



Climate Genocide Act Now

ADDRESS/EMAIL Address REDACTED

9 December 2022

Detective Sergeant Marcus Bolam
SO15. War Crimes Team
New Scotland Yard
Victoria Embankment,
London SW1A 2JL

Dear DS Bolam,

Request for criminal investigation: [REDACTED: 5 Senior UK Politicians] : Crimes against humanity and genocide associated with the mass loss of life caused by the policies that drive climate change.

Article 30. 2(b) Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

I have now had time to consult with this team so I can respond to your letter of 24 October which reached me electronically on 2 December 2022. There is no record of lost post sent to this address, so I have no idea why your letter of 24 October didn't arrive.

Now that you have had a chance to look at the papers in 2019 and 2020 you will see that I repeatedly pressed SO15 to explain its thinking on Article 30.2(b) and why SO15 felt it didn't apply. Despite repeated requests SO15 refused to explain its thinking.

This group believed that SO15 had perverted the course of justice; so we made a significant number of representations to the CPS, judicial representative bodies and key members of the judiciary to explain this fact and our belief that we suffer a corrupt criminal justice system that protects those who kill by causing climate breakdown but prosecutes peaceful protesters trying to stop the killers. SO15's decision has embarrassed the CPS Board and members of the judiciary. These figures are aware that a second attempt is now being made to use Article 30.2(b) to stop an unprecedented scale of suffering and killing. It is our expectation that if a criminal investigation is commenced, the politicians who cause climate breakdown will immediately change their policies, thereby saving millions of lives.

In light of Sir Mark Rowley's public announcements about his intentions to police ethically, without fear or favour and to stamp out corruption, I now look to you to be transparent, clearly explaining your rationale. There is no doubt that we have proven 'oblique intent', in accordance with the threshold for Article 30.2(b) to apply, and we believe we have also proven 'direct intent'.

In order to get to the bottom of this and establish your rationale, I ask that you answer these questions: -

1. Do you dispute the science relating to climate change; specifically the scientific evidence that shows climate change is causing sea level rise and worsening tropical storms, and this has begun to drive people from their homes on several low lying island states, including Tuvalu, Vanuatu, The Solomon Islands and Marshall Islands?

2. Do you dispute the scientific evidence that shows that climate change is worsening drought in the Horn of Africa that is contributing to mass loss of life?
3. Do you dispute the scientific evidence that climate change is worsening flooding, such as that which occurred in Pakistan in the summer and that one of the biggest killers is the increased spread of disease that has killed thousands of people, most of whom are very young children?
4. Do you dispute the DARA International report commissioned for the United Nations by several 'victim' nations that showed 400,000 people are being killed a year by climate change, including around 360,000 infants killed by the increased spread of disease?
5. Do you dispute the Office for National Statistics and Public Health England data that shows 3,271 people were killed by the record breaking 2022 summer heatwaves in England and Wales?
6. Do you dispute that the 3,271 people who died were unlawfully killed?
7. Do you dispute that the UK has less than 1% of the world's population but is responsible for around 4.5% of historical global CO2 emissions?
8. Do you dispute that UK government policies to expand polluting activities, for example, aviation, ocean cruises and other luxury activities, contribute to mass loss of life associated with climate change?
9. Do you dispute that UK government policies to slow the pace of decarbonising the UK economy, for example by weakening the rules on home insulation, led to increased greenhouse gas emissions and thereby contributed to further death and suffering?
10. Do you dispute that the 5 politicians named know that climate change is real, that it kills and that their policies contribute to the loss of life that is already occurring in the UK and around the world?
11. Do you dispute that the politicians have seen clear evidence of death, suffering and the beginning of the annihilation of several low lying island states?
12. Do you dispute that the 5 named politicians know that they cannot achieve their economic objectives without increasing greenhouse gas emissions in some sectors (e.g. aviation), maintaining such emissions at unnecessarily high levels in some sectors (e.g. home insulation) and that they know their objectives can only be fulfilled by contributing to mass loss of life associated with climate change?

13. Do you dispute that the 5 politicians know that for them to achieve their economic objectives, the number of people being killed must increase, the number of people suffering must increase and that the pace of destroying the low lying island states must accelerate?

14. Article 30.2 says this: - 'For the purposes of this article, a person has intent where:

(a) In relation to conduct, that person means to engage in the conduct;

(b) In relation to a consequence, that person means to cause that consequence or is aware that it will occur in the ordinary course of events.

Do you dispute that the 5 politicians are aware that the suffering and death outlined in the dossier will occur in the ordinary course of events and that the threshold in 30.2(b) has been reached?

15. Do you dispute that the 5 politicians mean to engage in the conduct outlined in the dossier of evidence (and the behaviour reported in my letter of 22 November)?

16. Do you dispute that 'direct intent' has been proven by virtue of the fact that the death, suffering and damage to property is absolutely certain and, despite this certainty, the politicians have repeatedly made it clear they will continue with the range of policies that contribute to the crimes?

17. Do you dispute that the crime of genocide has been proven by virtue of the fact that the 5 named politicians know that the policies they support are guaranteed to lead to the annihilation of several low lying island states and that they cannot achieve their objectives without destroying several low lying island states?

18. Do you dispute that 'direct intent' to commit crimes against humanity is proven by virtue of the fact that the 5 politicians know with absolute certainty that their policies contribute to agricultural damage in several parts of the world, and particularly within Africa, and that they cannot achieve their economic objectives without inflicting this crime upon those populations?

Conclusion

You will appreciate that I have to show to the courts and CPS that I have made a reasonable attempt to resolve this issue with you.

In light of Sir Mark Rowley's comments about the ethical standards he now expects from all Met staff I ask that you answer all questions. If there is anything else that would help this group to understand your thinking, I ask that you are completely transparent, making it clear why you do not accept the evidence that has been submitted.

Yours sincerely.

Jon Fuller

Climate Genocide Act Now