## The War On Energy And A Second Term

## By Art Horn

It is strange for me to see the president of the United States actually working against making this nation stronger. I must confess I've never seen anything like it. It feels different and it is different. Ever since he took office, president Obama has overtly and covertly worked fastidiously to close electric generating facilities that use coal. The rhetoric in his speeches about his belief in man made global warming and his commitment to funding so called "renewable energy" projects is disconcerting. Of course it's his operatives at the EPA that are the actual troops on the ground carrying out the mission. If he were somehow re-elected to a second term, the unreported and unprecedented war on fossil fuels will continue unabated.

Recently the New Yorker magazine published a story titled <u>"The Second Term"</u> by Ryan Lizza. The story speculates about what the major priorities of the current president would be if returned to the White House. Lizza says "Obama has an ambitious second-term agenda, which at least in broad ways, his campaign is beginning to highlight. The President has said that the most important policy he could address in his second term is climate change, one of the few issues he thinks could fundamentally improve the world decades from now." One thing is for sure, President Obama, if re-elected will not change his horse in mid-stream. He has been and continues to be committed to taxing carbon dioxide one way or another. Cap and Trade failed but least we forget, shortly after that defeat <u>he said</u> "Cap-and-Trade was just one way of skinning the cat, it was not the only way." You can bet the ranch that any cat inside our boarders will be scurrying for their lives if he is re-elected.

On January the 1<sup>st</sup> 2013 the Bush Era Tax Cuts will come to an end. Because of this the size of the federal government will be reduced and taxes will increase. It is speculated that this could have a major negative impact on the sputtering and fragile economy. Speaking from Air Force One on June the 6<sup>th</sup> 2012 president <u>Obama insisted</u> that he will not extend the Bush Era tax cuts for wealthy Americans. The president forgot to mention that all Americans will see their taxes increase on January 1<sup>st</sup>, not just those earning over \$250.000 a year.

So what will the President do if he is re-elected and faced with this situation? My guess is that he will continue the path he has pursued all along. He will continue his attack on the fossil fuel industry. Using fear of global warming as his weapon, he will extract capital from the economy with a so called "carbon tax." However, it will not be a tax on carbon. The term "carbon tax" is a smoke screen. It will actually be a tax on every industry and every entity that produces carbon dioxide gas. It will be Cap-and-Trade re-formulated, reconstituted and re-marketed in the name of saving the economy and having the double benefit of saving the world from global warming, excuse me, climate change! The president believes he has that kind of power. Remember on the night he was nominated he said "Let it be know that this was the day the oceans stopped rising and the planet began to heal."

I wonder if the President knows that carbon dioxide is a colorless, odorless gas that makes up a tiny 0.038% of the atmosphere and is beneficial and essential to all living things. The re-formulating of Cap and Trade into a carbon tax makes it sound like he is actually trying to do something about carbon. Using the word carbon intentionally conjures up images of black soot and dirty miners and filthy air. The use of the term carbon, when actually referring to carbon dioxide, has been a deliberate attempt by the media and the administration to convince the scientifically illiterate people in their audience that carbon dioxide gas is dirty and is a pollutant. Using the word carbon as a substitute for carbon dioxide gas is willfully and knowingly deceptive.

The story in the New Yorker speculates that a new carbon tax might not be so far fetched. <u>The article says</u> "Early discussions on Capital Hill suggest that, in a wide-ranging deal, a carbon tax (sic) might be part of a grand bargain to settle Taxmageddon." Taxmageddon is the term used by some to describe the negative impacts of the ending of the Bush Era tax cuts in early January 2013.

The Obama administrations war on carbon dioxide and those that produce it is a multifaceted battle front. Piloted by Lisa Jackson, the EPA will continue to be the lead tank rumbling over industries that get in the way, squashing them out of existence with crushing regulations. If Obama is re-elected this massive, unchecked government juggernaut will be fully armed to destroy one of our most abundant resources. Lisa Jackson's has focused the barrel of the EPA cannon squarely on coal. On April 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 Jackson's <u>EPA issued</u> "Interim Guidance on Clean Water Act (CWA) Procedures for Appalachian Surface Mines." There was no warning this was coming and no period for public comment as is traditionally the case.

Measuring the electrical conductivity of water in streams is an indirect measure of the total dissolved solids (TDS) in the stream. The conductivity is measured in microsiemens per centimeter. Drinking water typically has a conductivity level of 500 to 800 micro-siemens per centimeter. In the EPA's April 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 issuance of "guidance on water quality requirements for coal mines in Appalachia" the standard set for streams was 300 to 500 micro-siemens. This is a level below that of drinking water and is virtually unattainable in Appalachia. On July 21<sup>st</sup> 2011 the EPA put out its "final guidance on issuance of the CWA and lowered the conductivity standard to no more than 300 micro-siemens in West Virginia and Eastern Kentucky.

EPA knew from the beginning that these levels are unattainable by the coal industry. Any <u>activity upstream</u> such as salting of roads in winter, highway construction, agricultural activities or a storm can cause increased in conductivity levels unrelated to mining. The intent of the EPA is clearly to shut down the permitting of coal mining operations by using unrealistic water standards under the Clean Water Act.

If President Obama is re-elected this obstructive standard, now being used in Appalachia, could be spread across the nation with devastating effects on the coal industry, its employees and ultimately the United States economy and its people. If they are

successful in shutting down coal with this regulatory firepower they would be free to turn the cannon around and target their next enemy, natural gas.