

**Jack Venrick**

---

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2008 12:04 AM  
**Subject:** HUMAN SACRIFICE ON THE ALTAR OF GAIA

----- Original Message -----

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 11, 2008 3:08 AM  
**Subject:** Re: FW: HUMAN SACRIFICE ON THE ALTAR OF GAIA

<http://honestmoneyreport.com/forum/index.php?topic=3842.320>

**Re: OT : Senate Kills Carbon Cap-and-trade**

« **Reply #320 on:** June 09, 2008, 08:48:25 PM »

Here is more stuff on global warming.

Read the key section and the entire essay, if you are interested.

Do any of you forum members regard the global warming theory as "good science"?

If you do, please post a brief essay explaining why you believe this is so.  
Why do you think that this is good science?

Steve

Key Section:

Second, global warming is unscientific because it can't be disproved. When temperatures slightly dropped over the past decade, then were predicted even by alarmists to drop more over the next decade despite ever-rising CO2, rather than admit their theory is wrong, the story line changed. Now we're told the entirely unpredicted 20-year cooling is only temporary. If temperatures go up, it proves global warming. If they go down, voila! It proves global warming.

+++++  
Full story:

<http://www.oeregister.com/articles/government-warming-global-2061971-co-year>

Editorial: We dodge a bullet on carbon cap-and-trade  
Senate kills a potentially disastrous bill, but possibly worse legislation could be coming  
An Orange County Register editorial

The nation avoided global warming-related devastation last week. The Senate killed a grandiose scheme to clamp down on emissions of CO2, a benign, necessary, natural atmospheric gas. However, something

similar, if not worse, will be back next year.

The devastation wouldn't have been the 1- or 2-degree temperature increases that may have occurred over the next century, which may not even be related to CO<sub>2</sub>. The real devastation would have been gasoline prices increasing \$1.40 per gallon by 2050, millions of jobs lost or shipped overseas, an effective \$3,700-a-year tax on families, a 33-percent increase in home energy costs by 2020, and, says the Heritage Foundation, the equivalent economic cost of 35 Hurricane Katrinas every year for two decades.

Those would be certain results of the failed Climate Security Act's vastly expanded government controls to extract trillions of dollars from productive companies and redistribute the money to politically favored interests, say the bill's opponents.

What's uncertain is whether the trouble and expense would have bought anything. Even if CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are returned to the level of horse-and-buggy days, an increase of 0.013 degree Celsius might be avoided over the next century, says climatologist Patrick Michaels. That's if CO<sub>2</sub> increases temperature, which many scientists doubt. So, why go down this path?

"Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream," MIT climate scientist Richard Lindzen said. "If you control carbon, you control life."

Global warming is the perfect big-government issue. First, it's predicated entirely on predicted disasters based on arbitrary data fed into computers. What's fed changes continuously. That's why a few years ago sea levels were predicted to rise 20 feet, but now only 20 inches or less. Garbage in, garbage out.

Second, global warming is unscientific because it can't be disproved. When temperatures slightly dropped over the past decade, then were predicted even by alarmists to drop more over the next decade despite ever-rising CO<sub>2</sub>, rather than admit their theory is wrong, the story line changed. Now we're told the entirely unpredicted 20-year cooling is only temporary. If temperatures go up, it proves global warming. If they go down, voila! It proves global warming.

Third, global warming is blamed for what has happened since the beginning of time. Climates always change. This ensures permanent government involvement. Fourth, if government imposes costly, Draconian solutions, and temperatures rise, it only means more Draconian solutions are needed. If temperatures drop, it only means Draconian solutions must continue.

Last week we saw how political support is mustered for such an unintuitive idea. Hundreds of billions of dollars never collected by the government before would be doled out to favored interests, after government pocketed its share. The failed bill would have given \$51 billion to so-called energy-efficient manufacturers, \$68 billion to automakers making government-smiled-upon cars and \$150 billion to owners and operators of favored energy producers.

Disguised as a "cap-and-trade" plan, it would have made CO<sub>2</sub> emitters pay to do what they've always done for free. Deceptively passed off as a market-based plan, cap-and-trade is really a hidden tax.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid assured us, "Gas prices will not go up. They will go down." In the end, the obvious connection to ever-higher gas prices politically killed the Climate Security Act. Next year another version is certain to return with a president inclined to sign it. We had a preview of the future last week. It's grim, costly and authoritarian.

[Report to moderator](#)  [Logged](#)

[sailboi](#)

Hero Member



Posts: 2432



[Re: OT : Global Warming Hysteria](#)

« **Reply #321** on: June 11, 2008, 05:58:16 AM »

[QUOTE](#) 

[MODIFY](#) 

[DELETE](#) 

Quote from: Steve Randall

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid assured us, "Gas prices will not go up. They will go down." In the end, the obvious connection to ever-higher gas prices politically killed the Climate Security Act. Next year another version is certain to return with a president inclined to sign it. We had a preview of the future last week. It's grim, costly and authoritarian.



Liberty for All



## HUMAN SACRIFICE ON THE ALTAR OF GAIA

Wendell Krossa [[wkrossa@shaw.ca](mailto:wkrossa@shaw.ca)]

*Anne Gardiner presents a good summary of some of the pagan mythology behind modern environmental thought (CCNet, 9 June 2008). Alston Chase similarly traces something of the mythological roots of this movement in his book *In A Dark Wood*.*

*Gardiner also expresses the great battle for human minds and freedom that this environmental movement is shaping up to be. It is becoming the defining issue of our time- the environmentalist assault on human freedom. Some have suggested that it could become a totalitarianism that would outdo totalitarianisms of the past because it wants to legislate human behavior in constraining detail that other movements did not engage. And it demands a reversal of the human enterprise (and humanity itself) on a scale that few other movements envisioned.*

*But I am not sure that Gardiner's alternative is up to the task of countering the core mythology of environmentalism. The Christian story is also one of human sacrifice and this does little to effectively challenge the similar pagan call for human sacrifice. Competing against one form of mythology with a similar story does not really resolve anything fundamental. Also, the Christian belief system assumes a fallen humanity which is little improvement on the devaluation of humanity offered by environmental paganism.*

*At the root of all this mythology is the valuation or perspective on humanity that people hold. This is a critical issue - how do we view and value humanity? What is our place in the overall scheme of things?*

*I would argue that with consciousness we hold a unique place in nature and a privileged responsibility to humanize nature and life. With consciousness we have awareness of what truly humane reality is about and we are responsible to bring this awareness to our engagement with the rest of life. Easterbrook (*A Moment on the Earth*) suggests that nature has waited a long time for us and our endowments of mind and intelligence. We can now help nature out of the dead ends that it has gotten into by its blind, random, and dumb processes (e.g. predation, disease, natural disasters).*

*A related issue here is how we view nature. Nature is not some pristine or pure reality aside from humanity. It has rightly been called a "wicked old witch" or Dark Nature (Lyall Watson). It is violent, disease ridden, and in need of rescue. While enlightened consciousness leads us to respect the rest of life, we should not apologize for our status and responsibility toward life and the Earth; to humanize nature. In fulfilling our responsibility, we ought to feel no guilt over our engagement of nature and our use of its abundant resources.*

*So nature has no inherent right to supremacy over humanity. Ideologies/mythologies that place something else above free human persons have always led to the neglect and abuse of real people. Such is the history of religious and ideological movements. Whenever people place something above human persons and their rights and freedom, then they fall prey to totalitarianism. This is equally true of this pagan nature worship. One would think it would be clear to most people that a dumb, blind, and randomly driven environment cannot take precedence over conscious persons.*

*I would suggest that an effective answer to this environmental mythology lies in the proper valuation of humanity or human persons. Each of us will do this in our own way according to our personal worldviews. Let me just note that helpful alternatives have been offered here by people like Joseph Campbell. Few have expressed the wonder of being human as well he has in his books *Myths To Live By*, *The Power of Myth*, and *An Open Life*. Catholic theologian Thomas Sheehan also offers an interesting valuation of humanity in his essay *From Divinity to Infinity*. He suggests that humanity is the new "marker" (or stand in) for divinity. Divinity, he says, has disappeared into humanity to explore the infinity of human potential in improving life. Campbell similarly offers the perspective that each of us embodies the great Consciousness or Mind of the universe. From such insight it becomes obvious that we are not just another animal subject to nature and its ecosystems (and after all, the story of humanity is one of freedom from natural constraints and limitations). We are so much more than just the 2 percent difference with apes. Others might prefer more secular perspectives on the wonder of being human such as that offered by Julian Simon in *Ultimate Resource*.*

*On the primitiveness or paganism of this contemporary environmental mythology I was reminded of a personal experience with a tribal man in Mindanao (Davao Del Norte province, Southern Philippines). He was fishing in a rainforest river. As he stood shivering on the bank holding his fishing spear I noticed that he had placed a piece of bamboo upright in the bank of the river with an egg held in the split top. I knew the mythology behind such sacrifice but I asked him anyway why he had done that. He replied, "So the river spirit will not be angry when I take fish from the river". Pagan, barbaric, and ignorant? Yes, its all that. But it is even more unsettling when such primitive thought is promoted by PhDs in our universities. Bill Rees, the father of the ecological footprint concept, had us read *The Re-Enchantment of the World* and lectured us on *Deep Ecology* in grad school (Planning) at the University of British Columbia. He had PhD candidates lecture us on nature as Goddess. And he also stated that he would not only halt the human enterprise for taking from nature, but would actually reverse it. Earth can only sustain about one to two billion people, according to him.*

*You can't discuss science with such people. Once in the grip of a mythology as powerful as this pagan nature worship, you can only let their hysteria run its course. But when that hysteria begins to push its totalitarian solutions on the rest of us, then it is the responsibility of all of us to stand up and refuse to let such insanity undermine human freedom and progress.*

**Wendell Krossa**  
[wkrossa@shaw.ca](mailto:wkrossa@shaw.ca)



« Last Edit: June 11, 2008, 06:00:54 AM by sailboi »

[Report to moderator](#)  [70.95.122.162](#)

There is danger from all men. The only maxim of a free government ought to be to trust no man living with power to endanger the public liberty.  
John Adams, Journal, 1772

On Tue, Jun 10, 2008 at 8:23 PM, Ronald Kitching <[ron.kitching@rahco.org](mailto:ron.kitching@rahco.org)> wrote:

This is an excellent essay on the Philosophy of the Dark Greens

**RAHCO Web Site**  
<[www.rahco.com](http://www.rahco.com)>

-----  
**Date:** Wed, 11 Jun 2008 10:21:45 +0800  
**Subject:** HUMAN SACRIFICE ON THE ALTAR OF GAIA

(7) RE: **HUMAN SACRIFICE ON THE ALTAR OF GAIA**

Benny,

Anne Gardiner presents a good summary of some of the pagan mythology behind modern environmental thought (CCNet, 9 June 2008). Alston Chase similarly traces something of the mythological roots of this movement in his book *In A Dark Wood*.

Gardiner also expresses the great battle for human minds and freedom that this environmental movement is shaping up to be. It is becoming the defining issue of our time- **the environmentalist assault on human freedom**. Some have suggested that it could become a totalitarianism that would outdo totalitarianisms of the past because it wants to legislate human behavior in constraining detail that other movements did not engage. **And it demands a reversal of the human enterprise (and humanity itself) on a scale that few other movements envisioned.**

But I am not sure that Gardiner's alternative is up to the task of countering the core mythology of environmentalism. The Christian story is also one of human sacrifice and this does little to effectively challenge the similar pagan call for human sacrifice. Competing against one form of mythology with a similar story does not really resolve anything fundamental. Also, the Christian belief system assumes a fallen humanity which is little improvement on the devaluation of humanity offered by environmental paganism.

At the root of all this mythology is the valuation or perspective on humanity that people hold. This is a critical issue - how do we view and value humanity? What is our place in the overall scheme of things?

I would argue that with consciousness we hold a unique place in nature and a privileged responsibility to humanize nature and life. With consciousness we have awareness of what truly humane reality is about and we are responsible to bring this awareness to our engagement with the rest of life. Easterbrook (*A Moment*

on the Earth) suggests that nature has waited a long time for us and our endowments of mind and intelligence. We can now help nature out of the dead ends that it has gotten into by its blind, random, and dumb processes (e.g. predation, disease, natural disasters).

A related issue here is how we view nature. Nature is not some pristine or pure reality aside from humanity. It has rightly been called a "wicked old witch" or Dark Nature (Lyall Watson). It is violent, disease ridden, and in need of rescue. While enlightened consciousness leads us to respect the rest of life, we should not apologize for our status and responsibility toward life and the Earth; to humanize nature. In fulfilling our responsibility, we ought to feel no guilt over our engagement of nature and our use of its abundant resources.

So nature has no inherent right to supremacy over humanity. Ideologies/mythologies that place something else above free human persons have always led to the neglect and abuse of real people. Such is the history of religious and ideological movements. **Whenever people place something above human persons and their rights and freedom, then they fall prey to totalitarianism.** This is equally true of this pagan nature worship. One would think it would be clear to most people that a dumb, blind, and randomly driven environment cannot take precedence over conscious persons.

I would suggest that an effective answer to this environmental mythology lies in the proper valuation of humanity or human persons. Each of us will do this in our own way according to our personal worldviews. Let me just note that helpful alternatives have been offered here by people like Joseph Campbell. Few have expressed the wonder of being human as well he has in his books *Myths To Live By*, *The Power of Myth*, and *An Open Life*. Catholic theologian Thomas Sheehan also offers an interesting valuation of humanity in his essay *From Divinity to Infinity*. He suggests that humanity is the new "marker" (or stand in) for divinity. Divinity, he says, has disappeared into humanity to explore the infinity of human potential in improving life. Campbell similarly offers the perspective that each of us embodies the great Consciousness or Mind of the universe. From such insight it becomes obvious that we are not just another animal subject to nature and its ecosystems (and after all, the story of humanity is one of freedom from natural constraints and limitations). We are so much more than just the 2 percent difference with apes. Others might prefer more secular perspectives on the wonder of being human such as that offered by **Julian Simon in Ultimate Resource**.

On the primitiveness or paganism of this contemporary environmental mythology I was reminded of a personal experience with a tribal man in Mindanao (Davao Del Norte province, Southern Philippines). He was fishing in a rainforest river. As he stood shivering on the bank holding his fishing spear I noticed that he had placed a piece of bamboo upright in the bank of the river with an egg held in the split top. I knew the mythology behind such sacrifice but I asked him anyway why he had done that. He replied, "So the river spirit will not be angry when I take fish from the river". Pagan, barbaric, and ignorant? Yes, its all that. But it is even more unsettling when such primitive thought is promoted by PhDs in our universities. Bill Rees, the father of the ecological footprint concept, had us read *The Re-Enchantment of the World* and lectured us on Deep Ecology in grad school (Planning) at the University of British Columbia. He had PhD candidates lecture us on nature as Goddess. And he also stated that he would not only halt the human enterprise for taking from nature, but would actually reverse it. Earth can only sustain about one to two billion people, according to him.

**You can't discuss science with such people. Once in the grip of a mythology as powerful as this pagan nature worship, you can only let their hysteria run its course. But when that hysteria begins to push its totalitarian solutions on the rest of us, then it is the responsibility of all of us to stand up and refuse**

**to let such insanity undermine human freedom and progress.**

Wendell Krossa

One of the best essays I have seen on the Dark Green Philosophy.

**Ronald Kitching**

**RAHCO Web Site <[www.rahco.com](http://www.rahco.com)>**