# Article information:

“See nothing but beauty”: The shared work of making anthropogenic destruction invisible to the human eye - ScienceDirect  
<https://www-sciencedirect-com.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/science/article/pii/S0016718521001123?via%3Dihub=>

# Article summary:

1. Manatees in Florida are forced to rely on power plant effluent due to the destruction of their habitat.

2. Visitor reviews of the Manatee Viewing Center (MVC) consistently ignore the presence of the nearby power plant.

3. The collective blindness reflected in these reviews exemplifies a broader tendency to create spaces of ecological "invisibility" and enables environmental inattention and inaction.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

Title: "See nothing but beauty": The shared work of making anthropogenic destruction invisible to the human eye - ScienceDirect

Critical Analysis:

The article titled "See nothing but beauty" explores the phenomenon of human-induced ecological destruction and its invisibility in everyday life. While the topic is important and relevant, there are several aspects of the article that warrant critical analysis.

1. Biases and Sources:

The authors, John Carr and Tema Milstein, are both affiliated with the University of New South Wales, which may introduce a bias towards a particular perspective on environmental issues. Additionally, the article does not provide any information about potential conflicts of interest or funding sources, which could influence the authors' viewpoints.

2. One-sided Reporting:

The article primarily focuses on the Manatee Viewing Center (MVC) in Florida and its proximity to a fossil-fueled power plant. While it highlights visitors' ignorance of the power plant's impact on manatees, it fails to provide a balanced view by exploring other factors contributing to habitat destruction or alternative perspectives on conservation efforts.

3. Unsupported Claims:

The article claims that visitor reviews of the MVC uniformly ignore the power plant without providing concrete evidence or data to support this assertion. Without proper methodology or analysis of visitor reviews, it is difficult to determine if this claim accurately represents visitors' perceptions.

4. Missing Points of Consideration:

The article overlooks potential reasons why visitors may not mention the power plant in their reviews. It fails to consider that visitors may be unaware of its impact on manatees or may prioritize other aspects of their experience at the MVC. This omission limits a comprehensive understanding of visitor perspectives.

5. Missing Evidence for Claims Made:

While the article suggests that quotidian practices and discourses enable collective environmental inattention, it lacks empirical evidence or case studies to support this claim. Without concrete examples or data, it remains speculative and subjective.

6. Unexplored Counterarguments:

The article does not address potential counterarguments or alternative explanations for visitors' lack of attention to the power plant. It could have explored factors such as visitor expectations, limited knowledge about manatee habitats, or the influence of marketing and promotion.

7. Partiality and Promotional Content:

The article presents a negative view of human impact on the environment without adequately acknowledging efforts made by organizations like the MVC to protect manatees. This one-sided portrayal may undermine the credibility of the analysis and overlook potential solutions or positive initiatives.

8. Not Presenting Both Sides Equally:

The article focuses solely on the negative aspects of human-induced ecological destruction and fails to provide a balanced perspective that considers both the challenges and successes in conservation efforts. This lack of balance limits the overall credibility and objectivity of the analysis.

In conclusion, while "See nothing but beauty" raises important questions about human-induced ecological destruction, it suffers from biases, unsupported claims, one-sided reporting, missing evidence, unexplored counterarguments, partiality, and a lack of balance. A more comprehensive analysis would require addressing these issues to provide a well-rounded understanding of the topic.

# Topics for further research:

* Alternative perspectives on conservation efforts in the Manatee Viewing Center
* Visitor reviews and perceptions of the power plant's impact on manatees at the MVC
* Factors influencing visitors' lack of attention to the power plant in their reviews
* Empirical evidence or case studies on quotidian practices and discourses enabling environmental inattention
* Counterarguments or alternative explanations for visitors' lack of attention to the power plant
* Positive initiatives and solutions in conservation efforts at the MVC and other similar organizations.

# Report location:
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