

# Hard Hitting

## HOW MUCH CAN WE TRUST SOME SCIENTISTS? WHY THE GAG?

**By Norris Hall**

The behaviour of the global environmental scientific community begins to stink as they puff-up themselves on their almost exclusive turf of knowledge in determining what is right or wrong for the World.

At an appropriate time as these scientists line-up behind academia and all the papers to stop the sky from falling in Belize and the country's development needs, there is a story to be told, a scandal actually, about a gag order which was issued by the Museum of Natural History (MNH) to their field man who was working for AMEC, a consulting and engineering firm. AMEC did some work for the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Chalillo Hydro-electric facility. This guy's scientific findings were not, apparently, consistent with the pre-conclusion drawn by the MNH whose agenda was to recommend against the dam and even to stop its construction, based on their inconclusive scientific evidence. They issued their gag order to their man who then vanished underground, anxious to protect its own integrity. Many of us would want to respect the scientific community until you get to know who they are. Clearly many of them in this club are not prepared to be served by science but rather to use science and distort information only to serve themselves.

Have you ever stopped to wonder why nutrition and health reports are sometime so inconsistent when beef is sometimes good and then not good for you, and so are milk and eggs and coconut oil and vegetable oil and so on and so on?

Here is a case in point: One of the World's most distinguished scientists and a dedicated green, E.O Wilson, who was recently described by *The Economist* magazine as having an "insufferable arrogance", was quoted as saying that. "*We are not just scientists but human beings as well. And like most people we'd like to see the world a better place.... to do that we need to get some broad support, to capture the public imagination. That of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. SO WE HAVE TO OFFER UP SCARY SCENARIOS, MAKE SIMPLIFIED, DRAMATIC STATEMENTS AND MAKE LITTLE MENTION WE MIGHT HAVE...EACH OF US HAS TO DECIDE WHAT THE RIGHT BALANCE IS BETWEEN BEING EFFECTIVE AND BEING HONEST*".

ences. we must indeed stop living in the past and look to the future

In other words Wilson has said save science for other scientists but in public, strike a balance between telling the truth and telling necessary lies. And the dupes in the media take the bait. One particular local paper is good at this. Purser says jump!.....Jump!!

The above scenario came out of an unscientific attack by green scientists on Bjorn Lomborg, the author of the very controversial book "The Skeptical Environmentalist". Mr. Lomborg argues that the environment is not in nearly such a bad shape as green scientists, activists and their dupes in the media would have the public believe.

*The Economist* reports that because Dr. Lomborg's book is based on hard scientific truths about the actual state of the world's environment, there isn't much scientific controversy around. However these environmentalists are showing their fangs "because it is a powerful and persuasive assault on the central tenets of the modern environmental movement", which includes bogus environmental fears that we are running out of Natural Resources, that the population is ever growing, leaving less and less to eat and that species are becoming rapidly extinct—a fact endorsed by the International Union of Conservation NGO's (IUCN) in the Meso-American context.

In fact, Allen Hammond of the World Resources Institute has noted that while Dr.Lomborg's book makes a factual and acceptable assessment of the environment it "holds only for the developed world while it mask worsening pollution in the mega-cities of the poor world. This is what the Green Party in Mexico should be concerned about rather than making wild charges in the Mexican press about developments in Belize.

Indeed when we review the contradictions made by scientists and the stretched distortions and outright lies about the environmental impact of this new hydroelectric facility in Belize, it is clear that they are off-balance in their academic ivory tower. *The Economist* has suggested that this place, this ivory tower, is a place where ideas can be arranged to suit the prejudices of the occupant, but they are not available in the real world and it is dishonest to suggest that they are.

Perhaps the British Museum of Natural History, which we would want to respect, could give us, the people of Belize, and indeed the Canadians, an explanation as to why their man in the field in Belize, was gagged.

There is more—much more!