

## 7. Details of alleged misconduct in research and integrity breach:

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg has repeatedly made public claims that carbon dioxide from human activity causes damaging global warming and climate change. I have sought empirical evidence for his claim yet his responses have never provided such evidence. His claims contradict empirical evidence.

I have requested the specific location of empirical evidence and logical causal reasoning proving human causation and his responses have never specified.

Following his October 2010 public comments I complained to then Vice-Chancellor Paul Greenfield who dismissed it without independent inquiry.

After the professor's 7<sup>th</sup> April 2015 court testimony, I complained to Vice-Chancellor Peter Høj. His initial responses and subsequent failure to respond are part of this complaint because I conclude that UQ is not fulfilling its ARC responsibility to provide a culture of objective scientific research based on empirical evidence. ***He failed to respond to serious systemic issues and my substantiated facts provided in response to his requests.***

After almost eight years investigating this political issue I understand and empathise with the university's reliance on ARC funding.

My complaint extends to the professor's serious misconduct involving dereliction of duties and apparently wilful misrepresentation of climate science.

Instead of empirical evidence his public and personal responses rely at various times on:

- False and misleading claims of consensus,
- Appeals to authority including citing the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that has no empirical evidence and causal logic proving human carbon dioxide affects global temperature or climate. See Appendix 2 and the 15 February 2007 Land and Resources Tribunal Queensland ruling (Suttor Creek mine). The Tribunal correctly concluded that no evidence had been presented to support the claim that human production of carbon dioxide affects climate.
- Invocations to peer-review despite the scientific literature lacking empirical evidence for his position,
- Portrayal of natural weather and natural variation as process change,
- Implied or explicit fearful projections contradicting evidence,
- Emotive statements distracting from lacking empirical evidence,
- Smearing those who disagree with him.
- Invocations of morality.

Although these sound scientific to lay people, this is not science.

The professor's apparently corrupt conduct adversely affects university science and includes possible fraud because his behaviour contradicting and misrepresenting empirical evidence provides direct and indirect benefit through consulting fees, payments from political activists, research grants associated with his core claim and academic status from misrepresentations.

Research misconduct. His behaviour appears to breach ARC's *Australian Code for the responsible conduct of research*: 1.6, 1.7, 4.5, 4.12, and 7.2. In his report to the Land Court, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg did not disclose payments received from political activist groups Greenpeace and/or WWF over a period extending more than two decades.

My complaint includes complaint about maladministration, specifically through conduct that is unlawful, arbitrary, improper and discriminates against empirical data and those presenting such data.

Please see accompanying documents.

The university could be in breach of the ARC Code as follows: 1.1, 1.2 and specifically 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 2.1, 4.1, 4.3, 6 Introduction, 6.1 with emphasis on impartial and 7.