

“The Chief Scientist Hat” — A Custom FAQ Track

For senior scientists, research directors, institutional advisors, and technical leads responsible for scientific integrity, review, or strategy.

? Does this book misunderstand how climate models work?

No — it assumes their structure is known, and critiques them on physical and diagnostic grounds.

The book acknowledges:

- Radiative forcing equations
- Feedback parameterisation
- Sensitivity tuning methods
- Calibration via hindcasting

But it raises concerns when:

- **Model outputs become evidence for the assumptions used**
- **Entropy flow is excluded from energy balance analysis**
- **CO₂ effects are modelled with linear dominance despite known saturation and feedback complexity**

The core question is: *Are we modelling the climate — or tuning a narrative that resists contradiction?*

? Are the critiques peer-reviewed or original?

Both. The book draws from:

- Established critiques (Essex et al. on GAT, Kramm & Dlugi on energy budgets, Pielke Sr. on land/ocean energy partitioning)
- Thermodynamic audits from foundational physics
- AI-assisted analysis (via prompt-engineered diagnostics traceable to the source literature)

It doesn't ask you to “believe a new theory.”

It asks you to revisit **first principles** and apply them *diagnostically*, not *retrospectively*.

? What is its scientific contribution?

It contributes a **methodological lens**:

- The **Collapse Typology** for mechanisms
- The **AEAA** (Adaptive Evidence & Assumptions Audit)
- A **Red Flag Diagnostic Map** for evaluating climate claims

These are not model substitutes — they are **falsifiability tools** for auditing mechanistic integrity.

The point is not to replace climate science — but to **realign it with epistemological discipline**.

? Could this create confusion in the public?

Only if we're unwilling to distinguish between:

- **Settled physical laws** (e.g., conservation, entropy, radiative physics)

- **Interpretive mechanisms** built from assumptions and fits

Chief scientists are not guardians of certainty — they are stewards of **methodological clarity**. This book invites you to lead the call for:

- Clear boundaries between data, inference, and narrative
- Stronger diagnostics for complex system claims
- Open forums where mechanisms are testable, not just transparent

? What if the book's claims are wrong?

Then test them. The book welcomes:

- Peer engagement
- Rebuttal based on constraint-based reasoning
- Model validation through falsifiable mechanisms, not correlation

If the science is strong, it should stand up to — and **grow stronger through** — these critiques.

✓ What This Section Gives You

- A frame for engaging the book without compromising scientific credibility
- Tools to identify where physical diagnostics are missing from climate discourse
- Language to separate **climate concern** from **mechanistic overreach**
- An invitation to lead in reasserting **scientific integrity over consensus conformity**

The claims analysed in *Rethinking the Causes of Climate Change* come directly from **published IPCC reports**, academic literature, and climate model documentation. Formulas, assumptions, and policy interpretations are cited transparently — and then tested using **first principles** of physics, thermodynamics, and logic.