



[Търсене](#)
[Настройки](#)
[Папки](#)
[Други услуги](#)
[Помощ](#)
[Изход](#)

[НАЧАЛО](#)
[ПОЩА](#)
[КАРТИЧКИ](#)
[АУКЦИОН](#)
[СПРАВОЧНИК](#)

[празници](#)
[времето](#)  
[кино](#)
[лайфстайл](#)
[спорт](#)

**Дата:** Fri, 31 Aug 2007 18:02:16 +0300 [31.08.2007 18:02 EEST]

**Подател:** Svetoslav Apostolov

**Получател:** Michel Claessens

**Относно:** Research-EU Magazine

Dear Mr. Claessens,

Thank you very much for your kind attention and for recommending to me the edited by you Research\*EU Magazine. I was really excited to learn about this magazine which has failed to attract my attention previously, most probably due to the different previous name. I really believe that there is a strong need in the EU of a magazine that would bring to the people the results of the cutting-edge scientific research in a common, easy to understand language. Therefore I highly value your initiative to make the Research\*EU Magazine this mediator.

However, having been an academic researcher myself and now being an expert in biodiversity conservation, and having written articles on scientific and technical issues myself, I was really disappointed to read Issue No 52 of the magazine, dedicated to global warming. I could not help noticing that, as much as I regret having to say this, the articles comply neither to the standards for a scientific publication nor to the standards of the professional journalism.

With respect to the **first incompliance** I should point out that the articles do not meet the requirements for a scientific publication in the sense that they only presented one of the hypotheses on the drive of global warming, namely - the anthropogenic nature of the phenomenon, leaving out completely all other hypotheses. Further, an attempt is made to diminish the significance of data that is crucial in taking decisions. However, an objective scientific publication should first present **all known hypotheses or theories on the researched phenomenon** and then focus on one, justifying the choice and backing it up with data. At the same time, the data should be derived from research and no attempt to manipulate it should be made.

I have two examples taken from Issue 52 to support the above claim:

*First*, nowhere in the articles dedicated to climate change / global warming in the cyted issue I read anything about the opinion of still a considerable deal of the scientific community that the observed climate change and the associated global warming can as well have entirely natural drive, as it has already happened many times in the past.

Moreover, the fact that the hottest year on record (1998) lies almost 10 years behind us is mentioned only once under the graph on p. 10. However, this is an extremely important observation if a justified decision on acting against climate change is to be made. One should ask him/herself the question - well, if the temperatures nowadays are lower than 10 years ago, maybe things are actually getting better, and not worse?

*Second*, the article presenting the marvels of non-food uses of plants does not mention at all the problem of water shortage that was recently brought up in relation exactly with the large-scale farming of non-food plants, such as the ones used for the production of biofuel. One should ask him/herself the question - if we are really going to increasing temperatures and number and severerity of heatwaves, probably we should restrict the use of water only to plants used for food and try to develop other alternatives to fossil fuels?

Nevertheless, having read the issue, I realized that the magazine called Research\*EU is actually not strictly focused on scientific research but is rather a "popular" one, written not by scientists for a limited number of professionals but by journalists aiming to reach the largest possible audience.

And here comes my remark with respect to the **second incompliance**, which is very similar to the above remark: a really professional journalist would have invited all sides to present their arguments, their "pros" and "cons" on the subject. Again, this is not the case in the issue in question.

**After all, in order to have a "democratic debate" at all (as the inside cover of the magazine reads), there should be at least two sides arguing over an issue. Moreover, to analyse results and to reinforce scientific excellence, the information should be presented objectively, in an unbiased way, with all "pros" and "cons" on a subject.**

To me, the current biased, single-sided way of presenting the topics in the Research\*EU Magazine is just **common brainwashing**.

I would really like to see more professionalism and more objectivity in the next issues of the Research\*EU Magazine.

I wish you good luck with the new image of the magazine!

Sincerely yours,

Svetoslav Apostolov (Mr.)  
 Sr. Expert  
 National Nature Protection Service  
 Ministry of Environment and Water  
 22 Maria Luisa Blvd.  
 1000 Sofia

Bulgaria  
EUROPE

This message contains information, which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message!  
Thank you!

-----  
БТК ADSL вече 2 пъти по-бърз от преди  
2 Мб БТК ADSL само за 15,49 лв/мес.  
Включи се в Центровете на БТК, на 0800 100 или в партньорската мрежа.  
[http://www.btc.bg/bg/more\\_fast\\_adsl.php](http://www.btc.bg/bg/more_fast_adsl.php)



© 1999-2009 Mail.BG

[Общи условия](#)

За помощ: [support@mail.bg](mailto:support@mail.bg)

[За реклама](#)   [Корпоративен сайт](#)