

From: Ben Cubby <bcubby@fairfaxmedia.com.au>
Subject:
Date: 19 February 2013 9:46:06 PM AEST
To: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>

Malcolm-Ieuan,

In considering your request that I identify errors in the report you sent to me - *CSIROh! Climate of Deception? Or First Step to Freedom?* - I find myself confronting an unusual problem: how does one critically analyse a pile of horse shit?

Even by the exceedingly low standards of Australia's climate skeptic community, your report is dire. You direct me to Appendix 13. It is littered with errors of all kinds: a mish-mash of muddled conjecture, impossible leaps of logic, fundamental misunderstandings of the scientific method, misread and misquoted research that has been poorly cited, internal contradictions, confused dates, spelling mistakes, and strangled grammar. It is, in all respects, a dud.

I am not going to comply with your demand that I "identify, specify and justify" all the errors in your report. There are too many. However, this should not be read as a reluctance on my part to address your complaints. You will recall that, many months ago, you asked me to provide you with some empirical evidence of human-induced climate change, and I immediately sent you a series of peer-reviewed papers that did just that.

You responded, a month later, after lengthy consultation with your science advisor Tim Ball (not "Tim Tall", as you call him in your report). You advanced an unpublished and frankly bizarre theory about underwater volcanoes. Apparently these hidden volcanoes conveniently rumbled to life at just the right rate to mimic both the rise and isotopic signature of human-generated atmospheric CO₂. With theories like this, it is not difficult to see why even other climate skeptics have distanced themselves from your work.

Your report tries to allege that there are factual errors in my reporting. If you honestly believe this, there is a fairly simple way to deal with it: request a correction from the newspaper. Your requests will be independently considered on their merits by people other than me. It is remarkable that you allege thousands of errors, spanning a period of several years, yet have not sought to address them in this straightforward, transparent way.

You demand I declare my "personal financial interests in advocating the claim that human CO₂ should be cut". First, I'm not advocating anything in particular, apart from fact-based reporting. Second, I have no financial interest in any industry related to emissions cuts. Nor have I worked for coal companies, as you have.

As I've made clear in earlier replies to your many emails, I don't mind a civil discussion about environment reporting or climate change. But until you start to ground your opinions in fact, I will continue to regard your correspondence as amusing spam.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Cubby

The information contained in this e-mail message and any accompanying files is or may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, reliance, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail or any attached files is unauthorised. This e-mail is subject to copyright. No part of it should be reproduced, adapted or communicated without the written consent of the copyright owner. If you have received this e-mail in error please advise the sender immediately by return e-mail or telephone and delete all copies. Fairfax Media does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of any information contained in this e-mail or attached files. Internet communications are not secure, therefore Fairfax Media does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message or attached files.