

guardian.co.uk

US oil company donated millions to climate sceptic groups, says Greenpeace

Report identifies Koch Industries giving \$73m to climate sceptic groups 'spreading inaccurate and misleading information'

John Vidal

guardian.co.uk, Tuesday 30 March 2010 15.32 BST



Greenpeace has identified Kansas-based oil firm Koch Industries as a multimillion funder of climate sceptic groups. Photograph: David McNew/Getty images

A [Greenpeace investigation](#) has identified a little-known, privately owned US [oil](#) company as the paymaster of global warming sceptics in the US and Europe.

The environmental campaign group accuses Kansas-based [Koch Industries](#), which owns refineries and operates oil pipelines, of funding 35 conservative and libertarian groups, as well as more than 20 congressmen and senators. Between them, [Greenpeace](#) says, these groups and individuals have spread misinformation about climate science and led a sustained assault on climate scientists and green alternatives to fossil fuels.

Greenpeace says that Koch Industries donated nearly \$48m (£31.8m) to climate opposition groups between 1997-2008. From 2005-2008, it donated \$25m to groups opposed to [climate change](#), nearly three times as much as higher-profile funders that time such as oil company ExxonMobil. Koch also spent \$5.7m on political campaigns and \$37m on direct lobbying to support fossil fuels.

In a hard-hitting report, which appears to confirm environmentalists' suspicions that there is a well-funded opposition to the science of climate change, Greenpeace accuses the funded groups of "spreading inaccurate and misleading information" about climate science and clean energy companies.

"The company's network of lobbyists, former executives and organisations has created a forceful stream of misinformation that Koch-funded entities produce and disseminate. The propaganda is then replicated, repackaged and echoed many times throughout the Koch-funded web of political front groups and thinktanks," said Greenpeace.

"Koch industries is playing a quiet but dominant role in the global warming debate. This private, out-of-sight corporation has become a financial kingpin of climate science denial

and clean energy opposition. On repeated occasions organisations funded by Koch foundations have led the assault on climate science and scientists, 'green jobs', renewable energy and climate policy progress," it says.

The groups include many of the best-known conservative thinktanks in the US, like [Americans for Prosperity](#), the [Heritage Foundation](#), the [Cato institute](#), the [Manhattan Institute](#) and the [Foundation for research on economics and the environment](#). All have been involved in "spinning" the "[climategate](#)" story or are at the forefront of the anti-global warming debate, says Greenpeace.

Koch Industries is a \$100bn-a-year conglomerate dominated by petroleum and chemical interests, with operations in nearly 60 countries and 70,000 employees. It owns refineries which process more than 800,000 barrels of crude oil a day in the US, as well as a refinery in Holland. It has held leases on the [heavily polluting tar-sand fields of Alberta, Canada](#) and has interests in coal, oil exploration, chemicals, forestry, and pipelines.

The majority of the group's assets are owned and controlled by Charles and David Koch, two of the four sons of the company's founder. They have been identified by Forbes magazine as the joint ninth richest Americans and the 19th richest men in the world, each worth between \$14-16bn.

Koch has also contributed money to politicians, the report said, listing 17 Republicans and four Democrats whose campaign funds got more than \$10,000 from the company.

Greenpeace accuses the Koch companies of having a notorious environmental record. In 2000 the [Environmental Protection Agency \(EPA\)](#) [fined Koch industries \\$30m](#) for its role in 300 [oil spills](#) that resulted in more than 3m gallons of crude oil leaking into ponds, lakes and coastal waters.

"The combination of foundation-funded front groups, big lobbying budgets, political action campaign donations and direct campaign contributions makes Koch Industries and the Koch brothers among the most formidable obstacles to advancing clean energy and climate policy in the US," Greenpeace said.

A spokeswoman for Koch Industries today defended the group's track record on environmental issues. "Koch companies have consistently found innovative and cost-effective ways to ensure sound environmental stewardship and further reduce waste and emissions of greenhouse gases associated with their operations and products," said a [statement sent to AFP](#) by Melissa Cohlma, director of communication. She added: "Based on this experience, we support open, science-based dialogue about climate change and the likely effects of proposed energy policies on the global economy."

Top 10 Koch beneficiaries 2005-2008

[Mercatus center](#): (\$9.2m received from Koch grants 2005-2008) Conservative thinktank at George Mason University. This group suggested in 2001 that global warming would be beneficial in winter and at the poles. In 2009 they recommended that nothing be done to cut emissions.

[Americans for prosperity](#). (\$5.17m). Have built opposition to clean energy and climate legislation with events across US.

[Institute for humane studies](#) (\$1.96m). Several prominent climate sceptics have positions here, including Fred Singer and Robert Bradley.

[Heritage foundation](#) (\$1.62m). Conservative thinktank leads US opposition to climate

change science.

Cato Insitute (\$1.02m). Thinktank disputes science behind climate change and questions the rationale for taking action.

Manhattan Institute (\$800,000). This institute regularly publishes climate science denials.

Washington legal foundation (\$655,000) Published articles on the business threats posed by regulation of climate change.

Federalist society for law (\$542,000) advocates inaction on global warming

National center for policy analysis (\$130,000) NCPA disseminates climate science scepticism.

American council on science and health (\$113,800) Has published papers claiming that cutting greenhouse emissions would be detrimental to public health.

Ads by Google

Earn 15-25% Annually

Producing Oil & Gas Properties, IRA 401K Qualified, \$25K Min, Dividends

USEnergyAssets.com

Caring for the Earth

on Earth Day and every day Children, adults learning together

www.MD-DC-VA-Churches.org

Oil Sands Of Canada

News And Discussion On Environment, Economy And Energy Supply Issues.

www.CanadasOilsands.ca

Comments in chronological order (Total 74 comments)

Post a comment

 Staff

 Contributor

Showing first 50 comments | [Go to all comments](#) | [Go to latest comment](#)



Barelysane

30 Mar 2010, 3:51PM

Thank you Guardian, another piece of fairly vacous journalism. A company spends £3.1 million a year on infomation and groups that are openly sceptical of global warming that are apparently either "inaccurate or misleading" but you provide no evidence of this. You don't mention the hundreds of millions that are spent every year promoting AGW (a slight advantage in the funding stakes i feel), and even James Lovelock has said that AGW is being exaggerated.

Was this article just an attempt to keep the faithfull happy after publishing the LoveLock interview yesterday? Because it seems to have very little merit otherwise.

Recommend? (32)

Report abuse

Clip |

Link



Kupfernigk

30 Mar 2010, 3:56PM

Now we know why Copenhagen was a complete Koch-up.

[Recommend?](#) (29)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



DeathFruit

30 Mar 2010, 4:02PM

I don't know what "vacous" is, Barelysane. Does Koch not pay you enough to get a decent spellchecker?

[Recommend?](#) (94)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Barelysane

30 Mar 2010, 4:07PM

@DeathFruit

I don't know what "vacous" is, Barelysane. Does Koch not pay you enough to get a decent spellchecker?

I'm merely paying as much attention to my spelling as this article does to the principles of good journalism and balance, seems fair to me.

[Recommend?](#) (12)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



printerink

30 Mar 2010, 4:08PM

We don't need Greenpeace to tell us where the vast majority of adherents to the eco-hysteria faith get their funding from.

We all know they get it from tax hungry national governments which already have incomes that make Koch's look tiny. When it comes to feeding the kids, paying the mortgage, running a nice car or three and taking holidays in faraway sunny places scientists hired directly by national governments or indirectly in state funded and state controlled/influenced universities know which side of the argument their bread is buttered.

[Recommend?](#) (21)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Kupfernigk

30 Mar 2010, 4:09PM

@Deathfruit,

Not to mention the "i", the "faithfull" and "LoveLock".

I fear that it's increasingly difficult to find educated people prepared to bang on about "AGW conspiracy" and the like, while it's probably quite easy to hire all the rednecks you want to cut and paste blog posts.

[Recommend?](#) (53)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[getbacktowork](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:12PM

GOOD WORK GREENPEACE

[Recommend?](#) (49)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[Christovir](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:13PM

What a bunch of Kochs...

[Recommend?](#) (15)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[CSRPR](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:15PM

Koch heads! I'm sure Barelysane is a Guardian plant to get intelligent people angry - don't rise to his/her nonsense :)

[Recommend?](#) (6)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[fernando5623](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:16PM

@Kupfernigk

Hey now! This is one redneck who believes in the validity of AGW. What I don't understand is why energy companies are pouring money into conspiracy theories about AGW and not uh reaping the benefits of green/alternative energy. Clearly there is a lot of money to be made here...

[Recommend?](#) (8)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[smoothisland](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:17PM

For a good overview of how big oil and the American right fund climate skepticism: [click here](#)

It's exactly the same as what the tobacco companies used to do except the end result was not the destruction of the planet.

[Recommend?](#) (28)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**JezJez**

30 Mar 2010, 4:19PM

At least it is their money. I'm not aware of being given any choice in how mine is being spent, subsidising the likes of CRU and others...

[Recommend?](#) (10)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**Sim1**

30 Mar 2010, 4:23PM

The other thing to note is that Koch Industries is a tiny company compared to Exxon or BP. The fact that they are spending this much on corporate PR via third parties suggests two things:-

1. This is just the tip of the tip of the iceberg. Other companies are almost certainly paying hundreds of times more (maybe thousands).
2. Companies at all levels of the fossil fuel supply chain, and from the smallest to the biggest clearly see CC mitigation as a dire existential threat.

[Recommend?](#) (20)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**gubulgaria**

30 Mar 2010, 4:24PM

@printerink

Could you refer us to the unbiased scientists who receive no support from any government or public body who demonstrated to you how the statements of the vast majority of corrupt, self-serving scientists were incorrect?

(N.B. I use the term 'scientists' to refer to scientists, as opposed to, say, bloggers)

[Recommend?](#) (11)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**lithic**

30 Mar 2010, 4:26PM

wow. It doesn't seem to matter if the "skeptics" receive massive funding from one party that obviously wants to deny the science in order to protect business as usual. They still come on here and push their bullshit.

I've seen the claim that AGW proponents are all getting rich from the "scam" of global warming many many times, but I have NEVER EVER seen a single shred of evidence for those claims.

Come on "skeptics" - show us the billions paid to climate scientists, show us their lives of luxury, their fast cars and huge gambling habits? Show us some, any, evidence that they are corrupt, and receiving cash for lying about global warming.

You can't. All you could ever show is that they get an average wage for a scientist from

3/30/2010

US oil company donated millions to cli...

whatever university or government employs them. And they have to do actual work for that. They have to study for years, and earn difficult qualifications to get their jobs. They have to be scrupulous about their facts and work or their careers get ruined. Your side, the bloggers and think-tank folk, dont have to have any qualifications, except a willingness to take oil money.

When "our side" shows that rich oil billionaires are giving money to groups just so they can deny the truth, you just manage to ignore it. If I discovered that the MET office were receiving 73 million from a shady secretive environmental group, then I was instantly start to suspect the reliability of their data. I guess you guys aren't really skeptics are you? you are just deniers.

[Recommend?](#) (49)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



ClubOwner

30 Mar 2010, 4:26PM

Only two deniers so far?

The professionals must be waiting for the Kochs to produce instructions, and the unpaid amateurs must all be desperately trying to get on the payroll, green with envy.

[Recommend?](#) (13)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



GerryP

30 Mar 2010, 4:28PM

@Barelysane printerink et al

Its predicable to see the lies and over- reaction taking shape yet again.

What is wrong with the Guardian reporting this subject? As far as I can see this is a factual report of a news release from Greenpeace. It alleges that an oil company has paid significant funds to individuals and organisations to promote the rubbishing of global warming science. Presumably because the funding organisation would be open to the charge of being biased by their commercial interests if they did this directly.

In normal circumstances I would have no problems with all this but the subject that has been systematically rubbished by this money is far too important to be treated in this way.

My guess is that if Lovelock is even partly correct in ten years the UN will be convening a tribunal to call these people to account for crimes against humanity.

[Recommend?](#) (17)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



mike65ie

30 Mar 2010, 4:28PM

\$73m? Koch were ripped off!

In a hard-hitting **report, which appears to confirm environmentalists' suspicions** that there is a well-funded opposition to the science of climate change, **Greenpeace accuses** well fancy that!

[Recommend?](#) (3)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**[smoothisland](#)**

30 Mar 2010, 4:29PM

@fernando5623

China, unhindered by democracy and political lobbying, realises there is a boom waiting to happen and invests more in renewable energy than any other country.

America and the rest of the world could ride a wave of investment and development that would provide millions of jobs but unfortunately the electorate in these countries reads Heat magazine and is easily lead by PR campaigns such as the one mentioned in this article.

[Recommend?](#) (24)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**[Plutonium](#)**

30 Mar 2010, 4:30PM

It would seem that an oil company would have an advantage if a "carbon tax" were imposed because power companies would be forced to buy more fuel oil and less coal. It would seem that the greenies were unable to find anything coal companies did to oppose their political agenda.

[Recommend?](#) (6)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**[smoothisland](#)**

30 Mar 2010, 4:30PM

@fernando5623

China, unhindered by democracy and political lobbying, realises there is a boom waiting to happen and invests more in renewable energy than any other country.

America and the rest of the world could ride a wave of investment and development that would provide millions of jobs but unfortunately the electorate in these countries reads Heat magazine and is easily lead by PR campaigns such as the one mentioned in this article.

[Recommend?](#) (5)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**[gubulgaria](#)**

30 Mar 2010, 4:32PM

@Plutonium

The report isn't about the oil industry, or the fossil fuel industry, it's about Koch. Just because one company has been proven guilty, doesn't imply that all others are innocent.

[Recommend?](#) (10)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Barelysane

30 Mar 2010, 4:33PM

@CSRPR, Kupfernigk, DeathFruit

Now that's entertaining, instead of picking holes in the substance of anything I write or even having an opinion on it, you go for grammar and poor spelling (not great on my part I know), or accuse me of being a plant for either the Guardian or Koch. And people say the sceptics are conspiracy theorists.

(Incidentally, I ran this post through a non-Koch funded spell checker to keep the pedants happy ;)

[Recommend?](#) (8)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Mezzum

30 Mar 2010, 4:41PM

I think its journalism like this that will start the fight back, we need more of it.

Greenpeace says that Koch Industries donated nearly \$48m (£31.8m) to climate opposition groups between 1997-2008. From 2005-2008, it donated \$25m to groups opposed to climate change, nearly three times as much as higher-profile funders that time such as oil company ExxonMobil. Koch also spent \$5.7m on political campaigns and \$37m on direct lobbying to support fossil fuels.

This is all good, but I think it should go further to have real impact.

For example, over 11 years Koch donated \$48m, but what was their profit/company value over this time? This would information would help give some context & help to illustrate how important are these donations really are to Koch, how important is AGW to Koch?

Cato Insitute (\$1.02m). Thinktank disputes science behind climate change and questions the rationale for taking action.

But how much does the Cato Institute gain from other donors? Who are they, and what are their philosophies, again contextualising Koch's support? Can we really say that the Cato & their stance on AGW is due to fossil fuel companies etc? This article doesn't say conclusively, but I think that with more investigation it probably could, and certainly should.

I think that well researched journalism could hold in large part the key to the success of the climate change debate. No one likes money hungry conglomerates, and if it really can be proven that they are duplicitously influencing the climate change debate toward their own selfish ends then this should vindicate the scientists, and make a lot of 'sceptics' feel pretty embarrassed with themselves.

The real game changer would be to find out who financed the UEA email hack, conclusively prove that to be BigOil and surely it couldn't be anything other than good night Vienna for all those who claim that AGW is due to a corrupt scientists & a communist world government in waiting, etc ad infinitum.

[Recommend?](#) (14)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)**4Ywedoaswedo**

30 Mar 2010, 4:41PM

Corporate money can buy anything and everyone currently running the engine of global misinformation. What's science when the big buck's involved.

[Recommend?](#) (9)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**chenier1**

30 Mar 2010, 4:42PM

Barelysane

I would love to comment on the substance of your posts.

Unfortunately there isn't any...

[Recommend?](#) (21)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**Barelysane**

30 Mar 2010, 4:43PM

@GerryP

What is wrong with the Guardian reporting this subject?

In terms of reporting facts and figures, nothing wrong with it as such, but failure to provide evidence to back up the "inaccurate and misleading" or to the amounts involved into full context i.e. compare it with funding promoting AGW (some of which has been shown to be exaggerated or misleading, for example some of the government posters) is at best bias by omission.

[Recommend?](#) (8)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**Kupfernigk**

30 Mar 2010, 4:46PM

@fernando5623,

Sorry about the lazy piece of categorisation. For information, I'm an Essex turnip.

The reason is simple. Large companies take on a life and culture of their own and become increasingly inflexible as time goes on. As a result, though the top management may want change, the mass of the long term decision makers don't and will sabotage it. This is probably why, say, Shell has backed off from becoming an "energy company". People heavily personally invested in refinery technology and oil pump maintenance really don't want suddenly to become experts in offshore wind turbines or power distribution. They want *you* - you out there - to be flexible and retrain when your job goes south, but that's so *they* don't have to and can keep doing business as usual.

It's why Microsoft is no good at search, News International is no good at web services, General Motors struggles to build economy cars, and the British Government still keeps trying to influence our former colonies in the Americas rather than work with our actual

neighbours.

\$75 million to trash a few propellorheads is peanuts compared to the cost of retraining and refocusing a large corporation.

[Recommend?](#) (11)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[CSRPR](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:47PM

Barelysane - I'm just advising people to stop wasting their time making exactly the same arguments again and again to people who clearly refuse to read anything written by anyone qualified to comment on climate science. There are loads of places to read authoritative discussion on the science - you clearly just don't want to read any of them.

Or perhaps can't.

[Recommend?](#) (13)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[rosbif71](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:47PM

Don't be too hard on Barelysane's spelling. From Juliette Jowit (I assume she is a Guardian journalist) today we have :

.The capital Windhoek, surrounded by desert, has the world's only system that treats wastewater and puts it straight back into the public water supply system

She must have golf on the brain. Or is the water in the form of dimpled balls of ice?

[Recommend?](#) (4)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[GWatheist](#)

30 Mar 2010, 4:48PM

This article is ridiculous propaganda.

How much money did CRU and the University of East Anglia harvest last year?

How much does the Met Office get funded?

It would be more relevant to think about who is funding AGW hysteria and why? Don't believe it's to "save the planet."

Is the only opposition to twisted science payed for by the world largest governments supposed to come from a handful of home run blog sites?

That oil companies fund "right-wing think tanks" does not surprise me . What does is the **complete lack of substance in the allegations of this article.**

Exactly what "misleading disinformation" are we supposed to see here. I see no information/disinformation whatsoever.

Sorry this is not journalism. I can get this down at the pub.

[Recommend?](#) (9)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

**Barelysane**

30 Mar 2010, 4:50PM

@chenier1

I would love to comment on the substance of your posts.

Unfortunately there isn't any...

Thank you for that witty, intelligent, and obviously well thought out reply. If only all ripostes to my comments were so brilliantly judged I could go to my grave secure in the knowledge that the new generation had achieved a level of wisdom and understanding I could only have dreamt of. Truly the world cannot be far from paradise with such great minds on the boards at CiF.

[Recommend?](#) (7)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

**ClubOwner**

30 Mar 2010, 4:50PM

Bareltsane

instead of picking holes in the substance of anything I write or even having an opinion on it, you go for grammar and poor spelling

This article is about Koch funding deniers and their mouthpieces.

Your only point was that it hadn't proved the "information" disseminated by these Koch funded bodies to be "inaccurate or misleading".

We've had the argument a million times about the accuracy of the denialists' "science".

Why should anyone bother to go through it all again for you? It 's not the topic here.

Maybe you didn't realise that, after all, you're such a fool that you don't even get piad to talk Koch.

[Recommend?](#) (11)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

**Kupfernigk**

30 Mar 2010, 4:50PM

@Barelysane,

have you ever read the Cato or Heartland websites?

It takes about ten minutes to realise that the carefully crafted prose produced by expensive copywriters is a cosmetic surface drawn over a slew of extremely nasty ideas.

The extreme right is kind enough to provide its own evidence for anyone to see.

[Recommend?](#) (12)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

**BOBSPARZO**

30 Mar 2010, 4:55PM

Whatever ! The environmental scientists conspired, lied and fiddled statistics. I do not see the point that the point Greenpeace is trying to make here.

Bobsparzo

[Recommend?](#) (4)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**DaveRH**

30 Mar 2010, 4:55PM

Koch spend on "climate opposition" over 11 years: roughly 30m Euros

Greenpeace spend on "climate & energy campaigning" in 2008 alone: roughly 23m Euros

Assuming that the figures are consistent (which they won't be) Greenpeace outspend Koch nearly 9 times over the same period. Also, apparently Koch outspend the famous ExxonMobil by about three times.

So **Lithic**, to answer your question - it doesn't appear that the scientists who do the work get the serious money - it's the campaign groups. And those campaign groups appear to outspend the most notorious "denial industry" funding groups by a massive amount.

Didn't Greenpeace tell a few porkies (i.e. flagrant lies) late last year about Artic ice?

Environmental campaign groups in glass houses shouldn't throw stones I feel.

[Recommend?](#) (7)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**Barelysane**

30 Mar 2010, 4:57PM

@ClubOwner

Your only point was that it hadn't proved the "information" disseminated by these Koch funded bodies to be "inaccurate or misleading".

Considering it's in the header of the article I would have thought providing the information or proof of such a claim would have thought including it in the article would only be good practice, don't you agree?

p.s. notice you use the same spell checker i don't, but i'm not going to make a big deal out of it :)

[Recommend?](#) (5)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**GloriaMachinTruc**

30 Mar 2010, 4:59PM

Barelysane

You could always just follow the links given in the article rather than bleating on about it being poor journalism.

Why would you expect people to engage with you seriously when you can't even be bothered to do that?

[Recommend?](#) (13)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)



Tehillim

30 Mar 2010, 5:00PM

@ printerink

We don't need Greenpeace to tell us where the vast majority of adherents to the eco-hysteria faith get their funding from.

We all know they get it from tax hungry national governments which already have incomes that make Koch's look tiny. When it comes to feeding the kids, paying the mortgage, running a nice car or three and taking holidays in faraway sunny places scientists hired directly by national governments or indirectly in state funded and state controlled/influenced universities know which side of the argument their bread is buttered.

Well said. Which is why I don't believe in the moon landings (why didn't they find any clangers?) and I will not believe any 'discoveries' made by the LHC in Switzerland - these scientists are hardly going to tell us to they ought to be shut down: mark my words, in about 6 months they'll be showing a Higgs-Boson in a petri dish and telling us they need another gazillion in order to find its parent. Milking the gravy train...

[Recommend?](#) (5)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



zappa2007

30 Mar 2010, 5:01PM

This article is ridiculous propaganda. How much money did CRU and the University of East Anglia harvest last year? How much does the Met Office get funded?

More proof, as I long suspected, that people who blog in favour of the oil industry are paid stooges. The difference between the two? Transparency - peer reviewed research, publicly available accounts, published material. Not grubby capitalists funding in secret. They can't fool me.

[Recommend?](#) (16)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



theonionmurders

30 Mar 2010, 5:01PM

Cato, Heartland, Koch and The Heritage Foundation all fund the **Tea Party** movement, which should tell us all we need to know really.

[Recommend?](#) (21)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Patriddiotic

30 Mar 2010, 5:05PM

The Koch brothers also created the "teabag" movement virtually single handed, via their proxies. See Jim Hightower's "Hightower Lowdown" newsletter for February 2010:

<http://www.hightowerlowdown.org/node/2247>

[Recommend?](#) (12)

[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**Barelysane**

30 Mar 2010, 5:08PM

@GloriaMachinTruc

You could always just follow the links given in the article rather than bleating on about it being poor journalism.

Why would you expect people to engage with you seriously when you can't even be bothered to do that?

Gloria, the links in the article appear not to take you directly to "misleading or inaccurate information", rather to various homepages, the Greenpeace report, or Guardian articles. If you'd care to highlight one i've missed that supplies the information supporting the "misleading or inaccurate information" claim i'll be happy to read it and discuss it from there.

[Recommend?](#) (5)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**jamesuf**

30 Mar 2010, 5:09PM

Why do the campaign groups spend money?

Because they represent the interests of their membership who wish to protect the environment for the future. This is not about financial self-interest and no-one gets rich.

Why do the oil companies spend money?

Because they represent the interests of their owners whose financial interests are damaged by an impartial analysis of the sciences.

[Recommend?](#) (8)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**ArseneKnows**

30 Mar 2010, 5:10PM

@Barleysane

Can you think in a logical manner?

The article states that Koch fund misleading claims and cites some of the organisations funded.

So just for you:

- 1/ Read the article and highlight one of the organisations cited as receiving Koch funding
- 2/ With the organisations's name highlighted hold down the ctrl key and press 'c'
- 3/ With the cursor in your browser's search bar hold down ctrl and press 'x', then hit enter
- 4/ Click on the organisation in the search results
- 5/ navigate to the organisation's section dealing with AGW and read

[Recommend?](#) (7)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)Photo
pending
approval**crompton**

30 Mar 2010, 5:11PM

Baretsane: You aren't alone, the problem is that the CAGWers are losing the argument and are casting about for reasons why. The "well funded sceptics misinforming the public" is the latest.

In fact Greenpeace say Koch has given \$25m over a nine year period to sceptics, that for the more intelligent among you averages around \$2.8M/annum. It's peanuts. Also, with the dissimulation we have gotten used to from CAGWers they can only identify \$12M going to "sceptical" organisations.

That's around \$1.34/annum. George Soros gives more than that to the CAGWers every week.

If you're losing the hearts and minds campaign to such poorly funded opposition when you have almost the entire MSM and the BBC on your side you need to take a look at the substance of your argument.

[Recommend?](#) (5)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**ArseneKnows**

30 Mar 2010, 5:12PM

oops step 3 should be 'v' not 'x' but then I am helping you for free, which must mean I'm not a right-winger as they would charge for the smell of their farts if they could find a way to do so.

[Recommend?](#) (2)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)**MrWho**

30 Mar 2010, 5:13PM

I don't know about the "massive" part.

US government alone has given the pro-AGW -movement 70 *billion* dollars in the last 20 years. That is one thousand times more than the amount we are talking here.

And that doesn't include the vast amount of money the EU and private companies have poured to pro-AGW science.

For some reason pro-AGW people can fund their studies with whatever money they like

- Phil Jones received funding from wind energy companies and carbon credit companies

- but anti-AGW people have to basically live under bridges.

[Recommend?](#) (5)[Report abuse](#)[Clip](#) |[Link](#)Photo
pending
approval**crompton**

30 Mar 2010, 5:14PM

Apologies to CAGWers this: " Also, with the dissimulation we have gotten used to from CAGWers they can only identify \$12M going to "sceptical" organisations."

Should have read:

" Also,with the dissimulation we have gotten used to from **Greenpeace** they can only identify \$12M going to "sceptical" organisations.

I don't want to label all CAGWers as dissimulators they're clearly not.

[Recommend?](#) (3)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Butareyousure

30 Mar 2010, 5:15PM

I see that there's an article out today being carried by the quality papers about the 'Gulf Stream not slowing down'.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/science-news/7536760/Gulf-Stream-is-not-slowing-down-scientists-claim.html>

No sight of that in this paper I note as it obviously doesnt fit in with the AGW position that is promoted so heavily.

Mind you the work has been done by Dr Josh Willis from NASA so it may be retracted soon when his 'peers' get to see the unforgivable thing that he has done.....I mean its positive news about the climate....give it time and he'll have to admit he got it all wrong again like he did with his ocean cooling paper a few years back!

<http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/OceanCooling/>

If his story on that research paper is to be believed his error was fundamental in the extreme which puts climate research in a very poor light and shows either how the current ideology and establishment has suppressed the 'peer review' process or that it simply has no value anyway!

[Recommend?](#) (4)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

[Showing first 50 comments](#) | [Go to all comments](#) | [Go to latest comment](#)

[Post a comment](#)

In order to post a comment you need to be registered and signed in.

[Register](#) | [Sign in](#)