

Credibility Panel Discussion

P. Murdin, R.A.E. Fosbury, D. Lorenzen, C. Madsen

How far can we in the name of science communication keep pushing, or promoting, our respective results or projects without damaging our individual, and thus also our collective credibility? The pressure is larger than ever, and the temptation for hype huge. Are comparisons between different projects of the sort "my scope is better than your scope" necessary? Do we really need scientific results to be peer-reviewed in advance of their public dissemination? Do we need internal political and scientific 'editorial boards', or is it just a kind of double-refereeing? How do we handle the really BIG discoveries (e.g. exo-Simpsons)? How do we treat the NEO threat? Why do press releases that are later proven wrong rarely get withdrawn? Is the time ripe to make a Code of Conduct for press releases that outlines recommended ethics and procedures for conflict resolution, analysis and retraction?