

Date published: Monday, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
Latest update:

## APPENDIX 13b

### REVIEW OF ABC-RADIO *BACKGROUND BRIEFING* EPISODE BROADCAST ON SUNDAY, JULY 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011

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

Program transcript is available here:

<http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/the-lord-monckton-roadshow/2923400#transcript>

Audio recording of program is available here:

[http://mpegmedia.abc.net.au/rn/podcast/2011/07/bbg\\_20110717.mp3](http://mpegmedia.abc.net.au/rn/podcast/2011/07/bbg_20110717.mp3)

The numerically keyed program transcript is presented in Appendix 13a available here:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13a\\_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingWorkingTranscript.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13a_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingWorkingTranscript.pdf)

Its superscript numbers are keyed to notes below.

#### Summary of transcript analysis:

Creating or implying likely misrepresentations by omission and/or unfounded association = 22

False statement = 18

Ignoring key arguments countering the position taken by Wendy Carlisle = 6

Sweeping inaccurate catch-all generalization based on personal value judgment = 2

Questionable or dubious comment including likely false statements = 2

Errors in transcript = 22

None materially significant

**Total = 50**

(Excluding errors in transcript)

That's an average of one breach of audience trust per program minute despite ABC reporter Wendy Carlisle talking only part of the time.

### **Notes on transcript of ABC-Radio National's *Background Briefing* episode broadcast on Sunday, July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

This review is followed by transcripts of my phone conversations with Wendy Carlisle, comments on our email exchanges and comments by others who had agreed to be contacted by her.

Superscript numbers identify notes specific to each section of the annotated transcript. The numbers are keyed to the transcript. Figures below in parentheses (x:xx') denote elapsed time in minutes and seconds during broadcast.

<sup>1a & 1b</sup> (Radio National website introduction). Two errors. The Galileo Movement is far from mysterious. Prior to launch it openly and comprehensively declared itself on its website page entitled '*Who We Are*':

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who\\_we\\_are.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who_we_are.php)

The Galileo Movement is not a force behind Viscount Monckton. The Galileo Movement was invited to help arrange Viscount Monckton's tour yet declined due to other priorities.

<sup>1</sup> (1:32') Contempt for the ABC was strong from speakers and from the crowd. There was appreciation for some newspapers and Sydney AM talkback radio.

<sup>2</sup> (1:36'), (1:49') Viscount Monckton's strongly English accent seems to suddenly lapse briefly into an Australian accent. Has the ABC confused its tapes?

<sup>3</sup> (2:41') The Galileo Movement is aiming to kill the carbon dioxide tax by restoring scientific integrity through exposing the corruption of climate science. That is stated clearly on the website page Wendy Carlisle visited. I repeated that to her during our conversation. Why does Wendy Carlisle make her false statement that misrepresents and smears The Galileo Movement?

Wendy Carlisle had advised during our telephone conversation on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011 that she had visited The Galileo Movement's web site page entitled '*Who We Are*'. My personal Declaration of Interests has been accessible there since the web site's inception. As have The Galileo Movement's purpose, philosophy, principles, values and strategy.

The Galileo Movement states clearly on its website page entitled '*Who We Are*', available at [http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who\\_we\\_are.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who_we_are.php), quote:

**“Purpose and Aims of the Galileo Movement:**

**to expose misrepresentations pushing a 'price on carbon dioxide'**

**The Galileo Movement seeks to protect Australians and our future in five areas:**

- **Protect freedom** - personal choice and national sovereignty;
- **Protect the environment;**
- **Protect science** and restore scientific integrity;
- **Protect our economic security;**
- **Protect people's emotional health** by ending Government and activists' constant destructive bombardment of fear and guilt on our kids and communities.

[Page top](#)

**Addressing the real threat:**

**We address those five areas in four ways:**

- **Exposing UN IPCC misrepresentation** of science, climate and Nature;
- **Presenting real-world science** and advocating for scientific evidence as the basis of policy;
- **Revealing economic damage** from needless additional taxation burdening people already reeling under high and rising costs of living;
- **Revealing environmental damage** of bureaucratic control taxing and 'trading' carbon dioxide.

[Page top](#)

**Philosophy and Principles:**

We see human freedom as essential for the benefit and progress of humankind and for protection of the environment. Freedom is the key to responsibility and sustainability.

With Earth's large human population, **environmental sustainability is essential for modern civilisation while civilisation is essential for sustainability**. Instead of choosing either civilization or sustainability the reality is each needs and depends on the other.

**Guiding Principles:**

Governance and management of the Galileo Movement is guided by

these principles:

- **Freedom:** protect freedom and let people be free. Challenge the increasing imposition of Government control on people's lives;
  - **Honesty:** rely on factual data, ensure decisions are based on facts;
  - **Fact based science:** protect and use science, a key to human progress, objective and fair decisions and freedom;
  - **Respect for people:** give people opportunity to speak up. Engage people so they want to be involved and are committed. Such people become owners. Give people a voice and provide a forum. It has been made politically incorrect, unfashionable and fearful to publicly state disagreement with the hypothesis that humans cause global warming. Convert that to an opportunity to take pride in speaking out. It's OK to tell the truth. To factually express dissenting views is admired and valued;
  - **Environment:** protect the environment. Separate political claims of global warming from the environment as two (2) separate issues;
  - **Non-political:** The Galileo Movement is non-partisan. We want to appeal to all political parties;
  - **Life enjoyment:** Life is for living and enjoying
- Intimidation through fear and guilt has been the weapon spreading climate alarm. People have a right to be free from that unfounded fear and guilt. Hundreds of millions of the world's poor have a right to environmentally responsible prosperity. Developed nations have earned the conditions for people to have easier lives in harmony with the natural environment. The developed world's progression to liberal democracy has provided the privilege of opportunity for full life enjoyment. The push to restrict human production of carbon dioxide is deadly with negative life-changing implications. Our campaign is serious. We aim to replace the fear and guilt heaped on us by reconnecting with life's inherent joy. We can have some fun.”

<sup>4</sup> (2:54') This is a completely false statement. The Galileo Movement has no members. It has two co-founders who work voluntarily. It has a small group of volunteer staff that are mostly part-time. Its donors are almost entirely individuals who donated relatively small amounts. It has a number of Independent Advisers comprising largely eminent, respected scientists supplemented by advisers in the media and law.

Presumably Wendy Carlisle's false statement is referring to climate science advisers who are accessible by The Galileo Movement. When establishing The Galileo Movement's website, some scientists listed on the site preferred to be listed as advisers accessible to The Galileo Movement. Some expressed their fear that if they were formally associated with a sceptic group they could be prevented from accessing scientific resources. They have always remained independent and at times some have suggested differing views on various matters. The Galileo Movement cherishes this since healthy, respectful dissent is at science's core.

<sup>5</sup> (3:00') The Galileo Movement's co-founders invited Alan Jones to be patron for many reasons: he has the courage to tackle big challenges; he's intelligent; he speaks his mind, he values accuracy; and he's extremely generous with his time supporting worthy causes, charities and voluntary community groups. Alan Jones has freely declared that he is the group's patron. He has even indicated his pride at being involved since the start of the group's public activities. He has shown his support for the group at public rallies. One wonders why Wendy Carlisle casts such apparently negative aspersions.

<sup>6</sup> (3:40') According to his and other readily available public statements Viscount Monckton has done much more than advocate one measure for people with HIV. He has displayed his enormous and profound sadness at the failure of governments to meet the challenge of HIV and to restrict the condition spreading.

<sup>7</sup> (4:06') No mention was made by Wendy Carlisle of Viscount Monckton's subsequent expression of regret for doing so. Why not?

<sup>8</sup> (5:28') Viscount Monckton made it clear that his rage is directed at pseudo-scientists who have applied unscientific methods to corrupt science and to contradict empirical science in an attempt to fabricate a non-problem.

<sup>8a</sup> (5:46') In his email dated July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011, The Climate Sceptics Party's Tony Cox advised me of his understanding and opinions, quote: "*Lord Monckton's tour after his Perth obligations was arranged and funded by The Climate Sceptics [TCS]. No speaking fee was offered or paid to Lord Monckton [LM] by TCS. The original plan was to give LM a tent and a sleeping bag and a painted thumb so he could hitch-hike between venues. After due reconsideration TCS put up funds to allow LM to have a roof over his head and transport between venues. Those funds were produced by a whip around from TCS members and I think Leon Ashby, TCS president, sold a couple of heifers. No coal industry money.*

*Anyway Ms Carlisle was shown every courtesy during her fact-finding expedition at Newcastle but still managed to get basic facts wrong. For instance Malcolm Roberts was NOT the MC, local ex-ABC DJ, Garth Russell was.*

*Nor does Ms Carlisle mention that Dr David Evans accompanied LM and Jo Nova to Newcastle. Dr Evans helped set up the Department of Climate Change computer models and was once a believer in AGW but is now a sceptic. Part of the original plan*

*was to also tour Professor Ross McKittrick with LM but funds did not extend that far; Leon did not sell enough cows.”*

In his email dated July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011, Climate Sceptics Party President Leon Ashby advised me of his comments and opinion, quote: “... *the Fact that despite Wendy Carlisle did speak to me about the tour the day before the Newcastle meeting to get the venue correct and I explained that most of the effort was done by the Climate sceptics.*

*In her report we did `t get a mention as to our real role nor the fact that it was our members putting up the funds for the majority of the tour something easily clarified if she wanted to know.*

*In fact since she spoke to me so she could find out where the meeting was, she must have known The climate sceptics were the organisers of that event in Newcastle.”*

Andy Semple volunteered to organise some of Viscount Monckton’s east coast venues and accommodation. In his email dated July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Andy advised me of his comments and opinions, quote: “*And I can confirm that I told her the same thing (Climate Sceptics sponsored the LM tour) when she interviewed me at Norths.*

*Obviously I gave her nothing she could use...I threw back questions to her questions so she gave up on me. All she was really interested in was trolling for negative stuff to say about Cory Bernardi...”*

What effort did Wendy Carlisle make to ask the organisers after I provided her with their contact details? Having been approached to organise the national tour, The Galileo Movement declined due to other priorities. It’s well known that Viscount Monckton’s national tour was organised by a combination of volunteers who scrambled and cooperated to arrange venues, transport and accommodation. It’s called a voluntary people’s initiative and movement.

Preceding comments by Leon Ashby and Andy Semple are disturbing. They’re consistent with other comments by Wendy Carlisle and by those she contacted. Why are unfounded implied doubts fabricated about Viscount Monckton and why is his tour falsely implied by Wendy Carlisle to be attributed to, quote “*a mysterious group called the Galileo Movement*” when she was advised about the tour’s real sponsors and organisers? Could it be that because The Galileo Movement’s purpose is to restore scientific integrity to the climate *debate* and expose pervasive corruption driving the CO2 tax, people pushing the tax fear The Galileo Movement and needed to discredit?

<sup>9</sup> (9:52’) Rather than address climate science, Wendy Carlisle raises a furphy. Could that be to discredit skeptics and/or to lend authority to climate alarmists? Possibly and quite likely. If so, it further emphasizes that climate alarmists lack evidence to substantiate their claim about human CO2.

<sup>9a</sup> (9:52’) Reportedly Naomi Oreskes has become infamous in scientific circles as the *Queen of Doubt*. A discussion on Naomi Oreskes’ tactics is available here: <http://joannenova.com.au/2011/07/this-is-not-journalism-wendy-carlisle/>

<sup>10</sup> (10:09’) Yet even in topics where science fails to prove a supposition, empirical

scientific evidence can often disprove that supposition. That is the case in the theory that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming: there is no empirical scientific evidence supporting the claim yet there is much empirical scientific evidence disproving the core claim.

<sup>11</sup> (10:48') (No colour highlighting.) What a surprise! The ABC presents someone with a mining and geological background who apparently supports the core claim about human CO<sub>2</sub>. Often, it seems, the ABC makes connections with the mining industry seemingly to imply unvalidated assertions discrediting skeptics.

<sup>12</sup> (10:58') Just in case the audience missed Naomi Oreskes point avoiding empirical scientific evidence on climate, Wendy Carlisle emphasizes.

<sup>12a</sup> (11:12') According to SEPP's Executive Vice-President Kenneth Haapala, these topics were discussed, quote: "*with emphasis on the inadequacy of the science*".

<sup>13</sup> (11:25) These are unrelated topics. The Galileo Movement was created conceptually and discussed publicly in September, 2010. The idea to form The Galileo Movement was born after the ABC and other media avoided reporting Viscount Monckton's first national tour in 2010. According to the founders, it's urgency was accelerated when it became clear that Prime Minister Julia Gillard and Deputy Prime Minister Wayne Swan would break their clear promise to not implement a tax on CO<sub>2</sub>. The Galileo Movement's ACN was obtained in February, 2011 and domain names secured in November, 2011.

Why did Wendy Carlisle associate these unrelated points? Is she implying association? If so, why? And on what basis? My understanding from the founders is that the reluctance of the media, and especially the ABC, to cover the first newsworthy tour of Australia by Viscount Monckton was the catalyst for their formation of The Galileo Movement. Did she ask anyone from The Galileo Movement about the organisation's formation and timing? To my knowledge she failed to ask that basic question. During our conversation she didn't ask me despite knowing that I'm The Galileo Movement's voluntary Project Leader.

<sup>14</sup> (11:36') Is this a grammatical error or a deliberate misrepresentation by Wendy Carlisle? Well before his statement Alan Jones was invited by The Galileo Movement's co-founder John Smeed to be patron. Alan Jones did not declare himself the patron.

<sup>15</sup> (11:38') Is this another grammatical error or deliberate misrepresentation. The co-founders had long beforehand chosen the name (The Galileo Movement). Alan Jones had nothing to do with the naming. Nor did Alan Jones' listeners name The Galileo Movement.

<sup>16</sup> (12:15') This is a false statement. Viscount Monckton is not a member of The Galileo Movement. His name is the last listed as an **Independent** Adviser. The Galileo Movement's Project Leader, Malcolm Roberts, was separately invited to be emcee for three functions in which Viscount Monckton participated including a public rally in Sydney's Hyde Park that was addressed by many speakers. Those functions had two different organisers. Are Wendy Carlisle and the ABC trying to falsely connect The Galileo Movement with Viscount Monckton and/or his tour organisers?

<sup>17</sup> (16:46') Jo Nova says nothing about putting science on trial. She clearly states that public debate is needed on the science. Jo Nova specifically distinguishes science without debate as akin to business without competition and to a trial without defence. She separates scientific assessment as based on debate separate from court trial. Is Wendy Carlisle misleading ABC listeners by sowing this unfounded thought so they misconstrue Jo Nova's words?

<sup>18</sup> and <sup>18a</sup> (17:10') and (18:06') Is Wendy Carlisle effectively implying confirmation of the idea she sowed before Jo Nova's comment and now bracketing Jo Nova's statement to reinforce what seems to be Wendy Carlisle's unfounded implied assertion? Why did Wendy Carlisle ask her question in this manner? This is more like an unfounded implied misrepresentation. Jo Nova was clear in her preceding argument. In subsequent questioning by Wendy Carlisle, Jo Nova further clarifies by stating clearly that the science needs to be debated publicly and then, quote: "*in as much as it relates to public policy*" the public policy needs to be settled in the town square. Jo Nova even states that she does not think science should be settled by a public debate, quote: "*No, I think we need much better than that*". Then Wendy Carlisle brackets Jo Nova's clear comment with her own comment that Naomi Oreskes says science isn't a matter of public opinion. Yet despite the benefit of hindsight and editing, Wendy Carlisle opened and then littered this segment with what could be easily seen as sloppy or misleading her listeners. Why?

<sup>19</sup> (17:53') Jo Nova mentions a key point ignored by Wendy Carlisle.

<sup>20</sup> (23:30') Dr. Wes Allen advises that his reading of the paper on polar bears reveals that Viscount Monckton is correct. Quoting Dr. Wes Allen: "*I did read the paper on polar bears and found that Monckton was correct and Wendy was wrong*".

<sup>21</sup> (23:36') Self-explanatory. Please see preceding note 20.

It seems Wendy Carlisle may have some difficulties with facts of a more basic nature. In her email to me on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Wendy Carlisle stated quote: "*Polar Bear populations increasing in warmer regions of the Antarctic*". My reply included, quote: "*Firstly, there are no polar bears in Antarctica. Could it be that the penguins cleaned them out?*"? One has to have some fun.

Polar bear numbers reveal the bears are thriving:

<http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/190805/20110802/polar-bear-global-warming-extinction-climate-change-research-world-wide-fund-wwf-geological-survey-s.htm>

And:

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/healthy-polar-bear-count-confounds-doomsayers/article2392523/>

And:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/scientist-who-helped-galvanise-action-on-climate-change-under-investigation-for-misconduct/story-e6frg6so-1226104033788>

<sup>22</sup> (24:46') The ABC relies on Greenpeace. Yet on the topic of climate science Greenpeace has contradicted empirical science and reportedly is a significant factor in corrupting science for UN IPCC reports.

<sup>23</sup> (24:55') False statement.

<sup>24</sup> (25:58') Viscount Monckton discussed the contribution of two ice sheets, Greenland and West Antarctica. Why did Wendy Carlisle use UN IPCC projections for total sea level rise?

This page in the UN IPCC's 2007 report may explain Viscount Monckton's comment: [http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch10s10-6-5.html#table-10-7](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch10s10-6-5.html#table-10-7) Specifically, Table 10.7, its middle scenario (A1B) show sea level rise to 2099 with Greenland supposedly 8 centimetres and Antarctica minus 2 centimetres for a combined total of 6 centimetres.

The UN IPCC itself declares massive uncertainty around estimates of sea level rise from these regions. The UN IPCC presents data in a way that is not easy to interpret. The UN IPCC has a record of contradicting empirical evidence and fraudulently corrupting science.

It's pleasing to see someone in the ABC admit that Al Gore is exaggerating. Why did Wendy Carlisle not aptly describe Al Gore's exaggeration as enormous?

<sup>24b</sup> (26:07') Retiree Case Smit, co-founder of The Galileo Movement advised me subsequently on what he had advised Wendy Carlisle during her interview of him, quote: *"When Wendy interviewed me, she seemed principally concerned to prove that the Galileo Movement was funded by big business of some sort or other. I told her that the bulk of our funds came from individuals and that we were not getting any substantial funding from any organisation. Also, that our funding is confidential and that many of our donors prefer it that way."*

<sup>25 & 26</sup> (26:10') (26:13') Both false. The Galileo Movement nowhere states it has a 'board' of 'scientific advisers'. In response to her question during our phone conversation I personally explained to Wendy Carlisle that quote: *"those people that we've listed I think you'll find that we've listed them as advisers in many fields that we can contact for advice and guidance. They're not actually part of The Galileo Movement"*. Further, The Galileo Movement's website page entitled 'Who We Are' ([http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who\\_we\\_are.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who_we_are.php)) was referred to by Wendy Carlisle in our phone conversation during the period when she was gathering information. She had visited the page. The Galileo Movement's donors are almost entirely individuals making donations of the order of \$100-\$200. One pensioner donated \$500. Few donors donated more than \$500. Some donations may be from small business. No donations have been received from wealthy magnates or entrepreneurs or large corporations. Given the fear of persecution it's clear that although many business leaders are skeptical on the supposed *science* driving unfounded climate

alarm they dare not be seen to be involved or even supportive. The number of donors making donations of more than \$100 is quite small.

The Galileo Movement has provided the preceding information when requested. We do not though disclose names of donors as it does not have their permission to do so. One wonders why Wendy Carlisle raises this and states it in the way she has.

<sup>27</sup> (26:19') David Archibald is not in The Galileo Movement. He is an independent external adviser. This is explained on the website page Wendy Carlisle said she visited. I explained it to her personally by phone on Thursday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011.

<sup>28</sup> (27:15') David Archibald is a competent and respected scientist, a geologist. He has shown accurate analysis and presentation of empirical science and made well-founded forecasts based on empirical evidence. The Galileo Movement does not assess scientists according to their gender, age, race, employment, religion, affiliations, business interests or other similarly subjective factors. The Galileo Movement assesses people's contribution based on their scientific method and competence, particularly their use of scientific process and empirical evidence.

Why does the ABC repeatedly use '*scientists*' with clear financial interests in advocating on behalf of government policy while corrupting climate science? Why does the ABC not disclose those *scientists*' obvious financial and other personal interests and in particular the their funding by government? Is Wendy Carlisle seeking to imply dishonesty or bias in David Archibald who makes a successful living based on his application of science in the commercial world where accuracy is rewarded? Why does Wendy Carlisle not mention that David Archibald's work on climate is voluntary and that as a geologist he has profound knowledge of Earth's past climate variation?

<sup>29</sup> (28:58') This is a reasonable question given the topic. Why does the ABC not ask academic advocates supporting the government's position about their funding and reliance on government funding? Did the ABC ask their frequent guest, Tim Flannery about his personal financial interests in alternative energy?

<sup>30</sup> (30:38') Why did Wendy not discuss David's key motivator and the valuable contribution David Archibald is making to the debate?

<sup>31</sup> (32:24) He has repeatedly disclosed that he is the patron of The Galileo Movement.

<sup>32</sup> (34:15') When scientific peer-review has been documented as corrupted, why does Wendy Carlisle not check the quality of Tim Ball's work and the respect with which he is held among climate scientists operating in the real-world outside computer models? Was the work of Albert Einstein formally peer-reviewed? Galileo Galilei's? Nicolaus Copernicus'? Did Wendy Carlisle check my advice to her on corruption of climate science and peer-review? Why did her program not discuss massive documented corruption of peer-review? Has Wendy Carlisle checked the comments of Tim Ball exposing UN IPCC corruption of science? Does Wendy Carlisle not understand that Tim Ball relies on science's ultimate arbiter: empirical science? There is no greater authority than this?

Does Wendy Carlisle not know of Tim Ball's real-world experience in the natural environment and in advising governments of all levels? Why does she rely on a criteria made infamous by the UN IPCC, the organisation that simultaneously drove corruption of *scientific peer-review* and prevention of *scientific peer-review*?

<sup>33</sup> (36:28') Fred Singer is an accomplished and internationally eminent scientist. In his review of Naomi Oreskes book, Norman Rogers says, quote: "*Subtle distinctions are not welcomed by the ideological groups. If you acknowledge that smoking cigarettes causes cancer, but then you dare to say that the hazard presented by secondhand smoke is exaggerated, you are tagged as a supporter of cancer. If you say that the case for man-caused global warming is full of holes you are tagged as an agent of fossil fuel companies. Very few scientists are brave enough to take the heat and personal attacks the come from standing up to junk science. Fred Singer has been doing it for a long time. In his late 80's, he is still writing scientific papers and traveling the world giving lectures. Oreskes is a promoter of junk science and for that reason cannot abide Fred Singer. Singer is her favorite punching bag. His name appears dozens of times in Merchants of Doubt.*" Norman Rogers' article, dated June 07, 2011 is available here: [http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/naomi\\_oreskes\\_conspiracy\\_queen.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/naomi_oreskes_conspiracy_queen.html)

Is Wendy Carlisle being sloppy or deceitful? Does she not know the difference between active smoking and passive smoking or does this comment indicate she is deceitfully smearing Fred Singer?

Fred Singer has raised questions about the absence of empirical evidence in work linking passive smoking to cancer. I have heard Professor Singer personally publicly advise an audience against smoking. He does not smoke. Is Wendy Carlisle aware of Fred Singer's career and achievements? They're readily available publicly. Here's a summary:

Siegfried Frederick Singer is an American atmospheric physicist and climate physicist. Singer is Professor Emeritus of environmental science at the University of Virginia, specializing in planetary science, global warming, ozone depletion, and other global environmental issues. He serves as Distinguished Research Professor at George Mason University.

He was the first Director of the US National Weather Satellite Service, where upon his leave he received a Gold Medal for Distinguished Federal Service. He served five years as Vice-Chairman of the US National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmospheres.

In 1964, Fred Singer became the founding dean of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences at the University of Miami.

In the 1950s, Fred Singer was Director of the Center for Atmospheric and Space Physics at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Fred Singer was Director of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Washington Institute for Values in Public Policy, Chief Scientist at the United States Department of

Transportation from 1987 to 1989 and Deputy Assistant Administrator for the United States Environmental Protection Agency from 1970 to 1971.

He is internationally respected for his ability, values, integrity and personable approach. He has contributed to the UN IPCC. He is an outspoken and accurate critic of the UN IPCC's politicisation.

He has published more than 400 technical papers in scientific, economic and public policy journals and is author or editor of more than twelve books and monographs

Fred Singer has also been a consultant to the USA House of Representatives Select Committee on Space, NASA, GAO, NSF, AEC, NRC, DOD (Strategic Defence Initiative), US DOE Nuclear Waste Panel, the US Treasury, and the state governments of Virginia, Alaska, and Pennsylvania, and to various industries including GE, Ford, GM, Exxon, Shell, Sun Oil, Lockheed Martin and IBM.

Fred Singer is an internationally eminent professor, a genuine environmentalist, ecologist, climate scientist and respected physicist. He is a real scientist who deals in hard data measured and observed in the real world. He is a UN IPCC expert science reviewer. Together with other eminent climate scientists, including other UN IPCC scientists, Fred Singer wrote an outstanding report entitled *Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate*. Please refer in particular to pages iv-vi of the NIPCC's summary for policymakers available at:

[http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC\\_final.pdf](http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf) He has had a distinguished career in government administration under both main political parties in America.

More on Fred Singer's public statements on smoking are available here:

<http://bunyipitude.blogspot.com.au/2011/07/wendys-wonderland.html>

Why is Wendy Carlisle relying on someone lacking a strong scientific education to smear a distinguished scientist with a proven record over many decades and with the courage to protect scientific integrity?

Is Wendy Carlisle aware that according to Elaine Dewar in her seminal book entitled *'Cloak of Green'*, quote: "*WWF Canada was actually run for its first ten years by executives seconded to it from Rothman-Pall Mall Canada, a subsidiary of the South African-owned tobacco giant, Rothman International. This mirrored events at WWF International. The founder of Rothman International, Rupert Anton, joined the board of WWF International in 1968. He and his company provided funds and personnel to run the international organisation in Switzerland just as the Rothman's subsidiary in Canada did for WWF Canada*"? (page 334)

<sup>34</sup> (38:42') False. This casts doubts on Naomi Oreskes comments. Ben Santer has reportedly admitted to singlehandedly contradicting and reversing the scientific conclusion of UN IPCC scientists in their 1995 report. In manufacturing the UN IPCC's Chapter 8 the original draft submitted by Santer read, "*Finally we have come to the most difficult question of all: 'When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of*

*human-induced climate change occur?’ In the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in the Chapter, it is not surprising that the best answer to this question is, ‘We do not know.’” This was changed by Santer to accommodate the SPM to read, “The body of statistical evidence in Chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points toward a discernible human influence on global climate.” Why did Wendy Carlisle not check Naomi Oreskes’ false statement about an event that has been widely reported publicly?*

Fred Singer has a reputation for scientific integrity and respect for people. I find it difficult to believe that Fred Singer attacked Ben Santer personally. Given the change in her voice when discussing Fred Singer one wonders whether Naomi Oreskes is obsessed with Fred Singer. That seems a distinct possibility according to Norman Rogers:  
[http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/naomi\\_oreskes\\_conspiracy\\_queen.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/naomi_oreskes_conspiracy_queen.html)

Why is the ABC citing and relying on an author of junk science to smear a renowned scientist? See here:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/06/oreskes-clumsy-venomous-smear-campaign-busted/>

And by Fred Singer:

[http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/science\\_and\\_smear\\_merchants.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/06/science_and_smear_merchants.html)

<sup>35</sup> (39:10’) Fred Singer is a staunch and well informed advocate of science who has courageously and vigorously exposed extensive corruption of science by the UN IPCC for many years. His passion is clearly to protect science and to ensure the scientific method is followed in order to protect science’s credibility. Why is the ABC smearing Fred Singer who understands that one of the first duties of a real scientist when presented with a claim is to be sceptical until the claim is proven? Fred Singer is one of many eminent climate scientists who knows that there is no evidence supporting the claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> production will cause catastrophic global warming or climate change.

<sup>36</sup> (39:14’) False. It is the subject of scientific investigation and debate.

<sup>37</sup> (39:22’) False. Fred Singer is a strong follower of scientific method. He is staunchly scientific in his approach as proven by his rewards and achievements. His character in challenging corruption of science has not endeared him to advocates of ideologically driven positions and policies that contradict empirical science and are not in accord with scientific reasoning. He is known for his strong yet respectful position and his integrity.

<sup>38</sup> (44:36’) (47:27’) As the program subsequently reveals, Viscount Monckton previously explained his position clearly and apparently accurately. Why, subsequent to the interview of Viscount Monckton did Wendy Carlisle introduce the topic in a way that seems to misrepresent Viscount Monckton? Is Wendy’s approach objective? Truthful? Fair? Reasonable?

<sup>39</sup> (44:40’) This seems shameful. By evidence presented later in the program Wendy Carlisle had, prior to the broadcast, been made aware by Viscount Monckton that the BBC had edited his original comments and in doing so removed his key qualifying

statements. Why did she introduce the documentary in this way? Technically, she may be correct in presenting unedited the excerpt from the documentary, yet in doing so she implies that the comment itself was unedited when that, according to Viscount Monckton is false.

<sup>40</sup> (44:48') (45:38') (45:44') (45:59') (46:14') (47:14') Why did Wendy Carlisle repeatedly ignore and seemingly misrepresent facts apparently presented to her personally by Viscount Monckton? Was Wendy Carlisle trying to smear him in an attempt to undermine his integrity in her audience's eyes?

<sup>41</sup> (45:44) (46:03') (46:06') (46:14') (46:22') (46:29') Why did Wendy Carlisle repeatedly interrupt Viscount Monckton's answers to her questions?

<sup>42</sup> (47:35'") Does being a climate sceptic imply a lack of integrity and/or competence and/or intelligence? What is the purpose of this statement? Given the facts and the empirical evidence, surely a person with a scientific approach is likely to be sceptical.

<sup>43</sup> (47:53') Viscount Monckton learned about Wendy Carlisle first-hand and came to the same conclusion as did many of the people to whom I introduced Wendy Carlisle. The common factor is not climate scepticism. The common factor is Wendy Carlisle's apparent intent, manner and goal. Others and I perceive her lack of integrity as revealed by her own tactics and conduct.

### **General Comments:**

Wendy Carlisle fails to refute sceptics' scientific data. Her primary focus instead appears to be trying to smear sceptics directly and indirectly by association or implied association.

Viscount Monckton understands the difference between anecdotal evidence and scientific evidence. Viscount Monckton long ago identified the corruption of climate science by the UN IPCC and others funded by national governments pushing a policy to cut human CO<sub>2</sub> production. He has since vigorously pursued the UN IPCC. The same cannot be said of Wendy Carlisle.

I introduced Wendy Carlisle to the corruption specifically and in detail. Contrary to her undertaking given in our phone conversation she apparently failed to honour that. Based on comments from those who spoke with her I wonder whether she deliberately avoided discussing corruption of climate science and instead tried to smear those exposing corruption.

I conclude that Wendy Carlisle interfered with the public's right to discover that our taxes are funding corruption of climate science. I conclude Wendy Carlisle acted as an advocate pushing a view supporting the government's corrupt policy. This is not the role for an ABC journalist, is it?

Abuse of taxpayer funds is cause for concern. Yet it's reassuring that despite the ABC's enormous resources it has failed to refute the empirical scientific evidence relied upon by genuine sceptics. The ABC has failed to contradict the massive documented corruption of science exposed by sceptics. More tellingly, the ABC has failed to discuss and broadcast the empirical scientific evidence and documented massive corruption of climate science as raised repeatedly by sceptics. Why?

Wendy Carlisle's one-sided approach against sceptics is remarkable. It may hurt genuine scientists such as Tim Ball gallantly and honestly protecting science yet her tactics reveal clearly she cannot refute the two fundamental cores of the sceptics' argument:

- There is no empirical evidence supporting the claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> needs to be cut while there is much empirical evidence refuting the claim; and,
- There is massive corruption of climate science at the root of the false claim about CO<sub>2</sub>.

Wendy Carlisle seems to find it unusual that Viscount Monckton is not aware of the funding and organisation of his tour. Yet my understanding is that climate realists came together spontaneously when they learned of his visit. Volunteers emerged to organise venues in their region. The ABC seems incapable of understanding that sceptics operate on scarce funds, much cooperation, open information sharing and a growing band of volunteers passionate about protecting science and our way of life. Among our most valuable assets are our reliance on empirical science and reliance on truth.

Instead of disparaging sceptics of the claim about human CO<sub>2</sub>, why doesn't the ABC actually analyse their empirical data and their qualifications. Why doesn't the ABC investigate alarmist claims compromised and tainted by conflicts of financial interest?

There are instances during the program when Wendy Carlisle introduces a topic or person in ways that contradict what she had seemingly learned in her actual prior conversations from the same person. Were those instances sloppiness or was Wendy Carlisle deliberately misrepresenting the person and/or topic to create a false impression in the audience's mind prior to introducing the person or topic? This is a tactic used by propagandists who understand that it is difficult to shift a first impression.

Wendy Carlisle was formerly with ABC-TV's '4 Corners' program. Did she learn her tricks there? If so, can '4 Corners' be trusted? Or is Wendy Carlisle a product of the ABC culture? If so can the ABC be trusted?

Prior to Wendy Carlisle's broadcast on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 the ABC responded by email dated July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 to Viscount Monckton's complaint. The ABC expressed confidence that as Wendy Carlisle was one of its most experienced investigative journalists she acted with integrity. Is that the ABC's format for an inquiry?

The same statement was used in the ABC's response dated July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 to my communication. ABC Radio's Michael Mason, Manager Radio National & Group PD, stated that the ABC had rigorous pre-broadcast standards and controls. Are we to conclude that Wendy Carlisle's bias is therefore systematic and/or intentional?

Are taxpayers aware that the ABC is using propaganda methods to discredit those opposing the government's policy?

From the program and from my emails with Wendy Carlisle and her responses I conclude that the ABC applies different standards to climate realists compared with advocates who seem to not face scrutiny.

On July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 The Galileo Movement's website received the following message from a man named Paul Xxxxxxx, quote: *"Message: Dear Galileo-I have just made a small PayPal donation to your organisation. I learnt of its existence from a snide reference to it in an email I received from ABC Radio National today notifying that their next "Background Briefing" program will be about Christopher Monckton. Below is a copy of a "Comment" I have just made on the Background Briefing website-I will be surprised if the ABC actually posts the comment.*

-----  
*Dear Background Briefing - your email today (15/6/2011) providing advance notice of your next program ("The Lord Monckton Roadshow") asks the question: "...who are the forces behind him?", and goes on to answer by stating: "Chief amongst them a mysterious group called the Galileo Movement...". I had never heard of this "mysterious group" until I received your email, so I did an internet search and had no trouble finding all the information you need about them - the link is: [http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who we are.php#A](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/who_we_are.php#A). Their website provides a comprehensive statement of their policies & objectives as well as details of the founders of the group and a listing of the scientists who support their views. There doesn't seem to be much of mystery to me! I sincerely hope that the producers of your program don't debase the ABC's credentials by trying to put forward some sort of conspiracy theory painting Monckton and "the forces behind him", (as you put it), as some sort of agents from the dark side. The government's Carbon Dioxide Tax package will cause the single biggest economic restructuring of the Australian economy in 100 years. The whole issue is extremely divisive and a lot is at stake for a lot of people in the private sector. The Australian public expects the ABC to provide a balanced analysis of such issues and not take a partisan or advocacy approach-and that includes Radio National. Are you with us on this?"*

**Transcript of phone conversation with Wendy Carlisle, 4:22pm on Thursday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011**

Yellow highlighting denotes significant comments for use in conjunction with ABC-Radio's *Background Briefing* program transcript.

Wendy Carlisle was made aware on details of the corruption of climate science and at her request was given access to scientists and analysts who can speak to the documented corruption of climate science. Yet she apparently failed to follow through on this. Instead, it seems she tried to discredit these scientists.

I referred her to links on The Galileo Movement's web site for discovering the corruption of science. She said she'd be back in touch.

In answer to Wendy Carlisle's question about The Galileo Movement's purpose, I advised her, quote: *"The Galileo Movement was formed only for one purpose and that's to stop the carbon dioxide tax and to stop it in a way that stops it forever so that it doesn't keep coming back in some other guise. And that means that we're going to essentially restore scientific integrity and truth to climate science because it's loaded with corruption at the moment"*.

In answer to Wendy Carlisle's question about scientists and others listed on The Galileo Movement's website, I advised her, quote: *"those people that we've listed I think you'll find that we've listed them as advisers in many fields that we can contact for advice and guidance. They're not actually part of The Galileo Movement."* And, quote: *"they're just a list of people that we can access for information"*.

Wendy Carlisle was advised that some Australian climate scientists sceptical that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming have faced severe personal repercussions for their stance.

Wendy Carlisle expressed interest in exploring that to learn more, quote: *"I'd be interested to know specific data that they're asking for that they're not being allowed access to I mean and what were the reasons."*

I explained that The Galileo Movement is almost entirely voluntary. (It is now entirely voluntary). I explained I'd been researching the claim of global warming due to human CO<sub>2</sub> for four years as a volunteer and that my wife and I had sold assets to fund my research.

Wendy requested examples of the corruption I'd discovered. My responses discussed: (1) the UN IPCC itself, (2) only five reviewers endorsed the claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused warming and that contradicted statements from Prime Minister Kevin Rudd that four thousand scientists supported the claim, (3) that in 1995 even the UN IPCC scientific report said that there is no evidence of warming due to human CO<sub>2</sub> yet the UN IPCC's 1995 political report contradicted that, (4) UN IPCC guidelines require scientists' reports to be changed to suit the political report, (5) corruption of the scientific peer-review process, (6) the UN IPCC Chairman repeatedly falsely stated publicly that the UN IPCC relied on 100% peer-reviewed science, (7) Wendy confirmed that she would like to talk with John McLean, Tim Ball, Dr Vincent Gray and as many people as possible to learn about the corruption of climate science, (8) the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO<sub>2</sub> contains no empirical scientific evidence for such a claim about human CO<sub>2</sub> supposedly driving climate, ...

Wendy Carlisle said she'd be investigating the corruption I raised in our conversation. She expressed appreciation for my offer to send many scientists for her to contact.

Despite my voluntary position as The Galileo Movement's Project Leader, Wendy failed to contact me for an interview. I wonder why? Was it because she knew that I would record the interview? Perhaps it was because she knew that I would hold her accountable for her subsequent email statements and errors and hold her accountable for the supposed scientific basis of her questions.

**Wendy Carlisle called me at 4:22pm on Thursday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011. Here is a transcript of our conversation.**

Malcolm Roberts, answering phone, quote: *"Hi Wendy?"*

Wendy Carlisle, quote: *"Yes"*.

Malcolm: *"Great"*.

Wendy: *"Look, I think I said in the email that I'm sort of researching a story on the carbon tax and the opposition to it."*

Malcolm: *"Yes"*.

Wendy: *"and I've come across The Galileo Movement and I'm just sort of ringing around, I'm still researching this story so I'm just talking to people on background which means I'm not quoting anyone, it's off the record and I'm not recording um just to make that clear."*

Malcolm, quote: *"That's OK, I record it because I just want to keep track of what I say."*

Wendy: *"Sure, sure. So look obviously if I was going to record an interview we're obliged to tell people at law anyway so that's pretty straight up and down. But anyway, in the first instance I'd just like to ring people and sort of help me understand you know, what the story is, and **why people are doing what they're doing** and all that stuff"*.

Malcolm: *"OK"*.

Wendy: *"So and then I was reading about The Galileo Movement and I read that you had been appointed the Project Leader or for want of a better word"*.

Malcolm: *"Project Manager. Yeah. Titles don't bother us."*

Wendy: *"Yeah, (giggle) "*

Malcolm: *"Oh by the way that's a voluntary position, it's not paid"*.

Wendy: “Yeah, well I did read your thing that you put up about it. So what is it that you’ll be doing? What are the activities (Wendy’s telephone ring tone interrupted her.) You’ll just have to ignore that”

Malcolm: “It doesn’t worry me if you want to get it”.

Wendy: “No, it’s fine I’ll leave it. Yeah so what does The Galileo Movement do, because there’s a list of people on it who are obviously very well known, and so what are those people’s role? People like, you know, Professor Singer and Professor Lindzen and you know, very well known names who are international names. Are they going to be coming out here to Australia or what, how does that work.”

Malcolm: “To answer your first question, Wendy, The Galileo Movement was formed only for one purpose and that’s to stop the carbon dioxide tax and to stop it in a way that stops it forever so that it doesn’t keep coming back in some other guise. And that means that we’re going to essentially restore scientific integrity and truth to climate science because it’s loaded with corruption at the moment. Now, to answer the second part of your question those people that we’ve listed I think you’ll find that we’ve listed them as advisers in many fields that we can contact for advice and guidance. They’re not actually part of The Galileo Movement. One of the things we noticed when we talked with some of these scientists, and for example you mentioned Lindzen and he mentioned a couple of Australian scientists to us that are on that list and he said ‘I’m very surprised that they will be joining the movement’. And I said well no they’re not joining the movement. He said that’s good because he said the way things are in Australia some of those people will be cut off from access to information if they’re tied up with a movement that is sceptical on the science. So ...”.

Wendy: “The scientists that you’ve listed?”

Malcolm: “Yes. Some of them. And I’ve confirmed that by talking to them. So ...”

Wendy: “Will be cut off?”

Malcolm: “Will be cut off from access to information. Yes.”

Wendy: “What sort of information?”

Malcolm: “Information to data, access to data, ...”.

Wendy: garbled.

Malcolm: “Sorry?”

Wendy: “What kind?”

Malcolm: *“Oh, scientific data, weather data, climate data. It’s quite scary what’s going on. So those people to answer your question, they’re just a list of people that we can access for information”*.

Wendy: *“So they’re saying that ... so would they be able to talk about that?”*

Malcolm: *“I can if you’d like to, I can ask them but I wouldn’t say that without their permission.”*

Wendy: *“Yeah, sure.”*

Malcolm: *“Would you like me to contact some of them?”*

Wendy: *“Yeah. Yeah.”*

Malcolm: *“OK”*

Wendy: *“I mean I’d be interested to know specific data that they’re asking for that they’re not being allowed access to I mean and what were the reasons. I mean I don’t know. They’re sort of alleging retribution in some kind are they?”*

Malcolm: *“Yes and that’s well known in climate science around the world. That if you take a sceptical position your career can be terminated, your funds can be cut off, research funding. That’s very well known. So you want permission to discuss with them the type of data and other?”*

Wendy: *“Well I’d be interested to know what evidence they’ve got”*.

Malcolm: *“OK”*

Wendy: *“So anyway and so what do you see your role as doing?”*

Malcolm: *“Mine personally, Malcolm?”*

Wendy: *“Yeah”*.

Malcolm: *“Essentially being the public face of The Galileo Movement, being accessible to the media, coordinating activities, and providing some of the rigour I suppose behind the actual data we’ve put up on the web site. I’ve been researching this for about close on four years, Wendy, what I’ve done is essentially withdrawn from paid work, we’ve been living off selling assets my wife and family and I and all I’ve been doing is apart from some things with the family I’ve been researching climate science and getting to know people and I’m quite alarmed at what’s going on.”*

Wendy: *“And what is it that strikes you, I mean what were the pieces of science that you felt that were fraudulent or corrupt I think was the word that you used? What was corrupt?”*

Malcolm: “*There are many. From the very start of the IPCC. What I did was I’ve been responsible in my paid work as an employee in the past for people’s lives based on my knowledge of atmospheric gases and literally responsible for people’s lives in statutory positions And so when I started hearing this about carbon dioxide I thought that’s a bit strange. But then, you know I just thought who is little ol’ me to question these thousands of scientists and thousands of politicians and all adamant about it and then it still didn’t sit so I talked to a couple of scientists and I thought gee I’m right, no it can’t be. So I kept looking and then I found out that the core of it all really is the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. What I found was that there are not four thousand scientists as Kevin Rudd proclaimed who are claiming that global warming was real and caused by human production of carbon dioxide. I found out from looking at the data that the UN itself has produced on its own review processes, its own reporting processes that only five reviewers endorsed the claim. I found out that in 1995 for example the scientists said there is no warming. This is the UN IPCC scientists themselves ....*”

Wendy: “*What year was that?*”

Malcolm: “*The UN IPCC scientists themselves in 1995 said there’s no warming due to human, there’s no evidence of warming due to human production of carbon dioxide and yet the scientific report, sorry the political report that went out stated something like, ‘the balance of evidence shows a discernible human influence on global climate’.*”

Wendy: “*Well where did they say there’s no evidence?*”

Malcolm: “*They said it five times in the scientific report. See Wendy what happens, and if you listen to Tim Ball or I can send you material from Tim Ball who’s a climatology professor in Winnipeg, retired now and an environmental consultant. What he has disclosed and it’s open knowledge that the IPCC guidelines require that the Summary for Policy Makers, the political document that goes to national governments and media, it purports to be a summary but it’s actually released before the science papers. And the summary and the guidelines for the IPCC require that the scientific chapters if they contradict the political chapter, the political summary, the scientific chapters have to be modified to be consistent with the politics. In other words it’s a political report not a scientific report. Now that is corruption of science. Stating ...*”

Wendy: “*Where is the link to that piece of information?*”

Malcolm: “*I’ll have to put you in touch with Tim Ball if you’d like.*”

Wendy: “*OK*”.

Malcolm: “*Would you like that?*”

Wendy: “*Yeah. Yeah.*”

Malcolm: “*He’s an amazing guy. Full of facts. Just straight off the top of his head. Quite stunning. A Canadian professor. He’s retired now. He’s seventy two years of age. A bundle of energy and a very calm easygoing guy. The peer-review processes Wendy are corrupted. It’s not, the IPCC report is not peer-reviewed. The IPCC chapters are not peer-reviewed in the scientific way. I’ve challenged Professor Karoly on this and said ‘could you please explain your understanding of what is peer-review? Could you please explain what the IPCC considers to be peer-review? And he won’t answer me.’*”

Wendy: “*But the IPCC’s summaries of what the science is, they’re not original pieces of science in and of themselves.*”

Malcolm: “*Correct*”.

Wendy: “*So why would the IPCC summaries be peer-reviewed if they’re simply summaries of what the peer-reviewed science says?*”

Malcolm: “*Well they say themselves that it relies, the Chairman of the IPCC for example Rajendra Pachauri states repeatedly publicly that the IPCC relies on one hundred percent peer-reviewed science. And that’s nonsense. It’s completely false because the 2007 report relied on 5,587 references that were not peer-reviewed. Including mountaineers’ stories, including newspaper articles, including political activists’ campaign material. So they’re claiming it’s based on scientifically peer-reviewed papers but they’re not.*”

Wendy: “*Yeah but it’s about receiving information isn’t it from industry ...*”

Malcolm: “*Sorry?*”

Wendy: “*It’s not claiming that those inputs are peer-reviewed?*”

Malcolm: “*Oh yes. It said a hundred percent reliance on peer-reviewed papers. That’s what Rajendra Pachauri stated. Repeatedly. And a New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart has documented times where Rajendra Pachauri has been corrected on that and has continued to falsify. So, the other thing is that the peer-review guidelines for the IPCC. I don’t know if ... are you familiar with the IPCC structure of the report?*”

Wendy: “*Hmmm (yes). Probably not as you, as much as you, but.*”

Malcolm: “*Just in broad terms, that Working Group One which deals with the so-called science showing that it’s warming and supposedly showing that our production of carbon dioxide is causing it. Then the second part is on impacts. And the third part is on how do we mitigate those impacts? So that means only the first part deals with the science supposedly. Now in that first section in 2007 there’s only one chapter that claims global warming is occurring and attributes it to human production of carbon dioxide. That’s chapter nine. The chapters before assume that that’s the case. And the*

chapters after assume that's the case. Now when you look at chapter nine, **would you like to get hold of John McLean?**"

Wendy: **"I'd like to talk to as many people as possible"**.

Malcolm: "OK. **I'll put John McLean in touch with you because it's very strange to me that this document that the IPCC produces has such huge global ramification politically and yet it's not really analysed in depth and it's not even public in many areas much of the data behind it is not public. What John did was that as a result of the IPCC's fear apparently of Steve McIntyre investigating it, because he's one of the two people who exposed the hockey stick graph from the 2001 report, they started to release some of the data on the authors. And John McLean has gone into the details on the IPCC authors of chapter nine which is the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of carbon dioxide. And what McLean has found is just startling. It shows that essentially it's (chapter 9) not at all scientific, there is no scientific evidence whatsoever. I then got in touch with Dr. Vincent Gray who's another one I'd recommend you talk to. He's in New Zealand so it's not much time difference. Now Vincent Gray has around sixty years real-world experience as a research scientist. And he's a PhD from Cambridge. He's done 21 years in climate. His work is voluntary. All of these people that I've mentioned, they're all voluntary. So there's no vested interest. And Vincent Gray has done by far the most, he's done 16 percent, one sixth of all the comments on the 2007 report. He's reviewed every chapter. And on the key chapter, the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of carbon dioxide, chapter nine, he's made 575 comments. Things from very tiny little grammatical errors or wording errors that falsely or misrepresented things or could have falsely implied things, right through to basic science. And there is no scientific evidence in chapter nine. None at all. No real-world scientific evidence that human production caused global warming. And yet the whole planet is supposedly relying upon this piece of paper. That's what's corrupt."**

Wendy: "This is the 2007 report you're talking about?"

Malcolm: "Correct. 2007 chapter nine."

Wendy: "OK, alright, well **I'll have a look**. Well if you could ... are you based in Melbourne? , Brisbane?"

Malcolm: "Correct. Well we're, it's an entirely voluntary organisation. There's only one paid person and she's in the office, she's trying to co-ordinate things. She's a single mother who's paid part-time. Apart from her, all the rest of us are volunteer. We use our own resources. We're essentially working out of a network of homes."

Wendy: "Sure".

Malcolm: "But most of us, well four of us, yeah, we're all in Queensland."

Wendy: *“But you, I’m just asking you just in case I need to pop you into a studio to do an interview”.*

Malcolm: *“Yep”.*

Wendy: *“Are you in Brisbane?”*

Malcolm: *“Yes. I can get to Toowong no problem”.*

Wendy: *“Good, good. OK, well look, you’ve got my email. If you would just send me some links that you think are pertinent”*

Malcolm: *“Some people to talk to.”*

Wendy: *“And people to talk to, that would be great.”*

Malcolm: *“The links I’d just refer you to our website.”*

Wendy: *“OK”.*

Malcolm: *“Now Tim Ball you’ll have to co-ordinate with him because it’s a Canadian time zone. They’re about, he’s on beautiful Vancouver Island, the town of Victoria which is about seventeen hours behind us. John McLean’s in Melbourne. Vincent Gray’s two hours ahead in Wellington New Zealand. And Bob Carter ... I’ll put this down in an email to you. I’ll send it to all of them. And Bob Carter, have you talked with him?”*

Wendy: *“No, no, look I’ve just sort of started, so.”*

Malcolm: *“Bob Carter is very good too. And also and he’s in Townsville. Where are you, in Sydney?”*

Wendy: *“Sydney, yeah”.*

Malcolm: *“OK. So most of these are close to you for time zone. And David Evans in the west coast and I’ll try to get a few more if you like.”*

Wendy: *“Alright. That’d be great. OK look Malcolm, thanks very much. I’ll be back in touch.”*

Malcolm: *“OK”.*

Wendy: *“I’ll look forward to your email”.*

Malcolm: *“OK”.*

Wendy: *“Thanks”.*

Malcolm: *"Thanks very much, Wendy. If you need anything give me a call anytime"*.

Wendy: *"OK will do. Thank you very much"*.

Malcolm: *"You're welcome"*.

Wendy: *"Bye"*.

Malcolm: *"Bye Wendy"*.

15 minutes and 18 second

### **Phone conversation with Wendy Carlisle, 8:55am on Tuesday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

Wendy Carlisle called me at 8:55am on Tuesday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011 seeking information on Viscount Monckton's presentation in Newcastle the following day. I advised that I was not organising Viscount Monckton's tour and gave her information on Andy Semple and Leon Ashby and provided their contact details. Wendy expressed difficulty in contacting Dr. Allen on the number I had previously provided her. I volunteered to contact Dr. Allen by email on her behalf as my experience had been that Dr. Allen always puts his patients first and won't interrupt patient consultations to take calls.

### **Emails providing Wendy Carlisle with contact details for 16 people around the world**

Subsequent to our phone conversation I contacted scientists and other advisers around the world for permission to provide Wendy Carlisle with their contact details. All readily agreed. My emails to them were sent on subsequent days.

A list of advisers who had already stated their availability to speak with the media was sent to Wendy. It included contact details and brief background material.

Names of scientists willing to discuss retribution against scientists sceptical about the belief that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming were given to Wendy Carlisle and identified as such to her.

New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart provided material for Wendy to access including audio recordings and written documents.

On June 30, 2011 I advised Wendy Carlisle of Dr. Wes Allen's review of Tim Flannery's book and provided her with a copy of Dr. Allen's spreadsheet summary. It's available here:

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TWM\\_Spreadsheet-11.pdf](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TWM_Spreadsheet-11.pdf)

And:

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific\\_untruths.php#G](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php#G)

In total I gave Wendy 16 names to contact. These included UN IPCC contributors and some of the world's leading climate scientists and experts on UN IPCC corruption of science.

On July 10, 2011 Wendy requested by email that I ask questions of Viscount Monckton on her behalf. She advised a deadline for my reply. I advised her that I would not do her job. My email reply to Wendy Carlisle is available here:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301\\_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf)

### **Wendy's behaviour raises questions about her memory and/or her intent**

As a result of disturbing comments from people to whom I had introduced Wendy Carlisle, on July 11, 2011 I advised all people contacted of the circumstances. Wendy Carlisle was copied on that email. It's available here:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1302\\_Appendix13bWendyEmail2.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1302_Appendix13bWendyEmail2.pdf)

Wendy Carlisle requested that my emails of July 11, 2011 be resent. Both were resent to her on the same day to both her email addresses.

Later on July 11, 2011 Wendy Carlisle advised me by email, quote: "*I note your claim that you advised me that you were recording our conversation. I have no recollection of this statement from you. Nor do my notes refer to this.*

*I do not believe that at any time I have misrepresented myself or the ABC in my research for this story.*

*We are running to a tight deadline, would you provide answers to the above information requests by COB tomorrow Tuesday July 12."*

On July 11, 2011 I sent Wendy Carlisle an email advising of many deficiencies in her approach. In that email I reminded her that she was advised that our conversation was being recorded 33 seconds into our conversation. That email was within the email available here:

[http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301\\_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf) as above

Later on July 11, 2011 I sent 'Background Briefing's Executive Producer Joe Gelonesi a copy of my email to Wendy Carlisle to advise him of the circumstances:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1303\\_Appendix13bGelonesiEmail.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1303_Appendix13bGelonesiEmail.pdf)

Could her note-taking, memory and/or interpretation be flawed? The above transcript of our phone conversation in which Wendy Carlisle twice acknowledged my advice to her that I would record our conversation.

On July 12, 2011 Wendy Carlisle requested by email, quote: “*I assumed that you were a tour co-ordinator, but obviously this is an error.*” Yet in her phone call to me on July 05, 2011 I advised her that neither I nor The Galileo Movement were organising Viscount Monckton’s tour. I gave her the names of two people organising parts of the tour. A copy of my email is available here:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301\\_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1301_Appendix13bWendyEmail1.pdf) as above

It’s clear that Wendy Carlisle had been independently advised by many people that The Galileo Movement was not organising Viscount Monckton’s tour. Yet she contradicted that repeated advice in the opening seconds of her broadcast by stating that The Galileo Movement is the, quote “*chief force*” behind Viscount Monckton.

Wendy maintained our email dialogue until I held her accountable for a number of errors and breaches of faith. She then asked on XXXXXXXX to cease email communication.

One person I contacted advised that Wendy had contacted her and asked sensible questions. That person expected though that the material would be cut in editing. It was.

### **Comments from others who had agreed to be contacted by Wendy Carlisle after my request to them on her behalf:**

My email dated June 23, 2011 was sent to eleven climate scientists and analysts in Australia and overseas seeking permission to introduce them to Wendy Carlisle and providing background on her request. Four more names were added later that same day. Other names were added on suggestions in responses from the scientists.

A mature and reasonable colleague who was copied on my request advised against giving names to an ABC journalist due to his opinion that ABC investigative journalists are untrustworthy, biased and pursuing hidden agenda.

I received many comments voicing strong opinions and disappointment on Wendy Carlisle’s behaviour. Some of these are provided below.

On June 28, 2011 Tim Ball advised me by email, quote: “*The Wendy Carlisle interview was the worst I have ever encountered. It was pure yellow journalism\*. She had no interest in discussing the science she simply wanted to prove I was a liar by trying to prove I had misrepresented myself. Every question was a "gotcha" question and when I answered it with facts she simply moved to the next one. There was not a single question about the science. I am sure she will present a hatchet job with carefully selected snippets. I should have hung up after the first few minutes.*”

\* Quoting definition of yellow journalism: “*Yellow journalism or the yellow press is a type of journalism that presents little or no legitimate well-researched news and instead uses eye-catching headlines to sell more newspapers.[1] Techniques may include exaggerations of news events, scandal-mongering, or sensationalism.[1] By*

***extension "Yellow Journalism" is used today as a pejorative to decry any journalism that treats news in an unprofessional or unethical fashion."***

On June 29, 2011 Tim Ball advised me by email, quote: "Absolutely. Warn everybody. I don't think I made any points. She was determined to keep attacking me personally. I corrected her errors but she had already decided her objective. I kept saying why don't you ask me about the science but she wasn't the least bit interested. I think I am going write an article explaining exactly what she did. It was like the old days attack the person don't let them talk about the science."

On July 08, 2011 Tim Ball advised me by email, quote: "I think a complaint to management is okay, but it won't do any good. She wouldn't do it if she didn't think she could get away with it. As the Jewish proverb says, a fish rots from the head down. I do not know of any national media outlet that isn't extremely left in its views and reporting. I told her in no uncertain terms what I thought of her interview including the complete failure to ask about the scientific facts. She claimed she had to clear up these issues but when I explained everything she wasn't satisfied and kept going back to the same issues. It was all about ad hominem and nothing to do with the issues."

On July 05, 2011 David Archibald advised me by email, quote: "I had a repeat of Tim's experience with Wendy Carlisle.

*She spent about ten minutes trying to get me to say that I had a personal financial interest in being against the carbon tax.*

*With hostile interviewers, you ignore the loaded question they asked and just repeat the message you want to get across.*

*I don't think I gave her anything useful to her purpose in a 30 minute radio interview.*

***Her purpose was to do a hatchet job on the Galileo Movement."***

On July 06, 2011 Dr. Wes Allen advised me by email, quote: "I phoned Wendy today and chatted for quite a while. She is clearly sold on the orthodox alarmist line, claiming that 98% of scientists agree that climate change will be catastrophic unless action is urgently taken. She was critical of my spreadsheet, saying my statements there were flippant and unsupported! She also tried to get me to postulate motives for scientists to push alarm buttons unless their concerns are valid, but I would not be drawn. I have emailed her a few select chapters and she is going to formally interview me on Thursday afternoon."

***It seems that Wendy Carlisle is able to pass judgment on a thorough analysis by Dr. Allen without knowing the underlying data.*** Her statement citing 98% of scientists is completely false and in gross error. It contradicts reality. That she could be so grossly misinformed after claiming to research the topic is troubling. Was she relying on the survey exposed here as relying on discredited, biased methodology?

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/01/what-does-it-take-for-a-worldwide-consensus-just-75-opinions/>

Please refer to Appendices 4 and 5. John McLean presents UN IPCC data provided by the UN IPCC to reveal that only five (5) UN IPCC reviewers endorsed its core claim that human CO2 caused global warming.

On July 07, 2011 Dr. Wes Allen advised by email, quote: *“Wendy was commenting on the spreadsheet you had sent her, as though it should have had full explanations and references. I explained that it was just my scoring sheet. I have sent her pdf copies of chapters 1-3, 16 and 24-26 to peruse. It is likely she will get a scientist like Xxxx Xxxxxxx (alarmist academic advocate funded by federal government), whom she seems to worship, to critique it for her. When I questioned her understanding of feedbacks and climate sensitivity, she admitted to being an ignoramus on the science. Her main interest was why I wrote the book and why I would question the hundreds of thousands of scientists who support Flannery. She was nonplussed when I informed her that fewer than 60 scientists were responsible for the IPCC's chapter 9, attributing climate change, and that they were nearly all modellers. She actually became quite defensive of the models and modellers (journalists are not supposed to be apologists or defenders of the faith) and very critical of Lindzen, when I mentioned his name. She said he hadn't had anything published in peer-reviewed journals for a long time. When I mentioned the Lindzen and Choi paper in 2009, she said that it had been demolished by Trenberth but couldn't tell me how. She was unfamiliar with Brassall, Spencer, Douglass, Balling, Michaels and others I mentioned.”*

On July 07, 2011 Dr. Wes Allen advised by email, quote: *“Tim was right about Wendy. She had dug up the Daly Inquiry into the Tweed Council in 2005, which resulted in the council (including Bob) being sacked because candidates had accepted developer funds, and she only wanted to focus on that to prove that Bob and I were unreliable ‘frauds’. It was indeed a shocking interview which I should have terminated. She was not interested at all in the science or a single error made by Flannery.”*

It seems that even when solid evidence from detailed and thorough analysis is presented to Wendy Carlisle she chose to ignore it. Instead it seems that she focussed on pushing her line apparently in an attempt to discredit Wes Allen.

Wendy Carlisle's interview of Dr. Allen triggered him to send a strong letter to the ABC. It confirms that Wendy Carlisle was seen as pushing a position according to a pre-determined agenda. It's available here and is self-explanatory:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1304\\_WesAllenComplaint.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1304_WesAllenComplaint.pdf)

Quoting Dr. Allen: *“I expect to be probed and challenged by journalists. But I have not encountered such hostility, arrogance, intimidation and bullying since saying goodbye to religion many years ago.”*

*That a medical doctor sees the need to send a NSW Supreme Court document to the ABC to defend his innocence reflects poorly on Wendy Carlisle's lack of preparation when confronting taxpayers who volunteer to be interviewed. That she is on the taxpayer payroll yet presents falsities to hurt taxpayers in an apparent attempt to discredit them is reprehensible. She does this to volunteers while apparently not scrutinising academics on the government payroll before blindly endorsing their claims that repeatedly*

contradict empirical scientific evidence. Why? Does Wendy Carlisle's behaviour reflect her standards and ethics or those of the ABC's?

On July 11, 2011 Jo Nova advised me by email, quote: "Wendy turned up at Monckton's events in Newcastle and in Sydney. Yeeeeouch.

*So having watched us all speak twice (four hours plus), and having been beaten down with a repeat message about argument from authority and ad hominem attacks, she went out of her way to make exactly those mistakes and yes, wanted to know what our investments were, and how we could disagree with authority.*

*So much for me spending an hour talking about the science to her the other day and sending her a list of peer reviewed refs. (And I thought she was reasonable?! What a disguise she wore.)*

*She dismissed our presentations as not having much peer reviewed information (despite all those graphs), but didn't want me to send her any more papers (I started naming them on the spot). She said she wished I'd publish my thoughts properly in the peer review. Ha ha ha. She got very uppity when I pointed out that "I am but a messenger -- just like you. Why don't **you** publish in peer review eh?"*

*She did not, by the way, ask David anything at all. His was the most serious science presentation there, and she avoided him.*

*She is a muckraker looking to do a character assassination. Maybe it's time for skeptics simply to say "no thanks" when she asks for an interview. There is nothing she will report that will advance the world of science. It is time to seriously freeze her out -- "we only deal with real journalists" (not Pravda agents). This is a losing deal for us. Any good points you make will be lost, and any slips amplified.*

*At one point, she decried Tim Ball's qualifications to me (like that had anything to do with our presentations), I pointed out that that's nothing to do with the climate. Why did she resort to an ad hom? Phah she said, "it's not an ad hom". (What can you say to that eh? "denier"?)*

*She got very snooty and stormed off and said that the ABC has a complaints process."*

On July 11, 2011 Jo Nova advised me by email, quote: "Wendy has previously interviewed Malcolm Turnbull, on [background briefing](#) and I may have missed it but I didn't see her ask any questions about his conflicts of interest or past life at Goldman Sachs.

<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/backgroundbriefing/stories/2007/1860535.htm>

Carlisle has been doing the carbon reporting game for years. Back in 2006 she wrote up a piece on carbon trading.

<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/backgroundbriefing/stories/2006/1712457.htm>

*Get ready for it... unless I've got it wrong, she's taking the side of the bankers, and she's wondering why the government won't let them make more money...*

*"Financial markets have responded to climate change by buying and selling greenhouse gases. This is the carbon trade, and business leaders are confident it will lead to solutions for global warming, but governments and politics are getting in their way. Reporter Wendy Carlisle."*

*Hmmmm."*

In response to my request for permission to print her opinion above, on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Jo Nova's email provided the following unsolicited opinion, quote: *"Malcolm, as far as I'm concerned, Carlisle was there to do a hatchet job. She was not there to inform ABC listeners of the whole story, she was there to fish for bits that fit her personal world view. She was an activist pretending to do "journalism".*

*Before the tour she wasted an hour of my time asking me to explain the science (she had no idea), I also sent her (at her request) a list of papers in evidence to back up what I said. She didn't reply. She saw David and I speak at least twice in full, for a total of over 2 hours -- yet covered nothing of the science we spoke of, or the money I revealed backing the believers.*

*She may say the program was called "background briefing" and was about the backers of the tour (and not the science) - but she fails on that score too.*

*She asked where David and I got our funds from, and I told her (and she recorded it) that we were self funded through our stock investments, and most of what we did was as volunteers. She did not mention any of that in the interview -- yet David and I spoke in Perth , Sydney and Newcastle with Monckton. We backed ourselves, and the fact that we are a grassroots volunteers was hidden from the ABC audience.*

*She felt it was more important for Australians to know about the controversy of a label of a department at a university in Canada three decades ago (where Tim Ball went) - yet he was not even on the tour - nor did he fund it.*

*She was mining for a character assassination. If I'd said we were funded by coal, instead of by our gold investments, would she have left out that detail? If the scientific papers I supplied her were articles from an oil and gas newsletter instead of peer reviewed, would she have made a fuss over our slipshod unscientific references. Of course she would.*

*In other words, prerecorded interviews with the ABC are a lose lose for skeptics. If you make a good point, they edit it out. If you slip up, it's a headline.*

*And Wendy Carlisle calls herself a science journalist. BTW - we had a very terse exchange at the end where she said she just wished we'd publish our theories in peer reviewed journals. I scoffed, and said, I sent you all my references. They're peer*

reviewed. "I'm just a messenger like you are Wendy, if I have to get published in a science journal, so do you."

And of course, I quote peer reviewed references. But Wendy quotes the Merchant of Doubt - Queen Smear herself -- Naomi Orsekes.

Jo”

More on Jo Nova’s opinion of Wendy Carlisle’s tactics is available here:  
<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/07/this-is-not-journalism-wendy-carlisle/>

Jo Nova sent a copy of her email to Tim Ball. In response on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 his email provided the following unsolicited opinion, quote: “*This parallels my experience with Ms Carlisle, except for her attending my presentations. I do know she had not seen any of the youtube material of my presentations and as I recall had not watched "The Great Global Warming Swindle"*”.

*The fact is there was a department of climatology completely separate from the Geography Department in that it was two floors above, had outer lab facilities and an inner office that I occupied. The sign on the outer door said "Climatology Laboratory"*.

*The climate facility was created in the late 1960s by Professor Bill Bell with who I worked until he left to become the State climatologist for the US state of Georgia. We were carrying out heat island studies, boundary layer studies and urban air pollution studies related to the urban heat island. My personal research involved reconstructions of long term climate records as Lamb had urged was necessary before any understanding of human effect could be determined.*

*Administratively it was managed through the Geography Department. I did not attend Geography Department meetings. Of course, there is nothing wrong with being affiliated with a Geography Department as many have tried to imply because geography is the original interdisciplinary discipline, just as climatology as a generalist discipline must integrate all disciplines. This arrogance about geography appeared with computer modellers taking over and arguing that only the "hard" sciences could do legitimate climate science. I am reminded of A.N.Whitehead's remark that, "There is no more common error than to assume that, because prolonged and accurate mathematical calculations have been made, the application of the result to some fact of nature is absolutely certain."*

*I kept asking Ms Carlisle why she didn't ask me about climate and the problems with the IPCC science - there was no response and the attempts to dig personal dirt continued. I finally hung up, something I had never done before.*

*I can say without exception that it was the most biased, shallow, single-minded, perverted interview I have experienced and that after thousands over 40 years. It was not journalism by any measure. You can make a mark by pulling yourself up or by pushing others down. Ms Carlisle practices the latter in the meanest, nastiest most*

*pointless way possible.*

*Tim Ball*

*On July 11, 2011 Viv Forbes advised me by email, quote: "I was interviewed by Wendy Carlyle a week or two ago. She spent one day fishing for things that might be embarrassing to me or other skeptics and then rang the next day apparently recording questions and answers along lines she had identified earlier as possibly fruitful to her clear aim.*

*Nowhere was she seeking the truth or even seeking our position. She was trying to find things she could attack us with and trying to get me to make admissions on various matters of the global warming agenda. She gave me the impression she was an unscrupulous advocate for the warmist position."*

On July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 in response to Jo Nova's and Tim ball's preceding comments, Viv Forbes said, quote: "Our experiences with Ms Carlisle are remarkably similar". His 50 years experience dealing with the media and studying history and totalitarianism makes his comments meaningful and damning about the ABC and Wendy Carlisle.

On July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011 John McLean advised me by email of his opinion, quote: "Her piece is accessible via  
<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/backgroundbriefing/stories/2011/3268730.htm>.  
*It's a hatchet job, as we expected after she misrepresented her position."*

Comment from Viscount Monckton to Wendy Carlisle, (Saturday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011) Hyde Park rally, Sydney, quote: "I said, 'Madam, if you're going to be deliberately offensive, you can go and ask your questions to somebody else.'

Viscount Monckton lodged a formal complaint with ABC's 'Background Briefing'.

The public is awakening to the ABC's abuse of taxpayer funds in broadcasting misrepresentations about climate science and advocating in support of the government's position:

<http://bunyipitude.blogspot.com.au/2011/07/wendys-wonderland.html>

My own personal experience is that Wendy failed to follow through on significant corruption issues I raised with her and which she advised she'd investigate. She subsequently asked irrelevant questions of me, made significant errors in her emails, and when held accountable failed to answer fundamental questions. Then she terminated correspondence. Our final email thread is available here:

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1305\\_Appendix13bWendyEmail3.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1305_Appendix13bWendyEmail3.pdf)

Please note that Wendy has failed to answer simple reasonable questions put to her following her statements, implied statements, claims, erroneous assumptions, misrepresentations and unfounded allegations. Why does she make accusations about religion? Given her many erroneous assumptions I wonder as to whether or not she has formed her worldview based on an ideology and on that basis pre-forms erroneous

assumptions and makes unfounded value judgments. I conclude that her approach on climate is closed and biased and that she fails to scrutinise academics and others paid by government to advocate cutting human CO<sub>2</sub> output. Why?

Why are taxpayers funding a reporter such as Wendy Carlisle? She is not willing to stand by, or be held accountable for, her work and her misrepresentations contradicting known observations and facts.

I conclude that Wendy Carlisle seems to: avoid discussion of empirical science; avoid discussion on massive documentation of corruption in climate science that is the basis of federal government and UN IPCC positions; be preoccupied negatively with Australia's major export income earner, the mining industry; be intent on smearing those sceptical of the government's position and/or having a different view; and, fail to hold advocates of the government's position accountable for their false claims and glaring conflicts of financial interest. I conclude that in presenting her *Background Briefing* program Wendy Carlisle shows extreme bias and negligence that misrepresents the position of those sceptical that human CO<sub>2</sub> impacts global warming or global climate. Her manner, approach and tactics fail to meet community needs for integrity, openness, fairness and accuracy.

The work of journalists such as Wendy Carlisle has, in my view, enabled the spread of bogus science to Australia's detriment. She is funded by taxpayers yet is abetting the fleecing of taxpayers via an unjust and unfounded tax driven by a political agenda. That the ABC supports her work is deeply troubling and 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.

Among those to whom Wendy Carlisle talked while preparing her broadcast some concluded that her clear purpose was to do a hatchet job on The Galileo Movement. It's reassuring that despite her misrepresentations and concerted effort she was not able to identify anything dishonest or incompetent about The Galileo Movement. It vindicates the decision by The Galileo Movement's leadership team to honestly base its position on proven facts.

Wendy Carlisle failed to tackle the fundamental issue of corruption of climate science by people advocating cutting human CO<sub>2</sub> output. I raised several in our phone conversation on Thursday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011. She ran from her commitment to return to discuss global warming (aka climate change) with me. That she ran from my issues and failed to tackle the core and basic issues I raised alludes plenty about the strength of The Galileo Movement's position. It says even more about the ABC and its reporter Wendy Carlisle.

It says plenty about government spending taxpayer funds on a government agency acting as a subtle yet nonetheless strong advocate for government policy needlessly hurting taxpayers and citizens.