



Green New Deal Making Dems Squeal

It's easy to be idealistic when you don't have to live with your ideals. But the Democrats will have to live with their Green New Deal ideals now at least a little bit, as Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said Tuesday that the Senate will schedule a vote on the plan. This has left many Democrats reeling and squealing because they'll now have to go on record as for or against a climate-change scheme that even fellow liberal Howard Shultz, a possible presidential contender, has called "unrealistic" and "immoral."



As American Thinker reports:

There's nothing quite like handing Democrats What They Want.

So to accommodate them, wily old Republican Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has scheduled a vote on freshman socialist Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez [D-N.Y.] and her sidekick Sen. Ed Markey's much-vaunted "Green New Deal," just to help them out.

But wait. The Senate lefties are not happy about it.

All that methane-filled and benzene ring-infused hot air about cutting cow farts, getting rid of cars, ending jet travel, and retrofitting every building in America to 'go green' — the plan which was so quickly signed onto by nearly all major Democratic presidential candidates, and then pulled from the website — suddenly isn't quite what Democrats want to go on the record about these days.

"Wily" is the word. As the *Hill* relates, "McConnell told reporters after a meeting of the Senate Republican caucus that he has 'great interest' in the plan, which would spell an end for coal, a key economic driver in McConnell's home state of Kentucky."

He certainly does, but his interest is in putting Democrats on the hot seat. "We'll give everybody an opportunity to go on record and see how they feel about the Green New Deal," McConnell explained.

Reacting to this, Senator Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii) <u>slammed</u> the GOP for pledging a "show vote." And Ed Markey (D-Mass.; shown above), "the guy who actually wrote the resolution with Ocasio-Cortez, and apparently the high-school style notes about the real agenda which got released earlier before the whole thing was pulled, is howling the loudest," *American Thinker* tells us. Just consider the tweet below:







Follow

Don't let Mitch McConnell fool you: this is nothing but an attempt to sabotage the movement we are building. He wants to silence your voice so Republicans don't have to explain why they are climate change deniers. McConnell wants this to be the end, this is just the beginning.



CSPAN 🔮 @cspan

.@Senatemajldr: "I've noted with great interest the Green New Deal. And we're going to be voting on that in the Senate. Give everybody an opportunity to go on record and see how they feel about the #GreenNewDeal."

1:48 PM - 12 Feb 2019

Yeah, I mean, can't a politician posture anymore without being called out?

Of course, voting is exercise of voice. As for sabotaging the movement, Markey and AOC (Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez) did a good job of that themselves by <u>disgorging a document that</u>, to <u>quote</u> a *New American* writer (me), reads like Bart Simpson meets the Bolsheviks.

Taking note of this was billionaire former Starbucks CEO Howard Shultz, who already has sent Democrats into a tizzy with talk of an independent 2020 presidential run. Hardly a conservative — he was mocked himself in 2015 for encouraging his baristas to discuss race with customers — Schultz said that Democrats should be "'truthful' about their environmental initiatives rather than just throwing policies 'against the wall because it's a good slogan,'" reports the Washington Examiner.

The *Examiner* continues, "'I read that by 2030 they're suggesting that every building in America becomes clean energy, conforms to clean energy, just to put that in perspective, because it's not realistic, that would mean that between 2,000 and 3,000 buildings a day would have to be reconstructed to conform to what they're saying,' Schultz said. 'So let's be sensible about what we're suggesting.'"

"'I don't understand how you're going to give a job for everybody, how you're going to give free college to everybody, how you're going to create clean energy throughout the country in every building of the land,' he said. 'I think it's immoral to suggest that we can tally up \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50 trillion of debt to solve a problem that could be solved in a different way,'" the *Examiner* also informs.

Yet it's even worse than Schultz indicates. The <u>Green Leap Forward</u> would truly be a cure worse than the disease because, well, <u>there is no disease</u>: The anthropogenic-climate-change thesis lacks foundation.

In fact, the "cure" would be a disease. Just consider the message of energy theorist Alex Epstein, founder and president of the Center for Industrial Progress and author of the book <u>The Moral Case for</u>



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on February 14, 2019



Fossil Fuels. Summarizing energy importance and realities, he writes:

- There are 7 billion people in the world who need cheap, plentiful, reliable energy to flourish....
- It is extremely difficult to produce cheap, plentiful, reliable energy. In the entire history of humanity, only three industries have achieved this on any scale: the hydrocarbon (fossil fuel) industry, the nuclear industry, and the hydroelectric power industry....
- Since the energy industry is the industry that powers every other industry, the fossil fuel industry increases productivity and prosperity in every area of life, from agriculture (diesel-powered farm equipment) to hospitals (24/7 electricity).

Below is an interesting Epstein video on the subject.

The reality is that modern, high-population civilizations require massive amounts of low-cost energy. We need energy to grow food at high yields and process and deliver it, to purify water and <u>pump it to cities</u>, to provide life-sustaining heat, to get people to work either by private or public transportation, to run our refrigerators and sewage plants, and to generate the electricity that powers virtually everything in the modern world.

America simply could not sustain 328 million people — or the world seven billion people — without massive energy supplies, and nothing on the horizon can replace fossil fuels. Instituted globally, the Green New Deal could "result in the death of nearly all humans on Earth," as Greenpeace co-Founder Patrick Moore <u>put it</u>. But before they died their miserable deaths, they'd cut down every tree for fuel and kill every animal for food.

What really does endanger the world is a changing political climate that, even more insane than portraying CO2 as a problem, accepts an AOC as a solution — and makes yesterday's preposterousness tomorrow's policy.

Photo of Rep. Ed Markey with Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez: AP Images

Related article:

Green New Deal Would Kill Almost Everyone, Warns Greenpeace Co-Founder





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.