

Search powered by Most popular | [Subscribe](#)

[Home](#) [News](#) [Travel](#) [Money](#) [Sports](#) [Life](#) [Tech](#) [Weather](#)

Become a member of the USA TODAY community now! [Log in](#) | [Become a member](#) [What's this?](#)



News ▾

[Shopping](#) [Buy a Car](#) [Job Search](#) [Real Estate](#)

OPINION

Views from our editorial board, columnists and readers

[« Our view on education: A pause that refreshes](#) | [Main](#) | [Hummer is for status »](#)

■ Our opinion



Two decades after oil spill, Alaskans still await 'new start'

On March 24, 1989, the oil tanker Exxon Valdez ran aground on the coast of Alaska and disgorged millions of gallons of oil into the waters of Prince William Sound. For thousands of Alaskan fishermen, the pollution wiped out a way of life, so they sued, hoping for some measure of justice. They are still hoping. But the case drags on and on, highlighting the gross unfairness of a Dickensian system that serves the interests of defendants and lawyers who profit from endless delays, but does little or nothing to protect those with a grievance.

The case has outlived at least four lawyers from the core group that filed suit, a federal judge who heard the first appeal and about 6,000 of the nearly 33,000 Alaskans who sought relief. Now, their heirs are waiting, too. On Wednesday, nearly 19 years after the spill, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments over whether the corporation must pay \$2.5 billion in punitive damages.

The injured Alaskans argue credibly that Exxon was irresponsible in leaving an alcoholic captain in charge. [Exxon contends](#) the award is excessive and not permitted under maritime law. Either way, the time taken to decide the case should embarrass every member of the court.

(1989 photo by Jack Smith, AP)

The case took five years just to come to trial. In 1994, a federal jury in Anchorage ordered Exxon to pay \$5 billion in punitive damages. The plaintiffs were elated: One of their lawyers [said](#) it would "allow them to make a new start on their lives."

They were wrong. With so much at stake, Exxon was expected to appeal, and the corporation did so, three years after trial. That put the case in the hands of the lethargic 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, where it languished. Four years passed before a three-judge panel finally issued its first ruling, an unconscionable delay. The court upheld the jury's judgment but ordered the award reduced. Twice more, as the Supreme Court handed down rulings on the size of punitive damage awards, Exxon filed new appeals, sending the case back to the appellate court, which in 2006 reduced the award to \$2.5 billion. Exxon then appealed to the Supreme Court, where the case arrives Wednesday.

The litigation's endless trek through the courts is extreme, but excessive delays are always at risk when one side has the incentive and the financial means to exploit the system. Preliminary findings in a study of damage cases in New York and California show shorter delays to be common. In 20% of the cases, plaintiffs waited a year after the verdict to get their first check; 10% waited more than two years, according to the study by the RAND Corporation, a California think tank.

In another extreme, high-profile case, lawyers for former president Richard Nixon used appeals and

Related Advertising Links

[What's This?](#)

Do You Know Your Credit Score?

The average U.S. credit score is up to 692. See... www.freecreditreport.com

Refinance Rates at 4.8% FIXED!

\$200,000 mortgage for \$599/mo. Get 4 FREE quotes! www.lendgo.com

Advertisement



[Click here](#) for today's cartoon

Subscribe to the Opinion feed [XML](#)

Today's topics

- Russia's new president draws questions, anxiety
- Our view on gun restrictions: Keep parks free of firearms
- Give gun owners uniformity
- A path out of poverty
- Lawsuits are behind surgeon shortage in USA
- Flip switch of USA's alternative power
- No mortgage relief

Regular features

On Religion

A weekly series explores the issues of faith that are shaping our world.

- [Read columns](#)

Common Ground

In Washington today, politicians too often just stand their ground. Liberal strategist Bob Beckel and conservative columnist Cal Thomas provide a better model.

- [Read columns](#)

Window on the Web

An at-a-glance look at online conversations selected for the newspaper.

- [Read comments](#)

Voices of Immigration

Readers discuss their personal experiences.

- [Read letters](#)

Voices of Katrina

Readers share the impact Hurricane Katrina has had on their lives.

- Read letters

Opinionline

What people are saying about the news of the week.

- Read columns

Al Neuharth

- Read columns

DeWayne Wickham

- Read columns

other delaying tactics to stall release of his White House tapes for more than two decades.

Nixon had a right to appeal, as does Exxon. But if justice delayed is justice denied, as British Prime Minister William Gladstone famously said in the 19th century, then the judiciary needs to force slow-moving cases such as these onto a faster track.

Slow justice

1989:

The Exxon Valdez, an oil tanker, runs aground in Prince William Sound, off the Alaskan coast, and spills millions of gallons of oil.

1994:

Federal jury finds in favor of 33,000 fishermen, Native Alaskans and other plaintiffs. It imposes a \$5 billion punitive damage award against Exxon.

1997:

Exxon appeals to the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

2001:

The court [upholds the judgment](#), but sends it back to the trial judge, telling him to reduce the amount.

2006:

The 9th Circuit [cuts the award](#) to \$2.5 billion.

Wednesday:

U.S. Supreme Court to hear Exxon's appeal.

Posted at 12:22 AM/ET, February 26, 2008 in Business issues - Editorial, Law/Judiciary - Editorial, Politics, Government - Editorial, Supreme Court - Editorial, USA TODAY editorial | Permalink

USA TODAY welcomes your views and encourages lively -- but civil -- discussions. Comments are unedited, but submissions reported as abusive may be removed. By posting a comment, you affirm that you are 13 years of age or older.

You must be logged in to leave a comment. [Log in](#) | [Register](#)

Submit

Comments: (33)

Showing: [Oldest first](#)



Ra-Horakhty wrote: 6d 15h ago

I can only hope that USA Today will keep up the pressure on Exxon and the 'judiciary' to find some remnants of honour in this disgraceful, nay, scandalous, affair. What is the matter with these people?

Recommend **3** | Report Abuse



HRW wrote: 6d 13h ago

Seems a miscarriage of justice when a multi-billion dollar corporation can do such terrible damage, be found culpible then be able to delay paying for the crime for 2 decades and running. Just using it's deep pockets and the American justice system, even.

Gas prices are outrageous anyway so it's not like there's some big worry that making Exxon pay for it's stupidity will make them rise further. That's happening anyway.

Not much hope can be held in this big business favoring government. But, maybe the Supreme Court can finally put an end to Exxon's blalant playing of the system.

Recommend **3** | Report Abuse

Opinions by subject

Education

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Election '08

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Immigration

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Iraq

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Reforming Washington

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Terrorism

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

Your Freedoms

[Editorials, Debates](#) | [Columns](#) | [Letters](#)

View all opinions

Editorials, Debates

[Read all editorials, debates](#)

Columns

[Read all columns](#)

Letters

[Read all letters](#)

Other USA TODAY content

- [USATODAY.com - News & Information Homepage](#)

Commitment to accuracy

To report corrections and clarifications, contact Reader Editor Brent Jones at 1 800 872 7073 or e-mail accuracy@usatoday.com. Please indicate whether you're responding to content online or in the newspaper.



Share your views

If you're interested in joining other conversations about topics in USA TODAY or subjects important to you, email letters@usatoday.com. Letters for print consideration are edited for accuracy, clarity and length, and comments of 250 words or fewer have the best chance of being published. Letters that include a name, address, day and evening phone numbers, and that are verified by USA TODAY, are considered for publication.

You may also submit commentaries to The Forum, USA TODAY's op-ed page, by emailing theforum@usatoday.com. Please consult our [guidelines](#).

Any submission to USA TODAY may be published or distributed in print, electronic or other forms.



John Q. Public wrote: 6d 11h ago

Again, why are we surprised when shareholder rights are given more weight than individual rights. Money for nothing carries far more weight than a fisherman's ability to sweat and bleed for fish.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



AveragePerson wrote: 6d 11h ago

Exxon does not believe in loosing a legal case ... at any cost. If the Supreme Court rules against Exxon, I would not be surprised if they still do not pay. Of course they can afford the \$2.5 billion ... look what their profits are!!!

[Recommend](#) **1** | [Report Abuse](#)



possum1 wrote: 6d 10h ago

THEY ARE HOGS, HOGS..

[Recommend](#) **1** | [Report Abuse](#)

Archives

- March 2, 2008 - March 8, 2008
- February 24, 2008 - March 1, 2008
- February 17, 2008 - February 23, 2008
- February 10, 2008 - February 16, 2008
- February 3, 2008 - February 9, 2008
- January 27, 2008 - February 2, 2008
- January 20, 2008 - January 26, 2008
- January 13, 2008 - January 19, 2008
- January 6, 2008 - January 12, 2008
- December 30, 2007 - January 5, 2008



hazeyc1 wrote: 6d 8h ago

My husband & I still do not purchase gas from Exxon due to their inability to take responsibility for the spill and the destruction they caused this region.

The amount of money they made in profits just in one recent quarter would have easily and quickly settled this. Instead they want to bleed the little people to death and drag this out to their lawyers enrichment. That 6,000 plaintiffs have died in the interim is unconscionable!

I do not patronize companies like that!

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)

More blogs about **news**.



mrmidwest wrote: 6d 7h ago

Yet the government decides to go after corporations like Microsoft instead of the obvious corporations that shirk their responsibilities to the people they have harmed. Exxons money and assets should have been frozen from the beginning to force them to stand up and be good corporate citizens. If they cannot abide by our laws then they should be taken over and all of their assets distributed back to the public. Corporations like Exxon have no place in our world anymore. It is time to demand action and retribution for these lawless corporations and protect the citizens of the United States. At this point Exxon should become an asset of the United States and their corporate board dissolved.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



brocma wrote: 6d 6h ago

This is not only happening in this case! My wife was part of litigation where the class action suit dragged on so long, the money that had been set aside to pay the injured was used up largely on the attorney related fees.

WHAT A SHAM!

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



truckman wrote: 6d 5h ago

this is another example of our justice system being perverted by lawyers. There should be a limit of how much time is allowed to present a case and defense. No one wins except lawyers and those with the deepest pockets. They should be paying interest on the damage 'captain morgan' inflicted.

[Recommend](#) | [Report Abuse](#)



Ronald David wrote: 6d 5h ago

The sham is those who complain, who want to keep their cake and eat it too.

All people benefit from the thousands of products made from crude oil, not the least of which is fuel to drive our cars and to heat our homes. Exxon is one among hundreds of oil companies doing their best FOR EACH OF US.

An accident is NOT reason to boycott an oil company, no matter how large the company! It was an accident, not a deliberate action to hurt the planet, fish, or humans.

A huge accidental crude oil spill killed lots of fish, birds, sea mammals, and temporarily hurt a few fishermen. A drop in the ocean compared to the fish, birds, and sea mammals that mankind around the globe kills every day for food and sport.

What is dishonorable, disgraceful, even scandalous is the lack of common sense on the part of environmentalists who wish to destroy an oil company for an 'accident'.

Cleanup commenced immediately, and fishermen were compensated, at least in part. If our Courts were doing their job they would stop the redundant law suits and put an end to an unfortunate accident.

Recommend | Report Abuse

1 2 3 4 Next ▶

[Subscribe Today: Home Delivery of USA TODAY - Save 35%](#)

Sponsored Links

Looking For Foreclosures?

Find foreclosed homes at 50% less. Pay \$1 for listings in your area.
[RealtyStore.com](#)

Do You Know Your Credit Score?

The average U.S. credit score is up to 692. See yours for \$0.
[www.freecreditreport.com](#)

Refinance Rates at 4.8% FIXED!

\$200,000 mortgage for \$599/mo. Get 4 FREE quotes!
[www.lendgo.com](#)

Get listed here

USATODAY.com partners: [USA WEEKEND](#) • [Sports Weekly](#) • [Education](#) • [Space.com](#)

[Home](#) • [Travel](#) • [News](#) • [Money](#) • [Sports](#) • [Life](#) • [Tech](#) • [Weather](#)

Resources: [Mobile news](#) • [Site map](#) • [FAQ](#) • [Contact us](#) • [E-mail news](#)
[Jobs with us](#) • [Internships](#) • [Terms of service](#) • [Privacy policy/Your California Privacy Right](#)
[Media kit](#) • [Media Lounge](#) • [Press room](#) • [Electronic print edition](#) • [Reprints and Permissions](#)

[Add USATODAY.com RSS feeds](#)

The Nation's Homepage

© Copyright 2007 USA TODAY, a division of [Gannett Co. Inc.](#)