

PLAN **B**



Press release: for immediate release

UK Government claims any discriminatory impacts of its climate policies would be “objectively and reasonably justified”



Responding to a [legal action launched in May](#) by three young people against its failure to take practical and effective measures against the climate crisis, together with the climate litigation charity Plan B and the [Stop the Maangamizi: We Charge Genocide/Ecocide Campaign](#), the UK Government has claimed that any discriminatory impacts of its policies would be “objectively and reasonably justified.”

The case is being led by three young British Citizens, Adetola Onamade (24), Jerry Amokwandoh (22) and Marina Tricks (20), who have family in Afrika and Abya Yala (the Americas, including the Caribbean and Latin America), regions of the world already experiencing extreme disruption from climate and ecological breakdown. They argue that, as young people, with families in the Global South, the Government’s failure to take practical and effective measures to mitigate and adapt to the climate crisis is a discriminatory and disproportionate interference with their rights to life and to family life.

Plan B is a Charitable Incorporated Organisation
Registered Charity Number 1167953

It is widely recognised that while the high consuming lifestyles of a minority are largely responsible for the climate crisis, those who have contributed least (the young and the low consuming) are being left to pay the highest price.

Yet, while publicly committing to the Paris Agreement ahead of COP26, the [Government's legal response](#) adopts a careless approach to the younger generation and all those on the frontline of the crisis, in the UK and around the world:

“Any inadvertent and indirect discriminatory impacts would ... be objectively and reasonably justified, if they could be established by the Claimants.”¹

The Government does not explain what that justification would be: the implication is that the younger generation and the Global South can be treated as collateral damage - a price worth paying for the Government's [addiction to carbon-fuelled economic “growth”](#).

Further, the Government claims in its legal response to be “*engaging with, and responding to, the advice of the [Climate Change Committee]*”², a claim which is contradicted by the Committee's most recent report, which says:

“... it is hard to discern any comprehensive strategy in the [Government's] climate plans we have seen in the last 12 months. There are gaps and ambiguities. Climate resilience remains a second-order issue, if it is considered at all. We continue to blunder into high-carbon choices. Our Planning system and other fundamental structures have not been recast to meet our legal and international climate commitments.”³

Confronted by the contradiction between its own position and the statements of the CCC, the Government has [lodged a further reply](#) with the Court claiming that CCC's criticisms demonstrate that “*the legal and regulatory framework established under the Climate Change Act 2008 (“CCA 2008”) is working*”.

Jerry Amokwando, claimant, said:

“This unconscionable language being used in defence by the Boris Johnson-led government about “objectively and reasonably” justifying the discriminatory impacts of its climate policies is the same old extremely violent and objectionable British imperial language of White Supremacy Racism with which all crimes of what our Afrikan Heritage Communities refer to as the Maangamizi (Afrikan Hellacaust and continuum of chattel, colonial and neocolonial forms of enslavement) have been justified; and which therefore exposes the very clear persistence of this Tory government in tackling the Worldwide Climate and

¹ See paragraph 103 of the [Response](#)

² See paragraph 67 of the [Response](#)

³ See page 6 of the CCC's recent [Progress Report to Parliament](#) (the Joint Foreword)

Ecological Crises by brutally resorting to Eco-Fascism, while at the same time indulging in the Greenwash hypocrisy of global leadership with regard to COP26!”

Marina Tricks, claimant, said:

“Behind the Government’s technical language lies a legitimisation of violence and a continuation of the same colonial rhetoric that prioritises its economic growth no matter the destruction that may mean for communities in the Global South. In their eyes our families, our lands, our waters are collateral damage. That means genocide and ecocide for our communities. It means communities across Abya Yala, from Mexico to Colombia to Brazil, are having to fight with their lives to defend life as they live through droughts, hurricanes and floods. A justice system that legitimises this destruction is not just and does not work in our image.”

Tim Crosland, Director of Plan B and a claimant in the case, said:

“It has taken us nearly 2 months to obtain the Government’s permission to publish its response to our legal claim. Now the public can see for itself the grim reality beneath Boris Johnson’s dishonest rhetoric of “climate leadership” ahead of COP26. The Government’s real position is that the devastating, disproportionate and discriminatory impacts for the younger generation and for whole regions of the world - those who have contributed least to the crisis - can be “objectively and reasonably justified”. Presumably, that means it considers our young people “collateral damage” in its pursuit of vast short-term profits for the few. But I don’t consent to my children being treated as collateral damage.”

Melinda Janki a lawyer leading the litigation team in our [sister case in Guyana](#) said:

“For centuries Britain has argued that slavery, colonialism, murder and the destruction of civilisations and cultures in the global south were justified. This attempt to justify inequality and discrimination is an insult to decent people in the UK and a grave warning to the global south of how far the Johnson regime will go to protect vested interests.”

Esther Stanford-Xosei, Coordinator-General of the Stop The Maangamizi Campaign said:

“Since law is being misused by the ruling classes to impose their geopolitical will, We the People have to engage in a counter ‘Law as Resistance’ strategy to effect the ‘Planet Repairs’ will of our Indigenous, Afrikan Heritage and other Global Majority Communities of Resistance in defence of our own lives and that of Mother Earth.”

Notes for editors

1. The Government's legal response was served on the Claimants on 25 May, but it is only now that the Government has granted permission for it to be published.
2. The parties are currently awaiting the Court's decision on whether permission will be granted for the claim to proceed to a full hearing.
3. If permission is refused, the Claimants have an automatic right to an appeal, which would be heard in open court.
4. There are four distinct grounds to the [Claimant's case](#) relating to the Government's failure to take practical and effective measures to i) meet its own emissions reduction targets; ii) adapt to the impacts of climate change; iii) align finance flows to the Paris Agreement temperature goal of limiting warming to 1.5°C; and iv) provide compensation for those suffering loss and damage.
5. The case has a "[sister case](#)" in Guyana, brought by a young indigenous activist and University lecturer in Guyana which challenges whether the massive greenhouse gas emissions from Exxon's planned oil buildout are compatible with the right to a healthy environment as guaranteed by the Guyanese Constitution.

For further info

info@planb.earth

07795 316164

W planb.earth

T @PlanB_earth

F @ThereIsAPlanB