

J A ROVENSKY

Telephone [REDACTED]
Jackie M [REDACTED]
email [REDACTED]

4 March 2014

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

Dear Dr Spence

Thank you for your response dated 28 February 2014, to my letter dated 7 February 2014.

Unfortunately once again you have failed to fully address my concerns. Instead you have continued to immediately defend Professor Chapman and in doing so you have not responded to or investigated the serious concerns I have reported to you.

I did not suggest Professor Chapman had financial ties to the Wind Industry, or anyone acting on their behalf. What I did state was that he has a 'close involvement' with it. This belief is formed by his evident bias for the industry in his many public utterances and publications supporting the industry as well as his support for the industry at functions as noted in my letter.

While it's now becoming an acceptable process for Universities to have research involvement with industries, it is hoped this involvement would be conducted in an unbiased research environment with research undertaken according to the usual ethical guidelines, by university staff in a manner to that ensures the integrity of both the researcher and University is maintained.

A copy of your procedures to ensure the integrity of such engagement where your researchers have such a close involvement with a particular industry would be appreciated.

Can you explain why the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University decided it was not necessary for Professor Chapman to obtain ethics committee approval to seek information directly from people who may have had to move from their homes because of the effect of wind turbine noise on their mental and physical health?

Was this decision made PRIOR to Professor Chapman's approach to these people, or was the decision made by the committee AFTER concerns were raised, and after damage had occurred? Is it acceptable and ethical for him to continually demonize a health professional in public because they refuse to be bullied and intimidated into releasing confidential information to him? Especially when the reasons for not providing this information include well founded concerns about the privacy of those who provided the information being violated by Professor Chapman or the industry with which he is so closely associated?

Further is it ethical for him to attack and personally denigrate the characters and reputations of those people he is "researching", but has never interviewed, and indeed refuses to engage with when invited by them and others to do so? Is it ethical for him to infer these people are lying simply because they do not trust him to show an unbiased understanding of their physical and mental health problems? Is it ethical or even legal that Professor Chapman as a non-medical public health academic should be making and publishing his diagnosis of people's medical problems as a "nocebo effect", which is in conflict with their own health practitioner's judgements that their symptoms are due to the consequences of exposure to the operation of industrial wind turbines, which were first reported to Australian health authorities by a treating medical practitioner in 2004?

It seems Professor Chapman is putting the cart before the horse with respect to his "diagnosis" of a "nocebo effect", as it would be clearly a more rational approach to consider the effects of changes to the environment as being the cause of reported health problems, or is there a reason for him to go straight to a conclusion that the victim is the problem. Why would he side-step normal research practices and not stringently and ethically explore all avenues of cause and effect?

While Professor Chapman may be one of the University's most senior academics, it does not follow that the amount of papers he's had published or peer reviewed, the awards he has received or his membership of associations, that entitles him to behave in a manner which harms others, nor do they ensure he is fully competent to make judgement on the physical or mental health problems of anyone, and especially on those whom he has never met. Nor does it afford him the right to dismiss the work of experienced and highly regarded clinical, scientific and engineering professionals and academics in a number of fields other than his own who have direct knowledge of the problems these residents are experiencing.

I would like to ask if you have taken the time to read the works I suggested you read, and if not if I suggest you do so. With your legal background and training, I am sure you will understand the seriousness of an injunction to immediately cease turbine operation overnight, to prevent "irreparable harm to physical and psychological health". Such inductions are not granted by courts lightly, but this is just what Justice Muse has granted in Falmouth, USA.

There is a wealth of information available which contradicts Professor Chapman's stated cause of people's medical health issues when he determines them to be suffering from the 'nocebo effect'. Recently the Irish Chief Medical Examiner was quoted as stating that "there are specific risk factors for this syndrome and people with these risk factors experience symptoms. These people must be treated appropriately and sensitively as these symptoms can be very debilitating." (The Irish Examiner, 3.3.14). She was referring to 'wind turbine syndrome'.

I repeat from my previous letter "*Surely these vulnerable citizens deserve to be treated as every other citizen, with respect and consideration of their predicament which they have no control over, in the expectation their rights to live and work without the imposition of annoyance causing them harm being thrust upon them.*"

From your current response to my latest letter and the one previously I come to the conclusion, inescapable conclusion, that Sydney University **unreservedly** supports the Industrial Wind Energy industry and its denials of any adverse health effects from its products, and that it supports the demonizing of medical professionals, acousticians and others who unlike Professor Chapman are directly investigating the problems, and are not closely associated with the global wind industry. The University's unreserved support of Professor Chapman's position with respect to these important issues, including that of ethical research, is a reflection of the actual ethical and research standards supported by the University's hierarchy.

Clearly these standards of ethical behaviour are not consistent with the stated ethical guidelines of the University currently on your website. They are not ethical or desirable behaviours, and in my opinion should not be supported by the University authorities, including the members of the University Senate.

Yours faithfully



JA Rovensky (Mrs)