

The Opinion Leader Hat— A Custom FAQ Track

For public thinkers, commentators, influencers, analysts, and thought leaders who help shape how others view science, risk, and responsibility.

? Is this book trying to stir controversy?

No — it's trying to restore credibility.

You don't need to be a scientist to recognise the difference between:

- A claim that invites testing
- And a model that protects itself from being wrong

This book isn't anti-science — it's pro-diagnosis. It examines where public climate narratives may:

- Overstep physical constraints
- Skip falsifiability
- Downplay alternative explanations

That's not controversial — that's what healthy science and healthy discourse *should* be built on.

? What if I've supported Net Zero, climate funding, and carbon policy?

You still can.

This book doesn't oppose climate concern — it refines **how we justify it**.

It says:

- Act with urgency, **but don't override physics**
- Push innovation, **but test core assumptions**
- Promote transparency, **but demand testability**

It's not a "denial" of climate change — it's a **demand for scientific discipline** in how we talk about it.

? Doesn't this make climate communication harder?

Maybe — but it makes it *better*.

If you're an opinion leader, your job isn't to repeat scripts — it's to **ask better questions** and model courage in doing so.

This book helps you:

- Navigate uncertainty without losing clarity
- Speak honestly about the limits of current models
- Elevate the public conversation from belief vs. denial to **method vs. narrative**

You'll gain a voice that resonates with:

- Scientists who want better models
- Skeptics who want real answers
- Citizens who want more than slogans

? Can this message work in media, social platforms, or talks?

Yes — and it's more shareable than you'd expect. Try:

"This isn't about denying climate change. It's about checking whether the models we trust obey physics."

Or:

"If a claim can't be falsified, it's not science — it's storytelling. That's where this book starts."

It reframes the debate — not by attacking others, but by **raising the bar** for what counts as robust science.

? What's the risk of not addressing these critiques?

Loss of credibility. Erosion of trust. Weaponisation of science for politics. When audiences discover that models were tuned, or that entropy wasn't considered, or that alternative drivers were never tested — they feel misled. This book helps you get ahead of that wave — by leading the push for **real scientific accountability** before others do it for less honest reasons.

✓ What This Section Gives You

- A grounded, shareable way to **move past climate dogma without abandoning climate concern**
- Quotes, reframes, and examples to use in talks, media, or podcasts
- Clear answers to "But what about CO₂?" and "Isn't the science settled?"
- A way to help audiences shift from **certainty-based language** to **inquiry-based thinking**

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 Website Section Titles

- "The Opinion Leader Hat — Speak Truth, Not Scripts"
- "For Public Thinkers Who Care About Scientific Integrity"
- "Don't Settle the Science — Lead the Conversation"
- "Your Voice Can Clarify What the Headlines Obscure"

Would you like a **public messaging guide** with soundbites, analogies (like the fogged thermostat or sealed battery), and 30-second answers to the top climate mechanism critiques? I'd be glad to create one tailored to podcasts, panels, or online publishing.