

The IPCC Hat — A Custom FAQ Track

For readers who support climate science and emissions policy but want to understand this critique without feeling attacked.

? Is this book anti-IPCC or anti-science?

You could assume that — but actually, it's the opposite.

The book **respects the mission** of the IPCC — to understand climate systems and inform action. But it raises a serious concern:

Some of the IPCC's core mechanisms may not hold up under **physics-based scrutiny**.

This isn't an attack. It's a **call to audit**.

Not to discredit the entire field — but to **rebuild trust through falsifiability**, not consensus.

? But the IPCC is transparent — isn't that science working?

You could say that — and transparency is a credit to the IPCC.

Publishing:

- Radiative forcing formulas
- Emissions pathways
- Model code and tuning steps

...is a sign of good faith.

But here's the issue:

Transparency isn't the same as testability.

You can share assumptions openly — and still:

- Leave them **untested**
- Avoid specifying **falsifiable alternatives**
- Use circular logic (e.g., tune a model to fit warming, then cite the fit as proof)

Transparency gives us the map.

This book says: let's now test the terrain.

? Doesn't critique like this weaken public trust?

You could worry about that — but avoiding questions is far riskier.

The public loses trust **when science becomes politics** or feels one-sided.

Real trust comes when people see that:

- Mechanisms can be challenged
- Contradiction is allowed
- Physical law sets the boundaries

This book doesn't break science — it re-anchors it to the method that makes it trustworthy.

? Even if some claims are uncertain, shouldn't we still act?

You could act — but not without diagnostic integrity.

The book doesn't argue against climate action. It argues for:

- **Auditing the physical claims** before anchoring policy to them

- **Pausing certainty**, not delaying progress
- **Funding research** into under-tested drivers (solar, oceanic, albedo, cloud feedback)

If a bridge engineer said, "Some equations are shaky, but let's build anyway," we'd say: **check the math first**.

The climate deserves no less.

? Are you denying CO₂'s role in warming?

No — but the role is being overstated without full testing.

CO₂ absorbs and re-emits infrared radiation. That part is not in dispute.

But the **diagnostic framing** of CO₂ as the *primary planetary thermostat* is under question.

The book asks:

- Is the effect already **saturated** in key IR bands?
- Are **feedbacks assumed or measured**?
- Are models **re-tuned to fit past warming** without confirming physical causality?

This isn't climate denial.

It's **mechanism-level diagnosis grounded in physics and entropy**, not politics.



So what's the takeaway for IPCC supporters?

You're not being asked to abandon the science.

You're being invited to **re-test it, rigorously**.

This book says:

- Keep what's testable
- Question what's unfalsifiable
- Rebuild around mechanisms that obey thermodynamics and allow contradiction
- Demand science that's **as strong as the stakes are high**



Summary: Why This Track Matters

- Honours the intent of the IPCC while challenging its execution
- Shows how transparency enables — but doesn't guarantee — scientific integrity
- Resets the bar for climate trust: not consensus, but testability
- Makes space for thoughtful readers to remain science-positive **and** evidence-demanding

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.



Suggested Web Section Title

- "For IPCC Supporters Who Still Believe in Testing"
- "Audit the Science — Even If You Support the Mission"
- "What If the Science Isn't Settled? Read This Before You Decide"
- "FAQ for Climate Optimists Who Respect the Scientific Method"

Would you like this formatted for your site as a **collapsible FAQ**, a downloadable explainer, or integrated into your "Types of Readers" section? I can also prep a version tailored for educators or policymakers who trust the IPCC but are willing to rethink its foundations.