

Trying to make sense of propagandist Graham Readfearn
by
Malcolm Roberts

It's time to call alarmist would-be journalists on their falsities, smears and unfounded support for corruption of climate science.

On June 1st, 2011 Graham Readfearn called me. With Graham's knowledge and concurrence our conversation was recorded. It's posted on The Galileo Movement's website at:

www.galileomovement.com.au/media/GrahamReadfearn-1_06_11-3_51PM.mp3

We talked for almost half an hour. My comments and conclusions follow.

Graham admits he doesn't read reports by the UN climate body (UN IPCC). Yet relies on those reports and promotes them as solid science. Why?

Graham seems not aware that the UN's latest (2007) report on climate contains only one chapter claiming global warming and attributing it to human carbon dioxide, Chapter 9. He seems to be not aware of its significance. Why?

Please see: http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/2_AppendixIPCC.pdf

He's thus not aware that sole chapter contains no evidence of human causation.

He is aware of some corruption of climate science yet peddles climate alarm based on that corrupt science. Why?

He avoids my offer to provide him with facts. His email address is publicly available yet he refused to give his address in response to my offer to send him facts. Why?

His belief is contrary to empirical scientific evidence. Yet separately he stridently pushes those views contrary to facts. Separately, his work falsely denigrates and smears people whose views differ from his. He resorts to peddling unfounded and false smears. Why?

He admits there is a lot of information on The Galileo Movement's website. In all that information he failed to find fault with any of the hundreds of statements and claims on our website. Yet separately he criticises and smears The Galileo Movement. Why?

Around three minutes from the recording's end, implicitly Graham seemed by exception to specifically confirm no error on The Galileo Movement's website.

He claimed to have visited The Galileo Movement's website <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/index.php> yet when questioned about it he seemed not able to sensibly answer. Why?

Since our discussion I've added my report on CSIRO. It's entitled *CSIROh! Climate of Deception? or First Step to Freedom?* It's available here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

My comments on key topics discussed in our conversation are supported by *CSIROh!* and appendices. John McLean's work is in Appendix 2 and empirical scientific evidence in Appendix 4.

(*CSIROh!* is more comprehensive than The Galileo Movement's website. In their response to my requests, senior executives of CSIRO and our Bureau of Meteorology failed to identify and specify any errors. The 25 page report and appendices total 800 pages covering many aspects of climate science and corruption of climate science. It has withstood scrutiny by academics pushing unfounded climate alarm.)

Graham makes statements based on apparently loose and unverified assumptions. Why?

Separately, he quickly and viciously spread false and unfounded implicit claims by Fairfax Media's reporter, Mike Carlton that The Galileo Movement is anti-Semitic. In doing so he failed to check Mike Carlton's falsities and was complicit in falsely smearing TGM's volunteers and both its directors whose family connections are Jewish. That dishonoured Suzi Smeed wife of co-founder John Smeed. Suzi survived the holocaust as an infant. Their response video is available here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_2gVALhIORM&feature=c4-overview&list=UU2UkS2qtnu7L3krRTF6bQIw

He claims his reason for calling me and then discussing for almost half an hour were to check whether or not I was employed by a particular company. I wasn't, never have been and am not employed by that company. That was resolved in the early minutes.

If I had been employed by that company, would it affect or disqualify my scientific facts and the empirical scientific evidence I present on climate?

Graham seems to be not aware that science is settled by empirical scientific evidence and accuracy of predictions not by smears and falsities. Why?

A person relying on unfounded smears and associations reveals he lacks scientific evidence to counter those whose beliefs differ. It's an implicit admission that he lacks the scientific facts and understanding. Why?

If he had the facts he'd present them, wouldn't he? He fails to do so. Why?

Graham's actions do not meet my need for being heard. His listening skills seem to be poorly developed. He clutches at straws and diversions. From what I've seen, this prevents understanding. Yet he purports to be a reporter.

Often he wouldn't allow me to answer his questions. From what I've seen that can be a symptom of fear that the questioner doesn't feel comfortable with the direction of the conversation and is trying to control. Underneath control invariably is fear.

He makes many errors and seems very loose in his conclusions and statements. Why?

After his many erroneous statements Graham eventually apologised.

He seems to be deluding himself and running from facts. It's clear that on the topic of global warming Graham has no idea of what he's talking. Listen and decide for yourself.