

Malcolm Roberts  
180 Haven Road  
Pullenvale QLD 4069

Phone: 04 1964 2379  
[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)  
[www.conscious.com.au](http://www.conscious.com.au)

Friday, April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013

The Hon Chris Bowen, MP  
Former Minister for Science and Research  
PO Box 6022  
House of Representatives  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

With copy to newly appointed Minister for Science and Research  
The Hon Don Farrell, MP

Dear Mr. Bowen and Mr. Farrell:

**LAWFUL NOTICE BY REGISTERED POST WITH DELIVERY CONFIRMATION  
WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND IN GOOD FAITH**

Thank you Mr. Bowen for your reply dated March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013 written in your capacity as Minister for Science and Research.

As advised in my previous letter, in the interests of accountability and transparency this reply from me and your subsequent response(s), if any, will be posted on the Internet.

My report and appendices acknowledged CSIRO's proud history in science. My report goes further by stating that CSIRO today contains many fine people. It is clear though that in climate science CSIRO's reputation is severely undermined by CSIRO's unscientific actions. Internationally eminent scientists referenced in my report support that conclusion.

Are you aware of claims made in the Sydney Morning Herald on Friday, April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 in an article headlined '*Call for inquiry as CSIRO comes under the microscope*'?  
<http://www.smh.com.au/technology/sci-tech/call-for-inquiry-as-csiro-comes-under-the-microscope-20130411-2hojm.html>

I agree with you that my report and appendices encompassed thereto make serious accusations about CSIRO. My claims are factual and substantiated.

I confirm correspondence with CSIRO executives on this matter. Contrary to your assumption, CSIRO executives have failed to provide me with any *scientific* explanation of their claims. CSIRO has repeatedly failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for its core claim that human carbon dioxide caused global warming.

Yet senior CSIRO executives have repeatedly falsely alluded to having such evidence. Each of their references fails to provide such evidence. I view that as dishonest, or at least highly incompetent, don't you?

My report is based on written interactions with senior CSIRO executives, on empirical scientific evidence and on documented corruption of climate science. I conclude that Drs. Clark and Johnson are misrepresenting climate, climate science and Nature. Please decide for yourself by reading my report's Appendices 6 and 6a available here:

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

Appendices 4, 4a, 2 and 5 provide further context for understanding CSIRO's false claims and unscientific misrepresentations contradicting empirical scientific evidence and corrupting science.

If you disagree with my conclusions about CSIRO please identify, specify and justify claimed significant material errors in my report and pertinent appendices. If you consider such errors exist please identify them specifically and provide empirical scientific evidence and/or facts.

If I have not received a specific and scientifically or factually justifiable list by Tuesday, April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013 I will conclude reasonably that you do not disagree with my report.

Unless you or CSIRO have empirical scientific evidence and reasoning of damaging warming caused by human CO<sub>2</sub>, please demand that CSIRO cease making direct or implied public claims that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> needs to be cut. Please instruct CSIRO to withdraw its past such claims and CSIRO reports. If you or CSIRO continue making such claims and fail to retract past claims you and/or CSIRO will be knowingly misleading the public and parliament.

The ultimate arbiter of science is empirical scientific evidence. CSIRO fails that test. Worse, CSIRO's core climate claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. That is explained in my report's Appendices 6, 6a, 2, 4 and 4a among others.

Please note that my report was sent by Registered Post with Deliver Confirmation to CSIRO Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark and CSIRO Group Executive—Environment Dr. Andrew Johnson. My letter sent with the report invited them to identify, specify and justify any errors in the report. It invited them to provide empirical scientific evidence. Dr. Clark failed to reply to my initial invitation dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013. She failed to respond to my subsequent letter dated March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Yet my report identifies serious unscientific behaviour.

Dr. Johnson replied to my letter of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 yet failed to address the specific points I raised. He failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and failed to identify any errors in my report. He was provided a second opportunity in my letter dated March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013. In his subsequent reply he again failed to identify any errors. My report is sound.

Rather than provide empirical scientific evidence Dr. Johnson used similar wording to your claim about the ranking of CSIRO research. That is an unscientific appeal to authority. Such statements are a matter of last resort and highlight CSIRO's lack of empirical scientific evidence. Indeed, if CSIRO has any such evidence for its core claim such evidence would nullify my position. That it cannot confirm your position and CSIRO's position as unfounded. It confirms my claims as sound.

My report is open to the widest possible public and scientific peer-review. CSIRO has repeatedly failed to identify any errors in my report. I've personally invited by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation all nine prominent Australian academic advocates of cutting human carbon dioxide to identify, specify and justify errors they perceive to be in my report. Your government presents all nine as climate experts. All are funded by your government. I've invited the Bureau of Meteorology's Director Dr. Rob Vertessy to identify, specify and justify errors. Over more than two months all these '*experts*' have failed to identify any errors in my report. Their failure validates my report.

Please find enclosed my letters to Drs. Clark and Johnson. Enclosed are Dr. Johnson's replies. Please refer to this page: <http://www.conscious.com.au/letters.html>

I would be pleased to discuss this with you and/or your successor as Minister for Science and Research the Hon Don Farrell, MP in a meeting. I would be pleased if you and/or Don Farrell chose to invite Drs. Clark and Johnson to attend that meeting.

Enclosed is my reply dated April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 to Greg Combet's response of March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2013 to my report. My response reveals the serious documented corruption of climate science that is the basis of Greg Combet's position and that of the ALP-Greens alliance. Do you condone such corruption? If not, what will you do to end the corruption and abuse of taxpayer funds?

In good faith I can show you how to reclaim the high moral ground and agenda on this issue perplexing many Australians. For that purpose I welcome an opportunity to meet with you and/or Don Farrell, together or separately. I assure my complete confidentiality at any venue you choose. I'm willing to meet with you in the company of any expert you choose.

If you require, internationally respected and independent climate scientists can accompany me. Please contact me to agree a date and time and potential invitees.

Yours sincerely,

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

Enclosures:

Copies of correspondence on my report with Drs. Clark and Johnson  
Copies of correspondence with Greg Combet and attachment thereto