What Others are Saying about U.S. LNG Exports:  
Editorials & Thought Leaders

“Exporting natural gas is a controversial issue, with powerful forces on both sides. But we are persuaded by the report’s core finding that the benefits of selling gas to other countries would more than offset the modestly negative impact of higher prices for domestic users of the fuel.”

“It would be particularly perverse for the Obama administration, which has made an explicit commitment to increasing the nation’s exports, to preserve restrictions on natural gas exports. The government should permit energy companies to sell as much of the fuel as the economics warrant, whether in Germany or Germantown.”

Wall Street Journal, Editorial Board (Dec. 6, 2012)  
“It makes no economic sense to complain that foreign markets are closed to American goods and then assert that U.S. interests are served by hoarding U.S. gas. American prosperity is best served by letting business exploit as many opportunities as possible, for the U.S. market or for export.”

USA TODAY, Editorial Board (June 20, 2012)  
“Blocking exports of natural gas might hold prices down a bit, but it would dampen production here, too. In fact, export demand will create more drilling-related jobs at home and give suppliers more incentive to produce. The best solution to this nice-to-have problem is to do what the U.S. usually does best, which is to let the free market work.”

Bloomberg News, Editorial Board (Nov. 25, 2012)  
“By green lighting exports of liquefied natural gas, Obama can hasten production of an abundant U.S. resource and open a new avenue of international trade. The president can also give growth a much needed jolt: Liquid natural gas exports could add billions to the U.S. economy, create tens of thousands of long-term jobs and help narrow the trade gap.”

“How can America, having asked Japan to reduce Iranian oil imports, turn around and prohibit the export of surplus natural gas to this key ally?”

“…American firms could make up to $3 billion per year by producing and exporting liquefied natural gas. It’s true that gas-dependent industries would have to pay more because of higher gas prices, but those costs would be substantially smaller than the benefits. But there are bigger stakes involved than just money. A decision to constrain natural-gas exports could have dangerous reverberations for American trade.”

“A policy that discriminates against producers in favor of consumers by restricting foreign sales will hurt both. The gas boom will recede as an engine of growth. For years, Americans have complained about trade deficits. Now that we have something more to sell, we shouldn’t turn away customers.”

Michael Economides, Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of Houston, and Editor-in-Chief of Energy Tribune (Jan. 15, 2013)  
“Ultimately, LNG exports benefit the entire U.S. economy, and promote economic growth globally. By increasing demand, exports increase domestic production of shale gas. The economic benefits of shale, to landowners, steelworkers, and communities across the country readily displace the modest increase in domestic natural gas prices that consumers might face.”

Amy Myers Jaffe, Executive Director for Energy and Sustainability at the University of California, Davis (September 17, 2013)  
“US exports of LNG are part of a package of export policies that could eventually depoliticize oil and make it difficult for countries to artificially inflate prices. In other words, US exports, even if they create additional demand, ultimately will contribute to a lowering of US energy costs over time by reducing monopoly power of foreign producer coalitions to increase prices. With the 40th Anniversary of the 1973 Oil Embargo, opponents of exports need to think more broadly about the broader benefits that might come from US energy export policy.”
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