

**From:** Malcom Roberts catalystforcorp@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Fwd: Invitation to Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio  
**Date:** 27 April 2014 7:57 pm  
**To:** Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

---

Emails between radio host Leon Pittard and Matthew England and Malcolm Roberts.

Email addresses have been redacted to maintain privacy.

This thread began with Leon Pittard's invitation to Matthew England and Malcolm Roberts to debate.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Invitation to Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio  
**Date:** 27 March 2014 5:37:21 pm EDT  
**To:** Matthew England <x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au>  
**Cc:** Pittard Leon <xxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>

Hi Matthew.

In my email reply to you last week I mentioned, quote: "I'll send you something in the near future that shows you have either very poor understanding of science or you're deliberating misrepresenting science, quite possibly deliberately, to Leon and attempting to do so to me."

Please see page 2 of my letter dated March 19th to Greg Hunt. It's here:  
<http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/letters/20140321/GregHunt.March2014.pdf>

Page 2 summarises CSIRO and BOM.

Page 3 presents my observations on the UN IPCC that you so vigorously and publicly support.

**In everyday terms, my understanding Matthew is that the definition of fraud is: presentation of something as it is not for personal gain.**

There is no empirical scientific evidence of human causation of global warming. That is clear and unequivocal. Yet you repeatedly take grants and build standing on the false implied and / or stated basis of having evidence.

Further, you repeatedly fail to provide empirical scientific evidence. Worse, you contradict empirical scientific evidence.

That fails to meet community needs for integrity, accuracy and accountability. I feel disappointed. And feel sad for you.

It's sad to see the damage you're doing publicly to your own reputation. Are you not aware?

Are you not aware that a growing majority of people are sceptical of any need to cut human CO2 output? Are you not aware that a growing number of politicians are joining reality in Australia and more so in Europe and especially in America?

Can you fault the logic and empirical science relied upon by my one page summary of the science of causation in item 5 on page 2 of my letter to Greg Hunt? If so, please be specific.

Perhaps you could name one person who has empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving HUMAN CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming from 1976-1998.

Perhaps you could specify one organisation anywhere in the world that has such evidence and causal reasoning and **specify** exactly where such causal evidence is located. Chapter, section, page, ...

**Your UN IPCC does not have such evidence of causation.** Do you realise that Chapter 10 of the UN IPCC AR5 claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 contains no such evidence? Do you realise that equivalent sole chapters in AR4 and AR3 (being chapters 9 and 12 respectively) contain no such evidence.

Do you realise that AR5 SPM contains no such evidence? Similarly, nor do SPMs in AR4 and AR3?

**It's a con Matthew. The question is: have you been conned or are you conning the people?**

Thanks to Nature and honest investigators, your position is unravelling Matthew. When your position is laid bare, as it soon will be, what will be the public verdict?

Just trying to help, Matthew. You have a choice: be a victim of Nature's reality or help lead the return to empirical science by coming clean publicly.

My questions are fundamental. They're simple. They're straightforward. They discuss topics you raise and you publicly advocate and for which you receive public funds. If I don't hear from you Matthew I'll assume you're not able to refute my clear conclusions on CSIRO, BOM and your UN IPCC.

Malcolm

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)>  
**Subject: Re: Invitation to Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio**  
**Date:** 20 March 2014 5:44:16 pm AEST  
**To:** Matthew England <[x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au](mailto:x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au)>  
**Cc:** Pittard Leon <[xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com](mailto:xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com)>

Hi Matthew.

Back on deck. I was interstate.

Your email is stunning. Is the Pierrehumbert paper that you recommend the same as the Pierrehumbert paper you recommended in February 2011? I explained to you earlier in this thread, quote: "On February 9, 2011 you were asked to provide empirical scientific evidence of human CO2 causing global warming. In response you sent me on February 10, 2011 a **theoretical** paper containing no empirical scientific evidence of human CO2 causing global warming."

Is the paper different? Have you not yet learned that empirical scientific evidence is the ultimate decider of science? Or does your receipt of grants for numerical computerised mathematical models blind your view of observations and empiricism?

In case you've forgotten here's the link to our email thread back in 2011:  
<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/E-mail%20reply.pdf>

Secondly Matthew, in response to my previous email you imply that UN IPCC reports are excellent as well in providing empirical scientific evidence. Yet there's no such evidence of CO2 from human activity fusing warming. That's a documented fact.

Are you aware of Appendix 2, here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>  
It exposes the many fabrications in UN IPSS reports and the fraud perpetrated by the UN IPCC

Possibly not, because you contribute to those reports don't you Matthew? And as a result grab millions of dollars in government grants for your UNSW Climate Change Research Centre where you're one of two Co-Directors that head the show.

Why does your Institute not have any empirical scientific evidence that shows causation of global arming by HUMAN CO2?

Are you aware that some of the world's most vocal critics of UN IPCC reporting processes and reports are UN IPCC contributors, including some UN IPCC Lead Authors?  
Appendix 2, here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Are you aware that the world's peak academic scientific body the Inter Academy Council damned the UN IPCC's 2007 report?  
Appendix 2, here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

I can understand why you won't debate. You have no evidence and you're part of the corrupt UN IPCC misrepresenting science and climate.

I'll send you something in the near future that shows you have either very poor understanding of science or you're deliberately misrepresenting science, quite possibly deliberately, to Leon and attempting to do so to me.

There is no empirical scientific evidence of human CO2 causing Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming from 1976-1995/1998.

None.

Malcolm

On 11 Mar 2014, at 5:58 am, Matthew England <[x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au](mailto:x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au)> wrote:

Hi Malcolm; there's a great paper by Ray Pierrehumbert (I think it was in Physics Today) setting out all the empirical facts. The IPCC reports are outstanding as well.

In terms of replying, I simply cannot reply to all emails received. My inbox has over 2700 emails unanswered as of today.

Professor Matthew England  
UNSW CCRC and ARC CoECSS  
<http://web.science.unsw.edu.au/~matthew/>

On 10 Mar 2014, at 11:21 pm, "Malcolm Roberts" <[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)> wrote:

Thank you, Matthew.

Your email presents another distraction.

Why distract with your thought experiment when all you need do is provide the empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning necessary to show human CO<sub>2</sub> caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming from 1976-1998.

Easy. Provide that and I'm out.

No need to bet anything, Matthew. Just provide the empirical scientific evidence and reasoning showing causation.

Fact is you can't Matthew. You contradict the empirical scientific evidence.

To explain what I mean by the reasoning and the empirical scientific evidence: <http://bit.ly/1btvTGE>

Now, to what you say is your thought experiment. That's not a thought experiment Matthew, it's a subtle ad hominem and smear. A distraction. Do you think I'm afraid to face consequences? Is yours a subtle way of saying my head is in the sand?

Fact, Matthew, I oppose not science. I oppose your blatant corruption of science. Your repeated contradiction of empirical scientific evidence.

Clever the way you check out of providing the empirical scientific evidence and now make a statement and check out from replying.

Some facts are repeatedly clear, Matthew. You lack the empirical scientific evidence. You repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence. You advocate for unfounded climate alarm supporting the previous government's desire to tax human CO<sub>2</sub>. And, you're funded by that government in many ways.

Further you're part of the fraudulent UN IPCC and spread it's false claims: <http://bit.ly/1eOoMXf>

Lastly, Matthew, your behaviour reveals you don't care about humanity or the natural environment: <http://bit.ly/1g9X100>

Remember, Matthew, all a true scientist would do is provide the ultimate arbiter of science: empirical scientific evidence.

Unlike you, I will end by saying I will reply to any future emails from you. It may or may not be tonight, but I will reply.

Malcolm

On 10 Mar 2014, at 9:40 pm, Matthew England <[x.xxxxxxx@unsw.edu.au](mailto:x.xxxxxxx@unsw.edu.au)> wrote:

Hi Malcolm, The science is absolutely robust: I'd bet everything I own on some of these basic facts that you deny are true. But I'll end with a thought experiment: supposing we climate scientists were saying "Carbon dioxide emissions will cause rapid warming, rising sea-levels, and profound levels of climate change. But that's all good: we need these climatic changes, and so let's continue burning fossil fuels without limit". I suspect you wouldn't be opposing the science in this scenario. Bottom line is, I think you oppose the implications of our science, not the science itself.

Good to discuss, and apologies if I don't get to future emails. I will try to, but I can't guarantee it.

Cheers, matthew

=====

On 10/03/2014, at 10:10 PM, Malcolm Roberts <[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)>

wrote:

Thank you, Matthew.

On February 9, 2011 you were asked to provide empirical scientific evidence of human CO<sub>2</sub> causing global warming. In response you sent me on February 10, 2011 a **theoretical** paper containing no empirical scientific evidence of human CO<sub>2</sub> causing global warming.

You can't identify empirical scientific evidence yet you're confident it exists.

**IF** you're as sure of your position as you state in your reply to Leon Pittard, a debate would end the matter. Surely, you have everything to gain and nothing to lose.

On the other hand, if you're not sure, then you have plenty to fear.

Wait, your reply claims, quote: "*the knowns established from centuries of research are not worth debating*". Matthew, the UN's claim is less than three decades old. I wonder how the knowns of human causation have been established for centuries. Centuries?

And the industrial revolution only occurred 160 years ago. Centuries?

As for the claimed UN-Hansen greenhouse mechanism, it was rejected by the American Meteorological Society in 1951. Even the early scientists dissented among themselves on that and were confused by the terminology, let alone the 'science'. Centuries?

No evidence and now a claim it's been known for centuries.

I understand your decision. Actions speak more loudly than do words.

Leon:

I remain available to debate.

With due respect and without knowing your priorities, perhaps you could find another advocate spreading climate alarm. I'm keen.

Have you looked among those receiving government grants?

I doubt though that you'll find any who want to debate as none have any empirical scientific evidence of human CO<sub>2</sub> causing global warming. Like Matthew they all contradict empirical scientific evidence on the UN's core claim.

Malcolm

On 10 Mar 2014, at 8:41 pm, Matthew England <[x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au](mailto:x.xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au)> wrote:

Sincere apologies Leon: we don't do these debates anymore as it gives the audience a false impression that there's still a debate about climate physics basics. We debate all the time amongst the science community on the unknowns, but the knowns established from centuries of research are not worth debating. Thanks for the invite nonetheless.

Best regards, Matt

-----  
Professor Matthew England  
ARC Laureate Fellow  
Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC) and  
ARC Centre of Excellence for Climate System Science  
The University of New South Wales  
UNSW SYDNEY NSW 2052  
Australia

Telephone: +61-2-9385-9766  
Facsimile: +61-2-9385-8969  
E-mail: [X.Xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au](mailto:X.Xxxxxx@unsw.edu.au)  
Web: [www.maths.unsw.edu.au/~matthew](http://www.maths.unsw.edu.au/~matthew)  
CCRC: [www.ccr.unsw.edu.au](http://www.ccr.unsw.edu.au)  
ARC CoE [www.climatescience.org.au](http://www.climatescience.org.au)

On 10/03/2014, at 8:13 PM, Malcolm Roberts <[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)> wrote:

Dear Leon.

Thank you for your invitation.

I am delighted to **accept your invitation**, subject implicitly to finding a suitable date.

I will do whatever I can to be flexible on timing to ensure the debate occurs.

In answer to your request for Matthew and me to individually weigh the four areas you list, here is my weighting:


- Is global atmospheric temperature rising unusually and is it continuing to rise? **1 - Top / First priority**
- Does the level of carbon dioxide, CO2 in air determine temperature? **2 - Second priority**
- Does human CO2 determine the level of CO2 in air? **4 - Fourth / Last / Lowest priority**
- Is warming harmful? **3 - Third priority**

I confirm acceptance of your suggested format.

Looking forward very much to the debate.

Malcolm Roberts

On 10 Mar 2014, at 5:48 am, Fairdinkum Leon <[xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com](mailto:xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com)> wrote:



10.03.14

[See More](#)

10.03.14

<Mail Attachment.jpeg>

<Mail Attachment.jpeg>

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom

