



[Divest Princeton](#) is a coalition of students, faculty, staff, and alumni calling on Princeton University to divest its endowment from fossil fuels and to reinvest responsibly because of the existential threat posed by climate change. We are asking the University to:

1. **Divest its \$37.7 billion endowment** as quickly as possible of all direct and indirect holdings offossil fuel companies;
2. **Phase out all research and formal relationships** with fossil fuel companies that either spread climate misinformation or develop fossil fuels in conflict with global efforts like the Paris Agreement, and;
3. **Create oversight bodies** to ensure that the endowment is ethically invested, that research relationships are ethically sought, and that progress toward these goals can be verified by the public.

Q: Why should Princeton divest and dissociate from fossil fuel?

A: Science has proven irrefutably that the burning of fossil fuels drives the [climate crisis](#). Lending fossil fuel companies financial and reputational support downplays the need for urgent reform and makes Princeton complicit.

Q: Will divestment hurt the University's endowment?

A: No. In the last 2 years, [Brown University](#) - which has divested – has led the Ivy League in returns. Investments in sustainable assets pose [fewer risks and greater long-term potential](#) than investments in fossil fuels. [PRINCO](#) has a fiduciary duty to divest.

Q: Will dissociation threaten Princeton's climate research?

A: No – Phasing out fossil funding partnerships will allow current projects to finish and it will guarantee academic integrity going forward. Fossil fuel companies have donated [over \\$35 million since 2000](#) to fund University research. That sounds big but it is nothing compared to the \$41 million and \$53 million Exxon and BP spent respectively [fighting climate legislation](#) in 2019 alone. Dissociation can only mean cleaner, more credible research.

Q: Don't Princeton's investments give it influence over fossil fuel companies?

A: No – where Princeton invests in fossil fuels, it may be a minority shareholder with little control of agenda setting. Where this isn't the case, Princeton has a presumption against using its investments for position-taking and has [refused to join](#) Climate Action 100+, an investor coalition to address climate change.

Q: How can Princeton dissociate from fossil fuel while it still uses so much?

A: Princeton's [Sustainability Action Plan](#) outlines a transition to carbon neutrality. Divesting from fossil fuels would support that goal and hasten decarbonization in other sectors like transportation.

Q: Isn't divestment a form of political position-taking?

A: The urgent [preservation of the planet](#) is not up for political debate. We call for divestment not just in the hope that it sparks change, but to align our investments with Princeton's Sustainability Action Plan, which encourages "movement towards the objective of nationwide decarbonization".

Q: Does divestment work?

A: Yes, [symbolically and materially](#). Shell is on-record saying divestment has a "serious, adverse effect" on its bottom line. Princeton's \$37.7 billion endowment is its greatest source of leverage overclimate change - now is the time to use it.

Please visit [divestprinceton.com](#) to find out more.