

**THE 2008 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON CLIMATE CHANGE
REMARKS OF JOHN COLEMAN**

As presented on March 2, 2008

At the Marriot Marquee in New York City

It is the greatest scam in history. I am amazed, appalled and highly offended by it. Global Warming; it is a SCAM.

With those words, posted on the weather page of the website of the San Diego Television station where I am chief meteorologist, I came out of the closet and into the spotlight in the movement to debunk the wildly out of control, hysterical frenzy about the supposed imminent climatic catastrophe of Global Warming. And, how does it feel to be in the ring dueling it out with the global warming doomsayers? In the words of James Brown, "WOW. I feel Good."

I feel Good because I know I am on the right side in this debate. I acknowledge the sides are very unbalanced. On the other side are the United Nations, the leaders of the many of the nations of the world, most politicians here in the United States including all the current candidates for President, the Governor of my home state of California and many other governors, virtually all of Hollywood's do-gooder stars, just about all of the national media, seemingly every environmentalist on the planet, a half dozen prestigious scientific organizations, many well known scientists, most teachers and up to 80 percent of the people. They all stand alongside of the Nobel Peace Prize and the Academy Award winner; the former Vice President of the United States, Al Gore.

So here I am now a part of an outcast, much assailed, way outnumbered group of global warming deniers. At least that is what we are called by the other side. Deniers, a demeaning and ugly term. I can handle their abuse. I don't like it; but I can handle it. But here is what I decided is not acceptable: Being silent when I know I am right. And I have pledged to make every effort to explain this scam and reveal the truth about climate change to all who will hear me. To cave-in and give lip service to the other side, the side that is wrong, dead wrong, is not an option. And no matter how it all come out, "Wow, I feel Good."

My father was raised on a farm. Even after he became a college professor he still liked to go on the farmer's evening walk to look at the weather and predict what tomorrow would be like. As a young boy I loved to go with him. This was way back in the late 1930's when weather data was scarce and weather forecasts were rudimentary. But in those boyhood days with Dad, I developed a sense of connection with the atmosphere. My future life as a meteorologist was being molded.

As a freshman in college I worked in a start-up, pioneering TV station. This was in 1953. One day the boss asked "Who knows about the weather?" My hand shot up and from that moment on I was a television weathercaster. When I went to class the next day, the Professor began, "I watched you report the weather on TV last night. What are

you doing here in Introduction to Meteorology?" I answered, "Trying to find out what I am talking about." Everybody laughed, but it was true. Thus began the education I needed to really forecast the weather.

All through college and for the 51 years that have followed, I have predicted the weather every day. I have walked in the weather and felt connected to my environment. Here I am, in 2008, still doing it. I walk in the weather. I predict the weather every day. I feel one with my environment. And, I feel Good.

Somewhere along the way, perhaps a decade ago, I began to read about global warming. I didn't take it seriously; after all, I had been through the coming Ice Age frenzy in the mid 70's. None the less, I read and listened. I had my doubts but tried to keep an open mind.

I am not a research meteorologist like many in this room with advanced degrees. I am your student. But, I am a serious student and totally immersed in my field of expertise.

As I studied, I couldn't believe what was happening around me. There was an unprecedented explosion of global warming hype. All the media was filled with the bad news that the sky is falling. We have been warned of the dire consequences our civilization faces. The coasts will be flooded by melting ice caps. The crops will fail. Millions will die. Species will be wiped out as their habitats vanish. Panic sweeps the media. There are new alarms sounded every day. It has gone on for more than two years.

I tried to stay calm. My studies had convinced me, beyond a shadow of doubt, this well orchestrated media frenzy is wrong; dead wrong. There is no unprecedented, unequivocal, uncontrollable man made global warming now and no evidence that it is to come. The entire frenzy is just as ridiculous as it can be.

People I meet ask me about Global Warming. I tell them to relax it isn't for real. And, some of them get very hostile with me. People with no scientific knowledge and no reason I can see to take a position, have accepted global warming as their mantra; their religion; their passion; their cause.

It has finally risen to the point, where, like Howard Beal in the movie "Network", I can't take it anymore. When Mr. Gore was given a Nobel Peace Prize and an Oscar, when CNN declared Earth a "Planet in Peril", when NBC went green to save the Earth from Global Warming and turned out the studio lights on a football pregame show: That was it. I essentially opened the window and shouted at the top of my lungs, "I am madder than hell and I am not going to take it anymore". That is when I wrote and published my global warming rant.

It is the greatest scam in history. I am amazed, appalled and highly offended by it. Global Warming; it is a SCAM.

That was mid November. Since I posted that first piece, I have written and posted 8 more briefs explaining the scientific basis for my stand on global warming.

I have intensified my studies. I have entered the debate where ever I have been invited. And I stand firm. Man made Global Warming is not a problem. There is no climate change crisis.

I am holding a document. At this point, I believe this is last remaining cornerstone document of the global warming advocate's case. This 113 page scientific paper is titled: Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. It is the much debated chapter nine of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I wonder how many people who are disciples of Global Warming have actually read it. I wonder how many understand it. This paper portends to explain how carbon dioxide, CO₂, drives a radiative forcing multiplier that turns this minor trace compound in the atmosphere into THE force behind uncontrollable global warming.

When the global warming hype was beginning, it was that hockey stick chart of average temperatures over the millenniums, the chart featured in Al Gore's book and movie that grabbed everybody's attention. That chart was reproduced everywhere. It was the centerpiece of Global Warming.

Thank goodness for Stephen McIntyre and Ross McKittrick. They lead the charge to expose this chart for what it is; a scientific fraud. Their papers were widely published and prompted others to conduct studies, as well. After a few years of debate, the hockey stick chart is dead and buried. Rest in peace.

But there was more bad science to keep the battle going. With great fanfare NASA began releasing papers that claimed to be detecting global warming in the average annual temperatures of Earth. Each year was said to be warmer than the last or among the warmest ten ever. However, it was not long before Madhay Khandekar and Joseph D'Aleo, Roger Pielke Sr., Ross McKittrick and Pat Michaels, Anthony Watts, Ben Herman and many others demonstrated the inaccuracy and data manipulations behind these NASA pronouncements. At one point, NASA admitted its errors and issued corrected figures that shifted the warmest decade from the 1990's back to the 1930's. What has become clear is that any warming that took place in the last 20 years of the 20th century was small, less than a degree, and was not totally, if at all, the result of mankind's activities.

Urban heat islands, problems with the sites where weather instruments are located, changes in the instruments themselves and even the paint on the instrument shelters all play a part in distorting temperature data. Determining which stations to include in averaging, the statistical methods used in processing the data, melding of sea surface satellite data with land based temperature measurements, considerations of measurements at different levels in the atmosphere are some of the complications in producing global temperature averages. They leave lots of room for error and for games to be played. The bottom line is, whatever warming may have occurred is not

great, not increasing year to year and not necessarily or entirely man made. After much debate and study, average global temperature increases, another cornerstone of the Global Warming frenzy, fell into discredit.

The global warming advocates fail to consider natural climate changes versus man made climate influences. We all know Earth has always gone through constant natural climate changes. There is no reason to assume that these natural shifts are not continuing and will continue to occur in the future. For instance, it is well documented that Earth has been in a long gradual warming trend following the last ice age. Solar cycles and shifting ocean current variations overlay that long term warm-up producing fluctuations from year to year and decade to decade. None of this is devastating, but it is important to consider when we produce climate predictions. I see no convincing evidence that natural climate changes have been overwhelmed because of the activities of mankind.

So that brings me back to this paper, Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. Since all of the other gambits of the Global Warming advocates have not withstood the scrutiny of peer review, how about this one. It all boils down to carbon dioxide. The Global Warming advocates claim the buildup of Carbon Dioxide in the atmosphere resulting from the burning of fossil fuels is leading directly to an uncontrollable warm-up in global temperatures which will accelerate over time and produce disastrous climatological consequences. If their hypothesis is wrong, then the entire Global Warming frenzy is without basis. This is indeed their last remaining cornerstone; their bottom line. All the other stuff we hear about ice caps melting, polar bears, hurricanes, droughts and heat waves is just antidotal noise. Most of it is wrong and none of it really counts. The only thing that matters now is the issue of CO₂ forcing.

I am confident that CO₂ forcing is not valid. I tell you without equivocation, after reading lots of research Papers, I conclude the CO₂ forcing hypothesis has failed the test of peer review.

The increases in Carbon Dioxide in the atmosphere were first measured and published by Roger Revelle, who is known as the Grandfather of Global Warming. He was a man of great accomplishment and stature; a true senior scientist. He was the founder of the Scripps Oceanographic Institution and later a Professor at Harvard where one of his students was Al Gore. Gore says his experience in Revelle's class became the foundation of his eventual Global Warming campaign. But, interesting enough, in later years Revelle himself cautioned against the assumption that CO₂ was the engine of climate change.

CO₂, the natural compound that we humans breathe out, that plants use in photosynthesis, that oceans absorb and release, is also in the exhaust of the burning of fossil fuels. It seems clear that much of the frenzy over Global Warming comes from environmentalists who want to end the burning of fossil fuels. They try to frame Carbon Dioxide as a pollutant that must be eliminated. Their case does not hold up. It is not a pollutant. And eliminating fossil fuels would not eliminate it, only reduce it.

Many well intentioned scientists have done studies that they say link the buildup of Carbon Dioxide in the atmosphere with warming of temperatures. Their historical evidence has been proven wrong. Increased CO₂ in the atmosphere follows warming, perhaps as a result of the warming, but clearly does not proceed warming. It is not the cause of warming. Studies of long term temperatures and CO₂ prove that.

But still the Global Warming advocates rest their case on their contention that CO₂ has a special influence on water vapor, the primary greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. They say it multiplies the greenhouse effect of the water vapor. This is called CO₂ forcing. Without this forcing effect, CO₂ couldn't have a significant impact on greenhouse warming because it is a mere trace compound in the atmosphere, around 38 molecules of CO₂ out of every 100,000 thousand molecules of atmosphere, a tiny fraction of the air around us.

That brings me back to this paper, Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. This paper, done for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been peer reviewed within the IPCC, accepted and made a part of the underlying documents of the Global Warming predictions of the IPCC. And very importantly, the CO₂ forcing formula from this paper is what has gone into those IPCC accepted climate computer models that predict climatic Armageddon. So this is it, the final and key cornerstone document. If it is correct, the Global Warming frenzy is valid. If it is not correct, the entire case is baseless. And this is a very substantial study building on a referencing dozens of prior studies. A large group of significant scientists have worked on aspects of and contributed to this final product. It is very substantial. Those scientists and their work and this paper cannot be lightly dismissed.

Many of the scientists who are here today have commented on this paper. Some have done studies that counter its findings; essentially they prove it wrong. I find the most convincing work on this to date is this paper, Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide, by Arthur B. Robinson, Noah E. Robinson and Willie Soon. To me they are absolutely convincing. But, I believe the debate on this issue may continue for some time.

When I discuss Global Warming debate with those around me, I often hear the plea, "John, if the United Nations and its panel of 2,500 scientists have concluded that global warming is a major threat to our planet, you should listen to what they say. They are the experts. The UN must be the final judge in this matter. You are a heretic." This is I believe the hardest hurdle to jump. Debating the science is logical and straight forward. People's view of the world structure is emotional and difficult to overcome. But let me try, please.

The United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was established in 1988. Engineer Alan Cheetham has done an exhaustive study of how this came about. It is an amazing political story with an undercurrent of effort to position third world nations to gain restitution from the highly developed nations for the pollution from their

industrial activity. The history also documents how the politicians clamored to create another bureau for the dream of a one world government and to entrench themselves in power.

Once the UN IPCC was established, it had to create documentation of manmade climate change to prove its own worthiness to exist and to gain funding for its activities. Money flowed to scientist to produce to the needed research. Meetings were held to validate their work, publications were made, publicity was generated and the bureaucracy not only prevailed but grew in importance and budget and the cycle has continued to compound.

What if the UN IPCC had produced studies that denied that man made climate change was a problem and that there was no cause for alarm. The IPCC would have been disbanded. No bureaucrat is going to let that happen. The bias to produce the desired results overwhelms reality.

At this point, much is made of the IPCC panel of 2,500 scientists being in consensus on Global Warming. But get this. We now know how few scientists actually reviewed that key chapter of the IPCC report, the one that concludes that it very highly likely that greenhouse gas forcing has been the dominant cause of the global warming over the past 50 years. Dr. John McLean has issued a detailed report on IPCC reviewers. He reveals that there were as few as 23 independent reviewers of that chapter and that only 4 explicitly endorsed the hypothesis. That's a long way from 2,500 and a long way from consensus.

The lack of consensus is also well documented by Dr. Vincent Gray who was a expert reviewer and member of the IPCC since the early 1990s. He has detailed just how contrived the IPCC process has been and how it hardly actually reflects a majority consensus of scientists at all. Dr. Gray asked hard questions. They were ignored. I conclude that the final report of the IPCC panel is a political not a scientific document.

Now, I turn to our media. Within the media, whatever the UN says is generally accepted as fact. The UN says there is a man made global warming crisis and its panel of 2,500 scientists is in consensus, that good enough. And if a former Vice President is the spokesman for the cause, well that's all the evidence the media needs to beat the drums for global warming. So now Global Warming is the American media's cause celeb.

I am not the only television weathercaster who is skeptical of global warming. I know of two dozen others who have made public statements. And two dozen others have privately contacted me but cannot make public statements because of their employment situations. In any case, we are not nearly influential enough to turn the media.

Marc Morano working for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has released an impressive list of more than 450 scientists who took a stand against the global warming frenzy in 2007. And there are the thousands of scientists who signed a

petition against the Kyoto Protocol. That is impressive. But, in the media world none of this seems to count. What we need to move the media is a network anchor or a Hollywood super star to join the side of the skeptics.

Let me put a few things into perspective. The media won't, so allow me to try. Through government we create an orderly civilization, or at least a reasonable facsimile of same. The media seems hung up on government. But the real advancements of the civilization are the product of science, not government. Science created the healthcare that cured me of cancer and has saved my life twice, so far, and provides the medications to keep me alive so I can be here today. Science created the power and machines and systems that made air and auto travel possible, that warm and cool our spaces. Science created our means of communication: our phones, our television and radio, our internet and most of all science created computers that extend our human capabilities by the power of millions. Science, not government, is the driving force of civilization. That is why I am so excited to be here at a meeting of scientists. I honor you and all your brethren around the world. You are the prime force of civilization. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Debate among scientists is the healthiest condition possible in our society. From disagreement is born study, serious considerations and re-considerations. To declare the debate about Global Warming to be over is anti-science, regressive and, in a word, dumb. Let the debate flourish.

In conclusion, here are things we should not expect: The UN will never withdraw its report. Al Gore will never admit he is wrong. The scientists who have developed the case for CO₂ forcing and global warming will not admit they erred. Environmental extremists will never relent.

Things we can work for: The media might be persuaded to give some coverage to our side of the debate. A significant percentage of the public may become climate change skeptics. As a result some politicians may come to our side of the argument. These are things we need to work toward.

Here is one question from me; a question, not a charge. If CO₂ is not the culprit in global warming, is the selling of carbon credits a financial fraud?

And, to paraphrase David Letterman, the number one thing to expect is: In 20 years we will have the last laugh. When the climate has not changed, the ice caps have not melted, polar bears are flourishing, the oceans have not flooded the shores, when climate change has not destroyed our lives, Ah, we will have the last laugh.

The frenzy will fade away and there will be global warming jokes and Al Gore's prizes will be tarnished.

Yes, we will have the last laugh.

It is the greatest scam in history. I am amazed, appalled and highly offended by it.
Global Warming...it is a SCAM.

And because we are standing up to the horde of Global Warming alarmists and doing our best to set the record straight, to calm the frenzy and provide proof that the sky is not falling; yes, because of the work of all of you here today,

Wow, I feel good.

Links referenced in John Coleman's remarks

KUSI Television, San Diego, John Coleman's comments on Global Warming

<http://images.bimedia.net/documents/Comments+on+Global+Warming1.pdf>

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

<http://www.ipcc.ch/>

The Al Gore movie, "An Inconvenient Truth"

<http://www.climatecrisis.net/>

The late James Brown

<http://www.funky-stuff.com/jamesbrown/>

An online article about the word "deniers" used to describe Global Warming skeptics

<http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?/site/article/1782/>

My father, Ernest Claude Coleman, PhD

<http://www.thecolemannet.com/index.htm>

United Nations IPCC Chapter 9, the key chapter on CO2 Forcing

<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-chapter9.pdf>

Natural Resources Defense Council Global Warming report

<http://www.nrdc.org/globalWarming/fcons.asp>

Michael Mann and the Hockey Stick Chart

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Mann_\(scientist\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Mann_(scientist))

Stephen McIntyre and Ross McKittrick's Paper refuting the Hockey Stick Chart

<http://www.climateaudit.org/pdf/mcintyre.grl.2005.pdf>

Stephen McIntyre's website

<http://www.climateaudit.org>

Ross McKittrick's website

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/~rmckitri/ross.html>

NASA web pages on average annual temperatures

http://www.nasa.gov/vision/earth/lookingatearth/earth_warm.html

Dr. Mayhay Khandekar and Joseph D'Aleo's post on the problems with the NASA average temperature calculations

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/PITFALLS.pdf>

Dr. Roger Pielke Sr.'s post on problems with calculation average global temperatures:

<http://climatesci.org/2008/02/08/an-error-in-the-construction-of-a-single-global-average-surface-temperature/>

Ross McKittrick and Pat Michaels paper detailing how observation points change over time influences global average temperatures

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/MM.JGRDec07.pdf>

Anthony Watts discovers serious site problems with many official weather observation stations in the United States and conducts a national effort to survey every location

<http://surfacestations.org/>

Dr. Ben Herman investigates questionable exaggerations in maximum temperatures at locations where certain types of new temperature sensors have been installed.

<http://climatesci.org/2008/01/21/guest-weblog-by-professor-ben-herman-of-the-university-of-arizona-maximum-temperature-trends/>

The controversy about the influence of urban heat islands on global temperatures is covered in the Wikipedia article at

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urban_heat_island

Long term climate changes on Earth, resulting from natural causes, primarily variations in the radiation received from the Sun are detailed by D. Bruce Merrifield

http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/07/global_warming_and_solar_radia_1.html

I write about the solar influence on climate variations on Earth in my brief The Force behind Climate Change

<http://images.bimedia.net/documents/Comments+on+Global+Warming.pdf>

Roger Revelle, the Grandfather of Global Warming and the man who inspired Al Gore, cautioned against alarmism from the carbon dioxide build-up

<http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=58e0c50c-1631-46ca-8719-778c0973526e>

Carbon Dioxide characterized as a pollutant, the force behind global warming

<http://worldcoolers.org/co2map/>

Typical newspaper article decrying carbon dioxide build-up in the atmosphere

http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2003716817_carbon22.html

Union of Concerned Scientists page on carbon dioxide

http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_vehicles/vehicles_health/cars-and-trucks-and-global-warming.html

The key Paper by Arthur B. Robinson, Noah E. Robinson and Willie Soon that explains that Carbon Dioxide Forcing is not valid

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/other/Robinson_Soon.pdf

Another excellent Paper by Allan M.R, MacRae showing that Carbon Dioxide is not the primary force in climate change

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/CO2vsTMacRae.pdf>

Dr. David Evans Paper showing that Carbon Dioxide does not cause Global Warming

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Evans-CO2DoesNotCauseGW.pdf>

Alan Cheetham details the history of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

http://www.appinsys.com/GlobalWarming/GW_History.htm

Dr. John McLean details the lack of significant peer review of the IPCC documents

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean/mclean_IPCC_review_final_9-5-07.pdf

Dr. Vincent Gray writes about his experience as a member of the IPCC

http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=155&Itemid=1

Two dozen Television meteorologists who are global warming skeptics are listed on ICECAP

<http://icecap.us/index.php/go/experts>

The report on the over 400 scientists who spoke out in opposition to global warming in 2007

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport>

The Petition against the Kyoto Protocol

<http://www.oism.org/pproject/>