

May 24, 2010

Dear Editor,

Sarah Palin, who proudly announced recently that she remains a "big supporter of offshore oil drilling", charges the Obama presidency with being too cozy with that industry in their oversight of the Gulf oil spill because his political campaign received \$900,000 in the 2008 election. I wonder what compels a politician from oil rich Alaska to accuse the president of industrial favoritism with zero evidence in hand, especially when the McCain-Palin campaign received \$2.4 million from the oil industry during the same period?

What makes this whole affair so laughable is that Palin would probably do the oil industry's bidding with glee even if she had received no money from them, while Obama in reality is likely to increase environmental and regulatory oversight starting with his proposed splitting up of the government's Minerals Management Services. One might even speculate, based on his record, that even if Obama had instead received the same \$2.4 million, which the McCain - "drill, baby, drill" - Palin campaign happily accepted, he would probably do his best to protect the environment and attempt to increase our energy security and reduce dangerous carbon emissions by reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. It's worth remembering, this is the same MMS, which under the leadership of the previous administration of former oil company executives, was literally (and I do mean literally) in bed with fossil fuel industry lobbyists!

Is this the audacity of apparently unintended irony? In other words, does anyone actually believe anything she says anymore?

John Donovan  
Eugene, OR