**"The media must stop cuddling with Greenpeace"**

*The environmental movement Greenpeace has built up such a high degree of legitimacy that it escapes scrutiny in the media, even when they are dealing with sheer madness, write Torbjörn Fagerström and Jens Sundström in a final reply.*

Gunnar Lind at Greenpeace Sweden reiterates in essence the arguments the organization has used at the international level earlier this summer to address the 110 Nobel Laureates criticism. It has the comic effect that half of his arguments deal with issues that we actually did not touch, while the other half was already answered by us in our first article.

But we take it one more time:

For a non-violent organization, you could say that Greenpeace is strikingly militant. Vandalism of research and field trials are well documented, and there is countless photo evidence of how Greenpeace highlights its logotype when it destroys research. In Australia, Greenpeace activists have been convicted of vandalism, and the organization has paid out millions in damages.

Well, the miracle rice is there. After a long period of development, it is now well established by both American and Chinese researchers, that a daily intake of a few dozen grams of golden rice is enough.

Sure, we know that the total world food production could in principle feed all the mouths if it were distributed more evenly. Greenpeace is welcome to present the economic-political system that would lead to such redistribution. In anticipation of this brave new world we will continue to do research on agriculture which can deliver more nutritional products, which could increase the total production in the poorest countries, and which may contribute to a reduced environmental impact. We share the Nobel laureate's view that it would help if Greenpeace did not put down all their campaign funds to obstruct against such a development.

The main reason we wrote our article, however, was not to pick a fight with Greenpeace, but to highlight what the 110 Nobel Prize winners have done. It was remarkable, we thought, that the Swedish media hardly noticed that a large number of Nobel laureates are accusing the world's most well-known environmental organization for crimes against humanity. This is certainly no trivial event, and it is ridiculous that it is we - not the media - which directs the spotlight on to this event, and of all places this happens in the Nobel Prize Foundation’s own country.

This is one example of many where the scientific community must act as scrutinizing journalists. We can only infer that there is a media touch horror against parts of the environmental movement. Greenpeace (and other environmental movements) has built up a high degree of legitimacy that escapes scrutiny in the media, even when they are dealing with sheer madness. It is serious for both journalism and research, but above all for the environment. It is mainly a question for social scientists and media scholars to reflect on how we have ended up in this situation. Meanwhile, it would be a relief for the scientific community if politicians and media could at least stop bowing submissively against Greenpeace and others, and perhaps even begin to call things by their right names. A vandal is a vandal, even in green disguise.
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