

The Skeptic's Hat — A Custom FAQ Track

For readers who doubt the mainstream climate narrative — and want to move from instinct to investigation.

? Is this book for climate skeptics?

Yes — but not to echo slogans.

It's for skeptics who want to move from *"this doesn't add up"* to *"here's exactly where the science falls short."*

The book equips you to **audit climate claims**, not just reject them.

It uses **physics**, not politics — and **thermodynamic reasoning**, not talking points.

Skepticism becomes powerful when it's structured, testable, and focused.

? Do you think climate change is a hoax?

In science, calling something a hoax isn't helpful — or accurate.

Yes, climate science has problems — serious ones.

But science doesn't deal in outrage. It deals in **mechanism testing, falsifiability, and evidence hierarchy.**

The book doesn't deny the climate is changing.

It asks whether the explanation we're using — especially the central role given to CO₂ — **has been scientifically constrained, or just politically entrenched.**

? So is CO₂ not a problem?

The book doesn't say CO₂ has no effect.

It says: **Let's put CO₂ into a diagnostic context.**

In climate diagnostics, like in medicine, we don't assume one cause — we use **differential diagnosis.**

Yes, CO₂ absorbs and re-emits infrared radiation. But:

- The radiative effect is **logarithmic** (diminishing with more CO₂)
- Key IR bands are already **near saturation**
- Feedback loops (e.g., water vapour) are **assumed**, not directly tested
- Alternative drivers (solar, oceanic, cloud systems) are **underrepresented** in many models

Conclusion: CO₂ may be a factor — but science must test *all* plausible drivers, not canonise one.

? I don't trust the IPCC. Does the book agree?

The book **shares your concern** — but upgrades your suspicion to diagnosis.

It shows how:

- IPCC mechanisms often **lack falsifiability**
- Models are **tuned to past trends**, then used to confirm those trends
- Important physical processes (entropy, saturation, convective systems) are **under-accounted**

But instead of just rejecting the IPCC outright, the book says:

"Let's test what they publish — not what they claim."

? Can I use this book to challenge others?

Yes — but not just emotionally.

It gives you **diagnostic tools** that make your challenge credible:

-  Red Flag Checklists
-  Thermodynamic Audits (First Law, Second Law, entropy flows)
-  Collapse Pattern Classifications (e.g., circular validation, saturation ignorance)
-  MegaPrompts for using AI to reanalyse mechanisms with physics-first logic

It's not about winning arguments. It's about **asking the questions the models forgot to ask**.

What This Track Gives You

- A **scientific structure** for your doubts
- Tools to move from skepticism to **evidence-based analysis**
- A reasoned path to say:

"I'm not anti-science — I'm *pro* falsifiability, physics, and accountability."

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.