

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

Wednesday, November 10th, 2010

Mr John Story, FAICD
The Chancellor
(University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072)

c/o Suncorp Group
GPO Box 1453
Brisbane QLD 4001

Dear Mr. Story:

Re: Formal complaint of unprofessional and possibly unethical conduct by University of Queensland's Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

As you are a member of the University of Queensland's Senate I draw to your attention my serious concerns. My intention, as a graduate of the University of Queensland (BE, Honours, 1976) is to assist you in protecting the University's reputation.

Part 2, Division 2, Section 8 of the University of Queensland Act, 1998 proclaims you as responsible for the university's governance. Part 3, Section 32 of The University of Queensland Act, 1998 proclaims the Vice-Chancellor to be the University's Chief-Executive Officer. As the Senate and Vice-Chancellor are responsible for conduct of the university's officers I please request that you arrange a formal investigation of my complaint and that you do so using a transparently open, objective and balanced body completely independent of the university. (<http://www.uq.edu.au/senate/docs/UnivOfQldA98-4B.pdf>)

University of Queensland's integrity and reputation are threatened:

As an Engineering graduate from the University of Queensland I am concerned about the conduct of Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg on ABC-TV's Stateline program broadcast on

Friday, October 29th, 2010. I am concerned that his behaviour brings the university into disrepute, is unscientific and likely unethical.

Using reputable and credible material I have previously drawn Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's attention to the UN IPCC's fraud. The UN IPCC makes its fraudulent core claim on global warming yet lacks any scientifically measured real-world evidence of a causal relationship between human activity and global climate. Yet Professor Hoegh-Guldberg continues making false statements in public. Given his responsibility for fund raising and his public falsities one wonders whether Professor Hoegh-Guldberg is acting fraudulently? (Dictionary definition of fraud: *Presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain?*)

Please refer to the enclosed Stateline transcript pasted into a Word document with my separate comments subsequently added in response to each of Prof Hoegh-Guldberg's statements. Please refer to the enclosed copy of my letter of today's date to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg.

I value UQ's reputation and seek to protect it and the value of my degree. These are among my reasons for submitting this formal complaint about Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour.

Unscientific, unprofessional and possibly unethical conduct:

After watching the interview of Professor Hoegh-Guldberg broadcast on ABC-TV's Stateline program on Friday, October 29th, 2010 I have written to the professor asking him for evidence supporting his public statements. I have again revealed to him that to rely on the UN IPCC's reports is unscientific and contrary to the science. I am dismayed that the professor continues to cite the UN IPCC. Apparently he has not checked or continues to ignore the UN IPCC's own data on its own reporting processes. That data was provided to him personally over seven months ago.

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg was made aware of the UN IPCC's fraud in March, 2010 when I sought evidence for Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's earlier statement that humans caused global warming. During the two weeks covered by our correspondence, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg failed to provide any scientifically measured real-world evidence despite my detailed rebuttal of his claims and my detailed request.

Enclosed for your reference are copies of e-mails I sent to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg on March 7th, 2010 at 2:30pm and March, 8th, 2010 at 2:30pm. Both are self-explanatory. They provide solid evidence that would cause a real scientist to pause and consider his position.

Please advise if you wish to see all e-mail correspondence between myself and Professor Hoegh-Guldberg. Upon request, I will be pleased to share these with you.

Loss of tens of millions of dollars of expected funding to University of Queensland:

Recently my interest in exposing the UN IPCC's fraud led to contact by a wealthy South-east Queensland philanthropist passionate about science and its benefits to humanity and the environment. He has donated tens of thousands of dollars to UQ for scientific research and had planned to donate up to ten million dollars to UQ. He advises that he has been appalled by the low standards of scientific knowledge among some UQ scientists he has interviewed and sponsored. He advised me that he is particularly concerned by UQ's advocacy, contrary to the science, that global warming was abnormal, catastrophic and caused by humans. Last week he advised that he will not be donating anything in future.

He further advises that he had been bringing in far wealthier people with the intent of them donating considerably more than the ten million he anticipated donating personally. He is now advising his colleagues against donating to the University of Queensland.

Legal threats and loss of public confidence:

John O'Sullivan is a British legal analyst with successful experience litigating claims in the USA. In confirmation of my own reading, he has personally advised that government agencies around the world and universities affiliated with the UN IPCC have failed to provide access to data upon which their climate claims are supposedly based. He has publicly made similar statements on many occasions such as this:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=24aEw7f1Xuc> (YouTube video: RT - "Cracking the Climate Fraud Wide Open" - John O'Sullivan - Climate Fools Day) or the third video on http://rt.com/Top_News/2010-10-27/climate-change-fools-sceptics.html?fullstory

In New Zealand recently, skeptics legally challenged in court the NZ government's stance and inflicted a legal defeat. The government agency (National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research) quickly capitulated by admitting it had nothing to do with the country's "official" climate record. The defeated climatologists are apparently now implicated in temperature data fraud. (O'Sullivan, "Legal Defeat for Global Warming in Kiwigate Scandal:

[http://www.suite101.com/content/legal-defeat-for-global-warming-in-kiwigate-scandal-a294157\)](http://www.suite101.com/content/legal-defeat-for-global-warming-in-kiwigate-scandal-a294157)

After listening to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's public comments I am concerned that UQ may be falling into the trap of issuing alarmist 'sound bites' to attract research grants. It is public knowledge that some universities have founded institutes similar to UQ's Global Change Institute to attract research grants and been delighted with results achieved.

Given the pressures on university funding today, I am concerned that UQ not fall into the trap that claimed the University of East Anglia and Pennsylvania State University. Please refer to page 4 of The Eco Fraud—Part 1 available at www.conscious.com.au and specifically http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf. Please refer to Climategate 'Inquiry' References at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf. Among the references please note 'The Climategate Inquiries. The Global Warming Policy

Foundation, GWPF Report 1' available at <http://www.thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/Climategate-Inquiries.pdf>. The Foreword by Lord Turnbull provides sound advice.

Science's role is to liberate humanity not kill people:

In my comments responding to Prof Hoegh-Guldberg's statements on Stateline's transcript, I ask whether he is aware that science's primary role is service to humanity. Is he aware that some of his recommendations will be highly detrimental to humanity?

It is troubling that his recommendations are not based on real-world science and contradict sound science.

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg seems to be not aware that people's lives are at stake and that his recommendations, if adopted will be very wasteful and threaten human lives.

Request for fully independent inquiry, retractions, apology, corrections:

Given the nature and seriousness of my observations and associated complaint my request is for a full and thorough independent investigation of my complaint about Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's conduct.

Given the apparent heavy emphasis on funding that directs the Global Change Institute and the political pressure amassed on the topic of global warming, the provisions under Rule 17 "Conduct of Inquiry", part (b) of "Senate Rules—Staff Tenure", are concerning. (<http://www.uq.edu.au/senate/docs/Senate%20Rules/Senate%20Rules%202010-updated%2026.08.2010.pdf>) It is essential that my complaint be assessed impartially. For that reason, scientific evidence will be important.

To assess Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's conduct, scientific evidence will be needed and assessed by qualified independent scientists. The inquiry would need to call external and internal witnesses with opposing views. Their evidence of causality needs to be assessed by independent scientists.

Grant funding and donations are likely structurally ingrained in the Global Change Institute's operations. It is thus essential the inquiry be independent and be seen to be independent.

The CSIRO and other organisations funded by the government need to be excluded. Despite my repeated written requests to Dr Megan Clark, CSIRO Chief Executive and Dr Andrew Johnson, CSIRO Group Executive—Environment, in their replies neither could provide any specific scientifically measured real-world evidence of human causation of global warming. The issue is heavily polluted by politics and CSIRO is beholden to funding that is seen by many scientists to be politically motivated.

In relation to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's statements broadcast on Stateline on Friday, 29.10.10 I specifically request:

- a public apology to geologists and engineers for Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's comments;
- retraction of his endorsement of the UN IPCC;
- correction of his alarmist complaints and their replacement by statements accurately reflecting scientifically measured, real-world observational data presented accurately in spatial and temporal context.

I request that the Global Change Institute's web site be withdrawn until its statements accurately reflect the science on global warming causes and effects by replacing emotive 'sound bites' with proven, solid, scientifically-measured real-world observational data presented accurately in spatial and temporal context. Claims on the web site need to be supported by specific, accurate scientifically measured real-world observations as evidence.

Within Australia and overseas, I have often witnessed systems (and leadership) within organisations being powerful sub-conscious drivers of people's behaviour. My experience in agriculture, mining, manufacturing and service sectors shows that organisational and personal performance measures can sub-consciously drive counterproductive managerial behaviours.

One past client is a major Australian university. Observations there revealed counterproductive behaviours driven by systems and leadership. In my letter to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg I suggested he consider the university's systems governing and thus driving his performance.

Rule 4 (b) of "Senate Rules—Institutes" states, quote: "Institutes must secure external funding." I respectfully suggest the Senate consider whether associated systems could be driving unscientific and/or unethical behaviours in the Global Change Institute.

I conclude that at best Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's conduct is unscientific, scientifically incompetent and irresponsibly foolish. At worst it could be dishonest or fraudulent. (Dictionary definition of fraud: *Presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain*).

Nonetheless, I do not seek punishment of Professor Hoegh-Guldberg. I simply seek restoration of scientific process and scientific integrity together with correction of his public statements. I seek to protect the university's reputation.

Although the UN IPCC has sparked a political and academic gravy-train, it is now clear that its position contradicts the science. Conducting an independent inquiry into Prof Hoegh-Guldberg's public statements will provide an historic opportunity for the University of Queensland to take leadership of Australian science and restore integrity to science.

That would likely result in the university re-establishing fundamentals for sustained success attracting future research funds, students and academic and research staff. In hard and soft sciences, the short-term and long-term benefits to the University of grasping this opportunity seem enormous.

Such opportunities are the makings of institutions and create strong, positive legacies.

Part 2, Division 2, Section 10 of The University of Queensland Act, 1998 states, quote: “The senate must act in the way that appears to it most likely to promote the university’s interests.” Part 2, Division 4, Section 26A of The University of Queensland Act, 1998 stipulates, among other things, that members of the Senate, quote: “must act honestly” and, quote: “must exercise reasonable skills, care and due diligence.”

The Senate as governing body and the Vice-Chancellor as chief executive are ultimately responsible for conduct of the university’s professors. There is overwhelmingly abundant material in the public domain exposing the UN IPCC as unscientific and as fraudulently peddling falsities contradicting science. The bubble is bursting. It is no longer a defence to hide behind the UN IPCC. The Chief Executive and governing body of an organisation simply deferring to the UN IPCC would now be personally tainted.

Assistance offered:

My reading during the last three years includes thousands of pages of scientific journals, books and articles on global warming. I have listened to, and communicated with, some of the world’s eminent climate scientists. If requested I will endeavour to locate scientists suitable for advising you. These now include eminent UN IPCC scientists openly and publicly disgusted with the UN IPCC’s fraudulent and unscientific practices.

Such eminent scientists would be pleased to protect our university’s reputation and restore its integrity.

www.conscious.com.au provides links to the compelling work of Dr Vincent Gray and John McLean. Dr Gray is a UN IPCC Expert Reviewer who has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports—1991, 1995, 2001, 2007. McLean’s first four articles presented at www.conscious.com.au cannot be sensibly refuted since they simply present UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. McLean obtained the publicly available data from the UN IPCC itself.

I am available to explain my complaint in person to the Senate and, subject to timing, could arrange to be accompanied by scientists recognised for their expertise in global warming and its causes and effects. My personal declaration of interests is publicly available at www.conscious.com.au. I am available on a volunteer basis to assist you in protecting our University of Queensland.

Having personal experience in governorship, it is clear to me that while governing bodies have clear responsibilities for current stakeholders, often their greatest responsibility is to those not yet born—future stakeholders, future citizens.

I believe you will agree that a university's role is not the creation of institutes based on tapping largess flowing from a bureaucratic lie driving a fraudulent political agenda. Instead of being destroyers of science, reputable universities endeavour to be protectors of civilisation's knowledge, learning, free thinking and critical inquiry.

This complaint in good faith is made to you as a governor of the university. My hope and request is that you protect our university's integrity and reputation.

Yours sincerely,

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

Enclosures:

Transcript of ABC-TV Stateline interview, Fr.29.10.10

Copy of personal letter to Prof Hoegh-Guldberg and accompanying material:

- E-mail of Su.07.03.10 (Roberts to Hoegh-Guldberg)
- E-mail of Mo.08.03.10 (Roberts to Hoegh-Guldberg)

Copy of formal complaint to ABC-TV

cc:

Official and Appointed Members of University of Queensland Senate

Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

Stateline program, ABC News, ABC-TV

Various scientists

Friends and fellow graduates of the University of Queensland

Various federal members of parliament responsible for protecting taxpayers' funds

Maurice Newman AC, ABC Board Chairman

Mark Scott, ABC Managing Director

Electronic copy to the Vice Chancellor's e-mail address for forwarding to all senate members so they can, if desired, easily check links for themselves

Mr John Story
The Chancellor
(University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072)

c/o Suncorp Group
GPO Box 1453
Brisbane QLD 4001

Mr Tim Crommelin
(University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072)

Chairman
RBS
GPO Box 202
Brisbane QLD 4001

Mr Charlie Sartain
(University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072)

Chief Executive Xstrata Copper
GPO Box 1433
Brisbane QLD 4001

The Hon David Hamill
(University of Queensland
ST. LUCIA QLD 4072)

Director
GPO Box 689
Brisbane QLD 4001