

Rejoinder from the Union of Concerned Scientists to American Petroleum Institute's Response to the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre

11 November 2021

API's response fits a pattern of denial, disinformation, and evading accountability that the [Union of Concerned Scientists](#) and [other experts](#) have documented. A team convened by API infamously created a [strategy](#) in 1998 explicitly aiming to confuse and misinform the public about climate change, and API was [called before Congress](#) just last month to answer for its disinformation activities. Major oil and gas companies active in Colorado, such as ExxonMobil and Chevron, [hide behind API](#) and other industry groups to lobby against climate action.

While there is much to criticize in API's response, here is our rebuttal to three of its most egregious claims:

- API says that it is “out front and transparent” about its stance on policy issues, and that its work is validated by “government studies and independent analyses.” Yet API funds front groups such as “Energy Citizens” and “Energy Nation” that falsely portray themselves as grassroots while opposing forward-looking climate and energy policy. And although API does not refer to specific “independent” analyses in its response, peer-reviewed research shows that API has [funded biased economic analyses](#) to claim that moving away from fossil fuels would be too expensive.
- There is painful irony in API's assertion that Colorado has a “uniquely robust” regulatory framework, when the trade group has repeatedly worked to weaken that framework. For example, Energy Citizens placed ads on TV, radio and Facebook attacking a Colorado Senate bill that tightened health and safety controls on the fossil fuel industry.
- API has provided no evidence or examples to substantiate its unfounded accusation that the UCS report is misleading. Our report is based on government economic statistics, lobbying disclosures, legal filings, investigative journalism, and other open-source documents, as detailed in our extensive references. What is misleading is API's claim to share the goal of a lower carbon future, which is not backed up by the trade group's policy positions or actions.