

Shamelessness Shouldn't Be Anyone's Nature

—An Open Letter to *Nature* (Part VIII)

Xin Ge, Ph. D.

Columbia, SC, USA

A fighting dog for commercial and political forces

Year 2005 was disastrous for Fang. In the winter, he and his backer He Zuoxiu participated in a debate called “Reverence for Nature,” which means that human being should respect their environment, or Mother Nature. Fang and He accused such a view of anti-science. The debate ended in February by Fang’s termination of his column in *Beijing News*, because he thought he didn’t received the favorite treatment from the newspaper he thought he deserved^[1].

A mysterious trip and a frenzied attack

In April, Fang took a trip to Nu River in Yunnan province with He Zuoxiu, Sima Nan, as well as two other people, to “inspect” or “examine” (“考察”) hydropower projects. During and after the trip, Fang’s attack on the environmentalists, who opposed the construction of dam on Nu River, got more and more ferocious and vicious, even his backer He Zouxu felt a little embarrassed^[2]. So, exactly how did Fang attack them?

First, he humiliated them by mocking their supposed ignorance, a tactic similar to his using English to humiliate the scientific intellectuals. For example, Fang accused [Ms. Wang Yongchen](#), the founder of [Green Earth Volunteers](#) and a reporter with China National Radio, of ignorance in junior high school level physics^[3]; a professor at Yunnan University of making up a concept of “original ecological river” (“原生态河流”) to hype for funding; He Daming, a professor at Yunnan University also, of making up a new term “longitudinal range-gorge region” (“纵向岭谷地区”) to lure for funds. Yes, Fang attacked the professors of Yunnan University on their campus, in front of their students, and in the presence of the president of their University.

Second, Fang accused the environmentalists of taking money from foreign organizations with political backgrounds, an accusation could send anyone into jail in China. This is what he said on April 8, 2005, at Yunnan University:

“These ‘environmental protection people’ claim they are NGOs, they are non-governmental organizations. In fact, many of these ‘environmental protection organizations’ take money from foreign organizations with political backgrounds. It is questionable whether these organizations should be still considered as NGOs. As a matter of fact, our *New Threads* is indeed an NGO, we have never taken a penny from any governments or organizations with political backgrounds. We are real NGO. Our NGO is able to play the role of monitor in this debate, play the role of supervision by public opinion.”^[4]

That was not the first time Fang tried to destroy the environmentalists by playing political card, it was not the last one either. On April 21, Fang escalated his attack on the environmentalists:

“I got information through public channel that some domestic ‘environmental protection

organizations' have received sponsorship from some foreign embassies, they have also received a large amount of activity fund from Heinrich Boell Foundation. For example, Boell Foundation provided 360,000 Yuan to Liao Xiaoyi's 'Global Village of Beijing,' as the English annual report of Global Village of Beijing showed. Boell Foundation is a political foundation belonging to German Green Party, one of their political goals is Tibet Independence."^[5]

[Ms. Liao Xiaoyi](#) was one of Fang's major opponents in the "Reverence for Nature" debate, and Fang tried his best to link her to Tibetan separatists, arguably the most severely prosecuted political force in China.

Caught in his own trap

However, Fang's attempt to politically destroy the environmentalists backfired. Even before he finished the trip, people started to question who were behind him, why they would pay three people without any relevant backgrounds in hydropower to "inspect" hydropower projects. Ironically, such questioning started first on the forum of his *New Threads*, it was then taken over news media^[6]. However, for about half a year, Fang refused to tell the public who was his sponsor, just like he won't reveal the name of the U. S. bio-information firm who supposedly hired him as a consulting scientist.

On October 24, 2005, Fang was interviewed by Hong Kong's Phoenix Satellite Television, and he told the Television that he still didn't know who sponsored his trip to Nu River, "no one told me, and I had no interest to know." ("没有人主动向我说明过, 我也没有兴趣去打听")^[7]. However, by that time, the secret had already been disclosed to the media by a man named Zhang Boting, the deputy secretary general of the China Society for Hydropower Engineering, a Fang's fanatical follower, and a self-admitted plagiarizer^[8].

According to a report published on *Business Week* (《商务周刊》) on October 21, 2005, Fang and Zhang "hit it off" ("一见如故") in early 2005. At that time, Zhang was deeply impressed by Fang's merciless attack on the "pseudo-environment protection people" in the "Reverence for Nature" debate, and Fang expressed his interest in the Nu River controversy, believing that the controversy would be a good opportunity to unmask the nature of "pseudo-environment protection people." Zhang then contacted the General Institute of Hydropower and Water Resources Planning and Design, and the latter agreed to provide fund to a group of five people, including Fang, He, Sima, Zhang himself, and academician Lu Youmei, the ex-General manager of the China Yangtze River Three Gorges Project Development Corporation. They spent 4 days in Nu River region and were accompanied by high rank Yunnan officials all along^[9]. The purpose of the sponsor was clearly revealed in the following paragraph:

"The General Institute of Hydropower and Water Resources Planning and Design belongs to China Hydropower Engineering Consulting Group, and is one of the major planning units for hydropower projects on Nu River. 'They spent a total of five years on the planning, environmental assessment alone cost them 5 million RMB,' Zhang explained. 'They supported us to get the information, then [we would] tell the truth to common people, which would be beneficial to their work.'"^[10]

Of course, the so called "tell the truth to common people" meant to attack the environmentalists publically. And the sponsor did get their money's worth.

The discrepancy between Zhang's story in *Business week* and Fang's story on Phoenix Satellite Television was so obvious that it couldn't escape anyone's notice. So on Oct. 27, 2005, Fang wrote an article to blame Phoenix Satellite Television for "intentional misleading the public by editing the interview out of context." ("这是断章取义的裁剪造成的误导"). In the article, Fang also explained the

difference between the money he took from hydropower force and the money the “pseudo-environmentalists’ took from foreign organizations:

“An institution paying money to someone for examination (or identification, selection, etc.) is different from a foundation providing activity funds to an organization. The former could not force the participants to draw a beneficial conclusion, which would be unethical; the latter requires the recipients do things completely according to their plan, which is perfectly justified, otherwise they would be held accountable.”^[11]

Yes, this is the same person who said half a year ago that “our *New Threads* is indeed an NGO, we have never taken a penny from any governments and organizations with political backgrounds. We are real NGO.” And after his lies were busted, he would resort to sophistry to continue his lies. In fact, Fang was hurt so much by that TV interview that six years later, he would attack the lady who interviewed him^[12].

The fact is, Fang posted *Business Week* report, with his comment, on the *New Threads* on the same day of its publication, so he did know the secret was out. Then why did Fang keep lying after the secret of his sponsor had already been disclosed? Won’t it make Fang look like a liar by doing what he did? Why he was so stupid? To get the answers to these questions, one needs not only knowledge in criminal psychology and psychiatry, but also Fang’s behavioral pattern. Briefly, Fang would keep telling his lies until he is confronted directly. And that’s exactly why he has never, ever accepted any challenges of face-to-face debates posed by his “[political opponents](#),” a term used by Dr. Zachary Burton, Fang’s Ph. D. advisor at Michigan State University, by which he meant the people who know Fang’s dirty secret. As long as no direct confrontation, Fang can always tell his lies, hoping his voice could overwhelm his opponents’. On the other hand, there are always some people, *Nature* included, willing, or needing, to believe his lies, for various reasons——“People will believe what they want to believe.”

State secret—another blow, another trap

Besides the financial issue, there was another episode of Nu River controversy. After Fang’s trip, the environmental assessment report of Nu River development was soon approved by Chinese government, but it was not made public as the law required, the government citing state secret as the reason. Therefore, at the end of August, 66 NGOs and 99 individuals signed an open letter to the government, asking for the release of the report. Then came Fang Zhouzi again. On September 9, 2005, Fang posted the open letter on the *New Threads*, with his own comment:

“……The environmentalists obviously knew that the report could not be made public legally, but they deliberately pressure Chinese government, ‘plea for publishing the Nu River hydropower environmental assessment report in accordance with the law,’ their purpose is to mislead public to believe that the report has some dirty secret. Of course, not every signee is an environmentalist, there may be someone who signed the letter under other people’s influence. If so, these people had better withdraw their names, otherwise, it is really shameless to ask government to publish a secret document which is prohibited by law. If you really want the report to be made public, then you should either ask government to revise the Secrets Act, or ask government to make an exception by releasing it illegally.”^[13]

Does anyone see a tiny thread of “[h]e even challenged official support……”? As a matter of fact, Fang was as loyal to the government as a lackey, and he acted just like a government agent. The thing is, according to Fang, he is a permanent resident of the United States, and he has no employment whatsoever in China, except for writing columns for newspapers. However, also according to Fang himself, he had access to the *Nu River Basin Hydropower Planning Report* as early as January, 2005^[14], and in September,

2005, Fang vehemently denied the allegation that he had read neither the planning report nor the environmental assessment report^[15]. The questions are, then, if the reports were really “state secret,” how could Fang have access to them? If an U. S. resident without any Chinese governmental affiliation was eligible to see the reports, how come Chinese citizens have no such a right? So, it seems Fang was either lying to the public, or cheating on the public. It was for this reason, plus some others, by the end of 2005, Fang’s creditability was almost bankrupted, and that’s why he kept crying that someone was trying to discredit him^[16].

Yankee Doodle came to town

Fang’s nightmare got even worse when *New York Times* published an article entitled [*Rule by Law: Seeking a Public Voice on China's “Angry River”*](#) on December 26, 2005, in which, there were following 22 words:

“Two prominent scholars toured the Nu - on a trip sponsored by dam developers - and attracted wide public attention by attacking the environmentalists.”

Even though *New York Times* didn’t name the names, Fang immediately identified himself as one of the “two prominent scholars.” Fang posted his “*Replies to New York Times reporter’s questions on Nu River controversy*” (《就怒江建坝 争议答〈纽约时报〉记者问》) the next day on his *New Threads*, in which he wrote:

“On December 4, 2005, I received an email from *New York Times* reporter Jim Yardley, he wanted to interview me face-to-face on the Nu River controversy. At that time, I foresaw the report would be biased in favor of China’s pseudo-environmentalists, so I rejected his request for face-to-face interview, rather, I requested the interview be conducted via email, so I could answer the complicate and delicate questions in detail, meanwhile, I would have my own record of the interview. On Dec. 17, that reporter sent his questions to me, and I replied them on the same day. The reporter acknowledged the reception and told me he would contact me if he had further questions. On Dec. 26, *New York Times* published that reporter’s report, *Seeking a Public Voice on China's ‘Angry River.’* It reported the unilateral views of anti-dam construction on Nu River, expressed by Yu Xiaogang, Wang Yongchen, Ma Jun, et al., and reported their untruthful words as facts. (For example, claiming ‘[t]he Nu also was one of only two free flowing rivers in China.’) On the other hand, the report reported the anti-anti-dam construction people with only one sentence: ‘Two prominent scholars toured the Nu - on a trip sponsored by dam developers - and attracted wide public attention by attacking the environmentalists.’ My point of views was not reported in the report, neither was academician He Zuoxiu’s (as far as I know, the reporter interviewed academician He also.)”^[17]

Of course Fang was lying when he said he rejected Jim Yardley’s request for face-to-face interview because he “foresaw the report would be biased in favor of China’s pseudo-environmentalists.” As a matter of fact, Fang has been accepting Chinese reporters’ face-to-face interviews all the time, and according to his own words and his followers’, many Chinese reporters, if not all of them, are nothing but “hookers” (“妓者”, jì zhě, which pronounces the same as “记者”, reporter). Also, Fang would soon admit that he had been “often citing the [New York] *Times* as the standard of good journalism when I criticized bad journalism of Chinese media.” So, the real reason, and the only reason, that he rejected the request by Jim Yardley was the same as he declined the invitation to London to accept the John Maddox Prize in person: he was scared to death to open his mouth to speak English. So you know what a habitual liar Fang has been. He lies about everything, necessary or not.

Fang has repeatedly claimed that he is good at “striking back” (“后发制人”), and *New York Times*’ blow on him was so humiliating that Fang felt he had to strike back, otherwise, his credibility and his “face” in front of his followers would be completely lost. Therefore he wrote an English letter to *New York Times* to protest. Unsure about his own English, Fang posted [his letter](#) on the forum of his website, apparently seeking others help, and here is his first sentence:

“Sir: As a royal reader of the *New York Times* since I came to the US in 1990 and often citing the *Times* as the standard of good journalism when I criticized bad journalism of Chinese media, I am surprised to see such a biased and inaccurate report published by the *Times* (Rule by Law: Seeking a Public Voice on China's 'Angry River', by Jim Yardley, December 26, 2005).”

Till today, Fang is still known to many people as “a royal reader.”

An old dog’s old trick

Fang’s 700-words letter went through several versions by many of his followers, publically on the forum and privately via emails, and finally sent out on Jan. 1, 2006. The sad thing was, except for an autoreply, *New York Times* completely ignored its royal reader’s complaint. Had *New York Times* been a Chinese medium, Fang would have not only denounced it, but also threatened it with a lawsuit^[18]. However, to “the standard of good journalism,” its royal reader Fang did neither. What he did was publishing [the Chinese version of the letter](#) on Jan. 9, 2009, on the *New Threads*, and submitted the English version to World Wide Media, which not only published Fang’s letter, but also a report, *New York Times blamed for false reporting on China*. Fang [re-published the report](#) on his *New Threads* on the same day.

◇◇新语丝(www.xys.org)(xys.dxiang.com)(xys.3322.org)(xys.xlogit.com)◇◇

New York Times blamed for false reporting on China

From: World Wide Media (www.wwm.cn)

January 10, 2006 - Dr. Fang Shimin (with a pen name of Fang Zhouzi), an influential Chinese scholar and outspoken public critic, blamed New York Times for one-sided and false reporting on China.

NYT ran on December 26 of last year a lengthy story entitled “Seeking a Public Voice on China’s ‘Angry River’”, written by NYT’s reporter Jim Yardley. The report said Chinese government had suppressed the voice of “environmentalists” so as to pass a proposal to build dams on the Nu River.

The NYT report cited quite a few “environmentalists” as saying that the proposed dam project would fatally damage the ecosystem along the Nu River, which had been designated by UNECO as a “World Heritage Site”. It further said that “domestic media coverage has been banned in recent months”.

Dr Fang Shimin says the NYT report is biased and inaccurate and made serious mistakes in stating the fundamental facts. Contrary to the NYT report, for example, the controversy on the dam project is still hot and never banned in China.

Dr Fang wrote a letter on January 1 to NYT editor and Jim Yardley pointing out the errors in the report but has not received any response. Yesterday he published the letter on his website New Thread, which is famous for exposing various wrong deeds and corruptions relating to scientific research.

[The screen image of New Threads webpage containing the WWM report](#)

So, who was this World Wide Media? Briefly, it was a website purchased by a person named Lu Xiang (“吕祥”), as shown by [“Who.is.”](#) And this Lu Xiang used to be the editor of *Newton - Science World*

magazine, the same magazine who sponsored the “Newton - Science World Cup Popular Science Books Award,” which gave the prize to Fang’s *Fangzhou Online* in 2000, and his *Ulcers* in 2001, and disqualified Dr. Mae-Wan Ho’s *Genetic Engineering: Dream or Nightmare?* under Fang’s influence. Mr. Lu is also an ardent believer of scientism, at least that is what he wants other people to believe, and he wrote an article in 2002, entitled *Let science be our way of living* (《[让科学成为我们的生活方式](#)》). After all these kind of hypes, Mr. Lu sold the magazine around 2002 or 2003, at an scientifically or scientistically inflated price, and then, apparently, started World Wide Media, which existed for only a short period^[19].

Has anyone understood how the trick worked? I call the trick “news laundering,” an analogy to money laundering by drug dealers or other criminals. The only difference is, the purpose of Fang’s “news laundering” is to deceive others by showing them how influential and powerful he is. Fang played a different version of this trick a few weeks ago: he let his followers at FDA or NIH “invite” him first, then he sneaked into the U. S. federal buildings, took some pictures, then showed off the pictures to Chinese people and told them that he had given speeches at FDA and NIH^[20]. The sad thing is, Fang has played this kind of stupid tricks so many times that even his followers don’t believe them anymore, and that’s exactly why many people thought the John Maddox Prize he received was a similar trick.

Aftermath

Fang stopped his attack on the “pseudo-environmentalists” almost completely after the *New York Times* article, although he continues to allow others, especially Zhang Boting, to attack them on his *New Threads*. However, Fang’s “fight,” for himself only and against everyone else, went on. From 2006, Fang started his crusade against traditional Chinese medicine, or in *Nature*’s words, “challenged official support of traditional Chinese medicine.” Why? Of course because his Hanlin Online Bookstore was closed, and TCM’s value to him plummeted to below zero. But the fight against environmentalists in 2005 did influence Fang’s decision. As a netizen pointed out in early 2006:

“After Nu River incidence, Fang’s personal moral and creditability bankrupted completely, no scholars want to be associated with him.……In 2006, Fang learned from his mistakes, started his transformation. His magic weapon was populism. Yes, after he realized that the scholars on the internet closed their doors against him after his credit bankruptcy, he turned to masses. He tried to use populism to make a comeback, and the landmark event was anti- traditional Chinese medicine.”^[21]

However, Fang won’t give up his battle ground in academia without a fight, and that fight exposed Fang’s evilness even more explicitly.

Notes

^[1] Fang Zhouzi. *Statement on the resignation from Beijing News columnist post.* (《[辞去〈新京报〉专栏作者一职的声明](#)》). For detail about the debate, see Yi Ming. *Fang Zhouzi and Nu River incidence* (《[方舟子与“怒江争坝”事件](#)》).

^[2] In an article published on April 12, 2005, Fang wrote: “Academician He just said that my denouncement of the pseudo-environmentalists yesterday was very jolly, but he could not have done that because he was afraid of being accused of no manners, no cultivation.” (Original Chinese: “何院士刚才说我昨天下午斥责伪环保人士很痛快，但是他做不到，怕人说没有风度，没有修养。” Fang Zhouzi. *Some views on Nu River dam construction—A speech on Yunnan Provincial Government*

symposium held in the morning of April 9, 2005. 《对怒江建坝的一些看法——2005年4月9日上午在云南省政府座谈会上的发言》).

[3] Fang's original Chinese: “她连千瓦和千瓦时、发电功率和发电量都分不清楚，初中物理没有学好。初中物理没有学好本来也没有关系，但是你既然要反对怒江建坝，这些最基本的数字总应该掌握，不懂总应该问，总应该搞清楚吧，不搞清楚就在媒体上乱说，误导了多少人，利用自己的话语权，误导了许多不了解情况的人。” (Fang Zhouzi. *Direct attack on the pseudo-environmental and anti-dam construction people* —A speech delivered at Yunnan University in the afternoon of April 8, 2005. 《[直击伪环保反坝人士——2005年4月8日下午在云南大学的演讲](#)》). Note: It turned out that Fang's own ignorance in junior high school physics was the cause of the accusation. For example, Fang obviously was unaware of the difference between work and power, installed power and generating capacity. See Yi Ming. *Fang Zhouzi and Nu River incidence* (《[方舟子与“怒江争坝”事件](#)》).

[4] *ibid.* Original Chinese: “他们这些‘环保人士’都自称是 NGO，是非政府组织，这些‘环保组织’许多实际上是拿国外有政治背景的组织的钱的，像这样的还能不能算 NGO，我觉得可以商榷。但是我们那个新语丝，的确是非政府组织，不从任何政府，不从任何有政府背景的组织拿一分钱，我们是真正的 NGO 组织。我们这个 NGO 组织就可以在这场争论中扮演监督者的角色，起到舆论监督的作用。”

[5] Original Chinese: “……我从公开的渠道了解到，国内有的‘环保组织’从外国大使馆获得赞助，而且从 Heinrich Boell 基金会获取了大量的活动经费（例如 Boell 基金会于 2002 年向廖晓义的‘北京地球村’提供 36 万元经费，有‘北京地球村’公布的英文年度报告为证），这是隶属于德国绿党的政治基金会，其中一个政治目标是藏独。我并不是说这些‘环保组织’是在中国从事与其身份不符的政治活动。我不过想指出，他们并没有他们自吹的那么纯粹。” (Fang Zhouzi. *Itemized comments on The Bund Pictorial's report “The background investigation on Fang Zhouzi and Sima Nan's Nu River trip* 《[方舟子点评〈外滩画报〉报道“方舟子司马南怒江行背景调查”](#)》). Note: Fang initially made [the allegation](#) on April 12, in response to criticism.

[6] The earliest such questions appeared on April 11, 2005, by a person called himself EYU, who [blamed Fang taking foreign country's royalties to bust China's frauds](#). Besides EYU, another person called Dr. Han Xiaoli (“韩晓立博士”) also questioned Fang's relationship with his sponsor. Fang banned Dr. Han Xiaoli's right of posting on the forum several times. On April 20, 2005, Shanghai's *The Bund Pictorial* published a report entitled *The background investigation on Fang Zhouzi and Sima Nan's Nu River trip* (《[方舟子点评〈外滩画报〉报道“方舟子司马南怒江行背景调查”](#)》). Fang never answered their questions directly.

[7] Fang Zhouzi. *Some explanations on the Phoenix Satellite Television's “Fang Zhouzi's view on the hydropower development on Nu River”* 《[对凤凰卫视“方舟子看怒江水电开发”的一些说明](#)》).

[8] Zhang committed multiple cases of plagiarism in his articles, even those published on the *New Threads*, so he was nicknamed “Veteran plagiarizer” (“抄袭老手”) on the forum of the *New Threads*. But Fang has never criticized Zhang, and he keeps publishing Zhang's articles on his website. So far, Fang has published nearly 300 articles written by Zhang Boting on the *New Threads*, almost all of them are pro-hydropower development and anti-environmentalists. For detailed information about Zhang's plagiarism and his relationship with Fang, see Yi Ming. *Fang Zhouzi and Nu River incidence* (《[方舟子与“怒江争坝”事件](#)》).

[9] Xu Xiaoying. *Has the battle of Nu River reversed?* *Business Week* Oct. 21, 2005. (胥晓莺: 《“怒江保卫战”逆转?》, 2005年10月21日《商务周刊》).

[10] *ibid.* Original Chinese: “水电水利规划设计总院属于中国水电工程顾问集团, 是怒江水电工程的主要规划单位之一。‘一个怒江规划他们做了整整5年, 仅环境评价工作就花了500万。’张解释说, ‘他们支持我们去了解情况, 把真实的情况告诉老百姓, 这对他们的工作有利。’”

[11] Original Chinese: “某个机构出经费请人考察(或鉴定、评选等等)和某个基金会为某个组织提供活动经费, 是不同的两件事。前一种经费不能强求参与者做有利于自己的结论(这将被认为是不道德的), 而后一种经费要求接受经费的一方完全按照自己的意图来做却是天经地义的事, 否则将被追究责任。”(Fang Zhouzi. *Some explanations on the Phoenix Satellite Television's "Fang Zhouzi's view on the hydropower development on Nu River"* 《对凤凰卫视“方舟子看怒江水电开发”的一些说明》).

[12] On October 3, 2011, Fang posted on his blog a comment on [Ms. Zeng Zimo](#), who interviewed him six years ago and questioned him on his sponsor of his Yunnan trip. Fang's comment was: “I used to be framed by this person, so it is fair to say her biggest characteristic is lying.” (Original Chinese: “[我被此人人构陷过, 说她最大特点是勇于说假话还差不多。](#)”).

[13] Original Chinese: “.....‘环保人士’明明知道《报告书》依法不可能公之于众, 却故意将中国政府一军, ‘提请依法公示怒江水电环评报告’, 目的是为了误导公众以为《报告书》不能公布是由于其中有见不得人的内容。当然, 签名者不都是‘环保人士’, 不排除有些签名者是因为不知情而被稀里糊涂拉入了伙, 如果这样的话, 还是尽早退出签名的好, 否则, 冠冕堂皇地提请政府依法公示一份依法不能公示的机密文件, 未免太无耻了一点。如果真的希望怒江水电环评报告能得以公布, 那么, 就应该或者提请政府修改保密法, 或者提请政府破例‘非法’公示机密文件。”(Fang Zhouzi. *Comment on the Plea for publishing the Nu River hydropower environmental assessment report in accordance with the law* 《[提请依法公示怒江水电环评报告\(附方舟子评论\)](#)》).

[14] In an article written on Jan. 15 and published on Feb. 20, 2005, on *Times People Weekly*, Fang wrote: “I looked up the *Nu River Basin Hydropower Planning Report*, the total installed capacity is as high as 21.32 million kilowatts” (Original Chinese: “但是一查《怒江中下游流域水电规划报告》, 总装机容量达2132万千瓦.....”) (Fang Zhouzi. *Does “environment protection” give you the right to say anything you want?* 《[“环保”是可以信口开河的吗?](#)》).

[15] Fang Zhouzi. *Reply to Ma Jun and Li Yucheng's Reply to Fang Zhouzi on the publication of Nu River environmental assessment report.* (《[答马军、李育成〈关于怒江环评报告公示回应方舟子〉](#)》).

[16] The term Fang used was “搞臭我”, literally means “make me smell stink.” Fang's sense of crisis started in May, 2005, and lasted till the end of that year. On May 29, 2005, Fang wrote: “Although I fell into the trap of discrediting me, designed carefully by the liberals who want to revenge on me for resigning the title of ‘50 Public Intellectuals,’ because my innate power was so strong that the trap was shaken off by me unknowingly.” (Original Chinese: “我虽然掉进了‘自由主义者’为了报复我辞去‘50名公共知识分子’而精心设置的要搞臭我的圈套, 但是因为内力太强, 竟不知不觉把其套子震破了”. Fang Zhouzi. *Netizens' comments on Southern People Weekly's Dialogue to Fang Zhouzi* 《[网民评论〈南方人物周刊〉“对话方舟子”](#)》). On June 14, 2005, Fang wrote: “Since my speech at Yunnan University, I have become the public enemy of environment protection, the environmentalists have continuously scolded me, they even tried every means to discredit me.” (Original Chinese: “我在云南大

学发表演讲之后，就如成了‘环保’公敌，‘环保人士’骂声不断，甚至不择手段要搞臭我。” Fang Zhouzi. *Comments on Times People Weekly's The controversy of true or false environment protection among Chinese people* 《时代人物周报：中国民间环保真伪之争》。 On Jan. 21, 2006, Fang published “A group of unpublished Fang Zhouzi's replies to reporters' questions” (《未刊出的方舟子答记者问一束》), in which he wrote: “some news media, especially so called ‘anti-scientism’ and ‘liberalism’ newspapers and magazines, jointly try to discredit me because I have busted the frauds committed by their comrades.” (Original Chinese: “某些报刊，特别是所谓‘反科学主义’和‘自由主义’的报刊，因为我批了他们阵营的人作假，也想同仇敌忾搞臭我。”)

[17] Original Chinese: “2005年12月4日我接到《纽约时报》记者Jim Yardley电话，希望能就怒江建坝争议当面采访我。我当时预料该报的报道将会倾向中国伪环保人士，拒绝了当面采访的要求，要求用电子邮件采访，以便我能更细致地回答这个复杂而敏感的问题并自己留下问答记录。12月7日该记者用电子邮件给我发来问题，我当天做了回答。该记者答复收到了我的回答，并说如果有进一步的问题再和我联系。12月26日，《纽约时报》登出该记者写的报道《对中国的“愤怒之河”寻找公共声音》(Seeking a Public Voice on China's ‘Angry River’)。该报道单方面地报道于晓刚、汪永晨、马军等人反对怒江建坝的看法，把这些人的一些不实之词当成事实陈述（例如声称‘怒江是中国仅剩的两条自由流淌的河流之一’），对反对反坝人士的报道只有一句‘两位著名的学者访问怒江——行程由大坝开发者赞助——并通过攻击环保人士而吸引了公众广泛的关注。’(Two prominent scholars toured the Nu - on a trip sponsored by dam developers - and attracted wide public attention by attacking the environmentalists.) 文中没有报道我的看法，也没有报道何祚庥院士的观点（据我所知该记者也采访了何院士）。”

[18] On Dec. 9, 2005, Fang started on the *New Threads* a “List of China’s Bad Journalists,” (“[中国不良记者名单](#)”) and update the list irregularly. As of today, the list contains 89 journalists’ names, their affiliations, and their “crimes,” such as “Xiao Chuanguo’s thug,” “Sun Haifeng’s thug,” “anti-science intellectuals’ thug,” etc. Besides the “List of China’s Bad Journalists,” Fang maintains a “List of China’s Judges Who Have Perverted the Law.” (“[中国枉法法官名单](#)”). Both lists have their links on the home page of the *New Threads*. So far, Fang has issued multiple lawsuit threats to Chinese media, but he has only actually sued two of them.

[19] Some of the webpages of wwm.cn, including [New York Times blamed for false reporting on China](#) and [Dr Fang Shimin's letter to New York Times](#), have been preserved on web.archive.org.

[20] On Nov. 23, 2012, Fang published [an article](#) initially published in *A & C Business News*, a family-run Chinese commercial newspaper. The title of the article was: *A guest of NIH, Fang Zhouzi reviews life course* (《[方舟子做客 NIH，回顾人生历程](#)》). Of course, Fang was not an official guest of NIH.

[21] Original Chinese: “在怒江大坝事件之后，方舟子的个人道德和信用完全破产，没有什么学人还愿意理会他。……2006年，方舟子痛定思痛，开始转型。他的法宝就是民粹主义，当他明白网络学人圈由于他的信用破产对他完全关上大门以后，他转向民众。试图利用民粹主义东山再起，其标志事件就是反中医。” (Bitehai. *Fang Zhouzi's hard time* 《[方舟子的艰难时刻](#)》).

Previous parts of my *Open Letter to Nature*:

[Part I: Shameless cover-up](#)

Part II: Shameless “standing-up”

Part III: Shameless make-up

Part IV: Fact distortion and mess-up

Part V: A shameless, fraudulent, and malicious fighter

Part VI: A fake scientist’s fight against science

Part VII: A fraudulent fighter’s fight for fraud

Part VIII: A fighting dog for commercial and political forces