

Al Gore: when climate change is newspeak for the Apocalypse



Following his controversial loss in the 2000 presidential elections against George W. Bush, former vice-president Al Gore has become the prophet of Global Warming. But what is less known, is that Gore's motivations are not science - but religion. Meet "Global Warning" as newspeak to mask his true belief: the upcoming Apocalypse.

"An Inconvenient Truth" won the 2007 Academy Award for Best Documentary. It rode high on international panels of scientists who are suddenly all agreeing that Global Warming is real - few dispute the fact - and that it is all our fault - which less people are willing to accept. Scientists like Henrik Svensmark, helped in his efforts by science writer Nigel Calder, are foremost to point out that politics, rather than science, is currently reigning over the debate. The injection of Gore into this mixture has not helped much. Instead, a consensus viewpoint has been achieved, in which scientists have largely stopped debating whether or not Man's actions are responsible for global warming and what we should do to combat global warming (raising taxes and give money to scientists being primary slogans used).

This "scientific veneer" on the global warming debate has bypassed a vital fact: Global Warming may seem far removed from the religious obsession with the Apocalypse that is sweeping throughout the world - specifically in America - but in essence, it is the same. Global Warming claims Mankind is killing the Earth; the End of the Times are imminent, unless we change. We have to repent - let go off Western luxuries, specifically anything that is exciting, like air travel and foreign holidays.

On the surface, it may indeed be a coincidence that science and a religious preoccupation overlaps, but you do not need to do dig far to realise something else is going on.



The film "An Inconvenient Truth" will not make you any wiser about what truly motivates Al Gore; as would be expected, some editing has occurred to make the film attain a required length and quality. But certain things have ended up on the cutting floor which would have given the real game that Gore is playing away: Gore is using Global Warming to preach a religious message: he believes in creation... and that the Apocalypse is neigh.

One part of the material that ended up on the cutting floor, but which Gore continues to use in his "live version" of the show is a rather boring comparison of the solar system and how the average temperatures of Earth and our neighbouring planets (Mercury, Venus, and Mars) show such drastic differences. Mars has almost no atmosphere, and has an average temperature of about -55 degrees centigrade. Earth has a life supporting atmosphere, which allows the planet to hold an average temperature of about 15 degrees. Venus (average temperature of about 500 degrees) has so much atmosphere that despite being further from the Sun than Mercury, it is about 200 degrees hotter on average than Mercury is.

With such information, it seems that Al Gore is very scientific. And one person who went to visit the live version of "An Inconvenient Truth" wrote how he had read blog comments before he went that indicated that Al Gore was a religious man, "which intrigued me, because from his movie, he comes across as a man who is ready to accept science as the proper methodology (versus evangelical faith in biblical literalism). He did not mention any kind of religious beliefs in the movie, and often used graphs plotting data back hundreds of thousands of years. Obviously, he isn't a Young Earth Creationist, who believes that the Earth is only 6,000 years old. I assumed that he wasn't an atheist or agnostic, because he's a politician, and according to the polls, it would be near impossible for an atheist or agnostic politician to ever get elected by the public (who apparently, according to the polls, trust homosexuals more than they trust atheists)."

But what to make of a slide that shows a graph of human population growth over the past couple hundred-thousand years. To quote: "It started off good. He pointed at the beginning of the graph, showing the population of humans on Earth from 200,000 years ago, and referred to the 'rise of humans.' [...] So he believes that Homo sapiens evolved from other hominid ancestors, right? Nope. In the very same breath, he then continued to explain that according to his religious beliefs, this 'rise of humans' was God's creation of mankind - apparently 200,000 years ago. His graph then changed to include the caption 'Adam & Eve' above this starting point."

Indeed: Gore's entire presentation exists in order to present people with the scientific data showing that human-caused climate change is a fact. He does his very best to include references in all of the slides, showing to any thinking person that this data is not made up, that it comes from the forefront of our scientific research. He then states he believes in creationism - by placing the words "Adam and Eve" right on the slide (which is actually a scientific graph) as a caption explaining the beginnings of mankind.

This is a dangerous mixture, for it is clear that science does not believe in Adam and Eve. Science adheres to theory of evolution.



So here we have it: the high priest of global warming is a creationist - though somewhat more liberal than most. This should be worrying, but then he is not totally out of place in what is largely a religious movement.

It is clear that within the scientific community, global warming is seen as a religion - a dogma -

and there are several accusations of "bad science" flying about also. "Those of us who study the pre-human history of the Earth find the current debate over global warming difficult to fathom," writes geologist Martin Keeley. He takes issue with the IPCC's "hockey stick" temperature curve for the last millennium, a set of statistics the IPCC used as the foundation for the Kyoto agreement. "In every other science when such a drastic revision of previously accepted knowledge is promulgated, there is considerable debate and initial scepticism, the new theory facing a gauntlet of criticism and intense review. Only if a new idea survives that process does it become broadly accepted by the scientific peer group and the public at large," writes John L. Daly. "This never happened with [Dr. Michael] Mann's 'Hockey Stick'. The coup was total, bloodless, and swift as Mann's paper was greeted with a chorus of uncritical approval from the greenhouse industry. Within the space of only 12 months, the theory had become entrenched as a new orthodoxy."

Al Gore used this "hockey stick" data in "An Inconvenient Truth". It helped to cement the theory into a fact, even though two Canadians with expertise in statistical analysis, Stephen McIntyre and economics professor Ross McKittrick, found considerable errors in the way the data was collated. McIntyre and McKittrick, in a paper published by "Geophysical Research Letters", "were unable to replicate Mann's results either by re-running his calculations once the errors were corrected or by constructing their own data set from the original sources. Their reconstruction of the Mann et al. data set from the original sources shows clearly that there was a period of greater warmth than the last century in the 15th century, and that the spike is not unprecedented. They have suggested that Mann should account for the discrepancies." In response, Mann accused the Canadians of engaging in a "political stunt" and dismissed their research. This has all the tell-tale signs of religion, not science.

As Bjørn Lomborg discovered, criticism to this new orthodoxy will not be tolerated. Lomborg is adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School and a former director of the Environmental Assessment Institute in Copenhagen. Lomborg authored "The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World", arguing that certain aspects of the global warming orthodoxy - including overpopulation, declining energy resources, deforestation, species loss, water shortages, and a variety of other global environmental issues - are unsupported by analysis of relevant data. In response, the IPCC's Rajendra Pachauri compared Lomborg to Adolph Hitler. Nice.

Sceptic Mary Burdman uses the same analogy, but with a different twist: "The real agenda of what can only be called climate 'terrorism', will be using this hoax to impose the kind of 'state of emergency' used when the Nazis took power in Germany, as the German newspaper ,Die Welt, has just warned. This crew is not only after everyone's pension; they are using green propaganda to target a generation of children, as Godzilla was used to frighten young Baby Boomers about the atomic age." Voila.



For Britains and Americans, the doom bell of Global Warming may not be overly clear - but the next generation is being prepped for the new religion and most of Europe is now firmly convinced of Global Warming - often sold on anti-Bush sentiments.

The British newspaper "The Scotsman" reported on February 23, 2007, about a recent study which revealed that half of over 1,000 British children between the ages of 7 and 11 lost sleep because of exaggerated fears about global warming. The British government is sending Al Gore's film "An Inconvenient Truth" to all schools in the country and the BBC cannot let a day go by without preaching from the gospel according to Global Warming Adherents. What is the news value of spending almost 12% of a main news bulleting on Germans holidaying in Germany, as these people (however many they are - 100? 1000?) do not want to go abroad because of the carbon footprint they would leave behind. It is not news. It is preaching, not from the pulpit, but from the news desk. Amen.