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The original message on the ‘paradigm of prevention’, which obliges government to address the emergency from terrorism, was first coined by former US Attorney General John Ashcroft. Soon after, Australian Prime Minister of the day John Howard was to follow Ashcroft’s call. The new Labor government in 2007 deployed a fresh strategy: ‘the precautionary principle’ where government justifies further intrusive measures to confront the emergencies of climate change. This silent messaging as placed in the news media, by inclusion or omission of certain facts, can be traced and exposed to reveal a quietly agreed process to influence the public to imagine the worst without solid evidence. While such hidden messages will continue to shape public opinion and cause obfuscation, journalism educators can develop learning experiences so their students can notice the detail. This paper explores how journalism educators can work with the realities of the news media, which fan public fear of imagined catastrophes on behalf of governments. Students can very quickly learn to join the dots through meticulous discourse analysis coupled with simple computer assisted research - something the compliant mainstream news media seems unable to apply in its normative role as a ‘watchdog’ of government.
The dog whistle: Under the radar, yet being obeyed

January 2010: A number of old stories re-emerged with new relevance in the media. With interplay of government spin, obfuscation and omission, these stories converged in creating fear, confusion and heightened emergency. One of such stories was former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair's revelation in the Chilcot Inquiry into the Iraq war that the file on the alleged suicide of weapons expert Dr David Kelly was embargoed for 70 years. The file would have contained Kelly’s medical record and coroner’s report on the cause of death. Microbiologist Dr Kelly was most likely to have known if Iraq really had weapons of mass destruction, the primary justification for the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The news media failed to adequately question the implications of the Hutton Inquiry’s 70-year embargo. Journalism failed to scrutinize the implications of this with the clarity and diligence required of journalists whose ‘first obligation is to the truth’ (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2001).

At around the same time, scientists at the Climate Research Unit (CRU), University of East Anglia (UK), were under investigation for alleged scientific fraud and for avoiding a legal obligation to reply to Freedom of Information applications for release of their raw scientific data. Again the mainstream news media failed to effectively report this despite news of the Dutch government relying on the main critic of CRU, the blog 'wattsupwiththat', to show that a ‘United Nations report wrongly claimed that more than half of the Netherlands is currently below sea level’.

In the lead-up to the Copenhagen Summit in December 2009, instead of due diligence and balance in reporting, the English speaking public witnessed advocacy in journalism relating to climate change. This overstated a looming emergency of catastrophic rising temperatures with subsequent rising sea levels from melting glaciers and polar ice caps.

January 20, 2010: Four Australian passports were used by Israel’s Mossad in the assassination of Hamas commander, Mahmoud al-Mabhouh, in his Dubai hotel room. Again failing to serve the public right to know, the Australian media missed the opportunity to adequately provide relevant background to the news story. This failing continued to May 2010 when Australian Foreign Minister, Stephen Smith, said in Parliament that Israel was responsible for faking the passports. He then requested a member of the Israeli Embassy be withdrawn from Australia.

The critical background in the public interest was that in 2004 New Zealand had convicted and jailed two Mossad agents, Uriel Kelman and Eli Cara, for their attempts to falsely obtain New Zealand passports. Public right to know imperatives are further reinforced in the reality that Australia and Israel are allies and share intelligence. In 2005, Israeli diplomat Amir Laty was expelled from Australia and this was said to be in response to his inappropriate and aggressive pursuit of women, including a Defence Department employee. It was also reported that another woman of interest to Laty was the daughter of federal Attorney-General Philip Ruddock. In ‘More sinister reasons for diplomat’s expulsion’, journalist Mark Forbes wrote in The Sun-Herald:

The matter attracted the interest of the Federal Police and ASIO, highly sensitive to the risks of identity fraud after September 11, 2001. Another element of the NZ case would have alarmed ASIO: Mr Cara was operating as a
travel agent in Sydney and probably working for Mossad. And who appears to have been his embassy contact? Amir Laty.

**Sydney 2006:** Eminent defence lawyer and critic of Australian laws in response to the war on terror, Phillip Boulten SC, opened artist Debra Dawes’ exhibition, ‘Cover Up’. Dawes’ installation, using military-purpose snow-camouflage coupled with her art on paper, explored the metaphoric potential of camouflage as deception. Boulten’s speech was recorded by Blackall and uploaded to YouTube, entitled *Dog Whistle.*

Dog whistle. A very apt term that describes a range of hidden messages enunciated clearly, but inaudibly by politicians ... camouflage. There have been some very good exponents of the dog whistle. Peter Reith was the Minister for Industrial Relations (1996-97) who conspired with right-wing ideologues to smash unionised labour on the waterfronts. He called this ‘industry reform’. The hounds could hear the true message and responded. Philip Ruddock abolished many procedural safeguards for refugees and asylum seekers and made an art of incarcerating Muslim men, women and children who had committed no crimes. He called this ‘border protection’. The dogs knew what he really meant. John Howard talked of the type of people who would throw their children overboard and the dogs heard it clearly as the signal to keep callous and dangerous Muslims out of Australia.

**Sydney 2010:** A speech by Australian Broadcasting Corporation Chair, Maurice Newman, expanded the notion of dog whistle to incorporate ideological conformism. Speaking to ABC staff, Newman described this sort of propaganda as being politically encoded – essentially ‘dog whistle journalism’.

He quoted Chris Uhlmann’s ABC blog posted last October, *In praise of the sceptics,* which is no longer accessible (Newman, 2010).

Climate science we are endlessly told is ‘settled’ … but to make the perfectly reasonable point that science is never settled risks being branded a ‘sceptic’ or worse a ‘denier’ …one of those words, like ‘racist’, which is deliberately designed to gag debate…You can be branded a denier if you accept the problem and question the solutions (Uhlmann 2009).

Some currently accessible blogs carry accusations that Uhlmann had committed heresy against the ABC.

Reporting on climate science has also failed to examine the federal government’s proposed and postponed legislation as contained in the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). A most disturbing aspect is the absence of the usual checks and balances in law, necessary in curbing the potential for malpractice in surveillance and policing within the carbon trading scheme. News-media’s failure in analysing the harshness in the proposed laws is further testimony to the issue of climate change generally being under scrutinised. The dog whistle as applied to terrorism, fanning fear of Muslims, is now relevant to the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme legislation (CPRS) within the ETS. Sections of law work as they do for suspected terrorists. In essence, the laws are as severe as the Anti Terror Legislation or the National Security Information Act. Journalism has failed to ask why such severity is necessary.
March 2009: Tim Wilson of the Institute of Public Affairs sent a press release to major news sources to expose the severity of the CPRS 2009 in a number of clauses, which cuts into centuries of law and jurisprudence. He cited parts of the Bill, demonstrating how it will enshrine in law, that anyone suspected of emitting too much carbon: their right to silence is abolished (clause 311-3), their right not to incriminate themselves is abolished (clause 300-1) and the onus of proof is reversed. A citizen suspected of such crimes will also need to prove they’re innocent instead of a court proving they’re guilty (clause 336-3). This amounts to a disappearance of habeas corpus. In the third 2010 version of the Bill, severity in some sections was hardened.

This follows a precedent set by the Australian Climate Change Regulatory Authority Bill, which removes the right to privacy, and that the government may pass on private information about Australian citizens, perhaps as journalists writing about such issues, to foreign governments (clause 48-1(r)), and the United Nations (clause 48-1(s)). In response to our question of how many parties in the news media responded to the contents of his release, Wilson replied: ‘As far as I am aware it didn’t get any media coverage’.

The Age, however, reported on June 12, 2009 (‘Federal police to enforce greenhouse law’) that police will enforce greenhouse emission laws under the proposed CPRS, but will do so without extra resources:

AFP Association chief Jim Torr told News Limited newspapers. “The government is effectively saying to us, ignore other crime types”. 14

August, 2010: The science on which carbon trade is justified continues to be found wanting, with limited news or scrutiny of alleged errors. For a decade, at least one satellite recording earth temperatures has been malfunctioning with hot spikes in temperatures as relayed to earth. US government National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) program coordinator, Chuck Pistis, recently confirmed that faulty data has been stopped from being streamed directly to climate modeling.

Launched September 2000, ‘NOAA-16’ is still operational in a sun-synchronous orbit 849 km above the Earth. It provides automated data feed of surface temperatures, which are streamed into climate computer models. The Wisconsin area and Lake Michigan in particular had recorded false temperature readings at well above the boiling point of water.

Such flawed data has been used from many ground measuring stations. While some stations being sourced throughout the world didn’t exist, others offered confused and affected data. Some raised temperatures were in response to urbanisation around many weather stations. Airport recording stations are gradually encroached by development. Air-conditioning and support engines pump hot exhaust and so raise temperatures around stations. Concrete, masonry and asphalt in car parks absorb heat from the sun throughout the day and re-radiate that heat at night, thus elevating readings in nearby measuring stations. Unaffected rural stations have generally shown decades of consistent temperatures. News media have failed to explain or examine these simple anomalies.

Journalists also fail to explain that approximately 135 giga-tonnes of carbon in atmospheric carbon dioxide mix with oceans each year; 6 to 8 giga-tonnes of this
carbon is human derived, less than 6% of total ocean exchange. Thus, only 6% of total carbon can be reduced by an ETS, taxes or forest offsets – simply ineffective.

The dog whistle as a political technology shaping public policy

Boulten explains that successive governments all attempt to convince people that they’re working towards the creation of a stable, just and secure political environment:

. . . governments have declared a seemingly never ending war on terror. In reality, what they are doing is establishing the basis for a never ending state of fear, where supposedly only those in power have the ability to keep people safe and secure (Boulten, 2006).

2007: Accountant Vinayagamoorthy, Tamil community newspaper editor Yathavan, and financial planner Rajeevan, were each charged with being members of and providing support to the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam. The Tamil Tigers or LTTE is a listed terrorist organisation. Victorian Police held a press conference outlining details of the men’s alleged crimes before they faced court and before one of them was formally charged. It was reported on the day of the arrest that, even though police held a press conference alleging the men were using funds raised for tsunami victims to instead fund a terrorist group, it would be 48 hours before Vinayagamoorthy’s lawyer, Rob Stary, would be given details of the charges so he could apply for bail.

The dog whistle went further in the case of Vinayagamoorthy and Yathavan. On May 1, one month after their arrest, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade renewed its travel warning to Sri Lanka, which reinforced the danger of LTTE. The advisory warned travelers of the ‘tensions between the government of Sri Lanka and the Tamil Tigers’ even though the Australian government’s level of alertness for the country in general did not appear to change and no other advisories from other countries were issued at the time. The alert was timely, reminding Australians that the Tamil men as charged were more dangerous to Australians than the Sri Lankan fans and cricket team touring Australia for four matches from October 27, 2007 to March 7, 2008. Later the charges against the three, of being members of a terrorist organization, were dropped.

By March 2010 the case was over. The three Australians were free but had criminal convictions with good behaviour bonds after pleading guilty to funding the Tamil Tigers. The Supreme Court judge, Paul Coghlan acknowledged that the three men did not accept LTTE as a terrorist organisation. However, in their controlling of the Australian humanitarian branch of LTTE and in sending funds, they risked those funds being channelled to military purposes. 15

The court heard all three anguished over their country’s civil war and wanted to provide humanitarian assistance. Given the multi-million dollar investigation by the Australian Federal Police on the case, defence lawyer Rob Stary argued for an inquiry into the way such cases were initiated. He said the police and security services tended to interpret the laws in the strictest of ways and so he called for a review of the terrorism laws.

In an interview with Monica Attard on ABC Radio National Sunday Profile, Arumugam Rajeevan identified the dog whistle at work in maintaining a public perception of heightened emergency. He was arrested near Penrith, after his car had
been followed and surrounded by a cavalcade of unmarked police cars. The officers were shouting and training their weapons on him as he was told to lay face down on the road and be handcuffed.

You know I would have expected people coming and having a chat about these things at my house or at my office or whatever. But you don’t expect these things to happen in the middle of the road and in a busy street in Penrith in broad daylight (Rajeevan, 2010).

Attard asked Rajeevan about the AFP traveling to Sri Lanka to investigate and collect evidence for the case. Rajeevan replied: “I believe there was a political agenda and . . . the AFP was serving the interests of a third party; in this case the interests of Sri Lanka as opposed to serving the national interests of Australia”.

In 2005, 13 men were arrested in Melbourne and nine in Sydney – all charged with terrorism offences. They were to become known as the ‘Barwon 13’ and the ‘Goulburn 9’ respectively, after their places of incarceration. Then Victorian Premier, Steve Bracks, was heavily quoted saying that the arrests had ‘probably disrupted the most serious preparation for a terrorist attack that we have seen in Australia’. However, a lawyer of one of the accused was quick to point out that ‘his clients had not been charged with planning a terrorist attack, but only with membership in a terrorist organisation’ (Bonner, 2005).

That Victorian Premier Bracks and others who echoed his sentiments at the time, including the media, were likely to be prejudicing a fair trial was evident in the sentencing remarks of the trial judge. After a long jury trial that concluded in September 2008, seven men were sentenced on February 3, 2009 by Justice Bongiorno on the basis that the group ‘led by Benbrika encouraged and / or took some act towards the commission of a terrorist act some time in the future on an as yet undetermined target’ (R v Benbrika & Ors (2009) VSC 21 at para 42).

Melbourne terrorism suspect, Joseph (‘Jihad’ Jack) Thomas also faced such problems at his first trial when he was charged with being associated with a terrorist organisation. In Key witness statement withheld from Jack Thomas’s lawyers, ABC Radio’s Alison Caldwell reported that the AFP had withheld evidence of an interview with convicted American terrorist, John Walker Lindh. This evidence stated that the Afghan Taliban ran the Al-Farooq training camp in Afghanistan where Thomas had trained. In court, the prosecution claimed the camp was run by al-Qaeda (Caldwell, 2006).

For Thomas, it was a worse offence to be training with a terrorist organisation rather than with the armed forces of a country receiving aid from Australia’s closest ally, the United States. However for thorough researchers the information was in the public domain. Robert Scheer wrote in Drug War Led Bush Astray Before 9-11, that the United States gave the Taliban US$43 million in May 2001 (The Nation, 14 April, 2004). In October 2008, in Thomas’s subsequent trial, he was acquitted of receiving funds from al-Qaeda, but convicted of falsifying his passport.

In Blackall’s video Dog Whistle Boulten names others he feels are heeding the call and repeating the message. Pointing out Sheik Taj Din al-Hilali’s ‘ill considered and generally regarded to be offensive comments’ on the status of women, 16 Boulten (ibid) reminds us of ‘calls from Ms [Pru] Goward, still supposedly an independent senior
government official, for Sheik Hilaly’s prosecution for inciting rapists … The double standard is easy to see – it is not well camouflaged.’

At the time, Goward was not just an independent senior government official, but seeking pre-selection for a safe Liberal seat in the New South Wales election in March 2007. She had already lost a pre-selection for the seat of Epping, but instead won for the seat of Goulburn on the NSW Southern Highlands. In media interviews, Goward called on Sheik Hilali to be deported for his comments (Leys, 2006). The dog whistle was again at work. Quoted in the media as Sex Discrimination Commissioner rather than a candidate in the upcoming NSW elections, Goward was forced to admit she didn’t know the Sheik’s residency status and could well have been calling for the deportation of an Australian citizen.

The media running with the dogs

But it is the case of Dr Mohamed Haneef where the parallels become so entwined to the extent that the media run with the pack and is obedient to the call. The dog whistle is always heard louder in the lead up to an election. NSW Director of Public Prosecutions, Nicholas Cowdery QC, pointed out that in the lead up to elections, crime becomes more obvious. “Elections cause crime waves,” he wrote. “They must – listen to the candidates! … We could obviously go a long way to reducing crime by not having elections” (Kerr, 2003). Dr Haneef discovered this in the lead up to the 2007 Federal election.

On 18 July 2007, Queensland barrister, Stephen Keim, leaked the full transcript to the media of a record of interview by the Australian Federal Police (AFP) with his client, Dr Mohamed Haneef. The source of the information was not revealed in The Australian, which published the interview, causing widespread speculation. As reported in The Australian’s media section the day after the leak: ‘Instead of debating the contents of the 142-page transcript … [media commentators and] critics were carping about the identity of the anonymous sources’ (Meade, 2007).

The transcript of the interview was also displayed on The Australian’s website, but was removed only hours after being uploaded, with an editor telling the New York Times that there had been ‘tremendous pressure’ from the government (Bonner, 2007). AFP Commissioner, Mick Keelty, called the editor of The Australian, Chris Mitchell, on the morning of the leak inquiring of its source.

And if Chris Mitchell, the editor of The Australian assures me that it was not the AFP, and he … I spoke to him earlier this morning and in fact I said to him that if I’m asked publicly today I’ll declare his name and the fact that he’s provided me with that information, and he was … he had no difficulty with that (Keelty ABC Radio National AM, 2007).

The online publication, Crikey.com, was quick to question the move by Mitchell, with Margaret Simons asking:

What is Mitchell doing entering into this conversation with Keelty given that almost any discussion of sources is dangerous for journalists since it necessarily narrows the field of suspects? So the great unasked question at present is why the editor and reporters of The Australian aren’t having their doors kicked in as
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we speak. Presumably Mitchell’s conversation with Keelty has forestalled any such action (Simons, 2007).

Mitchell defended his actions, stating: ‘You would have to be a moron to think that the leak came from the AFP. They would never leak something like that. I am not going to subject the paper to another search’ (Meade, 2007). Writing for *The Sydney Morning Herald*, Richard Ackland said, ‘The wiser course would have been to say nothing, and the excuse of the editor was not much of a line’ (Ackland, 2007).

For Dr Haneef, despite being granted bail in Brisbane, then Minister for Immigration, Kevin Andrews, enacted a contingency plan between the AFP and immigration officials to cancel Dr Haneef’s visa, citing confidential information. The public was not given any information other than Dr Haneef was dangerous. The case of Dr Haneef saw an email that demonstrated the Gold Coast doctor had no prior knowledge of the attack in Glasgow (see McKenna, M., ‘Haneef evidence withheld’, *The Australian*, April 30, 2008).

Since the Haneef case, under Labor, comments made by politicians continue to disrupt public perception during terrorism trials. Attorney General Robert McClelland recently called the verdicts against six of the Barwon 13, the culmination of Australia’s ‘most successful terror prosecution’, even though the jury was still considering a verdict for two of the accused (Maley and Rout, 2008).

Greg Barns, a barrister appearing for the defence in the Barwon 13 terrorism trial wrote in *Crikey.com* that “Australia’s anti-terror laws are so sweeping in their reach that they are embedding into our criminal justice system the repugnant concept of guilt by association” (Barns, 2008). He argues that this amounts to thought crime and so is Orwellian in nature.

The other aspect of these laws, which is troubling, is that an organization can be a terrorist organization even if it has no terrorist act in mind. It is enough that a person subscribes to the philosophy of violence with the purpose of achieving a political end (Barns, 2008).

Therefore what someone says and thinks can now be considered criminal. The dog whistle is insidious precisely because of its inherent intellectual dishonesty and for what it doesn’t say. It leaves suspicion hanging in the political air, ensuring that debate on emergency matters is, at best, polluted discourse. It is also fair to add here that the dog whistle provides an opportunity for politicians to justify punitive, discriminatory, racist and xenophobic discourse and policy in a politicised state of emergency context, when the usual laws and diplomacy do not tolerate such overt responses.

‘In Weather Chaos, a Case for Global Warming’ Justin Gillis wrote in *The New York Times* (August 14, 2010): “The floods battered New England, then Nashville, then Arkansas, then Oklahoma — and were followed by a deluge in Pakistan that has upended the lives of 20 million people.” The dog whistle in the title signifies blame for the floods on carbon dioxide emissions from cars, industry and power generation, so bringing problems to the atmosphere. However, the reality is that the immediate cause of flooding is directly related to the physical on-the-ground localised human activity upstream. Heavy rain falling on already full dams surrounded by deforested mountains leaves water no other path but to pound downwards, picking up everything it its path, increasing velocity as it goes. With no natural vegetation to absorb and slow the
impact of rain, in many cases whole mountainsides wash into rivers, increasing eroded load as it goes (China and Pakistan recently). This mechanism is simple, physical and observable and the ethics of responsible reporting are lost when mention is made of global warming in this context. Soils that usually sustain life, grow crops and sequester carbon are washed away in such floods. Revegetation and agriculture now may be impossible in many parts of Pakistan.

Applications for journalism education

Journalism education must continually refer to the basic obligation of the news media in informing the public right to know in order to help maintain a functioning democracy. Without an acutely educated scepticism, news media workers fall prey to the seductive and political tune of the dog whistle. However, well educated, sceptical and diligent investigative journalists will initially have to secure work by going along with the mainstream dog whistle agenda. Journalism educators therefore must develop a dual skill base for their students. Educators must develop integrity and fearlessness in student journalists, encouraging them to be sceptical and investigative, while also providing them with learning experiences that develop abilities to maintain crucial and strategic mainstream employability. Thus, journalism educators have to somehow develop in students the ability to be highly adept chameleons, enabling them to adapt to a range of working environments.

In providing journalism students with provocative and yet safe theoretical case studies for learning, educators can motivate students to actively expose truth. The ‘provocative’ aspect in the assignment hypothetical is crucial to elicit strong student response with subsequent highly motivated action.

Guided research into climate change firstly notes the myth of ‘scientific consensus’. Then it is noted how many local environmental emergencies on the ground and in the waterways continue to be ignored. In being referred to scientific and peer-reviewed papers, students find there are a range of valid scientific views on how environmental degradation might be mitigated. Students discover that what is left out of news amounts to critical information about alternative and proven action in mitigating environmental damage on the ground, resulting from human activity – in the soils, creeks, rivers, lakes and oceans – rather than specifically in the atmosphere.

A third year Bachelor of Communications investigative reporting subject at University of Wollongong has been the site where this technique was applied over the last two years. The ‘provocative’ hypothetical serves as the first assignment, where students are provided with an unpublished scientific academic paper, leaked by a source in absolute confidence.

The ‘hypothetical’ anonymous ‘source’ insists the information is reliable and that it will undo the whole theory on man-induced ‘carbon dioxide only culprit’ global warming and climate change. Students are required to design a series of features around climate change, to be run in their local newspaper each weekend in a month’s time. Students are also to consider ethics and law in respect to confidentiality, which they have accepted in receiving the document and associated material. Thus, a brief summary of the main legal and ethical danger points is critical in their report.
Students realise from their initial read that they may have a journalistic coup in being among the first to report such an exposé. In checking the veracity of the paper they quickly determine that the argument is based on authentic documents from many scientific sources. The required assignment is a pitch to the editor, in the form of a research report of 1000 words, including point form diary.

Despite their realisation of the extent of inaccuracy and bias in media reporting on global warming and climate change, student planned features for the mainstream media must be designed carefully, even conservatively. Students learn from this exercise the requirement of news media culture – play it safe. No newspaper would run anything too removed from the dominant view on climate variability.

Students see that policy, economics and desire for profit appear to be driving the selective use of scientific data. Fear of catastrophic climate change, melting ice and rising sea levels reinforces the emergency and so justifies worldwide carbon-trading. Online research easily reveals that the carbon markets are already in place and trading while deforestation continues. A great deal of deforestation is illegal and is not accurately accounted for in climate modeling. Students quickly understand that messaging to set public opinion is not being focused on a single reality, so the message for cleaning up the environment is confused in a sea of division and squabble over whether climate change is a plausible theory or not.

The same big American banks that made billions of dollars from sub prime derivatives that caused the 2008 world economy to collapse are now poised to make billions from carbon trading. Already, organized crime has usurped parts of European cap and trade markets and it is easy to envisage the potential for short selling on shareholders globally. Students begin to recognize the news media’s failing in reporting the potential for another bubble and yet another crash, once a trading scheme for reducing carbon emissions is set in law by the US Senate. Computer assisted research also shows that the number of nuclear power plants being built or near commissioning have proliferated since global warming became an issue. Students also saw Australian climate scientists, as guests on a range of ABC public broadcaster websites and programs, strongly advocating nuclear power. 18

Student responses ranged from exposing connections between the ETS and the lucrative carbon cap and trade markets and international banks like Goldman Sachs; to the finding that in 2006 the quasi US government entity, Fannie Mae set up a patent on cap and trade exchange. A primary source for bloggers on this story was Bloomberg in 2006. 19

The US Patent and Trade Office approved patent number 6904336 on November 7, 2006, immediately after Democrats took control of Congress. The patent had little to do with Fannie Mae’s charter on affordable mortgages; rather, it would have provided Fannie Mae a legalised trading advantage within the potential carbon cap and trade legislation. 20 The confidential and leaked ‘hypothetical’ paper as supplied to students demonstrates that deforestation has the same effects on climate as those of accumulating greenhouse gases. For some 10,000 years deforestation has steadily increased, argue the 119-page leaked and confidential paper, therefore conclusions in science about greenhouse gases simply cannot be made while deforestation continues, often illegally and undetected. Students cited research by scientists working in the Amazon basin, which shows how extensive clear felling interferes with the water
cycle and so a range of large scale ‘climate change’ symptoms appear (Dickinson & Henderson-Sellers, 2006).

By removing surface texture in forests, trees and scrub – wind patterns change and there are changes in albedo. Drying of the soil will follow with the potential for soil erosion and biomass loss. Soil fertility will collapse, while temperature extremes and reduced precipitation follow – essentially anthropogenic climate variability. The mainstream news media have not provided necessary public enlightenment on what is likely to be the best solution to abate climate change. Stop deforestation and initiate tree planting on a global scale and it might be possible to restore the naturally filtering ecosystems and biodiversity, and then perhaps, the weather patterns will normalize.

Notes

3 http://omniclimate.wordpress.com/?s=Willis+vs.+The+CRU%3A+A+History+of+%28FOI+%29+Evasion
7 http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2008/s2624781.htm
8 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7128634/BBC-criticised-for-scientific-cheap-sensationalism.html
9 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article699975.ece
11 Boulten’s November 2006 Opening Speech was exhibited a week later within the exhibition at Gallery Barry Keldoulis, Sydney. On YouTube the following year: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdMoJyAkXvK
13 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Children_Overboard_Affair
16 Wikiversity site for JOUR301: http://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Investigative_Reporting/
   Global_warming
17 See Professor Barry Brook: http://blogs.abc.net.au/events/copenhagen/
18 http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aDkAbYu5DtX8
Anti-terrorism, climate change and ‘dog whistle’ journalism

References


---

DAVID BLACKALL, PhD, is Senior Lecturer at the School of Journalism and Creative Writing, University of Wollongong in New South Wales. He teaches journalism ethics and law, makes documentary films and occasionally works on camera for ABC news and current affairs.

SETH TENKATE is Press Secretary for the Transport Workers Union. He has worked as a journalist for a number of rural and regional newspapers and is also well-known in public affairs and teaching.

We are grateful to Greg Barns for reading the early drafts of this paper. Greg is a barrister and Crikey contributor. He works with Republic Chambers and was defence counsel in the Barwon 13 terrorism trial.