



Earle de Blonville

@EarldeBlonville

Follow



Australia has a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for strong Oceanic science leadership in the Pacific. Zero-carbon ORI has the only long-range research fleet in the Pacific serving the UN Decade of Ocean Science. AusGovt: why not support ORI?



9:23 PM - 18 Aug 2019

3 Likes



1



3



Arnold Toynbee @ArnoldToynbee4 · 12h



Replying to @EarldeBlonville

On face value, there is not much to argue with the first statement given the challenge of climate change and Australia's location in the Pacific. But what makes it a "once in a lifetime" opportunity? Whose lifetime? Earl de Blonville's? Australia's? But the statement is crafted to a: light the reader's hair on fire with urgency and b:lead, with false logic, into the second sentence, which appears to offer ORI as that "one time opportunity". ORI's fleet being "zero-carbon" is, as a significant factor in doing good science, a gimmick, pure and simple. Organizations led by people with credentials, proven experience, fundraising track records will do more for oceanic science in oil-powered vessels and are the ones that will be funded. Science is not a gimmick. Retweets are not evidence of expertise or creative thinking.

The second sentence is pure smoke and mirrors. ORI's "zero-carbon" "long range research fleet" is NOT in the Pacific. It is tied up, as it has been for 6 years, unmaintained, at two different harbors in Denmark and neither ship is in any state of readiness to do oceanic research. But the second statement begs a question.. How is science conducted in service to the UN Decade of Ocean Science different from oceanic science in general?

Which makes it pretty easy to answer the concluding question. Just for starters, the AustGovt can see that ORI has no track record except Earle de Blonville's track record of failed grand schemes with himself as "skipper" and "CEO". AustGov can see that neither principal in ORI has a background in oceanic science. But more specifically, a review of Earl de Blonville's own tweets shows that he considers the Australian government derelict in their duty to recognize and take action on climate change. He regularly excoriates the Australian Government for it's lack of support. So why would the Australian Government want to support a very dubious startup led by a serial failure whose entire premise is disingenuous and which thinks the Australian Government stinks? Is it not more likely that the Australian Government would spend Australian taxpayer dollars on established groups with proven track records who aren't constantly, publicly, hoisting themselves on their own petard of righteous indignation and faux expertise?