FOR all who believe that global warming is caused primarily by humans and is an undeniable threat to our way of life, I would like to clarify three prime misconceptions about global warming and climate change. <table border="0" cellspacing="3" cellpadding="0" width="200" align="right"></table> Firstly, whatever you may hear about wildly rising temperatures, the actual recorded rise over the past 100 years has only been 0.5 degree Celsius. This amount is inconsistent with the much vaunted • and yet unproven • computer models that predict a rise of 1.5 degrees due to increased greenhouse gas emissions.

Doubly inconsistent with the global warming theory is that most of the recorded warming took place before 1940. Clearly, industrial and vehicular emissions were greater in the latter half of the 20th century. So why does the data not show an even greater temperature rise from 1940 onwards?

In fact, highly accurate satellite temperature measurements show a warming of only 0.04oC per decade, while grounded stations show an increase of around 0.17oC per decade.

Why such a discrepancy? Could it be because surface stations are often placed in absurd locations, such as in a blisteringly hot parking lot? Secondly, of the greenhouse gases blamed for global warming, carbon dioxide comprises just 0.0383 per cent of the entire atmosphere. In 2003, the top 20 carbon-emitting nations produced a scant 0.00034147 per cent of atmosphere in carbon emissions.

Such a tiny percentage seems unlikely to increase the greenhouse effect in any meaningful way. Global- warming proponents contend that the carbon dioxide absorbs infrared (heat) waves of a certain wavelength that would otherwise escape into space.

Sceptics counter that once that tiny fraction of infrared waves is absorbed, carbon dioxide ceases to play any meaningful role in the greenhouse effect • particularly when all of the other wavelengths of energy it can absorb overlap with other gases, including the ever-abundant water vapour.

More likely, other non-human factors such as the solar cycle are the drivers for climate change. Global temperatures rise and fall for the most part independently of human carbon emissions • as they have for the thousands of years before human industry, and for the eons before human civilisation even existed.

Thirdly, I find it astounding that many people unquestioningly concur when the main proponents of anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming theory, such as Al Gore and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), advocate taking drastic measures to cut carbon dioxide emissions.

I am not saying that we should not wean ourselves off fossil fuels and polluting lifestyles. I simply want everyone to get the facts straight on the matter of global warming.

The Kyoto Protocol has already cost Europe multiple billions of euros in higher energy expenses. Yet it has totally failed to curb rising emission levels. Can the developing nations with their fledgling economies afford such ineffective luxuries?

If the threat of climate change is not nearly as impending or dire as the alarmists claim, we would be far better off developing new technologies, building clean wind and solar farms, and gradually shifting to a carbon-neutral lifestyle.

And need I reveal that although Al Gore and the IPCC recently won the Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts in increasing the hysteria about climate change, the outcome was decided by a panel comprising a mere four politicians and one historian • not scientists?

Meanwhile, after much research and deliberation, the United Kingdom High Court ruled that nine major scientific errors were present in An Inconvenient Truth (Al Gore•s influential film on global warming), which it also found to be political and partisan in portraying only one side of the global warming debate.

In conclusion, let me remind you that there are always many sides to each story. Even as some nod their heads in agreement with An Inconvenient Truth•s

portrayal of Antarctic ice melting, others shake their heads at the fact that the film focuses on the mere two per cent of Antarctica that is warming, while the other 98 per cent not portrayed has actually been cooling &#65533; with more ice today than has ever been recorded!

For those who get their &#65533;facts&#65533; solely from the IPCC, I would suggest that you give a fair hearing to the sceptic&#65533;s point of view.

A quick browsing online will turn up many such sites. Some of them are obviously leaning towards strong scepticism, but many of them are well balanced and researched, such as Climate Audit run by Steve McIntyre, the man who recently exposed Nasa&#65533;s data on rising temperatures as skewed by the Y2K bug!