

Discussing Scientific Consensus on Climate Change

Matthew Silk

Is it morally permissible to strategically select what climate change information to share with the public, or are we obligated to provide all information come what may? Who should have final say in making that decision?

We often object to misinformation campaigns on the grounds that they undermine people's ability to make informed choices. So why not think that by providing only the important facts – thereby limiting the possibility for spin – we are simply assisting individuals in this endeavor? Isn't there a difference between actively distorting facts and passively omitting unnecessary details?

Given the public's inability to appreciate the finer details of climate science, why should we think it's necessary to relay every little bit of information? When might we instead be guilty of providing too much information and undermining people's ability to understand and choose?