

# Why Climate Change Is a Fraud



By Edwin Berry, Ph.D.

January 14, 2022

*The Science of the people who will not be slaves again!*

The journal, [\*Science of Climate Change\*](#), published my landmark scientific paper on December 14, 2021.

My paper, and papers by Murry Salby and Hermann Harde, are checkmate proof that natural CO<sub>2</sub>, not human CO<sub>2</sub>, causes most of the increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Physics proves our CO<sub>2</sub> does not change our climate.

**President Bush began the *climate fraud*.**

The UN *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (IPCC) makes this core assumption:

*Natural CO<sub>2</sub> remained constant after 1750 and human CO<sub>2</sub> causes all the observed increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.*

IPCC's core assumption is the basis of all climate laws, regulations, treaties, taxes, and education. It has cost us dearly in our energy sources, our economy, our national defense, our lives, our minds, and our freedom.

My paper shows why this assumption is wrong. But more important, my paper shows this assumption is not the result of a simple error by the IPCC. This assumption is an obvious fraud of global proportions.

President GHW Bush was the main force in forming and funding the IPCC in 1988. There is nothing in IPCC's Charter about investigating the cause of climate change. The IPCC merely assumes our CO2 causes climate change.

In June 1992, President G.H.W. Bush and 107 other world leaders attended the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development, or the "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro.

Secretary General Maurice Strong chaired the conference that 20,000 climate activists and green lobby members attended. The UN and the US government paid all attendees' expenses.

**Strong declared in his Summit speech,**

"A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally damaging consumption patterns. We may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrialized civilization to collapse. Isn't it our responsibility to bring this about?"

Strong declared,

"the real goal of the Earth Charter is that it will in fact become like the Ten Commandments."

Strong long supported global governance at the expense of national sovereignty. He said environmental mandates require the eventual dismantling of the power of the nation state:

"It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation-states, however powerful. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the imperatives of global environmental cooperation."

"We need a system of global governance through which nations can cooperate and deal with issues they cannot deal with alone. The ultimate example is climate change."

In 1992, Al Gore claimed,

“Only an insignificant fraction of scientists deny the global warming crisis. The time for debate is over. The science is settled.”

I attended the [meeting in the San Francisco](#) Bay area where Bush’s toady told some 100 climate physicists like me that we were out of a job. They did not want physicists to tell them our CO<sub>2</sub> does not cause climate change. They wanted and would fund only ecologists to write reports on the damage we do by burning carbon fuels.

**We must stop the *climate fraud*.**

I am sorry to see [Frosty Wooldridge](#) has fallen for the *climate fraud* (NWV Dec 30, 2022). I like many things Frosty does, but his promotion of the *climate fraud* is wrong.

Frosty wrote:

“The fact remains: adding population adds to catastrophic climate destabilization with millions of more people burning millions of barrels of oil 24/7.

“That means more wildfires in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of an “exceptional drought” in the West. That means more extraordinary tornadoes in Kentucky, Tennessee, Oklahoma and nauseum.

“It means massive hurricanes sweeping up our coasts. It means raising the temperatures at the poles to a point where all glaciers melt into the oceans.

“It means dropping more acidic carbon molecules into our oceans to kill more than 100 species daily across the planet.”

“Well, now, we’ve got catastrophic climate destabilization breathing down our throats.”

Frosty's climate claims are not science.

The dark side propagates its *climate fraud* by trying to scare you with its claimed consequences if you do not do what they tell you to do. Fear causes us to abandon our logic and common sense. Likely, the witch doctors of old used the same techniques.

### **How to understand the *climate fraud*.**

Every day, the news media tells us about a new "climate catastrophe." The subliminal message is "because it's bad, you caused it."

The *climate fraud* may be the mother of all frauds. Belief in IPCC's core assumption dumbs us down and makes us susceptible to other frauds, like gun control and COVID mandates.

They say, "natural CO2 emissions stayed constant and human CO2 caused the problem." This is the ecological nonsense of "Nature is Good, Human is Bad."

My book [\*Climate Miracle\*](#) explains in a short read the logic you need to defend yourself against climate alarmism.

### **The proof is important.**

According to the scientific method, it is impossible to prove a theory is true (as climate alarmists try to do) but it takes only one contradiction to prove a theory is false. My paper supplies that contradiction.

According to the scientific method, my paper overturns the "consensus" claim that IPCC's core assumption is true, and it "outvotes" the thousands of IPCC papers that claim IPCC's core assumption is true.

Now, the only scientific way for them to justify their climate alarmism is to show there is a major error in my paper. Many have tried but no one has succeeded.

## **Human CO<sub>2</sub> does not “accumulate” in the atmosphere.**

CO<sub>2</sub> flows through the atmosphere like water flows through a lake. Imagine a lake where a river sends water into a lake and lake water flows out over a dam. Pretend we arrive when the inflow is small but constant and the water flowing over the dam is equally small and constant.

The lake level is at equilibrium. Its outflow equals its inflow. The lake level is constant. Suddenly, the inflow increases. It raises the lake level. This rise in the lake level makes more water flow over the dam. The lake level rises just enough to make its new outflow equal its new inflow.

That illustrates now human and natural CO<sub>2</sub> that flow into the atmosphere change the CO<sub>2</sub> level in the atmosphere. Nothing accumulates. The level rises only enough to make CO<sub>2</sub> outflow equal to the CO<sub>2</sub> inflow.

## **Let's do a first approximation.**

The IPCC says annual human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are about 5% of natural CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This is like a recipe. What you put in is what you get. The only difference here is your recipe is flowing out of a hole in the bottom of your bowl as you pour things in.

Because human CO<sub>2</sub> inflow is 5% the human CO<sub>2</sub> level in the bowl is also 5%. The natural CO<sub>2</sub> level in the bowl is 95%.

Same for CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. This first approximation says human CO<sub>2</sub> is only 5%.

But the IPCC theory is that human CO<sub>2</sub> is at 30%. This shows IPCC's core assumption is wrong.

## **Let's do more accurate calculations.**

My paper uses IPCC's natural carbon cycle data and annual

human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data to calculate the true effect of human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Notice I use IPCC's own data to prove its assumption about human CO<sub>2</sub> is false.

Human and natural CO<sub>2</sub> do not react with each other. So, we can calculate their effects independently, which simplifies the calculations.

My calculations include human CO<sub>2</sub> that recycles back into the atmosphere and the transfer of human carbon from the slow carbon cycle to the fast carbon cycle. The whole banana.

The result, as of 2020, is human CO<sub>2</sub> has increased to only 8% of all atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. This is still nowhere near the 30% required by IPCC's core assumption. Therefore, IPCC's core assumption is wrong. Not even close. In fact, a fraud.


### **The IPCC attempts to explain this problem.**

The IPCC tries to get around this problem by claiming human CO<sub>2</sub>, but not natural CO<sub>2</sub> stays in the atmosphere for hundreds of years. And by staying around longer, the human CO<sub>2</sub> goes up to 30%.

### **Thus, the IPCC digs its own grave.**

This IPCC claim is absurd because human and natural CO<sub>2</sub> molecules are identical, so they flow out of the atmosphere at the same rate.

IPCC's story (and it is a story) would require a magic demon in the atmosphere that can separate human CO<sub>2</sub> from natural CO<sub>2</sub> molecules, and then detain the human molecules. It



can't happen. No one should fall for this baloney.

IPCC's climate fiction is so absurd that it proves the IPCC committed a fraud of global proportions.

**The COVID shutdown did not reduce the increase in the CO<sub>2</sub> level.**

The 2021 emissions reduction due to COVID did not stop the inevitable CO<sub>2</sub> increase caused by natural CO<sub>2</sub>. This proves climate treaties and green energy are useless because they ignore that unstoppable nature is the dominant cause of the CO<sub>2</sub> increase.

**Carbon dating data prove nature dominates the CO<sub>2</sub> increase.**

Carbon dating measures the percent of carbon-14 in a quantity of carbon-12. Carbon daters call these measurements  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  (delta 14C).

We can use  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  data to prove nature dominates the CO<sub>2</sub> increase.

The natural level of  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  is zero. That does not mean there is no carbon-14. It means the amount of carbon-14 compared to carbon-12 is exactly what nature has produced for millions of years.

But from 1950 to 1965, the atomic bomb tests almost doubled the  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  level. After 1965, the  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  level gradually decreased and today the  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  is back to zero.

**Here's the thing.**

Human CO<sub>2</sub> from burning carbon fuels has zero carbon-14. Therefore, human  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  is negative 1000. So, if human CO<sub>2</sub> caused

the CO<sub>2</sub> increase, it would have lowered the  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  equilibrium level below zero.

Look at it this way. Suppose you have a drink that has 8% alcohol, and you pour in an equal quantity of water. What happens to the 8% alcohol level? It drops to 4%.

Similarly, if human carbon causes all the CO<sub>2</sub> increase, it would have lowered the equilibrium level of  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  below zero. Data show human emission have had no effect on the  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$  equilibrium level of zero. Also, the increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has had no effect on the equilibrium level of  $\delta^{14}\text{C}$ .

Therefore, natural CO<sub>2</sub> dominates the increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

## Conclusions

The only scientific way for alarmists to argue that human CO<sub>2</sub> dominates the increase is to prove there is a major error in my paper. No one has done that.

I will make videos to help you understand my paper.

My paper shows if human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were to stop, the small human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> increase would quickly fall, meaning there is no scientific basis to claim there is a climate emergency or worry about our grand kids.

My paper overturns IPCC's *climate fraud* with a clarity that can win in a court of law. Good high school students can understand my paper. Now, we need lawyers willing to overturn climate laws, regulations, and taxes.

© 2021 Ed Berry – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Ed Berry: [ed@edberry.com](mailto:ed@edberry.com)