

The Journalist Hat— A Custom FAQ Track

For reporters, editors, science writers, podcast hosts, and media creators seeking clarity, neutrality, and intellectual integrity in covering climate science.

? Is this book just another “anti-climate” screed?

No — and that distinction matters.

This book doesn't deny warming or CO₂'s radiative effect.

It critiques how **climate mechanisms are constructed, tested, and communicated** — especially when:

- Assumptions are treated as facts
- Feedbacks are assumed but not falsified
- Models are tuned post hoc and then treated as proof

That's not contrarianism — that's science journalism's job:

To ask, “What is the claim, and does it hold up under scrutiny?”

? What story is this book really telling?

That **science improves when challenged** — and that climate science, like any other domain, must hold up to:

- **Falsifiability**
- **Thermodynamic constraints**
- **Alternative hypothesis testing**

The book tells a meta-story:

Climate narratives can become self-confirming unless grounded in mechanisms that invite contradiction — not just consensus.

? How do I cover this without amplifying “denialism”?

By focusing on the **method, not the motive**.

You can write or report:

“This book doesn't argue *against* climate change — it argues *for* better science.”

“It doesn't say CO₂ has no effect — it says differential diagnosis is needed to clarify how much, and what else matters.”

“It applauds IPCC transparency — but shows why transparency without falsifiability isn't enough.”

That's not denial. That's journalistic nuance.

? Is there a data angle or investigative hook here?

Yes — several:

- 🔍 Models are transparent — but is their logic falsifiable?
- 📉 Energy imbalance is claimed — but the uncertainty exceeds the signal.
- 🌍 Global Average Temperature is used — but it's not thermodynamically valid.
- 🔄 Feedbacks are assumed — but rarely tested independently.

The story isn't “the science is wrong.”

It's: "Here's how we can make it stronger — and why that matters before building global policy on it."

? What kind of sources or materials come with the book?

Journalists will appreciate that the book includes:

-  Chapter-based diagnostics (with audit tables)
-  Physics-first prompts for independent testing
-  Downloadable peer-reviewed reference maps
-  Visuals: energy flow diagrams, falsifiability tests, entropy flags
-  Access to both simplified and full-technical versions of key claims

It's **traceable**, **transparent**, and designed for **intellectual accountability**.

What This Section Gives You

- A framework to cover the book without framing it as denial
- Journalistic angles that go beyond headlines and binaries
- Diagnostic insights that sharpen science reporting
- Language to explore **complexity without polarising the audience**

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.