

Practice essay · Everyday practice

Keep the question small when you disagree

Amina Okafor · 16 September 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

Climate disagreements become more tractable when observations, explanations, and proposed responses are treated as distinct questions. This practice essay offers a source-reading approach rather than a promise of persuasion. It recommends agreeing a narrow claim, checking original chart definitions, and comparing geographical coverage, periods, units, and baselines before treating two graphics as contradictory. Royal Society material supplies the distinction between established physical understanding and remaining questions about regional effects, feedbacks, and future emissions. Personal experience can illuminate local impacts without measuring a global trend, while global evidence cannot resolve every access concern. The discussion keeps fairness and policy trade-offs visible, acknowledges boundaries around unsafe exchanges, and concludes that a careful shared question can improve one decision without requiring agreement on everything.

Keywords: climate communication · evidence interpretation · uncertainty · policy trade-offs · disagreement

Adapted from the Still North field journal. Original article. A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

A discussion can begin with a cold afternoon and end with arguments about scientists, household bills, public trust, and who should pay for change. By then, the original claim may have disappeared. A useful way to continue is to make the question smaller, not to make the evidence weaker.

That means agreeing what is being discussed, finding a source that can answer it, and noticing when the disagreement concerns a different issue. It does not mean treating every explanation as equally supported, or expecting one patient conversation to resolve a political conflict.

Identify which disagreement you have

There is a difference between disputing an observation, disputing its cause, and disputing a proposed response. Someone may accept that the climate is warming while rejecting a local transport scheme because of access or cost. Answering their access concern with another temperature chart does not address the argument they are making.

Try to summarise the question in a sentence the other person recognises. Is it about whether a particular record changed, whether human activity explains the wider pattern, or whether a policy distributes burdens fairly? If several questions are bundled together, choose one to examine and leave the others named rather than pretending they have been settled.

Personal experience is relevant to understanding effects and practical constraints. It is not automatically a measurement of a wider trend. Conversely, a global assessment cannot tell a resident exactly what happened in their street or whether a specific bus stop works for them. Respecting both scales avoids asking either kind of evidence to do the other's job.

Take one claim back to its source

For a shared chart, look for the original page, not just the screenshot. Check the title, axes, units, geographical coverage, date range, and any baseline. Find out whether the line represents a measurement, an estimate, or a projection under stated assumptions. A cropped image may omit the very qualification needed to interpret it.

If two charts appear to conflict, compare like with like before choosing a winner. A local winter temperature and a global annual average describe different things. A short interval can have a different direction from a longer record. Different baselines can shift the displayed values without changing the underlying trend. Write down the mismatch rather than dismissing one chart simply because it is inconvenient.

The Royal Society's explanation of climate change evidence and causes describes how physical understanding, temperature records, ocean observations, and other evidence fit together. It explains why natural variability and local conditions coexist with a long-term human influence. A cold day is a real observation; it is not a test capable of overturning that whole body of evidence.

Say what uncertainty changes

Uncertainty is more informative when attached to a question. The timing of a local effect may be uncertain. A future projection may depend on emissions choices. An instrument may have a measurement range. Those are not interchangeable with not knowing whether greenhouse gases affect the climate.

The Royal Society distinguishes established physical mechanisms from remaining questions about feedbacks, regional effects, and future emissions. Keep that distinction in the conversation. Do not make a precise promise that the source does not support, and do not let a genuine

gap become a reason to discard findings supported by independent lines of evidence.

It can help to ask what evidence would change either person's view of the narrow claim. If no possible observation would matter, more links may not be the useful next step. If there is a specific missing record or comparison, agree how to look for it and whether either person has the time to return to the discussion.

Keep the policy question visible

Science can constrain the consequences of different choices without deciding every value judgement. A proposal may reduce one risk while placing cost, inconvenience, or uncertainty on particular people. Ask which concern is about evidence and which is about acceptable trade-offs, responsibility, or fairness. The latter deserves a direct discussion, not a claim that a graph has already voted.

Nor is anyone obliged to remain in an abusive or unsafe exchange. Set boundaries, pause, or move a public meeting back to its agreed purpose. Avoid recording or sharing another person's words without permission. A useful discussion should not become material for humiliating someone later.

Our [sources and methods](#) page offers a consistent way to separate findings from interpretation. If the discussion reveals a shared practical concern, [Take action](#) helps turn it into a request with an owner and a review point. Agreement on everything is not required to check a source carefully or improve one decision together.

References

1. Royal Society's explanation of climate change evidence and causes (royalsociety.org)