

From: richard.tol@ivm.vu.nl  
To: "m.hulme" <m.hulme@uea.ac.uk>  
Subject: re: positives and negatives  
Date: Wed, 12 Nov 97 15:09:29 CET  
Cc: "timothy.mitchell" <timothy.mitchell@christ-church.oxford.ac.uk>

>It would indeed be interesting to poll all of our invitees using a more  
>sophisticated  
>questionnaire, **but this is not what we are about.** For example, if you  
>disagree  
>with the Statement I would be interested to know the grounds of your  
>disagreement.

**Right, what this was about was to generate signatures for the IPCC study**

Mike,

Thanks.

I am always worried about this sort of things. Even if you have 1000  
signatures, and appear to have a strong backup, how many of those asked  
did  
not sign?

Also, I happen to be of the opinion that the US proposal for Kyoto is too  
ambitious. **But of course I am thinking of real policies, not of  
negotiation-rhetoric.**

**Wow. I'll give credit where it is due, Kyoto was too much, that's why it was  
never ratified.**

Finally, I think that the text conveys the message that it is a scientific  
defense for the EU position. There is not any. Even DG11 finds a hard to  
defend (at least, in the draft version of their attempt -- I don't think the  
final version has appeared yet). Whatever you think about long-term goals,  
2010 is pretty soon. At the moment, no country has any experience with  
serious emission reduction POLICY. Minus 15% is serious, particularly  
because  
of the effort that will be spend on the monetary union and because the UK  
and  
Germany are too optimistic on their baseline emissions. **Rash action  
instead  
careful thinking may well run serious, international climate policy deep into  
the ground.**

**What I see here is a warning to move in a more incremental direction, rather than trying to go for it all at once. Because no one has attempted to try to create the One World Government under the guise of AGW. Yet.**

**Cheers**

**Richard**