



## Dems' Climate Campaign Kills Off Those Funding It

Michael Dorstewitz

February 21, 2020

Whether it's a conscious decision or not, the Democratic Party's extreme position on climate change would kill off the very groups they rely on to keep the wheels of commerce running — from the middle class to the super-wealthy.

One year ago Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., breathlessly warned that the world would end in 12 years if we failed to adopt her Green New Deal. Among other things, it calls for an end of fossil fuels.

At the time, **I observed** that "the Green New Deal is more than an energy policy — it's a blueprint to completely overhaul society as we know it. It's a cradle-to-grave social contract that is a socialist's dream and a capitalist's nightmare."

That was confirmed five months later when Ocasio-Cortez's chief of staff **candidly admitted** that the proposal wasn't about the environment so much as it was a "how-do-you-change-the-entire economy thing."

The Green New Deal would result in skyrocketing energy costs, affecting most strongly those who can least afford them, accompanied by escalating unemployment.

For example, under the Trump administration, the United States became a net exporter of oil and natural gas **for the first time in 75 years**, a feat achieved through increased hydraulic fracking.

Last month the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's **Global Energy Institute predicted** that if fracking were banned, it would double gas prices at the pump, raise each person's cost of living by more than \$5,500, and place 19 million people on the unemployment lines over a five-year period.

Nevertheless, Ocasio-Cortez **introduced a fracking ban** last month in the House, which mirrored one filed in the Senate by her mentor and fellow democratic socialist, Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt.

They might want to rename that bill, the "Destroy the Middle Class and Make the Poor Poorer Act," because that would be the result, but quality of life means little to Democrats when it comes to the environment and climate change.

In an extreme example, a far-left British professor had a plan for saving the environment. Instead of addressing climate change to save the human race, she suggests that we exterminate the human race to save the environment.

"The only solution for climate change is letting the human race become extinct," Professor **Patricia MacCormack claimed**. Her goal was to save all the lesser forms of life at the expense of humans.

That sounds ridiculous until you recall that a decade ago, San Joaquin Valley farmers were denied water to irrigate their crops in order to protect the delta smelt, a three-inch long fish. In the process, California created a man-made drought as well as another endangered species: the San Joaquin Valley farmer.

**It didn't work**: the delta smelt population continues to plummet, and this week the president had enough. He authorized the Department of the Interior to divert fresh water back south into the San Joaquin Valley. Without surprise, California Gov. Gavin Newsom, a Democrat, **plans to file a lawsuit**. Protect the minnow. And for what?

Sen. Sanders **claimed that** "You cannot go too far on the issue of climate change. The future of the planet is at stake, OK?"

But available data suggests otherwise.

The International Energy Agency, a Paris-based intergovernmental organization, **reported** earlier this month that "The United States saw the largest decline in energy-related CO2 emissions in 2019 on a country basis."

The Foundation for Economic Education, an Atlanta-based libertarian-leaning economic think-tank **reported** last year that "climate-related deaths are at historic lows."

And they were historically low before that.

The Washington, D.C.-based **Cato institute reported in 2015** that "In the decade from 2004 to 2013, worldwide climate-related deaths (including droughts, floods, extreme temperatures, wildfires, and storms) plummeted to a level 88.6 percent below that of the peak decade, 1930 to 1939."

Yet every Democratic presidential candidate has some form of extreme climate change proposal, with all but a few endorsing some form of the Green New Deal, an estimated \$93 trillion program. Who's going to pick up the tab?

Some suggest that the program would pay for itself. No one can take that seriously, and in addition to the poor and middle-class taking a hit, it would fall on the mega-wealthy.

When the candidates are asked how their lofty programs will be financed, including Medicare for All and "free" college tuition, they typically point to the wealthy. You can bet that the same group would be forced to bear the brunt of a climate change program.

Ironically, Sanders repeatedly says that **billionaires shouldn't exist**, and if he passes some form of the Green New Deal, he'll get his wish.

And that suggests another the question: Once Sanders eliminates billionaires, who will be left to pay for his fancy programs?

"May you live in interesting times," is said to be an English translation of a traditional Chinese curse.

We live in interesting times.