

DISCUSSING SWAMP ISSUES

Introduction

When a swamp issue is brought up in a conversation about global warming, it is difficult not to be dragged into the swamp and get bogged down. It also prevents the conversation looking at the crux of this issue.

This is unproductive and is likely to waste your time.

The following method of managing the conversation helps people to look at the crux of the issue, and then provides a way of methodically solving their swamp issue problem.

Managing the Conversation

Whenever a swamp issue is brought up in a discussion, you should start the conversation by following these steps.

1. You should say, "That's interesting and we are lucky because we know with certainty this problem is not caused by Man's CO₂. We should now look for other causes."
2. Then you follow up and say, "Let's look at the data you have got say over fifty years on that glacier retreating or storms increasing".
3. "With that data we might be able to identify cycles or periods of change, in both directions, and then try to identify what caused it in those years.
4. Then we should list all the probable causes we can think of and start testing each one.
5. "When a cause fails its testing, we can dismiss it and move on to the next possible cause".

In this way you are preventing lazy and irrational thinking, and at the same time helping them to find the real cause of their swamp issue.

Step 1

If they read "The Crux" page on this website, it should convince them that they are wrong to assume that Man and his CO₂ is causing this problem. Once accepted, it will immediately open their minds so they can search for other explanations. It is lazy thinking to continually jump to the same conclusion providing the same cause for a great variety of different problems.

Some people might find this difficult, so it is worth spending some time on this step to get agreement. First, it means you are talking about the crux of this issue and not being distracted with a swamp issue. Once a person learns about the crux

of this issue, they will benefit by being able to have an open mind, look further and find the real cause of a real problem. That is far better than incorrectly identifying something that is not causing the problem.

If they cannot be convinced about the crux, do not let yourself be pulled into a discussion about the swamp issue. You will find yourself in a never-ending irrational conversation that will not be based on science, facts, or logic. You will drown in the swamp and the gators will get you.

Step 2

In step two you should find the solid, objective data that supports the swamp issue. If it does not exist, there may be some anecdotal evidence available. Now you should take care, as you are stepping on soft ground and might find the so-called evidence is imagined.

Once you have checked and are happy the data is solid and not fabricated (*you would be surprised how much fabricated data the Greens have put on the net*), you will be ready to start problem solving.

Step 3

The solid data should be studied in depth. Any significant aberrations in the data should be investigated and brainstorming will start to throw up possible causes to the problem.

Step 4 & 5

Humans have a bad habit of jumping to a conclusion and then convincing themselves and others that their cause/solution is correct. Worst still, they then implement a change and assume the problem is fixed – without checking to see if it indeed is fixed.

It is important to identify many possible causes as you can then implement a fix, one at a time, and test to see if it works. If it does not work, you should discard it and look at the next cause. Through this methodical approach, you will eventually find the correct cause and implement a fix that works.

In contrast, look at what we have done in the global warming issue. We acted quickly, irrationally, and emotively. We convinced ourselves that the cause was carbon dioxide and our fix was to reduce Man's small contribution to the total carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere. This was an assumption and it quickly

became obvious that it was wrong and there was no scientific or logical basis to this assumption.

On implementing the fix, we did not check to see if our fix worked. We just assumed it would. So, forty years later the World is still spending trillions ^[1] of dollars each year, implementing a fix that does not work (**reducing emissions**), for a problem that does not exist (**man-made catastrophic global warming**).

How irrational are we?

Notes.

The European nations spent 15 trillion dollars in the 15 year Kyoto period, trying to reduce Man's small amount of CO₂. Their efforts did not dent the rise of CO₂ let alone effect global temperatures. All wasted dollars and effort. The wrong fix for the non-existent problem.