Obama Administration Moves Against Alaska Oil Drilling

—By Tim McDonnell | Wed Aug. 17, 2011 2:00 AM PDT

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in remote northern Alaska is home to a surprisingly diverse array of wildlife: polar bears, caribou, wolverines, lemmings, and others all call the frigid, windswept place home. But one infamous strip of coastline in the massive refuge is also home to nearly two billion barrels of recoverable oil (enough, the feds estimate, to supply America for nine months), which has placed it squarely in the center of a decades-long controversy over whether to open the ecologically sensitive region for oil and gas development or keep it locked up as wilderness.

On Monday the US Fish and Wildlife Service took the first step in granting increased federal protection to a relatively small, oil-rich region within ANWR known as the "1002 area" by nominating it for wilderness designation in a lengthy report (PDF) on conservation plans for ANWR. Only Congress can declare wilderness areas, and the "preliminary recommendation" made in the report is only the beginning of a long (and possibly dead-end) road to approval. But it is the first time
such a recommendation has been made since the area was set aside for study in a 1980 federal law ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d096:HR00039:@@@D&summ2=5&](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d096:HR00039:@@@D&summ2=5&)) (from which the area takes its name), and environmental activists ([http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2YXKfFETkQy&feature=player_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2YXKfFETkQy&feature=player_embedded)) and the FWS agree that it marks a major turning point in an ongoing struggle in Alaska between conservationists and oil and gas developers.

"We're still a long way from getting to the end of the road, and we don't know where the road is going, but it's a step" toward more comprehensive protection for the area, FWS spokesman Bruce Woods said.

The way things stand now, area 1002 is within the wildlife refuge but still potentially open to oil and gas development (with a permit from Congress, which it has yet to grant anyone). Monday's report found that the "coastal plain" region of ANWR (a large swatch that contains area 1002), along with the Brooks Range mountains and Porcupine Plateau, meets the requirements outlined in the [Wilderness Act](http://www.fws.gov/laws/lawsdigest/WILDRNS.HTML) for what can be designated wilderness—which, Woods added, do not include considering protection against potential development. Then again, he said from his Anchorage office, "most of Alaska would qualify [as wilderness], including some places I could slingshot from where I'm sitting now."
The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Area 1002 is at the top of the "Coastal Plains Wilderness Study Area (WSA)." Courtesy US Fish and Wildlife Service

Still, the ubiquity of wilderness in Alaska does not make it a less valuable commodity in ANWR. A wilderness designation for the coastal plain region would afford some protection from the specter of development that has loomed over it for the last 30 years, and that's "a critical piece of the puzzle for the Arctic refuge," according to Julia Kates of advocacy group Defenders of Wildlife. Moreover, she said, by giving the region due consideration for wilderness designation, FWS has created a forum for citizens to throw down directly in a fight that has until now raged mostly on Capitol Hill. (FWS will consider public feedback on the report until Nov. 15).

While the coastal plain is the only wilderness nominee with oil and gas development potential, all three areas host an array of wildlife whose future, some argue, might also be riding on a wilderness designation. Defenders of Wildlife released its own report (PDF) Monday, which found nearly half of the mammal species—including adorable little critters like the arctic fox and the Dall sheep—in ANWR to be "highly vulnerable" to climate change. The majority of these were animals who live in the
snowbound tundra, which is being "squeezed" further north by expanding forests, Defenders of Wildlife scientist Aimee Delach said.

In the past half-century, Alaska warmed twice as fast as the rest of the US. As temperatures rise, the geographic range of animals like polar bears who depend on cold tends to shift north. Unfortunately, north of ANWR is the Arctic Ocean, which is not really a viable housing alternative for a tiny lemming. The situation is "certainly distressing as far as the survival of the species is concerned," Delach said. While a wilderness designation would obviously not slow the effects of climate change, it could prevent habitat loss and general disturbance that would result from development and further threaten these species.

In any case, there's no chance any of these areas will officially become wilderness in the immediate future. Woods suspects it will be a year or more before anything definitive happens: "Trying to predict what's happening at the end of 2012 is something my crystal ball isn't capable of."

Tim McDonnell is an editorial intern at Mother Jones. For more of his stories, click here. Follow him on Twitter or send him an email.
I will assume that Obama is going to come to happy middle grounds and start drilling in Alaska's Wilderness .. What the tea baggers want the tea baggers get....

Drill Baby Drill!!

---

Obama would much more prefer to protect the crony capitalists and unions who fund his campaign by providing "green" jobs at the expense of American taxpayers. "Green Jobs" you know, is code word for quid-pro-quo - i.e.; handouts for votes.

I think overall that this is an nice energy strategy - that is, if you're on the receiving end of the Statist racket and don't mind being chained to middle east tyrants for your energy needs and other nicities developed from oil byproducts.

Curiously, while I doubt an entitlement state like Spain will learn from their mistakes in employing the same delusional strategy as Obama and the leftists, I wonder if our leftists leaders and followers are so fatally conceited as to think that they are somehow immune to the same type of foolishness.
and what percentage of your household items, car parts, clothing and food are the result of oil-based energy? (hypocrite)

You're no better than the rest of us though you pretend to be - the electricity from your jeep probably comes from coal or nuclear and is subsidized by the taxpayer anyway.

Perhaps you should consider riding your bike or taking a bus. Only drive as needed not as you please. Plant some veggies, install a drip system take out the lawn. Wow, simple examples of what I've done. I don't worry about gas prices I worry people like you believe we need more fossil fuel.

that's great, and i've done much the same and more but that doesn't give me a right to rule by fiat
boom. well said. ^

Flag

CitizenPlusPlus  08/18/2011 09:39 AM  in reply to slave2liberty

Oil prices are increasing, ... everywhere. Its because its running out. Pure and simple. Texas is almost dry. To suggest that one extra decade of oil from Alaskan Wildlife Refuges or Canadian Tar Sands is in any way comparable to the century of oil that came from Texas. Is to deny the awesomeness that was Texas. We had 100 yrs to do something amazing with the gift of oil. Don't destroy the ability of the planet to continue providing clean air and water just to extend the life of your suburban fantasy a couple extra years.

Flag

aligatorhardt  08/28/2011 12:50 PM  in reply to CitizenPlusPlus

Notice in the opening paragraphs that a lousy 9 months of domestic oil supply is what they are willing to destroy this natural resource for. 9 months of oil and permanent destruction of a resource.

Flag

PadiDoc91  08/22/2011 06:33 AM  in reply to slave2liberty

Remember, just because they drill here, doesn't mean they have to sell here. The companies are internationals and the price of oil is set on the commodities market. Most of our oil goes to Japan I believe, and most of our imports come from Canada and Mexico....
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Charles Lincoln Montes  08/25/2011 01:29 PM  in reply to slave2liberty

Oil is not sustainable. I'm not sure if you know what that means. It means we will run out. It is further damaging to your and my only home to keep drilling. What will it take for you to understand that simple concept? Earthquakes? The Earth run dry of all oil? What???
Let's hope this is a step in the right direction and not some ploy. Our last wild wilderness should be protected! There is so much we don't yet know. "The Tea Baggers" only get what we give them...so let's not give up!

Drill the CEO's 08/22/2011 08:30 AM
in reply to Marcus from the North (#comment-289172511)

Investing billions for 9 months supply of oil? In an area already stressed by global warming? After the Gulf disaster where "experts" were clueless for months as to how to stop the leak and the clean-up continues with taxpayers footing some of the bill?

Seems like a worthwhile investment. Although we could squeeze a lot more oil out of fat cat oil company CEO's.

in reply to Marcus from the North (#comment-289172511)

It is stupid that we're NOT drilling in that barren wasteland.

the earth is here for mans benefit, not squirrels worship. if we can gain a natural recourse in unused land without killing off any species or polluting the air or sea then why the f#ck would we NOT?

Stop keeping us slaves to foreign oil and at least help ease those shackles a tiny bit by letting us use what we have in our own soil.

Drill Baby Drill!! (except this time, without the sarcasm)

artic slope dweller 08/17/2011 05:23 AM
(#comment-289182254)

The east coast’s sensational need for oil is only compounding this issue. Jobs and marginal wildlife disturbance is a win-win and the oil should be extracted safely. How about these ecoterrorist start trying to get these big cities turned back into native habitat! If they feel the arctic tundra is so grand then go live in a tent there for a year and see how you feel about the mosquitos, frost bite and copepods then.

Flag

solo_poke 08/17/2011 07:44 PM (#comment-289762064) in reply to artic slope dweller (#comment-289182254)

Shut up ignorant troll, you have been brainwashed, sorry pea sized brain washed.

Flag

Impulse725 08/17/2011 08:44 PM (#comment-289803422) in reply to artic slope dweller (#comment-289182254)

How is them living there for a year in a tent remotely relevant?

Flag

Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 01:38 PM (#comment-295399941) in reply to artic slope dweller (#comment-289182254)

But that marginal wildlife disturbance never ends. Every year just a bit more and a bit more. You need to expand your thinking to the future. Stop thinking about how your going to fill up your gas tank tomorrow and start thinking about your life in 5 or 10 years.

Your either ignorant or playing stupid. Of course we cant live in the arctic tundra. But that does not mean that just because we have a huge population we should take over other animals homes. Your probably thinking that your life is more important than theirs. From there we can safely say your memory is short. Do you remember historical events of when some thought they were more important than others? Do you really want to repeat history?

Flag

Ringonature 08/27/2011 05:23 AM (#comment-296552930) in reply to Charles Lincoln Montes (#comment-295399941)

The Alaskan Pipe Line increased the Caribou herds….! And ANWR has 27 times the oil that has been pump through the Alasken Pipe Line to date...
aligatorhardt 08/28/2011 12:52 PM (#comment-297288634) in reply to Ringonature (#comment-296552930)

Repeating lies does not make them any less of a lie.

Monstrosity 08/17/2011 06:03 AM (#comment-289197003)

I voted for Obama, but honestly we are talking about a very small piece of wilderness where there is abundant oil. We do need to find alternative types of fuel (although these often get squashed by the oil companies). Until the day arrives that we do have alternate fuel we need to drill in Alaska. Gas prices are too high and are crushing the working class.

CattyNineTails 08/17/2011 08:20 AM (#comment-289271895) in reply to Monstrosity (#comment-289197003)

1. According to most experts, it would take 5 - 10 YEARS before oil from ANWR would even begin to supply America's long-acknowledged addiction to fossil fuels.

2. ANWR is the last pristine wilderness of its kind. Any portion of it that's opened up for drilling is LOST FOREVER.

3. NOT seeking new oil sources will help to speed the arrival of that day America runs on alternate, renewable fuel sources.

4. Based on the level of climate change denial in the oil industry, it's HIGHLY doubtful they'd ever bother to study how drilling in ANWR might be impacted by such known Artic environmental considerations as the rapidly thinning ice, endangered wildlife, etc.

5. Consider the oil industry's track record:

* Exxon has weasled out of cleaning up the Valdez spill

* Chevron's response to the vast, life-threatening pollution they've caused in both the Amazon
AND Nigeria has ONLY been vigorously avoiding any admission of their responsibility

* BP's clean-up of their immense Gulf spill has been HIGHLY admirable -- to anyone who admires greed, dishonesty, ineptitude or a total lack of conscience

Based on just that far-from-comprehensive list, the obvious and only logical conclusion is that opening up any part of ANWR for drilling is sheer, utter INSANITY.

Flag  (http://disqus.com/aligatorhardt) aligatorhardt and 22 more liked this (e)  Like  Reply

slave2liberty 08/17/2011 05:06 PM (#comment-289642599)  in reply to CattyNineTails (#comment-289271895)

#1  leftists have been saying that for 40 years. We could've been energy independent by now.

#2 Not true. Besides, man and nature can and are intended to co-exist. To think that nature and men are to live in vacuums disconnected from each other is not only irrational, but displays a sense of self-loathing and disdain for humanity. Until you quit breathing, you are a hypocrite who is more than happy to contribute to the "demise" of other regions of the world in order to providie you with the luxuries you obviously take for granted.

#3 Like in Spain? Should we first bankrupt America by artificially inflating the cost of energy? Should we throw our liberties out the door just so a few central planners can pick and choose which crony capitalists will be on the receiving end of their special plans? You are essentially supporting the notion that tyranny is ok as long as the intentions are good.

#4 So drilling will have the same impact as consumption? Technology has improved so that CO2 emissions are far better than even just 2 decades ago. It's not like ANWR will impact demand, it will only impact supply and prices.

It's...show more (#)

Flag

solo_poke 08/17/2011 07:49 PM (#comment-289766421)  in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-289642599)

Oil companies have been spending money for years to fool you into paying them for everything you do.
I built my own wind turbine, and converted my Jeep to electric drive, payback is less than 20 months, at current energy prices.

Why do fools accept anything those who profit from you tell you?
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slave2liberty 08/18/2011 03:05 PM (#comment-290417284) in reply to solo poke (#comment-289766421)

how does that address my points?

Flag

Impulse725 08/17/2011 08:47 PM (#comment-289805483) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-289642599)

If you cared about energy independence, throw your support behind renewable energy research. Drilling in Alaska won't make us anywhere close to free from foreign oil.

Flag

slave2liberty 08/18/2011 02:36 PM (#comment-290400988) in reply to Impulse725 (#comment-289805483)

i do throw my support behind "renewable" energy - I just don't subscribe to the zealotry and dogma of environmental extremists, nor do I feel compelled to blindly promote crony capitalism which is a direct result of the Statists' never-ending promotion of their altruistic (purportedly) agendas.

More often than not, our fatally conceited, wannabe dictators create unintended consequences because of their ignorance of basic economic concepts and disdain for liberty and federalism.

Flag

Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 01:55 PM (#comment-295408436) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290400988)

Our agenda is the Earth. We extremists actually believe there are more important things than ourselves and our own concept of the world however extreme you may
find us.

#1 - we would be energy independent by now but money runs the world and oil companies have a lot of it. there is tons of proof of oil companies squashing technology that would free us from oil. dont ask me what it is go look it up

#2 - Man and animals are meant to co-exist in their natural form. When you start talking about drilling into the earth and sucking out oil that is not supposed to be on the surface of the earth that is anything but natural. We are doing a very bad job of co-existing due to our greed and you know that dont play dumb to extend your point.

#3 - No one knows what the answer is and i guarantee you it is none of the insane things you suggested. But he is correct the sooner we stop seeking new oil sources the harder it will be for us to survive. only through that struggle will people actually try to change things. You like...

Flag

1 person liked this. Like

**wake up** 09/20/2011 06:04 PM (#comment-316295793) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290400988)

More often than not, our fatally conceited, wannabe dictators create unintended consequences because of their ignorance of basic economic concepts and disdain for liberty and federalism like dubya and cheney and rove and rumseld and whole axis of stupidity.

Flag

**aligatorhardt** 08/28/2011 01:00 PM (#comment-297292011) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-289642599)

None of you assertions are true. Making policy based on wishful thinking while ignoring the facts is insanity. We do not have the oil reserves to meet our present needs and certainly do not have enough for self sufficiency. Why do you think we have to drill in 5 mile deep water? It is because the easy places were all drilled first. But of course I realize you don't think of anything other than how profit margins will increase for oil investors selling a commodity that is running out and prices can only go up. So you try to convince everyone to do nothing but drill, to ensure that oil prices will skyrocket to the top, as that is enough for your short term
gains, and to hell with your children and everyone else.
If you are not holding oil stocks and running a Ponzi scheme, them you must be an idiot for
listening to those who are doing that.


"Abundant Oil?" Perhaps you are not up on current events. ANWR is nothing but a drop in the barrel
and the latest USGS estimates would provide the US with about 2.5 months of gas at the pump and
would knock about 1 cent off at the gas pump until that 2.5 months ran out. Try reading this and the
intense marketing behind it

http://goo.gl/GJMCw

So it is your believe that by the time we reach 2020 (ANWR's peak) if ANWR went online in 2018 that
2% of the US needs is "Abundant Oil?"

Also just so we are all clear, what is your perception as to where Our oil comes from currently?

slave2liberty 08/18/2011 02:37 PM (#comment-290401746) in reply to Sean Bond (#comment-289353636)

"ANWR is nothing but a drop in the barrel ..."

Great, then there is nothing to fear in terms of overall impact to the environment - so, what
explains the level of anti-oil bigotry by the left?

Sean Bond [http://twitter.com/iam_seanbond] 08/19/2011 08:31 AM (#comment-290960850) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290401746)

"Great, then there is nothing to fear in terms of overall impact to the
environment - so, what explains the level of anti-oil bigotry by the
left?"
Typical response from the uninformed... I'm an Independent and I'm not anti-oil and certainly not a bigot, as unlike bigots, I'm not hostile to those of differing sex, race, ethnicity, religion or spirituality, nationality, inter-regional prejudice, gender and sexual orientation, homelessness, various medical disorders particularly behavioral disorders and addictive disorders. Not sure why you are using a word more closely tied humans to describe corporate greed and the unwillingness to pursue research for alternative sources of energy. Ignorance I suppose.

Have YOU personally been to an oil field during production and after the wells have gone dry? Until You have, don't be making comments that "there is nothing to fear in terms of overall impact to the environment," as You have no clue. Your crass statements on this site proves it.

I mean seriously... Who are you trying to impress with this?

"I just don't subscribe to the zealotry and dogma of environmental extremists, nor do I feel compelled to blindly promote crony capitalism which is a direct result of the Statists' never-ending promotion

...show more (#)

Flag

slave2liberty 08/19/2011 03:01 PM (#comment-291347330) in reply to Sean Bond (#comment-290960850)

"Have YOU personally been to an oil field during production and after the wells have gone dry? "

no, i haven't. But i'm sure that i'd prefer the pre-oil field state just as i'd prefer the trees and fields that existed where the EPA now stands.

One leading question deserves another (right?) - Have you personally been to a farm that previously provided a variety and abundance in crops before the environmental extremists coerced the federal government into subsidizing ethanol? or to a beautiful countryside that is now marred by wind turbines and solar panels? or to a river outlet on the west coast littered with plastic bags because government forced stores to use plastic instead of paper?
My point is that we humans require energy to live, roads to drive on and house to live in, and that our existence no matter how thoughtful will disturb the "natural" state of being for our planet. The answer to our problems is not and should not be to act hastily and irrationally in addressing the legitimacy of environmental conservation.

The hypocrites who continue to demagogue oil, coal and nuclear while they themselves consume these same resources, demonstrate extreme unreasonableness and a disconnect from the details and requirements of...show more (#)

Flag

aligatorhardt  08/28/2011 01:09 PM (#comment-297295757). in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-291347330)

These remarks are senseless.
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Ringonature  08/27/2011 05:49 AM (#comment-296560832) in reply to Sean Bond (#comment-290960850)

When the EPA lowers CO2 levels in January 2012... A year before, they are to do an impact study... This will Shut Down 81 gigiwatts of power plants, and DOUBLE Electric Prices... To replace 81 gigiwatts, with windmills, and solar power.. It will take, almost TWICE the windmills, and Solar panels, to make up this lost power...!
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aligatorhardt  08/28/2011 01:16 PM (#comment-297298680). in reply to Ringonature (#comment-296560832)

That is a total ridiculous assertion. The installation of mercury scrubbers is not an unbearable expense. Wind energy is the cheapest of any. The use of coal adds $300 billion or more every year in health care costs. Cost of Wind Power — Kicks Coal's Butt, Better than Natural Gas (& Could Power Your EV for $0.70/gallon) | CleanTechnica

Coal Costs the U.S. $500 Billion Annually in Health, Economic, Environmental Impacts | Fast Company

Any coal plant that closes is the best gift money can buy. But compliance with EPA rules is not a plant killer. It is about time the pollution costs are paid by pollutors instead of everyone else.
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canada can achieve a million times there energy usage by using geothermal alone. so why don't we do this first instead of permanent destruction.

it would be more conservative.

Flag

aligatorhardt 08/28/2011 01:07 PM (#comment-297295032)  in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290401746)

Look at the damage to the Gulf of Mexico from ONE oil spill. Then consider that with floating ice skimming a spill is nearly impossible. Microbe action in digesting oil is far less than in warm climates. There are no cities and ports to get support and supplies to the scene in a reasonable length of time. The prospect of getting a spill cleaned up in those conditions is very unlikely. Look at the Alaska oil spill of 25 years ago. Oil is still in the gravel of the beach, fishing stocks have still not recovered to previous levels. Clean up is a false promise.

Flag

Flag

you need to answer the other person's question first. that is common courtesy. do you have any perception of where US oil comes from?

Flag

Ringonature 08/27/2011 05:40 AM (#comment-296558129)  in reply to Sean Bond (#comment-289353636)

And the USGS estimates there is over a TRILLION BARRELS in North Dakoda....!

If gas prices are too high the working class could always take the train. Seriously, it's not that bad, just find an empty seat, kick back with a book and forget everybody else is there and it's like having your own personal driver.

yeah, and we can have the shelves of our supermarkets, retail outlets, restaurants and businesses stocked by train delivery. And instead of flying across the ocean, we can take train to Spain and see how great centrally-planned "green" energy is for society and the economy.

your taking the points that you disagree with to extremes. no one is talking about going back to the stone age to get around. did you know that there is an engine that runs on magnets? did you know that a man invented an engine that runs on water? oil is obsolete

If it runs on magnets then it's a MOTOR not an ENGINE. Magnets mean electricity - where does the electricity come from? Just like the Chevy Volt runs on electricity when you have to plug it in to an outlet which gets generated by coal or nuclear, and when the batteries go dead, it's backed up by an engine that runs on GASOLINE. Where's the "green" in that?
Renewable energy --not coal, not nuclear-- read it tard, and listen for a change.

The working class has hurt itself. Fossil fuel is not the answer to end all poverty. Get better involved with the community and show more interest. When a community bands together it can accomplish so much.

Find other ways of getting to work. Sell your SUV and drive a cheaper car. You always have a choice.

You MUST live in the city.... You people have no clue. Besides, lets all jump on trains and buses and be sitting ducks for Ali-Baba when he gets on board with his backpack bomb? GO to Hell. I'll keep my pickup, thank you.

Inquiring minds want to know... Will you vote for Obama again...?
Improving gas mileage and public transportation would do much more toward easing our petroleum needs than the small amount of petroleum we might get from the 1002 area in ANWR.
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slave2liberty 08/18/2011 02:41 PM (#comment-290403632) in reply to Jessica DeForest (#comment-289206679)

agree. We should elect dictators to mandate that everyone be FORCED to take "public" transportation and that all businesses use public transportation for shipping and receiving goods!

It'll be a great financial success just like the USPS!
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Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 02:01 PM (#comment-295412582) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290403632)

again... taking things to the extreme.

Flag

Johnnypopper 08/27/2011 01:09 PM (#comment-296755370) in reply to Jessica DeForest (#comment-289206679)

I like your avatar, Jessica. I look for products not tested on animals either. That being said, mass transit only works in densely populated areas. It's not for country folk like me...
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Rejinl 08/17/2011 06:46 AM (#comment-289216290)

Oil drilling is a very dirty, polluting process. Potentially destroying this pristine area and the habitats of so many species is a HUGE price to pay for 9 months worth of oil. And since it is speculators that drive up the price of gas, "Drilling Here and Drilling Now!" won't even lower the prices at the pump. It would just be a pure gift to the oil companies and their shareholders.
GET OFF NUCLEAR ENERGY / DUMP FOSSIL FUELS

Hemp; could replace fossil fuel, eliminate farm subsidy, replace wood pulp for paper, provide much of the world's energy needs and it is a highly nutritional food source, it makes better clothing than cotton.

Who would be against a totally green energy source and its by-products?

1 Big Oil, 2 Big Timber, 3 Big Cotton, 4 Big Coal, 5 Big Nuke

Seven states — Hawaii, West Virginia, Maine, Maryland, Montana, Kentucky, and North Dakota — have legalized hemp production; however, not one is producing the crop because of resistance from the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration. Hemp farmers in North Dakota are granted licenses by the state, but they are required to obtain separate permits from the DEA. The agency has continually refused to accept applications, leading farmers in North Dakota to file a lawsuit against the federal government.

Hemps hurds are 77 percent cellulose - a primary chemical feed stock (industrial raw material) used in the production of chemicals, plastics and fibers ... an acre of full-grown hemp plants can provide from 50 to 100 times the cellulose found in cornstalks, kenaf or sugar cane.

"Farming only 6 percent of the...show more (»)
Charles Lincoln Montes  08/25/2011 02:04 PM (#comment-295414904) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290405830)

It makes me wonder why those companies have failed. I have a friend that makes his own diesel to run his 3 trucks that he owns. if one man can do it why cant large companies? you should open your mind to that

Ringonature  08/27/2011 06:36 AM (#comment-296578696) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290405830)

I have been farming the last 18 years Organically.. I use B 100 in all my equipment... I have been experimenting growing Algae, to product Bio-Algae Diesel... And I’m sure that I am breaking some EPA regulation... If not.. I am, sure they will make one up...! Since Our Government, under Our King.. I mean Our President, Wants to run every thing in our lives. I bet, to some of the Greene's, Bio-Algae isn't Green enough... Guess What... I am going run it in my DIESEL GENERATOR....! OFF THE GRID IN 2012....!

Ring - I've been collecting , settling , and producing bio from waste oil in local restaurants for 4 years now. I've had no problems and it works great on my small scale. I run my Ford pickup , JD backhoe , Kubota mower , and my home heating oil fusean and my fuel bills have gone down significantly. The algaediesel has always intrigued me though - good luck !!
Native Americans called forests, mountains, plains, valleys along with its abundant natural resources "greensong." They were shocked by European settlers attitudes who called it "wilderness." Wild, the operative word, inspiring fear, required its destruction and man's dominion over it. Nothing has changed really, has it? Contrivance between oil interests and congress using national security interests as an excuse to open the ANWR will result, eventually, in exploitation. We've learned nothing from either the Exxon Valdez or the BP Deepwater disasters to mitigate, let alone curb, our gluttony for crude. This, of course, comes with a steep pricetag: climate, wildlife, our collective health and that of the planet all compromised.
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slave2liberty 08/18/2011 02:54 PM (#comment-290411338) in reply to boredwell (#comment-289269916)

Some Native Americans also burned downed millions of acres of forest as a way to force out game in their hunting practices. Some also drove herds of game over cliffs by the thousands as part of their hunting practices. Some Native Americans also raped and pillaged nearby indian tribes.

"Wild, the operative word, inspiring fear, ..."
Have you considered that wild may mean "not tame"? Are you to say that a greensong mountain lion is to be no less feared than a domesticated chicken?

The fact is, we all require energy to survive. Humans can co-exist with nature and use the resources which she provides. Would you prefer we go back to the middle ages or even the 1800's and burn kerosene or whale blubber for heat? Should we not refrigerate our food?

"...gluttony for crude." All I see from the anti-oil bigots are a bunch of self-loathing hypocrites who condemn the very industry which provides most of the essential goods, services and creature comforts which they cannot let go of.

If all of the environmental hypocrites were to ban together and refrain from using any oil-based product we could reduce consumption by over 50% i would guess. So, what's holding you...
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Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 02:12 PM (#comment-295420317) in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290411338)
yes native americans did that. back then the population was much to small to have a global impact. you cannot use that point to talk about today because the scope of people is exponentially larger.

of course we require energy to survive. but why must it be oil? the fact that we are still burning oil for all of our energy shows how complacent and lazy we have become as a race of course we should refrigerate our food. but why should we have to have huge polluting coal-fired plants to do it?? your thinking is too rigid.

we condemn the industry for its blatant disregard of the very earth that they make their profit off of. the oil tycoons take from the earth, pollute it, and squash any effort to change the way things are done. That is why we condemn them. stop assuming things you don't understand.
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Maura M. 08/17/2011 08:26 AM

I deeply despise this "use it or lose it" attitude. Southerners wanting to make a buck see it as their right to exploit the Arctic. Like people don't live there. Like their hasn't been continual human occupation in the region for 10 000 years. Like aboriginal people died and went away and now they're free to do what they like. Oil and gas companies can spew out nonsense about clean drilling, that doesn't make it true. BP can run commercials about how clean the Gulf is, and then delay compensation to the people affected, including those suffering long and slow deaths.

I realize I'm a little out of my depth, as I'm familiar with the Canadian Arctic, but not the American, I just don't understand how this is a non-issue.
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Sean Bond 08/17/2011 09:37 AM

Yes let us spend billions of dollars to get 9 months of refined oil, then abandon it all chemicals and pollution left behind. Actually with the revised USGS estimates & expert consumption estimates, it is more like 2 months at the current rate of consumption. Palin was Pitching ANWR for the longest time and based on my research I got to the source as to why this is being pushed...
Also based on information I found it seems there is something up with the whole Alaska deal with Russia and it's possible they have legal claim to take it back. Of course that fits Palin perfectly as she truly will be seeing Russia from her front porch.

Put solar panels that create NO WASTE, and produce CLEAN ENERGY on your house. You will NEVER have an electric bill again, and if you produce enough energy you can charge it back to the grid, and GIVE the electric company a bill.

Most states will allow you to make up to $1000 a month or more charging electricity back to your local electric company. That's a $12,000 a year direct income that coupled with savings from not having an electric bill would net you around $15000+ yearly.

BRAINSTORM!

We should give all the middle/poor class people solar panels so they can charge electricity back to their local electric companies. Give them electric cars too so that they never have to pay for gas, and make sure those cars have solar panels on them so they are always charging. The financial offset alone would dramatically help our economy.

Of course the Republicans would rather you stay dependent on FILTHY energy sources like oil, and nuclear power. Solar power would upset the Republican plan to murder the middle/poor classes.

Right on Andrew!

Last year there was alot rebates on solar photovoltaic.. I was so busy all last year installing solar on
small businesses with flat top roofs. As soon as the rebates ended last November my job also ended. The gross subsidies that the oil companies get need to come to an end and those subsidies need to be focused on creating green jobs. Unfortunately the ghosts in the dinosaur bones whisper 'sweet nothings' into the ears of our politicians. "Drill baby Drill"

Marcus - Grist had an update on an announcement in the PV solar industry that they will hit $1.42/watt soon. Unfortunately this may not get you your job back ASAP but at $1.42/watt people would have to be insane not to buy solar PV. I hope you're a young man because I think the market will explode and you will have a long and great career.

"Last year there was alot rebates on solar photovoltaic"

Rebates = taxpayer funded subsidies for those who should use their own money instead of that from those who cannot afford it.

Yeah, like Fox News which is now running their main office on solar power but feeding lies to slaves like you, and you just eat it up, then regurgitate all that spew. Ulcers can be cured with a round of antibiotics but there's no cure for you. You're really a hemorrhoid, aren't you?
oh, quite the contrary my platitude ridden friend. my knowledge comes from economic, philosophical and historical studies - and though no expert, i try to formulate my opinion based on well-thought out materials.
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Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 02:15 PM (in reply to slave2liberty)

you are paying a lot more taxes in subsidies to oil than to the small population using solar. so your saying that your ok with those huge subsidies to oil companies... but not ok with small subsidies to frontiers of innovation? it seems all too obvious that you are what you claim we are (hypocrites)
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Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 02:14 PM (in reply to slave2liberty)

slave2liberty 08/18/2011 02:56 PM (in reply to Andrew Carvin)

you mean the solar panels made from oil-byprodcts? them solar panels?
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DFH2pointo 08/19/2011 02:42 AM (in reply to slave2liberty)

Yeah, your total failure will require that you attend chemistry 101 all over. A little geology will help, also.

Solar panels are primarily composed of silicon, conductive alloys, glass(silica) and construction grade alloys. Small amounts of adhesives and caulking are used in the assembly of solar panels and generally contain trace amounts of petroleum products in the form of polysulfide and silicone.
Silicon makes up about 30% of earth's crust. And has absolutely nothing to do with oil or any by-products. Neither does silica.

Nice talking point though. Too bad your wrong. Pick up a book once in a while.

Are you allergic to science? Or just an anti-science bigot?

To set the record straight, i'm a huge advocate of solar and use it frequently.

While solar is great, it is not a replacement for oil or coal until it becomes more cost effective and can power its own production and distribution. As long as the delivery of solar technology relies on oil-powered jets, ships, trains and manufacturing facilities rely on coal-fired electricity, then it's not the end of all of our problems - but it is a great supplement and even replacement in certain uses for those who can afford it.

Am I to assume that you are acutely aware of ALL of the solar industries manufacturers and their practices regarding their dependence on oil for the production of their products? Have you considered that the smelting process for metals, alloys and glass require the use of CNG, LPG and oxygen? How about manufacturers that are located locally? And manufacturers that derive their power from nuclear and other alternative power sources already in existence? You realize that the oil that you are so quick to defend also requires delivery and distribution?

Yeah, I'm sure.

Supplement...no. Replacement....not fast enough.

Now how about addressing your claim that solar panels are manufactured from oil and...
oil by-products? That's what my reply was about and that is your claim. Your lack of knowledge coupled with your insistence on posting replies to just about everyone's comments indicates that any further reading of your scribblings is a waste of time.

Next time, do your homework before you go on your next posting binge.

Record set straight.
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Charles Lincoln Montes 08/25/2011 02:20 PM (#comment-295424874), in reply to slave2liberty (#comment-290412373)

solar panels are made from silicon, admium telluride, and copper indium selenide/sulfide. none of which come from oil... please do your research before claiming to know something
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