

**From:** Andy Pitman <[andy.pitman@gmail.com](mailto:andy.pitman@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Reply 2 Re: Just read your article  
**Date:** 10 January 2011 8:28:08 PM AEST  
**To:** Malcolm Roberts <[catalyst@eis.net.au](mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au)>  
**Reply-To:** [a.pitman@unsw.edu.au](mailto:a.pitman@unsw.edu.au)

---

Hello,

your e-mails have been blocked at receipt and automatically deleted. They have not been delivered to the nominated recipient or read.

If you believe this to be in error please write to the address below.

I sincerely apologise if this is in error.

Andy Pitman

On 10/01/11 9:21 PM, Malcolm Roberts wrote:

Andy:

Further to my previous response to your e-mail below, please note that the UN IPCC Chairman, Rajendra Pachauri has reportedly made blatantly false and exaggerated claims about the extent to which UN IPCC reports rely on peer-reviewed science. In light of that and in consequence of your advice below, please clarify your understanding of the term peer-review.

Do you mean genuine scientific peer review as commonly accepted in the scientific community? ie, broadly, authors freely make available all their raw data, methodology and references to their anonymous peers for scrutiny. This step is followed by authors addressing in writing the comments they receive from their anonymous peers and then either modifying their paper accordingly or defending with reasons justifying not revising their paper.

Or, do you mean corruptions of scientific peer review that have been falsely claimed as peer review by the UN IPCC? This has apparently been demonstrated by many references cited by UN IPCC reports.

Or, do you mean activists' statements not scientifically peer-reviewed yet cited, relied upon and referenced in the UN IPCC's 2007 report that UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri reportedly assured us were 100% peer-reviewed?

Are you aware that the UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies upon 5,587 references not peer reviewed?

Or, do you mean papers from the close knit cabals of 'scientists' as authors and reviewers such as those of chapter 9 of the UN IPCC's 2007 report? My understanding is that many of that small cabal had vested interests in writing the chapter and had a closely interconnected network of 'peer-reviewers' who were not anonymous. Indeed, it seems reviewers were colleagues or even sub-ordinates of authors. If so, do you claim that is objective peer-review?

This is significant because as you know, chapter 9 is the core of the UN IPCC's supposed detection of global warming and attribution of supposed global warming to human production of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Or, do you mean key UN IPCC reports claimed to be peer reviewed yet whose authors refuse to allow peers access to data?

For further clarification, what do you mean by the term 'published' in reference to scientific papers? Do you mean published in formerly respected scientific magazines that are now widely discredited as un-scientific? Do you mean published in the journal of a once prestigious scientific body that is now directed by a journalist in place of scientists?

Do you mean publication in the journal of an institute after that body has contravened its own guidelines for peer review?

How do you classify a scientific paper, for example, that was peer-reviewed in accordance with an institute's procedures and published. One of its authors was then targeted by scientists with an opposing opinion who stated they sought to knock him out because his paper threatened their case. The publishing body then succumbed to a challenge from the opponents. Despite the second review contradicting the journal's own peer-review processes, the paper was knocked out. Yet the authors were given no right of reply. In your view, is that paper peer-reviewed or not?

How do you classify occurrences in which scientists actively attempt to make it impossible for those of opposing views to be published?

Are you aware that UN IPCC data (provided by the UN IPCC itself) reveals that even the UN IPCC's supposed 'peer-review' processes have been corrupted and at times completely bypassed?

What is your definition of peer review, Andy, not the UN IPCC's definition?

Before I embark on further analysis of the 2007 report's chapters on observations and on radiative forcing can you please give me assurances on the types of peer-review relied upon by those chapters?

What is to be gained from further analysis of work from an organisation, the UN IPCC, that is blatantly not scientific and is motivated overwhelmingly by political agenda? What is to be gained from further analysis of its reports when solid data and its leaders' false public statements prove to me the UN IPCC's work is fraudulent?

You are a UN IPCC Lead Author and prominent public advocate of global warming caused by human CO<sub>2</sub>. Can you not see that by providing one specific piece of scientifically measured real-world evidence you would provide a powerful answer?

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

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

180 Haven Road  
Pullenvale QLD 4069  
Phone:  
Home 07 3374 3374  
Mobile 04 1964 2379  
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

On 09/01/2011, at 5:51 PM, Andy Pitman wrote:

Hi Malcolm,

I suggest you read the chapters in the IPCC 2007 report on observations,

and on radiative forcing. If I simply quote you subsets of these reports I might be accused of selectivity, or misrepresentation. You need to read them in their entirety and read a suite of the accompanying literature cited therein.

This is, of course, a huge undertaking but unless you do this people can easily mislead you by simple explanations that "its natural" or "its volcanoes" or "its the sun" and that is such a waste of everyone's time.

If you form the basis of a judgment based on evidence that will convince you. If you have already made up your mind that the climate scientists, physicists, oceanographers, most geologists, biologists, hydrologists have just made this all up then I do not think I can help.

I hope you enjoy the reading. If you cannot access specific papers please let me know and I may be able to help.

Andy Pitman

On 9/01/11 6:04 PM, Malcolm Roberts wrote:

Andy:

Happy new year to you and yours.

Having just read your article printed in The Australian ("No need to go gaga over Gaia") I noted this paragraph of yours, quote: "For the record, that the Earth is warming due to greenhouse gases emitted by human activities is as certain as pretty well anything else in mainstream science."

Please provide one piece of specific scientifically measured real-world data proving your claim.

Please do not cite computer models as these have not been validated and have proven erroneous.

Please do not cite UN IPCC reports as the 2007 report's core chapter 9

does not provide any real-world scientific evidence. None.

Please do not claim the UN IPCC relies on peer-reviewed science. That is a proven falsity.

And this paragraph, quote: "There is scientific doubt about global warming, too, but we know with certainty that continued emissions of carbon dioxide will lead to warming, rising sea levels and ocean acidification at unprecedented rates, and that these changes will trigger expenses and outcomes that dwarf the costs of actually solving the problem."

Please provide one specific piece of scientifically measured real-world data proving this claim of certainty.

Just one piece of real-world scientific data for each of your claims, please Andy.

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

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

180 Haven Road  
Pullenvale QLD 4069  
Phone:  
Home 07 3374 3374  
Mobile 04 1964 2379  
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

--  
Professor AJ Pitman  
Co director, Climate Change Research Centre,  
The University of New South Wales.

a.pitman@unsw.edu.au  
skype: andy.pitman.

Phone +61 2 9385 7075

--

Professor AJ Pitman  
Co director, Climate Change Research Centre,  
The University of New South Wales.  
[a.pitman@unsw.edu.au](mailto:a.pitman@unsw.edu.au) skype: andy.pitman.  
Phone +61 2 9385 7075