

Editorials Opposing Liquid Coal

The Coal Trap

“[The country would be investing billions to produce fuels that, from a global warming perspective, leave us at best treading water. That is unacceptable... A similar investment in biofuels like cellulosic or sugar-based ethanol — which could yield substantial reductions in greenhouse gases — would seem a lot smarter.”

New York Times, May 30, 2007

Coal as Motor Fuel: No, we're not there yet

Expanding coal isn't a smart choice for America right now. Although cheap and plentiful, it's dirty. Its environmental byproducts outweigh its benefits... Clean, renewable energy can be harnessed in all 50 states from resources such as wind, solar, water and biomass. It creates jobs in rural America and in manufacturing, provides energy at stable prices that will never run out, and reduces urban smog and pollution that contributes to global warming. "King Coal" should not rise again until technology advances to neutralize its environmental impact.

Philadelphia Inquirer, 3 June 2007

Liquid coal a new version of snake oil

“[E]nergy independence won't do any good if we end up frying the planet... The solutions to energy independence and global warming must go hand in hand. Liquid coal is not a solution; it's an expensive distraction from dealing with both problems and reducing carbon output.”

Lexington [Kentucky] Herald-Leader, June 3, 2007

Renewable fuels as energy options

“At this point, no energy solution should get Congress' blessing unless it also can be shown to contribute to reducing global warming... Before wider use of coal is encouraged in the United States, it needs the dual applications of better technology and tougher regulatory standards to make it a cleaner energy. Meantime, Congress should turn its attention to promoting renewable energies and increasing conservation.”

Miami Herald, June 4, 2007

Billion-Dollar Boondoggle

“Liquefying coal is not the answer to either energy independence or a cleaner environment.”

Roanoke (Virginia) Times, [June 5, 2007](#)

Wrong path toward energy independence

“This country cannot afford to support the creation of a bigger carbon-spewing infrastructure even if it solves other problems along the way... Cellulosic ethanol, biodeisel and sugar ethanol hold far greater promise.”

The Denver Post, June 9, 2007

No subsidy for a filthy fuel

“[When it comes to replacing gasoline, the government should be subsidizing an alternative like cellulosic ethanol, which emits 90 percent less carbon dioxide than gasoline -- and not liquefied coal, which would just speed the warming of the planet.”

Boston Globe, [June 12, 2007](#)

The Senate Energy Bill: Ignoring the 800-pound gorilla in the room

“The emerging coal-to-liquid movement... would be a sop to the coal industry that would pump more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. That is not the way to go.”

Washington Post, [June 14, 2007](#)

Congress Loves Coal

“The capital costs for a new plant are estimated at between \$2.5 billion and \$6 billion, and perhaps higher, because sequestration projects are years away from a working pilot phase. So making CTL viable requires a great deal of taxpayer – that is, your – money... The coal-to-liquid subsidy rush is one more sign that taxpayers will be the biggest losers in our current energy panic.”

Wall Street Journal, June 15, 2007

Coal-to-Liquid Boondoggle: A risky solution to America's energy woes

“[C]reating CTL, as it is known, is a very intensive process requiring coal, water and cash... [L]arge-scale and premature subsidies for this untested and environmentally risky technology may amount to nothing more than a big giveaway to Big Coal.”

Washington Post, [June 18, 2007](#)

Our view on energy woes: Put brakes on pricey plans to convert coal to car fuel

Process costs a fortune, gulps water, worsens global warming

“The liquefaction process... is economically viable only with vast subsidies... What's more, it produces greenhouse gases while consuming scarce water supplies.... Liquefaction is an answer whose time has not come, and probably never will.”

USA Today, [June 19, 2007](#)

Tradeoffs

[T]he enthusiasm in Washington for liquefied coal ought to give the public pause. ... If coal-to-liquid technology really is the answer to America's oil woes, then it will succeed quite well without federal help. If it isn't, then federal subsidies will just drain resources from more promising innovations. Either way, Washington should butt out.

Richmond (Virginia) Times-Dispatch, June 21, 2007