

From: Andy Pitman <andy.pitman@gmail.com>
Subject: **Re: Just read your article**
Date: 10 January 2011 8:05:45 PM AEST
To: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Reply-To: a.pitman@unsw.edu.au

hi,

please see previous e-mail.

I have not read this - do not intend to.

Andy Pitman

On 10/01/11 8:57 PM, Malcolm Roberts wrote:

Thank you, Andy.

Your comments intrigue and are digging you into a deeper hole. They raise serious questions and lead me to conclude that your public comments are evidence of negligence or deception.

Adequate answers to questions triggered by your false statements and by your unsupported statements could dig you out of your deepening hole.

1. What do you imagine is my political party?

I've been asked to join parties yet have declined because the discussion of global warming has always been driven by a political agenda contrary to real-world science. **I have never been a member of any political party and am not a member of any political party.**

2. Why do you make unfounded statements contrary to the facts? Is this typical of your approach?

3. Could you please specifically correct the errors you claim are on my web site? I take considerable care to ensure my statements are honest and correct to the best of my knowledge. Thus, please advise corrections you consider as needed.

4. Why do you fret about being accused of selectivity? Is selectivity something you practice yourself?

5. Is your evidence so poor or lacking altogether that it could not withstand such accusations? If your evidence is sound wouldn't such accusations rebound on and embarrass anyone using it to accuse you of selectivity?

6. Why are you so worried about the inadequacy of your evidence?

7. Why do you advise me to read the UN IPCC literature when it is now known the UN IPCC's core claim is fraudulent and based on falsities?

In connection with this and in further response to your previous e-mail I will be separately asking you important questions to clarify your understanding of peer-review.

8. Will you please declare your personal interests in advocating human CO2 as the cause of global warming? In the absence of real-world scientific data, your advocacy is unfounded.

I've publicly declared my personal interests and maintain a public declaration on my web site. It can be found at: <http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf>

I would hope that you, as a prominent public advocate of anthropogenic global warming, would want to clear your name tainted as it is now in my view by your repeated inability to provide real-world evidence.

9. Your statements are driving and encouraging policies that will be very costly to every citizen and taxpayer? As a fellow citizen and as a taxpayer am I not entitled to have evidence from you? Why do you not want to fulfil your responsibilities as a citizen and as a scientist?

If you or your institute have received public funding, your responsibility would seem even greater.

10. You're persistent in your refusal to provide any real-world scientific evidence. Why? Surely it would be easy for you to provide the evidence, assuming you have any.

Someone in your position would benefit from quickly providing legitimate evidence to support your bold and dramatic public claims and comments.

Until you provide real-world evidence, your name will be on my growing list of warming proponents failing to provide evidence. The number providing

evidence is zero.

With the aim and intention of protecting Australian science and of restoring your credibility I look forward to your reply.

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

www.conscious.com.au

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

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

On 09/01/2011, at 6:27 PM, Andy Pitman wrote:

hi,

I can - but I do not want you to accuse me of selectivity. You need to read the literature. You need to do it effectively. There is a great spin off for you as it would let you correct the material on your web site.

Lets leave it there please. I am aware of your views, your web site and your political party and I decline to invest my time on you.

Andy Pitman

On 9/01/11 6:57 PM, Malcolm Roberts wrote:

Thank you, Andy.

Your promptness is appreciated.

You have failed though to provide one piece of specific scientifically measured real-world evidence.

Aren't you a Lead Author for the UN IPCC? Surely you can give me one piece of specific scientific evidence, can't you?

Malcolm

On 09/01/2011, at 5:51 PM, Andy Pitman wrote:

Hi Malcolm,

I suggest you read the chapters in the IPCC 2007 report on observations, and on radiative forcing. If I simply quote you subsets of these reports I might be accused of selectivity, or misrepresentation. You need to read them in their entirety and read a suite of the accompanying literature cited therein.

This is, of course, a huge undertaking but unless you do this people can easily mislead you by simple explanations that "its natural" or "its volcanoes" or "its the sun" and that is such a waste of everyone's time.

If you form the basis of a judgment based on evidence that will convince you. If you have already made up your mind that the climate scientists, physicists, oceanographers, most geologists, biologists, hydrologists have just made this all up then I do not think I can help.

I hope you enjoy the reading. If you cannot access specific papers please let me know and I may be able

to help.

Andy Pitman

On 9/01/11 6:04 PM, Malcolm Roberts wrote:

Andy:

Happy new year to you and yours.

Having just read your article printed in The Australian ("No need to go gaga over Gaia") I noted this paragraph of yours, quote: "For the record, that the Earth is warming due to greenhouse gases emitted by human activities is as certain as pretty well anything else in mainstream science."

Please provide one piece of specific scientifically measured real-world data proving your claim.

Please do not cite computer models as these have not been validated and have proven erroneous.

Please do not cite UN IPCC reports as the 2007 report's core chapter 9 does not provide any real-world scientific evidence. None.

Please do not claim the UN IPCC relies on peer-reviewed science. That is a proven falsity.

And this paragraph, quote: "There is scientific doubt about global warming, too, but we know with certainty that continued emissions of carbon dioxide will lead to warming, rising sea levels and ocean acidification at unprecedented rates, and that these changes will trigger expenses and outcomes that dwarf the costs of actually solving the problem."

Please provide one specific piece of scientifically measured real-world data proving this claim of certainty.

Just one piece of real-world scientific data for each of your claims, please Andy.

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

www.conscious.com.au

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

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

--

Professor AJ Pitman
Co director, Climate Change Research Centre,
The University of New South Wales.

a.pitman@unsw.edu.au

skype: andy.pitman.
Phone +61 2 9385 7075

--

Professor AJ Pitman
Co director, Climate Change Research Centre,
The University of New South Wales.

a.pitman@unsw.edu.au skype: andy.pitman.
Phone +61 2 9385 7075

--

Professor AJ Pitman
Co director, Climate Change Research Centre,
The University of New South Wales.

a.pitman@unsw.edu.au skype: andy.pitman.
Phone +61 2 9385 7075