




Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 25, 2025

Study: \$28 TRILLION in “Climate Damage” From Biggest Companies; Now Gov Can SUE Them

Ready for higher prices — for everything? Because this *will* be the result if a new academic study’s authors have their way. The researchers, out of Dartmouth College, claim that the world’s largest companies have caused \$28 trillion in “climate damage.” They make no bones about their money-grabbing agenda, either. “[W]e argue that the scientific case for climate liability is closed,” they write in their study summary. So now, “science [is] no longer an obstacle to the justiciability of climate liability claims,” they [conclude](#).



RapidEye/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Translation: The “science is settled.”

(My, where have we heard that before?)

This is no small matter. While the Trump administration won’t be acting on this “science,” it’s there at the ready should a future, left-wing administration desire a pretext for the proctology-exam version of another private-sector fleecing.

Note here, too, that companies don’t pay taxes or fines, people do, and our whole civilization runs on energy. Thus would such government theft mean higher prices for everyday Americans — *across the board*.

All That Beautiful Money — Just Waiting!

Reporting on the story, The Associated Press [writes](#) that the climate study, published Wednesday in the journal *Nature*, is

part of an effort to make it easier for people and governments to hold companies financially accountable, like the tobacco giants have been.

A Dartmouth College research team came up with the estimated pollution caused by 111 companies, with more than half of the total dollar figure coming from 10 fossil fuel providers: Saudi Aramco, Gazprom, Chevron, ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, National Iranian Oil Co., Pemex, Coal India and the British Coal Corporation.

For comparison, \$28 trillion is a shade less than the sum of all goods and services produced in the United States last year.

... The researchers figured that every 1% of greenhouse gas put into the atmosphere since 1990 has caused \$502 billion in damage from heat alone, which doesn’t include the costs incurred by other extreme weather such as hurricanes, droughts and floods.

To provide more detail, CBS News [informs](#) that the researchers



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 25, 2025

used 1,000 different computer simulations to translate those emissions into changes for Earth's global average surface temperature by comparing it to a world without that company's emissions.

Using this approach, they determined that pollution from Chevron, for example, has raised the Earth's temperature by .045 degrees Fahrenheit.

Of course, someone could use 1,000 different computer simulations to show that the Dartmouth researchers are blowing hot air. And I used 1,000 different computer simulations and found that the world would be a better place without college academicians.

Who's Responsible, Again?

For the record, so I don't get fact-checked by Poynter, that last line was a *joke*. Not funny at all, however, is the unique onus being put on oil companies. After all, each one of us happily uses energy in various forms continually. So accepting the climate-change narrative for argument's sake, aren't we all complicit in a sense?

Moreover, what of government? It has said to energy companies, essentially, "We're going to allow you to sell this product."

"And now [we're going to sue you](#) for selling the product."

Huh?

Climate alarmists will contend that energy companies knew the "climate damage" their products allegedly cause, but lied about it. Assuming this is true, however, is it plausible that government didn't know? And where does the buck stop?

Under statist's philosophy, it should be with the government, which they consider the end-all and be-all.

The Big Picture

Now, *The New American* has refuted the anthropogenic climate-change narrative repeatedly, such as [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). Even upon accepting the Dartmouth thesis and the \$28 trillion figure, however, there's a problem. As an MSN commenter [put it](#) regarding the AP article:

Now do a study on the value of good these companies have done. Vastly improved standard of living, life extending medications, increased food production, heating and cooling, etc. I'm not sure there is anything in modern society not dependent on fossil fuels and related chemistry. I, for one, do not want to go back to 12th century living conditions.

As late economics Professor Walter E. Williams has pointed out, you can make anything look heavenly or hellacious by focusing on only its pros or cons. This is precisely what the Dartmouth researchers did, too — to push an agenda.

What's more, to paraphrase economist Dr. Thomas Sowell, in life there usually aren't solutions, only trade-offs. So what's the side the Dartmouth greentopians *don't* present?

Just consider information Grok AI provides from the sources [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). It writes:

The correlation between energy use and GDP is well-documented; studies often cite a near-



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 25, 2025

linear relationship, where a 1% increase in energy consumption correlates with a 0.5-1% increase in GDP.

... Fossil fuels have likely contributed around \$63.8 trillion to \$67.4 trillion to global economic growth since 1900....

In other words, even *if* we accept Dartmouth's damages estimate, it's dwarfed by the benefits fossil fuels deliver.

Conclusion

It should be added that higher temperatures [are generally beneficial](#) and that Dartmouth's study reflects activism, not science. But the bottom line is that, historically, man's economic norm was grinding poverty — until modern energy production made today's prosperity possible. In fact, most of us would be dead, or would've never existed in the first place, without oil and gas.

Energy is life. Heck, without it, there wouldn't even be that much for the government to tax — or steal.

Or, is that a redundancy?



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.