or vacant land) and the Doctrine of Discovery most visibly from 15th century Papal Bulls (Newcomb, 2008; Reid, 2010). Among the trio of Papal Bulls which legitimized European seizure of Indigenous lands and asserted Indigenous peoples had no sovereign rights in relation to their own land, Pope Alexander VI’s papal bull Inter caetera in 1493 consolidated theological assumptions of Christendom into the Doctrine of Discovery with specific reference to the Americas (Newcomb, 2008; Reid, 2010, p. 342). The essence of the Doctrine of Discovery remains entrenched in Canadian and U.S. laws, dating back to the Royal proclamation of 1763 and the U.S. Supreme Court ruling of 1823, Johnson v. M’Intosh (Newcomb, 2008; Reid, 2010). The monumental impact of the Doctrine of Discovery remains ever visible on European colonized lands, and specifically in Canada where the concept of Crown Land continues to stifle Indigenous land claims (Reid, 2010; Yellowhead Institute, 2019).

extended to settlers of other religious identities, such as Settler Muslims, Hindus, or Buddhists but they require further examination without risking over-generalizing such identities.
Religious responses to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)’s Call to Actions have coalesced religious actors in attempt to take responsibility for the legacy of the Doctrine of Discovery. Religious institutions that ran residential schools as well as other national religious bodies, notably the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, and to a lesser extent, the Presbyterian, Methodist and United Churches (D. MacDonald, 2015) have respectively issued statements (Anglican Church of Canada, 2015; Anglican Church of Canada et al., 2016; Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2016). Statements from some of the signatory bodies suggest their support for the United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and repudiation of *terra nullius* and the Doctrine of Discovery. Such statements fall in line with official apologies for Indian Residential Schools offered by the Anglican, Presbyterian, and United Churches in the 1990s (Dube, 2016, p. 155; TRC, 2015a, p. 129). To date however, the Roman Catholic Church has yet to officially apologize for the Catholic Church’s role in the residential school system, even though one of the Catholic missionary organizations operating residential schools has offered such apology (Dube, 2016, p. 155). Other informal and grassroots religious efforts such as KAIROS and Citizens for Public Justice have similarly responded by leading efforts on decolonization, reconciliation education, and policy discussions to respond to TRC Calls to Action (KAIROS, 2010; Munn-Venn, 2018). Religious settler attempts have also percolated into educational practices. For instance, a small but emerging cluster of First Nations and Christian thinkers have called for more grassroots attempts to advocate for the implementation of UNDRIP and advocate alongside Indigenous peoples on the front lines of Indigenous-led movements (Heinrichs, 2013, 2016 and 2018).

1.2.5.3 **Limits to Indigenous-religious settler reconciliation**

Despite the calls towards reconciliation and decolonization, limits to Indigenous and settler reconciliation persist and inform the politics surrounding Indigenous and settler claims of justice. Although a majority of this literature has focused on generalized conceptualizations of the settler,
religious settlers are similarly susceptible to subscribing to notions of settler colonialism or surface notions of decolonization without fully disengaging from the suite of underlying narratives, ideologies, or spaces that perpetuate settler colonialism. Settler attempts at reconciliation may blindly assert existing power and colonial structures upon Indigenous peoples based on the types of narratives they situate themselves in. In calls for reconciliation in settler states, Anishinaabe scholar Sheryl Lightfoot (2016) distinguishes two models of efforts on Indigenous-settler reconciliation in the Canadian context. The Doctrine of Discovery model is premised on the narrative of Canada’s national identity; whereas the Indigenous model of reconciliation is grounded on Indigenous land rights, self-determination, and free, prior, and informed consent (Lightfoot, 2016, pp. 169-198). In the context of the mainstream environmental movement, questions on whiteness in race can emerge as the driving wedge among environmentalists to feed into a privileged narrative of domination rather than interruption of settler colonialism (Curnow & Helferty, 2018, p. 153).

Other Indigenous scholars have been sharply critical of the rhetoric of reconciliation used by non-Indigenous peoples. Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard for instance, argues colonizers may use reconciliation politics for political gains and subversions that perpetuate existing logics of domination (Coulthard, 2014, pp. 105-107). Such rhetoric of reconciliation also flies in the face of contradictions of failed attempts at honouring treaties and commitments to calls to action, despite the impressive 440 calls to action from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in 1992 (Coulthard, 2014, pp. 115-120). Citizen Potawatomi scholar Kyle Whyte (2018a) similarly criticizes the subversion of parasitisms in settler approaches to reconciliation especially when it comes to Indigenous dependence on resource extraction. Gestures of reconciliation, Whyte argues, is limited if purely “symbolic in intent and less about actually transforming the conditions that perpetuate violence, domination, and denial of rights” (Whyte, 2018a, p. 280). As such, Indigenous communities may view settler attempts at reconciliation including apologies and Truth and Reconciliation Commissions as reproducing the old system of viewing Indigenous peoples as subjects and welfare recipients of the benevolent state (Whyte, 2018a, p. 283). Coulthard and Whyte’s critiques could
similarly be applied to religious settlers and religious settler institutions that benefit from Indigenous land dispossession or refuse to respond favorably in aiding restoration of traditional Indigenous knowledge and cultures. Such grounds pose much needed self-reflexivity and interrogation for religious settlers and religious settler institutions on delineating and de-constructing their own colonial patterns of thinking.

Attempts of settlers, settler states, and settler institutions may also risk using reconciliation as an abolition of guilt (Jung, 2018; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Such efforts towards decolonization may continue to perpetuate reconciliation as a project of affirmation or move towards innocence in hopes of finding closure or achieving redemption through the act of listening (Davis et al., 2017; Jung, 2018; Tuck & Yang, 2012). In particular, moves to innocence refers to strategies that relieve the person or community of guilt and responsibility without fundamentally changing the initial conditions or wrongs (Jung, 2018, p. 260; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Religious settlers and religious settler institutions, for instance through Christian sacraments may offer apologies in exchange for forgiveness but could instill settler normalcy and absolution of any future accountability of past wrongs (Jung, 2018, p. 261). To their defense, settler Mennonite educator Steve Heinrichs (2018, p. xvi) argues that Christianity is not “inherently colonial” but admits that throughout generations, the Church and its faith has been frequently exploited as “instruments of dispossession in the settler colonial arsenal”.

Religious settlers may further assume a move towards innocence if they do not commit or seek to participate in long-term efforts to support Indigenous resurgence and struggles. Although some settlers may be sympathetic towards Indigenous efforts, they may be unwilling to commit towards Indigenous issues (Davis et al., 2017; McGuire & Denis, 2019). Critical learning and unlearning are necessary to unsettling one’s identity or else reconciliation initiatives may offer false optimism when it fails to promote substantive change (Davis et al., 2017, p. 408). Other critics have similarly noted the limits and warranted skepticism towards Indigenous-settler efforts. In *Limits to Settler Colonial Reconciliation*, Maddison and colleagues (2016, pp. 6-7) notes that the emergence of
formal reconciliation policies and the formation of affinity groups by churches and environmental organizations have been criticized for reproducing colonial relations and gesture at the colonial destruction of Indigenous polities, orders, economies, and territories.

Moves towards decolonization under the guise of reconciliation can be taken with scrutiny if decolonization does not translate into actual transformation of patterns that shape Indigenous peoples. Aleut scholar Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (2012) for instance, stresses that decolonization is not a metaphor or a symbolic gesture when it comes to transforming the paradigms in contemporary programs that include education. Such usages of decolonization severely undercut the meaning behind the process and prompts empty platitudes and false promises. With the deeply implicated legacy of settler colonialism, Tuck and Yang (2012, p. 7) argue that beyond raising critical consciousness, the demand for repatriation of lands in decolonization is what precisely makes decolonization so unsettling especially across lines of solidarity. Tuck and Yang’s argument is a blunt reminder that claims to reconciliation without actually delivering on intended actions or desired outcomes produces more harm than good.

Denis and Bailey (2016) further warns against self-serving motivations underlying religious attempts at reconciliation. Participants in Denis and Bailey (2016)’s study tended to be older, whiter, and more affiliated with Christian churches that ran residential schools. In sum, how religious settlers engage in justice messaging, while in view of the road towards reconciliation should encompass near-term immediate solidarities (Denis & Bailey, 2016). Denis and Bailey (2016, p. 155) echo the call by Tuck and Yang (2012), in that actions have to be in view of the necessary transformation of political and economic structures in settler societies for Indigenous nations and their lands. Reconciliation initiatives through state-sponsored schemes such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission indeed open up settler discussions of Indigenous reconciliation in the form of repatriation of land, power and self-sufficiency to Indigenous nations. However, the legacy of Christian denominations responsible in administering and operating Indian residential schools also opens up questions surrounding specific interpretations and practices that similarly legitimize and perpetuate settler colonial processes. While
such responsibilities may immediately fall on the shoulders of religious settlers of affiliated Christian denominations, those responsibilities to some extent may be relevant for other religious settlers who wrestle with and integrate public expressions of faith and justice.

Critical assessments from Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars on attempts toward reconciliation offer a blunt picture in settler and religious settler attempts at reconciliation. Recognizing the real limits of religious settler engagement in the Canadian context, the fundamental issue at play is not whether reconciliation can be achieved per se but rather to be unsettled by the underlying power dynamics, racial, colonial, and patriarchal structures and processes, and slow-going attempts of taking responsibility of historical wrongs and addressing present-day injustices. Situating these dimensions in context provides a clearer position to underscore the claims that are advanced under the guise of reconciliation. Claims to reconciliation also does not simply translate to reconciliation in relations in itself. Rather, what needs to be interrogated is how religious settlers position themselves to take political responsibility to Indigenous peoples on the legacy of settler colonialism (Maddison & Statsny, 2016, p. 232) and by what means they demonstrate these endeavors in unlearning one’s tradition and reliance on colonial assumptions (Heinrichs, 2013, 2016, and 2018). Any attempts at reconciliation necessarily encompasses settlers who commit towards helping in the restoration of Indigenous rights, sovereignty, and land repatriations under Indigenous resurgence (Asch et al., 2018; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Whyte, 2018a; Yellowhead Institute, 2019). In the context of resources development, the recognition of Indigenous sovereignty and governance further suggests that Indigenous peoples have the final say to decide on activities on their lands (Lightfoot, 2016, pp. 169-198; Yellowhead Institute, 2019).

The above overview on the advances in and limits to Indigenous-religious settler reconciliation provides a powerful context to examine underlying claims towards or actions on the name of “reconciliation” in Indigenous-settler contexts. Ultimately, rejecting settler colonialism and embarking on reconciliation through decolonized solidarity efforts on the ground has to work in tandem in support of Indigenous resurgence (Asch et al., 2018; Snelgrove et al., 2014; Yellowhead
Institute, 2019). Indeed, there has been a growing body of literature, initiatives, and activities that fosters religious settler consciousness. These attempts have come namely through national bodies and bottom-up initiatives through formal recognition of dispossession and violence, education, and some forms of restitutive measures in financial reallocation. Yet, questions remain as to how these initiatives interrogate and extend religious settler consciousness in the context of Indigenous-led pipeline resistance remain under-explored. The discussed literature presents wider conceptual and practical implications for religious settler institutions and communities, specifically regarding religious settler self-interrogation and responsibilities. If the call of Indigenous decolonization of settler states and individual settlers is to work towards Indigenous visions of land justice, what implications might decolonization present for religious settlers and institutions with Indigenous peoples of the territory they reside on? What types of repatriations and relationships might these processes demand? And ultimately, what types of hermeneutics, interpretations, and practices have to be identified, emphasized, or rejected in view of decolonizing religious traditions?

1.2.6 Messaging strategies of religious actors in climate change communication

This section draws on the array of factors that can influence the messaging strategies of religious actors. Building on 1.2.1, this section calls to re-situate the perspective and associated concepts used along the U.S., Christianity-oriented studies on climate change communication and religious audiences. Climate change communication recognizes the dynamic and complex interplay of individuals, organizations, institutions, and diversity of knowledges, politics and cultures in addressing climate change (Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, n.d.). Drawing on the multiple interactions of climate science and society, climate change communication seeks to inform and educate individuals by increasing a population’s understanding of scientific consensus about climate change, achieve some degree of social response, and foster deeper changes to social norms and cultural values (Moser, 2010, p. 38). However, the literature has neglected the particularities of
climate change communication as a culturally constructed exercise that is embedded within socio-cultural fabrics of religious communities.

Going beyond surface correlations between religious attitudes and climate change beliefs, problematizing religious audiences offers a closer examination of religious actors in religious-based climate change messaging. Relocating religious actors in the climate change communication-religion interface places these actors as potential agents to tailor make values-based messaging. Strategies in targeting and tailoring the message to religious individuals are becoming increasingly recognized, but under-studied to how such communicative efforts take shape and under what context. The section concludes finding that there is a lack of empirical cases that focus on the opportunities and challenges that REOs face in the message tailoring process.

1.2.6.1 Relocating religious actors in the communication-religion interface

In climate change communication, religious audiences may constitute any self-defined groups or community at multiple scales based on religious identity or affiliation (Carvalho et al., 2017; Haluza De-Lay, 2017; Hine et al., 2014; Myers, 2017). Religious engagement in climate change communication has sparked interest because the moral guidance and values within religious traditions represents an untapped constituency that could potentially mobilize on climate change (Haluza-DeLay, 2017; Hulme, 2017; Veldman et al., 2014). However, studies have found that religious guidance may present problems among certain religious communities in the U.S.. This has been most visible among conservative Christianity which has been correlated with low levels of climate change belief, attitude, and behavior (Arbuckle, 2017; Kilburn, 2014; Goldberg et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016; Pew Research Center, 2015; Shao, 2017). Such issues have been further magnified by the dominance of climate change communication-related studies on religion in primarily examining Christianity in the U.S. context (Arbuckle, 2017; Kilburn, 2014; Li et al., 2016; Myers et al., 2017; Shao, 2017; Sleeth-Keppler, Perkowitz & Speiser, 2017; Vimcentnathan, S. Vincentnathan, & Smith, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015) and to a lesser extent Christianity in other countries.
(Bomberg & Hague, 2018; Fair, 2018; Fielding et al., 2012; Haluza-DeLay, 2008, 2014; Kidwell et al., 2018; Marshall, 2016; Nunn et al., 2016; Pepper & Leonard, 2016; Scoville-Simonds, 2018). Low levels of climate change acceptance and skepticism among sub-populations of Christianity have been attributed to incompatibility of religious interpretations with evolution (Ecklund et al., 2017; Wilkinson, 2012), viewing environmental concern as a liberal interest and endorsement of nature, pantheistic, or neo-pagan worship (Marshall, 2016; L. Vimcentnathan, S. Vincentnathan & Smith, 2016; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015), scientific mistrust and anthropogenic climate change as a hoax (Taylor et al., 2016, p. 313; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015), and literal and errant beliefs of religious texts that confirm environmental degradation towards “end times” eschatology (Taylor et al., 2016; Wilkinson, 2012, p. 59; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015). A notable caveat to these factors is the division of climate change attitudes along racial lines (Veldman, 2019). In the U.S., non-white Christian audiences have comparatively higher levels of acceptance in anthropogenic climate change than white Christian audiences (Pew Research Center, 2015).

The narrow presentation of climate change communication of studies of select Christian sub-population presents a distorted picture that overshadows the broader interaction between climate change and other religious and spiritual traditions (Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Jenkins et al., 2018; Veldman et al., 2014). More importantly, such presentations of religion could further exacerbate the purported conflict between climate change and religion (Haluza-DeLay, 2014) which run the risk of suggesting the incompatibility of religion and science. Overrepresentations or misrepresentations of such views need to be clearly cautioned as only one set of literal, dominion-like interpretations that arise from one strand of the Christian tradition.

In spite of this literature, other scholars have devised empirical approaches to assess the broader roles that religious actors may play in sustaining climate change engagement with respective religious communities (1.2.3).

Expanding the definition of religious actors offers a wider conceptualization of the ways they access, interpret, and communicate climate change in religious spheres. Highlighted in 1.2.1 and
1.2.2, the socio-cultural construction of climate change calls into question the constellation of respective ontologies, epistemologies, and ethics present among Indigenous and religious communities that ought to be accounted for to have fruitful conversations and responses on climate change (Goldman et al., 2018). Rethinking the climate change communication-religion interface then begs a deeper grounding of the multifaceted relationships that climate change, including climate science, is understood within religious communities and systems (Callison, 2014; Cloud, 2016; Hulme, 2017; Jenkins et al., 2018; Mahony & Hulme, 2018). Relocating Indigenous and religious actors implies that other traditions and spiritualities that are premised on biocultural epistemologies may communicate climate change in ways that resonate and do not rely solely on Western science.

Indigenous traditions offer lessons for how religious communities and systems may localize and culturally embed climate change in personal and collective terms (Geohagan, Arnall & Feola, 2019). Within traditional and ecological knowledges, indigenous leaders, elders, and other knowledge keepers for instance may interpret climate change as biogeophysical changes which are simultaneously connected to moral, spiritual, and affective dimensions (Byg & Salick, 2009; Callison, 2014, pp. 39-80; Davies et al., 2019; Turner & Clifton, 2009). Furthermore, Indigenous traditional and ecological knowledges may comprehend climate change into their knowledge systems as a predictor of the past and foretelling of the future in relation to their place-based relationships and histories (Jenkins et al., 2018, pp. 14-15; Whyte, 2016b). Whereas, religious actors of major religions may approach climate change within their respective religious domains and frames that awakening to an ecological dimension (Bauman et al., 2017; Taylor, 2010). Among liberal strands of Christianity such as Quakerism, Unitarian Universalism, as well as Dharmic religions such as Hinduism and Buddhism, religious actors may emphasize on the interconnectedness of humanity, the natural world, and the cosmic order of the universe suggest that such communities take climate action to limit the abhorrence of violence and reduce harm to others (Brumanns, Cheong, & Hwang, 2016; Le Duc, 2017; Marshall, 2016; Quaker Earthcare Witness, 2017; Stevenson, 2007; Strain, 2016). Climate change may suggest disruptions to and the visions for restored ontological relationships that are
accessible and known through Indigenous and religious epistemologies (Bauman et al., 2017; Goldman et al., 2018; Sinclair, 2018).

Furthermore, how climate change comes to be negotiated, situated and sensitized has to account for the internal logics, values, trust, and expertise within religious communities (Callison, 2014; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2009 and 2017). Religious actors (e.g. institutions, organizations or groups, communities, leaders, elders, and other knowledge keepers) may offer a crucial access point not only to convey the enormous risks and impacts of climate change but moreover position themselves to relay trust, affect, and expertise (Amri, 2014; Callison, 2014; Cloud, 2016; Nita, 2016; Sleeth-Keppler, Perkowitz, & Speiser, 2015). Islamic groups in the U.K. and Indonesia for instance, may serve as catalysts to translate the community’s knowledge on climate change into religious responses through reforestation efforts, eco-lifestyles, and rituals such as “fasting for the planet” (Amir, 2014; Nita, 2016). Some preliminary evidence further suggests that Christian audiences may be more receptive if a trusted messenger relays the message (Callison, 2014; Cloud, 2016; Myers et al., 2017; Sleeth-Keppler et al., 2017). Drawing upon identity and value-based frames that integrate teleology, cosmology, and ethics, religious actors may bridge the gulf between climate science and politics to religious audiences (Callison, 2014; Corner et al., 2014; Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Moser, 2016; Veldman et al., 2014) and even facilitate co-production of knowledge and meanings (Davies et al., 2019; Diver, 2017; Green, Billy, & Tapim, 2010; Reyes-Garcia et al., 2020). These brief examples illustrate the importance of religious actors as informal communicators in religious spaces (Callison, 2014; Davies et al., 2019; Sleeth-Keppler et al., 2017). Informal communicators may offer calibrated approaches that in embracing the climate change imperative and contextualizing perspectives that are grounded in held values, meanings, relationships, and field of view of the underlying local and epistemic politics (Bloomfield, 2019; Callison, 2014, p.137; Goldman et al., 2018; McNaught, Warrick, & Cooper, 2014; Sleeth-Keppler et al., 2017). Across these mediums, climate science indirectly informs and complements religious and cultural knowledge and awareness for substantiating climate responses (Callison, 2014, p. 247).
Relocating the role of the religious actor in the climate change communication-religion interface thus offers a gateway to investigate the underlying values, relationality, and trust that represent overlooked dimensions in religious-based climate change messaging. The subsequent sections provide an overview of the considerations and technicalities that may underlie how religious actors may tailor climate change messaging to align with religious audiences.

1.2.6.2 Targeting and tailoring the message

From raising awareness of the scientific basis of climate change to highlighting the approaches and solutions, framing the message is an essential part of climate change communication process because it specifies the format and content for how climate change becomes understandable to particular audiences (Lakoff, 2010; Nisbet, 2009). Messages on climate change, intentional or not, are framed in part by the communicator who gives greater weight to aspects that connect the importance of climate change to one’s social world (Nisbet, 2009; Cox, 2013). Common typologies of climate change frames include progress, development, morality and ethics, and scientific uncertainty that are geared towards particular audiences (Callison, 2014; Nisbet, 2009). These messages are calibrated for a variety of reasons, but are generally tailored to different experiences, mental and cultural models, and underlying values and worldviews in relation to climate impacts and contributions (Bloomfield, 2019; Callison, 2014; Nisbet, 2009; Yale Program on Climate Change Communication, n.d.).

The literature has generally classified targeting and tailoring as two types of messaging styles to prime climate change messaging to audiences (Bostrom, Böhm, & O’Connor, 2013; Ellingson, 2016; Hine et al., 2014; Metag & Schäfer, 2018). Bostrom and colleagues (2013) define message targeting as identifying segmented sub-populations, such as classifying individuals by similar socio-demographic traits or behaviours. Whereas, message tailoring involves personalizing content with the communication strategy. For instance, new content is provided and used to connect prior knowledge and experiences of the targeted audience.
Tailoring the messaging based on geographical proximity has more recently been viewed as one way to situate the audience to contributions to and impacts of climate change (Scannell & Gifford, 2013; Spence, Poortinga, & Pidgeon, 2012). Major considerations can include impacts and attachments on ecosystems (Galway, 2019), receptibility of the localized message, and gender (Scannell & Gifford, 2013). However, there have been noted instances where message localization especially in light of self-transcendent values may be ineffective and even counterproductive (Schoenefeld & McCauley, 2016).

1.2.6.3 Consensus-based and values-based messaging

The climate change communication literature has generally emphasized the use of consensus-based messaging to convey the importance of acting on climate change (Brewer & McKnight, 2017; Kahan et al., 2011; Pearce et al., 2017; Pepermans & Maeseele, 2016; van der Linden et al., 2015). Consensus-based messaging involves the formulation and dissemination of the scientific consensus around climate change that warming has taken place and been primarily caused by human activities (Cook et al., 2018; Pearce et al., 2017). The focus of this style of messaging is on persuading the audience using numbers, scientific certainty, and authority, notably emphasizing the scientific consensus that 97 percent of climate scientists have concluded that human-caused climate change is happening (van der Linden et al., 2015). While there has been experimental evidence preliminarily suggesting its effectiveness in increasing belief in the existence of anthropogenic climate change (van der Linden et al., 2015), their study misinterprets the statistical significance of study participants (Kahan, 2017) and oversimplifies the complexity in perceiving climate risks by failing to consider cultural effects (Corner, Markowitz, & Pidgeon, 2014; Spence, Poortinga, & Pidgeon, 2012). Others have also noted that an increased supply of information about climate science consensus messaging may have less success in altering views (Corner, Whitmarsh, & Xenias, 2012) and may have insignificant effect in resolving the polarizing belief in anthropogenic climate change among conservative religious groups (Dixon, Hmielowski, & Ma, 2017). Ethnographic evidence has
suggested that religious groups are more concerned about the impacts of climate change rather than the scientific precision of climate consensus. This line of evidence claims that conveying climate consensus, although informative for communicators as a starting point to establish the case for scientific credibility, is nevertheless secondary in communication efforts with religious audiences (Callison, 2014; Wilkinson, 2012).

Values-based messaging strategies has been increasingly explored as an approach to tap into existing values of audiences to navigate the politics of climate change (Corner, Markowitz, & Pidgeon, 2014; Dixon et al., 2017; Tschakert et al., 2017) and to induce climate-adaptive behaviour (Clayton et al., 2015; Dixon et al., 2017; Markowitz and Guckian, 2018). By contextualizing climate change to people’s moral guidance and directives, tapping messages into values builds on and heightens predisposed values of audiences, enabling them to consider how climate change is significant in individual and ingroup terms (Dixon et al., 2017; Fielding et al., 2019; Tschakert et al., 2017). In contrast with informational-based climate change messaging which relies on a one-way, heterogeneous model of information dissemination (Whitmarsh, Lorenzoni, & O’Neill, 2011), value-based climate change messaging can signal behaviour and lifestyle changes that align with pre-existing values of the affected community (Corner et al., 2014; Hine et al., 2014; Markowitz & Guckian, 2018; Scannell & Gifford, 2013). This approach has served as a way to address the cultural factors (Corner et al., 2012) that underlie the cognition and uptake of climate change among diverse societal groups (Kahan et al., 2012; Mahony & Hulme, 2018; Markowitz & Shariff, 2012). The concept of cultural cognition has been a primary way to characterize how individuals selectively perceive information that reinforce their perceptions of risk and cultural ways of life. Among which, these individuals situate themselves among communities that share like-minded interests (Kahan, 2011). For instance, in Fielding and colleagues (2019)’s study, in-group messaging via messengers to conservative audiences increased their level of acceptance of government interventions on climate change policies such as the carbon tax.
More recent evidence has suggested that tapping into religious worldviews and figures of authority may provide potentially greater normative signaling and guidance that could pave the way for behavioural change (Marshall, 2016; Schuldt et al., 2017). Extending the discussion in 1.2.4.2, frames of religious stewardship, justice, and spirituality have been more recently re-introduced into the lexicon for the basis of religious environmental movements to concretize climate change (Ellingson, 2016; Ellingson et al., 2016; Kearns, 2011; Nita, 2016; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Wilkinson, 2012). The composition and structure of frames represent a simplification of the interpretive process of reconfiguring human-environment relationships within religious traditions (Bauman et al. 2017; Grim & Tucker, 2014; Jenkins et al., 2018). There is preliminary evidence that suggests REOs are becoming more acquainted with value-based climate change communication strategies. Ellingson (2016)’s book explains how REOs are developing strategic niches to mobilize a particular segment such as religious individuals, congregations and other religious bodies, to help realize their mission. Christians for the Mountain, one of the REOs in Ellingson (2016, p. 16), would tailor the language towards conservative Christians in the form of stewardship, sin, divine judgment and relationship to God to potentially resonate the importance of environmental stewardship.

1.2.6.4 Socio-political dimensions of values-based messaging

A key concern in value-based messaging pertains to the degree of heightening the values of the perceived audience. The use of values-based messaging to communicate climate change becomes a matter of how resonating issues align with the values to politically diverse ends of the spectrum (Corner et al., 2014; Wolsko, 2017). The tendency of values-based messaging to religious audiences has been explored in the form of message targeting based on political and theological interpretations based on in-groups and echo-chambers (Callison, 2014; Veldman, 2019; Veldman et al., 2014). As climate change is heavily politicized in certain religious denominations (Hulme, 2009; Taylor et al., 2016), factors such as political ideology, affiliation, and identity have been elevated as mediating variables on audience receptibility of climate change. Given this ideological variation on climate
change among religious communities (Veldman et al., 2014), climate change messages can be tailored to appeal to conservative and liberal audiences (Graham et al., 2013; Hine et al., 2016; Wolsko, 2017). Conservative audiences may be more likely to resonate with messaging that appeal to individual-centered principles, such as the avoidance of waste, or patriotic support for particular technology (Whitmarsh & Corner, 2017) and free market options (Dixon et al., 2017). Dixon and colleagues (2017) suggest messaging tailoring through targeted messaging towards free market solutions to climate change are more effective at improving conservative climate change acceptance than consensus-based messaging. Liberals may align with messages of justice or other themes that might resemble or align with claims commonly found within the environmental movement (Hoffman, 2011; Whitemarsh & Corner, 2017). A corollary to value-based messaging for religious audiences is the use of moral and affective values. Appealing to these values that elicit emotions such as hope with fear (Chapman, Lickel, & Markowitz, 2017; Clingerman & Ehret, 2013; Nabi, Gustafson, and Jensen, 2018), loss of affective connection to places and identity (Tschakert et al., 2017), and expanding group identity (Haidt, 2012) could heighten particular audience receptibility and readiness to respond to climate change (Nabi et al., 2018; Veldman et al., 2014).

Nevertheless, the ideological split of climate change remains a persistent pattern that divides religious conservative and liberal groups or individuals that cater to their respective ideological communities (Wilkinson, 2012; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015). The general inclination is that some religious communities with more conservatively focused interpretations of their texts espouse climate change skepticism and denial (Taylor et al., 2016; Wilkinson, 2012), which present questions as to whether religion can indeed be a vehicle for greening (Taylor et al., 2016). The alignment of evangelical conservative Christianity and political conservatism has been the most prominent in the U.S. context (Clements, Xiao, & McCright, 2014; Wilkinson, 2012), but features of climate skepticism among these communities have been noted to a lesser extent in other western countries such as Australia (Pepper & Leonard, 2016) and small island nations (Fair, 2018). In the study by Pepper and Leonard (2016), their examination of national surveys in Australia found that the religious individuals
identifying as Pentecostal, Baptist and Church of Christ, and other smaller denominations are less likely to believe in anthropogenic climate change.

However, there is less evidence that assess the extent climate resonating messaging may penetrate into religiously conservative communities to address climate denial (Dunlap & McCright, 2015; Wilkinson, 2012). Specifically, attention is needed to unpack the composition and rhetorical features of value-based climate change messaging that elicit tailored responses from audiences (Landrum, Tomaka, & McCarthy, 2016; Prelli & Winters, 2009; Scoville-Simonds, 2018). Some scholars such as Wilkinson (2012, p. 139) have challenged that such approaches in assessing religious responses to climate change reinforce binaries of liberal and conservative religion which hinder the examination of the variability of possible responses for religious communities to become sensitized to climate change.

The above studies are generally confined among Christian denominational differences and may have less applicability to other dominant world religions. Furthermore, these studies on values-based messaging have yet to be substantively explored outside the U.S. context. Nevertheless, prying open the discussion for how climate change can become meaningful to particular communities, when they are more likely to respond to things that matter to them most are threatened by climate change, could serve as the gateway for more attuned approaches that draw upon existing values and cues of specific religious communities to elicit climate action.

1.2.6.5 Religious messengers in overcoming ideological polarization on climate change

The literature has also paid increased attention to the role of religious actors as messengers. Messengers act as conduits, translators, and bridge-builders, serving as an intermediary in representing the values of the audiences, translating climate science materials into religious languages (Callison, 2014; Laudrum et al., 2017; Wilkinson, 2012), facilitating access of messages (Kahan,
2010, p. 297), and helping to overcome ideological polarization in communities (Callison, 2014; Cloud, 2016; Kahan et al., 2010; Russill & Nyssa, 2009). Messengers may include authoritative figures such as Pope Francis (Schuldt et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2016), respected members of the community (Callison, 2014; Wilkinson, 2012), and religious organizations (Ellingson, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012). For instance, Cloud (2016), proposes three strategies that Katharine Hayhoe and Andrew Farley, two prominent climate scientists and evangelical Christians, use to communicate climate change to a spectrum of evangelical Christian audiences. First, they emphasize shared values with religious audiences that derive from religious texts and teachings, such as the concern for charity and love for one’s neighbour in the Good Samaritan parable. Second, they draw upon more physically proximate examples of climate change to make it more present and accessible for skeptical audiences. And third, they reinforce the in-group belief of conservative Christians that they too have a moral responsibility to care for the earth while disassociating themselves from the caricature of “earth-worshipping” environmentalists, a theme that has been echoed in other studies (Wilkinson, 2012; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015). Callison (2014) adds to the complexity, noting that Christian evangelical efforts reframe climate change as climate care, which heightens individual concerns and moral responsibility of evangelical Christians to care for neighbours in the Global South by reducing their own emissions. Subsuming scientific language under moral claims in communication strategies speak to the multiple access points for religious messengers to target audiences, tap into values, and encourage actions that align with political leanings.

Rather than presenting prescribed behaviours and values from the standpoint of the communicator, the evidence suggests religious-based climate change messaging begins inductively from the place of in-group chambers of religious audiences. Taking on this grounded perspective for climate change communication, meanings attached to, strategies on, and responses to climate change therefore suggest that tailoring climate change messaging entails a constellation of factors that facilitate the narratives, translation, and proximation of religious significance of climate change to the targeted audience. Such conceptualizations have however, been explored to a limited extent. Further
empirical testing is needed to substantiate these claims and under what circumstances messengers may over or under-perform in overcoming ideological polarization.

1.2.6.6 Religious actors in climate change communication in Canada

In the growing literature on climate change communication in Canada (Callison & Tindall, 2017), there has been some attention to the role of non-Indigenous religious actors in the communication process (Haluza-DeLay, 2008; Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018; Moyer & Scharper, 2019). Haluza-DeLay (2008)’s auto-ethnographic account of climate change engagements in church-based contexts identifies paradigmatic, applicability, and critical and convictions as four sets of obstacles, Haluza-DeLay finds that subcultural practices and demonstrating and leveraging praxis of practice through public theology could be productive for environmental engagements in church-based contexts. Lysack (2014) notes that religious institutions have launched a number of initiatives to increase engagements on climate change. Moyer (2018) and Moyer and Scharper (2019) find that a number of meso-level organizations within various Christian denominations and across interfaith, Muslim and Jewish communities broadly engage on translating worldviews into practice. Yet, the literature remains spotty even though Christianity remains one of the highest self-reported religious affiliation in the country (Pew Research Center, 2013). To what and how religious actors such as REOs consider in orienting climate change messaging to religious communities remain under-explored.

1.2.7 Research gaps

This literature review has raised three important issues that inform the background and significance of this study. Given the inconclusive trends in the debate of the greening of religions, tracing the trajectory of the religious environmental movement and its latest fronts of action represent possibilities and limitations for further examination. The literature review has identified three key issues which inform the research question and study.
First, there remains ongoing interest in understanding the particularities of religious environmental framings of climate change across different audiences and settings. These particularities include clarifying the relationship and processes that give rise to these frames, examining the actors and settings for how these frames take place, and exploring the kinds of interpretations religious actors use to ground them in practices. Although there have been examination of national level organizational efforts that advocate for incorporating climate change into the religious lexicon, there is growing interest and under-exploration in less-formalized religious groups in local settings (Haluza-DeLay, 2014; Hulme, 2017) and the bottom-up efforts that articulate climate messaging and actions apart from the broader climate movement they are situated in (Nita, 2016). Situating religious environmental action in the surge of Indigenous-led, climate movements in Canada provides another entry point to assess religious environmental frames. Examining the construction of religious environmental frames in the context of Indigenous-led climate movements also begs questioning the extent religious settlers demonstrate self-reflexivity and responsibilities to Indigenous lands in view of religious settler attempts at reconciliation.

Second, how climate change becomes articulated within the spaces of religious environmentalism is to some extent, mediated by its geographical contexts. Studies on the religious environmental movement have largely focused on situating religious environmental frames with movement emergences of REO intra-group networks and relationship with religious bodies and institutions. While the literature generally suggests that the religious environmental movement has largely developed as a distinct and parallel movement mirroring mainstream environmental and climate movements, there is more recent evidence that suggests the movement is increasingly intersecting with environmental movements, attending to local debates that frame the ethical dimensions of climate change and taking part in local activism. One area that is of immense need for research is religious environmental engagement especially in Indigenous-led resistance against expanding fossil fuel infrastructure in the Canadian context. Examining the alignment between what REOs say they stand for (e.g. values, principles), and what and how REOs actually go about
delivering these promises (e.g. campaigns, strategies, and tactics) could inform the conditions in shaping and tailoring religious-based climate change messaging.

Finally, the dominance of the consensus frame for climate change communication has neglected to account for the socio-political dimensions of climate change in messaging towards religious audiences. The emergence of value-based approaches through religious environmental frames of messengers point to the potential of tailoring value-based messages as a key component in communicating climate change to religious audiences. Expanding on the factors in targeting and tailoring strategies, opportunities, and challenges in messaging may improve understanding of the dynamics in the communication process with respect to religious audiences.

1.3 Research question and aims

This study examines how religious environmental organizations (REOs) construct and tailor the content of messaging on climate change to religious audiences. To answer this question, this study develops four aims that correspond to respective findings in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. First, this study aims to unpack the ways REOs construct their climate change messaging. Connected to this first aim is the second aim of examining the extent religious settler consciousness inform climate change message construction. Third, it aims to situate their framing strategies and processes of REOs in the context of Indigenous-led resistance. And last, given the urgency of addressing climate change as part of their involvement, it examines the opportunities, challenges, and strategies for how REOs tailor messaging on climate change to religious audiences.

Chapter 2 presents the case study of the Trans Mountain conflict before discussing the study method.
Chapter 2: Method

Based on the single case of the Trans Mountain resistance, this study adopted framing as a conceptual approach to examine how REOs construct and tailor climate change messaging to religious audiences. This approach highlights the interlocked spiritual, ethical, and ecological dimensions that underlie climate change messaging. Seven REOs were sampled and data was collected from semi-structured interviews, movement texts, and social media texts. Content analysis provided the structure and substance for the frame analysis, and textual analysis facilitated the examination of micro-linkages to substantiate the frame analysis. Researcher ethics, access, and positionality are discussed.

2.1 Case study of the Trans Mountain resistance

This study adopts a single-case study approach (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) on the Indigenous-led resistance to the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (hereafter the Trans Mountain resistance) to contextualize the place of climate change messaging of REOs (Coast Protectors, 2018; Protect the Inlet, 2018g). The Trans Mountain resistance is significant in the context of climate movements and environmental conflicts in Canada (Gobby & Gareau, 2019; Tindall & Robinson, 2017). Emerging anti-pipeline campaigns across Canada have argued that pipeline expansion is a key driver of exacerbating Canada’s cumulative greenhouse gas emissions (Hoberg, 2019). Regionally, the British Columbia coast is a strategic access point for overseas export of fossil fuels from Alberta (Hoberg, 2018a) and historically site to environmental conflicts over title to land claims and resource development between the Indigenous communities and Canadian state (Tindall, Trosper, & Perreault, 2013). Recent pipeline oppositions such as the Northern Gateway pipeline (Veldmeyer & Bowles, 2014; Wood & Rossiter, 2017) underscore the contention over the prescriptions over the Crown’s duty to consult and obtaining consent over large-scale energy projects from Indigenous communities.
This case overview demonstrates that issues of Indigenous governance, informed consent, and the broader politics of climate change underlie the competing positions of project proponents and opponents. The core issue is whether the affected Indigenous communities who oppose the project on the grounds of inadequate consent can serve as a project veto may outweigh the stated national benefit and vast majority of affected Indigenous communities who have expressed consent or no opposition to the project (Federal Court of Appeal, 2020). While Indigenous groups have led the resistance, environmental and grassroots groups have strategized and mobilized in the wider resistance (Hoberg, 2016). National level religious bodies viewed the project approval as a contradictions to the promises on reconciliation and exacerbating climate change.

2.1.1 Overview of the Trans Mountain system

Built in 1953, the existing 1,150 kilometer long Trans-Mountain pipeline carries approximately 300,000 barrels of refined petroleum and synthetic, light, and heavy crude per day from Strathcona County, Alberta to terminals and refineries in Sumas and Burnaby, British Columbia as well as Washington State (Figure 2.1) (NEB, 2016).

In December 2013, Kinder Morgan filed a formal application to the National Energy Board (NEB) to request the twinning of the original pipeline (NEB, 2016). The Trans Mountain expansion would increase the system’s capacity to 890,000 barrels per day and build an additional 980 kilometers of new pipeline, allowing for dual line operation and transport of various grades of refined oil products (NEB, 2016). The expansion would construct new right-of-ways, tanker farms, and facilities and serve up to 37 vessels per month (Trans Mountain, n.d.).
As of March 2020, the project has continued construction at the Burnaby Terminal and Westridge Marine Terminal (Trans Mountain, 2019a; Appendix A for timeline of major events). Despite pending outstanding permit approvals on sections of the route, the project is slated for completion by 2022 (Trans Mountain, 2019a). The project faced numerous legal challenges and underwent two rounds of consultation and approvals in 2016 and 2019 respectively. As part of the approval in May 2016, the NEB stated that Kinder Morgan must meet 157 conditions throughout the project lifecycle (NEB, 2016). However in August 2018, the Federal Court of Appeal ruled that the federal government failed to fulfil its constitutional duty to engage in meaningful dialogue with First Nations...
who were affected by the project. The federal government subsequently issued a second NEB-led review, expanding consultation with Indigenous communities and focus on increased tanker traffic impact on B.C.’s marine environment (Harris, 2018). Following the second NEB recommendation in February 2019, the federal government subsequently re-approved the project in June 2019. During the two rounds of consultations, the federal government’s purchase of the Trans Mountain system in between the two approval periods secured the fate of the project (The Globe and Mail, 2018b). In February 2020, the Federal Court of Appeal upheld the federal government’s re-approval of the project, but Indigenous applicants filed leave to appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada (Bellrichard, 2020; Federal Court of Appeal, 2020).

2.1.2 Regulatory and legal contexts: duty to consult and obtaining consent

Adequacy of consultation and obtaining consent of affected Indigenous communities remains one of the central issues in the Trans Mountain conflict. Although the last phase of consultations engaged 129 Indigenous communities, the consultation process was criticized for its short timeline, lack of meaningful two-way dialogue, and pre-determined outcome (West Coast Environmental Law, 2019). Out of the affected 129 Indigenous communities who were consulted, 120 of whom either support or do not oppose the project (Federal Court of Appeal, 2020). In addition, 43 Indigenous communities have signed mutual benefit agreements with Trans Mountain (Trans Mountain, 2018b). However, an investigation has found that only 41 communities have agreements of some form (Owen, 2018). Furthermore, it has found that outstanding communities with no signed agreements varied in positions ranging from engaging with Trans Mountain through employment opportunities, opposing the project due to lack of concern about the environment, meaningful consultation, or simply refusing to engage with Trans Mountain (Owen, 2018).

An overview of major regulatory and legal issues provides a closer look at the constitutional debates that affect the strength and credibility of claims of project proponents and opponents. The past several decades of landmark court decisions have interpreted Section 35 as a means of advancing
reconciliation by further defining and recognizing the importance of consultation to protect Aboriginal rights and treaties (Brideau, 2019, p. 3; Hanson, n.d.). Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution recognizes and affirms the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal peoples in Canada, enshrining the constitutional requirement in the duty to consult with Aboriginal peoples (Brideau, 2019; Wright, 2018). Section 35 assumes that the Crown has sovereignty over lands and resources that were formerly held by Aboriginal peoples (Brideau, 2019, p. 2). Duty to consult arises when the Crown is aware of potential or adverse potential impacts to Aboriginal rights or title (Brideau, 2019; Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2019). The scope of the duty to consult is designed to determine and evaluate the content and level of consultation required, and the potential impacts from the proposed project (Brideau, 2019, p. 5). Regardless of the extent of consultation, the Crown must always carry out consultations in good faith and abide by the duty to accommodate concerns of interested Aboriginal groups, even when Aboriginal title has yet been proven in the courts (e.g. trilogy of decisions from *Haida, Taku, Mikisew*, and affirmed in *Tsilhqot’i In*) (Brideau, 2019; Hoberg, 2018; Wright, 2018).

Determining sufficiency in the duty to consult and limit in accommodating Indigenous concerns has implications for the extent to which consent can be used as grounds to veto projects. In the context of federal pipeline infrastructure, the Crown relies on the NEB to meet its consultation obligations (Wright, 2018, p. 208). Engaging in consultation does not imply or guarantee consent from Indigenous communities. Consent must be freely given or obtained and free of coercion (Hoberg, 2018b, p. 87; Yellowhead Institute, 2019, p. 5). Since *Haida*, the courts have consistently held that the duty to consult does not provide Indigenous communities with a veto over final Crown decisions over projects, but rather requires a process that balances different interests, requires good faith efforts to understand and address each party’s concerns, and does not require the parties to agree (Wright, 2018, p. 196). In the post-*Tsilhqot’i In* context, consent sets the standard for projects crossing territory of title-holding Indigenous communities (Wright, 2018, p. 193). If Indigenous communities do not consent to federal linear energy infrastructure projects, the only way project proponents can
proceed is to justify the infringement of Indigenous rights under the *Sparrow* legal test (Wright, 2018, p. 208). In recent cases such as *Gitxaala* and *Tsleil-Waututh*, the courts further found that the Crown’s consultation process was flawed in consulting on matters of substance (Wright, 2018, p. 203). These cases suggest the ways the Crown and its reliance on the NEB to fulfill its fiduciary duty to consult First Nations present problems in how consent is determined from all affected Indigenous communities. Obtaining Indigenous consent has coincided with the ongoing legislative developments to free, prior, and informed consents under the guidance of UNDRIP, such as the Principles Respecting the Government of Canada’s Relationship with Indigenous peoples and in Bill C-262 (Wright, 2018). While the Supreme Court has commented on consent and veto power, it has yet to legally clarify free, prior, and informed consent with respect to UNDRIP and major resource projects and Indigenous rights (Wright, 2018, p. 212). The Canadian government’s interpretation of such obligations have also come under scrutiny for falling short of principles of mutual consent and undoing colonial injustices on a nation-to-nation basis (Rollo, 2018). Moreover, such interpretations over Section 35 in the courts remain steep under colonial-based constitutional frameworks of Indigenous rights under Crown sovereignty (Christie, 2005). Although there is progress towards recognizing Indigenous titles under Canadian common law, the courts and the Canadian government have yet to fully recognize full legal sovereignty of Indigenous titles and self-governance (Christie, 2013; Morales & Nicols, 2018; Rollo, 2018).

The overview above illustrates that assessing arguments for obtaining Indigenous consent either assume the government must in the lower end simply fulfill the duty to consult or in the higher end secure free, prior, and informed consent of every affected Indigenous community as the ultimate

---

6 Yellowhead Institute (2019, p. 20) expands on each dimension of free, prior, and informed consent. Free consent is “consent given voluntarily without coercion, intimidation, manipulation” or externally imposed timelines. Prior consent indicates that consent is “sought sufficiently in advance of any authorization or commencement of activities”. Informed consent marks “the nature of engagement and type of information provided prior to seeking consent and as part of an ongoing consent process”. Consent represents the “collective decision made by right holders and reached through the customary decision-making processes of the communities”.
condition for project approval. The debate is further problematized by the legal and regulatory bodies that execute responsibilities to fulfill the duties to consult and accommodate Indigenous concerns but stopping short of accommodating and obtaining consent from affected Indigenous communities. Under the competing definitions of consent, identifying where different actors stand in their level of agreement to proceeding with the project is central to understand how different actors position themselves on debating the legitimacy of the project.

2.1.3 The Trans Mountain conflict

This section briefly describes the establishment and consent positions deployed respectively by project proponents. The two positions illustrate the conflict over the interpretations of what constitutes Indigenous consent (Hoberg, 2018b), which mark the considerable gap between the establishment doctrine of consultation and accommodation and the aspirations of some Indigenous leaders to have the right to consent on projects affecting their lands and title (Hoberg, 2018b, p. 88). Key actor groups in this conflict are discussed to contextualize the positions and rationales of religious actors.

2.1.3.1 Proponents and the establishment position

Project proponents that deployed the establishment position (Hoberg, 2018b, p. 77) uphold the importance of the process of consultation rather than the outcome of consent. Even if First Nations have been consulted and refused to consent to projects, proponents in this frame claim that First Nations do not equate directly to a veto to the project (Hoberg, 2018b, p. 79).

Proponents consist of Trans Mountain, the oil sands lobby, the federal and Alberta governments, and several Indigenous coalitions. Trans Mountain and the oil sands lobby argued that the pipeline expansion was essential for Alberta’s economy as it would enable access to overseas markets, stressing over $46.7 billion in government revenues, 50,000 jobs, and additional benefits to
communities including the Aboriginal peoples (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, 2018; Canadian Energy Pipeline Association, 2019; Trans Mountain, 2018a). The federal and Alberta governments at both levels have supported the project. The previous Conservative federal government highlighted the importance of Canada’s resource sector to the economy (CBC News, 2015a). In 2015, upon the electoral promise of conducting further environmental assessments, the federal Liberal government announced in 2019 that the project balanced economic and environmental priorities, including the use of generated revenues to mitigate and offset environmental impact which was within the public interest of Canada (Government of Canada, 2019; Office of the Prime Minister, 2019). Similarly, consecutive Alberta governments have unequivocally supported the project (Alberta NDP, 2019; Rieger, 2018; UCP, 2019). Additionally, several First Nations coalitions, such as Western Indigenous Pipelines Group, Project Reconciliation, and Iron Coalition advocated for potential acquisition of Trans Mountain to alleviate poverty and enhance Indigenous voices in decision-making (Coletta, 2019; Hamelin, 2019; Iron Coalition, n.d.; Project Reconciliation, n.d.).

2.1.3.2 Opponents and the consent position

First Nations groups, environmental, and grassroots groups adopt the position of consent in the Trans Mountain resistance. The position of consent is based on the ethics of consent and procedural rule within the respective legal framework of United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and laws within respective Indigenous community territories (Hoberg, 2018b, pp. 84-85). Tying historical and modern-day resource development in Canada and especially British Columbia (Hoberg, 2016), project opponents cited the principle of free, prior, and informed consent, recognizing the role of Indigenous groups in decision-making to their own territories as justification to project opposition (Hoberg, 2018b, p. 86; United Nations, 2007).

First Nations groups have led the opposition to stop the project. The Union of BC Indian Chiefs warned prospective First Nations coalitions prospecting investment into Trans Mountain of financial risks of the project in the face of climate change (Union of BC Indian Chiefs, 2019a) and
stressed the consultation process fell below the legal standard of meaningful consultation (Union of BC Indian Chiefs, 2019b). Similarly, several First Nations, as well as Treaty Alliance and Save the Fraser Declaration issued formal statements and pursued litigation to highlight the insufficiencies to duty to consult and accommodate Indigenous concerns during consultation (Meyer, 2018; Treaty Alliance, 2018; West Coast Environmental Law, 2017 and 2019). Pull Together, Protect the Inlet, Coast Protectors, and Tiny House Warriors represented the front line campaigns of First Nations. Pull Together fundraised support for legal challenges of First Nations, notably the Squamish, Coldwater, Secwepemc and Tsleil-Waututh Nations (Pull Together, n.d.; RAVEN, n.d.). Launched on March 10, 2018 after the 10,000 people march on Burnaby Mountain (Protect the Inlet, 2018e; 2018g), Protect the Inlet erected and hosted Indigenous gatherings and ceremonies at the traditional Coast Salish Watch House (Protect the Inlet, n.d.). Coast Protectors, a related campaign spearheaded by Union of BC Indian Chiefs, had been active in the resistance since 2016 (Coast Protectors, n.d. and 2017). Finally, Tiny House Warriors were a frontline group whose mission is to stop the project from crossing into unceded Secwepemc territory by building tiny houses along that stretch of the proposed route (Tiny House Warriors, n.d.).

Environmental and grassroots groups have been heavily committed in opposing the project (Hoberg, 2016). Groups consist of international, multi-issue, mainstay provincial, and local groups, such as Stand.earth, Greenpeace, Dogwood Initiative, LeadNow, Wilderness Committee, and Burnaby Residents Against Kinder Morgan (BROKE) (Hoberg, 2016). These groups strategize tactics to mobilize and garner public attention, such as launching campaigns, petitions, legal challenges, as well as engaging in direct action and civil disobedience (Hoberg, 2016; Shea, 2016; Speers-Roesch, 2018). Grassroots groups such as Caretakers of the Mountain, Camp Cloud, and BROKE further held protests and occupations outside the Kinder Morgan properties from 2014 to 2018 (Boothby, 2018b; Shea, 2016; Verenca, 2017).
2.1.3.3 Positions of religious bodies

Aside from REOs, national religious bodies largely adopted the position of consent into their messaging through public statements (Table 2.1). Statements expressed regret and opposition, support for front-line resistance, and exacerbation of climate change impacts and injustices on Indigenous peoples from the project. Statements generally suggested that the project approval was done so on the grounds that breached principles of free, prior, and informed consent under UNDRIP and that the federal government failed to the call to respond to Action 45 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Call to Action. Some bodies such as the Canadian Service and Friends Committee further stated that Section 35 of the Constitution Act was violated. The United Church of Canada further claimed that project approval contradicted Canada’s goal to meet its Paris commitments. Ongoing resource extraction and climate exacerbation contradicted religious environmental teachings and practices.

Positions of national religious bodies broadly inform the positions and actions of some REOs in pipeline resistance. The participation of REOs was first noted in mainstream media, starting with protests, blockades and subsequently, the use of civil disobedience as a symbolic gesture to express project opposition (Kidd, 2018; Pawson, 2018; Protect the Inlet, 2018a, 2018b). Several REOs are affiliated with national religious bodies, while a number of REOs remain unaffiliated or independent. The extent that national-level statements may inform message construction and actions of REOs is considered in Chapters 3 and 4.
Table 2.1  Statements of national religious bodies on the Trans Mountain conflict, adapted from Canadian Service and Friends Committee (2014), Dueckman and Muir (2018), KAIROS Canada (2018), Kidd, 2018, and United Church of Canada (2016).

| National Religious Body                  | Given that Mennonite Church Canada has been supportive of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and said yes to affirming and living into the ‘Calls to Action,’ and given that Mennonite Church Canada has also repudiated the Doctrine of Discovery, it is important for the church nationally and regionally to ‘put feet’ to the decisions that we have made. . .
| Mennonite Church of Canada               | As we seek reconciliation with Indigenous peoples, so must we continue to seek reconciliation with all of creation. We had dared to hope that such principles also underlay the Canadian government’s stated commitments to Indigenous rights and climate change. That hope was dashed on November 29 when Prime Minister Trudeau announced the government’s decision to approve the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline.
| United Church of Canada                  | We write to express our support for, and solidarity with, those working on Burnaby Mountain to stop the expansion of the Kinder Morgan pipeline... An equally critical reason why this project should not go ahead at this time is that Kinder Morgan and the Government of Canada have failed to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of the Indigenous peoples whose unceded territories would be impacted.
| Canadian Service and Friends Committee   | KAIROS . . . continues to be profoundly disappointed with the federal government’s decision to support the pipeline expansion. This position has significant implications for reconciliation with Indigenous peoples in Canada. It violates the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. It endangers Indigenous peoples and their territories, and amplifies the impact of climate change. It is not in the national interest.
| KAIROS Canada                            | The pipeline project does not align with the Anglican Church of Canada’s fifth Mark of Mission to “safeguard the integrity of creation . . . [a] large increase in bitumen extraction and transmission will generate large amounts of carbon dioxide when burned, which will upset the delicate atmospheric balance necessary to sustain life on Earth.
2.2 Framing as conceptual approach

Framing was adopted to understand how REOs construct and tailor climate change messaging. Framing assumes that social actors assemble different elements to construct cognitive schemas that may resonate with their audiences (Benford & Snow, 2000). In this study, frames are assumed to encompass interlocking spiritual, ethical, and ecological dimensions7 (Figure 2.2). Providing a set of descriptive and prescriptive lens may offer a conceptual construct that focuses on how REOs understand climate change, notably how climate change entails significant meanings that is defined, interpreted, and negotiated in respective religious traditions. Detailing the conceptual schemas of REOs in the deployment of religious environmental frames is crucial to understand how REOs formulate, amalgamate, and hybridize inherited and borrowed elements from respective religious traditions as well as other modes of knowing (Ellingson, 2016; Scoville-Simonds, 2018; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997). For instance, climate and planetary sciences aid religious paradigms to diagnose the problem and actions demanded of people of faith to climate change. This approach triangulates components and mechanisms under these dimensions to ground preliminary conceptions of REO frames (Ellingson et al., 2012; Kearns, 2011). Building validity upon interrelated dimensions may offer robust explanations to the extent religious actors deploy and align religious environmental frames as a function of religious environmental activism (Nita, 2016) in the broader Indigenous-led climate movement. Arising factors in tailoring climate change messaging also become present in engagements with religious audiences (Haluza De-Lay, 2017; Hine et al., 2014).

7 Baker et al. (2017) proposes a preliminary moral ecologies framework that examines how environmental movements are motivated and shaped by cultural and spiritual connections between people and their environment.
2.3 Sampling and data collection

A stratified, purposeful, and criterion sampling (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011) was adopted to examine REOs from Christian, Quaker, Unitarian, and multi-faith traditions. Sampling of REOs considered the REO’s size, duration of participation, degree of activity, position on the project, and size of social media following. This study initially scoped for potential REOs based on iterative searches, finding a majority of the organizations to be from Christian or multi-faith traditions. Email correspondences with REOs aimed to gather referrals or contact of members of other REOs to ensure that less visible REOs were accounted for.

In total, seven REOs were sampled (Table 2.2). REOs consisted of a spectrum of autonomous, semi-autonomous, and institutionally affiliated organizations. REOs were fairly small in size, generally consisting of a few to tens of core members depending on respective characterizations. Positions of REOs on climate change and reconciliation varied accordingly depending on the REO’s institutional affiliation and relationship. As REOs reflected a small subset of critical voices, the views and actions of REOs do not necessarily reflect that of affiliated institutions or nearly most mainstream views of religious environmentalism in Canada (for example, see Lysack (2014) and Moyer (2018)) in recognizing Indigenous-settler dynamics.

Figure 2.2 Frames of REOs entail interlocking spiritual, ethical, and ecological dimensions.
Data comprising semi-structured interviews, movement texts and social media texts was collected from October 2018 to May 2019. Four REOs were also observed but were excluded due to time constraints and lack of response. The four REOs were KAIROS Canada, Development and Peace, Interfaith Institute for Justice, Peace and Social Movements, and Mountain Rain Zen Community.

Table 2.2 Background of and data collected from sampled REOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REOs</th>
<th>Tradition/ Sub-grouping</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Movement texts</th>
<th>Social media texts (between 2016 to 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>Christian / Ecumenical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salal + Cedar</td>
<td>Christian / Anglican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams of Justice</td>
<td>Christian / Baptist</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Quakers</td>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian Church of Vancouver</td>
<td>Unitarian / Multi-faith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td>Christian / Independent Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Free Faith</td>
<td>Multi-faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>709</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Semi-structured interviews

Interviews enabled the gathering of in-depth understanding of key informants within the sampled REOs. Interviews provided an insider’s perspective in how REOs decided and communicated upon the messages within the REO. Based on the initial contact list, invitation letters (Appendix G) were sent to REOs, targeting a range of 15 to 20 interviewees. Interviews were conducted from October to December 2018. The inclusion criteria for interviewees was gauged on their length of time in the REO, with the minimum requirement that they must at least be involved with the REO during the resistance. The criteria were intentionally broad to obtain the perspectives of leaders and members.

s Two interviewees took part in a group interview.
An interview guide comprising five broad sections refined topics of interest (Appendix I). These sections covered the REO’s views on climate change, involvement as well as decision-making in the resistance, use of communication platforms, and background and structure. The interview guide was circulated before the interview and interviewees were instructed to prepare accordingly. After the first interview, the interview guide was slightly refined for clarity.

Over 25 emails were sent out to prospective interviewees. 17 interviewees responded and 15 were interviewed (Table 2.2; details in Appendix F). Interviews took place in public settings and lasted anywhere between 45 minutes to one hour and 45 minutes. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were subsequently circulated to interviewees for member checking (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

2.3.2 Movement texts
This dataset consists of a compilation of 107 hardcopy and softcopy texts of REOs’ activities and views during the resistance. Texts included but were not limited to websites, statements of support and blog posts (H. Johnston, 2005; Stoddart & L. Macdonald, 2011). These texts provided access to how REOs characterized and explained their reasons for action, such as event organization or civil disobedience. These texts further facilitated systematic comparison of communication repertoires of religious actors (Callison, 2014; H. Johnston, 2005; Wilkinson, 2012). Initial collection of texts from web searches of sampled organizations and affiliated institutions informed the background of REOs. REO interviews subsequently identified key documents relevant for data analysis (Appendix C).

2.3.3 Twitter and Facebook texts
276 Twitter posts and 433 Facebook posts were analyzed. REOs used Twitter and Facebook to generate and disseminate a variety of messages on climate change. Twitter has emerged as an organizing platform and gatekeeper for climate rallies (Segerberg & Bennett, 2011) while Facebook has served as an
important platform for online environmental campaigns (Hodges & Stocking, 2016; Katz-Kimchi & Manosevitch, 2015). These platforms offered accessible, rapid, and raw content delivery of messages to religious audiences.

Twitter data of REOs was collected using software from Crimson Hexagon, a company which specializes in social media metrics (Hodges & Stocking, 2016). The Crimson Hexagon software was accessed with permission through the UBC Graduate School of Journalism. A tutorial was provided which introduced basic commands and functions for data extraction and analysis. However, Crimson Hexagon was unable to extract historical Facebook posts due to recent restrictions over data harvesting. To overcome this challenge, a manual data collection technique was developed to extract Facebook data.

Twitter and Facebook posts between 2016 and 2018 were collected from each REO (Tables 2.3 and 2.4). All posts of REOs on both platforms were examined for closer analysis. A random purposeful sample was conducted for REOs with over 100 posts to ensure focus on content (Creswell, 2007). A codebook was developed through a first-round in-vivo coding of the REOs’ Twitter and Facebook posts, along the lines of post categories (e.g. content dissemination, education, reflection), content, and hashtags (e.g. #climatejustice) (Saldana, 2009). The codebook was checked with interview codes for a second-round focused coding across REOs for consistency in post categories and hashtags. Subsequent analysis integrated these codes to validate interview themes and codes and configure the REO’s social media strategy.

Table 2.3 REOs with Twitter accounts, extracted sample, and justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Earthkeepers</th>
<th>Unitarian Church of Vancouver</th>
<th>Fossil Free Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Posts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2016-2018)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extracted Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Justification</strong></td>
<td>Every second tweet</td>
<td>Mention of Environment Committee, climate change or Kinder Morgan</td>
<td>All tweets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 REOs with Facebook accounts and total posts, examined period, and extracted sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Earthkeepers</th>
<th>Salal + Cedar</th>
<th>Streams of Justice</th>
<th>Vancouver Quakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Posts</strong></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extracted Sample</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 REOs with Facebook accounts and total posts, examined period, and extracted sample (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unitarian Church of Vancouver</th>
<th>Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society</th>
<th>Fossil Free Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Posts</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined Period</strong></td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extracted Sample</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unitarian Church of Vancouver is a unique case in that its Environment Committee posts information, events and activities under the general Vancouver Unitarians Twitter handle and Facebook page.
2.3.4 Supplementary sources

To re-construct the length and extensiveness of religious involvement during the resistance, news articles and videos from a variety of media sources were obtained. Statements issued by nationally based religious organizations in opposition to the project provided background and proxies for potential religious involvement and framing. Documents and websites of Indigenous, environmental, and grassroots groups were consulted to triangulate REO frames.

2.4 Data analysis

2.4.1 Procedure

Data processing and analysis were conducted using NVivo and Microsoft Excel from February to June 2019. Three major rounds of comprehensive coding and content analyses were conducted from January to May. After the third-round of comprehensive coding of interviews in April and May, codes were reapplied to movement and social media texts in May and June for validation. Textual analysis was conducted in May and June.

2.4.2 Content analysis

A systematic process comprising a mixture of theoretical and in-vivo coding was developed to gather content for the frames of climate change messaging of REOs (Krippenhoff, 2004; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Four areas that emerged from initial, theoretical coding established the general parameters that guided in-vivo coding. The four areas included the basis for REO frames, convergence of messaging on reconciliation, effects of REOs roles and network in shaping framing strategies, and considerations for tailoring climate change messaging to religious audiences. Guiding questions were developed to facilitate coding. The examination of movement and social media texts refined, maintained consistency, and ensured replicability of the themes and codes (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).
2.4.3 Frame analysis and textual analysis

Frame analysis extended the content analysis by re-constructing macro-level structures of content in climate change messaging of REOs (H. Johnston, 2005). Textual analysis was applied to provide finer analysis of REO texts to extrapolate and analyze meanings (Fairclough, 2003) and evaluate similarities and differences of frame structure and content to overall reliability and validity of the frame (H. Johnston, 2002; Lindekilde, 2014).

Textual analysis aims to unpack the interdiscursive elements of texts (Fairclough, 2003). Interdiscursive elements of texts refer to texts that are lodged in different discourses, genres, and styles that articulate political and social dimensions of life (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 2-3). Textual analysis facilitated examination of central claims in each frame and contextualization of key terms such as reconciliation, colonialism, and extractivism. Comparing the similarities and differences of such claims revealed the inter-linkages, meanings, and significance within select texts to substantiate the re-construction of the frame. Textual analysis was applied to texts that were flagged by REO members or deemed by the researcher as significant documents. Four types of textual analyses, namely recontextualization, legitimation, representation of social events as well as argumentation, assumption and ideologies, were applied as they were considered appropriate in examining the meanings behind particular texts. Recontextualization appropriates elements of one social practice within another context and transforming it into the present context (Fairclough, 2003, p. 32). Legitimation specified what motivated people in rationalizing their social practices. The four main strategies for legitimation were authorization, rationalization, moral evaluation, and mythopoesis (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 98-100). Representation of social events distinguished social processes, participants, and circumstances to locate meanings of participants in the set of processes and circumstances (Fairclough, 2003, p. 141). Argumentation, assumptions and ideologies unpacked the grounds, warrants, backing and claims of the overall argument (Fairclough, 2003, p. 81). Semantic relations which identified relations between sentences and clauses or over long stretches and whole texts respectively (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 89-91) was generally applied to interpret excerpts and other in-text quotations.
2.5 Research ethics

2.5.1 Informed consent

The Behavioral Research Ethics Board application was submitted in July 2018 and received approval in September 2018 under ethics certificate H18-00481. Written consent was obtained at the time of or shortly after the interview (Appendix H). Interviewees remained anonymous. Pseudonyms were assigned and use of direct quotations were reduced to minimize identity disclosure. As Twitter and Facebook data of REOs were publicly accessible, using this data presented low risk to REOs.

2.5.2 Positionality, access, and rapport

As a first-generation Hong Kong-Canadian Christian settler, I entered the field as a participant observer. As I had some loose affiliation with Earthkeepers in 2018, I had insider knowledge and understanding of the values and systems in which some REO and members were embedded in within the wider REO network. However, I also had outside knowledge in that I was unaware of the world that some of them inhabited. I was curious to learn more about why and how REOs and members positioned themselves and was prepared to challenge my own assumptions about the involvement and positions of REOs on the Trans Mountain resistance.

Engaging with REOs and interviewees prompted my encounter of decolonization as a researcher. Appendix E features auto-ethnographical vignettes from a portion of my field notes (Humphreys, 2005), demonstrating how my thinking evolved during and after field work. I build upon Datta (2018)'s re-definition of researchers wrestling with decolonization as “an on-going process of becoming, unlearning and relearning regarding who we are as a researcher and educator, and taking responsibilities for [interviewees]” (Datta, 2018, p. 2) who were themselves undergoing their own process of decolonization. How does this research challenge the assumptions of researchers in acknowledging Indigenous lands, peoples and sovereignty, honoring Indigenous approaches to knowing the world, and possibly engaging in the anti-colonial struggles (Datta, 2018)? While my research does not directly interact with interviewees
of Indigenous backgrounds, how REO members interacted with Indigenous communities and individuals and deployed messaging that centred on actions in the name of reconciliation prompted me to examine the historical context and multiple layers that inform religious framings of climate change. Positioning myself to see through the assumptions in the conceptualizations of frames impacted how I as a researcher, an apparatus in qualitative inquiry (Berger, 2015; Carter et al., 2014; Marshall & Rossman, 2011), entered the field and unpacked my own biases and privileges within western knowledge and training (Smith, 1999) over the course of the field work. Early into entering the field, I sensed that where I stood as an immigrant settler of Chinese descent and self-identified Christian had a role to play in shaping how I conducted research, prompting me to be more critical about the motivations of REO members during the field work period (Appendix E, E.1 to E.4). It also provided space for me to confront my own biases as well as racial and socio-economic privileges (E.1 and E.8). As REO members shared their experiences of engaging and entering into decolonization processes, I began to reflect on my own social location in the field setting and embarked on my own journey in learning about the politics, promises, and failures on Indigenous-settler reconciliation (E.5). Encounters with Indigenous scholars prompted my thinking on the long-term implications, possibilities, and limits behind religious-based solidarity movements in potentially supporting Indigenous resurgence (E5 to E.7; Asch, Borrows, & Tully, 2018; Heinrichs, 2016; Whyte, 2018b). These reflections clarified the broader questions of the role of religious settlers in shaping climate change messaging on justice and the implications that poses for solidarity. This process eventually led to the creation on religious settler consciousness in Chapter 3.

As a researcher who is positioned as an “insider of one REO and an “outsider” to other REOs, entering into the field enabled an in-depth perspective at some of the decisions and structure of the REO and allowed for rapport development. Nevertheless, I recognized that this position of being both an “insider” and “outsider” posed potential risks. To clear any potential conflict of interest, I declared my positionality in the ethics application. I checked with my supervisor to minimize confirmation bias in the data collection and analysis. Reflecting on my thought process in the field notes and illustrations in the vignettes demonstrated the steps I took to maintain my positionality as a researcher. Negotiating access
was not an issue. However, having recognized dynamics of power, race, and gender in the social space of REOs (Berger, 2015), some interviewees noted the importance of speaking on their own terms rather than risk representing their REO for concerns over misrepresentation of organizational views. Therefore, I respected the privacy and confidentiality of interviewees by exercising sensitivity and discretion in portraying the views of interviewees as being constitutive rather than representative of the REO.

Chapter 3 describes and explains the processes underlying the construction of REO frames for climate change messaging.
Chapter 3: Religious framing for climate change messaging

This chapter finds that REOs constructed climate change messaging based on frames of stewardship, bio-region, justice, and interconnectedness. Five interrelated components structure frames: origins, influences, interpretations, expressions, and religious environmental ethics. Textual analysis further demonstrates that stewardship, bio-region, and interconnectedness bridge justice, foregrounding climate change messaging across all REOs. Examining the case for reconciliation as a core theme under justice-based message framing, the latter half of this chapter explores the ways religious settlers play a crucial role in shaping justice-based messaging, launching them into political engagement.

3.1 Four frames for message construction

REOs drew upon frames of stewardship, bio-region, justice, and interconnectedness to construct climate change messaging during the resistance (Figure 3.1). Each frame establishes boundaries for how REOs orient content in their own climate change messaging. However, as 3.3. demonstrates, frame bridging between stewardship, bio-region, and interconnectedness towards justice underscored messages across all REOs.
3.1.1 Stewardship

Stewardship generally promotes a duty to protect and uphold the intrinsic value of non-human creation beyond human utility. Stewardship can be expressed in interpretations and principles derived from a range of religious traditions (Gottlieb, 2006; Jenkins et al., 2018; Marshall, 2016) but has been most commonly received in the literature as some derivation of creation care in the Christian tradition (Lohmann, 2012; Roberts, 2012; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Wilkinson, 2012). The stewardship frame presents creation as an integrative spiritual-material space that is commonly associated with Earth but is equally translatable as the universe that is created by God. Genesis 1 presents the created order out of chaos as very good, embowing intrinsic value to the whole of creation. Genesis 2 presents God in the garden, tasking humans to till and keep it. The task for humanity is therefore to support the integrity, stability and beauty of the whole of creation (Lohmann, 2012, p. 95-96). Emphasis of human responsibility to the world means that the role of humans is not to subject but to be tasked in maintaining the integrity of the whole of creation (Lohmann, 2012, p. 100). In contemporary practice and expressions, liberal and mainline Christian traditions had a longer history with conceiving stewardship in response to

Figure 3.1 Four frames REOs used to construct climate change messaging.
dominion-based interpretations (Kerber, 2014; Taylor et al., 2016) and has more recently been taken up by conservative and evangelical Christians (Bloomfield, 2019; Roberts, 2012; Wilkinson, 2012). The prevalence of stewardship as the basis for justifying concern for climate change among REOs can further be seen with the influence of regional seminaries such as Regent College and Vancouver School of Theology, as well as the widespread popularity of intellectual and public figures such as Katharine Hayhoe and Pope Francis. These schools of thought and influencers buttress the credibility, legitimacy, and substance for stewardship.

Earthkeepers, Vancouver Quakers, Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society, and Fossil Free Faith exhibited the stewardship frame in their message construction. Among these REOs, Earthkeepers illustrated prominent messaging components characteristic of the stewardship frame. For Daniel, one of the core motivations for the beginning of Earthkeepers stemmed from affirming and highlighting the Biblical mandate of stewardship specifically from Chapter 2 of the Book of Genesis [I-1]. Karen extended the continuity of this mandate into the gospel story which should prompt Christians to respond to climate change:

. . . climate change is a gospel issue, because Jesus is here to redeem the whole entire world and this includes the earth. . . he’s going to redeem it one day, and climate change is just one of those things . . . if we are to be able to love our neighbor, we need to be able to address climate change because it affects so many people that are living on this world. [I-2]

Taking climate change as one of many interconnected issues behind the spiritual vision of Christianity, Karen inscribes the ethical commitment to practicing neighborliness as obedience to live according to the gospel for restoration of the world. Under stewardship, climate change presents a real threat to how to practice neighborliness.

Expressions of the stewardship frame was also explicit through the promotion of weekly prayer and provision of resources. For instance, Earth at 11 was a campaign that encouraged members and the wider community of Earthkeepers to pray at a designated time for the stewardship of creation particularly for local protection of creation [A1-1-7]. Earthkeepers further provided links to resources to enhance
members’ ability to care for creation [A1-1-9]. Drawing from selected readings from the Bible, influential scholars, and thinkers, Earthkeepers stated that providing background on the ethical and scientific context would stimulate knowledge in creation care and relationship with climate change. Influential thinkers in the evangelical environmental movement, such as Loren Wilkinson and N.T. Wright provided additional support to validate stewardship-based interpretations that promoted a theocentric ethic over dominion-based interpretation that promoted anthropocentric ethics. Justifying these re-interpretations, a member of Earthkeepers presented options to publicly demonstrate expressions of faith:

There are a lot of things that can be done and we should all prayerfully consider personal and community plans of action to protect God’s good earth and to witness to and peacefully resist those that may want to harm it. [A1-1-22]

3.1.2 Bio-region

Analogous to stewardship but distinct in its own right is the bio-region frame. Bio-region captures the cosmological imaginations, ecological relationships, and spiritual connections tied to a particular locality or place. The Watershed discipleship movement, a Christian-based movement influenced by theologian Ched Myers [I-5; I-6] (Bock, 2018; Myers, 2018) was a paradigmatic example in this case. The vision of the watershed discipleship movement is to “nurture watershed consciousness and engagement in our faith traditions” (Watershed Discipleship, n.d.). Criticizing the stewardship frame of the creation care movement for its lack of focus and abstraction, the watershed discipleship movement re-defines neighborliness in the setting of the local church through bio-regionally grounded reflection and action in the inhabited watershed (Bock, 2018). Watershed discipleship is also compatible with articulations of justice as it critiques the global industrial system and its impact and neglect for the poor and the earth.

The messaging of Salal + Cedar embodied the essence of the bio-region frame. Salal + Cedar, a ministry of the regional Diocese of New Westminster, aimed to foster watershed discipleship in the Lower Mainland region [A2-1-1; A2-1-2]. Salal + Cedar demarcated the boundaries of the Lower Fraser river and Lower Mainland watersheds and Indigenous territories, fostered hands-on opportunities to learn,
contemplate, and take action to protect ecological relationships and the issues that disrupt or threaten these relationships. The spiritual relationships with the watershed was integral to their organizational purpose, as Alex from Salal + Cedar pointed out: “the more relationship you have, the more love you have, the more compelled you are to action” [I-5].

Other REOs have also drawn upon the bio-region frame to emphasize the importance of place in interpreting their tradition. As one of the contributors of the online lectionary emphasizes the ecology in the Bible, Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society emphasized nature metaphors and place-based indigeneity in the scriptures [I-13]. In cultivating a sense of place and extending moral consideration to other actors in this region, the bio-region frame enhanced knowledge of and affective connection within the region.

### 3.1.3 Justice

The justice frame broadly captures contested notions of environmental and climate justices. In highlighting the disproportionately harmed or unfairly treated beings as a result of climate change, this frame advocated for a fairer protection and enshrinement of rights of these beings. Centering of particular teachings or principles from particular religious traditions, justice has been most visibly displayed from Christian traditions (Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Wilkinson, 2012). Among evangelical Christian communities, elements of justice can be found in key documents such as Pope Francis’ encyclical, *Laudato Si* and the Lausanne Cape Town Commitment. Brought up by Daniel of Earthkeepers, the Lausanne Cape Town Commitment is one significant framework for evangelical Christians to articulate justice. As a command by the laws and prophets in the Bible, justice “[reflects] the love and justice of God in practical love and justice for the needy . . . that we do justice through exposing and opposing all that oppresses and exploits the poor” (Lausanne Movement, 2010). Other REOs articulated congruent messages that resonated with teachings or principles of justice, reflecting interpretations from more liberal and progressive strands of religious traditions (Marshall, 2016; Taylor et al., 2016). For Vancouver Quakers, Vancouver Unitarians, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society who shared
similar access to the KAIROS ecumenical network, their alignment with the justice frame could broadly reflect the prescriptions of ecological justice of KAIROS. For KAIROS, ecological justice encompasses social justice, notably in participation in decision-making and sustainable use of natural resources, and the economy within the balance and integrity of the ecosystem (KAIROS Canada, n.d.).

REOs anchored justice to depict contribution from, impacts, and distribution of climate change messaging at global and local scales. Different REOs combined messaging of the two scales to different extents. The global scales in justice messaging stemmed from contributions of greenhouse gas emissions by developed nations such as Canada put vulnerable, at-risk communities from climate change impacts. For instance, Earthkeepers emphasized the disproportionate harm that more affluent countries have in impacting the most vulnerable populations in the Global South. Earthkeepers therefore focused their efforts in connecting with broad Christian audiences to minimize their carbon footprint and promote behavior that would reduce individual impact on their global neighbors [A1-1-2].

REOs simultaneously articulated the local scale of justice messaging, attributing the consequential processes and its disproportionally impacts of climate change on Indigenous populations in Canada [I-3; I-9; I-10; I-13; I-14]. Streams of Justice epitomized the core tenets of the justice frame. Members of Streams of Justice have attempted to strive for a more critical interpretation of the Christian tradition, which encompasses liberation theology and the prophetic tradition. Michelle from Streams of Justice, when asked about how their environmental justice work intersects with climate change, explained that:

... for Indigenous peoples, what [they] see now as climate change has been happening since colonial contact ... lives were being disregarded, taken, used, exploited ... how [Streams of Justice] articulate[s] work around resistance to pipelines or anything related to climate change has been a lot [about] colonialism as well as capitalism. [I-8; I-9]

Climate change has to be viewed through a political-socio-economic praxis, tracing the history of European settler colonialism in North America and the processes that took place to initiate and expand resource extraction [I-8; I-9]. These lines of evidence were interpreted with readings from liberation theology. Emerging as a movement that critiques temporary social, cultural and political realities,
liberation theology affirms the basic dignity of every human being and centers human liberation of these realities (Slessarev-Jamir, 2011, p. 38). By forging a link between climate exacerbation and resource extraction, this interpretation has led Streams of Justice to attribute European settler colonialism as the primary cause for injustices committed upon Indigenous peoples. These grounds provided the primary justifications for REOs to engage in front-line support and direct action.

Excerpt 1 (Appendix D, D.1) provides a closer look at the arguments made for environmental justice. Streams of Justice unequivocally expressed solidarity with affected communities where consent has not been obtained for resource extraction projects. Even if consent had been obtained, resource extractive projects rarely attended to traditional lands and rights of Indigenous peoples. By reading environmental justice particularly through Indigenous peoples through colonial processes of dispossession, displacement, and capital accumulation, Streams of Justice acknowledged these realities and sought to redress these injustices in front line work to stand for Indigenous rights.

3.1.4 Interconnectedness

Interconnectedness encompassed a range of non-Abrahamic expressions that uphold the intrinsic value of other human and non-human beings. One widely shared assumption in interconnectedness that emerged among REOs is pantheism. Pantheism claims that god is held or manifested within all things (Taylor, 2010). While interconnectedness may be constructed based on a variety of sources, influences, and interpretations, they nevertheless converged on a set of universal principles over the relationship of humans and non-human beings and their relative moral standings.

Interconnectedness served as the basis that guides Unitarian and Quaker interpretations and expressions in the Trans Mountain resistance. Because of the religious pluralism among Unitarians and Quakers to freely interpret and follow different

---

11 The language of interconnectedness of humanity, the natural world, and cosmic order of the universe is present within biocultural ontologies of Indigenous worldviews as well as Dharmic religions such as Hinduism and Buddhism but is derived from different set of philosophical underpinnings (Asch, Borrows, & Tully, 2018; Marshall, 2016).
creeds and dogma from religious traditions, the unity of their core belief in interconnectedness provided a basis to articulate cosmological, material, and spiritual relationships (McKanan, 2013; Williams, 2008).

The Unitarian Church of Vancouver, as a member congregation of the Canadian Unitarian Council, affirmed and promoted the Seven Principles of Universalist Unitarianism. Interconnectedness was derived from the 7th Principle, which is “respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part” [A5-1-8]. The 7th Principle then, extends the preceding six principles which affirms the intrinsic value of all other aspects of human life [I-11; I-12]. Expounding on the 7th Principle into Unitarian practices and duties towards non-human beings, Peter from the Environment Committee emphasized that “we all interact and have equal rights to existence. So killer whales in the Salish Sea have just as much to exist as I do” [I-11]. The 7th Principle in conjunction with other principles, provided a holistic basis that extends intrinsic value, enshrines rights of, and seeks to protect human and non-human beings.

Similarly, the Vancouver Quakers formulated their messaging around interconnectedness. Quakers find that God is viewed in all people [A4-1-4], and more recently this view has been extended to find God in all creation [I-10]. Therefore, safeguarding creation is a sacred duty to leave the planet in better conditions for future generations [I-10]. Janice elaborated on this commitment for restorative justice of living things. At the same time however, safeguarding creation implied that power structures and existing patterns of fossil fuel consumption must be challenged. Janice further commented:

The powers [of fossil fuel corporations] that are driving this ship are very short sighted. They are just focused on the short, profit, just the short vision of trying to get as much profit as they gain . . . this cannot continue. [I-10]

3.2 Frame components

Building on the processes underlying message construction, this study finds that five interrelated components serve as proxies to structure frames for climate change messaging. Frame components
included origins, influences, interpretations, expressions, and religious environmental ethics (Figure 3.2 and Table 3.1). Origins consists of the historical, social, and cultural dynamics that shaped the current positions of the REO. Influences include movements, prominent figures, and thinkers which have been pivotal to the interpretations and formulations of the REO. Interpretations include texts or schools of thought or traditions REOs find influential to shape the orientation of REOs. While this term can be easily misunderstood, this study assumes that interpretations or hermeneutical frameworks may influence how REOs align with left or right strands of religious environmental thought. Expressions entail the ways interpretations become integrated into practices. Using this basic definition clarifies how forms of eco-spirituality become assimilated into movement practices (Shibley & Wiggins, 1997). Lastly, religious environmental ethics consists of how the REOs draw from the interpretations and influences that assume and prescribe moral obligations with themselves, humans, and the rest of the non-human world to justify their courses of action (Ellingson et al., 2012, p. 268; Rolston, 2011; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997, p. 345). Particular attention is paid to how REOs reconceive human, spiritual, and ecological relations. Moral obligations entail types of duties that REOs establish towards particular humans, and non-human beings. Altogether, these components influence REOs in their decisions for climate change messaging (see details in Appendix B).
Figure 3.2 Five frame components guide REOs in constructing climate change messaging.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Stewardship</th>
<th>Bio-region</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Interconnectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>Salal + Cedar</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Vancouver Quakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unitarian Church of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fossil Free Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable REOs</strong></td>
<td>Evangelical scholars (Loren Wilkinson)</td>
<td>Ched Myers</td>
<td>Liberation theologians (West-Howard Brook, William Stringfellow)</td>
<td>Transcendentalist pioneers (Emerson, Thoreau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katharine Hayhoe</td>
<td>Sallie McFague</td>
<td>Walter Brueggemann</td>
<td>Public intellectuals (Al Gore; Naomi Klein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pope Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wendell Berry</td>
<td>Quaker tradition (William Penn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian saints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origins and Influences</strong></td>
<td>Stewardship mandate</td>
<td>Anglican Church’s fifth Mark of Mission (safeguard integrity of the earth)</td>
<td>Post-colonial interpretations (liberation theology, Exodus narrative)</td>
<td>Seventh principle of Unitarian Universalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change and the gospel as redemption of humans and earth</td>
<td>Watershed discipleship</td>
<td>Violate principles of Unitarianism</td>
<td>God in all creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wild lectionary</td>
<td>Climate and environmental injustices upon vulnerable populations</td>
<td>Resolutions and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contemplation (outdoor services)</td>
<td>Global South and Indigenous experiences</td>
<td>Ground activism with spiritual practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretations and Expressions</strong></td>
<td>Enhance the moral standing of non-human creation</td>
<td>Cultivate relationship of place and with non-human creation</td>
<td>Expose and rectify injustice e.g. human treatment of land and marginalized populations</td>
<td>Intrinsic value of other life (Salish orca, eagles on Burnaby mountain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human responsibility as stewards</td>
<td>Resist commodification of land</td>
<td>Resist commodification (extractivism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity in ties of Indigenous peoples to land</td>
<td>Value Indigenous worldviews, knowledges, and practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious environmental ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two major patterns were observed in structuring the frame for climate change messaging of REOs. The first pattern was that origins and influences of REOs were deeply intertwined. Tracing the founding of REOs distinguished small but subtle differences in how REOs approached climate change. Streams of Justice, Vancouver Quakers, the wider Unitarian Church of Vancouver, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society shared a long history of social justice and progressive activism that repeatedly emphasized the inseparability of activism from their religious or spiritual life. Whereas, recently founded REOs such as Earthkeepers, Salal + Cedar, and Fossil Free Faith emerged out of the wider context of project opposition. Closely related to the origins of the REO are the influencers that shaped the vision and mission of founders or members of the REOs. The names of influencers were also brought up throughout their emergences, campaigns, and engagements. Influencers included canonized individuals, theologians, scientists, and pioneers of the traditions, as well as public intellectuals and Indigenous authors and figures.

The second pattern is that the interpretations and expressions of REOs were intertwined with the social context. How REOs approached their texts was contingent on respective interpretations of teachings which were conditioned by their tradition. Whether that be from the stewardship mandate in the Book of Genesis, lessons of liberation from the Exodus narrative, key principles and respective teachings on justice from each religion within Unitarian Universalism or visions of sacredness in all creation in Quakerism, the underlying denominator across interpretations were that new expositions guided, grounded, and localized religious expressions in the context of climate movements. Through prayers, advocacy, direct action, or civil disobedience, REOs iteratively practiced and experimented with religious expressions, situating themselves between religious texts and their positions on the lines of the resistance. In other words, the political engagement of REOs (Chapter 4) simply goes beyond a political statement. Political engagement simultaneously points at the ramifications of the religious connotations and spiritual imaginations in framing and messaging processes.

The above patterns suggest that other factors besides religious interpretations merit attention in the construction of climate change messaging. Despite sharing similar interpretations of liberation
theology, the differences in origins, influences, and expressions between Earthkeepers, Salal + Cedar, and Streams of Justice accentuated the diversity of processes in message construction. Climate change messaging goes beyond religious symbolism and significance. Identifying other frame components alongside interpretation may reflect a more nuanced interaction of hermeneutical (how climate change is perceived in text) and non-hermeneutical factors (climate change message construction in social context) that may prove integral in shaping the message. This insight challenges the implied linearity of translating ecological interpretations of religious texts into religious practices and expressions. Broadening out the various factors comprised in message construction opens up the possibilities for other factors to become salient in the climate change message construction process. Placing these factors on equal footing into the message construction process adds evidence to the inseparability of examining religious actors, from their social contexts and relationships to climate change.

3.3 Frame bridging

While REOs relied on four respective frames to construct their messaging, this study finds that REOs gravitated towards frame bridging of base and converging frames (Figure 3.1.). Benford and Snow (2000) argue that social movement organizations deploy frame bridging to link two ideologically separate frames together. Subsequent analyses of REOs establish a growing empirical basis for frames and suggest patterns of hybridizing frames (Ellingson et al., 2012; Kearns, 1996 and 2011; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997, p. 338). In this case study, REOs bridged messages containing concerns for Indigenous rights, and the lack of free, prior, and informed consent and climate change as grounds for project opposition. Base frames of stewardship, bio-region, and interconnectedness operated as metanarratives which order and explain knowledge and experience in individual interpretations (Lejano, 2019). As the converging frame, justice serves as the connective layer that intersects base frames. Examining REO messages provide further evidence of frame bridging in linking base frames to justice.
3.3.1 Stewardship to justice

Frame bridging of stewardship and justice calls into question the human role and relationship towards the earth but implies managerial responsibility of humans and their covenant with the Judeo-Christian God. The stewardship mandate that emphasizes the individual and communal duty to act responsibly towards the earth and non-humans (Wilkinson, 2012). This general duty extends to individual and communal impacts that contribute to climate change, raising concerns for other environmental issues that including water, food, and biodiversity (Grim & Tucker, 2014; Wilkinson, 2012). Behind this duty however, lies a more fundamental issue regarding the orientation between the place of God, humans, and co-existence with other beings on earth (Gottlieb, 2006; Lausanne Movement, 2010; Pasquale, 2018). The Christian message of the Gospel and efforts of reconciliation, an argument propelled in emerging green evangelical thought on climate change (Roberts, 2012, p. 119-120) may become central to justice. Stewardship therefore calls into effect that such actions cannot be engaged unless it calls into attention the spiritual dimensions in stewardship as an outcome in one’s spiritual relationship with God.

For Earthkeepers, stewardship may be bridged with justice to articulate the basis for Biblically rooted notions of stewardship that extend concern for care for creation as well as the poor. Demanding active engagement in voicing out against various forms of injustices that they view as disruptive to the integrity of God’s creation, stewardship presents a global cosmological frame that can be refined to advance claims that address injustices in local contexts. A key text from Earthkeepers is examined to demonstrate bridging of stewardship to justice. Having participated at the Faith Day of Action on April 28, 2018, members of Earthkeepers published a subsequent reflection that demonstrates their justification of actions through recontextualization and mythopoesis (Excerpt 2, Appendix D, D.2). The author of the blog post compares circumstances that lead religious witnesses to stand up and voice out social and ecological injustices as distortions to God’s order of creation. In the civil rights context, the post stressed that the majority of Christian and white churches in the U.S. stood on the sidelines and some leaders even criticized Martin Luther King Jr. for disrupting the status quo. However, Martin Luther King Jr. and other actors remained undeterred in working to fight for equal rights of black people. In the Trans
Mountain context, Earthkeepers’ experiences reflected general sentiments of apathy of lay Christian believers over the connection between the love of neighbors most impacted by climate change but moreover, the neighbors of the traditional territory they stood on who demand full respect for their rights and refusal to unsustainable forms of extracivism [I-1; I-3; I-4]. Comparing the case context with the civil rights context evoked similar forms of procedural injustices and emphasized the rights of marginalized populations.

### 3.3.2 Bio-region to justice

Bio-region grounds the human role and relationship based on the horizontal-ness of one’s relationship and incarnation to place to advance claims of restorative and procedural justice. These claims question social, economic and political status quos and translate them into eco-spiritual religious commitments and cosmology. Watershed discipleship adopts the interconnectivity of incarnational living and embodied action towards social and ecological justice (Bock, 2018; Myers, 2018). The project and its associated impacts in the watershed, and its violation of Indigenous consent on the grounds of reconciliation presents significant interruptions to the spiritual and bio-physical relationships in the watershed, warranting Salal + Cedar to take action.

The blog post from Salal + Cedar’s co-organization of the Ecological Stations of the Cross in **Excerpt 3 (Appendix D, D.3)** provides clarity to the centrality of one’s relationship to place and justification to act amid injustices. The presence of Salal + Cedar in the Lower Mainland watershed presented an opportunity to resist further threats from potential adverse impacts from pipeline expansion on inhabitants around the Kinder Morgan tank farm, notably the aquatic life and creatures that depend on healthy ecosystems. In doing so, it also recognized the rightful ownership of the traditional and ancestral land of the Coast Salish peoples. Burnaby mountain and the surrounding areas, having been imbued with spiritual significance, added to Salal + Cedar’s urgency to respond in the resistance. Underlying Salal + Cedar’s message is the fluidity of spirituality in ecology, mediated through human perception and relationship to place. Any major forms of disturbances to those relationships, notably in the heightened
threats of a major oil spill as a result of an expanded pipeline, may heighten biophysical and spiritual risks. Focusing on the bio-regional changes and harm to spiritual relationships, this message stressed the perceptual and relational integrity, as well as historically and currently affected actors. These affected dimensions provided Salal + Cedar the grounds to politically engage.

3.3.3 Interconnectedness to justice

Upholding principles that guide the protection of sacredness of all spheres of life (Taylor, 2010), bridging interconnectedness with justice stipulates that the denigrated, relegated, or stripped of such spheres thus calls for action. Quakers were similar to Unitarians in combining interconnectedness with justice; however, they differ on the grounds to action. Vancouver Quakers focus on the justice frame based on their duty to safeguard the integrity of creation. Whereas, Unitarians justifies messages on justice in upholding the 7th Principle on the interdependent web of existence. Based on the Resolution on Proposed Oil Pipelines in BC from the Unitarian Church of Vancouver, Excerpt 4 (Appendix D, D.4) illustrates frame bridging of interconnectedness to justice. The Resolution frames the modes of production and consumption of fossil fuels as a grave moral issue that extends to all spheres of life. Increasing fossil fuel consumption exacerbates climate change, which impacts the universal spheres of life, such as atmosphere, water, salmon, and the particulars in the livelihoods and dignity of Indigenous peoples. Violation of core principles thus warranted Unitarians to address disruptions to the vision for all life.

3.4 Discussion on frames

The first half of this chapter has argued that the logics behind the four types of frames follow from the five components that guide construction of climate change messaging of REOs. Distinguishing base and converging frames for frame bridging, justice emerged as the converging frame across all REOs. These findings advance the existing conceptual terminology as a descriptive apparatus to religious environmental frames (Ellingson et al., 2012; Kearns, 1996 and 2011; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997). It
validates existing conceptions of stewardship (Roberts, 2012; Lohmann, 2012; Wilkinson, 2012) and bio-region (Bock, 2018; Myers, 2018), and modifies conceptions of eco-justice and eco-spirituality to justice and interconnectedness. Rather than positing stewardship, eco-justice, and eco-spirituality as analytically separate but related frames, the results point at the ideological congruences through frame bridging to demonstrate the weight towards the justice frame and justice-based messaging. That the immense political activity and social justice leanings of REOs influenced message construction is not surprising given previous progressive religious movements (Nita, 2016; Slessarev-Jamir, 2011). However, the place of REOs in the message of Indigenous reconciliation and free, prior, and informed consent in Indigenous-led climate movements could suggest additional motivations for how REOs constructed their messaging. A closer examination in 3.5 examines these meanings which shape the understanding of REOs in engaging in the resistance (Chapter 4) and tailoring climate change messaging to religious audiences (Chapter 5).

Although this study does find that REOs construct messaging in ways that align with their goals (Shibley & Wiggins, 1997), this explanation falls short in accounting for the array of historical, political, and geographical dimensions that shape frames. Using frame components as proxies for frame structure suggests that non-hermeneutical factors can underly frames and guide the composition and distinctiveness of the message. Non-hermeneutical factors such as the origins and influences in effect, may matter as much as how REOs engage in how particular texts or principles are interpreted and practiced. Linking the patterns of frame components in construing climate change messaging thus provides a more complete picture of the backgrounds, motivations, and evolutions of thought and practices of REOs.

Interrogating frame components that structure the frames has also raised the potential and limitations of the conceptual approach to examine processes underlying message construction. The broadened conceptual approach to religious environmental framing played an instrumental part in this study. Setting out each frame as interlocking spiritual, moral, and ecological dimensions, the process for message construction also provides a first step to conceptually distinguish normative claims that derive from a set of teachings and principles and its actualization in what occurs through religious messaging and expressions. By implying the spiritual dimensions as an embedded dimension of the frame rather than
a distinguishable set of practices, it suggests that spirituality, as concerning the quest for meaning, transformation and healing (Taylor, 2016), is a fundamental part of the climate change messaging process rather than a compartmentalized dimension. This position gives rise to messaging as an interaction between textual interpretations, personalization of messaging, and social contexts. However, the role of the religious actor in critically embodying the frame and understanding how climate change is situated within the context of Indigenous-led pipeline resistance has been unexamined. Examining this question in 3.5 may provide hints of the significance of the religious actor in the climate change messaging process.

3.5 Religious settlers and reconciliation-based messaging under the justice frame

REOs articulated messages under the converging justice frame through messages on the theme of reconciliation. As the rhetoric of reconciliation and its associated terms such as consent and consultation have emerged in the national conversation about Indigenous rights and future of large energy projects in Canada (D’Arcy et al., 2014; Wright, 2018; Yellowhead Institute, 2019), more care and attention is needed to examine in what ways and reasons why reconciliation is defined, contested, and possibly unsettling for REOs as they engage in this messaging strategy.

In recent years, the high-profile, national conversation on Indigenous reconciliation as part of the Truth and Reconciliation process (TRC, 2015a) has prompted Canadian religious institutions to respond in kind (Anglican Church of Canada, 2015; Anglican Church of Canada et al., 2016; United Church of Canada, 2018a). The process of reconciliation is about “establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal peoples” in Canada, with awareness of “the past, acknowledgement of the harm that has been inflicted, atonement for the causes, and action to change behaviour” (TRC, 2015a, pp. 6-7). However, reconciliation can also be used in ways for colonial aggressors to compensate for acts of guilt and responsibility without following up with concrete actions (Davis et al., 2017; Land, 2015; Maddison et al., 2016; McAdam, 2016). This primary concern is grounded on the notion that reconciliation has been exploited in ways that devalue and displace experiences of afflicted peoples under colonial rule. Furthermore, critics have argued that attempts of
settler peoples at reconciliation in providing support and collective action may be perceived as justifying actual support for reconciliation and justice, even if those actions are far from interrogating existing, embedded colonial systems and ways of thinking (Whyte, 2018a, pp. 286-287).

The historical relationship between religious institutions and Indigenous peoples in Canada foregrounded the reconciliatory-based messaging of REOs in the resistance. Almost all REOs articulated motivations and goals of religious responses to Indigenous reconciliation, notably stressing the importance of free, prior, and informed consent among Indigenous communities opposing the project [A1, A2, A3; A4, A5, A6]. Their emphasis on respecting the consent of First Nations to the project can be read most directly in view of the direct opposition from the Tsleil-Waututh Nation, the First Nation whose traditional territory encompasses the major sites of project contention near what is contemporarily known as Burnaby Mountain and the Burrard Inlet. The emphasis of REOs on principles of free, prior, and informed consent also point to a broader support for Indigenous rights. REOs called on the Canadian state and project proponents to respect the rights of Indigenous communities, and the implementation of the principles of UNDRIP into Canadian legislation [A1; A2; A3; A4; A5; A6]. Although only Streams of Justice explicitly mentioned Indigenous sovereignty in some form in relation to the injustices of the current constitutional and legal regimes which undermines Indigenous rights and titles [A3], other REOs made related commitments towards working for the rights of Indigenous peoples within their organization and their networks [A1; A2; A4; A5; A6]. The commitments of REOs towards reconciliation were further demonstrated and reinforced through their actions throughout the resistance (See Chapter 4).

This section examines how REOs configure meanings of reconciliation in climate change messaging. In what ways does reconciliation become tangible in their messaging strategy? What challenges and possibilities did REOs face in conceptualizing reconciliation in justice-based messaging? Self-identification of religious settlers, along with their experiences and reflections shaped the construction of reconciliation-based messages.

The latter half of this chapter argues that the position of the religious settler plays an instrumental role in the construction of climate change messaging. REOs attempted to ground reconciliation by tracing
the history and relationship of land and climate change, unmasking injustices, and reflecting upon their identities as religious settlers. Through their political involvement, REOs found themselves in an uneasy spot as actors engaging in Indigenous reconciliation in addition to being messengers of religious responses. While REOs viewed themselves as undoing historical harm committed against Indigenous peoples, some REOs consciously disassociated themselves, and even outwardly disapproved of the historical role that religious institutions played in justifying the colonial project of land dispossession.

This section is developed in four parts. REOs viewed reconciliation as a mediating concept to know and address climate change (3.5.1); as a lens to critique social and economic structures (3.5.2); as need for education and reflection of one’s identity (3.5.3); and as heeding Indigenous leadership (3.5.4). A discussion on configuring reconciliation messaging, religious settler consciousness, and its significance for religious environmentalism scholarship concludes the chapter (3.5.5).

3.5.1 Mediating term to know climate change

Even though almost all REOs recognized to various extents the Indigenous rights and sovereignty as grounds to oppose the project, REOs can be distinguished as explicitly or implicitly linking reconciliation to ground and articulate the realities of climate change [I-3; I-4; I-8; I-9].

Reconciliation was explicitly recognized as a present-day issue between relations of settlers and Indigenous peoples linking the historical continuity of the sources and causes for climate change to Indigenous land dispossession. Particularly, the experiences of Indigenous peoples and other marginalized voices were perceived to amplify the human toll of climate change. As Jerry stated in how Streams of Justice has approached the issue of climate change over the years:

. . . climate change is this kind of universalizing…it’s going to affect everyone, and now we should care about it because suddenly my interests are threatened, but I think that just sort of exposes the inequalities in terms of environmental risks that people have based on social inequalities. . . the way I have understood the framing [of climate change is] more about these historical and ongoing and much more immediate kinds of threats. [I-8]
Personalizing climate change through the lens of Indigenous peoples and inequality of risks and harms suggests that the significance of validating subjective experiences on climate change is just as valuable as the universalizing impact of climate change. Historicizing climate change in its immediacy and perceptiveness of threats from the direct experiences of particular people groups points towards the power of human experiences as proxies of climate change (Callison, 2014; Hulme, 2009; Tschakert et al., 2017).

Similarly, Margaret commented on how climate change intersected with the message on reconciliation: “. . . we’ve done all these studies [on climate change], that’s where the umbrella framework comes from. But where the actual action is has been in reconciliation and Indigenous issues” [I-14]. Margaret pointed to the immediacy of reconciliation as what was at stake in foregrounding the Trans Mountain conflict. Framing climate change on the grounds for consent of First Nations implies that what is at stake in climate change goes beyond contributions of greenhouse gas emissions, but rather the actors in the decision-making process of projects that shape the climate. At heart then are issues of land recognition, rights, and sovereignty that were inextricably tied to Indigenous decision-making and consent to resources development and the marginalization of Indigenous communities in the history and current development of natural resources projects. In this manner, messaging on reconciliation contained dual meanings. The first meaning attends to calling out Canada’s failure to its political commitment to limit carbon emissions and throughput. The second meaning calls out the failure to social, legal, and political reconciliation on the lack of procedural will and respect for Indigenous sovereignty and consent to projects.

Reconciliation also serves as a mediating concept for climate change in implicit ways. In this way, messaging on reconciliation acts as a parallel in the treatment of Indigenous peoples with the treatment of other beings. Jenny from Salal + Cedar found that work on reconciliation was integral to the work of climate justice, which entailed interrogating the political economic structures that placed economic profit above responsible treatment of humans and other species. This linkage between climate change and reconciliation crystallized Jenny’s experiences of practicing watershed discipleship:

I know a lot of Indigenous activists see very clearly the links between how their lands is
treated and how their women are treated and I think this is another way of seeing the same thing.

. . . Where we live, it’s been part of the stories of people who are most marginalized and assaulted in our culture and who are the most erased. [I-6]

Viewing the treatment of peoples and the land within the context raises timely questions on how to engage and recontextualize Christian interpretations and practices in their geographical settings [I-6].

REOs further acknowledged the religious connotations of reconciliation that sought to rectify injustices. For Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society, the backdrop to reconciliation was the awareness and rectification of historical acts by the Catholic Church in the colonial project [A6-1-8; I-13; I-14]. The sermon by Miriam concluded that “Our situation today is the result of the Christian European colonizing powers acting only on the meanings: recruit and indoctrinate. They paid lip service to belief in the Trinity but acted as if only God the Father, the Almighty King” [A6-1-8]. Her diagnosis criticized the legacy of the Catholic Church which participated in the justification of the colonial process of oppression, persecution, and dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands, cultures, and livelihoods. However, the sermon proposed an alternative vision that prescribed the centrality of restored relations in Christian reconciliation. This vision entailed spiritual and material restoration, re-emphasizing the purpose and place of humans, the rest of creation, and Trinitarian love of the Bible: “We are all made in the image of God, whose love is self-effusive. Love flows between the Persons of the Trinity, as well as outwards to creation. We and the rest of creation are all God's love made manifest” [A6-1-8]. The emphasis on the presence and manifestation of love in God through the Holy Trinity in humans and the Earth is therefore the reason behind the commandments to love God and one’s neighbors [A6-1-8]12. If other parts of creation and other humans are mistreated in a way that does not hold up to the love of God,

12 We are all made in the image of God, whose love is self-effusive. Love flows between the Persons of the Trinity, as well as outwards to creation. We and the rest of creation are all God's love made manifest. We manifest God's love when we open our hearts and minds to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. We manifest the creative love of the Mother as we develop right relationships with and between all beings. We can manifest Jesus’ redemptive love by living as he taught, that is, to treat each other in ways that contribute to the well-being of all. [A6-1-8]
then the duty of the Christian is to stand up to these injustices. Reconciliation thus becomes the prescription for reconciled relations and the motivator to act.

### 3.5.2 Interpretive lens to highlight climate injustices

Reconciliation in REO messaging serves as a lens to magnify the injustices under climate change, along with structures and actors that perpetuate such practices. Reconciliation efforts initiated by the Canadian government and the Catholic and Anglican Churches of Canada have been called upon to redress historical wrongs by providing social, economic, financial, legal, political and environmental reparations to Indigenous peoples (TRC, 2015a). REOs articulated opposition of the Trans Mountain project through the lens of Indigenous opposition from the lack of consent in two ways.

The first way was that the federal government’s project approval failed to honor the principle of free, prior and informed consent according to UNDRIP [A2-1-13; 15; A3-1-27; A5-2-9; A6-1-1]. Among all REO documents, the Resolution made by the Unitarian Church of Vancouver [A5-2-9] specifically mentioned Articles 19 and 32 of the UNDRIP as the grounds for free, prior, and informed consent. The Resolution emphasized that Article 19 points out the importance of good faith of negotiation by the state with Indigenous peoples while Article 32 points out the importance of consent prior to any project approval on Indigenous lands or territories. Although some REOs noted Canada’s attempts to adopt UNDRIP in formal legislation such as Bill 262, it has yet to be passed in Parliament and thus lagged on further meaningful action [A2; A6-1-1]. An extension of adopting the UNDRIP is in institutional and communal responses to the Truth and Reconciliation’s Call to Action. Of interest are Actions 48 and 49 pertaining to settlement agreement parties and the UNDRIP and Actions 58 to 61 pertaining to church apologies and reconciliation. Nearly all REOs brought up the important of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report in the interviews. Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society was explicit in echoing the call on all faith and interfaith groups to repudiate the Doctrine of Discovery and *terra nullius* which have been used to historically justify colonization over Indigenous lands and peoples [A6-1-1] (Reid, 2010). Similarly, Salal + Cedar noted their activity surrounding pipeline resistance was
congruent to the promises the Anglican Church had made, including the repudiation of the Doctrine of Discovery\textsuperscript{13}, in response to the Calls to Action [I-5] (Anglican Church of Canada, 2015).

The second way was the association of Indigenous opposition with the broader opposition of global processes and systems of resource extraction. Some members of REOs coined this notion as extractivism [A2; A3]. Extractivism is predicated in the political economy and history of colonialism (Veltmeyer & Bowles, 2014). The former understanding of extractivism is understood within a broad framing of the dynamics of capitalist development, which predicates itself on separating direct producers from the land and means of production to amass accumulation by dispossession (Veltmeyer & Bowles, 2014: 61). The latter understanding of extractivism is contextualized in the impact of imperialism and colonialism on the social structure of Indigenous societies in relation to the land (Veldmeyer & Bowles, 2014, p. 61). Settler colonialism in Canada was and continues to be inextricably tied with Indigenous lands and natural resources extraction to further colonial interests (McGregor, 2018; Yellowhead Institute, 2019) and as such resulting in environmental racism and colonialism in Indigenous communities (McGregor, 2018).

REOs captured extractivism in these two ways as primary obstacles to their messages on reconciliation [I-3, I-4, I-6, I-8; I-9]. A majority of respondents have pointed out that the intricate ties of the government and the oil lobby in enhancing oil sands production and transportation was contrary to the aims of reconciliation [I-2, p.5; I-10; I-14; I-3]. REO members noted the close relationships between the federal government and the oil sands lobby in light of the Liberal government’s decision to purchase the Trans Mountain pipeline infrastructure in May 2018 [I-12; I-14]. However, some respondents proceeded further to critique the set of assumptions that were embedded in sustaining the extractivist mindset [I-3; I-4; I-5; I-6; I-8, 9].

\textsuperscript{13} The 39th General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada voted to repudiate the Doctrine of Discovery in 2013 (The General Synod of The Anglican Church of Canada, 2018).
David directly confronted the issue of disembodiment in extractives practices and disordering of relationships with the land, the rest of creation, and future generations:

The deeper problem is a particular assumption about the value of the land and the value of other creatures, of non-human creation. The same system which sort of claims it, that we own it, is very much the colonial mindset that it’s ours alone (the land), so we can use it however we want without regard to the future generations or without regard for the poor who are experiencing the brunt of it. [I-4]

What David and interviewees from other REOs seemed to suggest was that extraction perpetuated a capitalist model of growth and profit that degraded the value of non-humans. This form of exploitation is suggestive of the dominion model in the Christian tradition, as opposed to the stewardship model to tend God’s garden and his earth [A1-1-22] (Wilkinson, 2012). However, neither models of dominion or stewardship are capable of escaping the reproduction of extractivism and settler colonialism, nor confront the deeper issues and underlying logics that undermine Indigenous visions of reconciliation.

REOs also articulated grounds to resist extractivism, raising the stakes and consequences of procedural justice and fairness to different political actors. In a sermon written about the courses of actions between Kinder Morgan and participants in the resistance, Miriam pointed out that individuals engaging in direct action were disproportionately penalized compared to corporations that infringed on environmental regulations and human rights [A6-2-3]. Similarly, acts of reconciliation conceived as resisting extractivism, translated into personal and potentially collective costs. In the case of Salal + Cedar, their trespass onto Kinder Morgan property resulted in a SLAPP14 suit [I-6]. As defendants in the civil litigation, issues of liability and politically overt activities were points of contention between Salal + Cedar and the Diocese of New Westminster. By shouldering the risk in direct action, the example of Salal

---

14. “SLAPP or “Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation” or “Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation” are lawsuits, or the threat of a lawsuit, directed against individuals or organizations, in order to silence and deter their public criticisms and advocacy for change.”

3.5.3 Prompting religious settler self-reflexivity and decolonization

Reconciliation opened up opportunities and challenges for REOs to unsettle themselves and others about the role of religion in settler colonialism and Indigenous-settler relationships. As Australian settler scholar Clare Land (2015, pp. 162-163) describes in her study of primarily non-Indigenous, white Australians engaging in decolonized solidarity, this process of getting to know oneself or themselves in historical and political context involves decolonizing one’s thinking and minds, gaining a clear view of the workings of race, privilege, and complicity to colonialism at personal and structural levels.

Members of REOs first identified the need to acknowledge one’s privilege and position on the land they stood on [I-2; I-4; I-6; I-8; I-9; I-14]. Although some respondents were more explicit than others, the general acknowledgement of one’s identity was indicative of the power dynamics that were often unconsciously exercised in the posture in engaging with Indigenous peoples and on Indigenous lands. Karen’s comment candidly illustrated this point in the conflict between settler and Indigenous rights to resources and sovereignties over unceded, Indigenous lands:

We as Settlers, as people who historically were not Indigenous, we were part of this because we wanted all this and this land. We didn’t want to share it with people who were originally here.

And yet, why are we the ones who are saying, we need to build the pipeline? [I-2]

Karen’s question juxtaposed the paradox in pipeline support and opposition, situating herself as a settler complicit in the larger process of settler colonialism. Settlers have had the power to determine the use of resources, while the voices and rights of Indigenous peoples have been and continue to be sidelined and marginalized. Similarly, power dynamics were evident in the way members of REOs engaged themselves in the resistance.

David acknowledged his privilege in his experiences with confrontations with the police on the arrests on Burnaby mountain in 2014:
It wasn’t going to change things in and of itself and with the recognition that as like a white, middle-class, cis-gender . . . settler, I have a whole bunch of privilege and I am not treated the same way as people of colour or are Indigenous when they confront the police. [I-4]

David’s comment provoked the question of who has position and access to engage in direct action in ways that intersect race, class, and gender.

Race, class, and gender resonated in the testimony of Michelle during her court appearance for her arrest on the April 28th day of action (Excerpt 5, Appendix D, D.5). As a self-identified Chinese woman, Michelle’s personal testimony provides access to how reconciliation is defined personally and what it means to advance stories of finding common ground with Indigenous alliances to protect humans, land, and earth. Michelle’s testimony pointed that reconciliation goes beyond simply a cognition of wrongdoing. Reconciliation was an invitation and entry into connecting one's story, including genealogical history and knowledge with Indigenous peoples whom have stood on Turtle Island or what is contiguously known as “North America” for millennia. It acknowledged the sacredness of the land and the water, ancestral knowledge and power, and where one stood in the face of history and overturning the past in the course of the reconciliation process. Reconciliation connoted more than legislative or legal recognition (e.g. through UNDRIP) despite their significance. Rather, Michelle highlighted the immense socio-cultural dimensions to reconciliation. This process acknowledged the self-learning in reconciliation, representing a meeting place where people acknowledged different backgrounds, places, and identities. It was an initiation to either reject, remain complacent to, or stand on the side of Indigenous peoples who have resided for millennia off the lands. Reconciliation, crystallized through the praxis of self-reflexivity in a religious settler of colour, weaved together social and historical histories of migrant and Indigenous peoples and backgrounds into the present moment.

The second part of education was unlearning one’s identity as a religious settler. The logic behind unlearning implies a process of abandoning thought and practices that perpetuated the colonial mindset in the first place while experimenting with alternate expressions that promoted a renewed engagement that unraveled the religious dimensions in Indigenous issues (Nadeau, 2016; Regan, 2010). Unlearning these
mindsets can come in the form of challenging one’s own knowledge about the political and religious institutions they belong to. As part of the wider network of KAIROS Canada, the Vancouver Quakers have used the Blanket Exercise\(^{15}\) as an entry point to initiate conversations about the history of Indigenous peoples on the land, including the impact and legacy of colonialism [A4-1-3; A4-2-4].

An extension of this education process entailed trenchant critique of colonial patterns, structures, and interpretations. For some members of Earthkeepers, reconciliation demanded an outright rejection of existing interpretations in favor of a post-colonial interpretation to justify their actions to stand alongside allies on the lines of Indigenous resistance. As founding members of Earthkeepers, Howard and David were particularly influenced by readings of liberation of peoples from “consumerist and capitalist influence” [I-3; I-4]. Howard distinguished this reading from the “therapeutic” reading of the gospel which focused on the inner peace of the individual and family [I-3]. They claimed that expressions of modern Western evangelical Christianity is rooted in an individual-centric interpretation that is mute on matters beyond personal circumstances. Seeking a solution, Howard proposed a particular interpretation of the Christian gospel that is rooted in the liberation narrative of peoples and their relationship with the land. Contextualizing similar readings onto place and in the resistance, David adopted post-colonial interpretations to stress that religious settlers be respectful in residing on unceded Indigenous lands [I-4] as well as participate in long-term engagement and solidarity with local Indigenous communities that are on the front lines of resistance against resource extraction, such as the Alberta tar sands [I-4]. The divide over personal and public matters of Christian expression is an ongoing debate between progressive and conservative claims over religious identity and matters of faith (Hoffman, 2011; Slessarev-Jamir, 2011; Zaleha & Szasz, 2015). In this case however, concern for the neighbor and well-being of the integrity of the earth far outweighs the strict focus on individual salvation.

\(^{15}\) Created in 1997 in response to the Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, the Blanket Exercise is an interactive exercise that invites participants to step into the role of Indigenous peoples walking on blankets that represented the land (KAIROS Canada, 2019). The facilitator would read scrolls and carrying cards that ultimately determine the outcome of participants as they experience pre-contact, treaty-making, colonization, and resistance with European explorers and settlers. Participants conclude by debriefing their experiences.
On the other end of education were critiques of Christian institutions and the process of unlearning the colonial thought and language surrounding whiteness [I-8; I-9]. Streams of Justice bluntly identified the “white man’s education curriculum” and the role of Christianity in the colonial project were responsible for the erasure of Indigenous history [A3-1-3]. Their own efforts towards solidarity with Indigenous struggles and their own paths of decolonization were therefore inseparable from teasing out these issues to address the fundamental injustice from colonization of Indigenous lands and peoples [A3-1-3]. Michelle of Streams of Justice further identified the importance of de-constructing these ideologies and rhythms which have shaped the historical and present Christian church, such that unlearning would magnify the platforms of affected Indigenous peoples [I-8; I-9]. Institutional critiques served to deconstruct the legacy of racism and genocide committed upon Indigenous peoples and the role of religious institutions in continuing to perpetuate and guide such ideologies. In this process, religious settlers may face contradictions of living within the system, while becoming an agent in seeking reforms (Denis & Bailey, 2016; Land, 2015). Engagements in unlearning and relearning became opportunities for critical reflection, transforming white and coloured religious settlers in the process of unlearning their own past and committing to acts of solidarity towards Indigenous causes.

3.5.4 Following Indigenous leadership

Reconciliation was expressed as a process of finding common ground and heeding to Indigenous voices. Members of Earthkeepers noted the common ground on stewardship based on traditional Indigenous teachings and the Biblical mandate [I-2; I-4]. As Karen observed:

As long as it aligns with the scripture, I think it makes sense right now given that we need to take care of the land. In many ways, because the First Nations have seen themselves as stewards of this land and for us, be given this mandate by God to take care of the planet, is exactly the same. [I-2]

Beyond obvious epistemological and ontological differences separating the two traditions, Karen’s point suggests shared principles of responsibility with the land that can be found within Indigenous traditional
knowledge and spirituality as well as in Abrahamic traditions (Hulme, 2017; Marshall, 2016; Turner & Spalding, 2013). A website post of Earthkeepers echoed this observation, stating that land recognition must accompany acts that underscore the inaction among the wider religious community to Indigenous reconciliation:

If we as Christians want to be serious about reconciliation, then we have to ask: where is harm continuing to happen? . . . And since silence is complicity, what will we as the church actually do about that harm?” [A1-1-17]

In illuminating the inaction of Christian institutions to engage in meaningful dialogue and response to repair the harms done upon Indigenous peoples, Earthkeepers’ actions underscored what they viewed as ways to tangibly support Indigenous-led resistance. Situating this self-reflexive question in the Canadian context raises a larger point on the intersection of the radical activist elements of religious environmentalism with ongoing social and environmental injustices upon Indigenous peoples. The religious history of Canada and its embeddedness with settler colonialism and acts of the Canadian settler state circumscribes issues of power and representation in religious solidarity with Indigenous peoples. This history sets the tone for why attempts of religious solidarity in Indigenous struggles recognize the interconnected, longstanding Indigenous traditions, lands, and territories that have existed since time immemorial long before the existence of Canada. These issues of representation and power linger, becoming present and ongoing in foregrounding the rituals, ceremonies, and elements of solidarity, which up to now have been under-theorized in religious environmentalism.

Other REOs such as Vancouver Quakers have come to express solidarity in grounding themselves through the development of novel forms of interreligious expressions at protest sites. From 2017 to 2018, Janice organized several inter-faith worship meetings adjacent to the Indigenous Watch House on Burnaby Mountain. Having obtained permission from the Watch House to conduct meetings, the Quaker-style meeting was grounded in silent prayer and were open to members of all religious and Indigenous traditions. By placing themselves at the site of resistance and the leadership of Indigenous peoples, Janice expressed how these meetings were aimed at orienting herself and others towards placing Indigenous
issues front and center in their actions [I-10]. Receiving consent from and performing spiritual practices adjacent to the Watch House forged mutual consent, respect, and reminder that the purpose in gathering was ultimately to express solidarity with Indigenous peoples to defend their lands.

At the same time however, following the leadership of Indigenous peoples entailed difficult questions about the historical baggage of religious traditions and skepticism of shallow reconciliation efforts [I-2; I-6]. For instance, David cautioned on the ongoing challenge that religious settlers faced in pre-occupying themselves with doing rather than waiting, listening, and responding to Indigenous calls for allies:

Settlers and Christians who may have the best motives in terms of reconciliation and solidarity can easily slip into thinking of coming up what that looks like and what that means . . . rather than listening and paying attention and hearing what Indigenous people are saying they need, or how they are choosing to lead. [I-4]

Who determines calls for allyship is significant because it disrupts and reverses power relations, implying that Indigenous peoples are the ones in position to fully call upon others as allies (McAdam, 2016; Simpson, 2017; Sullivan-Clarke, 2020). While reconciliation often implied in view of restitution of religious institutions for past wrongs, David insisted the focus should be foremost on respecting, listening, and responding to the demands of Indigenous peoples and their interests. The importance of respect and support for Indigenous self-determination resonated in Earthkeepers’ messaging in their reflection of the April 28th Call to Action for people of faith:

When Indigenous people are saying “No” to that which would compromise the livelihood of their people, their land, and their water, we need to pay attention. And we need to add our voices, our prayers, our money, our bodies, our privilege to their cause. [A1-1-17]

Configuring the politics of allyship and religious institutions also shaped how some REOs have interacted with Indigenous peoples on the front lines. For instance, Jenny stressed the need to maintain low-profile during Salal + Cedar’s visits to Camp Cloud, putting the focus on the resistance as “about solidarity with the Indigenous people” and “not on us, me . . . me. I’m getting arrested for [engaging in direct action]”
Although Jenny did not deny the agency of Salal + Cedar in supporting the resistance, her explicit gesture to re-direct the central focus on Indigenous leadership in these struggles, suggests an implicit conflict between religious affiliation associated with historical wrongs and need stand in support. Salal + Cedar had been consistent in strategically centering the attention on the problems associated with the lack of Indigenous consent in their expressions of watershed discipleship. These expressions included volunteering at and providing supplies to Camp Cloud [A2-1-3; A2-1-4; A2-1-5 and A2-1-7] and circulating the call out by Will George for the April 28th Call to Action for people of faith and friends [A2-5-20] (see details in 4.2.2 and 4.3.3). Yet, such efforts to immerse oneself in the resistance also meant negotiating identification with religious affiliation and struggling alongside Indigenous peoples on the front lines.

Although REOs recognized the opportunities they could play in shaping efforts in reconciliation, they faced social norms and structural factors that continued to influence and guide how they engaged in the resistance. Nevertheless, examining personal encounters of REO members on the lines of climate change messaging revealed a complex and at times, deeply unsettling process. The collective and personal reflexivity of REO members in interpreting the contestation of reconciliation-based messaging solidified their rationales and established credibility underlying their involvements and message tailoring to religious audiences.

### 3.5.5 Discussion

This discussion focuses on the interpretations of reconciliation in justice-based climate change messaging which establishes the rationales for REOs to engage in political engagement. Tracing the intertwined history and relationship of climate change, Indigenous lands and resource development, unmasking injustices, and reflecting upon their identities as religious settlers in unlearning and solidarity, the range of meanings under reconciliation speak to the horizontal-ness of climate change messaging as a platform to deconstruct and re-construct religious settler identities in Indigenous spaces (Heinrichs, 2016; Land, 2015; Maddison et al., 2016; Regan, 2010). As such, justice-based messaging on climate change enable
critical moments of self-reflexivity of religious settlers. Not only has the message itself become a focus in articulating frames, but the process of arriving at such messages brings to the forefront the importance of interrogating religious settler consciousness, identities, and responsibilities in Indigenous settler contexts (Nadeau, 2016; Regan, 2010).

The findings solidify the motivations behind REOs in bridging messages on justice, emphasizing the importance of interrogating the actor relative to the social location in the framing process. REOs viewed reconciliation-based messaging through political activism, advocacy, and re-interpretation of religious texts to counter hegemonic narratives that perpetuated colonial dispossession. With the varying degrees of participation of REOs in environmental resistance, their experiences demarcate an initiation in the transition that interrogates the use of religion, notably dominion-based interpretations of Christianity in justifying the process of Western colonization. Hinted by various REOs in their framing, the core assumption that belies land and hence, natural resource ownership and rights derives from the Christendom interpretation of Doctrine of Discovery and terra nullius (Newcomb, 2008). Unearthing the impacts of these doctrines and legacies on Indigenous title and ownership, REOs opened up the ways religious institutions participated in justifying the exploitative and capitalistic narratives to acquire land and resources to strengthen the empire. Land ownership allowed for settler colonial expansion over large swaths of land that legitimized various forms of economic activity, including extractive activities that fueled fossil fuel production (Parson & Ray, 2016). The disrepair of such relationship is compounded by the colonial legacy and structures that continue to pervade in Canada, something that may be overlooked by a majority of religious settlers. In response, REOs attempted to participate in a reconciliation narrative that attests to resetting relationships between Indigenous communities and religious settlers (KAIROS, n.d.; Heinrichs, 2018).

Placing reconciliation-based messaging in this frame of geographically and historically situated understanding, it is of little wonder why advocacy and direct action has been central tactics to grounding claims of REOs in the resistance. Framing justice unmasks the extent institutionalized religion contributed to legitimizing colonial dispossession, assimilation, and genocide. Unravelling the stories and
encounters of the colonial Christian church with Indigenous peoples became inflection moments for religious settlers to question their spiritual and ethical commitments and assumptions of their religious traditions. Considered in these respects, reconciliation-based messaging demanded more than social solidarity of REO members to lend support to the importance of Indigenous rights and free, prior, and informed consent. Self-reflexivity of the social location and legacy of the social and political arrangements that lingered in Indigenous-state relations prompted members of REOs to call into question the political and legal legitimacy of fossil fuel expansion on unconsented portions of Indigenous lands. Pipeline resistance thus became a cornerstone in liberating oneself from religious settler narratives that perpetuate myopic assumptions of capitalist, extractivist principles under dominion interpretations of stewardship.

Unpacking the politics of reconciliation emphasizes the crucial ingredient of religious actors in configuring the meaning in justice-based messaging. REOs injected themselves in the process of decolonization to guide the construction of religious environmental framing. In other words, frames, understood through the actor, become entry points that ground the historical tensions and conflicts in Indigenous-settler relations. Through reflection, restitutions, and reparations, the process of decolonization of the religious settler hints at the rejection of underlying logics and structures that contributed to colonization. For some Christian communities, reconciliation-based messaging means acknowledging historical wrongs towards Indigenous peoples and in turn reforming their own relations to the land. As some REO members have pointed out, calling into question the colonial mindset is necessary for true reconciliation to take place, and to some, be inclusive of land reparation and recovery of Indigenous visions of the land (Heinrichs, 2018). This message was at the forefront of some Christian communities to “condemn colonialism, collectively work at decolonization, and seek to understand the language of colonial domination, and then unmask it” (Heinrichs, 2018, p. 285). Underlying these efforts are calls for the deconstruction of socio-environmental history of religious participation in colonial processes in Indigenous settler contexts. Such calls highlight opportunities and challenges to rectify past
and present socio-environmental injustices. How religious settlers posture themselves in their ongoing framing strategies and engagements matter in decolonizing their messaging on climate change.

If the messaging of justice is a direct call for decolonization, then it has direct theoretical and empirical implications of the role that religious settlers play in shaping the construction of justice-based messaging on climate change. The broader significance of re-examining religious actors is to systematically interrogate and re-build religious interpretations and practices apart from colonial ideologies that have permeated in western thought and practices (Smith, 1999, p. 56). This process is especially timely in Indigenous-settler contexts where remnants of Doctrine of Discovery and *terra nullius* still linger in social, political, and legal arrangements. In the Canadian context, messages in support of and initiating the Calls to Action by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and calls to justice on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, and reforms to the Indian Act represent starting points in overturning these remnants. These potential efforts compound existing calls to unsettle the complex history of Christians and colonial encounters with Indigenous peoples and moreover, the deep-seated logics that continue to permeate in justice-based climate change messaging.

However, this examination also calls for greater care to the uses of reconciliation in climate change messaging. Attending to the critiques on claims towards reconciliation in the beginning of this section, any use of language surrounding reconciliation always bears scrutiny, as Indigenous and settler scholars have rightfully pointed out (Coulthard, 2014; Maddison et al., 2016; Whyte, 2018b). Rhetoric of reconciliation can ring hollow and become empty platitudes without any proper action or are used to perpetuate colonial logics of dispossession. Such efforts would be insufficient at a collective level if there are no serious efforts on the critical self-awareness of individual religious settlers to reflect and wrestle with the troubling role of the Christian churches the dispossession, assimilation and systemic racism towards Indigenous peoples (Barker et al., 2016). Engaging in self-critique has been argued by some settler scholars such as Regan (2010) as a painful, although necessary step in being reminded of the history and wounds that are packed in words such as reconciliation.
This section serves as a blunt reminder that religious settlers could potential play a supporting role only once they engage on their own process of decolonization (Curnow & Helferty, 2018; Regan, 2010, pp. 222-223) if they are to proceed on any tangible progress with supporting the process of healing and reparations in view of Indigenous resurgence. Nevertheless, such sketches remain preliminary and further evidence of such initiations of religious settlers on reconciliation-based climate change messaging remain scant. Further examination is needed to clarify and substantiate the relationship between the actor and messaging process in similar or other Indigenous-settler contexts. Only then is it possible to arrive at more informed position to assess potential and limitations of religious settlers in climate change messaging.

Broadening out the significance of this section is its connection with religious environmental frames and implications for the framing process (3.4). Examination of the rationales for messages on reconciliation under the justice frame in this section has highlighted the significance of historical, political, and geographical factors in shaping REO frames. The resonance of reconciliation in justice-based climate change messaging in the Canadian context opens up the constellation of meanings and narratives of settler religious processes associated with settler colonialism on Indigenous lands. On one end, religious environmental frames on climate change may offer additional precision in unmasking the extent of religious actors in legitimizing settler colonial processes. In other words, religious environmental frames may shed light into the ways religious actors and practices mesh with colonial politics in shaping the environment in settler-colonial contexts. Taking religious environmental frames on this vein of thought imply a greater attention towards and merit in attending to the colonial dimensions underlying religious environmentalism, a view that has received insufficient attention in greening-of-religion circles16. Acknowledging the underlying colonial dimensions implies that analysis under religious environmental framing can entail social, cultural, and political dynamics and its embeddedness with

16 A exception would be Jenkins and colleagues (2018, p.15) as they acknowledge that the relationship of Indigenous peoples and climate change, as well as Indigenous peoples’ movements destabilize and demand self-reflexivity into categories of religion and climate change.
colonial legacies, ties, and practices of defunct and existing religious actors. At the same time, this perspective gives rise to the insights from the central findings of this chapter. Religious environmental frames can also act in ways that facilitate religious actors to interrogate religious traditions so that it may recognize its role in upholding colonial patterns, spark self-reflexivity of colonial ways of thinking, interrogate underlying value assumptions in teachings and interpretations, and redirect attention to religious cosmologies that center on teachings and practices in closer relation with the Earth (Fontaine, 2016, pp. 172-213; Graber & Klassen, 2020; Nye, 2019). In sum, religious environmental frames may operate as an analytic vehicle that exposes and decenters settler colonial dimensions of religiously shaped landscapes. Religious environmental framing on climate change thus marks the realignment of religious environmental frames with religious actors in unmasking religious legacies, undergo critical self-consciousness, and demonstrate commitment to taking responsibility and undergoing unsettling processes.

Examining the types of religious environmental frames in the Canadian context has simultaneously highlighted the neglected issues of representation, power, and privilege associated with dominant forms of religion and more plainly, challenging notions of what constitutes greening of religion and with attention to the Canadian context. Grounding religious environmentalism is in effect connecting with religious history and its legitimization of and complicatedness in colonialism including settler colonialism. This case study revealed a crucial but missing link notably in power dynamics, privilege, and race intermingle with religious environmentalism and often linger in the background yet remains unacknowledged. In illuminating the experiences of REOs grappling with Indigenous struggles on consent and more broadly on Indigenous rights and titles, questions of who speaks and how they speak can highlight the explicit and visceral connections religious settlers make to defining issues of power and privilege in religious environmentalism. Religious environmentalism thus goes beyond demonstrating environmental consciousness in the greening of religion as much as it can become a project in decolonizing religious traditions and in part, unmasking and deconstructing hegemonic and dominion-like attitudes (Fontaine, 2016; Grabber & Klassen, 2020; Nye, 2019). Exposing the broader politics and power
dynamics embedded in religious environmentalism suggests a possible roadmap to unmask and challenge religious hermeneutics (and by extension, theology), histories, impacts, and responsibilities, and its intertwined patterns with settler colonialism on Indigenous peoples and lands (Heinrichs, 2018; Godin, 2019). As this chapter has demonstrated, critical voices among religious individuals and collectives are imperative in this effort. Religious environmental framing through religious settler consciousness informs the praxis to re-situate the rootedness and responsibilities of religious and settler identities within place-based relationships.

The two sections of this chapter began by unravelling the content of four specific frames which converge on the justice frame. In analyzing frame content and underlying motivations of religious actors in the religious environmental framing process on climate change, this chapter contributes to the literature in two ways. First, it exposes and decenters settler colonial assumptions in religious environmental frames with particular relevance to Indigenous-settler contexts. By extension, it underscores the pivotal place of religious settler self-consciousness in the process of illuminating settler colonial assumptions in religious environmental frames. Justice as the religious environmental frame can become a descriptive and prescriptive vehicle to equip religious actors to recognize, interrogate, and take responsibility for dominion-like attitudes that underlie religiously legitimized acts of historical injustices.

Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion of where REOs locate themselves in the politics of resistance. It claims that although the formation of the religious environmental movement is distinct, it is located within and developing alongside the wider web of resistance.
Chapter 4: Climate change messaging in the religious environmental movement and the resistance

This chapter examines how REOs emerged as a small but vocal voice in embodying religious-based climate change messaging in the resistance. In clarifying the chronology of involvements, typologies, and locations of REOs among the network of resistance actors, this chapter argues that religious climate change messaging is shaped by the movement building of the nascent religious environmental movement in tandem with efforts within Indigenous-led climate movements. This chapter raises questions for religious settler-Indigenous collaborations.

Two claims are advanced to support this argument. The first claim is that REOs formed a distinct, nascent religious environmental movement that developed throughout the resistance. The four typologies of REO roles derived from the views and positions of REOs. The inflection of religious environmental frames in political engagement translated into diverse tactics among REOs, ranging from education, advocacy, event organization to front line support and direct action. Presence and shortcomings of statements by national religious bodies provided the stage for REO to deepen engagements, highlighting the ways REOs negotiated the fine line of religious environmental activism.

Building on this first claim is the claim that REOs were embedded within the wider web of the resistance. The sustaining waves of action and calls for civil disobedience from other non-REO actors from late 2017 to April 2018 cumulated with the strategic call for religious-based opposition on the Faith Call to Action on April 28. This call represented a rare moment for Indigenous, environmental, and religious collaboration to amplify the message on free, prior, and informed consent as grounds for opposing the project. These series of actions, however, has to be understood within the context of ongoing coordination and actions of other movement actors. Furthermore, some REOs viewed themselves through their relationships and overlapping roles with other REOs and other non-REO actors for collective
messaging. In grounding religious environmental frames through their practices, REOs gradually assimilated themselves into the resistance.

4.1 provides a brief chronology of religious involvement in the Trans Mountain resistance. 4.2 conceptualizes four typologies that REOs adopt in demonstrating their messaging. 4.3 explores the alignment of messaging with REOs in the broader set of networks among other REOs, national religious bodies, and other resistance actors. 4.4 discusses the implications of political engagement of REOs for climate change messaging.

4.1 Chronology of involvements

Religious involvement in the Trans Mountain resistance had been ongoing since 2012 when talks about the proposed expansion were underway. Table 4.1 marks the major involvements in this period. The Unitarian Church of Vancouver marked one of the first instances of religious involvement. As the Chair of the Environment Committee at the time, Peter stated that the Unitarian Church of Vancouver had debated the resolution to express opposition against the then Northern Gateway pipeline. The Resolution stressed that the projects and expansion of tar sands in its potential contribution to climate change and violation of Indigenous rights of consent went against the 2nd, 5th, and 7th Principles of Universal Unitarianism [A5-1-9; 10]. Foreseeing the application and environmental review of the Trans Mountain project, the resolution also included provisions to express opposition to the current project [A5-1-9]. The resolution passed with over 70% support in the congregation [I-11; I-12; A5-1-9].

Some of the first waves of protests occurred on Burnaby Mountain in November and December 2014. Over 100 protesters, including individual members of Earthkeepers, Vancouver Quakers, and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver, crossed the injunction line by Kinder Morgan tank farm [I-4; I-10; I-11; A1-1-23]. In April of 2016, then recently formed Salal + Cedar collaborated with Fossil Free Faith along with Greenpeace and 350.org to organize a spiritually rooted direct action training [A2-1-12; A7-1-1], preparing participants for civil disobedience ahead of the local pipeline rally by the Kinder Morgan tank farm as part of the global Break Free from Fossil Fuels movement in May 2016 (Pawson, 2016). In
November 2017, as part of the semi-organized wave of actions coordinated by environmental groups such as Greenpeace and 350.org, members from Salal + Cedar and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver, together with the Justin Trudeau Brigade began blocking the gates of the Westridge Marine Terminal on a weekly basis [I-5; I-6; I-11; A2-1-13]. Aim at garnering increased media attention to pipeline opposition, this blockade lasted until March 2018 when Trans Mountain filed a damages lawsuit against blockading activists [I-5; I-6; I-11]. This lawsuit simultaneously pursued a court injunction which was indefinitely granted by the B.C. Supreme Court on March 15 to prevent protesters from further work disruption [I-6] (CBC News, 2018).

Actions in April and May 2018 generated a series of coordinated responses from REOs, representatives of national religious bodies, and individual religiously affiliated activists. On April 20, a smaller group consisting Anglican clergy members, members of Salal + Cedar, as well as Mennonites, Lutherans, and Quakers blocked traffic from entering the Westridge Marine Terminal and held a banner that read “Protect the Water, Land, Climate: STOP Kinder Morgan” [I-5 I-6] (Boothby, 2018a; Kidd, 2018). On April 28, over 100 members from REOs such as Earthkeepers, Streams of Justice, Quakers, Unitarian Church of Vancouver, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society as well as the broader faith community comprising Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, and Christians gathered outside the gates of the Kinder Morgan tank farm and facilities on Burnaby Mountain for the Faith Call to Action [I-5; I-7; 8; I-9] (Pawson, 2018). Organized by Salal + Cedar, Protect the Inlet, and environmental groups to provide a controlled environment open to all faiths and allies, this event aimed to consolidate religious solidarity with the ongoing Indigenous-led and environmentally backed waves of action against the project [I-5; A2-1-5; A2-5-20; A3-1-1] (Protect the Inlet, 2018a; 2018c, 2018d). Some participants, such as members from Streams of Justice, Vancouver Quakers, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society [I-7; I-8; I-9; I-10; I-13], engaged in civil disobedience in defiance of the court injunction [I-5; I-8; A2-5-20; A3-1-1]. Meanwhile, other participants marched, prayed, chanted, and declared statements from various national religious bodies [I-7]. With support from members of the
Watch House, members of Salal + Cedar subsequently launched an autonomous action on May 28, chaining themselves to the Douglas Fir adjacent to the Kinder Morgan tank farm [I-5; A2-4-15].

Drawing on the concept of political opportunities as structural factors that affect the actions and outcomes of social movements (H. Johnston, 2005), the opportunities leading up to April and May 2018 demonstrated potential formation of the religious environmental movement and its alignment with the wider resistance. Tracing the footsteps of REO activities, REOs intersected with other movement actors in numerous ways from the onset of the resistance. The first wave of organized protests in 2014 catalyzed subsequent REO mobilization and networking opportunities between 2015 to 2017 [I-4; I-5; I-10; I-11]. These opportunities included REO formation (e.g. Earthkeepers and Salal + Cedar), collaborations between REOs (e.g. Ecological Stations of the Cross), and collaborations between REOs and Indigenous, environmental, and grassroots groups. Events in February and March 2018 became turning points in gathering movement momentum and public attention to project opposition (Appendix A). Events included sustained waves of actions from environmental groups, semi-organized actions such as the Westridge Marine Terminal blockade by members of the Justin Trudeau Brigade and Salal + Cedar, and the march of thousands of people on Burnaby Mountain on March 10 (Protect the Inlet, 2018g; Speers-Roesch, 2018) [A2-1-13] prior to the indefinite injunction order of the Trans Mountain vicinity on March 15 (CBC News, 2018). With restrictions on gathering in place, Protect the Inlet announced a new wave of protests starting on March 17 including a wide call for mass civil disobedience outside the Kinder Morgan tank farm (Protect the Inlet, 2018c; Protect the Inlet, 2018d). The call resulted in arrests of more than 170 activists on the week of March 17 to 24 (Protect the Inlet, 2018f). Between arrests of high-profile activists, politicians, artists, retired professionals, and other citizens from March to May 2018 (Protect the Inlet, n.d.), media coverage from mainstream outlets and Indigenous campaigns additionally featured the arrests of members from REOs and other faith communities on April 20, April 28, and May 28 (Coast Protectors, 2018; Pawson, 2018; Protect the Inlet, 2018a, 2018b). The additional coverage by religious and social media (Dueckman and Muir, 2018; Kidd, 2018) raised the visibility, profile, and contribution of religious communities in the wider resistance, adding pressure to religious national bodies,
governments, and Kinder Morgan to its commitments and responsibility to Indigenous reconciliation and respect for Indigenous consent. Cross-referencing these developments suggests the interdependence of REOs with the ongoing efforts of movement actors, generating momentum and synergies in the religious environmental movement and the wider resistance respectively.

Table 4.1 Timeline of major REO events throughout the Trans Mountain resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Major Event</th>
<th>Key Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 19 2012</td>
<td>Unitarian Church of Vancouver adopts resolution to oppose the Northern Gateway Pipeline and Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion</td>
<td>I-11 and I-12; A5-1-8, A5-2-9 and A5-2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November to December 2014</td>
<td>Protests on Burnaby Mountain</td>
<td>I-4; I-10; I-11 and I-12; A1-1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26 2016</td>
<td>Ecological Stations of the Cross</td>
<td>F-A1-43; F-A2-43; F-A2-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30 2016</td>
<td>Spiritually Rooted Direct Action Training</td>
<td>A2-1-12; 8-1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17 2017</td>
<td>Ecological Stations of the Cross</td>
<td>F-A1-47; F-A6-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017 to March 2018</td>
<td>Blockade at Westridge Marine Terminal</td>
<td>I-5; I-6; I-11; A2-1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31 2018</td>
<td>Ecological Stations of the Cross</td>
<td>F-A1-218; F-A2-238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20 2018</td>
<td>Blockade at Westridge Marine Terminal</td>
<td>I-5; I-6; A6-1-1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28 2018</td>
<td>People of Faith and Friends Against Kinder Morgan (Faith Call to Action)</td>
<td>A1; A2; A3; I-13; A1-1-14; A2-5-20; A3-1-27; F-A2-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28 2018</td>
<td>Autonomous action against Kinder Morgan</td>
<td>I-5; I-6; A2-4-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Typologies

REOs positioned themselves in multiple roles throughout the resistance. In each role, REO embodied tactics to pursue specific strategies as part of their own campaign (Cox, 2013). The findings suggest that while REOs advocated for distinctive campaigns based on religious environmental frames (Chapter 3), the similarities in REO framing strategies also gave rise to opportunities for REOs to participate in and co-organize activities. Involvement of REOs were broadly classified as education and advocacy, event organization, front-line support, and direct action which included rallies, protests, and acts of civil disobedience (Table 4.2). Each classification entailed political risk and implications (Ellingson et al., 2012) for REOs in climate change messaging. Education and advocacy may be less risky than direct action. At the same time, certain actions may be decided upon or heightened given the window of opportunity (H. Johnston, 2005) or the type of joint action (Ellingson et al., 2012). Front line actions in November 2014 and April 2018 which corresponded with injunction orders and wave of arrests of other activists were two notable instances.

This classification found that REOs aligned their messages and actions through four types of decision-making roles, suggesting the emergence of religious environmental activism in its own right. These roles are education and awareness building, organizer, institutional critic, and support and provision. Each role demonstrates critical instances of REOs in their decision-making processes and political engagements.

Although REO roles were wide-ranging, two particular patterns could be observed. The first pattern is that REOs consistently engaged in educational initiatives and extended their action well into various degrees of political involvements, from advocacy to event organization and finally front-line support and direct action. REOs operationalized their frames into their choices for political activities which were shaped by pre-existing relationships and frame congruences with other REOs. These congruences suggest that REOs were more likely to participate or organize a type of activity together (Ellingson et al., 2012). For instance, the Ecological Stations of the Cross, a featured event over the Easter period was attended by members of Earthkeepers, Salal + Cedar, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin
Community Society. Similarly, under the convergence of the justice frame and the interconnectedness frame, members from Vancouver Quakers and Unitarian Church of Vancouver were more likely to align in front-line and direct action tactics such as their participation in BROKE and crossing the injunction line on November 2014. The second pattern is that the extensivity of REOs’ front-line activities were contingent on their level of activism at particular time periods. Members from Earthkeepers, Vancouver Quakers, and the Environment Committee of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver crossed the first set of injunction lines at the Kinder Morgan tank farm on Burnaby mountain in November 2014 [I-3; I-4; I-10; I-11]. Similarly, members of Streams of Justice and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society crossed the injunction lines in April 2018 [I-8; I-9; I-13; I-14].
Table 4.2 REOs and their activities throughout the Trans Mountain resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Earthkeepers</th>
<th>Salal + Cedar</th>
<th>Streams of Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>• Conduct seminars and talks at churches and conferences&lt;br&gt;• Mail-in letters and petitioning&lt;br&gt;• Attend NEB hearing</td>
<td>• Sacred Earth Youth leadership camps&lt;br&gt;• Sermons at parishes&lt;br&gt;• Court support for other religious activists</td>
<td>• Organize forums and workshops focusing on resource extraction and land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Organization</strong></td>
<td>• Ecological Stations of the Cross&lt;br&gt;• Carols for the Climate&lt;br&gt;• Communion services prior to Climate Convergence rallies</td>
<td>• Spiritually rooted direct action training&lt;br&gt;• Outdoor Eucharist services&lt;br&gt;• Organize protests on April 20, April 28, May 28 2018</td>
<td>• “Land is Life: Indigenous Defenders Speak”&lt;br&gt;• “Extraction or Sustenance: Rethinking our relationship to land”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front-line Support</strong></td>
<td>• Fundraise for legal support fund for arrestees</td>
<td>• Support for Camp Cloud</td>
<td>• Facilitate event coordination for First Nations speakers&lt;br&gt;• Volunteered at Watch House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;(e.g. rallies, protests, and civil disobedience)</td>
<td>• November 2014 protest and arrest&lt;br&gt;• Kinder Morgan rallies e.g. March 10 2018&lt;br&gt;• Participate in April 28 2018 Faith Call to Action</td>
<td>• November 2017 flotilla protest&lt;br&gt;• November 2017 to March 2018 Westridge Marine Terminal work stoppage&lt;br&gt;• March 2018 arrest&lt;br&gt;• May 28 2018 tree lockdown</td>
<td>• Participate in March 10 2018&lt;br&gt;• April 28 2018 Faith Call to Action and arrest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2 REOs and their activities throughout the Trans Mountain resistance (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Vancouver Quakers</strong></th>
<th><strong>Environment Committee, Unitarian Church of Vancouver</strong></th>
<th><strong>Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fossil Free Faith</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Education and Advocacy** | • Reconciliation Committee  
• KAIROS blanket exercise  
• Canadian Friends Service Committee statement | • Sermon to the wider congregation  
• Forums, workshops, and podcasts  
• Congregation-wide resolution opposing Trans Mountain and Northern Gateway  
• Attend and speak at NEB hearing  
• Court support for other religious-based activists | • Study group on UNDRIP, reconciliation and church’s role  
• Contributing member of KAIROS blanket exercise team | • Presentations at congregations  
• Liaise with religious communities |
| **Event Organization** | • Earth Witness worship meetings by Watch House | • Unitarian Service at Watch House | • “This Changes Everything” film screening | • Spiritually rooted direct action training |
| **Front-line Support** | • Participate in BROKE | • Support Caretakers on the Mountain  
• Participate in BROKE  
• Material support | • Deliver supplies to Camp Cloud | • Volunteer at Watch House |
| **Direct action** (e.g. rallies, protests, and civil disobedience) | • November 2014 protest and arrest  
• Rally attendance (e.g. November 2016)  
• April 2018 actions | • November 2014 protest and arrest  
• Rally attendance (e.g. September 2017; May 2018) | • April 28 2018 Faith Call to Action and arrest | • 2016 protests  
• Personal and congregation-based level attendance of public demonstrations |
4.2.1 Awareness builder

Information provision and advocacy: Earthkeepers

Earthkeepers provided resources ranging from books and essays to scripture readings and written prayers [A1-1-10 to 12]. Facebook and Twitter were generally used to disseminate content, circulate events, provide educational resources, and post reflections. Earthkeepers also engaged in in-person workshops at various public events, including outreach events at major Christian platforms. Earthkeepers also organized events such as Carols for the Climate and co-organized Ecological Stations of the Cross with Salal + Cedar [A1-1-20; F-A1-15; 47]. Carols for the Climate was an event to fundraise for the legal costs of First Nations in challenging Kinder Morgan in court [A1-1-20]. Whereas, Ecological Stations of the Cross took participants to various parts of Burnaby mountain to reflect on the death and resurrection of Jesus as a symbol for hope in the resistance [F-A1-15].

Earthkeepers broadly recognized the importance of finding common ground with the Christian community. Even though Earthkeepers took on a variety of roles, most members appeared to be in agreement of the importance of having an ecumenical, Christian presence in opposing the pipeline [I-1; I-3; I-4]. Daniel viewed the role of Earthkeepers in the resistance as a balance of prayer, provision, and general advocacy [I-1]. Whereas, Howard viewed the role of Earthkeepers as mostly through education through dialogue, movie screenings, and consultations [I-3]. There was also a major education component, given how Christians, and particularly the evangelical Christian community had been slow to respond to climate change [I-1; I-4].

Community mobilizer: Fossil Free Faith

The messaging of Fossil Free Faith primarily situated their role in the form of a community-oriented response to climate change. Based in the Lower Mainland, members of the Youth Fellowship Program had discussed the various pipeline projects in Canada, including Northern Gateway which was more pressing than the Trans Mountain project at the time of the Fellowship Program. Although Fossil Free Faith was less directly involved as a collective in the resistance than other REOs [I-15], members engaged
at an individual level in various efforts such as attending rallies, volunteering at the Watch House, and actively disseminating pipeline resistance in their faith communities as a strategic step to stopping climate change [I-15].

Encompassed in the messaging of Fossil Free Faith on halting pipeline expansion is its central message that divestment in religious communities is a legitimate tactic to effectively address climate change. This strategy revolved around elevated messaging based on frames around stewardship and justice, where expanding consumption of fossil fuels would exacerbate climate change and subsequently impacts on vulnerable, poor communities. Combining multi-faith teachings that emphasize just use of financial resources, Fossil Free Faith created educational and discussion materials on divestment, offered training for direct action, and empowered Youth Fellows as public speakers to educate and mobilize religious communities towards divestment [A7-1-1; A7-1-3; A7-1-6]. Fusing financial stewardship as a centerpiece of stewardship and justice frames enabled Fossil Free Faith to fill a gap in prognosing solutions for community-oriented solutions towards climate change that has implications for fossil fuel infrastructure.

Similar to Earthkeepers and Salal + Cedar, Fossil Free Faith emphasized the linkages between expanding fossil fuel consumption and climate change by engaging religious audiences. Entailed in this message was the co-organization of different roles to stop fossil fuel expansion, such as co-organizing the spiritually rooted direct action training with Salal + Cedar, Greenpeace, and 350.org [I-15; A7-1-1; A7-1-2; A-7-1-3]. While the training was directed at the global climate march in Vancouver, organization of the training suggested that it had prepared their members and other participants of grounding spiritual forms of political engagement in pipeline resistance [I-15].

4.2.2 Organizer

Salal + Cedar collated and sustained the momentum of collective religious responses from late 2017 to May 2018. Salal + Cedar’s role as an organizer was a result of collaboration with other REOs and non-REO actors. This was illustrative in the organization of the series of blockades with members of the Justin
Trudeau Brigade from November 2017 to March 2018 and the chain of events on April 20, April 28, and May 28 of 2018. Joining in the wave of coordinated actions by environmental groups such as Greenpeace and 350.org, Salal + Cedar and members of the Justin Trudeau Brigade erected blockades outside Westridge Marine Terminal in November 2017 [I-5; I-6; A2-1-13]. These blockades were sustained until early March 2018, just before the major rally on March 10. As one of the key contacts in the series of actions, Alex recalled that the events on April 20, April 28, and May 28 consisted of a series of related religious-based actions that was part of the wider strategy of providing various platforms for religious engagement [I-5]. The small gathering of faith-based activists on April 20 outside the Westridge Marine Terminal was done in collaboration with the coalition of Indigenous and environmental groups [I-5]. Building on the momentum from April 20, Alex viewed April 28 as providing a controlled protest space to demonstrate capacity of the multi-faith coalition with support from Protect the Inlet [I-5]. These efforts contrasted with other subsequent and autonomous actions such as May 28 which was aimed at disrupting operations at the Kinder Morgan tank farm [I-5; A2-4-15].

Salal + Cedar further played a key organizational role in mobilizing and disseminating these actions to its members and other REOs [I-5; I-9; A2-1-13], and organizing other activities such as weekly Eucharist services, prayer walks, conservation activities, youth environmental education activities, and front line support at Camp Cloud [A2-1-3, 4, 6, 13, 17; F-A2-27]. Salal + Cedar’s strategy for capacity building of religious solidarity served to catalyze the overall messaging on reconciliation and consent. At the same time, capacity building of religious solidarity also relied on existing social ties and coordination from the coalition of Indigenous and environmental groups to echo the broader opposition.

4.2.3 Institutional critic

Streams of Justice

Streams of Justice concentrated its efforts primarily in event organization and direct action to take further action beyond positions of national religious bodies on Indigenous reconciliation. Rooting itself in the prophetic tradition to call out the colonizing patterns of the church institution, Streams of Justice sought
to incorporate a range of Indigenous and critical voices that facilitated the decolonization of Christian thought and practices. Over the years, Streams of Justice hosted and provided spaces for forums, roundtables and workshops that featured panellists speaking on topics such as decolonization for settler allies, relationship with land as extraction or sustenance, faith and justice, and climate change and the Christian church, with fundraising proceeds going towards Unis’ot’en Camp [A3-1-8, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19; 21; 22; 24]. Event panellists featured nationally and locally recognized activists, scholars, and thinkers, such as Reuben George, Glen Coulthard, Khelsilem Rivers, Arthur Manuel, and Kim Haxton [A3-1-17; 18; 20; 21].

Streams of Justice’s explicit callout to members to join the rally on April 28 for the Faith Call to Action [A3-1-1] provided a clear case of embodying the role of institutional critic. Tom and Michelle viewed their decision to engage in civil disobedience as expressions of religious convictions. Dow’s (2018, pp. 804-805) envisionary view of environmental civil disobedience as an act of performative justice helps to put into perspective the moral, and arguably religious imagination to uphold the values of justice that transcend existing laws, policies, and power structures. Adopting this view of environmental civil disobedience to compare Tom and Michelle’s explanations opens up access to the meanings behind individual frames in crossing the injunction line. Prior to Tom’s arrest, he stapled the “We Dare to Hope” declaration on the gates of the Kinder Morgan tank farm. As a minister of the United Church of Canada, Tom viewed the declaration as holding symbolic meaning. Two segments from the declaration (United Church of Canada, 2018b) particularly resonated in view of reconciliatory actions. The first segment was a specific reference to the rights of Indigenous peoples:

Today we seek to do as Jesus did:
To make room as Indigenous peoples assert their right to be at the table
As they assert their right to consent—to say yes, to say no
To build a new relationship rooted in covenant, not colonization. [A3-2-25]

The second segment was the closing statement, emphasizing the purpose of reconciliation:

In this time of reconciliation, of binding up wounds, we dare to hope
To find creative solutions together

We say, ‘reconciliation, reconciliation’

That all might be healed and our relationship transformed. [A3-2-25]

The meaning of reconciliation could be interpreted in two ways. The first way would be a strict interpretation of reconciliation as the repair of relations between Indigenous peoples and the church. The second way would be a broader interpretation of reconciliation in the body of the text. This interpretation would capture the spiritual imagination and ethical obligations in the relations between humans and particularly Indigenous peoples, and with the rest of creation. Stapling the declaration in conjunction with the act of civil disobedience, nevertheless proved to be insufficient for Tom. Reflecting on the moment he crossed the injunction line, Tom explained his reason in submitting to the arrest:

In [concretizing] some of the pronouncements . . . they become alive . . . and take on some flesh and blood meaning, but unless that happens and until that happens, they are just as likely to remain very general pronouncements. [I-7]

Tom’s explanation highlighted the limitations national religious bodies have in executing more politically risky activities, especially when these actions were broadcasted and witnessed by non-religious audiences in the resistance and the wider public. Putting one’s body on the lines of resistance served as opportunities for REOs to embody the ethical meaning of institutional statements into practice.

Unlike Tom, Michelle considered herself loosely affiliated with her church’s Baptist denomination. Rather, Michelle engaged in direct action largely based on her own experiences with Indigenous communities, places, and knowledge (Excerpt 5, Appendix D, D.5; explication in 3.5.3.). This decision was consistent with the larger critique of the institutional structure and thought from liberation theology to stand in solidarity with marginalized voices [I-9]. Contextualizing the motivations of Tom and Michelle underscored the institutional limitation of embodying the message unless those decisions were carefully weighed on an individual basis.
Reconciliation in practice: Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society

As a congregation that welcomes excluded members of the Catholic Church, Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society (OLGTCS) focused its efforts on educating its congregation on Indigenous reconciliation. In early 2018, they conducted a series of book studies on the Doctrine of Discovery, the UNDRIP, and a guidebook on churches working towards Indigenous reconciliation [I-13]. Because the Trans Mountain project had been framed as an impediment to Indigenous reconciliation, OLGTCS viewed the rounds of protest in April 2018 as an opportunity to become more fully engaged in the resistance [I-13; I-14]. Coincidently, their book study coincided with the call for the Faith Day of Action on April 28. Recalling her decision to call her congregation to participate in protest and her own arrest that day, Miriam emphasized, “we were supposed to start the second book on April 28, and we thought what kind of reconciliation is that if we are reading about it and not doing it?” [I-13]. Miriam explained several factors in shaping her decision to cross the injunction line. As the minister of the congregation, Miriam expressed the desire to role model to congregants the tangible responses to reconciliation. In her written responses, she compared the political act of protesting against the project as “an act of inclusive gospel love” in reconciling with Indigenous peoples in Canada and further heeding the recommendations from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Call to Action [A6-1-1; A6-2-5]. Miriam also had practical considerations as she thought she would pass future opportunities for action [I-13].

The history of dissension with the Catholic Church over its teachings and power underscore the significance of OLGTCS in their efforts to advance messaging on reconciliation (Mayblin, 2019). Affiliated with the Catholic Workers Movement and Roman Catholic Women Priests of Canada, OLGTCS represented the marginalized voices who may be overlooked when seeking responses from the Catholic Church in engaging on reconciliation. As a Roman Catholic woman priest, Miriam’s arrest represents a juncture in standing alongside other marginalized voices. Placing themselves on the lines of resistance not only represented their frustrations at the misogynistic and patriarchal legacy and structures of the Catholic Church, but also underlaid the ongoing and overlooked marginalization of excluded members of the Catholic Church. By siding with the historically and presently oppressed peoples of the
Catholic Church, OLGTCS’s actions embodied a double meaning of reconciliation, placing them in position to unravel the historical issues and baggage associated with reconciliation.

4.2.4 Support and provision

Grounding activism in spiritual reflection: Vancouver Quakers

Vancouver Quakers mainly engaged in direct action, event participation, message dissemination, and hosting spaces for contemplation. Janice and other members of the Vancouver Quaker community were active since the beginning of the resistance, starting with the arrests for crossing the injunction lines in the initial round of protests in 2014 on Burnaby Mountain [I-10]. Following that action, the Quaker Monthly Meeting organized a multi-faith service prior to a resistance rally and circulated the Faith Call to Action [A4-1-1-; F-A4-5; 6]. Nationally, the Vancouver Quakers received national support from Canadian Friends Service Committee to engage in non-violent civil disobedience to stop the project [A4-1-8; I-10] and promoted KAIROS’ statements in the pursuit of justice and support for the resistance [F-A4-7, 8, 11, 12]. At the local chapter level, efforts such as hosting the KAIROS Blanket exercise aimed to increasing awareness on colonization and residential schools as part of the religious response to the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission [A4-2-4; I-10] (TRC, 2015b).

Individual members of Vancouver Quakers contributed in different ways. Janice organized the interfaith Earth Witness worship meeting which provided a sense of community for faith-based participants in the resistance. The meeting offered space for participants to ground their activism in spiritual practices according to their own traditions. Janice had been leading this worship meeting adjacent to and with permission from the Watch House on Burnaby Mountain since mid-2018. Inspired by the Quaker tradition of call for worship, participants would sit in a circle in silence, wait and search for spiritual communion, and be free to speak or sing [F-A4-9]. Originating out of the desire for a spiritually grounded response to the project, this meeting served as a reminder to activists of the purpose in allyship and Indigenous reconciliation [I-10; F-A4-9; 10]. Janice explained the purpose of the meeting:
This is a place where we go deeper inside and get in touch with what we are doing and finding more of a sense of peace with nature and what it is that we are trying to protect. for me, it is about really trying to get solidly grounded and getting out of the us and them mentality and really wanting to be coming from a place of love. [I-10]

In these moments of reflection and recovery from front-line activist work, hosting the meeting beside the Watch House held political and spiritual meanings for reconciliation, for these gatherings commemorated the depth of the Indigenous caretakers and ancestors of the land they stood on. Coupling spiritual reflection with political activism helped activists to look towards a higher power in the contentious relationships between themselves and the police [I-10].

Principles-based advocate: Environment Committee of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver

The Environment Committee had curated resources, engaged in advocacy in the congregation, provided front-line support, engaged in direct action. The Committee spearheaded discussions on sustainable development and ecological footprints and introduced Earth Day worship services [I-11]. In 2012, the Environment Committee submitted a draft resolution titled “A Resolution on Proposed Oil Pipelines in BC”. This resolution passed in the Unitarian congregation in 2012 expressed opposition to the Northern Gateway pipeline, as well as any oil sands projects, with brief mention of the Trans Mountain project (Appendix D, D.4.) [I-11; I-12 p.12; A5-2-9]. In particular, the resolution cited Article 19 of the UNDRIP as evidence to claim that proceeding with pipeline construction without obtaining free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples violated the rights of Indigenous peoples. The resolution further cited the Save the Fraser Declaration which establishes the grounds of opposition of Indigenous nations in the Fraser River watershed towards any tar sands projects that would compromise the integrity of the watershed.

Having passed the resolution, the Unitarian Church of Vancouver published a public letter of opposition [A5-2-10]. Despite the activist leanings of Unitarians, the letter spoke of the unprecedented nature for the entire congregation to express opposition to public policy decisions. The opposition was
justified because the issues were of “deep ethical concern” that it was in their conscience to formally speak out. The consistency in Unitarian activism emphasizes the crux of a rights-based approach in Unitarian beliefs. Despite broad acceptance of different creeds and teachings, the unity around the seven principles, when deemed violated by the majority in congregation, provided sufficient justification for action.
4.3  Exploration of the networks of resistance

While the typologies of REOs sought to conceptualize and empirically demonstrate potential contributions of religious actors in religious environmental movements, the extent of message alignment as a function of their relationship with the wider resistance remained under-explored. Similar to other religious-based movements on climate change (Ellingson, 2016; Nita, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012), this study finds that there is a more complicated relationship between REOs and their affiliated national religious bodies and with other non-religious movement actors in collaboration and spillover memberships.

An exploratory, qualitative mapping exercise was conducted to locate actors in the network of resistance (Ellingson et al., 2012). Social movement networks consist of “informal interactions, between a plurality of individuals, groups or associations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity” (Diani, 1992, p. 13). Underlying these interactions among REOs and movement actors is a preliminary assessment of their range of relationships and activities (Ellingson et al., 2012), such as in information sharing, event participation, and collaboration (Bodin & Crona, 2009; Ellingson et al., 2012). While the data is limited to suggest the extent of tie strength, the data does offer a basis to conceptualize networks that may underlie framing strategies and alignments among actors on climate change messaging. Illustrating this basis provides further evidence of movement building in the religious environmental movement as part of the wider web of resistance.

This exploration of the networks of resistance adopts the point of view of REOs (Figure 4.1). Networks in the religious environmental movement consist of relationships among REOs and between REOs and affiliated national religious bodies. Within the religious environmental movement, REOs connected with other REOs primarily through event collaborations and overlapping memberships. Depending on the REO, some REOs found themselves moderately tied to affiliated religious national bodies. REOs were observed to have interacted and collaborated to various extent with Indigenous groups, grassroots groups, and environmental groups. Although this exercise was based on one set of perspectives, this exploration lays the groundwork for future research on the extent that social networks of
the religious environmental movement and other actors in the resistance may have impacted climate change messaging of REOs.

**Figure 4.1** Overview of actor-level relationships centered on REO involvement.
4.3.1 Inter-REO network

**Figure 4.2** REO-level network marked by key events between REOs (EK = Earthkeepers; S+C = Salal + Cedar; SoJ = Streams of Justice; VQ = Vancouver Quakers; UCV = Environment Committee, Unitarian Church of Vancouver; OLGTC = Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society; F.F.F. = Fossil Free Faith).

REOs remained proximate through the form of informal working relationships (**Figure 4.2**). Proximity in this network emerged from the intricate involvement in events and mass actions. The significance of Salal + Cedar as a central actor can be traced to its role as an organizer for multiple events such as the collaboration with different REOs and other actors in orchestrating events including Ecological Stations of the Cross, Westridge Marine Terminal blockades, and April 28 Faith Call to Action. In particular, the call out for the April 28 action was circulated across the Facebook pages of all REOs except for the Unitarian Church of Vancouver.
Identification of three clusters signify the potentially pivotal location of Salal + Cedar in corralling the ties for the religious environmental movement. First, members of Salal + Cedar had close connections with Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society, where they organized the movie screening of *This Changes Everything* [I-13; F-A2-91]. Second, Salal + Cedar had ongoing collaborations with Earthkeepers for the Ecological Stations of the Cross from 2016 to 2018 [I-2; I-6; A2-1-3]. And last, another set of close relationships were observed between overlapping memberships in between REOs or other actors. Members from Earthkeepers overlapped with membership in Salal + Cedar and Fossil Free Faith. Whereas, members of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver and Vancouver Quakers had overlapping participation with BROKE. Streams of Justice organized independently apart from the other REOs.

The network of REOs has implications for the alignment of REO messages despite differences in respective traditions. REOs are generally collaborative in information sharing and momentum building for major events of joint action (Ellingson et al., 2012). Some members of REOs have stated that collaborations were crucial to overcome resources constraints [I-13] and general lack of organizational capacity [I-5]. Underlying inter-REO collaboration however suggest that REOs with shared interests and religious environmental frames may be able to form social ties and enhance mobilization capacity under limited resources (Van Dyke & Amos, 2017). Forming social ties based on ideological and cultural congruencies are indicators for coalition formation and the alignment in messaging (Ellingson et al., 2012, p. 282; Van Dyke & Amos, 2017).
4.3.2 REOs and religious organizational affiliation

Figure 4.3 Network of REOs and local and national religious bodies defined by formal (solid line) and loose affiliations (dotted line) (ACC = Anglican Church of Canada; MCC = Mennonite Church Canada; UVC = unnamed Vancouver church; UCC = United Church of Canada; F&CG = Faith and the Common Good; SSC = Spirited Social Change; CUC = Canadian Unitarian Council; CFSC = Canadian Friends Service Committee; RWCP = Roman Catholic Women Priests Canada; CWM = Catholic Workers Movement).

The relationship between REOs and their affiliated national religious bodies provided a closer examination of the interactions that shaped climate change messaging of REOs (Figure 4.3). Solid lines represent direct and explicitly mentioned affiliations with religious bodies. Dotted lines represent implicit affiliations based on individual associations with religious bodies. An exception to the denomination-based national religious body was KAIROS Canada, a Christian ecumenical organization with regional
Members from Streams of Justice, Vancouver Quakers, and Unitarian Church of Vancouver were individually associated with the KAIROS BC-Yukon Network Gathering [I-5; I-7; I-10; I-11]. Their intersections with the KAIROS network may have facilitated further information sharing across REOs and other represented national religious bodies.

Although the Vancouver Quakers and Unitarian Church of Vancouver were local chapters of larger national bodies, only the Canadian Friends Service Committee had issued a statement of support on the ground. While the Canadian Unitarian Council had released news updates of opposition to the pipeline, they have yet to release any formal statements.

The relationship between Salal + Cedar and the Diocese of Westminster and the Anglican Church of Canada was nuanced [I-5; I-6]. Members of Salal + Cedar noted that statements or actions of individuals affiliated with the Anglican Church were only indicative of the person and not representative of the views of the whole Church or local Diocese. Granting freedom to how one chose to identify oneself in carrying about politically and legally risky actions thereby relinquished responsibility of the church in the event of wrongdoing. However, this distinction also meant that individual actions by way of religious organizational affiliation carried limited weight in the spectrum of views at the Anglican Church or Diocese level. To complicate matters, issues of race and institutional endowment have inhibited Salal + Cedar’s efforts to constructively criticize institutional responses to climate change [I-5; I-6]. Despite these challenges, the representations of the Anglican Church of Canada and Mennonite Church Canada along with Salal + Cedar and others at Westridge Terminal in March 2018, and the legal support from the Anglican Church for members of Salal + Cedar facing SLAPP suits represented some notable instances of support from national religious bodies towards front line efforts [A2-4-21; I-5].

Streams of Justice and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society operated relatively autonomously with some exceptions. Some members of Streams of Justice expressed complications in their affiliations with a local Vancouver church. Streams of Justice was welcomed by parts of the community even though not all members of Streams of Justice considered themselves to be a part of or an
offshoot of that church [I-7; I-8; I-9]. For Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society, their affiliation with the Catholic Worker Movement and Catholic Romanpriests of Canada were rather loose given how the Society and these organizations were offshoots of independent Catholicism. These affiliations had a neutral effect in influencing their messaging and strategy.

Actions of REOs that were deemed overtly political may entail legal ramifications for organizational operations and potentially their affiliated religious bodies. Legal ramifications were expressed in two instances. The first instance was concerned with the relationship between Salal + Cedar and the Anglican Church in the provision of legal support for overtly political actions [I-5; I-6]. The second instance was concerning charitable statuses of the REO. The Vancouver Quaker community and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society expressed concerns over the risk of taking political positions that ran counter to government oppositions, possibly impacting their charitable statuses [I-10; I-13]. As Janice noted:

[The Vancouver Quakers] had come out in support in various political things, but we [were] also a charitable organization…it’s not so bad right now but at various times in the last five to ten years, there’s been a crackdown, like when the Conservatives were last in power . . . auditing and harassing charitable groups that were involved in political group[s]. [I-10]

Where REOs stood politically on their positions and engagement could have repercussions to the groups’ longevity and freedom, pointing to the politically contested nature of REOs in their political positions and organizational sustainability. Implications of potential repercussions contrasted with the outpouring of support from the general membership of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver for front line actions of the Environment Committee [I-11].
4.3.3 REOs and other actors

REOs were embedded among the network of Indigenous, grassroots, and environmental groups in the resistance (Figure 4.4). Solid lines represent direct interactions (e.g. event collaboration and front-line support) between REOs and other actors. Dotted lines represent sporadic connections.

**Figure 4.4** Movement-level network of REOs and other resistance actors (JT Brigade = Justin Trudeau Brigade; BROKE = Burnaby Residents Opposing Kinder Morgan).
REOs and Indigenous groups

Converging on messaging towards Indigenous reconciliation, REOs collaborated with Indigenous groups in two notable instances. The organization of the Faith Call to Action provided a clear example of the intersection between Indigenous groups and Salal + Cedar in opposing the project. As one of the main organizers of the Faith Call to Action in April 2018, Salal + Cedar situated the action weeks prior to the various waves of direct action and civil disobedience on Burnaby Mountain (Protect the Inlet, 2018a, 2018b, 2018d, and 2018e). Alex explained the organic nature of the organizational effort. Recalling the efforts to elicit a faith-based response, the conversation started with one of the leaders of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation. From then on, the conversation carried onwards with a leader of an environmental group who suggested to Alex that there could be a specific day of response dedicated for people of faith, calling for unity among people of religious identification to express their support for the shared concerns of local Indigenous nations. With connection to an organizer for Protect the Inlet, Alex recalled a phone conversation that the message had to be targeted towards reconciliation and the grounds of free, prior, and informed consent such that the message would resonate with people of faith [I-5]. This conversation subsequently materialized into a published statement titled Dear Religious Leaders on the Facebook page of Salal + Cedar. This statement by Will George of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation emphasized the urgency in stopping Kinder Morgan and its threats to Coast Salish lands, waters, culture, and spirit. Responding to these threats, George urged people of faith to take bold action against Kinder Morgan on April 28 by standing with Coast Salish peoples as they assert their traditions and practices on their territory, for the sake of “reconciliation and decolonization” [A2-5-20]. Documentation and choreographing by Protect the Inlet of the day’s events [I-5; I-8; I-9] (Protect the Inlet, 2018a; 2018b) further revealed the events in faith-based actions in building momentum for the wider resistance. Similarly, Salal + Cedar received support from members of the Watch House to engage in autonomous action in May 2018 [I-5].

REOs also provided support to front line Indigenous groups. REOs hosted fundraisers for legal costs to support Indigenous efforts [I-2; I-6; I-8; I-9] and offered material support to Camp Cloud and the
Watch House [I-5; I-6; A2-1-3]. Individual members of Streams of Justice and Fossil Free Faith had volunteered at the Watch House [I-2; I-6; and I-8; I-9; A3-1-27].

**REOs and grassroots and environmental groups**

Members of REOs collaborated with grassroots and environmental groups. As a disclaimer, teasing out this relationship became a challenge as the lines blurred between how REO participants viewed themselves as representing REOs or in their involvement with various groups. Nevertheless, a number of particular connections were observed. Members of Vancouver Quakers and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver identified themselves in the actions of Burnaby Residents Opposing Kinder Morgan (BROKE) rather than speaking of the action as from their Quaker and Unitarian communities [I-10; I-11]. BROKE consists of a coalition of local residents and concerned citizens who live adjacent to the Kinder Morgan tank farm. While their REO affiliations did not come front and center, these layers of identities may suggest that their religious tradition was secondary to their engagement through a non-religious organization.

Several collaborations between REOs and other movement actors engaging in front-line actions were noted. Members from Salal + Cedar and the Environment Committee of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver collaborated with the Justin Trudeau Brigade in the ongoing blockades at Westridge Marine Terminal from November 2017 to March 2018 [I-5; I-6; I-11; A2-1-3]. Members of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver further participated on the front lines of the protests in 2014 and collaborated with Caretakers of the Mountain in organizing public demonstrations [I-11]. Similarly, members Salal + Cedar organized regular visits to Camp Cloud [I-5; I-6].

Environmental groups, as a major backbone in the resistance (Hoberg, 2016), served to broker relationships, provide resources support, and facilitate action of different movement actors. Several particular instances of coordination between REOs and environmental groups were observed. The foremost interaction was the pivotal role of the unnamed leader of the environmental group in establishing contact with Alex to initiate the organization of the Faith Call to Action. Alex’s recall of the
question from that environmental group leader in early 2018 after the erection of the Watch House illustrated the initial spontaneity of the organizational effort: “wouldn’t it be great to get a bunch of clergy people up for an action at the Watch House?” [A1-5]. Aside from the Faith Day of Action, Greenpeace and 350.org specifically provided facilitation such as the spiritually rooted direct action training in 2016 and coordination support for the wave of actions including the Westridge Marine Terminal blockade from November 2017 to March 2018 [A7-1-1; F-A7-27]. These specific instances, along with general participation of REOs in Climate Convergence rallies [A1; A2; A4; A5; A7], speak to significant interdependence of REOs with the background mobilization efforts of environmental groups.

4.4 Discussion

The formation of a distinct, nascent religious environmental movement and its interactions with the wider web of resistance shaped climate change messages of REOs. In particular, the lengths of political engagement in shaping climate messaging suggest more granular relationships within networks of REOs and other actors. To highlight the significance of the formation religious environmental movements within Indigenous-led climate movements in the Canadian context, three areas are examined in view of the literature (Ellingson, 2016; Ellingson et al., 2012; Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018; Nita, 2016). These areas are the formation of the religious environmental movement, spillover of activity into the wider resistance, and opportunity to locally resonate REO messaging amid the marginal presence of national religious bodies.

The first area is the formation of an evolving, collective climate change messaging strategy of REOs which is distinct from the wider resistance. Where and how REOs situated themselves not only defined their stakes in climate movements, but also pointed at their capacities to adopt religious environmental framings into the politics of resistance. Similar to REOs with similar framing strategies (Ellingson et al., 2012), the convergence of a deep sense of historical and ongoing injustices and the need to emphasize the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous communities to pipeline opposition formed the core of spiritual, moral, and legal claims of REOs to justify various courses of action. Based
on the chronology of major events, REO actions steadily gained momentum from 2012 to 2018, with spikes of protests and arrests between 2014 and 2018. With increasing inter-REO collaboration and connections, signs of religious environmental movement formation between 2014 to 2018 occurred as REOs collaborated on events. What started out as individual niches of REO members in responding to the resistance evolved eventually into a network of coordinated religious responses within the wider resistance. The heightened messaging and actions during the months of March, April, and May 2018 by the Kinder Morgan tank farm in Burnaby not only represents a set of coordinated actions to sustain momentum of the resistance, but also was the result of the social ties, behind-the-scenes discussions, and collaborations with Indigenous, environmental, and grassroots groups. What demarcates the formation of a religious environmental movement is also the rationales for different courses of action. While REOs engaged in similar tactics ranging from education to civil disobedience as other movement actors, the meanings and motivations of REOs to engage in such actions are fundamentally distinct. To that end, the alignment between the messaging and action, and typology of REOs roles build the case for a small and nascent religious environmental movement (Ellingson, 2016; H. Johnston, 2005). Additionally, the chronology and networks of the resistance demonstrate that this formation has to be understood within critical moments for political opportunities and ongoing resource mobilization and strategies of Indigenous and environmental groups. Extrapolating from this case, these developments indicate the movement-building and the decisions that underlie role formation as a contributing factor in movement-building in religious environmental movements. Clarifying where religious actors are situated in view of the larger movement provides the space to evaluate the multiple roles and levels that permeate in shaping religious-based climate change messaging (Witt, 2017).

The second area is the activism among REO members that spills over into other REOs and non-REO groups to achieve similar goals of messaging. This finding validates earlier observations of the emerging faith-based mobilization as outsiders of traditional environmental advocacy initiatives among national religious bodies (Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018). Specifically, the findings suggest that some members of REOs engage in various forms of religious environmental activism that extend beyond their
REOs. Individual and structural considerations in decision-making emerged in explaining the motivations behind REO engagements. Even though REOs were generally in support of the broader commitments of the resistance, individual members of REOs, such as David and Howard, engaged in actions with other REOs with similar messaging strategies which underscored different pathways to pursue goals. Similarly, the additional layer of politics with national religious bodies adds complexity to these processes. Recognizing the limits and weaknesses of national religious bodies, individual members of REOs negotiated and positioned themselves in support of local struggles of Indigenous peoples. REO had to carefully tread and test the limits of religious activism, to the extent that individual members shouldered the responsibility upon themselves to engage more directly in the resistance, often at personal and legal costs.

REO members serving in roles beyond REOs could suggest other forms of spill overs in messaging. To achieve their aims, some members of REOs may choose to participate in secular environmental groups to find community yet hold onto their religious identities (Nita, 2016). The findings build on this insight in that REO members adopted intersectional identities between the religious and secular spheres of activism. In their interviews, REO members such as Janice and Peter did not explicitly delineate differences in their identities and work in Vancouver Quakers and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver and their roles in BROKE. This involvement could be partially explained by the rise of liberal traditions and dissolution of religious and secular spheres (Williams, 2008). It could also suggest that REO members find complementarity of their REOs to coalesce with like-minded activists to strike claims on pipeline opposition, as seen in the coalition in the Justin Trudeau Brigade. Individual religious identity and motivation in participating in non-REO groups are not as easily dissectible as they may appear to be.

These outlying cases serve as reminders of the significance of role perspectives (H. Johnston, 2005, p. 248) in assessing the motivations and identities of REO members. Overlapping memberships in religious and secular settings raise further questions regarding the extent religious identities and motivations are contested in the secular spaces of climate change activism (Nita, 2016).
The third area considers the tensions and opportunities between REOs and their affiliated national religious bodies in shaping climate change messaging. Some REOs were embedded in the logics of their tradition and decisions made by national religious bodies (Ellingson, 2016). Indeed, REOs received some institutional support in the form of denominational statements and even legal and front line support that provide the spiritual and moral legitimacy for political action. Published statements such as that of the Canadian Friends Service Committee served as one indicator that justified direct action of Quakers. Similarly, the Westridge Marine Terminal blockade on April 20 2018 by representatives and members from Anglican Church of Canada, United Church of Canada, Mennonite Church Canada, and Salal + Cedar (Protect the Inlet, 2018a; 2018b) represented notable instances of national and local collaborations. However, REOs also meticulously engaged in local involvements that went beyond national religious initiatives and leadership (Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018) to amplify localized messages linking between climate change, justice, and Indigenous reconciliation. Such critical instances of political engagement of REOs suggest that local religious actors may play a critical role in contextualizing religious institutional positions into concrete action.

The under-explored individual-level decision-making in the REOs has shown to be critical in materializing certain forms of actions. REOs such as Salal + Cedar were able to negotiate the fine lines of independent actions that could go further than the position of the national religious bodies. Furthermore, standing in solidarity with Indigenous peoples became interpreted by REO members as symbolic and tangible action that embodied personal and religious connotations for religious actors to engage in place-based energy infrastructure resistance. Delineating the politics between national religious bodies and REOs and its (or lack thereof) influence on REOs messaging and subsequent actions inform the broader sets of opportunities and constraints that shape messaging and actions of REOs.

Bracketing the three sets of relationships clarifies how REOs construct climate change messaging strategies of the nascent religious environmental movement within the wider web of resistance. Adopting this view suggests the inseparability of the localization of framing strategies of REOs alongside framing strategies of other actors. The alignment in the various lengths of actions and different degrees of risks
spoke to how REOs embodied their messaging in the window of political opportunities. Establishing the case for existence of this particular emergence of the religious environmental movement is further supported by the findings established in Chapter 3, where critical self-reflexivity of religious settlers fuels the collective organization and personalization of actions. In her examination of decolonization processes among non-Indigenous Australians in Australia, settler scholar Clare Land (2015, p. 200) claims that settlers conducting critical self-reflexivity and committing to public political action should be informed by a decolonizing ethic of attentiveness to place and local struggles. This process involves self-interrogation, cognizing the workings of race and privilege, and calling religious settlers to reflect on and respond to calls of action and solidarity on shared, Indigenous lands (Heinrichs, 2018; Land, 2015; Regan, 2010). Taking these views into consideration in support of Indigenous rights, individual members of REOs may find themselves aligning with framing strategies, tactics, and other actors in the resistance, even if religious identities are not always explicit in such actions. Moreover, even though REOs adopt similar tactics in the resistance, actions of REO members held considerable meaning and brought to light questions of power and privilege in Indigenous spaces. Broadening out, this case study has shown that REOs as the actors in the religious environmental movement may cross-fertilize their activism and network building in the wider environmental politics and resistances. These nuances while subtle, points to calls to further unravel the complex, messy, and contentious spaces underlying multi-group collaborations in climate movements.

This chapter has argued for the formation of the nascent religious environmental movement within Indigenous-led climate change movements. The chronology, typologies of religious actors, and networks of resistance suggest a distinguishable formation of religiously motivated actors. However, its formation has to be viewed in light of its interdependence with the dynamics of the wider movement. Empirically, this chapter establishes the length, modes, and networks of political engagement of REOs in the resistance.
Locating the positions of REOs in the extent of resistance illustrates the social context of REOs as they navigate the factors, opportunities, and challenges in tailoring climate change messaging. Chapter 5 will examine these issues.
Chapter 5: Tailoring climate change messages to religious audiences

This chapter examines the factors that REOs as messengers consider in tailoring their messaging. Messengers act as conduits, translators and bridge-builders, serving as an intermediary in representing the values of the audiences, translating climate science materials into religious languages (Callison, 2014; Laudrum et al., 2017; Wilkinson, 2012), and facilitating access of messages to religious communities (Callison, 2014; Kahan, 2010, p. 297; Marshall, 2016). This chapter argues that REOs tailored climate change messaging within the broader discourse of responsibilities of religious communities to reconciliation. However, REOs encountered structural and value conflicts which impeded their efforts to penetrate messaging to religious audiences. This chapter calls for greater attention to the salient factors, opportunities, and challenges that underlie audience-centric messaging approaches to religious audiences.

This chapter is structured in five sections. 5.1 describes how REOs locate their audiences. 5.2 examines gatekeeping as an opportunity despite limitations. 5.3 demonstrates the three styles that REOs used to deliver messages. 5.4 explores the extent REOs use social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter as an extension of their messaging strategy. 5.5 provides a brief discussion. This chapter draws heavily upon the experiences of REOs, namely Earthkeepers, Salal + Cedar, Streams of Justice, Unitarian Church of Vancouver, and Fossil Free Faith. These REOs either explicitly mentioned a target audience, or devoted significant time and effort to some extent towards climate change communication.

Tailoring their messaging opens up questions about how REO messaging strategies are negotiated in message delivery across heterogeneous audiences within religious communities (Bostrom et al., 2013). Opportunities and challenges were based on the experiences REOs have had in their interaction with religious audiences, including their encounters with climate skeptical voices (Table 5.1).
Table 5.1 Summary of opportunities, strategies, and challenges in tailoring messages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rely on or substitute gatekeepers</td>
<td>• Balance different content, e.g. climate science, religious significance, and response</td>
<td>• Skeptical voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish currency of messaging with pre-existing concerns</td>
<td>• Vary “soft” and “hard” messages to entice audiences on different ends of the political spectrum</td>
<td>• Power dynamics with religious institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foster long-term relationships with gatekeepers and audiences</td>
<td>• Storytelling</td>
<td>• Competing priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sensitivity to political and cultural considerations</td>
<td>• Tapping into emotions, e.g. unity and hope</td>
<td>• Gatekeepers and inclusivity of voices that deviate from climate consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Locating religious audiences

Locating the religious audience proved to be one of the foremost considerations of REOs in tailoring climate change messaging. Framing climate change as a scientific, political, and ethical problem in messaging raised issues surrounding audience composition, political sensitivity, and attention to cultural context.

5.1.1 Segmentation

The primary issue REOs considered in communicating climate change was determining their audience [A1, A2, A3, A5, A7]. Problematizing who the “religious audience” is significant because it opens up the particular concerns and assumptions specific to each audience segment, whether they be skeptical, indifferent, agnostic, or concerned on climate change (Hine et al., 2014). By connecting with audiences on their terms, grasping the vocabularies and values in their frames of understanding, and engaging in a dialogue rather than contend as adversaries (Bloomfield, 2019, p. 12; Dixon et al., 2017), REOs may enhance the significance and receptiveness of the climate change message. Diagnosing the audience.
means identifying audiences that are more difficult to communicate on climate change, including ambivalent audiences.

REOs adopted segmentation to identify their audiences (Hine et al., 2014). Some REOs learned where their audiences were located by relying on prior knowledge of where they stood in climate change beliefs. First, the need for segmentation could begin by detecting the gaps in audience reach. Daniel stated that Earthkeepers filled in a notable gap in addressing Christians, particularly evangelical audiences in Metro Vancouver. Striving to link climate change action as a sign of faithful witness, Daniel stated:

No one has talked with the Christians. You know there’s David Suzuki, there’s the Wilderness Committee, there’s 350.org, there’s Greenpeace, everybody is talking about that to everybody but no one is talking to the Christians. Christians seem to be off in their own little world worrying about other issues. And we are saying no, our mandate is to Christians. Wake these guys up. [I-1]

Daniel’s observation raises an important point about niche audiences. While mainline Christians by and large were aware and believed in human-caused climate change (Taylor et al., 2016), Daniel assumed the evangelical Christians in Canada, similar to evangelicals in the United States (Hoffman, 2011; Wilkinson, 2012; Veldman, 2019) may be equally as skeptical of climate change. Targeting this specific niche, the formation of Earthkeepers and other REOs can be viewed as responses that attempt to connect religious identity to climate mitigation and adaptation. Second, other REOs segmented their audiences by distinguishing general and interested congregants in their extent of participation in REO-organized events and actions [A2; A3; A5]. And last, REOs segmented audiences by tapping trusted leaders or gatekeepers who have direct knowledge, understanding, and access to religious audiences (see 5.2) [I-1; I-5; I-8; I-9]. However, segmentation techniques were contingent on the social distance between REOs and intended religious audiences [I-3; I-8; I-11]. How messengers foster and reciprocate trust with the audience is a major consideration.
5.1.2 Political sensitivity

Political sensitivity of climate change emerged as a defining issue [I-5; I-6; I-11]. The ideological orientation of the audience can shape how messages are received (Haidt, 2012; Wilkinson, 2012). Sometimes the dominant issue was not climate change itself but rather the more tangible issues that related to the priorities of the audience. This aspect of tangibility was prominent for Salal + Cedar. Salal + Cedar had been working on the intersection of Indigenous issues as a matter of addressing environmental justice in the New Westminster Diocese. Since Indigenous reconciliation is a priority for the Anglican Church of Canada (2015), Salal + Cedar’s messaging strategy foregrounded Indigenous reconciliation and the threat of climate change as their motivations for their involvement [I-5; I-6]. However, there was a limit to linking the message of Indigenous reconciliation and climate change. Messages that were perceived to challenge power in the institutional church were politically unwelcoming made it difficult for members of Salal + Cedar to proceed further into the conversation [I-5; I-6].

5.1.3 Cultural context

The potentially charged nature of climate change encouraged REOs to gauge the sensitivity of the socio-cultural context of messaging. A finer distinction in the perception of religious audiences could be made between the knowledge of climate change and the general receptibility of climate change as a tangible threat. In the cultural context of Vancouver, some REOs noted that religious audiences were aware of climate change, given the proximity to outdoors [I-2; I-4; I-10; I-11]. As Karen of Earthkeepers pointed out, “. . . more folks in this part of the world get it. They get that climate change is a thing. . . so it hasn’t been as rocky as battle as some places in the States or in Canada too.” [I-2]. Compared to people in other places which were generally perceived as less concerned about climate change, David also alluded to the cultural influence of Vancouver and potentially the Pacific Northwest as one of the ways people were already accustomed to climate change [I-4]. While this perception of heightened environmental awareness was generally acknowledged in environmental attitudes of inhabitants of the Pacific Northwest (Tindall &
Robinson, 2017), Alex from Salal + Cedar hinted at how Vancouver is simultaneously an active economic hub for extractive industries in Canada (Bennett, 2019): “Vancouver is a wealthy city. A lot of the wealth from Canada is around resource extraction. There’s lots of people whose income and livelihood and identity [are] related to those industries” [I-5]. Perceiving messages as threats to livelihoods and identities and their inextricable links to the natural resources sector, this juxtaposition presents the contradicting realities of Vancouver as a climate friendly yet extraction-oriented activity hub. Raising the profile of climate change, as well as implications for justice among religious communities, could potentially raise more conflict and division than unity [I-5]. To complicate matters, members of Salal + Cedar attributed the general norm of politeness in the Anglican Church which obscured deeper issues between climate and livelihoods from being seen. The culture of tolerance, while open to diverse opinions, also polarized the Anglican Church when it came to introducing more radical tactics such as fossil fuel divestment [I-5; I-6].

Segmenting audiences entails not only problematizing the audience but goes further to point out the array of social, political, economic, and cultural dimensions that underlie how religious audiences perceive climate change messaging. To that end, the experiences that REOs endure suggest that audiences are heterogeneous. Considerations such as their job sectors, ideologies, and situated knowledges permeated the spaces and politics of religious communities for climate change communication. In tailoring messaging, how REOs built bridges across vastly different characteristics of religious audiences, while also navigating social sensitivities and political polarization can become a delicate balancing act.

5.2 Engaging gatekeepers as opportunity and constraint

Gatekeepers17 generally refer to figures that have leverage over the message and people to a particular community (Erzikova, 2018; Illingworth et al., 2018). Among religious communities, these could include teachers, rabbis, priests, and pastors (Illingworth et al., 2018). However, not all communities welcome

17 It is important to note that gatekeepers can also act as messengers because they can also be in positions of trust or leadership (e.g. religious leader who can act to keep out climate skeptical information, while delivering a pro-climate message). For the purposes of this section it is necessary to keep these two terms analytically separate.
outside messengers as entry depends on their purpose and identification. As such, it is the responsibility of the gatekeeper to either maintain distance or frame issues that directly relate to community concerns. By filtering the types of messages and messengers, gatekeepers play a pivotal role in allowing what messengers and which messages can influence their communities.

REO members mentioned numerous opportunities to engage gatekeepers. For instance, Earthkeepers engaged gatekeepers by maintaining contact with receptive church pastors from congregations of various sizes. Doing so enabled Earthkeepers to test out the reception of their message to different congregations [I-2; I-4]. Similarly, Salal + Cedar raised the importance of fostering ongoing relationships with pastoral teams at local Anglican parishes [I-5]. For ministers who were unfamiliar with REOs, they may be at first skeptical of the kinds of messages REOs may deliver to congregations. Salal + Cedar’s invitation pamphlet to Anglican parishes highlighted their proactiveness to contextualize expressions of worship and congregant’s understanding of ecology and spirituality based on the needs of gatekeepers:

Depending on your community, [environmentally contextualized liturgy] can be as unobtrusive as the introduction of new prayers or as wild as trees in the sanctuary, a blessing of animals, a procession of bicycles, chickens at Sunday School, a public ecological lament, and a creek-side baptism in the rain. [A2-2-10]

Integrating spirituality into biodiversity conservation, livelihoods, and climate justice in the bio-region frame, the pamphlet served as a gateway to acquaint gatekeepers to the spectrum of topics that can be appropriately modified to community members. The specifics of the message content then would be discussed with and approved by gatekeepers beforehand [I-5]. To that end, Alex stressed the priority of building trust and credibility with gatekeepers. Yet, part of this gradual process also entailed performing religious duties and working alongside the pastoral team before easing congregations to spiritually-driven responses to climate change [I-5]. Instead of focusing solely on the message content, gatekeepers represent an important ally in calibrating the appropriateness of climate change messages in view of the socio-cultural dynamics of religious communities.
However, engaging gatekeepers may be less effective in reducing the distance between REOs and religious audiences than initially thought. Given their need to respect the diverse views of community members, gatekeepers may forego potentially polarizing topics, resulting in trade-offs in content and length. Jerry from Streams of Justice in working alongside their affiliated church, remarked how the pastors tried to remain very inclusive of all members of the congregation:

I know that [inclusivity is] something that pastors have been really concerned about. Rightly so, trying not to alienate people. . . . [yet] my perception is that anytime that in a sermon there is a reference to climate change as a center, they do also get pretty consistent, negative pushback against it from [a particular member] of the congregation. [I-8]

Gatekeepers may have a wider set of considerations, including negotiating the politics within religious communities, which can influence the priority of the climate change message.

Even when gatekeepers are in the position to deliver messages on climate change before the congregation, they may find it difficult to dive into its extent of consequences and implications. This situation resonated especially in the Unitarian Church of Vancouver. Even though the Unitarian Church minister has delivered sermons specifically addressing climate change, Peter from the Environment Committee expressed his dissatisfaction with the minister’s sermons in that the sermons did not reveal the full implications of climate change:

It’s not the full horror of the actual situation. And for a good reason. He’s very much hope oriented. That’s fine. I’m just a little frustrated there’s not more digging deep into it and dealing with the negative emotions. Because they are there. I’d figure we better find ways to deal with them. [I-11]

Peter not only alluded to the challenges religious leaders faced in dialing back alarmist sentiments of climate change, but his dissatisfaction revealed the disjuncture that REOs may feel in pushing climate change on the agenda, only to find that it falls short of expectations.Acknowledging this tension points towards the importance of who controls and deliver the message of climate change. Under such circumstances, other trusted figures could potentially bypass gatekeepers. During the extensive
involvement of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver and its Environment Committee, Peter delivered a sermon in 2018 on the importance of engaging in direct action for climate change. One theme of the sermon was his reiteration of moral obligations towards not only to the wider circle of life in the Salish Sea, but it also encompassed intergenerational obligations to act and prevent the collapse of civilization in his son’s lifetime [A5-2-11; I-11]. Peter’s substitution of the gatekeeper presented an alternative approach that similarly conveyed the message.

5.3 Styles of messaging

Another major component of tailoring the messaging is deciding on the style of message delivery. Strategizing the message entails catering messages to the considerations and values of the audience (Cox, 2013; Hine et al., 2016). REOs engaged in three styles of messaging, notably balance, variance, and storytelling.

5.3.1 Balance

Earthkeepers primarily adopted the tactic of balancing different content in the messaging. Balancing content included presenting the scientific background on climate change, highlighting the victims from climate change impacts, explaining the significance of these issues in relation to their faith, and promoting responses according to the principles and teachings of the Bible [I-1]. The website and social media channels of Earthkeepers demonstrated the use of different channels to advance this style of messaging. In a reflection on the motivations of Earthkeepers’ participation in the Faith Day of Action, it wrote:

[The event] was an opportunity to reach out in solidarity to our Aboriginal neighbors who have lived in these lands before us and who are fighting to protect these traditional territories and their way of life. It was a tangible witness to the hope for another type of an economy that is kinder and respectful of God’s creation and inclusive for all, and a call to stand for climate justice. It was
an opportunity for us to live out our biblical calling to care and steward for the earth as Earthkeepers. [A1-1-14]

Providing the rationale for engaging in the Faith Day of Action contrasted with more informational types of messaging on Facebook, such as this post in 2017 where they attributed the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey to climate change: “Hurricane Harvey has dumped more than 50 inches of rain on Texas. Many people are talking . . . about whether this storm is related to climate change — here’s an excellent guide to how to have that conversation” [F-A1-58]. Balancing the messaging strived to provide a mixture of scientific content and ethical guidance for audiences to comprehend the enormity of climate change.

5.3.2 Variance

Varying the message means that the communicator would highlight differences, contrasts, or the spectrum to demonstrate the width of responses applicable to climate mitigation and adaptation. Salal + Cedar engaged in what Alex distinguished as “soft” and the “hard” styles of Christian-based climate messaging. The “soft” style was viewed as creation care. This style extended a dominion model of trusteeship that falls in line with the stewardship frame [I-5]. In this style, Alex would explore creation symbols throughout the Bible to reinforce the mandate to care for creation [I-5]. In contrast, the “hard” style to environmental justice emphasized the justice frame. In particular for Salal + Cedar, this style relied on the Anglican school of incarnational theology that reinforced the rootedness of one’s place and connecting that to scripture. More concretely, this theology focused on the incarnation of the follower as the embodiment of the divine in the mundane world [I-5]. In unveiling the centrality of the incarnation as the fulfillment of the covenant between God, humans and the rest of creation, incarnational theology establishes the basis for Christians to participate in God’s ongoing activity of redemption and renewal on earth (Kirkpatrick, 2009). This call for relationship into the world thus provided a tangible pathway for Salal + Cedar to connect the Anglican community to embody their beliefs through political action.

Considered in this view, “soft” and “hard” styles of messaging in actions prompted responses that can
range from “lobbying, or gardening . . . habitat restoration, [and] also paddling kayaks out to stop tankers” [I-5]. This style of messaging remained consistent on other platforms. On the website, Salal + Cedar acknowledged watershed discipleship as the inseparability of the spiritual dimensions in their interactions with the biophysical world. Believers can “[feel] most connected to God in ocean, forest, river and field and on global climate change, while also connecting racial, economic and environmental justice in their faith work” [A2-1-14]. Salal + Cedar regularly posted throughout their page their conservation efforts [F-A2-91], weekly eucharist services [F-A2-80], and activist work, including reporting from the front lines [F-A2-68]. By blending in direct but potentially contentious forms of engagement such as activism with more conventional and amenable forms of engagement such as environmental education, Salal + Cedar offered a suite of options for Anglicans to choose from [I-5; I-6]. In this manner, this messaging style offered a suite of entry points for religious audiences of all stripes, depending on their exposure, knowledge, and background to engage in some form of concrete climate action.

5.3.3 Storytelling

Storytelling drew on affective approaches to forge links between oneself and people around them to inspire climate action (Arnold, 2018). Drawing upon the climate change communication training to religious audiences, Brenda noted the strength of this style to situate the audience to work towards a collective goal: “the story of me, us, and now. . . It’s used politically and also in grassroots organizing. . . You start out with, who am I? What’s my story? And how are you part of it? And what is the story of now? What do we do?” [I-15]. Targeting audiences from multiple faiths and with diverse backgrounds, storytelling as an approach also suggested creative ways for members of Fossil Free Faith through the Faithful Voices Speakers Bureau to curate and work with community partners to tailor this style of messaging [A7-1-6]. Rather than focusing simply on getting the right words together, this technique heightens the attention of the audience, before incorporating religious concepts such as stewardship and justice to reinforce that story and the appropriate lengths of actions. Storytelling introduced a gambit of
ways to experience the power of narratives to guide communal religious responses (Arnold, 2018; Bloomfield, 2019, p. 6; Fair, 2018; Marshall, 2016).

Aside from presenting a balanced messaging, members of Earthkeepers also opted for elements of storytelling to specify dimensions of climate justice that intersected with the Biblical narrative. Howard and David highlighted the importance of weaving the story of the Biblical narrative into the present-day context [I-3; I-4]. Howard expressed this technique by evoking scriptural and historical images and stories of the Israelites and of Jesus and the apostles and interpreted them in light of modern-day parallels [I-3]. As such, Earthkeepers was able to historically situate these stories to demonstrate the continuity of the ideological roots and sources of the extractivist, colonialist, capitalist narrative [I-3].

In storytelling, some REOs further incorporated affective messaging to trigger more visceral responses from religious audiences [A1, A2; A7]. Incorporating the use of emotions can enhance the intensity and emphasis during message delivery (Nabi et al., 2018). Members of Earthkeepers displayed strategies to provoke emotional responses by showing images of people affected by climate change such that they stir up guilt and counteract that feeling with hope [I-2; I-4]. As David stated:

I think climate change is an issue that really breeds a lot of despair and out of powerlessness. . . . There’s a lot of deaths already locked in, and I think you need to show people that there are practical alternatives that are becoming more and more possible. . . . Whether it’s in renewable energy or different sort of ways of organizing our communities. [I-4]

He inscribed the mixture of despair with hope through spiritual renewal for both themselves in relation to God, and also with the entirety of the world: “I think hope is, that’s what we as Christians, that’s what we ascend to. We ultimately believe that God will renew all things, and that same spirit who will renew all things, is alive now” [I-4]. David’s vision suggested that connecting this hope with the eschatological renewal and restoration of all things provided clarity and vision for an uncertain future.
5.4 Social media platforms in extending message dissemination

While social media use has been examined as an integral campaign strategy in climate movements (Hodges & Stocking, 2016; Katz-Kimchi & Manosevitch, 2015), no studies to date have explored how REOs have used social media as a platform for climate change messaging to religious audiences. This avenue is significant to explore as the plethora of climate (dis)information is rapidly available online, presenting opportunities and challenges for REOs when engaging with counter-narratives to the climate change consensus (Bloomfield & Tillery, 2019; Wilkinson, 2012). Classifying major patterns of the use of Facebook and Twitter, this section finds that some REOs modestly used these platforms as extensions of their overall messaging strategy.

5.4.1 Twitter

Table 5.2. shows the top three REO message categories and notable hashtags. Content dissemination refers to general, circulated information by REOs that were relevant to the resistance. Content dissemination and education were consistent across all three REOs. Other types of information that were circulated included events and messages on reconciliation and direct action.

REOs used an array of hashtags that aligned with frames of stewardship and justice. For instance, Earthkeepers’ use of hashtags to reinforce the frame of stewardship was similar to Fossil Free Faith’s use of faith as a way of projecting into the future. Climate justice was tied with hashtags common in the Keep It In the Ground and divestment movements. Earthkeepers actively used more hashtags compared to the other two REOs. Whereas, the Unitarian Church of Vancouver primarily posted excerpts of texts and embedded a hyperlink to the lengthier post on their website.
Table 5.2 Summary of Twitter content analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Earthkeepers</th>
<th>Unitarian Church of Vancouver</th>
<th>Fossil Free Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweet / Retweet /</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Three Categories
- Content dissemination
- Event circulation
- Education and Reflection
- Content dissemination
- Education
- Messaging
- Content dissemination
- Direct action
- Education

Notable Hashtags
- #COP23
- #climatechange
- #seasonofcreation
- #creationcare
- #StopKM
- #walkforRec
- #keepitinthe ground
- #climatejusticemonth
- #faithinourfuture
- #divestment
- #climatejustice

Twitter was used as a general means to circulate upcoming opportunities for various events.

Fossil Free Faith avidly reminded followers regarding the spiritually rooted training workshop on direct action [T-A7-34]. Whereas, Earthkeepers used Twitter to circulate upcoming events, such as the March 10 rally on Burnaby Mountain:

@CoastProtectors Local Coast Salish Elder Ta'ah Amy George invites you to stand with her and thousand of allies on Saturday to #StopKM Lake City Way Skytrain, Burnaby | 10:00am | Saturday March 10 | Join us RSVP online: https://t.co/3mxMOln0DK RSVP on Facebook.

[T-A1-89]

Earthkeepers and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver circulated their educational resources as part of their involvement in the resistance. Earthkeepers posted a range of educational materials from divestment and creation [T-A1-33; T-A1-16; T-A1-53]. On creation care, Earthkeepers tweeted “A free study guide is now out for Loren Wilkinson's "Making Peace with Creation," a film on #creationcare” [T-A1-33]. The Unitarian Church of Vancouver used Twitter as a way to announce the upcoming Earth Day service featuring a sermon on Indigenous reconciliation: “The 2018 Earth Day Service was put on by the Environment Committee today. Guest speaker Aline Laflamme gave a moving, insightful sermon titled ‘All My Relations’. She spoke of the Indigenous view of what ‘relations’…” [T-A5-75]. This message
was later followed by the announcement to further circulate materials to the congregation and wider audience [T-A5-77].

5.4.2 Facebook

Table 5.3. summarized the major content categories across all REO Facebook feeds. Earthkeepers primarily used Facebook to disseminate events, content updates, and reflections. Reflections underscored their Christian identity and commitment to personal and political actions to demonstrate concern for the earth, the poor, and future generations [F-A1-59]. Earthkeepers regularly circulated events on the resistance [F-A1-31; F-A1-33; F-A1-57]. Moreover, they organized their own events around these major events. In announcing the communion service ahead of a rally opposing Trans Mountain pipeline in September 2017, they stated “. . .we cannot passively watch as Kinder Morgan is moving ahead on construction. We will fail to bear witness to the gospel if we ignore the significant threat to life on earth caused by climate change” [F-A1-60].

Table 5.3 Summary of Facebook content analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Earthkeepers</th>
<th>Salal+Cedar</th>
<th>Streams of Justice</th>
<th>Vancouver Quakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of posts</strong></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(top 3)</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unitarian Church</strong></td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Vancouver</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection and actions</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our Lady of Guadalupe</strong></td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fossil Free Faith</strong></td>
<td>Info</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fossil Free Faith used similar messaging techniques on Facebook which were classifiable in three ways. First, their messaging focused on highlighting what and how religious traditions were greening through lifestyle changes and in institutional divestment. Echoing stewardship and justice frames, these messages included activities, events, news reports, and progress at various levels in making the link between fossil fuels and the religious tradition [F-A7-52]. Second, their messaging connected fossil fuels, climate justice, and Indigenous rights. These messages were viewed in light of the call to reconciliation, both specifically, to people of the land in Canada, as well as broadly, to people all over the world who are affected [F-A7-65]. And third, their messaging also promoted some of the developments in non-religious based organizations and groups [F-A7-54; F-A7-53]. These messages underlaid the overarching narrative of the need for and progress in global renewable energy transitions, and momentum of the global divestment movement in halting the expansion of the fossil fuel industry [e.g. F-A7-53].

The postings of Salal + Cedar, Vancouver Unitarians and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society reflected an array of front-line activity and theological reflection, demonstrating their support for the Indigenous-led resistance. Salal + Cedar provided content on a range of activities, from posting spiritual readings and reflections through a collaborative lectionary blog, to circulation of materials and events, to front line support and reporting. Active on the front line, Salal + Cedar would provide updates and support at Camp Cloud [F-A2-44; 47]:

Camp Cloud at the [Kinder Morgan] tank facility is alive and well and resistance is strong. Police have blocked the street to vehicles but supporters can walk up. More witnesses, dry wood, warm food, and capacity to charge phones all needed. [F-A2-44]

In supporting Indigenous causes, the Unitarian Church of Vancouver affirmed Indigenous rights and its violation as grounds for Unitarian action to work towards reconciliation: "As Unitarian Universalists we affirm and promote the inherent worth and dignity of each person and we recognize that when it comes to the Original People on this land, this principle has not been upheld" [F-A5-25]. As such, the Unitarian Church of Vancouver provided subsequent updates on the formation of reconciliation networks [F-A5-60], forums on decolonization and resistance [F-A5-62] and podcasts on reconciliation [F-A5-47].
Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society extended this discussion of reconciliation in how the language of reconciliation merited theological reflection. To them, reconciliation was viewed as an inclusive expression of divine love that transcended race, wealth, gender, sexuality and human-nature binaries:

The good news is the radical inclusivity of God, for God so loved the world. Not just some in the world who are white, or rich, or male or heterosexual. God loved the whole world of animals and plants and the entire ecosystem that is a victim of this same rapaciousness and nearly mindless drive for political domination. [F-A6-59]

5.4.3 Factors shaping social media use

Audience reach, technological capacity, and user socio-demographics emerged as salient factors that shaped how REO used social media for messaging. Audience reach broadly captured how social media platforms connected the messages of REO to their audiences. Technological capacity considered the capability of members of the REO in using the suite of online technologies for message mobilization. User socio-demographics factored in as an enabler or inhibitor for the extent to which REOs used social media (Correa, Hinsley, & de Zúñiga, 2010).

Although Salal + Cedar was a central actor in the religious-based involvement of the resistance, their use of social media was limited, with a moderate traffic website which provided regular updates and event information. Salal + Cedar members attributed the use of Facebook as a networking and event-sharing platform that provided sufficient capacity to reach their audience base [I-5; I-6]. While the Unitarian Church of Vancouver regularly circulated content, events, and reflections on the resistance and climate change, Peter from the Environment Committee maintained his preferences for certain channels of communication, such as monthly newsletters, flyers and emails because of his lack of familiarity with other channels. Similarly, Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society maintained its fair use of Facebook for it was accessible among an older demographic[I-14].
In contrast, Fossil Free Faith, primarily led by younger adults, proved to be more strategic in communicating their messages through a wide range of channels. The Youth Fellowship Program of Fossil Free Faith was able to disseminate their content across an array of religious-based and mainstream online media platforms such as The Discourse, Ricochet and The Jewish Independent [I-15; A7-1-6]. Despite recent and younger membership, Streams of Justice was an outlier in that members were divided over the merits of social media. While interviewees from Streams of Justice stated the importance of using social media to reach a broader demographic, they noted that other members viewed social media as secondary to investing in concrete actions to advance their causes [I-8; I-9].

REOs weighed the tradeoffs in the strengths and limitations of online and offline platforms for messaging. Acknowledging the potential of social media to reach greater numbers of people [I-2], David from Earthkeepers stated that it was also likely to reinforce in-group effects in gaining following. Facing an older demographic who preferred interpersonal means for communication, Earthkeepers and Fossil Free Faith emphasized the importance of using offline platforms such as speaker events to engage religious audiences. In their experiences, Earthkeepers found in-person communication to be most effective because it fostered personal relationships [I-4]. Similarly, Brenda from Fossil Free Faith expressed that hosting events that were outside of prayer as a plausible entry point for discussing climate change and possibilities for divestment [I-15].

Although this study has opened up the discussion for the potential of REOs in using social media to tailor climate change messaging, the above findings demonstrate there is presence, continuity and fluidity of REOs to creatively deploy social media as an extension of their overall messaging strategy. Nevertheless, further questions remain as to the extent REOs deploy the full suite of online and offline mobilizations (Earl & Kimport, 2011) for religious engagement on climate change. Such questions would require separate studies but are nevertheless timely to explore as they complement the variety of tools for wider engagement of religious audiences.
5.5 Challenges

Despite potential opportunities to tailor messaging to religious audiences, three major challenges emerged. They included the presence of marginal, skeptical voices on climate change among religious audiences, resistance met by religious institutions, and the place of climate change responses amidst competing priorities.

REO interviewees reported the presence of marginal, but vocal voices expressing skepticism towards climate change. Personal encounters of members from Earthkeepers and Streams of Justice with climate change skeptics captured moments of such engagements. For instance, David from Earthkeepers would weigh into questions that challenged climate mitigation efforts without succumbing to heated arguments. He further noted the gap between climate actions and beliefs, by entertaining questions and responding to criticisms:

People are still using [fossil fuels] to fly our planes and drive our cars, so why should we stop the pipeline? You can’t just turn off the taps just in one moment because society would fall apart.

So responding to that in a thoughtful way. [I-4]

Another instance of responding thoughtfully was the case of Streams of Justice’s at their affiliated church. Church leaders organized a forum featuring members of the congregation who spoke about their views on climate change in relation to the topic of faith and culture. Views represented those who were fully believed to being skeptical of anthropogenic climate change, and what paths to take going forward. After the forum, they dispersed into smaller groups. Jerry recognized the difficulty with engaging further with skeptical voices when there was no mutual agreement on the root cause, which left little room for further discussion:

I was in the group with the person who said, here are all my reasons this doesn’t exist, and sure, you can identify some common ground. Whether it’s enough to be shared action to be any resemblance to addressing climate change is another question. . . . no action is possible if you can’t agree on the basic idea that [climate change] is happening. [I-8]
REO respondents generally acknowledged where skeptics were coming from, even though they strongly disagree with their climate skeptical views. Such encounters of climate skepticism also pointed to a larger issue of audience demographics and the characterization of climate change. Given its explicit focus towards Christians who may be indifferent to or skeptical of climate change, Earthkeepers was the only REO that devoted space on their website to detail that there is sufficient scientific evidence to demonstrate that humans were the primary drivers of change to the climate [A1-1-2]. Whereas, other REOs including Streams of Justice often characterized climate change as the climate crisis or climate justice. Climate change was either implied, or that action was warranted based on the assumption that the science of climate change was already well-established, attributable to human causes, and required immediate action.

Related to the issue of navigating climate skepticism was the challenge of power dynamics. Coexistence of members of REOs and marginal climate skeptics in the same religious community magnified the false balance in representation of views, leading to a distorted sense of disproportionate voices for climate action and climate skepticism. This challenge resonated particularly for Streams of Justice and Salal + Cedar. Recognizing the struggle for environmental justice even in a progressive church setting, Michelle from Streams of Justice stressed that “we can’t have a conversation that accepts both [sides] as equal players … when one side that is complicit in that imbalance” [I-9] by continuing to allow climate change to exacerbate impacts to people around the world. Coming to terms with the power differential, Michelle’s point acknowledged the entanglement with inclusivity of diverse voices and disproportionate voicing of climate skepticism. Whereas in the context of the Anglican church, members from Salal + Cedar raised several major institutional challenges that hinted at more structural issues, notably that the general sentiment of the Anglican Church as a culturally polite but generally affluent space. While institutional principles, statements and responses on climate change were welcomed, both Alex and Jenny stated that national religious bodies did not go far enough into addressing the issues of power, politics, and money that were associated to indifferent views on climate action [I-5; I-6].
The last challenge has to do with competing priorities within religious communities which could stifle climate change awareness and action. This issue resonated for members of Earthkeepers. From Daniel’s assessment, support for issues among evangelical audiences were topic-specific and siloed:

A lot of people . . . have their own kind of ministry, maybe I’m focused on the youth group or I’m focused on prostitution, or I am focused on housing and homelessness . . . some people [do not see] climate change as my issue. That’s what I think is the problem . . . They’ve said, yeah, but I’ve got other things to do. [I-1]

This issue of competing priorities can be largely understood within Christian evangelical contexts where certain ministerial work is devoted towards addressing a particular need and finding solutions (Ellingson, 2016; Wilkinson, 2012). The rigidity and silo effect diverted attention to uniting religious communities to find common ground on climate change. Even when climate change was framed as an issue of justice, David from Earthkeepers acknowledged a common criticism:

There are so many justice issues, so many issues going on. What makes [climate change] special? Why should we give energy to this one [issue] over other issues, especially if you are coming from a perspective where the focus is on people and saving people. [I-4]

Binaries that compartmentalize social issues echo a common refrain from the American evangelical movement which emphasizes sharing Christian gospel (Wilkinson, 2012) at the expense of matters of works such as justice-related ministries (Lysack, 2014). Because of this binary between saving humans and the earth, members of Earthkeepers were determined to construct messaging that forged the links of climate justice as integral to witnessing the Gospel [I-1; I-2; I-4].

5.6 Discussion

The findings demonstrated the range of factors REOs weighed in tailoring climate change messaging, notably through audience segmentation, sensitization to respective contexts, and the deployment of styles of messaging. In identifying challenges, REOs sought diverse set of strategies to enhance engagement.
Four areas are discussed to assess the potentially novel and challenging aspects of tailoring climate change messaging to religious audiences.

First, how REOs calibrate climate change messaging (Galway, 2019; Scannell and Gifford, 2013) to local concerns and challenges speak to the effect of grounding and registering frames with religious audiences. The resistance served as an introduction to the urgency of climate change, becoming an entry point to unify discussion on the ongoing use of fossil fuels and violation of Indigenous rights with practices and compatibilities within the broader set of religious texts, positions, and values in religious communities. In doing so, the findings open up questions about the interlocutors and the range of issues they face in communicating climate change in specific settings. The role of places and peoples who receive the messaging may overdetermine how the messaging becomes tailored, pointing to the importance of distinguishing the extent of message targeting over tailoring, an area which has remained under-developed for religious audiences (Bostrom et al., 2013; Hine et al., 2014; Hine et al., 2016). Recognizing audience heterogeneity, REOs adopted segmentation techniques to refine more precise and tailored messaging that remained sensitive to the cultural context. Meanwhile, REOs fostered continued relationship and dialogue with religious communities. Gauging the levels of access and trust, message targeting and tailoring becomes in effect an iterative balancing process.

Second, examining REOs as messengers on climate change highlight the audience-centric approaches of REOs in tailoring the message. In identifying three different styles of messaging used by REOs, notably balance, variance, and storytelling, this study shows that delivery of message is affected by audience familiarity, issue sensitivity, and political feasibility. To get their messages across, REOs not only had to refine their messaging, but had to grapple with the relationships and power dynamics that are embedded in the setting REOs find themselves in. Compared to the balance approach, the metanarrative approach of storytelling and delineation of “soft” or “hard” approaches in variance present a spectrum of options to navigate the political acuteness in raising climate change among religious communities. Balance may provide an integrative approach that holds together the knowledge, impact, and significance of response. Following a similar logic, storytelling encapsulates climate change and major issues by
anchoring a broader narrative. By contrast, variance is mostly action-oriented, introducing personalized actions that is integrated within the suite of one’s faith. Considered together, these styles can serve as entry points that originate from what people value (Dixon et al., 2017). But more importantly, these engagements cannot occur meaningfully without having established some degree of relationship and credibility with audiences.

This audience-centered approach speaks to the rhetorical strategy of enthymemes which Bloomfield (2019, p. 55) states, “instead of combating . . . deep-seated belief, [one] can embrace [deeply held religious interpretations as truth and authority] as a feature of [audience] discourse and use it to frame [one’s] responses”. Drawing upon the full suite of ideological repertoires in conservative and liberal messaging (Haidt, 2012; Markowitz & Shariff, 2012; Nabi et al., 2018), styles of messaging did not immediately label ideological differences per say but attempt to build on the knowledge and values of the audience, prompting discussions that provoke questions surrounding individual behaviors to structural, conceptual, and spiritual changes. Adopting an audience-centric approach implies that REOs could calibrate the delivery and depth of messaging to unite meanings to places and peoples with the teachings and responses in emotionally resonating climate change into the deeply held values of religious audiences.

Third, the findings extend the basis for REOs in engaging gatekeepers to access religious audiences. Unlike previous studies which adopted a descriptive approach or assumed the institutional authority (Kearns, 1996; Shibley & Wiggins, 1997; Wilkinson, 2012), this study highlighted the importance of examining power dynamics, leadership, and legitimacy in religious communities (Ellingson, 2016) that underlie the relationship between REOs and gatekeepers. The cases of Salal + Cedar, Streams of Justice and even the Unitarian Church of Vancouver demonstrate that the relationship with gatekeepers is crucial to accessing religious audiences. How to maintain open channels without being overly forceful or slow as to feel no impact, can be viewed as a tricky quandary for REOs to navigate in these relationships. REOs with less institutional capacity, support or networks may not always
have access the resources to maintain these connections. This may be especially the case when the approaches of REOs appear overly radical or confrontational.

Although gatekeepers provide a reference point to validate the messages of and offer segmentation advice to REOs, the effectiveness of gatekeepers may be limited if they overextend their expertise in introducing climate change or have core commitments to congregational cohesion over prioritizing climate change messaging could polarize the congregation. As the case of Streams of Justice further illustrates, even when commitments to congregational cohesion and religious messaging align, gatekeepers may be limited at controlling the range of voices that may challenge the basis of climate change. Such telling evidence suggests that an overreliance of gatekeepers and overreaching of content operationalization may be insufficient to counter infrequent climate skeptic voices. This dilemma between the REO and gatekeepers is thus a negotiation of the terms of messaging, acceptability, and tolerance for difficult but frank situations, exposing the fundamental epistemological and priority differences at the heart of clashes within the religious community. These findings speak to the uneasy task of deepening climate change messaging through gatekeepers given their respect for the diversity of voices and the need to maintain social cohesion in religious communities.

And last, despite recent approaches for climate change messaging in environmental campaigns (Hodges & Stocking, 2016; Katz-Kamchi & Manosevitch, 2015), adoption of social media as a messaging platform of REOs remains a novel but limited extension of their messaging strategy. The findings provide preliminary exploration into how REOs use social media as an extended platform that tailored messaging on climate change but remained contingent on audience reach, technological capacity, and user socio-demographic. However, the findings provide early evidence of the types of circumstances REOs may politically engage in using social media platforms for movement mobilization. For some REOs that established the importance of social media as an outreach tool, they devoted efforts to provide updated information on the Trans Mountain project, particularly to time-sensitive events such as the April 28th action, and reflections that had not otherwise been posted on their website. At the same time, social media posts provide a complementary toolkit that consolidated the REO’s messaging which construed climate
change and reconciliation. Nevertheless, REOs such as Streams of Justice provided additional room to consider the tactility and purpose of using social media for engagement and the need for a core, committed group of activists in the first place. As such, the spectrum of the wide-ranging use of social media provides REOs with enhanced access and expanded reach to audiences which is contingent on the decisions, time, and resource constraints of REOs in adopting such strategy. As REOs are generally resource constrained (Veldman et al., 2014), informal (Nita, 2016), and possibly demanding technological affordances to translate online and offline actions (Earl & Kimport, 2011), the role that social media continues to play is likely to be increasingly important strategy in an digitally saturated world where religious actors seek to garner religious audiences for attention and action.

Underscoring these themes suggest there are two ends of the equation in messaging towards religious audiences. On the one end, the constellation of factors noted above underlie the situational awareness of religious actors as they tailor their messaging to religious audiences. How messaging resonates with religious audiences not only derive from the ethical contours that underlie religious traditions as is often claimed to be. Instead, broader socio-cultural dynamics, ranging from institutional positions and relations, gatekeepers, to audience heterogeneity can facilitate or constrain the broader process that inform message targeting or tailoring. Unless religious actors possess some degree of access, leverage or influence, these factors remain beyond their control.

Compounding this side of the equation is the lingering effect that climate skepticism could possibly have in influencing the politics in the religious community. The findings revealed that climate change skepticism was marginally present among religious audiences in encounters with some REO members. Indeed, brief snapshots such as these moments are anecdotal and insufficient to generalize, but they provide some proxy into the presence of climate skepticism in religious communities. While a majority of the literature on religious environmentalism has centered on addressing climate change skepticism in the U.S. context, specifically targeting conservative Christianity (Veldman et al., 2014), the lower degree of expressed skepticism in Canada could be attributed to generally higher levels of pro-environment attitudes and concern of climate change (Tindall and Robinson, 2017) and religious
moderates (Pew Research Center, 2013) in the Metro Vancouver region and British Columbia, compared to other parts of Canada (Mildenberger et al., 2016). Despite marginal instances of climate skepticism, it may have an overshadowing effect upon religious communities and messengers. At the heart of these challenges is a reflection of the conflict between religious identities and the wider debates surrounding livelihoods, political identity, and skepticism of scientific authority (Corner et al., 2014; Kahan, 2010; Veldman et al., 2014). Caution is warranted when the perception of tackling climate skepticism is taken up as politicizing climate change in religious settings.

These situational factors may overshadow the other end of the equation which are the strategies that are within the control of REOs. The findings provide glimpses into the ways REOs may leverage their networks and calibrate their messaging depending on the audience and situation. As some REOs align themselves with more progressive liberal religious traditions (Slessarev-Jamir, 2011; Williams, 2008) or frame climate change as an obligation to establish Indigenous rights for the goal of reconciliation, such efforts face challenges at different ends. Depending how climate change is introduced, such messaging may give rise to collaboration or result in further friction or division within communities. Religious identities may be compromised and or traded off when climate change does not appear to resonate with the values of the audiences. In navigating these uncertainties, the types of rationales and more importantly the posture offered by REOs is instrumental in connecting with the audience. The task then becomes how to maintain message consistency and firmness on the science, indicators and predicted impacts of climate change, while remaining sensitive and considerate to the host of concerns posed by the audience. Suggestions such as by Bloomfield (2019, p. 174) to engage in interaction to improve the frame of understanding of audiences provide additional starting points for tailoring the message. Even when such engagements are difficult, seeking dialogue and repositioning frames to adapt messaging for opposing viewpoints may seem necessary if there is any chance of breaking through echo chambers on climate change.

An audience-centric focus on religious-based climate change communication is fundamentally about relationship building. Situating REOs in the religion-climate change communication interface has
uncovered the salient factors that arise in climate change messaging in association within the broader discourse of responsibilities of religious communities to reconciliation. In relocating religious actors and relationship with climate change within the religion-climate change communication interface, this chapter has called for greater attention towards a more sensitized and grounded understanding of the importance of attending to differences within religious audiences in tailoring messaging strategies. In doing so, it has highlighted opportunities for engagement, distinguished three specific messaging strategies, and identified challenges REOs faced in tailoring climate change messaging. While it has provided an exploration of the engagements of REOs with climate skepticism and other challenges, more examination on the extent, potential, and effectiveness of values-based messaging is needed to improve the understanding of the relationship between message tailoring and reception of these messages in religious communities.

The final chapter discusses cross-cutting themes, contributions, limitations, and areas of future research from this study.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

This chapter discusses cross-cutting themes from this study before stating its limitations and outlining areas of future research. This study began by investigating how REOs construct and tailor climate change messaging to religious audiences. In various chapters, it has sought to build upon the notion of frames in constructing climate change messaging, deepen the framing processes through reconciliation-based messaging, anchor messaging through political engagement, and highlight salient factors in message tailoring.

The following discussion synthesizes four cross-cutting themes that support overall study contributions. 6.1 examines the spaces for climate change messaging in the religious environmental movement. 6.2 discusses the implications for sensitizing pathways for messaging to religious audiences. 6.3 evaluates the uses of and challenges the assumptions underlying religious environmental frames. 6.4 discusses the opportunities and challenges facing religious settlers in reconciliatory-based messaging in Indigenous-settler contexts.

6.1 Configuring the spaces for climate change messaging

This investigation began with an enduring question over how the religious environmental movement could demonstrate the greening of religion. In investigating the specific processes for greening, this study has attempted to demonstrate the emergences, intersections, and possible collaborations of the religious environmental movement with Indigenous-led climate movements. The specific contributions and limitations of religious actors is striking given the under-exploration in the literature on emerging forms of collaborations between Indigenous and environmental groups in opposition to expanding fossil fuel infrastructures (D’Arcy et al., 2014; Estes, 2019; Gobby & Gareau, 2019; Grossman, 2017; Klein, 2014). As an emerging actor within the religious environmental movement, REOs represent an important line of progressive religious climate actors in local and sub-national spaces (Moyer, 2018). Documented in
Chapter 4, the coalition of Christian, Quaker, Unitarian, and multi-faith traditions epitomize the informal, political engagements of REOs that attempt to work within as well as beyond religious institutional arrangements to advocate for justice and structural change (Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018; Slessarev-Jamir, 2011, pp. 4-5). Together, religious actors may adopt a wide range of framing repertoires in the emerging progressive religious activism of climate change politics in the Pacific Northwest of Canada.

Nevertheless, the circumstances that allow for the emergence of such religious environmental movement merit attention related to their replicability in other case contexts. In this case study, collaboration with other actors to stop global climate change and protect Indigenous rights in pipeline resistance inform the broader spaces of religious settlers on dispossessed Indigenous lands (Dwyer, 2016; Klassen, 2019). In interactions with other actors, REOs gradually formed their own niches and collaborations with other REOs and committed to the front lines and behind the scenes activities. REOs were diverse in deciding how to respond through political engagement and message dissemination to religious communities. Their responses ranged from undertaking individual to organizational considerations, including the seizing of political opportunities in engaging in civil disobedience. Earthkeepers and Salal + Cedar had differences among individual positions, highlighting the non-linear decision-making in messaging on religious terms. Other REOs such as Vancouver Quakers and the Unitarian Church of Vancouver upheld the value of group-based decision-making before pursuing action. Despite similar commitments in aims REOs diverged on engagement tactics. The formation of the nascent religious environmental movement however must be understood within its interdependence with the strategies and coordination of Indigenous, environmental, and grassroots actors.

Despite institutional influences, REOs may have more leverage in their messaging than initially thought. Findings in Chapter 3 and 4 suggest that institutional associations and affiliations of REOs can amplify or constrain their messaging. Building on Lysack (2014)’s observation on faith-based mobilization outside of environmental advocacy among national religious bodies and extending Moyer (2018)’s profiles of institutionally aligned REOs across Canada, the findings suggest that REOs may fill a meso-level gap between national religious bodies and local communities. Ellingson (2016)’s conception
of logics of appropriateness partially explain why REOs fitted in this niche. Logics of appropriateness guide acceptable actions of REOs within the larger prescription and rules established by their affiliations with larger religious institutions. This concept may be valid to explain messaging of some institutionally aligned REOs, such as Salal + Cedar and the Environmental Committee of the Unitarian Church of Vancouver. However for non-institutionally affiliated REOs such as Earthkeepers and Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonanzin Community Society, such considerations may not apply. In instances where REOs find it useful to gauge institutional sensitivity, REOs may find ways to navigate around institutional logics. Salal + Cedar and Streams of Justice, in declaring individual actions apart from institutional positions, enabled themselves to execute more radical actions on an individual capacity. These notable exceptions suggest constraints and opportunities for REOs to navigate structural factors that affect the dissemination of messaging.

Connecting the political engagement of REOs is the acuity and foresight of leveraging climate messaging. As messengers, REO decided what materials to relay to audience and how the message could become accessible, trusted, and emotionally resonant. Stepping up to this task, REOs not only had to be climate literate but also equipped to navigate around local and epistemological politics of climate change. As religious actors, REOs may serve as advocates, communicators, and cultural guides in articulating and navigating the scientific, ethical, and religious debates in calibrating climate change messages. Seeking multi-sided religious efforts beyond institutional statements on climate change, more work is needed to determine how REOs negotiate with or seek opportunities to reduce institutional or community friction. These examinations will have major implications in determining the relevance and stake of the religious environmental movement as an emerging voice shaping global and local climate change movements and politics.

6.2 Sensitizing pathways to reach religious audiences

Politicization of climate change presents challenges and opportunities to communicate climate change to religious audiences. This study has stressed the array of pathways for climate change to become
assimilated into the experiences and meanings of religious communities (Callison, 2014; Hoffman, 2011; Hulme, 2017; Scoville-Simonds, 2018; Veldman et al., 2014). Connecting Chapters 3, 4, and 5, unravelling social, political, and cultural dimensions in the message tailoring process highlights the interaction of the actor, strategy, and setting for climate change communication.

In embodying and conveying climate change through frames, REOs translate the essence, impacts, and significance of climate change into digestible matters of faith. REOs have done so by adapting messages to local circumstances, actors, and entities and what that might mean in personalized terms to religious audiences. The example of Salal + Cedar to convey climate messaging through its education and curation of sermons, while also providing platforms for audiences to engage in hard-line tactics demonstrates the practicality of meeting the needs, experiences, and perspectives of segmented audiences (Bloomfield, 2019). Moreover, the various styles of messaging anchor religious metanarratives in religious environmental frames (Lejano, 2019). Through the guidance of religious environmental frames, REOs rely on metanarratives to construct messaging that conjure affective appeals (Nabi et al., 2018; Salama & Aboukoura, 2018). Whether a message supports values of purity by safeguarding the integrity or sacredness of creation and emphasizing individual responsibility and stewardship of the earth, the metanarratives in frame content may depend on how well the message aligns with the audiences’ pre-existing orientations and values. In proposing a two-part equation to theorize the communication system between religious audiences and messengers in Chapter 5, religious actors may be able to close this gap by drawing upon compelling metanarratives that reduce perceived value conflicts.

The findings further suggest that REOs were unable to overcome pre-drawn political lines in their tradition and convince climate skeptical voices. The anecdotes in Chapter 5 are instructive in offering lessons on the ground to test the range of targeting tactics that could overcome differences across political aisles. Earthkeepers and Salal + Cedar were notable in that they remained committed to building bridges and engaging audiences of different stripes. Whether it was the focus on the Biblical case of stewardship or justice for Indigenous communities, the underlying lesson in message tailoring to audiences of different stripes is that such requirements require authenticity, trust, and rapport. The willingness for
REOs to make themselves present, fielding questions from participants to connect the abstract nature of climate change to personalized issues represents a gradual, but steady step in changing both minds and hearts of religious audiences. Despite possible entry points, other hurdles remain. Facilitating tailoring efforts to an extent may come down to endowed relationships with key influencers or gatekeepers or by invitation of community leaders. Without access, the challenge remains as to how REOs can practically engage in conversations with religious audiences met with voices of indifference or lone skepticism within communities or institutional bodies. Social media platforms, widely perceived as an extension of overall framing strategies, has been moderately used by some REOs and remain peripheral to the default option of face to face encounters. Whether religious messengers can appeal using religious-based values to overcome climate change polarization (Kahan, 2010) remain to be further examined.

6.3 Re-orienting religious communities through religious environmental frames

Examining the construction of frames has provided conceptual and practical tools for how and why members of REOs convey the re-orientation of spiritual, ethical, and ecological dimensions of one’s religious tradition towards climate change. In replicating religious environmental frames (Ellingson et al., 2012; Kearns, 1996 and 2011; Shibley & Higgins, 1997), identifying frame components of origins, influences, interpretations, expressions, and environmental ethics may serve as initial proxies for REOs to undertake in constructing their message. Frame components may offer tools which define how REOs embed meanings, associations, and metaphors to create audible and affective messages. Sensitivity to locality has emerged as a particularly critical mechanism in constructing the message (Galway, 2019; Scannell & Gifford, 2013) but it has been done so by grounding metanarratives to local circumstances. The case study raises the centrality of the justice frame not simply in how justice becomes localized but how it opens up questions of what, whom, how, and why people are affected in fossil fuel infrastructures. Aligning climate implications of the project with the lack of Indigenous consent among select communities, the messages clarifies how one’s tradition and frame articulate and configure religious responses to justice.
Despite replication and potential of religious environmental frames, this study has raised the issue of the rules that constitute the frame. While the literature on religious environmental frames have been descriptive at best, its vagueness in calling into question the contested meanings of nature, land, and place begged further scrutiny. This study, in unpacking the interpretations of reconciliation-based messaging, has exposed the lack of temporal and historical situatedness of frames. In this case, unravelling the messaging in the frames unpacks the history and assumptions of religious histories on Indigenous lands (Klassen, 2019; Jenkins et al., 2018). The messages have indicated how REOs might articulate, practice, and express ways which may re-connect with the land and reject the problematic, persisting legacy of Christianity in colonialism and the spiritually motivated claims behind the Doctrine of Discovery and terra nullius (Klassen, 2019; Reid, 2010). In doing so, REOs such as Streams of Justice and Salal + Cedar have hinted at possible directions at disrupting, interrogating, and repurposing the sets of assumptions in their traditions. Deepening these frames raise further questions on interpretations of humans, ecology, and the cosmos in text and how that calls into questions of the implied material-historical relationships of the people and the land in Indigenous-settler contexts.

Exposing this tension explains why the justice frame as a descriptive and prescriptive lens has been a powerful analytical vehicle in this investigation. On the surface, REOs converged on messaging that focused on participatory and recognition-based justice, stressing the lack of participatory access to adequate consent of Indigenous peoples and marginalized and oppressed populations affected by climate change (Bohannon & O’Brien, 2017). Looking deeper however, localizing the configurations of injustices prompted self-reflexivity of REO members. Messaging on justice raised fundamental questions of who defines and is impacted from justice, and how that fashions the content of climate change messaging.

In turn, who the actors are and what assumptions they carry in climate change messaging matter. REOs in part attributed their responses to the insufficient responses within their own traditions, adding evidence to the pattern of rising dissatisfaction among groups affiliated with national religious bodies in Canada that have been lagging on climate action (Lysack, 2014). This study adds the dimension of power and race to religious actors who embody religious environmental frames. REOs provide a critical and
under-explored perspective to illuminate divergent or dissenting voices that are not easily assimilated into the institutional fabric. Departing from previous studies which have traced the responses of institutionally-bound religious actors to climate change (Haluza-DeLay, 2014), the focus on grassroots and locally-based REOs in this case study has surfaced issues of power, race, gender, and socio-economic statuses which subsequently shaped how REO members interpreted climate change. In addition, several members of REOs stated they or their congregants were victims of practices committed by their affiliated national religious bodies, while some wished to distance themselves or even go about to reject institutional engagements and histories into its colonial past. In this tumultuous relationship, the call for justice equated to a cry among members of REOs at silent and apathic institutional responses and attitudes to climate change and Indigenous reconciliation.

6.4 Reconciliation in climate change messaging as opportunity and challenge

Reconciliation in climate change messaging foregrounded in-depth examination of precarities and potential of the movement, message, and actor in Indigenous-settler contexts. Examining the interpretations in climate change messaging revealed that messages capture the grounded reality in bringing the message to fruition but also the religious actors and histories into Indigenous-led movements.

Among the many studies on religious responses and climate change (Jenkins et al., 2018; Veldman et al., 2014), a key contribution of this study has been to initialize conceptualizations of religious settler consciousness and identities in Indigenous-settler contexts (Davis et al., 2017; Dwyer, 2016; Heinrichs, 2016; Klassen, 2019). Who is being researched reflects assumptions and social location of the researcher. As Klassen (2019) notes, the positionality of the researcher and religious communities are shaped by the land that we live on which unmask the “layered pasts of the land and waters on which [we] live” (Klassen, 2019, p. 5) and deepen thinking about the interaction between research and the communities, lands, and waters. Triangulating findings and auto-ethnographical vignettes (Appendix E), a re-occurring theme emerged suggesting that the evolution of resistance became a platform to seek
common ground particularly between religious settlers and Indigenous groups. Yet, the usefulness of religious environmental frames and pervasive forms of religious environmentalisms is only as sufficient as the religious actor and also that of the researcher investigating the phenomenon. Over the course of self-reflexivity with interviews, movement texts, social media texts, and critical encounters (Appendix E), the positionality of the researcher forged a crucial link in unlocking the underlying dynamics of power, privileges, and race of religious environmentalism in Indigenous-settler contexts. Unmasking these assumptions further calls into question the wider research paradigm underlying religious studies and the environment. This call is further buttressed by very recent calls for decolonization in the discipline of religious studies (Grabber & Klassen, 2020; Klassen, 2019; Nye, 2019).

Within the wider call for decolonizing spaces and research programs, reflecting on reconciliation beyond the message and examining the actual relations between who is being conciliated becomes fundamental to extending the conversation about the possibilities and limitations of religious environmentalism. This study has wrestled with contested notions embedded in messages of reconciliation from the perspectives of religious settlers, opening up questions regarding how religious settlers negotiate collaborations in Indigenous-led climate movements. The collaborative messaging effort between REOs and Indigenous groups on the Faith Day of Action on April 28 2018 marks an interesting start within the Trans Mountain resistance context. But this opening for such collaboration may warrant promises met with skepticism. Drawing on critical geography scholar Zoltán Grossman (2017, pp. 275-284), re-orienting relationships of land between settlers and Indigenous peoples can be understood as birthing common sense of place, purpose, and understanding. These three senses are to some extent preconditions of what Grossman considers key ingredients for successful, cross-cultural alliances in Indigenous-settler contexts.

In this case study, the varied engagements and self-reflexivity processes of REOs suggest the possibilities of religious settlers standing in solidarity with Indigenous peoples of whose lands they stand on. However, such questions have to be viewed through the recognition that members of REOs having begun various degrees of unsettling the role of religious institutions in justifying settler colonialism and
entitlements of the Canadian settler state on Indigenous lands. Applying Grossman’s criteria, collaboration suggests that REOs sought to find common ground while respecting fundamental group differences in the face of unequal power dynamics, historical situatedness, and taking ownership of religious settler responsibilities. The shared sense of place and understanding towards the problem (climate change) and the underlying symptoms (fossil fuel-based systems that undermine Indigenous sovereignty and climate stability) is further contrasted with the legacy of the colonization under the hospices of Christians churches and appropriation of Indigenous lands for resource extraction. Reversing this narrative, REOs sought to align themselves with demands of the broader resistance on the grounds of free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous communities opposing the project. Underlying such encounters inaugurates the significance of unsettling the identity, space, and livelihood of religious settlers on Indigenous lands (Heinrichs, 2018; Land, 2015; Regan, 2010; Spice, 2018).

However, this opportunity of viewing reconciliation on the grounds of collaboration is remarkably different on the basis of purpose. As detailed in Chapter 3 and 4, reconciliatory-based messaging must first be problematized within the rhetoric of reconciliation. In the case study, REOs positioned themselves as religious actors that have to various extent demonstrated self-reflexivity, signaling initiations of decolonization of the self, and potential for reforming and atoning for the legacy of religious institutions (Heinrichs, 2016; Land, 2015; Regan, 2010; Spice, 2018; TRC, 2015a). Some REOs thrusted themselves into political engagement, bringing to the forefront the urgency and importance of acknowledging the historical context and expressing support for entrenching legal and constitutional rights of Indigenous peoples (McAdam, 2016). REOs whose affiliation with Christian denominations had participated in justifying land dispossession and genocide of Indigenous peoples foregrounded the practicality of such efforts (MacDonald, 2015; McAdam, 2016). In demonstrating climate change messaging, participating in the network of resistance as an expression of solidarity signals the potential for religious actors to join in social and political forms of reconciliation in Indigenous-settler contexts. By challenging the social, economic, political, as well as underlying ethical status quos in responses to climate change, REOs could be potential join the table of voices among Indigenous climate movements,
arguing the impacts of climate change against Indigenous peoples are a product of the underlying relationships and moral bonds between people, societies and institutions.

However, such limited optimism for solidarity must be countered with the recognition of incommensurability of any solidarity or coalition-based collaboration in light of historical atrocities. As Tuck and Yang (2012) point out, while there may be some desired common outcome overlapping in movements, neglecting the fundamental differences in the existence of such movements in the push for collaboration could risk replicating colonial practices of subsuming Indigenous sovereignty under a more powerful or privileged movement. And as settler scholars Cory Snelgrove and Rita Dhamoon and Cherokee scholar Jeff Corntassel further point out, any attempts at decolonization is incommensurable but not incompatible to other struggles (Snelgrove et al., 2014, p. 4). Religious atonement struggles for historical and ongoing injustices are similarly incommensurable in the face of truth-telling the intergenerational violence, annihilation, and pain endured by Indigenous peoples. Yet, not all hope is lost. As Snelgrove and colleagues (2014, pp.3-4) add: “...solidarity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples must be grounded in actual practices and place-based relationships”. Predicating truth before attempts towards reconciliation is instrumental in such collaborations. As this case has further shown, any attempt at solidarities also warrant examination of power disparities in view of intricacies of race and religion.

Recent literature on settler colonialism have further attempted to deepen readings of any attempts of participation in Indigenous spaces. This study has extended preliminary conceptualizations of religious settler consciousness based on the working definition of settler consciousness by settler scholar Lynne Davis and colleagues (2017, p. 402) (see 1.2.5 and 3.5). Conceptualizing this praxis is calls for the additional veneers of the historical, spiritual, and political dimensions that underlie climate change messaging. If settlers are called to decolonize their solidarity efforts, and called into supporting Indigenous movements, then pipeline movements similarly may present one specific opportunity for religious settlers to re-articulate religious environmental frames with explicit awareness of colonial dimensions and underlying settler colonial processes and structures.
This case study has marked several ways religious settlers may come to terms to their own awakening and workings of religious settler consciousness (Davis et al., 2017; Heinrichs, 2016). Documented in detail in Chapters 3 and 4, efforts of REOs in the Trans Mountain resistance offered one tangible glimpse into the potential for religious actors in unravelling questions of religious settler consciousness in Indigenous-led movements. First, REOs attempted interrogate and re-interpret their own traditions, then engaged themselves in the resistance, and subsequently disseminated their experiences and insights into the localized significance of climate change to members of their communities. The most obvious starting point is with grappling with the uncensored atrocities committed by religious institutions on Indigenous peoples in Canada and not only working towards church commitments to reconciliation, but bearing upon their shoulders the work of undoing colonial patterns of thinking in religious institutions and structures. In doing so, religious actors may be positioned to initiate their own unlearning on their own terms (Heinrichs, 2018; Land, 2015), while keeping vigilant that their own process of decolonization should be in view of long-term Indigenous land struggles (Davis et al., 2017; Denis and Bailey, 2016).

Second, the framed messaging of REOs can trenchantly critique the silent institutional responses to the systems and logics that legitimate resource extractivism embedded in settler colonialism at the expense of upholding Indigenous rights and sovereignty (Heinrichs, 2018). And last, broadening out to other potential cases, religious actors may seek to learn from, take responsibility for the history and impacts of their tradition, and pursue reforms in their communities. This process is exploratory, iterative, and non-linear.

Such discussions have gained traction among some religious institutions and communities to engage in longer term efforts towards Indigenous reconciliation (Heinrichs, 2016; Heinrichs, 2018; KAIROS, 2019; Munn-Venn, 2018). Nevertheless, more work needs to be done. Reconciliation, as a process through the ongoing restoration of relations of human relations and the earth (Asch et al., 2018; Heinrichs, 2018; TRC, 2015a), could serve as a gateway for religious actors, to realize, reconceive, and correct institutional views, structures, arrangements and interpretations that shape relationships between land and people. However, the power, privilege, and place of religious actors in relation to settler
colonialism processes on Indigenous peoples and lands has to be central in religious settler transformation. This awakening entails not only unlearning religious settler entitlements and privileges that perpetuate ideologies and practices of empire (Heinrichs, 2018), but also place-based settler responsibilities, relationships, and practices with Indigenous peoples (Snelgrove et al., 2014).

Skepticism remains warranted of potential claims of collaboration to reach any sort of short-term, romanticized, or idealistic view of reconciliation (Maddison et al., 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Whyte, 2018a). Any attempts at reconciliation must further entail calls for Indigenous sovereignty, laws, culture, and knowledge for resurgence (Asch et al., 2018; Simpson, 2017; Snelgrove et al., 2014; Whyte, 2018b). A more historically attuned question on the promises and limitations of messaging on settler-Indigenous reconciliation should ask how claims of reconciliation are construed, and whether such claims and actions are consistent, and in support of restoring legal and constitutional rights, including treaty rights, and traditional knowledges of Indigenous peoples (Vignette 6; Whyte, 2018a). Although the uptake in the language and work on reconciliation among REOs is laudable in this case study, it remains to be seen whether such efforts can be sustained, expanded, and more importantly commit to religious settler responsibilities. Religious institutions have indeed started with acknowledging and rejecting the Doctrine of Discovery and support efforts on reconciliation. Ongoing investigations into any claims on reconciliation as justification for REO messaging bears proof to demonstrate how and under what circumstances the abovementioned goals could be achieved. It also remains to be seen how ideologies of dominion continue to permeate and inhibit discussions over repatriation of or at the very least, honour historical treaties on Indigenous lands.

Foregrounding the conditions and limits of reconciliation through collaboration with the context of the Canadian settler state, this case lays the ground for assessing the claims and motivations of religious responses to climate change in other Indigenous-settler contexts. Ongoing examination on this front is theoretically and empirically significant as the religious environmentalism literature has yet to adequately examine the politics of religious solidarity with Indigenous peoples in land-based resistances.
6.5 Contributions

This study offers four theoretical contributions. First, this study builds upon existing religious environmental frames of stewardship, bio-region, justice, and interconnectedness for climate change messaging and clarifies social and political dimensions associated within religious environmentalism. Five frame components were further identified to guide message construction. Frame bridging of base frames to justice offers general frames of reference to examine how other meso-religious actors may generate and output climate change messaging. Converging on justice, the configuration and meanings of reconciliation-based messaging pointed towards the process of self-critical reflexivity among religious settlers that proved pivotal in political engagement. At the same time, power, representation, and privilege of religious settlers may unearth settler colonial assumptions, unmask hegemonic and dominion-like attitudes within existing strands of its religious traditions, and initiate de-construction and re-construction processes within religious environmentalism. Illuminating these approaches underscore the salience of historical, political, and geographical dimensions of religious environmental frames.

Second, this study offers a preliminary sketch of religious settler consciousness in the context of Indigenous-led pipeline resistance notably in destabilizing reconciliation through the lens of climate change, interpreting climate injustice, prompting self-reflexivity, and following Indigenous leadership in Indigenous-led struggles. The self-reflexivity of religious actors in reconciliation-based messaging mark the conceptualization of religious settler consciousness as a possible pathway to in view of very real limits to decolonizing solidarity efforts in Indigenous-settler contexts.

Third, this study adds support for the emergence of the nascent religious environmental movement and its support of Indigenous-led climate movements in Indigenous-settler contexts. In particular, it demonstrates the formation of the religious environmental movement can be identified through the alignment of framing strategies with corresponding roles, mobilization capacities, and networks of REOs. The degree of overlap of REOs with the wider movement underscores the complexity and versatility of REOs and its members to embody the messaging outside of formal religious settings.
And last, this study extends the considerations for religious actors in adopting audience-centric approaches through segmentation, styles of messaging, and gatekeepers in tailoring messages in relation to religious reconciliation efforts to religious audiences. Underlying structural and value conflicts persist as prominent challenges associated with climate change communication to Christian audiences.

Empirically, this case study contributes to the growing documentation of religious communities that are responding to climate change at local levels (Haluza-DeLay, 2014) that inform the composition of the religious environmental movement in the Pacific Northwest of Canada (Haluza-DeLay, 2008; Lysack, 2014; Moyer, 2018; Moyer & Scharper, 2019). It also provides support for emerging religious participation in Indigenous-led campaigns against expanding fossil fuel infrastructure (Estes, 2019; Grossman, 2017; Klein, 2014; Spice, 2018). This study has highlighted REOs as a set of emerging religious actors and the range of opportunities and constraints they encounter in political engagement and communication of climate change in Metro Vancouver. These efforts represent junctures and highlight challenges for initiating dialogue and action among religious settlers in linking climate change and decolonization efforts in settler colonial contexts. Additionally, these efforts have opened up particular strategies and revealed challenges for religious settlers to open up to uncomfortable, but necessary and hard truths about the persisting settler colonial processes in Canada and the role of religious institutions and communities in participating in such processes.

This study provides two policy and practical contributions. First, governments, religious institutions and communities as well as educators may draw upon the case study, strategies and synergies to facilitate critical dialogue on climate change awareness and action among religious audiences. Similarly, for religious institutions, REOs raise challenges as well as opportunities to climate advocacy and projects on adaptation and mitigation. A synonymous but equally important specific contribution is the attention and rejection of the ideologies and practices that underlie the Doctrine of Discovery. Equally linking this discussion with activities to educate, nurture depth, and strategies to encourage discussions surrounding religious history, apologies, and responsibilities towards Indigenous rights and land resistance is much needed (TRC, 2015a; TRC, 2015b). Specifically, the role of the Catholic and Anglican
Churches in returning artefacts and sharing archival observations and records from early missionary encounters could sustain restitutive efforts in epistemic justice. Second, this study provides a detailed case context to inform future religious engagement on climate change. Climate change communicators may find strategies and challenges useful in light of the cultural context, composition, and sensitivity of the audience.

6.6 Limitations and future research

Study findings are based on a single case that focuses on Christian, Unitarian, Quaker, and multifaith traditions in one Indigenous-settler context and a limited number of interviewees at one point in time and location. Expanding the number of REO members, examining REOs in other traditions, and comparing responses from religious bodies across scales would enrich study findings. Indeed, comparisons with religious and spiritual perspectives that offer biocultural ontologies and conceptualizations of climate change would shed light on how climate change is constructed and bear meaning within those respective communities. Comparing religious actors and other movement actors and their interactions would further crystallize the dynamics behind climate change messaging to different constituencies.

Looking beyond this case study, many pressing questions remain. Verifying the frames as well as the mechanisms that explain the formation and execution of framing is needed. Framing processes such as the role of actors in constructing the frame under Indigenous-settler contexts may provide new directions for research on religious environmental movements. Following this research thread is the relationship of the framing strategy of the religious environmental movement with respect to the wider movement context. Mapping out and clarifying these relationships may contribute to a more informed view of the potential and limitations of religious environmental activism in climate change movements and politics. Are REOs and other religious actors increasing their participation in similar land-based or Indigenous-led movements? If so, who are these actors, and what are their interpretations and explanations that motivate them to participate in these movements? Furthermore, as there are more nuanced overlaps between religious identity and non-religious organizational affiliations, how do religious climate activists find
themselves nestled in the spaces of climate change activism? And to what extent might REOs be bounded by affiliated national religious bodies? Attending to historically and politically situated questions offer opportunities to fields such as political ecology with the analytical lens to investigate the politics among religious communities in doctrinal, policy, and collective actions on climate change (Wilkins, 2020). The political ecology lens would further refine how power dynamics, race, and gender resonate as salient factors to religious environmentalism. For instance, racialized communities who intersect with religious environmentalism may engage in place-based solidarities under Indigenous resurgence (Baugh, 2017; Simpson, 2017, pp. 211-231). Connecting these investigations with historical contextualization of the Christian church and secularization trend such as in the Pacific Northwest (Marks, 2017) or conceptualization of religious settler identities beyond Christian identities may provide additional starting points to increase validity of religious settler processes in Indigenous-settler contexts.

Another line of inquiry is the extent and effect of religious-based targeting and tailoring processes of climate change. Examining the relationship between message tailoring and reception of these messages across religious communities, particularly beyond Christian communities would improve the ways climate change bears cosmological and political significance (including the presence and extent of climate skepticism) among other religious traditions. Drawing upon ethnographic or rhetorical approaches to examine in-depth interactions between religious messengers and audiences on different styles of climate change messaging could improve understanding of the potential effectiveness of value-based messaging (Dixon et al., 2017) as well as provide vivid description of emerging patterns that arise within specific settings (Bloomfield, 2019; Callison, 2014). Such studies would benefit from testing message effectiveness and perceived conflicts between religious beliefs and scientific evidence (Donner, 2011).

These lines of work would further benefit from comparative research from other religious traditions, in Indigenous-settler contexts in the Global South, and socio-demographic dimensions such as race and gender.
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### Appendices

#### Appendix A  Timeline of major events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>NEB initiates project hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Tsleil-Waututh Nation launches a legal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Kinder Morgan begins surveying work on Burnaby Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>Kinder Morgan wins court injunction to remove anti-pipeline activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>Over 100 activists are arrested when they crossed the injunction line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>Tsleil-Waututh First Nation rejects the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>The NEB postpones public hearings after it finds economic evidence prepared by a Kinder Morgan consultant was soon to begin working for the NEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>The NEB recommends approval of the project subject to 157 conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>Thousands of protesters demonstrate in Vancouver to voice project opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>Prime Minister Justin Trudeau approves the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>B.C. NDP and Greens form a new B.C. government, agreeing to use “every tool available” to stop the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>Justin Trudeau Brigade escalates direct action against the project with daily blockades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Thousands of people gather in Burnaby to participate in an Indigenous-led protest against the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>BC Supreme Court grants indefinite injunction preventing protesters from coming within five metres of the project work site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17-24</td>
<td>More than 170 protesters are arrested at the Kinder Morgan tank farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Kinder Morgan suspends spending on the project and issues an ultimatum, stating it would refuse to commit funding to the project unless the B.C. government steps aside from its opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 29  The federal government announces that they have reached an agreement with Kinder Morgan to buy the pipeline system

August 30 The Federal Court of Appeal rules in *Tsleil-Waututh Nation* that the federal government failed in its constitutional duty to meaningfully engage with First Nations who were affected by the project in the November 2016 approval

September 11 The Federal Government instructs the NEB to review the project’s impact on the marine environment

2019

February 22 The NEB recommends for the second time to the federal government to approve the project

June 18 The federal government re-approves the project

September 4 The Federal Court of Appeal agrees to hear from six appeals on the adequacy of Indigenous consultation in the 2019 project re-approval

November 5 Tsleil-Waututh Nation and environmental groups appeal Trans Mountain ruling to the Supreme Court of Canada

December 3 Federal government and Trans Mountain representatives mark the start of project construction

2020

February 4 The Federal Court of Appeal dismisses the appeals of the four First Nations groups, upholding the federal government’s re-approval of the project

Appendix B  REO Profiles

B.1  Earthkeepers

Earthkeepers is an ecumenical Christian REO that seeks to “tangibly witness the reconciling love of God for all peoples and all creation” [A1-1-3]. The earth is sacred, because “the living God has made healing and renewal available to the entire cosmos, including [human beings]”. And that “this reconciliation [is] central to the Christian good news, “the gospel”. As climate change is anthropogenic, it poses global distributional injustices to vulnerable populations most susceptible to impacts of climate change [A1-1-2].

Members of Earthkeepers generally pointed out that the role of stewardship extends to justice concerns. Their agreement stemmed from similar interpretations of the Book of Genesis that God tasked humans the power and privilege to tend and safekeep His earth through the stewardship mandate. One of Earthkeepers’ blog post provided the scriptural basis from readings of the Old and New Testaments of the Bible that emphasized the calls for stewardship of creation in the meta-narrative of the Biblical story [A1-1-10]. It began with the relationship between the creator and the creation (Genesis 1), to instruction to
preserve the garden of Eden (Genesis 2), the renewed covenant of all life (Genesis 9), origin of all being found in Jesus (John 1), and redemption of all things through the ultimate vision of the New Creation (Romans 8; Colossians 1; and Revelations 21-22). Earthkeepers’ interpretations of Revelations departed from apocalyptic interpretations which generally point towards an image of “burning of the earth” (A1-1-22; Wilkinson, 2012). Rather than being taken up into heaven, members of Earthkeepers’ argued that readings of Revelations implied that heaven comes down to earth, suggesting the coming of spiritual and even a material renewal of the earth, as captured in the summary of the passage from Romans 8, “creation is groaning and needs to be redeemed, and in this vision it is divinely redeemed and renewed in Christ.” The view of encompassing all things under creation being redeemed and renewed in Christ was expressed as a restorative vision and hope for humans and their relationship with God and all material and spiritual entities on earth.

Founding members of Earthkeepers first coalesced in late 2014, when a number of protesters, including Howard and David, attended the demonstration on Burnaby Mountain to protest the surveying work for the Trans Mountain project. David was arrested and subsequently submitted a reflection to a local Vancouver Christian community newsletter (A1-1-23), leading him and other concerned Christians to meet and start up Earthkeepers in early 2015 [I-3]. Over the years, members represented Anglican, Catholic, Baptist, Christian Missionary Alliance and Mennonite denominations [I-1; I-4]. The work of Earthkeepers can be divided into three avenues of responses: prayer and contemplation, civic engagement, and experiencing creation [A1-1-1] through public engagements in the form of presentations, dialogue, art spaces and other creative events.
Salal + Cedar Watershed Discipleship Community is a ministry of the Anglican Diocese of New Westminster. Salal and Cedar integrates a place-based, bio-regionalism into the theology and practices of Anglicanism in Christianity [A2-1-2]. Their aim is to re-connect Christians to the creation-values and land covenants at the core of the Christian tradition by practicing contemplative ecology and spiritually rooted action [A2-1-2]. Salal + Cedar concurrently is an affiliated ministry in the Watershed Discipleship movement [A2-1-2]. Unlike creation care, watershed Discipleship emphasizes the importance of caring for the land, focusing on the actual watersheds and nurturing watershed consciousness and engagement in their tradition (Watershed Discipleship, n.d.) [A2-1].

Salal + Cedar originated as a response by the Diocese of New Westminster to the advocacy of the leaders who wanted to address the growing need of the younger church demographic on environmental stewardship and greater engagement on environmental and social justice [I-5]. Salal + Cedar roots itself in Anglican incarnational theology. Its core mission is to fulfill the commitment to the Fifth Mark of Mission of the Anglican Church of Canada, “to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain
and renew the life of the earth” [A2-1-1; A2-1-16]. This interpretation of the based on Anglican incarnational theology emphasizes the material conditions and relationships in the process of the being of one with Christ (Kirkpatrick, 2009). This framework of watershed discipleship enables members of Salal + Cedar to acknowledge the importance of fostering intricate relationship with the rest of creation. Jenny suggested that the meta-narrative of the Bible which sees rivers flowing out of Eden, alluding to the Garden in the book of Genesis, and ends with the streams of justice in the book of Revelations. She alluded to leaves that heal nations and with individual or communal encounters with holiness that were set outdoors [I-6, p.29-33] as nature imagery and metaphor for God’s justice and holiness through encounters with God’s creation. An extension of Salal+Cedar’s interpretations derive from the Exodus narrative which emphasizes teachings on justice. The Exodus narrative recorded the plight, escape and deliverance of the Israelites from the empire of Egypt which resonates with how the relationship to land was tied to the relationship of the people [I-6]. Both Alex and Jenny recognized how these stories of injustice parallel injustices faced by Indigenous peoples in the ongoing struggle for reconciliation [I-5; I-6].

By embodying this sense of relationality and responsibility to the spiritual and ecological dimensions, Salal + Cedar incorporates this expression into their practices in the watershed of the Lower Mainland [A2-1-2] which coincides with the jurisdiction of the Diocese of the New Westminster [I-6]. Activities of Salal + Cedar range from providing leadership and outdoor education for youth, conducting outdoor Eurcharist services, to front line activism such as supporting to Camp Cloud, organizing for religious solidarity for Indigenous opposition such as Faith Call to Action, and engaging in civil disobedience by trespassing the property of the Kinder Mogan tank farm.

Expressions of faith included their weekly Eurcharist services, prayer walks [A2-1-3], conservation activities [A2-2-6], youth environmental education activities [A2-4-17; F-A2-27], and front line support at Camp Cloud [A2-1-3; 4; 13], and participation in kayak protests since early 2016 [I-5; I-6].
B.3 Streams of Justice

Streams of Justice is a radical activist group that emphasized the justice tenets and prophetic traditions of the Christian faith. Streams of Justice was established since the early 2000s based on the work of the co-founders who were congregants of a local East Vancouver church. The intent for the organization was to respond to urban homelessness and poverty [I-7]. The name of Streams of Justice is based on Amos 5 of the Bible, “Let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like a never-failing stream” [I-7; A3-1-5]. Their interpretation of this notion of justice is concerned with protection vulnerable members of society and fighting for equitable access to resources, sufficient economic means for meaningful participation and into decision-making, and enshrining personal dignity and mutual respect [A3-1-5]. Streams of Justice recognizes and opposes oppressive and hierarchical structures of political, social and economic powers, and respects the human dignity of individual and collective self-determination [A3-1-5]. Their explicit focus on the processes of injustices serves as a praxis for conversations about personal, corporeal, political, economic, biblical, theological or sociological dimensions of justice [I-7; I-9].

Environmental justice and Indigenous solidarity are two main lines of work of Streams of Justice [A3-1-2; A3-1-3; I-8; I-9]. Their work is rooted in the Biblical prophetic tradition [A3-1-4], which
upholds readings rooted in liberation theology. Liberation theology emphasizes the undoing of oppression and interaction of Jesus with those on the margins of society, as illustrated in Isaiah 58 and the Exodus narrative [A3-1-4; I-8; I-9] (Slessarev-Jamir, 2011). A key interpretation from liberation theology has been deconstructing the church institutions as deeply embedded colonial, racist, and capitalist structures that must be called out in its problems [A3-2,3 p.8:3-8]. As such, Streams of Justice seeks post-colonial interpretations of the Bible by re-constructing problematic interpretations of the Bible [I-8; I-9] and pursuing different pathways for human solidarity, communal flourishing and care for the earth that sustains all life to rectify injustices [A3-1-5].

Streams of Justice has been active in organizing events, particularly forums to provide space for a range of speakers and fundraisers. Aside from environmental justice and Indigenous solidarity, they also work to address racism, migrant justice, poverty, and housing and homelessness.
Vancouver Quakers based their broad framing that connect interconnectedness and stewardship frames with justice, notably tapping into their tradition of engaging in non-violent, direct action, which has played a prominent role the abolition, anti-nuclear, and civil rights movements [I-10] (Williams, 2008). Quakers generally uphold a pantheistic view of God in all people [A4-1-5] where everyone has direct access to the Spirit and that truth is revealed through Christian and non-Christian sources [A4-1-5; 6]. In recent decades, there has been an extension of this view to encompass simply humans but has been extended to all creation [I-10] (Quaker Earth Witness, 2017). Care and obligation for creation has been interpreted not only through its Judeo-Christian roots [I-10], but through the broader sense of sacredness with creation such that it demands a duty to protect it [I-10]. Adopting a broader spiritual frame has allowed Quakers find resonance with the knowledge and teachings, traditional titles, and roles as custodians of the land of Indigenous peoples [I-10].
The Vancouver meeting of Quakers formed in the late 1800s [A4-1-2]. Throughout the 20th century, the meeting conscientious objected to military service and acts of war. During the 1970s, Dorothy and Irwing Stowe, both members of the Vancouver meeting, established Greenpeace in 1971. A reconciliation committee was formed in 2017 to work towards bridging environmental issues and Indigenous concerns [I-10]. The Vancouver Meeting generally followed the unprogrammed tradition, meaning that the meeting is open towards people of other spiritual paths [I-10; A4-1-6].
The Unitarian Church of Vancouver (UCV) share diverse and inclusive beliefs of religious traditions that support the free and responsible search for truth and meaning [A5-1-12]. While the first six principles of Unitarian Universalism established the fundamental rights and dignity of humans, concern for the earth is rooted in the 7th principle of Unitarian Universalism which is the “respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part” [A5-1-8], forming the bedrock for the interconnectedness frame.

The Church has a legacy of integrating spirituality into environmental activism, starting with the founding of Greenpeace [I-11; A5-1-13] (Zelko, 2004), to inaugurating Earth Day worship services [A5-1-13; I-11] and ushering in earth spirit and neo-pagan ritual groups [F-A5-45]. Tracing its origins to the 1980s, the Environment Committee is primarily concerned with the stewardship of the earth [A5-1-13]. The Environment Committee, in conjunction with the Social Justice Committee have a history of uniting concerns and acting on major environmental issues, from nuclear proliferation to sustainable development and more recently to pipeline expansion [A5-1-13; I-11; I-12].
Peter, a member of the Environment Committee, delivered a sermon in 2017 to justify the legitimacy of direct action to stop climate change \[I-11; A5-2-11\], demonstrates the integral aspect of action based on injustice to non-human beings. Drawing on Al Gore and Naomi Klein, Peter provided an argument which stressed the violation of unitarian principles as cause for action. Peter compared the success of the abolitionist movement to resist slavery as an important lesson to parallel modern-day climate resistance:

“In their day, [abolitionists] were considered crazy radicals for opposing what was economically expedient. . . if the minds of slave owners were deaf and blind to the humanity of slaves, perhaps we city folk are deaf to the voice of the Living Salish Sea. Perhaps we are blind to the Living Rain Forest which like the indigenous nations, also has rights.” \[A5-2-11\]

This sermon reinforced a principle-based approach to establish the inherent rights of non-human beings, and that projects that owe significant detriment to these rights be stopped. The infringement of human and non-human rights demands interrogation of underlying structures and processes of fossil fuel production and consumption.
B.6 Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonantzin Community Society

Our Lady of Guadalupe Tonantzin Community Society (OLGTC) is an independent Catholic congregation that aims to “[encourage], [support] and [accompany] each other to ever deeper relationship with God, the Earth, all beings, each other and our true selves” [A6-1-2]. Affiliated with the Catholic Worker Movement and the Roman Catholic Women Priests of Canada, OLGTC broadly encompasses dimensions of social and environmental justice in supporting the ordination of women priests, inclusiveness of LGBTQ members, and cultivation of relations to community and place [A6-1-2; I-13] (Machado, 2016). Because of their dissension with teachings on ordination and sexuality of the Catholic Church (Mayblin, 2019), OLGTC operates outside the confines of the Catholic Church [I-13; I-14; A6-1-2]. Inspired by the native goddess Tonantzin from Tepeyac Hill outside of Mexico City, Miriam founded OLGTC in part to strive towards reconciliation [A6-1-2], including the message of reconciliation with Indigenous peoples in its bearing name [I-13]18, and LGBTQ parishioners who were barred from Roman Catholic Church [I-13].

18 https://www.theyucatantimes.com/2014/12/our-lady-of-guadalupe-or-tonantzin/
Similar to Streams of Justice, OLGTCS derive their interpretations from liberation theology. They stress readings that attend to the compassion and inclusion of the marginalized in society and emphasize the importance of personal relationships with nature [A6-2-5; A6-2-6], which can be traced to the Franciscan schools of thought such as Saint Bonaventure and Saint Francis [I-13]. Members of OLGTCS acknowledged that climate change is a deep-seated issue but approached it from different angles. Miriam approached climate change from the lens of environmental racism. Racialized communities, including Indigenous peoples in Canada, have been unfairly situated beside material waste streams and the process of land dispossession of Indigenous peoples on reserves [I-13]. Whereas, Margaret viewed climate change as foregrounded by reconciliation and the lack of consent in pipeline controversy [I-14].
Fossil Free Faith was a multi-faith consortium across Canada which supported and engaged faith institutions about climate justice, fossil fuel divestment and reinvestment [A7-1-2]. Their mission is to bridge Canada’s faith communities with the larger fossil fuel divestment movement [A7-1-2]. They provided resources on other faith-based organizations and initiatives from Canada, U.S. and other parts of the world that work at the intersection of religious environmentalism and ecological justice.

Fossil Free Faith began with several members from Greening Sacred Spaces and Faith for the Common Good. Fossil Free Faith organized the BC Youth Fellows Program, which was the focus in this study [A7-1-5]. The Program consisted of appropriately twelve young adults whose backgrounds represented Islam, Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Christian, Quaker, Unitarianism, and Jewish traditions [I-15; A7-1-6]. In workshops held in 2015 and 2016, they discussed various religious perspectives on climate change, the space and tension of environmental work and religion in Canada and strategies for storytelling climate change to religious audiences [I-15]. In particular, agreement over interpretations of stewardship and teachings on justice could become entry points for community engagement on divestment [A7-1-5; 6].
## Appendix C  REO movement texts cited in main text and Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Ways to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Climate change &amp; Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-3</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-7</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Earth at Eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-9</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-14</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Reflections on the April 28 Day of Prayer and Bold Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-17</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Reconciliation – It’s Time to Move Our Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-20</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Carols, Christmas, and a Different Sort of Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-22</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Recovering the Sacred Vision of Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1-1-23</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Burnaby Mountain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Disobedience based on respect for Indigenous rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>What is Salal + Cedar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>What is watershed discipleship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-3</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Past events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-2-6</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Year 1 Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-2-10</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Invite us (to your church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-12</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Direct Action Training Day - Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-13</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Salal + Cedar prayer action against Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expansion project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-1-14</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Salal and Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salal and Cedar Watershed Discipleship Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-4-15</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Salal and Cedar members lock down a tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-4-17</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Sacred Earth Camp: Love &amp; compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-5-20</td>
<td>Social media posting</td>
<td>Dear Religious Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-4-21</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Anglicans stand against Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion as project hits roadblocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Call-out: faith-based action against Kinder Morgan!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-3</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Indigenous Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-4</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Parable of the Ruthless Ruler in Luke 19:11-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-5</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-8</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>April 25: Extraction or Sustenance: Rethinking our Relationship to Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-13</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Faith and Justice Roundtable Discussion # 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-17</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Facing Privilege: A Decolonization Workshop for Settler Allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-18</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Join us! Decolonization 101: What it is and why it matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-19</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Brunch Not Bitumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-20</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Land, Water, Air &amp; the City – A Community Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-21</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Land is Life: Indigenous Defenders Speak!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-22</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Pies Not Pipelines: Coffeehouse Fundraiser for the Unist’ot’en Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-24</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Resistance Cabaret!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-2-25</td>
<td>Word document</td>
<td>We Dare to Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-1-27</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Call-out: Take faith-based action against Kinder Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Standing Against the Kinder Morgan Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Our History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-1-3</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Reflections on the Blanket Exercise: a Gift of Communities Coming Together for Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-2-4</td>
<td>Word document</td>
<td>Reflections on the Blanket Exercise: a Gift of Communities Coming Together for Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-1-8</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>CFSC supports nonviolent work on Burnaby Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-1-8</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>The Principles and Sources of our Religious Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-2-9</td>
<td>Word document</td>
<td>A Resolution on Proposed Oil Pipelines in BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-2-10</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Subject: Opposition to proposed pipelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-2-11</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Finding My Spiritual Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-1-12</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>About Us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-1-13</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>BLOG: THE CRIMINALIZATION OF RECONCILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-2-3</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Be Careful How You Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-1-5</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>2018 Sermons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-1-6</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>2017 Sermons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-1-8</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>2015 Sermons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-1-1</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Spiritually rooted Direct Action Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-1-2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Fossil Free Faith: Canada’s Interfaith Divestment Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-1-3</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Who Has Divested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-1-5</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>BC Youth: Concerned about climate change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-1-6</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Connecting to a spiritual or faith community in BC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faithful Voices Speakers Bureau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D  Excerpts from textual analysis

D.1  Excerpt 1

Source: Streams of Justice (A3-1-2)

The capitalist principle of relentless growth has had devastating impacts on the life and well-being of people, communities, non-human species, regional landscapes, water systems, and climate...

Indigenous communities have been most negatively affected by industrial resource extraction projects, such as corporate fishing, mining and oil and gas industries. The land and water they have depended on for millennia to support their lifeways have been destroyed, and they have been forced off their traditional territories to make way for corporate resource extraction enterprises, aided and abetted by the state with its political, legal and bureaucratic apparatus. This sweeping system of resource extraction has impacted indigenous communities in so-called “Canada”, as well as indigenous and non-indigenous communities throughout the world, through Canada’s numerous multi-national corporations.

To stand alongside impacted communities and fight against the forces that are destroying the earth and displacing people from their homes and communities is an essential dimension in the struggle for justice. Resistance to tar sands development and pipeline construction, expanded mining projects on indigenous territory, without free, prior and informed consent of the first peoples, has become an important component in the work of Streams of Justice.

Analysis (Argumentation)

Grounds:

(1) Unrestrained growth gives rise to resources extraction.

(2) Resources extraction devastates people, communities, land, non-human species, water, and climate.

(3) Resources extraction most negatively impacts Indigenous communities.
(4) Resources extraction has destroyed their livelihoods, displaced communities, and become managed under the state.

(5) Similar instances of extraction-displacement-dependence-on-state are prevalent in other jurisdictions.

**Warrants:**

(1) Such impacts that destroy earth and displace Indigenous people from homes and communities result in injustices.

(2) Impacts occur without the free, prior and informed consent exacerbate injustices committed against Indigenous peoples

**Claims:**

(1) Streams of Justice’s mission to seek justice means that we stand alongside impacted communities.
D.2 Excerpt 2

**Source:** Earthkeepers (A1-1-14)

**Analysis:** Recontextualization and mythopoesis

"Last week’s event was an opportunity to tangibly witness to the danger that a pipeline expansion would pose to our common home here in unceded Coast Salish territories as well as the global effects of climate change on our neighbors, including the least of these and the global poor that have little to no contribution in carbon pollution but bear its effects. . . Fifty years ago, the majority of Christians and white churches in the USA stood on the sidelines when Martin Luther King Jr. and supporters marched in Montgomery and the South and called for desegregation and equality. Some Christian leaders criticised him for disturbing the status quo and implored him to be patient and submissive to the powers of government and of the state. In Letter from a Birmingham Jail, Martin Luther King Jr. responded that injustice for some was injustice for all, and warned of how apathy also enables oppression. Today, we have the opportunity to join our Coast Salish and other aboriginal neighbors that are calling for meaningful action on reconciliation and the implementation of the UN Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples, particularly as it relates to protecting Indigenous traditional territories and ensuring meaningful participation in decision-making, including consent for pipeline projects."
D.3   Excerpt 3

Source: Salal + Cedar (A2-1-13)

“Since Burnaby Mountain is where we do our annual stations of the cross, our sacramental life is also very tied to place. Our love of neighbor in our watershed and our capacity to be present with our bodies and to put ourselves in the way of harm is a very real opportunity here. We’ve been growing this capacity and looking to this possibility, because the threats here are quite personal. There are families that are part of Salal + Cedar who live in homes that are threatened by the fact that there really is no adequate fire and emergency response to a pipeline spill. The resident orca pods that live in the waters off of the land here are dwindling in number because of the depletion of wild salmon stock. And the audio harm that the pile driving will do to those communities is inestimable and immeasurable. . .

In an effort “to know and love our neighbors in that place, and to raise up the names of the various species that are endangered by this project,” Salal + Cedar plans a species survey count, traversing the land around the Kinder Morgan facility. “All across these private property lines, salmon streams, eagles, ravens, bushtits, and all kinds of living creatures are moving back and forth across these artificial lines” . . . [I-5] also calls attention to the Coast Salish people, whose land is yet again being destroyed and diminished by this project, though their ancestry can be traced back thousands of years in that region..."
Analysis (Social Processes)

“Since Burnaby Mountain is where we do our annual stations of the cross, our sacramental life is also very tied to place. Our love of neighbor in our watershed (Material, Actor+AFFECTED+PROCESS+PLACE) and our capacity to be present with our bodies (MENTAL, EXPERIENCER+PHENOMENON) and to put ourselves in the way of harm (Material, ACTOR+AFFECTED+PROCESS) is a very real opportunity here (RELATIONAL-2, TOKEN+VALUE). We’ve been growing this capacity and looking to this possibility, because the threats here are quite personal.”
"the Unitarian Church of Vancouver, as a member of the Canadian Unitarian Council (CUC), adheres to the CUC’s Seven Principles, the first of which states “We affirm and promote the inherent worth and dignity of every person”, and the seventh of which calls on us to "respect the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part", and in addition, our church's mission statement calls on us to promote “social justice” and “environmental sustainability”;

"Whereas the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, signed by the Government of Canada, promotes "free, informed, and prior consent" by indigenous peoples before intrusion on their traditional territories. . ."

"Whereas over one hundred First Nations in B.C., Alberta, and the North West Territories have signed the "Save the Fraser Declaration" which states: "...Therefore, in upholding our ancestral laws, Title, Rights and responsibilities, we declare: "We will not allow the proposed Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipelines, or similar Tar Sands projects, to cross our lands, territories, and watersheds, or the ocean migration routes of Fraser River salmon...."

"WHEREAS, a potential disaster worse than a major oil spill, would be the successful shipment and use of increasing volumes of diluted bitumen, and all the resulting carbon dioxide being spilled into the atmosphere; and

" WHEREAS, due to the disastrous impacts of climate change, Canada’s present volume of production and consumption of fossil fuels is a great moral issue4, and contrary to our Seventh Principle;""
Analysis (Argumentation)

Climate change is an issue given the pollution to the global atmosphere, but more importantly it violates moral principles of Unitarians, namely the 1st and 7th principle.

Grounds

(1) Unitarians affirm and promote the first and seventh principles of the Canadian Unitarian Council.

(2) Unitarian Church of Vancouver promotes social justice and environmental sustainability.

(3) The UNDRIP, with Canada being a signatory of the Declaration, upholds the principle of free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous peoples.

(4) Indigenous peoples have expressed opposition to the pipeline due to its impacts on Fraser River salmon.

Warrants

(1) Climate change violates the Unitarian principles of promoting the inherent worth and dignity of people and the respect for the interdependent web of all existence.

Claim

(2) The Unitarian Church of Vancouver ought to oppose said proposed pipelines, and any further financial assets associated with fossil fuels.
D.5  Excerpt 5

Source: Streams of Justice (A3-1-27)

Analysis: Re-contextualization

"I am here today as I was on the day I was arrested for participating, like others, in nonviolent civil disobedience – standing in solidarity with Indigenous people, here on these territories, and across Turtle Island. I mean no disrespect to the court in my actions. I simply wish to live in a way that honours those whose voices, stories, and wisdom predate the court system on these lands, and whose rights remain unrecognized. I hope that one day we will not only adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in theory, but put each of its articles into practice as a starting point for true reconciliation.

Myself, I come from a migratory people, a family tree with a history of displacement like many living in diaspora. It is here on these territories that Indigenous Elders, siblings, and friends have generously taught me the beauty and resonance in being rooted to a place, in speaking to ancestral knowledge, power, and pride, in protecting the land and water as sacred. I work in the Downtown Eastside and have been gifted with friendships with remarkable women whose songs and drum beats nourish both my spirit and my resistance. Like them I work for a world free of violence – violence against Indigenous women, two-spirit and trans people, and violence against the land and the earth. I carried their medicine with me up to the mountain as a way to honour them, knowing my decision was out of this deep and abiding respect; for these warrior women as well as for future generations whose home is under threat.”
Appendix E Auto-ethnographical vignettes

Auto-ethnographical vignettes document the portrayals of the events in everyday life during field work to provide details of my interaction with participants in relation to the collected data and social context (Humphreys, 2005). These notes of reflexivity demonstrate how I as the researcher am an instrument in the qualitative research process (Berger, 2015; Carter et al., 2014; Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Each vignette provides access into how I as the researcher leveraged my positionality and self-reflexivity to guide my data analysis and writing process.

E.1 Vignette #1 - November 2 2018

Today’s interview with I-2 went much better than my first interview but I know I found it difficult to keep my composure. As I maintained the conversation over the phone, I found it fascinating but challenging to draw linkages to different questions as I simultaneously engaged in conversation and focused on writing down everything that was said. I need to change this practice.

Several things stuck out to me from the interview. One thing I think that I could improve on is defining the meaning of messaging. What is inside the messages of climate change? To convey meaning? Symbolism? Metaphors? Exactly what do I mean? It could be said that messages could convey a number of things, such as the meaning of climate change in the grand scheme of things, and what climate change could mean locally in terms of impacts, and what kinds of language is used to frame climate change.

Another theme that has emerged is the issue of identity. Do I believe something simply because I know the facts, or because it is something I know aligns with them personally? Where are the participants positioned that makes them say what they say? Where do participants locate themselves in the resistance and the roles they play can shape the themes they bring up.
E.2  Vignette #2 - November 12 2018

I was quite fascinated with I-4’s interview. One of the reoccurring themes I am noticing is that the emerging theme surrounding decolonization, and what it means to stand with Indigenous brothers and sisters. I-4 pointed out that by first recognizing his privilege of race and accessibility before discussing the issues that stood out to him as part of his journey of standing in solidarity with Indigenous peoples.

I can also sense his choice of words. I can hear that when he speaks, in the midst of his pauses, that I-4 is really trying hard to make an intentional effect to exercise care with the issues that are being brought up. It raises the question of how he connects his activism with his faith, and how that becomes expressed in the way he and others participate in Earthkeepers and the resistance.

E.3  Vignette #3 - November 14 2018

After my interview with I-13, I began to reflect on the role of REOs in breaking through the divide on climate change. I was quite struck as she began to describe how she founded the congregation because she wanted to provide community for marginalized peoples that were excluded by the Catholic Church. Although this aspect was beyond the scope of my study, I thought it was worth noting that REOs have immense social justice leanings. Among these REOs are individuals that attempt to work outside of the orthodoxy suggest that there is a loosely connected faith-based network have been more vocal in this resistance. This trend fits with other REOs. For instance, members of Earthkeepers have felt compelled to take that extra step to educate others and bridge the divide to wider range of evangelical audiences.

Although I-13 spoke about her act to engage in direct action within the spirit of reconciliation, her personal circumstances became the motivating factor for why she was willing to get arrested on April 28th. Even though she suggested that her arrest was a small gesture of symbolic action that was amplified by media optics and public spotlight, her actions speak to her solidarity and support for Indigenous peoples on the front lines of resistance.
A pattern I am noticing from the interviews is the relationship between reconciliation, Indigenous peoples and land. REOs spoke of the differences across traditions towards reconciliation. I think there is more to this nuanced term in underlying their motivations for engaging in direct action.

Another dimension to further examine is the types of relationships among traditions and between REOs. These can be broadly conceived as building relationships with members within the tradition to communicate the significance of climate change, build relationships in congregations, or even more broadly as movement-building within the religious environmental movement. More importantly, these efforts underscore how REOs and the frames they deploy are contingent on the similarities and differences in their frames. I will need to start taking greater care to examine these linkages to understand what it takes for REOs to build trust and rapport with the audience.

E.4 Vignette #4 - January 9 2019

As I compile the dataset, I am revisiting the motivations and strategies of REOs. What motivates them to engage and what strategies do they adopt in the resistance?

I think one way to simplify the answer to start off with the alignment of REOs to their tradition. For instance, when they say our group will go about participating in direct action, they are implying that they might consider certain risks, politically and institutionally. Starting with this interpretation may provide REOs with fertile ground to launch into courses of action.

Another issue I am thinking about is the process in framing. How did scholars previously establish the three frames that we know today, namely stewardship, eco-spirituality, and eco-justice? There is some exploration by these authors but by in large, how the frames are constructed have been rather descriptive and lack conceptual depth. Using the refined research question, I hope to enrich the conversation by getting a better sense of the discussions and decisions that shape and guide where REOs end up where they are. There are still many questions left unanswered, but at least we could pin down a
few of the major issues so we can play around with themes that REOs may draw upon in constructing and tailoring value-based messages one climate change.

Also, I have been thinking about how the Trans Mountain resistance parallels other pipeline resistances happening right now in British Columbia, notably the opposition against the Coastal GasLink pipeline. The Unist’ot’en camp has blockaded a segment of the proposed route to prevent further construction. At the heart of these reactions is symptomatic of the complex relationship between Indigenous peoples of Canada and natural resource development. Pipelines often represent essential infrastructure of the fossil fuel economy, but the voiced oppositions and broader political imperatives raise questions on the decision-making and procedure for obtaining adequate consent to projects. Context matters enormously in shaping the spaces and conditions of REOs in how climate change makes its way into their messaging and becomes expressed through their actions and communication to religious audiences.

E.5  Vignette #5 - January 24 2019

One thing that I have noticed among participants from Earthkeepers and other REOs is the differences in relationship between the informalities of REOs and the larger structures of national religious bodies. How these relationships configure themselves unexpectedly can involve power dynamics. I also notice a broad theme surrounding the tensions of communicating to religious audiences and the hopelessness that comes with trying to push for community-wide reforms. This point was particularly highlighted in the interviews with members from Streams of Justice.

A question I keep returning to is how climate change messaging of REOs align with their actions. What constitutes these messages, and how might these messages lead to actions? How is meaning generated within these messages? REOs generally make claims about reconciliation through allyship with Indigenous peoples by raising awareness and engaging in strategic actions. In what ways do these messages align with actions? And what does this say about members of REOs and what they are trying to do? Who has the right to claim allyship?
Given the contentious rhetoric behind the term reconciliation, I hope to take a more critical approach to unpack the ways REOs interpret reconciliation in the messaging. This exercise would be helpful to flesh out what reconciliation entails in the context of alliances or coalitions in support of Indigenous-led movements. In this case study, fundamental questions surrounding the contentious Indigenous-settler relationships could play a role in shaping the processes for framing climate change messaging. Messages of course, are not developed in isolation. They are intentional decisions based on members of REOs, a majority of them who self-identify with European ancestry while a handful self-identify as people of color. As such, I take this as a challenge and opportunity to critically reflect on the identity of religious settlers. Clarifying the individual motives that explain the messaging behind REOs could reveal unexpected findings about what it means to live on this land. Unpacking these issues can also help inform how participating in the pipeline resistance, including engaging in civil disobedience, may be viewed as a act of “reconciliation”.

Another point I am reflecting over as I re-read interview transcripts is how some REOs are explicit about the assumptions and problems in their tradition when it comes to meaningfully reflect on engagement with Indigenous peoples. This expression is refreshing as they work to think and work beyond the mechanics of the institution. At the same time, their intention and work towards re-constructing the tradition by re-interpreting key scriptures to rationalize and justify their motives and actions points to opportunities and challenges ahead in making fuller sense in sensitizing their tradition to the historical context. Later on, as I dig deeper into the data through discursive textual analysis, it would be interesting to see what other connections and underlying messages I can unearth to reflect critical moments.
E.6 Vignette #6 - January 31 2019

“Acknowledging my positionality including my power and role in continued colonization of this land and social places is essential. Reflexivity is needed to aid the often-slow process of coming to understand harm that was done despite the best intentions.” (Carter et al., 2014: 370)

Today’s meetings consisted of the informal session with Dr. Kyle Powys Whyte, the IRES seminar with Dr. Michelle Daigle, and the one-on-one session with Dr. Powys Whyte. While my study does not directly engage with Indigenous populations, it nevertheless entails contextual questions of Indigenous-settler relations. Since REOs have by and large expressed different degrees of reformative visions of colonialism, capitalism and Indigenous reconciliation, I think it is necessary to become familiarized with the language Indigenous scholars use in attending to colonialism, interrogation of structures of power, and acknowledging privilege along racial and spatial lines.

What comes to my mind about REOs, and largely religious environmentalism to what extent REOs are part of a reformative effort in their tradition. In doing so, it embraces not just what religious traditions prescribe but also what has conjoined with forms of colonialism that have legitimized the suppression of Indigenous peoples, cultures and knowledges, as well as instill the binary between relations of the self and the land. How do REOs become part of sustaining the tradition and reforming the institution when they are also part of the institution they are trying to critique? The baggage in this context further raise issues of power and influence. The difficulty is enormous and it is often easier said than done. Reforming institutions and structures of power is never easy, but at least getting the dialogue started is an admirable step to take. There are places where my data seems to suggest that REOs are intersecting with these larger debates.

Reflections after the meeting

Today’s brief one-on-one discussion with Dr. Kyle Whyte was helpful in several ways. I felt I was on the right track in grappling with what it means to engage in reconciliatory work with Indigenous peoples. At the same time, I am cognizant of the need to be critical of how ideas and practices are conducted through
the systems that impose these acts of injustice. As such, I think I have to take greater care in lining empirical findings to theoretical contributions. I need to bring evidence that bridges the link between the religion, ecology, and culture debate, and how these discussions foreground pipeline politics. Another area of exploration is how these engagements spill over to other settings.

Additionally, I have to be careful about my own positionality and how it might affect the outcome of the study. At first, I was somewhat sympathetic to the cause of REOs. However, having distanced myself from the interviews, I feel I am in a better position to critically assess the ways REOs have been effective or not in reaching through the larger domains and structures of power and influence within respective religious circles. How political discussions such as Indigenous topics and issues are discussed also has to be handled with great care. I think it is imperative to listen, interact, and learn from Indigenous voices especially the people in helping to discern the issues at this stage of thinking and writing.

E.7 Vignette #7 - March 20 2019

Whenever the word reconciliation is mentioned during data analysis, I think about how big that word is and how easy it is to toss around the word without engaging in any concrete action. On a more practical level, when it comes to healing between two people groups with power differences, I think about the smaller things that one can do to improve the lives of the disenfranchised that continue to live with historical and present injustices and inequities. It is a process of restitution. It is a process of making things right again. But the more I look into the literature on the Indigenous peoples and settler state relations in Canada, the more I find that past injustices continue to be unheard. As a Christian, I also cannot help but reflect on the gravity of the issues and also the difficulties in finding common paths forward towards all forms of reconciliation.

With that said, reconciliation has to be examined on multiple sides to understand what it really means for different people. What exactly does this reconciliation looks like for those who self-identify with religious affiliation but come from settler backgrounds? Linking to an earlier note, I am beginning to think about what and why this message on reconciliation matters in the context of resource development.
There are broader sets of political issues that involve money, access, and power. Some of these conflicts are embedded in the historical legacies of property rights, Indigenous-Crown relations, and more fundamentally contrasting visions of relations between people and the land. I have to give more thought in fleshing out these issues as I assemble my findings.

E.8 Vignette #8 - April 16 2019

“A key methodological issue is for researchers to examine their own story in ways that explicate their own personal reasons to undertake the research. Although not all researchers have the capacity to do so, in doing so, the researcher further unearths his or her assumptions and driving forces of the research.” (Carter et al., 2014, p. 368)

Reflecting on the first stages of drafting interview findings and receiving feedback from my presentation to the IRES community, I realize I need to become better equipped in reflecting and examining the stories we tell. Which ones we decide to tell and not tell, and why that might be the case. Aside from triangulating the spectrum of similar and contrasting viewpoints, I think I have approached the matter by writing about the stories of participants which surprised me. To really hear these voices that are speaking to these stories, I must first allow themselves to speak how they feel, even if I might personally disagree with them. The truth is, the individuals behind these groups or organizations are the marginalized or minority of voices within the tradition, who are attempting to provide a reasoned voice behind the intersection of Indigenous reconciliation and addressing climate change.

“As qualitative researchers, we must constantly reflect on our emotions and positionality and how they influence our approach to research (Hunt, 2010). At the same time, we acknowledge that reflexivity is imperfect and that we can never know exactly how the researcher affects the research (Bishop & Shepherd, 2011). In order to maintain a rigorous process, we need to constantly interrogate self as the researcher, our responses to participants, and the interpretive process of analysis.
Another question I began to ask myself is to what extent I might have injected myself in there. In all interviews, I did make myself clear I was entering into the field as a researcher. Other than the interaction with members of Earthkeepers, I think this distance was pretty well established. At points in the interviews, the conversations turned into a reflective exercise of what the participants actually did in the past few years. Hopefully this process also benefited the participant. But I think this process in a way also helped me gain clarity of the participants, better understanding them as ordinary people who are committed to a complex, but socially and environmentally just cause. They also got their own challenges and difficulties they face on a day to day basis. They have work. They have friends. They have kids. They go through their own battles and sicknesses, and deal with the same sorts of issues I think we all go through at certain periods of life. My role as a researcher is handle these topics in a serious manner but in a way that establishes rapport and empathy with participants.

Another part of this current work makes me think a lot about my own journey living under post-colonial societies notably Hong Kong. After the 150 years of British rule of Hong Kong, Hong Kong had thrived and achieved a semi-autonomous political identity and cultural uniqueness. It defined my parent’s generation and subsequently influenced my generation and the ones after. For Canada, I cannot help but imagine if the colonizers actually honored their treaty commitments and dealt good faith in nurturing settler nation to Indigenous nation relationships. What kind of Canada would that have been?

While a majority of my time has been spent living in Canada, never until this study had I seriously questioned the structures, powers, and legacies that colonialism had and continues to have on the people and this land that we now commonly refer to as “Canada”. As an immigrant of color who has benefited from economic-style immigration policies of the Canadian state in the late 1990s, conducting this study has become a mini journey of self-exploration into the assumptions and privileges, I as an immigrant settler of color, have relative to Caucasian settlers and Indigenous communities. This distinction is not meant to downplay my own position, but rather it is meant to confront and acknowledge
how much more there is to learn to live as an awakened settler of Hong Kong Chinese ethnicity, on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations. In doing so, I also knowledge that I have assumed certain privileges such as housing, education, social status, and endowment of religions from immigrant settlers.
## Appendix F  Background of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Code</th>
<th>REO</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Role in REO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Earthkeepers</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Salal + Cedar</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Salal + Cedar</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7</td>
<td>Streams of Justice</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Streams of Justice</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-9</td>
<td>Streams of Justice</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10</td>
<td>Vancouver Quakers</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-11</td>
<td>Vancouver Unitarians</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Environment Committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-12</td>
<td>Vancouver Unitarians</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Social Justice Committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-13</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-14</td>
<td>Our Lady of Guadalupe</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonanzin Community Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Fossil Free Faith</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G  Invitation letter (email template)

[Date – mm/dd/yyyy]

[Name of invited participant]

[Organization address]

Dear (participant name),

Invitation to take part in an interview regarding [your organization’s] participation in the resistance against the [Trans-Mountain Pipeline Expansion project]

My name is Victor Lam and I am a Masters candidate at the Institute for Resources, Environment Sustainability at the University of British Columbia. Together with Dr. George Hoberg and Dr. Leila Harris, we are currently conducting interviews with informants from religious environmental organizations for the project titled “The Roles of Religious Environmental Organizations in Climate Movements: Framing Climate Change in the Resistance Against the Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion.”

Project Aim and Background
This project aims to understand the roles that religious environmental organizations may play in climate change politics and communication, by clarifying how and the extent these organizations articulate climate change. Climate change presents an unprecedented challenge to society in how we can rapidly and effectively respond to impacts of climate change. Amidst the call for the end of fossil fuel extraction within the global climate movement, more locally-based movements have emerged. These movements have garnered the support and drawn together a broad coalition of environmental and grassroots groups, Indigenous peoples, and religious communities.

The participation of people from different walks of life, particularly religious communities in the form of religious environmental organizations, represents an interesting development in the role of religious participation in climate politics. Religious environmental organizations (REOs) have emerged as one of the actors that seek to bridge religious concern on climate change, as well as transform existing practices within respective traditions through a myriad of actions. For instance, some organizations have participated in major rallies against fossil fuel projects or petitioned for the divestment of fossil fuels within their respective religious
institutions. However, what is known about how REOs articulate these messages on climate change, and how they place themselves within climate movements is limited.

**Invitation and Your Involvement**

We would like to cordially invite you, on behalf of your organization, *[organization name]* to take part in a 1 to 1.5-hour long, semi-structured interview with our research team. We would like to learn more about *[organization name]* participation in the resistance against the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

This interview will be based on the following topics regarding your organization:

1. views on climate change;
2. involvement in the resistance against the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion;
3. communication of climate change in case of the pipeline resistance;
4. the platforms for communicating climate change; and
5. organizational background.

To enrich the discussion, a copy of the interview guide will be circulated for your reference prior to the interview. We kindly ask that you prepare responses ahead of time.

We kindly ask that this interview take place at a public setting or at your organization’s office. Please note that this interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis.

**Confidentiality and privacy of information**

Respecting participant confidentiality and privacy is our utmost priority. Please rest assured that you will not be identifiable throughout the study. We will assign a pseudonym when there is need to cite any part of the interview.

**Participant Feedback on Interview Transcript**

We will circulate a copy of the recorded transcript from the interview within two to three weeks after the interview. Please take a close look at the transcript. If there are any discrepancies between what you have stated and what you actually meant to say, or should other issues arise, please do not hesitate to contact me.

**Contact**

Please feel free to contact my supervisor, Dr. George Hoberg or I should you have further questions about this study. Our contact information can be found below.

Thank you for your consideration. We very much look forward to learning more about how your organization is making climate change an important matter in your religious tradition.
Yours Truly,

Victor Lam  
Co-Investigator  
Master of Arts Candidate  
Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability  
University of British Columbia

George Hoberg  
Principal Investigator  
Professor; Faculty Associate  
School of Public Policy and Global Affairs;  
Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability  
University of British Columbia

Leila Harris  
Co-Investigator  
Associate Professor  
Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability  
University of British Columbia
Appendix H  Consent form

The Roles of Religious Environmental Organizations in Climate Movements:
Framing Climate Change in the Resistance Against the
Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion
Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability
University of British Columbia

I. Study Team

George Hoberg (Principal Investigator)
Professor, School of Public Policy and Global Affairs;
Faculty Associate, Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability
*If you have any further questions or concerns with this study, please feel free to contact Dr. George Hoberg.

Victor Lam (Co-Investigator and Primary Contact)
Master of Arts Candidate, Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability

Leila Harris (Co-Investigator)
Associate Professor, Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability

II. Why should you take part in this study? And why are we conducting this study?
This study is part of a thesis for the partial completion of the Master of Arts degree in Resources, Environment and Sustainability for Victor Lam (Co-Investigator). The impending challenges of and growing calls to respond to global climate change has generated a new wave of climate activism. In particular, locally-based climate movements have garnered the support of and drawn together a coalition of environmental and grassroots groups, Indigenous peoples, and religious communities. How these actors generate meaning and persuade their followers and communities to respond to climate change within respective contexts is an interesting, yet under-explored area.

This study is interested in how religious environmentalists come to articulate climate change in climate movements. In particular, this study will examine how religious environmental organizations frame their participation in the resistance movements against the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. We will be interviewing leaders and representatives of religious environmental organizations.

III. Yes, I want to be a part of this study. What do I need to know?
Your involvement will entail a semi-structured interview that will last between one to one and a half hours in a public setting or at your organization’s office. To facilitate the interview, we kindly ask that you dedicate one to two hours (as needed) to prepare for this interview. During this interview, you will be asked about the participation of your religious environmental organization in the respective resistance movement. You will be asked about your views on how your organization articulates messages on climate change and in particular in the ways in which it has been used in the resistances. You will also be asked about the different platforms your organization uses to disseminate these messages on climate change.

IV. How will the study results be disseminated?
The study results will be disseminated through a variety of channels. Primarily, this study will be publicly accessible in the form of a published graduate thesis in the UBC Thesis database. This study will also be turned to an academic journal article for publication among academic audiences. Written pieces documenting portions of this thesis may be publicized after thesis publication.
V. What are the potential risks of this study?
We think there are minimal potential risks to study. There might be a chance where you might be identified in this interview. Some discussed such as acts of civil disobedience, may present potential financial implications to your organization. We will mitigate these risks by ensuring anonymity and minimizing quotes. Furthermore, some questions may involve your degree of personal involvement or care about the issues. To reiterate, you do not have answer any questions where you prefer not to, and you can exit the study at any time without repercussions.

VI. What are the potential benefits in participating in this study?
You may potentially benefit from this study by learning about the similarities and differences between these two resistance movements, and how other religious environmental organizations have participated in these movements. Your organization may also be noted in public record about its participation in the pipeline resistance movement and spark greater academic and public interest in the role of religious environmentalism in climate movements.

VII. How will disclosed information be kept confidential?
You will remain confidential throughout the study. All participants and documents will be identified only by a code. The list of codes will be kept on an encrypted hard drive stored at the Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability at the University of British Columbia. Participants will be identified by pseudonyms in publications of the completed study.

VIII. Contact for Information about the Study
If you have any questions or concerns about what we are asking of you, please feel free to contact the Co-Investigator (Lam) or the Principal Investigator (Hoberg). Their contact information is available in section I).

IX. Contact for Complaints
If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598 or by e-mail at RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

X. Participant Consent and Signature
Taking part in this study is entirely up to you. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part, you may choose to pull out of the study at any time without giving a reason and without any negative impact.

- Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.
- Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study.

____________________________________________________
Participant Signature  Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name of the Participant
Appendix I  Interview guide

Version B0.2e

The Roles of Religious Environmental Organizations in Climate Movements:
Framing Climate Change in the Resistance Against the Trans Mountain Expansion Project

Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability
University of British Columbia

1. Your Organization’s View on Climate Change
   a) What is your organization’s official position on climate change?

   b) How did your organization come up with this view on climate change?

   c) What scriptures, schools of thought, and leaders in your tradition support this view on climate change?

2. Participation in the Pipeline Resistance
   a) Can you please speak about your organization’s involvement in the pipeline resistance?

      (For example, when did participation begin? How often was the participation? How would you characterize your organization’s role(s) in participation? Feel free to elaborate by providing examples.)

   b) Why did your organization decide to participate in this movement?

      (For example, what underlying purpose and objectives does your organization have in mind when issuing a statement of support?)
3. Communicating Climate Change Through Participation in the Pipeline Resistance

a) How does your organization try to articulate the problems with the pipeline?

b) Has your organization also proposed solutions or alternatives to the pipeline?

c) To what extent has climate change been included to frame the discussion of the pipeline?

d) Have the messages around climate change changed over the course of the movement?  
   (For example, are these messages time-sensitive, or responsive to certain issues or events?)

e) What kind of messages on climate change have you found to be effective or ineffective?

f) Do these messages on climate change resonate with some audiences more than others?  
   (For example, do some words or metaphors resonate more or less with particular audiences given their 
   backgrounds?)

4. Platforms of Communication

a) Who is/are the intended audience(s) in your organization’s communication on climate change?

b) What kinds of platforms does your organization use to communicate with your audience(s)?

c) To what extent does your organization make use of Facebook and Twitter?

d) What is the primary goal of using these platforms?

e) How do you think your organization’s messages are being received by your audience(s)?

5. Background of the Organization

a) Can you please share a brief history of your organization?

b) What is the core vision or mission of your organization?

c) What is the overall organizational structure of your organization?

d) Do the religious institutions affiliated with your organization have any impact on how you talk about climate change?