

Submitted Written Testimony of Marc Morano, Publisher of Climate Depot & Author of Best Selling [The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change](#) & former staff of U.S. Senate Environment & Public Works Committee

Presented to Western Caucus' Green New Deal Forum on Capitol Hill - February 27, 2019

Submitted Testimony of Marc Morano – Publisher of Climate Depot

February 27, 2019 – I want to thank Congressional Western Caucus for hosting this hearing on the Green New Deal. My background is in political science, which happens to be an ideal background for examining the Green New Deal and man-made global warming claims they are based upon. I am the author of the best-selling 2018 book, [“The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change.”](#)

I have been passionate about environmental issues since I began my career in 1991, having produced a [documentary on the myths surrounding the Amazon Rainforest in 2000](#) and I was a fully credentialed investigative journalist who reported extensively on environmental and energy issues such as deforestation, endangered species, pollution and climate change. In 2016, I wrote and starred in the film Climate Hustle, which debuted in over 400 theaters in the U.S. and Canada.

In my capacity as Communications Director for the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee under Senator James Inhofe, I was speechwriter and hosted the [award-winning U.S. Senate](#) blog. I released the first ever [U.S. Government “Skeptic’s Guide To Debunking Global Warming Alarmism”](#) in 2006. I also authored the 255-page [Senate report of over 700 dissenting scientists](#) on man-made global warming originally published in 2007 and updated in 2008, 2009. In 2010, the number of [dissenting international scientists exceeded 1000](#). I am now [the publisher](#) of the [award-winning Climate Depot](#) and work daily with scientists who examine the latest peer-reviewed studies and data on the climate as well as the feasibility of the alleged “solutions.” The Green New Deal is neither “Green” or “New” and it is a “Raw Deal.” It is one Big Bowl of Crazy.

A few key points:

“Global warming” is merely the latest environmental scare with the same solutions of wealth redistribution and central planning. “Global warming” is merely the latest environmental scare with the same big government solution.

The “Green New Deal” has very little to do with the environment or climate.

The Deal claims Free college or trade schools for every citizen.

The government will ensure “healthy food” to all, “safe, affordable, adequate housing,” incomes for all who are “unable or unwilling” to work.

Seeks to go after meat eating and “farting cows.”

Will end all traditional forms of energy in the next ten years. The Green New Deal is “a 10-year plan to mobilize every aspect of American society at a scale not seen since World War 2 to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions.”

The cost of the Green New Deal is not cheap. Bloomberg News: Green New Deal Could Cost \$93 Trillion, Group Says - “The so-called Green New Deal may tally between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10-years, [concludes](#) American Action Forum, which is run by Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who directed the non-partisan CBO from 2003 to 2005. That includes between \$8.3 trillion and \$12.3 trillion to meet the plan’s call to eliminate carbon emissions from the power and transportation sectors and between \$42.8 trillion and \$80.6 trillion for its economic agenda including providing jobs and health care for all.”

Recycling The Same “Solutions”

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’ of New York has acknowledged that her “deal” will require “massive government intervention.” See: [OCASIO-CORTEZ: FIXING ‘GLOBAL WARMING’ REQUIRES ‘MASSIVE GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION’ & Green New Deal” will bring “a massive transformation of our society.”](#)

Ocasio-Cortez is echoing the former UN Climate chief’s rhetoric. See: [Flashback: UN climate chief Christiana Figueres seeks ‘centralized transformation’ that is ‘going to make the life of everyone on the planet very different’ in order to fight ‘global warming’](#)

But, as I said earlier, the “Green New Deal” is neither “green” or “new.” The environmental Left has been using green scares to push for the same solutions we see today — wealth redistribution, central planning, sovereignty limiting treaties — since the overpopulation scars of the 1960s and 1970s.

2019 Green New Deal proposed “solution”: [FORMER OCASIO-CORTEZ CAMPAIGN AIDE CALLS ‘GREEN NEW DEAL’ A PLAN TO ‘REDISTRIBUTE WEALTH AND POWER’ FROM RICH TO POOR](#)

The Green New Deal borrows from previous proposed “solutions”: [Flashback: UN IPCC official admits UN seeks to ‘redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy’](#)– ‘This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore.’

Flashback 1974 proposed “solution” to battle environmental degradation: Different Environmental Scare, Same Solution: In 1974, future Obama science czar John Holdren proposed “redistribution of wealth” to battle environmental degradation. Holdren testified to the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, “The neo-Malthusian view proposes conscious accommodation to the perceived limits to growth via population limitation and redistribution of wealth in order to prevent the ‘overshoot’ phenomenon. My own sympathies are no doubt rather clear by this point. I find myself firmly in the neo-Malthusian camp.”

2019 “Solution:” [AOC explains why ‘farting cows’ were considered in Green New Deal – ‘Maybe we shouldn’t be eating a hamburger for breakfast, lunch, and dinner’](#)

AOC Borrowing from the UN: [Former UN Climate Chief: Meat eaters should be banished, treated ‘the same way that smokers are treated’](#) - Christiana Figueres, the former United Nations official responsible for the 2015 Paris climate agreement, has a startling vision for restaurants of the future: Anyone who wants a steak should be banished. “How about restaurants in 10-15 years start treating carnivores the same way that smokers are treated?” Figueres suggested during a recent conference. “If they want to eat meat, they can do it outside the restaurant.”

2019 Green New Deal proposed “solution”: [‘Green New Deal’ Unveiled: Entire economy would operate it – Govt would have ‘appropriate ownership stakes’ in ALL Green New Deal businesses](#)

Flashback 1974 proposed solution to overpopulation: Different Environmental Scare, Same Solution: Amherst College professor Leo Marx warned in 1974 about the “global rate of human population growth. All of this is only to say that, on ecological grounds, the case for world government is beyond argument.”

There is nothing new about the Green New Deal. “Global warming ” is merely the latest alleged environmental scare that is being substituted to push the same “solutions.” Instead of arguing the merits of the economic and political changes of the Green New Deal, they are using — in the words of Al Gore – a “torqued up” climate change scare to urge quick imposition of the policies to protect us from a climate emergency.

In my book, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Climate Change*, I showcase how they use the same hysteria for the different environmental scares in the 1970s, whether it’s resource scarcity, over-population, rainforest clearing, et cetera.

They will say, “We need a global solution; we need global governance; we need wealth redistribution; we need sovereignty threatening treaty, or some kind of economic activity limiting.” No matter what environmental scare in the past that they tried to scare people with, it was the same solutions they’re proposing now.

In the book, I go back and show over and over that global warming is merely the latest scare they’re using to get their agenda. I feature climate activist Naomi Klein, who’s an adviser to Pope Francis, who wrote the book, “Capitalism vs. the Climate.” Klein actually says that they would be seeking the same solutions even if there was no global warming and that essentially, capitalism is incompatible with a livable climate. She urges people, that they need to jump on this because solving global warming will solve what we’ve been trying to achieve all along.

Even the New York Times recognizes the Green New Deal as a cover for other non environmental issues. [NYT gets it! Is the Green New Deal ‘merely a cover for a wish-list of progressive policies?’ - NYT Editorial Board: "Is the Green New Deal aimed at addressing the climate crisis? Or is addressing the climate crisis merely a cover for a wish-list of progressive policies and a not-so-subtle effort to move the Democratic Party to the left? At least some candidates — Amy Klobuchar of Minnesota among them — seem to think so....Read literally, the resolution wants not only to achieve a carbon-neutral energy system but also to transform the economy itself."](#)

Even the Washington Post is souring on it. [WASHINGTON POST RIPS GREEN NEW DEAL: ‘WE CAN’T AFFORD BAD IDEAS’](#) *They should not muddle this aspiration with other social policy, such as creating a federal jobs guarantee, no matter how desirable that policy might be,” the editorial board wrote. The Post also called the Green New Deal’s goal of reaching “net-zero” greenhouse gas emissions within 10 years “impossible” and criticized the resolution’s “promise to invest in known fiascos such as high-speed rail.”*

The climate activists openly are using climate scare tactics to achieve their ends. And in order to get those ends achieved, they have to hype and scare. It’s been a very effective strategy because they’ve bullied Republican politicians, who should know better, into at least submissiveness and silence.

AOC and Sen. Markey have bungled the release of the Green New Deal. They had to pull parts of it from their website. There’s a whole dispute over what they meant on nuclear power. They haven’t even gotten this straightened out.

But what they do have straightened out: this is the litmus test for the 2020 Democratic contenders. And in a way they, have given anyone who cares about free markets, liberty, and science, a grand opening to expose anyone who signs on to this plan.

Another aspect that is remarkable is that the “Green New Deal” is how it is not sitting well with many environmental activists and other factions of the Democratic Party base.

[Prominent environmentalist Shellenberger: ‘I am calling Bullsh*t’ on Ocasio-Cortez! Declares AOC is ‘a climate fraud’ – Rips ‘Green New Deal’ as ‘climate fakery’ - Environmentalist Michael Shellenberger, President of "Environmental Progress" & an activist Time Magazine called a “Hero of the Environment”:](#) - *"I am calling bullshit not just on AOC but on her progressive enablers in the news media who are giving her a pass on the most crucial test of moral and political leadership of our time when it comes to climate change: a person's stance on nuclear power." "I am calling bullshit on climate fakery. Anyone who is calling for phasing out nuclear is a climate fraud perpetuating precisely the gigantic 'hoax' that [Oklahoma] Sen. James Inhofe (R) famously accused environmentalists of perpetuating." "If you want to be a self-respecting progressive or journalist who is fairly considering or covering the climate issue, please stop giving Ocasio-Cortez and other supposedly climate-concerned greens a pass. THEY ARE INCREASING EMISSIONS."*

[Major labor union \(which endorsed Hillary & Obama twice for Prez\) unloads on ‘Green New Deal’ as ‘unrealistic manifesto’ that will ‘destroy workers’ livelihoods’ – & cause ‘economic and social devastation’ - Labor leader Terry O’Sullivan, who’s union twice endorsed President Obama for President and endorsed Hillary Clinton in 2016, is have come out swinging against the “Green New Deal”](#) *from New York Democrat Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. Statement of Terry O’Sullivan, General President of the Laborers’ International Union of North America, On the “Green New Deal” "It is exactly how not to win support for critical measures to curb climate change...It is difficult to take this unrealistic manifesto seriously, but the economic and social devastation it would cause if it moves forward is serious and real...threatens to destroy workers’ livelihoods, increase divisions and inequality, and undermine the very goals it seeks to reach. In short, it is a bad deal."*

In summary, the Green New Deal has to be opposed, exposed and defeated. We must challenge the economics, ideology and science claims of this deal. I thank the Western Caucus for this opportunity and look forward to them leading the battle.

Thank you.