



PO Box 71  
Ashgrove West Q 4060

Phone: 1300 766 715

Email:  
[admin@galileomovement.com.au](mailto:admin@galileomovement.com.au)

Website:  
[www.galileomovement.com.au](http://www.galileomovement.com.au)

14 September 2012

Dear friends and supporters,

The Galileo Movement is disappointed that the fabricated smear originating from the Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) that The Galileo Movement is anti-Semitic is still being reported as fact. To prevent this ridiculous, vile claim being spread further, we'd like to highlight a few facts and expose the techniques and the dishonest tactics used by people too lazy to do real research, who wish to silence us by calling us anti-Semitic.

Firstly, the claims are preposterous. Both Directors of the Galileo Movement have a strong Jewish heritage, including John's wife who is a Holocaust survivor and Case's mother, most of whose family were murdered for being Jewish.

Secondly, the Galileo Movement has never spoken or published anything that is anti-Semitic. The non-profit group of unpaid volunteers have a single, publicly stated purpose – to remove the unnecessary and damaging "Carbon Dioxide Tax", its derivatives and the means by which such negative, economic and socially destructive legislation may be reintroduced.

The Galileo Movement promotes science and the scientific method. Yet in order to distract people from these inconvenient facts which they obviously have no answer to, some people attack the messenger, rather than discuss the science. The method of censor through denigration is further discussed [here](#).

The process of trying to discredit us began with Sydney Morning Herald reporter Ben Cubby, who contacted us to ask our opinion of the Muller et al (alarmist) and Watts et al (sceptic) papers which were released the day before. The recording of the interview with our Project Leader Malcolm Roberts, presents a clear and precise scientific explanation of the problems with Muller's paper. Additionally, he spoke at length outlining the motives of those supporting AGW including, academics feeding off taxpayer grants, politicians seeking political benefit and bankers harvesting carbon credits. Of the 48 minute interview, Cubby strangely chose to virtually ignore almost all of the science and facts (plus mention of the Watts et al paper) and instead chose to highlight the banking industries comment.

The smear was created when Mike Carlton, also from the SMH, with no proof or without contacting us, linked a discussion on banks making profits from Carbon Trading to *"In Rightspeak, understand, that's code for the Great Jewish Conspiracy"*. Afterwards, others began repeating this fabricated connection as if it were a proven, undoubtedly hoping to stop others listening to our science based critique.

Malcolm Roberts, our Project Leader, used the term ‘banking families’ during the interview to describe the major banking institutions that plan to profit from the trading and financing of CO<sub>2</sub> abatement.

Neither Malcolm, nor ourselves, were aware that using the term ‘family’, when referring to banks, could in any context be anti-Semitic. We submit that any reasonable person would take the meaning at face value. Finding non-existent meanings and hidden codes are the tricks our opponents use. They revert to these tired and transparent techniques to desperately avoid discussing the science.

How could Mike Carlton’s ill-informed opinion find its way into a mainstream Australian newspaper? Why did a reporter like Ben Cubby ignore basic science? Is it bias or groupthink?

We have a few ideas for the Sydney Morning Herald that they might to report on. It’s readers will find these both interesting and also puzzling as to why they have not heard such facts previously. Let’s start with:

- Why not request your reporters to ask scientists to provide empirical evidence that an increase in human CO<sub>2</sub> production caused the slight increase in atmospheric temperature, a warming trend that ended in 1998 and explain why global temperatures have not risen since despite increasing human CO<sub>2</sub> production?
- Why not also ask scientists to explain why computer models supposedly simulating Earth's future temperature to warm with projected increased CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, can’t explain why the atmospheric temperature has not warmed since 1998?
- Could you ask your reporters to explain how spending \$257 billion on renewable energy to produce only 3% of the world electricity is [economically sustainable](#) when only \$302 billion was spent on fossil fuels and nuclear energy to produce the remaining 97%?
- Is the SMH aware that the August, 2010 report by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council revealed fundamentally that none of the UN IPCC's 800 statements of certainty could be trusted? Is the SMH aware that CSIRO lacks empirical scientific evidence for the claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming and climate change and that CSIRO's core climate claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. Why has the SMH failed to hold both these bodies accountable for their unfounded, unscientific and false claims about human CO<sub>2</sub>?

The Galileo Movement will continue to hold to account those in science, economics and politics who continue to promote unscientific, dishonest and unfounded claims of man-made global warming. We will continue to stand by fellow sceptics who find themselves being falsely smeared by their opponents.

Regards

John Smeed & Case Smit