



New York:
+1 212 517 1850
15 Gramercy Park South
Suite 8C
NY, NY 10003

London:
+44 207 556 1092
Blackwell Hse
Guildhall Yard
London, EC2V 5AE

MRA accuses Heineken of “feet-dragging and moralwashing”

- The Moral Rating Agency says Heineken ran down the clock in pursuit of greed while it moralwashed.
 - The immoral company ended up with nothing except a €300 million loss and a damaged brand.
-

For Immediate Release, 25 August 2023: The MRA reacts to Heineken’s exit from Russia:

18 months too late

Mark Dixon, MRA founder said:

“Heineken is no hero. 18 months of supporting the Russian economy should never be forgotten. During this time, the company moralwashed its refusal to leave.

Its explanation that it took longer than expected doesn’t hold water, because it’s obviously difficult to find a buyer if you remain so long a pariah state.

It also engaged in ‘staff-washing’ – saying it needed to care for its staff.

On top of that, it used the argument that it didn't want the assets to be nationalised – only to sell the company in the end for one euro which is exactly the same outcome.”

Greed over morality

“Feet-draggers want more money than their Russian assets are worth. They put greed above morality but they get burned in the end. Indeed, after the 18-month wait, all that

Heineken shareholders ended up with was one euro, a 300 million euro loss, and a brand damaged by 18 months of Russian contagion.

Heineken has failed its shareholders, its customers as well as Western democracy.”

Feet-dragging circular logic

“Feet-dragging results in exit difficulties that provides a self-fulfilling justification for further feet-dragging. The inability to sell excuse is nothing other than self-serving circular logic.

This is the *de rigueur* excuse currently being sported by the remaining immoral companies still in Russia.”

* * *

The Moral Rating Agency, the corporate watchdog, was set up to get companies out of Russia, to get Russia out of Ukraine, Putin out of Russia, and dictatorships out of the world. The MRA rates global companies on how effectively they are pulling out of Russia on its site moralratingagency.org.

For press inquiries, please contact press@MoralRatingAgency.org. Or, for comment/interview, we can be reached on one of these numbers:

London: +44 207 556 1092

New York: +1 212 517 1850

About the [Moral Rating Agency](#)

The Moral Rating Agency was set up “to get Russia out of Ukraine, Putin out of Russia, and dictatorships out of the world”.

In addition to exposing, and crediting, corporations through moral ratings, the MRA maintains an [Indelible Ledger](#) of a company’s actions so any later corrective actions do not wipe the slate clean. Time is of the essence, so the rating system includes a disincentive for delay through exposing and tracking what preceded a later corrective action.

Unlike ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance) rating agencies, which have a commercial responsibility to their institutional investor clients to cover the range of issues these clients wish, the Moral Rating Agency is zeroing in on a single corporate moral issue, in this case the Russia-Ukraine war.

The MRA was founded and is led by Mark Dixon, who runs the mergers & acquisitions consultancy Thinking Linking in the City of London and New York. He was one of the co-founders of the online financial commentator [BreakingViews.com](#), which is today part of Thomson Reuters. Mark has been opposed to autocratic regimes, particularly to the Chinese government and to Putin's transformation of Russia from a nascent democracy into a fully-throttled autocracy. He has a personal connection with Ukraine because he has owned an apartment in the city of Lviv since 2010. He has also lived in China.

The MRA has a paid staff of moral raters, verifiers, and fact-checkers who operate according to its [Rating Methodology](#). It also has an on-site team involved in statistics, media relations, site production and publishing.

The MRA has no customers, external commercial relationships, or conflicts of any kind. It will rate and publish so that consumers, media and governments can judge companies on a single topic on a fair basis. This objectivity on individual companies and their relative scores is maintained despite the campaigning nature of the agency, as explained in [Rating Philosophy](#).