

#### 4.5 Written interaction with Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

On and since 6<sup>th</sup> March 2010 I have corresponded with Professor Hoegh-Guldberg using email, Registered Post letters (with Delivery Confirmation) and standard Australia Post letter services. Specifically, I have requested empirical evidence proving human causation of global warming or climate change (variability) on the following occasions, numbering seven times:

- 6 March, 2010
  - Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's response on 6 March 2010 said: *"... I recommend that you read the evidence outlined in the fourth assessment report of the IPCC. This is the consensus of the world's best scientists on the issue of climate change. I think you'll find what you need to understand both the link between anthropogenic carbon dioxide and climate change, as well as how serious this issue is. I have attached a copy of the summary for policymakers from the IPCC AR4 for your convenience."*
  - I had previously done as Professor Hoegh-Guldberg advised. There is no such evidence of human causation. This is confirmed by internationally eminent climate scientists, including UN IPCC report authors and reviewers;
  - **7 March 2010: in my respectful and gracious response I extended an invitation to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg "I invite you to identify specifically just one piece of scientifically measured real-world evidence proving causal relationship between human production of CO2 and global temperature. Just one." He did not do so.** Yet in his biography on the UQ Global Change Institute website he says, quote *"I have been deeply motivated by the desire to communicate science effectively"*. **He did not respond yet based on his claims and earlier response one would have thought it would be easy. Having researched UN IPCC reports I know it is impossible for him to specify any such empirical evidence of human causation because there is none. I requested him to "please provide me with your declaration of personal interests" and he did not do so;**
- 19 March 2010, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg publicly implicitly criticised me based, in his words *"on the content of your talk (scheduled) on March 24 – there is no other interpretation"*. Yet he did not know the content of my talk among many management and leadership topics at an engineering, business and industry group conference that in fact did not proceed. The title of my scheduled talk indicated that I did not agree with the views on climate that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg shares;
- 10 December 2010. Formal complaint lodged with the University of Queensland (UQ) Senate and copied to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg with a personal letter including detailed explanation. My complaint was dismissed by then UQ Vice Chancellor (VC) Professor Paul Greenfield relying only on internal UQ discussion and failing to address the serious scientific issues and behaviours that my complaint raised. The VC was subsequently dismissed for breaches of ethics on another unrelated matter yet my complaint was not re-examined and has never been independently investigated. No reply was received from Prof Hoegh-Guldberg;
- 19 December 2010 email inquiring as to whether Prof Hoegh-Guldberg had found any empirical evidence of human causation of global warming or climate change. No response received;
- 30 April 2011, in response to an email from Professor Hoegh-Guldberg

- I requested empirical evidence for his claim that human carbon dioxide affects global warming or climate. No response has been received;
- 20 March 2014, an internet-based radio compere invited Professor Hoegh-Guldberg and me to openly debate on climate. I immediately accepted. After no response from Prof Hoegh-Guldberg the compere provided a reminder and in his response on 30 March Professor Hoegh-Guldberg defamed me. **I again invited Professor Hoegh-Guldberg to provide empirical evidence for his core claim of human causation and made it easier by giving him options to provide: a URL link to a peer-reviewed paper providing empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing *human CO2* caused Earth’s latest modest cyclic global *atmospheric* warming from 1976-1998; the name of one organisation that has empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing *human CO2* caused warming and specify exactly where such causal evidence is located? Title, chapter, section, page, ... ; the name of one climate scientist who has empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing *human CO2* caused warming and specify exactly where such causal evidence is located? Title, chapter, section, page, ... .** I asked him: *“Can you fault the logic and empirical science relied upon by my one page summary of the science of causation in item 5 on page 2 of my letter to Greg Hunt? If so, please be specific.”* I stated: *“Further, you repeatedly fail to provide empirical scientific evidence of causation. Worse, you contradict empirical scientific evidence.”*
    - 3 April 2014 Professor Hoegh-Guldberg replied and in doing so smeared Canadian investigative reporter Donna Laframboise;
    - 3 April 2014 I reminded Professor Hoegh-Guldberg that he had replied to none of my requests and requested that he substantiate his claims about Donna Laframboise. He never did so;
    - **4 April 2014 Professor Hoegh-Guldberg introduced religion and conspiracy into the climate discussion when he sent me an email stating only: *“Is it true that you believe in a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world?”***
    - 4 April 2014 I replied: *“No Ove, it’s false. I make decisions based on evidence. I’ve never seen any evidence of any religion wanting to take over the world. Have you? Many of my closest and most admired friends are Jewish and none have discussed the wild conspiracy that you now introduce. From what I’ve seen some people introduce conspiracy theories to deflect attention from something they don’t want others to know of or to attempt to falsely discredit others. Why do you raise “conspiracy” and Jewish people? Now let’s get back to the science, Ove. I’ve pasted below the questions from our email conversation yesterday that you twice failed to answer. Please answer my questions.”* It seems that Professor Hoegh-Guldberg was following on from a defamatory article by then Fairfax journalist Mike Carlton who smeared prominent journalists Andrew Bolt and Alan Jones, The non-profit and voluntary Galileo Movement and me. Mike Carlton implied we are anti-Semitic for our association with The Galileo Movement that was in fact co-founded by two retired men having close links with people of the Jewish faith including one through marriage to a survivor of the World War Two Holocaust. Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s inquiry came despite a publicly available media release refuting of Mike Carlton’s false smear;

- 4 April 2014 Professor Hoegh-Guldberg said: “*Good to hear*”;
- 4 April 2014 I responded: “*Delighted, Ove to receive your judgment. Will you now please answer my straightforward questions?*” Yet Professor Hoegh-Guldberg did not reply to any of my previous simple and straightforward questions;
- 24 April 2015 I initiated my complaint to the current UQ Vice Chancellor Professor Peter Høj about Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s climate misrepresentations and claims in court under oath/affirmation and copied Professor Hoegh-Guldberg on that and on subsequent correspondence with the Vice Chancellor.

**Professor Hoegh-Guldberg has demonstrated that he does not understand the concept of empirical evidence and does not understand what is logically required to prove causal relationships. It seems Professor Hoegh-Guldberg is prone to smearing and ridiculing those whose view differs from his own yet he has never been able to provide evidence for his claim that human carbon dioxide affects global temperature or climate variability. Given correspondence with Professor Hoegh-Guldberg and given his behaviour and implied public statements and claims, I conclude that he has no scientific or engineering justification for his continued public claims that human carbon dioxide affects climate and that his core climate claims contradict empirical evidence. I further conclude that his position is based on a lack of competence and is not honest. My investigations during the last eight years confirm that he has no empirical evidence as proof of human causation because there has never been any such evidence of human causation and there remains no such proof. Professor Hoegh-Guldberg’s responses to my requests for him to provide empirical evidence have never provided such evidence yet he wrongly states or implies that it exists in a report he sent me.**

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg is one of nine members of a close-knit group of academics falsely claiming human carbon dioxide caused global warming and global climate change. All received funding from the previous government pushing its policy to tax carbon dioxide. All misrepresented climate science, climate and nature, many through ABC TV and radio broadcasts. I have requested all to provide evidence of their claim. Most responded to my request yet none has provided any evidence of human causation. My documentation of their behavior is in *CSIROh!* Appendix 9 here: <http://bit.ly/1snwKVB>

This small group has had extensive access to government funding, government media and instrumentalities. Their core claim of human causation of global climate variability is profoundly false and contradicts empirical evidence. Nonetheless, through repeated broadcasts their distortions and contradictions of fundamental scientific facts have taken root in the public psyche.

**If a person who claims to be a scientist is not prepared to defend his/her findings by providing necessary relevant data or disclosing possible vested interests then one can reasonably conclude that those research findings are irrelevant and/or illegitimate. This conclusion is confirmed beyond doubt when the person’s claims contradict empirical evidence.**

It seems reasonable to conclude that the UQ has never impartially investigated or held Professor Hoegh-Guldberg accountable for his work or behaviour.

I have requested of him and of our university that they provide empirical evidence for the basis of the claim that carbon dioxide from human activity affects global climate variability, or provide the specific location of such evidence being book/report/journal title, chapter, date, author and page

numbers. In their responses they have never provided any such evidence or location of such evidence.

The reason is clear: there is no such evidence.

**I have provided empirical evidence proving their core climate claim is false. They have never refuted it in any specific way, let alone scientifically.**

As scientists it is inconceivable that they do not know this. The first duty of a scientist is to examine the empirical data. I conclude that they are either incompetent or dishonest. Both reasons ensure they are not suitable to be expert witnesses.

Advice from these people is not scientific and cannot be trusted.

Instead, in his public responses and his responses to me, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg has used many diversions. He has at various times relied on:

- Output 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;
- 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 warming and climate change,
- Portrayal of natural weather events and inherent natural variation as process change (ie, exceptional variation),
- Broad and generalised yet unsubstantiated claims contradicting empirical evidence,
- Implied fearful projections contradicting science,
- Emotive statements that distract from the lack of empirical evidence,
- 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 or engineering.

Contrary to his claim and that of his colleagues fomenting climate alarm, there is not a consensus of climate scientists supporting his core claim. Although John Cook, whom he supervises at the University of Queensland has co-authored a paper fabricating a claimed consensus, an independent and scientifically peer-reviewed analysis of Cook's claim reveals that his claimed 97% consensus is really only 0.3%.

**That Professor Hoegh-Guldberg relies on a claimed consensus rather than empirical evidence and the scientific process is disturbing. That he relies on an unfounded and false fabrication raises serious questions.**

**This claimed consensus that was fabricated under his supervision and the then UN IPCC Chairman Dr. Rajendra Pachauri's similar false claim are discussed on pages 6-7 of the accompanying report entitled *False Claims Reveal Hidden Opportunities*.**

If the Board requires, I can make copies of my correspondence with Professor Hoegh-Guldberg available to the Board.