



For Immediate Release: September 20, 2006

## ***Guardian's Accusations False:* Corporate Interests Do Not Influence Institute Positions**

**This statement was issued by Jeff Kueter, President of the Marshall Institute**

The Guardian's article, "The Denial Industry" (September 19, 2006), accepts as fact George Mombiot's rhetoric in his book *Heat*. This is unfortunate because the book, at least as evidenced by this excerpt, is little more than a compilation of his opinions. Passing those off as facts is pseudo journalism.

The foundation for Mr. Mombiot's argument is that the science of global warming is conclusive. A careful reading of the International Panel on Climate Change's work group report on science, reports issued by the U.S.'s National Academy of Science and the U.S.'s Climate Science Strategic Plan would demonstrate to any objective reader that the state of climate science is anything but conclusive. This is not an opinion it is a demonstrable fact.

No one denies that global warming is real, that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have risen, or that human activities — like living and pursuing a rising standard of living — have an impact on climate. Beyond those facts almost everything else of significance in the field of climate science is subject to large uncertainties. As the U.S.'s National Academy of Science clearly stated, "Because there is considerable uncertainty in current understanding of how the climate system varies naturally and reacts to emissions of greenhouse gases and aerosols, current estimates of the magnitude of future warming should be regarded as tentative and subject to future adjustments (either upward or downward)." That would hardly be a statement about a field of science that is settled.

Mr. Mombiot can't make his case with facts, so he attacks the integrity of anyone who does not subscribe to his environmental philosophy and agenda. There is little doubt that he has an agenda and in pursuit of that is willing to attack and attempt to discredit the reputations of any person or organization that gets in his way. The "end justifies the means" philosophy can have a chilling effect on both discourse and knowledge creation.

His attacks on the Marshall Institute and one of its founders reflect this strategy and his lack of regard for intellectual honesty. He does not attack the substance of what the Institute has published because he cannot. So, he uses one source of funding to imply and assert something that he cannot prove — that our reports are not scientifically robust.

He attaches great importance to sources of funding for some organizations but conveniently overlooks the substantially larger funding by environmental advocacy organizations to create the impression of a consensus that the world will experience an environmental catastrophe unless it reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which means reduces its energy use. As our 2005 survey of support for climate change programs uncovered, private foundations, led by the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Energy Foundation – which is an affiliate with Pew and the Hewlett Foundation – distribute a minimum of \$35-50 million annually to non-profit organizations and universities to comment on or study various elements of the climate change debate. That funding overwhelms many times over the funding of organizations that do not subscribe to the climate change orthodoxy.

While tabloid journalism can make something sinister out of who provides funding for an organization, what counts is whether the work product of an organization meets standards of excellence. The Marshall Institute's interest in climate change began long before we received a single dollar from any corporate entity. Our reports are well documented and have stood the test of time and scrutiny. Simply put, our views are not for sale. And, for the record, ExxonMobil has never attempted to influence our work or dictate specific conclusions.

*The George C. Marshall Institute, a non-profit research group founded in 1984, is dedicated to fostering and preserving the integrity of science in the policy process. The Institute conducts technical assessments of scientific developments with a major impact on public policy and communicates the results of its analyses to the press, Congress and the public ([www.marshall.org](http://www.marshall.org)).*