

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2012
Latest update:

APPENDIX 13

GOVERNMENT FUNDED ABC TV & RADIO NETWORK AND OTHER MAINSTREAM AUSTRALIAN MEDIA

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

Definitions

Please refer to Appendix 1d for definitions of the words *science*, *scientist*, scientific, corruption, *lie*, *fraud* and *propaganda*.

Introduction

Another taxpayer-funded organisation with a previously strong reputation for serving Australians has become an advocate for the government's climate policy: the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, ABC.

Firstly, I acknowledge many fine people, past and present involved in Australia's ABC TV and Radio networks. Those people provide an essential service, sometimes under trying circumstances. Their dedication to the nation, to Australians, to their listeners and viewers and to providing high quality entertainment and reliable information is acknowledged and appreciated.

Sadly those many fine people are betrayed by a cultural bias lending itself to political advocacy. That is illustrated in broadcasts on global warming (aka climate change).

The ABC has been heavily biased toward consulting government-funded academics advocating the government's position and broadcasting their comments. Sceptic scientists have complained that even when they've made themselves available the ABC has spurned them in favour of advocates misrepresenting climate and science.

The ABC has given rare glimpses of reality. For example, during its special program entitled *I Can Change Your Mind About Climate Change* broadcast on Thursday, April 26th, 2012 the ABC referred to climate change as a "*bubble*". Statistics from analysis of that program though confirm the bias.

Analyses of sample ABC-TV programs

1. ABC-TV's *Qanda* program, *Climate Debate*, broadcast Thursday, April 26th, 2012:

<http://www.abc.net.au/tv/qanda/txt/s3487316.htm>

My annotated analysis in Appendix 13c is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13c_AppendixQandAClimateDebateWorking.pdf

Analysis of the transcript reveals the following:

- Questions based on, or about or sympathetic to or implying human CO₂ as causation of global warming = 5
- Questions neutral = 4
- Questions based on, or about or sympathetic to or implying scepticism that human CO₂ caused global warming = 1
- Statements from supposed *experts* in the audience supporting or sympathetic to taking action to cut human CO₂ = 3
- Statements from supposed experts in the audience demonstrating neutrality. = 1
- Statements from supposed experts in the audience opposing or sympathetic to opposing action to cut human CO₂ = 0
- Statement from ABC attributing or implying scientific authority to a position = 3 (all supported human CO₂ as causation, contrary to empirical scientific evidence)
- Transcript error by ABC = 1

Of perhaps greater significance than the imbalance of questions was their sequencing. Before allowing the first question doubting human causation, four questions supporting or implying the notion of cutting human CO₂ were asked. As were two neutral questions and all three experts in the audience consulted. This would be the tactic of someone attempting to form audience opinions by excluding contrary views until the audience perceives overwhelming support for the desired opinion;

Questions aired on ABC-TV's *Qanda* are submitted prior to the program and selected by ABC-TV.

Please consider the following:

- Sceptics were supposedly represented by a retired *conservative* politician and a large mining billionaire who fits the incorrect and outdated caricature of mining. With both lacking scientific qualifications and detailed knowledge in climate science, was the ABC falsely positioning sceptics as not being scientific?
- Advocates of climate alarm were represented by an attractive young activist and by the Chief Executive of CSIRO, portrayed as being strong on climate science. Yet the ABC has apparently failed to do its due diligence since CSIRO lacks any empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning for its climate advocacy supporting the government;

- Advocates of alarm on the panel were effectively swelled by two members of the audience in prime position with at least one already ‘*miked-up*’: Matthew England, Director of UNSW Climate Change Research Institute and Matthew Wright, Executive Director of Beyond Zero Emissions. They effectively made a panel of four alarmists including two (2) presented as scientists;
- Yet both supposed *scientists* (Matthew England and Megan Clark) have seriously misrepresented climate and science. In their written responses to my requests both have failed to provide any empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their climate advocacy supporting the government that funds them;
- The program billed as a ‘*Climate Debate*’ opened and continued as a debate about alternative energy on the clear assumption that CO₂ production needs to be cut. One position was reinforced in the first quarter of the supposed *climate debate*. The groundwork was established, the verdict enshrined.
- Why did ABC-TV fail to provide any opportunity for a sceptical scientist to participate and comment? Why did ABC-TV rely on, and broadcast the advice of Matthew England a mathematician who works and/or promotes on unvalidated computerised numerical models rather than a real-world climate scientist?

Despite ABC-TV’s biased slant and sequence, the ABC’s unscientific poll results before and after the program was aired revealed increased doubt and scepticism.

One wonders who advises Tony Jones on climate. Consider this revelation about Tony Jones’ citing of volcanologist Gerlach in ABC-TV’s *Lateline* program broadcast on December 15th, 2009:

<http://geologist-1011.mobi/>

Note: In the associated preceding ABC-TV program entitled “*I Can Change Your Mind About Climate*”, climate activist Anna Rose refused to debate Marc Morano a distinguished sceptic and accomplished political staffer who even the ABC credits as, quote: “*the man credited with bursting the climate belief bubble in the US.*”

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yGYW7IEIirk>

Mark Morano’s biography as it relates to climate is summarised here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1306_MarcMorano.pdf

He’s an award-winning journalist acknowledged for his balanced coverage of climate science and his thorough and amazingly quick recall of facts. Perhaps that’s the reason Anna Rose refused to debate him and chose instead to imply unfounded smears. No one from the ABC held her accountable?

That seems to be a tactic of advocates of climate alarm: make claims and then avoid scrutiny.

Given that on ‘*Qanda*’ she cites the scientifically and economically discredited and dubious Stern Report one can understand why she refuses to debate Marc Morano. He’s

famous for his comprehensive command of global warming (aka climate change) facts and his clear presentation.

Anna Rose has close ties with GetUp!, a socialist movement reportedly heavily funded by the union movement, supportive of the ALP and reportedly with ties to similar organisations funded by George Soros actively pursuing global governance of his design.

Jim Simpson from the grass-roots volunteer organisation *Climate Realists of Five Dock* was in the audience. He witnessed what he saw as segregation of the audience by the ABC in an apparent attempt to manipulate viewers' perceptions of studio audience reactions. Comments from his email dated May 2nd, 2012 to journalist Miranda Devine are copied and pasted here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1307_JimSimpson.pdf

2. ABC-TV's *Catalyst* program, 'Science Under Siege' broadcast Thursday, September 8th, 2011

Broadcast Thursday, September 8th, 2011 barely a month before parliament's vote on the carbon dioxide tax.

<http://www.abc.net.au/catalyst/stories/3313559.htm>

Analysis of the transcript is in Appendix 13f available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13f_AppendixCatalystTranscriptWorking.pdf

Analysis of statements made during the program:

- ABC endorsing or implicitly endorsing cutting human CO₂ as causation of global warming = 4
- ABC statement sceptical of, or implying scepticism that, human CO₂ caused global warming = 0
- Statements from supposed experts advocating or portrayed as supportive of the stance to cut human CO₂ = 12
- Statements from supposed experts demonstrating neutrality. = 0
- Statements from supposed experts opposing action to cut human CO₂ = 3
- Meaningless or unscientific claim driving misrepresentations = 2
- Statement from ABC attributing or implying scientific authority to a position or omitting and/or misrepresenting reference to strong sceptical point = 12

Based on my analysis, my conclusion is that the ABC took sceptic statements out of context and used statements by taxpayer-funded advocates of the government's position without checking their underlying science or credentials. Catalyst's script was disparaging toward skeptics.

Consider the people ABC-TV uses to speak for science. Firstly, the implied portrayal of a political staffer as a scientist knowledgeable on climate is a new low even for the ABC. Refer to link below on Anna-Maria Arabia.

Secondly, ABC-TV cites marine biologist Ove Hoegh-Guldberg who is funded by government, Greenpeace and WWF. In the program's context he was implied to be a climate scientist.

He previously broadcast misrepresentations about climate science and even science in his own field of marine biology:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/ABC%20transcripta.pdf>

His personal responses to my questions repeatedly failed to provide me in with empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for his false claims about human CO₂.

The ABC gives the final say to that academic advocate for unfounded alarmism contradicting empirical science

Thirdly, ABC-TV cites comments by the Chief Scientist who has no empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning as evidence of human causation of global warming.

The ABC is correct in concluding that the climate debate is harming science's credibility. Yet the ABC reverses reality. Academic advocates funded by government and misrepresenting science and climate are destroying science's credibility. That is clear in the broader community

There seems a deliberate or unconscious assumption that the science is as academic advocates decree and that skeptics are misguided and possibly corrupt. Whether the program is deliberate propaganda or a self-fulfilling confirmation of cultural bias within the ABC is debatable. Given its nature, it seems likely that the bias is premeditated.

3. ABC-TV's *4 Corners* program, 'The Carbon Wars' Monday, September 19th, 2012:

ABC-TV's '*4 Corners*' program broadcast Monday, September 19th, 2011.
<http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/stories/2011/09/15/3318364.htm>

Analysis of the transcript is in Appendix 13g available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13g_Appendix4CornersTranscriptWorking.pdf

A brief analysis of the ABC reporter's words is presented below. TV's powerful use of evocative images and emotion is omitted from this brief review. Neither are omissions included in the review. They can be powerful as revealed by '*4 Corners*' conveying its endorsement that human CO₂ caused global warming by omission. In these and other ways the following analysis vastly understates the program's bias.

Summary of analysis of ABC reporter's statements on *Four Corners*:

ABC endorsing or implicitly endorsing cutting human CO₂ = 6

Casting aspersions by association = 3

Meaningless or unscientific claim driving misrepresentations = 2

Transcript errors = 13.

The ABC's repeated false and unfounded assumptions

Implicit repeatedly in the '*4 Corners*' broadcast is the false assumption that human CO₂ will cause supposedly catastrophic global warming at some future unspecified date.

Yet, with massive ABC resources why has no ABC journalist got to the core of this issue and reported on it publicly? Why then does the ABC implicitly reinforce the false claim that contradicts empirical science?

The '*4 Corners*' broadcast is based on a second false assumption that claims about human CO₂ causing warming are scientifically sound. Yet has any ABC journalist investigated massive systemic corruption of climate science?

Why does the ABC allow Ian Chubb to imply endorsement of the science by national academies yet not check and expose his false claim? He knows about the Inter Academy Council's damning report doesn't he? If not why not? If so, why is he making claims about 32 national academies hijacked by the debate? Why has the ABC apparently not done its research? Why, by failing to do its due diligence has the ABC endorsed falsities and corruption of science?

Refer to comments on the office of Chief Scientist elsewhere in this report, particularly Appendix 8.

Thirdly, the ABC has given massive predominance to academic advocates of alarm, all funded directly or indirectly by government. Prominent sceptic scientists have said that it is difficult for them to arrange even a hearing on the ABC.

'4 Corners' relied on a government-funded chemical engineer Will Steffen as a climate scientist. It relied on the Chief Scientist Ian Chubb who contradicts empirical science. It relied on Chris Dunstan from UTS Institute for Sustainable Futures.

Why did the ABC fail to interview any sceptic scientist? Why did it not ask in the broadcast an electricity generator executive for comment on the effect of mandated renewable energy targets on electricity prices?

Fourth, although Alan Jones' public comments about the Prime Minister are harsh, why did the ABC fail to scrutinize his basic point being Julia Gillard's contradiction of science and Nature, quote: "*It is absolutely laughable. The woman's off her tree*".

Fifth, one wonders when ABC journalists will get the point. If they bothered to consult the protesters opposing the carbon dioxide tax they would learn a few fundamental facts including:

- Many of these protesters have never before protested publicly about anything. They are far from radical. They are justifiably deeply upset;
- Protesters have largely done their homework and come to their conclusion that climate science is corrupted and being destroyed. They are deeply upset about Julia Gillard breaking her promise and the contradictions, misrepresentations and broken promises and assurances from government ministers and media;
- Many are from Eastern Europe and understand first-hand the signs of totalitarian government and massive government control.

The ABC's broadcast proved their conclusions to be sound.

Why did the ABC cast aspersions by associating the protesters with minority groups?

Sixth, '4 Corners' made much of death threats against scientists and used this to carry multiple messages to the public. Requests of ANU scientists made under Freedom of Information regulations were denied and then received after appeal. The actual emails revealed those threats to be dubious:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/05/death-threat-fictions>

And:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/05/death-threat-emails>

And:

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/carbon-threat-cold-as-claim-years-old/story-fn6b3v4f-1226071921368>

The latter was published three months before the '4 Corners' program broadcast.

Has the ABC retracted its broadcast statements and claims? Why did the ABC not include balanced coverage of the claims?

Have ABC journalists investigated the claims? Has the ABC considered why ordinary citizens, mostly of mature age and not prone to violence, become angry and defiant?

4. ABC-TV's Media Watch program

Declaration of association: I am the voluntary Project Leader of a non-profit organisation, The Galileo Movement. The founders invited Alan Jones to be the organisation's voluntary Patron.

In conducting my analyses of Media Watch's comments I did so independently and without ever discussing my analysis or objectives with the personalities that are the subjects of Media Watch's programs listed below.

ABC-TV's Media Watch program purports to provide an independent and impartial analysis of media programs. Analysis of two programs dealing with climate reveals Media Watch's Jonathan Holmes to be far from objective. He contradicts empirical science to subtly yet powerfully advocate the unscientific view that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change).

Analysis of two Media Watch programs reveals them, in my opinion to be blind misrepresentations of climate sceptics and blind defence of misrepresentations by climate alarm advocate David Karoly.

Analysis of two Media Watch programs discussing climate are available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13d_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMarch2011.pdf

And here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13e_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMay30-2011.pdf

Watch the programs, read the transcripts, review my analyses and comments and then decide for yourself.

Analysis of Media Watch program broadcast on March 21st, 2011 reveals statements classified as:

- Contradicting empirical evidence and/or facts = 17
- Directly or implicitly denigrating those taking a sceptic position = 12
- Citing independent scientists = 0
- Citing '*scientists*' funded by government and/or in government positions = 7

For reasons explained below, this analysis is indicative, not exact.

My analysis omits comment about accurate statements by commercial radio presenters that seem to be presented or implied by Media Watch as erroneous.

My analysis omits mention of the basic premises underlying Media Watch's presentation. Those premises are difficult to encapsulate. Yet viewing this Media Watch episode I conclude that it seeks to skillfully denigrate commercial radio station hosts skeptical of government's position and lends powerful yet unfounded implied support to

reinforce scientists funded by government and/or contradicting empirical science.

Media Watch's presenter is accomplished at stating words in ways that cleverly convey an intent and message that is the opposite of the show's script. Jonathan Holmes' sarcasm is well known. This is difficult to capture in an analysis of transcript words. The numbers above understate Media Watch's bias.

Analysis and Comments:

Media Watch sarcastically seems to imply talkback radio hosts are misrepresenting arithmetic. Yet their arithmetic is essentially correct and reasonable as a way of meaningfully conveying simple yet seemingly complex figures to a wide audience. It's telling and noteworthy that instead of refuting comments by his targets Jonathan Holmes uses sarcasm to imply ridicule.

Jonathan Holmes' article could easily be seen as his attempt to reinforce the unscientific myth that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest global atmospheric warming by implying that talkback radio hosts have got it wrong. Yet empirical science and logical scientific reasoning supports the talkback radio hosts' position. They likely arrived at the position using empirical scientific data and reasoning. In doing so they join thousands of scientists worldwide.

It seems clear from discussions at various rallies around Australia that talkback radio listeners are relying on AM radio to discuss empirical science. Many listeners have given up on the bias they perceive on the ABC and in the Fairfax press and the apathy demonstrated by commercial TV networks' news reports.

Consider the academics consulted by Media Watch. Media Watch does not disclose the funding of academics it cites.

Matthew England is a mathematician who works on computerised numerical models and contributes to the UN IPCC. The organisation of which he is a co-Director receives federal government funding. Additionally he's on the Science Advisory Panel to Tim Flannery's Climate Commission. For that he's paid directly by the federal government. His statement cited by Media Watch starts with a vague general statement, moves on to convey unfounded precision and then contradicts empirical science to assert an unfounded quantity implied to be reliable. Yet it is implausible, unfounded and contradicts empirical science and laws of science. He omits to declare his conflict of financial interests.

Steven Sherwood is Matthew England's co-Director and benefits indirectly from federal government funding. His statement about volcanic sources of CO₂ contradicts eminent scientists in other fields and appears to make concrete a measure that is noted by many scientists to be difficult to estimate and highly variable.

Michael Ashley supports Matthew England's flawed and unscientific logic contradicting empirical science and laws of science. His statement is based it seems on the flawed and false assumption that CO₂ sinks are saturated when science and Nature reveal they are temperature dependent. Atmospheric CO₂ levels are determined by balancing oceanic CO₂ and partial pressure of atmospheric CO₂.

Does academic Michael Ashley benefit directly or indirectly from federal government funding?

David Karoly has repeatedly misrepresented climate science in broadcasts across Australia through ABC TV and radio networks. Andy Pitman's background is in computer modelling. Will Steffen is a chemical engineer. Government funds all. Nowhere does Media Watch mention this.

Why does Media Watch imply by assumption that their work can be relied upon when in reality the work of David Karoly, Will Steffen, Andy Pitman and Matthew England on climate is highly dubious and hotly contested by eminent scientists who work in the real world of science worldwide?

Why does the ABC repeatedly accept and spread false statements by alarmist academics funded by government? What are the ABC's motive and intent?

Has Media Watch ever held Tim Flannery accountable for his many false statements misrepresenting climate and science or for his many contradictions and failed doomsday forecasts?

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/climate-of-dissent-being-punished/story-e6frfifx-1226500249819>

Why were Ian Plimer and Bob Carter apparently not given an opportunity to comment? Why were they not given an opportunity to respond to their critics?

It's encouraging that so many commercial broadcasters have done their homework and seen through the climate con.

It raises an obvious question: how can so many talkback radio hosts sneered at by Jonathan Holmes get it right yet the ABC funded by federal government repeatedly get it so wrong? Why are the large investigative journalistic resources of the ABC seemingly impotent?

Why is Chris Smith ridiculed for supporting a people's revolt? If he avoided doing his job supporting his listeners the truth would not have emerged. Or is Media Watch ridiculing Chris Smith because he is effective?

Why does Media Watch imply that by being in apparently independent agreement, so many commercial radio station hosts have got it wrong? Yet in reality they got it right? The hosts' are rightly upset about the misrepresentation of science by the political and unscientific campaign pushing human CO₂ as a cause of climate change.

Why is Media Watch implying that Fairfax radio stations are not balanced without commenting that Fairfax newspapers are widely regarded as biased to the other side? Could it be that commercial radio is serving the needs of a large group of Australians currently disregarded by ABC TV and radio networks heavily skewed to promoting unfounded climate alarm? Could it be that commercial radio is fulfilling a need created by the ABC's bias?

A summary of Media Watch's uninformed position is the question Jonathan Holmes asks, quote: "*what does Ross Garnaut know?*" Indeed, if Media Watch and the ABC had done its due diligence, the Australian public would know that on the topic of climate economist Ross Garnaut knows little about climate and seriously misrepresents science, climate, humanity and Nature. It's a pity that Jonathan Holmes had not investigated the questionable environmental credentials of Ross Garnaut as unearthed by ABC-TV's '7:30 Report'. Please refer to my letter to Ross Garnaut referenced elsewhere in this report.

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/GarnautMarch2011.pdf>

Analysis of Media Watch program broadcast on May 30th, 2011 reveals statements classified as:

- Directly or implicitly denigrating those taking a sceptic position = 8
- Contradicting empirical scientific evidence and/or facts* = 8
- Citing 'scientists' funded by government and/or in government positions = 1
- Citing independent scientists = 0
- Personal value judgment = 12

*These do not include David Karoly's many false statements.

Analysis of Media Watch program broadcast on May 30th, 2011 is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13e_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMay30-2011.pdf

Media Watch's statements and startling omissions point to it being extremely biased. My analyses are provided so readers can watch the program, read the transcript and assess my analysis for themselves.

David Karoly once again fails to provide any empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998. Yet he falsely purports to provide such evidence. In doing so I conclude that yet again he misrepresents climate, science and Nature. Check and decide for yourself.

Jonathan Holmes' comments seem to assume that advocates of human causation of climate change are correct and that those who disagree are not only wrong, they are seemingly mischievous and/or incompetent and/or dishonest.

Significant facts unearthed by Alan Jones seem to be ignored and/or downplayed and/or ridiculed by Jonathan Holmes. Those facts include:

- David Karoly's failure to provide empirical scientific evidence for his core claim that human CO₂ is warming Earth's atmosphere;
- David Karoly's apparent conflict of interest in being paid by the government whose policy he advocates.

Why does Jonathan Holmes seem to simply accept David Karoly's many mistakes and false statements contradicting empirical scientific evidence? Why does Jonathan Holmes ignore aspects in the interview that contradict or present alternative views to those he raises? Why does Jonathan Holmes legitimise David Karoly's views and claims despite the fact that those claims contradict empirical science and/or contradict reality or material facts?

Why does Jonathan Holmes take Alan Jones' statements out of context—particularly when David Karoly clearly understood and confirmed the context of Alan Jones' statements? Is it to misrepresent Alan Jones' statements?

Why are Jonathan Holmes' errors so heavily slanted one way in favour of David Karoly and against Alan Jones? Why is Jonathon Holmes allowed by the ABC to be an advocate for one position in contradiction of empirical scientific evidence?

Alan Jones has challenged senior Liberal party leaders for their unscientific Direct Action policy contradicting empirical science and based on orchestrated corruption of climate science.

He has interviewed and challenged academics and politicians advocating cutting human CO₂. None have given him any empirical scientific evidence or logic that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998. Statements by some have contradicted empirical scientific evidence yet on that Jonathon Holmes falls silent. Why?

Over decades of broadcasting, Alan Jones' has been found to have made only two accuracy breaches. An interview of the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) Chairman Chris Chapman by ABC reporter Matthew Carney was broadcast on Friday, June 5th, 2012 is revealing. It's available here:

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-06-15/shock-jock-guilty-of-accuracy-breaches/4073322>

ACMA's Chairman rightly dismisses the ABC's claim that two breaches over a, quote: "*number of years*" and quote: "not a systemic breach". He says, quote: "*there have been very few breaches by Alan Jones over the years*". He says, quote: "*we've found over the last several years two accuracy breaches across a very significant number of hours of live broadcasting.*" And: "*Our (ACMA) assessment is ... qualitatively different to the one you (Matthew Carney, ABC) just put to me.*"

In each of the Media Watch programs listed above Jonathan Holmes has made more than two errors. That is despite Media Watch having the luxury of being able to prepare a script at its leisure outside the rigours of talkback radio. Given that Media Watch's errors seem to be all, or largely one way and in support of climate alarm one could easily conclude that the ABC's errors are indeed systemic.

My formal complaint dated to the ABC over its broadcasting of biologist Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's many misrepresentations of climate science revealed that the ABC does not take responsibility for the statements of its guests. I conclude that the ABC does not investigate such complaints as a component of deciding whether or not to interview the same person again in future. If my conclusion is correct it indicates that the ABC takes little or no responsibility for the veracity of claims made by those it chooses to interview and whose views it broadcasts.

Consider reports provided here:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/03/jennifer-marohasy-and-abcs-mediawatch-tribal-warfare/>

Here:

<http://jennifermarohasy.com/2012/03/media-watch-under-scrutiny-2/>

Here:

<http://abcnewswatch.blogspot.com.au/2012/03/murray-gate-some-questions-for-media.html>

And here:

<http://bunyipitude.blogspot.com.au/2012/03/rum-lot-at-media-watch.html>

All raise serious issues about the purpose, tactics and ethics of Media Watch.

Question 15 at the second link raises issues about productivity and value for money. As a management consultant I wonder whether it raises issues about the opportunity for staff to be idle and mischievous?

It's ironic that Media Watch pretends to hold commercial media accountable. Commercial broadcasting has to deal with ACMA, an independent body. Commercial broadcasting has to deal with audiences having choice and deserting those who fail to meet audience needs and expectations. As Fairfax newspapers are discovering.

Who holds the ABC and Media Watch accountable? A toothless tiger?

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/press-and-abc-polar-opposites-in-complaints-arena/story-e6frgd0x-1226298595034>

Not quite because on Saturday, September 29th, 2012 *The Australian* newspaper published an article entitled "*Media Watch breached ABC code: ACMA*":

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/media-watch-breached-abc-code-acma/story-e6frg996-1226483794991>

The Weekend Australian newspaper editorial dated Saturday, May 26th, 2012 and entitled makes clear and accurate comment about Media Watch, quote: "... *the program*

remains predictably jaundiced in its views and is increasingly being seen, under current host Jonathan Holmes, as the in-house enforcer of ABC orthodoxy.”

And, quote: *“The greater concern is that Media Watch and other elements of the ABC are captives to groupthink on crucial issues such as climate change”*

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/editorials/media-watch-keeps-an-eye-out-for-abc-heretics/story-e6frg71x-1226367389119>

On May 19th, 2012 *The Australian* made further disclosures and comments about Media Watch in an article entitled *ABC 'climate death threats' reports undermined*, quote: *“The Weekend Australian's editor, Nick Cater, said: "Media Watch's flaw is that it is vulnerable to capture by its presenters' pet obsession. Jonathan Holmes has taken a neutral stance on most issues, but on climate change he has clearly fallen victim to ABC group think.”*

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/abc-climate-death-threats-reports-undermined/story-e6frg996-1226360656074>

I conclude that Media Watch’s comments are heavily biased in advocating cuts to human CO₂ output. Media Watch makes unfounded misrepresentations of climate, the climate debate and participants in that public debate. Is any regulator holding the ABC to account?

5. Robyn Williams and his *The Science Show*, ABC-Radio

Robyn Williams presents a show purporting to discuss science. Although his program has broadcast many unfounded claims that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change), he has never presented evidence to support such claims. There is no such evidence because his claim contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Why does the ABC's *Science Show* host repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence? Robyn Williams earned ridicule with his comment in 2007 that climate change could cause 100 metres of sea level rise by 2100

<http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/warming-williams-exaggerates-again/>

Journalist Andrew Bolt states, quote: "*Robyn Williams, host of the ABC's Science Show, is a shameless exaggerator of global warming*". According to Andrew Bolt's research, Robyn Williams exaggerates, by 100 fold the claim of his own guest whom he cited as apparent '*justification*' for his wild and unfounded claim. Robyn Williams exaggerates the unfounded claim of the corrupted UN IPCC by 169 times.

He contradicts empirical data on actual sea level rises that reveal that rates of sea level rise are falling. Based on actual rates of rise over the last two decades, sea levels in 100 years will be 3-5 centimetres higher, an inch or two. (Appendix 4a)

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/EvidenceForNoSeaLevelChange.pdf>

And:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378383912000154>

And:

<http://www.real-science.com/sea-level-data-corruption-worse-than-it-seems>

A recent episode of the *Science Show* broadcast on Saturday, November 24th, 2012 understandably triggered many letters of protest in the media and outrage from people across the community:

<http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/scienceshow/science-show-24th-novemeber-2012/4381750>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/11/breaking-skeptics-are-like-paedophiles-drug-robyn-williams-abc-time-to-protest/>

And:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/letters/sophistry-cannot-hide-corruption-of-values-in-abc/story-fn558imw-1226544756203>

And:

Perhaps an argument could be raised that the transcript's words by themselves reveal that Robyn Williams is not equating skeptics (of the view that human CO₂ caused warming) with paedophiles. Yet tone and context are often far more significant than mere words. Subtle intonation can reverse the meaning of phrases. The strength and hostility of reaction to his comments confirm that Robyn Williams managed in many

people's view to associate skeptics with paedophiles. At the very least he manages without any justification to question the integrity, morals and ability of skeptics.

Why is the ABC's supposed science reporter working with and quoting Stefan Lewandowsky whose work has been revealed by experienced statistician Steve McIntyre as deeply flawed and hopelessly wrong? (Appendix 9)

Why is ABC-Radio's Science Show contradicting empirical scientific evidence? Why has it never presented any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving human CO₂ was responsible for Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998?

Robyn Williams' behaviour as revealed by his own works leads to questions about the integrity, morality, ethics and competence of his work.

On Saturday, December 20th, 2012 *The Australian* newspaper summarised the significance of Robyn Williams' comments effectively, quote: “

Balanced coverage of contentious issues such as climate change is the very least we should expect from the ABC. Mr Newman is not the only listener who believes that the national broadcaster's imbalance is becoming more overt. The volume of correspondence to The Australian's Letters to the Editor section in recent weeks shows the corporation's coverage is widely mistrusted. Nor do we encourage the use of offensive language in debate; in our experience, arguments are more persuasive when made in simple, unadorned English.”

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/the-abc-lets-itself-off-the-hook/story-e6frf7jo-1226540718074>

The immediate past-Chairman of the ABC, Maurice Newman recently revealed that in his experience ABC coverage of climate is under the control of a clique, quote: “*I retain a deep affection for the ABC. But, like the BBC, there are signs that a small but powerful group has captured the corporation, at least on climate change.*

It is up to the board and management to rectify this.”

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/abc-clique-in-control-of-climate/story-e6frgdox-1226538612935>

Could it be that by stooping to such desperate tactics Robyn Williams is admitting that his position is unsound? If not, why does he not present empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving that HUMAN CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998? Given his contacts and the ABC's reach, that should be easy, shouldn't it? Why has he failed to do so in many years covering global warming?

The most telling condemnation of the ABC is by its own repeated omissions: it has never presented any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the claim it so cleverly, subtly and even outrageously peddles.

In my brief exchange of emails with Robyn Williams in March 2010 I provided him with detailed evidence of corruption of climate *science*. His responses were telling: he requested that I cease on the basis that he receives many emails each day. Where in Robyn Williams' behaviour is the journalist's curiosity and desire to uphold integrity? Does Robyn Williams condone and rely upon corruption of climate science?

6. Dr. Karl Kruszelnicki, ABC Science

Dr. Karl Kruszelnicki's broadcasts on ABC purport to discuss science. Although his broadcasts include many unfounded claims that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change) there is no evidence to support such claims.

Why does the ABC's *Science Show* host repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence?

7. Personal experiences with ABC reporter Wendy Carlisle

On June 21st, 2011 I received an email (through my website) from ABC reporter Wendy Carlisle. My reply was prompt and advised that due to my 93 year old mother being taken to hospital I could be called the next day.

Subsequent events are discussed in my analysis of the transcript of Wendy Carlisle's program '*Background Briefing*' in Appendices 13a and 13b available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13a_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingWorkingTranscript.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13b_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingNotes.pdf

My analysis includes frank views of others personally involved with Wendy. From my analysis I conclude that Wendy Carlisle engaged in propaganda supporting the government's position while avoiding her responsibility to investigate facts given her on pervasive corruption of climate *science* that underpins the government's position. I conclude that she seemed intent on smearing prominent climate realists.

I conclude that Wendy Carlisle seems to: (1) avoid discussion on empirical science; (2) avoid discussion on massive documentation of corruption in climate science that is the basis of federal government and UN IPCC positions; (3) is preoccupied with the mining industry; (4) is intent on smearing those sceptical of the government's position and/or having a different view; (5) fails apparently to hold advocates of the government's position accountable for their false claims and conflicts of financial interest while (6) subjecting climate realists to unwarranted scrutiny of personal affairs in an apparent attempt to discredit realists.

I conclude that in presenting her '*Background Briefing program*' Wendy Carlisle shows extreme bias and/or negligence in misrepresenting the position of those sceptical that human CO₂ impacts global warming or global climate. My conclusion is that her manner, approach and tactics fail to meet community needs for balance, integrity, openness, fairness and accuracy.

During my first conversation with Wendy I advised her that our conversations would be recorded.

Wendy Carlisle entered a Twitter discussion apparently siding with John Cook from Skeptical Science who failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence that HUMAN CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1308_JohnCookTwitter.pdf

Does Wendy Carlisle not understand that science's ultimate arbiter is empirical evidence?

The work of journalists such as Wendy Carlisle has, in my view, enabled the spread of bogus science to the detriment of Australia. Taxpayers fund her yet she is abetting the

fleeing of taxpayers via an unjust and unfounded tax driven by a political agenda. That the ABC specifically endorses and supports her work is deeply troubling. It raises questions as to whether the ABC is being politically manipulated by the government, senior management and/or a journalistic culture that disregards facts and fairness in pursuit of ideology and political agenda.

In my view, Wendy Carlisle's tactics raise serious questions about the ABC's role in modern Australian society. It raises serious questions about her show's producer and that area of the ABC. It raises serious questions about apparent absence of accountability within areas of the ABC.

As Jo Nova says, quote: *"No wonder the public is angry. The ABC will report irrelevant minor and incorrect minutiae of people who were not even on the Monckton tour, but can't find ten minutes to explain the independent scientist's arguments."*

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/07/this-is-not-journalism-wendy-carlisle/>

Please consider the ABC's focus on pseudo-science by broadcasting advocates of climate alarm such as: Tim Flannery repeatedly contradicting empirical scientific evidence and contradicting himself; Will Steffen serially misrepresenting climate science; and sloppy or unbalanced journalism from ABC reporters such as Wendy Carlisle. This seems to have burned the public and caused people to ask questions about the ABC and climate.

The ABC's overzealous misrepresentations and advocacy and its overuse of unfounded fear backlashes climate alarm. The ABC has proved that the public is smarter than the ABC and climate propagandists had assumed.

Sadly, Wendy Carlisle demonstrates through her conversations an implicit assumption that skeptics are dishonest and motivated by personal interests. It's a theme of her work and her conversation. For that she needs our compassion.

8. The ABC in general

The ABC shows apparent bias, tactics of belittling and/or discrediting those skeptical of the government's corrupted science and reluctance to present the views of prominent climate realists. This makes it difficult for scientists of the real world to present the public with empirical scientific evidence. In this way **the ABC has thereby prevented a debate on the science.**

Instead, the ABC provides a free ride for sensationalist advocates funded by government and relying on unvalidated computerised numerical models and/or other forms of corruption of science. The ABC has used taxpayer funds to misrepresent science to the public.

Why does it broadcast unfounded claims based on what is effectively little more than discussions among conference goers and clearly contradicting empirical science?

<http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/solid-foundations-of-alarm/>

All three 'facts' implied by the ABC broadcast discussed by Andrew Bolt are not only false, they wildly contradict empirical science. Why?

http://www.australianclimatemadness.com/2012/05/anu-death-threat-claims-debunked-the-australian/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=anu-death-threat-claims-debunked-the-australian

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/abc-climate-death-threats-reports-undermined/story-e6frg996-1226360656074>

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/green-left-climate-change-bias-easy-as-abc/story-e6frgdox-1226363902728>

Is the ABC fundamentally confused about the role of a news provider and/or the nature of science? Consensus is the realm of politics, not science. The latter relies on empirical scientific evidence.

Quote: "An ABC spokeswoman again defended its decision when asked if the APC adjudication meant the ABC might review it. "The ABC acknowledges there are climate scientists who question the core thinking about climate science. The ABC gives them . . . air time. The weight of our coverage, however, rests with the weight of the broad consensus, focusing on the extent of the impact of climate change and the speed and nature of human interventions required in response."

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/abc-sets-lower-standards-bar/story-e6frg996-1226540744470>

Sections of the ABC have helped spread corruption of climate science and mislead the public and members of parliament. They have avoided and even undermined presentation of empirical scientific evidence and discredited real scientists who present such evidence. In doing so the ABC has discredited science.

My comments supported with facts to ABC Producers have gone unheeded. My official complaint received a response in which the ABC absolved itself from taking responsibility for checking the validity of its interviewees.

The ABC is using taxpayer funding to abet the stealing of additional taxes by repeatedly broadcasting corruption masquerading as science.

Significant elements within the ABC have shown they are not working for the people of Australia nor in the people's interests.

Perhaps then ABC Chairman Maurice Newman was being timidly polite and constrained by ABC culture when he alluded to a need within the ABC for objectivity, particularly when covering climate. His speech was published in *The Australian* on March 11th, 2012: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/maurice-newman-speech/story-e6frg996-1225839427099>

Quote: *“Climate change is a further example of group-think where contrary views have not been tolerated, and where those who express them have been labeled and mocked. In his ABC Online blog last October Chris Uhlmann wrote a piece called in praise of the sceptics. “Climate science we are endlessly told is “settled”” he wrote. “But to make the, perfectly reasonable, point that science is never settled risks being branded a “sceptic” or worse a “denier”...one of those words, like “racist”, which is deliberately designed to gag debate...You can be branded a denier if you accept the problem and question the solutions.”*

And, quote: *“At the ABC, I believe we must reenergise the spirit of enquiry. Be dynamic and challenging – to look for contrary points of view, to ensure that the maverick voice will not be silenced. There should be no public perception that there is such a thing as an “ABC view” – we must be neither believers nor atheists but agnostics who acknowledge people have a right to make up their own minds.”*

Please note comments in two articles published by *The Weekend Australian* articles on Saturday, May 26th, 2012. Firstly, ‘Groupthink takes over at national broadcaster’ available here:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/media/groupthink-takes-over-at-national-broadcaster/story-e6frg996-1226367388769>

Secondly, ‘The world according to ABC has its own climate’:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/the-world-according-to-abc-has-its-own-climate/story-e6frgdox-1226367393192>

Watching and listening to ABC broadcasts it's easy to conclude that the ABC has a cultural bias toward advocating in favour of the unfounded claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. At times that appears to be entrenched groupthink. At other times it appears to be thoughtless blind or slavish acceptance of dogma. It appears at other times to be carefully calculated propaganda.

The ABC does broadcast programs hosted by journalists who question the so-called climate orthodoxy. These are tiny exceptions to the generally blind advocacy of the government's position that typifies the ABC.

On Monday, July 23rd, 2012 former ABC Chairman made a statement free from the shackles of ABC staff politics. He paints a grim picture revealing gradual, relentless and severe loss of freedom of speech in Australia:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/sound-of-silence-kills-free-speech/story-e6frgdox-1226432218279>

One wonders whether and to what extent his view is based on his experience working under a government pushing a position contradicting empirical science with complicity from cowed or supportive national broadcast staff?

It raises an obvious question: how can talkback radio hosts sneered at by Jonathan Holmes get it right yet the ABC funded by federal government get it so wrong, repeatedly? Why are the massive journalistic resources of the ABC impotent? Or worse, why are some blatantly advocating a pro-government position in contradiction of empirical scientific evidence and objective journalism and logical reasoning?

Why have so many ABC journalists failed to identify blatant corruption of climate science? Why have they spread the unfounded and unscientific claims of academic advocates contradicting empirical science? Why has the ABC become an agency spreading corruption of science using propaganda?

We need to demand resignations from the ABC management and journalist staff, particularly the investigative journalism staff.

As an aside, some are grateful to the ABC for its propaganda. Its exaggerations have led people to ask questions. Here's an email received by The Galileo Movement, quote:

*"Firstly, I don't describe myself as a "Climate Sceptic", as there is nothing to be sceptical about – this ongoing pseudoscientific fraud by the alarmists is pretty obvious to me. I describe myself as "**a recusant**" – a rarely-used legalistic term that originated in Elizabethan England to label "a person who refused to worship in the church of the new religion" (following the Reformation).*

I was motivated to get more involved in the Global Warming "debate" around about 2007 because of the ABC. I simply got sick of seeing the ABC TV News almost every night cite some new disaster that was going to result from "global warming", and while the news reader narrated the item, visual images of white CO2 billowing out of chimney stacks would flash onto the TV screen, followed by visuals of a few seconds of an iceberg collapsing into the ocean (as icebergs have a wont to do), instantly followed by a scene of parched & cracked earth in the outback with a desiccated animal skull thrown in for good measure, and then the ubiquitous shot of a polar bear floating away on an icefloe. My old man made sure that all of us kids got a good education, so of course I learnt many years ago at school (when they actually taught real science) that CO2 was a colourless & odourless gas. I got really upset when around about 2009,

one of the True Deceivers in the ABC's News Department decided to monkey around with the imagery even further and they started to show the billowing clouds of "CO2" silhouetted against the sun so that it looked black – you know, evil carbon black !!

I learnt something of the history of the 1930s while at school and it wasn't hard to recognise that the ABC's practiced use of deceptive images to push the global warming scare down the throats of their viewers was a technique taken straight out of the handbook for Josef Goebel's propaganda machine – the "Reichpresseamt". Like the average German in the 1930s, most Australians simply seemed to believe what they were being authoritatively told – especially the gullible and scientifically illiterate journalists of the mainstream media. What the ABC has done is simply unforgiveable.

I searched around for some organisation I could support that had taken up the fight, and at the time the only one I could find was the Lavoisier Society, which I joined and convinced a friend to do likewise. The Galileo Movement didn't appear on the scene for quite some time later, and if it weren't for the ABC's Background Briefing, I would probably not have heard of it !!

Anyway, I think that you guys & gals at Galileo are doing a great job – thank you."

People are awakening not only to climate corruption, they're awakening to groups like the ABC enabling and/or spreading climate corruption.

That's despite sceptics (paraphrasing a supporter) sometimes feeling as though we are farting against government funded thunder.

By destroying its credibility the ABC is hurting itself and its staff. It's hurting its audience and taxpayers.

That's similar to the situation now engulfing the BBC, another government-funded advocacy cloaked as a news provider.

The ABC's British sister and some Aussie cousins suffer the ABC disease

9. The BBC

The BBC has been repeatedly outed for biased reporting on climate. Many commentators have long seen it as a government propaganda arm, particularly under Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Gordon Brown vigorous advocates of CO₂ taxes and *trading*.

In November 2012 it was revealed that the BBC had previously used a *workshop* involving advocates of cutting CO₂ to develop its climate policy. Why does a supposed news provider require a policy on specific issues? Isn't its policy to report the facts without opinion and to label opinions as such? A policy of telling the truth would suffice.

When forced to admit the workshop had occurred the BBC initially implied it involved a group of top scientists. Later the group was revealed to be a combination of activists and vested interests. The BBC's credibility has been smashed. It seems clear that the BBC's bias is intentional and implemented deceitfully. On the topic of climate the BBC is not a news provider, it's a propagandist.

<http://principia-scientific.org/supportnews/latest-news/20-28-gate-bbc-crisis-deepens-in-exposure-of-rigged-and-unlawful-climate-policy.html>

Quote: "Since then the BBC relied on the findings of the meeting to block airtime to dissenters of global warming alarmism."

Quote: "revealed a list which the BBC cannot describe as a bunch of dispassionate scientists: it's a veritable who's who of the green lobby. So now we know the names, the remaining question is: why did the BBC feel it was so important to cover the identities up? Their official explanation — protecting journalistic sources — simply does not stand up."

<http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/2012/11/revealed-who-decides-the-bbcs-climate-change-policy/>

Wouldn't spending taxes to avoid openness indicate that BBC staff knew that what they did was wrong? Yet they did it.

Quote: "Now we can see that the meeting which was claimed to be with a policy-defining group of top scientists was, in fact, an activist jolly/propaganda exercise. And trying to hide this has cost the BBC a lot of money and face."

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/11/12/breaking-the-secret-list-of-the-bbc-28-is-now-public/#comment-1145539>

And:

<http://omnologos.com/why-the-list-of-participants-to-the-bbc-cmep-jan-2006-seminar-is-important/>

And:

<http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2012/11/13/quote-of-the-day.html>

And:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/12/08/the-bbc-and-climate-change-a-triple-betrayal-ho-ho/>

The connections broaden to include the Climategate scandal:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/11/27/climategate-2-impartiality-at-the-bbc/>

Quote: *“It was only last weekend that the BBC’s Environment Analyst Roger Harrabin and Dr Joe Smith of the Open University made headlines in the Mail on Sunday newspaper. This was because their jointly run - Cambridge Media and Environment Program – (CMEP) that had organised seminars at the BBC between 1996 and 2009 had been revealed to have received funding from the Tyndall Centre (UEA) from 2002 - 2006. These facts alone seem to be a significant conflict of interest that should concern the BBC Trust. The new emails reveal that not only was the CMEP being sponsored by the Tyndall Centre (UEA) to promote its agenda in the media, but at the same Roger Harrabin was on the Advisory board of the Tyndall Centre. --Barry Woods.”*

And:

<http://order-order.com/2012/11/13/the-list-of-names-the-bbc-did-not-want-you-to-see-scientist-exposed-by-climategate-set-bbc-policy/>

And:

<http://www.thegwpf.org/why-tyndall-sponsored-harrabinsmith-company/>

BBC bias on global warming is powerful. From the experience of renowned conservationist and naturalist David Bellamy the bias is either deeply rooted culturally or powerfully imposed:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2266188/David-Bellamy-The-BBC-froze-I-dont-believe-global-warming.html>

Quote: *“in 2004, and in the face of scientific convention and public opinion, he dismissed man-made global warming as ‘poppycock!’*

‘From that moment, I really wasn’t welcome at the BBC. They froze me out, because I don’t believe in global warming. My career dried up. I was thrown out of my own conservation groups and I got spat at in London.’

Quote: *“But it was his global warming comments in 2004 that really cut him adrift. The killer blow came when he was dropped by The Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts, of which he was president. ‘I worked with the Wildlife Trusts for 52 years. And when they dropped me, they didn’t even tell me.*

They didn’t have the guts. I read about it in the newspapers. Can you believe it? Now they don’t want to be anywhere near me. But what are they doing? The WWF might have saved a few pandas, but what about the forests? What have Greenpeace done?’”

Is the BBC’s core problem a bloated organisation with low or no accountability feeding on taxpayer funds shovelled initially from Tony Blair’s government to push propaganda?

<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/bbc-scandal-the-seeds-of-disaster-lay-in-a-bloated-management-structure-8306993.html>

Appendix 14 reveals more on control and manipulation of media pushing a political agenda.

The ABC could learn from an analysis of its British counterpart the BBC. The report is by respected journalist Christopher Booker. His review of the BBC entitled *'The BBC and Climate Change: a Triple Betrayal'* has a foreword by distinguished BBC writer, broadcaster and producer Sir Anthony Jay. It's available here:

<http://thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/booker-bbc.pdf>

The BBC earns a formal complaint from prominent British MP Peter Lilley:

<http://www.thegwpf.org/peter-lilley-complaint-regarding-bbc-newsnight-5th-september-2012/>

The BBC's bias seems systematic:

<http://climateréalists.com/index.php?id=10506>

Corruption in one area of an organisation spreads:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/bbc-boss-quits-over-shoddy-journalism-at-flagship-show-newsnight/story-fnb64oi6-1226514549323>

Could government funding be pushing media bias? Although that's likely, sadly in Australia the Fairfax media is widely seen as spreading biased climate nonsense through its flagship newspapers being the Sydney Morning Herald, The Age and to a lesser extent The Australian Financial Review.

10. The Sydney Morning Herald drags in persecuted religion and conspiracy

In August 2012 Sydney Morning Herald reporter Mike Carlton falsely smeared two prominent Aussie journalists, myself as a volunteer and the voluntary Galileo Movement. He falsely implied we're all anti-semitic. We're not. Both co-founders of The Galileo Movement are intimately connected with people of Jewish faith. Why did Mike Carlton drag a persecuted religion and race into climate? Why did he need to falsely smear people? Without any foundation he raised *conspiracy*: why? Why did he run from my email of March 8th, 2010 asking him for evidence and reasoning? Why does he resort to changing the topic? Why does he avoid accountability?

Appendix 14 explains standard responses of climate alarmists lacking evidence and reasoning. It reveals methods typically used to discredit people whose view differs. Exploring Mike Carlton's outburst below reveals and illustrates significant lessons. It reveals methods reporters can use without any evidence and contrary to facts to trigger panic and shut debate. Are those valid goals for a news reporter?

This section discusses one of Australia's most cherished newspapers bringing a major religion into the climate debate. That religion has been horribly and murderously persecuted and decimated for centuries. The newspaper article's prominent journalist did so with no grounds and in contradiction of facts.

All major religions share common values. All contain zealots contradicting those values. Why would one of Australia's most prominent newspapers seek to make this a religious issue?

The fact that a prominent SMH journalist—Mike Carlton—can fabricate material involving a major religion and use it to falsely imply smears against two prominent and widely respected journalists and a volunteer group fails to meet people's needs for integrity, accuracy and a fair go. That the volunteer group's co-founders are closely connected with that same religion is deeply disturbing and sounds an ominous threat to all religions, all Australians and our nation.

The need by some people to resort to fabrications and smears often reflects a desire to control. In turn, beneath control there is always fear. The actions of Mike Carlton and his younger colleague Ben Cubby could point to pain and desperation. For that we need to extend our compassion.

Events provide a revealing insight into the power wielded by those who have the privilege to publish their words widely. They triggered what seems possibly to have been panic in a prominent and highly respected journalist trying to distance himself from their smear. That behaviour reveals the power of misrepresentations through possible hurt and fears that they trigger in some people.

For those who want a quick factual response, it's available here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/IsTheGalileoMovementAnti-Semitic.pdf>

Details and a chronology of events follow.

On Monday, July 30th, 2012 Ben Cubby, Environmental Reporter for the Sydney Morning Herald (SMH), contacted The Galileo Movement's volunteer Paul Evans. Ben Cubby writes on global warming (aka climate change) and follows the Galileo Movement on Twitter. He requested that someone comment on a paper by American Richard Muller et al and secondly on a paper by Anthony Watts et al. Both papers had been released just days earlier.

The Galileo Movement readily accepted and Ben Cubby called me. Early in our conversation I advised Ben Cubby that our conversation and interview was being recorded. He agreed and admitted that he does not record interviews. Instead he relies only on notes made as he converses.

The transcript of our interview is here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/ROBERTS,Malcolm-InterviewWithBenCubby-30July2012WorkingCopy2.pdf>

From the tone and words of Ben Cubby's comments during our first unrecorded phone conversation in which I agreed to be interviewed and during the interview itself I gained the impression that he thought Richard Muller's paper was a game-changer and would be fatal to the core sceptic argument. Ben Cubby initially advised that the interview would need only ten minutes or so. We concluded after 48 minutes had elapsed.

During the interview it became clear that Richard Muller's paper is no threat to the sceptic view. Instead, it introduced the opportunity to discuss massive corruption of climate science.

Ben Cubby seemed to feel uncomfortable as topics continually returned to discuss corruption of the climate *science* that he has peddled publicly to millions of people. During our conversation I raised corruption 27 times, with most instances in the first half of our conversation about the *science*.

Please note that I discussed solid empirical evidence to support my points.

The transcript doesn't convey Ben Cubby's tone as his storyline disappeared under the weight of my evidence and my advice on corruption. It seemed that he wanted to push the line that Muller's paper was the death-knell of climate scepticism. As the transcript reveals, my facts reversed that for him. Ben's apparent initial story angle was dashed.

Prior to publishing his story Ben Cubby checked it with Jo Nova whom he had interviewed after I provided him with her contact details. He did not give me the same opportunity to check his story.

Ben Cubby's article was published the day after our interview, Tuesday, July 31, 2012:
<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/climate-sceptics-unmoved-by-scientists-aboutface-20120730-23a6s.html>

His article ignored massive corruption of climate science that I'd mentioned 27 times and supported with credible detailed information. He ignored facts I presented on Muller et al and Watts et al. We spent more than half our 48 minutes discussing the science. His article swept it aside.

Unable to headline and proclaim the death of climate skepticism his article discussed a point I made in response to his requests for motives driving corruption of climate science. He latched onto my comments about international bankers. They were in answer to his question as to the motives driving the corruption. Note that his article omitted the first four motives I mentioned and six of the eight motives I mentioned.

When I touched on the highly significant UN Agenda 21 aligned with the international bankers' push for global governance Ben Cubby said he didn't have time to discuss it. Yet he requested information about the motives driving climate alarm.

Ben Cubby admitted during our interview that he knew little about the UN IPCC. He admitted he did not know of Maurice Strong. Yet Ben Cubby is supposedly the SMH's Environmental reporter and writer on global warming. Despite his profound ignorance on a core topic he has been chosen to push the SMH's unfounded and biased climate reporting onto hundreds of thousands of people.

Soon after on Saturday, August 4th, 2012 the SMH's Mike Carlton tried to write a funny article about the Olympics. To that he tacked two pieces. His article is here: <http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/anthems-to-stir-the-common-man-20120803-23knh.html>

In his article's third and last item he involved media personalities Andrew Bolt and Alan Jones. Quoting Mike Carlton: "*Australia's very own Galileo Movement of crackpot deniers (patron Alan Jones, booster-in-chief Andrew Bolt) fears that evil forces are at work. The Galileo manager, Malcolm Roberts, assured the Herald's environment editor, Ben Cubby, this week that climate science had been captured by "some of the major banking families in the world" who form "a tight-knit cabal"*".
End of quote.

Note from Mike Carlton's article that he then went on to fabricate an unfounded and false smear and raised a religion that has been persecuted horrifically in recent centuries. Mike Carlton raised the terms, quote: *conspiracy* and *international drug trade* and *starting both world wars* and some *protocols*.

Note that I never raised these items in my interview with Ben Cubby. Yet Mike Carlton smeared me by falsely associating me with these topics that he raised and introduced into Australia's climate discussions.

For those who want a quick factual response, it's available here: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/IsTheGalileoMovementAnti-Semitic.pdf>
And here: http://www.galileomovement.com.au/restoring_morality_justice.php

Note that although The Galileo Movement has no political or religious affiliation. Both co-founders are intimately connected through their families with the Jewish religion. John Smeed's wife Suzi is a survivor of the holocaust. She was two years of age when liberated from a NAZI concentration camp.

That begs the question, "*why did Mike Carlton raise these items and why did he raise a religion whose adherents have been murdered by horrific persecution*"?

Could it be because he's defeated on climate? On March 8th, 2010 he ran from me when I held him accountable for false statements he made during our email exchange.

Could it be, as seems likely, that Mike Carlton raised religion to smear The Galileo Movement because he lacks empirical scientific evidence for his unfounded belief?

As a result apparently of Mike Carlton's article it becomes more interesting. Andrew Bolt has been prominent in Aussie media in recent years. He's been rightly and bravely outspoken on global warming and on supporting freedom of speech. In the last twelve months our federal government has unfairly bashed him. He's been criticised heavily by the Fairfax press. Reportedly he's received death threats.

An associated contemporary event is of interest. During the subsequent week, on August 14th, 2012 Andrew Bolt issued an apology to well known and much liked cartoonist and columnist Larry Pickering. His apology was for abandoning Larry. It's here:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/on_2gb18/

He said, quote: "*On 2GB tonight, **fear of being sued again made me disown Pickering more than I should have, for which I apologise. He has a courage that shames the many journalists who have run dead on this scandal.***"

<http://lpickering.net/item/16736>

Later, in an update, Andrew Bolt qualified his apology, quote: "*On 2GB tonight, fear of being sued again made me disown Pickering more than I should have, for which I apologise. He has a courage that shames the many journalists who have run dead on this scandal. (UPDATE: Then again, he does print stuff that I find offensively personal, and also unfairly speculative if not outright untrue.)*"

Could it be that around August 2012 Andrew Bolt was suddenly very sensitive? Or was he rattled? Was he scared of flak after unfair court action following his brave public stance protecting freedom of speech?

In an email Andrew asked one of The Galileo Movement's co-founders, Case Smit for an explanation of a reference to me in Mike Carlton's article. Case had previously invited Andrew Bolt to be part of the Galileo Movement's advisory group and had readily agreed to join the list of Galileo Movement advisers.

Case Smit forwarded Andrew Bolt's email to me. Although I knew Case Smit was travelling outback my respect for him required me to reply to him and not directly to Andrew Bolt whom I've never met.

After eventually receiving Case's approval I forwarded the email directly to Andrew.

Andrew Bolt published his first blog post on Sunday, August 5th, 2012 without confirmation from The Galileo Movement. Mike's Carlton's fabrication and implied smear seems to have caused Andrew to be deeply concerned and rushing. That's somewhat understandable. Is it though justifiable?

Andrew Bolt's email to Case Smit asking for an explanation of comments publicly (and falsely) attributed as mine. It's provided in the chronology of correspondence and events available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1309_AndrewBoltEmails.pdf

In the meantime and before receiving a reply to his email, Andrew Bolt published his blog falsely accusing me of raising religion.

Why did Andrew Bolt give credence the Mike Carlton's unfounded fabricated smear by repeatedly referring to the Galileo Movement?

Did Andrew Bolt think that he had to do something quickly to distance himself from Mike Carlton smear of Andrew Bolt, Alan Jones, The Galileo Movement and me? That's for readers to decide. I don't know what's in Andrew Bolt's mind. I don't know his needs.

I know that Alan Jones was made aware of Mike Carlton's falsely implied smear. He didn't flinch. He's been smeared repeatedly by people who amass far more power than does Mike Carlton.

My response to Andrew Bolt's public unfounded comment about The Galileo Movement and me was posted on Andrew Bolt's blog:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/happy_to_help_those_who_ask_but_not_people_who_peddle_this/PO/

When Andrew Bolt replied by email asking for names of international bankers my direct response to Andrew provided the names of six international banking and financial interests. I labeled four as most prominent and stated that one had apparently been absorbed into the first-named financial empire during the late nineteenth century. I named two banks as being less powerful than the first four.

Thus I named six financial institutions. Of these, four are American, one German and one headquartered in the City of London.

I added the comments, quote: *"Others whose names I've forgotten. If you want more names of major international bankers please advise and I'll check my references tomorrow."*

I added, quote: *“By the way, Andrew, you do know don't you that Dr. Megan Clark, CSIRO Chief Executive was a director of Rothschilds Bank Australia and is now on the Advisory Board of a major American international bank?”*

Again, as with my interview with Ben Cubby, my response to Andrew Bolt and my email listing major bankers I did not name any specific religion. That's because I see that as irrelevant.

The following day Andrew Bolt fabricated his second blog post on me:

He said, quote: *“On now receiving an email from Malcolm Roberts, I've sent this reply: Malcolm, Your conspiracy theory seemed utterly stupid even before I knew which families you meant. Now checking the list of banking families you've given me, your theory becomes terribly, shamefully familiar. Two of the three most prominent and current banking families you've mentioned are Jewish, and the third is sometimes falsely assumed to be. Yes, this smacks too much of the Jewish world conspiracy theorising I've always loathed. Again, I insist: remove me from the list of people you claim are prepared to advise you. I've never advised you, Malcolm, and would never want to. I am offended to be linked to you. Andrew Bolt”*

Why didn't Andrew Bolt publish my email to him?

For a man upset about Mike Carlton raising a specific religion that has been horribly persecuted for centuries I wonder why Andrew Bolt raised the same religion. Could it be coincidence? Or, as Andrew Bolt revealed in his blog on Larry Pickering, was it fear?

I wonder why Andrew Bolt reinforced Mike Carlton's raising of *conspiracy theory* yet falsely attributed it to me despite the fact that I never used the words in my interview with Ben Cubby. Nor did I ever imply those words.

(Appendix 14 details no secret conspiracy. Although minutes of meetings of small groups pushing global governance are withheld from the media and the public, it's open knowledge that the groups meet and that they are led by prominent international bankers.

Andrew Bolt has shown dexterity in handling numbers during his highly effective and accurate blogs exposing corruption of climate *science*. I'm wondering why his blog about The Galileo Movement and me said that I only provided names of three bankers, not six. I wonder why Andrew Bolt stated that two of his three are of a religion he raised. Yet I had never mentioned their religion since to me that is irrelevant. Why did he imply that identifying their religion as something I did?

I'm wondering why he did not state that four of the six names I gave him are American.

Shhh, Don't tell my wife and kids. They're dual American-Australian citizens.

My response to his blog update was prevented from being published. That's despite my response being respectful, calm and truthful. Does the champion of free speech in Australia think that some speech should be censored?

A few months later Andrew Bolt posted this item on international bankers
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/is_the_carbon_tax_great_just_ask_the_banker_at_your_table/

Quote: *"What a curious way for Julia Gillard to sell a tax - even to businessmen - which we were originally told was needed simply to save the world from disastrous overheating:*

International carbon markets will cover billions of consumers this decade. Ask the bankers at your table whether they want Australia to clip that ticket. We're going to help them get their share.

Hmm. That explains why so many bankers are global warming preachers, too. Think of those billions! Those tickets to clip! That share of the dosh!"

Andrew Bolt has done remarkably courageous work protecting free speech in Australia. Yet it seems that he did not want his readers to hear my views. In my experience it is so easy for humans to want to control others. Whether that be as parents trying to control teenagers or as teachers controlling students or managers controlling their people or as ... journalists making hurried false statements, quite possibly in fear of reprisals as a result of someone like Mike Carlton falsely implying potentially embarrassing claims.

If not so deeply worrying for free speech and for religion, it would be farcical.

Andrew Bolt correctly said early in his public statements that he has never met with or spoken to me. I wonder why he did not mention that I have given him material by email and for that he has thanked me in writing.

He has my contact details including phone numbers yet never bothered calling to check whether Ben Cubby and Mike Carlton had reported accurately and fairly.

In my mind, two points arise:

- With no justification Mike Carlton fabricated a smear on Alan Jones, Andrew Bolt, The Galileo Movement and me. Why?
- Andrew Bolt rushed to separate himself from Mike Carlton's smear and in his rush made many uncharacteristic factual errors and in the process misrepresented the facts and misrepresented The Galileo Movement and me.

Another point is that it seems even courageous journalists can be shut down by smears such as those from Mike Carlton. That reveals how serious is the situation in Australia It confirms the fears for the survival of democracy so effectively and powerfully articulated by Canadian Mark Steyn and Briton James Delingpole. To protect our democracy and our personal freedoms we need take heed.

On Saturday, August 27th, 2011 I participated in a street protest supporting Max Brenner's Hot Chocolate Café in Southbank Brisbane. The business is an Israeli company and protesters were protecting free speech and acting to thwart actions of anti-Israeli protesters attempting to shut the store. Does Mike Carlton understand? Does he care?

The need to smear is a form of control. Could it be that Mike Carlton is afraid that The Galileo Movement, Andrew Bolt and Alan Jones are being successful in exposing the climate scam?

After being roped into an email exchange that I'd not requested, I asked Mike Carlton on March 8th, 2010 for justification of his comment and claims. He failed to provide any. Instead he abandoned reason and provided insults before leaving.

Jo Nova writes of those who smear others: *"Got no evidence? Can't hold a rational discussion? Just call people names – smear them."*

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/08/compulsive-namecallers-nutter-conspiracy-theorist-anti-semitic-denier-trying-to-censor-through-denigration/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/06/how-green-is-your-bankster-bank-of-america-spends-50-billion-to-save-the-world/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/06/global-carbon-market-hits-176-billion-in-2011/>

Such smears can have lasting consequences and lead to other misrepresentations when taken out of context as a result of Mike Carlton's fabrication and Andrew Bolt's rush:

<http://www.desmogblog.com/andrew-bolt-cuts-ties-climate-science-denying-galileo-movement-over-alleged-anti-jewish-conspiracy-theory>

And:

<http://watchingthedeniars.wordpress.com/climate-sceptic-conspiracies/profile-the-galileo-movement/>

And:

<http://www.vexnews.com/2012/08/red-faced-fairfax-enviro-editor-ben-cubby-shamed-after-repeating-anti-semitic-climate-groups-false-claims/>

It's ironic that VexNews makes so many errors in its article.

And:

<http://skygodsvsusearthlings.blogspot.com.au/2012/08/is-galileo-movement-or-is-climate.html>

And:

<http://denyingaids.blogspot.com.au/2012/09/aids-and-climate-change-are-all.html>

And:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/09/10/the-daily-lew/>

And:

<http://watchingthedeniars.wordpress.com/2012/09/10/a-cabal-of-bankers-and-sister-souljah-lewandowsky-versus-the-extreme-sceptic-fringe/>

And:

<http://www.independentaustralia.net/2012/environment/bolting-like-lightning-from-galileo-movement/>

And:

<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskySouljah.html>

Sadly, Ben Cubby's damaging work is not his first error.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/cut-paste/smh-eco-hero-who-uncovered-anz-funding-hoax-should-come-out-of-his-cubby-house/story-fn72xczz-1226549834788>

Some years ago I realised the significance of people make value judgments about another person instead of simply documenting facts and observations. The significance is that onlookers learn more about the speaker than the subject. Given the company and demeanour of the preceding collection of sites and their failure to provide empirical scientific evidence readers can decide for themselves.

After one of Ben Cubby's tweets he was asked by a volunteer from The Galileo Movement to provide empirical scientific evidence for the claim that HUMAN CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998. Ben Cubby provided the name of a reference paper. That paper contains no such evidence. Advised of that Ben Cubby sent another reference. That contained no such evidence. Ben Cubby sent another. That failed. This continued until Ben had sent seven references. All failed to contain empirical scientific evidence that HUMAN CO₂ caused ATMOSPHERIC warming. Ben's tweets fell silent.

It seems that Ben Cubby doesn't know what empirical scientific evidence means. Yet he proclaims climate *science* to hundreds of thousands of people. His articles apparently trigger unfounded alarm about climate and humanity. It's no surprise that almost seven of every ten respondents to an SMH online survey by over 23,300 respondents voted that they're scared of claims in an article by Ben Cubby:

<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/where-even-the-earth-is-melting-20121127-2a5tp.html>

On Monday, December 24th, 2012 I entered an email exchange with Ben Cubby. I requested that for each of the references he provided to The Galileo Movement's volunteer, he identify the specific location of the empirical scientific evidence he claims. He declined.

Soon after publishing their lengthy articles on Richard Muller's work Fairfax papers pulled the articles from public view:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/08/major-australian-dailies-disappear-the-muller-conversion-article-ops-404-error/>

When the SMH jumped on board the Richard Muller ride did it fail to do its due diligence?

http://www.truthnews.com.au/web/radio/story/mullergate_a_muddled_professor_who_meddled_with_the_media

Richard Muller's earlier paper had failed the peer-review process. Volunteers at The Galileo Movement knew that. Why didn't Ben Cubby who is presumably paid to do research?

During my interview Ben Cubby requested further information including contact details for Professor Tim Ball. Ben Cubby had promised to contact Tim Tall. To date, he has failed to do so. Is Ben Cubby not interested in learning about science and climate?

It's clear that, like some ABC journalists, Ben Cubby is misinformed on climate and has failed to do his due diligence. Yet he's the SMH's reporter on the environment and climate.

Ben Cubby tweeted on Sunday, December 30th, 2012 after apparently flying across Australia by jet:

"Ben Cubby @bencubby

There are a lot of toyota landcruisers in Perth. Like other fossil fuel-dependent desert economies i guess."

Should Western Australia now be called Middle Eastern Australia?

A volunteer at the Galileo Movement reports, quote: *"Ben Cubby: I have just finished watching the Cubby interview, and the last question is a beauty. Cubby asks Monckton (in Jan 28 2010), if global warming was to continue rising, at what point would Monckton consider revising his opinions? With our benefit of hindsight we ought to ask Cubby, given that the observed data shows NO global warming, at what point will the alarmists consider their opinions are no longer valid?"*

Yet Ben Cubby's articles are cited by citizens as proof that human CO₂ caused global warming. That's despite the fact that he provides no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning of such causation and despite the fact that his cited reference similarly fails.

Perhaps that question need be asked of the SMH Editor and Fairfax Board. The SMH is part of the Fairfax press group. Its three main newspapers tend toward socialism/government control and actively push a biased pro-AGW line and tend to ignore real climate scientists. Their circulation is dropping. The group is in dire strife.

The irony is that Ben Cubby is paid by a collapsing newspaper group yet is being exposed by a few volunteers that he prodded. Yet volunteers relying only on truth and empirical scientific evidence exposing him.

Always, beneath control is fear. Whatever their other possible varied motives—fear, malice, sensationalism, ... expediency—Mike Carlton, Ben Cubby and Andrew Bolt provide valuable experience in leading to Appendix 18.

What are the SMH's advertising and other sources of revenue from government?

The behaviour of Ben Cubby, Mike Carlton and some prominent ABC journalists raises another question: Are universities and schools of journalism driving media bias?

One newspaper standing out by its willingness to publish both sides of the debate is *The Australian* and its environmental reporter Graham Lloyd and Editor-In-Chief Chris Mitchell.

Their editorials and opinion pieces rebut unfounded wild claims by the Climate Commission. They provide a platform for scientists such as Bob Carter and Ian Plimer who work in the real world as distinct from peddlers of unvalidated and erroneous computerised numerical models. The Australian fulfils the newspaper's role. Is that the reason it's been a target of the national government? Without *The Australian* one wonders whether skeptics would've been able to emerge victorious.

An interesting comparison here of the treatment of CSIRO news by *The Australian* compared with SMH:

[http://forum.weatherzone.com.au/ubbthreads.php/topics/1128026/Re Interesting news articles a](http://forum.weatherzone.com.au/ubbthreads.php/topics/1128026/Re_Interesting_news_articles_a)
[http://forum.weatherzone.com.au/ubbthreads.php/topics/1128026/Re Interesting news articles a](http://forum.weatherzone.com.au/ubbthreads.php/topics/1128026/Re_Interesting_news_articles_a)

(Refer to post by PG headed *How Fairfax reported it:*)

Reportedly journalist Paul Sheehan is able to think for himself. After reading Professor Ian Plimer's book he reportedly changed from supporting or being neutral on human causation of global warming to becoming a sceptic.

11. Conclusions

Arguably the UN IPCC's most senior contributor claiming human CO₂ caused global warming is an Australian, David Karoly. His advocacy for cutting CO₂ output and his misrepresentations and false claims on climate are frequently broadcast by the ABC. Yet in his responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence for his claim that human CO₂ caused global warming he failed to provide any such evidence and failed to provide logical scientific reasoning of causation. Given the ABC's many investigative journalists why was this not discovered and exposed by ABC reporters?

The ABC has never broadcast any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998

My conclusion is that the behaviour of prominent ABC journalists has left the ABC and its management open to serious charges of bias and even to abetting corruption of science. The apparently poor or non-existent level of scrutiny speaks poorly of the ABC's level of journalistic integrity. It appears groupthink is rampant. It seems likely that some ABC journalists and programs are active advocates pushing the government's position and corrupting science and misrepresenting real scientists as part of ABC advocacy.

A formal independent inquiry is needed into the ABC's biased reporting of, and advocacy for, unfounded and at times false claims that human CO₂ caused warming. The inquiry needs to receive depositions and supporting evidence under oath.

An inquiry is needed to determine whether or not the ABC's failure to present objective balanced coverage involved collusion and is systematic. It needs to investigate whether or not such bias is cultural and/or tied to government funding. It needs to discern whether the bias is ideologically driven and extends to associated political topics such as the UN's push for global governance under UN Agenda 21 (Appendix 14) and the environment.

The ABC cannot be trusted on climate. Why should we trust it on other science or environmental issues? We should not. Until journalistic integrity is restored to the ABC we need to dismiss the ABC when it broadcasts on topics such as the Great Barrier Reef, marine parks, fisheries, sea levels and other topics used by the campaign to install UN Agenda 21.

As taxpayers we cannot afford to fund campaigns designed to cede national sovereignty and curtail personal liberty.

We need to beat deceit by supporting humanity not insanity.

As a result of CSIRO's prominent public advocacy and unfounded endorsement of the UN IPCC, I conclude that the media has been misled. Many journalists have knowingly or unintentionally misled the public, voters and politicians. The media in general has failed. It has betrayed the public's trust.

Important elements of Australian media are biased in favour of advocating for cutting human CO2 output. This investigation of media bias explains its perpetration:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PpBW6Tx2bGs&feature=player_embedded

Media bias involves material the media reports and, significantly, material it omits to report.

In general when reporting on global warming, Australian mainstream media journalists have failed their responsibility to their nation, to Australians, to their profession and to humanity.

Richard Heinlein's quote is appropriate though: *"Do not assume malice when an explanation of stupidity is sufficient."*

This is more than an issue of accuracy, integrity and fairness. It goes to the heart of freedom:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/where-free-speech-is-dead-as-the-dodo/story-e6frgd0x-1226541451689>

That will be explored in detail in Appendix 14. It reveals individual freedom is under serious threat in Australia. Appendix 14 reveals more on methods used to control the media and to control public perception.