
Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Just take the environment into consideration when voting for elected officials

Re: Just take the environment into consideration when voting for elected officials

Author: : ryanh

Date: : 2007/7/3 9:47:19

URL:

Tom,

Like I said I agree with WMass that it is important to look at a candidate's stance on conservation issues. I however think that the article he used to articulate his case was a poor choice. My statement about "go pitch it somewhere else" meant that I am not buying the "facts" offered in that article. I have no issue against WMass's freedom of speech or anyone else's for that matter. I do however think that he hurts OUR cause by using an argument that is so flawed.

Look, I have battled with this in my own heart over the years. I concluded that most of these environmental activists are just anti-establishment folks who use environmentalism as a means to their own ends.

When I worked for the pipeline I used to think "who is actually protecting the tundra". Well it certainly was not the long haired hippies who used to harass me on my way to work.

This is something I take very seriously. I get Edward Abby. I walk the walk. Most of these schmucks don't, and I take great offense to their sanctimonious attitudes. Seriously, Sheryl Crow wants me to use 4 squares of TP.....she uses more energy in ONE of her concerts than my family will in our whole lives. And if I ever saw Al Gore I would take a swing at him. They sell BAD SCIENCE. I should know I am in the business of selling bad science. The problem is that the majority of the populace does not understand what they are saying, or are following the fad of being pseudo green.

Just so we are all on the same page here are the points I take issue with in that article;

'What followed was the largest fish kill the West had ever seen, with tens of thousands of salmon rotting on the banks of the Klamath River. '

-These were Pacific Salmon. They ALL die EVERY year. This statement while true does not mean anything. They don't say that the policy change is what killed the salmon. They just said that the salmon died. If they spawned before they croaked and the farmers got adequate water than that is EFFECTIVE resource management. It does not have to be either/or. Also as you well know the ecosystem of the Pacific Northwest is reliant upon the "salmon rotting on the banks"

"It was Cheney's insistence on easing air pollution controls"

-The idea of tradeable air permits have been around for a long time and are highly effective. Yes some places may emit more pollution under this plan but on a whole the level goes down. It gives business a carrot and a

stick, not just the stick. They now have an incentive to innovate their processes, and they can sell their unused credits at a profit. EVERYBODY wins.

"The vice president also pushed to make Nevada's Yucca Mountain the nation's repository for nuclear and radioactive waste, aides said, a victory for the nuclear power industry over those with long-standing safety concerns."

-the fact is that the waste has to go somewhere. There is no place in the country that would make these people happy.

And keep in mind that the environment, at the end of the day, is an ancillary issue in the whole scheme of things.

I would personally kill every brook trout in Pennsylvania and protected cutthroat in Yellowstone if it guaranteed that my family would forever be safe from a suicide bomber. This illustration is not as ridiculous as it seems on its face if you look at the people running our government today.