

Saving Humanity By Winning the Climate Change ‘Debate’

L.D. den Boer, Dec. 2022

Summary

Debate is a fundamental aspect of humanity, one we encounter in many guises throughout our daily lives, ranging from heated argument to congenial discussion. Understanding the nature of debate entails analyzing the factors that ultimately determine its evolution and outcome. Such analysis is valuable because it provides a larger perspective, enabling participants to objectively evaluate the process, to engage more effectively in it, and to better manage their expectations of its outcome. The key to understanding any debate is *recognizing the objectives of everyone engaged in it*.

What is Debate?

Debate may be formally defined as *a contest between two sides to prove or disprove an assertion*. Debates can be broadly classified as *resolvable* or *unresolvable*. The former category includes cases where evidence acceptable to both sides can be produced to prove or disprove the assertion. The latter category includes cases where incontrovertible evidence is either unavailable, or is rejected by one side. Debates can be *moderated* or *unmoderated*, depending on whether or not impartial adjudicators are assigned the task of deciding the assertion based on evidence presented by both sides. While moderated debates are more likely to be resolvable, the validity of the outcome ultimately (and crucially) depends on the impartiality of the moderators.

Presumptions Underlying True Debate

Since the goal of debate is to uncover truth, it is fundamentally predicated on presumptions of *objectivity* and *honesty*. Human emotions are a key factor in any debate because they tend to interfere with objective discussion. Consequently, the degree to which emotions become involved in a debate is one factor influencing whether or not resolution is feasible. Objectivity also requires that debate remains *impersonal*; that is, the focus of debate is the assertion, not individual advocates. Thus, each side is expected to treat the other with respect and refrain from making personal attacks.

Honesty is an even more vital factor impacting debate resolution. Accordingly, *constructive debate* is defined as one in which the goal of both sides is to achieve resolution via legitimate means. A presumption of honesty implies that if either side is insincere or fraudulent, a debate is unresolvable. A side that recognizes their arguments are flawed or false may try to win illegitimately, by corrupting or even fabricating evidence, for example. Alternatively, a side that knows it is unable to win by legitimate means may choose to sabotage a debate by impeding resolution in any way possible. Accordingly, *obstructive debate* is defined as one in which the goal of one side is to either achieve resolution fraudulently or obstruct it otherwise. From these definitions, it follows that for a debate to be resolvable, it is necessary for each side to understand not just the other side’s arguments, but their underlying motives.

Examples of Constructive Debate

Provided it is strictly independent and not subject to political (ideological) influence, a court of law constitutes a highly formal example of *moderated* constructive debate. The two sides (plaintiff and defendant) are represented by advisors (legal counsels) who act as spokespersons. The assertion to be proven or disproven is that the defendant is guilty of an offence. Evidence and arguments are reviewed by a judge who acts as moderator. Each side presents their evidence and formal arguments. Based on this information, the judge resolves the debate by deciding the assertion (true or false).

Although its previously untarnished reputation is currently in jeopardy, science has historically represented one of humanity's best examples of *unmoderated* constructive debate. Before the twenty-first century, scientific progress was marked by the development of new theories that supplanted preceding ones by virtue of their ability to more accurately predict experimental outcomes. Crucially, this progress was possible because most scientists were scrupulously honest, and because scientific dishonesty was regarded as morally repugnant. Scientific debate was thus largely free of fraudulence. Unfortunately, as moral values have weakened or been discarded, science has gradually grown corrupt. A significant number of persons who claim to be scientists have thus chosen ideology over science, by surrendering their honesty and objectivity in exchange for money.

Obstructive Debate

Human beliefs can be broadly classified as either *rational* (evidence-based) or *ideological* (agenda-based). A debate is resolvable only if the stance of each side is rational. If either side is ideological, a debate is prone to be obstructive and hence unresolvable. A variety of tactics and techniques can be employed to obstruct a debate. Moreover, their use instantly classifies a debate as obstructive and identifies the side using them as ideological.

Obstructive techniques include falsifying data, via either: *manipulation* (e.g. using invalid measurements, collection procedures, and/or processing methods), *distortion* (e.g. selecting a non-representative subset of data and claiming it represents the whole) or outright *fabrication*. Obstructive tactics include: *ensorship* (denying opposing advocates platforms for publicly sharing their views), *bribery* (e.g. offering opposing advocates money to either switch sides or cease their advocacy), *intimidation* (e.g. trying to silence opposing advocates via attacks or threats), *disinformation* (e.g. trying to discredit opposing advocates or their arguments, or corrupting primary data sources), and *obfuscation* (e.g. attempting to draw attention away from relevant issues and focus it on irrelevant ones).

A particularly sinister tactic involves censorship. Moderated debates are vulnerable to censorship and fraud, since adjudicators can be bribed or threatened to arbitrarily resolve a debate in favor of one side, catastrophically nullifying the whole purpose of debate. An example of such censorship includes the so-called 'peer-review' process for some scientific journals (e.g. *Nature*). Any paper that purports to contradict their chosen dogma is thus rejected. If/when this type of ideological control is imposed by a government on its legal system, courts cease to dispense justice and enforce government tyranny instead.

An Example of Obstructive Debate: Climate Change

The issue of *climate change* [also referred to as: *global warming*, *man-made global warming*, *anthropogenic warming (AW)*, *anthropogenic global warming (AGW)*] constitutes a definitive example of obstructive debate. The assertion is that human emission of carbon dioxide (due to fossil-fuel combustion) is responsible for overheating the planet. The side claiming this to be false is rational; the side claiming it is true is ideological, their agenda being to destroy the world's economy and to impose global totalitarian control (communism) in its place. What is remarkable about this obstructive debate (which began in the late 1970's and continues to the present day) is not just that the assertion is so obviously absurd and false, but that the debate has lasted so long. The reason for this longevity is that the ideological side has vast resources (money and power) at their disposal, whereas the rational side does not. Moreover, the ideological side has carefully engineered this monopoly of power precisely to keep the debate alive for as long as possible – *by striving to deprive the rational side of the means to effectively oppose it.*

The ideological side is comprised of politicians, scientists, wealthy elites, and celebrities, who are either corrupt (deliberately touting false arguments and/or data) or naïve (accepting the assertion on faith without critically analyzing it). The fact that some individuals claiming to be scientists have traded their honesty for money is largely responsible for discrediting science. *Moreover, discrediting science is part of the ideological side's agenda, because if science cannot be trusted then the lay public do not know whom or what to believe.* The ideological side has employed (and continues to employ) all of the tactics and techniques described above for obstructing debate. Propaganda and censorship, whether via scientific 'peer-review' or via corruption of primary data sources (e.g. internet), are key elements of their strategy. Moreover, this strategy is not new – it was articulated by Hitler and implemented by Goebbels in WWII. '*The big lie*' is based on saturation propaganda and is commonly used by totalitarian dictators to control public opinion. It is predicated on the assumption that a lie repeated often enough will eventually be believed by a majority of individuals.

Of all the varied tactics and techniques employed by the ideological side to spread their propaganda and disinformation, censorship and corruption of the internet are by far the most serious and potent. For ordinary people around the developed world, the internet has become the *de facto* primary source of their information. Accordingly, the ideological side in the climate change debate has made control and censorship of the internet their top priority. Complicit search engines (e.g. *Google*) are designed to steer users to disinformation, by placing 'good' links (i.e. to propaganda and disinformation) at the top of the search list, and either deleting 'bad' links (i.e. to information that contradicts dogma), or placing them at the bottom of the search list. This form of censorship is particularly insidious since many users are either blissfully unaware of it, or unwilling to invest the effort to examine links further down the search list. Fortunately, employing more than one search engine is still an effective remedy for this type of censorship. Censorship of popular internet information sources (e.g. *Wikipedia*) is another tactic employed by the ideological side in the climate change debate. Like censorship via 'peer-review', the ideological side is able to censor opposition by infiltrating their adherents into positions of control

(editors) of such information sources, thereby ensuring that only their narrative is presented. William Connolley is case in point.^{1,2}

Since the ideological side is (as yet) unable to eradicate links to information contradicting their agenda, they have devised the tactics of ‘debunking’ and ‘fact-checking’ to discredit them. Thus, once the ideological side becomes aware of a link to information contradicting their dogma, they create other links (to disinformation) that aim to discredit the targeted link, by ‘debunking’ or ‘fact-checking’ it with spurious ‘facts’ and arguments. The cunning underlying this strategy is that it doesn’t matter if the disinformation presented is false – *because its sole purpose is to sow doubt.*

Winning the Climate Change Debate

As it is unmoderated and obstructive, the climate change debate cannot be resolved by any effort from the rational side, no matter how concerted, because the ideological side will always resist resolution. However, this does not mean that the rational side should abandon the debate, or allow the ideological side to pursue their agenda unchecked. Even though it cannot be formally resolved, the debate can still be won. To win it, the rational side must marshal its limited resources and reach out to the undecided, to explain what the ideological side is trying to do, and how this will hurt not just them, but the people they love.

Even more than genuine scientists (those who have not sold their honesty), ordinary people need to understand that the climate change debate is a smoke-screen – a convenient cover for an agenda that has nothing to do with helping humanity or improving its welfare. The goal of the globalist elite pursuing this agenda is to enrich themselves by imposing global totalitarian control and enslaving the rest of humanity. Their plan for achieving it includes depopulation, deindustrialization, and global economic collapse.³ Global warming is their excuse for achieving the collapse of industrialized society, by eliminating cheap and efficient energy (fossil fuels). The Covid p(l)andemic is their excuse for achieving depopulation, by forcing people to be jabbed with a toxin designed to kill them rather than protect them.

The only way to prevent globalists from achieving their goal is to educate people. To grasp the problem, imagine that the views and opinions of all humanity about ‘climate change’ correspond to individual grains of sand, piled up to form a two-dimensional bell-shaped mound (the familiar normal distribution from statistics). The peak of the distribution corresponds to the neutral view of the undecided, who do not know (or even care, perhaps) if the assertion that humans cause climate change is true or false. To the left of the peak are those who claim with increasing conviction that the assertion is true, while to its right are those who know with increasing certainty that it is false. The only way the rational side can win the climate change debate is to expose the destructive radical-leftist agenda of the ideological side, and by so doing, to shift as many grains of sand as possible from the central peak toward the right.

¹ <https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/wikipedia-bans-real-climate-propagandist>

² <https://ep.probeinternational.org/2009/12/19/wikipedia's-climate-doctor-how-wikipedia's-green-doctor-rewrote-5428-climate-articles/>

³ <https://www.newagebd.net/article/129804/the-great-zero-carbon-criminal-conspiracy>

It may not be possible for humans to resolve the climate change debate, but Mother Nature has the power to do so beyond any human capacity to resist or refute. Within the next ten years (before 2035), the reality of *global cooling* (due to cyclic solar quiescence) will expose the vast sham of 'man-made global warming' for what it is – for everyone to see. However, the rational side cannot afford to wait for this to happen, because by then, the economic damage wrought by the destructive policies of the ideological side may be too severe to undo or even counteract. So long as these uneconomic policies are allowed to continue, the clock counting down to economic collapse will continue ticking. The rational side must arise *en masse* and awaken the silent majority, in order to transform them into a vocal majority capable of effectively opposing the ideological side that seeks to enslave them. Winning the climate change debate may be the key to saving humanity itself.