What would environmentalists do with ANWR?

By Matthew J. Kotchen

J ohn McCain has taken to referring to the issue of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as a “national security” issue. He remarks that the United States has a “hobnail in our economic gut” that will keep the economy growing without ANWR. Clearly, he must have forgotten that the government’s domestic energy policy is a memorial tribute to the economic history of every energy两手都误国.

But for environmentalists, the argument that ANWR would be a “win-win” is not persuasive. ANWR would increase the world’s production of oil — a “win” for environmentalists. But ANWR’s production of oil would not be available immediately, and the timeframe for peak production has been revised from 5-10 years to more than 60 years. So the “win” for environmentalists is not immediate. In addition, the oil that would be produced from ANWR, even at its peak, U.S. imports of foreign oil would remain constant. McCain cannot be so naive about the threat posed by oil. As director of the federal Terrorist Threat Integration Center, I can say that our intelligence community is unanimous in its assessment that the terrorist watch list is vital, and the terrorist watch list continues to be a critical tool for protecting our nation.

As we contemplate the potential for ANWR to continue protecting our nation, we must remember that the terrorist watch list is not a perfect tool.

There have been lots of different studies about the threat posed and the appropriate responses to counterterrorism efforts. But perhaps the simplest study experimental of what environmentalists would do to help prevent the threat of terrorism. We should all acknowledge that drilling in ANWR would not satisfy our addiction to oil, nor would it provide a solution to climate change. The revenues could probably be used to help the oil industry with a tax cut, or even better, it could be used to fund alternative energy sources that would otherwise be too expensive.

But environmentalists are not in serious need of new ideas for how to address energy and climate policy. As is reported in the San Diego Union-Tribune, former Vice President Al Gore just rejected a proposal from Congress to use tax incentives to fund renewable energy generation for electric power and to include an “energy efficiency clause.” The benefits would not be realized for about 30 years. Environmentalists have begun calling for an energy efficiency tax clause.

But it would not be right to argue that environmentalists have begun calling for an energy efficiency tax clause. They have been doing so for the past 15 years. For example, in a 2008 study by the Alliance to Save Energy, co-authored with the National Alliance to Save Energy and Resources for the Future, it was concluded that energy efficiency tax incentives would be a much better use of the money.

It is important to remember that the government’s domestic energy policy is a memorial tribute to the economic history of every energy两手都误国.

But there is an alternative to drilling in ANWR. It is a solution that includes a demand side management approach to energy, which means that people would have to consume less energy. Environmentalists have long been advocating for this approach. They have been pushing for energy conservation, which means that people would have to use less energy.

If progressive energy policies were adopted, it would be possible to achieve a 50% reduction in energy consumption by 2050. This would have a profound impact on the environment. It would also have a significant impact on the economy, as we would be able to save money by reducing our energy consumption.

So, let’s imagine that ANWR would be abandoned. Instead, let’s imagine that we have a comprehensive energy policy that includes conservation, energy efficiency, and renewable energy.

If we were to abandon ANWR and adopt a comprehensive energy policy, it would be possible to achieve a 50% reduction in energy consumption by 2050. This would have a profound impact on the environment. It would also have a significant impact on the economy, as we would be able to save money by reducing our energy consumption.

But let’s not forget the role of environmentalists in addressing energy and climate policy. They have been pushing for energy conservation, which means that people would have to use less energy. If progressive energy policies were adopted, it would be possible to achieve a 50% reduction in energy consumption by 2050. This would have a profound impact on the environment. It would also have a significant impact on the economy, as we would be able to save money by reducing our energy consumption.
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