

Why america should not drill in the anwr

[Economics](#)



This controversial issue is not new. For many years, people of America have been more than aware of this as it concerns not just their safety, not just their pride and value, but the future, or fate, of America's largest protective wilderness, not to mention the final frontier in the country's conservation, which is now being considered as our single most endangered national treasure.

The persistent attempts, particularly of the Bush administration, have failed several times, but the idea remains open and often raises argumentative discussions between the parties involved.

The pros see it as a solution to economy's longtime foreign oil dependence; a concern heightened by terrorist threats and the increasing instability of peace in Iraq and throughout the Middle East, making it look like an economic necessity as they have predicted it would create more jobs and more money.

The cons, on the other hand, expect something better than those given reasons; as they have seen it as a smoke screen, use to conceal an unnecessary and dangerous change. According to NDRC or Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental action group (2008), " Oil from the refuge would hardly make a dent in our dependence on foreign imports -- leaving our economy and way of life just as exposed to wild swings in worldwide oil prices and supply as it is today.

The truth is, we simply can't drill our way to energy independence. Although drilling proponents often say there are 16 billion barrels of oil under the refuge's coastal plain, the U. S. Geological Service's estimate of the amount

that could be recovered economically -- that is, the amount likely to be profitably extracted and sold -- represents less than a year's U. S. supply."

But there is more to it than that, perhaps more important than saving money and energy; it is the environmental impacts of drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

The concerned

American people made clear of their support on natural conservation, may be the primarily reason why after all those repeated attempts of some influential government officials, this idea continues to fall short. According to Matthew Kotchen and Nicholas Burger, authors of the article entitled "Should we drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge?

Economic perspectives" (2007) " Aside from direct effects on animal populations, oil spills are a concern. Even with the greatest care and best technologies, development in ANWR might still result in accidental spills with adverse effects on the environment. Another environmental concern that is sometimes raised is that ANWR oil will promote air-pollution and greenhouse-gas emissions."

This evidently explains that no matter how much oil the refuge might produce, is not really worth all the things that are at stake. We might not see the devastating results of this issue in a year or two, but it does not mean that they could hide forever. People must use their wide imagination and skills to keep up with change, without ruining a gift so precious and priceless, like nature.

We must remember that this was never a battle between how much money we can save and how can we achieve it, the true battle is between whether

we have enough nerves to save something, that can't save itself without our help, and what are we going to do about that.

It all comes down to the choices we make, that would determine the fate of one of the nature's greatest gift for us. Bear in mind that each and every one of us shall pay the extreme price. Nothing will ever be the same once nature strikes back. And when that happens, who would care about money?