

## ***HOW MANY IPCC SCIENTISTS FABRICATE AND FALSIFY RESEARCH?***

*By Norm Kalmanovitch*

The measured global temperature record which started around 1856 shows that the Earth was in a warming cycle until around 1880. The CO<sub>2</sub> record shows that CO<sub>2</sub> was increasing by about 0.21ppmv/year over this period. During the cooling cycle which followed from 1880 to 1910, the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration increased at a rate of about 0.30ppmv/year.

The next warming cycle from 1910 to 1942 saw a dramatic increase in global temperature, but the rate of increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration only grew to 0.33ppmv over this time period.

The well documented global cooling period from 1942 to 1975 that had the world concerned about an impending return to the equivalent of the Little Ice Age, had a contemporaneous rise in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> that equated to 0.63ppmv/year; almost twice the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> of the previous warming cycle.

During the warming that took place from 1975 to 1998, the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> increase took another dramatic jump to 1.54ppmv/year, but this was followed by an increase to 1.91ppmv/year that we are currently experiencing during the present ongoing cooling cycle.

Each successive cooling cycle has had an increase in the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> growth over the previous warming cycle, indicating that there is no possible correlation of CO<sub>2</sub> with global warming.

In 1988 Hansen et al published a paper "Global Climate Changes as Forecast by Goddard Institute for Space Studies Three-Dimensional Model" in the Journal of Geophysical Research that introduced a "CO<sub>2</sub> forcing parameter".

This parameter had no actual physical basis, but was merely based on the assumption that a 100ppmv increase in CO<sub>2</sub> was directly and primarily responsible for the measured increase in global temperature of 0.6°C that had been observed over the past century.

This assumption ignored the fact that over this time period there was both cooling and warming concurrent with rising CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and considering that this paper was published just 13 years after a 33 year cooling trend that also had a concurrent increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration there is no possible valid rationale for this assumption. Essentially in the 46year period from 1942 to when the paper was published in 1988, there were 33years of cooling and only 13years of warming concurrent with increases in CO<sub>2</sub>, yet the models used a forcing parameter that directly related only warming to CO<sub>2</sub> concentration increases.

With no basis in fact, this parameter is entirely a fabrication, and the projections of climate models that are based on this fabricated parameter are also meaningless

fabrications.

In addition to the fabrication, there is a bit of scientific fraud in the creation of this CO2 forcing parameter.

The Earth had been warming since the Little Ice Age at a rate of about  $0.5^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{century}$ . The temperature value that went into determining the CO2 forcing parameter was  $0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ , with the difference from the  $0.5^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{century}$  value likely due to the urban heat island effect. Even if this difference was directly due to CO2 increases, the difference between the observed temperature and the natural warming since the Little Ice Age is only  $0.1^{\circ}\text{C}$  but the full  $0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$  was used to fabricate the forcing parameter.

It seems that one fabrication leads to another, and when it became obvious that the natural warming of  $0.5^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{century}$  since the Little Ice Age demonstrated the obvious deficiency in this forcing parameter of the climate models, the MBH98 temperature proxy also known as the "hockey stick" was fabricated to remove the Little Ice Age and allow the full  $0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$  temperature increase to be related to CO2 increases.

Considering that the climate models are the only support for the AGW premise, and the AGW premise is the only support for the climate models, exposing this simple fabrication is all that needs to be done to put an end to this circular argument that forms the basis for the entire climate change lunacy.