Bert Bolin and the Foundational Fiction of the IPCC Climate Attribution

By Jonathan Cohler • November 14, 2026

Bert Rickard Johannes Bolin (15 May 1925 - 30 December 2007) was the **single most important architect** of the modern climate attribution framework. He co-authored the 1958 paper that first asserted fossil fuel combustion as the driver of rising atmospheric CO2. He succeeded Carl-Gustaf Rossby at the Institute of Meteorology in Stockholm. He chaired every major international scientific body that transformed that assertion into global policy: the ICSU Committee on Atmospheric Sciences from 1964, the Global Atmospheric Research Programme from 1967, the 1985 Villach Conference, the Advisory Group on Greenhouse Gases from 1985, and finally the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change from its founding in 1988 until 1997. He served as Scientific Advisor to the Swedish Prime Minister. He co-founded the Stockholm Environment Institute. He received the Blue Planet Prize, the Milutin Milankovic Medal, the Tyler Prize, the GEF Global Environment Leadership Award, and the Global Environment Leadership Award.

The attribution he built his career on has no foundation. It has only a **sciency-sounding facade**, forced on the world through the authority of the institutions he built for that purpose. The Revelle factor global constraint has no derivation and no measurement at any point in Earth history. The functional form of the proposed CO2 retention curve was asserted, not derived. The tracer-bulk split later invoked to protect the framework against the bomb-14C relaxation data has no mechanism and no equation behind it. Each is a lie stated in the vocabulary of physics: a construct without a physical referent, presented as if it were a measured quantity, and forced into global policy through institutional authority rather than through scientific demonstration.

Bolin lied for nearly fifty years about the carbon cycle, and he knew he was lying. He had Craig (1957) in his own reference list, which gave an atmospheric residence time inconsistent with his retention claim. He lived through sixty years of bomb-14C relaxation data that falsified the long-tail retention his framework assumed. He chaired the institution that assessed this body of evidence across every assessment cycle and never permitted the audit. He acknowledged in his final book that politics dominated the IPCC's work. He knew what the paper claimed, he knew what the evidence showed, and he knew what the institution he built was for. He told the lie anyway. He built the institution that enforced the lie as international consensus. The entire policy architecture of net-zero commitments, social cost of carbon figures, carbon budgets, and climate liability law is downstream of his 1958 lie. This document sets out the record.

The 1958 Paper

Bolin and Eriksson (1959) [3] submitted their paper on 15 November 1958. It was published in 1959 as "Changes in the Carbon Dioxide Content of the Atmosphere and Sea due to Fossil Fuel Combustion" in *The Atmosphere and the Sea in Motion: Scientific Contributions to the Rossby Memorial Volume*, edited by Bert Bolin himself, published by the Rockefeller Institute Press, pages 130 to 142.

The paper did two things that would define the next sixty-seven years of climate attribution.

First, it **asserted** fossil-fuel combustion as the principal driver of atmospheric CO2 accumulation. The paper projected a 25 percent increase in atmospheric CO2 by the year 2000 under then-current emissions trends, citing Callendar's earlier work and extending it with their own calculations. The projection was made before any increase in atmospheric CO2 had been systematically documented. Keeling's Mauna Loa record did not begin until 1958 and would not produce a characteristic curve for several more years. The attribution was assertion in advance of observation.

Second, and more consequentially, it imported the concept of the local Revelle factor from **Revelle and Suess (1957) [14]** and **fabricated a non-existent "global" version of it** as a rate constraint on ocean CO2 uptake. The Revelle factor is a local intensive surface-chemistry quantity. **A "global" version of it is not a real quantity and cannot exist as one**. Bolin and Eriksson wrote it down anyway. Revelle and Suess themselves had been tentative about the factor's broader significance. Their own paper estimated that the ocean was absorbing most of the fossil emissions and that only a small fraction remained airborne. **Bolin and Eriksson inverted that conclusion**. They argued the Revelle factor would limit bulk ocean uptake on relevant timescales, forcing the atmosphere to retain a large fraction of emitted CO2 for extended periods.

This inversion is the central mathematical falsehood of the entire IPCC attribution framework. The entire modern framework of long-tail CO2 persistence, from the Bern Impulse Response Function to Archer's ten-thousand-year retention figures, descends from this single 1958 fabrication. Without it **the attribution structure has no mechanism to concentrate emissions in the atmosphere**.

The paper provided **no derivation**. It provided **no measurement**. It cited **no empirical demonstration** that the ocean behaves at bulk scale the way the surface chemistry parameter would suggest. The step from local parameter to "global" constraint is not a derivation and not an extrapolation. It is the fabrication of a quantity that *cannot* exist. Every subsequent carbon-cycle model inherited that non-existent quantity as its load-bearing premise, wrote it in the vocabulary of physics, and forced it through as settled science.

The Global Revelle Factor Is a Mathematical Fabrication

The Revelle factor is a parameter from aqueous carbonate chemistry. It is defined as the ratio between the fractional change in dissolved CO2 partial pressure and the fractional change in total dissolved inorganic carbon in a parcel of seawater at equilibrium. It is an intensive quantity. It applies at a point, under specified conditions of temperature, salinity, alkalinity, and chemical state. It has been measured at a handful of ship-track points on the ocean surface, and those measurements apply only to the ocean mixed layer.

The mixed layer is roughly one hundred meters deep. The ocean averages roughly three thousand seven hundred meters. The mixed layer therefore represents less than three percent of ocean depth and the surface is a two-dimensional film regardless of area covered. The ocean beneath the mixed layer holds approximately fifty times the dissolved inorganic carbon of the atmosphere and roughly ninety-seven percent of total ocean volume.

What Bolin and Eriksson did in 1958, and what every subsequent carbon-cycle model has inherited, is to treat this local surface mixed-layer parameter as if it governed the uptake rate of

the entire ocean. This is not an extrapolation. An extrapolation requires a mathematical operation that takes a well-defined quantity from a narrower domain to a wider one. No such operation exists for an intensive variable.

The Physical Tether Theorem (Cohler (2026) [6]) proves formally that no operator aggregating an intensive variable across different physical conditions is singled out by classical thermodynamics as uniquely correct. The "global Revelle factor" is therefore not a derived quantity, not an extrapolated quantity, and not a measured quantity. **It is a mathematical fabrication**, not a physical quantity of any kind, written down on a page in 1958 in direct violation of what PTT would later formally prove. There is no derivation of it anywhere in the published literature. **There can be no measurement of it ever, because PTT proves formally that no such quantity can exist as a physical observable**. The quantity named "the global Revelle constraint" has no physical referent, no mathematical path by which one could exist, and no empirical test that could ever confirm or deny it, because there is nothing there to confirm or deny. It is a structurally impossible construct that was written down in 1958 and treated as a physical constraint ever since.

The geological record directly falsifies the behavior the fabrication was invented to assert, on top of the fact that the fabrication itself cannot describe any physical quantity in the first place. Every high-CO2 episode in the Phanerozoic was fully drawn down. The Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum injection, estimated at several thousand gigatonnes of carbon over several thousand years, was absorbed. The Permian-Triassic excursion was absorbed. The Pleistocene glacial-interglacial cycles moved approximately one hundred parts per million of CO2 into and out of the ocean on millennial timescales repeatedly, with no sign of a buffering ceiling. The Holocene record shows the same pattern. Across every measurable interval of geological time, the ocean has absorbed and released CO2 across orders of magnitude of atmospheric concentration with no empirical signature of a bulk uptake rate limit.

The quantity exists only in the equations of models that assume it. It exists nowhere else. Bolin and Eriksson did not derive it. They did not measure it. They wrote it down. They built their 1958 attribution on it. The IPCC architecture Bolin later founded enforces it as consensus. The object the Bolin framework rests on is formally proven not to exist. It is a lie. Bolin knew it was a lie. He told it anyway and built a career on telling it.

Global Mean Surface Temperature: The Second Mathematical Fallacy

Bolin's framework rests on **two mathematical fallacies of the same type**. The global Revelle factor is the first. **Global Mean Surface Temperature** is the second.

Temperature is an intensive thermodynamic variable. Like the Revelle factor, it is defined only at a point, under specific local conditions of a system in local thermodynamic equilibrium. Averaging temperatures across a system not in thermal equilibrium, which the Earth's atmosphere emphatically is not, does not produce a physical temperature. It produces a number with no physical referent. Attaching units of Kelvin or degrees Celsius to that number does not make it a temperature. Units belong to physical quantities. The arithmetic area-weighted mean of surface temperature readings across the globe is not a physical quantity. It is a number.

Essex, McKitrick, and Andresen (2007) [10] demonstrated this formally in "Does a Global Temperature Exist?" (*Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* 32(1), 1-27, 2007,

scipr.link/essex). They proved that no unique global temperature can be constructed from spatial averages, because different averaging operators (arithmetic mean, geometric mean, harmonic mean, root-mean-square, and others) all have equal physical status and give different answers that can trend in opposite directions. The choice of operator is arbitrary and the result depends on the choice. No unique physical quantity emerges.

Cohler (2025) [5], "The Father of Lies Hijacking Climate Science: Global Mean Surface Temperature Does Not Exist" extends the proof. GMST has no precise regulatory definition in the framework that treats it as a policy-forcing quantity. It is physically meaningless under thermodynamic principles. Every IPCC climate model is tuned to reproduce historical GMST trends, which means every IPCC climate model is tuned to reproduce a mathematical artifact rather than a physical observable. The entire model-tuning enterprise is tuning to fiction.

The Physical Tether Theorem covers both the Revelle case and the GMST case as instances of the same general principle. No operator aggregating an intensive variable across different physical conditions is singled out by classical thermodynamics as uniquely correct. Any proposed "global intensive quantity," whether Revelle factor, temperature, salinity, pH, or chemical potential, is a construct chosen by the modeler, not a physical measurement.

Bolin's 1958 paper assumed the global Revelle factor. His IPCC assessments treated GMST as a measured physical quantity whose historical trends define the climate problem and whose projected trends define policy response. The entire 1.5°C and 2°C "targets" in the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement are expressed in units that cannot attach to the quantity they purport to describe. Both quantities, the global Revelle factor and GMST, are mathematical artifacts presented as physical measurements. Both are lies. Bolin knew the Revelle factor was a surface mixed-layer parameter and knew it was being extrapolated without derivation. He knew temperature was an intensive quantity and knew averaging it across a non-equilibrium system did not produce a measurement. He built his career and the IPCC's authority on asserting both as physical anyway.

The Swedish Technocratic Internationalist Context

Bolin operated his entire career within the Swedish socialist scientific-political establishment. Swedish Social Democracy is a democratic form of socialism. Socialism, by Marx's own definition in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* and by every subsequent Marxist taxonomy, is the transitional lower phase on the path from capitalism to communism. Social Democrats are socialists. Socialists are Marxists by the definitional structure Marx himself established. Bolin's political and institutional matrix was Marxist by any honest definition. He was mentored by Carl-Gustaf Rossby at the Institute of Meteorology in Stockholm, succeeded him in 1957, and held the first permanent chair of meteorology at Stockholm University from 1961 for nearly thirty years. He served as Scientific Advisor to the Swedish Prime Minister. His institutional ascent was synchronous with the rise of Olof Palme's Social Democratic government and its associated international environmental agenda.

The operational character of this tradition is supranational authority through credentialed expert cadres. Marx was explicit on this point in the closing of the Communist Manifesto: "Workers of the world, unite!" The First and Second Internationals built the organizational template for authority transcending national sovereignty. The Communist Manifesto framed nation-states as bourgeois constructs to be overcome. The essence of the doctrine, stripped to its structural core,

is supranational authority replacing national sovereignty, with a credentialed cadre directing human activity for stated collective ends.

The specific economic doctrine of abolishing private ownership is one expression. The operational structure of central planning by expert cadres under supranational authority is the essence. Letting that structure operate under softer labels, technocratic internationalism, global governance, planetary boundaries, sustainable development, while asserting it is not Marxism because the economic surface differs, is the move that has allowed the ideology to expand for seventy years without organized resistance.

Bolin was a Marxist by his political affiliation and a globalist by his institutional practice. The two are the same thing at different scales. The 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, opened by Olof Palme in Stockholm, established supranational environmental authority as a template. UNEP was created directly from that conference. The Advisory Group on Greenhouse Gases was placed under WMO, UNEP, and ICSU auspices with Bolin among its founding members. The 1985 Villach Conference, which Bolin chaired, issued its warnings under the same three-organization auspices. The 1988 founding of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change by WMO and UNEP, with Bolin as first chairman, completed the architecture: a supranational body with authority to define scientific consensus for national policy compliance across every member state.

The Swedish socialist matrix supplied the institutional culture: international solidarity rhetoric, expert-led governance, central planning as a default posture, systematic skepticism of national sovereignty on questions declared global. Bolin was a Marxist. The Swedish socialist establishment that shaped him was Marxist. The internationalist climate-governance apparatus he built is Marxist and globalist. The labels used to soften that identification, Social Democratic, technocratic, environmental, sustainable, planetary, are the same ideological move that has let the doctrine expand under cover for a century.

The technical fiction of the 1958 paper and the political architecture of the IPCC are not separable. The paper required an enforcement institution because it would not survive audit on its own. The institution required a scientific claim as justification for its authority. Each held the other up. Bolin was the single figure present at every structural step of both the paper and the institution, across forty years.

Building the IPCC Machine

The institutional arc from the 1958 paper to the IPCC traces almost entirely through Bolin personally.

In 1964, the International Council for Science (ICSU) formed its Committee on Atmospheric Sciences. Bolin was its first chairman. In 1967, ICSU launched the Global Atmospheric Research Programme (GARP). Bolin was its first chairman. In 1980, GARP was folded into the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP). Bolin's institutional network operated the scientific planning for every major international atmospheric research effort for sixteen years before the IPCC existed.

The 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, opened by Olof Palme, produced UNEP as a new supranational environmental authority. The first World Climate Conference followed in Geneva in 1979. The first Villach meeting met in 1980. These served to

build the institutional infrastructure and the professional expert community, called an "epistemic community" in the political science literature analyzing this process, that Bolin would later chair into the IPCC.

The 1985 Villach Conference, held from 9 to 15 October in the Austrian Alps under WMO, UNEP, and ICSU auspices, is the hinge event. Bolin chaired it. The conference statement declared, "It is now believed that in the first half of the next century a rise of global mean temperature could occur which is greater than any in man's history." The warning rested entirely on model projections built on the 1958 Bolin and Eriksson attribution framework. No independent audit of the carbon-cycle premises was performed. The statement was delivered to policymakers as a scientific consensus.

The Advisory Group on Greenhouse Gases formed immediately afterward with Bolin among its founding members. The AGGG is widely recognized by political analysts of this process as the direct forerunner of the IPCC. In 1987 the Brundtland Commission released *Our Common Future*, which Bolin contributed to, framing environmental and development questions as requiring supranational governance.

In November 1988, WMO and UNEP jointly established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Bolin was appointed its first chairman and served until 1997. Under his chairmanship the IPCC produced its First Assessment Report (1990), which led directly to the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change signed at the Rio Earth Summit, and its Second Assessment Report (1995), which led to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. Every treaty obligation, every national emissions target, every domestic climate policy and every subsequent assessment cycle enforcing them descends from the architecture Bolin assembled and the attribution he had authored thirty years earlier.

Bolin also co-founded the Stockholm Environment Institute in 1988 as a parallel scientific-policy organization. He served on the Governing Council of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. He served as scientific director of the European Space Research Organisation. The institutional network reached into every relevant corner of international environmental and scientific governance.

The machine was designed around a single feature: the original 1958 paper would never be reopened. Each IPCC assessment cycle cites the previous. Carbon-cycle modeling chapters cite the Bern IRF and its descendants. The Bern IRF cites Bolin and Eriksson 1959. No assessment has ever audited the Revelle factor extrapolation. No assessment has ever confronted the Bern IRF three-exponential functional form with the bomb-14C single-exponential relaxation record. The author lists, the review processes, the summary-for-policymakers structure, and the governmental endorsement ritual together insulate the founding paper from scrutiny. Bolin's institutional design works. It has worked for thirty-seven years.

The Falsification Record

The empirical record falsifies the Bolin framework at every observable timescale.

Pre-bomb atmospheric residence time

Craig (1957) [9], "The natural distribution of radiocarbon and the exchange time of carbon dioxide between atmosphere and sea" (*Tellus* 9, 1-17) established the atmospheric residence time

of CO2 at approximately five to ten years from the pre-bomb 14C distribution. This measurement was published one year before Bolin and Eriksson submitted their paper. A short atmospheric residence time is algebraically inconsistent with the long-tail retention structure the 1958 paper asserted. The reconciliation was never performed in the paper. Craig (1957) is cited but his residence time constraint is not addressed against the retention claim.

The bomb-14C relaxation

Atmospheric 14C peaked in 1963 from above-ground nuclear weapons testing and has been measured continuously since. The relaxation of the excess 14C provides a direct observational constraint on carbon turnover between atmosphere, ocean, and biosphere. From 1965 onward the atmospheric 14C decay curve has been in the published literature, available to every carbon-cycle modeler, continuously, for sixty years.

No carbon-cycle model proposed in that sixty-year period has ever come close to aligning with the bomb-14C data. Not the 1959 Bolin and Eriksson framework. Not Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann's 1987 oceanic carbon-cycle model. Not the Bern Impulse Response Function in any of its subsequent editions. Not any CMIP Earth System Model carbon-cycle module. Nothing. The divergence from the observed decay begins within the first year after the 1965 peak and grows monotonically. **By 2019, at 54 years post-peak, the AR2, AR3, AR4, and AR5/AR6 Bern functions predict 33%, 35%, 42%, and 48% of the pulse remaining airborne. The observed value is 4.3%.** The Bern functions are wrong by a factor of approximately **10x at 54 years**. At 100 years the divergence reaches a factor of approximately **90x**. At 200 years it reaches approximately **18,500x**. These numbers are established in **Cohler and Soon (2026) [7]**, which fits a single exponential with e-folding time $\tau_rel = 18.383 \pm 0.015$ yr at $R^2 = 99.998\%$ to the bias-corrected **Hua et al. (2022) [11]** global Δ14C compilation.

The Bern Impulse Response Function, which has been the standard IPCC carbon-cycle representation across every assessment cycle, assumes a three-exponential decay with a substantial permanent retention component. This functional form is algebraically incompatible with the observed single-exponential relaxation of the bomb-14C pulse. The incompatibility is not a parameter calibration issue. The functional forms do not match at any parameter choice.

The IPCC suppressed the comparison

No IPCC assessment report, across the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Assessment cycles, has ever published a plot showing the observed atmospheric bomb-14C relaxation curve on the same axes as the Bern Impulse Response Function retention curve or any other carbon-cycle model retention curve. **Joos et al. (2013) [13]**, which supplies the Bern IRF fit used from AR5 forward, presents eight figures of multi-model pulse decays. None shows the ensemble against atmospheric Δ14C observations. AR6 WG1 Chapter 5 contains 33 figures. None is a CO2 pulse impulse response. The single graph that would most directly expose the falsification of the Bolin framework has never appeared in any IPCC document in thirty-seven years.

The suppression is documented in the IPCC's own review record. During the **AR6 First Order Draft review**, **Stephen E. Schwartz** (review comment **25656**) **[12]** raised the omission, observing that an observation-based impulse response function *"would be very different from those presented by Joos et al. (2013)."* The authors' response was *"Noted. We are exploring such an addition."* **No such addition appeared in the published AR6 WG1 Chapter 5. A peer**

reviewer asked, on the record, for the one graph that would expose the framework. The authors acknowledged the request, on the record. The graph was not published. Three steps on the record. This is not a suspicion of suppression or an inference about intent. It is documentary proof of deliberate suppression, written in the IPCC's own files, by the IPCC's own hand. The reviewer asked. The authors said they would consider it. They did not do it. They never intended to.

This is not oversight. It is suppression. Bolin chaired the institution for its first ten years and designed its assessment architecture to work this way. The decision not to publish the one graph that would end the attribution framework is a decision his institution has protected across thirty-seven years, and that his successors have maintained through documented review requests. The graph is absent from every IPCC report deliberately. It is the operational signature of a lie being actively concealed.

The paleoclimate record

Every high-CO2 episode in the Phanerozoic was fully drawn down. The Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum carbon injection, estimated at thousands of gigatonnes over several thousand years, was absorbed. The Permian-Triassic excursion was absorbed. The Pleistocene glacial-interglacial cycles moved approximately one hundred parts per million of atmospheric CO2 across the air-sea interface on millennial timescales repeatedly, with no indication of a buffering ceiling. The Holocene record shows the same pattern at smaller amplitude.

No full-physics Earth System Model has ever been integrated for ten thousand years. David Archer's much-cited 2009 claim that ten percent of fossil-fuel CO2 would persist in the atmosphere for one hundred thousand years is not a model result. It is an input assumption written into the box model's parameterization and extracted as output. The paleoclimate record contradicts it at every observed episode.

The protective rhetorical lies

Faced with the falsification data, defenders of the Bolin framework have deployed a sequence of rhetorical lies in place of empirical responses.

First, the tracer-bulk split, introduced by Joos and Bruno (1996) and inherited by every downstream paper. The claim is that the bomb-14C relaxation reflects isotopic exchange across the air-sea interface without bulk carbon transport, so a fast tracer relaxation can coexist with slow bulk retention over centuries and millennia.

The premise is backwards from physical reality. The atmospheric CO2 turnover time, measured directly from gross fluxes, is $\tau_{res} \approx 3.8$ yr. The bomb-14C relaxation time, measured directly from the 1965-2019 atmospheric record, is $\tau_{rel} \approx 18.4$ yr. The 14C relaxation is approximately five times SLOWER than the molecular turnover, not faster. The Joos-Bruno "fast tracer" framing inverts the actual timescale ordering to protect the long-tail retention claim. The tracer relaxation the IPCC calls fast is slow compared to the molecular turnover it is being contrasted with.

No mathematical derivation of the tracer-bulk split has ever been published. No physical mechanism for differential ocean transport of 14CO2 versus 12CO2 at the order-of-magnitude level has ever been proposed. Carbon dioxide molecules do not distinguish themselves by

isotope at the air-sea interface for transport kinetics. Fractionation is small (a few per mil for 13C, kinetically negligible at the transport level). No paper in the entire Bern lineage contains an equation of the form "14CO2 transport velocity equals X, 12CO2 transport velocity equals Y, X ≠ Y because of physical mechanism M." The split is an asserted lie with no derivation behind it anywhere in sixty years of literature. Joos and Bruno wrote it down in 1996. The IPCC community has repeated it for thirty years. No physics backs it. No derivation was ever given. No derivation exists.

Second, the airborne fraction framing. The IPCC and the Global Carbon Budget report "airborne fraction" at approximately 44%, computed as the ratio of annual atmospheric CO2 growth to annual anthropogenic emissions (ABF_C). This is a single-year rate ratio that says nothing about what fraction of emitted carbon remains in the air, and that contradictorily counts land-use change as part of "emissions." It is unstable, ranging from 17.9% to 77.4% over 1966-2019, a factor of 4.3x variation with coefficient of variation 28.7%. Its apparent stability requires smoothing windows of 15 to 30 years, far longer than the physical residence time of the system. Under proper mass-balance reservoir routing with $\tau_{res} \approx 3.8$ yr, the actual long-run airborne fraction (ABF_L, defined as cumulative anthropogenic mass still airborne divided by cumulative anthropogenic mass ever emitted) is approximately 6%, an order of magnitude smaller than the 44% figure the IPCC reports. The two quantities are not interchangeable. The IPCC glossary defines one and reports the value of the other without noting the substitution. That is a lie of definition, on the record, in the IPCC's own documents.

Third, the mass-balance identity argument. Some defenders assert that because anthropogenic emissions exceed observed atmospheric growth, the non-fossil-fuel reservoirs must be a net sink, therefore fossil emissions must cause the rise. The argument has two independent failures.

The premise requires the inequality $F_{anth} > dM_a/dt$ to hold in every year for the inference to go through. This is an empirical condition, not a derivable physical law. In any single year where atmospheric growth exceeds anthropogenic emissions, the non-fossil-fuel reservoirs must be a net source in that year, which directly refutes the "always a net sink" claim the argument needs. One year of exception trivially falsifies the premise. The modern record shows interannual variability in atmospheric growth by factors of three to four across ENSO cycles, and the anthropogenic emissions estimate itself carries large uncertainty in the land-use change term. The claim that the inequality holds strictly in every year, across the entire pre-industrial through modern record, has never been rigorously demonstrated. It has been asserted, not shown.

Even if the inequality held in every year without exception, the argument is an accounting identity. Accounting identities follow from mass conservation alone and carry zero evidential weight for causal claims. Cohler and Soon (2026c) prove this formally. That non-fossil-fuel reservoirs are, on average, absorbing some fraction of fossil input does not establish that fossil combustion drives atmospheric growth. A rising non-fossil-fuel source with a slightly larger rising non-fossil-fuel sink satisfies the same inequality while leaving fossil-fuel attribution refuted.

Fourth, the Suess effect appeal. The observed decline in bulk atmospheric δ13C is cited as independent evidence of fossil fuel dilution of the atmospheric carbon pool. This is false. The declining bulk atmospheric δ13C is consistent with dilution by any source whose isotopic signature is lighter than the atmospheric average, including the ocean's own non-fossil-fuel

outgassing and the biosphere. It is not evidence of fossil causation. Citing it as such is moron-level reasoning that collapses the moment the correct isotopic quantity is examined.

The correct isotopic quantity is δ13C_I, the mass-balance signature of the NET carbon input to the atmosphere, extracted as the Keeling-plot intercept. δ13C_I has been stationary at approximately −13‰ across a 500-year record spanning three independent measurement techniques: the modern instrumental Keeling period from Francey and successors, the sclerosponge proxy record, and the Law Dome ice-core reconstruction via Köhler. Three independent methods converge on the same value over five centuries. The net atmospheric input signature has not shifted during the industrial era.

If fossil fuel combustion (δ13C_F ≈ −28‰) were the dominant driver of atmospheric CO2 growth, the mass partition equation $\delta13C_I = f \cdot \delta13C_F + (1-f) \cdot \delta13C_N$ would force δ13C_I to shift substantially toward more negative values as the fossil fraction f grew over the past 150 years. It has not shifted. **The Cohler-Soon analysis (Cohler and Soon (2026) [8]) bounds the fossil fraction of net atmospheric CO2 addition at a maximum of 1.3%, essentially zero.**

The quantity the IPCC calls "the Suess effect" is a different quantity from δ13C_I. The two are routinely conflated in the carbon-cycle literature to produce apparent fossil-fuel attribution from data that, read correctly, refutes it.

Each of these rhetorical lies protects the framework from a specific falsification and introduces its own unsupported premise. None answers the structural problem that the Bern functional form is unmeasured and underived at its foundation, and that the Revelle fabrication is not merely unmeasured but structurally unmeasurable, a direct violation of PTT. One cannot measure what does not exist. The defenders of the framework know this. They tell the rhetorical lies anyway because telling them is the only option left once the data is in.

Documentary Evidence

The campaign is documented in Bolin's own words across his career, from the attribution assertion itself in 1958 and 1959 forward to the end of his life.

The 1959 National Academy of Sciences presentation

On 28 April 1959, speaking at the National Academy of Sciences meeting in Washington, D.C., Bolin presented the Bolin and Eriksson projection in its most quotable form. The *New York Times* reported his statement: "Members of the academy were told that within 40 years the amount of carbon dioxide in the air may have increased from 25% to 30% above the level at the time when man began using fuels. The effect on climate allegedly might be radical. The matter was discussed by Dr. Bert Bolin of the University of Stockholm."

***Science News* (1959) [16]**, in its 9 May 1959 issue, reported Bolin's claim in more detail: "Dr. Bert Bolin of the University of Stockholm in Sweden told the National Academy of Sciences meeting in Washington that the burning of coal, oil and gas was adding carbon dioxide to the air at about one-half a percent each year.… The increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere during the last 100 years, he said, is much more likely to be about eight percent than the usually quoted two percent. Carbon dioxide is believed the cause for earth's suspected warming trend of two to three degrees Fahrenheit in the last 50 years."

The claim in the record, delivered within months of the 1958 paper's submission, is that the fossil-fuel contribution had been systematically underreported and that the 150-year total to 2000 would reach 25 percent of the pre-industrial baseline. The attribution was presented as settled science. It rested on the **Revelle fabrication**.

The numbers in the 1959 claims are garbage

Every quantitative claim attributed to Bolin in the 1959 Science News piece is wrong on its face or wildly overstated. Taking them in order:

"Burning of coal, oil and gas was adding carbon dioxide to the air at about one-half a percent each year." Atmospheric CO2 in 1959 stood at approximately 315 ppm. The observed annual growth at Mauna Loa in 1959 was approximately 0.7 ppm per year, which is 0.22% of the atmospheric CO2 inventory per year, not 0.5%. Bolin's figure overstated the actual net accumulation rate by roughly a factor of two. If he meant 0.5% of the atmosphere (not of CO2), that would be 5000 ppm per year, absurd by a factor of several thousand. Either reading of the number is garbage.

"The increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere during the last 100 years is much more likely to be about eight percent than the usually quoted two percent." The "two percent usually quoted" figure has no identifiable source in the pre-1959 literature. Bolin invented a straw man to argue against. The actual rise from the pre-industrial baseline of approximately 280 ppm to the 1959 value of 315 ppm is roughly 12.5%, higher than Bolin's 8% guess. Bolin was wrong in the other direction on this one, understating the rise while claiming the opposite.

"Carbon dioxide is believed the cause for earth's suspected warming trend of two to three degrees Fahrenheit in the last 50 years." Two to three degrees Fahrenheit equals roughly 1.1 to 1.7 degrees Celsius. The standard surface-record series, themselves physically meaningless quantities per PTT, showed warming of approximately 0.5 to 0.9 degrees Fahrenheit over 1910-1960. Bolin's figure overstated the apparent warming by a factor of three to six, using a quantity that does not correspond to any physical observable.

"Carbon dioxide is believed the cause." No derivation accompanied this claim. CO2 is a trace constituent of the atmosphere at approximately 0.04% by volume. Water vapor, the dominant greenhouse gas, is one to four percent by volume with substantially broader infrared absorption bands. The assertion that the 0.04% trace gas controls the planet's radiative balance against the 1-4% dominant gas requires a physical derivation. None was given in 1959. None has been given since. The claim was asserted as a belief in a popular science magazine. Bolin presented the belief as scientific consensus. It was neither.

The 1959 Science News piece is a sequence of overstated, invented, and physically unmotivated numbers presented to a general audience as scientific findings. Every quantitative claim either overstates its referent by a factor of two to six, cites a strawman "usually quoted" baseline with no source, or asserts physical causation without derivation. Bolin did not correct the piece. Bolin was the piece's source. Bolin spent the next forty-eight years building the institutional architecture that would enforce this same quality of claim as global scientific consensus.

The 1985 Villach Conference statement

Bolin chaired the International Conference on the Assessment of the Role of Carbon Dioxide and of Other Greenhouse Gases in Climate Variations and Associated Impacts, held in Villach, Austria from 9 to 15 October 1985 under WMO, UNEP, and ICSU auspices. The conference statement declared the following as consensus finding: "It is now believed that in the first half of the next century a rise of global mean temperature could occur which is greater than any in man's history," and that "the probability that these potentially serious impacts may be realized is sufficiently great" to justify immediate policy action.

In **Bolin (2007) [2]**, *A History of the Science and Politics of Climate Change: The Role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, he recounted his assessment of Villach's significance on the train ride home: "An analysis that was wider in scope, greater in depth and more international was most desirable." The sentence is Bolin describing his own conclusion that an institutional expansion was required. The IPCC followed three years later.

The 1988 WMO press conference

At a WMO press conference in Stockholm in June 1988, Bolin delivered the declaration that the IPCC architecture would enforce for the next three decades. The *Christian Science Monitor* reported his statement on 21 June 1988: "climatic problems will be part of people's lives over the next century," and "We are entering a new phase... we told the world what scientists believe will be the case.... Now nations and politicians must start to think about the problems."

The Toronto Conference statement issued at the end of June 1988, downstream of the Villach findings Bolin had chaired, declared: "Humanity is conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences could be second only to global nuclear war." The nuclear-war analogy entered the policy discourse as consensus finding. Its technical foundation was still the 1958 paper.

The 2000 Royal Swedish Academy lecture

On 16 March 2000 at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Bolin delivered a lecture titled "How Will the Risks for Climate Changes Limit the Use of Fossil Fuels?" (**Bolin (2000) [1]**) In it he presented the carbon budget as settled measurement science. Three of the four numbers in the table below are fabrications. They are advertised with ± error bars to appear as observational quantities. They are not observations. They are bookkeeping output of the 1958 Revelle fabrication, presented as data:

Flux (Gt C/yr)	Value
Emissions from fossil fuel combustion and cement production	5.9 ± 0.4
Storage in the atmosphere	3.3 ± 0.2
Uptake by the oceans	2.2 ± 0.8
Net terrestrial uptake from the atmosphere	0.4 ± 0.9

The atmospheric storage figure of 3.3 is the only real measurement in the table: direct in-situ CO2 concentration at Mauna Loa and the complementary station network. The ocean uptake figure of 2.2 ± 0.8 is a model output under the global Revelle fabrication, not a measurement.

Nobody has ever directly measured a global ocean-atmosphere net CO2 flux. The net terrestrial uptake figure of 0.4 ± 0.9 is pure subtraction arithmetic: emissions minus atmospheric storage minus the fabricated ocean figure, with the error bar carrying all the compounding uncertainty of the inputs. The fossil-fuel-and-cement emissions figure of 5.9 ± 0.4 is partially measured from energy statistics and partially estimated, with the land-use change component carrying large separate uncertainty.

Three of the four figures are fabrications. The table presents them as if they were the output of an observational program. They are not. This was Bolin in 2000, forty-two years after writing the 1958 paper, presenting its bookkeeping output to the Royal Swedish Academy as the state of carbon-cycle science. The lying-dog presentation is characteristic of the entire framework: the numbers look like measurements, they are advertised as measurements, and they are not measurements.

The 2007 testament

In his final book, published in November 2007 one month before his death, Bolin wrote the authoritative history of the IPCC in his own voice. The book makes clear his role as architect of the institution and his unwavering commitment to the attribution framework through every criticism it faced. He acknowledged in it: "It is a danger every time the IPCC meets that the politics will dominate." The acknowledgment is consistent with a man who understood that the institution's authority depended on its appearance of scientific neutrality while serving a political function. The sentence was repeated in his obituaries as a sign of integrity. Read against the structure he had built for forty years, it reads as something else: an acknowledgment that the machine he assembled was political from the start and that the science was its cover.

The strategy named

A 2023 scholarly analysis of Bolin's advisory role, published in a Cambridge University Press collection, concluded that Bolin "had the capacity to be perceived as remaining distanced from controversies" and that "Bolin adopted several protection strategies to enhance the IPCC's authority, credibility and countercriticism." That is the operation described plainly. The institution he built was designed, in his own documented practice, to project scientific neutrality while enforcing a political consensus. The attribution the institution enforced was a lie. The strategies he deployed protected the lie from audit. The documentary record is explicit on both counts.

Legacy

The 1958 Bolin and Eriksson paper is the foundation stone of the modern climate attribution framework. Every downstream carbon-cycle model inherits its Revelle-factor fabrication. Every long-tail CO2 persistence claim rests on its functional form. Each IPCC assessment report rests on the models that rest on the paper. Every major international climate treaty, the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the 2015 Paris Agreement, rests on the IPCC assessments. Every national net-zero commitment, every carbon budget calculation, every social cost of carbon figure, every climate liability lawsuit, every disinvestment campaign, every Environmental, Social, and Governance screening rule, and every trillion-dollar energy transition program is downstream of the IPCC's assessments and therefore of the 1958 paper.

The paper has never been audited by any IPCC assessment cycle. The global Revelle factor cannot be subjected to empirical test. There is no quantity there to test. PTT proves formally that no scalar aggregation of an intensive variable across a non-equilibrium system with non-constant intensive field can serve as a value of that intensive variable for the system. The global Revelle factor is not an empirical claim that happens to be unverified. It is a structurally impossible construct. One cannot measure what does not exist. The Bern Impulse Response Function has been used in every assessment as the standard representation of the carbon cycle without any reconciliation with the bomb-14C relaxation data available in the published literature since the 1960s. The institutional architecture Bolin designed insulated the founding paper from scrutiny. It has worked for sixty-seven years.

Bolin died on 30 December 2007, two months after his book was published and six months after the IPCC he had built received the Nobel Peace Prize jointly with Albert Gore. His obituaries were uniformly reverential. The scientific community he shaped treated him as a founding father. The institution he chaired went on to assess, and continues to assess, the attribution he had authored, under the models he had sponsored, as settled science.

The entire basis for the claim that human fossil-fuel combustion is the cause of rising atmospheric CO2 is a lie. Not a flawed theory. Not an incomplete model. Not a hypothesis awaiting better data. **A lie.** Bolin knew it was a lie when he wrote the 1958 paper. He defended the lie for five decades. He built the IPCC specifically to institutionalize the lie as global policy-forcing consensus and to protect it from the audit that would expose it. The Swedish socialist culture he was formed within was Marxist by definition, since socialism is the transitional stage Marx himself identified as the path from capitalism to communism. Its operational character is supranational authority through credentialed cadres, exactly the template Marx identified with the words "Workers of the world, unite." Bolin built that template at the global scale under the softer labels of climate science and environmental governance. **He was a Marxist and a globalist. The institution he built is Marxist and globalist. The attribution it enforces is a lie.**

What the falsification of the fossil-fuel attribution means for the institutional edifice is simple. The authority of the IPCC and every policy architecture downstream of it rests on a specific, auditable technical claim: that fossil fuel combustion causes rising atmospheric CO2 through an ocean uptake constraint that has never been measured and whose functional form is incompatible with the observations available since the 1960s. When that claim is audited publicly and the falsification record is admitted, the authority dissolves. The institution has no backup foundation. It rests on the 1958 paper. The 1958 paper rests on nothing.

That is the inheritance. That is why it will be defended. That is why it has not been audited from the inside in sixty-seven years. The audit will come from outside the institution or it will not come. Bolin built the machine to prevent it. Measuring the machine against the physical record is the task that remains.

Sources

1. Bolin, B. 2000. How Will the Risks for Climate Changes Limit the Use of Fossil Fuels? Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences lecture, 16 March 2000.
2. Bolin, B. 2007. *A History of the Science and Politics of Climate Change: The Role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.

3. Bolin, B. and Eriksson, E. 1959. Changes in the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere and sea due to fossil fuel combustion. In *The Atmosphere and the Sea in Motion: Scientific Contributions to the Rossby Memorial Volume*, ed. B. Bolin, pp. 130-142. Rockefeller Institute Press.
4. *Christian Science Monitor*. 21 June 1988. Man-made climate changes: alarms need worldwide response.
5. Cohler, J. 2025. The Father of Lies Hijacking Climate Science: Global Mean Surface Temperature Does Not Exist. *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* vol. 30.
6. Cohler, J. 2026. The Physical Tether Theorem: A Rigorous Formal Synthesis of Representational Measurement Theory, Operationalism, and Classical Thermodynamics. Under review.
7. Cohler, J. and Soon, W. 2026. Fifty-Four Years of Atmospheric Bomb-Radiocarbon Decay Falsify the Central Assumptions of the IPCC Carbon-Cycle Framework. Under review. papers.jcohler.com/bomb14c.
8. Cohler, J. and Soon, W. 2026. Mathematical Falsification of the Fossil-Dominant Hypothesis for Rising Atmospheric CO2 Using the Keeling Relation. *Science of Climate Change, 6*(4), p. 81–99. papers.jcohler.com/keeling.
9. Craig, H. 1957. The natural distribution of radiocarbon and the exchange time of carbon dioxide between atmosphere and sea. *Tellus* 9, 1-17.
10. Essex, C., McKitrick, R., and Andresen, B. 2007. Does a Global Temperature Exist? *Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* 32(1), 1-27.
11. Hua, Q. et al. 2022. Atmospheric radiocarbon for the period 1950–2019. *Radiocarbon*, 64(4), 723–745.
12. IPCC AR6 WG1 First Order Draft review comment 25656 (Stephen E. Schwartz) and author response.
13. Joos, F. et al. 2013. Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 13, 2793-2825.
14. Revelle, R. and Suess, H.E. 1957. Carbon dioxide exchange between atmosphere and ocean and the question of an increase of atmospheric CO2 during the past decades. *Tellus* 9, 18-27.
15. Rodhe, H. 2013. Bert Bolin (1925-2007) - a world leading climate scientist and science organiser. *Tellus B* 65, 20583.
16. *Science News*. Science Past from the issue of May 9, 1959.
17. Somerville, R.C.J. 2009. Bert Bolin and his 1959 forecast of atmospheric carbon dioxide and climate change. 89th AMS Annual Meeting.
18. *The Independent*. 5 January 2008. Bert Bolin: Meteorologist and first chair of the IPCC.
19. *The Guardian.* 9 January 2008. Bert Bolin: Swedish meteorologist who persuaded the world to take climate change seriously.
20. WMO. 1988. The Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, Toronto Conference Statement.