

# TOOLS OF DECEPTION 1

*“If you control the language, you control the argument”*

“Nineteen Eighty-Four”, George Orwell discussing ‘Newspeak’

## Using Our Vivid Imagination

Often the Greens’ Public Relations (PR) machine will not be precise about an event but gives us enough information so we can draw our own conclusions. Having drawn our own conclusions, we have no problem accepting the accuracy of our own finding. In contrast, if the Green PR machine explicitly describes an event, you might challenge it, and maybe not agree with it.

For example, the Greens talk about catastrophic weather events but rarely, if ever, describe what they mean by “catastrophic”. They could say twice the normal wind speeds of a natural cyclone, or twice the annual rainfall – but they don’t. This has two benefits.

First, we are unlikely to delineate between natural and man-made effects – which might be very small. Second, each one of us is imagining what a catastrophic event would be and agreeing with everyone else that it is really bad. Without realising that each of us have a different interpretation of what is bad.

Come what may, we don’t disagree, and the Greens’ assertion remains unchallenged.

In a similar fashion, the Greens will use suggestive language to have our imagination run riot, and once again achieve agreement all based on ignorance and irrationalities.

## Power of Suggestion

Your big sister tells you there is a bogey man under your bed, and he is out to get you. Several things now happen. First, you believe your sister without thinking. Why? Because she has status – not yet knowing this explanation uses an illogical argument.

Second, you are scared and will now spend an unusual amount of time looking under the bed. This will be done during daylight with the bedroom door open, so you have an unimpeded escape route to your mother who is in the kitchen. When you tell your big sister that you can’t see him, she blithely tells you the bogey man is only there at night. Now you are really scared.

You start to bravely look under the bed at night. Sooner or later in the poor light at night you will see something move in the shadows. You are now convinced that the bogey man exists and from that day forth you will wear a blinkered set of glasses that sees bogey men everywhere. Finally, you will revere your big sister.

Power of suggestion is often used by the Greens. We are told that “global warming will cause catastrophic weather events” – the bogey man. Then we are told

that “the number and severity of storms will increase – and it is happening now and is accelerating” – night has arrived. We are now wearing blinkered glasses seeing evidence of this everywhere.

The Greens have turned on our imagination, and it is running amok. If it slows down, a few well-placed deceptions laid down by the public relations machine will recharge and invigorate our imagination. For example, a news item talking about a recent storm being a “once in a century storm”. Even if a few weeks later we find out the storm was really one in eighteen months - the deception is locked in.

### **Redefining a Word and Not Telling the Audience**

At the beginning of the global warming campaign, the Green PR machine told us Man was 100% responsible for all global warming. Not critically thinking, many believed this assertion. However, those who challenged the statement pointing out there had to be some natural warming were told that they didn't understand.

It was then explained the Greens define “global warming” as the warming caused by Man. Then by using a circular argument they could claim Man was 100% responsible. This of course was deception because the total amount of warming (**both natural and Man's contribution**) was all being attributed to Man – and not nature and Man.

In some way, such redefinitions are used as an excuse for misleading the public and stops critics calling the Greens liars.

Believing what turned out to be very poor predictions made by the Green scientists, the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) predicted that by 2010 the World would see 50 million climate refugees. Well past 2010, sceptics mocked UNEP for being so naïve to suggest such a prediction. In a fit of pique, UNEP came up with a similar prediction for the future and said it would be met this time. Why the confidence?

UNEP went on to explain they had redefined a “climate refugee” to be any refugee unless someone else proved otherwise (UNEP refused to do the checking). Of course, the public and others were not alerted to the change in this definition. Today you hear people talking about climate refugees without realising that these are normal refugees not refugees fleeing from a ‘climate event’ – whatever that means.

Indigenous historians have convinced the UN to accept a new definition of ‘genocide’ based on racial grounds. For example, if five or more aborigines are killed these historians can describe this as genocide. The new definition is not known to the public, so the public are misled and envision millions dying. More misdirection and deception.

For example, a jilted aboriginal lover and his friend arrived in an aboriginal camp and killed his ex-girlfriend and seven other aborigines. The killers were aborigines from another tribe, and they fled into the bush. Later they were caught, tried and sent to jail for murder.

Historians could now call this genocide. However, not wanting to portray aborigines in a poor light, the history was fabricated accusing an unknown white farmer of the murders. Now they could use this as proof of the genocidal intent of white settlers. More misdirection and deception

The point being made here is rather than calling this, accurately and unemotionally, a multiple murder, these historians could deceive us and call it genocide carrying a lot more emotional baggage.

In any discussion always take care to identify the definition being used for words that are crucial to the discussion.

### **Loose Language**

The power of words to influence should never be underestimated. All public relations professionals are aware of this, and the Greens have some of the best public relations professionals working for them

Words used correctly enhances clarity and allows conciseness while describing ideas or views. If you wish to deceive, you will rarely use our language in this way. You will deliberately use loose language and carefully chosen words that evoke an emotional response.

Mention emotion and you hear the pounding hooves of the horses delivering all the fallacies and irrational arguments to support our newly discovered but emotionally driven conclusions.

There was a natural cooling period between 1945-1970. "Swimming with the tide", the Greens ran a campaign that predicted by the year 2000 we would be in an Ice Age with a sixty metre block of ice in the backyard. When a natural warming began in 1970, the Greens seamlessly changed gears and we were now going to be half way to "frying and dying" by the year 2000. The global warming campaign had begun.

They predicted that this warming period would be very different to past natural warming periods and rather than having a temperature rise of 0.3 degrees, Man would cause temperatures to rise by 3-5 degrees. They also stated that we would never see another natural cooling period – the next cooling period was expected to start around the year 2000 – while CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere continued to rise.

CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations did continue to rise but by the year 2000 temperatures had only risen by 0.3 degrees and the next natural cooling period had begun. This "catastrophe" – their words – had to be dealt with by the Greens' public relations machine.

The word went out to 300 Green organisations World-wide, that the use of the word 'global warming' was to be avoided and replaced by 'climate change'. In a very short time, a google search of both terms would see the use of 'climate change' rise 80%, and the use of 'global warming' drop by the same amount.

This change had three benefits. Now any climate event either cooling or warming could be blamed on Man – even though CO<sub>2</sub> could only warm. Second, the failed predictions falsifying the theory underlying the campaign could be hidden. Lastly, the momentum of the campaign could be maintained especially if the word ‘cooling’ could be removed from public discussion. A raft of different words and phrases were introduced to avoid using the “C” word.

The World was then told that this natural cooling period was: “a hiatus in warming”, “an interruption in the warming”, “a pause in warming”, “a reversed warming period”, “a warming trend interruption”, “a plateau in warming”. The World was inundated with the use of the word “warming” in phrases that were describing a natural cooling period.

### “Weaponised” Words

For those that wish to deceive us, there is an incentive to deliberately use loose language if they can choose a word that carries a significant amount of emotional baggage. Some describe this as “using weaponised words”.

This relieves the deceiver from defending his stand. The word itself will convince listeners before the issue is even discussed. The word fires up emotion, has the listener embrace irrational arguments and fallacies, and they will blindly and unthinkingly accept what they are being told.

Those that disagree with the Green beliefs are not accurately described as critics but are labelled “deniers”. This weaponised word has so much negative emotional baggage, no one will feel comfortable being in the company of a person who denies the Holocaust, let alone listen to his ideas. The critic is ostracised with the use of one weaponised word – irrespective of the inaccuracy when being used.

Softer weaponised words can push a listener down a path you wish him to take. Greening Australia’s chief executive stated; “***It’s not enough to stop or reduce your emissions, we need to draw carbon out of the atmospheres as well.***” The words ‘emissions’ and ‘carbon’ are weaponised words. There is no carbon in the atmosphere, and CO<sub>2</sub> is not legislated as an airborne pollutant in any emission laws.

So, the emotional baggage that ‘carbon’ carries leads people to believe CO<sub>2</sub> is dirty, solid, nasty and black, rather than an invisible odourless gas that is vital to all life on our planet. ‘Emissions’ conjures up visions of pollutants as ‘yuk’ and nasty stuff that all would want to get rid of.

Say no more, the argument is won without investigating the issue itself.

That is even before you realise that we are chasing a surrogate goal that is no longer useful. ***Without correlation there can be no causation.*** CO<sub>2</sub> does not drive global temperatures so there is no longer a need vilify it in this way.

Over a period of forty thousand years, more than a thousand groups of people settled in Australia. In the past two hundred years another thirty groups have settled here. In vilifying these last groups, the weaponised word “invasion” is used with all its negative connotations.

At the same time Napoleon did invade Spain with seven armies, each with 20-40,000 soldiers. No armies have ever invaded Australia to date, the recent settlers were accompanied with 140 marines for self-protection. The same so called “invaders” paid aboriginal tribes for the land that they needed – hardly the act of an invading force.

## **CONCLUSION**

Unfortunately, with so many groups, organisations and individuals attempting to mislead and deceive us on this issue, we must critically look at every word, phrase and sentence to thwart this deception.

We cannot just blindly and unthinkingly believe what we are being told.