

Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/0016.html>

From: Dr. Jai Maharaj (usenet_at_mantra.com)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 05:28:04 GMT

WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

Forwarded message from Fidyl <fidyl@yahoo.com>

[Subject: Which Science or Scientists Can You Trust?

[From: Fidyl <fidyl@yahoo.com>

[Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005

Which Science or Scientists Can You Trust?

Michael Meacher told a public conference on Science, Medicine and the Law in the strongest terms that we need independent science and scientists who take the precautionary principle seriously and sweeping changes are needed in science funding and scientific advice to the government that ensures the protection of independent science

Which scientists?

Nobody disagrees that debate over whether we should go ahead with new technologies should be conducted on the basis of science, but which science? Independent science or industrial science? Let me test out a few examples on you.

Fifteen years ago a lorry driver accidentally tipped 20 tonnes of aluminium sulphate into the public drinking supply in north Cornwall — nearby residents and local doctors are convinced they were poisoned; but two Government enquiries found no evidence. Whom do you believe?

There are childhood leukaemia clusters in villages down the Cumbrian coast — local residents and independent scientists think it is the consequence of chronic exposure to low-level radiation from nearby Sellafield; but the Department of Industry (DTI) and British Nuclear Fuels (BNFL) think it is

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

nothing to do with local nuclear power stations — their best explanation is that it is caused by high levels of inward and outward migration. Whom do you believe?

Mark Purdey, a Somerset farmer turned epidemiologist, has produced detailed evidence to show that BSE was caused by farmers spreading Phosmetz, an organohosphate (OP), over the backs of cattle as a prophylaxis, but the Government's MRC Toxicology Unit – funded by the pharmaceutical company Zeneca – apparently refuted this theory. Which company held all rights over the production of Phosmetz? Zeneca. Whom do you believe?

Gulf War Syndrome has been a persistent disabling, and sometimes lethal, condition since the first war in Kuwait in 1991. Both UK and US soldiers and their independent scientific advisers are convinced that the soldiers were poisoned by the OP insecticides that they were liberally sprayed with. But the MOD and chemical companies insist there is no evidence for this. Whom do you believe?

Well, if you have any doubts, look at what has actually happened in the past when Government, in the teeth of overwhelming evidence, have often finally been forced to back track from entrenched positions that they always said were supported scientifically.

Science can quite often get things wrong.

Which science?

Government biologists initially refused to accept that power stations in Britain or Germany could kill fish or trees hundreds of miles away in Scandinavia; later the idea of acidification caused by SO₂ was universally accepted.

Government scientists originally did not agree that chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were destroying the ozone layer; but during the 1987 negotiations on the Montreal Protocol the industry — ICI and Du Pont — abruptly changed sides, and ministers and scientists soon fell into line alongside them.

The Lawther working party of Government scientists roundly rejected any idea that health-damaging high levels of lead in the blood came overwhelmingly from vehicle exhausts, only to find that after lead-free petrol was introduced, blood-lead levels fell 70%.

The Southwood committee of BSE scientists insisted in 1990 that scrapie in cattle could not cross the species barrier, only to find by 1996 that it did just that. And there are

many more examples.

Scientific uncertainty and the precautionary principle

The only way to deal with these problems is by applying the precautionary principle. Perhaps the classic formulation of the precautionary principle was at the Rio Summit in 1992 principle 15: "in order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by states according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation."

That principle survived renegotiation attempts during the Johannesburg Summit in September 2002, and was reaffirmed in the Plan of Implementation that resulted from the Summit.

Why has this not been adopted by scientists and policy-makers? There can be only one reason: cynicism of not disturbing powerful political and economic interests.

It is highly disturbing to realise how long it takes for poisonous chemicals to be banned after scientific evidence emerged that they were harmful.

* Benzene was demonstrated as powerful bone marrow poison in 1897

* Acute respiratory effects of asbestos was identified 1898

* The ability of PCB to induce chloracne was documented in 1898

But it was not until 1960–70s that significant progress was made in restricting damages caused by these agents.

Independent scientists vilified

Efforts were made to discredit independent critics, as in the case of Richard Lacey and Mark Purdey in BSE, & Arpad Pusztai in GM food, and too many other examples.

Data and reports have been regularly suppressed or publishers intimidated, as in the Great Lakes chemical case.

The Southwood Committee on BSE believed a ban on the use of all cattle brains in human food chain might be justified, but considered that politically unfeasible.

There was also incompetence: the Department of Health was not informed by MAFF (the then Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, now disbanded) about the emergence of

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

new disease (BSE) until 17 months after MAFF was first alerted.

Pervasive mistrust of science and scientists

No wonder that there is a pervasive mistrust of science and scientists. But the roots for this go deep.

First, the Rothschild revolution under Thatcher made the funding of science much more subservient to business interests. Over the past two decades, getting finance for scientific inquiry inimical to the commercial and political establishments has become increasingly difficult. The science is owned by a tiny number of very large companies and they only commission research which they believe will further their own commercial interests. And when that turns out not to be the case, as when research turns up results which may be embarrassing to the company, they are most often dubbed "commercially confidential" and never published.

In addition, companies have learned that small investments in endowing chairs, sponsoring research programmes or hiring professors for out-of-hours projects can produce disproportionate payoffs in generating reports, articles, reviews and books, which may not be in the public interest, but certainly benefit corporate bottom lines. The effects of corporate generosity – donating millions for this research laboratory or that scientific programme – can be subtly corrosive. Other universities regard the donor as a potential source of funds and try to ensure nothing is said which might jeopardise big new cash possibilities. And academics raising embarrassing questions (as they should) – such as who is paying for the lab; how independent is the peer review; who profits from the research; is the university's integrity compromised? – would soon learn that keeping their heads down is the best way not to risk their career, let alone future research funding. The message is clear: making money is good, and dissent is stifled. Commerce and the truth don't readily mix.

A second reason why there is such pervasive mistrust of science and scientists is that the scientists staffing the official advisory committees and Government regulatory bodies in a significant number of cases have financial links with the industry they are supposed to be independently advising on and regulating. A recent study found that of the five scientific committees advising ministers on food and safety, 40% of committee members had links with the biotechnology industry, and at least 20% were linked to one of the Big Three – Monsanto, AstraZeneca, or Novartis. Nor

Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

is that an accident. The civil servants who select scientists for those bodies tend to look for a preponderant part of the membership, and particularly the chairperson, to be 'sound', i.e., can be safely relied on not to cause embarrassment to the Government or industry if difficulties arise.

Third, the culture of spin and intimidation is far more pervasive than should ever be allowed. The shocking sacking and vilification of Dr Arpad Pusztai, when he produced GM research results inconvenient to the Government, bio-tech industry and the Americans, was no doubt, deliberately intended as a warning to others if they stepped out of line. And the threats and insinuations made clear to the only two independent scientists on the UK Government's GM Science Panel, Dr Carlo Leifert and Andrew Sterling, demonstrates all too clearly how viciously the Establishment will fight to safeguard its own interests.

And on spin, how many times have we heard the false argument that is still regularly deployed by ACRE, the Government's main GM advisory committee, when it announces that, "there is no evidence that this GM product is any greater risk to human health than its non-GM counterpart". In fact they have not sought such evidence directly, merely relied on the biotech companies telling them that their GM product was 'substantially equivalent' to its alleged non-GM analogue.

Fourth, science is not, and never has been, a value-free search for the truth. It is a social construct influenced by a variety of rules, peer group pressures, and personal and cultural expectations. It is developed, like all human thought, from preconceived built-in judgements, assumptions and dogmas, the more powerful because they are often unconsciously held.

So what is to be done?

What all this means is that science can only be fully trusted if it is pursued with the most rigorous procedures that guarantee total independence and freedom from commercial and political bias. That is far too often not the case today. The implications for policy are clear.

One, if the Government truly wants independent research, it has to be prepared to pay for it, not lay down, as it has, that 25% of finance for publicly funded research should come from private sources, thus forcing the universities into the hands of corporate sponsors.

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

Two, the Government should also require that no member of its advisory committee or regulatory bodies should have any current or recently past financial or commercial link with the industry concerned.

Three, contributors to scientific journals should be required to make full disclosure of current and prior funding sources, so that any conflicts of interest can be exposed and taken into account.

Four, we need above all a Government with the political gumption to stand up to the United States and those demanding calls from the White House, to stand up to the biotech companies, and to stand up to big business, and make clear that there will be no succumbing to dominant political /economic interests, e.g. no growing of GM crops in this country until proper, systematic, independent, peer-reviewed research, which is totally absent at present, has been carried through and made public which demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt whether GM foods are safe or not.

We should never forget the words of Winston Churchill, who said "Science should be on tap, not on top".

This is an edited version of Michael Meacher's keynote address to the Green Network Conference, Science, Medicine and the Law, 31 January to 2 February 2005, Royal Institute of British Architecture, London, UK, which will be published in issue 26 of Science in Society (www.i-sis.org.uk)

This article can be found on the I-SIS website at

<http://www.i-sis.org.uk/>

ISIS is an independent, not-for-profit organisation dedicated to providing critical public information on cutting edge science, and to promoting social accountability and ecological sustainability in science.

If you would prefer to receive future mailings as HTML please let us know. If you would like to be removed from our mailing list unsubscribe at

<http://www.i-sis.org.uk/maillinglist/unsubscribe.php>

CONTACT DETAILS

The Institute of Science in Society, PO Box 32097, London NW1 OXR

Telephone – 44 20 8452 2729; 44 20 7272 5636

Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

End of forwarded message from Fidyl <fidyl@yahoo.com>

Jai Maharaj

<http://www.mantra.com/jai>

Om Shanti

Hindu Holocaust Museum

<http://www.mantra.com/holocaust>

Hindu life, principles, spirituality and philosophy

<http://www.hindu.org>

<http://www.hindunet.org>

The truth about Islam and Muslims

<http://www.flex.com/~jai/satyamevajayate>

The terrorist mission of Jesus stated in the Christian bible:

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not so send peace, but a sword.

"For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.

"And a man's foes shall be they of his own household.

– Matthew 10:34–36.

o Not for commercial use. Solely to be fairly used for the educational purposes of research and open discussion. The contents of this post may not have been authored by, and do not necessarily represent the opinion of the poster. The contents are protected by copyright law and the exemption for fair use of copyrighted works.

o If you send private e-mail to me, it will likely not be read, considered or answered if it does not contain your full legal name, current e-mail and postal addresses, and live-voice telephone number.

o Posted for information and discussion. Views expressed by others are not necessarily those of the poster.

FAIR USE NOTICE: This article may contain copyrighted material the use of which may or may not have been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. This material is being made available in efforts to advance the understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, democratic, scientific, social, and cultural, etc., issues. It is believed that this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research, comment, discussion and educational purposes by subscribing to USENET newsgroups or visiting web sites. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>

If you wish to use copyrighted material from this article for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

copyright owner.

PROFILE OF ABUSER ALAN SCHWARTZ aka 'Uncle Al' <uncleal0@ix.netcom.com>

There's more information about Alan Schwartz
in the public archives at:

<http://tinyurl.com/5qjmw>

[Subject: Profile: Schwartz, Alan
[From: serialkiller90002@hotmail.com
[Newsgroups: sci.physics
[Date: 21 Mar 2004 13:34:46 -0800
[Message-ID: <b31a8173.0403211334.25f9abc5@posting.google.com>
[NNTP-Posting-Host: 61.11.26.150
[X-Trace: posting.google.com 1079904887 30505 127.0.0.1
[(21 Mar 2004 21:34:47 GMT)
[NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 21 Mar 2004 21:34:47 +0000 (UTC)

[
[

[Name: Schwartz, Alan
[Country: USA
[Residential Address: SANTA ANA, CA 92705

[Map:

<http://www.mapquest.com/maps/map.adp?country=US&countryid=250&addtohistory=&address=&city=SANTA+ANA>

[Postal Address:
[Alan Schwartz
[49 Fabriano
[P.O. Box 005
[Irvine, CA 92620-2525
[E-mail(s): uncleal0@ix.netcom.com, UncleAl0@ix.netcom.com
[Tel: 714-771-2526 (+1 714 771 2526 for international callers)
[Spouse: Jackie Schwartz
[Spouse Occupation: Para-legal
[Spouse workplace: <pending disclosure>

[

[ISP: <http://www.earthlink.net>
[Email: <http://support.earthlink.net/support/MYACCT/forms/csform.jsp>

End of forwarded message from

<http://tinyurl.com/5qjmw>

Or,

<http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=b31a8173.0403211334.25f9abc5%40posting.google.com&output=gplain>

In article <43d9f575.0408101155.15fe136e@posting.google.com>,
eagleson2004123@yahoo.com posted:

Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

> > *EXPOSED – Lying scum and stalker 'Uncle Al' aka "Alan Schwartz"*
> <uncleal0@ix.netcom.com>
> >
> > *How to handle stalkers and*
> > *'Uncle Al' aka "Alan Schwartz" <uncleal0@ix.netcom.com>*
> >
> > [*Subject: How to handle stalkers and Uncle Al*
> > [*From: Archimedes Plutonium <plutoni@willinet.net>*
> > [*Newsgroups: sci.chem,sci.physics,sci.archaeology*
> > [*Message-ID: <3A6128B1.7ED158B6@willinet.net>*
> > [*Date: Sat, 13 Jan 2001*
> > [
> > [
> > [*Ryan Doherty wrote:*
> > [
> > [> *Uncle Al (24.16.181.181),*
> > [>
> > [> *I am consider this message of yours SPAM, so please*
> > [> *keep your childish postings to yourself!*
> > [> *By the way, Grow up.. you are wasting more bandwidth*
> > [> *with your repeated responces that Archimedes and his*
> > [> *questions!*
> > [>
> > [> *Ryan*
> > [
> > [> *Ryan, you are talking to a fence post when you talk to*
> > [> *Uncle Al. He and his motley crew of cohorts have stalked*
> > [> *me for years. In fact they have stalked me nonstop for 7*
> > [> *years now.*
> > [>
> > [> *Uncle Al feels he is a police cop of sci.chem and*
> > [> *sci.physics and wants to chase out any poster he does not*
> > [> *like. Many chemistry professors have put Al Schwartz into*
> > [> *their killfile. That is about the only real solution.*
> > [>
> > [> *Some say Al Schwartz is a failed chemistry professor of*
> > [> *80s in age living in Tallahassee Florida or Denton Texas.*
> > [> *He is old, cranky with nothing to do but post to the*
> > [> *Internet. He feels a righteous duty to stalk me. No*
> > [> *matter if I post pure chemistry to sci. chem or pure*
> > [> *physics to sci.physics, Uncle Al feels that none of my*
> > [> *posts belongs to those newsgroups.*
> > [>
> > [> *He has set himself up as a self righteous self imposed*
> > [> *police cop of sci.chem.*
> > [>
> > [> *Many other people have complained about Uncle Al in sci.*
> > [> *chem.*
> > [>
> > [> *SOLUTION: the only solution that I can see is to killfile*
> > [> *Uncle Al and all Al supporters. And to add sci.chem and*

Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

>> [> *sci.physics* to all of your posts to the Internet. Let
>> [> Uncle Al stalk you everywhere, not just *sci. chem* or *sci*
>> [> *physics*. Make it so that everyday Uncle Al wakes up, his
>> [> chores and work are to stalk people on the Internet. Make
>> [> it such that the essence of life for Uncle Al will now be
>> [> to stalk 1 or 3 or 20 or 117 people every day.
>> [>
>> [> So, I am asking of all those people on the Internet who
>> [> have been attacked by Uncle Al, to give Uncle Al what he
>> [> craves. Add *sci.chem* and *sci.physics* to all of your
>> [> Internet posts. And killfile Uncle Al.
>> [>
>> [> Uncle Al is already a crackpot and is insane, but drive
>> [> him wildly insane.
>> [>
>> [> Force him to waste minutes and hours every day of his
>> [> life stalking you.
>> [>
>> [> And you just sit back and laugh at how the idiot Uncle Al
>> [> is making himself a monkey idiot.
>> [>
>> [> Last year someone emailed me saying that *sci.chem* was
>> [> back to normal and that Uncle Al had been put under
>> [> sedation and it was safe to post to *sci.chem* again.
>> [> *Sci.chem* was flooded by outsiders because Uncle Al had
>> [> pissed them off.
>> [>
>> [> Well, that is not the way to handle the self imposed
>> [> *sci.chem* police dog of Uncle Al. The way to handle Uncle
>> [> Al and other stalkers like him is to "killfile them" and
>> [> then force them to stalk you all over the Internet. Let
>> [> everyone see what a fool he is, not just *sci.chem* folk.
>> [>
>> [> I wish that someone is archiving all of the Uncle Al
>> [> stalks of Archimedes Plutonium. I have him killfiled and
>> [> so I have zero. But I would imagine that Uncle Al has
>> [> about 500 posts per year of attacks.
>> [>
>> [> So, I ask everyone who knows Uncle Al, to add *sci. chem*
>> [> to their Internet posts and to killfile Uncle Al. Let the
>> [> fool make himself a larger fool.
>> [>
>> [> And it takes little energy for me or for you to add
>> [> "*sci.chem*" but think of how much energy and how much rage
>> [> it gives Uncle Al. Why, I just burst out into laughter at
>> [> all the energy spent by Uncle Al in stalking this and
>> [> other posts of mine. Uncle Al is too stupid to realize he
>> [> has been defeated and that the world laughs at his cop
>> [> enforcement. That method (if they have a newsgroup
>> [> hangout) will deal with all stalkers of the Internet, not
>> [> just Uncle Al.

sci.physics: Re: WHICH SCIENCE OR SCIENTISTS CAN YOU TRUST?

> > *End of copy*

> >

> >

> >

> > [*Subject: Re: How to handle stalker Alan 'Uncle Al' Schwartz*

> > [*Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2004*

> >

> > *In article <ZcednUDSG4Zb5NPdRVn-jg@comcast.com>,*

> > *Bill Vajk <bill9north@hotmailDITCHTHIS.com> posted:*

> >

> > > *Arindam Banerjee wrote:*

> > > > *Dr. Jai Maharaj wrote in message*

> > > > *news:<Stalker-Uncle-Al-27hf3.20040308@news.mantra.com>...*

> > >

> > > > > *In article <404D34BE.30087280@hate.spam.net>,*

> > > > > *Uncle Al <UncleAl0@hate.spam.net> posted:*

> > > > > > *[... reference to lies and defamation...]*

> > > > > > *How to handle stalkers and "Uncle Al"*

> > > > - *snip* -

> > > > *Thanks, Jai, looks like this fellow was not worth my attention. It is*

> > > > *depressing to think, that those in power in the field of modern*

> > > > *physics are what chaps like these want to be.*

> > >

> > > *Al is a chemist wannabe physicist.*

> >

> > *Alan Schwartz has published his contact information:*

> >

> > *Alan Schwartz*

> > *49 Fabriano*

> > *P.O. Box 005*

> > *Irvine, CA 92620-2525*

> >

> >

> >

> > <http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:Nu16TComWkEJ:www.mazepath.com/uncleal/advert.htm+%22Schwartz%22+%22>

> >

> > *and e-mail addresses:*

> >

> > *"Alan Schwartz" <uncleal0@ix.netcom.com>*

> >

> > *"Alan Schwartz" <UncleAl0@ix.netcom.com>*

> >

> > - - - - -

> *Thanks for the warning about the modern scientist who defends*

> *science all the time. Uncle Al is ignored. He is the*

> *flip side of the open thinking philosopher scientist.*

>

> *Meaning he requires literally a falsified predicate thinking.*