By itself, reality isn't worth a damn. It's perception that promotes reality to meaning.

Joseph Brodsky

Perception of Disaster
by Prof. Sergei Braun

Since the creation of Modernity, the world perception of the European intellectual underwent dramatic changes. It is befitting to describe these changes in terms of classic Greco-Roman myth.

The 19th century in Europe was the Silver Age of optimism. During this Age, many refused to worship gods and began to venerate the Man instead. Great scientific discoveries deeply influenced the life of ordinary citizens. Cheaply produced material goods provided for better living. Education and health care were becoming available to masses. The planet offered her charms to Humanity for taking. It opened itself to Man as does a captured woman, subdued and inexhaustible, full of promise. Of course, there were tensions and strains, results of Industrialization, but Science and new social theories held a promise of cure.

The 20th century signified the advent of the Bronze Age. It was nothing short of a catastrophe. Zeus destroyed men of the Silver Age at the pinnacle of their self-assurance, perhaps, for their impiety. Two cataclysmic wars swept over the staid world, destroying the Europe of picturesque cities of churches and townhouses, Gothic and Baroque. Whole generations of Europeans were extinguished in the terrible tribulation. The arrogance of Humanism retreated before the sway of neoplatonic religions - the tribal creeds of racial and class purity. Despite the flood of hatred that washed over Europe, science and industry profited, providing for incomparable levels of leisure and prosperity.

Paradoxically, fascism and communism - the collectivist social creeds opposing the industrial society and its democratic institution worked in practice hand in hand with their foe, the consumerism, destroying traditional communal organizations: the guilds, rural collectives, church congregations even traditional large families, where several generations cohabitated under the same roof. Their place was taken by individualism, by nuclear family hedonism and the feeling that the Earth is orphaned.
In the Iron Age of 21st century, men became greedy and impious. Truth, modesty, and loyalty were nowhere to be found, and gods abandoned the Earth.

This feeling caters to deep-seated fear and anxiety of the populace, and expresses powerful currents of public unconscious. We, the inhabitants of prosperous world feel “that strange melancholy, which often haunts the inhabitants of democratic countries in the midst of their abundance, and the disgust of life, which sometimes seizes upon them in the midst of calm and easy circumstance” (Alexis de Toqueville). We know that “if everything seems to be going well, you have obviously overlooked something” (Steven Wright; we are worried. Whether this worry is justified or not, we sense that our world, the Mother Earth herself, is in danger. The decision time looms and we must take action. We need someone to show us the villains and lead us against them. In the world lacking powerful religious, military and political authority, where only media darlings are the ones that exercise influence, each of us feels inadequate, uncertain, facing fateful decisions unprepared. The success of Al Gore propaganda spool “An Inconvenient Truth” that won him the Nobel Prize has its roots in this fertile ground. It gave people certainty, telling them a cohesive story, not necessarily true, but nonetheless deeply satisfying.

In ancient Greece, no serious decision has been taken without consulting the oracle at Delphi. The prophetess, Pythia, sat on a tripod at the opening in the earth, through which noxious fumes emerged that kept her in trance. The supplicant was aided by the priest of Apollo, who interpreted the incoherent utterings of Pythia. The personal inadequacy of Pythia’s petitioner has been overcome by the awareness of gods’ will; thus his uncertainty was resolved.

In this parable, we, the public, are supplicants. Our politicians are the priests of Apollo, and Pythia is our collective unconscious that mutters and coos enthused by the fumes rising from the depth of Gaia, the Mother Earth. Like all good politicians, Al Gore and the Nobel Peace Prize committee were destined to become oracles of modern times.

It is worth noting, how easily the images of ancient myths, of Gaia, Python and Apollo crop up in association with public unconscious, especially so in relation to our thinking about the cardinal
questions of the counterpoint between the Man and the World. No wonder: myths are the language of public unconscious!

I’m sure that all the honorable members Nobel Peace Prize committee and Mr. Gore himself would protest loudly my placing their activity into the irrational domain of public unconscious. They are proudly rational people of the “Era of Rationality”. Aren’t we all rational, except, perhaps, for some fundamentalist loonies, whom we wouldn’t mention for the fear of stereotyping? Rationality is Sanity! Insanity is our greatest fear. We, Mr. and Ms. John E. (E stands for ‘Educated’) Public, tend to treat as rational even the most esoteric of our beliefs. We don’t let the primitive fears and urges to interfere with our daily activities. We relegate them to the dusty attics and cobwebby cellars of our mind, allowing them to surface only under the controlled conditions of pulp fiction and B-movies. Yet in the depths of our soul we all know that our world and our lives are irrational. Nothing expresses this feeling better than the line from Macbeth, which has found its way into the title of one of the greatest modern tales: ‘Life’s … a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing’.

We are rational. The Other is not. The other is violent, dirty, polluted, overheated; and it leads us straight into the fiery Armageddon. It is our sacred duty to protect us, the world, the people of good will and the community of pure. The Inconvenient Truth is that we must act and we must act now, before it’s too late. Some of us would go to the logical end of separating the lambs from the wolves, retreating into Puritan communities of the chosen, into Eco-Villages; some would commit brutal acts of desperate violence for the sake of love and peace.

The tension between our rational conscious and the irrational forces outside it are alone sufficient to generate panic attacks, grass-root movements, Nobel Prizes for Peace and Oscar nominations. There is no need for facts, although the “rational” mind always wills facts into reality. Once there is the will, there will be facts, and woe to the Inconvenient Facts! The bearer of inconvenient facts will be publicly humiliated, branded with the trade mark ‘Made by Exxon’ and otherwise flogged.

The winners of 2007 Nobel Peace Prize have obtained it for ‘their efforts to spread awareness of man-made climate change’. Climates change; there is no news in that - we learn that early in
school; they are impersonal, blameless. Whom should we blame for relentless advances and recessions of glaciers, for capricious behavior of sun spots, for eruption of super-volcanoes?... God?... Nature?... How could we sue them? Awareness of natural climate changes wouldn’t get us even the Nobel Prize in Archeo-Meteorology! The 2007 Prize was given for the awareness of the man-made climate change. Now that we are aware, blame can be attached to the man or men who cause the climate to change.

Is there a man-made climate change? No issue, since the demise of Soviet Communism, has polarized the society as much as the issue of global warming. It has become a profession of faith. ‘To one who has faith, no explanation is necessary’ said Thomas Aquinas. In the heated discussion of man-made global warming, facts have become mere jabs at the sparring partner. Is there a man-made climate change? The simple answer is: We don’t know; we’re not yet aware of it. The Nobel Prize was premature.

Yet, people take sides. I will not try to hide my true self behind the agnostic I-don’t-know. I am a traitor to the human race; I was hired by Exxon Mobile to do their dirty work. I am not convinced to any degree of certainty that the global warming has anything to do with men. ‘Your Highness, I have no need of this hypothesis’ (Pierre Laplace). Actually, I never heard from any of my scientist friends any solid argument for it. I make an exception here for mathematicians, who work in manipulating symbols; they are prone to wild beliefs. Perhaps, my statistical sample is too insignificant; I am aware of a faction in scientific opinion, which is in favor of man’s contribution to the change of climate. It’s normal for the scientists to disagree. They rarely agree on anything. They frequently switch sides, since they are aware that their conclusions are mere hypotheses which fit current observations best. They are always expecting an uninvited inconvenient truth to come in and change the picture. I must continue from Thomas Aquinas: ‘To one without faith, no explanation is possible’. Faith in Science is replaced by a fluid judgment, by a hypothesis based on cold weighing of available facts, as much as it is possible to remain cool in the heated atmosphere of global warming.
My hypothesis based on incontrovertible facts is that we are witness to a normal fluctuation in the world climate. The speculations about global warming will follow the fate of the global cooling scare of the 70ies and disappear from the public conscious, as if they never existed.

We are currently living in one of the coldest periods in the history of earth. There were periods of much higher average global temperatures long before humans evolved. Rise in the temperature of the oceans releases water-dissolved carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. These two parameters are tightly linked. Carbon dioxide increase in the atmosphere is the consequence of warming, not its reason.

Within our recorded history, the climate also has changed considerably, prior to the advent of the industrial society. By consensus, before we became aware of Al Gore, such changes were attributed to the increase in solar output, related to the number of spots on the Sun. We are currently experiencing such a period of increased solar activity. The ice is receding not only in Greenland but on Mars as well. In 2005, data from NASA’s Mars Global Surveyor and Odyssey missions revealed that the carbon dioxide ‘ice caps’ near Mars’s South Pole had been diminishing for three summers in a row. The current increase in the temperature is well within the range of changes on the recent record. As a scientist, when drawing conclusions from the available facts I must not commit parsimony, I have to avoid assuming unwarranted complications (such as human factor) in my hypothesis. As William of Ockham (1285-1349) has said: “Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate” - Multiplicity is not supposed without necessity. Wikipedia defines parsimony as the 'less is better' concept of frugality/economy/stinginess or caution in arriving at a hypothesis or course of action. One shouldn’t be parsimonious in choosing one’s course of action! Talk to me about the Kyoto protocol!

But then, of course, I may be wrong. The conclusion of a scientist is never final. Exacerbated by human release of greenhouse gases, the current global warming might, perhaps, end the world as we know it. There are people, who claim that ‘man-made emissions of carbon dioxide have caused its amount in the atmosphere to increase by about 30% since pre-industrial times, and this
is a major cause of global warming’. Is it true? I don’t know. I think it’s highly unlikely, but as I have already said: ‘We don’t know; we’re not yet aware’.

Although there is no verifiable record of human impact on the global climate, man’s activity, agricultural and other, has left its imprint on the microclimate, and, visibly, on the landscape. We are rarely aware that many beautiful landscapes are man-made. In his book, ‘Landscape and Memory’, the English historian Simon Schama points out that the breathtaking contrast between the forested slopes and the grassland of the Yellowstone Lamar valley that so impressed Hancock, Dixon, and Colter were not created by Nature, but by Micmac Indians regularly slash-burning the brush in the gorge to allow for agriculture.

When Julian, the Apostate, the last pagan Roman Emperor (361-363), had to hurry his legions from Colonia (the modern Cologne), where he was campaigning against Franks, to Byzantium, he crossed the Rein and entered the forest so dense that it was submerged in eternal twilight. The Emperor and his soldiers have not seen the sunlight until they emerged from the forest in the Balkans. Waste open spaces, as if created for the well tended fields and picturesque groves, of modern Germany, are all man-made.

Many Germans flock every year to Harz, a mountain range in the Northern Germany, the place of great natural beauty. When I was vacationing there, I found puzzling that unlike the neighboring lands of Westphalia, Saxony and Anhalt, the forest covering the slopes of Harz Mountains consists mainly of spruce. I asked the local guide: ‘Why are there so many spruce trees, instead of the usual small knobby pines? He told me that busy and
important silver mines of the Medieval Harz needed the spruce hardwood for support. The week pine wood went up the chimneys and spruce was planted instead. It is commercially harvested until today.

Man always recreates its environment, destroys certain species of wild life, plants and supports propagation of the others. The very spread of human species is based on man’s ability to adapt environment to its needs. Examples could be drawn from all continents and climatic zones from the rice paddies of South-East Asia to terrace agriculture of the Middle East, to herds of Northern elk in the tundra. Walking the trail in the Siberian taiga, as under-populated as the Sahara desert, miles upon miles away from human habitation, one immediately spots a trace of human by noticing near the trail the plants associated with man: nettles, burdock and hemp, which grow poorly on the thin soil of the forest rich in lignin, but assert themselves in the soil fertilized by the mere passing presence of man. In the loneliness of the eternal taiga, these plants are the welcome sign of human presence, warm and reassuring.

We are all aware of less beneficial aspects of human activities as well: desertification, land salination, soil erosion, and of the catastrophic results of megalomaniac projects such as the disappearing Aral Sea. Men should treat their environment with respect and care. We should take care of it as the family treats its own house and plot of land with respect and love, tending to it, making it more convenient, more pleasurable to live in, preserving it and preparing to hand it over to the next generation. The work of habitat preservation should be done as rationally as possible, working out compromises that are landmarks of clever politics. It should steer away from heroic measures, hysteria, panic or anticipation of impending doom.

Hysteria, unwarranted perception of disaster and the urge to shut down the industry, the only activity able to sustain the current human population density are trademarks of the man-made global warming campaign. Spun out of control, it is more likely to promote global war than
global peace. The zealots of global warming perceive to have more at stake than the fate of
discussion on salvation by Grace or the nature of Eucharist, which precipitated a century of
religious wars in Europe.

What worries me is the mythological dimension in the global-warming discussion. I have already
shown above how the Inconvenient Truth can be derived from the dichotomy between the
rationality of the modern mind and the irrationality of human condition. In ancient times, men
could operate without conflict in two domains: the sacred and the mundane. Ancients were
perfectly rational in the mundane and as perfectly intuitive in the sacred. A Roman farmer
tended to his field with all the rationality he could master. He knew that if he won’t work hard
he’d die of hunger even if he prays to Gods all day long. The same farmer also prayed for the
harvest, knowing that even if he works well, the fruit of his work may be taken from him at any
moment by forces, over which he has no control, but by performing traditional rituals.

Our times have cancelled the Gods
and their rituals, but the uncertainty
about the outcome of our efforts still
dwells with us, and with ample
reason. We all perform our private
rituals, protect ourselves from evil by
erecting magic walls around our
holiest-of-holies, but we have no
confidence of the Roman farmer in the
power of our non-traditional rituals.

In fact, in our rational hours, we don’t believe that the symbolic walls we erected are able to
contain the evil.

The Roman farmer believed in the magic of rituals, we believe only in Science. The majority of us
actually believe in the Science as reported by media. We are not that different from the Roman
farmer. The sacred domain in us cannot remain empty. The very thing, in which we believe,
permeates our unconscious. Heroes and monsters take the form and symbols of the science.
Science becomes the source of modern mythology. Some of us are still terrified of the ‘evil eye’,
but everybody is anxious about viruses. Some of us pray to God to rid us of cancer, but all of us
take vitamins, antioxidants, food additives, or avoid certain foods to ward cancer away. None of
this is rational; everything is rationalized in scientific terms provided by the media, which
capitalize on feeding our hungry public unconscious, catering to our fears and superstitions. The
media provide us with monsters and heroes, suggest expiating rituals, and predispose our thinking for millennial trends.

Let us analyze how it is done in reporting the global warming on a very moderate example of the un-sensational style. In September 2007, the ‘serious’ Israeli newspaper Haaretz has published an item bound to incite in its readers’ interest, outrage and, perhaps, activism. The article by Assaf Uni was entitled: Scientists see in Greenland’s melting ice a harbinger of things to come. The story of melting Greenland’s ice is told touchingly from the point of view of a 39-year-old local Inuit fisherman, ‘Arna Langa, who still remembers the last time the sea around his village froze over, some 10 years ago. Global warming is changing all aspects of life in Langa's village and all over his homeland.’

Arna Langa cannot go on ice to fish halibut anymore! Let me rewrite the sentence in different context: “The Norwegian oil rig ‘Arne Lang’ belonging to the multinational ‘Norsk Hydro’ had to evacuate its crew due to the danger posed by recent increase in the number of icebergs.”, or “The Danish businessman, Arne Langerson, on vacation in Greenland, complained that he had to give up his favorite hobby of fishing halibut on ice”. Doesn’t it compel less compassion, perhaps, none in most readers? Since the beginning of modernity the Rousseau-istic noble savage, who lives in harmony with nature and with himself, is the mythic antipode of the modern man, the latter being egotistic, decadent and self-serving. The newspaper uses this myth to provoke in the reader, an environmental worrier, a gut reaction: halibut should be protected from the destroyers of environment, multinationals and businessmen; the native people should be allowed to continue their lives in harmony with the environment. Both goals can be reached by curtailing noxious carbon dioxide emissions, thus delivering a blow to multinational globalizers and protecting innocent pre-capitalist Inuit fishermen from the plague of man-made global warming unleashed on the world by the industrial civilization.

Although the title of the article invokes the high authority of the science, the only mention of it is the following phrase: “Scientists believe that Greenland, with a population of some 50,000, is an accurate thermometer of global warming. If this is true, then the developments, its residents are now witnessing, are alarming news for the entire world”. This may all be scientifically true or
not. Assaf Uri fails to bring the voice of a scientist into the story, but this is besides the point. The science stands there for the prophetic warning. The very word ‘science’, in one line, one sentence makes any statement true.

The scientist is the devil and the Messiah of the modern mythology. Science is the basis of modern society; it has replaced and undermined religion. Scientist is the priest and the sorcerer, the prophet and the healer, the source of the sacred knowledge. In common perception, scientist uses his rationality to arrive at the truth, one and indivisible. Of course, there are rogue scientists; an insignificant yet dangerous minority, such as deniers of man-made global warming, people, who serve Mammon, lackeys of capitalism, supporters of G.W. Bush.

Reading that Greenland is an accurate global thermometer, one, of course, wonders why Greenland is called a green land. It is far from being a green land today. Had this thermometer have shown higher temperatures in the past? Yet the newspaper never asks this obvious and easy question. Every faithful viewer of National Geographic Channel could provide the answer. In 982, an Icelandic Viking Eric the Red Thorvaldsson killed two men in a fight. In fear for his life, he sailed to a land North-West of Iceland, where at the end of a deep fiord, he found a valley covered with trees and grasses. He set up a colony there in 985, which grew to host more than three thousand colonists. Although it wasn’t much greener than the Ice-Land, from where he came, he proudly called his new home Greenland. The summers in Greenland were short and the land was poor but the colonists could produce plenty of cow meat and dairy products. Greenland exported to Norway and the German lands wool, leather, furs, meat, butter and cheese in exchange for corn and iron. The Little Ice age in the 15th century made the dairy farming of Greenland Vikings and their trade with Europe impossible; the colony was abandoned.

The ‘accurate global thermometer’ has registered a temperature higher than today in the 10th century, and lower than today in the 15th. Omission of this fact from the publication indicates either stupidity and ignorance, or, more likely, the bias of the newspaper, the desire to scare.
In the democracy, there are two ways to get control over the public: to dress it in uniform or to scare it. During peace, the first solution is limited to Armed Forces and tightly controlled by the legislature. The second approach is the favorite domain of politicians and of media. ‘Vote for me!’ shouts the candidate, ‘or your life, health, education and property will be in danger!’ ‘Buy my newspaper, or you’ll be ignorant of the evil things that are going on just now behind your backs!’ Both go directly to this creeping uncertainty that dwells in our collective unconscious.

We live in the age of uncertainty. The 1st World War shattered our belief in rationality and liberalism as guarantees of eternal peace and progress. The 2nd World War destroyed our faith in the goodness of man and our faith in man-made social theories. The Cold War taught us that there are ten times over rockets able to end the life on Earth. Of course, we feel that the world we live in is dangerous, imperfect, soiled. The Cold War ended, but the feeling of existential danger has not passed. We are obsessed with millennial dreams of near Armageddon triggered by a giant meteor causing global cooling, by nuclear winter, by overpopulation, by militant Islam, by industrial pollution, by pesticides, by man-made global warming (Thank you Mr. Gore for making us aware of it.), by genetically modified monsters. Make your pick!

The motive of pollution is the basis underlying all these scenarios of the end of the world: pollution by meteoric dust, by strangers, by industry, by science. This basic fear of pollution is deep within our ancestral genes. In Christian culture, there always existed a concept of mankind corrupted by the original sin. In Augustinian tradition, the fall of Man was so abysmal that it is beyond redemption but by Grace. Evangelical Christianity, the Calvinist thought, which is the source of our mentality, made this thesis central in its theology. ‘Mankind is a pollution and it spreads pollution’; this is ingrained in our collective unconscious.

Despite all evidence to the contrary, the masses believe that the burgeoning humanity contaminates water that we drink, air that we breathe and soil that sustains us. You can make available the statistical data, that we live longer, our health is better, than 100 years ago; that the new cases of cancer are on decline year after year for more than 25 years; that at least in the developed world the water is safe to drink. It won’t help. The affluent and educated would
continue to drink bottled water, which is less safe than the tap water, would pay outrageous prices for the hoax called ‘organic’ food and would protest against installation of cell networks’ antennas in their neighborhood, while buying the 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation cell phones.

The pesticide-free ‘organic’ agricultural produce of the pre-industrial centuries was substandard in quality, full of pathogens, microbial, insect and fungal toxins, natural carcinogens and just plain dirt. Mycotoxin-caused diseases sometimes developed into epidemics; the most famous is that of ergotism or ‘St. Anthony’s Fire’. The name was given for the burning sensation experienced by sufferers in the limbs. Ergotism results in hallucinations, convulsions, gangrene and death. The disease is caused by ergot alkaloids, which come from the fungus \textit{Claviceps purpurea}, a pathogen of wheat and rye. The word ergot is derived from the old French ‘argent’ meaning the cock’s spur reminiscent of the \textit{C. purpurea} fruit body. Outbreaks of ergotism caused 11,000 deaths in Russia as late as 1926.

There were speculations that the formidable events of the French revolution were triggered by psychic instability induced by bread contaminated with ergot, the parent compound of the famous hallucinogen LSD.

If not the French revolution, then the success of American Revolution may be, in part, attributed to the microbial pollution of the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century. Some historians say that King George III never paid necessary attention to the developing situation in colonies, because William Pitt’s physical infirmities prevented him from making but few public appearances and detracted from his political influence. He had for many years the non-specific symptoms of what we would call today a common cold.

The strength of belief in natural, in organic is purely mythological. World was not created to make our lives convenient. Paraphrasing Stephen King, ‘the world has teeth and it can bite you
with them anytime it wants’. It is our public unconscious that whispers to us that the world is meant to be a safe playground for men; both the Bible and Hesiod agree: at the beginning there was paradise, the golden age. The pollution of sin has corrupted it. This belief may well go to the sources of European philisophy. Natural by Plato is opposed to artificial, manmade. Since humankind is a corrupted race, already once removed from the natural world of perfect ideas, man’s creations are twice removed from it.

An ultrareligious member of the Israel’s Knesset rabby Rawitz replied once to the opposing parliamentarian’s remark: ‘But you want to take us back to Middle Ages!’ ‘No, he said, I want to take you much, much more back in time.’ The unconscious desire to retreat back in time is shared by the main ‘rational’ religions of the 20th century – communism and fascism. Italian fascists wanted back to the glorious days of Roman Empire, German Nazis to the Teutoburg Forest and the communists to the property-free ways of hunters-gatherers. We, secular or nominally religious people, share with rabby Rawitz the unconscious desire to retreat into the past, real or imaginative, to escape alienation into communal life, to escape the cities for the life in Nature. The origin of this wish is found in the concept of Nature and natural of the 18th-19th century Romanticism. Of course, in our feminized modern society, the Romantic hero has discovered his feminine side. He is not aggressive; his testosteron levels are down as are his sperm counts. He buys organic food, free-range chicken eggs, opposes globalism and shy to use violence for the defense of himself and his way of life.

Our hero ‘is torn between the aspiration to universality and the special circumstances of the national situation; between attachment to democratic ideas and a taste for aristocratic values; between love of liberty and revolt against the power and the technical civilization of United States; between moral inspiration and the acceptance of cynicism’. He perfectly fits this description of the Leftist intelligentsia by Raymond Aron. Indeed, the promotion of the man-made global warming hysteria is uniquely a preoccupation of the Left. The Left runs this show.

The contemporary Leftie feels vaguely Marxist, as an average French or Englishman feels hazily Christian. Like the latter, he is not a Marxist theologian or even a Marxist churchgoer. He is for ‘brotherly love’ and ‘meek will inherit the Earth’. He is against globalization, capitalism; he’s not sure about Fidel anymore, but Che Guevara is his Elvis. Let’s define him as a non-card-holding
Marxist. Since the disappearance of Soviet communism, he does not feel ashamed or defensive for talking loudly about the superiority of Marxist ideas, the great humanitarian treasures of Marxism. Revising the minimalist definition of generalized Marxist by Raymond Aron, this Marxist still believes that his world view is rational, and, therefore, the only possible, but he has lost his historical optimism. He feels that his Utopia is in clear and present danger from the money-grabbing globalizers.

The global warming show fits the new Left ideally. It provides the Left with its rational Apocalypse. It marks the industrial civilization as the Devil; it delineates the boundaries between Good and Evil, between the community of the pure and the polluters: ones that don’t accept their responsibility for the global disaster. The global warming has become the founding myth of the Catholic Church of the New Left. The leftist intelligentsia was immediately joined by the intransigent communists, who still lurk in the liberal academic circles, and among the leaders of the 3rd world with magic solutions for political and social problems.

Secure in its earnings, educated and literate, the Left is well poised to dominate the media. It has the confidence to stand in eternal opposition to more balanced and cautious opinion of people with responsibilities, people, who run the industrial civilization.

This opposition may well exist within the same person. Al Gore, the man who made us aware, the prophet of man-made global warming, calls for immediate measures, for shutting down the Industry. Elected to a position of power and responsibility, he would, probably, become more cautious; the limitations of political action would make him to see the counterarguments.
Raymond Aron warned: ‘Free of the necessity to produce, the opposition is given to extremes instead of compromises’. This is what he calls the ‘imprudence and intolerance of the Left’. The inconvenient truth about the ‘Inconvenient Truth’ is that it is not the incontrovertible truth, perhaps, not a truth at all. ‘The last word,’ R. Aron insisted, ‘is never said and one must not judge one’s adversaries as if one’s own cause were identified with absolute truth.’
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