

The topic of global climate change (GCC), formerly global warming, has grasped an international audience as a result of environmental scientists clearly communicating how GCC will impact everyone's day-to-day life. However, scientists have done an equally poor job of explaining how they have used verifiable, reproducible observational evidence to arrive at the, often foreboding, conclusions. It is in this disconnect between enunciation and explanation that GCC detractors, many of whom are laymen, have seized the opportunity to distort or misinterpret the observational data and computer simulations. The result is a deafening din of nuanced discussion between experts which often leaves the public in confusion about what is "right." The unfortunate consequence of this battle is that the underlying message which most everyone can agree on is being trampled: humans are making the environment which sustains us uninhabitable through careless and reckless industrial, personal, and governmental actions. History has a clear statement on situations which are debated in such a way: cease the debate, focus on the primary problem, and plot a course of action which is independent of right and wrong but instead addresses what is mutually beneficial. Such an approach would focus on what is in the best interest of humans, flora, fauna, and *terra firma*.