

From: Malcom Roberts catalystforcorp@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Conspiracy
Date: 27 April 2014 9:12 pm
To: Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Begin forwarded message:

From: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
Subject: Re: Conspiracy
Date: 4 April 2014 11:36:02 pm EDT
To: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@uq.edu.au>
Cc: Pittard Leon <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>, " xxxxxxxxxxx,xxx@gmail.com" <xxxxxxxxxxx,xxx@gmail.com>, Cox Tony <xxxx@xxxxxxxx.com.au>, Cook John <x.xxxxx@uq.edu.au>

Delighted, Ove to receive your judgment.

Will you now please answer my straightforward questions?

Malcolm

On 4 Apr 2014, at 1:32 pm, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@uq.edu.au> wrote:

Good to hear.

Regards,

Ove

From: Malcolm Roberts [<mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au>]
Sent: Friday, 4 April 2014 12:38 PM
To: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg
Cc: Pittard Leon; xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx@gmail.com; Cox Tony; John Cook
Subject: Re: Conspiracy

No Ove, it's false.

I make decisions based on evidence. I've never seen any evidence of any religion wanting to take over the world. Have you?

Many of my closest and most admired friends are Jewish and none have discussed the wild conspiracy that you now introduce.

From what I've seen some people introduce conspiracy theories to deflect attention from something they don't want others to know of or to attempt to falsely discredit others.

Why do you raise "*conspiracy*" and *Jewish people*?

Now let's get back to the science, Ove. I've pasted below the questions from our email conversation yesterday that you twice failed to answer. Please answer my questions.

Malcolm

PS: If religious conspiracies are really your thing and of interest to you, Ove, you may want to discuss with Fairfax's Mike Carlton and Ben Cubby, who have falsely raised it in public for no reason. See pages 30-40 in Appendix 13 here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

On 4 Apr 2014, at 11:15 am, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@uq.edu.au> wrote:

Is it true that you believe in a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world?

Regards,

Ove

Email to Ove sent yesterday (Th.03.04.14) copied and pasted here:

Thank you, Ove for your reply.

Sadly, your reply failed to address most of my previous email's requests, comments and questions (*italics*).

For example:

1. ***"Please either provide proof of what you claim is my "dishonesty" and my "lowly tactics" or apologise for your error."***

Your reply provided only an opinion with no facts or proof.

Are the words '*specific*', '*evidence*' and '*reasoning*' not in your vocabulary? That could explain why you falsely foment and spread unfounded fear by contradicting empirical scientific evidence.

Are you not conscious of what you're doing? Or, are you knowingly contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

Please re-read my complaint to the University and my annotated transcript of ABC-TV's *Stateline* interview of you. Copies were concurrently sent to you by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. Both specify clearly the scientific and other evidence supporting my complaint. My previous email contained the URL link. The annotated transcript provided facts and empirical scientific evidence. **You continue to fail to refute any of my specific facts or statements.**

You have no empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 causes warming yet you claim or imply that it does and that it will cause imminent catastrophe.

You claim you could provide plenty of examples yet fail to provide any. Why?

That sounds like the evidence that you claim for human CO2 causing warming. You imply or state that you have plenty of evidence yet always fail to provide any.

You're doing it again, Ove.

Science is about evidence, Ove, not your unfounded opinion contradicting empirical scientific evidence.

Ove, your claims in your email reply to Leon are defamatory, libellous and false.

2. *"I wonder why you need to resort to falsities and false smears? Are you in fear of what is increasingly being revealed about your position and about your reliance on funding from taxpayers and especially from political activists?"*

No response. Why?

3. *"Can you recall our email exchanges in March 2010, Ove? They included your stated claim that the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) in the 2007 UN IPCC report provides evidence of human CO2 causing global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998. Yet when I asked for the specific location of such evidence of causation you failed to reply. I know there is no such evidence of causation in that document. Why did you make that demonstrably false claim?"*

No response. Why?

4. *"Are you able to refute comments by Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise here?"*
(URL's provided)

No response. Why?

"It seems you've been cashing cheques from activists for about as long (20 years) as the ongoing lack of global warming (19 years)."

No response. Why?

5. *"You continue to fail to identify any errors in my annotated transcript of your interview on ABC-TV's Stateline program on October 29th, 2010. It was posted to you by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation and is here: (URL provided)"*

You've failed again. Why?

6. *"Please note page 2 as a summary of climate science on global warming claims. Please note comments on page 3 discussing your UN IPCC that you vigorously advocate publicly.
Can you fault my comments on temperature on pages 2-3?"*

No response. Why? It seems you're not able to refute. Your inability endorses my observations and conclusions.

7. *"It's obvious that the peer-review process to which you refer has been corrupted, bypassed and even prevented by people associated with the UN IPCC. Are you not aware?"*

No response. Why?

8. *"That URL link presents my report entitled CSIROh! and its 32 appendices. They were published publicly on February 4th, 2013. On Monday, October 11th 2013 you were sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation a personal copy of my report and a signed personal written invitation to provide comment. A copy of my invitation to you is here:
<http://www.conscious.com.au/letters.html>. You failed to reply. Why?"*

No response. Why?

9. ***"Whether or not you agree with my publications please provide a URL link to a peer-reviewed paper providing empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing human CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming from 1976-1998."***

No response. Why?

10. ***"Please provide the name of one organisation that has empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing human CO₂ caused warming and specify exactly where such causal evidence is located? Title, chapter, section, page, ... "***

No response. Why?

11. ***"Please provide the name of one climate scientist who has empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing human CO₂ caused warming and specify exactly where such causal evidence is located? Title, chapter, section, page, ..."***

No response. Why?

12. *"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."*

No response. Why?

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

No response. Why?

14. *"Are you not aware that a growing majority of people are justifiably 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?"*

No response. Why?

15. **"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."**

No response. Why?

16. **"Do you realise that AR5 SPM contains no such evidence? Nor do SPMs in AR4 and AR3?"**

No response. Why?

17. **"If you contend I am wrong, please specify exactly where such causal evidence is located. Chapter, section, page, ..."**

No response. Why?

18. **"The UN IPCC is a con Ove. The question is: have you been conned or are you conning the people?"**

No response. Why?

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

No response. Why?

20. **"I'm just trying to help, Ove. You have a choice: be a victim of nature's reality or help lead the return to empirical science by coming clean publicly."**

No response. Why?

21. **"You claim to be a marine biologist yet seem to fail to understand**

that oceans control the level of CO2 in air. In fact, your claims implicitly contradict that fact about oceans.”

Startling. No response. Why?

22. *"My questions are fundamental, simple and straightforward. They discuss topics you raise and you publicly advocate and for which you receive public and activist funds. You claim or imply that you have such information readily available. If I don't receive the information sought from you Ove I'll assume you're not able to refute my clear conclusions on CSIRO, BOM and your UN IPCC and that you have no evidence of human causation."*

Ove, you're not able to refute my clear conclusions on CSIRO, BOM and your UN IPCC. You have no evidence of human causation.

23. *"Perhaps you could send your Communications Fellow, John Cook to debate me? He's copied hereto."*

No response from you, Ove, nor from John Cook.

24. *"I look forward to your reply either with evidence or an apology."*

No evidence. No apology.

Ove, I note your view that your email, quote: *"is a private and confidential email"* and *"Not for further distribution"*. I confirm that I will comply with your request.

I remain free to publish my replies.

Ove, you said, quote: *"I would also caution you from repeating other lies and mistruths from Ms Donna Laframboise and other unsubstantiated and patently false claims about me."* **Please advise which of Donna Laframboise's comments about you are deemed by you to be unsubstantiated and patently false.**

Having seen you speaking on stage and TV, having read some of your work and knowing your lack of empirical scientific evidence for your core claim that human CO2 caused global warming I do not trust you.

Having seen Donna on stage and having read her factually supported work with

supporting evidence I do trust her. I will continue sharing her work in accordance with my needs for integrity and accuracy. I will do so to continue protecting my children from the effects of your unscientific advocacy and your contradiction of empirical scientific evidence. The effects of your work include:

- Destruction of science;
- Diversion of resources from real environmental and humanitarian challenges ignored and bypassed by unfounded focus by advocates such as you on nature's atmospheric trace gas essential to life on Earth;
- Destruction of Australia's economy;
- Continued spreading of unfounded fear and guilt;
- Removal of freedom and the end of the age of enlightenment by advocates such as you supporting UN Agenda 21 and pushing policies based on belief not evidence.

Ove, it seems that you're in a self-inflicted predicament because of choices you made during the past 20 years of cashing cheques from activist groups such as WWF and Greenpeace, cashing cheques from taxpayers funding grants investigating global warming for which you have no evidence yet foment fear, and cashing cheques from corrupt organisations such as the Gillard-Brown Climate Commission. On the latter you presumably provided advice in your capacity as a member of its Science Advisory Panel despite there being no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ causes warming.

Compounding these roles and choices are your leading role in the fraudulent UN IPCC's reporting processes that corrupt science and contradict empirical scientific evidence.

There's a clear pattern in this Ove: you have no supporting evidence, you contradict evidence and you make money doing so.

Ove, I can empathise with what seems to be your fear, anger and discomfort. Your predicament has nothing to do with me though. I'm not responsible. You are harvesting the legacy of your choices.

Having addressed all the points you raised in your reply, Ove, please address my previous email's simple, fundamental and straightforward requests.

I look forward to your reply with answers accompanied by either evidence or an apology.

Cheers,

Malcolm Roberts