ISSUE #2 // APRIL 2024

MOMENT OF TRUTH

The Art of Critical Thinking - Part 2

BY GIDEON

In the last issue we asserted the need for, and general lack of, critical thinking. Now let's take a look at how to do it.

In a nutshell it's all about asking questions and not simply going along with something because it superficially sounds plausible. Let's take a topic you may already have an opinion on, and see how robust your convictions are after we've taken a few basic steps together in critical thinking:

Is there a climate change crisis?

Ever heard this claim: 'based on well-established evidence, about 97% of climate scientists have concluded that human-caused climate change is happening.'? [1]

1. If statistics are quoted, how were they derived? Meteorologist and founder of 'The Weather Channel' John Coleman warned: 'the (US) government puts out about two and half billion dollars directly for climate research every year. It only gives that money to scientists who will support the global warming hypothesis… Therefore 97% of the scientific reports published support global warming, because those are the ones the government pays for!' [2]

Environmentalist Tony Heller agrees: 'Only 52% of American Meteorological Society members believe that man is the primary contributor to global warming.' [3]

2. Have a sharp nose and be alert for changes in language, specially when terms are switched half way through

QUOTE OF THE WEEK

"Too often we enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought."

JOHN F. KENNEDY

the debate, without an explanation. Did you notice that 'global warming' became 'climate change'?

3. Examine the credibility and authority of the source. What is their track record on the truth? Are they known for making bold statements that don't stand the test of time? What is their worldview and what might their motives be?

Ever heard about NASA's 'irrefutable proof', upon which much climate policy is based? It turns out they tampered with the graphs. The US temperature record (since 1880) from NASA's GISS was published in 1999, but there is also a 2012 version of the same graph, except that in the 2012 version they cooled the past and warmed the present.[4] They altered the data because it didn't fit their hypothesis.

In June 2008, GISS director James Hansen said that within five to ten years, the Arctic would have no ice left in the summer. Harvard Professor James Anderson expressed a similar sentiment in 2018: 'The chance that there will be any permanent ice left in the arctic in 2022 is essentially zero.' There was in fact 4,7 million square kilometres of it.[5]

4. Extend the timeline. Take a step back. Consider for example, is it a new idea for people to heat their homes using fossil fuels (e.g. sticks collected from the woods)? Is it therefore sensible that a special licence is required to own a wood burning stove?

5. Be open-minded and avoid prejudice. People like labelling people: either you're a 'climate alarmist' or a 'science denier', depending on which camp you are in. But critical thinkers don't retreat into camps to throw rocks at those whose opinions differ.

6. Apply common sense. Greta Thunberg recently deleted her tweet from six years ago (2018) which read, 'A top climate scientist is warning that climate change will wipe out all of humanity unless we stop using fossil fuels over the next five years.' Since global fossil fuel consumption increased during this period and we are all still here, there is clearly[6] something wrong with the models being used and/or the way the data is being interpreted.

Nevertheless atmospheric CO2 levels have steadily increased in line with global industrialisation and the large-scale use of fossil fuels (if the measurements taken by the Mauna Loa Observatory since 1958 are accurate, which we might reasonably assume they are). Therefore we see that there is merit on both sides of this debate.

'Follow the science' and 'trust the science' do not mean that we prematurely shut down the debate, as some have tried to do, pushing for criminalisation of climate change scepticism. Experts are often wrong, especially well-financed experts who have been incentivised to bend the data and reach conclusions that favour certain political or commercial agendas - the switch to electric vehicles for example, which is associated with grave ethical and environmental concerns.

No, if we want to get to the truth we must behave like true scientists, who adapt their hypothesis or test new hypotheses when the evidence they have gathered disproves or throws into doubt their initial hypothesis. Let's keep the debate open, continue to gather evidence, validate the assumptions we're making, and in the meantime take *appropriate* actions to reduce our disruption of *all* delicate ecological balances.

1. https://climate.nasa.gov/scientific-consensus/?n=@
2. John Coleman, "Weather Channel Founder destroys CNN's Brian Stelter on Global Warming", Youtube, 28. June 2017
3. https://realclimatescience.com/who-is-tony-heller/#gsc.tab=0
4. https://realclimatescience.com/tracking-us-temperature-fraud/#gsc.tab=0
5. https://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/sea-ice-tools/
6. https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/global-fossil-fuel-consumption
7. https://therevelator.org/electric-vehicles-environment/

"But test and prove all things [until you can recognize] what is good; [to that] hold fast."

1 THESSALONIANS 5:21

FACT OF THE WEEK

About 30 pounds of [cobalt] go into each EV battery... But today 70% of cobalt comes from the Democratic Republic of Congo, where an estimated 40,000 children as young as 6 work in dangerous mines. The mines also bring deforestation, habitat fragmentation and high carbon emissions from mining and refinery processes...[7]

Scan here to open the digital edition, find useful links and more:

rocksolidtruth.de