



Concealing their sources - who funds Europe's climate change deniers?

Corporate Europe Observatory
December 2010

They are a tiny minority, a network of just a few dozen individuals around the world. Their numbers contrast starkly with the overwhelming majority of scientists who agree on the reality of man-made climate change, and on the urgent need for action. But the voices of climate deniers, are amplified in Europe by a handful of extremist free marketeers and right-wing think tanks, which try to block action to tackle climate change. Using non peer-reviewed publications, hijacking scientific debates, and targeting the mass media, they create confusion in the minds of the public about both the reality of global warming and the policies designed to curb emissions. Just last week one of these think tanks, CFACT Europe, coorganised a pseudo scientific conference in Berlin to coincide with international climate negotiations in Cancun.

Climate change denial is used here to describe “organized attempts to downplay, deny or dismiss the scientific consensus on the extent of global warming, its significance, and its connection to human behavior, especially for commercial or ideological reasons”¹.

Where does the money come from to fund these activities? Some of these think tanks, such as Danish CEPOS or Spanish Instituto Juan de Mariana have been shown to operate with money connected to Koch Industries (the US oil group). The think tanks themselves however are very secretive about their funding sources and there are no mechanisms in place that allow for proper scrutiny. The European Transparency Initiative, which includes the European Commission's lobby register, fails to cast any light on the shadowy world of think tank funding. Corporate Europe Observatory's (CEO) research however finds that at least one think tank, the UK Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), receives money from BP.

The Koch Web

Koch Industries is a conglomerate dominated by oil and chemical interests. A report by Greenpeace² in March 2010 revealed that this little known private company had out-spent ExxonMobil in funding climate change deniers (from 2005 to 2008, ExxonMobil spent \$8.9 million and the Koch Industries controlled foundations contributed \$24.9 million). The research covers campaign contributions, lobbying budgets, and a substantial share which goes to a web of think tanks and front groups which are funded by foundations controlled by the Koch family and company. Among the 40 or so climate denial organisations receiving Koch foundation grants are the Institute for Energy Research, the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, the Cato Institute and the George C. Marshall Institute.

European think tanks – hiding their funders

Among the European think tanks dealing with climate change, either as a single issue or as part of a broader agenda, there are a handful of hard-core free marketeers and libertarian groups which can be classed as climate deniers. They appear to be well established, connected and funded.

ExxonMobil's role in funding a number of these think tanks has been known for some time³. Earlier this year Greenpeace uncovered funding for some groups by Koch Industries⁴. And more recently CAN Europe revealed that some of the biggest European emitters are contributing money to climate deniers in the US Senate⁵. This raises the question as to whether big European corporations are similarly funding the climate denial machine in Europe.

That question is not easy to answer. In the EU there is no obligation for think tanks to disclose their funders.

The European Transparency Initiative and the Lobby Transparency Register

The European Commission launched the European Transparency Initiative (ETI) in 2005 with the aim of promoting transparency in EU policy-making. The question of lobby transparency has become one of the key and most debated components of the ETI. In spring 2008 the Commission launched a web-based public register for all lobbyists, including think tanks.

Analysis of the lobby transparency register by the Alliance for Lobbying Transparency and Ethics Regulation in the EU (ALTER-EU) shows that the data in the register is incomplete, with less than 40 per cent of Brussels-based lobby groups registered. The register is voluntary and the information disclosed is often unreliable. As a result, the register gives an incomplete picture of who lobbies, on whose behalf, on which issues or with what level of budget⁶.

Think tanks which choose to register only have to report their overall budget and how much of their funding is public or private. But they do not have to disclose their funders and how much each contributed. These gaps will not be addressed in the new joint EP-EC register which will be launched next year⁷.

CEO has looked at eight European think tanks which are producing and/or promoting a wide range of material focused on denying climate change, from aggressive denial of climate science to more sceptical views which target action to combat climate change. This group is not exhaustive, but gives a snapshot of climate deniers active in Europe, including the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), International Policy Network (IPN) and Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF) from the UK, CFACT Europe in Germany, the Spanish Instituto Juan de Mariana, the Danish group CEPOS, the French Institut Économique Molinari and the Austrian Hayek Institute. None are registered. So we contacted them⁸ and asked to disclose their sources of funding for climate activities. They provided very little information in response.

As the think tanks refused to reveal their funding sources, CEO decided to ask some of the European companies that are lobbying on climate issues and which have a strong interest in climate policy. We asked the EU's eight largest emitters (ArcelorMittal, BASF, Bayer, BP, E.ON, GDF Suez, Lafarge and Solvay) and three other oil companies (Repsol, Shell and Total) to disclose what funding they have provided for think tanks in Europe working on climate issues. Most were more open than the think tanks. According to their replies, only one of the 11, the oil giant BP, admits to financially supporting one of the eight think tanks, the UK Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA).

BP and the IEA

Founded in 1955, the Institute of Economic Affairs⁹ is a well-known free-market think tank in the UK. It is not primarily focused on climate, but promotes a radical free market approach, not just for the economy but also across society. BP was initially evasive, but eventually disclosed that it has

an annual corporate subscription to the IEA, which it said: “along with the IPN, Hayek Institute, CEPOS, Instituto Juan de Mariana and Institute Economique Molinari, is a highly-respected, liberal, market-based think-tank”¹⁰. BP said their subscription to the IEA was not tied to any particular piece of work and that “we certainly do not consider the IEA to be an organisation primarily interested in climate policy (nor, indeed, in lobbying the EU), although inevitably free market think-tanks will comment on aspects of climate and energy policy in as much as they affect the market.”

BP was one of the first oil companies to admit the existence of man-made climate change in 1997 and has been one of the companies pushing a carbon trading system in the UK and Europe¹¹. BP also lobbies for other 'false solutions' such as agrofuels, coal and carbon capture and storage (CCS) and nuclear energy.

CEO asked BP if they were aware of the climate views promoted by the IEA which contradict the climate policies advocated by the oil company. In their response, BP argued that they have publicly accepted the scientific consensus on climate change, but “at the same time, we are very conscious that there remains an enormous debate among the economists about the best way of addressing the issue. As a supporter of free markets, BP along with many (most?) governments is keen to see a market-based solution and thus we believe it is right and proper that the IEA encourages its community to look at this issue.”

BP also went on to highlight a debate organised in 2009 by the IEA as part of the group’s educational work, highlighting IEA’s comment that “on the question of climate change it is possible for supporters of free markets to hold different views and of course there are both scientific and economic aspects of the question.” The oil company said that this does not mean that BP subscribes to the views of every single person who speaks at an IEA event or who writes a chapter in an IEA-edited publication.

BP’s response appears to imply that the IEA simply holds a free-market approach to climate change, and objects to climate policies on economic grounds, rather than actually promoting sceptical or denialist views on the science of climate change. A closer look at the material featured on their site and at some of their core people reveals just how key climate change denial is in their activities. The debate¹² referred to by BP in their response is just one clear example where IEA provides a ready-platform for extremist climate deniers, in this case Fred Singer, a career denialist who has argued against the reality of man-made climate change since the '90s and Nigel Lawson, who established the Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF), the leading voice of deniers in the UK. There are also many examples in IEA’s publications where climate science is clearly denied. See for example, *Global Warming False Alarms*¹³ by Russell Lewis, a former Acting General Director of the Institute of Economic Affairs; *Climate Alarmism Reconsidered*¹⁴, by Robert Bradley, describing global warming as beneficial; or *Climate Change: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom*¹⁵, edited by Julian Morris with contributions from among others Roger Bate (both connected to the International Policy Network see below).

Excerpt from IEA’s presentation of Global Warming False Alarms:

“This readable and entertaining introduction to the climate change debate suggests that government claims about the seriousness of global warming are suspect – they may be an excuse for mounting taxes and controls. They are also strikingly similar to the dire predictions of 40 years ago of an imminent ice age and to other past doom forecasts due to alleged overpopulation, depletion of food and fuel supplies, and chemical pollution.”

Several of the most notorious climate change deniers hold key positions at the IEA. Robert Bradley, a former Enron executive, is the IEA Energy and Climate Change Fellow, and he is also

founder and chief executive of the US Institute for Energy Research (which received over \$300,000 from ExxonMobil between 2003 and 2007¹⁶), a scholar at the US Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), a Washington-based corporate-funded group which is among the most active on climate change denial¹⁷ and the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank co-founded by Charles Koch, one of the billionaire brothers and co-owner of Koch Industries¹⁸. Bradley regularly speaks at conferences organised by the Heartland Institute, which bring together climate deniers from around the world, and according to Desmogblog (a Canadian website exposing the world of climate deniers) are “a blatant industry effort to greenwash oil and coal while simultaneously attacking the credibility of climate scientists”¹⁹. The Institute for Energy Research (IER) has active links with several of the European climate deniers think tanks included in CEO’s survey and has commissioned bogus research by European think tanks (see Instituto Juan de Mariana and CEPOS below) and then organised campaigns to promote these in the US with the support of fellow right-wing think tanks so as to attack Obama’s push for renewable energy and green jobs.

John Blundell is now a distinguished senior fellow at the IEA after serving as Director General between 1993 and 2009. He has held a number of positions, including as former President of the US Atlas Economic Research Foundation (dedicated to facilitate the establishment of free market think tanks all over the world) and the Charles G. Koch Foundation. Julian Morris (see IPN below) and Roger Bate, who both previously worked for the Institute, sit on the IEA advisory council.

Roger Bate is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), a very influential right-wing US think tank which promotes denialist positions on climate change, and was head of the environmental unit of the IEA until 2000. In 1994 he founded the European Science and Environment Forum (ESEF) a front group funded by the tobacco and oil industry and in 2001 he set up the IPN, which he co-directed until 2003. He also sits on the advisory board of US CFACT, the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow²⁰, a free-market group focused on environment and consumer issues which has received over \$500,000 from ExxonMobil since 1998. Morris and Bate wrote one of the first books on climate change scepticism, *Global Warming: Apocalypse or Hot Air?*, published by the IEA Environment Unit in 1994.

Even if BP’s annual corporate subscription to the IEA is not earmarked for climate or energy work, it is hard to see how the oil company can defend its support for a think tank with such a sceptic record. Yet BP boasts of a “decade-long track record of advocating and taking precautionary action to address climate change”²¹. BP refused to disclose the amount of its subscription, but claimed that it was small and that “it would be better for them [IEA] to talk about their own finances.” The IEA did not respond when asked how much BP contributed. Their website does not mention the number of corporate subscribers. In 2004, the US branch of the IEA, the American Friends of the Institute of Economic Affairs received \$50,000 from ExxonMobil²².

Climate change deniers in Europe: a snapshot

Of the other seven think tanks surveyed, the **International Policy Network (IPN)**²³ is a London-based think tank run by Julian Morris, who has been producing climate change misinformation for more than 15 years. The IPN, funded by the late Antony Fisher, is an offspring of the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, which played a role in spreading the web of Koch Industry money to Europe (see Instituto Juan de Mariana and CEPOS below). The IPN was originally called the International Institute for Economic Research, then changed its name to Atlas Economic Research Foundation (UK) and was rebranded in 2001 as the IPN. Julian Morris, like Roger Bate, previously worked at the IEA and was also involved at the ESEF.

Morris holds quite extremist positions on climate change and other environmental issues, yet he manages to appear regularly in mainstream media. For instance he featured as an expert commentator in a daily blog in the Financial Times last year during the COP15 climate conference in Copenhagen. While even reluctant policy makers accept that temperature change should be kept under a change of 2°, and the climate justice movement has warned of the disastrous effects of exceeding a 1° temperature rise, Julian Morris wrote in the FT: “It is feasible that humanity could

adapt at relatively low cost to a warming of 4 degrees. But for that to be possible, it is essential that existing barriers to adaptation be removed; especially restrictions on trade and weak property rights”²⁴.

Apart from being a prolific writer, Morris has used his experience gained in staging front groups. His statements against the Kyoto Protocol and other policies designed to curb climate change are often promoted under the name of the Civil Society Coalition, which is described as 59 independent civil society organisations from 40 countries but which in reality is a group of libertarian and free market think tanks under his lead. IPN also used to set up groups in the South which then attacked Western environmentalists for being imperialists.

IPN is one of the European groups that was generously funded by ExxonMobil until the scandal hit the headlines in 2006. From 2003 to 2006 IPN pocketed close to \$400,000 from the oil company²⁵. When asked by CEO to disclose its funding, several emails and calls resulted in no real information, except to say that the IPN is supported by a broad range of donors, including individuals, foundations and businesses, and that they do not get government funding. Earlier this year, when questioned by news agency IPS²⁶ Julian Morris claimed not to have received money from corporations or other organisations directly involved in the fossil fuel industry for the last three years. IPN is known to run mostly on corporate money. According to Sourcewatch in both 2003 and 2004 about 85% of their funds were from corporations²⁷. According to Morris, IPN’s annual income is around 1.4 million dollars.

IPN’s links with the Atlas Foundation and the Koch web are also clear from its board. Members include John Blundell (see above) and Linda Whetstone, the daughter of founder Anthony Fisher. Whetstone is Chairman of the International Policy Network, sits also in the board of the Institute of Economic Affairs, the Atlas Economic Research Foundation and the Mont Pelerin Society, an international network of neoliberal intellectuals, among others. Bridgett Wagner, head of the IPN US branch is also at the Heritage Foundation, a neo-conservative US think tank very active on climate policy, which is funded by ExxonMobil.

Although the UK is home to many of the most active climate denying think tanks, partly because of the close links with the US, this phenomena is not alien to other parts of Europe. One of the most active groups, **CFACT Europe**²⁸, is based in Germany. It is a branch of the US Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow and a prolific producer of some of the most radical denialist material and very secretive. Its website gives no explanation of the group and no financial information. Even its phone number is hard to find. CFACT Europe was founded in 2004 by Holger Thuss, who is its Executive Director. CFACT did not reply to any of the emails or reminders CEO sent asking them to disclose their funding for climate activities. When we phoned, Thuss reacted angrily: “Do I ask you about your money?” When informed that we were not asking about his money but about the CFACT’s funding (CEO’s funding is published in detail online²⁹), he responded: “Why would I tell you about my money? CFACT is my property”. However, the US CFACT website lists Holger Thuss as staff. He is also the President of EIKE, the European Institute for Climate and Energy (Europäisches Institut für Klima und Energie).

CFACT Europe actively promotes the views of climate deniers. It is one of the main organisers of the recent gathering of deniers in Europe, the International Conference on Energy and Climate. The conference, which took place in Berlin on 3 - 4 December was an attempt to revive media attention for the climate sceptic views during the Cancun climate talks. CFACT had promised that “leading international scientists will present new findings in the fields of climate science and energy. In many cases these findings are contrary to the claims made by the IPCC”³⁰. These ‘findings’ were presented by leading sceptics such as Fred Singer and UK prominent denier Christopher Monckton (Viscount Monckton of Brenchely). The German steel industry, a strong opponent of the EU restrictions on CO2 emissions was represented at the conference with Dieter Ameling, former president of the German Steel Federation and board member of several corporations.

CFACT Europe attends and makes an effort to be visible at all UN climate negotiations, not only at the major COPs but also the sessions in between. For instance in April 2010 CFACT Europe went to Bonn with Monckton, who was in December 2009 listed by Mother Jones magazine as second to only Exxon in doing most to scupper action to tackle climate change. He for example toured Canada describing CO₂ as a harmless and beneficial trace gas, funded by the Heartland Institute. Writing on Monckton, CFACT Europe maintains that “he will neither be silenced, nor ignored. As Mahatma Gandhi told us, first they ignore you, then they ridicule you, then they fight you, then you win”³¹.

CFACT also coorganised a counterconference at COP15 in Copenhagen attended among others by Fred Singer, Monckton. Sally Baliunas, a leading sceptic involved in many ExxonMobil-funded organisations such as the Heritage Foundation and the Competitive Enterprise Institute; and Cécile Phillipe, head of the Institut Économique Molinari (see below) sit on the board of CFACT Europe.

Back in the UK, a newly formed (2009) think tank devoted to the issue of climate change has become the leading voice in the media for the climate change deniers. **The Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF)**³² was set by the former Tory chancellor Nigel Lawson. The GWPF claims that their main purpose is “to bring reason, integrity and balance to a debate that has become seriously unbalanced, irrationally alarmist, and all too often depressingly intolerant”³³. Yet it relentlessly claims that climate change will not have too serious effects. The group’s claim to be sceptical about climate policy and not about climate change itself appears a strategic choice, given that the GPWF oozes climate change denialism.

When asked about funding for climate activities, GWPF’s director, well-known sceptic Benny Peiser replied that “the GWPF is not a lobbying organisation and we do not lobby or campaign on any issues. For that reason, the ETI is irrelevant to us.”³⁴ Asked to reconsider this response Peiser chose not to reply to any further emails or phone calls. Not only are think tanks meant to be included in the lobby transparency register (see box) but GWPF’s activities are aimed at influencing decision makers and public opinion.

The group’s website states that they do not accept gifts from either energy companies or anyone with a significant interest in an energy company. However, it is not possible to get a glimpse of their funding sources. Peiser told IPS, that GWPF will present a report on its finances later this year and he will seek permission from its main donors to name them³⁵.

The GWPF has played a prominent role in trying to rekindle Climategate, when hacked letters from the University of East Anglia in the UK were used as evidence that scientists had colluded to manipulate data to in order to aggravate the effects of climate change in the reports from the IPCC. Of course climate deniers everywhere have tried to exaggerate those events ad infinitum, but the GWPF has made it a major political issue in the UK, using a recent report written by Andrew Montford, with a foreword of Andrew Turnbull, who sits in the Academic Advisory Council of the GWPF. He is joined there by high-profile climate change denier Richard Lindzen³⁶, from the Massachussets Institute of Techonology, who is linked to ExxonMobil-funded think tanks such as the Cato Institute and the George C. Marshall Institute, which has received \$840,000 from ExxonMobil since 1998³⁷. GWPF’s Peiser is also an advisor to the Scientific Alliance, which was set up to counter the environmental movement.

Another think tank whith close links to hard core US climate change deniers is the Spanish libertarian **Instituto Juan de Mariana**³⁸. It was founded in 2005 and launched with a seminar against the Kyoto Protocol, attended by Christopher Horner, from the Competitive Enterprise Institute. Horner was caught redhanded in 2005 when the Independent newspaper revealed documents showing his attempts to convince large EU energy firms to support a campaign against the Kyoto Protocol³⁹. Gabriel Calzada, the founder and President of Instituto Juan de Mariana represented the Center for the New Europe in Spain, a radical free-market Brussels think tank that

used to be funded by Exxon and has now closed. Calzada's message is blunt: there is no direct relation between CO2 emissions and "supposed global warming". Humans have no capacity to cause climate change.

In 2009, Calzada wrote a report⁴⁰ on the impacts on employment of the government's policies to support renewable energies. The report, which had substantial flaws⁴¹, claimed that for every green job created by government spending on green energy 2.2 jobs were destroyed. The report was in fact commissioned by the US Institute for Energy Research (IER): "Because the president [Obama] emphasized Spain, we thought it was important to take a closer look at the Spanish experience. We commissioned a study in Spain and the results were astounding. What was meant to be a green energy revolution in Spain turned out to be an economic disaster"⁴². The report was picked up by Calzada's allies in the US and heavily promoted to attack Obama's push for green jobs.

The IER has received over \$300,000 in funding from ExxonMobil⁴³ and also receives money from the Koch industries⁴⁴. A report by Greenpeace⁴⁵ showed that groups which had received Koch money, like the Heritage Foundation, Americans for Prosperity, and the American Energy Alliance, were actively disseminating the study. Instituto Juan de Mariana co-sponsored the last sceptic conference organised by the Heartland Institute. Gabriel Calzada was one of the speakers.

In their reply to CEO⁴⁶, Instituto Juan de Mariana affirmed that it "finances all its activities through the individual donation of his over 250 individual members" and that they did not receive corporate funding with the exception of a small Spanish insurance company. When contacted again to check whether the Institute for Energy Research (IER) support for the above study was financial, the Institute stopped responding.

In mid November 2010, Instituto Juan de Mariana got \$10,000 from the Atlas Foundation as an award⁴⁷ for their *Green Jobs and Green Energy Campaign*. Atlas, nourished by Koch and other corporate money, supports lots of think tanks all over the world.

Koch money has also been linked to **CEPOS**⁴⁸ in Denmark, founded in 2004 by a faction of the Danish right who would like the right-wing government to have a more radical approach to dismantling the welfare state and public services. CEPOS hardly works on climate issues, but its chief executive Martin Ågerup is a climate sceptic and a fellow at the International Policy Network (IPN), where he previously published a paper criticising the scientific methodology used by the IPCC⁴⁹.

In 2009 CEPOS published, *Wind Energy – The Case of Denmark*,⁵⁰ which claims that wind energy in Denmark accounts for about 10 and not 20% of the country's electricity consumption and that among other things the use of wind energy has slowed Denmark's economic growth. The report, which was also commissioned by the IER, was full of factual errors⁵¹ and misrepresentations. The IER has extensively used it to attack Obama's support for renewable energy⁵². The report has also been promoted by the Heritage Foundation and other US groups. The IER brought co-author Hugh Sharman and CEPOS' Martin Ågerup to the US in September 2009 to present the study⁵³. Greenpeace reported that CEPOS was also awarded a \$100,000 grant from the Atlas Economic Research Foundation (supported by both the Charles G. Koch and Clude R Lambe Foundation)⁵⁴.

Ågerup told CEO that "the only funding CEPOS has ever received for energy economic research was for the study, which was funded by The Institute for Energy Research in Washington. Ågerup also claimed that the IER had no influence on the content or conclusions of the report and that neither did CEPOS.

Institut Economique Molinari⁵⁵ is a francophone think tank founded by Cécile Phillipe, who was also a senior fellow at the now defunct Center for New Europe. Molinari takes a clear denialist position on climate change. Gabriel Calzada from the Instituto Juan de Mariana is an associated

researcher at Molinari. Like Phillippe, he used to be at the Center for a New Europe.

Phillippe told CEO that they do not receive money from oil companies: “None of them give us a penny for what we do, nor any organization connected to them. We finance our activities through individual donations that support our mission in general. In any case, we do what we do because we believe in the issue and not because any organization or people would like us to write. Our mission is to analyze public policy issues in order to show that they are inefficient because they violate private property rights as it is the case of climate regulations”⁵⁶. When asked if they received funding from other corporations, CEO did not get a reply.

The Austria-based **Hayek Institute**⁵⁷ does not focus on climate change, but more general economic issues but promotes the Heartland Institute conferences and sells online books denying the science of climate change⁵⁸. The Austrian think tank also features regularly the work by the IPN.

The only reply we got when asked them to disclose their funding for climate activities is that they have not done any fundraising related to climate change⁵⁹. Further enquiries got no response.

Are European corporations funding climate deniers in Europe? They respond

Once it became clear that the think tanks CEO had approached for financial disclosure were going to remain secretive about their funding, CEO asked several corporations if they were funding think tanks working on climate issues. We asked⁶⁰ the eight biggest CO2 emitters in Europe⁶¹ (ArcelorMittal, BASF, Bayer, BP, E.ON, GDF Suez, Lafarge and Solvay) and three oil companies, Repsol, Shell and Total. Most of the companies approached were more responsive and open than the think tanks, perhaps because they have invested more in their image of social responsibility.

The exception being Shell, which appears to have abandoned its PR-friendly approach. After several emails and calls, their head of EU liaison Hans van der Loo said: “I’m not going to answer you”. Steel giant ArcelorMittal also chose not to answer after being asked on the phone; Spanish oil company, Repsol and GDF Suez did not reply, despite repeated requests by email and phone.

Two chemical companies, Bayer and Solvay provided partial information. Bayer stated that they do not give money to any think tank for climate activities⁶². Solvay has confirmed that they do not fund any of the eight think tanks listed in the survey, but is a member of the ERT⁶³. As already stated, BP disclosed that they have an annual corporate subscription to the Institute of Economic Affairs. It confirmed that it does not support the other seven financially. It also denied funding candidates who deny climate change in the US Senate, although documents show donations from a BP Political Action Committee (PAC)⁶⁴. French oil company Total stated that their Brussels office does not contribute to any of the think tanks listed and that they are not aware of “any contributions made by other TOTAL entities to those associations... The think tanks of which my office is in charge are ERT, EPC, CEPS and Friends of Europe that may not be considered, to put it mildly, as focused on climate change issues”⁶⁵.

The three most transparent corporations were French cement company Lafarge, energy firm E.ON and German chemical BASF. All three affirmed that they do not contribute to any of the eight think tanks. Lafarge also disclosed⁶⁶ that it is a member of the European Roundtable of Industrialists (ERT), International Emissions Trading Association (IETA) and IDDRI, Institut du Développement Durable et des Relations Internationales, a French think tank with an international climate change programme. Lafarge says that this totals around 80,000 euros.

BASF said that they contributed € 47,539 to the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), €17,500 to CSR Europe, €4,000 to the Conference Board (a US group which provides business with information) and €12,000 to the European Policy Center (EPC)⁶⁷. E.ON explained that pay an annual membership fee to the WBCSD of 70,000 Swiss francs and \$10,000 to the Global Compact (since 2010). They also specified that they are active in the ERT⁶⁸.

In need of mandatory financial transparency

According to their replies, this sample of European corporations do not directly contribute to climate deniers in Europe, with the exception of BP funding the Institute of Economic Affairs. Several of them support financially more mainstream think tanks like the European Policy Center (EPC) or the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), groups like the ERT and the WBCSD and trade associations like CEFIC (the European association of the chemical industry) or Europa (association of the oil-refining and marketing industry).

Total's response

Total said: "the associations based in Brussels in which my office participates are mainly trade associations that do not directly address climate change issues but mainly express their members' views on draft legislations and business issues. Indeed, OGP [International Association of Oil and Gas Producers], Europa, Eurogas, Cefic etc may not be considered as think tanks."

However, trade associations and think tanks such as the ERT or the WBCSD (which receive most funding from the corporations surveyed) do actively work on climate policy. CEFIC, Europa, the ERT and others such as BusinessEurope are leading the corporate war against higher CO2 emissions reductions targets and are successfully lobbying for the flagship of the EU climate policy, the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), to keep benefitting polluters. Many of the corporations listed in this survey have made windfall profits from the ETS.

When CEO last surveyed the financial transparency of think tanks in Europe in 2005 and 2006⁶⁹, we found they were very secretive. The European Transparency Initiative (ETI) was then being drafted offering a window of hope. But four years later it is clear that it has not worked. None of the think tanks surveyed are registered.

Of the corporations, only E.ON and Repsol are not registered. ArcelorMittal, Bayer, BP, Lafarge and Total mention in the register that contributions to third parties are not listed to avoid double counting. The end result, as third parties do not disclose and are not forced to do so, is that even in the cases where the corporations are claiming to be open, the information is very partial. According to the recently agreed rules for the upcoming new register (2011), companies will have to list all organisations they give money to lobby the EU institutions. But think tanks will still not have to report specific funding sources.

The GWPF and the IEA say in their responses that they do not lobby, and therefore are not subjected to these transparency requirements. Think tanks are expected to register and they do lobby. They are influencing the content of policy debate, and also helping to set the agenda. The think tanks approached by CEO, though a minority, have still managed to increase media coverage for their views. Their activities, aimed at sowing confusion about the reality of climate change and blocking measures to combat it like the gathering of sceptics organised by CFACT Europe last week cost money. To know where this money comes from would allow public scrutiny of the interests that lie behind these groups. As it is, rich individuals and powerful companies are allowed to play a double game, skewing public discourse to promote their ideological perspectives and their commercial interests.

References:

1 Dunlap, Riley E. and McRight, Aaron M. (2011). "Climate Change Denial: Sources, actors, and strategies". In Constance Lever-Tracy. *Routledge Handbook of Climate Change and Society*. [Taylor & Francis](http://www.tandf.co.uk/AUTHORS/authors.asp?AUTHOR1=Dunlap%2C+Riley+E.). ISBN 0415544785.

2 Greenpeace, USA March 2010, "Koch Industries: Secretly Funding the Climate Denial Machine."

<http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/koch-industries/#a0>

3 See Corporate Europe Observatory, March 2007 "ExxonMobil's covert funding of global warming skeptics – will the

European Commission clear the air?" <http://archive.corporateeurope.org/longerversioncleaningtheair.html> and ExxonSecrets <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/exxon-secrets/>

4 Greenpeace USA, March 2010, "Koch Industries: Secretly Funding the Climate Denial Machine." <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/koch-industries/#a0>

5 CAN-Europe, October 2010. "Think globally, sabotage locally. How and why European companies are funding climate change deniers and anti-climate legislation voices in the US Senate" <http://www.climnet.org/policywork/eu-energy-and-climate-policy/254-caught-eu-business-lobby-funding-climate-legislation>

6 For more information on the lobby transparency register see file "Petloonyes and other distortions why the EU lobby register needs fixing!" ALTER-EU Briefing Note, October 2010, http://www.alter-eu.org/sites/default/files/documents/petloonyes_and_other_distortions_in_the_ec_lobby_register-1.pdf

7 http://blog.transparency.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/Draft_Agree_TransparencyRegister.pdf

8 What CEO asked was: "As you know, the European Commission launched few years ago the European Transparency Initiative (ETI) aimed at improving the transparency around lobbying in the European Union. In this context, we ask you to disclose some information which is not available in the transparency register (as your organisation is not registered) nor on your website. The information we request is an overview of your funding for any type of activity related to climate policies (including energy policy, transport policy, fuel policy and other climate related issues and including funding which is not earmarked for climate related issues but is spent on it)."

9 <http://www.iea.org.uk/>

10 Several email correspondence with BP press officer Robert Wine throughout October and November 2010.

11 Corporate Europe Observatory and Platform, January 2009 "BP - Extracting influence at the heart of the EU" <http://archive.corporateeurope.org/extractinginfluence.html>

12 The Copenhagen Summit: Do Science and Economics Support Government Action on Climate Change? <http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=event&ID=217>

13 <http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=book&ID=403>

14 <http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=book&ID=218>

15 <http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=book&ID=52>

16 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=115>

17 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php>

18 http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Cato_Institute

19 <http://www.desmogblog.com/taxonomy/term/1636>

20 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=25>

21 <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle.do?categoryId=9032939&contentId=7060399>

22 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=126>

23 <http://www.policynetwork.net/>

24 <http://blogs.ft.com/energy-source/2009/12/08/raising-temperatures-and-offers-climate-experts%E2%80%99-forum/>

25 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=108>

26 "Who Pays To Deny Climate Change", by David Cronin, IPS, 3 October 2010 <http://www.globalissues.org/news/2010/10/03/7143>

27 http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=International_Policy_Network#endnote_ipnAccounts2004

28 <http://cfact.eu/>

29 <http://www.corporateeurope.org/about-corporate-europe-observatory>

30 <http://cfact.eu/2010/11/10/cfact-cosponsors-international-conference-on-energy-climate/#more-3031>

31 Lord Monckton is under attack — a sure sign that he's winning on warming. Monckton fights back and refutes Prof. Abraham. 12 August 2010, CFACTEU, <http://cfact.eu/2010/08/12/target-monckton/#more-2881> [Target: Monckton](#)

32 <http://thegwpf.org>

33 <http://thegwpf.org/who-we-are.html>

34 Email from Benny Peiser dated 7 October 2010.

35 "Who Pays To Deny Climate Change", by David Cronin, IPS, 3 October 2010 <http://www.globalissues.org/news/2010/10/03/7143>

36 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/personfactsheet.php?id=17>

37 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=36>

38 <http://www.juandemariana.org/>

39 <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines05/1208-03.htm>

40 Universidad Juan Carlos I, "Study of the effects on employment of public aid to renewable energy sources", Gabriel Calzada Alvarez, March 2009 <http://www.juandemariana.org/pdf/090327-employment-public-aid-renewable.pdf>

41 http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/paltman/credit_for_trying_spanish_stud.html

42 <http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2010/11/23/the-problem-with-spains-green-jobs-model/>

43 <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=115>

44 Greenpeace, USA March 2010, "Koch Industries: Secretly Funding the Climate Denial Machine." <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/koch-industries/#a0>

45 <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/koch-industries/case-study-the-spanish-study/>

46 Email from Instituto Juan de Mariana dated 26 October 2010

47 Templeton Freedom Awards 2010, <http://atlasnetwork.org/blog/2010/10/2010-templeton-freedom-award-winners/>

48 <http://www.cepos.dk/>

49 "Climate Change Predictions: Bad Economics, Bad Science", <http://www.policynetwork.net/sites/default/files/climate%20change%20predictions.pdf>

50 http://www.cepos.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/Arkiv/PDF/Wind_energy_-_the_case_of_Denmark.pdf

51 <http://www.aweablog.org/> archive 15 September 2009 American Wind Energy Association, "The Truth about Wind Power in Denmark"

52 See fi http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/denmark/Danes_Fact_Sheet.pdf

53 <http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2009/09/14/something-rotten-obama-says-danes-receive-20-of-their-power-via-wind-new-study-tells-the-real-story/>

54 <http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/koch-industries/case-study-the-danish-study/>

55 <http://www.institutmolinari.org/>

56 Email by Cécile Phillipe dated 9 November 2010

57 <http://www.hayek-institut.at>

58 <http://www.hayek-institut.at/index.php?popup=0&id=48&publicationType=2&publication=19&PHPSESSID=gjeb8c1oobn4kh9q6obkg0dd43&PHPSESSID=gjeb8c1oobn4kh9q6obkg0dd43>

59 Email from [Dorothee Sommeregger](#) dated 18 November 2010

60 CEO asked them for "an overview of the funding given by your firm to think tanks for any type of activity in Europe related to climate policies (including energy policy, transport policy, fuel policy and any other climate-related issues, as well as any funding which is not earmarked for climate related issues). " Later CEO asked them to specify "if your firm contributes funds (including membership fees but not only that) to the International Policy Network (IPN), the Global Warming Policy Foundation, the Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), Hayek Institute, Institut Economique Molinari, Instituto Juan de Mariana, CFACT Europe and CEPOS."

61 According to Sandbag in 2009 Arcelor Mittal's CO2 emissions in the EU equaled 42,5 million tonnes, Lafarge 15 million tonnes, and in 2008 GDF-Suez CO2 emissions in the EU equaled 43 million tonnes, BP 15 million tonnes, BASF 8 million tonnes, BAYER 2 million tonnes and Solvay 4.5 million tonnes (source www.sandbag.org.uk)

62 Email from Dirk Frenzel, Bayer's spokesperson for public policy and environment, 18 November 2010

63 Email from Erik De Leye, SOLVAY Corporate Press Officer, 19 November 2010

64 <http://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/lookup2.php?strID=C00060103>

65 Email from TOTAL's Director of European Public Affairs, Thierry Reveau de Cyrières, 22 November 2010

66 Several emails by Anne Vauchez, European Public Affairs at Lafarge

67 Telephone conversation and email correspondance with Johanna Coleman, Vice President Communications & Government Relations BASF Brussels Office

68 E.ON also explained that in Germany E.ON also supports national chapters and mentions one as an example, econsense, with €20,452 per year; and that they are actively engaged in business associations such as the ERT; BDI, the German Industry Association, BDEW - German Energy and Water Industry or IZ Klima - Information Centre on CO2 Technologies. E.ON also supports R&D on climate and energy and the E.ON Research Center at Aachen University and EWI-Energy Institue at Cologne University. Email correspondance with Sebastian Tschentscher, Political Affairs and Corporate Communications, E.ON

69 Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO), December 2006 "Brussels think tanks persist in funding secrecy ExxonMobil covertly funds EU climate skeptics", <http://archive.corporateeurope.org/ThinkTankSurvey2006.html> and Corporate Europe Observatory, July 2005, "Transparency unthinkable? Financial secrecy common among EU think tanks", <http://archive.corporateeurope.org/thinktanksurvey.html>