

From: Malcom Roberts catalystforcorp@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Defamation and libel (Fwd: Reminder - Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio)
Date: 27 April 2014 6:58 pm
To: Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Copy of email thread between radio host Leon Pittard and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and Malcolm Roberts.

Thread was initiated by Leon Pittard inviting Ove and Malcolm to debate on Leon's radio program.

In his reply to Malcolm, Ove requested that Ove's email not be shared with others. For this reason it's been redacted using x's.

It seems Ove does not want people to read his reply. Why?

Due to comments in Ove's reply others were copied on Malcolm's reply to Ove. All email addresses have been redacted to maintain privacy.

Malcolm

Begin forwarded message:

From: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
Subject: Re: Defamation and libel (Fwd: Reminder - Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio)
Date: 3 April 2014 2:36:27 pm AEST
To: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@ug.edu.au>
Cc: Pittard Leon <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>, "xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx@gmail.com" <xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx@gmail.com>, Cook John <x.xxxxx@ug.edu.au>, Cox Tony <axxxx@xxxxxxxx.com.au>

Thank you, Ove for your reply.

Sadly, your reply failed to address most of my previous email's requests 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:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/ABC%20transcripta.pdf

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

Returning to your reply to Leon Pittard, please consider some of my publications listed below for your personal review.

Here's the URL link to my letter to Greg Hunt dated March 19th, 2014:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/letters/20140321/GregHunt_March2014.pdf

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?

My letter to Greg Hunt refers to my review of the UN IPCC and its reports. It's at Appendix 2 here:

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

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?

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?

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.

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, ...

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, ...

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.

There is no empirical scientific evidence of human CO2 causing 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 such evidence. Your position is unfounded and false. It misrepresents climate, science and nature.

Further, you repeatedly fail to provide empirical scientific evidence of causation. 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 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?

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? Nor do SPMs in AR4 and AR3?

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

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

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?

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.

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.

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.

As an aside, given your comments to Leon Pittard one wonders why you won't debate. If what you said were true it would be easy for you to ...

will.

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

As is lawyer Tony Cox.

Remember, please provide proof of your claim that I am dishonest and use lowly tactics. Failure to do so leaves you open to legal action to protect my reputation.

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

Malcolm Roberts

04 xxxx xxxx

Begin forwarded message:

From: XXXXXXXXXXXX Leon <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>
Subject: Fwd: RE: Reminder - Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio
Date: 1 April 2014 9:44:22 pm AEST
To: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
Cc: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@uq.edu.au>

Malcolm,

fyi

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Reminder - Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio
Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2014 10:22:48 +0000
From: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <xxxx@uq.edu.au>
To: XXXXXXXXXXXX Leon <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>

Dear Leon,

Apologies for my delay in replying. I know of Mr Roberts through his dishonest letter writing campaigns and attempts to get me dismissed from the University of Queensland. Naturally, I don't have a high degree of respect for him or his lowly tactics.

Putting that aside, it is widely recognised that the best place for debating science is in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. I invite Mr Roberts to write a paper with his data and analysis for submission to a top journal like Science or Nature. Once it is published – my professional colleagues and I will be able to give it some serious consideration.

Till then – good luck with your radio show.

Regards,

Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg PhD FAA
Professor and Director
Global Change Institute
University of Queensland

From: XXXXXXXXXXXX Leon [<mailto:xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>]
Sent: Saturday, 29 March 2014 9:00 PM
To: Ove Hoegh-Guldberg
Cc: Malcolm Roberts
Subject: Reminder - Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio
Importance: High

Mr Ove Hoegh-Guldberg,

Dear Ove,

I have not received a response as yet from you. This is a friendly reminder and request to acknowledge my invitation. Malcolm Roberts has accepted we await your response before publishing accordingly.

Thank you,

Leon Pittard

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Invitation Climate Debate - Fairdinkum Radio
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2014 15:22:25 +1100

From: XXXXXXXXXXXX Leon <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.com>

FROM:XXXXXXXXX LEON <XXXX@XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.COM>
Organisation:Fairdinkum Radio
To:xxx@uq.edu.au, Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
CC:XXXXXXXXX Leon <XXXX@XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.COM>

<image001.jpg>

To:

Mr Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

Mr Malcolm Roberts

RE: Invitation to open climate debate.

Dear Ove and Malcolm,

My<image002.jpg> name is Leon Pittard and I am the Host of Fairdinkum Radio. Fairdinkum Radio is open source media dedicated to being the voice of the people for the people.

We host regular conversations on important subjects without the influence of Government or Corporate advertising, influence or direction.

I am sure you both know of each others work in the area of Climate Research.

You have both been chosen because of your willingness to speak publicly on the subject of this debate, and your dedicated personal research into the subject matter. I note that the weighting of time allowed on Corporate State media, is always in favor of the Corporate State interest and direction. Therefore we aim to balance the conversation.

Therefore, I invite you both to an Open Debate on the subject of Climate Change. I propose that each participant has 30m each during the 60m segment. I propose the following outline:

Host welcome and outline	5m
Opening statements (5m x2)	10m
Participant 1	10m
Participant 2	10m
Participant 1	10m
Participant 2	10m
Closing comments (5m x2)	10m
Host thank you and close	5m

Basic rules:

Host will time and adjudicate and have no comment during the debate.

Any response must take place during your allotted time.

No cross arguing or talking over.

Subject:

I have below four subject points that you are able to choose and weight accordingly. Please nominate in order of preference. The decision of the subject will be decided by the weighting process x 3. Participant 1,2 and myself as the Host. Both responses will be available to the other if requested.

- Is global atmospheric temperature rising unusually and is it continuing to rise?
- Does the level of carbon dioxide, CO2 in air determine temperature?
- Does human CO2 determine the level of CO2 in air?
- Is warming harmful?

This invitation will remain private until a response is received. your response is requested within 14 days. Should either participant choose not to respond or take part we will publish accordingly.

Looking forward to your response,

Leon Pittard

--

Yours sincerely,

Leon Pittard

Host of Fairdinkum Radio



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

--

Yours sincerely,

Leon Pittard

Host of Fairdinkum Radio



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

--

Yours sincerely,

Leon Pittard

Host of Fairdinkum Radio



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.