

X Reply Playbook: How to Answer Without Chasing Every Rabbit

Social-media flat-earth arguments are optimized to branch. A good reply does not chase every branch; it narrows the claim until reality can test it.

The Four-Move Reply

1. **Quote the claim:** “You are claiming we see too far for a globe.”
2. **Name the missing variable:** “What observer height, target height, distance, and refraction conditions?”
3. **Ask for a prediction:** “What should your flat model predict before the photo?”
4. **Link the test:** send the relevant claim-lab page or tool.

Do Not Accept the Claim Stack

If the topic jumps from curvature to NASA to Antarctica to Bible verses in one thread, pause and return to the first testable claim. A stack of suspicions is not a model.

Useful Replies

- “What observation would prove your model wrong?”
- “Can your model predict that before we check?”
- “Which flat map are you using, and what distance does it predict?”
- “Does this explanation also work in the southern hemisphere?”

- “Are you rejecting NASA only, or also sailors, surveyors, eclipse chasers, ham radio operators, and amateur astronomers?”

Win Condition

The win is not humiliating someone. The win is getting the claim into a form where a curious reader can test it.

Revision #1

Created 2026-04-27 23:16:41 UTC by Daniel

Updated 2026-04-27 23:16:41 UTC by Daniel