

Malcolm Roberts
180 Haven Road
PULLENVALE QLD 4069
Phone: 07 3374 3374
Mobile: 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Wednesday, November 10th, 2010

Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg
Director
Global Change Institute
University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072

Dear Professor Guldberg:

Re: Your interview on Stateline, Fr.29.10.10; Request for evidence; Formal complaint to UQ Chancellor

Watching your responses on ABC-TV's Stateline program broadcast on Friday, October 29th, 2010 I feel annoyed and saddened that someone in a leadership position such as yours failed to meet needs for accuracy, integrity and responsibility.

Please refer to the accompanying transcript of your Stateline interview and my comments in response to each of your replies to interviewer Jessica van Vonderen. Note especially the UN IPCC's own data on its reporting processes. That shows clearly that the UN IPCC on whom you rely is fraudulent and unscientific. Peer review has been corrupted, bypassed and prevented by the UN IPCC. Note the qualifications of UN IPCC Chairman and author Rajendra Pachauri.

My comments on the transcript draw your attention to data on sea levels, storms, temperature and the Great Barrier Reef.

In my view, your continued broadcasting of statements and inferences contrary to science does profound damage—seemingly in part funded by taxpayer funds. Thus, I will be copying this letter to friends and politicians. If, in response, you provide scientific evidence of errors in this letter that will be welcomed and shared with recipients.

Ove, we share much in common. As a boy I spent days walking and riding in the bush so it was a pleasure to read of your time in the bush as a boy. Having snorkelled and dived on the Great Barrier Reef I appreciate and treasure its majesty and beauty. We agree the reef is an emotive symbol. Sadly, it is often used politically to emotionally foment alarm contrary to science.

My awe and love of Nature together with deep reverence for the human spirit's need to be in touch with Nature are the basis of my desire to protect the environment.

I cannot know your needs driving your many unfounded statements contrary to science and subverting science. What I've seen is that everyone does the best she/he can. Maybe your passion for the reef clouds your objectivity or maybe your passion for the reef leaves you vulnerable to prominent politicians falsely inciting fear the reef is threatened.

As with those politicians your use of emotive 'sound bites' (your term) seems designed to foment unfounded alarm. Witnessing your misrepresentation of science and climate I feel shocked. Your statements fail to meet a need to connect people with our inherent oneness with Nature and our natural environment.

I wonder what seemingly broke your connection with Nature and empathise with your apparent loss. My experience as a manager and director and as a management and leadership consultant includes many organisations in which I identified systems sub-consciously driving counterproductive managerial behaviour. Are the systems—especially key performance measures—governing you as Director of the University's Global Change Institute responsible for your apparent loss? Could it be that repeated use of 'sound bites' on Stateline contradicting real-world scientific data was aimed deliberately to capture attention and bypass science to promote research funding?

Hearing you push unfounded claims of fear and guilt directly onto kids and adults via the media I feel annoyed because needs for integrity and for human peacefulness are not met. Learning that you seemingly foment fear and guilt indirectly through apparent misleading of politicians I feel annoyed that you're pushing public policy away from objective science and away from reverence for Nature.

I will protect my kids and my family from needless fear and guilt. For three hundred years science has succeeded in lifting humanity out of superstition and the rule of bullies and tyrants. Thanks to thousands of scientists, the scientific process has liberated vast human populations from disease, natural disaster, early death and the daily struggle for survival. Our children deserve this freedom and the political, economic, social and physical security we now enjoy. Today's children deserve to live in a world in which reason enshrines legitimacy and authority.

Unless addressed and rectified, your unfounded statements could impact enormously on our future and on the future of our nation's kids. Bombarding and misleading kids with relentless unfounded fear and guilt scars the future leaders of human civilisation.

I refer you to our exchange of e-mails in the fortnight 06.03.10 through 19.03.10 when, in response to my request for specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence showing human production of CO2 caused global warming, you failed to provide any evidence.

During that exchange copied to others, you implied unwarranted and unfounded public inferences about me. Although I provided you with my declarations of personal interests and requested same from you, you failed to declare your interests. I wonder why.

Enclosed is a copy of my e-mails to you on Sunday, March 7th, 2010 and Monday, March 8th, 2010. The e-mails highlight comprehensive material exposing the UN IPCC as fraudulent. Did you not then check the material for yourself? From your continuing dependence on the UN IPCC I conclude that your approach is not scientific and is contrary to the clear and strong evidence of unscientific UN IPCC fraud. It seems you are deliberately brushing aside UN IPCC fraud. Combined with your inability to provide evidence of human causation this casts enormous doubt on both your integrity and your understanding of science.

Ove, if a scientist is not prepared to defend his/her findings, conclusions and public statements by providing all of the evidence or disclose possible vested interests then one can conclude that those research findings are irrelevant and likely of questionable legitimacy. When people proclaiming themselves as scientists make public statements they open themselves to public scrutiny.

That your institute is part of a public university and apparently relies on taxpayer funding invites scrutiny. That you refuse to disclose your funding and financial interests is troubling. That you ignore my own public declaration to imply unfounded inferences about me and about professions such as geologists and engineers raises need for scrutiny.

Please note that my qualifications are similar to those of UN IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri who allows himself to be referred to as the "world's top climate scientist". ie,, engineering and postgraduate degree in business/economics.

Although my educational qualifications are similar to those of Rajendra Pachauri, I do not have his reportedly many serious conflicts of interest. My personal declaration of interests was made publicly when exposing UN IPCC fraud via e-mails to federal politicians. An abbreviated form was later included in my first two public documents. A detailed declaration has been provided on the web site: www.conscious.com.au since the site's inception.

Please provide your declaration of interests, including financial interests, funding of your work and funding of UQ's Global Change Institute where you are Director.

Rajendra Pachauri claims the UN IPCC relies on 100% peer-reviewed science yet the UN IPCC's latest, (2007) report cites and relies on 5,587 references not peer-reviewed, including hikers' stories, newspaper stories and political activists' campaign material.

There are many references to Rajendra Pachauri making public statements contrary to the scientific data. New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart provides examples in his fully referenced book “Air Con’. I have easily found and can provide more highlighting Rajendra Pachauri’s reported conflicts of interest and unscientific and untruthful falsities.

The UN IPCC’s data on its own reporting processes shows that its core claim that humans caused global warming was endorsed by just five reviewers—and there’s doubt they were even scientists. This contradicts the UN IPCC chairman’s publicly repeated statement that 4,000 scientists claimed human production of CO2 caused global warming. His statement is blaatanly false. The reality is not 4,000 scientists, just five reviewers. Five!

I’ve read the UN IPCC’s latest (2007) report’s core chapter—chapter 9—attributing global warming to human production of CO2—completely, twice. There’s no scientifically measured, real-world evidence that humans caused global warming.

Do you now agree on this since you have failed to identify any real-world scientific evidence in that chapter? If not, please identify the specific scientifically measured real-world evidence of human warming in that chapter.

Please refer to www.conscious.com.au. In particular please refer to the work of UN IPCC Expert Reviewer Dr Vincent Gray (PhD, Cambridge) who reviewed all four UN IPCC reports—1991, 1995, 2001, 2007. I direct you to his detailed and comprehensive review of every chapter of the 2007 report provided on the web site—especially that reviewing chapter 9.

In addition to his PhD, Dr Gray has almost six decades experience as a practical scientist including almost 20 years studying climate and the UN IPCC. Unlike your statements demonstrating a lack of understanding of scientific process, Dr Gray is solid on the scientific process. He states there is no evidence that human activity caused global warming. His position is shared by a growing number of scientists including many UN IPCC scientists disgusted with the UN IPCC’s corruption of peer-review and of science.

Please refer to www.conscious.com.au and for links to publications by John McLean. The first four articles listed under McLean cannot be sensibly refuted since he simply presents data on UN IPCC reporting processes. That data was obtained from the UN IPCC itself. It exposes the UN IPCC’s corruption of science and the scientific process.

Although I cannot know your needs underlying your behaviour, I do know with certainty that your statements made on Stateline about the UN IPCC are false and grossly misleading.

To borrow your doctor analogy used so effectively yet misleadingly on Stateline: in sending the public and politicians to the UN IPCC, you are sending people not to a doctor, but to a quack—indeed, to a snake-oil salesman.

It is not only your reliance on the UN IPCC that is troubling. Your Global Change Institute’s web site contains a page entitled Research: <http://www.gci.uq.edu.au/research>. That page

listed claims under the heading “Climate Change” and the sub-heading “Australia and the globe are experiencing rapid climate change”. Those claims are pasted below. My responses are in underlined bold adjacent each of your site’s claims. The list of claims begins with, quote: “Impacts already felt include:”

- “Rapidly rising oceans: sea level rise is already affecting coastal areas and is accelerating”. **Response: the Queensland state government’s Maritime Safety Queensland (MSQ) data reveals that during the last 15 years Australian sea levels have risen by a “very low” 0.3 mm annually. This is less than one fifth (20%) the international average annual rate (1.6-1.8mm pa) stable over the last century. Relative sea levels, as measured on land, depend on vertical land movements (rise/fall) as well as sea levels. Refer to “Sea Level Rise” at: http://www.icsm.gov.au/SP9/links/msq_tidalreferenceframe.html. Further references and information are provided in my comments responding to statements in Stateline’s transcript.**

- “Rapid changes in precipitation: rainfall is declining rapidly along the east coast of Australia”. **Response: viewing a century of data from the Australian Bureau of Meteorology shows your statement is false. Over the whole of Eastern Australia the time series graph for Eastern Australia shows a small increase in rainfall trend. For the East coast in particular, the trend map shows Queensland’s coast is slightly drier, while NSW’s coast is wetter. Surely, Ove as an Australian biologist you must know there is enormous variability in rainfall from place to place and year to year. As a school boy did you not study Dorothea Mackellar’s poem “My Country” containing the lines, quote: “I love a sunburnt country, A land of sweeping plains, Of ragged mountain ranges, Of droughts and flooding rains”? The Federation Drought of 1901 is regarded as being far more severe than was Australia’s recent drought. Thanks to technology and human care for the land and humanity, Australia suffered much less in our latest drought than we did 110 years ago. There is much more to do Ove, yet things are improving. There’s no justification for the fear and guilt you peddled relentlessly on Stateline.**

- “Increasing temperatures: the current decade is the hottest on record”. **Response: The accepted scientific position world-wide proven by many scientific studies is that the Medieval Warming Period 800 years ago was far warmer than today’s temperatures. Earth’s current temperatures remain below Earth’s average temperatures for the last 3,000 years. Why do you use a bare 150 years of data? Why do you use ground-based temperature data known to be hopelessly corrupted? Are you aware that rural temperatures in Australia and America show no net warming since the 1890’s?**
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/policy_driven_deception.html
http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf
Refer to “Thriving with Nature and Humanity” available at www.conscious.com.au. The UN IPCC’s 2001 report contained the now infamous ‘hockey stick temperature graph’ by Mann et al purporting to show wildly accelerating temperature increase. I would

be very surprised if you are not aware that the graph is now scientifically discredited world-wide as a complete corruption of science. Why does the UN IPCC resort to relying on fabrications, falsities and fraud?

• “Ocean acidification: rising atmospheric carbon dioxide is changing the chemistry of the oceans”. **Response: Work by Professor Ian Plimer and many other scientists completely discredits your web site’s claim. Are you not aware that Earth’s terrestrial and marine plants and animals thrived when atmospheric CO2 levels were six to seven times higher than current? Try talking with geologists and paleoclimatologists.**

• “Polar and glacial ice is disappearing: increasing global temperatures are driving major losses of sea and glacial ice”. **Arctic ice is displaying natural variation and Antarctica is reportedly showing growth in total ice. Some glaciers are advancing and others retreating. Please refer to page 10 of “Two Dead Elephants in Parliament” available at www.conscious.com.au and discussing Himalayan glaciers.**

Ove, where are the references to scientifically measured real-world data supporting your web site’s wild and unfounded claims contradicting reality and science? I found none. The site claims, quote: “However, there is overwhelming evidence that changes have serious implications for human and biological systems”. Without references citing scientifically measured real-world evidence the web site’s supposed ‘research’ is hearsay and your claims on Stateline are hearsay. The claims contradict internationally accepted science. They are comparable with solid emissions from the south end of a north-bound bull.

Please note that even if the statements on the web site are true, they are not evidence of any causal relationships between human production of CO2 and climate. There is no such evidence anywhere in the world. There is much evidence disproving any such causal relationship. That you falsely imply otherwise damages UQ science and its reputation.

Why is it that as Director you support such statements contrary to science? Yet in our exchange of e-mails from 06.03.10 through 19.03.10 and in response to my question: “**Do you have any scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global warming that ended around 1998?**” you were not able to provide any scientifically measured real-world evidence?

Although dismayed by your failure to provide evidence of human causation of global warming, I was not surprised.

Ove, please consider these questions:

- what gives you the right to falsely foment and spread unfounded fear and guilt through your emotive ‘sound bites’?
- what gives you the right to contradict real-world science by advocating recommendations jeopardising the economy and the environment, especially when your recommendations to cut CO2 production can have no impact on climate?

- are you aware that the measures you advocate have four serious destructive impacts on the natural environment?
- what gives you the right to recommend and endorse UN IPCC fraud that is advocating the loss of Australia's sovereignty to UN treaties and destruction of personal freedom?
- why are you making unfounded public statements destroying science and the scientific process?
- Are you aware of the dictionary definition of fraud: *Presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain?*

Ove, I challenge you to a public debate on the three topics central to your false claims on Stateline:

(1) UN IPCC;

(2) global warming; and,

(3) economic and environmental damage from artificially increasing prices of carbon fuels via subsidies on alternative energy and via extra costs on carbon fuels.

Together with Bob Carter and Viv Forbes I can form a team of three speakers to debate you and any two people you select to complete your team. Please advise acceptance of my challenge and we can complete making arrangements for the debate.

Maybe, you'd prefer to discuss this letter's contents in person. Living in Brisbane, I welcome an opportunity to discuss the UN IPCC with you.

My conclusion is that through your statements on Stateline you are, without foundation, misleading the public. Maybe you have in turn been misled by the UN IPCC. That was initially the case for many scientists who have since checked for themselves and now disagree with the UN IPCC's false claim that humans cause global warming. Alternatively, maybe you are knowingly misleading the public and the university.

Three Requests

I seek a formal retraction of your public smearing of geologists and mining engineers. Geologists, and especially paleoclimatologists, are scientists well versed in Earth's climate and past climate changes. Mining engineers, like all engineers are real world practitioners of science. Mining engineers are practitioners of Earth sciences and through their knowledge of atmospheric gases are responsible for people's lives.

Further, I seek that you check McLean's provision of UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes and retract your public endorsement of the UN IPCC.

I seek that the Global Change Institute's web site replace unfounded emotive 'sound bites' with proven, solid, scientifically measured, real-world observational data in accurate spatial and temporal context. Major claims need to be supported by scientifically measured real-world evidence.

Ove, only you know whether you have the courage to question your beliefs and replace them with scientific evidence. Do you have the courage to admit your error and acknowledge that you've been duped by the UN IPCC's clever and prolonged campaign? Your choice now is whether to show courage and integrity by accepting and acknowledging your error or have your error thrust on you in public as the UN IPCC continues unravelling. Be the hero, not a victim.

History is littered with sound intentions derailed by lack of evidence. For care to be effective it needs to be informed. I encourage you to consider the material presented in this letter and accompanying enclosures and then either provide me with solid evidence in support of your claims or acknowledge your error and retract your statements. That would meet my needs for our kids' security and the emotional and spiritual well-being of our planet's future leaders. I hope that is something you desire and for which you care.

It would meet my needs for integrity. It would rekindle people's connection with all majestic and natural living things—with Nature's beauty and wonder. It will define your personal legacy.

Ove, what will be your legacy?

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons, UQ), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Enclosures:

Transcript of ABC-TV Stateline interview, Fr.29.10.10 and formal complaint to ABC
E-mail of Su.07.03.10 (Roberts to Hoegh-Guldberg)
E-mail of Mo.08.03.10 (Roberts to Hoegh-Guldberg)
Copy of formal complaint to Official and Appointed Members of UQ Senate

cc:

Official and Appointed Members of University of Queensland Senate
Stateline program, ABC News, ABC-TV
Various scientists
Friends and fellow graduates of the University of Queensland
Various federal members of parliament responsible for protecting taxpayers' funds
Maurice Newman AC, ABC Board Chairman

Mark Scott, ABC Managing Director