

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2013
Latest update:

APPENDIX 13e

REVIEW OF PROGRAM BY ABC-RADIO'S MEDIA WATCH SHOW

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

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.

Media Watch, Monday May 30th, 2011

Lessons in Hyperbolic Gestures

<http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/s3230989.htm>

Analysis of statements on Media Watch

Classification legend and measured totals:

Directly or implicitly denigrating those taking a sceptic position = 8

Contradicting empirical evidence and/or facts = 8

Citing 'scientists' funded by government and/or in government positions = 1

Citing independent scientists = 0

Personal value judgment = 12

Annotated transcript:

(Annotations are bracketed in italics.)

And tonight we're going to look at a major climate change breakthrough. Last Wednesday on Sydney radio station 2GB, Breakfast host Alan Jones did his first interview this year with a climate scientist who doesn't reckon that the whole thing is nonsense.

Mind you, it's stretching the term to call Alan's half-hour chat with Professor David Karoly of the University of Melbourne an interview. It was part interrogation, part harangue.¹ Here's a sample:

“Alan Jones: You were intimately involved in the writing and reviewing of these United Nations intergovernmental reports on climate change?”

David Karoly: As were many, many thousands of other scientists.

Alan Jones: Yeah, but no I'm just talking about you now, but you were intimately involved?

David Karoly: That's correct.

Alan Jones: Is there any empirical evidence proving human production of carbon dioxide as distinct from nature's production caused global warming? Is there?

David Karoly: Yes.

Alan Jones: ... in these reports? Yes or no?

David Karoly: Yes.

Alan Jones: Yes. Now where would I find that in chapter 9? That's your chapter.

David Karoly: Sure, you would find that evidence in the peer reviewed scientific studies and in the data that's in chapter 9...

Alan Jones: But where in chapter 9?

David Karoly: So...

Alan Jones: Where in chapter 9? Where can I open chapter 9, 'cause I looked? Where in open chapter 9 is that evidence? Where is it?

David Karoly: It's... I can't tell you the page number because I don't have the page in front of me...

Alan Jones: No, no, no, no, no it's not there. It's not there.

David Karoly: Well no Alan...

Alan Jones: It's not there. You're the chapter review editor. It's not there. That's why you can't tell me the page number. The evidence is not there.

David Karoly: That's not true, Alan.”

— 2GB, *The Alan Jones Breakfast Show*, 25th May, 2011

(2GB's web site reveals through its podcast list that prior to interviewing David Karoly, Alan Jones had interviewed UN IPCC contributor Richard Lindzen and me. During my interview I stated that there is no evidence in UN IPCC reports of human CO2 causing global warming. I'd read David Karoly's UN IPCC chapter twice. In his responses to my requests for evidence David Karoly had repeatedly failed to provide any empirical evidence. I advised Alan Jones of those facts. (<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110518-aj2-malcolmroberts.mp3>). That was one week before his interview of David Karoly. 2GB's podcasts reveal that soon after interviewing David Karoly, Alan Jones interviewed Canadian climate expert Tim Ball who is thorough in his knowledge of UN IPCC reports. He interviewed UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer, Dr. Vincent Gray who has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports and publicly states that there is no evidence of human causation. Alan Jones interviewed John McLean, Aussie IT expert who analysed David Karoly's chapter using data provided by the UN PCC itself. John McLean publicly revealed stark truths about David Karoly's chapter. From my experience being interviewed at 2GB's studio and from discussions with Alan Jones' staff it's clear he thoroughly researches before key interviews. Accuracy seems extremely important to him. Is it inconceivable to Jonathan Holmes that David Karoly is not able to provide the evidence Alan Jones sought? Does he not understand that David Karoly failed to provide empirical evidence for the UN IPCC's false claim that is based on his chapter that is the sole chapter claiming human CO2 caused global ATMOSPHERIC warming? Is Jonathan Holmes not aware that for the equivalent sole chapter in the UN IPCC's 2001 report that contained no evidence, David Karoly was the Lead Author? Can Jonathan Holmes not learn from the interview that David Karoly avoided providing empirical evidence? When held accountable David Karoly eventually produced statements that seemed to be scientific yet failed to provide the empirical evidence sought by Alan Jones. Please refer to my observations and discussion of David Karoly's behaviour elsewhere in this report and to notes and excerpts from the interview transcript below. Is it appropriate for a journalist such as Jonathan Holmes to make false assumptions when portraying himself as an arbiter of media fairness?)

*(By omission, **Jonathan Holmes contradicted facts** and **implicitly denigrated Alan Jones' well-founded sceptic position in holding David Karoly accountable.**)*

Of course that's not the way Alan treats scientists whose conclusions he agrees with.

Professor Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, is a respected meteorologist who argues that if man-made global warming is happening at all, it's likely effects are being grossly exaggerated.

On May 17th Dr Lindzen received the Jones soft-soap treatment...

"Prof Richard Lindzen: No, I mean Australia, Australia could sink into the sea without affecting the CO2 balance significantly.

Alan Jones: That's it. Australia could sink into the sea without affecting the CO2 balance significantly."

— 2GB, *The Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 17th May, 2011*

Awed repetition is a classic sign of Jones approbation. Here's another one...

"Richard Lindzen: ... there is no way current models can predict anything for a region as localised as Australia. Where your politicians come off with these statements sort of borders on the unbelievable.

Alan Jones: Good on you...

Alan Jones: "Borders on the unbelievable."

— 2GB, *the Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 17th May, 2011*

(Why does Jonathan Holmes seem so amazed that the facts could contradict his position? Why is Jonathan so misinformed? Or is he aware of the facts yet engaging in propaganda?)

Professor Karoly is just as distinguished a scientist as Professor Lindzen. A lead author of the IPCC reports, **a scientific adviser to the Climate Change Commission.** **But Alan Jones doesn't agree with him, so he cops this:**

(David Karoly uses unvalidated computer models in an attempt supposedly to simulate climate. Richard Lindzen is an internationally regarded meteorologist basing his comments on empirical science. Both contribute to the UN IPCC. Richard Lindzen publicly reveals that the UN IPCC is unscientific in its approach. David Karoly has often misrepresented science and spreads UN IPCC misrepresentations. Is Jonathan Holmes not aware that another UN IPCC Lead Author, the eminent John Christie is scathing in exposing UN IPCC corruption? If not why not? The UN IPCC's corruption of climate science raises serious roles about arguably its most senior climate contributor, David Karoly and his role in UN IPCC misrepresentations, particularly in drafting the UN IPCC's Summary for Policy Makers. Why is Jonathan Holmes silent on this?)

"David Karoly: ... carbon dioxide on average is going from the atmosphere into the ocean...

... and not the other way around.

Alan Jones: No but hang on, hang on, you've agreed with me. You've agreed with me...

David Karoly: Sure.

Alan Jones: ... that 97% of CO₂ comes from nature and if the oceans represent over 70% of the planet and the bulk of the oceans are in the southern hemisphere, they may be causing that that's the natural phenomenon of CO₂ production.

David Karoly: Alan, you're not listening to me, but that's fine.

Alan Jones: Yeah I am.

David Karoly: You're welcome to your opinion.

Alan Jones: I'm listening to everything.

David Karoly: ...would you like me to . . .

Alan Jones: I'm listening attentively.

David Karoly: Good, excellent.

Alan Jones: Yeah no I am, I'm here. I'm sweating as well.

David Karoly: Well, I'm sure you are.

Alan Jones: You've got me nervous.

— 2GB, the Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 25th May, 2011

But Alan wasn't nervous, and he wasn't listening. Instead, he was subjecting the Professor to a blizzard of figures.

(Please see notes below. Alan Jones discussed three simple fundamental figures in a period of over one and a half minutes. He checked each figure with David Karoly and repeated the core figures. If David Karoly was confused it's surprising because those figures are standard and well known. Hardly a blizzard, Alan Jones' repetition bordered on being boringly repetitive to ensure his lay audience understood. Alan Jones clarified the context of those figures five times. Each time David Karoly agreed.)

“Alan Jones: So, .04 of a per cent of the air is carbon dioxide, 3% of that .04 of a per cent is human activity, and Australia produce 1½% of the 3%, so we are producing...

.000018 of carbon dioxide.”

— 2GB, the Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 25th May, 2011

(Why does Jonathan Holmes take this out of context? Alan Jones explained this to his non-technical listeners five times and David Karoly agreeably continued on Alan Jones' train of logic and endorsed it.)

No Alan. Even if your reasoning was correct, and many would argue it isn't, that would be the figure for the percentage of the entire atmosphere, not just of carbon dioxide, represented by man-made CO₂ emissions from Australia. Yet you made the same mistake over and over again...

(That's exactly what Alan Jones clarified five times with David Karoly's repeated agreement and endorsement.)

“Alan Jones: ... of all the carbon dioxide Australians are producing .000018 of a per cent. Give me a break, Doc!

WHITE NOISE

Alan Jones: I'm simply saying that Australians - you've agreed with me - are producing .000018% of carbon dioxide”

— 2GB, the Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 25th May, 2011

(As above.)

Understandably bamboozled, it's true that Professor Karoly didn't pick Alan up **on the error** during the interview.

(Please see notes below)

However afterwards he sent an email to 2GB setting out why he reckons **Alan's figures are completely wrong**.

Check it out on our website - you won't find it on 2GB's - but here's the bottom line...

“**...0.45% of the total CO₂ in the atmosphere is due to Australians**”

— Professor David Karoly, 26th May, 2011

[Read Professor Karoly's email to 2GB](#)

(In regard to the second error claimed by David Karoly's email to be made by Alan Jones, David Karoly confirms all the figures used by Alan Jones in the latter's calculations. David Karoly then (falsely) claims Alan Jones' logic is faulty and introduces an unfounded figure that contradicts empirical science.)

*(Remarkably David Karoly seems to give away his own game by claiming in his email, quote: “I am a climate change scientist”. Is he the first of his new field of **'climate***

change’ scientists? Consider the dictionary definition of the word ‘advocate’, David Karoly’s many misrepresentations of science, climate and Nature and know that he’s a spokesman in his paid ‘**climate change**’ roles advocating support of the unfounded notion that human CO2 causes global climate change. It seems reasonable and accurate for Alan Jones to describe David Karoly as a ‘climate change advocate’, doesn’t it?)

Professor Karoly's estimate - almost half a percent - is twenty-five thousand times bigger than the figure with all those zeroes that Alan kept repeating.

But according to 2GB, it doesn't matter. Last time we visited this issue, I pointed out that Alan had made a similar mistake with his maths...²

“Alan Jones: Nature produces nearly all of the carbon dioxide in the air. Human beings produce point 001 percent of the carbon dioxide in the air...”

— ABC, Media Watch, 21st March, 2011

That figure was nonsense too.

(Why does Jonathan Holmes cite this figure again from an earlier program when Alan Jones has repeatedly stated the figure correctly as 0.001% of the atmosphere?)

Following our program, a number of people complained to 2GB. response to two of those complaints. The station didn't deny that Alan's figure was fantasy. Instead, it made this remarkable claim... We've seen

“...this particular statement made by the presenter is more a hyperbolic gesture to elucidate this opinion, rather than as a statement of scientific fact.

— 2GB, 23rd May, 2011

Ah! A hyperbolic gesture! Presumably that applies just as much to Alan's new figure...

“Alan Jones: .000018 of a per cent.”

— 2GB, The Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 25th May, 2011

Six decimal places of hyperbolic gesture. Well here are some figures which we are prepared to stand by.

In his interview with Professor Lindzen, Alan spoke for 30% of the time, and Professor Lindzen spoke for 70%.

In his 'interview' with Professor Karoly, Alan Jones spoke for 60% of the time, and Professor Karoly for 40%.

(Why does Jonathan Holmes not mention David Karoly's apparent attempts to avoid

answering fundamental questions. That required Alan Jones to repeatedly hold David Karoly accountable. Why did Jonathan Holmes not mention that David Karoly failed to accurately answer the fundamental question David Karoly was asked by Alan Jones?)

And amongst all Jones's **blather and bulldust** was this:

“Alan Jones: Are you being paid for being on the Government's Climate Commission Science Advisory Panel?...”

David Karoly: No, my salary is not being paid by that.

Alan Jones: Are you in any, and in receipt of any, benefits or funds or anything at all from the...

David Karoly: I am receiving a travel allowance to cover the costs of going to meetings of the Science Advisory Panel and I am receiving a small retainer which is substantially less than your daily salary.

Alan Jones: So you're paid by the Government and then you give an opinion on the science of climate change. Have you ever heard about he who pays the piper calls the tune?”

— *2GB, The Alan Jones Breakfast Show, 25th May, 2011*

(Why does Jonathan Holmes seemingly attempt to distract people's attention from a valid fundamental point that raises serious questions about David Karoly and the government? Is it because Jonathan Holmes is paid by the government? Is it because Jonathan Holmes is, like David Karoly, misleading viewers on climate? Is it because Jonathan Holmes blindly supports David Karoly's falsities unquestioningly? Is it ...)

This is the man who, according to an inquiry by the Australian Broadcasting Authority, was found in the 1990's to have signed contracts worth millions of dollars, which he didn't disclose to his listeners, to spruik the virtues of Optus, and Qantas, and the State Bank of New South Wales, and the Walsh Bay development, and the Walker Corporation...

And Alan Jones is accusing **one of Australia's most respected scientists** of being corrupted by the payment of a **small** retainer? The **hypocrisy, and the gall, are breathtaking**.

(Why does Jonathan Holmes seek to dismiss a key conflict of interest? Why does Jonathan Holmes not make comment about the substantial other payments from government upon which David Karoly relies? Why does Jonathan Holmes describe David Karoly as one of Australia's most respected scientists when David Karoly fails to provide empirical scientific evidence for his core claim and fails to provide accurate scientific reasoning for his core claim? How does Jonathan Holmes know that David Karoly's retainer is small? Why does he again apparently accept, endorse and repeat David Karoly's view without presenting evidence? Is Jonathan Holmes again assuming

David Karoly is accurate?)

The current regulator, ACMA, tells Media Watch that today it's begun an investigation into 2GB's coverage of the climate change debate.

(Did Jonathan Holmes accurately cover the result of that decision and include the tone of ACMA's Chairman as the latter himself revealed here ³:

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

End of transcript

Notes:

¹ Why does Jonathan Holmes not mention David Karoly's apparent avoidance of answering one of Alan Jones' key questions? Why does Jonathan Holmes fail to mention that David Karoly failed to provide empirical evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming? Is there anything more central to the discussion on global warming? Why doesn't Jonathan Holmes know that, contrary to David Karoly's false assertion, there is no such evidence? Based on Alan Jones interviews of real climate scientists in May and June 2011 it seems Alan Jones' did his research and knew there is no such evidence. Why does Jonathan Holmes not comment on David Karoly seemingly avoiding answering Alan Jones' key question? Why then does he try to smear Alan Jones when Alan Jones had apparently done his research? Alan Jones asked the core question of the key UN IPCC official, quote: "*Is there any empirical evidence proving human production of carbon dioxide as distinct from nature's production caused global warming? Is there?*" When David Karoly failed to answer that question, Jonathan Holmes seemingly ridicules Alan Jones. Hmmm. Why?

² Earlier statement by Alan Jones on March 21st, 2011:

"Alan Jones: Nature produces nearly all of the carbon dioxide in the air. Human beings produce point 001 percent of the carbon dioxide in the air..."

Alan Jones' first sentence is true and correct. His second sentence is an obvious error since he has consistently stated that human production of CO₂ is 0.001 percent of Earth's air... Thus the second sentence would seem to be an honest error by Alan Jones.

Alan Jones authoritatively tackles many highly controversial and challenging topics. In a tight early morning format he quickly gets to the heart of tough issues. It seems his listeners value that skill. It seems that ACMA's Chairman Chris Chapman admires Alan Jones' record of just two errors over many years. The ACMA Chairman rightly seems to see that as quite an achievement. Listen here and decide for yourself:

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

Secondly, the error by Alan Jones is meaningless and of no consequence. That's because in reality the level of CO₂ in Earth's air is controlled entirely by Nature regardless of human production. The level of CO₂ in air is independent of human production of CO₂. This is confirmed by examination of measurements of CO₂ levels cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC.

Many scientists agree with and endorse Alan Jones' logical illustrative depiction of CO₂ levels for his listeners. These include UN IPCC *Review Editor* David Karoly who confirmed and endorsed Alan Jones' explanation to his radio listeners during their discussion broadcast on May 25th, 2011.

Nonetheless, empirical scientific measurements lead to a different conclusion. Humans cannot affect CO₂ level. It's controlled by simple ocean-atmosphere interactions. This is explained in Appendix 4.

Alan Jones did not understate the contribution of human CO₂ production to the atmosphere. He overstated it. As do many people, including UN IPCC academics and many real climate scientists. Nature proves otherwise.

Another calculation is provided by Geoff Brown using methods from various scientists here:

<http://theclimatescepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/2012/10/alan-jones-and-facts-about-co2.html>

He concludes that Alan Jones' statement was in error in that Alan Jones overstated the human contribution to atmospheric CO₂ levels. Alan Jones' figure though was far closer to reality than was David Karoly's figure as cited by Media Watch.

Why did Media Watch rely on the earlier statement (March 21st, 2011) when Alan Jones stated the correct underpinning figures and context in his broadcast of May 26th, 2011 program that is the subject of this Media Watch episode? This seems highly dubious and leads to questioning Media Watch's intent and tactics.

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>

³ Who holds Media Watch and Jonathan Holmes accountable? Could it be ABC News Watch, here?

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

On behalf of taxpayers, Media Watch reportedly employs 11 staff to produce 15 minutes of pre-arranged programming each week for 39 weeks annually.

2GB employs around half that number of staff to produce 12 hours of live programming each week, 52 weeks of the year. I checked.

Alan Jones' program deals live with many controversial issues—unscripted and live.

Jonathan Holmes presents a pre-arranged, prepared monologue containing many mistakes. One wonders how Jonathan Holmes would fare in the turbulent, spontaneity of talkback radio dealing with significant controversial topics.

Would it be reasonable to say that 2GB's Alan Jones program produces 780 hours* of live programming annually and Media Watch produces just 9.75 hours?

* 3 hours per day x 5 days per week x 52 weeks annually

Acknowledging rounding and broad assumptions, it still seems reasonable to include staffing levels in the comparison. On that basis the raw productivity in terms of program hours per 2GB staff on the Alan Jones' program appears to be about 160 times that of Media Watch's staff?

Allowing for use of broad numbers and including a significant margin of error, the multiplier may not be accurate. Nonetheless the difference is indicative, isn't it?

2GB is accountable to its customers. Media Watch is not.

2GB is under constant scrutiny by ACMA. It seems Media Watch is not under independent scrutiny.

Analysis and Comments:

Why does Jonathan Holmes take the apparent position of assuming that David Karoly is correct?

When David Karoly avoids providing the empirical evidence Alan Jones sought, why does Jonathan Holmes seek to discredit Alan Jones for persisting?

Why does Jonathan Holmes apparently believe and endorse David Karoly's position when eminent scientists, including UN Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray declare publicly that there is no evidence that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused Earth's latest modest global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998? (Some say 2002, others say 1997 and some even say 1995.)

When Alan Jones exposes David Karoly's financial conflicts of interests why does Jonathan Holmes not share that significant point with the audience?

Why does Jonathan Holmes not discuss the many significant key points Alan Jones uncovers as a journalist holding a significant political advocate accountable? Why indeed when that player is funded by the government whose position he advocates.

Specific comments

CO2 figures:

Let's check Jonathan Holmes implied assertion from the 2GB podcast publicly available at <http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110525-aj2-davidkaroly.mp3> with bracketed figures (x:xx') denoting elapsed time in minutes and seconds during the podcast.

David Karoly understood what Alan was discussing, quote: "*the level of carbon dioxide **in the air (1)** is less than point oh four of a percent*" (3:13'). Alan Jones even vocally emphasised '*in the air*'. David Karoly agreed immediately. Alan Jones then said again, quote: "**CO2 in the air (2)** about point oh four of a percent" again with vocal emphasis on '*in the air*' (3:27'). David Karoly agreed again. I'm confident any reasonable person would understand that Alan Jones was discussing the percentage of CO2 in the atmosphere. In subsequently outlining his calculations, Alan Jones then raised Earth's annual production of CO2 to isolate the human component and emphasised quote: "*that of the Earth's annual production of carbon dioxide, this point oh four of a percent that's **in the air (3)**...*" (3:40'). David Karoly agreed. Alan Jones then emphasised, quote: "*I just want to get this clear on maths because you're the scientist, I'm not*". He immediately repeated, quote: "*Point oh four of a percent **of the air (4)** (3:55) is carbon dioxide and of that point oh four of a percent*". In his next step he focussed on the contribution of Australian industry to the amount of CO2 as a percentage of Earth's air. David Karoly agreed at every step with every key figure Alan Jones cited in his calculation and confirmed with the words "*Alan, you're absolutely right*". Then Alan Jones summarised, quote: "*so point oh four of a percent **of the air (5)** is carbon dioxide*" (4:29') "*three percent of that point oh four of a percent is human activity*" (4:34') "*and Australia produce one and a half percent of the three percent, so we are producing point oh four multiplied by point oh three by point oh five, that's point zero zero, zero, four zeroes one eight Australians, of carbon dioxide.*" (4:51')

Strictly speaking, Alan Jones made an error by stating "*point oh five*" when he meant '*one point five*' and then said "*carbon dioxide*" when he implied '*of the air as carbon dioxide from Aussie industry*'. Yet David Karoly understood and did not object at the time, nor after the podcast was available.

Over a period of just one minute and 38 seconds in which both Alan Jones and David Karoly spoke while going from the current level of CO2 in the air to the percentage of CO2 from Australian industry in the air, Alan Jones used and at times emphasised the words "*in the air*" five times.

Certainly the professor continued engaging with Alan on that basis.

This repetition to ensure understanding for his listeners who are largely laypeople could hardly be described as a blizzard, could it? It was necessarily laborious. Did Jonathan Holmes listen to the podcast or simply accept David Karoly's email advice?

Although David Karoly's email of the next day proposed an alternative unfounded and unscientific figure for the amount of human CO₂ in the air, his email clearly implied agreement that the topic of discussion was the amount of Aussie CO₂ as a percentage of Earth's air.

Astoundingly, David Karoly's email argues that instead of using Alan Jones' minuscule figure one should use David Karoly's minuscule figure. Regardless, Alan Jones' core point is correct in estimating a maximum level of Aussie CO₂ in Earth's air. Alan Jones' figure at each step is correct and was verified by David Karoly. Empirical data falsifies David Karoly's email challenging the logic used by Alan Jones. Regardless, David Karoly's email does not change Alan Jones' key point. It confirms Alan Jones' key point.

Alan Jones' calculation shows Aussie CO₂ is a maximum 0.000018% of Earth's air. David Karoly's unsubstantiated and unfounded numbers result in him claiming Aussie CO₂ is 0.00018% of Earth's air: one zero less. Why then does he say in his email, quote: *"This is still a small number, but it has a lot less zeroes than Alan said"*?

When it suits David Karoly apparently one less zero is *"a lot less"*. Why does Jonathan Holmes not bring this to viewers' attention? Why did Jonathan Holmes repeat David Karoly's ridiculous false assertion?

David Karoly essentially proposes that instead of using Alan Jones' minuscule figure one should use David Karoly's minuscule figure.

Although David Karoly's figure contradicts empirical relationships Jonathan Holmes presents it as scientific and assumes it to be accurate. Further Jonathan Holmes then accuses Alan Jones of being grossly in error.

Yet David Karoly's email states, quote: "Given Alan's obvious interest in the interview to get the numbers correct, and confirmed by me." Why did Jonathan Holmes did not quote this statement?

Some of David Karoly's errors and misrepresentations during the interview:

Why did Jonathan Holmes not identify any of the many following misrepresentations made by David Karoly?

(1) David Karoly's unsupported claim that human CO₂ is 30% of CO₂ in Earth's air. Yet that contradicts empirical science showing that CO₂'s residence time is short at around 5-7 years with recent studies showing that it can be less than twelve months. It contradicts known scientific evidence showing that temperature determines CO₂ levels. It contradicts the UN IPCC's own data revealing that Nature alone controls and determines atmospheric CO₂ levels. It contradicts understanding of variation;

One would hope that David Karoly as a UN IPCC Lead Author and a UN IPCC Review Editor would be familiar with the literature available and the empirical science. Why then did the UN IPCC select only low CO2 measurements to falsely misrepresent pre-industrial levels of CO2? <http://drtimball.com/2012/pre-industrial-and-current-co2-levels-deliberately-corrupted/>

And:

<http://drtimball.com/2011/ernst-georg-beck-a-major-contributor-to-climate-science-effectively-sidelined-by-climate-deceivers/>

And:

http://www.biomind.de/nogreenhouse/daten/EE%2018-2_Beck.pdf

And:

<http://drtimball.com/2011/zbigniew-jaworowski-m-d-ph-d-d-sc/>

And:

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/icecore/zjmar07.pdf>

And:

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/icecore/IceCoreSprg97.pdf>

And:

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/icecore/>

Please see page 128 in this extract from the prize-winning book entitled ‘*A Short History of Planet Earth*’ by international award-winning scientist Professor Ian Plimer: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/EarthHistoryPlimer2.pdf>

An article about UN IPCC controlling calculations of human production of CO2 to purport constantly rising human CO2 production:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/ipcc-control-calculations-of-annual-human-co2-production-for-political-agenda/>

And:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YrI03ts--9I&feature=youtu.be>

And:

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/global-warming-background-articles/carbon-dioxide-growth-rate-at-mauna-loa/>

Please note the summary posted at The Galileo Movement’s website:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science_futility.php

and access Bob Beatty’s document and slides.

(2) David Karoly states that “*increasing greenhouse gases*” are “*known*” by “*scientists*” to be a, quote ‘*very important factor in affecting climate*’. (5:15) Yet he has repeatedly failed to produce empirical scientific evidence in his responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence of that core claim. His core chapter (chapter 9) contains no empirical evidence. Yet that sole chapter is the supposed basis for the UN IPCC’s core claim that global warming was caused by human CO2. Labor and Greens federal MP’s have stated that the UN IPCC report is the basis of their parties’ climate policies;

(3) David Karoly claims (6:35’) that human contributions of CO2 have led to 35% more atmospheric CO2, yet levels of CO2 in air are determined by Nature alone. CO2 sinks

and sources are not saturated, they are temperature dependent and result from interplay of CO₂ concentrations in the air and oceans with temperature driving and determining the level in air.

(4) David Karoly states to Alan Jones, quote: *“I agreed with you (on the basic figures). Now you need to agree with me that human contributions are an important factor”*. Yet David Karoly has provided no evidence for his unfounded claim that contradicts empirical science and that contradicts the advice of eminent scientists. When Alan Jones’ research has apparently led to his realisation that the UN IPCC cannot be relied upon why should he agree with the UN IPCC simply because the UN IPCC’s top man says so?

(5) David Karoly discusses current CO₂ levels in air without discussing far, far higher levels in Earth’s past. (6:40’) He fails to mention that in Earth’s relatively recent past Nature has driven CO₂ levels through far greater rises and falls and apparently more quickly than Earth’s current modest rise from alarmingly low levels. Why does he not tell the full scientific picture?

(6) David Karoly makes an analogy of CO₂ levels in the air to level of water in a bathtub (7:18’) when in reality CO₂ levels in air are temperature dependent;

(7) David Karoly states, (7:26’) quote *“now in the atmosphere we have 35% more carbon dioxide than the earth has experienced at any time over the last million years”*. As Lead Author and Review Editor why is he not aware of the UN IPCC’s deliberate omission of 90,000 reliable measurements of atmospheric CO₂ levels during the last 180 years? Or, is he aware?

(8) David Karoly claims that the 97% of Earth’s annual CO₂ production by Nature is removed by Nature and the 3% produced by humans is not taken entirely out of the air. (8:35’) In reality, CO₂ levels in air are known scientifically to be determined by temperature. Levels of CO₂ in air cited by the UN IPCC reveal Nature overwhelms human production to seasonally drive **down** CO₂ levels. See Appendix 4;

(9) David Karoly emphasises his contradiction of empirical data (9:03’) repeatedly and then claims human CO₂, quote *“has caused increases in global temperatures”*;

(10) David Karoly falsely states, quotes: *“no reasonable scientist would question that the increases in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are contributing to the warming we’ve seen”* (9:14’). That statement contradicts many eminent scientists. As a UN IPCC Lead Author (2001) and Review Editor (2007) why does David Karoly make this statement when he has supposedly reviewed the literature? This statement of his transcends the understandable limitations of his personal knowledge likely restricted by his narrow specialty in computer modelling, yet as a Lead Author and Review Editor he should surely be aware of the literature worldwide, shouldn’t he?

(11) David Karoly dismisses 700 peer-reviewed articles disputing the theory of human CO₂ causing global warming by stating, quote: *“that most of the conclusions in those papers are highly limited and biased”*. (11:00’) Yet he was essentially responsible for the UN IPCC’s core claim of human causation of global warming despite the sole chapter on

which that claim is based relying on a narrow cabal of authors, many of whom have conflicts of financial interest and who fail to provide empirical evidence for their claim;

(12) At (12:55') David Karoly claimed droughts were caused by higher temperature. Yet reality—as explained to him by expert hydrologist Professor Stewart Franks more than once—is that high temperatures are due to drought. As a professor of meteorology David Karoly should know this, shouldn't he?

(13) Alan Jones asked David Karoly (14:12') about the Queensland floods of 2011 saying, quote: *"Did you state or imply that the floods were unusual in that they were caused by the human production of carbon dioxide?"* David Karoly's answer: "No". Alan Jones, quote: *"Did you imply that?"* David Karoly's answer: "No". David Karoly denied that he said or implied that Queensland's floods were caused by human production of CO₂. On December 31, 2010 in a report headed *'Floods: Climate link can't be denied'* he reportedly said, quote: *"What we are seeing over the last 50 years and over the last 100 years is a change in this pattern of extremes with more hot and more wet extremes in northern Australia and more hot and more dry extremes in southern Australia and that pattern is exactly what we would expect from climate change due to increasing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere."* <http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/46524> Reports show viewers concluded from David Karoly's various other public comments that Queensland's floods were more severe due to human CO₂. Yet in the previous 170 years there have been six more severe floods. He's a professor of meteorology and should know that, shouldn't he? He has access to weather and floods statistics.

(14) David Karoly states (15:36'), as taken from Media Watch's transcript, quote: *"... carbon dioxide on average is going from the atmosphere into the ocean... and not the other way around."*

Doesn't this raise questions about David Karoly's integrity and/or competence?

1. Why does David Karoly fail to acknowledge that massive quantities of carbon dioxide annually move from the ocean to the atmosphere? Why does he falsely imply it's a one-way process? Even corrupt UN IPCC's figures on sources of CO₂ reveal that oceans are by far the largest source of CO₂. This is widely recognized by scientists.
2. Climate alarmists falsely claim that a supposed rise in atmospheric CO₂ levels is due to human CO₂ production. That is based on their false claim that oceans are saturated with CO₂. Yet David Karoly's statement contradicts that argument. The UN IPCC deliberately omits 90,000 reliable measurements taken during the last 180 years. Some of these reveal CO₂ levels up to 40% above current levels. Why do they contradict these facts?
3. The oceans typify Nature's wonder, variety, beauty and intriguing complexity. CO₂ is not uniformly distributed through the atmosphere. There exists tremendous variation in ocean temperature with depth and spatial location, salinity and season. Why do climate alarmists defy and even contradict Nature's wondrous beauty and dynamism?

Nature's complexity reveals that passage of CO₂ between the ocean and atmosphere is affected by many factors including the mixing of sea water at depth, atmospheric winds, cold water sinking at the poles, natural variability in ocean pH (alkalinity), El Nino and

La Nina cycles, ...

Variation—including inter-annual and intra-annual variation—reveals that human CO₂ cannot determine atmospheric CO₂ levels. Nature alone controls CO₂ levels in air.

Empirical evidence and an understanding of variation displayed by CO₂ measurements, including those cited by the UN IPCC, reveal nature alone determines CO₂ levels in air. That is consistent with laws of science governing solubility of CO₂ in water.

4. Is David Karoly's quote by Media Watch a case of deliberate misrepresentation by David Karoly or inadvertent misrepresentation or simply sloppiness that becomes persuasive given most citizens' ignorance of technical details?

Is it yet another case of Media Watch blindly accepting and broadcasting the opinions of alarmist academics advocating unfounded alarm?

(15) David Karoly states, (16:50') quote: "*we also can look at the isotopes, the different atoms in the molecules of carbon dioxide and they show clear evidence that the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere that has been increasing is primarily due to burning fossil fuels and land clearing.*". That's a very interesting claim on two counts. Firstly, volcanic CO₂ has the same isotope as that in CO₂ from human combustion of fuels containing carbon. Secondly, does land clearing produce an isotope—or indeed, an isotope different from that produced by forest fires? Note scientist Tim Casey, quote: "*CO₂ contributions of volcanic origin isotopically indistinguishable from those of fossil fuel consumption*" <http://carbon-budget.geologist-1011.net/>

(16) David Karoly states, (17:47') quote: "*the isotopic evidence clearly shows that human burning of fossil fuels and land clearing is the main cause*" (of increased atmospheric CO₂ levels). He goes on, quote: "*You and your listeners are welcome to their opinions but (17:56') the scientific evidence shows that there is a major human contribution that's led to a 35% increase in the concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere*". As shown above, empirical measurements of pre-industrial atmospheric CO₂ levels reveal the UN IPC only selected low readings to falsely purport increasing CO₂ levels. David Karoly seems to be ignorant of or dismissive of scientific evidence that Earth's CO₂ atmospheric levels have been much higher in Earth's recent and mid-term past.

(17) Alan Jones mentioned that scientists on the UN IPCC that proclaimed global warming due to combustion of oil and coal were in 1974 proclaiming imminent catastrophic cooling due to the combustion of fuels containing carbon. David Karoly's responded, (19:27') quote: "*No Alan, they were not.*" Yet the late prominent UN IPCC contributor and senior advocate Stephen Schneider was one such prominent scientist warning of cooling.

(18) Alan Jones asked David Karoly (20:04') in the latter's senior role in producing UN IPCC reports, quote: "*Is there any empirical evidence proving **human** production of carbon dioxide as distinct from nature's production caused global warming? Is there in these reports?*" "Yes or no?" David Karoly's response, (20:36') quote: "Yes". Alan Jones, quote: "*Now where would I find that in chapter 9? That's your chapter.*" (20:42') David Karoly, quote: "*Sure. You would find that evidence in the peer-reviewed scientific*

*studies and in the data.” Alan Jones, quote: “Where in chapter 9?” “Where can I open chapter 9, because I looked. Where when I open chapter 9 is that evidence? Where is it?” David Karoly, quote: “It’s, I can’t tell you the page number because I don’t have the document in front of me.” Alan Jones, quote: “It’s not there. It’s not there.” (20:50’) “It’s not there. You were chapter Review Editor. It’s not there. That’s why you can’t tell me the page number. The evidence is not there”. David Karoly, quote: “That’s not true Alan.” Alan Jones, quote: “Well I’ve got scientists on stand-bye who are going to listen to all of this. So your reputation’s on the line when you say that. I’m telling you chapter 9 is your chapter. You were in fact the chapter’s Review Editor and you can’t tell me where the evidence is.” David Karoly, (21:20’) quote: “Yeah I can. Would you like me to tell you where the evidence is? The evidence is in the spatial patterns and the time variations of temperature changes in the observations”. Alan Jones, (21:30’), quote: “Woo woo woo woo woo. Chapter 9, chapter 9 David, is **the** chapter. It was originally chapter 12 in the 2001 report. In the 2007 report you were the Review Editor of this chapter on the direction, detection of climate change . It’s now called ‘Understanding and Attributing climate change’ . Now to understand climate change you need to know what evidence there was for all of this. In chapter 9, it’s not there.” (21:57’) David Karoly, quote: “No Alan, it is there. So would you like me to tell you which figure in particular in chapter 9 shows that evidence? It looks at the patterns of climate variations over the last fifty and the last one hundred years and what it does is it makes an evaluation or an assessment. It talks about how climate has changed. It compares it with what we’d expect from greenhouse gas variations. It also looks at other factors. Factors like changes in sunlight from the sun. Changes in the effect of volcanoes. Natural variations like El Ninos. Natural variations like the Pacific Decadal Oscillation. And what it shows, what it clearly shows is that the patterns of change are outside the range of natural variability, aren’t due to changes due to sunlight from the sun. And we can see that because sunlight from the sun would cause more warming in the daytime when the sun’s really important. But we’ve actually observed more warming at night. We’ve seen changes in the temperatures in the lower atmosphere and in the upper atmosphere which clearly show that the changes are due to the increases in greenhouse gases and aren’t due to natural variability. And aren’t due to other factors”. (23:14’) This is not evidence of **human** CO2 causing Earth’s latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998 (or as some claim ended in 2002, others say 1997, others, including prominent UN IPCC contributors, say 1995.) UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray, PhD is a research scientist who has more than 60 years’ experience across many fields of science in the real world, including over 20 years in climate. That’s distinct from David Karoly’s specialty in using unvalidated computer models. Dr. Gray has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007. He says there is no evidence in chapter 9 that **human** CO2 caused what little modest warming had occurred. He even doubts as to whether or not the modest warming was significant at all. Further, Dr. Gray states that the chapter (unscientifically) downplays the two known powerful drivers of climate: solar activity and ocean-atmosphere oscillations. I’ve read chapter 9, twice. It contains no empirical evidence nor any logical scientific reasoning proving **human** causation. It presents output from unvalidated computer models (David Karoly’s specialty) in a way that readers could misinterpret as actual data and measurements. Yet it contains no empirical data.*

(19) Earlier in the interview, Alan Jones correctly stated that to claim human CO2 caused catastrophic global warming (climate change) one would need to empirically prove all four key and basic causal relationships: (1) occurrence of unusual ongoing atmospheric temperature changes, with (2) those changes being caused by CO2 levels in the air, with (3) those levels in turn being due to human production of CO2 AND (4) evidence that warmer temperatures are catastrophically detrimental. David Karoly has failed to produce evidence of even just one of those four factors. Science in the real world proves that none of the above is occurring. David Karoly's chapter fundamentally misrepresents climate, Nature, science and humanity. David Karoly's chapter misleads readers. Yet it is the UN IPCC 2007 report's sole chapter claiming human production of CO2 caused warming. Presumably this is why David Karoly failed, yet again, to provide any empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning proving that human CO2 caused atmospheric warming. There is no such evidence. As Dr. Gray and many reputable scientists worldwide state.

(20) UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray, PhD advises that he has received no comments on his review of chapter 9. Yet when advised of that by Alan Jones, (23:20') David Karoly responded, quote: *"That's not true. His review comments were thoroughly evaluated by the authors as is every comment and the responses to his comments are available from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and he knows that he can get those responses. He's seen those responses."* This is not scientific peer-review. David Karoly was Review Editor for that chapter. The Inter Academy Council report in August 2010 specifically stated that the review process is very loose and effectively not a review. It's certainly not a scientific review.

(21) Alan Jones asks, (24:40') quote: *"Do you know David McLean, an IT specialist who's gone through all the IPCC processes, all the IPCC data and he says that chapter 9, your chapter claiming human production of carbon dioxide causing global warming in the 2007 report, John McLean says it was not scientifically peer-reviewed? He's seen all the data."* David Karoly said, (25:03') quote: *"He's welcome to his opinion but you, any of your listeners if they're interested can contact the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, can get the review comments and can get"* Alan Jones, quote: *"peer peer peer peer peer-reviewed, was yours peer-reviewed?"* (25:16') David Karoly, quote: *"Absolutely it was"*. Alan Jones, quote: *"Well the UN's own data, the UN's own data shows only five of its reviewers, only five, this is the UN's own data endorsed the claim that carbon dioxide caused global warming and there's doubt that they were even scientists. These are your people, the reviewers, you were the Review Editor it's your chapter"*. David Karoly, (25:37') quote: *"Alan you're wrong and John McLean is wrong. The number that he's referring to, I don't know where they come from, but there were more than two thousand review comments from more than 100 different authors providing independent peer-review of chapter 9. And those data and the authors and the review comments they are available from the IPCC."* Alan Jones (26:00') *"Five hundred and seventy five, five hundred and seventy five comments on your chapter. Five hundred and seventy five."* Yet by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation on Tuesday, November 17th, 2009 I provided David Karoly and the University of Melbourne with the following titles of John McLean's work, saying, quote: *"McLean's reports are not sensibly refuted since they simply present UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself on its own processes for producing UN IPCC reports."*

The reports presenting UN IPCC data are entitled:

- *'The IPCC can't count its "expert scientists": Author and reviewer numbers are wrong'.*
- *'An Analysis of the Review of the IPCC 4AR WGI Report'.*
- *'Prejudiced authors, Prejudiced findings: Did the UN bias its attribution of "global warming" to humankind?'*
- *'Why the IPCC Should be Disbanded'.*
- *'Peer Review? What Peer Review? Failures of scrutiny in the UN's Fourth Assessment Report'.*

McLean's presentation of UN IPCC data appears to vindicate my conclusion that Professor Karoly lacks an understanding of scientific process and or lacks integrity in his work and comments on climate." Separately, David Karoly was given Internet URL's for each of these articles. Further, David Karoly's chapter 9 was not scientifically peer-reviewed in the accepted meaning of peer-review in science.

(22) David Karoly states (26:49'), quote: *"I have never said the science on climate change and its regional impacts is settled"*. Oh, really.

(23) Alan Jones asked, (27:48') quote: *"Can I just ask you a final question in all this we could go on forever. Are you being paid for being on the government's Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel?"* David Karoly: *"I beg your pardon"*. Alan Jones: *"Are you being paid for being on the government's Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel?"* David Karoly: *"No my salary is not being paid by them"*. Alan Jones: *"Are you in any in receipt of any benefits or funds or anything at all?"* David Karoly: *"I am receiving a travel allowance to cover the costs of going to meetings of the Science Advisory Panel and I am receiving a small retainer which is substantially less than your daily salary."* Alan Jones: *"Hang on, hang on. But, but you are in the pay of the Gillard government."* David Karoly: *"As you are in the pay of 2GB."* Alan Jones: *"Yeah, hang on, hang on. That's got nothing to do with it. You're in the pay of the Gillard government. So you're paid by the government and then you give an opinion on the science of climate change. Have you ever heard about he who pays the piper calls the tune?"* David Karoly: *"Um Alan, let me give you some information about the evidence on climate change."*

(24) Alan Jones said (28:53'), quote: *"I'm happy to talk to you again, further. And perhaps, perhaps we should arrange a meeting, a debate. And I'd be happy for you to meet with people from The Galileo Movement."*

(25) David Karoly, (29:27') quote: *"And the perceived truth is that geological factors are the only important factors affecting climate."* False. Across the field of climate science, scientists know that weather and climate are affected by galactic, solar, terrestrial, geological, oceanic, atmospheric and other factors.

On October 21st, 2011 Alan Jones challenged Tony Abbott on the corrupt foundation of the absurd Liberal policy of cutting human CO2 production through the Liberals' Direct

Action policy. Alan Jones has held the NSW Liberal government for not following through on dismantling coastline management plans introduced by the previous Labor government based on corrupt UN IPCC and CSIRO projections.

Please refer to Appendix 9, pages 6 to 13 for observations and comments on David Karoly's statements and behaviour.