

Are You Being Played?

I suspect Scott Adams has been playing his listeners. I've suspected this for months, but have only discussed this with one person. Until now.

I'll go ahead and tell you now what I think has been going on.

I believe he is using the technique of "pacing and leading" to get his "conservative" listeners to change their minds on "climate change" (and a few other topics as well). He plays the neutral "voice of reason" with his audience who seems to mostly be Right Statist, but he is much more Left Statist than he lets on. (I so dislike using the terms "Left" and "Right" in political discussions, since there's really only Statist or not. Yet sometimes it seems necessary to examine the interplay between these mirror images.)

Back when he first started discussing the topic, I got the distinct feeling this was what he was doing. In spite of his protests of "*I'm just looking at the argument- I don't know because I can't know. I'm not a climate scientist.*" it seemed to me he was going to take the alarmists' side when it was all said and done. He gave clues to that effect. Because he *is* a government supremacist, after all.

And this is the general arc of what I've watched happening.

He started off leaning slightly to the skeptical side. So as to agree with the listeners he was (apparently) wanting to influence. Pacing them. He has been slowly and carefully moving slightly more to the alarmist side since then. Two steps forward and one step back. Leading them to where he seems to want them to go.

He has straight out said he uses persuasion (and hypnosis) techniques in his writing and podcasting. He has described these techniques and pointed out examples when they are used by others. Then he uses the techniques on his listeners. He's doing it right in the open. I believe his intent is to influence his listeners to move away from Right Statism toward Left Statism- maybe to bring them to a center position.

Can I prove it? No. He would say I'm mind reading and there is no written or stated evidence that this is what he wants to do. As I've said before, since I can't read minds I am left with reasoning out what someone is thinking by their actions. I could be wrong, but I doubt it. The future will tell.

I still listen to Scott because I find him interesting and because I still find it informative to get insight into the workings of the statist mind. But I try to mentally vaccinate myself against his persuasion while doing so by knowing what he's doing. Who knows if I'm protected sufficiently.

Years ago, when I first started reading his Dilbert blog, he once claimed to be "*libertarian, but without the crazy stuff*". I pointed out that the "crazy stuff", as he defined it, is also called *consistency*. Consistency, based in *principles*. Things which get in the way of a full-on embrace of statism. Once you believe it's OK to govern others and use government violence to force others to do what you want and stop them from doing what you don't want them to do, there seems to be nothing that's too far to justify. This is the road he travels. He expects you to follow. And he may be tricking people into following him.