# Article information:

Delta, Credit Suisse Claim Carbon Neutrality Using Junk Carbon Offsets
<https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2022-carbon-offsets-renewable-energy/>

# Article summary:

1. Many global companies, including Delta and Credit Suisse, claim to be "carbon neutral" using cheap renewable-energy offsets that experts consider to be useless in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

2. These companies heavily rely on low-quality offsets tied to renewable-energy projects, which are considered largely bogus because they assume support for clean energy displaces dirtier alternatives that are already being phased out due to cost competitiveness.

3. Despite doubts about their efficacy, renewable offsets remain widespread, with close to 40% of carbon offsets purchased in 2021 coming from renewable-energy projects. Companies like Delta and La Poste have been found to prioritize these cheap offsets over more rigorous removals that directly remove carbon dioxide from the air.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Junk Carbon Offsets Are What Make These Big Companies 'Carbon Neutral'" raises concerns about the use of cheap renewable-energy offsets by major global companies to claim carbon neutrality. The article argues that these offsets are ineffective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and are essentially an accounting maneuver that allows more emissions into the atmosphere.

One potential bias in the article is its focus on the negative aspects of renewable-energy offsets without providing a balanced view of their benefits. While it acknowledges that renewable projects can displace dirtier alternatives, it dismisses them as largely bogus because they are already cheaper than building new coal or gas power plants. However, it fails to consider that supporting renewable energy projects can still have positive environmental and social impacts, even if they may not be the most effective way to reduce emissions.

The article also makes unsupported claims about the credibility of renewable-energy offsets. It cites experts who consider them low-quality credits that do not avoid or reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, it does not provide specific evidence or data to support this claim, relying instead on general statements from these experts.

Furthermore, the article overlooks the fact that there are different types of carbon offsets with varying levels of credibility and effectiveness. While some renewable-energy offsets may have limitations, there are also high-quality offsets available from projects that directly remove carbon dioxide from the air. The article briefly mentions this but does not explore it further or provide examples of such projects.

The article also lacks exploration of counterarguments or alternative perspectives on carbon offsetting. It presents a one-sided view that suggests all offsetting efforts are ineffective and misleading. It does not acknowledge that offsetting can be part of a broader climate strategy when used in conjunction with emission reductions and other sustainability measures.

Additionally, the article includes promotional content for certain companies that claim to be carbon neutral but rely heavily on cheap renewable-energy offsets. It highlights Delta Air Lines' advertising campaign aimed at guilt-ridden travelers and suggests that the company's claim of carbon neutrality is misleading. While this may be a valid concern, the article's focus on specific companies and their marketing strategies detracts from a more comprehensive analysis of the broader issue of carbon offsetting.

Overall, the article raises important questions about the credibility and effectiveness of carbon offsets but falls short in providing a balanced and nuanced analysis. It lacks sufficient evidence for its claims, overlooks alternative perspectives, and focuses too heavily on specific companies rather than addressing the broader challenges and complexities of carbon offsetting.

# Topics for further research:

* Different types of carbon offsets with varying levels of credibility and effectiveness
* High-quality carbon offset projects that directly remove carbon dioxide from the air
* Benefits of supporting renewable energy projects beyond emissions reduction
* Counterarguments and alternative perspectives on carbon offsetting
* Integration of carbon offsetting into broader climate strategies
* Challenges and complexities of carbon offsetting beyond specific companies' marketing strategies
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