

---

## MORE ABOUT GREENPEACE'S "RHETORICAL HYPERBOLE" ON FREE SPEECH ISSUES

---

It's well known that Greenpeace has been energetically on the side opposing free expression in the two biggest First Amendment legal matters in recent years. They have publicly denounced the Supreme Court ruling in the Citizens United case and have applauded a group of attorneys general for a RICO investigation launched against groups Greenpeace opposes on environmental issues. That position stands against the ACLU, Free Speech Defense & Education Fund, Institute for Justice, AFL-CIO, California First Amendment Coalition, and dozens of groups across the political spectrum. Even a group that Greenpeace cites as a supporter, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, was sharply at odds with Greenpeace's position on free speech in one of these cases.

Many news organizations already realize that Greenpeace's posturing on free speech issues lacks credibility, which is why so many journalists have recently pointed out the group's disingenuous position.

- ▶ As Washington Post legal columnist Jonathan Adler [wrote last year](#), describing Greenpeace's hypocrisy on its RICO position, "if the statute may be deployed against climate skeptics, as Greenpeace has urged, I see no reason why it can't be used against environmentalist groups as well, particularly if some groups are deliberately fabricating evidence as part of their media and fundraising operations."
- ▶ Here's how the [ACLU described](#) the position of opponents like Greenpeace on Citizens United: "[Their legal position] will fatally undermine the First Amendment, diminish the deterrent factor of a durable Constitution and give comfort to those who would use the amendment process to limit basic civil liberties and rights. It will literally "break" the Constitution."
- ▶ Greenpeace has already admitted, in its own legal filings, that its attacks on Resolute were "without question non-verifiable statements of subjective opinion [and] at most non-actionable rhetorical hyperbole."
- ▶ The pretense that Resolute is "controversial" is coming primarily from Greenpeace, in the hope of short-circuiting customer procurement policies with circular logic. But every company, including ours, has a right and obligation to stand up for its sustainability and business practices. By Greenpeace's tautology, \*any\* company that they opposed would be "controversial."

In the last year, a wide range of news outlets that have examined Greenpeace's methods have harshly criticized its serial dishonesty, especially on public discourse issues, and/or affirmed Resolute's position:

- ▶ [Washington Post](#) (Adler column): "Specifically, Greenpeace [spokesperson] called upon the Justice Department to undertake a 'broad' investigation to 'look into the role of fossil fuel companies, trade associations, and think tanks in sowing public doubt...'"
- ▶ [Wall Street Journal](#): "The First Amendment was not created to protect fabrication of evidence."
- ▶ [Washington Post](#) Headline: "107 Nobel Laureates Sign Letter Blasting Greenpeace."
- ▶ [Wall Street Journal](#) (again): "Even Resolute's competitors are privately cheering on the company and we're happy to do so publicly. For the sake of workers and shareholders everywhere, let's hope that American executives will follow Resolute's example."
- ▶ [Financial Post](#) (Canada): "The incentive to gain for fear-mongering environmentalists is to distort reality so extremely that forests are made "figurative" and the truth becomes unrecognizable...It has unquestionably cost Canadian jobs, which...has created an unlikely alliance of union leaders, First Nations chiefs and government officials, all lined up against Greenpeace's crusade."
- ▶ [National Review](#): "Free speech is one thing. It's another to lie about a company just because you don't like it. And environmental organizations like Greenpeace go even further — they try to raise money through pitches based on lies."