

THE GLOBAL WARMING SUICIDE CULT

[-Click here for printer/full screen version](#)

By Don Feder

Posted December 26, 2007

The Global Warming movement has been compared to a religion – albeit one without God, but with a vision of sin and repentance, damnation and salvation.

Not quite.

Real religion is about improving the human condition by encouraging moral conduct in obedience to the will of God. The proponents of Global Warming are creating a suicide cult, which – if followed to its logical conclusion – will lead to human extinction.

Forget the Kyoto Treaty. Forget the Luddite Lieberman-Warner bill to cut so-called greenhouse gas emissions by 70% by 2050, which would cost the U.S. an estimated \$1 trillion and result in the loss of 3.4 million jobs. That's just the beginning.

Ultimately, the Global Warming crusade is a frontal assault on procreation, the family and the future of mankind.

In the December 9th edition of *Medical Journal of Australia*, Professor Barry Walters urges a one-time “baby levy” of \$5,000, followed by an annual tax of \$800 per child, on Australian families with more than two children.

“Every newborn baby in Australia represents a potent source of greenhouse gas emissions for an average of 80 years, not simply by breathing but by the profligate consumption of resources typical of our society,” writes Walters, who calls childbearing “greenhouse unfriendly behavior.”

Walters will have to look hard for families to tax. Australia's fertility rate (the number of children the average woman has) is 1.75 – well below replacement level (2.1) and less than half of what it was in 1960 (3.6) .

Angela Conway of the Australian Family Association thinks Walters should pay his own gas tax. “I think self-important professors with silly ideas should have to pay carbon tax for all the hot air they create,” Conway says.

Beyond the fiscal flogging to be administered to families who stubbornly continue to procreate, Walters says he wants the Australian government to consider population control measures like China's, with its one-child-per-family policy backed by draconian penalties, sterilization and forced abortions.

In Britain, a group called The Optimum Population Trust has the same agenda. The Trust is horrified by a brief blip in the U.K. birthrate – up from 1.8 in 2005 to 1.87 in 2006.

It notes that the lifetime energy consumption, or “carbon footprint,” of a child born in Britain today is the equivalent of 620 roundtrip, trans-Atlantic flights. The Trust urges government coercion for Brits who don’t follow the Planned Parenthood model.

Global Warming-ists see people only as energy consumers (or pollution-generators), never as potential creators – of say a more efficient light bulb or engine, or a new way to clean the environment.

The greenhouse-gas gang is on a population-control kick.

“Human population growth is the paramount environmental issue,” says Ric Oberlink, a spokesman for the ominous-sounding Californians for Population Stabilization. “Global warming is a very serious problem, but it is a subset of the overpopulation problem.”

Ric (dropping the consonant is his contribution to conservation) claims the problem isn’t just too many people, but too many Americans, who, by our evil nature, will consume too much energy over the course of our lives. Americans are “by far the most voracious consumers and the greatest producers of greenhouse gases per capita of any nation on earth,” Ric remarks.

That America has spent the past century showering prosperity on the rest of the world (not to mention defeating the twin totalitarian horrors of the 20th. century) is irrelevant to Ric. It’s all about our voracious consumption and great production.

“One solution to the crisis (*a hot globe*) is for people to stop having so many babies,” says a March 14th posting by Dave Johnson at that fount of idiocy, The Huffington Post. “We’ve already used up the fisheries. The cattle being raised to feed so many meat-eaters is as big a problem as the cars we’re all driving.” So the solution is to stop having babies and become bicycle-riding vegans.

“The population explosion has severely disturbed the ecological relationships between human beings and the environment,” the Sierra Club warns. “In recognition of the growing magnitude of this conservation issue, the Sierra Club supports a greatly increased program of education on the need for population control.” The left is really into control.

Global Warming fanaticism seems to lend itself to self-loathing. In 1989, David Graber, then a biologist with the National Park Service, was quoted in the *Los Angeles Times* observing: “Human happiness and certainly human fecundity are not as important as a wild and healthy planet. I know social scientists who remind me that people are part of nature, but it isn’t true... We have become a plague upon ourselves and upon Earth. Until such time as homo sapiens should decide to rejoin nature (*by wearing natural fibers and living in trees?*) some of us can only hope for the right virus to come along.”

And they call them misanthropes.

Is the right plague what Jacques Cousteau had in mind, when he wrote in 1991: “In order to stabilize world population, we must eliminate 350,000 people per day. It is a horrible thing to say, but it’s just as bad not to say it.” A speaker at Gorbachev’s 1996 State of the World Forum in San Francisco called for cutting the global population by 90%. He did not specify the method.

Most of the Global Warming-ists are content to make preposterous predictions and induce panic, while leaving their ultimate agenda unstated.

Thus, in accepting his politically correct Nobel Peace prize, Al Gore (the Herman Munster of Global Warming) declared that, “We have begun to wage war on the Earth itself.” Gore predicts that our trashing of the ozone layer could cause sea levels to rise by 20 feet in this century.” Would that be before or after New York City is covered by a glacier, a la “The Day After Tomorrow”?

In a column in Sunday’s New York Times (“It’s Too Late for Later”), Thomas L. Friedman squawks: “The fact that global warming is now having such an observable effect on pillars of our ecosystem – like the frozen sea ice within the Arctic Circle, which a new study (*conveniently, unnamed*) says could disappear entirely during summers by 2040 – is certainly one big factor (*in the change of “global consciousness”*). But the other is the voracious power of today’s global economy, which has created a situation in which the world is not just getting hot, it’s getting raped.” Look at the bright side: At least when Friedman is babbling about the environment, he’s not blathering about the Middle East.

The doomsayers notwithstanding, Global Warming is not an observable phenomenon, which is why hysteria is an essential part of the sales pitch. I write this while gazing out the window of my New England home at 12 inches of snow and ice – in mid-December, for God’s sake.

As a group of scientists reported in a study published in last week’s online edition of the *International Journal of Climatology*, over the past three decades, the forecasts of computer-generated climate change models (which warming alarmists rely on) don’t correlate with actual, measurable data from weather balloons and orbiting satellites.

But that’s just the tip of the Arctic ice cap (which, by the way, is not shrinking)

- According to Brazil’s MetSul Weather Center, this year, the Arctic ice cap is within 1% of the winter norm, and winter has just begun. Ice on the southern polar ice cap has grown substantially, compared to last year.
- Australian Cardinal George Pell, Archbishop of Sydney, notes that the atmospheric temperature of Mars has risen by 0.5 degrees Celsius. If only Martians would stop having so many kids with huge carbon footprints and start riding bicycles.

- Hurricane expert William Gray of Colorado State University believes the Earth will start to cool within 10 years. Neil Frank, a former director of the National Hurricane Center, calls Global Warming “a hoax.”
- Richard Lindzen, a professor of meteorology at MIT, points out that Europe was far warmer in the Middle Ages than it is today. But the 17th. century was much colder. (Then, it wasn't unusual for the Thames to freeze over in the winter.) In other words - - please pay attention, Albert -- the Earth goes through periodic cycles of warming and cooling, completely unrelated to carbon emissions.
- There are now an estimated 22,000 polar bears, compared to 5,000 60 years ago. Apparently, the creatures enjoy the effects of Global Warming on their environment – witness their predilection for sunglasses and Hawaiian shirts.
- The temperature in Greenland is lower now than it was in 1940.
- A thousand years ago, Viking settlers were growing crops in Greenland, which really was green. Sadly, Sven and Inga began driving SUVs and burning fossil fuels to run their 11th. century factories. Ja, by jimmeny, the rest is history.
- Reid Bryson, professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, considered the father of scientific climatology, explains: “We’ve been coming out of a Little Ice Age for 300 years. We have not been making very much carbon dioxide for 300 years.”
- From what we know about climate change over the past 12,000 years (based on historical accounts and data like growth rings on trees) the Earth’s warming and cooling cycles exactly coincide with the sun’s magnetic activity.
- How about that scientific consensus in favor of man-made Global Warming, touted by Gore and company? It’s a myth. There are plenty of scientists with the courage to call it a fraud – the 21st century equivalent of the Piltdown Man. Others are silenced by intimidation. Scientists who are willing to go along to get along get tenure,

research assistants, grants and peer recognition.

- As Lindzen explains, “Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their funds disappear, their work derided, and themselves labeled as industry stooges.” The invective is vicious. Lindzen: “I can tolerate being called a skeptic because all scientists should be skeptics, but then they started calling us deniers, with all of the connotations of the Holocaust (*deniers*). That is an obscenity.”

Lindzen is one of those who compares the dogma of Global Warming to a religion. “Do you believe in global warming? That is a religious question. So is the second part: Are you a skeptic or a believer?”

The professor is mistaken. Global Warming is a religion only in the sense that Jim Jones’ People’s Temple and the Heaven’s Gate were religions.

In its more extreme variation, Global Warming is a suicide cult whose prophets and priests warm to the idea of the mass extinction of humanity.

While many warming alarmists are content to repeal the industrial revolution, and others favor the end of civilization through gradual de-population (worldwide, fertility rates have declined by 50% in the past half-century, and still they carry on about over-population), others are more ambitious.

Underlying the left’s agenda has always been a hatred of humanity. Enlightenment philosophers hated mankind because our nature wouldn’t conform to their utopian ideals.

Marxists hated us because we were selfish beasts who stupidly refused to embrace scientific socialism. Ah, the misuses of science.

An earlier generation of ecologists hated us for polluting, for despoiling virgin wilderness with skyscrapers and shopping malls, for not allowing them to contemplate pristine nature from their vacation homes.

Animal rights activists hate us for dominating other species.

And Global-Warming-ists hate us for having children, not driving hybrid cars, destroying the ozone layer with CO2 emissions, making life miserable for the penguins and polar bears, and, eventually – according to their nightmare scenarios – making the Earth uninhabitable.

Hence, the inevitable conclusion: The world would be better off with all of us dead.

- “Given the total, absolute disappearance of Homo sapiens, then not only would the

Earth's community of Life continue to exist, but in all probability, its well-being enhanced. Our presence in short is not needed," Paul Taylor in "Respect for Nature, A Theory of Environmental Ethics."

- "We have no problem in principle with humans reducing their numbers by killing one another. It's an excellent way of making humans extinct," a spokes-creature for the Gaia Liberation Front.
- "Human beings, as a species, have no more value than slugs," John Davis, editor of the journal *Earth First*.
- In the book "The World Without Us," Alan Weisman celebrates what he sees as the inevitable extinction of humanity, as vine and branch, deer and bear, reclaim our cities.
- There's even a Voluntary Human Extinction Movement, which describes itself as "the humanitarian alternative to human disasters." VHEMT explains that "the hopeful alternative to the extinction of millions of species of plants and animals is the voluntary extinction of one species: Homo sapiens... us."
- Continuing with this cheery line of thought: "When every human chooses to stop breeding, Earth's biosphere will be allowed to return to its former glory, and all remaining creatures will be free to live, die, evolve ... and will perhaps pass away, as so many of Nature's 'experiments' have done throughout the eons." Is that why liberals seem to be disappearing?

The let's-all-die-for-the-planet movement may be the fringe of Global Warming. But their conclusion is the logical expression of its ethos. Why settle for the gradual extinction of humanity through below-replacement birthrates and deindustrialization when we can accomplish the same thing in a generation? (For other Global Warming-ists, their death wish is more subconscious.)

But rather than having the decency to just kill themselves, they need to make a statement – like the poor bastards who go to a mall with a high-powered rifle to see how many innocent bystanders they can take with them.

If you see Al Gore in a shopping center with what looks like a semi-automatic – or at a podium handing out Kool-Aid -- run.

[-Click here for printer/full screen version](#)

An earlier version of this commentary appeared at [GrassTopsUSA.com](#)



PREVIOUSLY FEATURED COMMENTARY

GOLDEN COMPASS – NARNIA IT'S NOT [-Click here for printer/full screen version](#)

By Don Feder

Posted: December 18, 2007

Like Japan's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, "The Golden Compass" (an atheist's stealth attack on faith) was unleashed on December 7.

Unlike Yamamoto's attempt to sink the U.S. Pacific Fleet, there isn't much bang to "The Golden Compass." The \$150-million blockbuster (actually, it would have a hard time busting a street sign, let alone an entire block) is as flat as cola left in a glass overnight -- as stale as a week-old bologna sandwich.

The first in a planned cinematic trilogy intended to rival "The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe" and "The Lord of The Rings," "Compass" may turn out to be the "Heaven's Gate" of juvenile fantasy films.

The movie is based on a series of children's books ("His Dark Materials"), by British writer Philip Pullman, that are rabidly anti-faith. Pullman is an atheist who makes Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens seem sane by comparison.

"I don't think it's possible there is a God," Pullman opines. "I'm trying to undermine the basis of Christian belief." "My books are about killing God" and "I am all for the death of God."

In this regard, Pullman brings up the rear of a very long line. The death of God has been a cherished goal of French revolutionaries, German philosophers, Soviet commissars and the architects of Nazi genocide. (Hitler confessed that genocide was an act of deicide -- that by killing Jews, he intended to prove the non-existence of God) -- not to mention Hollywood scriptwriters and the current crop of proselytizing atheist authors.

"The Golden Compass" is devious project that has enlisted powerful allies. Everyone from Random House (publisher of Pullman's books) and Barnes and Noble to brand partners like Coca-Cola and Burger King have a big stake in the movie's success.

So as not to offend families at the outset, Pullman's message has been downplayed to

the point where most of the story's anti-religious elements were removed from the script.

While the books make it clear that the evil Magisterium is a Calvinized Catholic Church (demonstrating Pullman's grasp of theology), in the movie, it's an ominous authority bent on global domination, whose motives are murky.

Still, there are echoes of the books' anti-religious theme. Agents of The Magisterium refer to certain ideas as "heresy." Unknown to most 8-year-old moviegoers, "Magisterium" refers to the teaching authority of the Catholic Church embodied in the episcopacy.

If "The Golden Compass" succeeds, Pullman's agenda will be up front in the next two installments.

Director Chris Weitz (the genius who brought us "American Pie") told MTV MovieBlogs.com: "The whole point, to me, of ensuring that 'The Golden Compass' is a financial success is so that we have a solid foundation on which to deliver a faithful, more literal adaptation of the second and third books. This is important: whereas 'The Golden Compass' had to be introduced to the public carefully, the religious (*anti-religious*) themes in the second and third movies can't be minimized without destroying the spirit of these books."

Thus, the movie is chock-a-block full of cute, talking animals (external reflections of the human soul), armored polar bears, valiant flying gypsies, good witches, and even poor Sam Elliot typecast as the wise, folksy ole hombre (but looking like he'd rather be in a sequel to "The Big Lebowski").

"The Golden Compass" (movie, not book) may be mostly innocuous. It's also insipid. As the wicked Mrs. Coulter, agent of The Magisterium," Nicole Kidman looks and feels as sinister as a *Vogue* model. This is thin gruel next to Tilda Swinton's menacing, manipulative White Witch in "The Chronicles of Narnia." Even the young heroine (actress Dakota Blue Richards) comes across more bratty and petulant than spunky. (Its lack of luster is reflected at the box office. "Compass" bombed its opening weekend. In the U.S. and Canada, the box office was only \$26.1 million – compared to \$65.5 million for "Narnia" on its first weekend out, and \$33.3 million for the recently released Disney flick, "Enchanted.")

There's nothing tentative about Pullman's books, which the author proudly declares are about "killing God" (exactly what happens in the final volume of his trilogy).

Various characters instruct young readers that: "The Christian religion is a very powerful and convincing mistake, that's all," and "In every world, the agents of the Authority (*Magisterium*) are sacrificing children to their cruel god!"

The Magisterium experiments on children, separating them from their animal spirits (called daemons) and turning them into zombies, in an attempt to create a more compliant, docile populace. Sounds like public education.

Mark Morford, who spews for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, is a huge Pullman fan. (In an October 24 commentary, the columnist sounds like he wants to have the author's child.)

Morford is borderline delirious over Pullman's books: "The nefarious thing the books aim to kill is, well, religious authority. It's about the destruction of dogma. It's about power, about who wants to control and manipulate life on Earth; it is about blind, ignorant, even violent adherence to insidiously narrow codes of thought and belief and behavior, sex and desire and love. This, of course, is the God of organized religion. This is the false deity that promotes numb groupthink and inhibits growth and abhors the feminine divine ... the same paranoid, dreadful God that votes for George W. Bush because, well, he will smite the icky gays and protect us from vile pagans and Buddhists and Muslims and feminists and frumpy genius atheist British writers."

Secularists never want to control or manipulate, which is why we have the progressive income tax, campus speech codes, hate-crimes legislation and the cult of global warming.

It's revealing how the God-haters always get around to whining about constraints on their sexual behavior. They long for the happy days of Canaanite frat parties, when sex was purely sensual and people rolled in the proverbial hay with men, women, children, domestic animals and every imaginable combination thereof – much like San Francisco today.

That's what feckless middle-class parents are supporting when they schlep their kids to see "The Golden Compass" and buy them boxed sets of Pullman's trilogy for Christmas. How's that for irony? ("Mommy, why does the Catholic Church want to turn me into a zombie?")

Hollywood has been bashing believers for decades. In movies like "V for Vendetta," "King Arthur," "The DaVinci Code," "Kingdom of Heaven," "The Saint," "The Name of the Rose," and "The Magdalene Sisters," Christians are portrayed as vile, violent (but also cowardly), sadistic, hypocritical, greedy, lustful and intolerant, with marked totalitarian tendencies.

Compare the number of movies that depict Christians positively (I saw only one this year – "Amazing Grace") to those that show them as mutants.

There is no more powerful force for inculcating values (especially in adolescents) than Hollywood, witness a Barna Group Survey, released in September ("A New Generation Expresses its Skepticism and Frustration with Christianity").

The survey found that only 3% of non-Christians (mostly the never-churched or those who've fallen away from the faith) had a favorable impression of evangelicals, versus 25% of the Boomer generation. Most of the former view Christians generally as judgmental (87%), hypocritical (85%), old-fashioned (78%) and too involved in politics (75%).

As a result, while non-Christians are less than 25% of adults over 40, they comprise fully 40% of Americans 16 to 29. Barna observes that this is not a passing trend which will change as the youth of today mature. “While Christianity remains the typical experience and most common faith in America, a fundamental recalibration is occurring within the spiritual allegiance of America’s upcoming generation.”

You can thank Hollywood for that. More than any other institution, the entertainment industry shapes our attitudes about everything from fashion, politics and personal conduct to religion.

I just saw a photograph of Arlington National Cemetery in the snow, with Christmas wreaths resting against row upon row of headstones. Courage and loyalty don’t come from Bruce Willis movies but from the faith symbolized by those floral displays.

Pullman understands this, writing: “The kingdom of heaven promised us certain things: it promised us happiness and a sense of purpose and a sense of having a place in the universe, of having a role and a destiny that were noble and splendid; and so we were connected to things. We were not alienated.”

But now that God is dead (or at least on death row), Pullman finds, unsurprisingly, that, “I still need these things that heaven promised, and I’m not willing to live without them.”

The British novelist believes that all can be achieved in a “republic of Heaven” – a this-worldly, secular utopia.

This is the delusion of Jacques-Rene Hebert (with his Goddess of Reason), Marx, Stalin, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, psychotherapy advocates and other proponents of the isms that have dominated the past two centuries. All end at the gates of Auschwitz, the steps of the scaffold, in an icy gulag, at the doorway of an interrogation cell or on a psychiatrist’s couch at \$150 an hour.

Pullman has created a world with talking spirits in animal-form, flying witches, warrior polar bears and a compass that detects the truth. But without God there is no magic (what the Lion Aslan calls “the deep magic”).

Not surprisingly, Pullman detests C.S. Lewis’ children’s classics, calling the series “cruel,” “unjust” and “anti-life” (not to mention that Lewis is a better writer).

Of the Narnia books, Pullman says: “I hate them with a deep and bitter passion, with their view of childhood as a golden age from which sexuality and adulthood are a falling away.” (Sex again.) Besides God, this author of children’s stories also hates childhood.

Magic is more than the miracles celebrated at this season (for Jews, the miracle of the menorah; for Christians, a virgin birth). The wonder is all around us. A flower, a sunset, a lover’s kiss, a friend’s embrace, the smile of a three-year-old – these too are magic.

Everything in creation has a purpose. Doubt often leads to certainty. By challenging complacent faith, atheism can lead to a more mature belief.

For a half-century, Antony Flew was the world's most prominent atheist. An eminent philosopher, Flew was Dawkins before Dawkins – Hitchens with an intact brain.

Beginning with his paper “Theology and Falsification” (which became one of the most widely read philosophical treatises of the 20th century), delivered at the Oxford Socratic Club when Lewis chaired the group, Flew argued passionately and persuasively for the non-existence of God.

The professor said that absent convincing evidence, atheism must be the default position. However, if I ever find that proof, I'll get back to you, Flew promised.

He did in 2004, announcing that he is now a deist. Among other factors, Flew observed that human biology can't be explained by evolution or accident but presupposes a prime mover. This argument is expanded in his just-published book, “There Is a God: How the World's Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind.”

So there is hope for Philip Pullman. In the meantime, by challenging us (modestly), he will end by bringing some closer to God. And that must drive him nuts.

An earlier version of this was posted at GrassTopsUSA.com

[-Click here for printer/full screen version](#)