

THE EMPEROR IS NAKED

**On the Earth's climate and its science
in the light of the Budapest Climate Change Conference**

László Csaba SZARKA

Geophysical Engineer, Ordinary Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Clintel Ambassador (Hungary),

Chair of the Energy Working Group of the Batthyány Society of Professors,
Initiator and Organizer of the Conference „Beyond the Climate Change Consensus”

D4CE, January 8, 2026

TEN PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE



We, Hungarian researchers and professionals, are alarmed by one of the great global problems of our time: the fact that world leaders want to subordinate all socio-economic tasks to climate policy. Feeling responsible for the future, we want to conduct honest scientific discussions about the real challenges and provide them with wide social publicity. For this purpose, we recommend in good conscience to consider the following:

1. Let's clarify the basic concepts!

Around the world, many common concepts in the field of environment and energy are inherently confusing or have become confused. In the words of Count István Széchenyi, the founder of the Academy of Science in Hungary, we have a duty to “*spread clear concepts, and clean confused ones from their dross as much as possible...*” Here is an example: according to the UN definition of “climate change” in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1992; in Hungary: LXXXII Law of 1995), its cause has been reduced to activities of man causing changes in atmospheric composition.

2. Our home is a wonderful Earth

The lack of clarity of concepts even makes us forget that the Earth is an open system; its wealth is greater and its functioning is far more imaginative than it has been made up to be.

3. The basis of our civilization is energy

The Earth is also a place with dangers, but man has created a home and a civilization within the harsh conditions of nature. The natural basis of all of these is energy. Thanks to the most efficient types of energy sources accessible today (nuclear, water, natural gas, oil, coal), everyone in the world could get out of poverty if this process were not artificially inhibited.

4. The essence of the energy transition

Energy transition has always taken place continuously, and its essence has been the involvement of increasingly concentrated types of energy. The continuous transition could progress on its natural path today (with the spread of nuclear energy and by other ways invented by human creativity, eventually perhaps by fusion), but the aggressive green policy has diverted the energy transition in an unnaturally short time, and exactly in the opposite direction to what is desirable, towards “thin” (low energy density) types of energy.

5. Energy is also the basis of sovereignty

The basis of our sovereignty is the existence of adequate domestic energy sources. If we were to judge our natural resources on the basis of reality and not on an ideological basis, it would turn out that we are not poor. Regarding the so-called renewables (hydro, solar, wind, biomass, geothermal energy): in the field of hydropower, a complete, non-political rethinking is offered as the most important possible objective, since hydropower plants are also energy storage. In the field of other renewable energies, their use as local supplementary energy source should be promoted. It is only justified to connect capricious wind and solar energy to the electricity grid to the extent of the capacity of the hydropower reservoirs.

6. Climate policy leads dangerously astray

In the Western world, and especially in the European Union, the range of questions concerning the natural prerequisites of civilization (energy, mineral raw materials, water, soil, nature) is now dominated by climate policy. Forcing a renewable-based green transition is technically unfeasible, attempting it is extremely destructive to nature, and its implementation has consequences which may destroy civilization. “Switching” away from carbon-containing energy carriers, accounting for four-fifths of the global energy supply, is reasonable only partially, and only after the construction of nuclear power plants.

7. Severe economic-social consequences

The rush of the EU towards decarbonisation and the European climate policy are equivalent to a significant economic decline, it is synonymous with losing competitiveness. The energy and agricultural policies of the European Union have been turned upside down irresponsibly, creating climate anxiety among young people, in severe conflict with the value system of normal people. The European green policy goes against the realities of physics, chemistry, biology, economy, and geopolitics, and even elementary logic.

8. Adaptation and mitigation

Even today, Nature works properly in its own way, there is no so-called “climate emergency”. There should be a stop to the globally organized disinformation of society. We cannot change the natural processes which are of global proportions. We should try to change only what is possible to change and needed to be changed. For example, environmental damage and waste are possible to reduce, and should be reduced, water management can and should be solved. At all spatial scales, H₂O does moderate weather and climate extremes.

9. Even the road to hell is paved with good intentions

It is time to notice: the fashionable deep green view, to which so many have succumbed, never solves anything. The deep green politics is a part of the problem and not of the solution. In the global consumer society, the hedonistic view of the individual-focused ideologies, serving the profit-oriented production systems, has diverted the normal consumers, which are the majority of human beings, from the path of temperance, however, now the same ideologies blame these very people for succumbing to those temptations.

10. Back to science!

Serious scientific doubts have arisen regarding the basic assumptions of climate policy. Namely: the climate policy not only follows false illusions regarding the desirable path, but already its reference base is shaky; CO₂ is the nutrient for plants, the basis of all life on earth, and the climate policy is based on false models. For the clarification of most questions, unbiased and fact-based scientific research, as well as open scientific debates are necessary. Consensus as argument and the principle of authority: do not exist in real science, capable of progress.

All participants of scientific life must maintain in their judgements their capacity for critical thinking and mutual respect.

Prepared by the Energy Working Group of the Batthyány Society of Professors

October 3, 2024

First signatories:

László Csaba Szarka, Csaba Attila Szabó, Károly Reményi, István Bársony, István Bérczi, Tamás Biró, Béla Bollobás, Dezső Csejtei, László Csernai, György Dévai, Botond Gaál, György Kádár, Ádám Kiss, Paul G. Mezey, József Zsigmond Szabó

Who would like to sign the document, please write to this address: laszloszaruka54@gmail.com

The 10 points, signed by quite a few members of the Batthyány Society of Professors, and many non-members, are about climate, energy and environment. The direct climate-related points are in bold:

- 1. Let's clarify basic concepts!**
- 2. Our home is a wonderful Earth**
- 3. The basis of our civilisation is energy**
- 4. The essence of energy transition**
- 5. Energy is also the basis of sovereignty**
- 6. Climate policy leads dangerously astray**
- 7. Severe economic-social consequences**
- 8. Adaptation and mitigation**
- 9. Even the road to hell is paved with good intention**
- 10. Back to science!**

Problems in climate issues:

Many common concepts are inherently confusing or have become confused. ([No1 of the Ten Proposals for the Future](#))

Serious scientific doubts have arisen regarding the basic assumptions of climate policy. For the clarification of most questions, unbiased and factbased scientific research, as well as open scientific debates are necessary. ([No10 of the Ten Proposals for the Future](#))

In a sea of misinformation, it is not easy to find the right answers, despite many's best efforts. If skeptic scientists talk about details, people cannot follow them. But they cannot be too simplistic, because the mainstream accuses them of fake news propaganda. In any case, the media ignores skeptic views, or, if it does not work, tries to misinterpret them. (Respect to rare exceptions, e.g. recently in Hungary.)

What we did one month ago:

The President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences made possible to organize an international scientific conference at the Academy, with the title „[Beyond the Climate Change Consensus](#)”. It took place on December 8, 2025.

Conference: 3 lectures (Szarka, Koutsoyiannis, Furfari) **+5 contributions** (Vinós, Embey-Isztin, Kovács, Báder, Huszár) **+4 written comments** (Sánta&Garbai, Scafetta, Soon, Zharkova),
Pre Event: 2 lectures (Vinós, Crok)

*„To spread clear concepts
and clean confused ones from their dross as much as possible...”
Count István Széchenyi: Around the Hungarian Academy (1842)*

[Photo: Wim Röst](#)



Headquarters of the 200 years old Hungarian Academy of Sciences
on December 8, 2025

BEYOND THE CLIMATE CHANGE CONSENSUS: EVENTS IN BUDAPEST ON DECEMBER 8, 2025

8 December 2025 | PM 02:00 - PM 05:00
MTA Székház, Nagyterem
1051 Budapest, Széchenyi István tér 9.

Beyond the Climate Change Consensus

International conference providing an insight into the science beyond the climate change consensus

Date: 2:00PM to 5:00PM, Monday, December 8, 2025

Venue: Grand Hall of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapest V., Széchenyi tér 9.)

2:00PM to 2:05PM

Gábor NÁRAY-SZABÓ, O. M., Chair of the conference

Welcome and programme description

2:05PM to 2:30PM

László SZARKA, O. M., Initiator of the conference

What is climate science?

2:30PM to 3:15PM

Demetris KOUTSOYIANNIS (Prof, National Technical University of Athens)

H2O, CO2, Climate Change

3:15PM to 4:00PM

Samuel FURFARI (Prof, ESCP London; emerite ULB)

The Conventional Energy Counterrevolution

4:00PM to 4:55PM

Discussion

4:55PM to 5:00PM

Gábor NÁRAY-SZABÓ

Closing words

+ a Pre Event in the Library of the
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
with **Javier VINÓS** and **Marcel CROOK (Clintel)**

PART 1: ON BASIC CONCEPTS (Szarka)

PART 2: WHY NOT CO₂? (Koutsoyiannis)

PART 3: WHY NATURE? (Vinós, Szarka)

3.1 Thermodynamic approach (Vinós)


3.1 Other examples

PART 4: POLICY DEVELOPMENTS (U.S. DOE, Clintel, Furfari)

PART 1: ON BASIC CONCEPTS

([BCCC lecture „What is Climate Science?” by L Szarka](#))

What is Science?



GY KORNIS 1922

(+many other classical definitions):

*...a methodological
and systematic human activity
aimed at learning about reality*

Rules of Science:

things that are God's and not Caesar's
(see Matthew 22:21)

**R
U
L
E
S**

**POSTMODERN
„SCIENCE”
SOPHISTRY**

(P. FEYERABEND 1975):
*...an „anarchic enterprise”
where no single method applies
and
„anything goes”*

**„Consensus Building”
is outside the rules of science,
because consensus origins from
values and/or interests.**

What is Climate?

The ancient Greek „κλίμα” means inclination, slope, latitude. The Hungarian „éghajlat” means „the bend of the sky”.

Climate is what on an average we may expect, weather is what we actually get. (A J HERBERTSON 1907: an exact definition)

There are about a dozen modern definitions. According to AI:
„the average weather patterns in a region over a long period, typically 30 years or more, including temperature, precipitation, and humidity”

The modern definitions of climate do not highlight its nonstatic nature.

„Climate is represented as a time average... A time average of a stochastic process (...) is not a number but a stochastic process per se.”

(D KOUTSOYIANNIS 2021)

There are unpredictable changes in the weather, as well as in the climate

A geophysical approach:

Ensemble of elements of the Earth System and their interactions:


Extraterrestrial factors:
Sun, Solar System, space.

Terrestrial factors:
phenomena of the atmosphere, geosphere, hydrosphere, cryosphere, biosphere (incl. human)

Interactions: not precisely known or unknown.

(L SZARKA 2023)

What is Climate System?



UNFCCC 1992:

"Climate system" means the totality of the atmosphere, hydrosphere, biosphere and geosphere and their interactions.

It is a restrictive definition (e.g., the Sun is missing)

The atmosphere is like an apple peel.

What is Climate Change?

GEOPHYSICAL APPROACH:

A change in characteristic climatic state of a region on decadal scale, due to the ever-changing elements of the Earth System.

WMO

(in accordance with the modern definitions for climate):

Climate change is the term used to describe changes in the state of the climate that can be identified by changes in the average and/or the variability of its properties and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer.

D KOUTSOYIANNIS 2021:

It is a redundancy:
The term “climate change” ... is a pleonasm, as the climate, like the weather, has been ever-changing.

UNFCCC:


...attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.

The UNFCCC definition is restrictive; it is in conflict even with the WMO one.

What is Climate Science?

**Since its basic terms are controversial,
we should look into UNFCCC 1992.**

Since 1992 (UNFCCC, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change), human-caused greenhouse gases (GHGs) have been in the spotlight. UNFCCC suggests that climate is a constant value, a horizontal line in time, altered only by humans.




UNFCCC is a real frame of thinking:
phenomena + interactions outside this frame are largely ignored or attributed to human.



„Space”



Solar System




Sun




GHGs



Biodynamics (greening)




Geodynamics, incl. volcanos




H₂O



Hydrosphere, cryosphere, clouds



Energy transport



Feedbacks (e.g., Le Chatalier's Principle)

It is guaranteed that

RESTRICTIVE DEFINITIONS

+

RESTRICTED FOCUS



BIASED CONCLUSIONS

Since 1992, the UNFCCC has been leading science to wrong conclusions.

The basis of UNCCC is the „Climate Consensus“. How it was born?

ID Card Data of the Consensus:

Name: International Conference on the Assessment of the Role of Carbon Dioxide and of the Other Greenhouse Gases in Climate Variations and Associated Impacts

Parentage: UNEP, ICSU, WMO

Place of birth: Villach (Austria)

Date of birth: October 9-15, 1985

Birth document: [WMO-No. 661, WMO \(1986\)](#)



[Photo](#)

Page 7 of the 1985 Villach Conference Report (WMO 1986)

This conference has two important tasks:

- to develop a consensus statement on the present state of our scientific knowledge of increases in CO₂ and other radiatively active gases, and the physical and socio-economic impacts, and
- to develop sound recommendations for action by countries and by international agencies, based on this scientific consensus.

Consensus No 1 in Page 2


These conclusions are based on the following consensus of current basic scientific understanding:

- o The amounts of some trace gases in the troposphere, notably carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrous oxide (N₂O), methane (CH₄), ozone (O₃) and chloro-fluorocarbons (CFC) are increasing. These gases are essentially transparent to incoming short-wave solar radiation but they absorb and emit longwave radiation and are thus able to influence the Earth's climate.

The consensus lacks all scientific knowledge born after 1985.

The 1985 Consensus statement No 1 and NASA CERES data (2000-)

(The figure was presented at a H. A. S. meeting by Major 2024, discussed by Szarka 2024)



1. The actual warming ($\text{NET} = \text{ASR} - \text{OLR} > 0$) is due to an **increase in ASR**.
2. The trends are changing on a decadal scale.

SOL: Incoming Solar (SW) Radiation (ISR)
 SW: Reflected Solar (SW) Radiation (RSR)
 ASR: Absorbed Solar (SW) Radiation
 OLR: Outgoing Longwave Radiation
 NET: Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI)
 TOA: Top of Atmosphere

NET = ASR - OLR
ASR = ISR - RSR (= SOL - SW)

Mainstream reactions to the contradiction:

1. *...we have known the determining cause for a long time* ([Haszpra 2022](#))
2. *Climate science requires a methodological shift away from its initial „physics-first” orientation toward one of usability-centered science-for-policy.* ([Jebeile, Roussos 2023](#))

Physical science’s „value-free ideal” can hamper the production of usable science-for-policy (Jebeile, Roussos 2023)

3. *We own the science* – told Melissa Fleming, Under-Secretary-General for Communication about the science of climate change at the WEF event of Oct 2022, [from 41:58 to 42:40](#)

Finally, what is Climate Science?

**Climate Science:
is a methodology
aimed at learning about climate**
Rules of Climate Science:
things that are God's and not Caesar's.

**Physics-oriented Climate Science
is considered as Climate Science,
as far as the rules of sciences are
strictly followed.**

**Climate Science is far to be settled.
Questions are always welcome.**

**R
U
L
E
S**

**Sophistry
„Science“-For-Climate-Policy**

„The end justifies the means.“


„anything goes“

„Consensus Building“


Dogmatic adherence to a frozen view
based on the 1985 consensus: not science

**It is time to rigorously reexamine
each and every climate claim.**


**PRESENT:
Sophistry-For-Climate-Policy**



**FUTURE:
Climate Science**



Raft illustration: Márki 1910



Hypotheses inside

**PAST:
science**

**There is a need for a
healthy and honest,
physics-oriented climate science.**

PART 2: WHY NOT CO₂?

(BCCC lecture „H₂O, CO₂, Climate Change” by Demetris Koutsoyiannis)

Demetris Koutsoyiannis
 in 58 slides,
 summarizing his research results,
 provided a complete refutation
 of the mainstream climate view.
 Open for discussion.




My climate decalogue: Main results of my recent research

1. **Climate change is real** —and climate crisis too.
 - Climate change has been real throughout Earth's entire 4.5-billion-year history.
 - Climate crisis is a purely political issue, with no relationship to the real world.
2. There is **no greenhouse effect** (GHE), nor greenhouse gases (GHG), in the atmosphere.
 - These are misleading terms, whose real meanings are “atmospheric radiation effect” (ARE) and “radiatively active gas” (RAG), respectively.
3. The ARE mostly depends on the **temperature gradient** in the atmosphere.
 - At the equilibrium (an isothermal atmosphere) the ARE is zero.
 - In case of temperature inversion, the ARE results in cooling, not warming of the Earth.
4. In the standard atmosphere (with gradient of 6.5 K/km) the **ARE is dominated by H₂O** (water vapour and clouds).
 - CO₂ is playing a very minor role (quantified at 4-5%).
5. The **century-long observations** of longwave (LW) radiation show **no change in the ARE**.
 - The substantial increase of atmospheric [CO₂] did not give a discernible signal.
6. **No proof** has ever been presented that the increase of atmospheric [CO₂] **causes temperature increase**.
 - On the contrary, paleoclimatic and modern observational data support the reverse causality as the increase of temperature happens before that of [CO₂].
 - Climate models suggest a causality direction opposite from that seen in the data.
7. The carbon balance in the atmosphere is **dominated by natural processes**.
 - Human CO₂ emissions (by burning fossil fuels etc.) are only 4% of the total.
 - The increase of temperature resulted in substantial increase of natural CO₂ emissions.
8. **Isotopic carbon data** ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$) show changes in the isotopic synthesis of atmospheric CO₂, but **no sign of human influence**.
 - They show that the changes seen are driven by natural processes.
9. The dynamics of atmospheric CO₂ can be recovered from **natural processes only**.
 - Multiple evidence confirms a residence time of atmospheric CO₂ at 4 years, despite “climate science” longer estimates reaching thousands of years.
10. Temperature increase in the 21st century is **consistent with changes in the SW radiation**.

Old instrumental data confirm that climate change is real

The graph shows the longest instrumental record on Earth, that of the Roda Nilometer (849 years of Nile's water level).




Data from Koutsoyiannis (2013), available at <https://www.itia.ntua.gr/1351/>; graph from Koutsoyiannis and Iliopoulou (2024); photos from Koutsoyiannis (2024g), courtesy of Nikos Mamassis.

Quiz: what is (potentially) the cause and what is the effect?

The values plotted are **annual averages** of differenced time series for differencing time step of 1 year.

Each point represents the time average for a duration of one-year ending at the time of its abscissa.


The two time series are **lagged by six months**.



Source: Koutsoyiannis et al. (2023, graphical abstract) completed by addition of three most recent years (empty rectangles).

#7 The carbon balance in the atmosphere is dominated by natural processes



1. **Humans** are responsible for **only 4%** of carbon emissions (based on IPCC data).
2. The vast **majority of changes** in the atmosphere since 1750 (red bars in the graph) are **due to natural processes**, respiration and photosynthesis.
3. The increases in both CO₂ emissions and sinks are due to the temperature increase, which **expands the biosphere and makes it more productive**.
4. The terrestrial biosphere processes are much more powerful than the maritime ones in terms of CO₂ production and absorption.
5. The CO₂ emissions by the ocean biosphere alone are much larger than human emissions.
6. The modern (post-1750) **natural CO₂ additions** to pre-industrial quantities (red bars in the right half of the graph) **exceed the human emissions by a factor of ~4.5**.



The estimates are “official” from IPCC (2021; Fig. 5.12). The presentation in the figure above is “unofficial”, adapted from Koutsoyiannis (2024c). In the recent publication by Lai et al. (2024) the estimates of gross photosynthesis and respiration are even higher, 157 and 149 Gt C/year (instead of 142.0 and 136.7 Gt C/year), respectively.

#7 The carbon balance in the atmosphere is dominated by natural processes

1. **Humans** are responsible for **only 4%** of carbon emissions (based on IPCC data).
2. The vast **majority of changes** in the atmosphere since 1750 (red bars in the graph) are **due to natural processes**, respiration and photosynthesis.
3. The increases in both CO₂ emissions and sinks are due to the temperature increase, which **expands the biosphere**




**SITUATION
~ TWO CENTURIES AGO**

are “official” from IPCC (2021; Fig. 5.12). The presentation in the figure is “official”, adapted from Koutsoyiannis (2024c). In the recent publication by the estimates of gross photosynthesis and respiration are even higher, Gt C/year (instead of 142.0 and 136.7 Gt C/year), respectively.

4. The terrestrial and maritime CO₂ fluxes are much larger than human emissions.
5. The CO₂ emissions by the ocean biosphere alone are much larger than human emissions.
6. The modern (post-1750) **natural CO₂ additions** to pre-industrial quantities (red bars in the right half of the graph) **exceed the human emissions by a factor of ~4.5**.

#7 The carbon balance in the atmosphere is dominated by natural processes

1. **Humans** are responsible for **only 4%** of carbon emissions (based on IPCC data).
2. The vast **majority of changes** in the atmosphere since 1750 (red bars in the graph) are **due to natural processes**, respiration and photosynthesis.
3. The increases in both CO₂ emissions and sinks are due to the temperature increase, which **expands the biosphere and makes it more productive**.



NATURAL FLUCTUATIONS NOWADAYS ARE MUCH HIGHER THAN TWO CENTURIES AGO: „GLOBAL GREENING”

>80 % OF CO₂ ADDITIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE COMES FROM NATURE, NOT HUMAN

OPEN QUESTIONS: (1) GEOLOGICAL CO₂ EMISSION, (2) HENRY’S LAW

Final remarks: What the evidence actually shows


- Human **CO₂** as the climate control knob is **empirically untenable** once we properly account for:
 - (1) natural CO₂ fluxes (~25× larger);
 - (2) the effect of H₂O (vapour + clouds, ~20× larger);
 - (3) the huge complexity of the climate system, including the biosphere's role.
- Climate models are in disagreement with observation while **reversing cause and effect**.
- In complex systems, data are sovereign — and the **data have falsified the mainstream climate theory**.
- The emission-centric paradigm was a **political project that conscripted science to provide authority**.
- “Climate science” is therefore not just corrupted science — it is purpose-built instrumentation **wearing the lab coat of science while abandoning its method**.
- **Scientists' job is to kill bad theories and rip science back from politics — not posture as saviours of the planet.**

PART 3: WHY NATURE?

3.1. A THERMODYNAMIC APPROACH


[\(BCCC Pre Event lecture by Javier Vinós\)](#)

Absence of solar energy in December, January, February.
All heat energy arriving here is emitted into the space



The gradient is key for temperature changes


$$\Delta T = \Delta T_1/2 + \Delta(\delta T_2)/4$$



The gradient is key for temperature changes

$$\Delta T = \Delta T_1 / 2 + \Delta(\delta T_2) / 4$$

Glacial to interglacial: $\Delta T_1 = +1^\circ$ $\Delta(\delta T_2) = +20^\circ$



Global temperature changes do not depend on the tropics. They depend little on changes in the GHE


Meridional energy transport

PART 3: WHY NATURE?

3.2. OTHER EXAMPLES


LET THE DATA SPEAK!

The most warming regions are in the continents of the Northern Hemisphere



[Berkhout 2025 \(President of Clintel 2019-2025\)](#)


Once again about the Roda Nilometer data



We patched together all available data (Toussoun 1925) by using a correct mathematical procedure, and we published 1300 years long time series, and corresponding data analyses.

[AD 622-1456: Koutsoyiannis 2013, Hydr Sci J](#)



[AD 622-1921: Szűcs et al. 2024, J Hydr](#)



The difference between the two time series is the altitude of the Roda nilometer, ~9 m.


Riverbed sedimentation cannot be excluded.

MODELLED ΔT -CONTRIBUTION OF NATURE




OBSERVED NORTHERN HEMISPHERE (NH) TEMPERATURE CHANGES

Theory 1: Climate change is mostly human-caused



Theory 2: Climate change is mostly natural



A version of so-called „outside” temperature changes, extrapolated largely from „inside” temperature measurements

„Outside” temperature changes, observed exclusively from „outside” temperature measurements

Astonishing consequence: assessing the climate role of the Sun depends on the selection of the time series.

Austria: Long-Term Trends in Temperature, Sunshine & CO₂ 20-Year Rolling Averages with Trend Correlations (1900-2024)





Fig 26: Austria (1900–2024): 20 year rolling means of the annual mean temperature (altitude-normalized), sunshine duration, and global atmospheric CO₂, with correlation coefficients for the rolling means


On the legend „Antarctic ice is shrinking rapidly”

Changes in the thickness of the land ice in Antarctica, between 2002 and 2012, based on satellite gravity (GRACE) measurements
([Földvary, Kiss 2016](#))




mm/year measurement unit expresses how many millimetres of ice is affected by mass changes in the given area ([Kiss 2014](#))

Geothermal heat flow map of Antarctica
([Shen et al. 2020](#))



The land ice is shrinking where it is heated from the inside of the earth.

Orbiting planets → Solar activity variation → Sedimentation variation



[Stefani et al. 2024](#)


(a) PSD (Power Spectral Density) of varved lacustrine-sediment data from Lake Lisan

(b) PSD (Power Spectral Density) of α - Ω solar dynamo, on basis of angular momentum computation from:

All planets + noise
All planets
Jupiter and Saturn




Lake Lisan (Jordan)



[Astronomy Stack Exchange](#)

Recent climate change on planet Mars



Recent changes were observed by NASA even on planet Mars (new gullies appeared)

Further climate-related BCCC contributions

gave insight to such unnoticed questions as

- Geological CO₂ emissions ([István János Kovács](#))
- Surface radiation energy balance ([László Báder](#))
- CO₂ saturation; water vapour issues; pyrolysis of crop residues ([Csaba Huszár](#))

The only opposing viewpoint ([Antal Embey-Isztin](#)) essentially re-stating IPCC opinions should also be studied.

(Mainstream scientists did not show up, some of them boycotted the event.)

Full Report on the Conference „Beyond the Climate Change Consensus” and its Pre Event, held in Budapest on December 8, 2025 have been published by [Batthyány Society of Professors](#) and [Clintel](#).

[Demetris Koutsoyiannis](#) published an excellent coverage.

PART 4. POLICY DEVELOPMENTS (U.S. DOE, Clintel, Furfari)




Figure 11.2 in the U.S. DOE Report ([Climate Working Group 2025](#))

**The new president of Clintel is Václav Klaus,
former state president of the Czech Republic
([Clintel News by M Crok \(Director of Clintel\) at the Pre Event](#))**



Samuel Furfari

The Truth
About the
COPs

30 years of illusions

[BCCC lecture by S Furfari](#)

SUMMARY

In 2025, the mainstream climate policy, based on the 1992 UNFCCC framework and the 1985 Villach climate change consensus, collapsed.

The Budapest Climate Change Conference, “Beyond the Climate Change Consensus” (BCCC), was a unique symbol: unprecedented for a country’s national academy to provide an official scientific forum on climate without censorship or bans.

The presented new hypotheses (e.g. Koutsoyiannis, Vinós) are not „final truths”, but open for scientific discussion.

It has been proven many times, including at the BCCC, that the mainstream climate theory, the Emperor (after Andersen’s fairy tale, The Emperor’s New Clothes) is naked. But propaganda continues to prevent the news from reaching the people.

It is expected that the year 2026 will indeed make obvious that the Emperor is naked.