



Environmentalists boycott ExxonMobil

Posted by [Yankee](#) on July 12, 2005 - 12:50pm

Starting today, a group of environmentalists including the [U.S. Public Interest Group](#), [Defenders of Wildlife](#), the [Sierra Club](#), the [Natural Resources Defense Council](#), the [Union of Concerned Scientists](#) and [MoveOn Political Action Committee](#) are planning on boycotting ExxonMobil. According to this [short New York Times article](#), ExxonMobil is being targeted because they still support drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and because the CEO is a known critic of the idea that human activity has led to global warming. According to the executive of the Sierra Club, Carl Pope, ExxonMobil was chosen because its record is worse than its competitors'. "The other oil companies have aspirations for environmental performance,' Mr. Pope said."

There was also [a piece about the boycott](#) on NPR's Morning Edition today.

The coalition's website [ExxposeExxon](#) goes on to note:

ExxonMobil has acted consistently to move our country backward on energy policy by opposing efforts to stop global warming, lobbying to drill in America's most pristine wilderness areas, and failing to promote renewable energy and fuel efficiency.

This would appear to be contrary to Chevron, which, as [we recently wrote about](#), has started a website called [willyoujoinus](#) that frankly recognizes that alternatives to oil are sorely needed and is engaging consumers in a dialogue that is apparently about peak oil (although they don't use that word overtly). A cursory search of other companies shows that they all at least have websites addressing issues such as global warming and alternative energy sources: [Shell](#), [BP/Amoco](#), [Hess](#).

I will single out Citgo as an interesting case, and not necessarily in a positive way. For one thing, it was somewhat more difficult to find [their position on global warming](#) on their website than it was for the other companies. When I finally found it, I was surprised at what I found. While some companies, like Hess, were pretty cursory, they at least seemed to accept that global warming is a real phenomenon and they have some verbiage about trying to reduce emissions. Citgo has a considerably longer treatise on global warming that both explains what it is in theory, but then goes on to let us know (using somewhat inflammatory language) that it's also a controversial topic in the eyes of the American government:

Ignoring the controversial science and questionable computer modeling on global warming, U.S. negotiators in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a global warming treaty that requires our country to cut emissions of greenhouse gases 7 percent below 1990 levels. Although some 160 nations may sign the treaty, emission reduction requirements will only apply to 34 developed nations. President Bush thinks that the science linking CO2 to climate change is weak and has instructed his administration to conduct additional research and develop a more practical solution that is less damaging to the U.S. economy. The U.S. Congress is also considering legislation to reduce carbon emissions.

Citgo's "solution" to the problem is a global credit and trading program for greenhouse gas emissions. Furthermore, they're seriously opposed to taxes:

If taxes are imposed to meet treaty obligations, the price of gasoline could double. This will increase the cost of every commodity that is shipped to every market and U.S. household. CITGO believes the United States should not impair its economy without full public education and debate.

I don't know. It sounds to me like the coalition should include Citgo in their boycott, if their primary concern is a company's denial of global warming.

Technorati Tags: [peak oil](#), [oil](#), [global warming](#), [environmentalism](#), [ExxonMobil](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 United States License](#).