

4. 2014 *Schnare and Riches falsify* ←
[WayBack](#) or [eelegal.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/2014.08.28-Petitioners-Reply.pages.pdf](#)
p.11 ‘We begin with the late Steven Schneider’s now infamous suggestion to his colleagues, including Drs. Overpeck and Hughes:

On the one hand, as scientists we are ethically bound to the scientific method, in effect promising to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but — which means that we must include all the doubts, the caveats, the ifs, ands, and buts. On the other hand, we are not just scientists but human beings as well. And like most people we’d like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climatic change. To do that *scientists should consider stretching the truth* to get some broadbased support, to capture the public’s imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. This ‘double ethical bind’ we frequently find ourselves in cannot be solved by any formula. *Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest.*²

² Stephen H. Schneider, Prof., Dept. of Biological Sciences and Sr. Fellow Inst. for International Studies, Stanford University, “Don’t Bet All Environmental Changes Will Be Beneficial,” American Physical Society APS News, 5:8 (1996) (*the first emphasis is in the original, the second is not*).

False. First emphasis (even the words) **never** in original. Second emphasis misleading, even more than omission of key last sentence..

3. 1996 *Schneider corrects Simon* ←
[www.aps.org/publications/apsnews/199608/environmental.cfm](#)
‘was taking only part of the full quote and that part was seriously out of context - . The full quote follows, where I have italicized what portions of it Simon quoted and **bracketed what I did not say but he attributed to me** ...:

"On the one hand, as scientists we are ethically bound to the scientific method, in effect promising to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but - which means that we must include all the doubts, the caveats, the ifs, ands, and buts. On the other hand, we are not just scientists but human beings as well. And like most people we'd like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climatic change. To do that we need [Scientists should consider stretching the truth] to get some broad based support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. This 'double ethical bind' we frequently find ourselves in cannot be solved by any formula. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest. **I hope that means being both.**"²

² J. Schell, *Discover*, pp. 45-48, Oct. 1989.

Schneider’s Italics got lost within APS, but the brackets are there.

2. 1996 *Simon fabricates, distorts* ←
[www.aps.org/publications/apsnews/199603/upload/mar96.pdf](#)¹
p.12 ‘I do not criticize unless the warner is willfully ignorant or dishonest. But some forecasts are knowingly exaggerated or false. Atmospheric scientist Stephen Schneider says:

Simon lied:
by fabrication of nonexistent words ...and then by omission of crucial last sentence.

“Scientist (*sic*) should consider stretching the truth to get some broad base support, to capture the public’s imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention about any doubts we might have...

Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest.”

I know of no evidence that false warnings of doom on balance are beneficial....’

¹ Julian Simon seems to have been Bjorn Lomborg’s inspiration, p.xix, *The Skeptical Environmentalist* (2001).

1. *Schneider original quote, context*
[stephenschneider.stanford.edu/Mediarology/Mediarology.html](#) or [WayBack](#)
‘...Here is the published quote from that interview with *Discover*, from which selected lines have been used for over a decade as "proof" that I exaggerate environmental threats:

*On the one hand, as scientists we are ethically bound to the scientific method, in effect promising to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but – which means that we must include all doubts, the caveats, the ifs, ands and buts. On the other hand, we are not just scientists but human beings as well. And like most people we’d like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climate change. To do that we need to get some broad based support, to capture the public’s imagination. That, of course, means getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. This “double ethical bind” we frequently find ourselves in cannot be solved by any formula. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest. **I hope that means being both.**’*

This was part of a long, nuanced interview, which Simon quoted out of context. Even as a short snippet, the last sentence in yellow is important, but Simon and others persisted in omitting it.