



FL-13: (0:30 DIGITAL AD) "ANOTHER CONNECTION" BACKUP

VISUAL	AUDIO	RESEARCH BACKUP
<p>Exxon documents</p> <p><i>Scientific American</i> article with relevant sections highlighted</p> <p><i>The Washington Post</i> article with relevant sections highlighted</p> <p><i>PBS News Hour</i> story with relevant sections highlighted</p> <p><i>Newsweek</i> article with relevant sections highlighted</p> <p>OIL GIANT HAD EVIDENCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE 40 YEARS AGO</p>	<p>ANNCR: Newly-released documents show oil giant Exxon had scientific evidence forty years ago that climate change is being fueled by carbon pollution...</p>	<p>1981 Exxon Document: "Increasing Level Of Atmospheric CO2 Is Causing Considerable Concern Due To Potential Climate Effects." In February 1981, Exxon's Research and Engineering Company wrote a report which stated, "The increasing level of atmospheric CO2 is causing considerable concern due to potential climate effects." [Inside Climate News, accessed 10/10/16]</p> <p>Scientific American Headline: "Exxon Knew About Climate Change Almost 40 Years Ago." [Scientific American, 10/26/15]</p> <p>Washington Post Headline: "Investigation Broadens Into Whether Exxon Mobil Misled Public, Investors On Climate Change." [Washington Post, 3/31/16]</p> <p>PBS News Hour Headline: "Has Exxon Mobil Misled The Public About Its Climate Change Research?" [PBS News Hour, 11/10/15]</p> <p>Newsweek Headline: "Exxon Knew About Climate Change In The 1970s, But Still Helped Block Kyoto Protocol In The '90s." [Newsweek, 9/16/15]</p>
<p>Oil executives being sworn in to testify</p> <p>Men in suits walking</p> <p>SPENT MILLIONS COVERING IT UP</p> <p>Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15; Union of Concerned Scientists, May 2012</p>	<p>... and spent millions covering it up, propping up politicians to block action to protect us.</p>	<p>Dating Back To 1977, Exxon Knew Of Increased Levels Of CO2 In The Atmosphere, Driven By "The Combustion Of Fossil Fuels ... And That This Posed A Threat To Exxon." [PBS News Hour, 11/10/15]</p> <p>Nearly Forty Years Ago, "Many Exxon Executives, Middle Managers And Scientists" Saw Climate Action As "The Kind Of Opportunity ... Aimed At Benefitting Mankind." [Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15]</p> <p>1998 – 2005: Exxon Spent Tens Of Millions Of Dollars "To Wage A Campaign Raising Questions About Climate Change." [Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15]</p> <p>2012 Report: Exxon Contributed To Anti-Climate Members Of Congress More Than 10 Times As Frequently As To Pro-Climate Members. [Union of Concerned Scientists, May 2012 (pg. 17)]</p> <p><i>NOTE: See addendum for additional backup</i></p>
<p>File photo of Jolly</p> <p>DAVID JOLLY</p> <p>Oil & Gas Contributions \$36,700 from oil and</p>	<p>The local connection – thirteenth district Congressman David Jolly.</p> <p>A longtime lobbyist,</p>	<p>2007 – 2013: Jolly Was A Registered Lobbyist. David Jolly appears to have been a lobbyist from 2007 until 2013. [United States Senate, Lobbying Disclosure Act Database, Accessed 10/20/16]</p> <p>Jolly Was The Free Enterprise Nation's Registered Lobbyist In July 2010. In a federal Lobbying Report form filed for the third quarter of</p>



<p>gas interests OpenSecrets.org, accessed 10/20/16</p> <p><u>VOTED THEIR WAY</u> Vote 99, 2/26/16; Vote 651, 12/1/15; Vote 408, 7/8/15</p> <p>DAVID JOLLY: Tens of Thousands From Big Oil & Gas</p> <p>David Jolly Protected big oil. Not us.</p>	<p>Jolly is one of the politicians listed taking tens of thousands from oil and gas interests...</p> <p>... and voting their way.</p> <p>David Jolly protected big oil. Not us.</p>	<p>2010, David W. Jolly of Van Scoyoc Associates signed as the contact name, and The Free Enterprise Nation was listed as the client name. The third quarter report covered the period of 7/1/10 through 9/30/10. [United States Senate, Lobbying Disclosure Act Database, Accessed 10/20/16]</p> <p>PolitiFact Ruled That Jolly, Despite Him Saying Otherwise, Did Lobby For Offshore Drilling. In January 2014, PolitiFact stated, “Jolly said he never lobbied for offshore drilling. But a lobbyist disclosure statement contradicts that, and Jolly said later that he did attend a meeting in which the legislation was discussed even though he didn’t actively lobby for it. When we looked into the rules of lobbying, it seems that the situation as he describes it -- being at a meeting but not actively pushing the measure with elected officials -- technically counts as being part of a communication about the proposal. We’ll never know the specifics of the meeting in question, and given the vague nature of lobbying reporting, the events may very well have been as low-key as he describes. But when it comes to the letter of the law, the way Jolly describes the incident counts as lobbying, experts say.” [PolitiFact, 1/10/14]</p> <p>Jolly Has Taken \$36,700 From Oil & Gas Interests, Including \$6,000 from Exxon Mobil. Over the course of his federal campaigns, David Jolly has taken \$36,700 from the oil & gas industry. \$6,000 of that came from Exxon Mobil. [Open Secrets, accessed 10/20/16]</p> <p>Jolly Voted Against Protecting The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge From Drilling. In February 2016, Jolly voted against a bill that would designate the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as Wilderness. The bill’s sponsor, Rep. Jared Huffman, said, “The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in northeastern Alaska is one of those uniquely American places, and we must do our due diligence to protect this one of a kind national treasure from the dangerous effects of drilling. By designating this area as wilderness, we can finally recognize the intrinsic value that this land holds.” The amendment was defeated 176-227. [H.R.2406, Vote 99, 2/26/16; Huffington Post, 4/25/16]</p> <p>Jolly Voted To Overturn The Clean Power Plan. In December 2015, Jolly voted to “overturn” the Clean Power Plan. The bill, as passed by the House, “would permanently block the main pillar of Obama’s climate agenda, and while they know they can do little to stop the rules while Obama holds the veto pen, Republicans said they feel that sending a strong signal against climate action is important.” The resolution passed 242-180. [S.J.Res.23, Vote 651, 12/1/15; The Hill, 12/1/15]</p> <p>Jolly Voted To Continue Subsidies For Oil And Gas Companies Producing Energy On Federal Lands. In July 2015, Jolly voted for an</p>
---	---	---



		<p>“amendment would bar any increase in royalty rates paid to the federal government for oil and natural gas produced on government lands. [Legislation sponsor Rep. Stevan] Pearce said increasing rates would levy added costs on an industry already struggling with low prices, threatening oil and gas companies that improve domestic energy security and help rural economies. An amendment opponent, Rep. Chellie Pingree, D-Maine, said changing royalty rates could increase government revenue by billions of dollars, giving the public ‘a fair return from the production of oil and gas from federal leases.’ The amendment passed 231-198. [H.R.2822, Vote 408, 7/8/15; Bangor Daily News, 7/10/15]</p>
<p>Paid for by League of Conservation Voters, www.lcv.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee.</p>		

Paid for by League of Conservation Voters, [www.lcv.org](#), and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee.



ADDENDUM: EXXON CLIMATE CHANGE

EVEN IN THE 1970s EXXON KNEW THAT BURNING FOSSIL FUELS “WAS THE MOST LIKELY MANNER IN WHICH MANKING IS INFLUENCING THE GLOBAL CLIMATE”; IT ENGAGED IN CUTTING-EDGE RESEARCH TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE IMPACT

Scientific American Headline: “Exxon Knew About Climate Change Almost 40 Years Ago.” [Scientific American, [10/26/15](#)]

Inside Climate News Investigation: Dating Back To 1977, Exxon Knew Of Increased Levels Of CO2 In The Atmosphere, Driven By “The Combustion Of Fossil Fuels ... And That This Posed A Threat To Exxon.” In November 2015, PBS News Hour reported on whether ExxonMobil “downplayed the risks to profits and therefore to investors of stronger regulations on burning fossil fuels ... The reporting has alleged the company misled the public about what its own scientists found about the risks of climate change and greenhouse gases.” The PBS News Hour report shows Inside Climate News reported Neela Banerjee saying, “We found a trail of documents that that go back to 1977. Exxon knew carbon dioxide was increasing in the atmosphere, that combustion of fossil fuels was driving it, and that this posed a threat to Exxon. At that time, Exxon understood very quickly that governments would probably take action to reduce fossil fuel consumption. They’re smart people, great scientists, and they saw the writing on the wall.” [PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]

Inside Climate News: “Long After Scientists Concluded That Unfettered Burning Of Fossil Fuels Is Leading To Catastrophic Climate Change,” Exxon Refused To “Confront The Threat Of Climate Change.” According to an Inside Climate News report, “For a quarter-century, stockholders have asked Exxon to confront the threat of climate change in all sorts of ways: by investing in renewable energy, cutting harmful emissions, providing carbon risk assessments and adding a board member with climate expertise. Year after year, the oil giant has said no, rejecting shareholders’ requests and downplaying their concerns long after scientists concluded that unfettered burning of fossil fuels is leading to catastrophic climate change.” [Inside Climate News, accessed [10/5/16](#)]

Exxon Not Only Understood Climate Science, It “Actively Engaged With It” By “Launching Its Own Ambitious Research Program That Empirically Sampled Carbon Dioxide And Built Rigorous Climate Models.” In October 2015, Scientific American wrote, “‘It’s never been remotely plausible that they did not understand the science,’ says Naomi Oreskes, a history of science professor at Harvard University. But as it turns out, Exxon didn’t just understand the science, the company actively engaged with it. In the 1970s and 1980s it employed top scientists to look into the issue and launched its own ambitious research program that empirically sampled carbon dioxide and built rigorous climate models. Exxon even spent more than \$1 million on a tanker project that would tackle how much CO2 is absorbed by the oceans. It was one of the biggest scientific questions of the time, meaning that Exxon was truly conducting unprecedented research.” [Scientific American, [10/26/15](#)]

1977: Senior Exxon Scientist Told The Organization’s Management Committee Of The “General Scientific Agreement That The Most Likely Manner In Which Mankind Is Influencing The Global Climate Is Through Carbon Dioxide Release From The Burning Of Fossil Fuels.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “At a meeting in Exxon Corporation’s headquarters, a senior company scientist named James F. Black addressed an audience of powerful oilmen. Speaking without a text as he flipped through detailed slides, Black delivered a sobering message: carbon dioxide from the world’s use of fossil fuels would warm the planet and could eventually endanger humanity. ‘In the first place, there is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels,’ Black told Exxon’s Management Committee,



according to a written version he recorded later. It was July 1977 when Exxon's leaders received this blunt assessment, well before most of the world had heard of the looming climate crisis." [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

1978: Senior Exxon Researcher Told "Exxon Scientists And Managers" That A "Doubling" Of Atmospheric CO2 Would Mean Rising Temperatures, Heavier Rainfall, And Some Countries Would "Have Their Agricultural Output Reduced Or Destroyed." In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, "A year later, Black, a top technical expert in Exxon's Research & Engineering division, took an updated version of his presentation to a broader audience. He warned Exxon scientists and managers that independent researchers estimated a doubling of the carbon dioxide (CO2) concentration in the atmosphere would increase average global temperatures by 2 to 3 degrees Celsius (4 to 5 degrees Fahrenheit), and as much as 10 degrees Celsius (18 degrees Fahrenheit) at the poles. Rainfall might get heavier in some regions, and other places might turn to desert. 'Some countries would benefit but others would have their agricultural output reduced or destroyed,' Black said, in the written summary of his 1978 talk." [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

In The Late 1970s, Exxon Launched "Extraordinary Research Into Carbon Dioxide From Fossil Fuels And Its Impact On The Earth," And Spent "More Than A Decade Deepening The Country's Understanding Of An Environmental Problem That Posed An Existential Threat To The Oil Business." In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, "His presentations reflected uncertainty running through scientific circles about the details of climate change, such as the role the oceans played in absorbing emissions. Still, Black estimated quick action was needed. 'Present thinking,' he wrote in the 1978 summary, 'holds that man has a time window of five to ten years before the need for hard decisions regarding changes in energy strategies might become critical.' Exxon responded swiftly. Within months the company launched its own extraordinary research into carbon dioxide from fossil fuels and its impact on the earth. Exxon's ambitious program included both empirical CO2 sampling and rigorous climate modeling. It assembled a brain trust that would spend more than a decade deepening the company's understanding of an environmental problem that posed an existential threat to the oil business." [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

1980: Exxon Researchers Viewed Uncertainties Around Climate Science "As Questions They Wanted To Discuss, Not An Excuse To Dismiss What Was Increasingly Understood." In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, "Like others in the scientific community, Exxon researchers acknowledged the uncertainties surrounding many aspects of climate science, especially in the area of forecasting models. But they saw those uncertainties as questions they wanted to address, not an excuse to dismiss what was increasingly understood. 'Models are controversial,' Roger Cohen, head of theoretical sciences at Exxon Corporate Research Laboratories, and his colleague, Richard Werthamer, senior technology advisor at Exxon Corporation, wrote in a May 1980 status report on Exxon's climate modeling program. 'Therefore, there are research opportunities for us.'" [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

1981: "Exxon Scientists Were No Longer Questioning Whether The Buildup Of CO2 Would Cause The World To Heat Up ... Company Researchers Had Concluded That Rising CO2 Levels Could Create Catastrophic Impacts." In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, "By 1981, Exxon scientists were no longer questioning whether the buildup of CO2 would cause the world to heat up. Through their own studies and their participation in government-sponsored conferences, company researchers had concluded that rising CO2 levels could create catastrophic impacts within the first half of the 21st century if the burning of oil, gas and coal wasn't contained." [Inside Climate News, [9/22/15](#)]

1982: Exxon Scientists, Working With Outside Researchers, "Confirmed An Emerging Scientific Consensus That Warming Could Be Even Worse" Than What They Had Thought A Few Years Earlier. In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, "By 1982, the company's own scientists, collaborating with outside researchers, created rigorous climate models – computer programs that simulate the workings of the climate to assess the impact of emissions on global temperatures. They confirmed an emerging scientific consensus that warming could be even worse than Black had warned five years earlier." [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]



1982: Exxon Scientist Discussed “Unanimous Agreement In The Scientific Community” That Warming Temperatures Would “Bring About Significant Changes In The Earth’s Climate,” And Urged Publication Of These Findings. In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “When Exxon’s researchers confirmed information the company might find troubling, they did not sweep it under the rug. ‘Over the past several years a clear scientific consensus has emerged,’ Cohen wrote in September 1982, reporting on Exxon’s own analysis of climate models. It was that a doubling of the carbon dioxide blanket in the atmosphere would produce average global warming of 3 degrees Celsius, plus or minus 1.5 degrees C (equal to 5 degrees Fahrenheit plus or minus 1.7 degrees F). ‘There is unanimous agreement in the scientific community that a temperature increase of this magnitude would bring about significant changes in the earth’s climate,’ he wrote, ‘including rainfall distribution and alterations in the biosphere.’ He warned that publication of the company’s conclusions might attract media attention because of the ‘connection between Exxon’s major business and the role of fossil fuel combustion in contributing to the increase of atmospheric CO2.’ Nevertheless, he recommended publication. Our ‘ethical responsibility is to permit the publication of our research in the scientific literature,’ Cohen wrote. ‘Indeed, to do otherwise would be a breach of Exxon’s public position and ethical credo on honesty and integrity.’” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

- **Exxon Published Findings In Several Peer-Reviewed Papers.** In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “Exxon followed his advice. Between 1983 and 1984, its researchers published their results in at least three peer-reviewed papers in Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences and an American Geophysical Union monograph.” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

Inside Climate News Headline: “Exxon Confirmed Global Warming Consensus In 1982 With In-House Climate Models.” [Inside Climate News, [9/22/15](#)]

Nearly Forty Years Ago, “Many Exxon Executives, Middle Managers And Scientists” Saw Climate Action As “The Kind Of Opportunity ... Aimed At Benefitting Mankind.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “At the outset of its climate investigations almost four decades ago, many Exxon executives, middle managers and scientists armed themselves with a sense of urgency and mission. One manager at Exxon Research, Harold N. Weinberg, shared his ‘grandiose thoughts’ about Exxon’s potential role in climate research in a March 1978 internal company memorandum that read: ‘This may be the kind of opportunity that we are looking for to have Exxon technology, management and leadership resources put into the context of a project aimed at benefitting mankind.’ His sentiment was echoed by Henry Shaw, the scientist leading the company’s nascent carbon dioxide research effort. ‘Exxon must develop a credible scientific team that can critically evaluate the information generated on the subject and be able to carry bad news, if any, to the corporation,’ Shaw wrote to his boss Edward E. David, the president of Exxon Research and Engineering in 1978. ‘This team must be recognized for its excellence in the scientific community, the government, and internally by Exxon management.’” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

1989: Exxon Scientist Told The Company’s Board That Data Confirmed “Greenhouse Gases Are Increasing In The Atmosphere ... Fossil Fuels Contribute Most Of The CO2.” In October 2015, the [Los Angeles Times](#) reported, “In 1989, Exxon scientists and managers began briefing employees at all levels of the company on the policy implications of climate change. LeVine made his presentation to the Exxon board as part of that effort, describing the known science and outlining the company’s position. Other documents in the archives indicate Exxon scientists had been researching the topic for more than a decade — outfitting an oil tanker with carbon dioxide detectors and analyzers and building models to project how a doubling of the gas in the atmosphere would affect global temperatures. ‘Data confirm that greenhouse gases are increasing in the atmosphere,’ LeVine told the board, according to a copy of his presentation in the Exxon Mobil archive. ‘Fossil fuels contribute most of the CO2.’” [[Los Angeles Times](#), [10/23/15](#)]

FOLLOWING 1988 SENATE TESTIMONY BY TOP CLIMATE SCIENTIST WHO SHINED



THE LIGHT ON THREAT OF WARMING, EXXON SUDDENLY CHANGED THEIR TUNE AND STARTED TO PUBLICLY CAST DOUBT ON AND DISCREDIT CLIMATE SCIENCE

June 1988: “Leading Expert On Climate Change” Testified Before U.S. Senate With That NASA Was “99 Percent Certain” That Rising Temperatures Were “Not A Natural Variation” But “Caused By A Buildup Of Carbon Dioxide And Other Artificial Gases In The Atmosphere.” In June 1988, the New York Times reported, “The earth has been warmer in the first five months of this year than in any comparable period since measurements began 130 years ago, and the higher temperatures can now be attributed to a long-expected global warming trend linked to pollution, a space agency scientist reported today ... Until now, scientists have been cautious about attributing rising global temperatures of recent years to the predicted global warming caused by pollutants in the atmosphere, known as the ‘greenhouse effect.’ But today Dr. James E. Hansen of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration told a Congressional committee that it was 99 percent certain that the warming trend was not a natural variation but was caused by a buildup of carbon dioxide and other artificial gases in the atmosphere. Dr. Hansen, a leading expert on climate change, said in an interview that there was no ‘magic number’ that showed when the greenhouse effect was actually starting to cause changes in climate and weather. But he added, ‘It is time to stop waffling so much and say that the evidence is pretty strong that the greenhouse effect is here.’” [New York Times, [6/24/88](#)]

After 1988 Senate Testimony From “Leading Climate Expert” That Global Warming Was Happening, “Exxon Started Financing Efforts To Amplify Doubt About The State Of Climate Science.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “‘Global Warming Has Begun, Expert Tells Senate,’ declared the headline of a June 1988 New York Times article describing the Congressional testimony of NASA’s James Hansen, a leading climate expert. Hansen’s statements compelled Sen. Tim Wirth (D-Colo.) to declare during the hearing that ‘Congress must begin to consider how we are going to slow or halt that warming trend.’ With alarm bells suddenly ringing, Exxon started financing efforts to amplify doubt about the state of climate science.” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

Exxon Become One Of Climate Research’s “Biggest Skeptics” Because It “Feared A Growing Public Consensus Would Lead To Financially Burdensome Policies.” In October 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported, “How did one of the world’s largest oil companies, a leader in climate research, become one of its biggest public skeptics? The answer, gleaned from a trove of archived company documents and the recollections of former employees, is that Exxon, now known as Exxon Mobil, feared a growing public consensus would lead to financially burdensome policies.” [Los Angeles Times, [10/23/15](#)]

1980s: Exxon Executives “Remained Cautious About What They Told Exxon’s Shareholders About Global Warming And The Role Petroleum Played In Causing It.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “In the early 1980s Exxon researchers often repeated that unbiased science would give it legitimacy in helping shape climate-related laws that would affect its profitability. Still, corporate executives remained cautious about what they told Exxon’s shareholders about global warming and the role petroleum played in causing it, a review of federal filings shows. The company did not elaborate on the carbon problem in annual reports filed with securities regulators during the height of its CO2 research. Nor did it mention in those filings that concern over CO2 was beginning to influence business decisions it was facing.” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

1988 Internal Exxon Memo Urged The Company To “Emphasize The Uncertainty” Regarding The “Noted Scientific Consensus On The Role Fossil Fuels Play In Global Warming.” In October 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported, “In an internal draft memo from August 1988 titled ‘The Greenhouse Effect,’ a company public affairs manager laid out what he called the ‘Exxon Position.’ Toward the end of the document, after an analysis that noted scientific consensus on the role fossil fuels play in global warming, he wrote that the company should ‘emphasize the uncertainty’ ... In order to stop the momentum behind the issue, LeVine said Exxon should emphasize that doubt. Tell the public that more science



is needed before regulatory action is taken, he argued, and emphasize the ‘costs and economics’ of restricting carbon dioxide emissions.” [[Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15](#)]

1989: Exxon Scientist Told Board Of Directors That Greenhouse Gases “Could Raise Global Temperatures Significantly By The Middle Of The 21st Century”; Also Told Board That “Public Policymakers” Would Argue For Urgent Action. In October 2015, the [Los Angeles Times](#) reported, “Duane LeVine, Exxon’s manager of science and strategy development, gave a primer to the company’s board of directors in 1989, noting that scientists generally agreed gases released by burning fossil fuels could raise global temperatures significantly by the middle of the 21st century — between 2.7 and 8.1 degrees Fahrenheit — causing glaciers to melt and sea levels to rise, ‘with generally negative consequences.’ But he also made it clear the company was facing another threat as well — from public policymakers. ‘Arguments that we can’t tolerate delay and must act now can lead to irreversible and costly Draconian steps,’ LeVine said.” [[Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15](#)]

1989: After Years Of Confirming “Emerging Scientific Consensus On Global Warming’s Risks,” Exxon “Publicly Derided The Type Of Work Its Own Scientists Had Done,” And “Cast Doubt On The Science.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News published an eight-month investigation into “Exxon’s engagement with the emerging science of climate change,” including how “Exxon conducted cutting-edge climate research decades ago and then, without revealing all that it had learned, worked at the forefront of climate denial, manufacturing doubt about the scientific consensus that its own scientists had confirmed.” The investigation stated, “Through much of the 1980s, Exxon researchers worked alongside university and government scientists to generate objective climate models that yielded papers published in peer-reviewed journals. Their work confirmed the emerging scientific consensus on global warming’s risks. Yet starting in 1989, Exxon leaders went down a different road. They repeatedly argued that the uncertainty inherent in computer models makes them useless for important policy decisions. Even as the models grew more powerful and reliable, Exxon publicly derided the type of work its own scientists had done. The company continued its involvement with climate research, but its reputation for objectivity began to erode as it campaigned internationally to cast doubt on the science.” [[Inside Climate News, 9/22/15](#)]

1989: Exxon “Helped Create The Global Climate Coalition ... To Question The Scientific Basis For Concern About Climate Change. In October 2015, Scientific American wrote, “By 1989 the company had helped create the Global Climate Coalition (disbanded in 2002) to question the scientific basis for concern about climate change. It also helped to prevent the U.S. from signing the international treaty on climate known as the Kyoto Protocol in 1998 to control greenhouse gases. Exxon’s tactic not only worked on the U.S. but also stopped other countries, such as China and India, from signing the treaty. At that point, “a lot of things unraveled,” Oreskes says.” [[Scientific American, 10/26/15](#)]

1990 – 2005: Exxon “Took Out Prominent Ads” In Leading Newspapers “Contending Climate Change Science Was Murky And Uncertain.” In October 2015, the [Los Angeles Times](#) reported that by 1990, Exxon, “while still funding select [climate change] research,” had “poured millions into a campaign that questioned climate change. Over the next 15 years, it took out prominent ads in the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, contending climate change science was murky and uncertain. And it argued regulations aimed at curbing global warming were ill-considered and premature.” [[Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15](#)]

At 1990 Annual Shareholders’ Meeting, Exxon’s Board Of Directors “Denounced A Dissident Shareholder Proposal That Called For Exxon To Reduce Carbon Dioxide Emissions, Citing ‘Great Scientific Uncertainties.’” In October 2015, the [Los Angeles Times](#) reported, “At the company’s annual shareholders’ meeting in 1990, the board of directors denounced a dissident shareholder proposal that called for Exxon to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, citing ‘great scientific uncertainties’ about the environmental effects of global climate change. The board also criticized ‘drastic and precipitant proposals,’ like those being considered by the United Nations.” [[Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15](#)]



1992: Exxon Joined Coalition Which “Vigorously Fought Potential Climate Change Regulations By Emphasizing Scientific Uncertainty” And Stressing Economic Impacts Of Potential Legislation. In October 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported, “In 1992, Exxon joined the Global Climate Coalition, an association of companies from industries linked to fossil fuels, which vigorously fought potential climate change regulations by emphasizing scientific uncertainty and underscoring the negative economic impact of such laws on consumers.” According to Inside Climate News, “Exxon helped to found and lead the Global Climate Coalition, an alliance of some of the world's largest companies seeking to halt government efforts to curb fossil fuel emissions.” [Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15; Inside Climate News, 9/15/15]

1996: Former Exxon CEO Said That “Scientific Evidence Remains Inconclusive As To Whether Human Activities Affect The Global Climate.” In November 2015, PBS News Hour reported on whether ExxonMobil “downplayed the risks to profits and therefore to investors of stronger regulations on burning fossil fuels ... The reporting has alleged the company misled the public about what its own scientists found about the risks of climate change and greenhouse gases.” The PBS News Hour report shows an excerpt of the Inside Climate News investigation, which former Exxon Corporation CEO Lee R. Raymond saying, in November 1996, “Proponents of the global warming theory say that higher levels of greenhouse gases are causing world temperatures to rise and that burning fossil fuels is the reason. The scientific evidence remains inconclusive as to whether human activities affect the global climate.” [PBS News Hour, 11/10/15]

1997: Exxon Chairman Said That “Many People – Politicians And The Public Alike – Believe That Global Warming Is A Rock-Solid Certainty,” Adding, “But It’s Not.” In October 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported, “In 1997, Exxon’s chairman and chief executive, Lee Raymond, derided potential regulations on carbon emissions at a meeting of the World Petroleum Council in Beijing. ‘Many people — politicians and the public alike — believe that global warming is a rock-solid certainty,’ Raymond said. ‘But it’s not.’” [Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15]

1998 – 2005: Exxon Spent Tens Of Millions Of Dollars “To Wage A Campaign Raising Questions About Climate Change.” In October 2015, the Los Angeles Times reported, “From 1998 to 2005, Exxon contributed almost \$16 million to at least 43 organizations to wage a campaign raising questions about climate change, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists, an environmental activist group. Greenpeace has estimated that Exxon spent more than \$30 million in that effort ... The company’s shift — from embracing the science of climate change to publicly questioning it — emerged from interviews with former and current Exxon Mobil employees, and a review of internal company documents by Columbia University’s Energy & Environmental Reporting Project and the Los Angeles Times.” [Los Angeles Times, 10/23/15]

Exxon Convinced The Bush Administration To Oppose The Kyoto Protocol. In November 2015, EcoWatch wrote, “For decades, Mobil—and then ExxonMobil—ran a weekly “advertorial” on the opinion page of the New York Times. After the 2000 election, these advertorials practically became a guidebook for the new Bush administration. In January 2001, an Exxon advertorial called the Kyoto Protocol ‘unrealistic’ and ‘economically damaging’ because of its ‘fundamental flaws.’ When President Bush gave his now-infamous June 2001 speech on climate change, he echoed Exxon—calling the policy ‘unrealistic,’ ‘fatally flawed in fundamental ways’ and said it would have had a ‘negative economic impact.’” [EcoWatch, 11/27/15]

Exxon Persuaded The United States “Not To Sign The 1997 Kyoto Protocol, The First International Attempt To Curb Emissions.” In September 2015, Newsweek reported, “In 1989, Exxon helped found a group called the Global Climate Coalition (which also included Shell and British Petroleum, among others) that sought to stop federal efforts to curtail fossil fuel emissions. The group would eventually help persuade the U.S. not to sign the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the first international attempt to curb emissions, according to InsideClimate.” [Newsweek, 9/16/15]



Newsweek **Headline: “Exxon Knew About Climate Change In The 1970s, But Still Helped Block Kyoto Protocol In The ‘90s.”** [[Newsweek, 9/16/15](#)]

2007 Study: Former Exxon CEO Spent “Millions Of Corporate Dollars ... To Discredit Climate Researchers.” In October 2015, Quartz reported, “One subject that particularly riled [Exxon CEO Lee] Raymond was the evolving science of climate change—he simply did not believe the increasing number of forecasts of a heating planet, less a human role in any such ongoing phenomenon. The most pressing environmental problem on the planet is ‘poverty, not global climate change,’ he said in 1997. But he went further than mere skepticism. Numerous reports detail Raymond’s expenditure of millions of corporate dollars on a campaign, sometimes surreptitiously [sic] through front groups, to discredit climate researchers, including this 2007 study by the Union of Concerned Scientists.” [Quartz, [10/26/15](#)]

2012 Report: Exxon Contributed To Anti-Climate Members Of Congress More Than 10 Times As Frequently As To Pro-Climate Members. A 2012 Union of Concerned Scientists report found that Exxon Mobil Corporation contribution to “members of Congress with voting records opposing science-based climate policy (‘anti-climate’) more than 10 times are frequently as they did to “members of Congress with voting records supporting science-based policy (‘pro-climate’).” [Union of Concerned Scientists, [May 2012](#) (pg. 17)]

2012 Report: Exxon Is “Well Known For Having Heavily Funded Skeptic Organizations That Spread Misinformation About Climate Science.” A 2012 Union of Concerned Scientists report stated, “Exxon Mobil Corporation ... is well known for having heavily funded skeptic organizations that spread misinformation about climate science (Hoggan and Littlemore 2009; UCS 2007). In a 2008 congressional hearing, a company executive took exception to a senator’s allegation that Exxon Mobil was ‘supporting junk science and trying to make people think that [climate change] is not an issue.’ The executive replied, ‘I think all of us recognize it is an issue . . . and I think we are dealing with it, and we are doing so in a responsible fashion’ (Simon 2008). Despite this claim and a company announcement that same year that Exxon Mobil would stop funding skeptic organizations, results from investigations (this one and others) indicate that the company has continued to make public statements that doubt climate science and to fund and affiliate with groups that spread misinformation (Adam 2009).” [Union of Concerned Scientists, [May 2012](#) (pg. 25)]

NY AG: “We Know” Exxon Mobil Issued Public Statements That Are “At Odds” With Their Claim That They “Included All The Information They Have About The Risks Of Climate Change In Their Public Filings, In Their Reports To Shareholders”; They Also Have “Funded Organizations That Are Even More Aggressive Climate Change Deniers.” In November 2015, PBS News Hour anchor Judy Woodruff and New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman had the following exchange:

JUDY WOODRUFF: In the company’s written statement, they start out by saying for many years, they have included all the information they have about the risks of climate change in their public filings, in their reports to shareholders.

ERIC SCHNEIDERMAN: We know that they have been issuing public statements that are at odds with that, and that they have been funding organizations that are even more aggressive climate change deniers. And they have made numerous statements, both Exxon officials and in Exxon reports, but also through these organizations they fund, like the American Enterprise Institute, ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, through their activities with the American Petroleum Institute, so directly and through other organizations, Exxon has said a lot of things that conflict with the statement that they have always been forthcoming about the realities of climate change.

[PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]

NY AG: “What You’re Not Allowed To Do Is Commit Fraud” By Having “The Best Climate Change Science” Internally, But Have That Be “Completely In Conflict” With What You’re Putting Out Publicly. In November 2015, New York



Attorney General Eric Schneiderman said, “There’s nothing wrong with advocating for your own company. What you’re not allowed to do is commit fraud. You’re not allowed to have the best climate change science that you’re using to build — in your planning of offshore oil towers in the Arctic, where you have to take into account rising sea levels and the melting of the permafrost and things like that. If you’re using that internally, but what you’re putting out to the world, directly and through these climate denial organizations, is completely in conflict with that, that’s not OK.” [PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]

Exxon Mobil VP: “Yes,” Exxon “Funded A Number Of Organizations That ... Have Been Openly Climate Change Deniers.” In November 2015, PBS News Hour anchor Judy Woodruff and ExxonMobil vice president for public and government affairs Kenneth Cohen had the following exchange:

JUDY WOODRUFF: [New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman] made a point of saying that Exxon has funded a number of organizations that he said that have been openly climate change deniers. He mentioned the American Enterprise Institute. He mentioned the American Petroleum Institute and the American Legislative Exchange. Has Exxon been funding these organizations?

KENNETH COHEN: Well, the answer is yes. And I will let those organizations respond for themselves. But I will tell you that what we have been engaged in, both — we have been focused on understanding the science, participating with the broader scientific community in developing the science, while at the same time participating in understanding what would be and working with policy-makers on what would be appropriate policy responses to this evolving body of science ... We have disclosed the risks of climate change to our investors beginning in the middle part of the last decade and extending to the present time.

[PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]

Exxon “Curtailed” CO2 Research Near The End Of The 1980s, And In The Following Decades, “Worked Instead At The Forefront Of Climate Denial” To “Manufacture Doubt About The Reality Of Global Warming Its Own Scientists Had Once Confirmed.” In September 2015, Inside Climate News reported, “Then, toward the end of the 1980s, Exxon curtailed its carbon dioxide research. In the decades that followed, Exxon worked instead at the forefront of climate denial. It put its muscle behind efforts to manufacture doubt about the reality of global warming its own scientists had once confirmed. It lobbied to block federal and international action to control greenhouse gas emissions. It helped to erect a vast edifice of misinformation that stands to this day.” [Inside Climate News, [9/15/15](#)]

BY CASTING DOUBT ON THE INCREASINGLY-ACCEPTED SCIENCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE, EXXON EVEN COPIED THE TACTICS OF THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Exxon Refused To “Publicly Acknowledge Climate Change” And Promoted “Climate Misinformation,” A Public Relations Approach That Was Similar To What The Tobacco Industry Did “Regarding The Health Risks Of Smoking.” In October 2015, Scientific American wrote, “Exxon was aware of climate change, as early as 1977, 11 years before it became a public issue, according to a recent investigation from InsideClimate News. This knowledge did not prevent the company (now ExxonMobil and the world’s largest oil and gas company) from spending decades refusing to publicly acknowledge climate change and even promoting climate misinformation—an approach many have likened to the lies spread by the tobacco industry regarding the health risks of smoking. Both industries were conscious that their products wouldn’t stay profitable once the world understood the risks, so much so that they used the same consultants to develop strategies on how to communicate with the public.” [Scientific American, [10/26/15](#)]

Exxon’s Tactics Seem “Ripped Straight From The Big Tobacco Playbook: Delay, Deflect, And Distract.” In June 2016, the [New York Times](#) reported that state Attorney General Eric Schneiderman “has consistently argued that he is trying to determine whether the company committed fraud by telling investors and consumers one thing while its research showed the opposite. ‘The First Amendment does not give any corporation the right to commit fraud,’ said Eric Soufer, a



spokesman for the attorney general. Mr. Soufer added, ‘Everything we’ve seen this week is ripped straight from the Big Tobacco playbook: delay, deflect, and distract from any serious investigation into potential fraud or corporate malfeasance.’” [New York Times, [6/16/16](#)]

Like The Tobacco Industry, “Exxon Could Be Liable For Stiff Penalties Should It Be Shown To Have Purposely Misled The Public For Corporate Gain.” In October 2015, Quartz reported, “The possible legal ramifications of the Exxon paper trail are that the company could potentially be shown in a court to have deliberately squelched scientifically based evidence that effectively accepted the consensus view. Science is rarely incontrovertible, but, as the tobacco industry was fined a decade ago for having lied about the dangers of cigarettes, Exxon could be liable for stiff penalties should it be shown to have purposely misled the public for corporate gain.” [Quartz, [10/26/15](#)]

2015: EXXON DENIED IT MISLED SHAREHOLDERS & THE PUBLIC

Exxon Spokesperson: “We Didn’t Reach Those Conclusions” That The Inside Climate News Report Did. In October 2015, Scientific American wrote, “ExxonMobil disagrees that any of its early statements were so stark, let alone conclusive at all. ‘We didn’t reach those conclusions, nor did we try to bury it like they suggest,’ ExxonMobil spokesperson Allan Jeffers tells Scientific American. ‘The thing that shocks me the most is that we’ve been saying this for years, that we have been involved in climate research. These guys go down and pull some documents that we made available publicly in the archives and portray them as some kind of bombshell whistle-blower exposé because of the loaded language and the selective use of materials.’” [Scientific American, [10/26/15](#)]

Exxon Mobil VP: Company Has Not “In Any Way Misled Or Been Dishonest With The Public About What It Knows About Climate Change.” In November 2015, PBS News Hour anchor Judy Woodruff and ExxonMobil vice president for public and government affairs Kenneth Cohen had the following exchange:

JUDY WOODRUFF: Has Exxon in any way misled or been dishonest with the public about what it knows about climate change?

KENNETH COHEN: ... The answer is a simple no. And what the facts will show is that the company has been engaged for many decades in a two-pronged activity here. First, we take the risks of climate change seriously. And we also have been working to understand the science of climate change. And that activity started in the late '70s and has continued up to the present time. Our scientists have produced over 150 papers, 50 of which have been part of peer-reviewed publications. Our scientists participate in the U.N.'s climate body. We have been participating in the U.N. activities beginning in 1988, running through the present time. At the same time, we have also been engaged in discussions on policy. And in the discussions on policy, for example, in the late '90s, we were part of a large business coalition that opposed adoption in the U.S. of the Kyoto protocol. Now, why did we do that? We opposed the Kyoto protocol because it would have exempted from its application over two-thirds of the world's emitters. Think about that. And that was in 1997. Going forward, if that policy were in effect today, it would have excluded almost 80 percent of the world's emissions. So that wasn't a good policy approach.

[PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]

Exxon Mobil VP: During The '70s And '80s, Exxon Mobil's Scientific Tools “Needed To Develop,” And That Process Was Occurring During That Time. In November 2015, ExxonMobil vice president for public and government affairs Kenneth Cohen said, “What our scientists discovered, working in conjunction with the U.S. government, with the Department of Energy, working in conjunction with some of the leading research institutions around the world in the '70s and the '80s, was that the tools available to science to get a handle on the risk, these tools needed to develop, and we, for example, were part of developing, working with others, some of the complex modeling that is used today. And, today, that work continues.” [PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]



Exxon Mobil VP: “Discussions Taking Place Inside Our Company ... Mirror The Discussions That Have Been Taking Place ... By The Broader Scientific Community.” In November 2015, ExxonMobil vice president for public and government affairs Kenneth Cohen said, “Our view of this very complex subject over the years, over the decades has mirrored that of the broader scientific community. That is to say, the discussions that have taken place inside our company, among our scientists mirror the discussions that have been taking place and the work that’s been taking place by the broader scientific community.” [PBS News Hour, [11/10/15](#)]