

From: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Subject: Caution: ABC's Wendy Carlisle appears to have misrepresented her position
Date: 18 January 2013 10:38:44 AM AEST
To: Roberts1 Malcolm <malcolm@conscious.com.au>

Begin forwarded message:

From: Malcolm Roberts <xxxxxxxx@xxxxxx.net.au>
Date: 11 July 2011 2:31:10 PM AEST
To: Paltridge Garth, Carter Bob, "Lindzen Richard, Dick", Tim Ball, Peter Ridd, McLean John, Pat Michaels, Singer Fred, "Allen Wes (David Weston)", Franks Stewart, Gray Vincent, Archibald David, Evans David, Nova Joanne, D'Aleo Joe
Cc: Wishart Ian, Solomon Lawrence, Wendy Carlisle, Fieravanti-Wells Concetta, Williams John
Subject: Caution: ABC's Wendy Carlisle appears to have misrepresented her position

Dear Garth, Bob, Dick, Tim, Peter, John, Pat, Fred, Wes, Stewart, Vincent, David, Jo, Joe, Ian, Lawrence:

You were recently sent an e-mail introducing ABC reporter Wendy Carlisle.

That followed an approach by, and conversation with, Wendy. Early in that conversation I advised her that our conversation was being recorded.

I just reviewed both my conversations with Wendy.

My introduction of her to you was made in good faith. Wendy stated and implied by her comments and by her requests that she was openly researching the sceptic position on global warming.

After my sharing of quantitative data and specific instances with her, Wendy requested access to be able to talk with scientists about the retribution faced by sceptic scientists who speak out on global warming. Wendy requested permission to contact them, quote: "*to know what evidence they've got*".

Wendy specifically requested Tim Ball's contact details and said she wanted to talk with as many people (scientists) as possible on the sceptic position.

I then went to considerable effort to compile contact details to make it easy for Wendy to contact scientists.

Regrettably, based on comments from people to whom I referred her, my conclusion is that Wendy did not honestly represent her position to me.

Some conclusions and opinions formed by those who've been contacted by her are presented below.

Please accept my regret for introducing someone to you whose actions have been offensive to some.

Whether or not you make yourself available to her is your choice.

I will be maintaining my invitation to her to contact me. I will be recording every conversation with her.

Wendy's apparent dishonesty though means that I will rescind my offer to provide her with support as needed to contact others.

It's deeply concerning that the ABC prefers to continually parade distortions, misrepresentations, omissions, evasions and/or lies from prominent advocates claiming or implying human causation of warming. These advocates include those who have repeatedly failed to provide evidence for their claims funded by government.

People such as Tim Flannery, Ross Garnaut, David Karoly, Will Steffen, Kurt Lambeck, Matthew England, Andy Pitman and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg continue to fail to produce evidence of human causation of global warming.

Yet the ABC may be trying to squash The Galileo Movement, a volunteer organisation receiving advice from real scientists. An organisation untainted by vested interests. An organisation whose Project Manager has publicly posted his declaration of interests since publishing his first document exposing corruption of climate science.

I maintain today a detailed publicly available declaration.

That the ABC allows its reporters to apparently tarnish real science while supporting and promoting propaganda is deeply troubling.

Fortunately, though, citizens are seeing the core issue. After yesterday's rally in Hyde Park, an older couple came to me and pressed three five dollar bills into my hand. The lady said thank you for speaking up and here's some money in support of The Galileo Movement. It's all they could afford at the moment. That's moving. The tone of their voice, the appreciation, the sincerity, the hug, the handshake.

Wendy meanwhile fishes to see if we have any large corporate donors. She is still not aware that thanks to misrepresentations and smears by the media and government, that corporations are afraid to donate. That's why The Galileo Movement has been formed.

She seems ignorant of the reality of vested interests and lobbyists positioning themselves as green and others corrupting science with government funding.

On Friday I wondered what Wendy would do after twice listening to solid data from Lord Monckton, Jo Nova and David Evans in Newcastle and Sydney. Both Jo and Christopher later expressed their disgust with the manner of Wendy's approaches and questions to them.

Wendy's approach seemingly reveals an ignorance of the IPCC and ignorance of real science. Yet she displays what I see as her keen interest in discrediting real science and making unfounded ad hominem attacks on honest citizens.

At last Saturday's rally in Sydney's Hyde Park it was clear that people are awake to the distortions, misrepresentations, omissions, evasions and lies from the government and from prominent advocates of global warming. Spread, in part, by some corners of the ABC.

Hang in there. Despite some ABC screeching, truth is emerging.

Malcolm

PS:

A little rule by which I live is to avoid saying anything about someone that I would not say to their face. Accordingly, Wendy is copied hereto.

PS:

Some conclusions and opinions formed by those who've been contacted by Wendy are:

"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 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."

And:

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

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

And:

"she only wanted to focus on that to prove that Xxxxxx and I were unreliable 'frauds'."

"she was not interested at all in the science or a single error made by (a notoriously unscientific proponent of AGW whom she purported to be interested in learning about)"

