

## **Open Kyoto to debate** (Traducción al Español al final del documento)

### ***Sixty scientists call on Prime Minister Harper to revisit the science of global warming***

Special to the Financial Post  
Thursday, April 06, 2006

An open letter to Prime Minister Stephen Harper:

Dear Prime Minister:

As accredited experts in climate and related scientific disciplines, we are writing to propose that balanced, comprehensive public-consultation sessions be held so as to examine the scientific foundation of the federal government's climate-change plans. This would be entirely consistent with your recent commitment to conduct a review of the Kyoto Protocol. Although many of us made the same suggestion to then-prime ministers Martin and Chrétien, neither responded, and, to date, no formal, independent climate-science review has been conducted in Canada. Much of the billions of dollars earmarked for implementation of the protocol in Canada will be squandered without a proper assessment of recent developments in climate science.

Observational evidence does not support today's computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future. Yet this is precisely what the United Nations did in creating and promoting Kyoto and still does in the alarmist forecasts on which Canada's climate policies are based. Even if the climate models were realistic, the environmental impact of Canada delaying implementation of Kyoto or other greenhouse-gas reduction schemes, pending completion of consultations, would be insignificant. Directing your government to convene balanced, open hearings as soon as possible would be a most prudent and responsible course of action.

While the confident pronouncements of scientifically unqualified environmental groups may provide for sensational headlines, they are no basis for mature policy formulation. The study of global climate change is, as you have said, an "emerging science," one that is perhaps the most complex ever tackled. It may be many years yet before we properly understand the Earth's climate system. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made since the protocol was created, many of which are taking us away from a concern about increasing greenhouse gases. If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.

We appreciate the difficulty any government has formulating sensible science-based policy when the loudest voices always seem to be pushing in the opposite direction. However, by convening open, unbiased consultations, Canadians will be permitted to hear from experts on both sides of the debate in the climate-science community. When the public comes to understand that there is no "consensus" among climate scientists about the relative importance of the various causes of global climate change, the government will be in a far better position to develop plans that reflect reality and so benefit both the environment and the economy.

"Climate change is real" is a meaningless phrase used repeatedly by activists to convince the public that a climate catastrophe is looming and humanity is the cause. Neither of these fears is justified. Global climate changes all the time due to natural causes and the human impact still remains impossible to distinguish from this natural "noise." The new Canadian government's commitment to reducing air, land and water pollution is commendable, but allocating funds to "stopping climate change" would be irrational. We need to continue intensive research into the real causes of climate change and help our most vulnerable citizens adapt to whatever nature throws at us next.

We believe the Canadian public and government decision-makers need and deserve to hear the whole story concerning this very complex issue. It was only 30 years ago that many of today's global-warming alarmists were telling us that the world was in the midst of a global-cooling catastrophe. But the science continued to evolve, and still does, even though so many choose to ignore it when it does not fit with predetermined political agendas.

We hope that you will examine our proposal carefully and we stand willing and able to furnish you with more information on this crucially important topic.

CC: The Honourable Rona Ambrose, Minister of the Environment, and the Honourable Gary Lunn, Minister of Natural Resources

- - -

Sincerely,

Dr. Ian D. Clark, professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. Tad Murty, former senior research scientist, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, former director of Australia's National Tidal Facility and professor of earth sciences, Flinders University, Adelaide; currently adjunct professor, Departments of Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Dr. R. Timothy Patterson, professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Fred Michel, director, Institute of Environmental Science and associate professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Carleton University, Ottawa

Dr. Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist, Environment Canada. Member of editorial board of Climate Research and Natural Hazards

Dr. Paul Copper, FRSC, professor emeritus, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ont.

Dr. Ross McKittrick, associate professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph, Ont.

Dr. Tim Ball, former professor of climatology, University of Winnipeg; environmental consultant

Dr. Andreas Prokocon, adjunct professor of earth sciences, University of Ottawa; consultant in statistics and geology

Mr. David Nowell, M.Sc. (Meteorology), fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, Canadian member and past chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa

Dr. Christopher Essex, professor of applied mathematics and associate director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Dr. Gordon E. Swaters, professor of applied mathematics, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, and member, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Research Group, University of Alberta

Dr. L. Graham Smith, associate professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.

Dr. G. Cornelis van Kooten, professor and Canada Research Chair in environmental studies and climate change, Dept. of Economics, University of Victoria

Dr. Petr Chylek, adjunct professor, Dept. of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax

Dr./Cdr. M. R. Morgan, FRMS, climate consultant, former meteorology advisor to the World Meteorological Organization. Previously research scientist in climatology at University of Exeter, U.K.

Dr. Keith D. Hage, climate consultant and professor emeritus of Meteorology, University of Alberta

Dr. David E. Wojick, P.Eng., energy consultant, Star Tannery, Va., and Sioux Lookout, Ont.

Rob Scagel, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, Surrey, B.C.

Dr. Douglas Leahey, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary

Paavo Siitam, M.Sc., agronomist, chemist, Cobourg, Ont.

Dr. Chris de Freitas, climate scientist, associate professor, The University of Auckland, N.Z.

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dr. Freeman J. Dyson, emeritus professor of physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J.

Mr. George Taylor, Dept. of Meteorology, Oregon State University; Oregon State climatologist; past president, American Association of State Climatologists

Dr. Ian Plimer, professor of geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide; emeritus professor of earth sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Dr. R.M. Carter, professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia

Mr. William Kininmonth, Australasian Climate Research, former Head National Climate Centre, Australian Bureau of Meteorology; former Australian delegate to World Meteorological Organization Commission for Climatology, Scientific and Technical Review

Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, former director of research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Dr. Gerrit J. van der Lingen, geologist/paleoclimatologist, Climate Change Consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, professor of environmental sciences, University of Virginia

Dr. Nils-Axel Mörner, emeritus professor of paleogeophysics & geodynamics, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Gary D. Sharp, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, Calif.

Dr. Roy W. Spencer, principal research scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville

Dr. Al Pekarek, associate professor of geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minn.

Dr. Marcel Leroux, professor emeritus of climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Dr. Paul Reiter, professor, Institut Pasteur, Unit of Insects and Infectious Diseases, Paris, France. Expert reviewer, IPCC Working group II, chapter 8 (human health)

Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, physicist and chairman, Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Dr. Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, reader, Dept. of Geography, University of Hull, U.K.; editor, Energy & Environment

Dr. Hans H.J. Labohm, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The Netherlands Institute of International Relations) and an economist who has focused on climate change

Dr. Lee C. Gerhard, senior scientist emeritus, University of Kansas, past director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey

Dr. Asmund Moene, past head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Dr. August H. Auer, past professor of atmospheric science, University of Wyoming; previously chief meteorologist, Meteorological Service (MetService) of New Zealand

Dr. Vincent Gray, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of *The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of 'Climate Change 2001,'* Wellington, N.Z.

Dr. Howard Hayden, emeritus professor of physics, University of Connecticut

Dr. Benny Peiser, professor of social anthropology, Faculty of Science, Liverpool John Moores University, U.K.

Dr. Jack Barrett, chemist and spectroscopist, formerly with Imperial College London, U.K.

Dr. William J.R. Alexander, professor emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa. Member, United Nations Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Dr. S. Fred Singer, professor emeritus of environmental sciences, University of Virginia; former director, U.S. Weather Satellite Service

Dr. Harry N.A. Priem, emeritus professor of planetary geology and isotope geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences; past president of the Royal Netherlands Geological & Mining Society

Dr. Robert H. Essenhigh, E.G. Bailey professor of energy conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University

Dr. Sallie Baliunas, astrophysicist and climate researcher, Boston, Mass.

Douglas Hoyt, senior scientist at Raytheon (retired) and co-author of the book *The Role of the Sun in Climate Change*; previously with NCAR, NOAA, and the World Radiation Center, Davos, Switzerland

Dipl.-Ing. Peter Dietze, independent energy advisor and scientific climate and carbon modeller, official IPCC reviewer, Bavaria, Germany

Dr. Boris Winterhalter, senior marine researcher (retired), Geological Survey of Finland, former professor in marine geology, University of Helsinki, Finland

Dr. Wibjörn Karlén, emeritus professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Dr. Hugh W. Ellsaesser, physicist/meteorologist, previously with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Calif.; atmospheric consultant.

Dr. Art Robinson, founder, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, Cave Junction, Ore.

Dr. Arthur Rörsch, emeritus professor of molecular genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands; past board member, Netherlands organization for applied research (TNO) in environmental, food and public health

Dr. Alister McFarquhar, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.; international economist

Dr. Richard S. Courtney, climate and atmospheric science consultant, IPCC expert reviewer, U.K.

© National Post 2006

## TRADUCCIÓN

### Debate Abierto sobre Kyoto

#### **Sesenta científicos apelan al primer ministro Harper para que reexamine la ciencia del calentamiento global**

Reportaje en exclusiva: El Correo Financiero  
jueves, 6 de abril, 2006  
Carta abierta al primer ministro Stephen Harper

Estimado Primer Ministro:

Como expertos acreditados en el tema del clima y disciplinas científicas relacionadas, le escribimos para proponer que se realicen unas sesiones objetivas y exhaustivas de consultas públicas para investigar la base científica de los planes del gobierno federal en relación con los cambios climáticos. Esto sería completamente consecuente con su compromiso reciente de realizar una evaluación del Protocolo Kyoto. Aunque muchos de nosotros se lo propusimos a los primeros ministros de entonces Martin y Chretien, ninguno de ellos respondió y hasta la fecha, no se ha realizado ninguna revisión oficial e independiente de la ciencia climática en Canadá. Gran parte de los mil millones de dólares destinados a la puesta en práctica del protocolo en Canadá será derrochada sin ninguna evaluación adecuada de los avances recientes en la ciencia climática. Las pruebas obtenidas de observaciones no respaldan los modelos actuales del clima realizados por ordenador, así pues hay pocos motivos por los que podemos confiar en estas predicciones para el futuro. Sin embargo, es precisamente esto lo que hizo la Organización de las Naciones Unidas al crear y promover Kyoto y sigue haciéndolo a pesar de los pronósticos alarmistas en los que se fundan las políticas canadienses sobre el clima. Incluso si los modelos climáticos fueran más realistas, el impacto medioambiental del retraso por parte de Canadá en poner en práctica Kyoto u otros proyectos con el fin de reducir la emisión de los gases invernaderos, hasta que termine el período consultivo, no tendría importancia. Sería el curso de acción más prudente y responsable que exigiera a su gobierno que convocara audiencias públicas y objetivas cuanto antes.

Aunque las declaraciones hechas con seguridad por los grupos medioambientales, que consisten en las personas no licenciadas en ciencias motiven titulares sensacionalistas, no sirven como una base para la formulación de políticas maduras. El análisis de los cambios climáticos globales es, como ya ha dicho usted, 'una ciencia emergente', a lo mejor la más compleja a la que hemos enfrentado jamás. Es posible que pasen mucho años hasta que entendamos bien el sistema climático del Tierra. No obstante, se han producido algunos avances importantes desde la creación del protocolo, gran parte de los cuales nos desvían la atención de la preocupación por el aumento de la emisión de los gases invernaderos. Si a mediados de los años 90, hubiéramos sabido lo que sabemos hoy sobre el clima, es casi seguro que no existiría Kyoto, porque habríamos llegado a la conclusión de que no era necesario.

Entendemos los problemas que tiene cualquier gobierno para formular las políticas lógicas, basadas en la ciencia, cuando parece que las voces más fuertes siempre presentan el punto de visto contrario. Sin embargo, al convocar las audiencias abiertas y imparciales, los Canadienses podrán escuchar los argumentos en pro y en contra de los expertos del mundillo de la ciencia climática. Cuando el público cae en la cuenta de que no existe ningún 'consenso' entre los científicos del clima sobre la importancia relativa de las diversas causas de los cambios climáticos globales, el gobierno estará en una mejor posición para desarrollar planes que reflejen la realidad y de ese modo beneficiar al medioambiente tanto como a la economía.

'Los cambios climáticos son reales' es una frase sin sentido, citada reiteradamente por los activistas para convencer al público de que nos amenace un catástrofe climático, y los responsables de ello son los seres humanos. Ninguno de estos miedos tiene justificación. El

clima del planeta está cambiando constantemente por causas naturales y todavía resulta imposible distinguir entre el impacto de los humanos y estas 'interferencias' naturales. El nuevo compromiso del gobierno canadiense de reducir la contaminación del aire, la tierra y el agua es encomiable, pero sería irracional destinar fondos para 'detener los cambios climáticos'. Tenemos que seguir con las investigaciones profundas sobre las causas verdaderas de los cambios climáticos y ayudar a nuestros ciudadanos más vulnerables a adaptarse a las sorpresas que la naturaleza nos depara.

Creemos que el pueblo canadiense y las personas que toman las decisiones dentro del gobierno deben y merecen escuchar la historia entera de este asunto tan complejo. Solo hace 30 años, muchos de los alarmistas actuales del calentamiento global nos decían que el planeta estaba en medio de un catástrofe de enfriamiento global. Sin embargo la ciencia siguió desarrollándose y todavía continúa ese desarrollo. Aunque muchos quieren ignorarlo cuando no encaja con las agendas políticas determinadas de antemano.

Esperemos que usted estudie cuidadosamente nuestra propuesta y estamos dispuestos a proporcionarse más información sobre este tema de crucial importancia.

(Traducción: Tomasz Dukannovich)