

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.  
180 Haven Road  
Pullenvale QLD 4069

[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)

[www.conscious.com.au](http://www.conscious.com.au)

Phone: 04 1964 2379

Monday, March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Dr. Andrew Johnson  
Group Executive—Environment  
CSIRO Ecosciences Precinct  
GPO Box 46  
Brisbane QLD 4001

Dear Dr. Johnson:

**LAWFUL NOTICE OF DEFAULT**

**SENT BY REGISTERED POST WITH DELIVERY CONFIRMATION  
WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND IN GOOD FAITH**

Thank you for your letter dated February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 in reply to my letter dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 accompanying my report entitled *CSIROh!* on climate science and corruption of climate science.

Firstly, as stated in the opening section of my report and in various places in its appendices I acknowledge that CSIRO is, quote: “*an Aussie science icon*”. I stated thereafter, quote: “*CSIRO developed a justifiably proud reputation over many decades and contains many fine, dedicated scientists and people across disciplines*”. I continued, quote: “*Why though does CSIRO corrupt science? Why does CSIRO’s executive management contradict empirical scientific evidence?*”

Secondly, your letter fails to address my offer and invitation dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, quote: “*I offer you this opportunity though to identify, specify and justify significant material errors you may perceive in my report. If you consider such errors exist please identify them specifically and provide empirical scientific evidence and/or facts.*”

I provided you with detailed analysis of CSIRO’s climate claims and implied claims. My analysis is supported by empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning. My analysis was formulated with assistance and material from some of the world’s most eminent independent climate scientists. You were asked to refute my analysis and report. Your failure to do so renders judgment by default and thereby endorses my claims.

Taxpayers fund you and CSIRO. Your response thus fails in your duty of care to all Australian taxpayers. You are a public servant and under legislation you are to serve the people and parliament to the best of your ability.

The sixteen pages of my report's *Part 1* entitled '*Review of CSIRO report in context*' explained my conclusions that CSIRO is corrupting climate science and thereby tarnishing CSIRO's reputation internationally and in Australia. Hundreds of pages of appendices provide evidence supporting my conclusion.

Although not required to do so, I now give you a further fourteen days to rebut this notice of default. Failure to do so by Friday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013 will render my claims as factual.

Failure by you to provide by March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013 a detailed factual rebuttal will trigger a Notice of Acceptance that you have accepted my claims to be true by way of judgment of default.

I note that you have personally signed your letter dated February 22<sup>nd</sup> and made yourself personally liable as the officer representing CSIRO and replying on behalf of CSIRO. Your failure to specifically refute my analysis is a personal failure.

Please note my further additional concerns as a result of your reply. Firstly, you provide no evidence for your rejection of my report. Instead you rely on a '*claim to authority*'. That is not scientific. It's a rejection of science and goes against science by proffering and relying upon opinion. In doing this you further undermine CSIRO's reputation and your personal standing.

I made my report in good faith and asked my questions of you in good faith. If you presented empirical scientific evidence it would end the debate. Yet you fail to provide such evidence. I conclude you have no such evidence. Your behaviour fails to meet my need for trust.

Your letter fails to respond to my request, quote: "*Please simultaneously declare your personal financial interests in advocating the claim that human CO2 should be cut.*"

By default your letter dated February 22<sup>nd</sup> confirms the following points and many others made in my report and the appendices it includes:

- You knew about the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) scathing report of August 2010 into UN IPCC processes and procedures. You would be aware that the body of the IAC's report calls into question all 800 statements of certainty made by the UN IPCC in its 2007 report. Further, you apparently failed to take action to investigate CSIRO's reliance on UN IPCC reports and CSIRO's involvement in producing UN IPCC reports;
- You are aware that your previous correspondence with me on climate failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for your claims and implied claims that human carbon dioxide (CO2) caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming period that ended in 1998;
- You are aware that you and CSIRO have failed to provide empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming and you are aware that you and CSIRO contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- You endorse my report's Appendix 4 and facts therein on empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning being the framework for confirming that human CO2 did not and cannot warm the planet.

I acknowledge with curiosity the inclusion of the following with your letter of February 22<sup>nd</sup>:

- My letter to you dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 returned to me;
- Parts 1 and 2 of my report entitled *CSIROh!* returned to me with four marks as noted below;

- An opened and empty Registered Post envelope addressed by me to CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark without my letter to her dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 that it had contained yet with what is presumably her copy of my report entitled *CSIROh!*

Under the circumstances, is your reply made on behalf of Dr. Megan Clark? That was the case with your reply dated March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Could you please explain your reasons for returning my letter and copies of my *CSIROh!* report?

Page 1 of the first copy of Part 1 returned with your letter contains four markings as follows:

- On the first line words "*at the invitation of Steve Austin, host on ABC-Radio 612*" have been highlighted in green;
- In the left margin beside the third line are handwritten words in blue ink. They state, quote: "*Error (undeciphered word) File not found*". I have checked the link and it operates successfully. Did you or an assistant not enter it accurately?
- In the second paragraph blue ink circles the letter "e" in my quote from Steve Austin's incorrect spelling of Dr. Megan Clark's name, "*Clarke*"; and,
- In the fifth paragraph the words "*each MP via Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation*" have been highlighted in green. Additionally, these words are underlined by blue ink.

Dr. Johnson, are you not aware of the serious humanitarian and environmental consequences of cutting human CO2 output? You are aiding and forcing detriment to my family without my consent. Why are you doing so without empirical scientific evidence and in contradiction of empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning? Why?

I have asked you to identify, specify and justify significant material errors in my report and to provide empirical scientific evidence and/or facts as your justification. Your failure to respond accordingly makes my report your default answer and the answer to which you agree.

With sincere intent to assist, Dr. Johnson, I encourage you to respond honestly, factually and specifically to my invitation and to do so with supporting empirical scientific evidence. It's your duty of care. Truth and honesty liberate.

In the interests of accountability and transparency this letter and any response(s) from you will be posted on the Internet and federal parliamentarians will be advised.

Yours sincerely,

*Original personally signed*

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.  
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)  
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

cc: Dr. Megan Clark, CSIRO Chief Executive