

J A ROVENSKY

Telephone: [REDACTED]
Jackie Mbl [REDACTED]
email: [REDACTED]

16 August 2012

Dr Michael Spence BA LLB Sydney DPhil PGDip Theol Oxf
Vice Chancellor and Principle
University of Sydney

Dear Dr Spence

Thank you for your letter dated 7 August 2012, which is purported to be in response to my letter dated 4 August 2012. I say purported because it appears to be a 'standard' letter written in response to possibly a number of other letters of complaint with respect to Professor Chapman's behaviour especially as you refer to my letters (plural) when I have only sent one.

You refer to the NHMRC forum. I watched this forum via the internet at the time it was held, and of course being of reasonable intelligence I realised he had been asked to present a paper as were other contributors, some of whom had different views, experiences and training to Professor Chapman.

With reference to the court decision re the Acciona's Allendale East proposal, you regrettably fail to mention the proposal was refused after first being accepted by the Local Council's Development assessment Panel then overturned on appeal to the Environment Resources Development Court.

Nor do you mention a Federal Senate Inquiry '*Senate Inquiry into the Social & Economic Impact of Rural Wind Farms*', made 7 Recommendations, after hearing and considering many submission's, presentations, and interviews, including Professor Chapman's.

A copy the list of recommendations is attached.

In South Australia there is currently a Government Select Committee looking into the subject '*Select Committee on Wind Farm Developments in South Australia*', a copy of their Terms of Reference is attached.

There have also been requests in the Senate for these Recommendations to be actioned by the Government.

Your apparent acceptance that the two points you make constitutes an automatic acceptance of Professor Chapman's view is a false argument, because there was and still is a growing list of opposing evidence to show the noise's produced by these Industrial Wind Energy Turbines are dangerous to human health. You also neglect to recognise that the UN and WHO recognise excessive noise is detrimental to human health. His reasons are not correct or justifiable, and the Universities acceptance in not taking an unbiased and balanced view is irresponsible.

In your letter you did not respond to my concerns about his behaviour toward other professionals and those who have opposing views to his own in public, and while he has a right to his own opinion my concern was/is he was giving it as a representation of the Universities view. Perhaps in light of your letter the University's view is the same as Professor Chapman's, no matter it is not a valid viewpoint.

Your short sentence with respect to his right to publically discuss matters in which he has expertise is not challenged by me or others, what I do object to are his public discussions on matters he has no expertise in. He is not medically trained nor trained as an acoustician; therefore he should refrain from commenting giving the impression he is an expert in these areas.

From your letter you appear to say he has experience in behaving ethically and observing the usual civilities, unfortunately I do not see any evidence of this in respect to his discussion and comment of Industrial Wind Energy Turbines and those suffering or having opposing views to his own.

With respect to the Cartoon, no I have never received an email from Professor Chapman and didn't say I had, but it is on his university tobacco website.

I would be grateful if you would send me the 'context' in which this program of deliberate ridiculing of those who have concerns in relation to having Industrial Turbines commissioned close to their homes is justified?

If you review the history of abuse you will find it was initiated by Professor Chapman's own dismissive and hurtful comments, dismissing and ridiculing of people who are suffering and living with or have had to leave their homes as a result of these turbines cannot be justified no matter what his personal view point is. I realise he has no empathy, but at least the University could distance itself from his comments and request he does not use his position at the University to justify them.

It appears Professor Chapman is trying to justify his theory rather than taking a scientific approach to ascertain whether these Turbines do cause health issues. He is pre-empting possible scientific findings when he should be concentrating on how to address adverse Health effects when scientifically proven they do occur.

Again thank you for your letter and I look forward to receiving the 'context' referred to.

Yours faithfully

JA Rovensky (Mrs)

*Attachments: Senate Enquiry Recommendations
South Australian Select Committee Terms of Reference*