

Summary

A challenge for each of the four bodies to which I've complained is for them to extract from Professor Hoegh-Guldberg the empirical evidence and logical causal reasoning proving that carbon dioxide from human activity causes global warming, global climate change or global climate variability.

In his responses to my requests for such empirical evidence of causation and in his public claims and statements, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg has never presented empirical evidence and causal logic proving his claim that carbon dioxide from human activity affects global temperature, global climate or global climate variability.

His claim and associated statements contradict empirical evidence. This applies to his public statements and to his claims made under oath/affirmation in court.

His behaviour contradicts the scientific method. See below.

He endorses and is part of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) climate reports that are demonstrably corrupt.

He has an apparent conflict of interest in receiving funding from extreme political activists Greenpeace for more than two decades and WWF for over a decade. Both organisations have corrupted UN IPCC climate reports and make false climate claims in promoting their political advocacy.

He has apparently breached the Queensland Professional Engineers Act, 2002.

He has apparently breached the Queensland Public Sector Ethics Act, 1994.

He has apparently breached the University of Queensland's Code of Conduct.

His climate claims enable him to benefit from a number of organisations whose funding has benefitted from false climate claims. These include, and are not limited to, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, UN IPCC Global Change Institute, Climate Commission, and the University of Queensland.

He supervises John Cook who led the false and misleading fabrication of a claimed consensus of scientists endorsing human causation of climate variability.

John Cook relies on a 'consensus' instead of proving causation using empirical evidence and causal logic.

John Cook misrepresents climate and climate science. He publicly contradicts empirical evidence and has never provided the empirical evidence and causal logic necessary to establish that carbon dioxide from human activity causes global warming/climate change/climate variability.

He contradicts empirical evidence and misrepresents climate and climate science.

He misrepresents as "deniers" those whose opinion differs from his.

UQ Vice Chancellor Professor Peter Høj made the clearly false claim that empirical evidence proving carbon dioxide from human activity affects climate is in UN IPCC reports. There is no such evidence in UN IPCC reports.

In correspondence with me he has not followed due process and has not exercised adequate due diligence.

He has contradicted data presented in a scientifically peer-reviewed paper and chosen instead to rely upon a discredited body with apparent conflicts of interest.

Instead of providing empirical evidence, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's public responses and his responses to me use many diversions from science. He has at various times relied on:

- Broad and generalised yet unsubstantiated claims contradicting empirical evidence,
- False and misleading claims of consensus,
- Appeals to authority,
- Invocations to peer-review despite the scientific literature lacking empirical evidence for his position that carbon dioxide from human activity causes dangerous global warming and global climate change,
- Portrayal of natural weather events and inherent natural variation as process change,
- Implied or explicit fearful projections contradicting science,
- Emotive statements that distract from the lack of empirical evidence,
- Output, directly or implicitly from erroneous, unvalidated computerised numerical models that the UN IPCC admits are erroneous and based largely on factors with very low levels of understanding and that omit or downplay significant natural drivers of climate variability known to control climate,
- Use of UN IPCC schematics that depend for validity on the implied assumption of the existence of unusually high temperatures that are not occurring,
- Presentation of the UN IPCC's qualitative and politically driven allocation of levels of uncertainty that contradict empirical evidence and known facts and that are not statistically valid and that misrepresent science and climate,
- Smears of those who disagree with his views,
- Invocations of morality.

Although these appear scientific to some journalists and members of parliament and to many members of the public, this is not science. That our university allows and defends such behaviour is of concern and it undermines science.

Our university's misrepresentations of climate and science distract from real and serious humanitarian and environmental challenges and globally harm people and our precious natural environment.