



How to avoid talking about inconvenient truths

SCC-Publishing

Ingemar Nordin

Michelets vei 8 B
1366 Lysaker, Norway

Dept of Philosophy, Linköping University, Sweden

ISSN: 2703-9072

Correspondence:
ingn063@gmail.com

Vol. 5.4 (2025)
pp.48-51

Abstract

In this talk I will give a few examples of the usual methods that are used in public debate to avoid giving the general public a truthful picture of the scientific debate (including IPCC WG1). They include biased interpretations, a selection of questions, avoidance of facts, a focus on political and dramatic events, and sometimes outright lies

Keywords: Climate debate; journalism; political debate

<https://doi.org/10.53234/scc202511/09>

Introduction

It is very annoying to see the big difference between the public debate and the scientific debate. The public debate is a discourse taking place in newspapers, public television and radio, and in the political domain in parliaments. The scientific debate is taking place in scientific journals and sometimes in scientific conferences. Although the media often claim that they have a task to inform us about climate and to enlighten people about what is taking place in the real world they utterly fail to do just that. The ignorance in public debate about the mechanisms and history of climate is widespread. We, the readers, listeners and viewers, are never informed about what is taking place in the scientific debate. Not a word about different views and theories that are discussed. Not a word about uncertainties and the complex system that is studied. All these topics are simply avoided.

I will stick to the climate discussion and not include energy. In the public discussion about energy production the green hegemony is not that dominant any more.

1. The argument from authority, 97 %

I will not present these stratagems in any special order. But this argument from authority is the most frequent one. And it is used as an obvious starting point in condemning all sceptics as marginal fools. Then you do not even need to counter their arguments in any factual or objective way. You do not have to discuss various scientific articles, which the journalists have not read or know about anyway.

The claim that 97 % of all scientists agree with the *catastrophic* climate change has been refuted many times. I will not dwell on this well-known discussion here. The purpose with this paper is rather to highlight examples of common methods that are used in the public debate in order to avoid inconvenient truths.

The question of consensus is often mixed up with the question of how many scientists agree with the claim that it is warmer today than it was during the Little Ice age. Obviously most researchers already agree on this (100 %?). But that is not the same as claiming that carbon dioxide has caused most of the warming, or that we can trust the climate models.

How many agree with the claim that *all* warming is caused by CO₂? (50%?)

2. Heat waves dominate the news

Media loves to tell us about all heat records all over the world. But what does it prove? – Not that we would not have very hot days without climate change. Climate history offers many examples of serious heat waves. The repeated reporting about heat waves only illustrates that the media is keen to frighten us with global warming. For a scientific debate about heat waves you need a historic data base.

To counter with a number of cold records would be just as unscientific if it were to be taken as a proof of global cooling.

The double standards in news selection show that media do not take the scientific question seriously.

3. Climate goals

News: "We will not live up to the Paris agreement", or live up to NetZero or to Agenda 2030.

All focus is on these and similar climate goals, and how to achieve them. And what we must do. How the government have failed so far. - Not about if the goals are economically or technical realistic, or even desirable.

I do not recall even one discussion, or an interview, about whether the goals are scientific, needed or helpful. No critics or experts in economy, politics or technology are ever invited.

Why? – Because "Science is settled", and it is claimed that "science" has proved that there is a Climate Emergency. And such "facts" must not be questioned or discussed.

4. Climate crisis

News: Citations from researchers, EU, UN etc – all claiming that we are living in a climate crisis. No critical questions from reporters. This is just repeated again and again.

Why? – Because it has been proved by all extreme weather events (World Weather Attribution).

The way to show this is by comparing present weather happenings to a fictional world made up by models. The models they use are extra sensitive to CO₂ increases and if they are turned backwards in time they do not show much variability or extreme weather. They are "verified" by the temperature rise in modern times. Therefore, the extreme weather events we see today are caused by the increased global warming and CO₂. This is clearly a circular argument.

That we are living in a "climate crisis" is taken as a given, never discussed. And the public have no clue how this is proved.

5. Extreme weather events

News: Reporting about extreme weather events. We never hear about reports of normal weather. That would not be "news", no drama.

Heavy rain, floods, wild fires, droughts ... all around the world. All events are explained as consequences of global warming. Experts are called in to the studio to agree, never to put critical questions.

The experts are interviewed by breathless and excited reporters and you always know beforehand what their answers will be. Both the reporters and experts seem to be just as surprised and worried.

No discussion of alternative explanations or even what IPCC has to say about extreme events. (Roger Pielke Jr for one is very frustrated about this open ignorance <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2025/08/23/pielke-jr-a-takeover-of-the-ipcc> .)

6. Conflation of weather and climate

Bad weather is usually described in terms of high or low pressures followed by their consequences for cloudiness, winds and precipitation. Climate, on the other hand, is weather over a period of 30 years or more.

This distinction is seldom noted, explained or discussed in the public debate. But it is very important since extreme weather events is not climate and prove nothing as such.

There is also very often a conflation between environment and climate. It often leads to the fallacy: "We want to save the environment; therefore we must stop climate warming."

7. Exaggeration and simple lies

The Golf Stream stops. The ice is melting. Coral reefs are disappearing. Ice bears are dying. Just 10 years left ... Etc.

We hear these claims again and again. But no journalist checks the facts.

These announcements work as red herrings in order to make us worried. Not to be checked or discussed, just announced as facts. A fact check would of course have disclosed them as exaggerations and pure lies, and they would not give the wanted effect on the public or hide inconvenient truths.

8. Always blame the climate

For example a recent blackout in Spain.

News: "Aagesen said operators of large gas and nuclear power plants had acted "inappropriately" in not cushioning the power surges on the grid.

But: The blackout had stirred debate over whether Spain's dependence on renewable power like wind and solar was behind the grid failing, which the government has denied.

Spanish Prime Minister Pedro Sanchez has said Spain will not deviate from its energy transition plans. “

<https://www.dw.com/en/blackout-in-spain-and-portugal-caused-by-voltage-surge/a-72954699>

9. Selection of news in general

Deliberate screening of news so that the climate alarmism is included in *every* news broadcast. The editorial staff seems to be programmed to always announce something climate scary. All to preach and caution us to march together into the Great Green Reset.

Other issues are ignored, such as the opposition to wind power, the economic burden (taxes) of the green agenda or the goals mentioned above. Or the news about the DOE Climate Assessment Report which surely also will affect us in Europe. Other issues are raised and one often wonders: why is this or that a news item given a large place in broadcasts without further ado?

Any questioning or serious discussion is dismissed as “climate denial”. Yes, it is even fascist and right-wing extremism and should be forbidden.

By using methods illustrated above one avoids talking about inconvenient facts. Keeping the public ignorant about what has been called the “most important problem in this century”.

It seems that this issue is the one to be avoid at any price.