

An open debate should allow to anybody to express all the pros and Cons arguments and to the author to check that people really understand. Caricature is not an argument: it is a way to reject any discussion.

There is no taboo and the author gives some examples of arguments, starting with the Cons.

It seems ( not confirmed) that people seem to have a so poor idea of the author that they have difficulty to understand that the author is able to give a balanced view of all of this.

So far, there has been no open debate, just reactions without discussion. People seem to judge without giving to the author any chance to explain what he did and found. People are looking for a pretext not to assess anything, giving no chance to the author to only reply.

Is it far to pretend to have an open debate without a real balanced debate ?

In italic, you'll find the author's answer.

The list should be alive and be completed during any open debate

<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Questions</b>
	Periodic cycle cannot exist:  → <i>In many countries, the study of wars has different schools: polemology, irenology... The father of Polemology "Gaston Bouthoul" wrote in his "Polemology treaty" that such a cycle could exist and gave clues, without finding such a cycle. Other authors have other opinions</i>	
	The duration of the war does not demonstrate this cycle	

Pros	Cons	Questions
	<p>→ <i>The difficulty of the periodic cycles is that authors demonstrate their cycle by mixing different types of events. Example, the birthdate of someone with the death date of another and so on. If you mix any type of events, it is easy to demonstrate any cycle. <b>In this study the only event used to demonstrate the cycle is the date of the start of the war as known commonly. In some cases some complementary events are given but for information (example: peace treaty ...)</b></i></p>	
	<p>Irak war in 2003 demonstrates it is wrong</p> <p>→ <i>It looks like a very good argument, at first glance, but:</i></p> <p><i>a) the author does not demonstrate that the “Return cycle” is a 100% cause, but only a statistical one. One point out of the target could mean 90% or less but not 0%</i></p> <p><i>b) if you have the complementary explanation of the return cycle ( book or extract), it is recommended to have a look at the Wikileaks data (about Irak) and the associated graph. In this case, it demonstrates that violence rates in Irak after 2003 followed almost perfectly the return cycle. Agreed we introduce another event</i></p> <p><i>c) if you are and advanced reader of the original theory, another application of the original theory “The Return Theory” is demonstrated only with the Irak</i></p>	

Pros	Cons	Questions
	<p><i>case. This Irak case is the keystone of the demonstration of another application.</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion: be careful before using this argument: it could become the most dangerous boomerang of your own credibility. It could look like the fatal argument, whose opponents are so proud, but be careful with this argument: it could only demonstrate you did not read or understand what wrote the author</i></p>	
	<p>Events have been chosen by the author to demonstrate the Theory and do not represent the reality</p> <p>→ <i>In the 5 graphs, this argument could apply only for the European graph and the world d graph: the other graphs are not contestable. For European and World graphs, a good reviewer could contest 2 or 3 events per graph, no more. And if the graph was recalculated with the right data (according to the conteste), it would not change anything to the global statistical result</i></p>	
	<p>There is no fatalism in wars</p> <p>→ <i>Agreed: for the author, there is no fatalism. Read the reference book before such an affirmation. It does not reflect what the author explains</i></p>	

Pros	Cons	Questions
Wars in the 20 <sup>th</sup> century are the main argument		
	<p>Wars in 21<sup>st</sup> century do not demonstrate the “return cycle”</p> <p>→ <i>True and false. True from a statistical view, false according to the recurrent wars (Israel, Pakistan-India, Europe ..) look at the book about the use for forecast done for the period 2006-2008</i></p>	
		<p>How can we use it to help to solve forthcoming conflicts?</p> <p>→ <i>Partial answer in the reference Book, if you understand explanation of wars ( another theory). Not given in the extract. It should need specific training and explanation.</i></p>
	<p>The author did not win renown about this subject</p> <p>→ <i>The affirmation is true, confirmed by the author, but it is not an argument. It means only that there has been no serious assessment until now. Are you looking for a pretext not to do anything ? Have you , at least, checked the data used to demonstrate the “Return Cycle” ?</i></p>	

