

## Judges plan to outlaw climate change 'denial'

A semi-secret, international conference of top judges proposed to make illegal any opinion that contradicted climate change



Poles apart: in 2013, the year scientists had forecast that the Arctic would be 'ice free', its thickness increased by a third Photo: Alamy



### Profit from property without purchasing

Owning bricks and mortar directly is not the only way to go about investing in London – or necessarily the best

LCP

By Christopher Booker

1:43AM BST 11 Oct 2015

We might think that a semi-secret, international conference of top judges, held in the highest courtroom in Britain, to propose that it should be made illegal for anyone to question the scientific evidence for man-made global warming, was odd enough to be worthy of front-page coverage.

Last week I mentioned that the Prince of Wales had sent a message to this conference calling for the UN's forthcoming climate meeting in Paris to agree on "a Magna Carta for the Earth". But only a series of startling posts by a sharp-eyed Canadian blogger, Donna Laframboise (on Nofrackingconsensus), have alerted us to what a bizarre event this judicial gathering turned out to be (the organisers even refused to give her the names of those who attended).

*It could be made illegal for any government, corporation (or presumably individual scientist) ever to question the agreed "science" again*



Including senior judges and lawyers from across the world, the three-day conference on "Climate Change and the Law" was staged in London's Supreme Court. It was funded, inter alia, by the Supreme Court itself, the UK government and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).

As one of the two UN sponsors of its Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, UNEP has been one of the main drivers of alarm over global warming for 40 years. The organiser and chairman of the conference was the Supreme Court judge Lord Carnwath, a fervent believer in man-made climate change, who has worked with the Prince of Wales for more than 20 years, and with UNEP since 2002.

The purpose of this strange get-together was outlined in a keynote speech (visible on YouTube) by Philippe Sands, a QC from Cherie Blair's Matrix Chambers and professor of law at University College, London. Since it is now unlikely that the world will agree in Paris to a legally binding treaty to limit the rise in global temperatures to no more than 2 degrees C from pre-industrial levels, his theme was that it is now time for the courts to step in, to enforce this as worldwide law.

Although his audience, Sands said, would agree that the scientific evidence for man-made climate change was "overwhelming", there were still "scientifically qualified, knowledgeable and influential individuals" continuing to deny "the warming of the atmosphere, the melting of the ice and the rising of the seas", and that this is all due to our emissions of CO2. The world's courts, led by the International Court of Justice, said Sands, could play a vital role "in finally scotching these claims".

"The most important thing the courts could do," he said, was to hold a top-level "finding of fact", to settle these "scientific disputes" once and for all: so that it could

then be made illegal for any government, corporation (or presumably individual scientist) ever to question the agreed “science” again. Furthermore, he went on, once “the scientific evidence” thus has the force of binding international law, it could be used to compel all governments to make “the emissions reductions that are needed”, including the phasing out of fossil fuels, to halt global warming in its tracks.

*India and China will merely respond with inscrutable smiles, as they continue to rely on fossil fuels*



The fact that it could be seriously proposed in the highest courtroom in the land that the law should now be used to suppress any further debate on what has become one of the most contentious issues in the history of science (greeted with applause from the distinguished legal audience) speaks volumes about the curious psychological state to which the great global warming scare has reduced so many of the prominent figures who today exercise power and influence over the life of our Western societies.

For perspective, we need only think of the likely responses to all this claptrap by China and India (which has just announced that it intends to triple its CO2 emissions by 2030). Not only have they already kicked into touch any chance of a “binding climate treaty” in December. At the thought of these self-important lawyers trying to force them to comply by international law, they will merely respond with inscrutable smiles, as they continue to rely on fossil fuels to power what will soon be the two largest economies in the world.

[Read more of Christopher Booker's column](#)

### Profit from property without purchasing



Owning bricks and mortar directly is not the only way to go about investing in London – or necessarily the best

How we moderate

© Copyright of Telegraph Media Group Limited 2015