

Sensation perfekt: Kanada trotz dem Kyoto-Protokoll- und senkt seine CO₂-Reduktionsverpflichtung um 90 %!

geschrieben von Michael Limburg | 16. Juni 2010


Damit zieht Harper die Konsequenz aus einer sich schon länger anbahnenden Entwicklung. Nicht nur, dass sich immer häufiger zeigte, dass die Prognosen des IPCC auf unvollständiger und häufig sehr kontroverser Wissenschaft basierten und zusätzlich auch noch ideologisch motiviert manipuliert wurden (Stichwort ClimateGate), sondern auch, dass die beschlossene Senkung um 50 Millionen Tonnen CO₂ die Wirtschaft Kanadas in erhebliche Schwierigkeiten stürzen würde. Mit fatalen Konsequenzen für die Prosperität und Stabilität des Landes. "Kanada reduziert Klimaziele drastisch, schreibt erstaunt der Spiegel

Nachdem zuvor bereits Indien seinen Rückzug aus dem IPCC verkündet hatte, weil es mit den als Fakten angebotenen Vermutungen wenig übereinstimmte, nachdem in Australien der Parteiführer der Liberalen wegen seiner Haltung zur "Klimakatastrophe" zum Rücktritt gezwungen wurde und sich eine neue Partei der Klimarealisten etablierte, vollzieht nun Kanada diesen drastischen Schwenk. Einer der Auslöser für diesen Rückzug – so wird berichtet – war die Kenntnis eines Dossiers von EIKE-Mitglied Bachmann, dessen Ausführungen – in Verbund mit anderen gleichlautenden Informationen Premier Harper kräftig aufstieß.

Dieser Schritt kommt jedoch nicht von ungefähr, da Meinungsumfragen unter kanadischen Bürgern zeigten, dass weniger und weniger Bürger an das Märchen von der Klimakatastrophe glauben.

Table 1: (Q1) At a conference in Copenhagen in December, the Canadian government will be asked to sign a treaty that gives power to an international organization to distribute Canadian tax dollars and influence energy policy in Canada. Which of the following four opinions is closest to your own? [RANDOMIZE]

N=1000	Raw %	Combined %	% After DNK/Ref removed	For vs. Against Signing Now
Canada should definitely sign the treaty	25	25	28	28
Canada should postpone making a decision until we are more confident about where the global economy is going	25	51	57	73
Canada should postpone making a decision until a lot more objective, scientific research is carried out on the issue of climate	26			
Canada should definitely not sign the treaty	14	14	16	
Don't know/Refused	11	11	NA	NA



Wann werden wir in Deutschland Ähnliches erleben dürfen?

Michael Limburg EIKE

P.S. Hier zur Erinnerung noch einmal der Brief im Wortlaut:
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 Chretien, 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,