

ADVERTISEMENT

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN™

Sign In | Register 0

Search ScientificAmerican.com



Subscription Center

Subscribe to All Access »

Subscribe to Print »

Give a Gift »

View the Latest Issue »



Subscribe

News & Features

Topics

Blogs

Videos & Podcasts

Education

Citizen Science

SA Magazine

SA Mind

Books

SA en español

Sustainability » News

10 :: Email :: Print

Exxon Knew about Climate Change Almost 40 Years Ago

A new investigation shows the oil company understood the science before it became a public issue and spent millions to promote misinformation

By Shannon Hall | October 26, 2015 | Véalo en español

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.



The company’s knowledge of climate change dates back to July 1977, when its senior scientist James Black delivered a sobering message on the topic.

Credit: Getty Images/MARS

Experts, however, aren’t terribly surprised. “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,

More from Scientific American

MIND »



Classics »



DIGITAL »



Includes tablet edition!

ADVERTISEMENT

meaning that Exxon was truly conducting unprecedented research.

In their eight-month-long investigation, reporters at InsideClimate News interviewed former Exxon employees, scientists and federal officials and analyzed hundreds of pages of internal documents. They found that the company’s knowledge of climate change dates back to July 1977, when its senior scientist James Black delivered a sobering message on the topic. “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. A year later he warned Exxon that doubling CO₂ gases in the atmosphere would increase average global temperatures by two or three degrees—a number that is consistent with the scientific consensus today. He continued to warn that “present thinking holds that man has a time window of five to 10 years before the need for hard decisions regarding changes in energy strategies might become critical.” In other words, Exxon needed to act.


But 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.”

One thing is certain: in June 1988, when NASA scientist James Hansen told a congressional hearing that the planet was already warming, Exxon remained publicly convinced that the science was still controversial. Furthermore, experts agree that Exxon became a leader in campaigns of confusion. 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.

But experts are still piecing together Exxon’s misconception puzzle. Last summer the Union of Concerned Scientists released a complementary investigation to the one by InsideClimate News, known as the [Climate Deception Dossiers](#) (pdf). “We included a memo of a coalition of fossil-fuel companies where they pledge basically to launch a big communications effort to sow doubt,” says union president Kenneth Kimmel. “There’s even a quote in it that says something like ‘Victory will be achieved when the average person is uncertain about climate science.’ So it’s pretty stark.”

SEE ALSO:

Health: [Subway Joins Other Fast-Food Giants to Cut Back on Antibiotics](#) | Mind: [Scientists Study Nomophobia—Fear of Being without a Mobile Phone](#) | Tech: [A Quick Guide to the Cybersecurity Bill Passed by the U.S. Senate](#) | The Sciences: [Exxon Knew about Climate Change Almost 40 Years Ago](#)



Follow Us:     

Since then, Exxon has spent more than \$30 million on think tanks that promote climate denial, according to Greenpeace. Although experts will never be able to quantify the damage Exxon’s misinformation has caused, “one thing for certain is we’ve lost a lot of ground,” Kimmell says. Half of the greenhouse gas emissions in our atmosphere were released after 1988. “I have to think if the fossil-fuel companies had been upfront about this and had been part of the solution instead of the problem, we would have made a lot of progress [today] instead of doubling our greenhouse gas emissions.”

Experts agree that the damage is huge, which is why they are likening Exxon’s deception to the lies spread by the tobacco industry. “I think there are a lot of parallels,” Kimmell says. Both sowed doubt about the science for their own means, and both worked with the same consultants to help develop a communications strategy. He notes, however, that the two diverge in the type of harm done. Tobacco companies threatened human health, but the oil companies threatened the planet’s health. “It’s a harm that is global in its reach,” Kimmell says.

To prove this, Bob Ward—who on behalf of the U.K.’s Royal Academy sent a letter to Exxon in 2006 claiming its science was “inaccurate and misleading”—thinks a thorough investigation is necessary. “Because frankly the episode with tobacco was probably the most disgraceful episode one could ever imagine,” Ward says. Kimmell agrees. These reasons “really highlight the responsibility that these companies have to come clean, acknowledge this, and work with everyone else to cut out emissions and pay for some of the cost we’re going to bear as soon as possible,” Kimmell says.

It doesn’t appear, however, that Kimmell will get his retribution. Jeffers claims the investigation’s finds are “just patently untrue, misleading, and we reject them completely”—words that match Ward’s claims against them nearly a decade ago.

 Rights & Permissions


Share this Article:



Most Popular



Exxon Knew about Climate Change Almost 40 Years Ago




Hurricane Patricia Rapidly Becomes Strongest Storm Ever in Western Hemisphere



The Tantalizing Links between Gut Microbes and the Brain



Computers Would Never Have Found "Alien Superstructure" Star--It Required Citizen Science



Time Travel Simulation Resolves "Grandfather Paradox"

Solve Innovation Challenges

Portable Roof Damage Detection



Deadline: Nov 10 2015
Reward: **\$75,000 USD**
The Seeker desires a technology that can detect seen and unseen anomalies, such as hail damage, on asphalt shingle roofs. The technology

Quantifying Drift Invertebrates in River and Estuary Systems



Deadline: Nov 16 2015
Reward: **\$30,000 USD**

Habitat restoration, improvement, and creation in rivers, streams, and estuaries are key elements for the recovery of salmon, trout, and

[More Challenges >>](#)

Powered By: **INNOCENTIVE**

ADVERTISEMENT




Download A Free Audiobook



Sign Up For A Free Trial Today. Treat Yourself w/ a Free Audiobook!



Recommended For You

- 1.  [Why There Will Never Be Another Einstein](#) 2 months ago
[blogs.scientificamerican.com](#) [ScientificAmerican.com](#) More Science
- 2.  [Men Are Attracted to Nonconformist Women](#) 2 weeks ago
[scientificamerican.com](#) [ScientificAmerican.com](#) Head Lines
- 3.  [The Problem with Female Superheroes](#) 4 months ago
[scientificamerican.com](#) [ScientificAmerican.com](#) Mind & Brain



Comments

Oldest – Newest ▾

nicolaslecorvec

October 26, 2015, 3:59 PM

Oh right give us a break too..

There is so many examples that are similar to the case.. tobacco, lead, Volkswagen and their emission rate

Large corporations are interested in profits, and will do anything to prevent laws restraining their profits.. we all know today the impact of lead on living organisms (check Herbert Needleman for example), how long did it take to ban it ?

Now let's imagine how much money in 40 years could have be spent on research that promotes renewable energies, batteries, public transportation and so on... but no, those companies (and not only Exxon) have deliberately hidden their knowledge for profits and lobbied against climate change since then and still today.

So yes, this is very comparable.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)

nicolaslecorvec

October 26, 2015, 4:01 PM

it seems the comment I have been replying to has been deleted...

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)

Laurenceofberk

October 26, 2015, 4:53 PM

Exxon's lies probably include perjury before Congress. (Further research on this is needed.)

But the US government is too corporate dominated to prosecute. Perhaps some other climate ravaged nation will do it.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)

Latest from SA Blog Network

The Mathematical Surprises of Triangles, Squares and Pentagons

Guest Blog | 11 minutes ago

Clouded Leopards Threatened by Sudden Increase in Poaching and Live Trade

Extinction Countdown | 7 hours ago

Presidential Candidates: Who Believes in Climate Change?

Guest Blog | 8 hours ago

To Every Scam There Is a Season: Report Shows Salmon Fraud Prevalent in Winter

Food Matters | 10 hours ago

Regrowing Severed Limbs Was Once NBD

Symbiartic | October 27, 2015

News From Our Partners



Tuberculosis Now Rivals AIDS As Leading Cause of Death, Says WHO



Kiribati's Dilemma: Before We Drown We May Die of Thirst



Real-Life "Tractor Beam" Can Levitate Objects Using Sound Waves



Cod Could Recover in Warming Waters

ADVERTISEMENT



ADVERTISEMENT

ChristopherScott

October 27, 2015, 8:43 AM

Obviously the time has come to hold public inquiries and pursue legal action against these corporations, their directors and senior management for willful blindness and malicious intent, both of which are actionable offenses. While the tobacco industry is despicable, the award for Ultimate Douche Bags clearly goes to the fossil fuel merchants of doubt. There is a special place in the hottest corners of hell for them.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**DCampbell**

October 27, 2015, 10:37 AM

I would like to think that as climate change coupled with population explosion occurs, the need for international efforts, as in the United Nations, will become a major force in designing an Ecological Economics in which profit only for the sake of profit takes a back seat. Ecological Economics is already a subject of discussion in the field of Jurisprudence. Are we too late?

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**AlextheGreatest**

October 27, 2015, 3:17 PM

It reminds me of the pharmaceutical industry too

http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/many-antidepressant-studies-found-tainted-by-pharma-company-influence/?WT.mc_id=SA_SP_20151026

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**Anchovy_Rancher** → **AlextheGreatest**

October 27, 2015, 7:38 PM

They're ALL culpable.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**sofistek**

October 28, 2015, 2:42 AM

Exxon's actions, if true, are unconscionable but so are the actions (or inaction) of countries around the globe, since we've known about the threat from human caused climate change for decades, even without Exxon's help. So, if some want legal action to be taken against Exxon, they should also call for legal action against our so-called leaders and against all those who vote for politicians who want to do nothing.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**hyp3rcrav3**

October 28, 2015, 5:05 PM

I knew about it by 1980 because I read this magazine and others like it.

National Geographic used to report on it until NewsCorp got their grubby paws onto the Board of Directors. They have been slowly expanding their grip until the recent privatization of a non profit....


Must keep facts out of public discourse.

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)**lesizz**

October 28, 2015, 6:11 PM

The psychotic demographic known as "climate change deniers" speak of a HOAX (usually in solid caps followed by a long line of exclamation points).

And they are right, there is a hoax, and this is it: Exxon.



Science Jobs of the Week

Postdoc in Computational biology m / f

University Medical Center Utrecht (UMC Utrecht)

Postdoctoral Position - Developmental Biology and Biophysics

Institut Pasteur

Faculty Positions Available

Department of Pharmacology and Pharmaceutical Sciences, School Of Medical, Tsinghua University,

[More jobs from Naturejobs.com >>](#)

Or should I say, EXXON!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

[Report as Abuse](#) | [Link to This](#)

You must [sign in](#) or [register](#) as a ScientificAmerican.com member to submit a comment.

TRY A RISK-FREE ISSUE

SubscribeS! Send me a free issue of Scientific American with no obligation to continue the subscription. If I like it, I will be billed for the one-year subscription.



Now

© 2015 Scientific American, a Division of Nature America, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

[Advertise](#)

[Special Ad Sections](#)

[SA Custom Media and Partnerships](#)

[Science Jobs](#)

[Partner Network](#)

[International Editions](#)

[Travel](#)

[About Scientific American](#)

[Press Room](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Use of Cookies](#)

[Subscribe](#)

[Renew Your Print Subscription](#)

[Print Subscriber Customer Service](#)

[Buy Back Issues](#)

[FAQs](#)

[Contact Us](#)