18th February 2014

Dear Professor Karoly,

We have been writing to you for a year requesting that you provide one credible study that supports your hypothesis of catastrophic, human caused global warming (CAGW). You have not been able to provide one. The letters and your responses are all on the public record https://www.facebook.com/DavidKarolyEmailThread?ref=hl

In March 2013 we issued you the opportunity to either renounce your alarmist claims on the ABC news, or publicly provide empirical data-based evidence, that is available for scientific scrutiny, to support them.

Almost a year has passed and still you have not provided the evidence.

We remind you that the Australian people are experiencing financial disadvantage as a result of the host of policies and administrative decisions driven by advice regarding the science of climate change. Is that advice false or misleading? Does it deceive by concealing or omitting or embellishing or misrepresenting relevant facts?

The definition of fraud is, according to Black’s Law Dictionary, quote: “a false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury.”

According to Malcolm Roberts, author of the CSIRO Oh! report http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh%21.html, you are prominently involved in many taxpayer-funded climate bodies fomenting unfounded climate alarm. One of your roles is that you are Editor-In-Chief of the Bureau of Meteorology’s (BOM’s) in-house journal. On page 10 of his report’s Appendix 7, Malcolm Roberts cites Peter Bobroff’s analysis, quote: “Publishing the research. The Bureau of Meteorology has its own in-house journal: the Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal (prev Aust. Meteorol. Mag.). The editor-in-chief responsible for the defence of the scientific method, elimination of all types of bias, automatic release of all relevant data and code is none other than David Karoly – the strident proponent of human causation of future catastrophic global warming. The BOM itself has taken a strong partisan position on the subject.”

Despite your BOM responsibilities, Malcolm Roberts adds, quote: “Yet David Karoly has repeatedly publicly contradicted empirical scientific evidence”.

According to their website you also appear to be BOM’s principal author. Graphs on the following pages were obtained or produced by various independents non-aligned
examiners and auditors of BOM records. Are you the author of the original regional temperature data or graphs used by BOM?

Every graph shows that the raw data, which shows either a flat or downward (cooling) trend has been “adjusted” to a warming trend. Are you associated in any way with producing BOM’s adjusted graphs? If so, in our opinion it is very misleading of both you and the BOM personnel to adjust the data to the extent that it misrepresents reality. We also think that it is very misleading of both you and BOM to omit to declare to the Australian people that you have “adjusted” the raw data.
Nhill 1910 to 2009 (Green is the Original Data, Red is the Adjusted Data)

Omeo 1910 - 2009 (Green is the Original Data, Red is the Adjusted Data)
Ararat 1910 to 2009 (Green is Ararat the original Data, Red is the Adjusted Data)
The original Rutherglen records show...
The original Rutherglen records show

Adjusted records
Darwin Zero Temperature "Homogeneity" Adjustment by GHCN

Post-1941 trend slope is 6 C per century...
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The original Alice Springs records show...
Under Australia’s strong democracy no one is above the law. Judges, politicians, scientists, academics, senior public servants, and managing directors can be held to account for breaching their fiduciary duty.

It seems that you have prominent roles across many taxpayer-funded entities promoting unfounded and unscientific claims of anthropogenic global warming and contradicting empirical scientific evidence. Your many prominent roles place you at the hub of the web of such agencies. You have thereby positioned yourself perfectly for answering our fundamental and straight-forward questions. As taxpayers and concerned scientists we look forward to your evidence based response. It is not a good look if you do not acknowledge this very public letter.
In closing, if there is anything we have said that you think is untrue please click reply all and let us know and we will apologise.

Dr Judy Ryan

Dr Marjorie Curtis