Per Blitzer, an exigency is an imperfection, obstacle, defect marked by urgency. A rhetorical exigency requires the capacity for controllable change. As he mentions, the passing of the seasons or living status is not a rhetorical exigency as we cannot be changed of our own volition. The exigency from my perspective would be humans impact on the climate. The audience of climate skeptics may not view it as an exigency. Or, if they do agree the climate is changing, they may not view it as a rhetorical exigency as the earth's climate fluctuates throughout its history due to uncontrollable things such as orbital patterns.

The audience being filled with climate skeptics is a constraint in and of itself. Another constraint would be the time allotted for the presentation and technology/props available for the presentation. These three constraints fall into the inartistic proof class of constraints.

The biggest obstacle to a successful presentation, where success is defined as convincing the audience to change their position from climate skeptic to climate agree-er, is the audience itself. We are unsure of the reasoning for the skepticism. Are they a group of CEO's of Oil and Gas companies who have had their experts find statistical proof that humans are not the cause of climate change? Are they a group of religious leaders who chalk up change as a deity's will? Are they a group of uneducated workers who have never looked into the problem before stepping into the auditorium? As you can imagine, there are many more reasons for climate skepticism than climate denial. Once we determine who the audience is and why they are here, we can more impactfully address the exigency of climate change resulting from human actions and behaviors. This actually brings to mind a video from a Nebraska farmer on fracking's impact during a meeting with the Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission team (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m0HL4L6Pa-4).

The other two constrains previously mentioned, time and technology/props make a significant impact to the presentation but are far behind the audience itself. Time is a fickle beast, a 5 minute presentation is better than a 15 hour presentation, but worse than a 45 minute presentation. Technology and props are another similar constraint. Using the video above, the farmer could not realistically bring gallons and gallons of the dirty water for the entire town to drink so he brought enough for the leaders of the meeting only. We could do something similar, but once again, if there are 200 audience members, then props such as these become a time-consuming distraction. Technology is a limiting factor as well because the presentation will likely rely upon PowerPoint – effective (there is a reason it has been around for decades) but boring and cumbersome. To counteract the drawbacks of PowerPoint, it would be good to utilize breaks – a comedic meme or an intra-presentation Q&A session or quick fun video that adds to the point.

The last question to answer is how to ethically present this information. And to me, this is the most interesting question. To think about it, I broke it into three yes/no questions:

1. Is it ethical to lie?
2. Is it ethical to lie to save a life?
3. Is it ethical to lie to save the Earth?

My response was No, Yes, Yes. So ethically, it would immediately appear that using any trick in the book would be beneficial to the presentation. However, further thought would counter that. If there is a trick used and the trick is found out, then the entire presentation can be thrown in doubt. This would only re-affirm the skeptics belief in being skeptical – and it may even push some towards denial. That seems to be a large risk for relatively small reward. Instead, I would

stay honest and utilize nice graphics to help make the point. I would also fully address their skepticism as a rational thought and try to address any exigencies they may feel such as the micro-economic impact of policy changes.