## Email to University of Queensland, 7th July 2015

This email included the following attachments
Fraud, Bias, and Public Relations

**Professor Peter Høj**
Vice-Chancellor and President
The University of Queensland

Dear Professor,

Further to my below correspondence of 1st July, which at this point remains unanswered, I make the following additional points.

Previously I asked why Cook et al, and the University, in support of Cook's paper, rejected the globally accepted UNFCCC criteria in attempting to establish a 'consensus' on AGW. As I pointed out, the Australian government, and governments around the world accept the UNFCCC criteria and therefore describe the goal of climate policy as being to prevent ***"dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"*.** Cook et al clearly state that their paper is designed to establish a '***scientific consensus'*** in support of ***'climate policy'***:

*"An accurate perception of the degree of scientific consensus is an essential element to public support for climate policy (Ding* et al *2011). Communicating the scientific consensus also increases people's acceptance that climate change (CC) is happening"*

Yet, in designing their survey methodology they completely rejected the globally accepted criteria and utilised their own arbitrary criteria. Why? Do you support this strategy?

**In the absence of any explanatory response, the perception is that they were simply trying to maximise positive survey responses in an effort to achieve the survey results they required.**

Astonishingly, you refer to the IPCC to support your case, even though, as I point out, the latest IPCC report contradicts your stance, particularly in regard to droughts, cessation of warming or 'hiatus', unreliability of climate models, and inability to identify AGW in local regions around the world. But unsurprisingly, the IPCC (in *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* , pp. 1101-1131), also accepts the globally accepted UNFCCC criteria, criteria rejected by Cook et al and the University of Queensland:

*"Climate-resilient pathways are development trajectories of combined mitigation and adaptation to realize the goal of sustainable development that help avoid "**dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system**" as specified in Article 2 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).*
*Article 2 of the UNFCCC outlines its ultimate objective as the "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent **dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system**"*

The criteria used by Cook et al contradicts the criteria used by the UNFCCC, the IPCC, and governments around the world.

If Cook et al did establish any so called 'consensus', of what relevance is it to Australian or global climate policy? Cook et al, for their own reasons, in rejecting the globally accepted criteria, have ensured their survey is completely irrelevant as far as global AGW policies are concerned.

The question is, why did they decide to take this action, and why has the University falsely endorsed the survey as showing a consensus in support of global climate policy?

Especially given the politicisation of climate science referred to below, the perception is that the paper of Cook et al, and the stance of the University, is more political rather than scientific.

The perception so far created by these issues, and by the refusal of both John Cook and the University to explain these issues, is indeed incriminating. If my claims are incorrect why the reluctance to cite contradictory evidence?

Regards

Graham Williamson

**Sent:** Wednesday, 1 July 2015 3:19 PM
**To:** 'UQ VC OFFICE'
**Cc:** 'Ove Hoegh-Guldberg'; 'John Cook'; 'Ron Hohenhaus'
**Subject:** RE: University tarnished

**Professor Peter Høj**
Vice-Chancellor and President
The University of Queensland

Dear Professor,
I thank you for your response of 29th June.

In my previous correspondence I outlined a number of key issues and asked very clear and specific questions in order to consider your official position in regard to those matters. For some reason, your response was characterised by a decision to avoided answering any of those questions.

Firstly, I noted that in seeking to establish a 'consensus' on AGW, Cook et al for some reason chose to reject the globally accepted criteria, endorsed by the UNFCCC and the Australian government, which is to prevent ***"dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"*.** Previously I have asked John Cook separately why the decision was taken to reject this internationally accepted criteria in his attempts to establish a consensus, but received no explanation. In view of these facts I asked you in my previous correspondence if the University also agreed with the decision by Cook et al to reject this internationally accepted criteria as the basis for checking on any consensus.

In your response you decided to completely avoid this question. Why? Such decisions merely prolong the controversy and reinforce the arguments of so called sceptics. The globally accepted criteria has already been clearly established by the UNFCCC, why the need to reject this and establish some spurious arbitrary criteria for a supposedly scientific 'consensus survey'? This creates the strong perception that an attempt is being made to manufacture a completely false consensus by maximising positive responses. Is it not in the University's best interests to completely dispel such a perception?

Perhaps even more astonishing was your response when I expressed my concern about misinformation concerning AGW, directly citing the IPCC AR5 scientific report in regard to the following issues.

1. According to the IPCC they got it wrong regarding worsening droughts and supposed human caused droughts. Sceptics have long said IPCC were alarmist and incorrect. Now IPCC agree with sceptics in this regard but yet most authorities still spread misinformation and pretend this is not so. Have you publicised the truth about this?

2. IPCC now admits there has been what they term a "15 year hiatus" in global warming which their computer models failed to predict. Although IPCC scientists confirm that AR5 climate models got it wrong as far as predicting the hiatus is concerned, they also point out that AR4 climate models were even more unreliable. Once again the IPCC have come to agree with so called sceptics.. Interestingly, in an attempt to repudiate sceptic claims about a 'hiatus', many scientists often prefer to cite only the politicised SPM and avoid citing the scientific report directly.

.

3. In spite of spending billions of dollars on research, and in spite of the many alarmist claims, so far no scientist, politician or researcher has been able to document and quantify the degree of human caused global warming or sea level rise in any city or local council area in Australia. Can you? Additionally, many scientists have pointed out so called 'global warming' is also NOT global. According to the science then, since local AGW cannot be detected, local climate policy is being based upon average data which comes predominantly from the other side of the world. Can you explain the scientific justification for this?

4. IPCC reports reveal widespread false and alarmist information is being circulated, particularly about AGW causing human morbidity and mortality and conflicts. Why the need to resort to making up stories, exaggerating, or cherry picking, if the facts are so revealing? And why are later reports now not confirming previous predictions and mortality? Is climate change now considered less dangerous?

As I pointed out, although these statements are all based upon the latest IPCC AR5 report, many scientists and politicians who support an alarmist AGW viewpoint have refused to publicise these facts. Previously I have addressed this issue with John Cook, in the context of his stated concerns about climate change 'misinformation', but predictably, he declined to respond or publicise these aspects of the IPCC report.

Although the statements are based upon the contents of the latest IPCC AR5 report (as confirmed by above links), your astonishing response was:

*"With respect to your broader claims about the veracity of the science of climate change, we can only point you in the direction of the latest assessment report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change";*

However, since I have directly cited the IPCC report to which you refer, it is astonishing that you would respond by referring me back to the report that I had cited. It is clear that you either disagree with the IPCC report, or you are unaware of the contents of the IPCC report to which you referred. Which is correct? My response to you is, I *can only point you in the direction of the latest assessment report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* You should be aware of the contents of that report, and those contents should be publicized truthfully.

For instance, let me quote directly from the IPCC report in relation to point 1 above concerning droughts.

In Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC are very clear about droughts, admitting in the Technical Summary that their previous AR4 report was wrong:

*"The most recent and most comprehensive analyses of river runoff do not support the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) conclusion that global runoff has increased during the 20th century. New results also indicate that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported."*

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** Lisa V. Alexander, Nathaniel Bindoff, John Church, and **Contributing Authors** Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes, Scott Power, and Stephen Rintoul.

In Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report the IPCC confirm again that they had previously exaggerated:

*"Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated…….. Based on evidence since AR4, SREX concluded that there were not enough direct observations of dryness to suggest high confidence in observed trends globally, although there was medium confidence that since the 1950s some regions of the world have experienced more intense and longer droughts."*

Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report include **Lead Author** Lisa V. Alexander, and contributing author, Markus Donat.

According to the IPCC in their AR5 Technical Summary:

*"There is low confidence in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall), owing to lack of direct observations, dependencies of inferred trends on the index choice and geographical inconsistencies in the trends. However, this masks important regional changes and, for example, the frequency and intensity of drought have likely increased in the Mediterranean and West Africa and likely decreased in central North America and northwest Australia since 1950. "*

And in Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report the IPCC state:

*"Confidence is low for a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, methodological uncertainties and geographical inconsistencies in the trends."*

The IPCC summarise in Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report:

*"In summary, assessment of new observational evidence, in conjunction with updated simulations of natural and forced climate variability indicates that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s should be tempered. There is not enough evidence to support medium or high confidence of attribution of increasing trends to anthropogenic forcings as a result of observational uncertainties and variable results from region to region (Section 2.6.2.3). Combined with difficulties described above in distinguishing decadal scale variability in drought from long-term climate change we conclude consistent with SREX that there is low confidence in detection and*

*attribution of changes in drought over global land areas since the mid-20th century."*

**Australians responsible for writing Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report** include Coordinating Lead Author Nathaniel L. Bindoff and Contributing authors Catia M. Domingues, Paul J. Durack, and Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes,

**But most alarming, and incriminating, is the admission by the IPCC in the AR5 Technical Summary, that droughts during the "last millennium", before the industrial revolution and rise of atmospheric CO2, were much worse than today:**

*"There is high confidence for droughts during the last millennium of greater magnitude and longer duration than those observed since the beginning of the 20th century in many regions. There is medium confidence that more megadroughts occurred in monsoon Asia and wetter conditions prevailed in arid Central Asia and the South American monsoon region during the Little Ice Age (1450–1850) compared to the Medieval Climate Anomaly (950–1250)."*

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** Lisa V. Alexander, Nathaniel Bindoff, John Church, and **Contributing Authors** Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes, Scott Power, and Stephen Rintoul.

**According to the IPCC in their AR5 Physical Science Report the evidence is very clear.**

- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing.**
- **There is no reliable evidence that humans are causing droughts.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**
- **Previous IPCC reports, as long claimed by 'sceptics', were alarmist or completely wrong in regard to droughts.**

Though these IPCC findings are stated quite clearly in their latest report, this is not widely publicised, especially by those scientists and politicians who pursue an alarmist political climate change agenda. This creates a perception of deliberate suppression of truth, a perception that could be so easily dispelled by authorities such as those associated with the University of Queensland. Will you correct this situation and publicise the above findings of the IPCC?

As far as the other issues mentioned above are concerned, they also are all backed up by the IPCC report as you are no doubt aware, so a word by word citation is unnecessary. The below question however, which you also decided to avoid answering, does bear repeating.

**IPCC scientists and CSIRO scientists have not been able to detect and quantify CAGW in cities and local council areas in Australia – shouldn't we be publicising this overwhelming consensus amongst scientists?**

It is indeed disturbing, as Fritz Reusswig points out (cited by Cook et al), that "*Climate science is a highly politicized science*." As Richard Glover notes, the global "***communal***" enforcement action made possible by UN involvement in the climate change debate was always going to guarantee the enthusiastic support of those on the left of the political spectrum:

*"People on the left instinctively believe in communal action, the role of government and the efficacy of international agencies such as the UN. They were always going to believe in climate change; it's the sort of problem that can best be solved using the tools they most enjoy using. The right tended to be sceptical about climate change from the start and for exactly the same reasons. It's the sort of problem that requires global, communal action, with governments setting rules. It is a problem that requires tools they instinctively dislike using. These initial responses to global warming, on both sides, were understandable. But there's a point in any debate where what you want to believe comes up against what you know to be true; where ideology yields to reality."*

As Glover notes, some on the left of politics seem to welcome any new environmental tragedy to reinforce their belief system:

*"There's a type of green zealot who appears to relish climate change. Every rise in sea levels is noted excitedly. Every cyclone is applauded and claimed as a noisy, deadly witness for their side. Suddenly, it's as if they have the planet's assistance in their lifelong campaign to bully everyone else into accepting their view of the perfect world. One without any human beings. Except for them. Living in a cave. Wearing an unwashed T-shirt that not only says ''Support wildlife'' but actually does."*

Equally though, as Glover continues, those who are blinded by the thick rose covered glasses of political fanaticism are guaranteed not to be able recognise reality:

*"Facts that don't fit one's world view can be difficult to see. Consider the way the left spent decades ignoring the horrors of Soviet communism, horrors that were obvious to anyone who cared to look from at least the early 1930s. The facts didn't fit in with the way they wanted to see the world, so they spent decades in denial, looking the other way."*

The pertinence of Glover's analysis is underlined by the fact that the professional views of scientists themselves are also heavily influenced by political bias. According to Stenhouse and colleagues, the attitudes of meteorologists towards global warming are determined largely by their own personal political beliefs:

*"Political ideology was the second strongest predictor of view certainty and causation, and was equivalent to perceived consensus as predictor of harm/benefit…….In other words, the notion that expertise is the single dominant factor shaping meteorologists' views of global warming appears to be simplistic to the point of being incorrect…….Political ideology was the factor next most strongly associated with meteorologists' views about global warming. This also goes against the idea of scientists' opinions being entirely based on objective analysis of the evidence, and concurs with previous studies that have shown scientists' opinions on topics to vary along with their political orientation (Nisbet, 2011; Rosenberg et al., 2009)……..At least for the measure of expertise that we used, climate science expertise may be a less important influence on global warming views than political ideology or social consensus norms"*

This troubling analysis explains the obvious bias or polarisation of scientists when it comes to climate change. However, the fact that some scientists have placed their personal political views ahead of any objective analysis of the scientific facts is most disturbing. As Professor Eckard has recently emphasised:

***"If you can disentangle climate change from the politics, we'd be so much better off."***

Sir, you have an opportunity to do precisely that by publicising the true contents of the IPCC report, as outlined above. Will you do so? Not to do so is to continue the obfuscation and deception driven by the politicisation of science.

Science should be totally separate from politics, with scientists required to state their political affiliations. Don't you agree?

Why not separate the science from the politics and stand up for science?

Regards

Graham Williamson

**From:** UQ VC OFFICE [mailto:uqvc@uq.edu.au]
**Sent:** Monday, 29 June 2015 9:22 AM
**To:** 'Graham'
**Cc:** UQ VC OFFICE; Ove Hoegh-Guldberg; John Cook; Ron Hohenhaus
**Subject:** RE: University tarnished

Dear Mr Williamson,

Thank you for your correspondence on 12th May 2015 in relation to the UQx course, Denial101x. The University of Queensland (UQ) upholds extremely high standards when it comes to the behaviour of its academic staff and their outputs.

The University of Queensland has thoroughly reviewed all components of the research undertaken by John Cook and research subsequently presented in the peer-reviewed publication 'Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature' (Cook et al., 2013, *Environmental Research Letters* 8 024024). The University is satisfied that the research is sound and may be relied upon for the purposes of proper academic discourse. The University has been in communication with the Publisher and Editor of *Environmental Research Letters* who have stated that they are completely satisfied with the University's review of the study and will not consider retracting the paper.

With respect to our employees Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook, The University of Queensland has found no reason whatsoever to question their integrity.

The course material is based on a body of scientific literature and it has been rigorously reviewed by internal and external expert reviewers, in accordance with the review processes at The University of Queensland and edX. We are therefore confident that it does not adopt a populist position but one based firmly in the scientific literature.

With respect to your broader claims about the veracity of the science of climate change, we can only point you in the direction of the latest assessment report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (www.ipcc.ch). 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. We recommend that you write to the IPCC secretariat if you have any concerns about the scientific consensus that they have formed as a part of their rigorous process.

Thank you again for communicating with the University on these matters.

Regards,

Peter

**Professor Peter Høj**
Vice-Chancellor and President
The University of Queensland
Brisbane Qld 4072

**Sent:** Friday, 22 May 2015 5:43 AM
**To:** Adam Harper; UQ VC OFFICE
**Subject:** University tarnished

**Professor G. Q. Max Lu**
Acting Vice-Chancellor and President
The University of Queensland
Brisbane Qld 4072

Dear Professor,

I have yet to receive a response to my communication of 12th May so I have repeated the issues below.

I am alarmed at allegations that the University of Queensland has participated in what has been termed "deceit", "politicking", and "corruption of climate science" (1, 2), and even suggestions the University is seeking to "block climate research". The allegations apparently relate to attempts by your University to suppress information which would enable the data and methodology supporting Cook's paper to be checked by normal review mechanisms. A subsequent statement by the University seeking to defend its position was described as containing a "number of falsehoods". Cook's paper, which was discredited by various experts (1, 2), and the University's apparent attempts to obstruct review of Cook's data, have seriously tarnished the reputation of the University of Queensland.

Various criticisms of Cook's paper draw attention to the fact that Cook and co workers attempts to establish a 'consensus' are dependent upon a failure to clearly define what is meant by this term and by so doing, maximise the positive responses. In fact, any surveyed paper that mentioned the ability of greenhouse gases to cause global warming, no matter how slight or inconsequential, could thereby be included as confirming the consensus. Such methods are not only a corruption of standard academic procedures, but most importantly, it is a distraction from the fundamental UN global climate change mitigation agenda under discussion. This agenda is described by the UNFCCC, and confirmed by the Australian government, as concerning greenhouse gases causing "*dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system"*(3, 4, 5)

The goal of the UNFCCC, and Australia's contribution to the control of global emissions is, according to Article 2 of the Convention:

*"The ultimate objective of this Convention and any related legal instruments that the Conference of the Parties may adopt is to achieve, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system."*

The Australian government, in agreement with the UNFCCC, has also confirmed the goal of their proposed emission targets (1, 2):
*"Countries have agreed that targets should be contributions towards achieving the ultimate goal of the UNFCCC, to '**stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic (human induced) interference with the climate system'**. "*

**The globally accepted criteria then, is "*dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system*".**

It is most noteworthy that Cook and colleagues appear to have deliberately avoided using this UN and Australian government criteria in establishing what can only properly be called, in this connection, a "***Cooked Consensus***".. When both the UN and the Australian government are so clear in their terminology why did Cook and colleagues seek to avoid calculating a consensus of those scientists believing in dangerous AGW as per globally accepted criteria?

**In any case, Cook and colleagues have clearly chosen to distance their paper from globally accepted UN and Australian government criteria, and thereby render it worthless as a means of establishing support for the current UNFCCC climate change mitigation campaign.** Suggestions that Cook's paper in some way justifies the current global AGW mitigation campaign are at best deceptive and misleading, and at worst, are deliberately fraudulent.

Does the University endorse this decision by Cook et al to reject the above UNFCCC criteria in determining their 'consensus'?

I share the University's concern about AGW misinformation, such as the further examples below.

1. According to the IPCC they got it wrong regarding worsening droughts and supposed human caused droughts. Sceptics have long said IPCC were alarmist and incorrect. Now IPCC agree with sceptics in this regard but yet most authorities still spread misinformation and pretend this is not so. Have you publicised the truth about this?

2. IPCC now admits there has been what they term a "15 year hiatus" in global warming which their computer models failed to predict. Although IPCC scientists confirm that AR5 climate models got it wrong as far as predicting the hiatus is concerned, they also point out that AR4 climate models were even more unreliable. Once again the IPCC have come to agree with so called sceptics.. Interestingly, in an attempt to repudiate sceptic claims about a 'hiatus', many scientists often prefer to cite only the politicised SPM and avoid citing the scientific report directly.

.

3. In spite of spending billions of dollars on research, and in spite of the many alarmist claims, so far no scientist, politician or researcher has been able to document and quantify the degree of human caused global warming or sea level rise in any city or local council area in Australia. Can you? Additionally, many scientists have pointed out so called 'global warming' is also NOT global. According to the science then, since local AGW cannot be detected, local climate policy is being based upon average data which comes predominantly from the other side of the world. Can you explain the scientific justification for this?

4. IPCC reports reveal widespread false and alarmist information is being circulated, particularly about AGW causing human morbidity and mortality and conflicts. Why the need to resort to making up stories, exaggerating, or cherry picking, if the facts are so revealing?

And why are later reports now not confirming previous predictions and mortality? Is climate change now considered less dangerous?

5. There is an assumption that there is only one 'cure' for climate change and that is to hand global economic and political power to the UN, but where is the scientific evidence indicating this is the one and only 'cure', assuming of course that a cure is needed? So far there has been no scientific evidence whatsoever to confirm this one and only cure.

**IPCC scientists and CSIRO scientists have not been able to detect and quantify CAGW in cities and local council areas in Australia – shouldn't we be publicising this overwhelming consensus amongst scientists?**

Given all this misinformation and discredited alarmism it is no wonder the AGW hypothesis is seen as 'on the nose' by so many people. If there is clear evidence, why not produce it?

Please note, I have only considered some of the alleged evidence supporting claims of catastrophic AGW above. Given the lack of credibility of these claims it is not necessary to consider the supposed basis of, and efficacy of, the alleged 'cure' for this alleged problem. This another issue entirely.

The reasons why the University has seemingly sought to abandon academic propriety and pursue apparent political goals are best known to the University. However, the reputation of the University is indelibly stained. Will you perpetuate this standard you have established?

If you feel the IPCC are wrong in some of their statements I cite in the links above, please let me know.

Regards

Graham Williamson