

**Stephen McIntyre
Climate Audit**

April 4, 2013

Robyn Owens
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).
University of Western Australia
dvcr@uwa.edu.au

Brian Little
Editor, *Frontiers in Psychology*
Distinguished Scholar, Department of Social and Developmental *Psychology*
Cambridge University.
bl321@cam.ac.uk

Frontiers Editorial Office
Frontiers in Psychology
EPFL Science Park, Building D
CH – 1015 Lausanne
Switzerland
editorial.office@frontiersin.org

Dear Sirs,

Policies of the University of Western Australia UWA policy on academic misconduct
(<http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policies/agreements/academic>) state:

A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth:

- state or present a material or significant falsehood
- omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.

A recent publication by Lewandowsky and coauthors in *Frontiers in Psychology* (“*Fury*”) contains multiple violations of this policy, including false statements that I have exhibited six different forms of supposed conspiratorial ideations: NI (nefarious intent), PV (persecution-victim complex), NS (nihilistic skepticism), NoA (nothing by accident), MbW (must be wrong) and UCT (unreflexive counterfactual thinking). These statements were made with “intent to deceive” and/or “reckless disregard for the truth”.

Alleged Conspiracist “Hypotheses”

Table 3 of *Fury* associates me with no fewer than four “conspiracist hypotheses”, which jointly or severally allegedly exhibited no fewer than six aspects of conspiracist ideation: Unreflexive

Counterfactual Thinking, PV (Persecution-Victimization), Nefarious Intent, MbW(Must be Wrong), NoA (Nothing As it Seems), NS (Nihilistic Skepticism), as summarized below:

Table 3

Summary of recursive—and at least partially conspiracist—hypotheses advanced in response to LOG12 during August - October 2012

ID	Date	Originator ^a	Summary of hypothesis	Criteria ^b
			
5	5 Sep	SMcI	Different versions of the survey	<i>NI, MbW, UCT</i>
6	6 Sep	SMcI	Control data suppressed	<i>NI, NoA</i>
7	10 Sep	SMcI	Duplicate responses from same IP number retained	<i>NS, MbW</i>
8	14 Sep	SMcI	Blocking access to authors' websites	<i>NI, PV, NoA</i>

Table 3 Item 5

Lewandowsky and coauthors stated that, on September 5, 2012, I had advanced a recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis: that there had been “different versions of the survey”; and that I had thereby exhibited three different forms of conspiracist ideation (Nefarious Intent, Must Be Wrong and Unreflexive Counterfactual Thinking.)

The factual background to this allegation was that, on September 5, 2012, I asked the following question at Lewandowsky’s blog (<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/cc2.html#234>):

Another couple of questions:

- 1) the link attached to the email to me HKMKNI_9a13984 was not the same as the link as at the Deltoid survey HKMKNF_991e2415
- 2) the number of questions noted up in comments at Deltoid was 40, while only 31 were reported in the article. In addition, the project description at UWA mentions questions concerning "life satisfaction" but these are not listed in the Appendix. What happened to them?

It is a material falsehood to characterize these simple questions as a “recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis”. I simply asked two questions. I did not make any hypothesis.

It is a material falsehood to characterize these questions as presuming Nefarious Intent or Must Be Wrong, as these are defined in Fury. I had made no such presumptions. I had asked simple questions about the methodology of the study that might and, in my opinion, ought to have been asked by the peer reviewers. I note that the methodological section of the article had not reported the existence of different versions of the survey or the purpose of those versions. Similarly, the methodological section of the article did not list all the questions that were in the survey nor explain why not all questions were reported.

It is a material falsehood to characterize these questions as exhibiting Unreflexive Counterfactual Thinking, which is defined in the article as follows:

that is, the hypothesis was built on a non-existent, counterfactual state of the world, even though knowledge about the true state of the world was demonstrably available at the time.... We argue later that this unreflexive counterfactual thinking is indicative either of the absence of a collective memory for earlier events, or of the lack of a cognitive control mechanism that requires an hypothesis to be compatible with all the available evidence (which is a hallmark of scientific cognition but is known to be compromised in conspiracist ideation; Wood et al., 2012).

Finally, the questions were well-founded. There were indeed different versions of the survey and items included in the survey had not been reported in the article. Omission of the information is a material omission that, according to the UWA policy, leaves a materially false impression and is thus a breach of the policy.

Table 3 Item 6

Lewandowsky and coauthors stated that, on September 6, 2012, I had advanced a recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis: that control data had been “suppressed”; and that I had thereby exhibited two different forms of conspiracist ideation (Nefarious Intent, Nothing As It Seems.)

The factual background was that, on September 6, a Climate Audit reader, who was on the faculty of the University of Western Australia, reported that an email from Charles Hanich had been sent to UWA staff on October 21, 2010 seeking their participation in a survey, now known to be the Lewandowsky survey. No mention of this part of the survey was made in the methodological section of *Hoax*. On learning of this unreported dataset, I asked the following questions at Climate Audit: <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/12/lewandowskys-unreported-results/>

Obvious questions: What was the results of UWA staff who actually took the survey. Surely this would have made an interesting comparison group with the bloggers who are the target of the Moon-landing paper. It would have been a logical comparison. Was it done and discarded? If so, why? If it wasn't, why wasn't it done?

It is a material falsehood to state that I had proposed a “recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis”. I simply asked obvious questions.

It is a material falsehood to state that the mere asking of these questions thereby presumed Nefarious Intent. I did not preclude the possibility of an innocent explanation. These are the sorts of question that a peer reviewer might well , and in my opinion ought to, ask.

It is a material falsehood to state that my asking these questions exhibited NoA conspiracist ideation, as this is defined in the article. I presumed that the non-reporting was intentional and not random. However, it was not NoA conspiracist ideation as I did not “weave” this question “into a conspiracy narrative and reinterpret [it] as indisputable evidence for the theory” as the authors allege.

Further, the questions were well-founded. Omission of the information that the questions were well-founded is a material omission that, according to the UWA policy, leaves a materially false impression and is thus a breach of the policy.

Lewandowsky et al did not answer the question at the time, waiting until Fury to respond. In Fury, they purported to justify non-reporting on the basis that the “invitation returned only a small number of respondents (N<80)”:

Control data suppressed (6). Data collection for LOG12 also involved an attempt to recruit a “control” sample via an emailed invitation to participate in the survey among the first author's campus community. Because this invitation returned only a small number of respondents (N < 80), only the sample of blog denizens was reported in LOG12.

In a recent article by Lewandowsky and coauthors (The pivotal role of perceived scientific consensus in acceptance of science), Lewandowsky et al's Study 2 was a survey of 100 respondents of which the “control group” was 49. If a control group of 49 was adequate in the one case, it is unclear why a control group of ~80 was not worth reporting in the other case. Be that as it may, there is nothing in my raising the question that warrants aspersions of “conspiracist ideation”.

By the way, the issue of sample groups being large enough is an important question that was inadequately discussed in Hoax. The total number of respondents purporting to adhere to Lewandowsky's signature Moon Landing conspiracy was only 10, of which the majority (6) were “warmists”. In my opinion, many, if not all, of these responses were fake. As a further aside, Harrison Schmidt, one of the last people to walk on the moon and said to be the photographer of the famous Blue Marble photograph, is a prominent “skeptic” and even a director of the Heartland Institute. There is not a whiff of Moon Landing skepticism in the major “skeptic” blogs, where astronauts tend to be lionized.

Table 3 Item 7

Lewandowsky and coauthors stated that, on September 10, 2012, I had advanced a recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis: that duplicate responses from the same IP address had been retained; and that I had thereby exhibited two different forms of conspiracist ideation (Nihilistic Skepticism and Must Be Wrong.)

The factual context here is as follows. There had been ongoing discussion of what precautions Lewandowsky had made against multiple responses from the same person. In Hoax, Lewandowsky et al stated:

Following standard recommendations (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004), duplicate responses from any IP number were eliminated (N = 71).

This cursory description did not clarify whether all the responses from one IP address were eliminated or merely the first one. Lewandowsky's reference (Gosling et al 2004) suggested several different methods for detecting repeat responders and did not really clarify what was done. For example, one of the recommended methods was elimination only of item-by-item duplicate responses. (See my discussion at Climate Audit <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/the-third-skeptic/>).

On September 9, Roger Pielke Jr sent me a 2010 email from Charles Hanich, in which Hanich had stated:

When we published the surveys, we had two options:

- a) Use the provision offered by the hosting company to block repeated replies using IP addresses. This, however, will block legitimate use of the same computer, such as in our laboratory, where numerous participants use the same PCs.
- b) Not to block multiple replies and allow for the possibility of repeated replies when evaluating the data.

We chose option b), which was more practical in our situation.

Why they would want to permit multiple responses to the survey from their own laboratory is an unresolved question. I speculated on possible interpretations, closing with the caveat:

I re-iterate that this is an interpretation of the methodological description and it is possible that the algorithm operated differently. Lewandowsky could easily clarify this issue without providing the actual IP addresses. It is trivial to assign a unique ID number for each unique IP address so that this phenomenon could be analysed.

A couple of days later, I inquired directly at Lewandowsky's blog as follows (an inquiry that was not reported in the supposedly exhaustive survey, though it was an inquiry by a major figure at Lewandowsky's own blog):

<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskyScammers1.html#916>

stevemcintyre at 05:42 AM on 13 September, 2012

Can you clarify your handling of multiple responses from a single IP address, as neither your article nor the above response does so. If you had multiple (but non-duplicate) responses from the same IP address, did you keep all of them? If not, how did you decide

which one to keep? If you had duplicate responses from the same IP address, did you eliminate ALL of the responses or did you keep one?

It is a material falsehood to state that the mere asking of these questions constituted a recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis.

It is a material falsehood to state that the questions exhibited Nihilistic Skepticism as this is defined in the article.

It is a material falsehood to state that the questions exhibited Must Be Wrong conspiracist ideation.

Table 3 Item 8

Lewandowsky and coauthors stated that, on September 14, 2012, I had advanced a recursive and at least partially conspiracist hypothesis: that the authors had blocked access to their websites, thereby supposedly exhibiting three different forms of conspiracist ideation (Nefarious Intent, Persecution-Victimization and Not An Accident.)

On September 14, while discussing Lewandowsky's false claim that there had been a link to the Lewandowsky survey at the SKS website, I mentioned in passing that I was unable to access either the Lewandowsky or SKS websites (both registered to John Cook) using my IP address, but was able to access them using a proxy server. In the past, I've been blocked from accessing data at ftp sites operated by Michael Mann's associates so this sort of conduct has precedent.

At the time, there was considerable controversy over the removal of comments by Lewandowsky and associates at his website, controversy that would soon lead to their deletion of all of Tom Fuller's comments <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-sks-link-to-the-lewandowsky-survey/#comment-352980>. I began my coverage of Lewandowsky's censorship a few days earlier (Sep 10) with a post at Climate Audit (see <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/>.) In comments to that post, Tom Fuller reported that Lewandowsky had deleted one of his comments <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350259>. Barry Woods then reported that his comment at Lewandowsky's blog that quoted Tom Curtis' criticism of scam responses had been deleted (<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350266>). Hector M reported that his comment at Lewandowsky's blog was disappeared (<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350313>). Then a comment by A Scott was deleted at Lewandowsky's blog (see <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350318>).

Because I was unable to access either Lewandowsky's or Cook's site using my own IP address, but was able to access both sites using an anonymous proxy server, I speculated that I'd been once again blocked by someone that I was criticizing. Commenters at my blog, some of whom were not known parties in the debate, subsequently observed that they too were unable to access

Lewandowsky's blog; that there had been routing outages on the internet; and that the proxy server might follow a different route to Australia than my normal IP routing. I immediately acknowledged that this might explain the phenomenon and withdrew my complaint.

It is a material falsehood to state that I exhibited "Persecution-Victimization", which is defined in the article as follows:

The theorist typically considers herself, at least tacitly, to be the brave antagonist of the nefarious intentions of the conspiracy; that is, the victim is also a potential hero. The theme of the victimization of conspiracy theorists or their allies features prominently in science denial, for example when isolated scientists who oppose the scientific consensus that HIV causes AIDS are Presented as persecuted heroes and are likened to Galileo (Kalichman, 2009; Wagner-Egger et al., 2011). We refer to this persecution-victimization criterion as PV for short.

While I concede that I had incorrectly surmised that I'd been blocked by Lewandowsky and Cook, I did not regard that as "persecution" or myself as being "victimized". Nor did I consider that there was any particular "heroism" on my side of the apparent blocking. On the contrary, I regarded their (apparent) conduct as merely juvenile and immature.

It is also a material falsehood by omission for Lewandowsky et al to fail to report that my conduct in this incident was singularly free of supposed Self Sealing refusal to accept contrary evidence, one of Lewandowsky's criteria. When a alternative explanation was presented, it was immediately accepted and corrections made.

Public Statements

As set out in my complaint concerning sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement, Lewandowsky actively concealed his association with the survey and then failed to notify me and other bloggers of his association with the survey, and then sought to harm the parties that he had originally deceived. Part of his effort to harm the parties that he had deceived were a series of material falsehoods in *Fury* in connection with this incident.

Lewandowsky et al stated:

Within short order, 25 "skeptical" bloggers had come publicly forward (<http://www.webcitation.org/6APs1GdzO>) to state that they had not been approached by the researchers. Of those 25 public declarations, 5 were by individuals who were invited to post links to the study by LOG12 in 2010. Two of these bloggers had engaged in correspondence with the research assistant for further clarification.

It was a material falsehood to say that the five bloggers who had received invitations from Hanich had "come publicly forward to state that they had not been approached by the researchers". Pielke, Morano and myself never made a "public declaration" nor did we ever say that we had not been approached by the "researchers". I and others responded by email to Jo Nova. In my email, I had conducted a search of my 2010 emails for the term "Lewandowsky" and only said that I had "no record", not precluding the possibility that I might have received and

deleted the email. I notified Lewandowsky that he had misrepresented my situation in response to his blogpost of September 4, but Lewandowsky nonetheless perpetuated and exacerbated the falsehood in *Fury*.

Lewandowsky's allegation that I had "aired the suspicion that "skeptic" bloggers had not been contacted" is another material falsehood. It seemed highly unlikely to me that someone would lie about something like this and I did not hold this particular "suspicion", let alone "air" it. If Lewandowsky claimed to have contacted five blogs, I presumed that he done so. It was unclear to me why Lewandowsky was refusing to identify the blogs, but that was a different question.

Lewandowsky et al then stated:

The names of the "skeptic" bloggers became publicly available on 10 September 2012, on a blog post by the first author of LOG12;
<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskyGof4.html>.

This is another material falsehood. I had reported my receipt of an invitation from Hanich a week earlier. In addition, following my Climate Audit post on September 8 mentioning Hanich's name, Pielke Jr notified both myself and Jo Nova on September 9. Jo Nova sent Hanich's name to others and in the morning (Eastern), both Roy Spencer and Marc Morano located Hanich emails. By noon (Eastern) September 10, all had been publicly identified both at Climate Audit and Jo Nova, prior to Lewandowsky's supposed outing.

Malice

The above material falsehoods were made either with an intent to deceive or with reckless disregard for the truth. Further, they were made with malice.

Cook's animosity is evident in his blogposts.

Cook's website (Skeptical Science) operates a private forum where Cook, as proprietor, has sanctioned vile commentary against both me and Anthony Watts. For example, one participant in Cook's forum wrote:

McIntyre need to go down, it is quite that simple.

Another wrote:

to be candid, McIntyre or Watts in handcuffs is probably the only thing that will slow things down.

Another stated:

my personal contribution will be to rip Anthony Watts' throat out – metaphorically of course...

Sometimes you just want to let loose and scream about how you want to take those motherfucking arseholes, those closed-minded bigotted genocidal pieces of regurgitated dog shit and do unspeakable violence to their bodies and souls for what they are doing to the safety of what and who we all hold dear. (Ain't a lack of a moderation policy a cleansing and liberating thing?)

In August 2012, shortly before commencing the present “research”, Hubble-Marriott publicly stated his intent to eradicate climate skepticism as a cultural and political force (<http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/12/protocols-of-the-elder-climate-scientists-and-banksters-part-2-rothschilds-money-masters-and-global-warming/>):

It's time to change our tactics, and time to fight a different battle. It's also time to set a new victory condition. What does victory look like? I suggest it is the side lining and destruction of the climate sceptic movement as a political and cultural force.

In the same post, Hubble-Marriott made scurrilous and unfounded accusations of anti-Semitism against David Evans, the husband of one of the targets (Jo Nova) of Fury, which I quote here so that you can fully adjudicate Hubble-Marriott's

bias: <http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/the-protocols-of-the-elder-climate-scientists-and-banksters-is-the-media-is-twiggling-to-just-how-extreme-some-sceptics-are/>.

Evans, who writes about money and currencies in his professional life, had written a short account of the development of paper currencies including the following statement which Hubble-Marriott quoted as particularly “alarming”:

“...Over time the goldsmiths became bankers, governments introduced central banking, and finally, in 1971, the world financial system switched from using gold as its base money to using cash (paper money). The world financial system is now unpinned by cash, which governments can print at will. We have a fully paper system, with no hard constraints on how much money there is.”

Hubble-Marriott continued:

In Evans reasoning is that “goldsmiths” from the medieval period – let's be frank he is clearly talking about Jews – founded a “paper aristocracy” that secretly rules the globe.

Gold.

Smith.

Got it?

Do I really need to spell it out?

It is hard to imagine less objective and more malicious attitudes.

Conclusion

As itemized above, in Fury, Lewandowsky, Oberauer, Cook and Gignac presented numerous material falsehoods, either with an intent to deceive or in reckless disregard of the truth, all in violation of UWA policies on academic misconduct. These are by no means the only material falsehoods in Fury.

I formally request that the University of Western Australia, Frontiers in Psychology and Psychological Science investigate these allegations.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. McIntyre". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Stephen McIntyre
Climate Audit