



Green New Deal: CFR Interviews Sen. Edward Markey

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) interviews Sen. Edward Markey on the proposed Green New Deal, providing keen insight into this fraudulent scheme to remake America. This is essential reading. □ TN Editor

Senator Edward J. Markey discusses the Green New Deal, a congressional resolution aimed at addressing the issue of climate change.

SANDALOW: Good morning, everyone. My name's David Sandalow. I am the inaugural fellow at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University. And I am delighted to be here for an on-the-record session with Senator Ed Markey.

He—the senator needs very little introduction in this town. He has been a member of Congress for more than forty years. He was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1976 and elected to the U.S. Senate in

2013. Energy and environmental issues has been a priority of the senator's for all of his career. To pick just a few examples, he's the author of the Appliance Efficiency Act of 1987, principal House author of the 2007 fuel economy law, coauthor of the landmark 2009 Waxman-Markey bill. From 2007 to 2010, he chaired the select committee on energy independence and global warming. Today in the Senate, he's a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

And in February, he introduced Senate Resolution 59, which is titled The Resolution Recognizing the Duty of the Federal Government to Create a Green New Deal, which is what we're here to discuss today. So, Senator, let me start with a basic question: What is the Green New Deal?

MARKEY: The Green New Deal is a massive mobilization to transform our climate, our economy, and our democracy. It is not prescriptive, but it is a set of principles that we lay out as a goal for the country. And it is as a result of a conclusion that has been reached, as a consensus, by the scientists of the United Nations and our own country. So we begin by just making it clear that the United Nations and all of their scientists concluded at the end of last year that climate is warming dangerously, that the goal should no longer be two degrees centigrade but one-point-five degrees. And that we have until 2030 before we start to see the real catastrophic consequences. And in the words of the United Nations scientists, that the threat is now existential to the planet.

Now, that's combined with the conclusion of thirteen separate federal agencies at the end of 2018, which also issued a report. Because of a federal law passed in 1990, every four years they must do so on the subject of climate change. Their conclusion was that if we continue business as usual that the planet is going to warm by nine degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. Nine degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. And that it could lead to a rise in sea levels of—in worst case scenario—eleven feet. So the magnitude of the threat is huge. And it is a consensus amongst global scientists and domestic scientists. It's no longer a debatable subject, regardless of how much money the Koch brothers throw at the phony science, no matter how much greenwashing

the fossil fuel industry seeks to engage in. That debate is over.

So then you move to the next question: What are we going to do about something that could result in nine degrees Fahrenheit warming. What are we going to do about something that could lead to an eleven-foot rise in sea level? What are we going to do about forest fires that today will look like a preview of coming attractions in thirty, forty, fifty years, in terms of the level of damage which they're able to do to our planet? So we call for this bold transformation—ten years—where we need a plan. We need to put in place the kinds of changes in our transportation, in our utility, agriculture, manufacturing sectors—in all sectors of our economy. And it's not an option.

However, we believe that we can create between three and five million jobs while we accomplish it. And what we want, and we state quite clearly in the Green New Deal resolution, is that we want for this program to be inclusive. Unlike the first New Deal, which actually excluded African Americans, the sharecroppers, from being able to participate in Social Security. We make it quite explicit that everyone should be included—marginalized communities, those where in many, many instances where the most polluting facilities were located and still are located today, should all be included in this transformation.

So that's our goal. And it has in just ten weeks transformed the discussion around climate change. It's triggered a national debate. Everyone has a view on it now. And it is now injected deeply into the—into the political debate in our country. And just for a frame of reference, in 2016—this is how sad it is—in 2016, neither Hillary Clinton nor Donald Trump were asked a single question about climate change, an existential threat to the planet. Not a single question asked by reporters. How sad is that? The Green New Deal has solved that problem for 2019, OK, and 2020. We don't have to worry that people are going to not have this as a central question. They are going to have to be prepared to answer.

SANDALOW: Senator, there's been some discussion about what exactly the Green New Deal is. And just in the past twenty-four hours, there's been a dialogue about the ten-year mobilization in the Green New Deal,

and the discussion among some people whether this is a deadline for achieving zero carbon emissions, or whether the ten-year mobilization is kind of a crash program to get started. What is the ten-year mobilization?

MARKEY: The ten-year mobilization is towards that goal. The analogy that I use is when President Kennedy felt that Soviet dominance in outer space was an existential threat to the United States in the '60s—Sputnik, Yuri Gagarin—that we could not fall behind. Whoever controlled outer space would control the destiny of the planet, given the nuclear weapons proliferation that was taking place. And so what he called for was a ten-year mobilization for the United States to send a mission to the moon. Now, when he spoke at Rice University, he said: We will have to invent metals, alloys, propulsion systems that do not exist. That we will have to return that mission safely from the moon through heat half the intensity of the sun, and we would have to do it safely within that ten-year period. And we would do it, not because it was easy, but because it was hard. And we would be successful because we were bold.

Now, we actually finished it within that period of time. And I think the U.S. looks back quite proudly at what happened. If it took eleven years, I think we'd still be proud. Or twelve years. But the mobilization is what had to be unleashed.

SANDALOW: So your point is, we need to start started.

MARKEY: Well, President Eisenhower actually criticized President Kennedy in 1962 for announcing this. Yeah, there's going to be skeptics. There, it was President Kennedy skeptical of President—President Eisenhower skeptical of President Kennedy in 1962. David Brinkley has this great book out right now on the subject. So the—but the challenge has to be something which we accept and embraced.

SANDALOW: So at the Conservative Political Action Conference, the president described the new deal as calling for, quote, “no planes.” And a former aide to the president said: The Green New Deal, quote, “wants to take away your hamburgers.” (Laughter.) Are those descriptions correct?

MARKEY: No. Surprisingly, something Donald Trump said is inaccurate. (Laughter.) So, no, it doesn't ban planes, and it doesn't ban hamburgers, and it doesn't ban nuclear power, and it doesn't ban carbon capture and sequestration. None of those words are actually in the Green New Deal. They're not even in there. So our goal is to challenge, you know, the country. And in fact, AOC and I, we actually did a—we took a picture of us eating ice cream saying: Well, you know, we love ice cream. And as a result we love cows. So we don't want to ban cows. OK, so we took a picture to that effect. So we have to deal with—you know, with Trump. And we know he has a historically high prevarication coefficient. (Laughter.) And we just have to deal with that as kind of his underlying personality trait.

And by the way, the same thing happened when we finished—out of the Energy and Commerce Committee—we finished the Affordable Care Act in the first week of August of 2009. And within a week, they had an attack on the Affordable Care Act that said that there were death panels inside of the Affordable Care Act—death panels. And we had people all over the country going: Do we really want death panels? And we go, no, there are no death panels in the Affordable Care Act. So that's what Trump is trying to do with this. He's trying to death panel it. You know, they hire all these smart consultants, they get them all—the talking points to everyone that goes on Fox TV. They repeat it enough times that your neighbor or the family member that you have that secretly watches Fox all day start internalizing it as though it's true, you know? And then you start doubting it yourself. And we have Democrats saying, I can't believe we put death panels in the Affordable Care Act, right? So we're working through this first line of attack which is, of course, lies and misrepresentations as to what in fact is specifically in the bill.

SANDALOW: Could you talk, Senator, about the role of public sector and the private sector in the Green New Deal? My colleague, Jason Bordoff, has written a great piece I think in Democracy Journal, which he calls, Ambition of the Green New Deal Best Achieved by Combining the Public Sector and the Private Sector in pursuing these goals. What's your view on that?

MARKEY: Well, exactly. Exactly what we wanted. By the way, David,

thank you for all your great work on energy and throughout your entire career.

So what are we looking for? Well, about a hundred years ago the oil industry convinced our federal legislators—and, by the way, in many states—pretty much every state legislator—to begin giving tax breaks to oil companies, and gas companies, and coal companies, and nuclear companies. Tax breaks. Those tax breaks are still on the books for the oil companies a hundred years later. So I guess that's a perfect public-private partnership, huh? And so what we're looking for is the perfect public-private partnership for the competition—wind, solar, electric vehicles, batteries, more efficient buildings. How does the tax code treat them? How does the regulatory process treat them?

So here's what we believe: If we got equal treatment that reflected the hundred-year money head start we gave the competitors, the new technologies would bury the old technologies. But you better be sure of one thing, they're not going to give up their old tax breaks. And you can also be sure they're going to fight as hard as they can for the new industries to get their tax breaks on a permanent basis that sends predictable signals to the marketplace, because they know that wind and solar has already dropped below coal, and dropped below nuclear, and dropped below other sources of energy generation.

And it's terrifying them, because I'll tell you one thing: The existential threat is to the Koch brothers' business model. It's to ExxonMobil's business model. That's what's really driving this debate. They're pouring—they're pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into this fight against the Green New Deal right now. And it's going to have—it's going to have billions of dollars because this thing is working. This revolution has taken place. And by the way, it's not just a resolution. It's a revolution we're talking about here—complete revolution in the way in which we generate electricity.

And it's frightening the board rooms of this country. So they have to—they can't win on the facts. So they call the Green New Deal socialism. Oh, it's socialism. Well, if tax breaks for oil, and gas, and coal, and nuclear for a hundred years is socialism, well, give us some of that

socialism. But they call it capitalism, so we'll call it capitalism. Give us some of that capitalism. If that's what it is, you give it to us too. Give it to our companies. And then our private sector companies, with those benefits, will deploy the wind, the solar, the all-electric vehicles, the charging stations, the new building materials, the doubling the efficiency of every new building in our country.

And then, slowly but surely, these companies, the old industries, are going to be saddled with stranded assets that they'll have to report to the Securities and Exchange Commission. And they really dread that moment, where they have to say that actually our business model is starting to collapse. So I guess from my perspective, yes, it's a public-private partnership. But we need the same kind of public investment, you know, that we've had for the existing mature industries.

[Read full story here...](#)



Joe Biden's 'Green Revolution' Isn't Good Enough For Ocasio-Cortez

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez is dominating the Democrat 2020 presidential race with her radical "Green New Deal" rhetoric. As she charges candidate Joe Biden with being too middle-of-the-road on global warming, Biden immediately defends. □ TN Editor

Former Vice President Joe Biden said during a campaign stop on Monday that we need a "green revolution" to tackle climate change, which could serve as an alternative to other 2020 Democrat presidential candidates' Green New Deal.

During a campaign stop in Hampton, New Hampshire, on Monday, Biden disputed one article's suggestion that he took the "middle ground" on the environment. He told members of the audience to look up PolitiFact, which allegedly confirms that Biden has been a "leader" on climate change.

Biden touted that, while he was vice president, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) doubled the gas mileage standards and moved to have more electric automobile charging stations across the nation.

Biden said that he will announce his plan for a "green revolution" by the end of the month.

Many Democrat presidential candidates such as Sens. Bernie Sanders (I-VT), Kamala Harris (D-CA), and Cory Booker (D-NJ) have made headlines by touting their Green New Deal plan to tackle climate change.

The former vice president also said, back in 1987, that "we have an existential threat" due to climate change and if "we don't act quickly we will basically lose everything we have."

"It's even more urgent now," Biden added.

Biden said, “We do need to finish this green revolution and we can do it in a way that’s rational, we can do it, afford it, and get it done now.”

[Read full story here...](#)



NYC Swan Dives Into Green New Deal With ‘Climate Mobilization Act’

With an overwhelming majority vote (45-2) , the NYC City Council drank the United Nations’ Sustainable Development cool aid and committed its 8.6 million residents to the Green New Deal. □ TN Editor

The New York City Council passed wide-ranging legislation to fight climate change known as the “[Climate Mobilization Act](#),” a package of seven bills that supporters said would help build a “Green New Deal for New York City.” The legislation passed Thursday by [a 45-2 vote](#),

according to CityLab and multiple other reports.

The bills' centerpiece requires buildings over 25,000 square feet to cut climate emissions 40% by 2030 and more than 80% by 2050, which officials said is "the most ambitious energy efficiency legislation in the country." The legislation also requires green roofs on certain large buildings and establishes requirements for smaller buildings to do the same; creates a Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing mechanism for commercial property owners; simplifies the applications and siting process for wind turbine installation across the city; requires the Office of Alternative Energy to post and maintain links on its website on green roofs; and helps the city move towards shutting down its 24 gas-fired power plants in the city and replacing them with energy storage and renewable power, with a feasibility study to follow.

"The Climate Mobilization Act is a down payment on the future of New York City — one that ensures we lead the way in the ever-growing fight against climate change," Council Member Costa Constantinides said in a statement before the bills passed.

This legislation represents perhaps the biggest and most ambitious city-level step to fight climate change, and leaders in New York City are urging their fellow major metropolitan areas to act. "We are on the precipice of climate disaster, and New York City is acting," City Council Speaker Corey Johnson [said in a statement](#) on Twitter after the bills passed. "I hope other cities follow suit."

The move to force large buildings in the city to cut emissions is an especially significant one, given that most emissions come from the building and transportation sectors. With numerous skyscrapers and other large developments in the city, cutting emissions there could be a major boon for the city's environment.

Some advocates have noted the legislation is not perfect and may bleed into other issues the city faces around housing affordability. [In a statement](#), the Energy Efficiency for All New York (EEFA NY) Coalition noted that buildings with rent-controlled housing face less strict requirements, while some affordable housing properties are completely

exempt. EEFA NY warned that discrepancy will “exacerbate the housing quality deficit in the long term for communities of color and low-income New Yorkers.” The group said many affordable housing developments are among the city’s oldest buildings, which were built in less environmentally-conscious times and so do not live up to current standards. While EEFA NY said the legislation will create jobs, improve air quality and lower energy costs, it called for the New York legislature and the city to work to make it easier for affordable housing to hit emissions goals and help them recoup the costs of doing so.

[Read full story here...](#)



New York Mayor Swoons Over

Green New Deal

The Green New Deal delusion is catching on like wildfire. New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio has caved to Rep. Ocasio-Cortez' by suggesting that "We're going to ban the classic glass and steel skyscrapers." □ TN Editor

Mayor Bill de Blasio marked Earth Day by outlining measures to make New York greener Monday, including dramatically cutting the carbon footprint of the city's signature building, the skyscraper.

"We're going to ban the classic glass and steel skyscrapers, which are incredibly inefficient," he told MSNBC television.

The New York version of the "Green New Deal" currently being pushed by freshmen Democratic members of Congress would make buildings of more than 25,000 square feet (2,300 square meters) cut their emissions by 40 percent by 2030, compared with 2005 levels.

The Democratic mayor said that those who fail to meet the new environmental standards could face fines of more than a million dollars, in the case of larger buildings.

The glass-sided towers that arose in the 1960s, and which have proven popular for their panoramic views, will only be approved in the future if they meet strict rules on energy efficiency.

"Every day we wait is a day our planet gets closer to the point of no-return. New York City's Green New Deal meets that reality head on," de Blasio said in a statement after signing off on measures adopted by the city council last week.

In recent months, the mayor has unveiled a number of initiatives in line with the more left-leaning Democratic presidential contenders, including a health care plan that would provide coverage for all New York residents, including undocumented immigrants.

[Read full story here...](#)



Deeper Discovery Into Origins Of The Green New Deal

Internationally, the Green New Deal first appeared in England in 2008 with a 44-page report by the Green New Deal Group, simply called *A Green New Deal*. An excerpt appears below, concluding with a download button and a supporting video produced by a sister organization called the New Economics Foundation.

The board of the Green New Deal Group is stacked with radical members of the green movement, including Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth:

- **Larry Elliott**, Economics Editor of the Guardian
- **Colin Hines**, Co-Director of Finance for the Future, former head of Greenpeace International's Economics Unit, policy advisor to Caroline Lucas
- **Tony Juniper**, former Executive Director of Friends of the Earth

- **Jeremy Leggett**, founder and Chairman of Solarcentury and SolarAid
- **Caroline Lucas**, Green Party MEP (Politician)
- **Richard Murphy**, Co-Director of Finance for the Future and Director, Tax Research LLP
- **Ann Pettifor**, Fellow at New Economics Foundation, former head of the Jubilee 2000 debt relief campaign, Campaign Director of Operation Noah
- **Charles Secrett**, University of Cambridge, Advisor on Sustainable Development, former Director of Friends of the Earth
- **Andrew Simms**, Policy Director, New Economics Foundation), board member of Greenpeace.

The Green New Deal is the total encapsulation of Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy, in a political form. All of its rhetoric is about economics but the plea is for political action to allow it to happen. As with the Trilateral Commission in 1973, which claimed it was never about politics but rather economics, they hijacked the U.S. Executive Branch in order to execute their economic policies. It was never about political power per se, but rather about economic accumulation.

The global elite are lurking behind the Green New Deal crowd, which has become their 'useful idiots' to promote their schemes of Agenda 21, 2030 Agenda, New Urban Agenda, etc. Real environmentalists who attended the 1992 Agenda 21 conference in Rio De Janeiro wrote a book called *The Earth Brokers* in 1994. They saw through the Agenda 21 scam and wrote:

"We argue that UNCED (UN Conference on Economic Development) has boosted precisely the type of industrial development that is destructive for the environment, the planet, and its inhabitants. We see how, as a result of UNCED, the rich will get richer, the poor poorer, while more and more of the planet is destroyed in the process."

All Americans, including those involved in the Green New Deal, should wake up and smell the organic coffee: 100 percent of the ecological

hysteria is fake and has always been fake. Remember that it was the Club of Rome who openly claimed authorship of global warming in its 1991 book, [The First Global Revolution:](#)

*“In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, **we came up with** the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill.”*

A Green New Deal

The global economy is facing a ‘triple crunch’. It is a combination of a credit-fuelled financial crisis, accelerating climate change and soaring energy prices underpinned by an encroaching peak in oil production.

These three overlapping events threaten to develop into a perfect storm, the like of which has not been seen since the Great Depression. To help prevent this from happening we are proposing a Green New Deal.

This entails re-regulating finance and taxation plus a huge transformational programme aimed at substantially reducing the use of fossil fuels and in the process tackling the unemployment and decline in demand caused by the credit crunch. It involves policies and novel funding mechanisms that will reduce emissions contributing to climate change and allow us to cope better with the coming energy shortages caused by peak oil.

The triple crunch of financial meltdown, climate change and ‘peak oil’ has its origins firmly rooted in the current model of globalisation. Financial deregulation has facilitated the creation of almost limitless credit. With this credit boom have come irresponsible and often fraudulent patterns of lending, creating inflated bubbles in assets such as property, and powering environmentally unsustainable consumption.

This approach hit the buffers of insolvency and unrepayable debts on what we think of as 'debtonation day', 9 August 2007, when the banks suddenly fully understood the scale of debts on the balance sheets of other banks, and stopped lending to each other.

In the same year, natural disasters struck body blows to entire national economies, and rising prices began to alert the world to the potential scarcity of oil. At both ends of the climatic spectrum, Australia saw a prolonged drought decimate its domestic grain production, and Mexico saw floods wipe out the agricultural production of an entire large state.

In the oil markets, growing numbers of whistleblowers pointed to the probability of an early peak in production, and a possible subsequent collapse of production. The International Energy Agency (IEA) said an oil crunch is likely in 2012.

Drawing our inspiration from Franklin D. Roosevelt's courageous programme launched in the wake of the Great Crash of 1929, we believe that a positive course of action can pull the world back from economic and environmental meltdown.

The Green New Deal that we are proposing consists of two main strands. First, it outlines a structural transformation of the regulation of national and international financial systems, and major changes to taxation systems. And, second, it calls for a sustained programme to invest in and deploy energy conservation and renewable energies, coupled with effective demand management.

In this way we believe we can begin to stabilise the current triple-crunch crisis. We can also lay the foundations for the emergence of a set of resilient lowcarbon economies, rich in jobs and based on independent sources of energy supply. This will create a more stable economic environment in which there is a lot more local production and distribution, and enhanced national security.

In the first half of this report we examine the financial, economic and environmental landscapes that are the backdrop to this triple crisis. In the second half, we propose a series of policies that can be

used to tackle the problems we have identified.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

We call our programme a Green New Deal – one that combines stabilisation in the short term with longer-term restructuring of the financial, taxation and energy systems. The Green New Deal is international in outlook, but requires action at local, national, regional and global levels.

Focusing first on the specific needs of the UK, an interlocking programme of action needs to involve:

- *Executing a bold new vision for a low-carbon energy system that will include making ‘every building a power station’. Involving tens of millions of properties, their energy efficiency will be maximised, as will the use of renewables to generate electricity. This will require a £50 billion-plus per year crash programme to be implemented as widely and rapidly as possible. We are calling for a programme of investment and a call to action as urgent and far-reaching as the US New Deal in the 1930s and the mobilisation for war in 1939.*
- *Creating and training a ‘carbon army’ of workers to provide the human resources for a vast environmental reconstruction programme. We want to see hundreds of thousands of these new high- and lower-skilled jobs created in the UK. It will be part of a wider shift from an economy narrowly focused on financial services and shopping to one that is an engine of environmental transformation. The UK has so far largely missed out on the boom in ‘green collar’ jobs, with Germany already employing 250,000 in renewable energy alone.*
- *Ensuring more realistic fossil fuel prices that include the cost to the environment, and are high enough to tackle climate change effectively by creating the economic incentive to drive efficiency and bring alternative fuels to market. This will provide funding for the Green New*

Deal and safety nets to those vulnerable to higher prices via rapidly rising carbon taxes and revenue from carbon trading. We advocate establishing an Oil Legacy Fund, paid for by a windfall tax on the profits of oil and gas companies. The monies raised would help deal with the effects of climate change and smooth the transition to a low-carbon economy.

- *Developing a wide-ranging package of other financial innovations and incentives to assemble the tens of billions of pounds that need to be spent. The focus should be on smart investments that not only finance the development of new, efficient energy infrastructure but also help reduce demand for energy, particularly among low-income groups, for example by improving home insulation. The science and technology needed to power an energy-and-transport revolution are already in place. But at present the funds to propel the latest advances into full-scale development are not.*
- *Re-regulating the domestic financial system to ensure that the creation of money at low rates of interest is consistent with democratic aims, financial stability, social justice and environmental sustainability. Our initial proposals for financial renewal are inspired by those implemented in the 1930s. They involve the reduction of the Bank of England's interest rate to help those borrowing to build a new energy and transport infrastructure, with changes in debt-management policy to enable reductions in interest rates across all government borrowing instruments. In parallel, to prevent inflation, we want to see much tighter controls on lending and on the generation of credit.*
- *Breaking up the discredited financial institutions that have needed so much public money to prop them up in the latest credit crunch. We are calling for the forced demerger of large banking and finance groups. Retail banking should be split from both corporate finance (merchant banking) and from securities dealing. The*

demerged units should then be split into smaller banks. Mega banks make mega mistakes that affect us all. Instead of institutions that are 'too big to fail', we need institutions that are small enough to fail without creating problems for depositors and the wider public.

- *Re-regulating and restricting the international finance sector to transform national economies and the global economy. Finance will have to be returned to its role as servant, not master, of the global economy, to dealing prudently with people's savings and providing regular capital for productive and sustainable investment. Regulation of finance, and the restoration of policy autonomy to democratic government, implies the re-introduction of capital controls. These are vital if central banks and governments are to fix and determine one of the most important levers of the economy - interest rates*
- *Subjecting all derivative products and other exotic instruments to official inspection. Only those approved should be permitted to be traded. Anyone trying to circumvent the rules by going offshore or on to the internet should face the simple and effective sanction of 'negative enforcement' - their contracts would be made unenforceable in law. Ultimately our aim is an orderly downsizing of the financial sector in relation to the rest of the economy.*
- *Minimising corporate tax evasion by clamping down on tax havens and corporate financial reporting. Tax should be deducted at source (i.e. from the country from which payment is made) for all income paid to financial institutions in tax havens. International accounting rules should be changed to eliminate transfer mispricing by requiring corporations to report on a country by-country basis. These measures will provide much-needed sources of public finance at a time when economic contraction is reducing conventional tax receipts.*

We also urge the UK to take action at the international level to help build the orderly, well-regulated and supportive policy and financial environment that is required to restore economic stability and nurture environmental sustainability. Our Government's objectives should include:

- *Allowing all nations far greater autonomy over domestic monetary policy (interest rates and money supply) and fiscal policy (government spending and taxation).*
- *Setting a formal international target for atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations that keeps future temperature rises as far below 2°C as possible.*
- *Delivering a fair and equitable international climate agreement to succeed the Kyoto Protocol in 2012.*
- *Giving poorer countries the opportunity to escape poverty without fuelling global warming by helping to finance massive investment in climate-change adaptation and renewable energy.*
- *Supporting the free and unconstrained transfer of new energy technologies to developing countries.*

In the words of France's President Sarkozy, 'we have to put a stop to this financial system which is out of its mind and which has lost sight of its purpose.' The Green New Deal will rekindle this vital sense of purpose, restoring public trust and refocusing the use of capital on public priorities and sustainability. In this way it can also help deliver a wide range of social benefits that can greatly improve quality of life in the future.

There is also an immediate imperative to restore some faith that society can survive the dreadful threats it now faces as a result of the triple crunch. Beyond that, we believe the Green New Deal can deliver a crucial national plan for a low-energy future and its provision on the ground. The absence of any such plan at present leaves the country very vulnerable.

There is no risk analysis of the peak-oil threat, and there is no contingency plan for what would happen if oil and/or gas supplies

collapsed rapidly. Our plan would include oversight and coordination for generating the funding from government, the energy industry and a range of private savings vehicles for investment in a vital multi-decade programme for the transition to a low-energy future. In short, it is a route map for the journey from energy and economic insecurity to one of energy and environmental security.

[*A Green New Deal*](#)- *The first report of the Green New Deal Group*

[A Green New Deal, Green New Deal Group - UK Download](#)

New Economics Foundation - UK



Fraud: Green New Deal Plagiarized From 2009 UN Environment Programme Report

In a stunning revelation from a 2009 UN document titled "[Rethinking the Economic Recovery: A Global Green New Deal](#)", it is discovered that Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez' (AOC) **Green New Deal** is not a new movement of the people, but rather a crafty (and plagiarized) creation of a small group of global elite working through the United Nations.

This 144-page report was headed by Edward B. Barbier, a professor of Economics and Finance at the University of Wyoming at the time, but specifically prepared for the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

It was UNEP that sponsored the infamous 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro that catalyzed the doctrine of Sustainable Development and produced the Agenda 21 book labeled The Agenda for the 21st Century. UNEP has been at the root of every intellectually bankrupt scheme to flip the world into its resource-based economic system while driving a fatal nail into Capitalism and Free Enterprise. In my books [Technocracy Rising](#) and [Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order](#), I have extensively documented that Sustainable Development is nothing more than warmed-over Technocracy from the 1930s.

Barbier credits a number of people as important contributors to his paper, but two in particular ring a loud bell: the [Center for American Progress](#) (CAP) and the [Peterson Institute for International Economics](#) (PIIE)

Center for American Progress

CAP was founded by John Podesta, a prominent member and operative of the Trilateral Commission. Podesta was the [principal architect](#) for the

U.S. environmental policy for well over 2 decades. He served as Bill Clinton's Chief of Staff, Special Counselor to Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton's 2016 Campaign Manager. In July 2002, the UN Secretary-General appointed him to the *High-Level Panel On Post-2015 Development Agenda* that created the text for the Paris Climate Agreement in 2015.

The Board of Directors for CAP includes Sen. Tom Daschle (Chairman), Stacey Abrams, Donald Sussman, and California billionaire climate activist Tom Steyer.

Peterson Institute for International Economics

PIIE was founded by Peter G. Peterson (1926-2018), a principal member of the Trilateral Commission for decades. PIIE's Board of Directors is a Who's Who of the Trilateral Commission and includes Lawrence Summers, C. Fred Bergsten, Richard N. Cooper, Stanley Fischer, Robert Zoellick, Alan Greenspan, Carla A. Hills, George P. Schultz, Paul A. Volcker, and Ernesto Zedillo. The PIIE paper cited by Barbier was [*Green Global Recovery? Assessing US Economic Stimulus and the Prospects for International Coordination*](#)

Plagiarized: Familiar Language

Echoing AOC's rhetoric, the Barbier's UNEP report states,

*The multiple crises threatening the world economy today demand the **same kind of initiative as shown by Roosevelt's New Deal in the 1930s**, but at the global scale and embracing a wider vision.*
(p. 5)

In an article by VOX titled [*Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez is making the Green New Deal a 2020 litmus test*](#), it stated,

*Until now, the Green New Deal has been more of an idea than an actual policy. This week, an Ocasio-Cortez resolution is set to make its debut. The plan prioritizes climate change, but **its strength lies***

in its symbolic ties to one of the Democratic party's biggest historical successes: the original New Deal under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The comparison to Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been prominent from the first day that Ocasio-Cortez became a public figure.

The official Global Green New Deal objectives are also reminiscent of the modern propaganda:

- *Revive the world economy, create employment opportunities and protect vulnerable groups.*
- *Reduce carbon dependency, ecosystem degradation and water scarcity.*
- *Further the Millennium Development Goal of ending extreme world poverty by 2015.*

If rewritten to current Green New Deal standards, it would look like this:

- Revive the U.S. economy, create employment opportunities and protect vulnerable groups.
- Reduce carbon dependency, ecosystem degradation and water scarcity.
- Further Sustainable Development Goal #1 of ending extreme world poverty by 2030.

Under the section, ***Reducing Carbon Dependence***, more Green New Deal language, almost word-for-word, is discovered:

- ***Retrofitting buildings to improve energy efficiency***
- ***Expanding mass transit and freight rail***
- ***Constructing a "smart" electrical grid transmission system***

- ***Developing renewable energy, i.e. wind power, solar power, next-generation biofuels and other bio-based energy.***

Five Crazy - and Failed - Predictions

The report [Rethinking the Economic Recovery: A Global Green New Deal](#) made five nutty predictions, all of which have failed miserably.

- *Global energy demand will rise by 45 per cent by 2030, and the price of oil is expected to rise to US\$180 per barrel.*
- *Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will increase by 45 per cent by 2030, leading to an increase in the global average temperature up to 6oC.*
- *The world economy will sustain losses equivalent to 5-10 per cent of global gross domestic product (GDP) and poor countries suffer costs in excess of 10 per cent of GDP.*
- *Ecological degradation and water scarcity will increase.*
- *There will be over 1 billion people living on less than US\$1 a day and 3 billion living on less than US\$2 a day by 2015.*

Currently, the price of oil is \$59, the rise in greenhouse gas emissions is not on its way to a 45 percent increase by 2030, the world economy never sustained losses of 5-10 percent of GDP, ecological degradation is not quantifiable, water scarcity is a myth and poverty levels of people with less than \$2.00 per day is only 767 million (World Bank, 2018).

The predictions from the current iteration of the Green New deal are just as crazy as the Global Green New Deal from 2009.

Conclusion

The modern “creators” of the Green New Deal claim that they developed it over a weekend. If true, it was only because they had a copy of

[Rethinking the Economic Recovery: A Global Green New Deal](#) sitting in front of them to copy text and then localizing it for the United States.

Furthermore, these policies are not popular with the American people, as constantly claimed, but have been consistently rejected by citizens.

The Green New Deal is simply not a movement of the people, nor has it ever been. Rather, it has been purposely created by the same global elite that started Sustainable Development in the first place, namely, by members of the Trilateral Commission and the Club of Rome working through the auspices of the United Nations Environmental Programme.

Shame on you Green New Deal ideologues. Plagiarism by any other name is still plagiarism. You will be rejected as certainly as the global elite has already been rejected.

Update: An alert reader submitted additional documents that demonstrate Green New Deal promotion one year prior to Barbier's report mentioned above. Most of this emanated from Great Britain.

[A Green New Deal](#)

[The Green New Deal Group](#)

[New Economics Foundation](#)

Note: tip of the hat to Dr. Willie Soon for forwarding this story to me, as originally highlighted in an email by Joseph Bast of The Heartland Institute.



The Real Drivers Behind Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's Green New Deal

As responsible research digs into the people and organizations behind AOC and the Green New Deal, it is important to understand that there is nothing new under the sun. GND is radical and impossible, but it can be used to shred what remains of the Republic. □ TN Editor

Meet Saikat Chakrabarti, the Rasputin of the 14th Congressional District and arguably the real brains behind the bright new shiny Democrat bauble of Congress now famously branded by the media as AOC, joining the exclusive club (JFK, LBJ, RFK, HRC) of politicians widely referred to by three initials.

In the space of just a few short months, Alexandra Ocasio-Cortez, with fewer than 16,000 votes in a primary election, went from the role of obscure bartender to perhaps the most famous and powerful freshman member of Congress ever. She instantly became a media darling who drives ratings and Internet clicks. Senior Democrats such as Sen. Ed Markey gush over her and edge in to get their picture taken with her as

they appear to hang on her every word.

Ocasio-Cortez was given a plum seat on the House Financial Services Committee. Her placement on the exclusive House Banking Committee, as well as the appointments of other newbie progressives to top committees was part of a larger deal to re-secure the speakership for Nancy Pelosi ahead of the midterms. Pelosi [agreed](#) to 40 percent progressive representation on the five top House committees.

How could this have happened? Look behind the curtain. You'll find her mysterious chief of staff, Saikat Chakrabarti, a well-funded radical left wing activist who, with other veterans of the 2016 Sanders campaign, including "Young Turks" host Cenk Uygur ([later purged](#) over past allegedly sexist, racist, pro-rape statements), established a web of campaign organizations and LLC's, including Justice Democrats and [Brand New Congress](#). As many as [16 groups](#) were housed in the same office space in Knoxville, TN, with [no apparent legally-required "walls of separation."](#)

The larger plot was and remains to recruit attractive people to run for Congress. The longer-term strategy seems to be to gain control of the Democrat Party, Congress and ultimately the United States government itself. Their stated goal "was to run hundreds of Democratic candidates" who do "not take corporate money and serve the voters rather than the donors," as well as "capture a significant amount of Congress with strong progressives" and "overpower the corporate Democrats."

In the 2018 elections, 26 of the 79 candidates endorsed by Justice Democrats won their respective primary elections. Along with AOC, six other of these progressive minority candidates won in the general election: [Raúl Grijalva](#), [Ro Khanna](#), [Ayanna Pressley](#), [Rashida Tlaib](#), [Ilhan Omar](#) and [Pramila Jayapal](#). The districts where they won were all solidly Democrat. This suggests why the far left wing newbies were not only given key committee assignments and but quickly found senior Democrats fawning over them. When Rep. Ilhan Omar was accused of anti-Semitic remarks, Democrats could not find the will to directly condemn her. Instead they passed a watered down meaningless

resolution against [hate](#). Pelosi and other establishment Democrats are understandably afraid of who will be targeted by the Justice Democrats in 2020 and they don't want to antagonize them.

In her primary, Ocasio-Cortez received 57.13% of the vote (15,897) to Joe Crowley's 42.5% (11,761) to defeat the 10-term incumbent. Ocasio-Cortez won the general election with 78% of the vote (110,318) to Pappas's 14% (17,762). The Democrats all got the message.

With the win, Chakrabarti became AOC's chief of staff. He and his left-wing associates, including her communications chief Corbin Trent, co-founder of Brand New Congress, and Sanders campaign veteran Zack Exley (an open borders advocate) had scripted and produced AOC's campaign video and organized her entire grass roots campaign effort, including fund raising and social media. They turned her into a brand to take control of the House seat from Crowley. There is evidence that most all of Ocasio-Cortez's communications are created by these men who appear to tell her what to say.

Watch the video below, excerpted from the longer well-researched material by "Mr. Reagan," as it shows Trent talking about 40% of Americans, or 160 million people making less than \$20,000 a year and then five days later, obviously reading from a script, Ocasio-Cortez makes the identical claim.

With Chakrabarti as Ocasio-Cortez's chief of staff, Ocasio-Cortez released the highly controversial far-left policy initiative known as the Green New Deal. It is designed to totally and fundamentally make over the American economy and the American political system. Ocasio-Cortez's office, led by Chakrabarti, released an "FAQ" which it withdrew after criticism for its extremist positions, including appearing to demand the elimination of animal agriculture, replacing commercial aviation with "high-speed rail," and providing "economic security for all who are . . . unwilling to work." Chakrabarti was forced to [admit](#) the office's authorship of the FAQ after Green New Deal supporters retweeted Rep. Ocasio-Cortez asserted quotes from the document about "unwilling to work" were fabricated.

The Green New Deal was drafted over a single December weekend by Ocasio-Cortez's staff and representatives of like-minded progressive groups including the Sunrise Movement, a grassroots climate organization; the Justice Democrats and a freshly organized policy shop called the New Consensus. Chakrabarti was [quoted](#) as saying, "We spent the weekend learning how to put laws together. We looked up how to write resolutions." It's unclear whether AOC was even present.

[Read full story here...](#)



Dear John Nolte: Ocasio-Cortez's 'Techno-Futurism' Is

Technocracy, NOT Fascism

A [recent article](#) on Breitbart by Editor-at-large John Nolte concluded that Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez' (D-NY) Green New Deal is Fascism:

In order to grab more and more control over our lives, she's selling a lie about being able to organize and control human nature through altruistic automation and altruistic taxes and an altruistic government that knows what's best for you. There is another name for this...

Fascism.

Thank you, John, for not calling it Communism, but it isn't Fascism either.

It's Technocracy.

Nolte writes,

Later in her talk, Ocasio-Crazy reveals what she means by this buzz-phrase "infinite resources:"

"Capitalism is based on scarcity and what happens when there is enough for everyone to eat, what happens when there is enough for everyone to be clothed, then you have to make scarcity artificial. And that is what has happened. We have created artificial scarcity and that is why we are being driven to work 80 hours a week when we are being our most productive at any point in American history. We should be working the least amount we've ever worked if we were actually paid based on how much wealth we were producing. But we're not. We're paid on how little we're desperate enough to accept, and then the rest is skimmed off and given to a billionaire."

This is even beyond socialism and capitalism, which are based on the idea the "workers" are in charge.

Ocasio-Crazy wants to sell us the snake oil of a world where workers are no longer necessary, where if we surrender to automation, we won't have to work. You see, the robots will produce the goods we need, complete the services we need, and the government will support us by taxing the robot-staffed companies producing those goods.

The idea of “infinite resources” comes directly from the original Technocracy economic model dreamed up by Columbia University engineers and scientists in the 1930s. It was crackpot then, just as it is crackpot today.

However, OCM is channeling Sustainable Development directly from the United Nations. It is obvious that her talking points parallel the UN's 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) In my books, [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#) and [Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order](#), I extensively document how Sustainable Development is also warmed-over Technocracy from the 1930s: Both are resource-based economic systems designed to replace Capitalism and Free Enterprise.

In fact, there has *never* been an alternative economic system in the world designed from scratch to replace the price-based economic system - except for Technocracy.

You have one observation that is exactly correct, John, and that is “Ocasio-Crazy's America is one where no one has to do *anything*; the machines and the government do it all.” That's Technocracy, pure and simple.

Americans rejected Technocracy in the 1940s, and we can do it again, but not if citizens don't have a clue as to what it is.

John, I would be happy to send you copies of both of my books on Technocracy and you can judge for yourself what Ocasio-Crazy is up to.

Just fill out the [contact form here...](#)



Green New Deal Draft Text Proposed For 116th Congress

Radical Green New Deal supporters have wasted no time in their attempt to take over the legislative agenda in the House of Representatives. It is radicalized Sustainable Development and more extreme than anything seen in Congress before. □ TN Editor

DRAFT TEXT FOR PROPOSED ADDENDUM TO HOUSE RULES FOR 116TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. [____]. COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND HOUSE OFFICES.

(a) Establishment of the Select Committee For A Green New Deal.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT; COMPOSITION.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a Select Committee For A Green New Deal (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “select committee”).

(B) COMPOSITION.—The select committee shall be composed of 15

members appointed by the Speaker, of whom 6 may be appointed on the recommendation of the Minority Leader. The Speaker shall designate one member of the select committee as its chair. A vacancy in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(2) JURISDICTION; FUNCTIONS.—

(A) LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(i) The select committee shall have authority to develop a detailed national, industrial, economic mobilization plan (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Plan for a Green New Deal” or the “Plan”) for the transition of the United States economy to become greenhouse gas emissions neutral and to significantly draw down greenhouse gases from the atmosphere and oceans and to promote economic and environmental justice and equality. In furtherance of the foregoing, the Plan shall: (a) be prepared in consultation with experts and leaders from business, labor, state and local governments, tribal nations, academia and broadly representative civil society groups and communities; (b) be driven by the federal government, in collaboration, co-creation and partnership with business, labor, state and local governments, tribal nations, research institutions and civil society groups and communities; (c) be executed in no longer than 10 years from the start of execution of such Plan; (d) provide opportunities for high income work, entrepreneurship and cooperative and public ownership; and (e) additionally, be responsive to, and in accordance with, the goals and guidelines relating to social, economic, racial, regional and gender-based justice and equality set forth in paragraph (6).

(ii) In addition to preparing the Plan as set forth in paragraph (2)(A)(i), the select committee shall prepare draft legislation for the enactment of the Plan (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “draft legislation”), in accordance with this section. Such draft legislation may be prepared concurrently with the development of the Plan, or as the select committee may otherwise deem appropriate, provided that such finalized draft legislation shall be completed in accordance with the timing set forth in paragraph (5)(B)(ii).

(iii) The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction and shall have no authority to take legislative action on any bill or resolution, provided that the foregoing shall not affect the select committee's ability to prepare draft legislation in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(i) and (2)(A)(ii).

(B) INVESTIGATIVE JURISDICTION.—In furtherance of the mandate set forth in paragraph (2)(A), the select committee shall have the authority to investigate, study, make findings, convene experts and leaders from industry, academia, local communities, labor, finance, technology and any other industry or group that the select committee deems to be a relevant resource. The select committee may, at its discretion and as its members may deem appropriate, hold public hearings in connection with any aspect of its investigative functions.

(3) PROCEDURE.—

(A) Except as specified in paragraph (2), the select committee shall have the authorities and responsibilities of, and shall be subject to the same limitations and restrictions as, a standing committee of the House, and shall be deemed a committee of the House for all purposes of law or rule.

(B)(i) Rules [to be confirmed by reference to overall House Rules package] (Organization of Committees) and [to be confirmed by reference to overall House Rules package] (Procedures of Committees and Unfinished Business) shall apply to the select committee where not inconsistent with this resolution.

(ii) Service on the select committee shall not count against the limitations on committee or subcommittee service in Rule [to be confirmed by reference to overall House Rules package] (Organization of Committees).

(4) FUNDING.—To enable the select committee to carry out the purposes of this section—

(A) The select committee may use the services of staff of the House and may, at its discretion and as its members may deem appropriate, use the

services of external consultants or experts in furtherance of its mandate;

(B) The select committee shall be eligible for interim funding pursuant to clause [to be confirmed by reference to overall House Rules package] of Rule [to be confirmed by reference to overall House Rules package] (Interim Funding - Organization of Committees); and

(C) Without limiting the foregoing, the select committee may, at any time and from time to time during the course of its mandate, apply to the House for an additional, dedicated budget to carry out its mandate.

(5) INTERIM REPORTING; SUBMISSION OF THE PLAN FOR A GREEN NEW DEAL; SUBMISSION OF DRAFT LEGISLATION—

(A) The select committee may report to the House or any House Committee it deems appropriate from time to time the results of its investigations and studies, together with such detailed findings and interim recommendations or proposed Plan or draft legislation (or portion thereof) as it may deem advisable.

(B) (i) The select committee shall complete the Plan for a Green New Deal by a date no later than January 1, 2020.

(ii) The select committee shall complete the finalized draft legislation by a date no later than the date that is 90 calendar days after the select committee has completed the Plan in accordance with paragraph (5)(B)(i) and, in any event, no later than March 1, 2020.

(iii) The select committee shall ensure and procure that the Plan and the draft legislation prepared in accordance with this section shall, upon completion in accordance with paragraphs (5)(B)(i) and (ii), be made available to the general public in widely accessible formats (including, without limitation, via at least one dedicated website and a print publication) by a date no later than 30 calendar days following the respective dates for completion set forth in paragraphs (5)(B)(i) and (ii).

(6) SCOPE OF THE PLAN FOR A GREEN NEW DEAL AND THE DRAFT LEGISLATION.—

(A) The Plan for a Green New Deal (and the draft legislation) shall be

developed with the objective of reaching the following outcomes within the target window of 10 years from the start of execution of the Plan:

1. Dramatically expand existing renewable power sources and deploy new production capacity with the goal of meeting 100% of national power demand through renewable sources;
2. building a national, energy-efficient, “smart” grid;
3. upgrading every residential and industrial building for state-of-the-art energy efficiency, comfort and safety;
4. eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from the manufacturing, agricultural and other industries, including by investing in local-scale agriculture in communities across the country;
5. eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from, repairing and improving transportation and other infrastructure, and upgrading water infrastructure to ensure universal access to clean water;
6. funding massive investment in the drawdown of greenhouse gases;
7. making “green” technology, industry, expertise, products and services a major export of the United States, with the aim of becoming the undisputed international leader in helping other countries transition to completely greenhouse gas neutral economies and bringing about a global Green New Deal.

(B) The Plan for a Green New Deal (and the draft legislation) shall recognize that a national, industrial, economic mobilization of this scope and scale is a historic opportunity to virtually eliminate poverty in the United States and to make prosperity, wealth and economic security available to everyone participating in the transformation. In furtherance of the foregoing, the Plan (and the draft legislation) shall:

1. provide all members of our society, across all regions and all communities, the opportunity, training and education to be a full and equal participant in the transition, including through a job guarantee program to assure a living wage job to every person who wants one;
2. diversify local and regional economies, with a particular focus on communities where the fossil fuel industry holds significant

- control over the labor market, to ensure workers have the necessary tools, opportunities, and economic assistance to succeed during the energy transition;
3. require strong enforcement of labor, workplace safety, and wage standards that recognize the rights of workers to organize and unionize free of coercion, intimidation, and harassment, and creation of meaningful, quality, career employment;
 4. ensure a 'just transition' for all workers, low-income communities, communities of color, indigenous communities, rural and urban communities and the front-line communities most affected by climate change, pollution and other environmental harm including by ensuring that local implementation of the transition is led from the community level and by prioritizing solutions that end the harms faced by front-line communities from climate change and environmental pollution;
 5. protect and enforce sovereign rights and land rights of tribal nations;
 6. mitigate deeply entrenched racial, regional and gender-based inequalities in income and wealth (including, without limitation, ensuring that federal and other investment will be equitably distributed to historically impoverished, low income, deindustrialized or other marginalized communities in such a way that builds wealth and ownership at the community level);
 7. include additional measures such as basic income programs, universal health care programs and any others as the select committee may deem appropriate to promote economic security, labor market flexibility and entrepreneurship; and
 8. deeply involve national and local labor unions to take a leadership role in the process of job training and worker deployment.

(C) The Plan for a Green New Deal (and the draft legislation) shall recognize that innovative public and other financing structures are a crucial component in achieving and furthering the goals and guidelines relating to social, economic, racial, regional and gender-based justice and equality and cooperative and public ownership set forth in

paragraphs (2)(A)(i) and (6)(B). The Plan (and the draft legislation) shall, accordingly, ensure that the majority of financing of the Plan shall be accomplished by the federal government, using a combination of the Federal Reserve, a new public bank or system of regional and specialized public banks, public venture funds and such other vehicles or structures that the select committee deems appropriate, in order to ensure that interest and other investment returns generated from public investments made in connection with the Plan will be returned to the treasury, reduce taxpayer burden and allow for more investment.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Why do we need a sweeping Green New Deal investment program? Why can't we just rely on regulations and taxes alone, such as a carbon tax or an eventual ban on fossil fuels?

- Regulations and taxes can, indeed, change some behavior. It's certainly possible to argue that, if we had put in place targeted regulations and progressively increasing carbon and similar taxes several decades ago, the economy could have transformed itself by now. But whether or not that is true, we did not do that, and now time has run out.
- Given the magnitude of the current challenge, the tools of regulation and taxation, used in isolation, will not be enough to quickly and smoothly accomplish the transformation that we need to see.
- Simply put, we don't need to just stop doing some things we are doing (like using fossil fuels for energy needs); we also need to start doing new things (like overhauling whole industries or retrofitting all buildings to be energy efficient). Starting to do new things requires some upfront investment. In the same way that a company that is trying to change how it does business may need to make big upfront capital investments today in order to reap future benefits (for e.g., building a new factory to increase production or buying new hardware and software to totally modernize its IT system), a country that is trying to change how

its economy works will need to make big investments today to jump-start and develop new projects and sectors to power the new economy.

- The draft resolution sets out a (non-exhaustive) list of several major projects that need to be completed fast. These include upgrading virtually every home and building for energy efficiency, building a 100% greenhouse gas neutral power generation system, decarbonizing industry and agriculture and more. These projects will all require investment.
- We're not saying that there is no place for regulation and taxes (and these will continue to be important tools); we're saying we need to add some new tools to the toolkit.

Why should the government have a big role in driving and making any required investments? Why not just incentivize the private sector to invest through, for e.g., tax subsidies and such?

- Two main reasons: (1) scale and (2) time.
- First - scale. The level of investment required will be massive. Even if all the billionaires and companies came together and were willing to pour all the resources at their disposal into this investment, the aggregate value of the investments they could make would not be sufficient. For example, the "\$1 trillion over 10 years" plan for investment in the green economy that has been floated by some policy makers has been criticized by climate experts as a wholly inadequate level of investment - \$1 trillion is the entire market cap of Amazon, one of the biggest companies of all time (and it is far ahead of its closest competitors in terms of market size).
- Second - time. The speed of investment required will be massive. Even if all the billionaires and companies could make the investments required, they would not be able to pull together a coordinated response in the narrow window of time required to jump-start major new projects and major new sectors.
- Time-horizons matter in another way - by their nature, private companies are wary of making massive investments in unproven

research and technologies; the government, however, has the time horizon to be able to patiently make investments in new tech and R&D, without necessarily having a commercial outcome or application in mind at the time the investment is made. Major examples of government investments in “new” tech that subsequently spurred a boom in the private sector include DARPA-projects, the creation of the internet – and, perhaps most recently, the government’s investment in Tesla.

- We’ve also seen that merely incentivizing the private sector doesn’t work – e.g. the tax incentives and subsidies given to wind and solar projects have been a valuable spur to growth in the US renewables industry but, even with such investment-promotion subsidies, the present level of such projects is simply inadequate to transition to a fully greenhouse gas neutral economy as quickly as needed.
- Once again, we’re not saying that there isn’t a role for private sector investments; we’re just saying that the level of investment required will need every actor to pitch in and that the government is best placed to be the prime driver.

How will the government pay for these investments?

- Many will say, “Massive government investment! How in the world can we pay for this?” The answer is: in the same ways that we paid for the 2008 bank bailout and extended quantitative easing programs, the same ways we paid for World War II and many other wars. The Federal Reserve can extend credit to power these projects and investments, new public banks can be created (as in WWII) to extend credit and a combination of various taxation tools (including taxes on carbon and other emissions and progressive wealth taxes) can be employed.
- In addition to traditional debt tools, there is also a space for the government to take an equity role in projects, as several government and government-affiliated institutions already do.

Why do we need a select committee? We already have committees with jurisdiction over the subject matter e.g. Energy and Commerce, Natural

Resources and Science, Space and Technology. Just creating another committee seems unnecessary.

- This is a big problem with lots of parts to it. The very fact that multiple committees have jurisdiction over parts of the problem means that it's hard for any one of those existing committees to generate a comprehensive and coherent plan that will actually work to transform America's economy to become greenhouse gas neutral in the time we have left.
- Not having a full 360° view of, and approach to, the issue (and only having authority over a part of the issue) means that standing committee solutions would be piecemeal, given the size and scope of the problem. A Democratic administration and Congress in 2020 will not have the time to sort through and combine all those solutions in the brief window of opportunity they will have to act.
- Select committees, in the Congressional Research Services' own words, serve the specific function of "examin[ing] emerging issues that do not fit clearly within existing standing committee jurisdictions or cut across jurisdictional boundaries." (see: <https://www.senate.gov/CRSpubs/312b4df4-9797-41bf-b623-a8087cc91d74.pdf>)
- The challenges that the Select Committee For A Green New Deal is mandated to meet fit squarely within this space.
- This does not need to be a zero sum proposition between committees. Just as Markey-Waxman was collaborative between the head of the Select Committee and standing Energy & Commerce committee, this can also be collaborative. More is more. A select committee ensures constant focus on climate change as the standing committee deals with that and many other issues of the day — such as [wild fires in California](#), [Infrastructure](#), [clean water issues](#), etc.

Why should we not be satisfied with the same approach the previous select committee used (i.e. the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming)? Why do we need a new approach?

- The previous select committee did not have a mandate to

develop a plan for the transformation of our economy to become carbon neutral. It mainly held hearings to draw attention to the problem of climate change. That was already too little too late in 2007-11 when the committee was active.

- The previous select committee's work can be summarized as follows
(see: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/111th-congress/house-resolution/5/text>, the old select committee is established in Section 4):
- The "sole authority" it did have was to "investigate, study, make findings, and develop recommendations on policies, strategies, technologies and other innovations, intended to reduce the dependence of the United States on foreign sources of energy and achieve substantial and permanent reductions in emissions and other activities that contribute to climate change and global warming."
- From March 2007 to December 2010 - a full 3.5 years - they did the job that they were tasked to do and held hearings and prepared reports
(see: <https://www.congress.gov/committee/house-energy-independence-and-global/hlgw00> and <https://www.markey.senate.gov/GlobalWarming/index.html> (in fact, they held 80 hearings and briefings)
- Per their website, they "engage[d] in oversight and educational activities through hearings, reports, briefings and other means intended to highlight the importance of adopting policies which reduce our dependence on foreign oil and our emissions of global warming pollution."
- So there has already been a select committee that did the investigating to highlight that it was important to have some action on this issue - it's now time to move on from investigating and reporting to action.
- The old select committee also had (even within its limited investigative mandate) the limitation that it focused on strategies for reducing foreign energy dependence and reducing emissions

- rather than treating climate issues as the integrated social, economic, scientific challenge that it is.

Why does this new select committee need to prepare draft legislation? Isn't investigation, hearings, briefings and reporting enough?

- The old select committee was mandated merely to investigate and prepare reports for other people and House Committees to read and act on.
- The idea was that (as per the old select committees website) "each Member of the Select Committee sits on legislative committees which process legislation and amendments affecting energy independence and global warming issues in other committees" and presumably, that those members would take the work of the select committee and come up with legislation in their own committees.
- However, this approach did not make a big impact relative to the scale of the problem we face. The one piece of legislation that eventually came out of the old select committees work - the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (ACES) (<https://www.markey.senate.gov/GlobalWarming/legislation/index.html>) was a cap-and-trade bill that was wholly insufficient for the scale of the problem.
- The House had a chance (from 2007 to 2010) to try a version of a select committee that investigated an issue and then passed along preparation of legislation to other committees - the result of that process doesn't inspire any confidence that the same process should be followed again if we wish to draft a plan to tackle the scale of the problem we face.
- The new select committee will also continue to have investigative jurisdiction, so the new proposal isn't taking anything away from the old one - it is adding things on to make the select committee more effective.

What's an example of a select committee with abilities to prepare legislation? Does the new Select Committee For A Green New Deal seem to fit on that list?

- Recent examples for select committees in the House include: Ad Hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf (94th-95th Congresses), Ad Hoc Select Committee on Energy (95th Congress), Select Committee on Homeland Security (107th Congress), and Select Committee on Homeland Security (108th Congress).
- The Congressional Research Service notes (in discussing these four recent select committees with legislative jurisdiction) that “The principal explanation offered in creating each of the four select committees with legislative authority was that their creation solved jurisdictional problems. The proponents in each case indicated that multiple committees claimed jurisdiction over a subject and that the House would be unable to legislate, or at least to legislate efficiently, in the absence of a select committee.”
(see: https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R40233.html#_Toc228679963)
- The proposed subject matter and mandate for the Select Committee For A Green New Deal sits squarely within this general description for a select committee with the ability and mandate to prepare legislation.

Doesn't this select committee take away jurisdictional power from the other (standing i.e. permanent) committees that have jurisdiction over at least part of the issue?

- All of the relevant standing committees will be able to provide input to and make their wishes known to the select committee during the creation of both the plan as well as the draft legislation, and then in a future Congress, when it comes to crafting and passing the final legislation, that Congress can take a decision on the best mechanism for bringing that final legislation to a floor vote and passage.
- Allowing the select committee to draft legislation doesn't take any jurisdiction away from current standing committees, it is entirely additive.
- The legislation developed by the select committee would still

need to be referred to and pass through the permanent House Committees that have jurisdiction over parts of the subject matter.

- For example, the legislation drafted by the Select Committee on Homeland Security needed to pass through the permanent committees on Agriculture; Appropriations; Armed Services; Energy and Commerce; Financial Services; Government Reform; Intelligence (Permanent Select); International Relations; Judiciary; Science; Transportation and Infrastructure; Ways and Means
(see: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-bill/5005/committees>)
- The benefit of a select committee in this case would also be that there would be a single forum that could act as a quarterback in working through and resolving any comments or issues brought up by the other House Committees, which would streamline the process of drafting this legislation.

But a select committee only exists for the congressional session that created it! So even if this select committee prepares legislation, it likely won't get passed in this session by a Republican-held Senate and White House, so why does having a select committee now even matter?

- The proposed new select committee would work in two stages (which wouldn't necessarily have to be sequential):
- First, they would put together the overall plan for a Green New Deal - they would have a year to get the plan together, with the plan to be completed by January 1, 2020. The plan itself could be in the form of a report or several reports.
- Second, they would also put together the draft legislation that actually implements the plan - they could work on the draft legislation concurrently with the plan (after they get an initial outline of the plan going) and would need to complete the draft legislation within 90 days of completing the plan (i.e. by March 1, 2020 at the latest)
- The select committee is also required to make the plan and the draft legislation publicly accessible within 30 days of completing

each part

- The plan and the draft legislation won't be developed in secret - they are specifically required to be developed with wide and broad consultation and input and the select committee can share drafts or any portions of their work with the other House Committees at any time and from time to time, so their work will be conducted in the open, with lots of opportunities to give input along the way.
- The idea is that between (a) developing the plan and the draft legislation (and holding public hearings and briefings along the way as needed), (b) the plan coming out in Jan 2020 and (c) the draft legislation coming out in March 2020, the relevant permanent House Committees, House members, experts and public will have time to engage with, discuss, revise the draft legislation between March 2020 and the end of the 116th Congress so that, by the end of this congressional term, there is a comprehensive plan and enacting legislation all lined up as soon as the new (Democratic) Congress convenes in January 2021.

What's wrong with the other proposed legislation on climate change? Can't we just pass one of the other climate bills that have been introduced in the past? Why prepare a whole new one?

- The shortest and most accurate response is that (1) none of them recognize the extent to which climate and other social and economic issues are deeply interrelated and (2) even if looking at climate as a stand-alone issue, none of them are scaled to the magnitude of the problem.
- Of the other proposed legislation, the OFF Act could be a good starting point

[Read full story here...](#)