

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 21 - Issue 2

February 2015

Gruber's arrogance is just the tip of the Iceberg Same lying tactics being used across the nation

By Tom DeWeese

Recently Americans were shocked by the surfacing of video clearly revealing the blatant arrogance of White House Medical Consultant Jonathon Gruber as he described how Obamacare proponents were able to lie to the American people to get the law passed. "Lack of transparency," he smugly stated, "is a huge political advantage." Gruber went on to pound his chest over the "very clever basic exploitation of the lack of economic understanding of the American voter. "Stupid," was his favorite word.

The fact is, what Americans actually witnessed in those videos is the way the insiders actually talk to each other behind closed doors and how they really regard the American people. This is their attitude as they force a complete agenda down our throats to radically change the American system. And when they get caught with their pants on fire, Barack Obama and Nancy Pelosi look at reporters with deadpan faces, saying, "I don't know who that guy is." And these deliberate deceptions are not just connected to the passing of Obamacare.

A blatant case in point is our nationwide fight to stop Agenda 21. We opponents aren't fortunate enough to have such revealing, dramatic video to instantly shock Americans awake. But we do have a whole lot of evidence to prove the same tactics are being employed, all the while, the proponents deny it even exists. Agenda 21? Never heard of it! Just a conspiracy theory! Wanna bet?

The facts clearly show that no one was denying Agenda 21 and its goals until after we made it a national issue. Just follow the bouncing ball:

1. On the American Policy Center's website, (www.americanpolicy.org), readers can see a CSPAN video from September, 1992, recording the official business in the US House of Representatives. This particular session was

held just after the UN's Earth Summit ended. It clearly shows Rep. Nancy Pelosi introduced House Concurrent Resolution #353, which called for the "United States to take a strong leadership role on implementing decisions made at the UN Earth Summit, including Agenda 21, through domestic and foreign policy." She went on to call Agenda 21 a "blue print," and a "comprehensive strategy." She also said her Resolution had 71 co-sponsors and was supported by Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that had been represented at the Earth Summit.

Apparently in September of 1992, Agenda 21 was considered a "blueprint" for the future, at least in our nation's main governmental body.

2. In 1994, the American Planning Association (APA) issued an article in one of its Newsletters entitled "How Sustainable is Our Planning?" The APA is considered one of the nation's most respected planning groups. Almost every city uses its policy guide book to make planning decisions and as it's been around for several decades, the APA doesn't openly have any ties to the United Nations.

Yet, this APA article, published just two years after the UN's Earth Summit openly discusses the origins of Sustainable Development coming from the UN's Brundtland Report entitled "Our Common Future." The report was produced by the UN's Commission on Global Governance (but the APA article doesn't call it that).

The most telling paragraph of the article is the fifth one. It says "Vice President Gore's book, *Earth in the Balance*, addressed many of the general issues of sustainability. Within the past year, the President's Council on Sustainable Development has been organized to develop recommendations for incorporating sustainability into federal government. Also, various groups have been formed to implement Agenda 21, a comprehensive blueprint for

IN THIS
ISSUE

PAGE 4 - CONCERNED OVER THE DRIVE FOR AN ARTICLE V CONVENTION OF STATES BY TOM DEWEESE
PAGE 8 - THE OBAMA WAR ON PIPELINES BY PAUL DRIESSEN

sustainable development that was adopted at the recent UNCED Conference in Rio de Janeiro (the ‘Earth Summit’)

In that one paragraph, the APA ties together its planning strategy to Al Gore, the President’s Council on Sustainable Development (which was organized to take the Agenda 21 soft law policy and make it official US policy), it revealed the organization of specific groups intended to bring Agenda 21 into federal, state and local policy. Above all, it defined Agenda 21 as a comprehensive blueprint for sustainable development.

Apparently in 1994, the American Planning Association considered Agenda 21 a “blueprint” to guide its planning policy in American cities.

3. In April, 1997, the United States issued a report to the United Nation’s Commission on Sustainable Development. The title of the report was “Implementation of Agenda 21: Review of Progress Made Since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development” (Earth Summit). It details all of the actions the US had taken in the five years since the Earth Summit to implement the policy. In the report the US recommends that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) “should continue to serve as the focal point for monitoring the implementation of Agenda 21 at local, regional and international levels.”

Apparently in 1997, the U.S. had no problem, not only implementing Agenda 21, but recognizing that the UN should be the main force to oversee it, even at the local level. By the way, for those not paying close attention, “local level” means YOUR community!

4. The Federal Register is the official document of the federal government, reporting on the day to day activities of Congress and detailing federal programs. In the August 24, 1998 Federal Register, on page 45156, there was a report entitled, “The Environmental Protection Agency: Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Program.” In that report was this interesting bit of information: “The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant

Program is also a step in implementing Agenda 21, the Global Plan of Action on Sustainable Development, signed by the United States at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.” It also describes various programs offered through the grants to help local communities implement the goals of Agenda 21.

Apparently, in 1998, everything was well under way to make Agenda 21 policy unquestioned US policy. That’s how non-treaty, soft law “suggestions” become US law.

So, right up to at least the year 2000, no one in Congress, the EPA, or even the main national planning group – the APA, gave any pause or doubt in their proud support for this “comprehensive blue print called Agenda 21. They were all equally proud to work right along side the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). During those years, ICLEI was able to get more than 600 American cities to become dues paying members for the exact purpose of implementing Agenda 21.

But then the fun started. A group of Americans who saw the Agenda 21 “blueprint” to be a threat to things like local elected control, private property rights and even national sovereignty, began to organize under the banner of Freedom 21.

We put together eleven national conferences to teach activists about Agenda 21 and to create new tactics to fight it. As those activists took what they learned into their local communities, and as articles began to pop up on the internet and local media a strange thing began to happen. Suddenly, the once bold Agenda 21 movement that proudly proclaimed their “comprehensive blueprint” of change, began to deny its very existence.

By 2005, the once pro-Agenda 21 crowd apparently had a complete lobotomy to wipe out any memory of Agenda 21. The most often used words now heard in association with Agenda 21 were, “Never heard of it.” And that was from the people who actually wrote it.

ICLEI removed references of it from its website. The American Planning Association quickly established a “Myths and Facts” section

DeWeese Report

Vol. 21, No. 2
February 2015

Published by
The American Policy
Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/
Fulfillment
Lola Jane Craig
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report
PO Box 129
Remington, VA
22734

Web Page:
www.deweese.com

Copyright 2015
The American Policy
Center
Issn 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Permission to photocopy,
Reprint and quote articles
from the DeWeese Report
is

hereby granted, provided
full acknowledgment is
included. All reprinted
articles must say:

Written
by Tom DeWeese, Editor
of DeWeese Report
(unless
another author is listed).
All reprints must carry the
DeWeese Report address
and phone number.

Samples of the reprint
must be provided to the
DeWeese Report

to its website, adamantly denying it had any connections to Agenda 21. “None of APA’s programs, products or services... are linked to Agenda 21,” it said. And if Agenda 21 was mentioned, it was prefaced by such words as “innocuous 20 year old document;” “Obscure United Nations accord;” “arcane UN document.”

Of course, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) rushed into the fray by attacking all of those who dared speak out about Agenda 21. Somehow such open discussion of a political policy labeled us, at best, fringe nuts, as worst domestic terrorists. In April, 2014 report, the SPLC said, “Agenda 21 is not a treaty. It has no force of law, no enforcement mechanisms, no penalties, and no significant funding. It is not even a top down recommendation.... It’s a feel good guide....” That description is a long way from all of those giddy references about Agenda 21 being a “comprehensive blueprint.”

However, as we continued our fight, the once proud Sustainablists worked harder to bury their connections. The American Planning Association, in particular, went into panic mode. First the APA organized boot camps to “retrain” its planners on how to deal with our opposition. Then they produced a “Glossary for the Public” to give planners guidelines on how to “talk” about planning. The opening line of the Glossary is the most telling: “Given the heightened scrutiny by some members of the public, what is said – and not said – is especially important in building support for planning.”

Can it be any clearer? Transparency was no

longer to be part of the debate on Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development. Hide it, deny it, lie about it. It was all summed up by one of the planners who actually had advised President Clinton’s Council on Sustainable Development. J. Gary Lawrence warned planners that “Participating in a U.N. advocated planning process would very likely bring out many... right wing conspiracy groups...who would actively work to defeat any elected official... undertaking local Agenda 21. So, we call our process something else, such as comprehensive planning, growth management or smart growth.”

In complete exasperation, the SPLC demanded that the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, local governments and the news media “stop reporting on Agenda 21 as if it were a bona fide controversy...” Further, it demanded that communities “need to be encouraged to return to or start to develop such plans in tandem with responsible groups like the American Planning Association.” In other words, stop questioning these plans and just shut up and do it. Ask yourself, what “plan” is the SPLC talking about, and why is it so very important that communities participate? Isn’t it all just “local” planning? Why would a national “anti-hate” group care so much about “local” programs?

There is no doubt that the attempts to hide implementation of Agenda 21 have been done using many of the same tactics Jonathon Gruber gloated over, and for the same reasons. If the American people knew the truth, they would rise up to stop it. ●

American Policy Center’s “Stop Agenda 21” Webinars Are Organizing Activists Nationwide

Throughout the summer and Fall, APC President, Tom DeWeese has hosted a series of Internet webinars designed to teach property rights advocates and concerned citizens about Agenda 21 and how to stop its policy of Sustainable Development.

Each session has a theme and features experts from across the nation. The webinars are presented free. Each is archived on the APC website www.americanpolicy.org and can be viewed at any time. More than 1,000 Americans are watching each session. In fact, since starting the online sessions last June, APC has added over 2,000 new activists to our fight.

Join us as we work to restore common sense government and defeat the policies that are causing massive government corruption in nearly every community in America.

<http://www.americanpolicy.org/webinars>

Every American Should Be Concerned Over the Drive For An Article V Convention Of States.

By Tom DeWeese

I've written many articles in the past concerning my opposition to a Constitutional Convention (Con Con). I've also helped win fights in Ohio and Kansas to stop Con Con resolutions. But recently there is a new twist in the effort to amend the Constitution to preserve freedom. It's called an Article V Convention of the States. Proponents say it answers my concerns over the dangers of a Con Con, and so many activists have asked me where I stand on this new effort. So here are a few thoughts.

I certainly feel the pain of patriotic Americans over the state of our Constitution. The original document has been basically put in a museum in Washington, DC and forgotten. We are told it is old and outdated. Not relevant to today's age of technology, and moral reality. Old guys in powdered wigs wrote it. They knew nothing about instant communications, international terrorists, and besides, they were slave owners. How could their ideas possibly be relevant to us today? I'm sure Nancy Pelosi never read the Constitution because she would have had to pass it through Congress before she could find out what's in it. For Obama, it's just a road block keeping him from his need to change the country.

Well, we've all heard those arguments. The result is a government out of control. Spending is skyrocketing. Gun rights are under siege. Obamacare...right! Property rights, American industry, the dollar, personal privacy, and even our ability to choose the foods we want to eat, are all disappearing under an out-of-control government.

Something has to be done. There are those who argue that we can't wait to try to elect the right kind of representatives in Congress and the White House. We have to take matters into our own hands immediately. We have to see that the Constitution is strengthened to assure a balanced budget. Some have gone so far as to declare 10 Amendments for Freedom, including a plan to repay the national debt, enforce legislative transparency, a line item veto, term limits, immigration control, English as the national language, only U.S. laws over America, no socialism and a government bound by "In God we Trust." And there are amendment ideas floating around to assure the Constitution is sound and strong for future generations.

Few of us would disagree with most of these ideas. They are put forth by respected leaders who have a record of

promoting limited and Constitutional government. But how do we put these plans into action?

Radio host Mark Levin wrote a compelling book suggesting that there is a pressure valve written into Article V of the Constitution that shows us the way, through a convention of the states - an Article V Convention, as it is called. And we are assured that this is not a Constitutional Convention (Con Con) through which states call on Congress to convene. Too dangerous they tell us - and I agree.

No, they tell us, an Article V Convention is different. We are told that the term Constitutional Convention or Con Con is inaccurate. That an Article V Convention is designed to precisely avoid the need for a Con Con. Specifically an Article V Convention is a meeting of the states -out of the control of Congress and the Pelosis of the nation. Each state will get one vote, and that will prevent a runaway convention that could result in the gutting of the Constitution. And through such a process, the states can control the agenda of the convention and therefore pass Mark Levin's freedom amendments. It's that simple. Moreover, the idea has captured the support of major Conservative leadership, including Sean Hannity, Home School leader Michael Farris, former Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, commentator Tim Baldwin, the Goldwater Institute, and the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), and many more. All well respected leaders and advocates of limited government and Constitutional law.

I won't begin to question them, their integrity, or their honorable intentions. I believe most are sincere in their concern and desire to save our Republic. But I have a few questions and observations.

First, what is the real issue here?

What is the real reason why we have to even consider trying to redefine what the Founders meant our government to be? After all, it's all in the Constitution already. Article V advocates, and Conservative movement in general, will readily tell you that the real issue is that our government, from the White House, to Congress, to the Supreme Court, are failing or refusing to follow Constitutional Law. They ignore it. So, say Article V proponents, that's why we must amend the Constitution to assure our freedoms are guaranteed.

But, here is my real question for Article V advocates: If government today refuses to follow the Constitution, what will change once it is amended with the Articles of Freedom?

What motivation will suddenly drive the Obamas and Pelosis to say “oh, the Constitution is the law of the land and we must follow it?” Especially when they oppose those freedom amendments for the same reasons they today ignore the entire Constitution. The Progressives who are in charge simply do not believe in balanced budgets, gun rights, and control of our borders. In addition, they really don’t care what a majority of Americans want, either. So an argument that the passage of the amendments will confirm that Americans want such a government cuts no ice with them.

Frankly, I believe that if we don't change the atmosphere and mind set in the nation to one that supports the ideas behind our Constitution, then all the amendments in the world aren't going to change the drive toward more and more government. One place to start that effort is by working to take back control of our local school systems, out of the clutches of the Federal Department of Education.

A second place to work is in the election process. Now, whenever opponents of the Article V convention suggest that the only real way to save the Republic is through the ballot box, advocate Michael Farris jumps up to declare that “it’s been tried and it hasn’t worked, and so times demand that we need something more drastic.” The fact is, we actually haven’t tried it – not in an effective way and not in a very long time. There is no effort underway by the forces of freedom to organize on the local level. It’s a huge job and difficult to do, but the Progressives have done it successfully because they understand that change is made at the local level to fuel their efforts at the state and national level.

If you want to understand what a huge job such organization truly is, just make a list of every single precinct in your community and make space for a name to fill that position. Throw in such other positions as ward committeemen, and you will see it’s not a job for the weak at heart. But it’s how winning is achieved. Contrary to the claims of the Article V proponents, the Founding Fathers did provide us with a Silver Bullet to preserve the Republic – and it is still there under the dust and rust of the Republic. It’s called Precinct Captain. And it’s the only way to preserve Freedom. You have to work at it.

Second, where do the Progressives stand on an Article V Convention?

As I listen to Article V proponents make their arguments about how they're going to bring about change - that they are going to bring all of these states together, hold a convention and pass their amendments, they seem to ignore the very existence of the Progressive movement that today controls nearly every aspect of our governing process. What do Article V proponents think these forces are going to do while the convention process is going on?

Here's what my research has found. Progressive groups like the Open Society Institute, the Center for American Progress, and the American Constitutional Society, to name a few, all groups funded by George Soros, are behind a movement for a more "Progressive Constitution." They are simply not going to let conservatives have the playing field to themselves. They will use every trick, spending every dollar in their bulging war chests, to assure they control the process.

Tim Baldwin has written with great vigor in support of the Article V Convention. But I think it is interesting to note that his father, Chuck Baldwin, former Constitution Party presidential candidate, author, columnist and a personal friend of mine, was quoted in a World Net Daily column in 2009, entitled "Globalists 'Salivating' over Collapse of America," said, "*The globalists who currently control Washington, D.C., and Wall Street are, no doubt, salivating over the opportunity to officially dismantle America's independence and national sovereignty, and establish North American Union -- in much the same way that globalists created the European Union. A new Constitutional Convention is exactly the tool they need to cement their sinister scheme into law.*"

Yes, Chuck was talking about a Con Con, but what will be different in an Article V Convention of the States if the Progressives get into the process?

Further, Eric Burk, Grassroots Coordinator for Convention of States, actually says his movement is “glad to receive support from anyone.” He says the United States was founded on the notion that liberty is best preserved by a variety of ideologies working together to “analyze and discuss problems in government and provide the best response.” Funny, I thought the United States was founded by people who pledged their lives, liberty and sacred honor to assure a very specific ideology was in place. And I thought the stated reason for the Article V Convention was to assure our liberties are secured.

To be clear, the ideology of our Founding Fathers was completely based on the Principles of Freedom. Those Principles are Individual Liberty, Limited Government, Free Enterprise and Private Property Rights. Diminish any one of

those principles and freedom is in danger. How are those freedoms preserved by working with the proponents of the very ideology that seeks to destroy them? Isn't Burk's argument really just empty, meaningless words, designed to ward off any possible weakness in the Article V scheme?

And I find it interesting that whenever Michael Farris speaks on the subject of the Article V Convention and an audience member brings up the possibility of Progressives taking control to force their ideas through, he answers by saying, "I won't allow that to happen." Which makes me want to ask him this question – "Will you be the only one attending the Convention?" Again, aren't these just empty words chosen to secure the support of those who haven't thought it through? Why else would these two proponents of an Article V convention make such silly claims?

Americans must ask themselves this question: do the proponents of the Convention of States truly want to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States and restore the Republic, or do they intend to change both? And ask yourself, where you stand in that argument. I personally believe that the Constitution is the greatest document ever derived. It doesn't need fixing. Those ignoring it need removal. An Article V Convention will not do that.

Third, how is the Article V Convention being promoted?

I have been an activist all of my life. I have seen pretty much every tactic used by powerful forces who are trying to railroad the people. The tactics always seem to be the same. Use the facilitation process to bring people into the fold, control the debate, and attack the opposition with accusations of deceit and fringe ideas. I have many times been awarded a tin foil hat by such forces for advocating ideas contrary to their vision for America.

So, I'm a little sensitive to such tactics when I see them employed – especially in my own movement. And I know that Tea Party activists are equally wary of such tactics. That, in fact, is one of the things that motivates true Tea Party patriots to take action against rich, powerful, DC based groups which try to usurp or control the Tea Party. Yet, these are exactly the tactics I see being employed today by Article V proponents. Some of my associates have attempted to speak out at meetings where Article V is being promoted, and are not allowed

the floor. That should sound familiar to Ron Paul supporters who have had microphones yanked out of their hands or turned off at state conventions.

Those Republican activists who recently faced the forces of Eric Cantor during the recent election convention process know too well the sting of this tactic. A couple of my friends have even been asked to represent the anti-Article V position. But, while the Article V proponent is given all the time he wants, the opposition is usually allowed only a few minutes to make their case. If the Tea Party is opposed to such tactics by County Commissioners, legislative committees, or Republican leadership at state conventions - then why don't they question it at their own meetings? A full, open debate is always healthy in a free society. A deliberate attempt to silence opposition should cause people to question the motives of the perpetrators.

Finally, why are Article V proponents attacking respected Conservatives?

The proponents of Article V take great comfort in reciting the powerful names of those supporting their efforts. As I said, many are very respected leaders of the Conservative movement. But, how dare they deride in such nasty fashion, those who oppose them? They've called Phyllis Schlafly an old lady and out of touch. Phyllis was fighting for the Constitution when most of these Article V proponents were still in school. She risked everything she had to stop the Progressives' Equal Rights Amendment.

Mike Farris has called the John Birch Society evil. JBS has been unwavering in its dedication to the Constitution through the dark days of Communist infiltration of the 1950's to today's fight against Agenda 21, and they have been proven right time after time. These are despicable attacks against some of the strongest proponents of freedom in this nation. It should give pause to any freedom loving patriot to hear such attacks coming from Article V proponents.

It is with great pain that I acknowledge that some people I really respect have joined the Article V effort. But I can't join them because, to me, something really smells about this Article V movement. Its arguments don't past scrutiny. Its tactics are underhanded. Its source of funding is not in the open. I think honest Tea Party members and dedicated freedom activists should ask a lot of questions before risking our precious Constitution to their lot. ●

Continued from page 8

A 2013 INGAA Foundation study found that the number of interstate natural gas pipeline authorizations issued more than 90 days after federal environmental assessments were completed climbed from 8% to 28% since Congress passed the 2005 Energy Policy Act. Rather than streamlining permits, as Congress had intended, the law had the opposite effect. It removed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ability to keep project reviews on a strict schedule, allowed both state and federal agencies to drag their heels on pipeline permitting, and opened the door to more objections by environmental pressure groups.

Authorization delays were caused by conflicts among federal agencies, as well as inadequate or under-trained agency staff, applicant changes to projects requiring additional or revised environmental review (often in response to environmentalist or other third-party protests and demands), site-access problems, and FERC and other agency reviews of requirements for mitigating asserted environmental impacts, INGAA concluded. Increased partisanship at FERC has also increased delays.

The Obama Army Corps of Engineers slowed pipeline permits by citing the Clean Water Act. Its Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) cited the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to justify slow-walking permits. Its Environmental Protection Agency wants to control all "waters of the United States" (WOTUS), so as to exert regulatory authority over activities on federal, state and private lands – including drilling, fracking and pipelines – in the name of sustainability, climate change prevention and other eco-mantras.

The MBTA bans the "taking" (harassing, harming, killing, capturing or wounding) of migratory birds, their nests and eggs related to natural gas pipelines and other projects. Because building a pipeline requires clearing a right-of-way, excavating and other activities that could affect wildlife for a short time, a permit is required. But native grasses soon cover the route, and state-of-the-art steel, valves and safety features greatly reduce the likelihood of ruptures and spills, compared to earlier generation pipelines.

And yet the Obama FWS drags its feet on pipeline permits – while approving numerous renewable energy projects beloved by the President and his "green" base, including massive wind turbines that slaughter millions of eagles, hawks, bats and other threatened, endangered and migratory species every year.

The FWS also blessed the huge Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System on the Nevada/California

border. It uses 300,000 mirrors to reflect the sun's rays onto three 40-story water-filled towers to produce steam and generate electricity. Eagles, owls, falcons and other birds that fly between the solar panels and towers become "streamers," because the 500-degree heat turns them into smoking, disintegrating corpses as they plummet to earth. There's little left to find or bury – making it easy for Big Solar regulators, operators and promoters to claim "minimal" wildlife impacts. In fact, during the Ivanpah project's environmental review, the FWS focused on desert tortoises and missed the bird crematorium issue.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Land Management unveiled a sweeping plan that would revise longstanding resource management plans, to install buffer zones around "sensitive" Gunnison sage grouse habitats, impose seasonal restrictions on oil and gas drilling and livestock grazing, and close roads and trails wherever grouse are present. But in the midst of this effort, BLM and various state governments are also working to streamline "eco-friendly" solar, wind, geothermal and transmission line projects that they claim will reduce "dangerous" carbon dioxide emissions. Natural gas would do that, too, of course.

Natural gas is clean, affordable and reliable – if it can reach consumers through pipelines, which are the safest form of energy transportation. Unfortunately, the Obama principle seems to be: If it requires subsidies, raises energy prices, costs jobs, impacts thousands of acres, and butchers birds and bats – expedite approval. If it generates royalty and tax revenues, produces reliable, affordable energy, creates jobs, and has minimal impacts on endangered and migratory species – delay or ban it. Talk about crazy.

The administration's fixation on ideological environmentalism is not helping the environment, the economy, or consumers. It is a political ploy designed to garner liberal votes and rake in more money from campaign donors like Tom Steyer, the billionaire hedge fund manager who got his money from coal.

America needs more pipelines. The Obama Administration needs to let industry build them. Perhaps a reconstituted Senate (with Harry Reid as Minority Leader) can lead the way. America will prosper!

Paul Driessen is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org) and author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death* and coauthor of *Cracking Big Green: To save the world from the save-the-Earth money machine.* ●

The Obama war on pipelines

Expedite wind and solar – but block coal, oil, gas, pipelines, jobs and economic recovery

“This is not the same industry we had 15 years ago,” Natural Gas Supply Association VP Jennifer Fordham said recently. That’s an understatement. The oil, petrochemical and manufacturing industries are also far different from those of 15 years ago. Together, they’ve created hundreds of thousands of new jobs and generated countless billions of dollars in economic activity. No thanks to the Obama Administration.

From EPA to Interior and even the Energy Department, the Administration continues to display a strong animosity toward fossil fuels. Its war on coal has hounded mines, power plants, jobs and communities. Its opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline has thwarted the creation of tens of thousands of construction jobs. Its bans on leasing, drilling and hydraulic fracturing on federal onshore and offshore lands have caused a 6% drop in oil production from those lands and a 28% plunge in natural gas output – costing thousands of jobs and tens of billions in bonus, rent, royalty and tax revenues to the U.S. Treasury.

Nevertheless, you’d think Obama regulators and policy makers would support natural gas pipelines. Even the Sierra Club promoted this fuel as a “clean alternative to coal” just a couple years ago. But no.

The fracking revolution on America’s state and private lands has unleashed a gusher of mammoth proportions. In just six years, 2008-2014, it has generated a 58% increase in oil production (from 5 million to 8 million barrels per day) – and a 21% rise in natural gas production. By the end of this year, U.S. crude oil production is projected to reach 9 million bpd. In the Marcellus Shale region, gas production is expected to reach 16 billion cubic feet a day, twice the volume of only two years ago.

However, this miraculous cornucopia is overwhelming the nation’s existing delivery

systems and, far from striving to eliminate the bottleneck, the Obama Administration is creating new ones.

Not having the Keystone pipeline to transport Upper Midwest crude to refineries has forced oil companies to move that oil by train. Rail accidents have caused spills and deaths, but the regulatory focus has been on stronger tanker cars, with insufficient attention paid to track maintenance and safety – or pipelines.

Insufficient natural gas pipelines mean producers cannot deliver this vital fuel to homes, hospitals, factories and electricity generating plants, or to petrochemical plants that use it as a feed stock for literally thousands of products. Pipeline companies are clamoring for construction permits.

With supplies rising, prices for oil and natural gas are declining. Global crude oil prices have fallen more than \$20 a barrel and are cheaper in the United States than in Europe. Natural gas prices in the Marcellus area have been about half the U.S. benchmark price, which is below \$4 per thousand cubic feet (mcf), compared to prices as high as \$9 or even \$20 per mcf (or Btu) in Europe and Asia. As a result, despite a clear need for gas, some drillers are re-examining their Marcellus plans, and an estimated 1,750 Pennsylvania natural gas wells are not currently producing because pipeline connections are not available.

Natural gas pipelines also ensure energy conservation and reduce air pollution. A North Dakota pipeline would collect gas produced with crude oil, eliminating the need to “flare” the gas. But permit delays, largely by federal agencies, mean enough gas to heat 160,000 homes goes up in smoke every month.

Why are pipelines lagging behind production? First, pipeline companies build new capacity only when there is a demonstrated need. Second, and most important, pipeline permit approvals are being delayed.