

IF "KYOTO" IS SO FLAWED, WHY DO SO MANY SCIENTISTS AND POLITICIANS SUPPORT IT?

(Published by the National Citizens Coalition, July 2007)

In this business that is called the Kyoto Protocol, it seems that the shakers and movers, the politicians and power seekers do not (want to) understand science and prefer cherry-picked opinion and research items to support decisions already taken.

The motive was probably developed in the early eighties within the United Nations (Maurice Strong and other Globalisation proponents) when they saw a cause being created by the "green" activist groups, which had been inflamed by a presentation of a young NASA scientist, Dr. James Hansen. Hansen had proposed that human/industrial carbon dioxide was increasing the greenhouse blanket to the extent that the globe would be warming up catastrophically. Trying to "control" this change of climate would allow the UN to further its goal of being the vehicle towards greater centralized power and to the transfer of wealth from rich to poor nations, thereby furthering the cause of "Global Governance". This particular opinion, while originally ridiculed, is now shared by many, as is the one that the Brussels bureaucrats of the European Union saw the chance of economic advantage *vis-à-vis* the United States

It should be realised that "human-caused global warming" is a *dogma* that underlies "Kyoto". It has never been proven. The assumptions of Hansen's temperature and carbon dioxide trend data have been repeatedly challenged by reputable colleagues, most recently by (respectively) Eschenbach and Beck. In addition, some historic and geologic correlations of temperature and carbon dioxide curves do not give a solution as to Cause and Effect.

It is not particularly good form for one scientist to accuse others of unethical or unprofessional behaviour. Scientific hypotheses are supposed to be discussed, challenges to be answered, and published papers subjected to peer-review. But the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), being a political organisation, does not work according to the Scientific Method. The science work is done by institutional and university researchers on behalf of the IPCC under contract. This sourcing by directed government grants puts it at great danger of becoming "Government Science". To many, the expression

"Government Science" is an oxymoron. In its early days, the IPCC's charter was established as an investigation of *human causes of climate change*. It never seriously considered other drivers that have affected the numerous changes in the planet's climate since its formation.

That is a shame, because in the field of Climate Science there are many sub-disciplines, from glaciology, paleontology, oceanography, astrophysics, isotope chemistry and meteorology to geophysics, computer science, demographics and statistics. Many of these people have contributed their work and viewpoints to the IPCC Working Groups and to the four Assessment Reports (ARs) that have been issued. These are good reports: They contain many divergent opinions. (Their thousands of pages can be seen at the ipcc.ch website).

However, this volume of work is unreadable for the public, the politicians and the media. Hence, the UN set its bureaucrats to work, assisted by some selected authors from the Working Groups, to create the "Summary for Policy Makers" (SPMs). As a critical Dr Vincent Gray (one of the officially appointed Reviewers of the UN reports) says: "It is not a summary *FOR* policy makers, but a summary *BY* policy makers".

In the creation of these SPMs, the expressions of contrary opinions, uncertainty of conclusions, and even recommendations "not to base official policy on the AR findings" are generally ignored. But the SPMs are what the media and the politicians absorb. The last SPM, early in 2007, was released with much fanfare, *months before* the underlying scientific reports (the ARs) were made available, thus – in the IPCC's own explanation – affording the opportunity to bring the conclusions of the scientific reports in line with those of the political SPMs. A travesty of science practice.

In Canada, the SPM-based policy was taken lock, stock and barrel by Environment Canada bureaucrats and scientific management (up to the ADM level) and sold to Ministers Anderson, Chrétien and Dion, all lawyers, who had no power of judgment on this scientific subject; Chrétien only had an (admitted) "gut feeling" that this was what Canada should commit to. So much so, that – when signing up to the Kyoto process - he committed to more than was necessary.

The problem with the Scientists within Environment Canada was (and is) that they are mostly meteorologists and atmospheric physicists. These professionals are more focused on "weather", than on "climate". Many lack the background (and the concepts of space and time) needed to appreciate the lessons of long past climates that earth

scientists have. They largely ignore the important astrophysical counter arguments and believe that computers can project the future.

It is no wonder that the *Friends of Science Society* was formed five years ago by a group of retired earth scientists who were aghast at the government's abuse of scientific principles of research. It has compiled and developed a base of scientific information and comment that can be accessed at www.friendsofscience.org

To deflect criticism within Canada of the goings on at Environment Canada where, by that time, the bureaucrats and their political bosses had committed themselves to the Protocol, independent scientists were barred from all discussions and from the traveling consultations ("Stakeholder meetings") that were held before and after ratification. *Friends of Science* has been refused access to meetings, including last year's "COP 11" in Montreal; we are not considered to be "stakeholders". Even one of our Advisory Board members, Dr. Khandekar, a retired Environment Canada research scientist, was refused the opportunity to register as an interested scientist.

In the United States, various Senate and House subcommittees have been active in conducting hearings and inviting expert dissident advice. In Canada, no meaningful open discussion has taken place. "The Science has been decided" is the government's mantra. The discussion now is about implementation and carbon credits. A lot of money can be made on both efforts.

Money and Power – not sound science – are propelling this wasteful and unnecessary enterprise. Thankfully, the voices of the dissenters have not been silenced. Many scholars from around the world continue to disseminate the sound scientific data that dispels the myth of man-made climate change and encourages initiatives that will really improve air and water quality. As the next round of climate change debate begins, let us hold our collective breath in the hope that science will ultimately prevail.

*Albert F. Jacobs, M.Sc., P.Geol.
Past Director,
Friends of Science Society*