

not only surface based but comprise multiple factors on land, sea, the biosphere, the troposphere as well as the Sun.

The IPCC models also do not explain such observations nor divergent temperature trends within eras. For example between 1856-2000 the temperature has increased somewhere between 0.4-0.8 C.<sup>695</sup> However, most of this temperature increased apparently occurred in two phases, during 1910-1945 and from 1975-2000. The first period is impossible to align with greenhouse emissions. The second phase can be aligned with emissions but 25 years does not constitute a meaningful long term trend, especially when between 1945-1975 there were rising emissions but no corresponding increase in temperature. The reasons for rising temperatures are dependent upon very complex issues and upon each issue there is little scientific consensus on how to model the issue accurately.<sup>696</sup> Certainly basing all modeling claims on limited land based and tree centric data does not conform to good scientific practice, when 70 % of the earth's mass is covered with water, and our atmosphere is composed of many layers.

The only way to properly take the planet's temperature is to use sophisticated space-based sensors mounted aboard Earth-orbiting satellites. Dr. Tim Patterson, professor of earth sciences at Ottawa's Carleton University, Dr. Pat Michaels, professor of climatology at the University of Virginia, Dr. John Christy, Professor and Director, Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama, and many others explain that these far more accurate and comprehensive satellite temperature sensors reveal only a very small temperature rise since measurements began in 1979. Dr. Christy says the trend is about 0.07C per decade, right at the edge of statistical significance and certainly far too small to be noticeable.<sup>697</sup> IPCC modelling does not reveal the fact that weather satellite data, the only truly global data we have, does not show the expected atmospheric warming trend. In fact the existence of satellites is not even mentioned in the IPCC reports.<sup>698</sup>

With the exception of the recent El Niño warming event both balloon and satellite data have shown only a very small amount of overall warming in the planet's average temperature over the past two decades. This is despite the fact that our Sun, the ultimate source of

all atmospheric warmth, is currently brighter than at any time in the past 400 years. With our star's variability accounting for about half of all the recorded warming in the last hundred years, only 0.3°C is left over for everything else, including urbanization and land use. The amount is even less if an additional 0.1-0.2°C of natural temperature fluctuation is factored in. If increased CO2 levels have contributed to global warming at all in the past century, its contribution must have been very minor indeed. All this variability has been occurring during a period of continuous rise in CO2 and other greenhouse gases due to human activities.<sup>699</sup>

Furthermore the IPCC and UN have not bothered to prove that CO2 emissions are in fact dangerous and constitute a threat to the environment through field work. Ninety to ninety-five percent of CO2 emissions come from natural sources and the earth releases 210,000 mega tonnes each year of CO2 gas. Only about 5-10 % of this comes from industrial and human activity. The IPCC nor the UN has bothered to do empirical testing proving that CO2 increases destroy the environment. Nature Magazine in 2001 published a report citing that CO2 levels have often been as high as 5 times what they are today.<sup>700</sup> In a North Carolina experiment 50 % more CO2 was pumped into in a forested area which resulted in faster growth, stronger trees and cones and no damage whatsoever to the ecosystem.<sup>701</sup> In a 2002 survey of the Antarctic, mean temperatures were found to be 22-28 C colder than the Kyoto models had predicted.<sup>702</sup> Kyoto supporters always portray the melting ice caps as proof of global warming but there is no evidence to support such assertions nor as the IPCC bothered to do field work to back up such claims.<sup>703</sup>

Even more interestingly the IPCC and UN consistently state that all credible scientists support the IPCC findings and the theory of human induced climate change. In fact it is more accurate to say that most scientists who are climatologists and have studied the issue are against Kyoto. The IPCC Summaries and reports are really political reproductions, which have changed significantly, key scientific findings. Such political pieces are presented as consensus mandated documents—when in reality they are not. For instance the original 1995 Working Group 1 Report was ratified by the scientists who worked