

## MONTH IN REVIEW

□ “And seeing the multitudes, He went up on a mountain, and when He was seated His disciples came to Him. Then He opened His mouth and taught them, saying: ‘Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.’

“Blessed are you when they revile and persecute you, and say all kinds of evil against you falsely for My sake. Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

“You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt loses its flavor, how shall it be seasoned? It is then good for nothing but to be thrown out and trampled underfoot by men.

“You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden. Nor do they light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven.”

—Matthew 5:1-16

□ “Evangelicalism, now much absorbed by the arts and tricks of marketing, is simply not very serious anymore.’ That is the judgment of David F. Wells of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in a new book, *Above All Earthly Powers* (Eerdmans). Forget about the poetic spelling of ‘powers’ in the title; this is a book of considerable interest. More than half of it is devoted to an overview of the last several decades of sociological writing about religion and modernity, with major attention to the work of Peter L. Berger, and laced with a theological critique indebted chiefly to Karl Barth. The last third of the book is a devastating polemic against the evangelical ‘megachurch’ phenomenon, with its pandering to ‘seekers’ in search of a vaguely spiritual uplift devoid of concern for truth or serious discipleship. The panders, writes Wells, claim to be winning souls for Christ, but in fact the number of ‘born again’ Christians is static. They are really engaged in niche marketing by selling spiritual entertainment that, by comparison, makes Bonhoeffer’s ‘cheap grace’ look like the way of the Cross. Wells writes: ‘This is probably the first time that Christian people anywhere in the West have thought that ecclesiastical architecture is, in principle, offensive, that religious symbols, such as crosses, should be banned from churches, that pulpits should be abandoned, that hymns should be abolished, that pews should be sent to the garbage dump, and that pianos and organs should be removed. All of this has been happening on the forefront of this movement. This is probably the first time, too, that churchgoers have wanted their buildings to be mistaken for corporate headquarters or country clubs.’”

—*First Things*, May 2006, p. 64

□ “In *The Kingdom of God in America* (1937), H. Richard Niebuhr famously summarized the gospel of Protestant liberal-

ism: ‘A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross.’ That is, *mutatis mutandis*, pretty much how David Wells describes the gospel on offer at the evangelical supermarkets. From my limited knowledge of that world, much of his indictment has the ring of truth. Certainly, a movement that sells entertainment and the experience of spiritual ‘highs’ to the neglect of the doctrinal, devotional, intellectual, and artistic traditions of historic Christianity will strike others, Christians and non-Christians alike, as ‘not very serious.’ At the same time, it must be said that the evangelicalism criticized by David Wells is hardly the whole of all the worlds of evangelicalism in this country.”

—*First Things*, May 2006, p. 64

□ “An enormous amount of UN activity now revolves around the so-called Millennium Goals, which aim to cut world poverty in half by the year 2015. This noble-sounding goal serves as a framework for calculating to the last decimal point a set of targets for which the UN system then decides how resources should be apportioned. UN agencies, agendas, working groups, and a never-ending succession of conferences, declarations, and plans testify to a determination to control the global climate, horn in on the Internet, and—à la Oil-for-Food—impose a UN-supervised income tax on the entire developed world. Where once the Soviet agency Gosplan issued five-year plans for an imprisoned people, the UN now aims to administer and profit from fifteen-year plans for the entire human community. Think of it as planetary socialism, supported and financed in ‘partnership’ with private capital.

“The United Nations was founded as a forum of governments. As we had ample occasion to learn over the decades, this arrangement presented quite enough problems of its own. Now the UN, in contravention of its own charter, is rapidly evolving into something larger, more corporate, and more menacing: a predatory, undemocratic, unaccountable, and self-serving vehicle for global government. Like the Soviet Union of old, the UN is unwieldy, gross, inefficient, and incompetent; it is also so configured as to reach deep into the national politics of its member states and, by sheer weight and persistence, to force at least some of the worst of its agenda upon all of us.

“There will never be enough John Boltons to counter all of this—not that it was easy to come up with even one. Indeed, with notable exceptions, generations of American officials and policy-makers have been content, sometimes for reasons of state, sometimes for reasons of convenience, to look away from the UN’s multiform deficiencies and derelictions while occasionally

## — UPCOMING EVENTS —

### SUMMER PROGRAM DATES

There is limited space in the sessions that are remaining. Call or write for your application, or download an application from our website. Don’t delay.

**Colorado:** July 9-July 21; July 23-August 4; August 6-18; August 20-September 1.

**Tennessee**—Bryan College: July 9-July 21; July 23-August 4.

indulging in minor punitive measures like withholding a proportion of our annual dues—akin to docking a delinquent’s bus money while continuing to pay for his liquor and his car. For many others in public life, and for many ordinary citizens as well, the institution itself, as the very embodiment of the multilateralist ideal, is still held in nearly sacred regard.

“All the more reason, then, to force ourselves at long last to take a hard, undeceived look at what the institution has in fact become, put aside the lengthy and futile quest for its reform, and begin to think more concretely about how, with or without it, we can best work to advance the interests and values of ourselves and other members of the civilized world.”

—Claudia Rosett, *Commentary*, April 2006, p. 36

□ “So, ‘the debate is over.’ *Time* magazine says so. Last week’s cover story exhorted readers to ‘Be Worried. Be Very Worried,’ and ABC News concurred in several stories. So did Montana’s governor, speaking on ABC. And there was polling about global warming, gathered by *Time* and ABC in collaboration.

“Eighty-five percent of Americans say warming is probably happening, and 62 percent say it threatens them personally. The National Academy of Sciences says the rise in the Earth’s surface temperature has been about one degree Fahrenheit in the past century. Did 85 percent of Americans notice? Of course not. They got their anxiety from journalism calculated to produce it. Never mind that one degree might be the margin of error when measuring the planet’s temperature. To take a person’s temperature, you put a thermometer in an orifice or under an arm. Taking the temperature of our churning planet, with its tectonic plates sliding around over a molten core, involves limited precision.

“Why have Americans been dilatory about becoming as worried as *Time* and ABC think proper? An article on ABC’s Web site wonders ominously, ‘Was Confusion Over Global Warming a Con Job?’

“It suggests there has been a misinformation campaign implying that scientists might not be unanimous, a campaign by—how did you guess?—big oil. And the coal industry. But speaking of coal . . .

“Recently, Montana Gov. Brian Schweitzer flew with ABC’s George Stephanopoulos over Glacier National Park’s receding glaciers. But Schweitzer offered hope: Everyone, buy Montana coal. New technologies can, he said, burn it while removing carbon causes of global warming.

“Stephanopoulos noted that such technologies are at least four years away and ‘all the scientists’ say something must be done ‘right now.’

“Schweitzer, quickly recovering from hopefulness and returning to the ‘be worried, be very worried’ message, said ‘it’s even more critical than that’ because China and India are going to ‘put more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere with conventional coal-fired generators than all of the rest of the planet has during the last 150 years.’

“While worrying about Montana’s receding glaciers, Schweitzer, who is 50, should also worry about the fact that when he was 20 he was told to be worried, very worried, about global cooling. *Science* magazine (Dec. 10, 1976) warned of ‘extensive Northern Hemisphere glaciation.’ *Science Digest* (Febru-

ary 1973) reported that ‘the world’s climatologists are agreed’ that we must ‘prepare for the next ice age.’ *The Christian Science Monitor* (‘Warning: Earth’s Climate is Changing Faster Than Even Experts Expect,’ Aug. 27, 1974) reported that glaciers ‘have begun to advance,’ ‘growing seasons in England and Scandinavia are getting shorter’ and ‘the North Atlantic is cooling down about as fast as an ocean can cool.’ The *Times* (May 21, 1975) said ‘a major cooling of the climate is widely considered inevitable’ now that it is ‘well established’ that the Northern Hemisphere’s climate ‘has been getting cooler since about 1950.’

“In fact, the Earth is always experiencing either warming or cooling. But suppose the scientists and their journalistic conduits, who today say they were so spectacularly wrong so recently, are now correct. Suppose the Earth is warming and suppose the warming is caused by human activity. Are we sure there will be proportionate benefits from whatever climate change can be purchased at the cost of slowing economic growth and spending trillions? Are we sure the consequences of climate change must be bad? Or has the science-journalism complex decided that debate about these questions, too, is ‘over’?”

“About the mystery that vexes ABC—Why have Americans been slow to get in lock step concerning global warming?—perhaps the ‘problem’ is not big oil or big coal, both of which have discovered there is big money to be made from tax breaks and other subsidies justified in the name of combating carbon. Perhaps the problem is big crusading journalism.”

—George Will, *The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, April 4, 2006, p. M6

□ “No matter if the science [regarding global warming] is all phony, there are collateral environmental benefits.... Climate change [provides] the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world.”

—Christine Stewart, *Calgary Herald*, December 14, 1998

□ “Environmentalists believe that the twentieth-century warming was caused by human activity, primarily the burning of fossil fuels. Their combustion produces carbon dioxide—one of several ‘greenhouse gases.’ Methane is another. The argument is that their release into the atmosphere wraps the earth in an invisible shroud. It makes the escape of heat into outer space slightly more difficult than its initial absorption by the Earth (from sunlight). This is the Greenhouse Effect. And the result is that the Earth warms.

(continued on page 5)

The *Journal* is the monthly publication of American Christian College d/b/a Summit Ministries, a non-profit, educational, religious corporation operating under the laws of the states of Oklahoma and Colorado. Correspondence:

P.O. Box 207, Manitou Springs, Colorado 80829

Phone: (719) 685-9103 • Fax: (719) 685-9330

E-mail: journal@summit.org

Although there is no charge for this publication, it costs Summit Ministries approximately \$20 per year per subscription. The *Journal* is edited by David A. Noebel, and printed by Golden Belt Printing of Great Bend, Kansas.



# From the President's Desk

Dr. David A. Noebel

Your editor receives requests from time to time to suggest an interesting masters or doctoral research thesis. I have a great suggestion for a masters thesis.

Probe the question—How were “86 top evangelical leaders” misled into believing mere human beings were going to bring the earth crashing to a halt via global warming?

The exercise would entail contacting all 86 and finding out who or what persuaded them to speak out on a subject most know next to nothing about. Most of these 86 cannot even predict the weather for any given Sunday, much less predict what will happen with the climate 100 years from now.

Can anyone imagine the embarrassment if these 86 leaders had rushed forward 30 years ago and insisted the climate was cooling (which was indeed then the cry of the radical “greens”), and we all needed to join a world government in order for the whole human race to battle “global cooling” and defeat it by replacing the West’s capitalistic system with some form of socialism, based on the assumption that socialism would be more environmentally friendly! Of course, we now know that the planet is not cooling, and that nations under socialism are worse polluters than all the rest.

These 86 leaders would have been the laughing stock of the born again community, presently placed at 100 million strong in the US alone.

Instead, we are now reading: “A Bible-based call to fight global warming has split evangelical Christians.” “Eighty-six prominent evangelicals are warning of ‘millions of deaths’ unless authorities act.” “The Evangelical Climate Institution, a new alliance of the 86 Christians that include college presidents, mega church pastors and humanitarian-agency leaders, says human induced climate change could raise sea levels, intensify heat waves, droughts and hurricanes, decrease agricultural production and increase tropical diseases” (Cox News Service, February 8, 2006).

The truth of the matter is one belch from a volcano can place more greenhouse gases around the globe than all human effort combined for years, and one blast from the sun can warm the earth more than all known human effort combined for a millennium.

For anyone interested in this subject, we highly recommend the following: Michael Crichton’s fictional *State of Fear*; Patrick Michael’s *Meltdown: The Predictable Distortions of Global Warming by Scientists, Politicians, and the Media*; Tom Bethell’s *The*

*Politically Incorrect Guide to Science*; and Bjorn Lomborg’s *The Skeptical Environmentalist*.

Lomborg, a Danish statistician and Greenpeace activist, set out to “disprove the views of the late Julian Simon, an economist who claimed that dire environmental fears were wrong and that the world was actually improving. To Lomborg’s surprise, he found that Simon was mostly right.” He also found out how reprehensible *Scientific American* can be as it heaped scorn upon him for his scientific findings!

Crichton’s *State of Fear* has a passage that is reflective of the present situation (p. 315,6). One of his characters says, “What’s logic got to do with? All we need is for the media to report it. After all, most Americans believe that crime in their country is increasing, when it has actually been declining for twelve years.”

This same character (Henley) then says, “Just think how far we have come! Back in the 1970s, all the climate scientists believed an ice age was coming. They thought the world was getting colder. But once the notion of global warming was raised, they immediately recognized the advantages. Global warming creates a crisis, a call to action. A crisis needs to be studied, it needs to be funded, it needs political and bureaucratic structures around the world. And in no time at all, a huge number of meteorologists, geologists, oceanographers suddenly became ‘climate scientists’ engaged in the management of this crisis.”

Henley tries to persuade Drake why just holding a conference will “establish abrupt climate change as a genuine problem.” Says Henley, “Stop whining. Don’t you remember how long it took to establish the global threat of nuclear winter? It took five days. On one Saturday in 1983, nobody in the world had ever heard of nuclear winter. Then a big media conference was held and by the following Wednesday the entire world was worried about nuclear winter. It was established as a bona fide threat to the planet. Without a single published scientific paper.”

The exact scenario is happening again, but this time 86 prominent evangelical leaders are swallowing the bait hook, line and sinker. How can we be so gullible?

One parting shot: if these 86 leaders really want to save the lives of millions of children, why not scoot up to South Dakota and help Dr. and Mrs. Allen Unruh save the lives of the unborn! That’s something within their calling, expertise, jurisdiction, and it’s immediately doable!



(continued from page 3)

“The effect itself is not disputed by scientists, but whether man-made carbon-dioxide emissions have been sufficient to cause measurable global temperature increases over the last thirty years is a matter of fierce debate. Carbon dioxide itself is a benign and essential substance. Without it, plants would not grow, and without plant life, animals could not live. The increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere therefore causes everything from plants to trees, forests to jungles, to grow more abundantly.

“The surface data itself suggests that man-made carbon dioxide has not been sufficient to increase global temperatures. Consider the period 1940-1975, a time of considerable fossil fuel consumption. Coal-fired plants emitted smoke and fumes without any Green Party or environmental ministers to restrain them. Yet the Earth cooled slightly. Also, if man-made global warming is real, atmospheric *as well* as surface temperatures should have steadily increased. This has not happened. Increases were recorded only in the late 1970s, but these were probably caused by a solar anomaly, not by anything man was doing.”

—Tom Bethell, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science*, p. 2, 3.

□ “Consider, in this context, the experience of Dr. David Deming, an assistant professor at the University of Oklahoma’s College of Geosciences. In 1995, he published a paper in the journal *Science*, reviewing the evidence showing that borehole temperature data recorded a warming of about one degree Celsius in North America over the last 100 to 150 years. Deming subsequently learned: ‘With the publication of the article in *Science*, I gained significant credibility in the community of scientists working on climate change. They thought I was one of them, someone who would pervert science in the service of social and political causes. So one of them let his guard down. A major person working in the area of climate change and global warming sent me an astonishing e-mail that said, ‘We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period.’”

“Mann was already working on it. Whether he intended to is another question, but the hockey stick eliminated that pesky Medieval Warm Period. The twentieth century was going to be warmest, regardless of the data.

“At the same time, Deming had his first encounter with the agenda-driven news media. He had ended his *Science* article with what he thought was an uncontroversial statement: ‘A cause and effect relationship between anthropogenic activities and climate warming cannot be demonstrated unambiguously at the present time.’ Simply stated, the evidence didn’t warrant the conclusion that recent warming had been caused by man.

“A reporter from National Public Radio then called him to discuss the *Science* article. But it turned out that he only wanted to know about that last sentence. ‘Did you really intend to imply that the warming in North America may have been due to natural variability?’ he asked.

“‘Yes,’ Deming replied.

“‘Well, then, I guess we have no story,’ the NPR man replied. ‘That’s not what people are interested in. People are only interested if the warming is due to human activities. Goodbye.’ And he hung up. Deming now knew how the media intentionally

screen what the public hears and have their conclusions firmly in mind beforehand.”

—Tom Bethell, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science*, p. 8, 9.

□ “Polar bears are not dying in the face of global warming. Bears in Alaska and Canada have large increases annually. Inuit hunter Larry Audlaluk told the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, ‘The Inuit...have always been conscious of our environment, our animals....We haven’t seen any indication the polar bear is dying off.’”

—*The New American*, May 1, 2006, p. 43

□ “Writing on the op-ed page of the *Wall Street Journal* on March 28 [2006], du Pont pointed out that the Kyoto Treaty has a larger agenda. As he said: ‘Masquerading as a global environmental policy, Kyoto exempts half of the world’s population and nine of the top 20 emitters of carbon dioxide—including China and India—from its emissions reduction requirements. It is in fact an effort to replace the world’s markets with an internationally regulated (think U.N.) global economy, perhaps better described as a predatory trade strategy to level the world’s economic playing field by penalizing the economic growth of energy efficient nations and rewarding those emitting much greater quantities of noxious gasses. Which explains why in 1997 the U.S. Senate voted 95-0 to oppose the signing of any international protocol that would commit Western nations to reduce emissions unless developing countries had to do so as well.’

“Occasionally, the propagandists reveal too much in the midst of their harmful nonsense. *Time* claims that China and India can help save the world, or destroy it—though admitting that these underdeveloped nations want the United States to carry the major burden. The idea is to level the playing field by lowering the standard of living in the United States. ‘Maybe,’ urges *Time*, ‘we can begin by living like the average Chinese or Indian—before they start living like us.’”

—*The New American*, May 1, 2006, p. 43

□ “Roy Spencer, principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and former senior scientist for climate studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, believes that small amounts of global warming could benefit the earth. ‘There isn’t enough appreciation amongst the public about the uncertainty of the science, because it’s the most dramatic claims that get the most press,’ he told *WORLD*. ‘We know from human history, warmer is better. Now, if it warms by 10 degrees Fahrenheit, that’s not good.’

“Mr. Spencer views competing scientific projections of climate change as exercises in futility—vain attempts to model a global system with countless unknown variables. He contends that meaningful debate on the issue must account for the economic consequences of proposed policies: ‘People don’t realize how painful it will be to substantially reduce carbon dioxide emissions.’”

—*WORLD Magazine*, April 22, 2006, p. 21

□ “Last Saturday morning, Steve Forbes said this about global

warming: "There are no real facts to back it up. It's now become a religion instead of science and great fundraiser for extreme environmentalists. I don't think it's a hoax, just bogus science, like eugenics was decades ago. I got news for you...the weather patterns change. A thousand years ago, Europe was warmer than it is today. Five hundred years ago we had a mini-ice age. Sixty years ago between 1940 and 1970, the weather got cooler. Not it gets a couple of degrees warmer and suddenly the world's comin' to an end. It's nonsense."

—*News Hounds* website, April 4, 2006

□ "We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind. There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth."

—Dr. Frederick Seitz, Past President, National Academy of Sciences, *The Wall Street Journal*, June 12, 1996

□ "The myth of 'global warming' starts with an accurate observation: The amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is rising. It is now about 360 parts per million, vs. 290 at the beginning of the 20th century. Reasonable estimates indicate that it may eventually rise as high as 600 parts per million. This rise probably results from human burning of coal, oil and natural gas, although this is not certain. Earth's oceans and land hold some 50 times as much carbon dioxide as is in the atmosphere, and movement between these reservoirs of carbon dioxide is poorly understood. The observed rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide does correspond with the time of human release and equals about half of the amount released.

"Carbon dioxide, water, and a few other substances are 'greenhouse gases.' For reasons predictable from their physics and chemistry, they tend to admit more solar energy into the atmosphere than they allow to escape. Actually, things are not so simple as this, since these substances interact among themselves and with other aspects of the atmosphere in complex ways that are not well understood. Still, it was reasonable to hypothesize that rising atmospheric carbon dioxide levels might cause atmospheric temperatures to rise. Some people predicted 'global warming,' which has come to mean extreme greenhouse warming of the atmosphere leading to catastrophic environmental consequences.

"The global-warming hypothesis, however, is no longer tenable. Scientists have been able to test it carefully, and it does not hold up. During the past 50 years, as atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have risen, scientists have made precise measurements of atmospheric temperature. These measurements have definitively shown that major atmospheric greenhouse warming of the atmo-

sphere is not occurring and is unlikely ever to occur.

"The temperature of the atmosphere fluctuates over a wide range, the result of solar activity and other influences. During the past 3,000 years, there have been five extended periods when it was distinctly warmer than today. One of the two coldest periods, known as the Little Ice Age, occurred 300 years ago. Atmospheric temperatures have been rising from that low for the past 300 years, but remain below the 3,000-year average.

"Why are temperatures rising? The first chart nearby shows temperatures during the past 250 years, relative to the mean temperature for 1951-70. The same chart shows the length of the solar magnetic cycle during the same period. Close correlation between these two parameters—the shorter the solar cycle (and hence the more active the sun), the higher the temperature—demonstrates, as do other studies, that the gradual warming since the Little Ice Age and the large fluctuations during that warming have been caused by changes in solar activity.

"The highest temperatures during this period occurred in about 1940. During the past 20 years, atmospheric temperatures have actually tended to go down, as shown in the second chart, based on very reliable satellite data, which have been confirmed by measurements from weather balloons.

"Consider what this means for the global-warming hypothesis. This hypothesis predicts that global temperatures will rise significantly, indeed catastrophically, if atmospheric carbon dioxide rises. Most of the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide has occurred during the past 50 years, and the increase has continued during the past 20 years. Yet there has been no significant increase in atmospheric temperature during those 50 years, and during the 20 years with the highest carbon dioxide levels, temperatures have decreased.

"In science, the ultimate test is the process of experiment. If a hypothesis fails the experimental test, it must be discarded. Therefore, the scientific method requires that the global warming hypothesis be rejected.

"Why, then, is there continuing scientific interest in 'global warming'? There is a field of inquiry in which scientists are using computers to try to predict the weather—even global weather over very long periods. But global weather is so complicated that current data and computer methods are insufficient to make such predictions. Although it is reasonable to hope that these methods will eventually become useful, for now computer climate models are very unreliable. The second chart shows predicted temperatures for the past 20 years, based on the computer models. It's not surprising that they should have turned out wrong—after all the weatherman still has difficulty predicting local weather even for a few days. Long-term global predictions are beyond current capabilities.

"So we needn't worry about human use of hydrocarbons warming the Earth. We also needn't worry about environmental calamities, even if the current, natural warming trend continues: After all the Earth has been much warmer during the past 3,000 years without ill effects.

"But we should worry about the effects of the hydrocarbon rationing being proposed at Kyoto. Hydrocarbon use has major environmental benefits. A great deal of research has shown that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide accelerate the growth

rates of plants and also permit plants to grow in drier regions. Animal life, which depends upon plants, also increases.

“Standing timber in the United States has already increased by 30% since 1950. There are now 60 tons of timber for every American. Tree-ring studies further confirm this spectacular increase in tree growth rates. It has also been found that mature Amazonian rain forests are increasing in biomass at about two tons per acre per year. A composite of 279 research studies predicts that overall plant growth rates will ultimately double as carbon dioxide increases.

“What mankind is doing is moving hydrocarbons from below ground and turning them into living things. We are living in an increasingly lush environment of plants and animals as a result of the carbon dioxide increase. Our children will enjoy an Earth with twice as much plant and animal life as that with which we now are blessed. This is a wonderful and unexpected gift from the industrial revolution.

“Hydrocarbons are needed to feed and lift from poverty vast numbers of people across the globe. This can eventually allow all human beings to live long, prosperous, healthy, productive lives. No other single technological factor is more important to the increase in the quality, length and quantity of human life than the continued, expanded and unrationed use of the Earth’s hydrocarbons, of which we have proven reserves to last more than 1,000 years. Global warming is a myth. The reality is that global poverty and death would be the result of Kyoto’s rationing of hydrocarbons.”

—Dr. Arthur Robinson, Dr. Zachary Robinson, *The Wall Street Journal*, December 4, 1997

□ “Here’s an inconvenient truth for ‘An Inconvenient Truth’: Remember what they used to call ‘climate change’? ‘Global warming.’ And what did they call it before that? ‘Global cooling.’ That was the big worry in the ‘70s: the forthcoming ice age. Back then, Lowell Ponte had a huge best seller called *The Cooling: Has the new ice age already begun? Can we survive?*

“The answer to the first question was: Yes, it had begun. From 1940 to 1970, there was very slight global cooling. That’s why the doom-mongers decided the big bucks were in the new-ice-age blockbusters.

“And yet, amazingly, we’ve survived. Why? Because in 1970 the planet stopped its very slight global cooling and began to undergo very slight global warming. So in the ‘80s, the doom-mongers cast off their thermal underwear, climbed into the leopard skin thongs, slathered themselves in sun cream and wired their publishers to change all references to ‘cooling’ to ‘warming’ for the paperback edition. That’s why, if you notice, the global-warming crowd begins their scare statistics with ‘since 1970,’ an unlikely Year Zero which would not otherwise merit the significance the eco-crowd invest in it.

But then in 1998 the planet stopped its very slight global warming and began to resume very slight global cooling. And this time the doom-mongers said, ‘Look, do we really want to rewrite the bumper stickers every 30 years? Let’s just call it ‘climate change.’ That pretty much covers it.’

“Why did the Earth cool between 1940 and 1970?”

“Beats me. Hitler? Hiroshima? Maybe we need to nuke

someone every couple of decades.”

—Mark Steyn, *Suntimes.com*, April 23, 2006

□ “Preachers used to warn of divine judgment if sinners did not repent and turn to God.

“Now, increasingly, preachers of the Left are instead warning of cataclysmic climate change if polluters (especially of the American variety) do not abandon economic growth and yield to the most apocalyptic scenarios of the environmental movement.

“President Bush, of course, is the main King Ahab against whom these prophets of doom now prophesy.

“The most recent prophecy, in March, came from the Church of England’s Archbishop of Canterbury. Rowan Williams, spiritual leader of nearly 80 million Anglicans worldwide, warned that politicians, i.e. Bush, might precipitate the deaths of ‘billions’ of people if they do not go sufficiently green.

“According to Ecumenical News International, Williams declared that Bush’s supposed refusal to cut greenhouse emissions was not compatible with Christianity.

“‘We very often come across situations where people are judged for not responding to warnings,’ the archbishop said. ‘I think what the Bible and the Christian tradition suggest is that those who have that challenge put before them, and not only that challenge but the evidence of it, and don’t respond,’ Williams said, ‘bear a very heavy responsibility before God.’

“‘Nobody likes talking about governmental coercion in this respect, whether it is speed limits or anything else,’ he said. ‘Nobody, for that matter, likes talking about enforceable international protocols.’

“But ‘unless there is a real change in attitudes,’ Williams added, ‘we have to contemplate these very unwelcome possibilities if we want the global economy not to collapse and millions, billions, of people not to die.’

“Not even the most extreme environmental pressure groups typically have the nerve to claim a potential death toll of ‘billions’ if warnings of Global Warming are not heeded. But bishops and theologians, used to speaking in the parlance of the Almighty, are often more given to hyperbole and flamboyant exaggeration than are their secular allies.

“Many Western church prelates of the Left are open to debate the authority of Scriptures and the central doctrines of Christianity. But for them, the latest and most extreme doomsday scenarios of the environmentalist movement must be accepted unquestioningly. Otherwise, they warn, a very, very hot Judgment Day is coming, in the form of Global Warming.

“Last year, the presiding bishop of the 5 million member Evangelical Lutheran Church in America appropriately used Earth Day, which he called the ‘Earth’s Easter,’ to summon Lutherans to the altar call of Global Warming. Bishop Mark Hanson insisted that ‘our liturgical celebration of Earth Day’ was a ‘matter of life and death,’ with the threat of climate change drawing nigh.

“Citing an Arctic tribe of Lutherans whose village supposedly will soon be inundated by melting ice, Bishop Hanson warned of a similar deluge of sorts for millions of others around the globe. That is, unless they repent.

“‘The forces unleashed by global climate change are literally washing away the earth,’ the bishop somberly preached, like Noah



American Christian College  
**Journal**  
P.O. Box 207  
Manitou Springs, CO 80829  
(719) 685-9103  
Journal@summit.org  
www.summit.org

NON-PROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
Great Bend, KS  
PERMIT 25

## ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

### Receiving Duplicate Mailings?

Please note your correct name and address, and return all labels to Summit Ministries for correction.

### Moving?

Please send us a change of address form (available at your local post office).

of old. 'How will the rest of us respond to global climate change and its threat to the well-being of all creatures and species around the earth?' he asked darkly.

"Bishop Hanson called 'all Americans to acknowledge our sinful complicity in producing one-quarter of the world's carbon emissions, which exacerbate global warming, even though we are only five percent of the planet's human population.' The prelate's sermonizing, though phrased in the verbiage of religiosity, was drawn from the usual talking points of the Green Left.

"We are committed to repent of our own sinful misuse and abuse of the Earth, direct and indirect,' Hanson intoned. 'We do this especially for the sake of the poor of the earth, working on their behalf, even as we contend with entrenched political, economic, and social forces.'

"The identity of these demonic and 'entrenched' forces went unnamed by Hanson, at least this time, but the names are easily imagined: Bush, the United States, oil companies, and perhaps the Religious Right, whose mindless denizens supposedly want to pollute and heat the planet until the Second Coming.

"This 'false gospel' of conservative religious believers who are allegedly more concerned about personal salvation than the salvation of a groaning Earth was the special target of select theologians assembled by the National Council of Churches. They gathered in Washington, D.C. in February 2005, only weeks before Hanson's liturgical Earth Day prophecy. And they too called for repentance by a polluting America, in a declaration called 'God's Earth is Sacred.'

"We have abused and exploited the Earth and people on the margins of power and privilege, altering climates, extinguishing species, and jeopardizing Earth's capacity to sustain life as we

know and love it,' the NCC's green prophets proclaimed. Like many pronouncements from the Religious Left, it draped its condemnation of U.S. policies in the pious language of self-mortification. The 'we repent' rhetorical ploy is actually a wagging finger pointed at the non-believers who are ignoring the Religious Left's prophecies and provoking Mother Earth's heated fury.

"The NCC green prophets naturally pointed out that any authentic 'repentance of our social and ecological sins' must acknowledge the 'special responsibility' of the earth's polluter in chief: the United States. Besides spewing out black emissions that are going to microwave the earth, the U.S. is busily perpetuating 'scandalous inequities at home and abroad.'

"How can America repent for its complicity in Global Warming? The 'repentance' required by the Religious Left includes all the demands of the secular Green Left: comply with the Kyoto Accord, reduce economic growth, regulate the economy more, increase taxes, reduce U.S. sovereignty, maximize U.S. aid to the supposed global victims of America's pollution and greed.

"Perhaps, then, a benevolent Mother Earth will withhold her anger, and spare a repentant America and the rest of the world from Her divine judgment of Global Warming, with its rising sea levels, withering crops, increased disease and pestilence, and, as Archbishop Williams warned, 'billions' of deaths.

"That's the prophecy of the Religious Left. More traditional religionists will recall, with the Psalmist, that the earth is the Lord's footstool, and it is not the fragile porcelain imagined by some ardent secularists and religious faddists. God may indeed judge the world, but the sins that provoke Him might be more serious than purchasing an SUV or occasionally voting Republican."

—Mark Tooley, *Frontpagemag.com*, April 6, 2006