

"You cannot manage what you cannot measure." Joseph Stiglitz.

Comment:

As long as no one is willing to identify spawning stocks of fish that we know aggregate, and develop the technologies to measure them with precision and accuracy, wrong or right, the opinion of the strongest political group (Pew - EDF - Oceana, etc.) will be used to make policy and management decisions. The R&D necessary to solve this problem about spawning aggregations has been ignored for decades by whatever government agency or ENGO that has political power. The government and ENGO's didn't need science to put them in power so why should they become advocates for transparent science?

However, it's becoming increasingly clear to the public and Congress that science is done by large, monopolistic government agencies, which seem mainly to exist to protect the status quo. Honest, transparent science includes individuals and institutions that are independent of the status quo and do not accept NOAA/NMFS dogma. Interviews with most Nobel laureates have revealed that they attribute success to the fact that they were defiant and did not accept the information from the text books. In the case of red snapper in the South Atlantic Ocean, fishermen rejected "science" because of the absence or even transparency of government applied research and management process for the past thirty-three years. Environmentalists, notably Pew Trusts, rejected "science" because it takes too long for solutions to overcome the failures of government science and ENGO's have an immediate goal to reduce fishing whenever and wherever they can in the United States. As Joshua Reichart says in the "*Environmental Forum*" article entitled, "*The Master Strategist*", "...the decision to address global warming and many other environmental problems is not so much of a scientific challenge as it is a political and moral one." In other words we, the fishing industry, want to use science as the basis of management decisions and he wants to use his morals and his politics.

Ironically, the public is starting to realize that you either keep science alive with a competitive spirit or it dies. And if science dies all of the management practices that have lead to its previous development also dies. No improvement in the process or adherence to the scientific principle.

Bacon called it degenerative learning but it is degenerative research, degenerative management, degenerative laws, degenerative economy, degenerative social values.

Bob Jones and friend.