

Re: Petition number P-06-1462 including a response to Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Climate Change and Rural Affairs, Huw Irranca Davies AS/MS

November 12, 2024

Annwyl Gadeirydd ac oll ar y Pwyllgor Deisebu / Dear Chair and all on the Petitions Committee,

Thank you for sending me the letter sent by Deputy First Minister, Huw Irranca Davies AS/MS and for the invitation to supply a response and further information. I will do this here and will try to keep it as short as is possible which is not always easy with such subjects alas.

I'm grateful to Mr Davies for taking the time to write his letter whilst I also fear that Davies has failed to understand the core issues raised in the petition. His letter simply regurgitates the government line on the subjects raised without welcoming an open discussion on this very important subject. I'll try to cover and enhance a bit on this here.

The first problematic issue is that Agenda 21 / Agenda 2030 / Sustainable Development / Net Zero have all been created and pushed by unelected globalist bodies such as the UN and WEF and no one in Wales have voted in the people behind these policies or indeed have voted on the policies themselves. This is an instant problem and a democratic vacuum that all members of the Welsh Government and Parliament should stand against these unelected bodies or be held accountable if they are interested in keeping their trust and integrity with all the citizens of Wales. The fact that the Welsh Government is carrying out policies created by unelected, faceless and unaccountable bodies is of genuine concern. We know that these unelected bodies will also try to use emotional blackmail and pressure on governments that question these policies being pushed on them from outside. But that is what governments including the Welsh Government must do. Only policies created from scratch in Wales by elected representatives in the Welsh Parliament and Government should have validity. Any policies originating from or guided by outside of Welsh democracy have no legitimacy. And those that, however well meaning and sincere they may believe themselves to be, promote these policies have to be accountable for their actions.

Next we come to the alleged science and the actual unelected powers behind Agenda 21 / Agenda 2030 / Sustainable Development / Net Zero. As mentioned these have all been created and pushed on to governments by unelected, unaccountable bodies affiliated with multinational corporations. I'm sure I don't need to remind anyone of the imminent danger that occurs when corporations and unelected bodies start to dictate government policy. It's known that net zero will be a disaster for Welsh farms and will drive many Welsh farmers to sell their farms.

The genuine worldwide movement to protect the environment has been hijacked by corporations and unelected billionaires. This new faux green movement is about power and control over the world's resources and people, not about protecting the environment. And it is about huge profits for a select few. For example, the person that came up with carbon credits is alleged to be behind junk bond schemes and is the inventor of financial derivatives.

Stopping man made global warming' will cost \$50 trillion dollars apparently. But who will get all this money? It will be a select few global corporations – they are the ones that create the alleged issue and hysteria around man made climate change and they will be the ones that benefit from the resulting mass spending in the goal for net zero, renewables and other such programmes, helped and facilitated by governments. These companies which are believed will benefit massively from zero carbon hysteria are alleged to include fossil fuel companies such as Shell and Exxon. Others are believed to include SunPower, General Electric, Huaneng Renewables are some of the bank's top picks. Tesla, VW, Panasonic, Albemarle, Bloom Energy, Chevron, BP, Air Liquide, Siemens and

Alstom.Neste, Sao Martinho, and Valero Energy.

In other words this is a racket. For more details on this please follow this link:

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/sergeiklebnikov/2019/10/24/stopping-global-warming-will-cost-50-trillion-morgan-stanley-report/#21c87c3551e2>

In terms of the claimed science behind this all, let's look at that.

The crisis according to many is that the climate is changing and that this 'needs to be stopped'. When considering the true meaning of these words and sentiments every reasonably sensible person should at least be able to consider that such a statement is meaningless and absurd.

The climate has always changed and changes in temperature are a natural part of this change. Trying to stop that is like trying to stop rain from falling or dogs from barking.

And history shows that the world has been much hotter and colder than it is at this point, and that these climate changes come and go in different times and cycles over time.

Of course the narrative behind all this is that it's the effects of CO₂ (Carbon Dioxide) output from human activities that are causing the world temperature to change. Or at least that was the narrative.

The script was changed after this narrative was challenged and defeated by a huge number of scientists who have argued effectively that there is no credible evidence that man or nature's CO₂ increases temperature. In fact, most evidence shows that the temperature first rises and that CO₂ levels then follow that temperature rise.

The famous hockey stick graph by Michael Mann used by the UN's IPCC which predicted an unprecedented peak in the late 20th century. Below that, Dr Tim Ball's graph (based on that o

So the narrative that global warming was caused by man's (and woman's) CO₂ output was stopped some years ago. In its place came the even more bizarre narrative that 'climate change needs to be stopped'. This is the latest non-sensical narrative to be pushed on us non-stop, especially on children.

What exactly is the evidence regarding climate change and mankind's impact on it? Below are hopefully a few helpful pointers:

1. Not only is there no credible evidence that CO₂ causes global temperatures to rise, but CO₂ is one of the essential gases of life. Zero net plans therefore are not only absurd and extremist but are also dangerous to life on earth. Without CO₂, no plant or tree would grow and therefore there would be no food for us and we would all eventually die. Plants will start to die once CO₂ in the atmosphere starts to go below around 180ppm. It can be argued therefore that those calling for a zero carbon future are calling for an end to life – a form of a death cult.

2. Of all the gases in the environment as a whole, the total amount of CO₂ is about 0.04%. Of this 0.04%, man's output is thought to be around 4%. So, from this, it can be said that the percentage of man's CO₂ output out of all the total gases in the environment is about 0.0016%. This is negligible and insignificant in scientific terms.

3. By now a huge cohort of scientists have stated that there is no credible evidence to show that the CO₂ from man or nature is causing temperatures to rise. Indeed, most evidence shows that CO₂ levels increase as a result of rising temperatures rather than causing temperatures to rise. One of the tests that attests to this are the Vostock ice tests which show that CO₂ follows temperature rises and not the other way round.

The IPCC admits that the Milankovitch cycles (solar activities) drove the ice age cycles and that

CO2 followed temperature change “with a lag of some hundreds of years”

4. The statement that ‘a consensus of 97% scientists agree with man made global warming has been discredited and shown to be incorrect. This misleading figure mostly comes from a major online investigation of 11,994 papers on the topic of global warming led by John Cook from the University of Queensland in 2013. Out of the 11,994 papers, only 32.6% supported the theory that global warming is due to CO2 from man. 0.7% rejected the theory and 0.3% said the cause of warming was uncertain. However, 66.4% did not express any opinion whatsoever on the subject. Very big questions have also been raised about the validity and methodology of the research in general. But even in the face of such information that dispels the myth of ‘97% of scientists’ consensus’ this is all still meaningless because science is not based on consensus or lack of consensus anyway but rather on presenting empirical evidence that is always open to challenge or correction.

5. It’s therefore thoroughly dishonest and misleading to state that there is a consensus among scientists that global temperatures are rising because of CO2. The mainstream press and media never mention the tens of thousands of scientists who have clearly stated that they do not believe in the narrative that man and CO2 are causing the temperature to rise. More than 31,487 scientists have signed a petition refusing this theory in the USA alone. Of these, 9,029 had a PhD. It’s claimed that this is 15 times more scientists of quality or qualification than those believed to be working seriously on the IPCC project. In Canada in 2007 68% of over 51,000 scientists surveyed stated that the science of global warming was not settled.

Similar results have been seen across the world, from Germany to Russia, India and more. These claims and petitions are often conveniently dismissed as the work of ‘the oil industry’ or other such bogeyman tropes. But the truth seems to be that the globalist conglomerates are only interested in power, profits and control, and will use any vehicle that can fulfill their own needs, whether they’re deemed ‘green’ or not. Regardless, real empirical science seems to have no place in this equation. What looks to be the overwhelming independent voices and findings of real scientists which fail to keep to the predetermined script are seemingly ignored across the world.

The uncomfortable truth is that these great number of scientists shows that there is an overwhelming majority and consensus of scientists who **do not** believe that global warming/climate change is created by man’s CO2 output. Again, that is if consensus was relevant in science. As mentioned science is not based on consensus anyhow, but rather on evidence and empirical proof.

To end I would implore those on the petitions panel and all members of the Welsh Parliament and Government to watch these two very well researched and presented videos on this subjects - which help to explain how true environmentalism has been captured and hijacked by groups and corporations which are using environmentalism to gain control over all of the world's resources and also our freedoms and rights as people and as a humanity. Please watch them with an open mind – they are not of any particular ideology – left or right – but are rather about getting using evidence and excellent unbiased research to get to the truth:

Rosa Koire: Agenda 21. Open Mind Conference
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ykELwj1Ta8>

'Stakeholder Capitalism Episode 1 (40 mins)' – by Richard Jeffs
<https://yellow.forum/t/stakeholder-capitalism-episode-1-40-mins/1454>

Many thanks for taking the time to look at this and consider all the points made.

Pob diolch,

G. Meredith