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“Americans love Jesus, Lincoln, and themselves”
Public Opinion Polling (N = 800)

Do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of...

- Yourself: 93%
- Abraham Lincoln: 91%
- Jesus Christ: 90%
- George Washington: 86%
- Mother Teresa: 83%
- MLK, Jr.: 74%
- Santa Clause: 67%
- Mahatma Gandhi: 64%
- Nelson Mandela: 64%
- Steve Jobs: 62%
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Is it morally sound to use air travel?
Moral Beliefs Survey
Sample size = 545 American English-speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All participants were exposed to the following definition:

**Moral values** refer to a set of principles that guide an individual on how to evaluate right versus wrong. An individual with high moral values typically displays characteristics of integrity, courage, respect, fairness, honesty and compassion.
What do you think: Morally acceptable?

- American veterans being unhoused/homeless: 74% (1), 18% (3), 5% (4), 2% (2)
- Price of health care in the U.S.: 56% (1), 30% (3), 11% (4), 3% (2)
- Foreign military using weapons on people in U.S.: 48% (1), 36% (3), 11% (4), 5% (2)
- President of a public university making $57,000 per MONTH: 35% (1), 30% (3), 20% (4), 14% (2)
- Denying refugees access into the U.S.: 32% (1), 27% (3), 19% (4), 21% (2)
- U.S. military using weapons on people in other countries: 26% (1), 34% (3), 26% (4), 14% (2)
- Using air travel for vacations: 8% (1), 22% (3), 63% (4), 9% (2)
- Driving, even when biking, walking, or bussing are possible: 2% (1), 9% (3), 42% (4), 47% (2)
All participants were also exposed to the following language:

Thinking about what you know of the teachings of Jesus as an example of moral guidelines, regardless of your beliefs, which of the following do you think Jesus would support if he were living among us today?
...which of the following do you think Jesus would support if he were living among us today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1 (Yes, would support)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 (No, would NOT support)</th>
<th>I truly don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American veterans being unhoused/homeless</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of health care in the U.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign military using weapons on people in U.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of a public university making $57,000 per MONTH</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denying refugees access into the U.S.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. military using weapons on people in other countries</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using air travel for vacations</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving, even when biking, walking, or bussing are possible</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing Republicans and Democrats
What do you think?

Morally acceptable or morally wrong?
U.S. military using weapons on people in other countries  (Republican n = 207; Democrat n = 225)

- Morally Acceptable: Republican 26.1%, Democrat 3.6%
- Morally Wrong: Republican 37%, Democrat 81%
Foreign military using weapons on people in U.S. (Republican $n = 207$; Democrat $n = 225$)

- Morally Acceptable
  - Republican: 8.7%
  - Democrat: 0.4%

- 2
  - Republican: 14.5%
  - Democrat: 7.6%

- 3
  - Republican: 30.4%
  - Democrat: 37.8%

- 4- Morally Wrong
  - Republican: 46.4%
  - Democrat: 54.2%

R: 77% Wrong (+40%)
D: 92% Wrong (+11%)
What would Jesus think?

Morally acceptable or morally wrong?
Would Jesus support: U.S. military using weapons on people in other countries (Republican $n=207$; Democrat $n=225$)

- **Yes, would support**: Republican 7.7%, Democrat 1.3%
- **No, would support NOT**: Republican 13.0%, Democrat 4.0%
- **Jesus would think?**: Republican 14.5%, Democrat 4.4%
- **I truly don't know**: Republican 3.8%, Democrat 5.8%

**Total Support Percentages**
- Republican: 72%
- Democrat: 89%

**Graph**
- Republican: 72% Not support
- Democrat: 89% No support
Would Jesus support: Foreign military using weapons on people in U.S. (Republican \( n = 207 \); Democrat \( n = 225 \))

- **Yes, would support**: 3.4% (Republican) 0.9% (Democrat)
- **2**: 4.8% 2.7%
- **3**: 15.9% 4.0%
- **4- No, would NOT support**: 69.1% (Republican) 86.2% (Democrat)
- **I truly don't know**: 6.8% 6.2%

Jesus would think?
- **R: 85% Not support (+13%)**
- **D: 90% No support (+1%)**
What do you think?

Morally acceptable or morally wrong?
Why ask about air travel?
Carbon Budget (1000 gigatons CO$_2$)
If everyone were allotted 2 Mt/yr = 66 years left
If everyone were allotted 16.5 Mt/yr = 8 years left

“Allocating a 2 °C cumulative carbon budget to countries”
If emissions had been shared equally from the beginning, the U.S. used up their share in 1944.
(calculated by ClimateInteractive.org)
Is air travel a significant contributor of GHG emissions?
Global CO₂ emissions (per capita; annual)  

World Bank, 2014

- World: 5
- U.S.: 16.5
- Iceland: 6.1
- India: 1.7
- Kiribati: 0.6

CO₂ emissions in metric tons
Global CO₂ emissions (per capita; annual)

- World: 5
- U.S.: 16.5
- Iceland: 6.1
- India: 1.7
- Kiribati: 0.6
- RT PDX Greece: 5.5
- RT PDX Hawai’i: 2.3
- RT PDX DC: 2.1

World Bank, 2014
Cool Climate Calculator, 2017
Morally acceptable or morally wrong?

What do you think?
Using air travel for vacations
(N = 545)

- 70.0% Morally Acceptable
- 17.9% Morally Acceptable
- 5.3% Morally Acceptable
- 6.8% Morally Acceptable

Republicans: 12% Wrong
Democrats: 16% Wrong
Driving, even when biking, walking, or bussing are possible
($N = 543$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morally Acceptable</th>
<th>Morally Wrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R: 7% Wrong
D: 12% Wrong
Using air travel for vacations
(N = 545)

- Republicans: 70.0%
- Democrats: 56.9%
- Respondents: 27.1%

Driving, even when biking, walking, or bussing are possible
(N = 543)

- Republicans: 61.8%
- Democrats: 51.6%
- Respondents: 30.9%

Red: 12% Wrong
Blue: 16% Wrong
Red: 7% Wrong
Blue: 12% Wrong
What would Jesus think?

Morally acceptable or morally wrong?
Would Jesus support: Using air travel for vacations

(N = 545)

1- Yes, would support
2
3
4- No, would NOT support
I truly don't know

Republican

Democrat

Jesus would think?
R: 23% Not support
D: 31% Not support
Would Jesus support: Driving, even when biking, walking, or bussing are possible

(N = 545)

Republican  Democrat

Jesus would think?
R: 24% Not support
D: 47% Not support (+16%)
Air travel: The environmentalist’s Achilles’ heel?

Survey from November 2015
Air travel for last year (Achilles’ heel?)

Pro-environmental $N = 263$, General public $N = 240$; Nov. 2015

Bar chart showing travel times:

- None: 36% Pro, 54% General Public
- < 2 hours: 5% Pro, 6% General Public
- 5 hours: 16% Pro, 13% General Public
- 10 hours: 21% Pro, 14% General Public
- 25 hours: 18% Pro, 10% General Public
- 50 hours: 3% Pro, 2% General Public
- 100 hours: 0% Pro, 1% General Public
95 Pro-environmental and 130 General public did not fly in the last year.

What is the reason you did not fly?

- No desire
  - Pro-environmental: 33%
  - General Public: 35%
- No opp/ No $
  - Pro-environmental: 50%
  - General Public: 53%
- Keep CO2 small
  - Pro-environmental: 7%
  - General Public: 3%
- Frugal
  - Pro-environmental: 11%
  - General Public: 9%
Is it morally sound to use air travel?
Take an honest look in the mirror.

Remember to share.
Lawyers’ Ethics and Climate Change

Courtney Johnson
courtney@crag.org
Professional Ethics

• Duties are to clients
• “Zealous” advocacy
• Oregon RPC 2.1 Advisor:
  o In representing a client, a lawyer shall exercise independent professional judgment and render candid advice. In rendering advice, a lawyer may refer not only to law but to other considerations such as moral, economic, social and political factors, that may be relevant to the client’s situation.
Sustainable Future Section

Mission:

The Sustainable Future Section supports sustainability within the Oregon legal profession and the practice of law through:
1. Educational programs,
2. Examination of the integration of law and sustainability, and
3. Dialogue about the needs and interests of future generations.

Activities:

Newsletter, Programs, Awards, Study Groups, Task Force, Community Activities
Oregon Bar Bylaw

Article 26 Sustainability:

- “The Bar supports the goal of sustainability, generally defined as meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. . . .

- “In the practice of law, principles of sustainability may be important in addressing competing economic, social and environmental priorities that impact future generations.

- The Bar will encourage education and dialogue on how law impacts the needs and interests of future generations ...”
Climate Change Task Force Recommendations

1. Issue a statement supporting carbon pricing
2. Provide legal support for climate change legislation
3. Encourage lawyers and law firms to reduce their carbon footprint
4. Amend the Oregon constitution to include a specific reference to the State’s duty to hold all natural resources in trust for future generations
5. Revise investment guidelines