

Panoramic Misinformation:

A Common Sense Look at Global Warming

By Jeremy Lucas

To most, the very idea of "global warming" conjures up an absurd and illogical foolishness that makes no sense. Essentially, a lot of scientific mumbo jumbo.

If I may, let me offer a simple illustration.

Take a clear empty container (something you can see through) and go to your freezer to recover an ice cube. Place the ice cube in your container and make note of the location where the ice is placed. To be even more specific, put the cube in the corner and just sit for a few minutes watching what happens.

At room temperature (natural progression), that ice will melt as one would expect. However, notice where the melted ice goes. Does it stay in the corner of the container where the original cube was or does it spread out? If it spreads out, where does it spread to? Another area? Or does it spread over the whole interior surface?

Naturally, when ice melts, its water spreads over the entire surface of potential. If a lake freezes, the melted lake water won't spread out into an empty field because it is contained. However, if you take a portion of Antarctica or Greenland where ice makes up the entire land mass... what happens if it melts? Where does the water go?

The whole surface of the earth.

If the melting is an insignificant portion (such as a square mile of Greenland), water will only spread so far and the water may rise worldwide a millimeter (thus, unrecognizable). However, if the entire land mass of Greenland melts... what would happen? How much would the world's ocean water rise? Is there a container where that melted water could go?

No there's not. The container is the entire earth. Thus, water rises significantly over all. Then imagine that Antarctica melts. How much higher do our waters rise?

If this makes sense so far, let me bring it into a more "clear and present" term. For the last couple of centuries, men have risked life and death to cross the Antarctica iceberg continent. Some are curious explorers. Some have been researchers. But in most cases, they've been able to observe the consistency of ice on which they walk.

Prior to the 20th century, there was a standard cycle of seasons that allowed melted ice to essentially "refreeze" to its original place. As you'll recall, melted water spreads out and therefore, a natural

refreezing process is necessary to maintain environmental order. Almost like letting a few drops of water melt from your cube of ice and then sticking it back in the freezer.

But what happens if the seasons are affected and the sun shines brighter for longer in the year? What if the rays of sun that generally heat the earth's atmosphere get trapped within that atmosphere because of what we put in the sky when they arrive?

If that happens, the heat doesn't go anywhere and things keep melting. Thus, a "refreezing" process is put on an unnatural hold. And as a result, icebergs that would have gone through their natural cycles can no longer function as such. Furthermore, that inability to refreeze allows the water to spread out along the ocean's waves almost unnoticed on an immediate level, but observed quite clearly on an annual level.

What Global Warming states is not an "end of the world" or "end of all seasons" extreme. It simply points out that because of our casual choice to continue putting pollutants in the air without second thought (oil, power plants, fuel, nuclear energy, etc), we are continuing to trap the heat of the sun within our atmosphere. If we do not make this a priority of global concern, warming will keep melting ice and waters will rise over the next few decades in catastrophic measures that will, understandably, alleviate cities that are either near or below current sea level. New Orleans and the results of Hurricane Katrina would look like Disney World compared to the nearly 50% of American states that are actually at a 0 sea level right now (New York, Oregon, New Jersey, etc).

Now, this is not a doomsday fear tactic. At least, it wouldn't have been perceived as such 30 years ago when it was first being introduced as a concern in government. Is it a priority to take seriously? That's up to you.

"[[A Psalm of David.]] The earth [is] the LORD'S, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods." Psalm 24:1-2

"For the earth [is] the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." I Corinthians 10:26

"And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." Genesis 2:15

As this presentation began, I noted that it is quite common among naysayers to immediately dismiss all things that suggest extreme measures of care for the earth. Why bother, right? Doesn't really matter, does it?

Perhaps. Perhaps not. But more often than not, our view of such things comes from failing to consider the most obvious points of common sense. Call it science and you'll have to discredit me, for I am no scientist. Call it sensible or logical and you can credit me for at least attempting to provide fair reason for what has come to be called "Global Warming."

Again, whether or not it is of impact to your personal life, the car you drive, the time you leave unnecessary lights on... these are decisions that come after having considered the points above. Most

who at least believe in the concept of Global Warming, such as myself or more prominently, wealthy politicians, are still filled with practical inconsistencies. I still drive a 1999 Dodge Dakota that burns fuel quite quickly (though there are plans to purchase a Camry Hybrid in 2008). I still have occasion to leave ceiling fans running and work under light energy all night.

The power we use all stems from the same earth that we've been given to "dress and keep." The question we have to ask ourselves, however, is how important our responsibility is while on this earth to maintain it's best interest. With a residence in heaven awaiting us, why would it be important to take seriously the present residence we live? Should it be passed on with an apathetic "God's going to bring a new earth anyhow" perspective? Perhaps.

But this leads us to ask why we bother with humanitarian efforts of preserving life in remote areas of Uganda or Afghanistan. Does it really matter?

"For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless to abide in the flesh [is] more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith;" Philippians 1:23-25

Indeed it does matter. For as long as we are here on this earth, there are still many who need to hear the gospel. Our negligence of this earth's condition merely shows that we prefer to get out. And mind you, that is not unreasonable. Paul was "betwixt" this life and the next. The next life because it would be great gain in the Lord. This life because it was necessary to abide for the furtherance of joy in the Body.

My encouragement to you is that you consider this as a basic summary of Global Warming from a non-extremist Grace viewpoint. We know where our permanent residence is going to be. But we've been given this temporary state to live and for that cause, it is only wise that we take seriously the level to which we care for it. By no means is this a call for the celebration of "Earth Day." Rather, this is a call for being wise about the decisions we make regarding our temporary home.