

**Philosophy and Progress**

**Volumes LXXIII-LXXIV, January-June, July-December, 2023**

ISSN 1607-2278 (Print), DOI : <https://doi.org/10.3329/pp.v73i1-2.75231>

## **BUSINESS SHAKES POLITICS: ITS IMPACT ON CLIMATE POLICY**

**Alamgir Hossen Khan\***

### **Abstract**

*Irresponsible carbon emissions by businesses are the leading factor in climate change, which are threatening human civilisation. Global leaders did little to curb industrialists' authoritarianism despite calls from all concerned. Many researchers believe that business has an important role behind policymakers' inaction. In this context, the main objective of this research is to explore the impact of business on climate policy when they shake hands or embrace with politics. This qualitative study used content analysis to meet the objective using primary data from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's Conference of Parties decisions, and so on and secondary literature from books, dissertations, journals, and others. This study demonstrates*

---

\* Assistant Professor, Philosophy OSD, DSHE, Bangladesh, Dhaka. & PhD Fellow, Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi. Email: [alamgirhossen88@gmail.com](mailto:alamgirhossen88@gmail.com)

*that businesses have vehemently opposed climate science since its inception. When the issue became political in the 1980s, animosity intensified as they feared climate regulations would harm their interests. So, initially, they attempted to negate climate science by portraying it as something unproven and promoting climate change as an opportunity for humanity. They additionally applied a variety of strategies like publishing books, periodicals, research articles, and newspaper articles, spreading media propaganda, and giving donations to mislead policymakers. As a result, climate policy formation and implementation are significantly delayed, and business interests are protected. This study implies that businesses will suffer if civilisation collapses due to the unwise use of fossil fuels. Therefore, all stakeholders must prioritise collective interests over individual ones. Otherwise, it will engulf everyone.*

**Keywords:** Climate change, climate policy, business lobby, business-politics collaboration, climate denial.

## 1. Introduction

Climate change is a serious moral problem threatening the world's survival. Irresponsible carbon emissions from businesses are deteriorating it. Scientists consider industrialisation-led climate change and its impact on nature as a 'civilisation-ending risk' (Parson, 2007) or an 'existential threat.' (Kumar, 2021) They urged global leaders to take immediate action to mitigate climate change and thus protect humanity and the ecosystem. After much debate, global leaders, with some exceptions, acknowledged scientific consensus and made climate change a political agenda in the late 1980s. They established many organisations and formed different rules and regulations. Businesses considered the scientific agreement on climate change and its political action as

an existential threat to their operations. They believed politicians could be easily influenced if climate science could be proven wrong. So, they became desperate to deny climate science first. Then, they applied different strategies to make every obstacle to introducing policies. Their obstacles led leaders to withdraw from implementing climate policies and even repealing many laws. As a result, scientific calls to slow the rate of climate change have largely failed. Climate change is speeding up like an unbridled horse rather than slowing down.

In this situation, commercial non-cooperation and antagonism against climate action, and its impact on climate policies must be exposed in detail so that meaningful action can be taken to solve the issues. The study was carried out for exposing those issues. In this study, business refers to carbon-emitting industries and industrialists only, whereas politics refers to climate change negotiations, and policymakers or decision takers.

## **2. The role of business in climate change**

Scientific investigations in the 19th and the 20th centuries demonstrated that industrialisation caused climate change. Investigators like Baron Jean-Baptiste Joseph Fourier (1827), John Tyndall (mid-19th century), Svante August Arrhenius (1896), Guy Stewart Callendar (1938), Roger Revelle (1957), David Keeling (1960), Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina (1974), Warles Braker (1975), and Charney (1979) have contributed to prove that industrialisation is the main cause of global warming. NASA scientist Jim Hansen notably said in 1988 that he was '99% certain' that climate change was triggered by anthropogenic activity. (Jaspal and Nerlich, 2014) Later, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),

representing numerous scientists worldwide, confirmed the claim and warned that if the world continues to emit GHGs at current rates and fails to implement strong climate mitigation strategies, the average global temperature could increase by 2.60-4.8°C by 2100 (BDP 2100). Like the IPCC, all major US scientific bodies, the British Royal Society, and the National Academies of Sciences from 80 states have recognised the agreement. (Cook et al., 2016)

The scientific consensus on industrialisation-led climate change is also supported by peer-reviewed scientific literature. Cook et al. (2013) analysed 11944 abstracts containing the terms ‘global climate change’ and ‘global warming’ from 1991 to 2011. According to the study, 97.1% abstract agreed, whereas 0.7% rejected anthropogenic global warming. Other researchers like Oreskes (2004); Stenhouse et al. (2014), Doran and Zimmerman (2009), Verheggen et al. (2014), Anderegg et al. (2010), Carlton et al. (2015), and many others did comprehensive research about the scientific consensus manmade climate change.

### **3. Business efforts to combat climate change**

All but a few believe that fossil fuels are the leading cause of global warming. Now the question arises, are they only changing the climate, or have they taken steps to prevent it? There are two ways to assess the role of the fossil fuel industry: a positive role and a negative role. But the researcher notes with great dismay that fossil fuel businesses have a significant role to play in deteriorating climate change, but not a significant role in preventing it. No academic literature regarding this has been seen by the researcher also. What business industries sometimes refer to as ‘green marketing’ is actually what many

call ‘greenwashing’ (Client Earth). Because they advertise about green marketing, but in reality, they remain in fossil fuel business and misguide people about the harmful effects of their products. For instance, BP spent millions of dollars for advertising on low-carbon energy or carbon neutrality, renewable energy, waste reduction, clean development mechanism, and cleaner natural gas campaigns in 2019. But in reality, more than 96% of the annual expenditure of that year was spent on the promotion of gas and oil. (ClientEarth, 2022) This applies not only to BP, but to all industries. Their main moto is to sell more oil and gas and earn more.

Recently some companies have come forward to develop renewable energy technology in contrast to the fossil fuel industry. They dramatically reduced the price of the wind generator and solar photovoltaics equipment. (UN, (n.d) Furthermore, they developed carbon capture and storage technology and managed methane emissions throughout the fossil energy value chain, which will help meet ambitious CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction targets. This type of industry is increasing daily, but it is still too small compared to fossil fuel industries.

#### **4. Political action against climate change**

Scientific evidence on industrialisation-led climate change has led conscious individuals, research institutes, NGOs, media, and social movements to put climate change on the political agenda and urged global leaders to act immediately to slow it down. The policymakers could not ignore this appeal of the conscious circles. So, in the 1970s, climate change was adopted as a political agenda. As a part of this, the first international environmental summit was held in Stockholm in 1972. This Conference led

to establish United Nations Environment Programme and also worked as a catalyst in the growth of “Green Movements” and “Green Politics” (Kumar, 2007). The first IPCC conference in Toronto recognised climate change as a worldwide issue, warned of its negative consequences, and recommended conserving the global climate for future generations by reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 20% by 2005.

The global leaders reached a consensus on limiting GHG emissions in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. The initial goal of the UNFCCC was to stabilise emissions at 1990 levels by 2000, and its final objective was the “stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” (Article 2, UNFCCC) The first Conference of the Parties (COP1) of the UNFCCC held in Berlin in 1995, with a more substantial emission reduction commitment. Since then, 27 COPs have been held and multiple initiatives have been taken to control the rate of climate change. Among these conferences, some plan of action and agreements were very crucial for climate negotiations. Some of are: the Kyoto Protocol, the Buenos Aires Plan of Action, the Marrakech Accords, the Delhi Declaration, the Bali Action Plan, the Copenhagen Accord, the Paris Agreement, and the Glasgow Climate Pact.

A number of dominant climate issues have been discussed in these conferences. Some of these are reducing carbon emissions by utilising low-carbon energy, carbon neutrality, carbon trading, cap and trade, clean development mechanism, keeping global warming to 1.5–2<sup>0</sup>C over pre-industrial levels,

developing CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration technologies and efficiencies, phasing out of coal-fired power stations, accelerating the phase-out of fossil-fuel cars, promoting renewable energy, establishing climate finance mechanism, founding climate change adaptation and mitigation fund, imposing adaptation tax, capacity building for climate-vulnerable people, loss and damage agreement, preserving biodiversity with marine and terrestrial habitats, banning illegal wildlife trade, afforestation and reforestation, sustainable agriculture, reduce transboundary pollution, transferring technologies to the developing countries, adaptation and mitigation measures, etc.

To meet these issues, many policy suggestions have come. Responding to these suggestions, global policymakers introduced various laws, policies, and regulations to limit GHG emissions. Eskander, Fankhauser, and Setzer (2021) found that, before 1990, global climate change legislation was only 35. During 1990–1999, 2000–2009, and 2010–2019, the numbers passing of new climate legislation were 110, 554, and about 1100 respectively. In 2013, a total of 33 countries passed climate change laws. The total reached 66 by 2015 and 198 by 2019. Now every nation has a climate change law or policy.

## **5. Business shakes climate politics**

Considering the global action against carbon emissions, business organisations (including oil, coal, gas, chemical, and automobile industries) thought that the emerging climate science, new mitigation policies and regulations would curb their business. So, to impede climate action, they shake or embrace with politics. To do this business took some strategies which are as follows.

### **5.1. Denial of climate science**

Businesses thought climate science to be the foundation for climate action. So, science must be proven wrong to delay policy formulation and implementation. With this intention, they first took a stand against climate science. Over 50 potentially affected industries and trade associations like ExxonMobil, Texaco, BP, Total, Koch Industries, Chevron Corporation, Peabody Coal (PC), Chrysler, Ford, the American Petroleum Institute (API), General Motors, US Chamber of Commerce, Murray Energy, National Association of Manufacturers, and National Mining Association (NMA) become united and quickly adopted the strategies of ‘manufacturing’ uncertainty and doubt to plague climate science. They decided to recruit high-profile representatives from business, public officials, and other individuals for promoting climate science as ‘sound science,’ and ‘junk science.’ (Washington, and Cook, 2011). So, they formed a number of umbrella groups i.e., conservative think tanks (CTTs), front groups, Astroturf Groups, conservative media and journalist. Researchers have identified some CTTs groups. Some of them are shown in Table 1:



Table 1: List of some CTTs

Name of the CTTs	Year of establishment	Country origin
Hoover Institution	1919	USA
American Enterprise Institute	1938	
Heritage Foundation	1973	
Cato Institute	1977	
American Council on Science and Health	1978	
Claremont Institute	1979	
Pacific Research Institute	1979	
National Center for Policy Analysis	1983	
George Marshall Institute	1984	
Citizens for a Sound Economy Foundation	1984	
Competitive Enterprise Institute	1984	
Heartland Institute	1984	
Global Climate Coalition (GCC)	1989	
National Wetland Coalition	1989	
Fred Singer's Science and Environmental Policy Project	1990	
Information Council on the Environment	1991	
Cooler Heads Coalition	1997	
Greening Earth Society	1998	
Robert Ferguson's Science and Public Policy Institute	2007	

Austrian Economics Centre	2007	Austria
Fraser Institute	1974	Canada
Instituto Juan de Mariana	2005	Spain
Liberales Institut	1979	Switzerland
Institut Économique Molinari	2003	France
Liberales Institut	1979	Germany
Europäisches Institut für Klima und Energie	2007	
Institute of Public Affairs	1943	Australia
Australian Environment Foundation	2005	
Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)	1955	United Kingdom
Centre for Policy Studies (CPS)	1974	
Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF)	2009	
Atlas Economic Research Foundation	1981	

Source: McCright and Dunlap (2003, 2011); Busch and Judick (2021); and Washington and Cook (2011)

These coordinated and well-funded machine or ‘industry’ typically serve as spokespersons and facilitators for fossil fuel industries (Dunlap, and McCright, 2011) and have consistently challenged scientific findings on ACC. They launched a public and political crusade against climate rules and regulations (Vormedal, 2011) as they consider climate science as a ‘religion.’ (Selby, 2019)

They also recruited some contrarian scientists (e.g., Patrick Michaels, Willie Soon, Fred Singer, Sallie Baliunas, Robert Carter, Ian Plimer) to meet their demand. Fred Singer’s Heartland Institute founded the Nongovernmental International

Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) in the early 2000s as an alternative to the IPCC. The NIPCC published *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science* in 2013, a scientific report that directly responds to the IPCC's *Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis*. The NIPCC report is an exclusive element in the politicisation of climate science (Idso, Carter, and Singer, 2015). Furthermore, the Murdoch-owned *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Post*, and Moon's *Washington Times* have been among the most crucial conservative print media to disprove climate science. Other notable contributors (magazines) include *Weekly Standard*, *National Review*, *American Spectator*, and online publication the *American Thinker*. (Dunlap, and McCright, 2011)

Carrington (2023) showed that six fossil fuel companies gave 27 US universities over \$700 million in research support from 2010 to 2020 to do research as per their demand. As a strategy to prove climate science unproven and unscientific, CTTs started to publish books. This strategy started from 1980s and it increased rapidly. Dunlap, and Jacques (2013) identified that from 1980s to 2000s, as much as 108 climate denial books were written.

## **5.2. Making ties with policymakers**

Along with climate denial, business organisation tried to get entrance to the policymakers. So they make a tight relation with the policymakers. Newell, and Paterson (1998) found that lobbyists had tight ties to senior bureaucrats in the trade, commerce, and finance ministries. Member of the World Coal Institute, Christophe Bouillon said, "We have many and wonderful contacts with ministries of industries... it is a battle between those ministries at the national level. Our influence probably

goes further because the trade ministries are more powerful than the environment ministries” (*ibid.*, p. 689). Even lobbyists have privileged access to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and the UNFCCC’s secretariat. For example, in the UN event in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt (COP27), a total of 636 oil and gas lobbyists were registered to attend the event. (Michaelson, 2022) So, before introducing any climate policy, governments often contact energy lobbyists.

Business lobbyists even prescribed politicians how to speak on climate issues. The Environmental Working Group got such a directory in 2002, written by Republican pollster Frank Luntz. It directs Republican candidates on how to speak about environmental issues, including tips on ‘winning the global warming debate.’ Luntz insisted that “voters believe that there is *no consensus* on global warming within the scientific community. Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly.” (Edwards, 2010: 109)

The lobby also sponsored lots of economic research, claiming that GHG rules and regulations would lead to catastrophic economic decline and that initiatives to curb emissions by 20% would cut GDP by roughly 4% and result in the loss of 1.1 million jobs. (Vormedal, 2011) They propose deferring action until more is known about the causes and impacts of climate change.

### **5.3. Business donation to policymakers**

Businesses think that policymakers formulate policies; so, their jobs will be much easier if they can be managed. Considering this, the business lobbyists applied their most powerful instrument. They regularly spend millions of dollars of dark money on the

policymakers. Brulle (2018) shows that over 16 years, from 2000 to 2016, more than \$2 billion was expended on climate lobbying. According to the Center for American Progress (2019, 2021), \$68,359,582 has been given to 150 United States members of Congress in the 116th Congress, and \$61 million has been given to 139 members in the 117th US Congress by the business organisation. Waldman (2023) has shown that in the 118th Congress (2023-2024), the top 50 House members who received donations from oil and gas companies received approximately \$28 million.

Outside of the USA, climate change denial industries are active in Australia. The Australian Labor Party, the Liberal Party, and the National Party received approximately \$19 million in donations from fossil fuel companies in 2018-19. The figure was around \$1.28 million in 2017-18, \$0.97 million in 2016-17, and \$1.03 million in 2015-16. The actual figure could be five to ten times higher (marketforce.org, 2020). Regarding the UK, Liz Truss, the Prime Minister, worked for Shell. Since 2019, her Conservative Party has received £1.5 million in donations from the fossil fuel industries. Kwasi Kwarteng, Chancellor of the Exchequer, received £16,000 and £4,500 from the same sources for his 2019 election campaign. (Green world, 2022) The Labour Party also received £18,400. By investigating into the European Transparency Register, Greenpeace discovered that companies spent up to 33.3 million Euros influencing EU decision-makers. (Carter, and McClenaghan, 2016)

## **6. The impact of business on climate policy**

These various businesses' strategies behind climate policymakers have succeeded. Many policymakers are caught up in companies'

tricks, whether they realize it or not. As a result, formulating and implementing climate policy has faced a significant impact. Some of them are focused below:

### **6.1. Patronisation of climate deniers**

Patronisation of climate deniers by policymakers is one of the greatest successes of business. Demands for climate policy first originated in the USA. Hence, climate denial and anti-climate views also originated there. Later, it spread to other countries. At the peak moment of climate negotiation in the 1980s, under the Reagan Administration (1981–1989), Julian Simon, named and honoured by CTTs, immediately became an ex-officio consultant and influenced US population policy considerably. (Dunlap and McCright, 2010) Reagan appointed Conservative scientist William Nierenberg who supported free market solutions to social issues as Chairman of the US National Academy of Sciences to review the scientific evidence of acid rain under White House science adviser George Keyworth. Nierenberg altered the executive summary of the committee's report to make acid rain appear less urgent. (Washington, and John Cook, 2011)

The Bush administration also appointed several prominent climate deniers in some vital posts. To manage the Office for Climate Change Policy, the administration appointed ex-oil lobbyist Philip Cooney as chief of staff at the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) without scientific credentials. Cooney edited federal bureaucracy climate change reports to reduce climate action at the CEQ. A House committee investigation found that Cooney made roughly 300 changes to the strategic plan for the climate change science programme

to “exaggerate or emphasise scientific uncertainties or to deemphasise or diminish the importance of the human role in global warming.” (Vormedal, 2011: 9) Furthermore, Bush employed Larisa E. Dobriansky, a former ExxonMobil activist as deputy assistant secretary for national energy policy; J. Steven Griles, a former coal industry executive and lobbyist with ties to the API and the NMA, as Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Thomas Sansonetti, a mining lobbyist formerly employed by PC, as Assistant Attorney General for Environment and Natural Resources (AAGENR); and David Lauriski, a former Utah Mining Association board member and general counsel, as AAGENR (Balková, 2020). The impacts of business on US climate policy became more obvious under President Donald Trump (2017-2021). He frequently advocated climate-skeptic arguments. (Busch and Judick, 2021) In 2018, he withdrew from the Paris Agreement, calling climate change a ‘hoax,’ ‘non-existent,’ or ‘mythical’ (Blondeel and Graaf, 2018), and took all necessary steps to impede climate science and outreach, including removing the word ‘climate change’ from government documents and hacking and repealing various environmental rules. When a team of government bureaucrats and scientists brought out a volume of the National Climate Assessment to the President, Trump denied it, saying, “I don’t believe it. No, no, I don’t believe it.” (Sangomla, 2020) He labelled campaigner Greta Thunberg an ‘alarmist’ who sought to ‘control every aspect of our lives’ (Cheun, 2020). Trump selected Scott Pruitt to run the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), known as President Obama’s Climate Action Plan. Scott Pruitt led multiple cases against the EPA and recently argued that global warming is not due to anthropogenic activity. (Selby, 2019) Trump also employed Rex Tillerson, ex-ExxonMobil CEO, as Secretary of

State; Rick Perry as Energy Secretary; Jim Bridenstine as NASA Administrator; and Kathleen Hartnett White as CEQ Chair (*ibid*).

It is well acknowledged that conservative governments from all over the world maintained good relations with climate denial scientists and businesses. (Dunlap and McCright, 2010) In the United States, Republicans promote conservative or anti-climate groups and policies (Agrawala, 1998), while Democrats favour pro-environmental groups and policies. Presidents from Democrat Party— Clinton, Obama, and Biden— attempted to execute climate-friendly measures. However, in most cases, they were unable to implement proper policies due to the conspiracy of businesses and their conservative friends. In some cases, they were even compelled to align themselves with the opposition's demands. For example, in the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress (2023-2024), Republican Cathy McMorris Rodgers, now head of the powerful House Energy and Commerce Committee (ECC), Republican August Pfluger, also appointed to the ECC, and Hunt served on the House Judiciary and Natural Resources committees. (Waldman, 2023)

The number of deniers in the US Congress proves how much influence businesses have over policymakers. Different research organisation (think progress, 2013, American Progress Association, 2015) and individuals (Emerson and Neuschatz, 2017) identified the number of climate deniers in the US Congress. (see Table 2)



Table 2: Number of climate denial in US Congress

Congress no.	Period	Number of climate deniers in the House	Number of climate deniers in the Senate	Total climate deniers in the Congress
113 <sup>th</sup>	2013-2014	133	30	163
114 <sup>th</sup>	2015-2016	131	38	169
115 <sup>th</sup>	2017-2018	232	53	285
116 <sup>th</sup>	2019-2020	200	50	250
117 <sup>th</sup>	2021-2022	109	30	139

In the 113<sup>th</sup> US Congress, majority of science and environmental committee members were climate deniers. Seventeen out of 22 Republican House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology members, 22 of 30 Republican House Energy and Commerce Committee members, and 100% of Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Republicans denied the existence of ACC. Even the 2016 Republican nominees were all climate skeptic. They believed that ‘there’s been zero warming’ and ‘climate change is not science, it’s religion,’ and expressed that any particular measure would ‘destroy the American economy.’ (Selby, 2019)

Not only in the USA, but climate change denial seems to thrive in countries with conservative governments. The countries that deny ACC are the UK, Canada, Australia, Denmark, Germany, the Czech Republic, France, etc. Tony Abbott, the 2013–2015 Australian Prime Minister, became a convinced climate contrarian and said ACC is unclear. Consequently, he fiercely opposed climate policies, believing that they would hurt

the Australian economy. (Pryck and Gemenne, 2017) Canada's Prime Minister, Stephen Harper (2006–2015), had the same idea (ibid). Another skeptic is Czech President Vaclav Klaus (2003–2013). He compared global warming to communism. Klaus was connected to American conservative lobbies, attending multiple Heartland Institute conferences (ibid). During the primary elections, former French President Nicolas Sarkozy suggested that human activity did not cause climate change (ibid). Considering this global journey of climate denial by the global leaders, Monbiot recently wrote: "Climate change denial is spreading like a contagious disease." (Washington and Cook, 2011: 109)

## **6.2. Impeding the implementation of climate policy**

Through the influence of businesses, policymakers often abstained from policy formation and sometimes nullified the previous regulation. George H. W. Bush (1989–1993), and OPEC nations can be mentioned in this regard. Bush was influenced by a coal industry-funded videotape named *The Greening of Planet Earth*. (Edwards, 2010) In response to these consequences, H. W. Bush signed the UNFCCC in 1992 but did not include mandatory objectives or deadlines for emission reductions. (Vormedal, 2011) The lobby also successfully eliminated the 'common measures' language from article 2(e) of a draft conference text in COP1. It directed that policy would be established nationally, allowing lobbyists to influence again. (Newell and Paterson, 1998) The GCC, a vibrant climate denial organisation, saw their effort as a success.

After the George H.W. Bush regime, when Clinton (1993–2001) suggested a BTU tax to meet his presidential campaign

target of limiting emissions to 1990 levels in 1993, the business lobby quickly began to undermine it amid widespread opposition. So, the bill ended up being dead in 1993. (Vormedal, 2011) After one year from this incident, in the 10<sup>th</sup> Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Climate Change meeting in August 1994, Clinton administration planned to cut emission of 1990 levels by the year 2000. To foil the plan, US power producers set out an extensive construction program of fossil-fired power plants throughout the next two decades, increasing US emissions from electric power by 35% over 1990 levels by 2014. (Newell and Paterson, 1998) Even in Congress, the GCC was able to secure the backing of a significant number of Republicans. In a 1995 congressional hearing, Dana Rohrabacher, the chair of the House Science Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, convinced several industry-funded 'skeptics' to give testimony before her committee, after which she openly declared global warming to be 'liberal clap trap.' (Vormedal, 2011) Later that year, the House passed legislation prohibiting the EPA from funding climate change research.

Business lobbyists also worked against the US ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. To prevent US participation, they allegedly choose Senator Chuck Hagel and Senator Robert Byrd. They sponsor a 'sense of the senate' resolution and argued that "The United States should not be a signatory to any protocol, at negotiations in Kyoto or thereafter, which do not mandate developing nations to abide by the same restriction imposed on the United States, or that would result in serious harm to the US economy." (Vormedal, 2011)

Just four months before the Kyoto meeting, the US Senate unanimously adopted Byrd-Hagel (97-0). Frederick Sietz, a

contrarian scientist wrote the Oregon Petition, which urged the US government to reject the Kyoto Protocol. (Washington and Cook, 2011) They also ran ads on television against it. They were even instrumental in launching a violent assault on climate scientist Benjamin Santer. (Dunlap and McCright, 2011)

The USA, along with Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada requested the EU to lessen its emission-reduction targets. Finally, under the pressure from world leaders, the US delegates finally consented to a commitment for industrialised nations to cut their GHG emissions by an average of 5.2% below 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. But the President never submitted the treaty to the Senate for enactment because it would have been defeated humiliatingly. W. Bush declared in 2000 that his government would officially withdraw the signature on the Kyoto Protocol because of an absence of Senate favour and its adverse impact on development, employment, and US business competitiveness. George W. Bush walked away from the Kyoto Protocol agreements in 2001. So, the Coalition's job was done.

On the first day of Donald Trump's presidency, the White House website declared that Obama's EPA would be eliminated, calling it 'harmful and unnecessary.' (Davenport, and Rubin, 2017) In March 2017, Trump signed an executive order formally repealing EPA to revitalise the coal industry. (Davenport, and Rubin, 2017) Other anti-climate policies adopted by Trump include the Keystone XL oil pipeline, official withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, and exclusion of climate change issues from the US national security agenda. (Selby, 2019) A bill was also submitted to reduce financial contributions to the IPCC, UNFCCC, and Green Climate Fund. (Pryck, and Gemenne, 2017)

Outside of USA, Denmark government decided to impose energy tax. Hearing this, Dutch heavy industry threatened government and declared that if the government introduced this unilaterally, they would relocate and transfer their new investments to abroad. Considering the prospective economic stagnancy, the government subsequently postponed this decision. In this way, industry protests effectively put an end to the proposal at birth. (Newell, and Paterson, 1998) The same incident has also been enacted in EU. The Trans-European Road Network, EU's road-building programme, was developed by several industries including the European Round Table of Industrialists and the International Roads Federation. This road network could increase carbon emissions by 15–18%. (Newell, and Paterson, 1998) Governments wanted to stop this project, but they found it very difficult to deviate. Actually, they were helpless.

The German government was also helpless. In Germany, industry actively volunteered to reduce emissions on a condition that government would delay regulatory steps to tackle climate change. In response to German businesses strengthening voluntary CO<sub>2</sub> reduction agreements, the German government said, "For its part... it has no plans to introduce a national CO<sub>2</sub>/energy tax and would exempt those parts of the industry that adhere to the voluntary commitment from any EU-wide tax." (Newell and Paterson, 1998)

Mark Diesendorf and Guy Pearse showed how the CEOs of major fossil fuel manufacturers and consumers known as 'Greenhouse Mafia' met with then-Australian Prime Minister John Howard to limit renewable energy growth. Finally, the Howard administration implemented a greenhouse policy on

their suggestion. (Washington and Cook, 2011) Furthermore, he also played a vital role against Kyoto protocol. (Dunlap and McCright 2011) Even the pro-environment Labour administration couldn't oppose industry and Garnaut Climate Review proposals. Business non-cooperation prevented the Labour government from fulfilling its renewable energy election promises. These include not funding the Energy Innovation Fund, meeting its 20% Renewable Energy Target, and significantly decreasing household solar electricity subsidies. (Washington and Cook, 2011)

In the UK, CTTs like the IEA, GWPF, and CPS are part of the *Tufton Street* network, which advocated for a hard Brexit and a deregulatory US-UK trade deal (Almiron et al., 2020), causing political chaos. The Brexit debate clarified the presence of climate deniers and their influence over UK politics.

### **6.3. Protection of carbon-emitting business' interests**

Business knows very well how to make their business profitable. They adopted these business strategies with the politicians and profited a lot. They received much more than they invested. According to Oil Change International (2023), total amount spent by big oil, gas, and coal industries in 113<sup>th</sup> Congress is \$350m. In the same Congress, they get subsidies of \$41.8b which is 11,900% more than they expend for lobbying. It demonstrates the global leaders' enthusiasm and the corporations' privileges. Charles Lindblom stated in *Politics and Markets* that in this regard "businessmen occupy a privileged position." (Falkner, 2009)

IMF research illustrated how much the heads of state protected business interests. The IMF found that the fossil fuel

industries got \$7tn explicit and implicit subsidies from 172 countries in 2022. This is 7.1% of global GDP, roughly two times of what the world spends on education and two-thirds of all healthcare spending. (Black, 2023) As per IMF data, 172 nations' fossil fuel subsidies from 2015 to 2022 are shown in Table 3:

Table 3: Year-wise data of fossil fuel subsidies in 172 countries

Year	Implicit subsidy (amount in trillion)	Explicit subsidy (amount in trillion)	Total subsidy (amount in trillion)
2017	\$4.3	\$0.4	\$4.7
2018	\$4.8	\$0.6	\$5.4
2019	\$5.0	\$0.6	\$5.6
2020	\$4.5	\$0.5	\$5.0
2021	\$5.2	\$0.7	\$5.9
2022	\$5.7	\$1.3	\$7.0

Source: Black, Parry, and Vernon (2023)

This table demonstrates that global leaders are tremendously subsidising fossil fuel businesses. The IMF identified G20 countries as responsible for 80% of global carbon emissions; in 2009, these countries promised to phase out 'inefficient' fossil fuel subsidies. According to Bloomberg NEF and Bloomberg Philanthropies (2023), in 2022, the G20 spent a record \$1.4tn on fossil fuel subsidies, up from \$693 billion in 2021. The EU blocs of G20 subsidies declined by 2% yearly from 2015 to \$636bn in 2019. But over the same time, Australia raised its subsidies for fossil fuels by 48%, Canada by 40%, and the USA by 37%. Subsidies in the UK decreased by 18% in 2019 but remained at

\$17 billion. The most significant donations originate from the USA, China, Japan, Russia, and India, accounting for two-thirds of subsidies internationally. (Yale E360, 2020)

This subsidising is contrary to scientific demands. Whereas environmentally conscious people advocate for renewable energy sources, the global leaders promote fossil fuel industries. For example, UK policymakers met with 63 fossil fuel and biomass producers between July 2019 and March 2021, which is nine times the number of meetings with renewable energy companies. According to the analysis of Liberal Democrats, renewable energy earned £60 billion in subsidies, but fossil fuel businesses received over £80 billion. (Carrington, 2023)

## **7. Conclusion and recommendations**

By declaring crusade against climate science and regulations, the business played one of the most dangerous and perplexing games. Their deceptive propaganda and multifaceted denial strategies inevitably influenced lawmakers. As a result, policymakers patronised climate deniers by appointing them as executives in different scientific agencies, dissolving advisory panels and scientific programmes, humiliating and attacking climate scientists and movements, presenting climate science as a matter of ideological conflict, prioritising economic development, delaying or postponing climate policy formation and implementation, subsidising fossil fuel industries, cutting environmental portfolio funding, prioritising climate deniers in elections, emphasising industry-relevant research, and more. So, this paradoxical stance on both businesses and policy makers must avoid. The gap between the commitments and actions on climate policy must be bridged.



It's true that, the state's development and the provision of providing people with basic requirements are heavily reliant on industrial development and manufacturing. So that the global leaders are bound to obey the business interests. But, by doing this, they are making an unjust world where underdeveloped countries are becoming more vulnerable and developed countries are growing rapidly. This unequal system cannot be allowed to continue. To establish a justice-based global system, all the stakeholders related to climate change should implement relevant policies to make businesses more sustainable so that economic growth may ensure life and livelihood, be healthy, and safeguard the environment and biodiversity. Otherwise, irresponsible and uncontrolled carbon emissions will destroy human civilisation, which is being predicted by climate scientists.

It is also mentionable that policies are not the only criterion for ensuring justice. It can only be ensured if policy and goodwill come together. The history of climate politics shows that hundreds of thousands of laws have been enacted to control the authoritarian form of climate change but have failed to control it. So, all stakeholders concerned with climate change must first ensure that they really want to control the rate of climate change. Furthermore, both business and politics must avoid strategic roles in creating and implementing climate policy. Otherwise, the law will only adorn the page of paper and will have no role in reality.

Additionally, both the fossil fuel industry and policymakers must move away from self-interest and embrace utilitarianism. They must pay particular attention to the vulnerability of underdeveloped countries when formulating policies. Uncontrolled carbon emissions in the developed world have already threatened the existence of underdeveloped countries

and must ensure that no further threats are created. Because just as the pain of a small part of the body hurts the whole body, the adverse effects of climate will not be limited only to underdeveloped countries, but it will consume the entire world. Therefore, the sooner world leaders and business organisations forget the conflict of interest and take effective steps on climate actions, the better it will be for all.

Businesses and policymakers must heed the call to focus on global renewable energy. Instead of giving incentives to fossil fuel industries, industries that are interested in working with renewable energy should be patronised. Along with this, it is also necessary to provide necessary support for technological advancement. Furthermore, the public's attitude should also be changed on consuming fossil fuel product.

Finally, we urge the two primary actors in climate change, business and politics, to take immediate measures to ensure sustainable development by slowing the rate of climate change. We hope that all the stakeholders in climate policy will prioritise collective interests over individual interests. We also hope that by working together, we can create a more humane world.

## **Bibliography**

- Agrawala, S. (1998). Context and Early Origins of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *Climatic Change*, 39(4), 605-620. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1005315532386>
- Almiron, N., Boykoff, M., Narberhaus, M., & Heras, F. (2020). Dominant Counter-frames in Influential Climate Contrarian European Think Tanks. *Climatic Change*, 162(4), 2003–2020. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02820-4>

- American Progress Association. (2015). Anti-Science Climate Denier Caucus: 114th Congress. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogressaction.org/article/anti-science-climate-denier-caucus-114th-congress/>
- Balková, T. (2020). *Fossil fuels lobby and climate change: Influencing the discourse in politics and media*. Retrieved from <https://dspace.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/119216>
- BDP 2100- Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100.
- Black, S. (2023). IMF Fossil Fuel Subsidies Data: 2023 update. *IMF Working Papers*, 2023(169), 1. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400249006.001>
- Black, Simon, Parry, Ian, and Vernon, Nate. (2023). Fossil Fuel Subsidies Surged to Record \$7 Trillion. Accessed November 19, 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2023/08/24/fossil-fuel-subsidies-surged-to-record-7-trillion>
- Blondeel, M., & Van De Graaf, T. (2018). Toward a Global Coal Mining Moratorium? A Comparative Analysis of Coal Mining Policies in the USA, China, India and Australia. *Climatic Change*, 150(1–2), 89–101. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-2135-5>.
- Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2023). 2021 Support for Fossil Fuels by G-20 Nations Reached Highest Level Since 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.org/press/2021-support-for-fossil-fuels-by-g-20-nations-reached-highest-level-since-2014/>.
- Brulle, R. J. (2018). The climate lobby: A sectoral analysis of lobbying spending on climate change in the USA, 2000 to 2016. *Climatic Change*, 149(3–4), 289–303. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-018-2241-z>
- Busch, T., & Judick, L. (2021). Climate Change—That Is Not Real! A Comparative Analysis of Climate-Sceptic Think Tanks in the USA and Germany. *Climatic Change*, 164(1–2), 18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-02962-z>

- Carlton, J. S. Perry-Hill, R., Huber, M. & Prokopy, L. S. (2015). The Climate Change Consensus Extends Beyond Climate Scientists. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(9), 094025. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/9/094025>.
- Carrington, D. & D. C. E. (2023). Fossil Fuels Being Subsidised at Rate of \$13m a Minute, says IMF. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/aug/24/fossil-fuel-subsidies-imf-report-climate-crisis-oil-gas-coal>
- Carter, J. S. C. Maeve McClenaghan, Lawrence. (2016). *Revealed: How the gas industry spent tens of millions of pounds lobbying UK & EU policymakers*. Unearthed. Retrieved from <https://unearthed.greenpeace.org/2016/02/25/revealed-gas-industry-millions-pounds-lobbying-policymakers/>
- Center for American Progress Action (2021). Climate Deniers in the 117th Congress. March 30, 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/climate-deniers-117th-congress/>.
- Center for American Progress Action. (2019). Climate Deniers in the 116th Congress. January 28, 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogressaction.org/article/climate-deniers-116th-congress/>.
- Cheun, H. (2020). What does Trump actually believe on climate change? BBC News. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-51213003>
- ClientEarth (2022). *Fossil fuels and climate change: The facts*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.clientearth.org/latest/news/fossil-fuels-and-climate-change-the-facts/>
- ClientEarth, *The greenwashing files*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.clientearth.org/projects/the-greenwashing-files/>
- Cook, J., Nuccitelli, D., Green, S. A., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., Way, R., Jacobs, P., & Skuce, A. (2013). Quantifying the Consensus on Anthropogenic Global Warming in The Scientific

- Literature. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(2), 024024. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/2/024024>
- Cook, J. Oreskes, N., Doran, P. T. Anderegg, W. R. L. Verheggen, B., Maibach, E. W., Carlton, J. S., Lewandowsky, S., Skuce, A. G., Green, S. A., Nuccitelli, D., Jacobs, P., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., & Rice, K. (2016). Consensus on Consensus: A Synthesis of Consensus Estimates on Human-Caused Global Warming. *Environmental Research Letters*, 11(4), 048002. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/048002>.
- Davenport, Coral, & Rubin, Alissa J. (2017). Trump Signs Executive Order Unwinding Obama Climate Policies. The New York Times. ISSN 0362-4331
- Doran, P. T., & Zimmerman, M. K. (2009). Examining the Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 90(3), 22–23. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009EO030002>.
- Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. (2011). Organized Climate Change Denial. *The Oxford handbook of climate change and society*, 1, 144-160.
- Dunlap, R., & McCright, A. (2010). Climate Change Denial: Sources, Actors and Strategies. *Routledge Handbook of Climate Change and Society* ed C Lever-Tracy. Milton Park.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Jacques, Peter J. (2013). Climate Change Denial Books and Conservative Think Tanks: Exploring the Connection *American Behavioral Scientist* 57, no. 6. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213477096>.
- Edwards, Paul N. (2010) *A Vast Machine: Computer Models, Climate Data, and the Politics of Global Warming*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Emerson, S. & Neuschatz, K. (2017, April 28). The Climate Change Deniers in Congress. *Vice*. <https://www.vice.com/en/article/pg5zqg/a-guide-to-the-climate-change-deniers-in-congress>

- Eskander, S. Fankhauser, S. & Setzer, J. (2021). Global Lessons from Climate Change Legislation and Litigation. *Environmental and Energy Policy and the Economy*, 2, 44–82. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1086/711306>.
- Falkner, R. (2009). Business and Global Climate Governance: A Neo-Pluralist Perspective. *Business and Global Governance*, ed. M. Ougaard and A. Leander. London: Routledge.
- Green World. (2022). Fossil Fuels and Government Corruption. Retrieved from <https://greenworld.org.uk/article/fossil-fuels-and-government-corruption>.
- Idso, C. D., Carter, R. M., & Singer, S. F. (2015). Why Scientists Disagree about Global Warming. *The Heartland Institute. Non-Profit Research Organization*.
- Jaspal, R. & Nerlich, B. (2014). When Climate Science Became Climate Politics: British Media Representations of Climate Change in 1988. *Public Understanding of Science*, 23(2), 122–141. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662512440219>.
- Kumar, A., Nagar, S., & Anand, S. (2021). Climate Change and Existential Threats. In *Global climate change* (pp. 1-31). Elsevier.
- Kumar, D. (2007). Coping with Climate Change: A Comparative Study of Bangladesh and India. PhD Dissertation: Jawaharlal Nehru University, India.
- Marketforce.org. (2020). Australia’s major political parties, brought to you by fossil fuels! Retrieved from <https://www.marketforces.org.au/politicaldonations2020/>
- McCright, A. M. & Dunlap, R. E. (2003). Defeating Kyoto: The Conservative Movement’s Impact on U. S. Climate Change Policy. *Social Problems*, 50(3), 348–373. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2003.50.3.348>

- Michaelson, R. (2022). Explosion' in Number of Fossil Fuel Lobbyists at Cop27 Climate Summit. *The Guardian*. Retrived from <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/nov/10/big-rise-in-number-of-fossil-fuel-lobbyists-at-cop27-climate-summit>
- Newell, P., & Paterson, M. (1998). A climate for Business: Global Warming, the State and Capital. *Review of International Political Economy*, 5(4), 679–703. Retrived from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4177292>.
- Oil Change International. (2023). Fossil Fuel Funding to Congress: Industry Influence in the U.S. Accessed July 16, 2023, Retrived from <https://priceofoil.org/fossil-fuel-industry-influence-in-the-u-s/>.
- Oreskes, N. (2004). The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. *Science*, 306(5702), 1686–1686. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103618>
- Parson, E. A. (2007). The Big One: A Review of Richard Posner's *Catastrophe: Risk and Response*. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45(1), 147–164. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.45.1.147>
- Pryck, K. De & Gemenne, F. (2017). The Denier-in-Chief: Climate Change, Science and The Election of Donald J. Trump. *Law and Critique*, 28(2), 119–126. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-017-9207-6>.
- Sangomla, Akshit. (2020). US Elections 2020: A History of Trump's Climate Change Denial. Accessed September 6, 2022. Retrived from <https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/climate-change/us-elections-2020-a-history-of-trump-s-climate-change-denial-74075>.
- Selby, J. (2019). The Trump Presidency, Climate Change, and the Prospect of a Disorderly Energy Transition. *Review of International Studies*, 45(3), 471–490. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210518000165>.

- Stenhouse, N., Maibach, E., Cobb, S., Ban, R., Bleistein, A., Croft, P., Bierly, E., Seitter, K., Rasmussen, G., & Leiserowitz, A. (2014). Meteorologists' Views about Global Warming: A Survey of American Meteorological Society Professional Members. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 95(7), 1029–1040. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00091.1>
- Think Progress. (2013). The Anti-Science Climate Denier Caucus: 113th Congress Edition. Retrived from <https://archive.thinkprogress.org/the-anti-science-climate-denier-caucus-113th-congress-edition-82ef03690c02/>;
- UN (n.d.). *The role of fossil fuels in a sustainable energy system*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/role-fossil-fuels-sustainable-energy-system>
- Verheggen, B. Strengers, B. Cook, J., Van Dorland, R., Vringer, K., Peters, J., Visser, H., & Meyer, L. (2014). Scientists' Views About Attribution of Global Warming. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(16), 8963–8971. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1021/es501998e>
- Vormedal, I. (2011). From Foe to Friend? Business, the Tipping Point and U. S. Climate Politics. *Business and Politics*, 13(3), 1–29. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.2202/1469-3569.1350>.
- Waldman, S. (2023). *Meet the top House recipients of oil and gas money*. E&E News by POLITICO. Retrived from <https://www.eenews.net/articles/meet-the-top-house-recipients-of-oil-and-gas-money/>
- Washington, Haydn, and Cook, John. (2011). *Climate Change Denial: Heads in the Sand*. London • New York: Earthscan.
- Yale E360. (2020). Fossil Fuels Received \$5.9 Trillion In Subsidies in 2020, Report Finds. Accessed July 16, 2023, <https://e360.yale.edu/digest/fossil-fuels-received-5-9-trillion-in-subsidies-in-2020-report-finds>.