



ExxonMobil's Continued Funding of Global Warming Denial Industry

Analysis by Greenpeace USA Research Department

A founding member of the Exxpose Exxon Coalition

www.ExxposeExxon.com

May 2007

Greenpeace USA

702 H St. NW Suite 300

Washington, DC 20001

Tel: 202-462-1177 • Fax: 202-462-4507

www.greenpeace.org

www.exxonsecrets.org

with special thanks to the Stewart R Mott Charitable Trust

RECENT QUOTES ON GLOBAL WARMING AND EXXONMOBIL

"At our meeting in July, I also told you of my concerns about the support that ExxonMobil has been giving to organizations that have been misinforming the public about the science of climate change. You indicated that ExxonMobil would not be providing any further funding to these organizations."

[Letter to ExxonMobil from the U.K. Royal Society. Sept. 4, 2006](#)

"ExxonMobil gives financial support to organization which research significant policy issues and promote informed discussion on issues of direct relevance to the company... These organizations do not speak on our behalf, nor do we control their views and messages. Our financial support for such organizations is publicly posted on our web site. We review funding of these organizations on an annual basis. As we are currently in that review process, it would be premature for us to discuss funding decisions for any particular organization."

Exxon press release responding to Royal Society. Sept. 20, 2006

"We are convinced that ExxonMobil's longstanding support of a small cadre of global climate change skeptics, and those skeptics' access to and influence on government policymakers, have made it increasingly difficult for the United States to demonstrate the moral clarity it needs across all facets of its diplomacy."

Senators Rockefeller and Snowe Letter to ExxonMobil CEO Rex Tillerson. Oct 27, 2006

"...Exxon decided in late 2005 not to fund for 2006 Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) and 'five or six' other groups active in the global-warming debate, Kenneth Cohen, Exxon's vice president for public affairs, confirmed this week... He declined to identify the groups beyond CEI; their names are expected to become public in the spring, when Exxon releases its annual list of donations to nonprofit groups."

Exxon Softens Climate-Change Stance - Jeffrey Ball, *The Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 11, 2007

Mark Boudreaux, a spokesman for Exxon, the world's biggest publicly traded company, said its position on climate change has been "widely misunderstood and as a result of that, we have been clarifying and talking more about what our position is."

Exxon Cuts Ties to Warming Skeptics - Timothy Gardner, Reuters, Jan 12, 2007

"On carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels and their impact on global warming, he [Rex Tillerson] said: 'It is clear that something is going on. It is not useful to debate (the issue) any longer.'"

**DAVOS: Exxon Mobil CEO sees 2030 world energy consumption up 50 percent
By Nigel Tutt AFX, Forbes.com, Jan. 25, 2007**

"Cohen said that Exxon's foundation, which he leads, decided in 2005 to cut funding, though that came to light only last fall."

Exxon Mobil Warming Up To Global Climate Issue - Steven Mufson, *Washington Post*, Feb. 10, 2007

"The oil giant has now closed its cash spigot to some groups challenging global warming. 'The funding was unfortunately becoming a distraction,' says ExxonMobil's Cohen."

Climate Wars: Episode Two - John Carey, *BusinessWeek*, Apr. 23, 2007

SUMMARY

ExxonMobil's campaign to fund "think tanks" and organizations that spread misinformation about the science and policies of global warming is now widely known. The company's multimillion dollar campaign has undoubtedly contributed to public confusion and government inaction on global warming over the past decade. Recently Exxon has claimed to have ceased this practice.

Revelations and charges of this shameful legacy have come from politicians, news media, non-government organizations including Greenpeace's ExxonSecrets.org, [the Exxpose Exxon Coalition](#), the [Union of Concerned Scientists](#), [the Royal Society of London](#), [Senators Snowe and Rockefeller](#), and many others.

Under increasing scrutiny and pressure over the past two years from scientists, policy makers and the public, the company was forced to reveal that it had stopped funding a handful of organizations identified as part of the company's denial campaign on global warming.

In July 2006, ExxonMobil met with officials from the Royal Society, the United Kingdom's national academy of science. When the Royal Society raised concerns about the company's funding of groups that were misrepresenting the consensus on global warming science, ExxonMobil officials indicated that the company had discontinued funding these entities.

After this dialogue was revealed in the press in September 2006, the company stonewalled at first, refusing to confirm that the Competitive Enterprise Institute was no longer funded and claiming that the funded organizations did not speak for the company. As the story unfolded, ExxonMobil's Ken Cohen, Vice President of Public Affairs and Chair of ExxonMobil Foundation eventually revealed that funding had been cut to CEI and "a handful" of other groups. The company then turned on an aggressive PR offensive in early 2007, when company spokespeople started proclaiming to reporters that the company's global warming stance had been "misunderstood".

However, Cohen ardently refused to reveal the groups that had been unfunded in 2006. This analysis of ExxonMobil's 2006 [World Giving Report](#) provides the first breakdown of the groups Exxon has dropped, and more importantly, continued to fund.

We have found that, despite the rhetoric, ExxonMobil continues to fund the majority of the organizations which have been central to the global warming denial campaign the company has run for the past decade or more.

Furthermore, analysis of recently obtained ExxonMobil tax documents reveals that the company withheld information from the public on climate-specific grants it awarded in 2005, portraying these grants as "General Support" in reports published on its website.

KEY CONCLUSIONS:

- ExxonMobil's newly published World Giving Report reveals that in 2006, ExxonMobil funneled \$2.1 million in grants to some 41 think tanks and front groups that continue to deny the science and block government action on global warming. (See Appendix A)
- Total ExxonMobil funding to all denial organizations from 1998 to 2006 now totals nearly \$23 Million, according to the ExxonSecrets.org database.
- Twenty four of the groups identified in a January 2007 report by the Union of Concerned Scientists as manufacturing uncertainty around global warming science between 1998 and 2005 received an additional \$1.6 million in funding in 2006.
- Four groups that received continued funding in 2006 have consistently been at the center of ExxonMobil's fight against action on global warming. These groups were named as participants in the leaked 1998 American Petroleum Institute memo that detailed *the Global Climate Science Communications Plan*, a multiyear, multimillion dollar strategy to manufacture uncertainty around the science of global warming. These groups are The Heartland Institute, George C. Marshall Institute, American Legislative Exchange Council and Frontiers of Freedom. Total 2006 funding to these groups was \$421,000 with a sum of over \$3.6 Million since 1998. (See Appendix B for funding totals, Appendix C for details of their work on global warming in 2005.)
- Two highly active organizations and individuals in the global warming denial campaign were not funded by ExxonMobil in 2006: The Competitive Enterprise Institute and Steve "Junkscience.com" Milloy and his latest vehicle, the Free Enterprise Education Institute, which attacks corporations progressive on global warming like General Electric and Federal Express.
- ExxonMobil's 2005 IRS Form 990 tax statements, the latest available, reveal that in that year, 14 organizations were funded specifically for work on the issue of climate change. In the company's public *World Giving Report*, it characterized these grants as "General Support" or failed to disclose the purpose of the funding.
- In total, ExxonMobil-funded denial front groups lost over \$1.4 million in 2006 funding due to increased pressure from the Exxpose Exxon coalition, shareholder activists, members of Congress, scientists and the media.

2006 CUTS TO EXXONMOBIL'S DENIAL MACHINE

Exxon's Public Relations officer Ken Cohen has repeatedly stated that ExxonMobil cut 2006 funding to a "handful" of groups including the Competitive Enterprise Institute, without revealing the names of those organizations or stating what company policy determined those decisions. In addition to CEI, we were able to identify four organizations that were given ExxonMobil grants or gifts in 2005 *to work specifically on global warming* and were not funded in 2006. (See Table 1)

We assume these are the "handful" of groups that ExxonMobil's Ken Cohen has been referring to in his public relations campaign to fend off mounting criticism (See Appendix B for grant details).

TABLE 1. EXXONMOBIL'S "HANDFUL" OF 2006 FUNDING CUTS

Organization	2005 ExxonMobil Funding	Total funding 1998-2005
Center for a New Europe USA	\$50,000	\$170,000
Center for Defense of Free Enterprise	\$60,000	\$230,000
Competitive Enterprise Institute	\$270,000	\$2,005,000
Environmental Literacy Council	\$50,000	\$50,000
Free Enterprise Education Institute.	\$70,000	\$130,000
TOTAL	\$500,000	\$2,585,000

Notes: Steve Milloy's Free Enterprise Education Institute total 98-05 funding includes a 2003 grant to Free Enterprise Action Institute, a previous incarnation of the same organization.

On the positive side, ExxonMobil's network of opposition groups have suffered at least a temporary financial setback.

- Funding totals by ExxonMobil dropped by more than \$1.4 million in 2006 versus 2005 funding levels. (See TABLE 3)
- Fifteen organizations, including the Competitive Enterprise Institute, were un-funded in 2006 compared to 2005 (See TABLES 1 & 2). However, without a clearly stated policy from ExxonMobil, it is unknown whether these groups will be funded again in the future or if they were dropped as part of ExxonMobil's global warming public relations makeover.
- The Cato Institute, a longtime member of the climate denial industry, was funded again in 2006 after not receiving a grant in 2005, illustrating a lack of consistency in ExxonMobil's funding policy.
- Total funding to all organizations identified as seeking to undermine the science and urgency of global warming dropped down from \$3.6 million and \$3.9 million in 2005 and 2004 respectively to \$2.1 million in 2006 (See TABLE 3)

TABLE 2. ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS UNFUNDED BY EXXON IN 2006 vs 2005 and 2004

Organization	2005 Funding	2004 Funding	TOTAL funding 1998-2005
American Council on Science and Health	\$25,000	\$15,000	\$125,000
Federal Focus	\$125,000	-	\$125,000
Hoover Institute	\$20,000	-	\$295,000
Hudson Institute	\$10,000	-	\$25,000
Independent Institute	\$30,000	-	\$70,000
Institute for Senior Studies	\$30,000	-	\$30,000
International Republican Institute	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$115,000
Institute for Study of Earth and Man	\$10,000	\$11,500	\$76,500
Media Institute	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$120,000
Reason Foundation	\$20,000	-	\$321,000

Source: ExxonMobil IRS Form 990s and annual foundation reports 1998-2006

TABLE 3. ANNUAL EXXON GRANTS TO DENIAL GROUPS

Year	Total Funding
1998	\$1,902,900
1999	\$50,000
2000	\$2,514,000
2001	\$2,401,850
2002	\$2,819,723
2003	\$3,547,750
2004	\$3,920,100
2005	\$3,573,600
2006	\$2,124,500
TOTAL 1998-2006	\$22,854,423

Source: ExxonSecrets.org database

CLIMATE-SPECIFIC FUNDING DETAILS WITHHELD FROM PUBLIC

New evidence discovered by Greenpeace in the company's IRS Form 990 tax reports shows numerous discrepancies between the ExxonMobil Foundation's detailed reporting to the government and its public World Giving Report published on its website and trumpeted as 'full disclosure' of its funding practices.

- Fourteen 2005 ExxonMobil grants were given specifically for work on global warming. The 2005 World Giving Report either listed these grants as "General Support" or failed to disclose the purpose of the grant. On the IRS form, these grants are variously listed as *Global Climate Change Issues, Activities, Efforts, etc.* (See Appendix B for full details of these grants)
- Notably, ten of the organizations receiving grants in 2006 received global warming specific grants in 2005.
- Many groups that received the largest grants in 2005 still got funding in 2006.
- Of the 80+ ExxonMobil-funded global warming denial groups tracked by ExxonSecrets.org since 1998, 41 were still funded by ExxonMobil in 2006, down from 56 in 2005.
- Two organizations previously unknown to be funded to work on global warming received grants from ExxonMobil specifically for that purpose in 2005: the Independent Women's Forum and the Environmental Literacy Council. The Independent Women's Forum also received a grant in 2006.
- Eighteen of the 42 organizations funded in 2006 have received grants in past years from ExxonMobil for specific work on global warming. In 2004, ExxonMobil's World Giving Report – perhaps inadvertently - specified which grants were for work on global warming. Additional evidence is from past 990 Forms and other sources.
- The 2006 World Giving Report does not specify which, if any, of the 2006 grants are targeted for work on global warming. However, we have not seen ExxonMobil's 2006 990 tax form presumably filed with the IRS.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER RECENT ASSESSMENTS OF EXXONMOBIL'S DENIAL CAMPAIGN

Greenpeace's widely used [ExxonSecrets](#) database covers not only the groups engaged in undermining the scientific consensus and confusing the public about global warming, but also those groups that generally obstruct and distort the global warming policy debate with political and economic alarmist tactics. The available data published by Exxon, and later ExxonMobil, starts in 1998, the year after the Kyoto Protocol was crafted. The database contains over 80 groups that have been funded by ExxonMobil's Foundation or ExxonMobil Corporation between 1998 and 2006. Data is taken from ExxonMobil Foundation's tax forms and the company's annual World Giving Reports, published on the company's website.

Of the organizations being tracked, 32 are known to have received grants specific to their work on global warming in at least one year between 1998-2005. These groups as well as the others serve as an echo chamber for a concerted attack on global warming science and policy. They share personnel and strategy, form coalitions, co-sign letters and initiatives, lobby in tandem and co-host events.

Several organizations and journalists have confirmed that ExxonMobil is the only known oil company to fund a network of organizations that deny the science and urgency of global warming. Depending on the criteria used to examine and parse the data on funded organizations, the results are slightly different. Each of these analyses, including this one, are simply snapshots of the Exxon-funded denial industry based on currently available information.

- In 2005, Chris Mooney, a journalist writing in [Mother Jones Magazine](#) determined that ExxonMobil funded 40 groups "that either have sought to undermine mainstream scientific findings on global climate change or have maintained affiliations with a small group of 'skeptical' scientists who continue to do so."
- In 2006, the Royal Society, among the most respected scientific academies in the world, said in a letter to ExxonMobil that its survey had identified 36 Exxon-funded groups that were distorting the science.
- In 2007, the Union of Concerned Scientists listed 43 groups that had engaged in "big tobacco's tactics to manufacture uncertainty on climate science".

CONCLUSIONS

Has ExxonMobil dropped its campaign to undermine global warming science and policy?

The answer is clear: no.

ExxonMobil has dropped the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), a group that clearly still does heavy lifting for the denial machine. CEI received a \$270,000 grant for "*General Support and Environmental Program*" grant from ExxonMobil in 2005. A key plank of the CEI's environmental program is its work on global warming. However, many CEI staff are also associated with many other groups with continued ExxonMobil funding and continue to broadcast through those groups. Additionally, the CEI continues to run the "Cooler Heads Coalition," a lobbying block active on Capitol Hill. Many of the coalition's

members are still funded by ExxonMobil including, CFACT, Heartland Institute, Frontiers of Freedom, NCPA, NCPPR, Atlas and Media Research Center.

ExxonMobil has dropped a 'handful' of groups in the 2006 funding cycle – yet it continues to fund the core network of groups who have been at the center of the campaign to undermine the understanding of global warming science for the past decade.

Many groups receive grants from ExxonMobil every year, whereas other groups have received funding sporadically through the years. In order to know if ExxonMobil is no longer pursuing its disinformation campaign by funding a network of denial groups, the company would have to clearly state its new funding policy and guidelines and then abide by it.

The company has seen that the world has moved. As additional corporations join the call for mandatory emissions reductions each day, ExxonMobil is increasingly seen as far outside the political center. Today, the company is more isolated than ever in its stance on global warming which threatens its political access as policies move quickly in the halls of Congress.

Rather than shedding its shameful legacy by dropping the global warming denial groups it has been funding, it has dropped a few while maintaining the majority – a clear sign that the company is attempting to change its Public Relations image without changing its behavior.

What should ExxonMobil do?

- Reveal ExxonMobil Foundation grants for 2007 now.
- Publicly release its 2006 IRS Form 990 and any additional details on 2006 grants.
- Discontinue current and future funding to all the groups listed on ExxonSecrets.org.
- Publicly disclose the full terms of all grants and corporate giving to advocacy groups and disassociate itself from work that misrepresents the scientific consensus on climate change.
- Fully disclose its grant giving procedures, including proposal guidelines and deliverables reporting.
- Reveal the terms of all grants awarded to organizations identified as vending misinformation on the science of global warming dating back to 1998, with specific details on climate-related work ExxonMobil funded.
- Admit it has been at the center of a campaign to undermine both climate science and progressive policy.
- Endorse mandatory greenhouse gas emissions reductions as many major corporations now have done.
- Apologize to the world for the damage delay caused by the company's actions to confuse the public understanding and slow political response to this global crisis.

APPENDIX A - DENIER GROUPS FUNDED BY EXXONMOBIL IN 2006

ORGANIZATION	2006 ExxonMobil funding	Total 1998-2006	2005 Climate specific grants	2004 Climate specific grants
Acton Institute	\$50,000	\$315,000		
American Council for Capital Formation Center for Policy Research	\$15,000	\$1,619,523	\$270,000	\$180,000
American Enterprise Institute	\$240,000	\$1,860,000		
American Legislative Exchange Council	\$86,000	\$1,126,200	\$101,500	\$137,000
American Spectator Foundation	\$25,000	\$25,000		
Annapolis Center	\$105,000	\$841,000		
Aspen Institute	\$10,000	\$71,500		
Atlas Economic Research Foundation	\$100,000	\$925,000		\$170,000
Capital Research Center (Greenwatch)	\$25,000	\$215,000		
Cato Institute	\$20,000	\$125,000		
Center for American and International Law (formerly the Southwestern Legal Fndn)	\$31,000	\$224,550		
Center for the Study of CO2 & Global Change	\$10,000	\$100,000	\$25,000	
CFACT Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow	\$70,000	\$567,000	\$70,000	\$85,000
Chemical Education Foundation	\$25,000	\$130,000		
Congress of Racial Equality	\$25,000	\$260,000	\$25,000	\$135,000
Federalist Society	\$15,000	\$105,000		
FREE Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment	\$30,000	\$240,000		\$20,000
Frontiers of Freedom	\$180,000	\$1,182,000	\$90,000	\$250,000
George C. Marshall Institute	\$85,000	\$745,000	\$90,000	\$170,000
George Mason Univ. Law and Economics Center	\$30,000	\$215,000		
Heartland Institute	\$115,000	\$830,000		\$25,000
Heritage Foundation	\$30,000	\$565,000		
Independent Women's Forum	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	
Institute for Energy Research	\$65,000	\$242,000		\$45,000
International Policy Network - North America	\$95,000	\$390,000		\$115,000
Landmark Legal Foundation	\$10,000	\$50,000		
Lindenwood University, St. Charles, Missouri	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Manhattan Institute	\$30,000	\$325,000		
Media Research Center	\$52,500	\$202,500	\$50,000	\$50,000
Mercatus Center, George Mason University	\$40,000	\$120,000		\$40,000
National Association of Neighborhoods	\$25,000	\$125,000		\$25,000
National Black Chamber of Commerce	\$50,000	\$225,000		
National Center for Policy Analysis	\$75,000	\$545,900		
National Center for Public Policy Research	\$55,000	\$335,000		
National Legal Center for the Public Interest	\$25,000	\$216,500		
Pacific Legal Foundation	\$15,000	\$120,000		
Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy	\$75,000	\$430,000		\$50,000
Property and Environment Research Center (formerly Political Economy Research Center)	\$20,000	\$55,000		
Texas Public Policy Foundation	\$15,000	\$30,000		
The Communications Institute	\$75,000	\$200,000		
Washington Legal Foundation	\$30,000	\$215,000		
TOTALS	\$2,099,500	\$16,148,673	\$741,500	\$1,502,000

Source: Exxon IRS Form 990s and annual World Giving Reports 1998-2006

**APPENDIX B:
2005 GRANT DISCREPENCIES:
Exxon's Public World Giving Report Compared to IRS Form 990**

Organization	2006 Total World Giving Report	TOTAL FUNDING 1998-2006	2005 Total World Giving Report	2005 Total 990 Form	Climate specific grant details from ExxonMobil's 2005 IRS Form 990	2005 World Giving Report Details
American Council for Capital Formation Center for Policy Research	\$15,000	\$1,619,523	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$90K Climate Change; \$90K Climate Change Education Efforts; \$90K Climate Environmental & Economic Research	No Description
American Legislative Exchange Council	\$86,000	\$1,026,200	\$241,500	\$151,500	\$80K Energy Sustainability Project (Climate Change); \$21.5K Climate Change Environmental Outreach	\$90K Annual Conference*; \$80K Energy Sustainability Project; \$71.5K General Operating Support
Center for a New Europe-USA		\$170,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	Global Climate Change Ed. Efforts	No Description
Center for Defense of Free Enterprise		\$230,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	Global Climate Change Issues	No Description
Center for the Study of CO2 and Global Change	\$10,000	\$100,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	Climate Change Activities	No Description
CFACT Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow	\$70,000	\$567,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$70K Climate Change & Energy	No Description
Congress of Racial Equality	\$25,000	\$260,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$25K Global Climate Change Env. Outreach	No Description
Environmental Literacy Council			\$50,000	\$50,000	Global Climate Change & Energy Education	No Description
Free Enterprise Education Institute		\$80,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$45K Corporate Social Responsibility and Climate Change	No Description
Frontiers of Freedom	\$180,000	\$1,182,000	\$140,000	\$90,000	\$90K Climate Change Efforts	\$50K Annual Gala and General Operating Support; \$90K General Operating Support
George C. Marshall Institute	\$85,000	\$745,000	\$115,000	\$90,000	\$90K Climate Change	\$25K Awards Dinner and General Operating Support*, \$90K General Operating Support
Independent Women's Forum	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15K Media and Opinion Leader Outreach on Climate Change Issues	No Description
Lindenwood University, St. Charles, Missouri	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	Climate Change	No Description
Media Research Center (Cybercast News Service)	\$52,500	\$202,500	\$50,000	\$50,000	Climate Change & Env. Issues	No Description
TOTALS	\$548,500	\$6,217,223	\$1,346,500	\$1,181,500		
Total of 2005 Climate Grantees 1998-2006	\$5,234,723					

*Note: All quotes are directly from Exxon documents

APPENDIX C

You Get What You Pay For

What ExxonMobil -Funded Groups Delivered in 2006

This is a partial list of prominent 2006 Exxon Fundees and their climate related work lately. For information of this sort on all funded groups go to ExxonSecrets.org

[American Council for Capital Formation](#)

The ACCF has released [17](#) climate-specific papers, policy analyses, op-eds and interviews since 2005 emphasizing a [“lack of scientific consensus”](#) on global warming and urging policymakers not to [“follow Mr. Gore](#) and tinker with failed policy that would lead to sharp increases in already high energy prices, lost jobs and reduced revenue.” ACCF devoted considerable energy to [battling California climate legislation AB 32](#), and insisting that [voluntary measures](#) are better for the economy than mandatory emissions curbs or [carbon cap/tax approaches](#).

[American Enterprise Institute \(AEI\)](#)

AEI scholars Steven Hayward and Kenneth Green sent out letters in the summer of 2006 to an unknown number of scientists and professors [offering \\$10,000](#) to author critiques of the forthcoming IPCC report, particularly highlighting the “limitations of climate model outputs.” In December 2006, Lee Lane, executive director of AEI’s Climate Policy Center, authored [“Strategic Options for Bush Administration Climate Policy,”](#) arguing that President Bush was correct to reject Kyoto and should reject cap-and-trade proposals in favor of a possible carbon tax, and [“advocates greater focus on developing breakthrough clean energy and geoengineering technologies.”](#)

[American Legislative Exchange Council](#)

Using the “states rights” guise to attack [“environmental federalism,”](#) ALEC has recently argued that states should not be forced to comply with federal laws protecting air quality or limiting emissions. ALEC warns of the economic disaster from “Kyoto Spawn” – state and regional efforts to adopt emissions reduction targets – arguing that [“the science of climate change is unsettled”](#) and the [“question is how much, if any, of this warming is caused by human activities.”](#)[PDF] ALEC argues against federal responses to climate change, and has issued reports attacking [gas tax](#) and [ethanol subsidy](#) proposals. ALEC has issued multiple pieces of [“model legislation”](#) including a resolution to [repeal elements of the Clean Air Act](#), and a [“Verifiable Science Act”](#) to ensure “sound science” because, ALEC claims, “Increasingly, ‘junk science’ has dictated the direction in which environmental policy is headed.”

[Center for the Study of CO2 and Global Change](#)

The Center now offers [greenhouse gas reporting](#) services and runs the [“Medieval Warm Period Project”](#) with the mission:

[“to truly convince most rational people that the Medieval Warm Period was indeed both longer and warmer than the portion of the Current Warm Period experienced to date. When this degree of realization occurs, it will undercut the only foundation in real-world data upon which the world's climate alarmists are able to build an edifice to support their many doom-and-gloom predictions of catastrophic global warming and biospheric breakdown based on theoretical computer-based and scenario-driven simulations. Only at that time, when we have achieved our ultimate goal, will the project end.”](#)

CFACT – Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow

CFACT is a trumpeter of the ‘natural variability’ argument that climate hasn’t been altered much by human activities. CFACT is a resolute defender of carbon dioxide, which it alleges has been [“exonerated”](#) from any negative impact on climate. Recently, CFACT “advisor” Dennis Avery authored [“Should we believe the latest UN Climate Report?”](#) which attacks the latest IPCC report.

Congress of Racial Equality

CORE senior policy advisor Paul Driessen has written several articles in his role with CORE (including the book “Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death”). Driessen recently authored an op-ed in the Washington Times in February 2007 arguing that America shouldn’t worry about (or devote funding to solve) [“exaggerated or imaginary crises”](#), specifically global warming.

Frontiers of Freedom

Frontiers of Freedom’s Center for Science and Public Policy (CSSP) publishes a weekly [“Climate and Environment Review,”](#) recent headlines include [“Hurricane forecaster: Oceans, not CO2, cause global warming,”](#) and [“Global Warming Natural, Says Expert.”](#) CSPP scholar Christopher C. Horner (and Staff Attorney for Competitive Enterprise Institute) authored a February 2007 report arguing that Kyoto Protocol’s future is [doomed not by U.S. inaction but by the failure of Europe to meet its commitments and the rest of the world’s resistance to “rationing” energy; and portends that U.S. emissions growth isn’t a problem if viewed “in perspective.”](#)

Frontiers of Freedom President George Landrith called recent efforts by Sens Durbin and Hagel to compel the CIA and Pentagon to assess the national security implications of climate change [“a big waste of time and effort,”](#) stating that climate change doesn’t even make his “top one-thousand list” of priorities. In January 2006, FF scholar Chris Horner authored [“An Assessment of Montreal COP/MOP 1,”](#)[\[PDF\]](#) about the implications of Kyoto post-2012 activities and criticized Kyoto’s “procedures and mechanisms” for curbing emissions, arguing they make things worse.

The organization’s [“Freedom Report” May/June 2006](#) – was an eight-page report dedicated entirely to questioning global warming science, policy and attacking Al Gore. “The truth is, there is no conclusive or reliable scientific proof that the sky is falling or that Earth’s climate is experiencing cataclysmic warming caused by man’s activities.”

George C. Marshall Institute

The Marshall Institute alleges an [“ongoing debate](#) about the contribution of human activities to the global warming of the past century and how they may contribute to warming that may occur during the 21st century.” While acknowledging “there is a sufficient basis for action because the climate change risk is real,” Marshall argues that “actions must not be predicated on speculative images of an apocalyptic vision of life in the near future.” Marshall Institute CEO William O’Keefe (former American Petroleum Institute officer and registered ExxonMobil lobbyist) [recently referred](#) to the April 2007 ruling by the Supreme Court (that EPA has the authority to regulate carbon dioxide) as “a triumph of judicial activism...ideology... political science” by a court that “may have been too influenced by political correctness and climate orthodoxy.” O’Keefe argues that [“There is clearly evidence that the U.S. is doing more to address the climate risk than other nations.”](#)[\[PDF\]](#) O’Keefe authored many articles in 2006 (occasionally accompanied by Marshall Institute President Jeff Kueter), notably criticizing Al Gore’s efforts ([“Climate Zealotry Produces Bad Policy”](#)); attacking the [Royal Society’s “censorship”](#) after the Royal Society asked ExxonMobil to [stop funding skeptic groups](#); and lambasting the IPCC ([“Group Think Masquerading as Consensus”](#)). In March 2007, Marshall Institute [“expert”](#) Timothy Ball presented [“The Science Isn’t Settled - The](#)

[Limitations of Global Climate Models,](#)" (which are referred to as "assumptions" and "guesses"), the speech is based on Ball's [2004 report of the same name prepared for the Fraser Institute.\[PDF\]](#) The Marshall Institute [published Pat Michaels et al's "Shattered Consensus: The True State of Global Warming,"](#) in 2005 and [held events in 2006](#) to support sales of the book which claims to ["shatter commonly held opinions about global warming and leave the reader with serious doubts about whether policies to 'fight' climate change are warranted at all."](#) Michaels is a well known climate science skeptic.

[Heartland Institute](#)

Earlier this spring, Heartland launched its new website [GlobalWarmingHeartland.org](#) (replacing ClimateSearch.org) which features a stable of "Experts" chock full of notorious global warming skeptics; the site serves as Heartland's clearinghouse of skeptic information on global warming. Heartland published a ["Guidebook for State Legislators"](#) on energy and climate change in January 2007. Heartland has devoted considerable time and energy to attacking [Al Gore](#) and the film, 'An Inconvenient Truth,' as well as the [IPCC](#), which Heartland Science Director Jay Lehr refers to as ["that font of unvarnished truth, the United Nations."](#) Heartland continues to assert there is ["no consensus about the causes, effects, or future rate of global warming,"](#) and "Reliable experts on climate change include Patrick Michaels, S. Fred Singer, and Sallie Baliunas." (see ExxonSecrets.org for detailed factsheets on these individuals)

[Heritage Foundation](#)

Heritage continues to discount climate change science with claims that a ["review of the evidence reveals fundamental uncertainties,"](#) as in this April 2007 "Discussing Global Warming in the Security Council: Premature and a Distraction from More Pressing Crises" urging the U.N. Security Council to shelve concerns about global warming because "Contrary to the impression given in press coverage, considerable scientific uncertainties and debate exist." Heritage argues that ["Even if global warming occurs as envisioned, it is far from clear that acting now to address the threat is the most efficient use of resources."](#) Most often led by scholar Ben Lieberman, Heritage releases regular challenges to the IPCC and other world authorities on global warming, as in its February 2007 statement ["Don't Rush To Judgment on U.N.'s IPCC Global Warming Summary,"](#) which emphasized that the Summary for Policy Makers was "Just a Summary," and urged policy makers to reject "Kyoto-style requirements" ... "lest the U.S. embark on a course that does more harm than good."

[Independent Women's Forum](#)

IWF asserts that ["Global warming's a crock,"](#) and referred to the Stern Report as ["The Latest Global Warming Alarmism."](#) Another recent article ["Higher Price of Gas Increases Potential for Bad Energy Policy,"](#) advising that "consumers need to recognize that changes in prices play an important role in energy markets, encouraging people to conserve when supplies are short. Government price controls will stifle this important process and create the potential for gasoline shortages."

[International Policy Network](#)

IPN Environment Program Director Kendra Okonski argued in a March 2006 critique of the Stern Report that [“it is clear that attempting to control climate change through global regulation of emissions or by government fiat more generally would be harmful and counterproductive.”](#) ...and suggests adaptation as the only reasonable approach, noting that... [“Adaptation should be understood as containing all possibilities in the realm of private, voluntary action - and eliminating government-imposed hindrances and obstacles to such action.”](#)[PDF] IPN also criticized the latest IPCC report as [“Alarmist claims,”](#) and trumpeted the “Independent” summary from the Fraser Institute, one of IPN’s fellow members in the newly formed [Civil Society Coalition on Climate Change \(formed in February 2007\)](#).

[Lindenwood University of Missouri](#)

Lindenwood hosted a [lecture by Roy Spencer](#) on April 19, 2006 titled [“How Serious is the Global Warming Threat?”](#)[PDF] Spencer asserted that the Earth is resilient and [“has the ability to cool itself,”](#) according to Lindenwood’s summary of the lecture.

Kenneth Chilton, director of Lindenwood’s Institute for the Study of Economics and the Environment serves on the [advisory board](#) of the Interfaith Stewardship Alliance and was a signatory of the ISA’s July 2006 [“Call to Truth, Prudence and the Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Response to Global Warming.”](#)[PDF]

[Media Research Center](#)

MRC regularly claims that the media “push global warming alarmism,” as in this April 19, 2007 study [“Morning TV’s One-Sided Climate Crusade,”](#) which asserts that major networks ABC, NBC and CBS “are giving Gore practically everything he demanded.” In 2006, MRC’s Business & Media Institute released its report [“Fire and Ice: Journalists have warned of climate change for 100 years, but can’t decide weather we face an ice age or warming.”](#) Dan Gainor, director of the BMI, was invited by Sen. James Inhofe in the waning days of his chairmanship of the Senate’s Environment and Public Works Committee to testify that the “alarmist” media have [“become lapdogs”](#) only capable of biased coverage on climate change. Senator Inhofe’s current Media Director Marc Morano was formerly a Senior Staff Writer at MRC’s CNS.com

[National Center for Public Policy Research](#)

Home of [prolific ExxonMobil apologist](#) Amy Ridenour, NCPPR posts numerous [blog entries and articles](#) on global warming such as Ridenour’s [two-part](#) blog [“Thank God for Senator Inhofe,”](#) praise for Senator Inhofe’s speech alleging that [“When the Debate is Balanced, Skeptics Win, Alarmists Lose,”](#) and random rants such as [“AP Reports Study Saying Carbon Dioxide Boosts Poison Ivy’s Itchiness, But Skips Study Saying CO2 Lowers Nicotine in Tobacco.”](#) NCPPR complains of [“Chilling Intolerance for Free Speech on Global Warming,”](#) and of the media [“Censoring Global Warming Skeptics”](#) and asserts that [“Al Gore’s a scaredy cat”](#) because he won’t debate skeptic Lord Moncton.

[Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy](#)

Pacific Research Institute released a DVD documentary [“An Inconvenient Truth...Or Convenient Fiction?”](#) for Earth Day 2007, along with its annual [“Index of Leading Environmental Indicators”](#)[PDF] which asserts that the environment is improving and there’s no need to worry about global warming. PRI Public Policy Fellow Dr. Amy Kaleita released a 2006 report urging governments to move slowly on carbon sequestration, claiming there’s [“no conclusive proof of the effects of CO2 on climate change,”](#) and any efforts to capture carbon would hurt consumers.