

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

Friday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Professor Paul Greenfield, AO, PhD  
Vice-Chancellor  
University of Queensland  
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072

Dear Professor Greenfield:

**Re: Your reply dated November 29, 2010 providing your personal response to my formal complaint of unprofessional and possibly unethical conduct by University of Queensland's Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg**

Thank you for your personal reply dated November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010 to my complaint to the University of Queensland, UQ senate.

My complaint was sent by Registered Post individually and personally to all Appointed Members and to all Official Members of the University of Queensland Senate and to your office electronically for distribution to all members of the Senate.

From your letter I conclude it conveys your personal response and is not made on behalf of the University of Queensland senate to whom my complaint was lodged.

Reading your reply I'm feeling incredulous, frustrated, despairing and deeply concerned because your response fails to meet needs for scientific integrity, respect, understanding, objectivity, accountability and leadership.

My November letter to you contained the following requests:

- that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg make a public apology to geologists and engineers for his unfounded and false public smearing of geologists and mining engineers;

- that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg retract his unfounded and grossly inaccurate endorsement of the UN IPCC and his false statements about the UN IPCC that contradict facts of which he was made aware eight months ago;
- for correction of Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's unfounded alarmist comments and for their replacement by statements accurately reflecting scientifically measured, real-world observational data presented accurately in spatial and temporal context;
- for withdrawal of the Global Change Institute (GCI) web site until its statements accurately reflect specific real-world science on global warming's extent, causes and effects by replacing emotive 'sound bites' with proven, solid, scientifically measured real-world observational data presented accurately in spatial and temporal context and with all claims supported by specific, accurate, scientifically measured real-world observations as evidence;
- for a fully independent inquiry into Profesor Hoegh-Guldberg apparently knowingly or negligently and unscientifically spreading falsities.

Your letter fails to address the serious issues at the core of my complaint: that is, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg uses falsities and/or unfounded statements not supported by real-world scientific data. The professor made statements contrary to data obtained by McLean from the UN IPCC itself and personally referenced by me to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg eight months ago. Many of the Professor's statements contradict real-world scientific data.

In failing to address any of my specific complaints, your response deepens and widens my concerns and raises serious questions.

### **Are you now complicit in spreading falsities?**

From your response I conclude that you and your executive staff **endorse** Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's blatant falsities. Does this not make you complicit in the GCI's spreading of falsities and inciting of unfounded alarm? Does not your apparent endorsement now make you personally responsible for those falsities?

If that is not the case, can you please explain how you are holding the professor and GCI to account for his falsities?

### **Are you oblivious to evidence? Are you rejecting or lacking faith in UQ science?**

Why did you choose not to present data and instead rely on your executive staff's unscientific and unsupported **opinions** oblivious to evidence? Did you fail to understand my complaint regarding UQ science? Or do you lack faith in UQ scientists? Or is it that UQ scientists cannot support Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's falsities broadcast on 'Stateline'?

I am stunned with your reliance on staff **opinions** that blatantly contradict the objective and sound impartial data I provided you. Your staff's **opinion** contradicts the UN IPCC's own data previously given to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg and referenced in my complaint.

Is it usual at UQ for science to be determined by administrators? Or, as is apparent in the climate industry, does that occur when administrators are party to applying for grants based on pseudo-science?

It seems from your letter that as Vice-Chancellor of a fine university that enjoyed a reputation for scientific integrity, you are oblivious to evidence.

Given the sound independent and impartial scientific evidence supporting my complaint could you please justify your decision? Given my complaint's seriousness, would you please provide me with a copy of the minutes of your executive staff meeting?

Your failure to provide an objective response and your implicit contradiction of scientific facts and abandonment of scientific integrity leave me exasperated—and determined.

### **Are you abandoning your responsibility to society?**

Why do you as a chemical engineer resort to opinions as a response to solid, objective and independent facts? Your action contradicts what we were taught in engineering at UQ and contradicts the foundation of professional engineering associations and industry bodies. Is not engineering the informed and ethical implementation of science enhancing people's lives in society?

One of the gems I carry with me from my studies at UQ is the advice of a then senior engineering professor who advised students in second year that ultimately the basic unit of measurement in engineering is the dollar. Are you aware of the actual and potential huge costs incurred by Australian taxpayers and citizens as a consequence of Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's unscientific and false comments? Do you not take responsibility for that?

### **Are you abandoning your responsibility to UQ students?**

In regard to the education of students taught by Professor Hoegh-Guldberg, are they receiving objective and open-minded scientific tutelage? Don't you agree this is something about which every university's Vice-Chancellor ought be concerned?

Under your leadership is the university aiming to produce open-minded young scientists who will strive in future to do their own independent research rather than merely being reflections of a particular professor's teachings and his unscientific ways and unscientific beliefs?

Because students need to pass exams and researchers need to obtain funds are students and budding researchers being stifled in the GCI?

**Are you undermining UQ's reputation and revenue?**

Are you concerned that some philanthropists have ceased donating to UQ science largely because of unscientific approaches to science at UQ?

I can understand that a Vice-Chancellor wants to be loyal to a professor, especially one who has a public profile and apparently attracts government funding and media publicity. Why though would that loyalty extend to undermining science and the university's reputation—and the loss of funds from philanthropists? Is your approach on this short-sighted?

**Are you aiding in tarnishing the reputation of UQ graduate scientists and engineers?**

Aside from the scientific matters I raised, how can you and your executive staff condone Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's smearing of geologists and engineers? On my latest check UQ still graduates geologists and engineers. Is your response condoning Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's public comments not an insult to engineers and to geologists? The latter themselves are scientists and the former apply science. How can you and your staff condone unfounded smearing of UQ's own graduates?

**My concern is now wider, deeper and more grave. My complaint is extended.**

You and I agree Professor Greenfield that the climate discussion in Australia is complex. Why though do you attempt to focus on that complexity when the core of my complaint is that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg spreads falsities, and does so apparently knowingly?

That you cannot understand that, or choose to avoid it, is disappointing. In my view it reflects poorly on your processes and on our university?

You have failed to address my conclusion, supported by scientific evidence, that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's conduct is, at best unscientific, scientifically incompetent and irresponsibly foolish. At worst, it seems dishonest or fraudulent. (Dictionary definition of fraud: *Presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain.*) Why does your reply ignore this?

I would expect you, as Vice-Chancellor to provide leadership in protecting our university's reputation. Is your response in conflict with Part 2, Division 4, Section 26A of the University of Queensland Act, 1998?

With my concern now deeper and broader, does the unprofessional conduct demonstrated by Professor Hoegh-Guldberg and the GCI web site extend to the University's administration and your leadership?

Five weeks after my letter to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg in his capacity as Director of the GCI he has not responded to my serious comments. Can you explain why? Eight months after our e-mail correspondence and one month after my challenge sent by Registered Post he has failed to provide any real-world scientific evidence of his core claim. A real scientist would have leapt to embrace the challenge or leapt to counter with solid data refuting my complaint. That he has failed to do either says much about a publicly prominent speaker speaking as a senior representative of UQ.

### **Are you passionate about institutional and scientific integrity?**

On a personal note, thank you for acknowledging my passion. It is driven and supported by extensive, objective data to protect our university. My passion was enhanced at UQ where I won academic and other awards and later at the rigorous University of Chicago Graduate School of Business where I was awarded an American national award and university awards.

My passion reflects my deep concern for our university.

The lecturers who made the biggest impact on me as a student were passionate about their subjects. Since graduation I have more than thirty years experience outside university. My experience in management, governance and leadership shows it is often people's passion that supports them in facing difficult issues and overcoming adversity.

History shows that passion fuelled by knowledge and respect for humanity and Nature is a key ingredient in human development—artistic, entrepreneurial, sporting and scientific. Passion grounded in solid data and understanding enabled many of humanity's advances and drove restoration of justice and integrity after instances of unfairness or dishonesty.

I am passionate about science and our civilisation and way of life to the extent I supported my complaint with abundant objective evidence. Why did you fail to address that evidence?

As a chemical engineer Professor Greenfield, you would be aware that millions of lives daily depend upon chemical engineers using sound reasoning and objective data. That guides their exchange of ideas. Does your letter's second paragraph imply there is no responsibility on those exchanging ideas to be accountable for the consequences of their ideas and the objective basis of their ideas? Do you agree that wherever possible, exchanges of scientific ideas need to be based on sound information supported by objective data?

I hope your actions in deferring to your executive staff's **opinions** and views do not indicate a culture of condoning falsities is ingrained at our university. I hope you will be able to return the university to an organisation passionate about reasoning and integrity. Thus, I hope you reconsider your personal response and discern the difference between Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's emotive falsities and my impassioned reasoning based on science.

I agree with your statement, quote: “we continue to grapple with this important issue”. From what I’ve seen and read though, the grappling and confusion continue precisely because people in positions of political or academic leadership such as yours are not using scientifically measured real-world data as evidence. Do you see that your responsibility extends beyond the university and affects Australia’s political and social discussions?

I look forward to the day when the University of Queensland’s Vice-Chancellor is passionate about scientific and academic integrity. I hope you can be that person by passionately fulfilling needs for truth, accountability, academic rigour and scientific integrity. Do you agree that our university and its students, staff, researchers and alumni deserve no less?

On a personal basis, Professor Greenwood, what needs of yours are being met by your apparent avoidance of the issues I raised last month? Wouldn’t it be in our university’s interests to address the five key requests in my November complaint? Wouldn’t it be in UQ’s interest to address my stated concern that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s behaviour brings the university into disrepute, is unscientific and likely unethical?

Please refer to my November letter in which I suggested that independently investigating Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s public statements will provide an historic opportunity for the University of Queensland. It will enable UQ to take leadership of Australian science and restore integrity to science. That will produce enormous long term benefits for UQ.

As a result of your personal reply my concerns are now deeper, broader and more grave. Consequently, I now extend my complaint to encompass your behaviour. Please refer to the attached copy of my Registered Post letter being sent to all Appointed Members of the UQ senate and to Official Members of the UQ senate.

Your letter increases my dedication to protecting our university’s quality and reputation. Please personally address my formal requests and support the senate’s independent investigation of my formal complaint into Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s behaviour.

I am available to voluntarily support you personally in protecting our university’s integrity.

Professor Greenfield, what will be your legacy?

Yours sincerely,

*All originals  
personally signed*

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

Enclosed:

Copy of formal complaint sent to The Chancellor and materially identical to formal complaints sent to each Appointed Member of the UQ senate and to Official Members of the UQ senate

cc:

Official Members and Appointed Members of University of Queensland Senate

Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Director of the Global Change Institute

Electronically to the Vice Chancellor's e-mail address for forwarding to all members of UQ senate

Electronically to various scientists

Electronically to friends and fellow graduates of the University of Queensland

Electronically to federal members of parliament responsible for protecting taxpayer funds