

Hidden Agenda of Global Warming & the Rhetorical Veil of “Carbon Credits”; Cosmic Panaceas: Unintended Consequences of Ethanol; Dominion Denial

Goldberg, Jonah. “Turning Up the Heat on Gore.” *National Review Online*, Mar 23, 2007.
<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=YWZiYWFhZTQ3ZmM2NDcyMzM3OTk1YWY5MjVjNmZkY2Y=>

As fate would have it, the same week Al Gore was testifying before Congress, I was doing a little testifying myself. Admittedly, there were a tad fewer paparazzi in the Madison, Wis., classroom where I was giving a talk on global warming (sponsored by Collegians for a Constructive Tomorrow). The debate in Washington offered some familiar echoes.

One student asked a long and rambling question that went basically as follows: He understood why I think Al Gore is dishonest and misleading. But how can I criticize Gore when all he wants to do is make people change their behavior and take care of this planet?

Translation: Gore is on the side of the angels and therefore it's mean-spirited to throw inconvenient truths back at the Oscar winner for *An Inconvenient Truth*. “Yeah, exactly,” the kid responded when I rephrased the question thusly.

The press and the Democrats seem to share this kid's sensibility. Covering Gore's congressional testimony, *The Washington Post's* Dana Milbank portrayed Gore as a man of science versus a bunch of creationist nut jobs.

Gore says global warming is “a crisis that threatens the survival of our civilization and the habitability of the Earth.” It's graver than any war. He compares it to the asteroid that allegedly killed the dinosaurs.

But here's the thing. If there were an asteroid barreling toward earth, we wouldn't be talking about changing our lifestyles, nor would we be preaching about reducing, reusing and recycling. We would be building giant wicked-cool lasers and bomb-carrying spaceships to go out and destroy the thing. But Gore doesn't want to explore geo-engineering (whereby, for example, we'd add sulfate aerosols or other substances to the atmosphere to mitigate global warming). Why? Because solving the problem isn't really the point. As Gore makes it clear in his book, *Earth in the Balance*, he wants to change attitudes more than he wants to solve problems.

Indeed, he wants to change attitudes about government as much as he wants to preach environmentalism. **Global warming is what William James called a “moral equivalent of war” that gives political officials the power to do things they could never do without a crisis. As liberal journalist James Ridgeway wrote in the early 1970s: “Ecology offered liberal-minded people what they had longed for, a safe, rational and above all peaceful way of remaking society ... (and) developing a more coherent central state.”**

This explains Gore's relentless talk of “consensus,” his ugly moral bullying of “deniers” and, most of all, his insistence that because there's no time left to argue, everyone should do what he says.

Isn't it interesting how the same people who think “dissent is the highest form of patriotism” when it comes to the war think that dissent when it comes to global warming is evil and troglodytic?

“If your baby has a fever, you go to the doctor,” Gore said this week. “If the doctor says you need to intervene here, you don't say, ‘Well, I read a science fiction novel that told me it's not a problem.’ If the crib's on fire, you don't speculate that the baby is flame retardant. You take action.”

True enough. But if your baby's crib is on fire, you don't run to a politician for help either.

You can tell that Gore's schtick is about something more than the moderate and manageable challenge of global warming when he talks of sacrifice. On the one hand he wants everybody to change their lifestyles dramatically. These are the sacrifices the voracious energy user Al Gore won't have to make because he can buy “carbon credits” [for example, for your “carbon footprint” see: <http://www.e-bluehorizons.net/product.php?productid=4>] for his many homes and his jet-setting.

But when asked this week about the enormous and unwise costs his plan would impose on the U.S. economy (according to the global consensus of economists), Gore said that his draconian emissions cuts are “going to save you money, and it’s going to make the economy stronger.”

Wait a second. This is the gravest crisis we’ve ever faced, but if we do exactly as Gore says (but not as he does), we’ll get richer in the process as we heal Mother Earth of her fever? Gore’s faith-based initiative is a win-win. No wonder so many people think it’s mean to disagree.

© National Review Online 2006-2007. All Rights Reserved.

NOTE: The above quotes by William James and James Ridgeway should be memorized by anyone who wonders what the hidden agendas are behind the rhetorical veils of the Progressive’s “global warming” campaign.

I continue to remind you of the Frankfort School’s modus operandi to bring about cultural Marxism: Antonio Gramsci’s advice to execute a “long march through the institutions.” Virtually every effort made by the Progressive’s in this country is designed to accomplish exactly that.

We have now completed our study of the seven areas of mental conditioning which lead to volitional assent to demonism: (1) mental attitude sins, (2) involvement in the occult, (3) religion, (4) idolatry—mental and overt, (5) phallic or sexual reversionism, (6) drug abuse, and (7) human sacrifice.

In our analysis of the cosmic systems we have now noted: (1) the sin nature, (2) aggressive negative volition toward truth, (3) degeneration of individual and collective integrity in the form of disorganized evil, (4) antiestablishment, and (5) demonism which is encountered through seven concepts of mental assent in the form of demon influence on the part of the cosmic believer and through both demon influence and demon possession by the cosmic unbeliever.

We are now ready to take up the subject of the sixth area of the Hatred Complex.

Cosmic Panaceas. A panacea is an English word derived from the Greek noun: **πανάκεια**. ***panakeia:*** a universal remedy; a cure for all ills or difficulties.

Much can be understood about cosmic thinking when it is remembered that Lucifer’s Fifth Assertion in Isaiah 14:14 was “I will make myself like the Most High [עֶלְיֹן *‘elyon:* an epithet for God].”

One of the challenges that seems intractable for mankind is the universal tendency to solve problems from human viewpoint. Through demon influence, Lucifer and his minions are able to convey the Dark Side’s principles of moral and immoral degeneracy to the masses.

Human viewpoint, human good, and evil are the result of this campaign and may be identified by the expressed exclusion of traditional establishment principles and biblical doctrines from its solutions.

Another characteristic of cosmic panaceas is the constant problem of their solutions having unintended consequences. There is a current issue that illustrates this point:

Pescovitz, David. “Ethanol Stirs Eco-Debate.” *Lab Notes: Research from the College of Engineering, University of California, Berkley, Mar 1, 2005.*
<http://www.coe.berkeley.edu/labnotes/0305/patzek.html>

In 2004, approximately 3.57 billion gallons of ethanol were used as a gas additive in the United States, according to the Renewable Fuels Association (RFA). During the February State of the Union address, President George Bush urged Congress to pass an energy bill that would pump up the amount to 5 billion gallons by 2012. UC Berkeley geoenvironment professor Tad W. Patzek thinks that's a very bad idea.

For two years, Patzek has analyzed the environmental ramifications of ethanol, a renewable fuel that many believe could significantly reduce our dependence on petroleum-based fossil fuels. According to Patzek though, ethanol may do more harm than good.

"In terms of renewable fuels, ethanol is the worst solution," Patzek says. "It has the highest energy cost with the least benefit."

Ethanol is produced by fermenting renewable crops like corn or sugarcane. It may sound green, Patzek says, but that's because many scientists are not looking at the whole picture. According to his research, more fossil energy is used to produce ethanol than the energy contained within it.

Patzek's ethanol critique began during a freshman seminar he taught in which he and his students calculated the energy balance of the biofuel. Taking into account the energy required to grow the corn and convert it into ethanol, they determined that burning the biofuel as a gasoline additive actually results in a net energy loss of 65 percent. Later, Patzek says he realized the loss is much more than that even.

"Limiting yourself to the energy balance, and within that balance, just the fossil fuel used is just scraping the surface of the problem," he says. "Corn is not 'free energy.'"

Recently, Patzek published a fifty-page study on the subject in the journal *Critical Reviews in Plant Science*. This time, he factored in the myriad energy inputs required by industrial agriculture, from the amount of fuel used to produce fertilizers and corn seeds to the transportation and wastewater disposal costs. All told, he believes that the cumulative energy consumed in corn farming and ethanol production is six times greater than what the end product provides your car engine in terms of power.

Patzek is also concerned about the sustainability of industrial farming in developing nations where sugarcane and trees are grown as feedstock for ethanol and other biofuels.

"One farm for the local village probably makes sense," he says. "But if you have a 100,000 acre plantation exporting biomass on contract to Europe, that's a completely different story. From one square meter of land, you can get roughly one watt of energy. The price you pay is that in Brazil alone you annually damage a jungle the size of Greece."

If ethanol is as much of an environmental Trojan horse as Patzek's data suggests, what is the solution? The researcher sees several possibilities, all of which can be explored in tandem. First, he says, is to divert funds earmarked for ethanol to improve the efficiency of fuel cells and hybrid electric cars.

"Can engineers double the mileage of these cars?" he asks. "If so, we can cut down the petroleum consumption in the US by one-third."

For generating electricity on the grid, Patzek's "favorite renewable energy" to replace coal is solar. Unfortunately, he says that solar cell technology is still too immature for use in large power stations. Until it's ready for prime time, he has a suggestion that could raise even more controversy than his criticisms of ethanol additives.

"I've come to the conclusion that if we're smart about it, nuclear power plants may be the lesser of the evils when we compare them with coal-fired plants and their impact on global warming," he says. "We're going to pay now or later. The question is what's the smallest price we'll have to pay?"

[© 2005 UC Regents](#). Updated 3/1/05.

This is benign compared to the unintended consequences of sex education which we will explore at a later date.

Lucifer is desperately trying to manage a planet that in its fallen condition simply cannot be organized short of divine viewpoint. The human race was given “dominion” over the earth which means that the Lord has granted us plenipotentiary authority over its plants, animals, and natural resources. Oil is not evil. It is a divine provision with which our nation has been blessed in abundance and would supply our energy needs well beyond the time more efficient methods are discovered.

It is a rejection of divine grace not to use this readily available resource, but human viewpoint, based on fable and myth, have driven us into a position where we are going to drive up food prices and the cost of drinking water in order to solve a nonexistent problem.

It is not the church’s job to make public policy or craft law, but it is the church’s duty to inform and influence those who gather before its pulpits. Orientation to grace and acknowledgement of God’s sovereign management of His planet removes undue concern for things that the human race is not capable of managing.

Dominion demands responsibility before the Lord to use those things he has provided wisely but at the same time prohibits the idea that God did not provide enough resources for our needs.

It is not the church’s duty to enforce doctrine upon the unwilling but rather to make it available to the positive.