

OPEN LETTER SENT TO LEEDS CITY COUNCIL – CLIMATE EMERGENCY

Dear Councillor,

OPEN LETTER - “CLIMATE EMERGENCY” and NET ZERO POLICIES

1. Background

As you will no doubt be aware, on 27th March 2019, Leeds City Council passed a motion to declare a “*climate emergency*” in Leeds. In the said motion, Leeds City Council resolved, inter alia, to “*Sign up to a science-based carbon reduction target that is consistent with achieving the Paris Agreement of no more than 1.5°C global temperature rise.*”

(<https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/b20549/Supplement%20for%20White%20Paper%20motion%20in%20the%20name%20of%20Councillor%20Judith%20Blake%2027th-Mar-2019%2013.00%20Counc.pdf?T=9>)

On 24th March, 2023, a Freedom of Information Request (“FOIR”) (which was later deemed to be an Environmental Information Regulations Request (“EIRR”)) was sent to Leeds City Council requesting, inter alia, the following:

1. Leeds City Council’s definition of “*climate emergency*”; and
2. The evidence, data, correspondence or other documents in support of Leeds City Council’s decision to declare a “*climate emergency*”.

Leeds City Council, in their response to this FOIR, were unable to provide the definition of “*climate emergency*” as requested pursuant to 1) above; and with respect to 2) above referred me to “*A Net-Zero Carbon Roadmap for Leeds*”. ([https://leedsclimate.org.uk/sites/default/files/Net-Zero Carbon Roadmap for Leeds.pdf](https://leedsclimate.org.uk/sites/default/files/Net-Zero%20Carbon%20Roadmap%20for%20Leeds_0.pdf)) https://www.leedsclimate.org.uk/sites/default/files/Net-Zero%20Carbon%20Roadmap%20for%20Leeds_0.pdf

2. Leeds City Council evidence in support of the declared “climate emergency”

In the document, “*A Net-Zero Carbon Roadmap for Leeds*” (the “Roadmap”), which you are relying upon to support your motion to declare a hitherto undefined “*climate emergency*”, the claims below are made (emphasis my own).

2.1 “*Climate science has proven the connection between the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the extent to which the atmosphere traps heat and so leads to global warming. The science tells us – with a very high level of confidence – that such warming will lead to increasingly severe disruption to our weather patterns and water and food systems, and to ecosystems and biodiversity. Perhaps most worryingly, the science predicts that there may be a point where this process becomes self-fuelling, for example where warming leads to the thawing of permafrost such that significant quantities of greenhouse gases are released, leading to further warming. Beyond this point or threshold, the evidence suggests that we may lose control of our future climate and become subject to what has been referred to as dangerous or “runaway” climate change.*”

2.2 “*Until recently, scientists felt that this threshold existed at around 2°C of global warming, measured as a global average of surface temperatures. However, more recent scientific assessments (especially by the IPCC in 2018) have suggested that the threshold should instead be set at 1.5°C. This change in the suggested threshold from 2°C to 1.5°C has led to calls for targets for decarbonisation to be made both stricter (e.g. for the UK to move from an 80% decarbonisation target to a net-zero target, which it did in 2019) and to be brought forward (e.g. from 2050 to 2030), which the UK has not done, although many local authorities, particularly C40 cities, and other places have set themselves this ambitious goal.*”

3. Flawed Science: the CO2 Myth

I will address each of the claims detailed in Section 2 above in turn.

At 2.1 the claim is made that *“Climate science has proven the connection between the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the extent to which the atmosphere traps heat and so leads to global warming.”*

To the contrary, climate science **does not** support the connection between the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and continued warming. In fact, it clearly shows us that, for example, greenhouse gases such as CO2 and methane are already saturated and thus not capable of continuing to warm the planet as claimed (as explained in this video: <https://vimeo.com/934299121#t=0>).

The work presented in the video is from two world leading scientists, one of whom has been a scientific adviser to three US Presidents. However, that appeal to authority is not evidence in and of itself rather the evidence comes from their work, which has been proven to be correct by direct observation.

At 2.1 the claim is also made that *“The science tells us – **with a very high level of confidence** – that such warming will lead to increasingly severe disruption to our weather patterns...”*.

Again, climate science **does not** support such a claim. In fact, to the contrary, extreme weather has lessened as the planet warmed. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (“NASA”), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (“NOAA”) and the UK Meteorological Office are all in agreement and conclude the same.

Indeed, Chapter 12, table 12.12, page 1856, of the IPCC Report linked here: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_Chapter12.pdf (see Footnote 1) shows no changes, beyond naturally occurring variations, in the following: frost, mean precipitation, river flood, heavy precipitation and pluvial floods, landslide, aridity, hydrological drought, agricultural and ecological drought, fire weather, mean wind speed, severe wind storms, tropical cyclones, sand and dust storms, snow, glacier and ice sheets, heavy snow fall and ice storm, hail, snow avalanche, coastal sea level, coastal flood, coastal erosion, marine heat wave, ocean acidity, air pollution weather, and radiation at surface.

Focusing on the UK, and by way of example only, Volume 43 of The Royal Meteorological Society Journal of Climate Science Figure 51, page 42 (<https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/joc.8167>) counts the number of days each year in which at least twenty UK stations recorded gusts exceeding 46/58/69 mph and notes:

“The most recent two decades have seen fewer occurrences of max gust speeds above the thresholds than during previous decades, particularly comparing the period before and after 2000.”

The report goes on to note:

“This earlier period [before 2000] also included among the most severe storms experienced in the UK in the observational records including the ‘Burns Day Storm’ of 25 January 1990, the ‘Boxing Day Storm’ of 26 December 1998 and the ‘Great Storm’ of 16 October 1987, while in the last decade the most significant major winter storms have been on 5 December 2013, 3 January 2012 and 8 December 2011 (for the latter three the strongest winds being across Scotland). Any comparison of storms is complex as it depends on severity, spatial extent and duration. Storm Eunice was the most severe storm to affect England and Wales since February 2014 but, even so, these storms of the 1980s and 1990s were very much more severe.”

There exists a significant amount of evidence illustrating that extreme weather has decreased over the last 150 years. I can provide you with a detailed evidence-based response to any claim you wish to make with regard to extreme weather events.

At 2.2, you make the claim that the threshold to avoid out of control climate change is 1.5°C yet, to date, the increase in temperature of circa 1.2°C, since the Little Ice Age, has been wholly beneficial to humanity and the planet. Are you suggesting that the people of Leeds would be better off living in the Little Ice Age with the accompanying extreme weather and famines? (It is perhaps worth noting here that with the same amount of land the world has been producing record crop yields year on year substantially helped along by the increase in plant food - CO2).

It is critical to understand the distinction between modelling and observation. In science, models are nothing more than opinions - they are not evidence. For example, there are almost one hundred different climate models none of which amount to evidence. All that matters in science is evidence derived from observation.

Dangerously, climate models are being confused with evidence with respect to CO2. The resulting Net Zero policies will be disastrous for the people of Leeds. Every single climate alarmist prediction, to date, has been proven to be wrong when its time came. For example, islands did not sink, they grew; polar bear numbers did not fall, they increased; the barrier reef is the healthiest it has ever been in recorded history and the Arctic ice is standing at its highest level, for this time of year, for twenty years. All of this can be evidenced by observation.

The theory of the climate alarmists, as represented by the IPCC modelling, is disproven by the observational data which proves the theory of the climate realists.

As Professor Richard Feynman said *“It doesn't matter how beautiful your theory is, it doesn't matter how smart you are. If it doesn't agree with experiment, it's wrong.”*

4. Conclusion

You were unable to define *“climate emergency”* when asked. Do you not think it odd that you resolve to provide a solution to a problem you are unable to define? I'll give you a helping hand - I think what you meant when declaring a *“climate emergency”* is this: *“the earth is experiencing planet-wide increases in atmospheric temperature as a direct result of greenhouse gas emissions, in particular CO2, caused by the activities and habits of humans resulting in an existential threat to the world and human life.”* However, the climate science relied upon, by you, does not support the *“climate emergency”* you declared. The climate science modelling, upon which you rely, is demonstrably flawed.

Decarbonisation is evidently at the heart of your policies to reach Net Zero by 2030 so you must believe, beyond any doubt, that CO2 is the cause of increased temperatures yet the Roadmap, as drafted by Leeds Climate Commission, is peppered with “may”, “suggests” and “felt” which would seem to indicate that they are far from forming a conclusive position. Are you sure that the Leeds Climate Commission are the “independent voice” they claim to be? Is it possible that bias, leading to pre-determination, is built into the system?

In pursuing a *“Net Zero Carbon Roadmap for Leeds”*, you are responsible for enacting policies based on modelling rather than observation i.e. flawed science with the resulting waste of hundreds of millions of pounds of financial resources; intrusion into the private lives of the people of Leeds; and, in the process, the impoverishment of the people of Leeds.

Your resolution to *“Sign up to a science-based carbon reduction target that is consistent with achieving the Paris Agreement of no more than 1.5°C global temperature rise”* has no grounding in science as has been illustrated in this letter. Your monomaniacal focus on Net Zero policies forgoes any and all considerations of costs and benefits to the people of Leeds and is thus both absurd and dangerous.

You are accountable to the people of Leeds for the policy decisions you make and you therefore have a responsibility, to the people of Leeds, to fully consider the position of those

scientists who provide evidence for their theories through observations. You have a duty to listen to the climate realists as well as the climate alarmists - the future well-being of the people of Leeds depends upon you doing so.

I welcome the opportunity to meet in person, accompanied by a scientist, to discuss the climate science upon the condition that the meeting be recorded.

I look forward to receiving your response – you have my email address.

Your sincerely,

A very concerned citizen of Leeds.

Footnote 1: Chapter 12 forms a part of the report entitled “Climate Change 2021 The Physical Science Basis” (https://report.ipcc.ch/ar6/wg1/IPCC_AR6_WGI_FullReport.pdf) which represents Working Group I’s contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC. The Sixth Assessment Report can be reviewed in its entirety here: <https://www.ipcc.ch/assessment-report/ar6/>