From: @frontiersin.org>
Sent: Monday, 6 May 2013 7:59 PM
To:
Cc: ; Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Subject: Re: Recursive Fury - In Strict Confidence
Attachments: 2013-05-06 UWA Confidentiality.docx

Dear

FYI, attached is the document that we will ask the evaluation team members to sign.

Best,

--

Frontiers
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T +

On Mon, May 6, 2013 at 1:56 PM, wrote:
Dear

Thank you for your email and for sending through a more detailed report.

We will request that the individual members of the evaluation team sign a confidentiality agreement before we forward them the report you provided us. We will not
send
these agreements to UWA
, since they contain the names of the evaluation team members,
unless an allegation of breach of this undertaking occurs, in which case
Frontiers will provide
this undertaking to UWA.

I hope this is an acceptable line of conduct for you.

Best,

Frontiers
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T _____

From: @frontiersin.org]
Sent: Wednesday, 1 May 2013 4:00 PM
To:
Cc: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Subject: Re: Recursive Fury

Dear

,

Many thanks for your message and the letter informing us of UWA's decision that no breach of the Australian Code for Responsible Research occurred in the research leading to the article known as "Recursive Fury", and the recommendations concerning dealing with conflicts of interest.

Frontiers has established a team consisting of senior academics, not Frontiers personnel, to evaluate the complaints made to Frontiers. There is of course some overlap in the subject matter, and ethical considerations are relevant to the evaluation being conducted. I am therefore writing to ask if it would be possible for the team evaluating the complaints to have have a little more information on the process adopted by UWA in assessing these issues. The sole purpose of any such access would be to assist the evaluation team in its work. We are striving to ensure that the evaluation is robust, even-handed and objective and this information could be helpful not only to facilitate this but also to allow it to be seen to be so. The idea would be that the team's report could state that they have seen UWA's decision and the background documents and are happy to be able to rely on that as a solid and well-founded decision (assuming that to be the case).

We are well aware of the sensitivity of this whole question – we are indeed ourselves trying to steer our way through it and Frontiers has a totally neutral stance on the issues raised pending the outcome of the evaluation. We therefore understand UWA's need to be cautious with the information it discloses, and Frontiers plus the evaluation team would of course be open to agreeing on protective measures.

If UWA felt able to share any of the following types of information it would be helpful:

1.

The specific complaints made

2.

The articles of the code of conduct which were considered relevant for the assessment

3.

Whether any codes of conduct relating specifically to psychology were considered relevant, and if so which one(s)

4.

The aspects or factors considered by UWA in its investigation

5.

The reasoning adopted to support the findings of the preliminary investigation

6.

Whether the recommendation referred to in UWA's letter concerning dealing with conflicts of interest means that UWA considers that conflicts of interest were present in this case

7.

Confirmation by UWA that those who assessed these allegations were independent of each of the authors and had no conflicts of interest or similar challenges in carrying out this task (note that we are not asking for details or evidence, just UWA's confirmation)

8.

Finally, from UWA's letter we understand that the conclusion is that there was neither any breach nor any research misconduct, as defined by the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. Is this correct?

Frontiers would be grateful for any help you can give along the above lines, and I repeat that we would be open to agreeing on appropriate measures to safeguard the integrity of UWA's processes.

I would of course be happy to discuss any issues by telephone or Skype if that is helpful.

Many thanks and best regards

Best,

Frontiers
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T :

"Recursive Fury": UWA Ethics Report

As a member of the team evaluating the complaints made to Frontiers concerning the "Recursive Fury" article , I confirm that I understand that the University of Western Australia (UWA) is prepared to make its report on ethical issues available on the basis that it will remain confidential.

I confirm that, if that UWA ethics report is made available to me, I will keep it confidential and will not disclose it to others, and will not use it for any reason other than to support my work as part of the evaluation team referred to above.

I understand that the evaluation team is authorized to make a reference in its report to the findings in UWA's report and to the fact that we have had the opportunity of reviewing that report.

I also understand that my name will not be disclosed to UWA unless an allegation of breach of this undertaking occurs, in which case this undertaking will be provided to UWA by FMSA.

Signed on the date set out below.

_____

Name:
Date:

From: @frontiersin.org>
Sent: Monday, 29 April 2013 1:04 PM
To:
Cc: ; Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Subject: Re: On the recent article

Dear

Thank you for your email, we look forward to receiving the outcome of your investigation.

Best,

Frontiers
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

RELEASED UNDER FOI

From: @frontiersin.org]
Sent: Friday, 26 April 2013 11:47 PM
To:
Cc: ; Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Subject: Re: On the recent article

Dear

I hope this finds you well.

I am writing to follow up on the reply by to my email of April 10 2013.

I would like to inquire about the progress of the assessment of the complaints regarding the article "Recursive Fury" by Our evaluation team is now in place and is working on their evaluation of the complaints. They have indicated a desire to send their draft report to us during the course of the next week. It would obviously be helpful if they had access to your own responses to the complaints in that process.

Would you be able to give us a date by which you will have sent us your responses to the complaints?

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

Frontiers
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T :

From: @frontiersin.org>
Date: 11 April 2013 12:53:35 AM NZST
To:
Cc: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office <psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>,

Subject: On the recent article

Dear

As has just written, I am the Frontiers point of contact with regard to the complaints being made against his recent "Recursive Fury..." article published by Frontiers. Frontiers' stance in this matter is entirely neutral – we currently, pending the outcome of the investigation into the complaints, have no bias towards continued publication, modification or retraction – and Frontiers indeed shares your approach of objectivity, respect, fairness and efficiency.

The first purpose of this message is therefore to state our desire to be of any help possible in your investigation of the complaints. We have received complaints from a total of twelve individuals, of whom only some have consented to their complaints being forwarded to for a response.

Secondly, we understand that you have opened one or more files in this matter. Your conclusion will of course be material to any decision Frontiers may make. In light of this fact, we are wondering if it would be possible for you to share any information with us on this process – for instance the number of complaints received, what exactly you will be assessing in handling these complaints, what standards you will apply in so doing, and (to the extent possible) the time you would normally expect this process to take?

Finally, will you be in a position to share your decision and its reasoning with Frontiers? Would the underlying documentation be available? Our reasons for these questions are to enable us to know to what extent we need to start our own parallel investigation. In general we would be happy to coordinate to the extent that this would be a correct process to follow.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks and best regards,

--

Frontiers

www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

RELEASED UNDER FOI

On 30/04/2013, at 11:18 PM, wrote:

Dear

You may recall, or be able to obtain from university records, the exchange of emails wherein I sought to raise with you my complaint about the academic conduct of who was at that time a member of your academic staff. The University demonstrated a complete lack of interest in my complaint.

I note a recent British report:

Two Bristol academics receive Wolfson Research Merit Awards

26 April 2013

Two Bristol academics are among the 27 new Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award holders.

Professors Stephan Lewandowsky, Chair in Cognitive Psychology in the School of Experimental Psychology, andFred Manby, Professor of Theoretical Chemistry in the Centre for Computational Chemistry, have both been successful in securing this prestigious award from the Royal Society, the UK's national academy of science.

Jointly funded by the Wolfson Foundation and theDepartment for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), the scheme aims to provide universities with additional support to enable them to attract science talent from overseas and retain respected UK scientists of outstanding achievement and potential.

Professor Lewandowsky receives the award for his project entitled 'The (mis)information revolution: information seeking and knowledge transmission', which addresses how people navigate the blizzard of information with which we are faced on a daily basis, not all of which is accurate or truthful. The project emphasises how people update their memories and under what conditions they are able to discount information that turns out to be false. The project also examines how people interact with, and influence, each other to understand how information spreads through a society.

Professor Manby's award is for his work on quantum chemistry, which uses the theory of quantum mechanics to explain molecular structure, the nature of the chemical bond, and chemical reactivity. His group adapts quantum theory equations to create software that can be used by chemists to make predictions and understand experiments. His research focuses on three main areas: theoretical advances in quantum chemistry; development of concrete methods for predicting properties of molecules; and development of methods for predicting how molecules will pack into crystalline structures.

I imagine that your university will be greatly relieved that this third rate academic has left UWA and has found a temporary home in the UK. The above note suggests that he has moved along from 'proving' that climate warming deniers are stark staring mad. I must confess I don't understand what his new project is all about.

But I remain greatly concerned that he received both university and third party research funding in Australia to conduct and publish nonsense which he claims to be research. I am wholly underwhelmed by the response which I received from your underling tame professor and yourself to my complaint about this issue. I am sure that my Vice Chancellor 40 years ago would have been more helpful.

The purpose of this note is, first, to confirm that UWA retains the capacity to investigate complaints about former members of staff (i.e.) in the discharge of professional responsibility whilst the member was working at the University.

Secondly, please let me have within 14 days, a list of the titles of all papers actually published by either as a sole author or as a co-author in peer reviewed journals. Please also advise me of all unpublished papers. I am aware of at

least two unpublished papers that are in circulation on the internet, and which have attracted widespread and withering criticism from well informed climate scientists.

If the University has issued any statement about in the past two months, please also let me have a copy of that statement.

I may be contacted at

Regards

RELEASED UNDER FOI

From: I
Sent: Wednesday, 27 March 2013 7:00 AM
):
Cc:
Subject: Ethics: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury

Hi

I left a brief message on your voice mail the other day, I'm afraid that I didn't get a chance to call you the next day (time zones and runs vs Australia)

Please see the concerns and correspondence (attached) that I have raised with the journal about the ethical conduct of the researchers involved in this paper.

I am known to the authors, and a critic of one of the authors earlier work LOG12, and was interacting with the authors of the Recursive Fury paper on their blogs, whilst unbeknownst to me they were researching me and I find have been named in their research (data)

t least one of the researchers) is publically hostile towards me, blogging about (at the high profile science blog Watts Up With That) and

) as far as I'm aware has no relevant qualifications. He headlined his article with which he has

runs a high traffic website, which is in with this on his blog.

For example, see a recent article debunked by the blog Watching the Deniers, where somebody had cherry-picked skeptical quotes from a few scientists who responded to the Doran and Zimmerman study

(Eos, January 20, 2009). This only reveals that some people confuse consensus with unanimity. – Skeptical Science (SkS)
http://www.skepticalscience.com/consensusforbes.html

The somebody is of course presumably on an WUWT article, is the standard appropriate enough for and SkS readers, but perhaps not that of professional academics, of course this was on their private blogs. But clearly shows the researchers of this paper are hostile to their human research subject, so is quite relevant to my concerns.

questioned how politicians and activists use / misuse a 'sound bite of 97% of scientists say' which is taken from research, this article questions The Skeptical Science position on this quotation from the Doran Paper (and Anderegg and other papers), it is a key reference for Climate Reality Project:

The Deniers: Climate Reality Project
"But 97 per cent of climate scientists understand that climate change is a reality. The scientists are not confused. And we shouldn't be either." (which links to SkS)
http://climaterealityproject.org/the-deniers/

So we have a very clear motive and need to 'claim' they article. I say claim they article, as the rely on the article, by to blog - with the shall we say unprofessional
http://www.skepticalscience.com/consensusforbes.html

This has also been used on more than one occasion.

Thus, as a named unwilling/unwitting (well known) participant in the research conducted by . I say well known - quoting blog here (with the):

In these circumstances, please advice me, of any and or all information I am entitled to know, according to the national guidelines with respect to this research and the university's guidelines that this research operated under. I am not aware of everything I am entitled to know, so please provide it all.

Not least of which is, the ethics clearance this paper went through and under what funding grant and justification this research came under.
In the circumstance described, I have asked the authors, publically, via their blogs and via the journal (I have no desire to communicate directly now) to remove my name and comment from the supplementary data to this research (as far as I can see the paper does not depend on it in anyway).

I have received no acknowledgement or response to date from the authors (most recent url).
http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/Recursive-Fury-Facts-misrepresentations.html#3018

My expectations are, in the first instance that the university first verify my concerns, (I will endeavour to assist in any way I can) and then I would hope the university react accordingly to the ethics issues raised without

formal complaint (in the interests of the university, the human subjects studied, and this niche of the field of psychology)

That is my hope, I will also consider the option of a more formal complaint if necessary.

Please note my concerns are not about who is right or wrong about any aspect of climate science, purely the conduct of the researchers

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 12:06 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury

Thanks for responding so quickly and I am sorry to bother you on your holiday.

I thought it would be in the journals interests as well as mine, to bring this to your attention.
I'll install Skype and have a brief chat if that is ok

Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 11:56 AM
To: I
Subject: Re: Fw: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury

Dear
I understand that you phoned me at yesterday. I am currently in Canada so I apologize for your being unable to reach me. My Skype handle is if you wished to talk.
Thank you for giving me the heads up on your email to the journal.
Best wishes,

On Mar 25 2013,

>Dear
>
> I thought I should make you aware of this email I sent to the journal

> yesterday.
>
>Best Regards
>
>
>
>mob:
>
>From: Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 2:46 PM
>To: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org Cc: support@frontiersin.org
>Subject: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury
>
>to the Editors / Editorial Board
>
>I thought I should bring my concerns to your attention
>

> Ref
>
http://www.frontiersin.org/personality_science_and_individual_differences/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00073/abstract
>
> I am a named, very recognizable individual in the climate debate, in the
> data for this paper.
>
> One of the author's of this paper has previously written about
> articles and writes disparagingly. He the article:
>
>
> In the same timeframe of LOG12 and whilst he was researching sceptics for
> this paper, he writes disparagingly of a number of identifiable named
> human subjects in the Recursive Fury paper on his private high profile
> anti-sceptic blog,
>
>
> The other named co-researcher was also referencing this 'work' and also
> writing in his own high profile anti-sceptic personal blog, articles

> against the people that are named in this paper, in the same timeframe as
> he was researching the actions and comments of the people named in this
> paper
>
> The lead author of this paper, within the timeframe of this research, was
> also engaged in writing a series of articles (a blog battle) with the
> critics of his earlier LOG12 paper, who were responding on their own blog.
> As Recursvive Fury is about the critics of this paper, it would appear to
> be an entirely inappropriate position for this lead author of the
> Recursive Fury paper (which about the criticisms of LOG12) to be in.
>
> The paper LOG12 is as yet still in press, so the critics of that paper

> have no formal route to respond to this paper. Thus giving rise to
> concerns that the Recursive Fury paper could be perceived by many, as
> being used to attack the critics of LOG12, by the author of LOG12, before
> those critics have had an opportunity to submit response to the journal
> Psychological Science.
>
> There are some concerns that the lead author was in fact provoking them
> for this material. (comments made by on the
> blog, with respect to the lead author liking to stir up the ants nest.)
>
> Please would the journal consider removing the supplementary data from
> this page, until such a time, that my name and comment is removed from it.
>
> In light of the above I think that would be an absolute minimum course of
> action for this journal to take, until such a time, the ethics of the
> situation are considered, where the researchers are clearly hostile to the
> human subjects they study. I have also noted other concerns about this
> paper in the comments of the abstract.
>
> I consider this a potential failure of peer review, the ethics policies of
> the author universities, and of the journal involved.

> I cannot see how this research passed any ethics consideration, or
> comprehend how authors who are so antagonistic to the human subjects they
> research,('sceptics') would be considered appropriate researchers in this
> field let alone for this paper
>
>I further note that this previous article by states
>
>-
>

> Referring to at the most WELL known sceptic blog Watts Up With
> That (the most high profile sceptic blog)
>
> Thus I consider the potential to damage my reputation, is high, and to all
> other 'sceptics' 'studied' in this paper.

> Please advice me of your proposed actions in light of my concerns that I
> have brought to your attention.
>
> I trust my concerns this will be treated in the confidence that my
> concerns deserve
>
>Best Regards
>
>
>
> I have documented all of this, with links, should you require it, but

> perhaps you wish to do your own investigations first. please withdraw the
> supplementary data, until such a time is my name and comment is removed (I
> do not believe the paper depends on this, so this should be a trivial
> exercise for the authors)
>
> I will be contacting the ethics committees at universities concerned at
> the earliest opportunity for me

--

Email:
Tel:
Personal
Dept Web:

RELEASED UNDER FOI

020

From:
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2013 5:56 AM
To: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office; @frontiersin.org;

Subject: RE:

Dear

Thank you for the update and I note that my complaint has been sent to

I would, however, like some more information on how your organisation plans to handle this matter.

You have said previously that Frontiers will review the article before making a decision on its future and also that you will deal with the complaints in an even handed and neutral manner.

Can you tell me whether you intend to appoint external independent experts to adjudicate between the author and his critics - or will this be done by your own staff? Will the decision be made by an individual or a panel - and what will their expertise be?

A common theme of the complaints that have been made is that has been falsifying data and I think it is vital that any response from him is vigorously tested by someone with appropriate expertise who does not have a direct professional or financial interest in the paper.

Sincerely

From: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org
Date: Mon, 8 Apr 2013 20:39:49 +0200
Subject: Re:
To:

Dear Sir,

Thank you again for your email and having consented forwarding of your message to . I would like to confirm that your complaint has been sent to who has agreed to treat complaints forwarded to him confidentially and not to publish them or comment on them publicly. He has agreed to this but has pointed out that they may become public through other channels such as FOI requests or through the university's complaints procedure.

Please allow some time for this investigation to be carried out. Thank you for your understanding.

Best Regards,

On behalf of:

Frontiers| Psychology Editorial Office
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

On Fri, Apr 5, 2013 at 1:23 PM, > wrote:
Dear

Thank you once more for a prompt response.

I now understand that I was sent a wrong response and I am happy to confirm that you may forward my entire original complaint to any of the parties involved in the authorship, review , editing, sponsoring or publication of the paper.

I absolutely agree with you that the important thing is to get to the bottom of these allegations and thoroughly review what has gone wrong.

With that in mind, I would like to introduce an additional and slightly broader element to my complaint.

You are obviously aware that the paper in which the defamations occurred was based on the reactions of certain individuals to an earlier paper by with different co-authors entitled *NASA faked the moon landing|Therefore (Climate) Science is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science.*

The underlying premise of the second paper was that those who criticised the first paper were exhibiting irrational "recursive fury" at the findings of the first one.

You may or may not be aware that, in parallel with the complaints about the defamations in the second paper, there has been ongoing discussion about possible academic misconduct and even fraud in the first paper.

This has now reached a point where even erstwhile supporters and collaborators of the authors of the papers are now pointing out that untrue statements were made about the sources of data in the first paper.

Although your organisation was not involved in the publication of the first paper, it must be clear to you that, it if turns out to have been fraudulent, the vigorous reactions of the people who spotted the fraud could be better interpreted as "righteous anger" rather than "recursive fury" - and this needs to be taken into account in your analysis.

These blog articles give a good summary of the alleged data fraud in the first paper:-

http://climateaudit.org/2013/03/28/lewandowsky-doubles-down/

http://climateaudit.org/2013/04/03/tom-curtis-writes/

Please consider them carefully, as part of your investigation.

I am happy to have this entire email to be treated as part of my original complaint.

Please let me know if you need any more information to take this matter further.

Sincerely

From: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org
Date: Fri, 5 Apr 2013 08:04:42 +0200
Subject: Re:
To:
CC: @frontiersin.org;

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your reply. Please accept my apologies as you were indeed sent the wrong response. Your allegation is quite specific enough to be dealt with. My question to you should have been to ask whether you consent to us passing on your allegation to the authors, and if not, whether you would please amend your email to a form in which you would consent to it being so forwarded. Frontiers is doing its best to deal with the complaints in an even handed and neutral manner, and its only way of doing so is to collect specific allegations and, in the first instance at least, to discuss them with the authors. Please therefore consider my request amended as above.

Regarding the timing, some complaints were received at the start of this week and we asked them to respond by Friday; they all agreed. I realise that this makes a tight deadline for you as your allegation arrived towards the end of the week. Regarding timing, my request to you is therefore the following: if it is merely a matter of providing your consent, it would be very helpful to have it during the course of Friday. If you need time to amend your email and can not do it during Friday, may I please ask for it to be with us latest during the course of Monday?

If your position is simply to refuse consent and to refuse to amend your email, I hope you can see that we will in such case be unable to take it any further as we will not be able to take our first fundamental step. I hope we can count on your cooperation.

Your email implies that Frontiers is taking sides on this issue; be assured that it is not. Frontiers is in the middle on this issue. The article went through our usual rigorous scientific peer review process and we have been surprised to receive allegations of defamation. Frontiers needs to review this to assess if the article does indeed contain defamatory statements before it can make a decision on the future of the article. This is why we removed the link to the article as soon as we became aware of the allegations.

I trust that this clarifies the matter and I hope that we can rely on your cooperation to allow us to investigate these matters as swiftly and effectively as possible.

Yours sincerely

On behalf of:

Frontiers| Psychology Editorial Office
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

On Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 10:08 PM,
Dear › wrote:

Many thanks for your prompt response to my complaint.

I'm very puzzled, however about your request for "specific references to quotes from the article, together with specific explanations of why you consider it or them to be defamatory".

I took great care in my complaint to detail all of this specific material, including quotations and links to sources.

I am afraid your response has given me the impression that you are simply inventing deficiencies in my complaint in order to avoid dealing with it.

I should also remind you that, if this proceeds to legal action, any court or tribunal would take a very poor view of you attempting to impose an arbitrary and unreasonable deadline of less than 24 hours for me to supply you with further information.

Nevertheless, if you go through my complaint carefully and let me have a detailed note of any further justifications, quotations or references you require, before 10am CET tomorrow April 5th, I will attempt to supply them later the same day.

Please try and understand that academic fraud and defamation are serious matters which cannot be dismissed so lightly.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely

From: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org
Date: Thu, 4 Apr 2013 21:08:23 +0200
Subject: Re:
To:

Dear

Thank you for your email on this subject. You have made a general allegation of defamation; to allow Frontiers to investigate any claim of defamation we need to have specific references to quotes from the article, together with specific explanations of why you consider it or them to be defamatory. Such latter explanations should include, where relevant, references to any other materials which support your allegation.

You will understand that Frontiers is neutral in this matter and simply wishes to establish the facts. We need to handle this matter swiftly and must therefore request that your detailed response, in a form to be forwarded to the authors, reach me by Friday 5th April at 1400 CET. If we have not received your materials by that time (which represents approximately three days since our original request) we will in principle have to proceed on the basis that you do not intend to proceed with your allegations.

Please let me know if you have any further queries.

Many thanks and best regards

On behalf of:

Frontiers| Psychology Editorial Office
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

On Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 6:12 PM, wrote:
Dear Sirs

I understand that you are collecting specific allegations of defamation relating to the contentious paper *Recursive fury: conspiracist ideation in the blogosphere in response to research on conspiracist ideation* by

Although I contribute to blogs under the anonymous username of I have sought legal advice which has confirmed that, as long as a reasonable number of blog readers are aware of my true identity and professional reputation (which is the case), I could potentially have a defamation action against the authors and publishers of this paper for an outright lie which was told about me.

I have so far pursued this complaint with university, UWA, and they are considering it.

I hope you will also give it consideration even though (so far) it comes from any anonymous source. Obviously, I understand that any legal action would eventually have to be prosecuted under my real identity.

My case is as follows:-

A comment of mine appeared as a response to a post by on his UWA sponsored "Shaping Tomorrow's World" blog.

http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/

had claimed in his original paper *NASA faked the moon landing|Therefore (Climate) Science*

is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science that he had to base his results on responses from "pro-science" blogs because the five sceptic blogs he had approached had refused to co-operate.

It was becoming apparent however that . had never made direct contact with the sceptic blog proprietors concerned – and he was challenged to confirm that he had by naming names.

He then put up the post concerned, claiming that he was unable to give the names of those he had approached because of ethical considerations:-

Unlike some of the people who have been emailing me, my work is subject to ethical guidelines and is subject to approval by my University's ethics committee—as is the work of any other behavioral scientist in Australia and elsewhere. It is therefore not solely my decision whether or not to reveal the identity of people who were approached on the presumption of privacy.
Because this issue is likely subject to different opinions, I have therefore approached the Australian Psychological Society and my University's Human Research Ethics Committee to provide guidance on this decision.
There is an obvious asymmetry of potential harm here: If I release the names but it turns out to have been unethical, this cannot be undone. If I decline to release the names, as I have done to date, and it turns out that this was unnecessary, then no harm is done if release of the names is delayed by a few days.
I am therefore awaiting guidance on this issue.

This improbable defence stimulated a degree of scepticism among readers but a supporter of who blogs under the name of defended him in the comments with:-

6

The central point is, therefore that the "Human Subjects" were the hypothetical sceptic blog proprietors, introduced by whose privacy ethics committee may have wanted to protect.
The comment and phrase had nothing to do with the subjects of the "research paper" – and knew it.

However my comment appeared in the published paper on your website under the heading in a form which linked to my comment, as an example of had taken part in the research:-

The notion of "scamming" took center-stage in the blogosphere's response to LOG12, although not all comments went so far as to suggest "... there are no `Human Subjects' "
(http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/ccc1.html#198).

- a completely different proposition and one which, if true, would expose me to ridicule and confirm the psychological defects the paper was alleging in people who share my opinions.

After my complaints to the authors and UWA, the text on the linked PDF version of the paper on your website was modified (implying that my criticism had been acknowledged) but the online text still maintained the defamation until your eventual recent removal.

I hope that you will see this was a clear case of quote falsification, academic misconduct and defamation and that the paper will now be permanently withdrawn.

I would appreciate your confirmation of receipt of this complaint and of the action you have taken.

Sincerely

From:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:32 PM
To:
Cc: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org; frontiersin.org;
Subject: RE: Academic Misconduct - Progress Update

Dear

Thank you for the update on the progress of this complaint.

I will continue to copy you in on my correspondence with the publishers to give you an opportunity to consider any relevant facts that arise there.

Likewise, I hope you are happy for me to copy them with our correspondence.

I would particularly like you to read my last communication with them, when I broadened my complaint to include the alleged academic fraud which took place in relation to the data used in earlier paper.

This is perhaps of lesser relevance to Frontiers, who did not publish it, but possibly greater relevance to your university, who were involved in both papers.

I would like the possible fraud in the first paper to be considered as the root cause of the strongly expressed opinions - on which / chose to base his second paper.

I look forward to hearing further from you in due course.

Regards

From:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 6:22 AM
To: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office;

Cc:
Subject: RE:

Categories: Printed

Since my earlier email I have become aware of something very disturbing about your company's response to my complaint.

It appears that, rather than treating individual complaints in a considered and professional way, you may have simply responded to complainants with a standardised form letter.

In a matter as serious as academic fraud and defamation, I think you have an obligation as publishers to deal with complaints on a considered and individual basis by giving due though to the particular allegations in each case.

Dealing with such important issues by sending a standard letter makes it seem as though you are not treating them at all seriously.

I urge you again to make a comprehensive and considered response to my complaint tomorrow - so that I can supply you with any further information you might need.

Remember that your company's responsiveness to these matters will be a major factor in determining any future legal actions.

Sincerely

From:
To: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org; @frontiersin.org;
CC:
Subject: RE:
Date: Thu, 4 Apr 2013 20:08:26 +0000

Dear

Many thanks for your prompt response to my complaint.

I'm very puzzled, however about your request for "specific references to quotes from the article, together with specific explanations of why you consider it or them to be defamatory".

I took great care in my complaint to detail all of this specific material, including quotations and links to sources.

I am afraid your response has given me the impression that you are simply inventing deficiencies in my complaint in order to avoid dealing with it.

I should also remind you that, if this proceeds to legal action, any court or tribunal would take a very poor view of you attempting to impose an arbitrary and unreasonable deadline of less than 24 hours for me to supply you with further information.

Nevertheless, if you go through my complaint carefully and let me have a detailed note of any further justifications, quotations or references you require, before 10am CET tomorrow April 5th, I will attempt to supply them later the same day.

Please try and understand that academic fraud and defamation are serious matters which cannot be dismissed so lightly.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely

From: psychology.editorial.office@frontiersin.org
Date: Thu, 4 Apr 2013 21:08:23 +0200
Subject: Re:
To:

Dear

Thank you for your email on this subject. You have made a general allegation of defamation; to allow Frontiers to investigate any claim of defamation we need to have specific references to quotes from the article, together with specific explanations of why you consider it or them to be defamatory. Such latter explanations should include, where relevant, references to any other materials which support your allegation.

You will understand that Frontiers is neutral in this matter and simply wishes to establish the facts. We need to handle this matter swiftly and must therefore request that your detailed response, in a form to be forwarded to the authors, reach me by Friday 5th April at 1400 CET. If we have not received your materials by that time (which represents approximately three days since our original request) we will in principle have to proceed on the basis that you do not intend to proceed with your allegations.

Please let me know if you have any further queries.

Many thanks and best regards

On behalf of:

Frontiers| Psychology Editorial Office
www.frontiersin.org | twitter.com/FrontiersIn
EPFL Science Park
Lausanne, Switzerland | T

On Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 6:12 PM, wrote:
Dear Sirs

I understand that you are collecting specific allegations of defamation relating to the contentious paper *Recursive fury: conspiracist ideation in the blogosphere in response to research on conspiracist ideation* by

Although I contribute to blogs under the anonymous username of I have sought legal advice which has confirmed that, as long as a reasonable number of blog readers are aware of my true identity and professional reputation (which is the case), I could potentially have a defamation action against the authors and publishers of this paper for an outright lie which was told about me.

I have so far pursued this complaint with university, UWA, and they are considering it.

I hope you will also give it consideration even though (so far) it comes from any anonymous source. Obviously, I understand that any legal action would eventually have to be prosecuted under my real identity.

My case is as follows:-

A comment of mine appeared as a response to a post by on his UWA sponsored "Shaping Tomorrow's World" blog.

had claimed in his original paper *NASA faked the moon landing|Therefore (Climate) Science is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science* that he had to base his results on responses from "pro-science" blogs because the five sceptic blogs he had approached had refused to co-operate.

It was becoming apparent however that had never made direct contact with the sceptic blog proprietors concerned – and he was challenged to confirm that he had by naming names.

He then put up the post concerned, claiming that he was unable to give the names of those he had approached because of ethical considerations;-

Unlike some of the people who have been emailing me, my work is subject to ethical guidelines and is subject to approval by my University's ethics committee—as is the work of any other behavioral scientist in Australia and elsewhere. It is therefore not solely my decision whether or not to reveal the identity of people who were approached on the presumption of privacy.
Because this issue is likely subject to different opinions, I have therefore approached the Australian Psychological Society and my University's Human Research Ethics Committee to provide guidance on this decision.
There is an obvious asymmetry of potential harm here: If I release the names but it turns out to have been unethical, this cannot be undone. If I decline to release the names, as I have done to date, and it turns out that this was unnecessary, then no harm is done if release of the names is delayed by a few days.
I am therefore awaiting guidance on this issue.

This improbable defence stimulated a degree of scepticism among readers but a supporter of who blogs under the name of defended him in the comments with:-

The central point is, therefore that the "Human Subjects" were the hypothetical sceptic blog proprietors, introduced by whose privacy ethics committee may have wanted to protect. The comment and phrase had nothing to do with the subjects of the "research paper" – and knew it.

However my comment appeared in the published paper on your website under the heading in a form which linked to my comment, as an example of had taken part in the research:-

The notion of "scamming" took center-stage in the blogosphere's response to LOG12, although not all comments went so far as to suggest "... there are no `Human Subjects' "
(http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/ccc1.html#198).

- a completely different proposition and one which, if true, would expose me to ridicule and confirm the psychological defects the paper was alleging in people who share my opinions.

After my complaints to the authors and UWA, the text on the linked PDF version of the paper on your website was modified (implying that my criticism had been acknowledged) but the online text still maintained the defamation until your eventual recent removal.

I hope that you will see this was a clear case of quote falsification, academic misconduct and defamation and that the paper will now be permanently withdrawn.

I would appreciate your confirmation of receipt of this complaint and of the action you have taken.

Sincerely

From: <
Sent: Thursday. 25 April 2013 7:55 AM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint Process Update

Dear

It has now been over two weeks since I last heard from you or your university. I understand the need for time in matters like this, but it has been a month since I filed my complaint with your university, and I haven't been shown anything that indicates progress. Moreover, I've not been given any indication as to how much longer I should expect to have to wait.

Could you clarify what the current status of my complaint is and approximately how long it will be before (preliminary) results will be available?

?

From: <
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2013 12:01 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint Process Update
Attachments: Frontiers_Complaint.pdf

Dear

I apologize for sending another e-mail, but my views on *Recursive Fury* have been evolving as I've been forced to examine it more. Specifically, while filing a complaint with the journal the paper was published in, I came to realize there is a major problem I had not previously thought much about. It is perhaps the most blatant example of data manipulation in this paper. The details of it are discussed in an attached document (which is the complaint I filed with the journal), but the basic point is this:

The Supplementary Material provided by the authors was said to include the "raw data" for the paper, described as "all the comments that we encountered that are relevant to the different theories." The reality is the authors provided only a small amount of the relevant comments they encountered. While there were thousands of relevant comments posted, the authors only provided approximately 120. The majority of the data not provided by the authors was data that failed to support the authors' conclusions. Indeed, much of it contradicted the authors' conclusions. By removing all such data from their "raw data," the authors manipulated their data into supporting their preconceived beliefs.

I understand this is late in the process, and I don't ask that the UWA consider this when handling my complaint. I merely wanted to inform you so you were aware the issue has been raised. You are free to handle the information however you wish.

On Mon, Apr 8, 2013 at 5:41 PM, < > wrote:
Dear ,

Your response was clear on that point. I was just confused as to what one would classify that particular accusation as. I suppose it might not matter what one calls it.

From: [mailto:
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2013 5:11 AM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint Process Update

Dear

Thank you for the update. I understand the need to take time to review things, and I don't think you're taking an undue amount. I do have a question though. Your response seems to indicate my accusation that the authors failed to take meaningful measures to guard against bias is considered different than an accusation of research misconduct.

What would it be considered then? My understanding is doing research on and publishing about human subjects one is biased against is, at best, questionable as it creates a conflict of interest. Moreover, there is risk of actual harm to people because human subjects are involved.

I claim the authors directly exposed the subjects of their work to the risk of harm by failing to implement any meaningful safeguards against their own biases. If that is not research misconduct, what is it?

Regards,

The primary contention of my complaint is the authors performed "research" on a group of people they were hostile toward, and this lead them to manipulate data to paint members of that group in a negative light. The second part of this contention was practically agreed to by your journal as it has acknowledged two blatant examples of the authors misrepresenting the subjects of their work (by modifying the paper to remove them). As such, the first part is the only part which deserves significant attention. When doing so, it is important to realize this paper has a Conflict of Interest Statement:

> *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*

The problem is this statement does not actually preclude conflicts of interest readers ought to be made aware of. As such, its existence is peculiar and possibly deceptive. The importance of this concern is alluded to by the authors themselves as they state:

> *the present analysis may therefore be biased by a potential conflict of interest....*
> *In addition, because data collection (via internet search) was conducted by two authors who were not involved in the analysis or report of LOG12, the resulting "raw" data available in the online supplementary material cannot reflect a conflict of interest involving the LOG12 authors. Moreover, the availability of these raw data enables other scholars to bring an alternative viewpoint to bear during any reanalyses.*

It is difficult to see the point of having a Conflict of Interest Statement which dismisses the possibility of COIs while the paper goes out of its way to discuss potential COIs. Regardless, the fact the authors refer to such potential COIs indicates the authors think they are relevant. Given that, it is important to consider what the authors say. When we do, we see troubling facts.

The first fact is both authors not involved in the LOG12 paper have clear conflicts of interest due to their personal activities. His site often criticizes and even demonizes people *Recursive Fury* examines. His site has gained a reputation with some as dishonest for a variety of reasons, including organizing a campaign to intentionally distort the review section of the Amazon website in regard to a book condemning climate skeptics (reviews which violated the rules of the site they were posted on).

An author who is willing to distort, mislead and deceive people in order to promote criticisms of climate skeptics shows such bias against climate skeptics that he has a conflict of interest which should prevent him from "analyzing" the writings of climate skeptics in order to denigrate them. Failing that, readers should at least have been made aware runs a site dedicated to arguing against the very people he's "researching." Moreover, is not uninvolved with the LOG12 paper. He actively and favorably communicated with about the paper, and his original research was included in the Supplementary Material of the paper:

> *All of the blogs that carried the link to the survey broadly endorsed the scientific consensus on climate change (see Table S1). As evidenced by the comment streams, however, their readership was broad and encompassed a wide range of view on climate change. To illustrate, a content analysis of 1067 comments from unique visitors to http://www.skepticalscience.com, conducted by the proprietor of the blog, revealed that around 20% (N = 222) held clearly "skeptical" views, with the remainder (N = 845) endorsing the scientific consensus. At the time the research was conducted (September 2010), http://www.skepticalscience.com received 390,000 monthly visits. Extrapolating from the content analysis of the comments, this translates into up to 78,000 visits from "skeptics" at the time when the survey was open (although it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link.)*

The "content analysis" referred to in that excerpt has never been published. It has never been made publicly available. The only way could have access to it for LOG12 is if it

were provided to them by . That shows he was directly involved with part of the LOG12 paper, and thus he was not free from COI as *Recursive Fury* would have readers believe.[1] The remaining , runs a site named that is so blatantly biased against the subjects of this paper as to not merit discussion.

While and are not subject to the COI discussed by the authors, they are undeniably subject to others. As the authors indicate a potential COI would be an important issue, it is inexcusable for this to have been hidden from readers. Moreover, as there are no unbiased authors involved with this paper, it is impossible to view it as objective.

The second fact we observe is the authors falsely claim to have provided "raw" data. This claim is most clearly made in a post on Skeptical Science by the authors and written to defend there work which says:

> *As well as the Recursive Fury paper, we also published Supplementary Material containing excerpts from blog posts and some comments relevant to the various observed recursive theories. In the paper, we characterise this as "raw data" - all the comments that we encountered that are relevant to the different theories. In contrast, the "processed data" are the excerpted quotes featured in the final paper, where we match the various recursive theories to the conspiracist criteria outlined above.*

This paragraph emphasizes a claim made in the paper:

> *the availability of these raw data enables other scholars to bring an alternative viewpoint to bear during any reanalyses.*

Both of these are unbelievable once one examines the Supplementary Material provided by the authors. All told, there are approximately 120 citations provided in the Supplementary Material. It is impossible to believe the authors only encountered 120 comments or posts which were "relevant to the different theories" discussed in their paper. A quick perusal of almost any blog post cited by the authors will find many relevant comments. As an example, we can consider this post cited by the authors in their Supplementary Material. No comments made in response to that post were cited by the authors. This is despite the fact there are over a dozen relevant comments on that page. Here are four examples.

It is impossible to believe the authors were unaware of comments like these. They cited comments made in response to other blog posts on the same site. That shows they were not only aware of the comments, but they thought the comments were an appropriate source. However, in both of those instances, they cited only a single comment despite there being many relevant comments.

This cannot possibly be taken as providing "raw data." The authors had to have engaged in some sort of filtering. There is no other way they could have come up with such a small sample of comments. Even the briefest examination of almost any source they offer shows far more data than the authors provided.

Moreover, most comments not cited by the authors show discussions which indicate a lack of belief in conspiratorial explanations. The four examples previously provided show the sort of comments not included in the "raw data" provided by the authors. Each disputed conspiratorial explanations. By failing to include these sort of comments, the authors hid many examples of their

1 It's important to realize something about this excerpt unrelated to the issue of COI. As a link previously provided shows, the website Skeptical Science never posted a link to the survey used for LOG12 as claimed. Contrary to what the excerpt claims, it certainly can "be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link." The link never existed, so that number must be zero. This means unpublished, unverifiable work was included in LOG12's Supplementary Material despite having no actual relevance to the paper's claims.

subjects displaying the exact opposite of the behavior LOG12 attributed to them. Hiding these comments amounts to hiding data which contradicted their results.

Put bluntly, the authors selected a small amount of data that supported their conclusions from much larger amount of data, called it their "raw data" and drew conclusions based upon it. That is blatant data manipulation. Moreover, that data manipulation makes any future reanalyses of data useless as they can only examine that data specifically chosen to favor the conclusions of *Recursive Fury.*

There is much more wrong with this paper than complaint details. A full accounting of all the problems with work is simply unfeasible. However, the bias of the authors is clear. The data manipulation by the authors is clear. In fact, your journal has already (tacitly) acknowledged two cases of data manipulation within the paper. It is difficult to see what more would need to be said to condemn this paper as an example of research misconduct.

Moreover, the data manipulation by the authors indicates either reckless disregard for the truth or an intent to deceive despite their work involving human subjects. That exposed the subjects of their work to the direct risk of harm. The authors endangered the subjects of their work with their research misconduct. There is little a scientist could do that is worse.

To perhaps explain the nature of the situation which caused the authors' work, I'll conclude my complaint with a quote from the lead author's review of a book written by a scientist named Michael Mann which sought to detail a concerted campaign against scientists by climate skeptics (an oddly conspiratorial position to advance):

> The war on the hockeystick that Professor Mann describes is therefore a war not only on him or a handful of colleagues, but it is a war on science in general--a war on those who are alerting us to a future risk that is perpetrated by characters who put their own short-term profits über alles in the world.

We cannot be surprised at bias or misconduct from an author who believes he is fighting a war with his research on "the biggest issue currently confronting global civilization."

From: <
Sent: Friday, 29 March 2013 2:46 AM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint Process Update

Dear , I apologize for sending a second e-mail, but I recently came across the supplementary material for the first of the two papers in question by (*NASA faked the moon landing - Therefore (Climate) Science is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science*, referred to as LOG12). It contains a very troubling paragraph:

All of the blogs that carried the link to the survey broadly endorsed the scientific consensus on climate change (see Table S1). As evidenced by the comment streams, however, their readership was broad and encompassed a wide range of view on climate change. To illustrate, a content analysis of 1067 comments from unique visitors to http://www.skepticalscience.com, conducted by the proprietor of the blog, revealed that around 20% (N = 222) held clearly "skeptical" views, with the remainder (N = 845) endorsing the scientific consensus. At the time the research was conducted (September 2010), http://www.skepticalscience.com received 390,000 monthly visits. Extrapolating from the content analysis of the comments, this translates into up to 78,000 visits from "skeptics" at the time when the survey was open (although it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link.)

This paragraph is outright deceptive as Skeptical Science never hosted the survey in question, and thus no visitors could have seen the link (details of this and more can be found here), but my primary concern is something else: No reference or source is given for this supposed analysis. The authors claim the of (referred to as LOG13) did an analysis, but they don't offer any reference for said analysis. As far as I can determine, it has not been published. It has not been reviewed. It has not been made available for anyone to examine or critique. As far as the public record is concerned, it may not even exist.

This is especially bad as the paragraph contains unrealistic claims. It says 20% of the commenters "held clearly 'skeptical' views" and the remainder endorsed the scientific consensus. It claims , a single individual, was able to ascertain the views of over a thousand people with perfect accuracy. That is practically impossible to believe. The authors are claiming unpublished, unverifiable work ascertained with perfect accuracy the viewpoints of over a thousand online commenters, and this work lends credence to their conclusions. Hand-waving doesn't begin to describe this.

Given this paper and the more recent LOG13 paper are inextricably linked, I thought it might be worthwhile to examine this issue in relation to my complaint. It provides an indisputable example of failing to meet even the most basic of research standards. I don't know if it would be worth examining in relation to my complaint, but I thought I should inform you of the issue.

On Thu, Mar 28, 2013 at 9:38 AM, < > wrote:
Dear ,

Thank you for contacting me to keep me updated. I can understand the need for time, especially with a holiday approaching. However, I should inform you both the paper and supplementary material for it have been taken down in response to complaints about misrepresentations by the authors. That is the second time this has happened. The first time it was re-published with several changes to address concerns (though these changes were inconsistently made leaving a discrepancy between the web version/pdf file). It's currently unclear whether that will happen again. The fact the journal publishing the paper acknowledges such problems should weigh in on any consideration of my complaint.

It may also cause some difficulty in reviewing the problem as the material is not currently hosted by the journal. Moreover, if the material is re-published, it will likely be different than in either previous version. I can provide copies of each previous version (there are three so far) and the original version of the paper's supplementary material (there is only one version of this so far) if that would be necessary/helpful.

I apologize if the journal's actions make handling my complaint more difficult. I find it as tedious as you might. I just think it is important to have a record of what changes are made to a published paper, and it seems this is the only way to do so.

RELEASED UNDER FOI

From:
Sent: Sunday, 5 May 2013 5:14 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Ref 1: access to information in relation to the research project

Hi

Ref: 1) access to information in relation to the research project;

It is my understanding that I am entitled to be shown any information relating to myself, with reference to the National Statement on research ethics (no FOI request required)

A little while ago I was referred to the FOI process and I have had a look at the procedures now.

It does say about checking whether the requested documents are available outside of FOI process.

Additionally, I would like to request copies of all information collated about me, by the researchers at UWA for the purposes of any psychology research,
as at least one of the co-authors and one of 2 of the named researchers I I is openly hostile towards me:

The article Watts Up With That article

At least one item has been collated, published in the 'Recursive Fury' paper et al.

I would like to find what else has been collated, in light of comments on his blog,

which is referring to a blog post, where is taunting sceptics.
http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/lewandowskySouljah.html.

blog: September 10, 2012 at 1-30 pm

"Actually – this is highly relevant to the blog as I'm tracking the statements made by high profile climate sceptics."

and in the same post, when a reader of his blog asked why he was tracking comments of sceptics said:

Cheers, many thanks. There is big picture and details." –

Now we know what the 'big picture' was, with the publication of the Recursive Fury paper.
I would still also like to see what research justification (and grant) was used to justify collecting and collating my comments and tracking me.

, I would hope that UWA would simply provide this information as a courtesy,
given the circumstances (where is openly and publically hostile towards me personally, and to other sceptics on his blog)

1) I would like to see what information about me (comments, articles, annotations by researchers, etc) that has been collated by the researchers and held by UWA for any research purposes.
It is my understanding that I am entitled to be shown this information, with reference to the National Statement on research ethics (no FOI request required)

Best Regards

From: _____
Date: 3 May 2013 8:30:50 PM AWST
To: _____
Cc:

Subject: Re: **Complaint - outcome notification**

Dear

My complaint was in reference to the National Statement of ethics for Australian research, it appears that UWA have not addressed any of my concerns in this area, nor answered any of my questions, nor undertaken my request to remove my data from the paper.

Also, as an unwitting/unwilling participant in this research, who has given no consent, I asked for the information I was entitled to know, and I have received no response.

UWA have also not addressed any of my concerns with the behaviour of
deeply antagonistic behaviour to me.
Nor have UWA addressed the ethic of deception in this research, where three of the author are known to me and I have engaged with them in the climate debate, whilst unknowingly they were 'researching me'

Nor have UWA have undertaken my reasonable request to remove my comment (which is cherry picked, not quoted in full), from the data of the 'Fury' Paper, given that at least one of the key researchers are openly publically hostile towards me.

As this paper does not seem to depend on my comment in anyway, I do think this is a reasonable request in the circumstances.

I am also surprised you say perceived conflict of interest, when the conflict of interest is absolute. With both and and their involvement in the Skeptical Science website, which provides material for Climate Reality project, which makes this conflict a potentially damaging very political conflict of interest.

I also do not accept that your email is either in confidence or private, as it is very much I feel in the public interest

As felt no problem seeking press attention for these papers, I see no reason for not seeking press attention for my concerns about these papers, should I decide to.

In particular, the fundamental flaws/lies in both papers.

1) Log 12 – The lie that the survey was held at the Sceptical Science blog, based on which the content analysis used to claim a diverse audience across all blogs

This is known to be totally false and that both and have lied about it. (doing so personally to me)

2) Fury paper – the claim that LOG 12 only received press attention from August 28 2012, and that the conspiracy ideations were traced back to sceptic blogs on this date.

This is false, and the researchers knowingly deceive the public/peers with this claim, as the LOG12 paper received extensive publicity in July (Huffington Post, Guardian in both in July), and was being widely discussed on many blogs throughout early August.
Thus making the paper worthless, as all that occurred is that the 'alleged' sources of ideation, were in fact just covering a story known for over a month publically, and people were just repeating the converstions at these high profile blogs.

Both of these matters will be made known in formal responses to the appropriate journals.

I remain very surprised that UWA can not see that even a 'perceived' conflict of interest with very public activism
and antagonistic behaviour to the very people that he is researching, is hugely problematic and potentially damaging for the field of psychology.

Please review your decision with respect to the National Statement of Research ethics for human participants.

Please request that the authors remove my name, my comment and url from the data of the Recursive Fury paper.
The researchers are openly publically hostile towards me, and thus this compromises its inclusion in any psychology paper.

Regards

From:
Sent: Tuesday, 23 April 2013 5:09 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint Progess & procedures

I'm surprised that there are no further questions for me.. and that I am not involved in the process

How is the review conducted and who by.
Can you confirm that the review encompasses the ethical concerns I raised.

Best Regards

From:
Sent: Thursday, 18 April 2013 8:52 PM
To:
Cc: ;
Subject: Complaint Progess & procedures

Hi

It has been ten days, can you advise me of the procedures and people and timescales involved.

I see this complaint as a very serious breach of ethical standards and academic misconduct with the authors being utterly conflicted.
are actively publically hostile in the media against the so called "skeptics" they research.

The authors also have an additional conflicted vested interest (and ?) with the Skeptical Science website providing material for Climate Reality Project, which also give the conflict of interest (even if only perceived) a potentially damaging political dimension to UWA and the journals involved.
https://realitydrop.org/#about

Special Thanks

We'd like to extend our thanks to Skeptical Science, an invaluable website for anyone who is fighting climate denial. A pioneer in offering fact-based rebuttals to those who deny climate change, Skeptical Science has contributed many of the supporting articles on Reality Drop. We are indebted to their work and grateful for their support.

additional involvement with Desmogblog, which has a Deniers Disinformation database, which includes US Senators (and scientists and people named in the papers,) shows a catastrophic failure judgement on part and I must conclude show failing in the ethics procedure and culture of the department.

ie. How might this be perceived by political opponents – activist politically motivated psychologist using psychology to pathologise critics!

I'm sure the authors do not see that, or feel this is what they are doing.. but even just the perception of this (real or otherwise) is I believe potentially very damaging to UWA and the field of psychology.

I assume that UWA would need to discuss this with me and ask questions for clarification.

Both these paper 'Moon Hoax' & 'Recursive Fury' should simply be withdrawn, statements made and an investigation made to find quite how such naked activism was allowed to take hold within psychology, in my opinion of course.

Best Regards

I thought a purpose of psychology was supposed to protect the public and explain this sort of thing below, not encourage it

at Desmogblog – December 2012:
http://www.desmogblog.com/directory/vocabulary/7236
http://www.desmogblog.com/search/google/lewandowsky?query=lewandowsky&cx=010071853556961239608%3Apfdia-m7na8&cof=FORID%3A11&sitesearch=

sceptics tagged and labelled who were named in these 2 papers:
http://www.desmogblog.com/steve-mcintyre
http://www.desmogblog.com/joanne-nova
http://www.desmogblog.com/anthony-watts

http://www.desmogblog.com/roy-spencer

US Senator – James Inholfe tagged/labelled a misinformer, Climate denier,

http://www.desmogblog.com/james-inhofe

and of course the irony, of ex US Senator, the last man to set foot on the **moon** and the only PhD scientist to do so also, in a climate denier database

http://www.desmogblog.com/harrison-schmitt

From:
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 9:42 AM
To:
Subject: Re: Complaint

Dear

Please proceed with this as a complaint.
If there are any questions please do not hesitate to ask.

Best Regards

From:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 7:00 PM
To:
Cc: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Subject: Fw: Complaint - Breach of National Research Statement - Identifiable human particpant in a pyschological research databank - Hostile/conflicted researchers

For Your Information

From:
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 11:55 AM
To: Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office
Cc:
Subject: Complaint - Breach of National Research Statement - Identifiable human particpant in a pyschological research databank - Hostile/conflicted researchers - No consent sort out, nor given - Hostile researchers - 'Fury' and LOG12

The Purpose

The purpose of this National Statement is to promote ethically good human research. Fulfilment of this purpose requires that participants be accorded the respect and protection that is due to them. It also involves the fostering of research that is of benefit to the community.

This complaint is to the authors (and their accredited employers) of the 'Fury' paper and 'Moon' paper and to the University of Western Australia and it demonstrates I believe multiple breaches of the ethical requirements for research on human participants, as such the papers should be withdrawn and any identifiable data (including unattributed comments, as these can be googled) of all unwilling participant destroyed. I will list the reasons below:

1)
The authors of the paper have been shown to active protagonists in the climate debate – championing the work of LOG 12 and attacking its critics, throughout the research timeframe at the publically funded blog Shaping Tomorrows World ( ) – Watching the Deniers – ( ) – Skeptical Science (is there and)

2)
Conduct: One of more of the authors is openly hostile towards me on) (; and others), publically . **This I feel alone is grounds for the 'Fury' paper to be withdrawn on ethical grounds** lone (tainted, by the authors behaviour on his private blog) and all named individual data collected for this research to be made known to (Ihave provided detail directly to the authors on their blogs (and to the journal already, but I will collate – referenced to this complaint, to follow as background material to my complaint.)

3)
Respect: One or of have failed to show respect or behave professional to the people named in the paper or the 'sceptical' community. blog posts as one example (more to follow) taunting the 5 sceptical blog owner he had 'contacted' on his blog and giving interviews about it – at places like Desmogblog (a website, that has a number of those sceptic blog owners photographed, named and shamed tagged denier, misinformed, disinformation, denial industry, amongst other derogatory labels, in it's Denier Disinformation Database online – http://www.desmogblog.com/global-warming-denier-database

How is it possible that did not see that this was totally inappropriate. A professional, would have JUST emailed the 5 blog owners straight away and said it was you, here is copy of the email my sent you. THIS behaviour alone, I think demonstrates the hostility of to his research subject matter (so called 'sceptics' or just members of the public that resent being labelled) and should preclude him (in my opinion) from this research and any research in this area.

4)
Conflict/Vested Interests: and are the of a number of Skeptical Science (SkS) accredited books, these books are a credited with UWA and Queensland Logos (is this official?) is a regular author at the Skeptical Science website. What is role at SkS, is it purely a private interest (but why the University accreditation, and the debunking handbook, is

promoted on the UWA - Shaping Tomorrows World blog. Skeptical Science would be considered in direct antagonistic opposition to Watts Up With That, Climate Audit and all the other sceptic blogs.

5)
Conflict/Vested Interest: Skeptical Science and its authors have a vested interest (it looks like commercial relationship) providing material for – Climate Reality Project – Reality Drop. As such they have a direct interest in opposing and countering sceptical blog material.
One example,
Watts Up With That article entitled – What Else did the 97% of scientists say,
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/18/what-else-did-the-97-of-scientists-say/
which claims to have

http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/07/20/here-we-go-again-watts-up-with-that-pushing-the-no-consensus-myth/
this was then endorsed by Skeptical Science
http://www.skepticalscience.com/consensusforbes.html

> *For example, see a recent article debunked by the blog Watching the Deniers, where **somebody** had cherry-picked skeptical quotes from a few scientists who responded to the Doran and Zimmerman study (Eos, January 20, 2009). This only reveals that some people confuse consensus with unanimity. – Skeptical Science (SkS)*

6)
Harm:Respect: Further concerns are the authors and UWA have caused me harm, have failed to treat me with respect, not sort or obtained my consent and have not been able to show any justification for deceiving in my questions about LOG12 and by concealing from there research and following this particular named human participant whose comments (what else) have been collected

7)
Complaint: In light of the summary above, My complaint is that the authors and UWA and any other associations of the authors, have failed to comply to the National Statement of Ethical Conduct in the Field of Human Research

> **The Purpose**
> The purpose of this National Statement is to promote ethically good human research. Fulfilment of this purpose requires that participants be accorded the respect and protection that is due to them. It also involves the fostering of research that is of benefit to the community.
> http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf

The National statement is a actually further 111 pages long, but this is merely, I believe, the technical detail for those that perhaps do not realise that all that follows automatically from the 3 sentences above. The onus I believe is on UWA to demonstrate that they complied to the National Statement for this research, ('Fury' & 'Moon') not for the unwitting/unwilling participants to show where they UWA failed to comply to the National Statement.

Please demonstrate that the in particular and the further co-authors of 'Fury' and 'Moon' authors are fit, unconflicted and appropriate persons to study human participants. The paper is littered with activist rhetoric like 'climate denials' and references to the Exxon/fossil fuel denial industry funding sceptics, conspiracy theory. How on earth did the peer reviewers not pick this up! and not say that it was inappropriate for psychologists of all people to talk this way.

8)

RESPECT: Please demonstrate the research justification for the LOG12 and Recursive Fury papers is beneficial and cause no harm.

Because harm has been done, I was initially amused to find myself named in the data alongside where the researchers of sceptics were so unaware of the debate and the people they research, that this was in fact of the , he asked if he was a conspiracy theorist and was met with a response from the an author. I asked the author, I was ignored, I asked another author (Watching the deniers) I was ignored. I asked all the authors by posting my concerns and asking for a response on the Skeptical Science blog, and Shaping Tomorrows World blog I was ignored. I asked the UWA to contact the authors and respond to me, I have received no response from any of the authors.

Both and I were named in the data for Fury and when we enquired why, we were we not treated equally.

My expectation of the journals and University and the whole field of psychology, that as an unwilling/unwitting participant in psychology research that finds my name in a paper, that my questions would be acknowledged and answered as a courtesy at the horror I felt of the ethical conduct, when I realised how many breaches of the Ethical Conduct had been brought to UWA and the journals attention

I expected that as soon as the authors public hostility towards me, and named others in the paper was shown, that the paper would be retracted, apologies given and an ethics and misconduct investigation would be undertaken. Sadly not

9)HARM and RESPECT

I approached UWA and th ejournals as concerned member of the public, not a label like a denier concerned that without my consent identifiable data about me had been collected, in words that well know sceptics were tracked – WHY, WHAT FOR, what possible justification, have I committed a crime, please explain yourself here.,

(and I should not have to explain to anybody, least of all a psychologist why) I was rather less surprised to find

I now feel unable to express myself freely publically, whilst I have a thick skin and can explain

So I can NOT I feel express myself feely anymore. The fact that I was perceived as of specific concern to be followed by psychology researcher, and perhaps my words twisted quoted out of context, as I have described in the 'Fury' case (my comment cherry picked, partially quoted)

10) ETHICS and GOOD FAITH
perhaps just an anecdote to take into account: When was championing as a hero (despite behaving unethical (and criminally?) to 'sceptics' –) , I was writing to and to ask them to tone it down, not to publish email address because I was concerned about whether his professional tragedy ( ) might turn into a personal tragedy.this was private correspondence

but and I believe was copied) can verify, my Good Faith not that I feel my conduct has in anyway demonstrated that I have ever communicated with anybody without behaving like a civil adult. I have also worked hard to try to depolarise a hostile debate, and tried

to engage with the supposed 'other side' (including) and persuade everybody to behave as adults.

see why here:
http://unsettledclimate.org/2012/02/02/clarifications-and-how-better-to-communicate-science/

11) My Request of UWA (given the circumstancces of demonstrably hostile / conflicted researchers)

I ask UWA identify any comments or data collated about me and held in any databank, or in other form, and present it to me.

I ask UWA to destroy any information collected in breach of the National Statement

I ask UWA as a courtesy to me, to provide, the grant funding, the research justification and ethical clearance for this research

I ask as a courtesy that UWA shows the benefit that this research project will bring to the community

I expect that UWA undertake (or any of the authors) seek to obtain my consent to perform further research on me, and that any any research justified as being allowed to deceive the participants fully complies with the National Statement.

The whole area of the 'blogospheres' surrounding climate change blog wars is no doubt a fascinating subject and I would think benefit from research to understand not least how psychologists and other climate scientists started using the language and rhetoric of political activists, and seemingly believe in an exxon/fossil fueled climate change denier industry? My only gain in the last 3 years would have been getting paid expenses to visit the to appear in a video with for their so my only linkage to anything would be 'big climate' itself

Best Regards

I have typed this in an email, in rich format, I hope that the formating comes through ok, because if a deadline, I hope that everyone can excuse and typos and bad/confusing grammar
I will collate all the evidence I have previously supplied with links and reference that support this complaint, and send them on later. As I'm still on Easter holidays

On 04/04/2013, at 6:44 PM, wrote:

Hi

Over a week ago I contacted the university with what I believe is gross violations and misconduct of the national ethical guidelines required of researchers at UWA.
At the time I merely requested information that I believed should be made available in the circumstances, as a matter of course

I am an unwilling named participant in a UWA psychology research program , without my consent, and where the researches I have shown to UWA to be openly hostile to their research participants. With very specific examples.

I made this request: (extract from my original email)

> *In these circumstances, please advice me, of any and or all information I am entitled to know, according to the national guidelines with respect to this research and the university's guidelines that this research operated under. I am not aware of everything I am entitled to know, so please provide it all.*
>
> *Not least of which is, the ethics clearance this paper went through and under what funding grant and justification this research came under.*
> *In the circumstance described, I have asked the authors, publically, via their blogs and via the journal (I have no desire to communicate directly now) to remove my name and comment from the supplementary data to this research (as far as I can see the paper does not depend on it in anyway).*

I believe that this is not an unreasonable request in the circumstance and I am extremely concerned and disappointed (surprised even) that I have not received this information. It is now over a week, since this request.

In addition, I request that UWA supply me a copy of all data about me that any researcher have collected and/or retained in this research (or any other research) in media form that it is held. My consent I must stress was not sort by UWA, nor ever given to UWA.

Please supply at the minimum, the research justification, the grant the research operated under, and the ethics consideration for this research. This should all be on file and be immediately available. I expect this information by return of email. On my behalf, Please escalate this concern to the highest level of the procedure you follow.

My only concern is for my reputation and rights and I will pursue all means at my disposal to protect them.

Best Regards

From:
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 10:59 PM
To: _____
Cc:
Subject: Ethics: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury

Hi

I left a brief message on your voice mail the other day, I'm afraid that I didn't get a chance to call you the next day (time zones and vs Australia)

Please see the concerns and correspondence (attached) that I have raised with the journal about the ethical conduct of the researchers involved in this paper.

I am known to the authors, and a critic of one of the authors earlier work LOG12, and was interacting with the authors of the Recursive Fury paper on their blogs, whilst unbeknownst to me they were researching me and I find have been named in their research (data)

At least one of the researchers is publically hostile towards me, blogging about I (at the high profile science blog Watts Up With That) and

as far as I'm aware has no relevant qualifications. He headlined his article with which he has

· runs a high traffic website, which is in with this , on his blog.

*For example, see a recent article debunked by the blog Watching the Deniers, where **somebody** had cherry-picked skeptical quotes from a few scientists who responded to the Doran and Zimmerman study (Eos, January 20, 2009). This only reveals that some people confuse consensus with unanimity. – Skeptical Science (SkS)*
http://www.skepticalscience.com/consensusforbes.html

From:
Sent: Thursday, 28 March 2013 5:41 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Request for publically available information - Recursive Fury

Hi

Thanks for your help, I don't know how this sort of enquiry for information works (how formal//informal, etc), procedures, etc. So I hope not to come across as tetchy.

Easter Holidays for me as well of course, or 2 this weekend, so will be very busy
So I hope to hear back from UWA after the Easter closure period. (how long?)

I spoke to the of the Frontiers journal yesterday, to express my concerns about a problem of one or more authors appearing conflicted. especially, with his derogatory articles about me and website) I have had no further correspondence from Frontier after that conversation, but I noticed the paper and data for "Recursive Fury" – , is offline.

What the exact status and reason is I don't know, I will send an email to Frontiers to ask, today

All the Best for the holidays

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 27 March 2013 6:27 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Request for publically available information - Recursive Fury

oops typo – 'put this in righting' ! – put this in writing..

only had a few hours sleep,

From: _____
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2013 9:53 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Request for publically available information - Recursive Fury

Hi

Thanks for the prompt reply, I've worked with colleagues in the past with office in Singapore and Australia and really do appreciate the problems of emails and telephone communication across multiple time zones. (especially as I was working in the industry at the time!)

I am not yet making a complaint, it was an informal enquiry to initially ask for some information and express a few concerns, as a member of the public that found my name appearing in a published academic piece of psychology research. I included some background information expressing the reasons for my concerns.

As a 'participant' in this research (albeit unwillingly and unwittingly) I am just asking for copies of any publically available information related to this research. Ie what funding grant, research justification and as a named human subject a copies of the ethics application made, that was required for this research.

Could you provide me with any / all information at I'm entitled to know as a member of the public, with respect to this research.

Presumably, as this is publically funded research, all of this should and could be readily available on file, with minimal time needed to supply this information to me, without any need to file a complaint or pursue any FOI, or any other procedures to obtain it..

But of course I understand that it is best to put this in **righting** and will things down into 2 points

1) I hope this email clarify the request aspect for any publically available information.

Am I correct in this thinking, as I'm from this is what I would expect from a institution, is this different in Australia?

2) I might also ask, for my name to be removed form the supplementary data, as an reasonable request in the circumstance I described in my previous email. As a gesture of goodwill on behalf of the authors and UWA (the paper does not in any way that I can see depend on my data)

I have asked them directly to consider this (Ie not wanting to formalise it) as a courtesy to me, on their publically and University funded website, in an article about the Recursive Fury paper - Shaping Tommorrows World..

http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/Recursive-Fury-Facts-

I will might ask also if publically funded blog moderators, think this comment by an anonymous person is appropriate.
http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/Recursive-Fury-Facts-misrepresentations.html

Perhaps the authors have missed my requests to remove my name, on Shaping Tomorrows World, Frontiers and Skeptical Science, (and via twitter !) As I have mentioned, this would be a good will gesture, and as far as I can see the paper does not depend on this quotation of mine in any way.

As I cannot be sure they are aware of my requests. So perhaps the university could bring my informal request to , and ; attention, merely by drawing their attention to the 1st link above (which they are of), with a brief explanation as to why. I have also asked the journal to put this suggestion to the

I would hope to be able to achieve these goals 1) and 2) amicably with UWA without having to make a complaint at this stage.

But in the mean time, (ref 1) could you send me any information that is available to me, as I have outlined above. I don't see why that information would not just be publically available on request? and (ref 2) make the authors aware of my request

Thanks and Best Regards

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 27 March 2013 7:00 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Ethics: Hostile researchers - Recursive Fury

Hi

I left a brief message on your voice mail the other day, I'm afraid that I didn't get a chance to call you the next day (time zones and vs Australia)

From:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 10:56 PM
To:
Subject: Re: Email regarding

Hi

Thanks for your response.

My email was not a formal complaint, but more in the nature of informational. I assumed the university would be concerned.

For the record, I have become convinced that future manmade global warming will not be a dangerous problem, and have reached that conclusion by the accumulating scientific evidence. For example, a recent Economist article documents that the globe is failing to warm as rapidly as climate models predicted, and discusses potential flaws in those models. http://www.economist.com/news/science-and-technology/21574461-climate-may-be-heating-up-less-response-greenhouse-gas-emissions

Because of my stance on the issue, people like might label me a "climate sceptic." I assure you, neither The Economist nor I believe the crazy conspiracy theories the claims we believe.

I have assumed he contrived his "surveys" so he could smear those who disagree with him on global warming. If he actually believes what he has written, he is delusional.

Regards,

From:
Date: Friday, 29 March 2013 11:14 PM
To: , <
Subject: Ethical Standards

The University of Western Australia has ethical and academic standards. must be investigated. How can there be any conclusion other than the co-authors lied, and that they crafted their "survey" in a manner to get desired results which were dishonest?

http://joannenova.com.au/2013/03/lewandowsky-cook-claim-78000-skeptics-could-see-conspiracy-survey-at-cooks-site-where-he-didn't-even-put-up-a-link/

http://geoffchambers.wordpress.com/2013/03/28/the-moon-hoax-has-landed/

http://climateaudit.org/2013/03/28/lewandowsky-doubles-down/

Regards,

From:
Sent: Tuesday, 7 May 2013 1:15 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Complaint - outcome notification

Dear

has meant I have had to put this matter on the back burner for the moment. However I fully intend to proceed with and extend the FOI request and do not intend the form letter you have forwarded to myself and others, without addressing key questions, stop my important enquiries.

Meanwhile you may like to read the story of Social Psychology Professor Diederik Stapel covered in the New York Times magazine April 26th 2013. It seems it was incredibly easy for him to get away with extensive academic fraud not just because of a compliant peer review system, and journals calling for suitably, sensational material to print, but because of the uncritical supervision of his Universities. You and your colleagues may find it instructive, and a cause to review your own internal procedures, rather than think you can fall back on the peer review system to catch any problems. In this example, the peer reviewers were not the ones holding the press conference!

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/magazine/diederik-stapels-audacious-academic-fraud.html?pagewanted=2&_r=4&hp&pagewanted=all&

An extract:

"At the end of November, *the universities unveiled their final report at a joint news conference: Stapel had committed fraud in at least 55 of his papers, as well as in 10 Ph.D. dissertations written by his students. The students were not culpable, even though their work was now tarnished. The field of psychology was indicted, too, with a finding that Stapel's fraud went undetected for so long because of "a general culture of careless, selective and uncritical handling of research and data." If Stapel was solely to blame for making stuff up, the report stated, his peers, journal editors and reviewers of the field's top journals were to blame for letting him get away with it. The committees identified several practices as "sloppy science" — misuse of statistics, ignoring of data that do not conform to a desired hypothesis and the pursuit of a compelling story no matter how scientifically unsupported it may be.*

The adjective "sloppy" seems charitable. Several psychologists I spoke to admitted that each of these more common practices was as deliberate as any of Stapel's wholesale fabrications."

Sincerely

From: _____

Subject: Re: _____ **- Your determination, principles of academic freedom, and new material**

Date: 3 April 2013 10:48:36 PM AWST

To: _____

Cc:

Dear ,

While you are preparing your urgent response and action, to my recent emails on the ' matter', including my FOI demand, you may wish to consider further third party input regarding professional misrepresentations:

"Curtis also reports that, as early as last September, he emailed both Lewandowsky (cc Oberauer) and Cook informing them that no link to the Lewandowsky survey had been posted at the SKS blog, only a tweet – a warning inexplicably ignored by Lewandowsky and Oberauer in their revisions to Lewandowsky et al (Psych Science)." Read more at http://climateaudit.org/2013/04/03/tom-curtis-writes/

On 29 March 2013 04:30, wrote:

Dear ,

Thank you for your email dated 12th October 2012

I had been holding off my response because I had taken the matter up with the "peer review publication", well before your advice to do so, and I was awaiting their promised final determination. Despite a number of follow ups, the editor failed to provide me with his final determination with regards the publication of the paper, but as you may know they have

determined to publish a paper **which is significantly changed from the one initially presented by your as the 'peer reviewed' paper to be published.**

This confirms at least two of my previous points:

1. The paper had not been competently peer reviewed, and
2. The paper did not satisfy the minimum standards for publication.

It appears the Journal editors at *Psychological Science and Frontiers* and eventually have agreed with me, though neither have had the courtesy to acknowledge the fact to me personally. However I will have a little more to say about the paper shortly. I first want to address your response to me on the matter.

You have advised that " The University has completed its internal review of the academic process followed and finds that the complaint made against is not justified." And that " The University will not act further on this matter."

I suspect this is another 'form' letter you have sent to others because it doesn't actually address the issues I have raised with the University. If I had raised concerns with the area of research, or with the way the research was to be carried out (via a survey using Internet blog sites), then your response may be appropriate, but I raised a number of matters which were outside the areas which would have been considered by the ethics committee, and outside a review of the academic process which you continue to avoid addressing. In addition, I doubt very much that certain aspects of the survey methodology were spelt out in research application and/or reviewed by the university. As a publicly funded institution you have an obligation to properly address the reasonable matters I have raised.

As the university's position appears to turn on the **'principle of academic freedom'**, would you be so kind as to define what is meant by this? It my help clarify for me and others why UWA has taken the position it has in this matter.

Academic freedom is a contested issue and, therefore, has limitations in practice. In the United States, for example, according to the widely recognized "1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure",[1] teachers should be careful to avoid controversial matter that is unrelated to the subject. When they speak or write in public, they are free to express their opinions without fear from institutional censorship or discipline, but they should show restraint and clearly indicate that they are not speaking for their institution.

In case, he is clearly and often speaking on matters well outside his area of expertise when he makes judgements about the status of climate science. He shows a very clear and controversial bias. What could be more controversial than the use of the term 'deniers' and attempting to link those who question issues surrounding climate science with those who believe the moon landing was faked?

But isn't it very convenient for UWA to hide behind the curtain of Academic freedom in this case but not promote academic freedom in all cases.

UWA academic staff didn't appear to support any 'academic freedom' when it came to utilising certain university facilities to speak on matters disagreed with in the middle of 2011. was hardly at the forefront arguing for academic freedom. A letter which received a great deal of prominence at the time was lead signed by himself and many other 'academics' from UWA including:

, UWA

061

PhD Candidate, UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

, UWA

UWA

UWA

s, UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

PhD Candidate, UWA

UWA

See letter and full list here: http://australian-news.net/global_warming/List_of_academics_opposing_free_speech.htm

It is hardly fair for in this instance to hide behind 'academic freedom' when he doesn't provide that freedom to anyone he disagrees with.

On that matter, hardly supported academic freedom by going out of his way to distance himself and the University at the time, from the presentation which was booked to be held at a UWA venue. So it seems to me that UWA's definition of support for academic freedom is fairly selective. This would appear to be in breach of **UWA's - A Code of Ethics and a Code of Conduct : 1.3 Academic Freedom**
"All academic and research staff should be guided by a commitment to freedom of inquiry and exercise their traditional rights to examine social values and to criticise and challenge the belief structures of society ***in the spirit of a responsible and honest search for knowledge and its dissemination."***

Update on Published Paper
You can and should read science writer and well known blogger Jo Nova's update on the eventual publication of the paper in question here: http://joannenova.com.au/2013/03/lewandowsky-cook-

claim-78000-skeptics-could-see-conspiracy-survey-at-cooks-site-where-he-didn't-even-put-up-a-link/

Nova repeats all the criticisms I and many others have raised which UWA appear happy to overlook including:

- poor methodology
- totally unacceptable statistical analysis
- unethical process
- unreliable data

And then of course there was ; unethical and unprofessional interaction with those who raised reasonable questions about his process, methodology, data and analysis following his wide publication and publicity of his paper. Including his refusal to provide the data necessary to authenticate the claims he was making in the paper.

These are all matters I have raised with you and detailed previously which you are choosing to ignore by either stating that the research was approved and that is protected by the principals of academic freedom. I feel certain that if you check the research application against the way the research was actually carried out, you would find that the 'approved process' was not followed, and/or that procedures were used which were not mentioned in the application which had they been so, the approval may not have been granted.

FOI Demand - Research Application

To test this theory I am requesting under Freedom of Information rights, a copy of the ORIGINAL research application submitted by , so that I can make an assessment for myself that the process was followed as you claim it was. If it was, then you should not have any problem with providing the application to me immediately by return email because the process is allegedly public information as laid out in paper which has been published. So there should be nothing which needs special consideration or protection.

Has Deliberately Misled?

As mentioned, the final version of paper is now available and is quite different from the one first published on-line July 7th 2012. The updated, and 'corrected' paper is available at http://pss.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/03/25/0956797612457686.full.pdf+html. As Ms Nova writes:

"The paper was delayed. The typesetting oddly took 8 months, and includes a new key point. To answer the rabid critics, needed to show that that many real skeptics did fill out the survey. " As you are probably aware, one of the biggest criticism's of the poorly run survey was that it was primarily hosted on 'non climate skeptic' blog sites which means that the survey responses are likely to have included few actual climate skeptic responses and are likely, as many well qualified analysts contested, contained survey responses which were deliberately 'gamed' to appear to have been completed by climate skeptics who believed in conspiracy theories. In fact has absolutely no way of knowing whether his entire paper's conclusions are not based on deliberately 'gamed' survey responses. Unless of course that was his intention all along, but I'd have to be a conspiracy theorist to believe that.

So had to come up with some evidence that climate skeptics did actually view and complete his survey. Nova goes on to write: ***"The evidence for that apparently relies on Cook's site (the ambush-labelled "Skepticalscience"). Lewandowsky et al now effectively claims skeptics really were reading Cooks site and lots of them did the survey there."*** | is of the and the of blog site].

But here is where things look decidedly shaky if they didn't already, and i wonder how much of this is known by UWA and was revealed in the application to do the research? A new addition to the paper was the claim that 78,000 climate skeptics visited the Skepticalscience blogsite in the month the survey was hosted. Here is what wrote in the paper:

Prevalence of "skeptics" among blog visitors All of the blogs that carried the link to the survey broadly endorsed the scienti

fic consensus on climate change (see Table S1). As evidenced by the comment streams, however, their readership was broad and encompassed a wide range of view on climate change. To illustrate, a content analysis of 1067 comments from unique visitors to http://www.skepticalscience.com, conducted by the proprietor of the blog, revealed that around 20% (N = 222) held clearly "skeptical" views, with the remainder (N = 845) endorsing the scienti

c consensus. At the time the research was conducted (September 2010), http://www.skepticalscience.com received 390,000 monthly visits. Extrapolating from the content analysis of the comments,**this translates into up to 78,000 visits from "skeptics" at the time when the survey was open** (although it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link.)

For comparison, a survey of the U. S. public in June 2010 pegged the proportion of "skeptics" in the population at 18% (Leiserowitz, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, & Smith, 2011). Comparable surveys in other countries (e. g., Australia; Leviston & Walker, 2010) yielded similar estimates for the same time period. The proportion of "skeptics" who comment at http://www.skepticalscience.com is thus roughly commensurate with their proportion in the population at large.

The problem is, there is absolutely NO EVIDENCE AT ALL THAT THE SURVEY WAS EVER HOSTED ON SKEPTICALSCIENCE BLOGSITE. This matter was raised by numerous people and the papers authors were given ample time to withdraw the claim. The host of the blog site, non of his many readers and supporters, nor **have been able to provide any evidence at all that the survey in question was ever posted on the blog site and therefore ever read or completed by any of the claimed 78,000 the authors rely upon to try to give this already sloppy paper some legitimacy.**

This is not a matter of academic freedom or whether the research that was done was approved, this is a simple matter of whether a member of UWA's academic staff has deliberately and knowingly published something he knows to be wrong and misleading in an effort to cover up an already embarrassingly poor quality piece of work, thus breaching the university's and academia's code of ethics and professional conduct.

Immediate Inquiry required!
If UWA have any interest in integrity in this matter at all, you will instigate an immediate inquiry. It will be difficult for to claim he was ignorant of inability to provide proof of posting the survey because there is plenty of evidence from ; own blog that he was assiduously following blog, where he grilled on the matter, eventually writing:

"Not to put too fine a point on it, it appears to me that you lied, when you asserted that your correspondence with Lewandowsky on 28 August 2010 was "forensic evidence" that showed that you had posted a link at Skeptical Science to the Lewandowsky survey on that day. I use the word "lie" because you had clearly examined the 28 August 2010 correspondence at the time of your email to Chambers and knew that this correspondence did not show that you had posted a link at Skeptical Science to the Lewandowsky survey on 28 August 2010 or any other day. Before I make any public statements about this matter, I am offering you an opportunity to rebut the belief that the statement bolded above was a lie." **did not respond. http://joannenova.com.au/2013/03/lewandowsky-cook-claim-78000-skeptics-could-see-conspiracy-survey-at-cooks-site-where-he-didnt-even-put-up-a-link/**

I look forward to your **immediate response** to my FOI demand and your **considered response** to the inquiry I believe is immediately required into the possibility that and/or is co-author have deliberately misled the community by submitting a knowingly inaccurate paper for peer review and publication. I also look forward to your **further consideration** regarding whether research in this case has met the standards expected at UWA (including whether it actually complied with the research application), and whether the general protection of Academic Freedom applies in case given his continued commentary outside his area of expertise on the quality and robustness of climate science, and also regarding the controversial manner in which he approaches public commentary.

Yours Sincerely

From: [mailto:]
Sent: Saturday, 30 March 2013 8:19 AM
To: general.enquiries@uwa.edu.au
Subject:

Just found out that the above named chap is employed at your university as a professor and changed my mind about studying there. One would assume that members of the staff be above reproach however the sort of garbage that surrounds this person and his desperate need to produce such highly unprofessional documents to prop up his rabid believe in Global Warming is more than enough to cause me concern about the rest of the staff and the quality of anything I may wish to learn at your establishment. I am now seriously considering looking elsewhere for an alternative facility that will provide me with less dubiously credible information regarding the subject I wish to study. I shall also actively discourage others who may be considering enrolling at your institution.

RELEASED UNDER FOI

From:
Sent: Monday, 1 April 2013 5:36 AM
To: general.enquiries@uwa.edu.au
Subject:

Dear

By now you are probably aware that one of your employees has been involved in fraudulent 'research' and publishing false claims.

The longer this employee remains in your employment the more damage will be done to the reputation of the University.

Yours

RELEASED UNDER FOI

From:
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 5:32 AM
To:
Subject: Re:

Dear

I emailed you last October expressing my concerns at and allegations being made against him regarding possible gross misconduct.
Please find attached a recent post on his continued conduct in relation to the same allegations.

Lewandowsky Doubles Down

Last fall, Geoff Chambers and Barry Woods established beyond a shadow of a doubt that no blog post linking to the Lewandowsky survey had ever been published at the Skeptical Science (SKS) blog. Chambers reasonably suggested at the time that the authors correct the claim in the article to reflect the lack of any link at the SKS blog. I reviewed the then available information on this incident in September 2012 **here**.

Since then, information obtained through **FOI by Simon Turnill** has shown that responses by both Lewandowsky and Cook to questions from Chambers and Woods were untrue. Actually, "untrue" does not really do justice to the measure of untruthfulness, as the **FOI correspondence** shows that the untruthful answers were given deliberately and intentionally. Chambers, in a post entitled **Lewandowsky the Liar**, minced no words in calling Lewandowsky "a liar, a fool, a charlatan and a fraud."

Even though the untruthfulness of Lewandowsky and Cook's stories had been clearly demonstrated by Geoff Chambers in a series of blog articles (e.g. **here**), in the published version of the *Hoax* paper, instead of correcting prior untrue claims about SKS, Lewandowsky doubled down, repeating and substantially amplifying the untrue claim.

Contrary to one of the many untrue claims in *Fury,* the first interest of the few people to originally interest themselves in the Hoax paper (primarily Geoff Chambers and Barry Woods) was the identity of the eight "pro-science" blogs which had supposedly published a link to the Lewandowsky survey. Woods emailed Lewandowsky, who promptly replied with a list of the eight blogs, all of which were stridently anti-skeptic. The most prominent of the eight were SKS, Deltoid and Tamino. Chambers, Woods and others sharply criticized the idea of trying a survey of skeptics at stridently anti-skeptic blogs, a criticism that has remains unrefuted.

Chambers and Woods quickly located referring blogposts at all of the blogs except SKS. They were able to locate a contemporary **tweet** from John Cook, but no SKS blogpost. Close examination of the Wayback machine archive showed beyond any doubt that there was no SKS blogpost on the Lewandowsky survey in August/September 2010 (see my previous post **here**.)

Woods directly asked Lewandowsky in early August 2012 for the location of the alleged SKS blog post. Lewandowsky unequivocally told Woods that Cook had "posted it" and that he (Lewandowsky) had "made a note" of it, though he had not kept the "actual URL". Lewandowsky speculated that Cook had deleted the post when the survey was closed (highly atypical blog behavior, to say the least):

> *I worked with John Cook directly at the time and he posted it (and **I made a note of it**), but I don't have the actual URL to the survey dating back to the time when he posted it. I suspect he removed it when the survey was closed because then the link would have been dead.*

The idea that Cook had deleted the SKS link to the Lewandowsky survey seemed highly implausible to, among others, Geoff Chambers, who asked about the incident in early September 2012 in comments at SKS **here**

> *Could you, John Cook, please clarify whether SkS posted a link to Lewandowsky's survey between Aug and Oct 2010, or helped in any other way, eg by providing email addresses of potential respondents?*

Cook replied with an inline comment that re-iterated Lewandowsky's assertion to Woods, saying as follows:

> *Skeptical Science did link to the Lewandowsky survey back in 2011 but now when I search the archives for the link, it's no longer there so the link must've been taken down once the survey was over.*

The 2011 date was clearly an error and was immediately challenged. Cook promptly conceded that the 2011 date was not correct and should have been 2010, commenting as follows:

> *My apologies, it was 2010, not 2011 (have updated the original response).*

The idea that Cook had deleted the referring blogpost remained implausible. Chambers continued to press for information, asking whether anyone at SKS remembered a blog post on the survey. Chambers' questions were cut off by an SKS moderator who told him to take up the matter with Cook in offline emails:

> *You have already received a public response from John Cook. Should you wish more detail, please submit an email to him. This is a forum founded and administered by him. Therefore questions of the nature you have been posting should more rightly be submitted to him in private correspondence. Continuance in this behavior now constitutes grandstanding and sloganeering, and will be moderated accordingly. FYI.*

Much to Chambers' surprise, Cook contacted him directly with a contact email address: 071

JC: Hi Geoff, you can email me via this email address if you have any direct questions, although there's not much more that I can add other than what I've mentioned in the comment threads.

Chambers then re-iterated his question about the "missing" SKS blog post, asking additionally for information about contemporary blog comments (which had been revealing at Deltoid and Tamino):

Thanks John. My interest comes from the fact that, of the eight "pro-science" blogs contacted by Lewandowsky, SkS is by far the most important. One might therefore expect that the majority of respondents to the survey came from SkS (depending on the coverage you gave it, and the date at which you posted it, etc.)
At two of the six (Tamino's and Deltoid) there was significant discussion of the survey, with people criticising and taking up positions. This, too, is interesting when it comes to interpreting the survey. So here are my questions:
- The date the survey was posted
- The date the post was deleted
- Were there comments to the post? If so, how many, and are they still available, or were they deleted along with the original post?

Cook's reply was unresponsive to Chambers' question. Cook said that all he could find was an email from Lewandowsky on August 28 asking Cook to link to the survey:

Hi Geoff, sorry for the delay in replying, very behind in my email correspondence at the moment plus for this email, had to fire up the old machine that I was using back in 2010 to find any email correspondence back then. All I can find is an email from Steve on 28 August 2010 asking for me to link to his survey.

Chambers, increasingly frustrated, again asked Cook whether he did "in fact link to the survey", suggesting that Cook had perhaps forgotten to post the link and that Lewandowsky's count of blogs in his article was incorrect – nothing more than a "silly mistake" that Lewandowsky could "easily correct":

GC: Hi John. Thanks for the reply. So did you in fact link to his survey? It looks to me that you just forgot and didn't post the link. So Stephan just assumed you had posted, and put in his paper the reference to eight blogs he'd contacted, including yours and the dormant NZ one. A silly mistake easily corrected. All he has to do is correct the "eight blogs" in his paper to six. Can you confirm that his survey was not in fact linked from Skeptical Science?

Rather than conceding the point, Cook re-iterated that he had linked to the Lewandowsky survey:

I did provide a link to the survey.

Increasingly frustrated, Chambers once again asked Cook for details on when the supposed link had been put up:

GC: Hi John. Any chance of telling us when you put up the link? Sorry to keep pestering you but you are being a bit coy.

In response, Cook reported that he had "no records in the blog archives", but claimed that he had found email correspondence between himself and Lewandowsky confirming that Lewandowsky had asked him to post a link to the survey and that Cook had replied on the same day that he had posted the link. Cook described the quality of the confirmation as "forensic evidence".

I've given you everything I've got – I have no records in the blog archives (I searched the database for kwiksurvey, came up empty) so I must've either deleted the text link or deleted the blog post once the survey had closed. ***The only forensic evidence I could find was the email from Stephan asking for me to post a link and my reply that I posted it on the same day.***

Subsequently, the actual email correspondence between Cook and Lewandowsky has been obtained through FOI. It completely confirms Chambers' original surmise that Cook had sent out a tweet but forgot or otherwise failed to place a linking blogpost at SKS. It shows that Lewandowsky's claim to have "made a note" of the linking blogpost was untrue. And as to Cook's claim that his email correspondence was "forensic evidence" containing his "reply that I posted it on the same day"? Surely it can only be described as a baldfaced lie.

The FOI Correspondence from August 2010

On August 28, 2010, Lewandowsky emailed Cook as follows:

Hi , I am ready to launch my internet-based survey ... I think I mentioned this to you before; the instrument is now ready to rock-n-roll. The link is shown below: ***http://www****. kwiksurveys. com/online-survey. php ?surveyiD=HKMKNG ee191483*

As you are my first "customer" I am not exactly sure how best to launch this, but ideally it would be some sort of flashing button that says "Contribute to Research-Record your attitudes about science by clicking here" or some such. Not sure the flashing button will work, but maybe you've got some idea? If you do write a post about it, maybe best not to mention my name but just anonymously refer to "researchers at the UWA" or some such?

let me know what you think ... I am happy to draft something if you need me to.
Cheers Steve

PS: I will circulate this among the planet30 folks once I've got a good way sorted with you in how to link into this.

The "planet30 folks" is a reference to the private **planet3.0 googlegroup**, which is composed of activists and from which skeptics are excluded. In addition to Lewandowsky, other participants include Tim Lambert (Deltoid), Grant Foster (Tamino), Barry Bickmore, Coby Beck (Ill Considered) , Scott Mandia and Gareth ^ (Hot Topic).

At 11:20 am on August 28, Cook replied that he had filled out the survey. Cook ironically noted that his only information on the JFK assassination came from Oliver Stone, a prominent advocate of JFK conspiracy theory:

Well, I filled out the survey. Problem is after you click Finish, it just goes to the kwiksurveys.com homepage so there's no message saying you've filled it out correctly. I think this is a bit of a faux pas as far as web functionality goes – people like to know whether their results were received.

Some of those conspiracy theories, I have no clue about – Oliver Stone is the only source of info I have for the JFK assassination 😀

Cook suggested that he simply start off with a tweet:

How about I start off with a tweet, something like: Help UWA research attitudes about science – fill out this online survey

Lew replied that a "tweet for starters" was fine:

Hi , a tweet for starters sounds good. I'll see what I can do about the end-of-survey message; this is obviously constrained by the software.

Cook asked if Lewandowsky wanted to make further changes to the survey before Cook sent out a tweet:

Let me know if you'd like me to tweet now or would like to tweak the system first.

Lewandowsky confirmed that Cook might as well send out his tweet:

Hi ... umm, tweet now. Not sure I can tweak much.

Cook sent out the tweet which Woods had already located (**online here**). It was word-for-word identical to his email to Lewandowsky.

Cook told Lewandowsky that Cook was "hoping" to do his own online survey and that he would "probably" mention Lewandowsky's at the same time:

I'm hoping to post my own (much simpler) survey online shortly – when I blog post about that. I'll probably include mention yours at the same time if show you the blog post when I'm ready to go).

Lewandowsky agreed with the plan:

thanks, sounds good.

As noted above, Cook's failure to post a link at SKS can be unequivocally verified on the Wayback machine, as Chambers, Woods and others had reported at the time and as summarized at CA **here**. The Wayback archive took a **screenshot** of the SkS home page on August 30. Below is a screenshot of the SKS homepage showing all posts bracketing August 28, the date that Lewandowsky and Cook claimed that SKS had posted a link. It does not show any post linking to the Lewandowsky survey, (Nor does it appear in the **screenshot** for the following week which shows posts starting on August 31.)

Sunday, 29 August, 2010

Human CO2: Peddling Myths About The Carbon Cycle

Before the industrial revolution, the CO2 content in the air remained quite steady for thousands of years. Natural CO2 is not static, however. It is generated by natural processes, and absorbed by others.

Read more...

Posted by gpwayne at 6:14 PM | 13 comments

Saturday, 28 August, 2010

Why we can trust the surface temperature record

Surveys of weather stations in the USA have indicated that some of them are not sited as well as they could be. This calls into question the quality of their readings.

However, when processing their data, the organisations which collect the readings take into account any local heating or cooling effects, such as might be caused by a weather station being located near buildings or large areas of tarmac. This is done, for instance, by weighting (adjusting) readings after comparing them against those from more rural weather stations nearby.

Read more...

Posted by John Russell at 7:41 PM | 24 comments

Saturday, 28 August, 2010

Ocean acidification threatens entire marine food chains

Not all of the CO2 emitted by human industrial activities remains in the atmosphere. Between 25% and 50% of these emissions over the industrial period have been absorbed by the world's oceans, preventing atmospheric CO2 buildup from being much, much worse.

But this atmospheric benefit comes at a considerable price.

Read more...

Posted by Michael Searcy at 10:11 AM | 35 comments

Friday, 27 August, 2010

Comparing volcanic CO2 to human CO2

The solid Earth contains a huge quantity of carbon, far more than scientists estimate is present in the atmosphere or oceans. As an important part of the global carbon cycle, some of this carbon is slowly released

The "forensic evidence" – which Cook had characterized as containing his "reply [to Lewandowsky] that [Cook] posted it [the blog link] on the same day" – clearly contradicts Cook's assertion to Chambers. The email correspondence unequivocally shows that Cook did not put up an SKS blog post as he had claimed. The email correspondence is entirely consistent with Chambers' original surmise: that Cook had only sent out a tweet, but had not done a blog post.

Worse, when one places the actual email correspondence against Cook's statement to Chambers about the email, it is evident that Cook had consulted the 2010 emails in question and had deliberately misrepresented them to Chambers.

In an email to Cook on February 14, 2013, I sent a detailed review of the above events and asked Cook to defend himself, concluding my email as follows:

Not to put too fine a point on it, it appears to me that you lied, when you asserted that your correspondence with Lewandowsky on 28 August 2010 was "forensic evidence" that showed that

you had posted a link at Skeptical Science to the Lewandowsky survey on that day. I use the word "lie" because you had clearly examined the 28 August 2010 correspondence at the time of your email to Chambers and knew that this correspondence did not show that you had posted a link at Skeptical Science to the Lewandowsky survey on 28 August 2010 or any other day.

Before I make any public statements about this matter, I am offering you an opportunity to rebut the belief that the statement bolded above was a lie.

Cook did not respond.

The *Hoax* SI

As Chambers had originally pointed out, it would have been easy enough for Lewandowsky to slightly amend the text of the*Hoax* article, to say that links had been posted on *seven* blogs, rather than eight blogs. Lewandowsky was aware of the evidence showing that there never was any SKS blogpost since a side comment in the contemporary CA **post** about the fictitious SKS blogpost was cited in *Fury*.

However, in the final published version of the *Hoax*, Lewandowsky not only continued to assert that he had contacted eight blogs, but added a discussion of blog participants at SKS.

In the "accepted" article (and in the published version), Lewandowsky had merely stated:

Participants: Visitors to climate blogs voluntarily completed an online questionnaire between August and October 2010 (N = 1377). Links were posted on 8 blogs (with a pro-science science stance but with a diverse audience); a further 5 "skeptic" (or "skeptic"-leaning) blogs were approached but none posted the link.

However, in the SI to the published version, Lewandowsky substantially amplified the discussion, with multiple references to SKS as follows:

*Prevalence of "skeptics" among blog visitors All of the blogs that carried the link to the survey broadly endorsed the scientific consensus on climate change (see Table S1). As evidenced by the comment streams, however, their readership was broad and encompassed a wide range of view on climate change. To illustrate, a content analysis of 1067 comments from unique visitors to **http://www.skepticalscience.com**, conducted by the proprietor of the blog, revealed that around 20% (N = 222) held clearly "skeptical" views, with the remainder (N = 845) endorsing the scientific consensus. At the time the research was conducted (September 2010),**http://www.skepticalscience.com** received 390,000 monthly visits. Extrapolating from the content analysis of the comments, this translates into up to 78,000 visits from "skeptics" at the time when the survey was open (although it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link.)*

*For comparison, a survey of the U. S. public in June 2010 pegged the proportion of "skeptics" in the population at 18% (Leiserowitz, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, & Smith, 2011). Comparable surveys in other countries (e. g., Australia; Leviston & Walker, 2010) yielded similar estimates for the same time period. The proportion of "skeptics" who comment at **http://www.skepticalscience.com** is thus roughly commensurate with their proportion in the population at large.*

Lewandowsky's claim that "it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors [to SKS} actually saw the link" is merely the latest untrue claim. In fact, the number of SKS visitors who saw an SKS link to the Lewandowsky survey can be precisely ascertained: it was **zero**.

Nor, as was observed at various blogs last fall, can readership figures be extrapolated from SKS to the other even more more antagonistic blogs. The relevant content analysis is not at SKS, but at Deltoid and Tamino, blogs where the Lewandowsky link was actually published and where "skeptic" comments are few and far between.

Last fall, long before Lewandowsky had expanded his accusations of "conspiracist ideation" to include the UK Met Office, one of Lewandowsky's coauthors (presumably Cook) observed that

Lewandowsky's critics were actually accusing him of "lying/deceiving/incompetence" rather than "conspiracy":

Maybe we should address more head-on the inevitable criticism that they're not accusing you of conspiracy because lying/deceiving/incompetence doesn't necessarily involve conspiring.

On this point at least – the need for Lewandowsky to address issues of "Lying/deceiving/incompetence" – even Lewandowsky's coauthors and critics appear to have found common ground.

RELEASED UNDER FOI

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: RE: Misconduct Complaint
Date: Wed, 3 Apr 2013 19:04:14 -0400
From: ≤ >
To: <editorial.office@frontiersin.org>

Dear Sirs,

Enclosed please find a misconduct complaint filed pursuant to policies of the University of Western Australia and the journals Psychological Science and Frontiers in Psychology regarding a material falsehood made by and with "reckless disregard for the truth". I have filed this as a discrete complaint because the issues are clearcut and distinct, and plan to file a formal complaint on other aspects of this affair separately. I request that this complaint be taken up according to each of your policies.

Yours truly,

April 3, 2013

University of Western Australia

Frontiers Editorial Office
Frontiers in Psychology
Lausanne, Switzerland
editorial.office@frontiersin.org

Dear Sirs,

I am hereby filing an academic misconduct complaint against , and in respect to 2013 (Psychological Science) ("*Hoax*") and 2013 (Frontiers) ("*Fury*").

I refer to the following definition of misconduct at the University of Western Australia (http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/staff/research-policy/procedures):

> "Misconduct" or "scientific misconduct" is taken here to mean fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research.

together with the following UWA policy (http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policies/agreements/academic):

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.

I submit that the claim by in *Hoax* (and as further disseminated by emails and in *Fury*) that a link to their survey had been published at the Skeptical Science (SKS) blog (www.skepticalscience.com) was a "material or significant falsehood" that was used to supposedly rebut criticism that their methodology had failed to actually survey "skeptics"; and that the falsehood in the published version was not made inadvertently, but either intentionally or in reckless disregard for the truth. Further details are summarized below.

This is not the only misconduct involved in this incident, but it is both clearcut and egregious and therefore this complaint is filed separately.

The Material Falsehood

In Table S1 of *Hoax*, asserted that the Skeptical Science blog (www.skepticalscience.com) was one of eight blogs that received an invitation to post a link to the survey and that posted a link to the survey. In the section of the *Hoax* SI entitled "Prevalence of "skeptics" among blog visitors", carried out an extended discussion of the alleged SKS link to their survey as follows [my bold]:

> *Prevalence of "skeptics" among blog visitors*
>
> All of the blogs that carried the link to the survey broadly endorsed the scientific consensus on climate change (see Table S1). As evidenced by the comment streams, however, their readership was broad and encompassed a wide range of view on climate change. To illustrate, a content analysis of 1067 comments from unique visitors to **www.skepticalscience.com**, conducted by the proprietor of the blog, revealed that around 20% (N = 222) held clearly "skeptical" views, with the remainder (N = 845) endorsing the scientific consensus. At the time the research was conducted (September 2010), **www.skepticalscience.com** received 390,000 monthly visits. **Extrapolating from the content analysis of the comments, this translates into up to 78,000 visits from "skeptics" at the time when the survey was open** (although it cannot be ascertained how many of the visitors actually saw the link.)
>
> For comparison, a survey of the U. S. public in June 2010 pegged the proportion of "skeptics" in the population at 18% (Leiserowitz, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, & Smith, 2011). Comparable surveys in other countries (e. g., Australia; Leviston & Walker, 2010) yielded similar estimates for the same time period. The proportion of "skeptics" who comment at **www.skepticalscience.com** is thus roughly commensurate with their proportion in the population at large.

However, the assertion by and co-authors that the SKS blog had carried a link to the survey was and is false.

First, despite repeated requests, neither nor have been able to produce any evidence of the existence of such a link. Links to the survey have been identified at the other seven blogs in Table S1 of *Hoax*, but no link has been identified at SKS. No such link exists in the present blog archives. has admitted in correspondence with , one of the "subjects" of *Fury*, that there is no evidence of the past existence of such a link in SKS blog records or archives. In response to controversy last September, , a SKS editor, conducted a search of SKS archives and failed to locate a link.

Second, correspondence between and relating to the SKS link has been obtained by under an FOI request. The correspondence of August 28, 2010, the supposed date of the "missing" blogpost, shows unequivocally that agreed only to send a tweet (which he did and which has been located) and that he did not agree to post a link at SKS. See the more detailed discussion of this correspondence at Climate Audit (see http://climateaudit.org/2013/03/28/lewandowsky-doubles-down/).

Third, the "Wayback Machine" archive recorded the SKS homepage on August 30, 2010 (and again the following week). The archived homepage as at August 30, 2010 shows all blogposts for dates bracketing August 28, 2010 and there is no blogpost linking to the survey. Nor does the archived homepage taken the following week.

The falsehood is "material or significant". The preprint of had been severely criticized for attempting to survey "skeptics" at stridently anti-skeptic sites, such as Deltoid and Tamino, where skeptic comments are few and far behind, and that the survey was not representative of actual "skeptic" attitudes. It was further suggested by some that it was implausible that a survey only linked from Deltoid, Tamino and similarly extreme blogs would yield ~20% "skeptic" responses, adding support to the widespread allegation that some supposedly "skeptic" responses had been faked. While SKS is very critical of "skeptics", it was not as openly hostile as the Deltoid and Tamino blogs and could much more plausibly claim some "skeptic" readership (though the claims by in the *Hoax* SI of a potential "78,000 visits" is very farfetched).

The false assertion that there had been an SKS link to the survey (together with the related analysis of SKS readership) was "material" and/or "significant" to the efforts by and associates to refute the allegations that they had failed to survey actual "skeptics" – hence its inclusion in the *Hoax* SI. The claim to have actually surveyed "skeptics" was, in turn, "material" and/or "significant" to *Hoax*.

Intentionality and/or Reckless Disregard

There is convincing evidence that the above falsehood was made intentionally or with reckless disregard to the truth. knew or ought to have known that there were serious

questions about the existence of the SKS linking blogpost through emails, blogposts that he knew of and unequivocal warnings from an SKS editor, but recklessly disregarded these warnings.

In August 2012, , an interested blog commenter and one of the targets of *Fury*, emailed requesting the location of the SKS link. was unable to provide a URL (none existed), but falsely told that he had personally seen a linking blogpost and had even "made a note of it". claim to have personally seen the SKS blogpost is impossible, since there never was any such linking blogpost.

In September 2012, another interested blog commenter and another target of *Fury*, in comments at SKS and then in email correspondence with also sought the location of the supposed blogpost. said that there was no evidence in blog archives, but claimed to have "forensic evidence" of the existence of the SKS link in the form of an email replying to August 28, 2010 request, containing "reply that I [ ] posted it [the SKS linking blogpost] on the same day." This claim is flatly contradicted by the correspondence itself which clearly shows that only undertook to send a tweet (which he did.)

On September 12, 2012, a blog article (http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-sks-link-to-the-lewandowsky-survey/) summarizing the evidence then available. (The correspondence between and did not become available until later.) It included the compelling Wayback machine evidence against the existence of a SKS linking blogpost on or near August 28, 2010. and associates were clearly aware of the Climate Audit blogpost summarizing the evidence against the existence of the SKS link, as this blogpost (9/14/2012) is cited in the Fury SI and is referred to in Table 3 of the Fury running text (as "14 Sep ") and three comments from the thread are cited in Fury (page 24). In the Fury SI, they even cited the following statement from Climate Audit clearly stating that SKS never published a link to the survey, but classified this as merely among "SKS conspiracies".

> In my [SM] opinion, the evidence is overwhelming that SkS never published a link to the survey. In my opinion, both claim to have published a link and claim to have seen it are untrue. But even if did post a link and then destroyed all documentary evidence of its existence, the situation is equally unpalatable.

Following my post, , an SKS editor, carried out a detailed search of SKS posts for the alleged linking blogpost. After being unable to locate the supposed link, notified in unequivocal terms on September 29, 2012 that there was no linking post at SKS:

> I've been looking into nooks and crannies with regard to the survey. One of the things I have found is a continuous record of SkS posts from the 17th of Aug to 23rd Sept contemporary with those dates. Comparison with the SkS archive makes it

almost certain that notice of the survey was not given on SkS during that period. At the same time, notice was given by you on Twitter on August 27th. It may also have been given by you on face book.

I'm letting you know so that you can notify if you think he may have a need to correct any reference to SkS in his paper, and to ask if you had anything further to add, or whether you would accept that account (notification on twitter but not on SkS) as essentially accurate.

recently notified me that he also sent an email directly to and at the time putting them squarely on notice that had only sent out a tweet.

Thus, by the end of September 2012, and associates either knew or ought to have known that there was no SKS blogpost linking to the survey. However, instead of correcting the claims in the preprint, and associates added the entire section quoted above (*Prevalence of \skeptics" among blog visitors)* either "with intent to deceive" or "in reckless disregard of the truth".

Conclusion

I submit that and , jointly or severally, have committed academic misconduct under the policies of the University of Western Australia. I request that the University of Western Australia and each of the journals investigate the above allegations according to their procedures.

Yours truly,

From: [mailto . - .]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 10:27 AM
To: . editorial.office@frontiersin.org;
Subject: Violations of sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement

Dear Sirs,

Enclosed please find a misconduct complaint filed pursuant to policies of the University of Western Australia and the journals Psychological Science and Frontiers in Psychology concerning multiple violations of sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement. I request that the University of Western Australia, Frontiers in Psychology and Psychological Science investigate these violations according to their policies.

Yours truly,

April 4, 2013

University of Western Australia

Frontiers Editorial Office
Frontiers in Psychology
Lausanne, Switzerland
editorial.office@frontiersin.org

Dear Sirs,

I hereby file a complaint concerning multiple violations by and of Section 2.6.1 of the UWA Code of Conduct for Responsible Research and sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement, including the following:

(1) In August 2010, actively concealed his association with the survey subsequently reported in 2013 (Psychological Science) ("*Hoax*") from me and other bloggers even though there were suitable alternatives including disclosure of association with the survey, in breach of NS section 2.3.1(a) and 2.3.1(b).

(2) made false representations to the UWA Ethics Committee in his application for active concealment.

(3) Following conclusion of the Hoax survey, did not disclose his association with the Hoax survey to me or others, in breach of NS sections 2.3.1(e) and 2.3.2(b).

After publication of the preprint of Hoax, I was asked by whether I had been contacted by . A search of my 2010 emails for the term " " did not have any returns, a result that I reported to by private email. In that email, I did not exclude the possibility that I had received a communication but had not retained it. As it turned out, the reason why my search for " " was unsuccessful was because

association with the Hoax Survey had been concealed from me and others at the time of the original invitation and because I and others had not been subsequently notified of association with the *Hoax* Survey pursuant to NS policies.

(4) In early September 2012, knew that I and others were unaware of his association with the Hoax Survey and ought to have immediately remedied his prior breach of NS sections 2.3.1(e) and 2.3.2(b). His failure to do so constituted a second breach of NS sections 2.3.1(e) and 2.3.2(b).

(5) Worse, instead of trying to mitigate the damage by providing required notice, took steps to actively harm (through ridicule and embarrassment) the very people that had he had previously deceived in breach of NS sections 2.3.1(c) and 2.3.2(a). These breaches include but are not limited to:

a. STW blog post of September 3, 2012
b. STW blog post of September 4, 2012
c. statement to desmogblog published on September 5, 2012
d. STW blog post of September 7, 2012
e. STW blog post of September 10, 2012

(6) In August and September 2012, began the "research" program resulted in the publication of 2013 (Frontiers in Psychology) ("*Fury*"). Stimuli from taunting by and his (and) was an integral component of the program, but failed to apply to the UWA Ethics Committee for permission in breach of section 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4.

(7) aggravated all of the above breaches, including a fresh breach of NS sections 2.3.1(c) and 2.3.2(a) through publication of 2013 (Frontiers in Psychology) ("Fury").

(8) In breach of UWA disclosure policies (http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policies/agreements/academic), in Fury, ', with intent to deceive or with reckless disregard for the truth, failed to disclose his acts of active concealment and breaches of NS policies.

Applicable Policies

Section 2.6.1 of the UWA Code of Conduct for Responsible Research requires compliance with the National Statement: (see http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/staff/research-policy/guidelines) as follows:

2.6.1 Research must comply with established guidelines such as the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) and the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes (2004).

The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf) sets out a variety of requirements and procedures governing limited disclosure (2.3.1) and active concealment (2.3.2), including demonstration that there are no suitable alternatives to the concealment and that a full explanation will subsequently be made:

2.3.1 Where limited disclosure does not involve active concealment or planned deception, ethical review bodies may approve research provided researchers can demonstrate that:

(a) there are no suitable alternatives involving fuller disclosure by which the aims of the research can be achieved;

(b) the potential benefits of the research are sufficient to justify both the limited disclosure to participants and any risk to the community's trust in research and researchers;

(c) the research involves no more than low risk to participants (see paragraph 2.1.6, page 18), and the limited disclosure is unlikely to affect participants adversely;

(d) the precise extent of the limited disclosure is defined;

(e) whenever possible and appropriate, after their participation has ended, participants will be: (i) provided with information about the aims of the research and an explanation of why the omission or alteration was necessary; and (ii) offered the opportunity to withdraw any data or tissue provided by them.

2.3.2 Where limited disclosure involves active concealment or explicit deception, and the research does not aim to expose illegal activity, researchers should in addition demonstrate that:

(a) participants will not be exposed to an increased risk of harm as a result of the concealment or deception;

(b) a full explanation, both of the real aims and/or methods of the research, and also of why the concealment or deception was necessary, will subsequently be made available to participants; and

(c) there is no known or likely reason for thinking that participants would not have consented if they had been fully aware of what the research involved.

2.3.4 Only a Human Ethics Research Committee (HREC) can review and approve research that:

(a) involves active concealment or planned deception;...

UWA policy on academic misconduct (http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policies/agreements/academic) further states:

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.

The Events

On August 12, 2010, submitted a total re-framing of his approved project (Understanding Statistical Trends), a project that involved a plaza survey of the public about statistical trends, to a completely different project involving an online attempt to associate skeptics with conspiracy theory. The survey was approved in less than a day by

On August 13, 2010, surprised by quick approval, sought permission to conceal his association with the survey from bloggers, an application that contained a material misrepresentation and which failed to properly consider available alternatives or potential harm to recipients:

> Hi, Kate – wow, thanks for the quick approval. One question: would it be possible to mention only my assistant's name, Charles Hanich, on the online survey (with full contact details, plus the usual HREC address of course)? The reason for this is that I have been writing on the climate issue in public e.g. abc and **my name alone routinely elicts frothing at the mouth by various people** e.g. . not to mention the hate mail I receive.
>
> Because I am interested in soliciting opinions also from those folks, I would like to withhold my name from the survey as I fear it might contaminate responding.
> Thanks Steve

As matters unfolded, I was one of the people from whom association was concealed. At the time, I had never heard of and it was untrue that mention of his name would have "elicited frothing at the mouth" by me. There was no valid reason for withholding association with the survey. I note in passing that, despite stated concern that disclosure of his name "might contaminate" responses, immediately proceeded to disclose his association with the survey to various activist bloggers.

Subsequently, in September 2010, I was contacted by a seeking my participation in a survey about attitudes to science. I did not know (nor, at the time, of) and paid no attention to the survey.

After completion of the Survey, as noted above, had an obligation to notify me and others of his association with the Survey, but neglected to do so.

In August 2012, published a preprint of Hoax, including the report that he had contacted five "skeptic" blogs, all of whom had refused to participate. (This was not exactly correct, since a link to the survey was published at Junk Science). It was readily foreseeable that this disclosure would lead to requests that these blogs be identified and indeed, was asked by email in early August 2012 to identify the blogs.

At this time, , knowing that his association with the invitation had been concealed from me and others, had an obligation to immediately notify me and the others of his association with the invitation, but failed to do so.

On August 30, blogger asked the identity of the blogs from ', who refused. In his refusal, added further false information to the record by falsely stating that he had personally requested participation ["my" requests] and the blogs had actively refused ["likely replied"]:

> Sorry, no, they likely replied to **my** requests under the presumption of privacy and I am therefore not releasing their names.

I and others were further misled by untrue statement, as we presumed (incorrectly) that the requests had been from ' himself ["my" requests] and that there had been active refusal (see http://rankexploits.com/musings/2012/tweet-your-permission-for-lewandowsky-to-out-you/#comment-102378; http://rankexploits.com/musings/2012/tweet-your-permission-for-lewandowsky-to-out-you/#comment-102495). To my knowledge, ' did not apply for or receive permission for this deception.

On August 29, I had been asked by whether I had been contacted by . I searched my 2010 emails for " " and did not locate a responsive email. I replied to in a private email saying that I had "no record" of being contacted by , but did not preclude the possibility that I had received and discarded an email from . Of course, the reason why my search was unsuccessful was because had concealed his association with the survey, a fact known at the time by but not to me and others.

While I had no record of being contacted myself, I presumed that must have contacted five bloggers: this didn't seem to me at the time as the sort of thing that someone would lie about.

Under the National Policy, had a duty not to harm people whom he had previously deceived. However, instead of mitigating the situation, on September 3, taunted the people that he had originally deceived. (Rather than issuing this sort of taunt, ought to have notified the people that he had originally deceived.)

> In the meantime, I understand that there is a list on the internet of individuals who have declared that they were never contacted. As we are awaiting the decision about release of the names, just a matter of general principle, there can be no harm if those folks were to again check their inboxes (and outboxes) very carefully for correspondence from my assistant at UWA in August and September 2010. I know how difficult it is to locate individual emails among thousands received in a year, and a double check may therefore be quite prudent. (Who knows, it might even prevent some overly trigger-happy and creative people from floating a conspiracy theory about how I just made up the fact of having contacted those blogs, similar to the way NASA faked the moon landing.)

I was attentive to the subtle change in wording from email to (in which had referred to "**my**" requests) to the reference in the blogpost to his "**assistant**" and carried out another search using "uwa.edu" and located the 2010 email from However, other persons that had been originally deceived by ( ) did not notice this change in nuance and did not carry out a fresh search,

I promptly recorded this at several blogs interested in the topic. Instead of apologizing to me for the misunderstanding occasioned by his original deception, in a September 4 blogpost entitled "Misplaced email in the climate wars? Not again, please!" ridiculed me at his blog for not finding the original email. untruthfully and inaccurately accused me of having "denied" receiving a link to post his survey – something that I had not done. (I had only made the limited statement that I had "no record" of being contacted by .)

> **It has come to my attention that one of the individuals who initially denied—yes, folks, that's the correct word, look it up in a dictionary—having received an invitation to post a link to my survey on the rejection of science on his blog, has now found that email.** This is laudable, if entirely unsurprising, and I bear no grudge against that person for having had such trouble finding a message from two years ago among mountains of other correspondence—anyone who has ever had to respond to frivolous FOI requests can share that pain.

I immediately posted a measured response at blog:

> In your post, you state:
>
> "It has come to my attention that one of the individuals who initially denied—yes, folks, that's the correct word, look it up in a dictionary—having received an invitation to post a link to my survey on the rejection of science on his blog, has now found that email."

I presume that you are referring to me.

In a post at blog, had said that she did not recollect receiving such an email from you, but did not preclude the possibility that one was in the tide of emails. Hence her permission to you to release her name if she was one of the addressees.

My situation was identical to hers. I did not recollect receiving such an email from you (and hadn't received such an email from "you"). However, I could not preclude receiving one in the tide of emails. Hence I added my name to the list of people who gave permission to you to release such a request. See my comment http://rankexploits.com/musings/2012/tweet-your-permission-for-lewandowsky-to-out-you/#comment-102397 at Lucia's blog.

Since invitation to the survey at his blog referred to a survey being carried out by " ", I had presumed that your name would appear in or be connected to the invitation and I had therefore searched my 2010 emails for correspondence referring to " " and did not locate any.

It did not occur to me that the invitation would not be from you, but would not include any reference to you as a participant. When you provided the additional information that it had been sent by a , I carried out a search for "uwa.edu.au" and located an email from a - an email which made no mention of " ".

Thus, if your post refers to me, it would be accurate to say that I did not recollect receiving the email, but it is not accurate to say that I "denied" receiving the invitation email, since, like , I did not preclude the possibility of overlooking something in the tide of email.

However, did not amend his accusation. Further, continued to misrepresent my actual statement in the following email to the

> Just for your amusement, one of the people who initially claimed not to have been contacted has now found the invitation email. That rather takes the sail out of this particular accusation of misconduct.

Instead of seeking to avoid or mitigate harm to the other parties that he had deceived, now clearly showed that his objective was to actually cause them harm, stating that he hoped that these deceived parties would have "egg on their faces" http://www.desmogblog.com/2012/09/05/research-links-climate-science-denial-conspiracy-theories-skeptics-smell-conspiracy

> So now there's a conspiracy theory going around that I didn't contact them. It's a perfect, perfect illustration of conspiratorial thinking. It's illustrative of exactly the process I was analysing. People jump to conclusions on the basis of no evidence. I would love to be

able to release those emails if given permission, because it means four more people will have egg on their faces. I'm anxiously waiting the permission to release this crucial information because it helps to identify people who engage in conspiratorial thinking rather than just searching their inboxes.

Following my discovery that name has been concealed from the survey and that it had been sent by a other bloggers searched their 2010 emails for " " and by noon Eastern on September 10, the information that and had also discovered an email from had been published both at Climate Audit and Jo Nova, which combined with me and the known link posted at Junk Science, appeared to be the five skeptic blogs.

Later on September 10 (Eastern) – after this information had been published on two blogs that and were monitoring - published a derogatory post, in which he claimed to "out" the various bloggers, entitled Bloggers Hall of Amnesia, http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/lewandowskyGof4.html. made numerous false claims in this post. First, asserted that "It will be noted that all 4 have publically stated during the last few days/weeks that they were not contacted." All four bloggers had responded by private email to , but none had made a "public" statement, let alone a sweeping public statement that they had not been contacted by the "researchers". Like me, all of them had been unable to locate an email from or referring to because of the original deception.

then asked rhetorically why these people had "failed to acknowledge" that they had been contacted:

2. *Why would the people who were contacted publically fail to acknowledge this fact?*

Several hypotheses could be entertained but I prefer to settle for the simplest explanation. It's called "human error." It simply means the 4 bloggers couldn't find the email, didn't know what to search for, or their inboxes were corrupted by a move into another building, to name but a few possibilities. The only fly in the ointment in that hypothesis is that I provided search keys and exact dates and times of some correspondence.

As noted above, and (and obviously myself) had already publicly reported. They had discovered the email not because of information or notification from , but because I had discovered name. The links claimed by as a "fly in the ointment" are merely further evidence of his failure to properly notify the parties: the links point not even to his own blog, but to desmogblog, a strident anti-skeptic blog not likely to have been seen by or .

Fury

compounded his effort to harm the parties that he had originally deceived by publishing a one-sided and inaccurate account of the above events in *Fury*

> Speculation immediately focused on the identity of the 5 "skeptic" bloggers. 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...
>
> One blog comment airing the suspicion that "skeptic" bloggers had not been contacted also provided the email address to which allegations of research misconduct could be directed at the host institution of LOG12's first author. This comment was posted by an individual (SMcI; see Table 3) who had been contacted twice by the researchers' assistant.
>
> 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.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/lewandowskyGof4.html.

As noted above, association with the survey had been concealed from the five bloggers, including me, in the first place. But instead of attempting to avoid and mitigate harm, is clearly attempting to exacerbate the harm.

Worse, efforts to exacerbate the harm involve further deceptions. Neither I nor the others had come "publicly forward... to state that they had not been approached by the **researchers**". reference is not to public statements by me or the others, but to a webpage by Jo Nova. I and the others responded by private email to , but did not make a "public statement". Nor did I (or the others) say that we had not been "approached by the researchers". I and the others had reported to that we had no record of being contacted by , an entirely different statement that happened to be true. As noted above, I had notified of the distinction at his blog but he ignored it.

Nor did I ever "air the suspicion that "skeptic" bloggers had not been contacted. This was not a suspicion that I held. Indeed, in a part of the comment cited in Fury that wasn't shown in the SI, I explicitly discouraged such thoughts.

Finally, allegation that the names of the bloggers did not become "publicly available" until his September 10 post is untrue. Obviously I had identified myself much earlier. In addition, and had all located the invitation by the morning of September 10 (Eastern) and their names had been published at Climate Audit and Jo Nova by noon September 10 (Eastern), prior to blogpost.

Conclusion

As stated in the introduction, has committed multiple violations of Section 2.6.1 of the UWA Code of Conduct for Responsible Research and sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement, compounded by violations of the UWA Code for Responsible Conduct of Research.

I request that the University of Western Australia and Frontiers in Psychology investigate these violations according to their policies.

Yours truly,

From: [mailto::]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:21 PM
To: editorial.office@frontiersin.org;
Cc:
Subject: Further Complaint regarding Ethics Approval

Dear Sirs,

I wish to add two further points to my academic complaint in respect to and It is my understanding that they failed to submit or obtain required ethics approval for either the program of research reported in 2013 (Frontiers in Psychology) and/or failed to obtain required ethics approval for various "stimuli" applied during this program, stimuli that included antagonistic statements about supposed subjects to the research. Nor were these "stimuli" reported in the Fury article itself.

Yours truly,

April 5, 2013

University of Western Australia

Frontiers Editorial Office
Frontiers in Psychology
Lausanne, Switzerland
editorial.office@frontiersin.org

Dear Sirs,

I wish to add two further points of serious misconduct to my complaint.

The "research" output of and co-authors reported in 2013 (Frontiers in Psychology) ("Fury") included the compilation and publication of a so-called "database" (the Fury Database) that included the names of identified parties, including myself. University of Western Australia polices (see http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/staff/human-research/facts) state that "human research" includes the identification of human subjects in a databank and that the persons so "identified in a databank" are "human participants":

> A 'human participant' in research is any person who, for example:...
>
> - Is identified in a databank, including unpublished human research data, e.g. an analysis of existing unpublished data collected by another researcher or collected for another research project

UWA policies also state that researchers intending to carry out human research are required to obtain ethics approval prior to starting research or collecting data.

It is my understanding that and ; did not obtain such ethics approval prior to starting research or collecting data.

While and co-authors will undoubtedly take the position that blog comments are made in public, they did not merely carry out passive observation of public activity. Instead,

and co-authors provided a series of "stimuli" and should have obtained ethics approval for each of these "stimuli". The stimuli include, but are not limited to:

- Blogposts and statements by , including the following statements, some of which directly disparage supposed subjects of the research, including me:
  - the STW blog post of September 3, 2012
  - the STW blog post of September 4, 2012
  - the statement to desmogblog published on September 5, 2012
  - the STW blog post of September 7, 2012
  - the STW blog post of September 10, 2012
- blogposts by , including the following blogposts at watchingthedeniers.org:
  - August 8, 2012 http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/12/protocols-of-the-elder-climate-scientists-and-banksters-part-2-rothschilds-money-masters-and-global-warming/
  - August 19, 2012 http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/09/04/lewandowsky-et-al-versus-the-were-not-conspiracy-theorists-but-brigade-part-1/
  - August 24, 2012 http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/24/conspircism-and-climate-scepticism-empirical-research-confrims-what-we-all-know-and-some-predictions/
  - August 28, 2012 http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/28/climate-deniers-object-to-being-called-conspiracy-theorists-propose-conspiracy-to-explain-why-labelled-such/
  - September 4, 2012 http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/09/04/lewandowsky-et-al-versus-the-were-not-conspiracy-theorists-but-brigade-part-1/

It is hard for me to believe that a responsible Ethics Committee would have sanctioned these sorts of "stimuli" as part of a human research program compliant with policies of the University of Western Australia and the Australian National Statement.

Further, ethics approval would have required a proper ethics application, in which the conflicts of interest of some of the authors would have been obligatory disclosure. The extreme hostility of researchers and to the subjects of the survey was a conflict of interest that ought to have been disclosed to the Ethics Committtee as part of a proper ethics application.

I recognize that blogs are public forums and that there is no reason in principle why participants cannot be studied. However, for such human research to be carried out by researchers at the University of Western Australia, it is my understanding that such research has to be done

according to the policies of the University, including obtaining ethics approval both for the program and for the various "stimuli" prior to undertaking the research.

and ought to be aware of these requirements and his failure to apply for or obtain such approval appears to me to be misconduct. I request that you investigate these allegations according to applicable policies.

Yours truly,

From: [mailto:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 11:41 AM
To: ; 'Frontiers in Psychology Editorial Office';
Cc:
Subject: RE: Complaint regarding

Dear Sirs,

In their recent publication in Frontiers in Psychology, and 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. The enclosed letter itemizes a number of these material falsehoods. I formally request that the Unversity of Western Australia, Frontiers in Psychology and Psychological Science investigate these allegations.

Fury also alleges that my work was

The attached complaint is based on violations of University of Western Australia policies on research conduct. The material falsehoods itemized herein are, in addition, defamatory,

Yours truly,

April 4, 2013

University of Western Australia

Frontiers in *Psychology*

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 and 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	*NI, MbW, UCT*
6	6 Sep	SMcI	Control data suppressed	*NI, NoA*
7	10 Sep	SMcI	Duplicate responses from same IP number retained	*NS, MbW*
8	14 Sep	SMcI	Blocking access to authors' websites	*NI, PV, NoA*

Table 3 Item 5

and 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 blog (http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/ccc2.html

> 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

and 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 had been sent to UWA staff on October 21, 2010 seeking their participation in a survey, now known to be the survey. No mention of this part of the survey was made in the methodological section of *Hoax*. On learning of this unreported dataset, 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 reinterprete [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.

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 and ; (The pivotal role of perceived scientific consensus in acceptance of science), 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 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

and stated that, on September 10, 2012 that duplicate responses from the same IP address had been retained; and that 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 had made against multiple responses from the same person. In Hoax, 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. 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 at Climate Audit http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/the-third-skeptic/).

On September 9, sent me a 2010 email from in which 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. 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, at blog as follows (an inquiry that was not reported in the supposedly exhaustive survey, though it was an inquiry by a major figure at own blog):
http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.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

and 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 s false claim that there had been a link to the survey at the SKS website, I mentioned in passing that I was unable to access either the or SKS websites (both registered to) 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 so this sort of conduct has precedent.

At the time, there was considerable controversy over the removal of comments by and associates at his website, controversy that would soon lead to their deletion of all of comments http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-sks-link-to-the-lewandowsky-survey/#comment-352980. coverage of 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, reported that had deleted one of his comments http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350259 . then reported that his comment at blog that quoted criticism of scam responses had been deleted (http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350266). reported that his comment at blog was disappeared (http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350313). Then a comment by was deleted at blog (see http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350318).

Because I was unable to access either or 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

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 heros 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 and 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 to fail to report that my conduct in this incident was singularly free of supposed Self Sealing refusal to accept contrary evidence, one of 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, 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 had "come publicly forward to state that they had not been approached by the researchers". 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 and only said that I had "no record", not precluding the possibility that I might have received and

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

allegation that I had 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 it. If claimed to have contacted five blogs, I presumed that he done so. It was unclear to me why 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.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/lewandowskyGof4.html.

This is another material falsehood.

In addition, following post on September 8 mentioning name, notified both and on September 9. sent name to others and in the morning (Eastern), both and located emails. By noon (Eastern) September 10, all had been publicly identified both at Climate Audit and Jo Nova, prior to 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.

animosity is evident in his blogposts.

website operates a private forum where as has sanctioned vile commentary against and . For example, one participant in 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, made scurrilous and unfounded accusations of anti-Semitism against of one of the targets ( ) of Fury, which I quote here so that you can fully adjudicate bias:http://watchingthedeniers.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/the-protocols-of-the-elder-climate-scientists-and-banksters-is-the-media-is-twigging-to-just-how-extreme-some-sceptics-are/.

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, and 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 Unversity of Western Australia, Frontiers in Psychology and Psychological Science investigate these allegations.

Yours truly,

From:
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 7:21 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: complaint to Psychological Science
Importance: High

Attached is a PDF copy of my complaint regarding a publication of
from the University of Western Australia, and published in Psychological Science.

The favor of an acknowledgement of receipt is requested.

Thank you.

University of Western Australia

Association for Psychological Science
1133 15th Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20005

(BY EMAIL) April 4th, 2013 4:15PM Pacific Standard Time

To the Editors and administrators of *Psychological Science*,

This letter is my complaint about your publication of

> *NASA Faked the Moon Landing—Therefore, (Climate) Science Is a Hoax An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science* DOI: 10.1177/0956797612457686 published online 26 March 2013 *Psychological Science* Stephan Lewandowsky, Klaus Oberauer and Gilles E. Gignac

Hereafter, referred to as "LOG".

I make this complaint because I believe that this research was not only done improperly, but with malice aforethought.

I point out these passages from the paper:

> *The Internet, by contrast, provides the opportunity for individuals who reject a scientific consensus to feed "each other's feelings of persecution by a corrupt elite" (McKee & Diethelm, 2010, pp. 1310–1311). Accordingly, climate-"skeptic" blogs have become a major staging post for denial, although blogs are also used by supporters of climate science to disseminate scientific evidence.*
>
> ...
>
> *Popular climate blogs can register upward of 700,000 monthly visitors, a self-selected audience that is by definition highly engaged in the increasingly polarized climate debate.*
>
> *Climate-blog denizens therefore present a highly relevant population for the study of variables underlying endorsement or rejection of the scientific consensus on climate.*

the most popular climate related blog in the world, WattsUpWithThat.com (WUWT) which typically logs approximately a million unique visitors per month, with typical months having 4 million page views. WUWT also recently approved its one millionth comment. By the definitions given in the LOG paper, WUWT would be a "popular climate blog".

WUWT is widely read by both sides of the debate and has been the subject of national television interviews, international print and web media stories, as well as the impetus for some congressional investigations into irregularities in climate science. While the audience is primarily of the climate skeptic nature, suffice it to say that WUWT is read by those who both embrace it and those who hate it due to its wide reach.

The reason for my compliant is that his and his excluded WUWT from the LOG paper data sampling process, and by doing so, created a situation that created a result that confirmed their expectations. This is not a case of , quite the contrary, my concern one of data gathering accuracy as it relates to the LOG paper. It seems that they created a confirmation bias by the procedure chosen.

While the LOG team members contacted five pro-AGW and skeptical blogs via an indirect contact method using with the intent of asking participation in their survey for the purpose of data gathering, the most visited and most widely read climate blog, WUWT, was excluded from the sampling. blog volunteer moderators received any invitation from any of the people associated with the LOG paper.

If the LOG author's intent was to get a true sample of the climate skeptic community, it would stand to reason that they would want to get a large of a data sample as possible, and a data sample that is truly representative of climate skeptic community they wished to sample.

Disturbingly though, WUWT was not one of the blogs asked to gather a sample by posting a survey, and further, it appears that by the LOG paper lead author's own admission, very few if any climate skeptic opinions were actually sampled. Comparisons of invitations in online and private discussions reveal that personally notified climate activist blogs of his association with the survey in the communications, but concealed his participation from the climate skeptic blogs contacted by having his make the contact.

And, it appears that only of the climate skeptic blogs contacted even noticed the request from let alone ran the requested survey, yet the LOG authors insist they have a valid sample of climate skeptic responses. From my own investigations and the investigations of other interested parties, it appears that only a handful of climate skeptics actually took the survey, and that the bulk of the data samples were comprised of responses of climate action advocacy blogs contacted personally by

engaged in active concealment of his involvement with requests to skeptic blogs via in violation of UWA academic policy listed in section 2.6.1 of the UWA Code

of Conduct for Responsible Research and sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of the National Statement See: http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/staff/research-policy/guidelines

1. In August 2010, actively concealed his association with the survey subsequently reported in LOG "The Moon landing paper" published in *Psychological Science* from myself and several other bloggers involved. There were options available to him, including disclosure of association with the survey, in breach of sections 2.3.1(a) and 2.3.1(b).
2. made false representations to the UWA Ethics Committee in his original application related to his use of active concealment.
3. Following the completion of the survey in 2010, did not disclose his association with the survey to me or others he claims to have surveyed, even though requested to do so, which are in breach of sections 2.3.1(e) and 2.3.2(b).

Based on this behavior, I suggest that the LOG sampling was biased by design, with specific intent to create a predetermined outcome, because had the LOG authors contacted WUWT and run their survey, or if the other skeptic blogs had noticed and run the request from the unknown I suggest the data sample gathered would very likely *not* support the premise of their paper.

To test this theory, WUWT replicated and posted the Lewandowsky survey questions for public participation, which you can see here: http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/09/08/replication-of-lewandowsky-survey/

1534 samples were gathered, and the data when collated suggests a climate skeptic opinion sample that is in stark contrast to that of the LOG paper. For example, in question 13 which asked:

13. The Apollo Moon landings never happened and were staged in a Hollywood film studio

	1	2	3	4	5	
Absolutely True	○	○	○	○	○	Absolutely False

The following results were obtained from the WUWT sampling:

CYMoon 12 2 14 40 1466

1466 respondents said that statement was "absolutely false" while 12 indicated it was "absolutely true"

Mean: 4.920 Standard Deviation: 0.440

Since this question is central to the conclusion of the LOG paper, how can the LOG authors reconcile their conclusion when this large sample on a climate skeptic blog is contradictory? The LOG paper is currently being circulated as proof of climate skeptics being irrational, believing in

conspiracy theories never even discussed on WUWT and other climate skeptic blogs, and believing that the moon landing was faked.

As a result of the LOG paper published in *Psychological Science*, and the reaction paper (*Recursive fury: Conspiracist ideation in the blogosphere in response to research on conspiracist ideation* published in *Frontiers in Pschology* and now withdrawn pending an investigation), I am personally being named in online discussions with such labeling as NI (nefarious intent), PV (persecution-victim complex), NS (nihilistic skepticism), NoA (nothing by accident), MbW (must be wrong) and UCT (unreflexive counterfactual thinking) now on a regular basis. Essentially, the PS publication has given license to libel me and others with claims that our responses make up the claim, when in fact WUWT and other climate skeptic blogs had no input into the data gathering at all.

It was always my understanding that the field of psychology had ethics that prevented the disclosure of diagnoses to named individuals publicly. Did obtain some sort of license to assign psychological diagnoses of individuals in absentia, never having gathered data from them or even engaged them in a professional consultation? If this is so, I would like to see documentation where UWA has endorsed such procedures.

I direct your attention to these sections of the Code of Ethics for the American Psychological Association, seen here: http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx

> **Principle A: Beneficence and Nonmaleficence**
> Psychologists strive to benefit those with whom they work and take care to do no harm. In their professional actions, psychologists seek to safeguard the welfare and rights of those with whom they interact professionally and other affected persons and the welfare of animal subjects of research. When conflicts occur among psychologists' obligations or concerns, they attempt to resolve these conflicts in a responsible fashion that avoids or minimizes harm. Because psychologists' scientific and professional judgments and actions may affect the lives of others, they are alert to and guard against personal, financial, social, organizational or political factors that might lead to misuse of their influence. Psychologists strive to be aware of the possible effect of their own physical and mental health on their ability to help those with whom they work.
>
> **Principle C: Integrity**
> Psychologists seek to promote accuracy, honesty and truthfulness in the science, teaching and practice of psychology. In these activities psychologists do not steal, cheat or engage in fraud, subterfuge or intentional misrepresentation of fact. Psychologists strive to keep their promises and to avoid unwise or unclear commitments. In situations in which deception may be ethically justifiable to maximize benefits and minimize harm, psychologists have a serious obligation to consider the need for, the possible consequences of, and their responsibility to correct any resulting mistrust or other harmful effects that arise from the use of such techniques.

I suggest that by the process of active concealment (subterfuge), exclusion of samples that may not support the premise of the LOG paper, and by assigning diagnoses publicly, has willfully

breached this code of ethics. Further, is his published online discussions, has engaged in what I can only describe as "taunting". This one, taunting is just one of many examples in online forum:

http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/lewandowskyVersionGate.html

> *I laud the stirring dedication to investigative Googling. Alas, this highly relevant detective work is far from perfect.*
>
> *If I am not mistaken, I can indeed confirm that there were 4—not 3—versions of the survey (unless that was the number of my birth certificates, I am never quite sure, so many numbers to keep track of... Mr. McIntyre's dog misplaced an email under a pastrami sandwich a mere 8.925307759554336^3 days ago, and I have grown at least one tail and several new horns over the last few days, all of which are frightfully independent and hard to keep track of).*
>
> *Versiongate!*
>
> *Finally this new friend from Conspirania is getting some legs.*
>
> *About time, too, I was getting lonely.*
>
> *Astute readers will have noted that if the Survey ID's from above are vertically concatenated and then viewed backwards at 33 rpm, they read "Mitt Romney was born in North Korea."*
>
> *To understand the relevance of Mr Romney's place of birth requires a secret code word. This code word, provided below, ought to be committed to memory before burning this post.*
>
> *So here it is, the secret code. Read it backwards: gnicnalabretnuoc.*
>
> *Translations are available in any textbook for Methodology 101.*

From my perspective, this is not the behavior of a professional psychologist. Many more examples of this sort of taunting and harassing dialog in response to questions about the LOG paper can be found on online forum. I direct you to this section of the APA code of ethics:

> **3.03 Other Harassment**
> Psychologists do not knowingly engage in behavior that is harassing or demeaning to persons with whom they interact in their work based on factors such as those persons' age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, language or socioeconomic status.

I would also like to point out this section on Informed Consent:

> **3.10 Informed Consent**
> (a) When psychologists conduct research or provide assessment, therapy, counseling or consulting services in person or via electronic transmission or other forms of communication, they obtain the informed consent of the individual or individuals using language that is reasonably understandable to that person or persons except when conducting such activities without consent is mandated by law or governmental regulation or as otherwise provided in this Ethics Code. (See also Standards 8.02, Informed Consent to Research; 9.03, Informed Consent in Assessments; and 10.01, Informed Consent to Therapy.)

By active concealment of his involvement in the survey, followed by published psychological diagnoses of the climate skeptics he supposedly studied via that survey, I believe that he has failed to obtain "Informed Consent" in his communications.

Regarding the premise of the LOG paper, the idea that I would deny the moon landing took place is ludicrous, especially since

While I'm reasonably certain the LOG authors would be quick to count these suggestions above and below as proof of my belief in "conspiracy theory", I suggest to you the following has occurred:

1. The data sampling was conducted erratically, with the method of contact almost guaranteeing participation of the friends and acquaintances of while likely excluding climate skeptic blogs.
2. Most data was gathered at climate activist blogs, representing a biased sample consisting mostly of non-skeptics.
3. The LOG questions themselves were so poorly worded, they tended to preclude the few climate skeptics who did encounter the survey from finishing it, further biasing the sample.
4. The resultant data, while known to the LOG authors as being a highly biased sample due to the flawed gathering methodology, was used to gauge the opinions of the minority of climate skeptic participants as being central to the paper.
5. The results are used by the LOG authors as a license to libel myself and others, to paint us with absurd and ludicrous opinions we do not hold.
6. The publication of the LOG paper in *Psychological Science* has given it a credibility by association, and essentially PS becomes a party to the libel that is now occurring.
7. Legitimate complaints of impropriety and flawed methodology in the LOG paper data gathering process are being held up by the LOG paper authors and others as "proof" of climate skeptics embracing the conclusions of their paper.
8. Multiple willful ethics violations have occurred in work.

Based on what was published, it seems to me that the *Psychological Science* journal was unaware of the background and circumstances involved in the data gathering, and it seems clear that these issues were not flagged for scrutiny during the peer review process. Whether this occurred due to non-disclosure by the LOG authors or by flaws in the review process, or both, is unknown to me at this time.

Therefore, given the issue I have described and detailed, I respectfully suggest these accusations and allegations as a result of the LOG paper are untrue, are unsupported by the data gathered, are defamatory and malicious to myself and others, and with the publication in *Psychological Science* are being used as a justification for the correctness of such claims by and others.

Given that the LOG paper has become news in itself, It is my opinion that *Psychological Science* has enabled such actions by a peer review process that completely missed (or ignored) the gross abuses of ethics and data gathering methodology resulting in a clearly biased data set from which erroneous conclusions were drawn. Those erroneous conclusions are being used to harm the careers and reputations of people that has disagreements with. Essentially he is using his position at UWA and the publication in *Psychological Science* as a tool to denigrate people that he studied. I cannot imagine a more egregious and obscene breach of ethics by a psychologist.

Therefore, I formally request that you investigate my claims, and temporarily retract the LOG paper during the investigation, while considering if permanent retraction is warranted.

Due to the complex timeline of this issue, I reserve the right to amend this complaint as additional issues are discovered and documented. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

From:
Date: 28 April 2013 9:48:51 PM AWST
To:

Subject: Re: I urge you to have a talk with your faculty at your Cognitive Science Lab

Dear

In regards to my email of April 22nd, do you intend to respond to me? If not, I will be forced to take further action. If you somehow missed it (spam filter, accidental deletion, etc.), no worries. But I deserve a response, sir.

Regards,

On Mon, Apr 22, 2013 at 12:47 PM, wrote:
Dear

I am writing to alert you that your Cognitive Science Laboratories are unfortunately producing papers that can (at best) be described as "dodgy". It is almost certainly in your university's best interest to further review their papers before publication, and perhaps review the academic procedures of the lab in general.

The paper that alerted me to this problem: NASA faked the moon landing-therefore (climate) science is a hoax: An anatomy of the motivated rejection of science. has been recently referenced in an article by the Huffington Post. A brief analysis of the paper pointing out some glaring methodology errors was subsequently done by economist Robert Wenzel at his blog Economic Policy Journal (link)

and she and I both vehemently desire the profession uphold the highest academic standards. The science of Psychology has historically struggled to achieve legitimacy in the eyes of the public and academia, and it would be tragic to see any of that hard-won acceptance diminished. I am sure you will want to review and correct this as your university has a long history of academic excellence standards.

I have taken the liberty of CC'ing your and in this email, as I am sure they also have an interest in correcting this.

Kind Regards,