

From: "Graham" <grahamhw@iprimus.com.au>
Subject: **Emails to Rick Stocker of the CSIRO**
Date: 30 April 2012 7:18:12 PM AEST
To: <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>

On 29th July, 3rd August, 12th August and 27th August I wrote to Rick Stocker asking why CSIRO web site was so biased and excluded all opposing climate information and scientists such as Richard Lindzen.

In connection with my claims of scientific bias the CSIRO offered no explanation as to why opposing scientific evidence does not appear on their web site but simply said (Rick Stocker, pers comm, 2/11/2011) "***we do not intend to comment in detail on the propositions you have put forward other than respectfully to disagree***" And again on the 26th August the CSIRO offered the following response (Rick Stocker, pers comm, 26/8/2011):

"I believe we have responded as fully as possible to your questions by providing links to our research. CSIRO stands behind the quality of its research and the information presented at its website – CSIRO.au."

My email of 27th August remains unanswered.

29th July Email to CSIRO

Dear Sir,

"I am concerned about the extreme scientific bias of your web site when it comes to climate change and the fact that when it comes to climate science you publish views which are consistent with government policy but exclude other evidence (please correct me if this is wrong). For instance, you endorse scientifically discredited organisations such as the IPCC but you fail to mention opposing evidence from thousands of other scientists such as those of the NIPCC. Why? Evidence from world famous climate scientists who disagree with government policy, such as Professor Richard Lindzen, are also excluded from your site. Why? Is there some criteria by which you selectively cite scientific evidence while excluding other scientific evidence? Why is it that the evidence you choose to highlight regarding climate change just happens to agree with government policy? Did you advise government of conflicting scientific views about climate change from others such as Lindzen and the NIPCC or did you just advise government of one side of the scientific story?"

3rd August Email to CSIRO

Hi Rick,

"Thank you for your email.

I have cited to you scientific evidence from world famous climate scientists which totally discredits your claims and those of the IPCC and yet you continue to endorse a policy of scientific bias which dictates that such evidence is excluded from your site. This selective use of scientific evidence creates the very clear perception that you only permit scientific evidence on your site which is supportive of government climate policy. This is cause for alarm. Also cause for alarm is your decision to continue with this policy. I should hardly need to point out that experts like Professor Lindzen and Professor Christy were once both IPCC scientists but yet both now have drawn attention to the inaccuracy of IPCC claims, discredited claims which you apparently still endorse. Interestingly, in keeping with the scientific bias which is apparent on your site, you refuse to mention these facts.

In the interest of truth and restoring the credibility of the CSIRO, are you prepared to debate these issues in a public forum with scientists who take an opposing view?

I am sure your answer will reveal the strength of your convictions and your commitment to truth."

12th August Email to CSIRO

"Dear Rick,

You have failed to answer my queries as reiterated again in my email of 3rd August.

Will you be correcting the scientific bias on your web site or do you intend to continue with your present policy? Since so far you have been unable to explain this bias the impression is clearly created that it is CSIRO policy to exclude scientific evidence which does not agree with government climate change policy. Is this correct? If not, when will you be restoring balance to your site?"

27th August Email to CSIRO

"Dear Rick,

I have been exceedingly patient with you in spite of your evasiveness and refusal to answer my questions.

You continue to show a determination to avoid responding to my questions about the serious scientific bias on your web site and your dismissal

you continue to show a determination to avoid responding to my questions about the serious scientific bias on your web site and your dismissive and discriminatory attitude to world famous climate scientists with whom you seem to disagree.

In spite of your evasive attitude, and your determination to support the scientific bias displayed on your site, I remain hopeful that you will reconsider and decide instead to supply a meaningful response.

It is indeed sad to see the scientific credibility and reputation of the CSIRO in tatters, some even holding the once respected CSIRO up to public ridicule (see encl).

I remain hopeful that you might share my concerns and assist in reversing this trend."