

# Funding Request

**Manmade carbon dioxide doesn't cause global warming or climate change; we can & will prove that scientifically and mathematically.**

## Introduction

### **Man Does Not Create Global Warming or Climate Change & We Will Prove It:**

Anthropogenic global warming (AGW,) sometimes referred to as manmade climate change, is the largest lie, fraud, and deceit, ever perpetuated by man against mankind. Unfortunately it is very complicated and complex for non-scientists to understand. Thus the average person does not attempt to analyze and evaluate it and therefore has ambivalent feelings about it. However, the climate change fraud is responsible for trillions of dollars in damages annually...not by weather and climate...but by man's ill-conceived responses such as carbon taxes, the green energy scam, and countless government programs taking taxpayer dollars in the name of climate change mitigation.

A concrete example of climate alarmism absurdities are the 1,500 frivolous climate related lawsuits worldwide. Over 1,250 of these lawsuits are in the United States. Collectively more than \$100 billion dollars are sought by the plaintiffs in these suites against a multitude of energy companies and suppliers.

There is a fundamental misunderstanding regarding the quantum effects of infrared absorption in bipolar gases such as H<sub>2</sub>O (water vapor), CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, etc. made by people who claim that the infrared absorption and radiated emissions of "greenhouse gases" is not true. This does a disservice to the battel against climate alarmism.

These gas molecules do in fact absorb Infrared energy at specific wavelengths. However they emit that enormously small burst of "heat" within  $5 \times 10^{-15}$  seconds (5 femtoseconds.) And most of that emitted kinetic energy is lost in inelastic collisions with other gas molecules such as nitrogen or oxygen in the atmosphere or lost to space.

Having said the above, these greenhouse gases do not create any statistically relevant or measurable warmth on the Earth from the energy they received reflected from the Earth which originally came from the Sun. To do so would violate the fundamental law of conservation of mass and energy (energy is neither created nor destroyed; but simply changed from one form such as mass to another form such as energy as formulated by  $E=MC^2$ .)

The problem is to describe this in terms that nonscientists, politicians, policy makers, media reporters, and average people can understand. This is simply not possible today because of the extremely poor science education these people have had. It is an impossible battle to fight the fraudulent notion of AGW/climate change based on the IR emissions issue and the transfer of "heat." Those arguments will not win this debate no matter how scientifically accurate and correct they are.

Other arguments in the debate attempt to explain...if not prove...what natural variations and effects cause climate change. These include the movement in the orbits of large near space objects such as the sun, moon and major planets. These movements cause perturbations in air and tidal movements on the Earth which alter climate. Small variations in the energy output of the sun also cause measurable changes over time as do volcanic eruptions, tectonic movements and even meteor strikes . But again, these simple scientific facts simply are not covered properly in today's elementary and secondary level science classes.

What can and will win the debate is to prove the true nature of "carbon cycle"...CO<sub>2</sub> formation and absorption in the biosphere. This involves Henry's law and Raoult's law, and the difference between carbon dioxide flux and flows. Furthermore it involves ocean chemistry. But all of this is also beyond the comprehension of "Americanoos Boobus" and their cousins worldwide.

This can be scientifically explained, experimentally measured, and mathematically calculated into a number. That number will be the "real time<sup>1</sup>" percentage of anthropogenic or man created carbon dioxide in the total atmospheric reservoir of carbon dioxide. That number will be extremely small; somewhere in the area of 0.001% to 0.09%.

This alone falsifies AGW. Why? Because AGW is based on the mistaken concept that manmade CO<sub>2</sub> from hydrocarbon fuel use and cement production is large enough to create redundant heat transfer to the Earth (based on the incorrect greenhouse gas emissions and heat transmission theory.) Yet we just said that man's contribution to total gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> is 0.001% to 0.09%. Any reasonable man...and certainly learned men...would laugh at this absurd AGW proposition!

Our work will provide this number over the next 6 months to a year. And we will litigate it in court and prevail by way of a multitude of current "fossil fuel lawsuits" in the US.

This will falsify AGW/climate change once and for all.

We are seeking financial contributions by way of equity investment or donations to our 501(c)(3) educational resource. I invite you to read our Pinatubo Study proposal which follows expanding on these concepts and presents our goals and objectives.

Questions may be addresses to [tomerc@climatecite.com](mailto:tomerc@climatecite.com) or by telephone at 916-482-2020.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Mission</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Problem</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Solution</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>We will do the novel analysis and set forth the proof</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The Feasibility Proof; the Pinatubo Study</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Why 95% of scientists are wrong on CO<sub>2</sub> &amp; climate change</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Scientific Validation from Ph.D.s</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Additional Scientific Validation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Plan</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Business Opportunity</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Financial Needs</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Projected Net Profit (License Fees:)</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Non-financial/tangible ROI/Benefits</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Certification</b>	<b>17</b>

# **Manmade carbon dioxide doesn't cause global warming or climate change; we can & will prove that scientifically and mathematically.**

## **Mission:**

Our mission is to falsify the AGW/Climate change hypothesis that manmade carbon dioxide gas resultant from worldwide use of hydrocarbon fuels and cement production increases tropospheric greenhouse gas radiated emissions resulting in a measurable increase of temperature or altered weather conditions on the Earth.

## **Problem:**

The entire world is mistakenly being taught that man produces climate change by his use of fossil fuels and cement production. The public is being scared by disingenuous politicians reinforced by the media, and educational systems which have been unwilling to properly analyze and disseminate the facts.

The mantra is that anthropogenic or manmade carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) creates global warming while ignoring water vapor which is Earth's major greenhouse gas.

As a result the UN IPCC is calling for the ultimate elimination of most fossil fuel use. Major developed countries like the United States, the European Union, Brazil, Mexico, and Canada, are blindly following this false narrative based on the false assumption that there are "green-renewable" alternatives to produce the massive amounts of energy these countries require.

Countries, energy companies, and citizens are punished through punitive and regressive carbon taxes used to subsidize so called green energy companies.

The net effect is the deprivation of 2 billion people worldwide of cheap affordable energy for heating, cooling, agriculture production, and transportation, leading to starvation, death, and war.

If these actions go unabated, additional consequences will include enormous worldwide population reduction over the next several hundred years approaching an order of magnitude (factor of 10,) the creation of a unilateral worldwide government, and the vast restriction of personal freedoms.

## **Solution:**

Mathematically and scientifically prove that the human CO<sub>2</sub> component in the total real time atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> is so small that it is virtually immeasurable and without consequence. This alone falsifies the AGW climate change argument.

## **Discussion:**

Since James Hansen and others first proposed the anthropogenic “emitted infrared radiation” greenhouse effect in the 1980s, much emphasis has been placed on producing computer models of the worst case scenarios based on the modelers limited understanding of the natural and physical processes. There has been no empirical proof that the Earth receives measurable warmth from these gases and the energy they release. These gases do delay cooling at night. But they do not increase heat. To do so would violate the fundamental law of conservation of mass and energy.

However it is not easily empirically and experimentally proven that that these gases and their radiated energy do not increase the Earth’s temperature given all natural variables such as planetary motions, the Sun’s output, and natural terrestrial events such as volcanic eruptions, and atmospheric oscillations such as El Nino events.

AGW/climate change is speculation promulgated by models sold by exaggeration.

Climate change has taken on an almost religious like dogma. It is widely accepted without rigorous analysis.

There is one simple and highly effective way to falsify the concept of manmade greenhouse gas warming based on man’s use of CO<sub>2</sub>. That is to ask one simple question. “How much manmade CO<sub>2</sub> is there in the average atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> content?”

This seemingly simple question is actually very difficult to answer. But one thing is certain; the total average amount of manmade CO<sub>2</sub> in the total atmospheric reservoir of CO<sub>2</sub> is very small; most likely in the area of a few hundredths of a percent. The science behind this is explained at <https://shalemag.com/the-physics-chemistry-of-carbon-dioxide-formation/>

IMAGINE a strong and honest member of the U.S. senate, who wanted to end this debate once and for all and terminate the multi trillion dollar “Green New Deal.” He would hold a Senate hearing and deliver an opening statement wherein he frames and concludes the manmade warming discussion as follows:

“What % of total average atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> comes from fossil fuel and cement production, and is this percentage enough to create climate change? Answer that question definitively.” The answer solves the issue once and for all.”

Finally the senator would say “I have the number and it is less than one tenth of one percent.

## **We will do the novel analysis, provide the answer, and set forth the proof:**

This has not been done before due to the incorrect understanding of the carbon cycle, its CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes, sea water chemistry, and physics.

I. **The challenge** is threefold:

(1) **Weak effect:** We must measure the long-term increases in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels due to manmade CO<sub>2</sub> emissions into the air which is greater than 100 or and perhaps greater than 1,000 times weaker than natural variations in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

(2) **Data Quantity & Quality problems:** The available CO<sub>2</sub> network of sensors consists of a small number of stations, and their resulting data have been processed in various ways that differ from station to station; are not faithfully published; and may in some ways & time periods be programmatically doctored to meet perceived political and funding objectives

(3) **Earth is a Complex planet:** Lastly, the Earth is a complex system: air, land and sea exchange heat, air and chemicals (such as CO<sub>2</sub>, water vapor and other greenhouse gases) — and all these molecules undergo chemical reactions which continually modify them. There are winds, rains, clouds, diffusion... Our best Earth models are still oversimplified. Not only that, but Earth’s temperature patterns are affected by many things besides the greenhouse effect and even outside our planet — such as changes to the Sun’s radiation (light and particles)

II. Advantageous factors:

(A) the anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> effect we are looking for (what engineers call the Signal Of Interest (SOI) ) — albeit quite tiny — is and has been predictably increasing while the much larger signals masking it — largely due to natural worldwide CO<sub>2</sub> flows & exchanges between oceans and air — tend instead to fluctuate on their own time scales, such as days & years.

(B) These fluctuations are largely governed by ocean water surface temperatures which drive CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

(C) Nature has performed various global ‘experiments’ for us that we will leverage to our advantage;

(C.1) volcanic eruptions temporarily reduce global temperatures, thus also reducing naturally-produced CO<sub>2</sub> levels, while not materially affecting anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emission levels;

(C.2) conversely, the COVID19 pandemic temporarily reduced anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emission levels while *not affecting* world temperatures patterns and thus, not affecting natural world CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, i.e., the much larger CO<sub>2</sub> sea-to-air-to-sea fluctuations that the temperature patterns controls.

**III.** Thus in consideration of the *above*, the calculation techniques we propose to apply to the several decades’ worth of CO<sub>2</sub> volumetric data at our disposal ... while quite sophisticated ... are ultimately based on a relatively simple idea:

— Use CO<sub>2</sub> data during the Mt. Pinatubo eruption period (and later, also during other episodes such as COVID), as well as the characteristic temperature-controlled variability of **natural** atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels, *to separate out* the much smaller **man-made** portion (our SOI in this case).

This mathematical separation is possible because while the natural portion of CO<sub>2</sub> present in the air overwhelms the manmade portion at any given moment — the two have completely different dependencies on time and temperature. Both the natural portion of CO<sub>2</sub> present in the air and the man-made portion are dependent on time and temperature, but during the example reference point chosen for the feasibility proof (Pinatubo eruption), both the changes with respect to time and the changes with respect to temperature are different for the natural portion of CO<sub>2</sub> present in the air compared to the man-made portion of CO<sub>2</sub> in air. Thus, using several decades’ worth of data, we show that it is possible to extract the latter signal of interest, from the much larger former signal — despite the complications of data sparsity, quality, and Earth’s natural variabilities.

## **The Feasibility Proof; the Pinatubo Study:**

The following temperature cause and effect correlations are generally known and accepted by most climate scientists and researchers.

- Correlation of decrease in average worldwide temperature and volcanic activity are high.
- Correlation of increase in average worldwide temperatures and El Niño events are high.

- Correlation of increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration preceding temperature increases is nonexistent; correlation of increasing temperatures followed by increased CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is high.

The total atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration represented by the Mauna Loa, Hawaii, Keeling curve shows a virtual 45 degree slope straight line rate of annual change from 337 ppm (parts per million) in 1979 to 408 ppm in 2018. The rate of change in annual anthropogenic global fossil-fuel carbon emissions is shown to be, in five year time frames, from 1979 to 1999, as follows; 1979-84 -89%, 1984-89 +817%, 1989-94 +169%, 1994-99 +344%, 1999-2004 +1,197%, 2004-2009 +933%. This shows that the Keeling curve reflecting total atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is not materially affected by annual anthropogenic global fossil-fuel carbon emissions as these sporadic changes are not represented on the Keeling curve.

On March 19, 2020, the COVID19 related lockdowns took effect virtually worldwide. From the period of March 20, 2020 to March 20, 2021 there was an approximate 30% reduction in the use of hydrocarbon fuels worldwide across all energy sectors of residential, commercial, industrial and transportation. Yet on March 20, 2021 the Mauna Loa Keeling curve continued its rise to nearly 418 ppm at a slope consistent with the last fifty years. In other words, even with a massive reduction of worldwide fuel use, the CO<sub>2</sub> trends recorded at Mauna Loa continued to rise in a slope undetectably different from that over the last 50 years.

Figure 1 below represents the Mauna Loa (HI) Keeling curve which is the most common format presentation of CO<sub>2</sub> increases. The slope of the curve is close to 45 degrees when plotted for a forty year period using the extremely exaggerated scale of 100 parts per million on the vertical axis. The predominate view of the majority of climate scientists is that the red irregular sawtooth wave superimposed over the Keeling CO<sub>2</sub> plot represents sessional changes in CO<sub>2</sub> due to plant life cycles. The orange dots signify volcanic activity events.

What the graph does not show is any change in slope resulting from the sporadic changes in fossil fuel use as developing countries put more fossil fuel generating plants online; nor the recent significant decreases in the use of fossil fuels due to the worldwide COVID19 pandemic.

What this shows in scientific and engineering terms is that the signal to noise ratio between anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> (the desired signal) versus the CO<sub>2</sub> flux (background noise) is too low to measure the real time anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> component of the total CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir.

Our scientific team has solved this problem of measurement and post computational analysis such that we will be able to deduce and define the accurate quantitative ratio of real time anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. We believe the final number will be greater than one hundredth of one percent and less than one tenth of one percent.



Contrast this predicted figure of merit to the claims by the mainstream climate scientists that ALL the “increases in CO<sub>2</sub> since the industrial revolution” are manmade.


And, of course, it must be recognized that CO<sub>2</sub> is not homogeneously mixed in the atmosphere but rather ebbs and flows and is subject to the natural movements in air currents worldwide.

As part of the ongoing patent process of *“A Preferred Means to Measure and Calculate The Relative Percentage of Anthropogenic Carbon Dioxide Within the Earth’s Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Reservoir,”* the inventors of which are [Tomer \(Tom\) Tamarkin](#) and [Clare Livingston \(Bud\) Bromley](#), we are conducting a preliminary study (hereinafter referred to as the “Pinatubo Study”) to test and refine our scientific and mathematical means of determining the real time content of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the Earth’s CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric reservoir. This study will, in part, provide exemplary discussion in the patent(s) and its methods will constitute specific, patent claims.

We have engaged the professional services of [Shahar ben-Menahem Ph.D.](#) and [Abraham Ishihara, Ph.D.](#), both of whom are doctoral graduates of Stanford University, to conduct the Pinatubo Study under the direction of Bud Bromley and Tom Tamarkin. The intent of this study is to use existing data to validate our scientific hypotheses that CO<sub>2</sub> levels are:

1. Dominated entirely by natural rapidly changing chemical exchanges between [CO<sub>2</sub> contained in the air and hydrosphere](#), primarily the oceans
2. Virtually [unaffected by human activities](#) such as the use of hydrocarbon fuels and production of cement.
3. Are primarily responsive to global temperatures and solar radiation.

Our intent is to verify this hypothesis through the analysis of records maintained by public institutions of CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric levels over periods defined in the chart below with particular emphasis on the periods surrounding the June 1991 Pinatubo volcanic eruption in the 1991-1993 time periods.



Copyright 2019 Tomer D. Tamarin. All rights reserved

**Figure 1** (adapted [from ClimateCite.com](http://ClimateCite.com))

The concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is a natural phenomenon. It is dominantly controlled by the temperature of the surface of ocean which in turn is controlled by the amount of sunlight on the surface of the ocean. When there are extended periods of high altitude clouds, such as caused by the massive 1991 eruption of Pinatubo volcano in the Philippines, then less sunlight reaches the surface of the ocean. Less sunlight results in cooler ocean surface. CO<sub>2</sub> is much more soluble in cold water than warm water, thus cold soda pop or beer retains its fizz. During and following the Pinatubo eruption, ocean surface in the tropics around the earth cooled and absorbed more CO<sub>2</sub>, but humans did not stop using fossil fuels during that period. Our project will exploit this differential to quantify the amount of human produced CO<sub>2</sub>.

Preliminary estimates are that the manmade component of the total CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric reservoir is between 0.019 and 0.059%. Our U.S. and international patent pending method will provide a definitive number. This falsifies AGW or man produced climate change.

As the above chart shows, Pinatubo is one of many instances of major volcanic events. Other natural events such as El Niño's also perturb the Earth's climate and future iterations of analysis by our team should identify similar effect in recorded atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.

The scheduled completion date for the Pinatubo Study is September 1, 2021.

To the extent that the Pinatubo Study verifies our hypotheses and the results are numerically quantifiable within the hypothetical limits, we will present the results of this

study to a consortium of energy companies to raise funds for the second phase of the project without diluting company ownership and mitigating the IP.

In the second phase we will connect these events to uniquely reveal a trend line of measured human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions which we have extracted from the natural CO<sub>2</sub> background. The “bottom line” figure of merit will be the real time anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> component of the CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir in the Earth’s troposphere.

Simply put in terms nonscientists, lay people, politicians and the media can understand, we will determine and write out how much of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmospheric reservoir of CO<sub>2</sub> is manmade.

We believe this will be sufficient to falsify AGW/climate change.

Additionally we will create a proprietary software tool which for the first time allows users to measure the non-fluctuating steady state rate of increase of mean atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> trend which is due to natural causes— which is the perceived causation most climate researchers have been claiming as evidence for manmade climate change. This tool will be licensed on a fee bases to countries, research institutions, universities and the like worldwide

## **Why 95% of climate scientists are wrong on CO<sub>2</sub> and climate change**

Why do so few scientists practicing in the climate field acknowledge Henry’s Law & ocean chemistry as the predominate CO<sub>2</sub> control factor?


Most scientists practicing in the “climate field” are not degreed physicists or chemists. They typically have geology, geography, and metrology backgrounds and are not well versed in the areas such as Henry’s Law, Raoult’s law or the Le Chatelier principle.

Most climate scientists pursued a decision branch based on an *a priori* assumption before consideration of Henry’s Law and other principals of physical chemistry concerning carbon dioxide and its interaction with aquis solutions. Henry’s Law is not the only important science that was ignored as a result of that decision branch or “fork in the road.” That assumption changed the fundamental questions that would be asked and studied in so-called climate research after the fork.

As part and parcel of that fork, climate researchers assumed that humans were responsible for the increasing trend in CO<sub>2</sub> coupled with IR radiative emissions for the

increasing temperature trend. There is a hole in their model and they plug it with human emission.


So, in addition to Henry's Law being ignored or incorrectly lumped into other oceanic chemistry, despite the expense of billions of dollars on climate research, there are almost no studies on the correlation between length of day (LOD or earth's rotational velocity) and its causes with respect to global average temperature, nor LOD versus sea surface temperature (SST), nor SST versus net global average atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, nor even a math/physics proof as simple as how does the atmosphere heat the ocean in defiance of 2<sup>nd</sup> law of thermodynamics (not to mention how does the CO<sub>2</sub> content of the atmosphere at 0.04% heat the ocean, let alone 0.004% or less.)



Shifting the negative LOD curve by 6 years to the right results in almost complete coincidence of the corresponding maxima of the early 1870s, late 1930s, and middle of 1990s ([Klyashtorin 1998](#)). Where are the papers falsifying delta temperature caused by delta LOD?

The same questions should have been asked about TSI (total solar irradiance) with respect to SST. The same questions should have been asked about AMO (Atlantic multidecadal oscillation) and PDO (Pacific decadal oscillation) with respect to global temperature.

Logically, the global CO<sub>2</sub> trend with respect to time versus the global temperature trend with respect to time are diverging. This could not happen if CO<sub>2</sub> trend were the cause of global warming trend. However, that would be expected if the global warming trend were the cause of the CO<sub>2</sub> trend. How could CO<sub>2</sub> be the cause of global warming if changes in global air atmospheric temperature always follow (rather than precede) changes in sea surface temperature?



In the case of the climate alarmist scientists, they are doing advocacy, not science. They are looking for evidence which supports their hypothesis, and avoiding evidence that falsifies their hypothesis. Scientific method is done by designing hypotheses and experiments which refute the hypothesis. They are not only ignoring Henry's Law, but almost all other possible natural causes and also the straightforward statistical analysis of their own single variable CO<sub>2</sub> data (e.g. NOAA Mauna Loa) such as done by Munshi, Endersbee, Salby, and others. Instead, proponents present melting glaciers for example as evidence of AGW without ever having demonstrating or validating a causal connection between human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and warming... the causal connection is their *a priori* assumption. They are asking the wrong questions, therefore they get wrong answers (i.e. their climate models do not validate and are not predictive of known conditions.) Perhaps...if not apparently...that is their intent.

This is criminal racketeering similar to protection rackets run by mafia and gangs. They stir up fear and then extort money from fearful people to protect them from the fear which they created. One must ask where the RICO prosecutors and class action lawyers are.

## Scientific Validation from Ph.D.s:

1. Our project recommended by Dr. Peter Stallinga, ["Comprehensive Analytical Study of the Greenhouse Effect of the Atmosphere"](#)
2. Igor Khmelinskii, Ph.D., ["My official Expert Review of the 5th IPCC Climate Report"](#)
3. Ole Humlum, Ph.D., Kjell Stordahl, Ph.D.' Jan-Erik Solheim, Ph.D., ["The phase relation between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature"](#)
4. Dr. William Henry, FRS, Founder Henry's Law, ["Experiments on the Quantity of Gases Absorbed by Water at Different Temperatures and Under Different pressures"](#)

5. Our project recommended by Patrice Poyet, Ph.D., “The Rational Climate Book”, page 19 on <https://climatecite.com>

## Additional Scientific Validation:

The following Informational post was placed on four media sites of scientists opposed to the manmade climate change alarmism. The site URLs and number of members follows the text. This post and link reached sites totaling 15,887 members most of whom are scientists in various disciplines. There have been no refutations or rebuttals.

**Manmade Carbon Dioxide doesn't cause global warming or climate change; we can & will prove that scientifically and mathematically.**

Our mission is to falsify the AGW/Climate change hypothesis that manmade carbon dioxide gas resultant from worldwide use of hydrocarbon fuels and cement production increases tropospheric greenhouse gas radiated emissions resulting in a measurable increase of temperature or altered weather conditions on the Earth.

We will prove that the human CO<sub>2</sub> component in the total real time atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> is so small that it is virtually immeasurable and without consequence. This alone falsifies the AGW climate change argument.

The signal to noise ratio between anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> (the desired signal) versus the CO<sub>2</sub> flux (background noise) is too low to measure the real time anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> component of the total CO<sub>2</sub> reservoir.

Simply put in terms nonscientists, lay people, politicians, and the media can understand, we will determine and write out how much of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmospheric reservoir of CO<sub>2</sub> is manmade.

Preliminary estimates are that the manmade component of the total CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric reservoir is between 0.019 %and 0.059%. Our U.S. and international patent pending method will provide a definitive number. This falsifies AGW or man produced climate change.

Read how and why at: <https://climatecite.com/the-pinatubo-study/>

- Destroying the CAGW Hypothesis  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1018871188127092> 3.3K
- Scientists Skeptical of Anthropogenic Global Warming  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/592667610853437> 11.2 K
- Climate Change is Natural Not Anthropogenic  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/424689381017698> 1.1 K
- The Climate Change Hoax  
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/701995983947184> 287

## Plan:

- We have filed a provisional international patent application to cover our scientific and mathematical processes and techniques titled: ***“A Preferred Means to Calculate Ratio of Anthropogenic Carbon Dioxide Produced by Human Combustion of Fossil Fuels Relative to Earth’s Measured Carbon Dioxide Atmospheric Reservoir.”***
- We will engage [Buchanan Ingersoll LLC](#) (BIPC) as patent counsel in August, 2021 to complete the patent application process. We have cleared their conflicts investigation and [Patrick Keane](#), senior partner has agreed to be our attorney of record in this matter.
- Complete current computational feasibility proof ([Pinatubo Study](#)) using our proprietary analysis technique with our math and science team of Shahar ben-Menahem, Ph.D., and Abraham Ishihara, Ph.D.
- Develop software product.
- Produce workbook & video courseware.
- Launch licensing company to energy companies worldwide
- Launch product ensemble to government al and educational organizations
- Launch product ensemble to defense councils of energy companies involved in frivolous lawsuits centered around their false notion of damages based on the fossil fuels they provide, sell or distribute.

## Business Opportunity:

### 1. Licensing defense councils in Climate Change Litigation cases

There are over 1,500 active climate change lawsuits worldwide; 1,250 in the US.

We plan to offer unlimited licenses to the defense attorneys in these cases on a sliding scale. The range is \$50,000 at top scale to \$5,000 at the bottom.

### 2. Professional, Scientific and Academic package

We plan to offer the software to the scientific, government, academic and media markets for noncommercial use at an appropriate price point.

### 3. Consumer games and toys based on the true drivers of climate change and the false narratives of politicians and the media.

4. **Mango the Movie** will be based on the real life story of the falsification of the AGW/climate change and **Mango the Movie** will be the principle means to communicate the true and correct information to the public worldwide.

## Financial Needs:

### Phase I

Pinatubo Study, patent council engagement, corporation(s) fees/taxes

**\$50,000**

Use of Proceeds:

- [Pinatubo Study](#)
- [Buchanan Ingersoll](#) engagement
- Corporate fees for and [ClimateCite](#)
- 501(c)(3) completion compliance work for [ClimateCite](#)
- Payables <\$1,000.00)
- Advance on compensation (Tom Tamarkin)

### Phase II

Completion of study producing bottom line figure of merit; amount of manmade CO<sub>2</sub> in atmospheric reservoir of CO<sub>2</sub>.

**\$400,000**

Use of proceeds:

- Completion of patent application
- Publication of work.
- Engagement with defense counsels in climate change lawsuits
- Engagement of PR firm
- Engagement with media

Phase II funds will come from a consortium of mid-sized energy production and distribution companies principally coming from our relationship with Shale magazine who targets those companies and their executive employees.



## Projected Net Profit (License Fees:)

Gross Revenue	\$6,428,000
Selling expenses, COGS, Legal, & G&A	<u>\$ 625,000</u>
Net Profit	\$5,803,000

## Non-financial/tangible ROI/Benefits:

In addition to the future financial return on investment, backing this project now will provide the satisfaction of backing those proving AGW/climate change is wrong, deceptive and fraudulent. This becomes a lasting family legacy for future generations.

## Certification:

I hereby confirm that I have written and produced this document based on my personal scientific knowledge and situational analysis coupled with the referenced sources. This document is accurate and highly meritorious. I fully support this plan and recommend it to investors without any equivocation or hesitation what so ever with the caveat that this is fundamental science and the ultimate outcome is subject to possible factors we have not considered.



---

Tom D. Tamarkin