

From: Malcolm Roberts

To: Høj Professor Peter, UQ VC OFFICE

Cc: Cook John, Hoegh-Guldberg Ove, Forbes Viv, Carter Bob, Plimer Ian, Marohasy Jennifer, Starck Walter, Ridd Peter, Ball Tim, Laframboise Donna, Bast Joe, Moore Patrick, Pyne Christopher, Prentice Jane, Abbott Tony, Abbott Tony2, Robb Andrew, Bishop Bronwyn, Morrison Scott, Truss Warren, Christensen George, Hawke Alex, Nikolic Andrew, Kelly Craig, Cobb John, Simpkins Luke, Jensen Dennis, Wyatt Ken, Day Bob, Leyonhjelm David, Bernardi Cory, Canavan Matthew, Abetz Eric, Brandis George, Macdonald Ian, Heffernan Bill, Scullion Nigel, Sinodinos Arthur, Xenophon Nick, Lambie Jacqui, Lazarus Glenn, Taylor Angus, McGrath James, O'Sullivan Barry, Lindgren Joanna, John Zornig

Date: Monday, 20 July, 2015, 5:50pm

Subject: Reply to UQ Vice Chancellor on his & UQ staff misrepresentations of climate

Dear Professor Høj:

Subject: RE: D14/10464 : Fwd: Taxpayer funding of University of Queensland aiding Greenpeace?

And: Re: D15/7927: Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

Thank you for your reply of 1st July 2015 to my letters dated 25 April and 21 May 2015.

In it you introduce the topic 'perjury'. I empathise with your predicament that you raise.

I did not mention perjury. My complaint reiterates my previous complaints about Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's public statements and implied statements out of court that have repeatedly been misleading, exaggerated, not correct and/or contradicting empirical evidence. My latest complaint includes his statements in the Queensland Land Court, as reported in The Australian newspaper on 7th April 2015, and that contradict empirical (scientific) evidence.

Thank you for confirming that Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg has taken money from activist organisation Greenpeace. Presumably from your letter, Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg was paid for his statements in the Land Court.

As a UQ engineering honours graduate I'm encouraged that you are beginning to acknowledge the seriousness of the situation in which Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook have placed you and our university.

That is the first step to restoring scientific integrity at UQ and then, on that foundation, rebuilding UQ as a premier Australian university admired worldwide for science.

Given that you raise perjury, it is disconcerting that **your letter has again not provided any empirical evidence, or specific location of such evidence, to support Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's court statements. Nor have you provided such evidence for his and John Cook's repeated core claim that carbon dioxide from human activity causes dangerous global warming or climate variability. As stated in earlier letters, the reported court statements and claims contradict empirical evidence.**

Of increased concern in your latest letter is your false implied claim that the UN IPCC's reports contain empirical evidence supporting the claim that human production of

carbon dioxide causes global warming or climate variability. They clearly do not.

As a result of your letter of 1st July, my complaint is now about three primary issues:

- 1. Your support, contrary to empirical scientific evidence, for Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's claims in the Land Court and, additionally your reliance on your false implied claim that the UN IPCC's reports contain empirical evidence supporting Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's claim;**
2. Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's statements, as reported in The Australian newspaper on 7th April 2015, and made under oath or affirmation in our state's Land Court, contradict empirical scientific evidence and are not correct. His public statements on climate repeatedly include or imply claims that mislead or exaggerate, misrepresent, are erroneous, or contradict empirical evidence;
3. John Cook makes and/or implies false climate claims, contradicts empirical evidence and relies on an unscientifically fabricated and false consensus that you support.

This letter focuses on these issues, addresses all your letter's inquiries and requests, and it discusses associated issues.

Regarding **your letter's first and second points**, there seems to be confusion on your part. To clarify, my complaint about Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour is not his appearance in court as a witness. I agree that our university should provide expert witnesses in court cases. My complaint is that, as reported, his court statements contradict empirical evidence.

(4) I hope that you do not support UQ staff making statements contradicting empirical science. Please clarify: is it acceptable for UQ staff to make statements contradicting empirical evidence?

In response to your letter's request for empirical evidence for my claim, please refer to supplementary details provided as part of this letter. In it I again provide and extend the empirical evidence supporting my conclusion and complaint. It really is quite straightforward.

The supplementary details go beyond your request: they prove that the UN IPCC upon which you now rely has never presented empirical evidence for its core claim that carbon dioxide from human activity causes global warming or climate variability.

The supplement goes further: it rigorously shows that no agency or organisation or person has ever presented empirical evidence that human activity causes global warming or climate variability. It shows that there is no such evidence. Prof, Hoegh-Guldberg's court statements and public claims, and John Cook's core climate claims are not correct.

I hope that with your science qualifications and your CSIRO board position you will readily understand the implications.

Item 27 in my letter of 21 May requested that you *"please provide the specific location (report title and page numbers; book and chapter title and page numbers; website page URL; scientific paper title with author name(s) and page numbers) of specific empirical scientific evidence proving human causation of global climate variability. To do so will end my complaint. To not do so or to incorrectly do so will make your support of John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg untenable and confirm their claims as unscientific."*

(5) You claim that our university has rigorously reviewed the work of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook. If so, that would have involved investigating climate science. Please confirm whether that was done. If not, why not? If so, it should have been easy

for you to provide the specific location of supporting empirical evidence. Yet you did not provide or specify any evidence proving human cause.

Why not? The supplement provides answers.

In all responses to my complaints, our university has never specified the review process, much less independence of process to substantiate that our university has thoroughly and rigorously investigated my complaints. More specifically, UQ has not rebutted my claims with facts. Instead, it has always relied on unsubstantiated opinion.

Internationally respected Canadian climatologist, Professor Tim Ball built on Prince Philip's comments when he said: "Universities are the only truly incestuous organisations because everyone in them and running them are products of the system". He continued: "the normal pattern for academics is to often seek to cover up a problem and keep it within the institution".

You have been made aware of three significant groups of facts, being empirical evidence contradicting your opinion, the lack of empirical evidence supporting your opinion, and your false claim and unfounded support for the demonstrably defective UN IPCC. These are explained again with more detail in the supplementary details.

(6) If you now maintain your stance without providing, or identifying the specific location of, empirical scientific evidence of causation, you will be intentionally and dishonestly misrepresenting climate and further tarnishing our university's reputation.

(7) It appears that through your behaviour in response to my previous letters, you and our university are breaching the Queensland Public Sector Ethics Act 1994. Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour appears to be in breach of the Queensland Professional Engineers Act 2002. Both these topics are detailed in the supplement and I request adequate and complete responses within four weeks from your receipt of this letter.

(8) I have been advised of a motion carried unopposed at the Liberal National Party's State convention on 11th July. Are you aware that you and our university staff are enabling potential destruction of Australian sovereignty? Please see the supplement below.

Your support for a claim that is profoundly dishonest is hurting our country's industry, economy and future. It is empowering the UN FCCC's campaign to take "additional funds" prior to 2020 and to then take \$16 billion dollars annually from Australian taxpayers.

As explained previously and again in the supplementary details below, Greenpeace and other activists use UQ staff statements to destroy industry yet those statements are not correct and contradict empirical evidence. In turn you are protecting, supporting and enabling such destruction and doing so without substantiating evidence for your position and you are doing so contrary to the facts and empirical data.

I hope that after reading the supplementary details you will independently and transparently investigate my complaint. I remain available to meet with you to discuss my complaint and supporting evidence.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Queensland, Hons), MBA (Chicago, Dean's award & Beta Gamma Sigma)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Supplementary details

Curiously, your email response to my letter of 21 May was not sent in the same thread. Instead, you replied in the thread in which I copied you as a courtesy on my letter to The Hon Christopher Pyne, federal Minister for Education. Your reply implied inaccuracies about me. For this reason, and to restore the integrity of our correspondence, our original letters up to and including my letter of 21 May are publicly posted here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/UQcorrespondence.pdf> My letter of 27 May to Christopher Pyne is here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/PyneUQ27May.pdf> My courtesy email to you sharing my letter to Mr. Pyne is here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/EmailPyne27MayUQVC.pdf> and your 1st July reply to my letter of 21 May is here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/UQVCreplyJuly1.pdf>

This letter is being shared with people copied on both email threads and will be posted at this page: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au> near our other correspondence after giving you the courtesy of receiving its contents.

John Cook's paper fabricating a false 'consensus' and misrepresenting science

I now address **your letter's fourth point**. The purpose of the Cook et al paper fabricating a false consensus is seemingly explained in the paper's opening sentence, quote: "*An accurate perception of the degree of scientific consensus is an essential element to public support for climate policy.*" Cook et al see perception of consensus as essential for public support.

Their paper's data, as revealed in a scientifically peer-reviewed paper from internationally regarded scientists and investigators (Legates et al 2013), is summarised on page 4 of my Appendix 5 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> It says:

- Cook et al claimed to have examined 11,944 abstracts of scientific papers on climate; 7,930 did not mention an opinion on climate change. Cook et al discarded these. That is, 66 per cent (66%) were discarded;
- That left 4,014. Of those 3,896 opined that humans caused (1) **some** or (2) **most warming** since 1951 or said (3) human activity **would cause catastrophic warming**. All three categories were combined. 3,896 of 4,014 is 97.1 per cent (97.1%). Remember, none have empirical scientific evidence for their conclusion;
- Legates et al show that only 41 papers concluded catastrophic warming would occur. Of the 4,014 papers that's one per cent (1%);
- Of the 11,944 abstracts surveyed, that's zero point three per cent (0.3%);
- Ninety nine point seven per cent (99.7%) do **not** claim human activity would cause catastrophic warming.

You ignore the data on the Cook et al paper and choose instead to rely on opinion. Your letter goes further and in is revealing.

Notwithstanding your statements introducing and regarding the Bedford and Cook (2013) paper, Legates et al (2013) state specifically that they investigated the claim in Cook et al (Environmental Research Letters, 2013) because Bedford and Cook (2013) relied upon it heavily. The Legates et al (2013) investigation showed that the 97.1% 'consensus' in Cook et al was merely 0.3%. Legates et al (2013) showed that the Cook et al (Env. Res Letters, 2013) claim is false.

I respectfully suggest you challenge the advice you are receiving within UQ.

The conclusion I draw from this data is that John Cook's claimed consensus is unfounded and secondly, that it is misleading. It is not an honest presentation of reality. Given the Cook et al paper's opening sentence and John Cook's employment as UQ Climate Communication Fellow, it seems reasonable to question the motives driving the Cook et al paper.

As stated in an earlier letter, even an honest consensus does not decide science. Empirical evidence decides science.

A fabricated, false 'consensus' raises questions about those, including you, who support it.

A second concern is that in your response of 11 May rejecting my complaint about the Cook et al paper, you relied upon citing the Environment Research Letters (ERL) journal. It published the Cook et al paper.

ERL's Executive Board includes Peter Gleick. Previously, and as widely reported at the time, he admitted to using a false identity to steal documents and later admitted to fabricating a document and falsely claiming it to be from America's Heartland Institute. It appears that was Peter Gleick's attempt to discredit those skeptical that human activity causes climate variability.

As shown below, there is no empirical evidence anywhere to support claims that human activity causes global climate variability or warming. ERL's Review staff include people whose claims and interests seem to be based on contradicting empirical evidence. Their backgrounds and affiliations appear to demonstrate bias and conflicts of interest because those reviewers apparently depend on funds associated with the climate 'industry'.

It is not at all surprising that ERL published and later supported the Cook et al fabricated 'consensus'. It is surprising that you rely on ERL.

Although it was widely reported that Peter Gleick publicly admitted his behaviour, Joe Bast, President of the Heartland Institute is copied for you to confirm for yourself.

In his responses to my requests for empirical evidence that carbon dioxide from human activity affects global climate variability or temperature, John Cook has never presented any such evidence. That is because his core claim contradicts empirical evidence.

I again draw to your attention the fact that the decider of science is empirical evidence, not consensus or peer-review. As detailed and evidenced below, the UN IPCC relies on corrupting, bypassing and preventing peer-review.

This reinforces the reasons why the arbiter of science is always empirical evidence.

Your reliance on ERL and your misrepresentation of the Legates et al paper's investigation leads to expressing concerns about your behaviour.

Your reliance on defective 'science'

Allow me to ask you, as a scientist, a fundamental question asked by all scientists: have you ever seen any empirical evidence proving human causation of global warming or climate variability?

If so, please specify it and explain how it logically proves human causation.

Your letter's fifth point diverts onto the UN IPCC and avoids the core of my complaint. You say, quote: *"After an extensive process of reviewing the available scientific literature, the IPCC has clearly concluded that the majority of peer-reviewed scientific literature supports the existence of anthropogenic climate change."*

Your claim is an appeal to authority. Secondly, you again claim and rely on an unsubstantiated consensus. You do not specify empirical scientific evidence.

You now rely on unidentified, unreferenced and unspecified claims based on the UN IPCC's 2013 Working Group 1 science report. More seriously, you imply and represent that the UN IPCC report contains empirical evidence of human activity causing global warming or climate change. Yet your representation is clearly false.

Significantly, you misrepresent the UN IPCC as scientific in its conclusions. This raises questions about the integrity of the advice you are receiving.

Contrary to your implied claim, the UN IPCC has never presented any empirical evidence of human causation of global temperature change or climate variability. This is detailed and proven in Appendix 2 at <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and in the attached PDF. Please note in particular, section 15 being 'Notes on AR5, 2013 report by UN IPCC' on pages 28-41 that discusses the specific reference you cited to me and upon which you rely.

Secondly, please refer to section 2, pages 7-12. Each of the last three UN IPCC Working Group 1 reports, being its 2001, 2007 and 2013 reports, contains one sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of carbon dioxide. These are respectively, chapter 12 in 2001, chapter 9 in 2007, and chapter 10 in 2013. I've read and analysed each, twice. **None contain empirical evidence for the claim and none present causal logic connecting human production of carbon dioxide with global climate variability or temperature change.**

Yet you, as the Vice Chancellor of our university, present UN IPCC reports as the basis for your position. It shows that your position is scientifically unfounded.

I have read each of the 2001, 2007 and 2013 UN IPCC's core chapters and Summaries for Policy Makers (SPM) at:

http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_and_data_reports.shtml Your science background should enable you to specify the evidence or failing that, enable you to confirm the UN IPCC has never provided empirical evidence for its claim.

Each UN IPCC SPM misrepresents climate and misrepresents the associated UN IPCC science report. The fact that Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg presented to me the 2007 SPM as the basis for his position on climate confirms his position is not scientific. Yet you support his claims.

Other sections of Appendix 2 that will be of particular benefit and assistance to you include sections 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12.

The UN IPCC is demonstrably pursuing a political agenda. Its processes corrupt science and it relies upon corrupted science. This conclusion is based on extensive examination and on comments from many scientists, engineers, MPs and journalists worldwide. It is based on documented evidence, examination of UN IPCC reports, and the behaviour of prominent UN IPCC officials and contributing authors.

My conclusion is based partly on the Inter Academy Council's damning August 2010 review of UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures. The IAC is the world's peak scientific

academic body. See Section 2 of Appendix 2 cited above.

My conclusion is based on the UN IPCC's complete lack of empirical evidence for its core claim and its contradiction of empirical data.

Fortunately, real and independent scientists not beholden to politicised government funding have been exposing the UN IPCC for what it is: a political organisation pursuing a political agenda. Prominent UN IPCC contributing scientists, including Lead Authors, concerned with the UN IPCC's corruption of science have led the spontaneous worldwide scientific movement that is exposing the UN IPCC and its tactics.

As thousands of scientists work to restore scientific integrity, our university under your leadership endeavours to support the UN IPCC's corruption. Your stance is assisting a relatively tiny group of UN IPCC academics, agency staff, UN bureaucrats, and national politicians to pursue a political agenda corrupting climate science. The majority of its deception though appears to be through naïve or ill-informed and often well-meaning "useful idiots," to borrow Lenin's appropriate phrase.

(9) Over the past seven years of independent research I did my due diligence on the UN IPCC thoroughly. I respectfully invite you and our university to do your necessary due diligence. If you disagree with my findings and continue to claim that the UN IPCC provides empirical evidence of human causation of global warming or climate variability, please cite report title and date, chapter, section number, and page numbers specifying the location of such evidence proving human causation.

(10) Your letter's fifth point implicitly and falsely endorses and misrepresents the UN IPCC. If you disagree with any significant material point made in my Appendix 2 cited above, please specify. If you do not accurately state and justify your specific disagreement with its facts I will conclude that you agree with the facts I present.

It is of deep concern that Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg remains a Lead Author of the unscientific UN IPCC. It is of no surprise that in correspondence with him since March 2010 he has cited the UN IPCC as having evidence for his claim yet in his responses to my reasonable requests to provide specific locations of **specific empirical evidence proving human causation**, he has never specified any such location or evidence.

Only after completing my investigation of UN IPCC science reports did I understand the reason for his inability: the UN IPCC has never presented any empirical evidence or logical causal analysis proving human carbon dioxide causes global climate variability or warming. His claimed scientific evidence and proof of causation is non-existent. His claim is false.

Your implied claim that the UN IPCC contains empirical evidence is similar to Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's response to me on 6 March 2010. He went further in providing a copy of the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policy Makers (SPM). It contains sweeping statements, exaggerations, unfounded opinions and conjecture yet no empirical evidence proving human causation of global warming or climate variability.

In claiming the SPM contains empirical evidence proving human causation of global warming or climate variability, Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg demonstrates that he apparently fails to understand scientific reasoning and the concept of causation.

It begs the question: is Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg incompetent as a scientist or dishonest?

(11) Please specify the location in the 2007 UN IPCC SPM of the empirical evidence and causal logic proving human causation that is claimed by Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg.

(12) This is fundamental. Yet despite your description of our university's investigation processes and reviews as "rigorous," UQ's investigations missed this fundamental point. How? Your response cannot be trusted. It is not credible. It is not honest.

Sadly, despite making clear to you in my earlier correspondence that empirical evidence—not claims of consensus—determine science, and despite your science qualifications, your fifth point stipulates reliance on a "consensus." As with John Cook's fabricated and false 'consensus', the UN IPCC purports falsely to have a consensus. That further exposes its unscientific nature and its misrepresentation of facts—and your support for such unscientific claims. Please see data in section 4 on page 13 of Appendix 2:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

(13) I trust this will be of assistance to you and that armed with these solid facts and after checking the empirical evidence you will treat our university with the respect it deserves and will independently investigate my complaints.

Failure to do so will make your behaviour wilfully complicit in enabling ongoing corruption of climate science.

Doing so though will enable your legacy to be one of restoring scientific integrity to our university.

As the wall of falsities and bluff surrounding Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg, John Cook and the UN IPCC crumbles, your choice is to decide on which side of the debris you will be positioned. Will you be seen to have joined in contradicting empirical science or in supporting science?

There is no empirical evidence of human causation for your position anywhere

My seven years of independent investigation involved the world's most respected and independent climate scientists and their work, and the most prominent academics advocating climate alarm and their work. From my investigation of climate data, science, claims and corruption worldwide I know factually that no agency, organisation or individual has ever presented any empirical evidence that carbon dioxide from human activity affects global climate variability or temperature. This is specifically explained in each of many appendices here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> Please note in particular appendices 2, 3, 6, 6a, 7, 8, and 9. Appendices 10, 11, 12, 13, 13a-13g and 15 are relevant.

I used Freedom of Information requests and correspondence from the heads of CSIRO and our Bureau of Meteorology (BOM). Their responses confirm my conclusions from detailed examination of CSIRO and BOM reports: neither the CSIRO or BOM has ever produced any empirical evidence for the core claim. Neither has such evidence. See Appendices 6 and 6a and then outcomes of my Freedom of Information requests at: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/letters.html>

(14) If you disagree and believe that CSIRO has any empirical evidence proving human causation, then as a CSIRO board member you should be able to easily obtain and provide that specific empirical evidence.

Your biography at <http://www.uq.edu.au/about/vice-chancellor> triggers serious concerns since you have a long background and extensive qualifications in science, yet you misrepresent the UN IPCC as having the empirical evidence proving human causation when it does not. How could someone with your background make such a mistake? Have you not checked your advisers' advice?

I have corresponded with the President and separately the Policy Manager of Australia's Academy of Science requesting empirical evidence of causation. Responses provide no empirical evidence for the claim and have been misleading. Similarly, Australia's Chief Scientist and the ALP-Greens Department of Climate Change have never provided empirical evidence of causation.

Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg was a member of the now-defunct Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel. The Climate Commission's reports never presented empirical evidence of causation yet the Climate Commission claimed such evidence existed. Its reports made false claims supporting the policies of its instigators and funders, the then ALP-Greens government. Its false claims reflect poorly on Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's competence and/or ethics.

Examining the climate reports, websites and public claims of senior officials in America's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and of NASA's Goddard Institute of Space Studies, confirms that these agencies present no empirical evidence of causation. Similarly the UK Met (Meteorological) Office and British Prime Minister Tony Blair's infamous Stern Report present no empirical evidence of causation.

Prof. Ross Garnaut's 2008 government-funded report and his 2011 Fifth Update contain no evidence yet the media and members of parliament cited it to support taxing people.

No national science academy has produced empirical evidence of human causation. Executives in two academies initially supported the UN IPCC although after member scientists complained, the executive endorsements were withdrawn or revised.

Further, the Inter Academy Council is the world's peak academic scientific body. Its review of UN IPCC processes and procedures was released in August 2010. The report is damning and calls into question all 800 of the UN IPCC's likelihood and confidence statements. See page 4, of Appendix 2: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

In their responses, none of Australia's prominent academic alarmists named in Appendix 9 <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> has produced evidence of human causation. **Empirical facts make their scary claims demonstrably false yet their claims have taken root in the public psyche due to an unbalanced emotional campaign to control people's beliefs.**

All but two of those academics are involved in the UN IPCC's corrupt processes and all endorse and rely on the fraudulent UN IPCC.

Further, I know that there is no empirical scientific evidence for the claim that carbon dioxide from human activity affects global temperature or climate variability because the empirical evidence clearly disproves human causation. This is detailed below and is the reason you have not provided empirical evidence of human causation is that there is none. Your position is scientifically unfounded and is not honest. The emperor has no clothes.

(15) If you disagree, please specify one source presenting empirical evidence that human activity producing carbon dioxide affects global temperature or global climate variability and specify such evidence's exact location by specifying report title and date, chapter, section and page numbers.

It is significant that a relatively tiny group of politically funded senior agency staff and academics claim evidence exists yet have never provided, and cannot provide, such evidence of human causation.

The tiny group of people in key agency positions misrepresented climate contrary to the science while portraying it as science. The group's members use unfounded alarm,

government grants, and misinformed media to falsely magnify the group as large.

The ABC has never produced or broadcast any empirical evidence of human causation yet has broadcast emphatic and false claims that such evidence exists. It has consciously and deliberately misrepresented climate, even after admission of such misrepresentation.

The common characteristic among these agency executives, academics, politicians and university spokespeople such as you is government funding within a small group of western democracies lacking parliamentary technical scrutiny and accountability.

UQ is not alone in closing investigations to external scrutiny. Investigations of prominent American and British universities following the Climategate affair were held in closed rooms. Dissenting views, witnesses and evidence were prohibited. Page 4:

http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

No nongovernment organisation such as Greenpeace and WWF has ever produced empirical evidence of causation yet both claim it exists and spread misrepresentations of climate.

It is this relatively tiny group of people contradicting empirical evidence and making false and unfounded claims of consensus, misrepresenting climate and endorsing the politicised UN IPCC that you now join. In doing so you take our university with you.

Or, perhaps, instead you are joining a larger group of people lacking the courage to investigate and objectively consider information. That group blindly follows unfounded assumptions and opinions—seemingly swayed by emotion and/or funding.

Recent Queensland political party policy change exposes UN FCCC agreement

I am advised that nine days ago at the Liberal National Party (LNP) state Convention, motion Number 20 was carried unopposed and the resolution is now LNP policy. It states: *That this Convention of the LNP requests the Australian Government instruct its representatives attending the UN FCCC COP21 Meeting in Paris from 30 November to 12 December 2015 that they must not agree to or sign any binding agreement that jeopardizes Australian National Sovereignty.*

Are you aware that in addition to the destruction of Australian sovereignty and governance, the UNFCCC agreement aims to take “additional funds” from Australia prior to 2020 and that from 2020 it involves taking 1% of GDP annually? In today’s figures, that’s \$16 billion every year.

This is part of the UN’s real motive pushing corruption of climate science. You and some of our university’s staff enable and abet the UN FCCC’s deceit through its IPCC.

Empirical evidence as you requested

The empirical evidence on carbon dioxide and temperatures is summarised on pages 9-11 of my report to Senator Birmingham and Bob Baldwin MP provided to you in my previous letters, It is entitled ‘*False claims reveal Hidden Opportunities*’ and is available here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/BaldwinBirminghamReport.pdf> In turn that link and associated correspondence is available here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/SBbboh.html>

Pages 9-11 are supported and referenced through detailed explanation and links to specific empirical evidence cited in Appendix 4 of my report entitled *CSIROh!*, here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Separately and independently from me, the empirical scientific evidence contradicting Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's claims is readily accessible at publicly available references and websites presenting satellite temperature data (1979-present), radiosonde weather balloon temperature data (1958-present), ground-based temperature measurements in BOM records from 1860-present, and for the world's longest continuous thermometer temperature record covering Central England Temperatures over the last 360 years.

The Medieval Warming Period (MWP) is scientifically recognised worldwide through empirical measurements of temperature proxies and historical evidence to be warmer than today. The UN IPCC's 1990 science report recognises the internationally accepted fact that the MWP was warmer than current decades. The UN IPCC's 1995 report downplayed it to misrepresent climate. The 2001 report replaced it with the infamous 'hockey stick' temperature fabrication that was used to drive scary, unfounded headlines worldwide before being *quietly withdrawn and not used in subsequent reports*.

The UN IPCC's core claim is that carbon dioxide from human activity is warming the troposphere and that that is warming earth's surface unusually. Satellites most accurately measure tropospheric temperature with radiosonde (weather balloon) temperature measurement confirming satellite accuracy.

The empirical data on atmospheric carbon dioxide levels for the last 60 years is available at NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory. The UN IPCC cites and relies upon this data. Ernst-Georg Beck's work presents empirical measurements over the last 200 years from reputable scientists including Nobel Science Prize winners and is available publicly at websites and in peer-reviewed papers. Ice-core data for the last 800,000 years is available publicly.

Appendix 4 <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> explains the four-step causal logic needed to prove that human carbon dioxide output is harmful. There is no such evidence and the UN IPCC reverses all four fundamental causal relationships.

(16) It really is quite straightforward and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to explain.

Please note that despite record human production of carbon dioxide in recent decades due to Chinese and Indian industrialisation, the UN IPCC's Dr. Phil Jones confirms that there has been no warming trend since 1995.

The atmospheric cooling from the start of radiosonde measurements in 1958 to 1976 occurred as western industrial economies produced record increasing quantities of carbon dioxide. The longer cooling of surface temperatures from the 1940s to mid-1970s occurred during rapid industrialisation.

Empirical evidence, everyday observations and history show the UN IPCC's claimed 'greenhouse effect' is unfounded and false. Please refer to Appendix 19 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and note the observations and empirical evidence provided directly and through references, including peer-reviewed scientific references invalidating the UN IPCC's 'greenhouse effect'.

McLean, de Freitas and Carter (2009) produced a scientifically peer-reviewed paper confirming strong statistical correlation between empirical global atmospheric temperature and the Southern Oscillation Index long thought to be a primary driver of temperature. http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/McLean_deFreitas_Carter_JGR_2009.pdf It confirms

scientifically similar conclusions from other climate scientists and meteorologists.

In addition to the empirical evidence on climate please note written history, the geological record and the enormous breadth of natural variation in seasonal weather and in weather events.

Note that natural weather events have been misrepresented by some agencies, alarmists and the media as climate change.

Please consider the UN IPCC and vested interests relying on the climate ‘industry’ while deliberately misrepresenting science.

Perhaps my earlier quote of Prof. Tim Ball explains the behaviour of your predecessor who failed to adequately investigate my earlier complaint about Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg’s behaviour and who was subsequently dismissed for a separate and unrelated breach of ethics.

Perhaps Tim Ball’s observation explains John Cook’s denial of invitations to debate publicly and instead seek support within the cloistered world of academia dependent upon his propaganda to maintain taxpayer funding? Perhaps Prof. Ball’s perceptive quote explains your support for a position contradicting the data and documented facts.

A further observation, Professor Høj, is shared because UQ staff have never provided empirical evidence of human causation. Instead, as is typical with those fomenting climate alarm, some staff have relied on the UN IPCC’s erroneous computerised numerical ‘climate’ models already proven hopelessly wrong. This is confirmed in the UN IPCC’s latest (2013) Working Group 1 report. Reading the 2007 report explains the models’ failure.

When held accountable, these UQ staff dodge evidence of causation and imply it exists—somewhere. When pressed, some hide behind emotive statements, resort to false and misleading claims of consensus, appeal to authority, cite cherry-picked and manipulated data, smear those presenting evidence, make fearful projections and/or invoke morality.

They do all this yet have no empirical evidence. If they had evidence, they would use it and specify its exact location in the literature. That would immediately silence their questioners, including me.

In contradicting the empirical evidence to defend Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg’s misrepresentations and incorrect claims, you are joining in his misrepresentation of climate and science.

I do not know your motive. Until now I have been wondering whether or not your contradiction of the facts is wilful. Your letter’s fifth point leads me to think that your advisers have misled you.

With due respect, Professor, it would be reassuring if you presented and relied on objective empirical data and on facts instead of relying on unfounded and unsupported opinion, on appeals to authority, on unfounded claims of fabricated ‘consensus’, and on a form of ‘peer-review’ that is not scientific.

You support John Cook’s branding of those who disagree with his climate *opinions* as ‘deniers’. Yet it seems that the people denying science are those denying the empirical scientific evidence, notably Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg, John Cook and you.

Academic freedom does not allow blatantly misrepresenting science

(17) Referring again to your letter’s final point, please provide your reasons for labelling

my open and honest discussion of UQ staff clearly misrepresenting climate as hindering their academic freedom. My complaint is fully supported with empirical scientific evidence and documented facts.

(18) Referring to your final point and in regard to Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's and John Cook's behaviour, please explain to me exactly how I am engaged in, quote: "misrepresentation of their characters and careers."

(19) Are you implying that our university's academic staff are free to misrepresent science and contradict empirical evidence without question?

UQ and the Queensland Public Sector Ethics Act 1994

A Registered Professional Engineer who is a chemical engineer and Fellow of the Institute of Engineers recently advised me of the Public Sector Ethics Act 1994 and the Queensland Professional Engineers Act 2002. He is concerned that our university is breaching both acts.

(20) Is UQ complying with the Public Sector Ethics Act that specifically applies to Queensland universities? Has the university an overall code of conduct? Does Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's Global Change Institute have a code of conduct? Are all UQ staff and officials complying with their obligations—particularly *Division 2 The Ethics Values* including 'integrity and impartiality', 'promoting the public good', and 'accountability and transparency'? Are staff 'committed to exercising proper diligence, care and attention'?

Based on my observation of the behaviour of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook for the reasons explained and evidenced above, I conclude not.

(21) Please advise the location of UQ's printed Code of Conduct and the Global Change Institute's Code of Conduct.

(22) Are you as Vice Chancellor, and Chief Executive Officer under the Act, fulfilling your obligations with regard to this Act? Based on my observation of your behaviour in responding to my complaint about the behaviour of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook, I conclude not.

Are UQ staff breaching the Queensland Professional Engineers Act 2002?

Are our university and you as Vice Chancellor aware of the Queensland Professional Engineers Act 2002 (QPE) under which it is an offence for someone to provide an engineering service when not registered as a professional engineer?

Under the Act, any University employee giving advice to, for, or on the behalf of a university or in connection with the university's name is providing a service. I'm advised that according to Mark's Mechanical Engineering Handbook and Perry's Chemical Engineering Handbook, "Heat Transfer" is an engineering subject. Thermodynamics and mass transfer are engineering disciplines.

Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg, John Cook and other staff not registered as professional engineers may be in breach of the QPE Act. That would make them in breach of the Public Sector Ethics Act. The UQ Vice Chancellor (ie, CEO) & the Senate could then be in breach of the Public Sector Ethics Act for allowing university staff to be breaching the QPE Act.

John Cook and Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg have no engineering qualifications and as such

could not be registered engineers. They have shown they know little if anything about heat and mass transfer. They have contradicted, exaggerated and misrepresented climate, weather and ocean data and have put forward false information.

Abusing people as deniers and other derogatory labels is in breach of their obligations under the Public Sector Ethics Act. Are our university under your leadership or any of its staff, in breach of the QPE Act?

(23) Please respond adequately to these questions associated with each Act within four weeks of receiving this letter.

Your letters support destruction of industry

Please note my responses to other items you mentioned in your letter of 1st July. I understand that it is acceptable for UQ staff to be members of Greenpeace and WWF. Until I became aware of both organisations' politically motivated corruption I would've considered joining Greenpeace.

Nonetheless, it is significant that Greenpeace's co-founder Dr. Patrick Moore resigned from Greenpeace as it is now not an environmental organisation. He now publicly criticises Greenpeace for its anti-human and anti-environment approach that drives its political agenda. He publicly exposed and rejected Greenpeace's politicised agenda and is copied hereto in case you wish to verify.

Further, Greenpeace's scientifically false and politically motivated trashing of Australia's role in caring for the Great Barrier Reef is now publicly questioned as a threat to our state's vital tourism industry.

A brief examination of the Coast and Country activists relying on Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's testimony for their Land Court case quickly reveals close connections with Greenpeace.

Greenpeace is recognised internationally for importing its ideology into target nations such as ours and then directing local puppet groups to engage in unscientific activism implementing Greenpeace's agenda and strategy.

Having understood WWF's roots and affiliations I would never consider joining WWF. Please see Appendix 15 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> I commend to you the work of investigator Henry Lamb who discusses WWF's formation, purposes and connections. Please refer to Appendix 14, page 35 and use the link to access his video series, particularly his second video. Or directly access Henry Lamb's work here: http://shelf3d.com/Search/The%2BRise%2Bof%2BGlobal%2BGovernance%2BPlaylistIDP_LKjJE86mQRtsd2abcjQkgq4uw-H5MLvMa Please note the work of Canadian investigative reporter Donna Laframboise and Canadian author Elaine Dewar exposing serious corruption associated with WWF. British author James Delingpole explains why WWF is far more dangerous than the scares it uses to instil and spread unfounded fear.

Greenpeace and WWF have been integral in the UN IPCC's misrepresentations of climate and climate science. That is well documented. Please see Appendices 2 and 15 <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and the references cited therein.

I am concerned that both Greenpeace and WWF are documented as deeply enmeshed in corrupting climate science and misrepresenting the Great Barrier Reef as a political weapon and that Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg has a long-standing connection of taking money from both organisations.

These are the organisations that Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's reports enable and support.

I hope the above triggers a Vice Chancellor's deep concern and a desire to thoroughly and independently investigate such associations and Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's funding.

I am delighted that our university encourages staff to have links with industry and to provide advice to groups outside UQ. My concern arises when staff publicly misrepresent climate and science as Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg has repeatedly done and when they contradict empirical evidence.

My concern deepens when our university's Vice Chancellor brushes aside and supports such behaviour. To ensure UQ's reputation is not tarnished, advice from UQ staff must be accurate, honest and supported empirically with valid scientific or engineering data.

I acknowledge your claims about Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's associations with Greenpeace and WWF. Given your lack of substantiation and your predecessor's lack of substantiation, I respectfully defer to the evidence from Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise and to material at the reliable website tome22 cited in Appendix 9, pages 54-59 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Your letter's third point discusses destruction of industry. I am disappointed that you fail to understand the ramifications of Greenpeace's self-admitted strategy of "Stopping the Australian Coal Export Boom" using funds from oil industry connections. Please refer to http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/1206_greenpeace.pdf and https://www.qrc.org.au/dbase_upl/stoppingtheaustraliancoalexportboom.pdf

Contrary to your claim, I extrapolated nothing and will be pleased to explain to you how Greenpeace, if successful, will kill Queensland's coal industry. Coal is our state's largest export income earner and a major employer of Queenslanders.

When I was a student at our university even students understood the consequences to exporters from action aiming to shut ports, stop shipping and prevent new businesses such as mines. The obvious result is that industry dies.

Greenpeace and WWF are contradicting empirical evidence and fabricating false claims to kill Queensland industry. One of our university staff is assisting them with statements made under oath or affirmation in court and that contradict empirical evidence. UQ staff making false and unfounded claims are assisting Greenpeace and WWF within our community. Our university's Vice Chancellor is condoning and enabling staff and activists to clearly misrepresent climate, reefs and the UN IPCC's contradiction of empirical evidence.

Your letter's six points have been addressed above.

Other issues that you as UQ Vice Chancellor have not addressed

To date, Professor Høj, you have not addressed items numbered 3, 4, 6-8, 12, 14 part 2, 17 part 2, and 18 from my letter dated 21 May. In regard to my letter of 24 April supplemented with my letter on 25 April you have not explained specifically why you disregard a scientifically peer-reviewed paper documenting glaring deficiencies in the John Cook et al paper.

The behaviour of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook that tarnishes our university and your leadership can be turned to a positive for our university and for you through a thorough, independent and transparent investigation of their behaviour. That would establish our university under your leadership as setting the standard in restoring scientific integrity to

climate ‘science’.

(24) Professor Høj, have Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook misled you and our university or are you and our university’s executive leadership and/or senate accomplices in their misrepresentation?

(25) Professor Høj, will you initiate, enable and support an independent, transparent and open investigation of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg’s and John Cook’s behaviour, work, advocacy and propaganda?

What about humanity? The environment? Governance? Our economy? Our future?

Universities were once bastions of science, objectivity, scholarship, research, free speech and compassion for humanity. Under your leadership this is being undermined. Continuing in this way will eventually devalue UQ’s reputation in the enormous and growing Asian education market.

Your unfounded support for Prof Hoegh-Guldberg’s court statements, core claim of human causation of global climate variability, and his behaviour together with your unfounded support for John Cook’s false core claim, for his smearing of those who use facts and data to oppose his opinion, and for his behaviour limits free discourse and scientific progress.

Despite your science qualifications, your position and advocacy contradicts empirical data and documented facts. It is not data-driven and scientific. It is faith-based, religious.

At stake is our university’s integrity and reputation. Do you share my desire for scientific integrity and for our university’s reputation?

Do you share my concern for protecting thousands of honest Queensland workers under the threat of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg’s claims contradicting empirical evidence?

Taxes on essential energy are highly regressive on Australia’s poor and are decimating industries. Do you share my concern for all industries and for Australians?

As an engineer educated at our university it is my duty to protect industry’s future.

Do you share my concern for our nation’s governance, sovereignty and personal freedoms?

Last year I visited the Indian state of West Bengal where my parents were living during my birth and formative childhood years. Hundreds of millions of Indians today lack services and facilities that we Australians take for granted. We have no right to deny the people of Indian access to cheap, clean and environmentally responsible energy that will enable them to reduce their impact on the natural environment.

Do you share my concern for the welfare of hundreds of millions of Indians and people in other developing nations who want access to clean, efficient Australian coal?

Important questions follow from this letter and from my previous letter: why is Prof Hoegh-Guldberg’s ‘advice’ contradicting empirical evidence and why is it supporting implementation of an anti-human, anti-Queensland agenda?

At stake is our university’s compassion. I hope you care about humanity and people.

History shows that truthfully and objectively addressing issues based on facts enables human progress. Your behaviour and latest letter undermine human progress and truth.

Do you share my concern for real and serious environmental and humanitarian challenges not adequately addressed because attention and resources are diverted onto the focus of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's false claims?

The misrepresentation of climate is already hurting our nation. Unless rectified it will hurt my children's future. As a parent it is my duty to protect that.

For humanity's sake, for our global environment's sake and for our university's sake, please hold a transparent, independent inquiry into Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour and statements and those of John Cook, and clear your name.

With or without the presence of Prof. Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook, I remain available to meet with you to discuss my complaint and my supporting evidence.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts

Attachment: PDF of my *CSIROh!* report's Appendix 2
<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>