

On 3 Sep 2014, at 7:53 am, Kevin Walsh <[kevin.walsh@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:kevin.walsh@unimelb.edu.au)> wrote:

Dear Dr. Ryan,

Dear Professor Walsh,

With the Malcolm Roberts permission i am forwarding his email to all those copied into the email thread. Please take the time to read the CSIROh document and its appendices. It is an evidence based document of the decades long struggle for the restoration of scientific integrity in Australia.

Sorry, this all appears based on the premise (false) that there is some sort of conspiracy to deny the truth about this issue. I do have an interest in having a debate on this, but in the peer-reviewed literature, not by e-mail, not by blogs, about these issues.

I have read the non-evidence based article you referenced written by your colleagues. Unfortunately Professor Walsh ,it does not address the specific questions regarding how the BOM has changed the raw data which showed a cooling trend for Rutherglen to a warming trend. As Jennifer Marohasy's work shows, Rutherglen is just one example of many instances of questionable homogenisation practices by the BOM.

Quite right, the article doesn't specifically address homogenisation of data at Rutherglen. What it does do is remove all the Bureau's homogenisation across Australia and then see what that does to the temperature record across all of Australia, which seems to be more important as a test of homogenisation than what happens at one or two stations. Now having said this, a debate on homogenisation techniques – again, one conducted in the peer-reviewed literature, not on an e-mail thread – is one worth having. No such technique is perfect.

As you now realise one of Australis largest newspapers is now questioning the BOM's temperature records. This is a very serious matter which needs to be discussed at a national and community level. The people of Australia have a right to be informed.

Asked and answered already. See Andy Pitman's article, which was written in response to the series of articles in "The Australian". To be perfectly honest, I don't think the people of Australia want to be informed about the details of homogenisation techniques. "The Australian" itself mentioned that the independent report previously conducted to evaluate the Bureau's homogenisation techniques had earlier concluded that the Bureau had done a good job.

Let's continue the debate, but in the way that scientists do it: by reference to the peer-reviewed literature, where claims have been examined closely before publication – or even better, by publishing in the peer-reviewed literature. I do note that other contributors to this debate have taken this important step. It's just too easy to refer to non-published work in support of arguments, and thereby to claim that scientists are motivated by a desire to push an agenda of some kind. Regarding personal agendas, I fervently wish that global warming did not exist: it makes life very difficult, in so many ways, and there are lots of other good topics in meteorology to work on. But my personal opinions on this issue cannot be permitted to conflict with my scientific judgement.

Good luck with your endeavours.

Cheers,

Kevin W.