

The Best Science Based Policy for Climate change.

It's most important to keep questioning the frozen narrative that CO2 is the climate change control knob.

Many experts have calculated the effect of CO2 increase to find that it does NOT support the level of temp increase that is being measured either the temp measurements are wrong or are overstated..... and/or the temp increase is caused by something else and not us.....

So that's why focused adaption using the power of fossil fuels looks like a far better policy than useless and wasteful and damaging CO2 mitigation and NetZero goals

Let's first look at the impact of CO2 on our climate.

Based on the physics of the radiation laws..... If from our current emissions we double CO2 from 420 to 840 and we get a clear sky projection of 1C per century and if we assume clouds will reduce the effect by 30% then CO2 is capable of increasing the temp by 0.7 C. And plenty of studies done on this.

That's an increase in CO2 by $840 - 420 = 420$ ppm..

And at our current rate of CO2 liberation by humans at 2ppm per year it should take 210 years to double.

So our contribution due to fossil fuels to the temperature increase should be about 0.35 C per century.

0.2 C per decade is our current total global warming rate... that's 2 deg per century

So something else other than CO2 is driving the extra 1.65 C per century and it cannot be our contribution.

So human emissions is only 17% of the issue..... and some experts have calculations that say its as low as 10%

Even the 0.2 C per decade (2C / century) is in dispute as global temp is being measured too high due to UHIE and data manipulation.

Even if the 2 deg per century is true and valid that's still less than the experience of the last 10,000 years as we saw higher average extremes in the 3 warm periods (BAWP,RWP,MWP).....

So... its far from a crisis or an emergency and may be more beneficial than dangerous as a slightly warmer planet with more CO2 will improve the growing cycles which the Ag facts support.

So... what may be the non-human related drivers contributing to the extra 1.65 C ?

Its no use asking the IPCC they are only mandated to politically link the increase to CO2 and humans and all of the scientific work is subjugated to that goal. They use inflated numbers for W/m² and feedback theory that appears to have been fabricated to back into the numbers to justify that all the temp increase is all due to Human use of FFs and not consider other drivers outside human control as the IPCC has a prime goal only find human induced climate change rather than look at science and the truth.

Climate Alarmists and the IPCC like to assume that all the temp increase so far is from CO2 and that all the CO2 is from burning fossil fuels.... This is in dispute as calculations show that even doubling CO2 from current levels will only increase the temp at a maximum of about 1 deg C in a century and this includes the contribution of all the other GHGs.

Some suggestions for the short-range contributing drivers other than CO2 are.....

The Sun/Gamma Rays/Clouds creates a much larger impact on climate than CO2.

A considerable amount of science theory and measurement correlations point to the fact that clouds have a significant effect on the climate, and far more than CO2, and further causation arguments point to not only solar output but also the effect Cosmic rays have in conjunction with the sun to control the formation of clouds. This implies that the main driver of global temperature is not CO2, but clouds via the natural variation of sun and gamma rays.

The GHG Radiative forcing MODEL is wrong, and a thermodynamics MODEL is correct.

Many scientific papers point to the argument that the GHG effect centered around CO2 may not be a significant climate change mechanism, and that mostly CO2 increase is driven by temperature and NOT CO2 driving temperature.

Also, recent theories and measurements point toward natural atmospheric based thermodynamics in concert with the sun having a far greater impact on climate change than the warming effect of CO2 increase.

Action Required?

So based on the fact that most of the climate change is not due to human activity then the need for useless and wasteful CO2 mitigation must be avoided and the future policies should be a focus on prosperity and adaption to support human flourishing using the power of fossil fuels.

This thinking is more in line with the positions expressed in the DoE report and the work done by CLINTEL and the CO2 Coalition and the many associated scientific groups that do not share the IPCC narrative.

.....

Attached is the presentation on how the gas law projections are calculated, and how it has been validated.

Also, why the current thinking about CO2 is so wrong, and that the whole scientific environment is being politically subjugated into trying to create a false narrative on a very unsettled science, and includes an explanation as to why the scientific peer review process and the IPCC cannot be trusted to get to the truth.

This means we are wasting our time on CO2 mitigation, and our focus should be on adaption.

Our future scientific efforts should be a focus the impact of changing cloud cover and the root causes.

As usual, the climate alarmists will not look at the material provided and just quote the frozen narrative of a climate emergency with no facts that can be supported.

The material they do provide is almost propaganda from tired articles or summaries of papers that keep the climate crisis wheels turning.

They spend far too much of the time on character assassination and inventing “nefarious” motives of us climate realists.

Or they insist on only looking at institutionalized peer reviewed material when it’s painfully clear that almost all of the scientific community has been politically subjugated and cannot continue to tell the truth as they have a bad case of funding-itis.

Any scientific papers they provide show no numbers.... but just give vague theories that CO2 is the causation of temp increase..... but without any substance.

No one has questioned the science and logic I have provided. It explains that the increase in human liberated CO2 is at most 4% of the total CO2 cycle and probably only 10% of the reason for any future and further increase in temp if current rates of temp increase continue. Work must continue on understanding the other 90% of the cause of temperature increase but reduced cloud cover now being recorded is certainly a strong candidate.

It is agreed that scientific debate is still open about CO2 saturation and water vapor feedback mechanisms and this part of climate science remains unsettled and needs more work.

The other common response from alarmists is to declare that we now have highly adverse impacts of climate change on our civilization, when its clear from hard facts that climate impacts are either benign or slightly beneficial in concert with normal weather variability across the globe with hardly any climate change signals detectable, and this is also the position of the IPCC.

They argue that further increase in temperature will create such an impact crisisbut the basis for this are climate models that are not fit for purpose, and overstate the impacts. When we explain that such an increase in temperatures is not unprecedented as they have happened at least 3 times before in the last 10,000 years and civilizations flourished, we are told about the Mann hockey stick that is clearly a rigged data set to feed the emergency narrative.

They also argue NetZero using CO2 mitigation is needed when we know it will do more harm than good and that solutions such as W&S will be ineffective.

So... the position is that climate change is mostly natural, its mostly not us, and its far from an emergency.

So based on the fact that most of the climate change is not due to human activity then the need for useless and wasteful CO2 mitigation via NetZero must be avoided and the future policies should be a focus on prosperity and adaption to support human flourishing using the power of fossil fuels.

This thinking is more in line with the positions expressed in the DoE report and the work done by CLINTEL and the CO2 Coalition and the many associated scientific groups that do not share the IPCC narrative.

.....

Attached is the presentation on how the gas law projections are calculated, and how it has been validated.

Also, why the current thinking about CO2 is so wrong, and that the whole scientific environment is being politically subjugated into trying to create a false narrative on a very unsettled science, and includes an explanation as to why the scientific peer review process and the IPCC cannot be trusted to get to the truth.

This means we are wasting our time on CO2 mitigation, and our focus should be on adaption.

Our future scientific efforts should be a focus the impact of changing cloud cover and the root causes.

[#56 William van Wijngaarden: Is Global Warming Hot Air?](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WfwnKWIWPzk&t=1846s>

Happer and Lindzen PHYSICS DEMONSTRATES THAT INCREASING GREENHOUSE GASES CANNOT CAUSE DANGEROUS WARMING, EXTREME WEATHER OR ANY HARM
<http://www.nigelsouthway.org/storage/01K0CGYVZN3P4FZ79E502FB683.pdf>

[Clouds Are Vanishing—And Earth Is Heating Faster Than Expected, Warn Scientists](#)

<https://www.sciencenewstoday.org/clouds-are-vanishing-and-earth-is-heating-faster-than-expected-warn-scientists>

[Microsoft Word - SCC-2025-vWijngaarden-Happer.docx](#)

<https://co2coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Radiation-Transport-in-Clouds-SCC-2025-vWijngaarden-Happer.pdf>

<https://nigelsouthway.substack.com/p/new-climate-report-from-the-us-doe>

[Basic Science For Climate Scientists](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8-zaQWAaPAg&t=3s>

[Will Happer: CO₂, the Gas of Life | Tom Nelson Pod #158](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CA8elCE75ns&t=9s>