

# **THE REAL WAR ON WOMEN**

**Time's Up for Radical Feminism and the  
Democrats' Liberal, Progressive, Socialist  
Agenda**

**By Jennifer Kerns**

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **PREFACE/INTRODUCTION**

## **CHAPTERS**

- 1. The Real War on Women: Government Lockdowns**
- 2. The Green New Deal is a Raw Deal for Women**
- 3. #TimesUp for #MeToo Hypocrites**
- 4. Defund the Police or Defend Women? The Real “Choice” Issue**
- 5. Critical Race Theory, Parents and FBI... Oh, My!**
- 6. Socialism & “The Squad”: Why Both Are Bad for American Women**
- 7. My Body, My Choice?**
- 8. The Big LGBTQIA+ Lie**
- 9. Biden’s Border Bungle: The True Cost of Illegal Immigration to America, Women and Girls**
- 10. Transgenderism vs. Title IX: A Losing Game for Girls**
- 11. Big Tech Bullies & Their Feminist Handmaidens**
- 12. It’s the Supply Chain, Stupid**

**13. Democrat Foreign Relations = An Abusive Relationship  
for Women & Girls around the World**

**14. VOTING RIGHTS: Who Really Suppressed Women  
and People of Color throughout History (Hint: It wasn't  
the Republican Party)**

**EPILOGUE/WHAT'S NEXT**

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

# PREFACE

In the wake of the U.S. Supreme Court's *Dobbs* decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, I knew that Democrats intended to convince women voters that the only issue that matters in American politics is the issue of "choice."

However, as I went through issue after issue, it became clear to me that Democrats and their feminists friends today don't give women much of a choice — on *anything*.

They also don't do a very good job of defending the most vulnerable women among us, in particular the minorities, women of color and girls which they claim to defend.

The idea for this book began after I witnessed the grilling of Supreme Court nominee Bret Kavanaugh. Like many Americans, I stood aghast at the vitriolic trial-by-media — a "high-tech lynching" as Justice Thomas Clarence once called it, except for a white guy who liked beer.

In the months since then, I've been dismayed with Democrats, feminists, and some in the media as they let other accused sexual predators largely off the hook such as then-New York Governor Andrew Cuomo and yes, even then-Presidential candidate Joe Biden. I was mostly dismayed because I had been part of a team that had once asked then-Presidential candidate Donald Trump about *his* treatment of women.

The left's hypocrisy was a clear sign to me that the modern-day feminist movement has gotten so cozy with the Democrat Party that it has strayed far afield from its original intent of protecting women. It's an outright betrayal of the "sisterhood" they once pledged to defend.

However, this isn't only about sexual harassment. It extends to every policy position pushed by Democrats today.

On a range of topics from "defunding the police" to the Democrat-led lockdowns that left a record 2 Million women running for the emergency exits of their careers, feminists have stood idly by during the last few years as their Democrat friends rushed to pass policies and hurl executive orders that harmed women at every turn.

As it turns out, it has been the Democrat Party all along who has betrayed women and I will prove it in these pages. Since the beginning of time — from the fight for women’s voting rights to voting rights for women of color — historic voting records show that contrary to the narrative today, it was the Democrats — not Republicans — who stood in the doorways blocking access to true liberation for women. It was the Democrats who fired the first shots in the so-called “War on Women.”

When I served as a writer/researcher on a popular U.S. Presidential Debate, I was aware that the questions I researched would undergo intense media scrutiny. Likewise, I have painstakingly laid out the case for *The Real War on Women* in a similarly well-researched, nearly 300-page book with more than 74,000 words and 280 endnotes that I welcome fact checkers to challenge.

Ultimately, it is my goal to give Americans a bedrock argument upon which to stand for this continued debate over whom is *really* on the side of women.

It is my hope that this book finds itself on the dashboard of every mom in the school drop-off line, under the arm of every dad who is fighting for his kids at the school board meeting, and on the desk of every politician from the West Coast to Washington, D.C.

Thank you for reading.

Jennifer Kerns

# THE GREEN NEW DEAL IS A RAW DEAL FOR WOMEN

Since the day she took office, Congress member Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has been pushing “The Green New Deal” — a \$93-trillion-dollar boondoggle that professes to save the planet from doom and gloom while absolutely fleecing Americans’ pockets.

For all of the ballyhoo over the Green New Deal, there has never actually been a “deal.” The Green New Deal has never passed muster in the United States Congress; it’s never received an up or down vote; it’s never been agreed upon by both parties; and no president has signed it into law either by regular order nor executive order.

That’s right, the Green New Deal does not actually exist.

For as little as we know about it, the landscape that the Green New Deal has the potential to cover is vast, and therefore it has the ability to creep into the daily lives of all Americans.

The worst part of the Green New Deal is that it specifically targets America’s free markets, and it attacks the very capitalism which has helped elevate millions of women throughout American history.

Oddly enough, the Green New Deal also limits “choice” — the *one* thing liberals preach they care so much about. That such a draconian program has been dreamed up by a woman is particularly jarring; after all, feminism as long proclaimed to promote freedom of choice and autonomy from the government, yet the Green New Deal offers anything but either. It also stands to hurt women the most.

## **First Things First: Hypocrisy**

First of all, if you ever want to know how serious Democrats truly believe a crisis is, look not at their speeches — instead, look at their actions.

Just like the COVID theatrics they perpetrated against the American people every day for the span of two years, Democrat Party leaders haven't been walking the walk on climate change prevention, either.

For all of her talk about the Green New Deal, AOC herself has not changed her living habits. That should tell you something regarding how much of an imminent crisis she actually thinks climate change is.

A review of the expenses for which AOC requested to be reimbursed while running for Congress gives us a glimpse inside the daily habits of AOC. It's shockingly instructive about the choices she makes on matters such as methods of transportation, travel arrangements and carbon emissions. AOC's own campaign finance paperwork shows that she most definitely did not follow her own advice about how Americans must change the way they live in order to "save the planet."

It turns out, just as she and her colleagues were lecturing Americans about having an addiction to fossil fuels, AOC dabbled in a bit of the petrol herself.

The hypocrisy began early in her campaign. In 2018, FOX News reported that AOC took 160 trips via Uber from April through June that year, amounting to roughly \$4,000.<sup>1</sup> She took another 90 rides in a car service named Juno. That wouldn't be a problem for say, a Republican candidate, but AOC at the time was railing against what she considered the piggish use of fossil fuels. (She was also railing against Uber itself for its labor practices yet still giving them business — a hypocrisy we'll visit some other time).

According to *The New York Post*, AOC took Uber-style rideshare services more than 1,000 times throughout her campaign, amounting to approximately \$30,000 in charges. Even worse? It wasn't as if she couldn't find transportation. The New York City subway system was just 138 feet away from the front door of her campaign office.<sup>2</sup>

You see, far-left politicians today are pushing ideas that are so radical and restrictive that they can't even live under the rules themselves.

However, once they become politicians, they know they can live by a different set of rules.

The problem with the Green New Deal is that the rest of America will be forced to suffer under the policies and programs set forth by this group of climate fascists.

Radical, self-described socialist AOC warned in a speech that “the world is ending in 12 years,” a famous trope from Al Gore’s “An Inconvenient Truth” film tour where he suggested that the world would imminently end due to global warming. (Liberals later had to change the phrase “global warming” to “climate change” to better suit the cooler weather pattern around the globe. What a farce!)

After we failed to careen to our deaths to the disappointment of Gore and others in the climate activism movement, AOC raised questions about the kind of lives she might ask Americans to *live* under her Green New Deal. She dared to suggest that every human being on planet earth is basically a liability and that Americans must ask themselves a “legitimate question: Is it OK still to have children?”

The fact that AOC would dare to ask fellow Americans to question their own families’ existence and to forgo starting families, when she herself can’t even forgo a ride to dinner or a campaign meeting tells us a lot about whom exactly is going to pay the ultimate price for the Green New Deal.

Make no mistake, the cost will be high for the average American but especially for women who wish to exercise their right to have a baby, start a household and ah yes, have to figure out how to pay for a nearly \$100-trillion-dollar price tag for AOC’s plan when 2 million of those women are still struggling to get out from under the massive economic damage that Democrat Party leaders caused women throughout the pandemic.

Green New Deal? More like a raw deal for women and for anyone who wants to drive a car, have a baby and live a life of freedom in America.

## **Even Bigger Hypocrisy**

Even greater than AOC's own hypocrisy is the hypocrisy of her friends in Hollywood, media, the fashion industry and big government who talk the talk but don't walk the walk when it comes to saving the environment.

Sure, we've all seen the likes of Leonardo DiCaprio and former Secretary of State John Kerry jetting off to green summits. We've seen the private jets lined up on the runways at the Paris Climate Accord Summit. Just one private jet operating for one hour produces two tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. In fact, the 1% elites of the world cause 50% of the world's aviation emissions.<sup>3</sup>

However, it goes far beyond Leo DiCaprio and the global elites.

Right here in America, whole industries are contributing to much bigger waste and pollution atrocities that AOC and her friends should care about, but they don't.

### ***Hollywood***

Liberal Hollywood is one of the biggest waste-filled industries on the planet. With its lavish movie sets, just one large movie production can leave behind "225 tons of scrap metal, nearly 50 tons of construction and set debris, and 72 tons of food waste," according to *The Los Angeles Times*.<sup>4</sup> That's a lot of craft service tables!

However, Hollywood's carbon footprint is just as big.

*The Guardian* newspaper reported that the average film production produces 500 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which is the same as running 108 cars for a whole year.

That's just the "average" movie set. A film project with a budget of \$50 million can produce at least 4,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. Films with even bigger budgets, well, you get the drift: the footprint is even greater. So much for our superheroes!

### ***The Fashion Industry***

The liberal-run fashion industry also has a dirty little secret. It is also secretly at odds with Mother Earth.

The fashion industry produces four percent (4%) of the world's pollution with a shocking 92 million tons of textile waste every year.<sup>5</sup> This means the equivalent of one garbage truck of textile waste is either placed in a landfill or incinerated every second.<sup>6</sup> Literally every second! While you were reading this sentence, four garbage trucks were filled with fashion waste.

Remember this the next time one of the glossy fashion magazines — which are ironically, printed on paper — lecture Americans about their consumption.

### *Starbucks*

Liberal-run Starbucks is also one of the biggest offenders. The liberal company — which has lectured Americans on everything from labor practices to defunding the police — uses more than 8,000 paper cups per minute<sup>7</sup> — per minute! — which leads to more than 4 billion Starbucks cups per year.

Nearly 2 million trees are killed every year for those cups. According to the organization Clean Water Action, the cups aren't even really recyclable since they are technically lined with a sheer plastic coating. In fact, only four American cities actually allow Starbucks cups to be recycled.

### *Gaming*

Even AOC's fun little video games are a huge problem for the planet. After AOC and Rep. Ilhan Omar made a surprise appearance playing the popular video game "Among Us," which was live-streamed on the social media platform Twitch, I delved into what this fun little hobby of AOC's is actually costing the environment.

In an article titled, "Next-Gen Gaming is an Environmental Nightmare," *WIRED Magazine* reports that U.S. gaming platforms "represent 34 terawatt-hours" of energy use per year<sup>8</sup> — that is more

than Sen. Joe Manchin's entire state of West Virginia uses in power each year.

Even worse, the popular gaming consoles used by AOC and her friends reportedly produce the same carbon dioxide emissions as 5 million cars per year, and those emissions are on the rise as the popularity of gaming increases.

Even more piggish? Waste from discarded gaming consoles contributes to approximately 10% of the 4.7 million tons of e-waste generated every year, according to the United Nations' Global E-Waste Monitor.<sup>9</sup>

Oops. Saving the planet is hard!

It turns out even for AOC and her liberal friends, from Hollywood to high fashion to yep, even Starbucks, life would be nearly impossible living under her Green New Deal.

### **“Conserve”-atives Were the First Environmentalists**

Before we go any further in the discussion on how to keep the planet beautiful and more importantly, livable, it's important to note that conservatives aren't anti-environmentalist. In fact, conservatives were the first to conserve energy and promote the importance of the conservation of our natural resources.

First and foremost, it is at the core of our name. “Conserve”-ative. True fiscal conservatives love not having to pay a penny more than needed for energy, utilities, and day-to-day living expenses. It's who we are. We are a penny-pinching bunch.

The conservative movement is littered (proverbially speaking, of course!) with prominent figures who were on-the-record for over the last century as conservationists.

President Theodore Roosevelt is the first and likely most well-known Republican environmentalist. A fan of nature his whole life, Teddy believed to his core that we must leave the world better than we found

it and when he became President of the United States, he used his power and appointed the Public Lands Commission; issued several proclamations and orders aimed at irrigation and the protection of wildlife and parks; and he also founded the United States Forest Service.<sup>10</sup>

Yet “conserve-ation” didn’t stop there.

According to a UC Berkeley Public Law Review Paper<sup>11</sup> conservative leader William F. Buckley, the founder of *National Review*, was an ardent conservationist. So was conservative U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater. They both took “vigorous public stands in favor of environmental protection.”

Another conservative, California Governor-turned-President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, also dedicated his career to looking out for Mother Earth. According to UC Berkeley papers, Reagan himself oversaw California’s pollution control agency and during his presidency “personally championed the international ozone agreement” of the 1980s and advocated for the protection of wildlife.

So, how did the left become so interested in the environment?

As with most policy issues championed by Republicans, they co-opted it.

I believe that as modern-day Democrats became hungry for more and more power, they realized that Socialist-based environmentalism was simply one more way to control people and yet one more tool to take down titans of industry in our capitalist society.

If you read the chapter in this book on Socialism, you’ll see that Marxist-based ideology is all about killing major industries within capitalist societies and turning those industries into property of the government.

Seeing that environmentalism could help them control the public masses and transfer massive private wealth to government programs, Democrats hopped the turnstile, jumped aboard the climate change gravy train and never looked back.

## **The Green New Deal's Cost to America**

Bloomberg News reported in 2019 that the Green New Deal will cost at least \$93 trillion over ten years.<sup>12</sup> By those estimates, the Green New Deal will cost the average American family at least \$65,000. By my count, that's \$6,500 per year, per family, during a time when the cost of food, energy, and other goods are skyrocketing.

To make matters worse, this burdensome cost comes at a time when Americans are still digging out from under the economic calamities caused by the pandemic and specifically, strict Democrat-led lockdowns.

Sadly, all of this comes just one year after President Donald Trump delivered the best economic numbers in 20 years and the lowest unemployment numbers in American history, particularly for women.

As the Green New Deal has gotten its foot in the door of President Joe Biden's Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, there are real-world costs to consider.

The price tag now only *begins* at \$93 million.

Biden's new infrastructure act alone costs \$1.2 trillion, according to the House of Representatives. The act doesn't even scratch the surface on what liberals would like the Green New Deal to alter.

For starters, AOC and her friends want to "green" America's supply chain.

Bloomberg News reported in October 2021 that in order to get the supply chain to turn green it will take a lot of green — \$100 trillion, to be exact.<sup>13</sup> That is, if there is any supply chain left after Biden and Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg are through with it. These two can't even get a treadmill delivered on time; they're going to improve the entire global supply chain? Not likely.

According to The Heritage Foundation,<sup>14</sup> the switch from traditional energy sources that Americans use in every day life to sources put forth by the Green New Deal would also cost a fortune.

The move away from clean coal, nuclear power and natural gas which millions of Americans use today, to Green-New-Deal-approved renewable energy sources would cost an additional \$5 trillion. Someone's got to pay for that, and it would likely come out of the hides of energy producers and American businesses.

American families would also bear the burden. Under the Green New Deal, Americans' own household electricity would increase 12% to 14% according to an analysis by The Heritage Foundation.

It's a lot of green.

What we don't know may also hurt us when it comes to funding AOC's Green New Deal.

Even the left-leaning FactCheck.org states, "experts told us the Green New Deal is too vague to try to estimate its cost."<sup>15</sup>

Talk about alarming.

As if a nearly \$100 trillion bill weren't enough, Americans could face the prospect of a much higher price tag. Most Americans understand that things in Washington, D.C. are often over-budget and rarely on schedule.

Even the left-wing CATO Institute estimates that for every \$1 billion the federal government pledges to spend on a project (such as the Green New Deal, or sending a man to space), it usually ends up spending approximately \$2 billion.<sup>16</sup> Given CATO's analysis, that means that the Green New Deal would actually cost more in the ballpark of \$200 trillion. It's hard to believe that an American public already gasping at a \$100 trillion price tag would go for a budget twice that.

Yet, it gets even worse when you consider that the Green New Deal is what one researcher would call a “mega project” — a public project so large that it tends to have even higher cost overruns.

For example, the launch of the Obama administration’s healthcare.gov website for “Obamacare” had a price tag that grew from \$464 million to \$864 million, quickly. We all remember how it fell flat on its face on its launch date. And that was just a website!

In another example, CATO reports that the International Space Station had a “quadruple” cost overrun, from \$17 billion to \$74 billion.

In yet another example, Veterans Administration hospitals over the decades have had — you guessed it — massive cost overruns. Not incidentally, they’ve also had dismal performance records of caring for *actual* humans.

As further proof that the Green New Deal would likely have major cost overruns, one could look at the research of Danish researcher Bent Flyvbjerg, co-author of the book, *Megaprojects and Risk*.

According to the CATO Institute, the professor examined 258 “large transportation projects across 20 countries. He found that 90% went over budget.” That’s a mighty high number.

Under this logic, the Green New Deal — which AOC purports would completely re-engineer American society on everything from infrastructure to education, from healthcare to housing — would almost certainly fall into the category of gargantuan International-Space-Station-kind of cost overruns. By the experts’ math, the Green New Deal would more accurately cost upwards of \$400 trillion — nearly half a “quadrillion.”

The cost to each American family, then, would be upwards of \$250,000 to enact the Green New Deal — not \$65,000 as initially estimated.

That, my friends, is a price tag that I believe very few Americans would support — especially women who are responsible for managing most household budgets.

## **From Diapers to Ziploc bags to SUVs: The Green New Deal is an Attack on the Everyday Lives for Women and Children**

In addition to its staggering price tag, the Green New Deal would make everyday products which most Americans rely upon, disappear.

In fact, it takes direct aim at most of the products that American women use on a daily basis — especially moms.

Most people don't know it but diapers are made of petroleum, as are many other everyday products.

It takes approximately one cup of petroleum to create one diaper. Twenty-eight billion disposable diapers are used each year, which is a lot of product from an oil industry which liberals today despise.

According to AOC, American moms today should force themselves to wash poop-filled cloth diapers over the toilet like their great-grandmothers did. She wants to set women back 70 years. Imagine if a Republican male had made such a suggestion! (“What’s next, being barefoot in the kitchen?” I can hear the Twitter chatter now!)

AOC’s logic, of course, spills over to other everyday products: the Ziploc bags that many American moms use for their children’s soccer games, the sippy cups that toddlers use and heck, even the SUVs that American women choose to cart the kids around to school and their various after-school activities. All of these everyday activities would come to a screeching halt if AOC’s Green New Deal were ever to become a reality.

Yet that is her aim.

An attack on petroleum and the petroleum-derived products that are so prevalent in America today is an attack on the women who use them. If the companies are forced out of business, the products that women use will go right out the door with them.

It's ironic that when it comes to the "choice" of how to run their everyday lives, AOC doesn't want moms to have much of one.

## **Higher Gas Prices**

We've already seen the price of gasoline skyrocket during the first two years of Biden's presidency.

It didn't happen because of the pandemic; in fact, during the pandemic gas prices were among the lowest of the last decade, because few people in America's largest cities were driving to work. (It is called "supply and demand" in economics school.)

The increase in gas prices came directly due to one of President Biden's earliest decisions to shut down a key energy source in America — the Keystone XL Pipeline — in large part due to pressure from his friends in the far-left, radical environmental wing of his party.

Under President Trump, the United States was not only producing plenty of oil and gas for ourselves — we actually had a surplus left over to sell to other at-risk countries and at a profit to ourselves, to boot. For example, under Trump we were able to sell energy to countries such as Poland in the dark of winter which helped them break their dependency upon Russian oil which had been not only bad for the North Atlantic country, geopolitically, but also bad for the rest of the world. When Russia and other authoritarian countries (Venezuela, etc.) sell oil, they fund their regimes.

There is no greater example of this than the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Whichever side you're on, the invasion was undoubtedly being funded by the 900,000 barrels of oil that Russia was selling to the world as countries could no longer get their oil from the United States of America. With American energy output being ground to a near halt, countries — especially those in Europe — had no choice but to purchase Russian oil.

In Biden's America, we are now faced with importing oil from foreign countries who don't like us — and that means spiked gas prices,

longer wait times from tankers to the pump, and most ironic of all, potentially dangerous journeys that foreign tankers must travel across our precious oceans, something that should bother even the slightest environmentalist.

Meantime American states such as Oklahoma, Texas, and even some parts of California stand ready to provide energy to the world, but the barriers are too high with Biden-era permitting rules and environmental requirements. The irony is that American oil is reportedly 64% cleaner than the Russian oil that we are now forced to import.

Allowing American companies to fulfill the demand could greatly drive down the price of gas at the pumps for single moms, working moms, carpooling moms, and their families AND it could help the planet, too.

That is good, clean foreign policy and simple math that everyone should be able to get behind.

## **Job Losses**

The job losses that experts estimate would take place under a Green New Deal is also jaw-dropping.

AOC and proponents of the Green New Deal admit that at least 6 million jobs would be lost — most likely in the oil, coal, and natural gas industries.

However, they don't include other jobs which economist Stephen Moore states will also be lost: those in the industries of manufacturing, transportation, and steel industries. Those jobs, he says, will likely go overseas to countries like China and India who will continue to pollute.

Other economies could also suffer. As jobs in the energy industry dry up, whole communities will as well.

It is estimated that Pennsylvania, which recently benefited from a natural gas boon, will lose more than 322,000 jobs if the Green New Deal goes into effect.<sup>17</sup> All of the industries that support the workers — the cafes where oil workers grab their morning breakfast and coffees, the real estate markets in the area, the property taxes that helped the schools — will all die on the vine. (This is in addition to the average family in Pennsylvania that will see their home energy costs go up more than \$300 per month.) It will have a real impact on real people.

It's amazing to think that the Green New Deal which stands to wreck so many lives is all based off of a 14-page proposal by a young socialist who has presented zero evidence to convince Americans that this is actually worth doing. It's frightening to think that America has followed her this far down the path.

### **Uneven Playing Field**

For all of its “saving the world” propoganda, the Green New Deal actually has very little bearing on, well,... the world.

The Green New Deal would *only* affect America's energy consumption and carbon output. It would have no bearing on the rest of the world.

The Green New Deal doesn't hold the world's biggest polluters — China & India<sup>18</sup> — accountable.

China is reportedly the largest polluter in the world, yet there is nothing in the Green New Deal to stem the tide of that country's output. According to the International Energy Agency, carbon emissions in the People's Republic of China increased 80% between 2005 to 2019, while emissions in America dropped by over 15 percent during the same time period.

China has repeatedly been the world's largest annual emitter of greenhouse gases since 2006 with a rate that is increasing every year, according to the U.S. Embassy.

The State Department also reports that the industrial mecca of Beijing is pumping into the air the world's highest levels of mercury, a harmful toxin that can affect people's brains.<sup>19</sup>

Although President Xi Jinping has committed to "carbon neutrality" by 2060, the State Department suggests that — much like AOC's — Xi's plan has been very light on details.

India does not fare much better.

China's and India's fossil fuel use has increased by 600% and 700%, respectively, since 1980.

They're not looking to slow down any time soon.

Between the two nations, China and India had 284 new coal plants in development as of January 2021.<sup>20</sup> Of the 20 most polluting cities on the planet, 15 are cities in India. Air quality in India's capital city of Delhi became so bad in November 2021 that government officials orders schools closed, power plants were shut down and businesses were ordered to keep half of their employees at home.

None of these tangible facts are being addressed in the Green New Deal.

AOC seeks to punish only American companies.

And that's just unfair.

Even though a Pew Research Poll in June 2020 showed that Republican women favor more measures to help the environment than GOP men, I know one thing about America's women voters: "fairness" is important to us. If the rules of the game are fair, American women tend to support a policy. However, if the rules aren't fair, then women voters (especially independent/swing voters) don't want to have anything to do with it.

How do I know? I've focus-grouped women voters on climate change and other issues over the past two decades, and what I've seen and heard from them from the other side of the two-way mirror confirms

their fair-mindedness. Sometimes, “fairness” matters to female swing voters more than the facts.

If the playing field isn’t even, then all bets are off.

When it comes to the Green New Deal giving the world’s two largest offenders of pollution a free pass while placing all of the financial burdens on Americans and their families, America’s women will take a hard pass at that.

American moms are acutely aware that their children are already behind other countries in other areas such as education. They’re not about to give additional advantages to the children of other nations while Americans foot the bill for vast social programs that don’t hold others to account.

### **Besides, It’s Been Tried Before: Solyndra**

As the ideas in the Green New Deal continue to be debated, it’s a shame that we have no reference point to which we can compare a government takeover of green programs.

Oh but wait, we do.

There is probably no better example than the government-subsidized Solyndra solar panel company to illustrate just how poorly the Green New Deal would play out.

In 2009, the Obama administration touted its darling in the “clean energy” industry and set out to make Solyndra a shining (no pun intended) example of how America could help cultivate alternate sources of energy.

What happened next was a colossal failure.

The White House threw their support behind the company, as did Wall Street. Through President Barack Obama’s stimulus plan to get the economy going again in 2009, Solyndra had hit pay dirt.

However, the company quickly began to falter as its technology could not keep up with traditional energy sources and could not compete with cheaper solar panels being sold by (shock!) China.

Solyndra ended up filing for bankruptcy in September 2011, and it was later discovered that the company's executives had "misled federal officials to obtain \$535 million in government-backed loans" (wait for it...) "with the help of the Obama White House."<sup>21</sup>

As a result, the U.S. government got soaked. Investors did too, to the tune of \$198 million.

It's precisely what will happen if the Green New Deal is allowed to go forward.

The only difference is that Solyndra was merely *one* company, in *one* town, in just *one* industry. AOC's Green New Deal would create a million little Solyndras, a million little scams.

It appears that Democrats have also learned lessons on how to pay for it. Instead of the government footing the bill for these experimental energy solutions like Solyndra, AOC would have the American people pay for it instead.

### **Bait and Switch**

Perhaps the worst part of AOC's Green New Deal push is that it most likely isn't about saving the planet at all.

*The Washington Post* reports that AOC's former chief of staff Saikat Chakrabarti was recently caught suggesting, "The interesting thing about the Green New Deal is it wasn't originally a climate thing at all... we really think of it as a how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy thing."

If her former chief of staff's statement is correct about AOC's true sentiment, and I believe it is, then the Green New Deal has more to do with instituting Socialism than greening the universe.

It's even more grotesque when you consider that the so-called "climate thing" carries a \$93 trillion price tag. If the Green New Deal isn't about the planet and is more about restructuring the economy as AOC's adviser says it is, then that would equate to the largest government-ordered transfer of funds from the American people to the government, thereby the largest bait-and-switch fraud of the century.

## **Snow Job**

There's something else that stinks in Queens.

For all of the discussion, debate and cost comparisons over it, the Green New Deal does not actually exist.

But don't take my word for it.

Even the liberal publication *The Atlantic* reports, "The Green New Deal Does Not, Strictly Speaking, Exist."<sup>22</sup>

The so-called biggest climate change policy of our lifetime has never been voted into law; in fact, it is not written down anywhere outside of a 14-page "resolution" that AOC introduced along with Senator Ed Markey in 2019.

Sure, some components of her Green New Deal were cobbled into Bernie Sanders' platform when he ran for president in 2020 and as I mentioned, some of it made its way into Biden's infrastructure plan. Other than that, however, *The Atlantic* goes so far as to say, "The idea has reshaped global climate policy, but is far less concrete than its supporters have been led to believe."

That's because it is a total snow job.

The Atlantic suggests that for all of the "histrionics" on social media about the Green New Deal, there isn't a lot of there "there."

To my knowledge, the Green New Deal has never been released as a policy "white paper" nor has it been submitted to the greatest

scientists in the world for peer review, which is what scientists do when they want feedback, fact-checks, and constructive critiques to show that their work can stand rigorous review. That fact alone shows that the concept is riddled with flaws.

*The Atlantic* is also spot on when it reports that even as President Biden’s “Build Back Better” infrastructure deal was being debated, the Green New Deal sat atop its shoulder cheering it on. Yet still, the Green New Deal itself as a standalone concept has never so much as passed muster in the U.S. Senate.<sup>23</sup> It is too radical to stand on its own two feet.

The fact that the Green New Deal doesn’t really exist on paper separates it from other gargantuan policy proposals pushed by liberals in the past.

The Affordable Healthcare for America Act — otherwise known as Obamacare — was 1,990 pages in its final form. It included a whopping 234,812 words.<sup>24</sup> Its pages were discussed ad nauseam on Sunday morning talk shows and a “white paper” of sorts was circulated far and wide within days of Obama’s 2008 election victory. The language for Obamacare listed concrete tenets of the plan, its costs, and more — just ask Speaker Nancy Pelosi who finally read the bill (you know, after she passed it!) Whether you agreed with instituting government-run healthcare or not, one thing was certain: unlike the Green New Deal, Obamacare was an official bill, with official bill language, it moved through the floors of Congress where it was vigorously debated, and the American public knew what it was about.

GOP Leader Kevin McCarthy’s American Tax Cuts and Jobs Act<sup>25</sup> was significantly shorter at approximately 200 pages, but its bill language was also clear. It was presented as a congressional revenue act, with specifics on tax cuts for families and reduction of taxes for businesses. Unlike the Green New Deal, the American Tax Cuts and Jobs Act’s benefits were laid bare for all to review.

Even President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal<sup>26</sup> in the 1940s existed in printed form, which were generated by typewriter; in fact, the New Deal took the form of numerous congressional bills which all

winded their way through Congress and were passed one by one then signed into law. FDR's New Deal included the congressional repeal of Prohibition; the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act; the National Industrial Recovery Act to allow unionization; the Glass-Steagall Act to impact banking; the New Deal and the Second New Deal, to name a few. The point is unlike AOC's Green New Deal of today, FDR's New Deal was detailed, scrutinized and had enough support from Congress to pass it and for the president to sign it into law.

The fact that the Green New Deal has not advanced through Congress in the nearly four years that AOC introduced it is concerning.

Most alarming is that the Green New Deal's financial components have never been scored the Congressional Budget Office.

I believe it is all by design.

If the Green New Deal's parameters are never fully written down on paper, AOC and her left-wing radical activists can continue to move the goalposts — just as liberals did on matters such as COVID-19.

AOC has moved the goalposts before. She previously inserted language into her informal "resolution" things like "affordable and safe housing, and protections for workers' right to unionize." These things that have nothing to do with how hot the earth gets if the temperature goes up by one degree.

If that isn't a snow job the size of Mount Kilimanjaro, I don't know what is.

Make no mistake, whether the Green New Deal exists on paper or not, the quest for zero carbon emissions worldwide is just as elusive as other liberal policies which have gone before it. "Zero COVID," anyone?

## **Follow the Money**

Lastly, when you're not sure what to believe in politics just remember the age-old saying, "Follow the money."

To understand what is truly going on with the Green New Deal, one must remember that Democrats perennially look for ways to neutralize their political opponents in Washington, D.C.

Historically, Republicans have been closely allied with the oil and gas industry. They've supported exploration and drilling. They've also benefitted throughout the decades from the lobbying spent on behalf of those oil and gas companies.<sup>27</sup> Most leaders in the oil and gas industry are Republican ideologues, from southern states, and they mostly back Republican candidates much like their extended cousins in the tobacco industry did for decades.

Like "Big Oil," the Democrat-coined "Big Tobacco" cared a lot about limiting taxes on their products, limiting government intervention and letting the free market dictate. Powerful lobbying groups such as Altria Group, Philip Morris International and Reynolds Group prominently backed Republicans who agreed with those tenets.

Just as Democrats ran the Republican-allied tobacco industry nearly out of business<sup>28</sup> they have designs on doing the same to the oil and gas industry today. I've long held this theory, but now Biden administration officials aren't even attempting to hide it.

Biden's recent nominee to a key post at the Treasury Department was caught on video suggesting of oil companies, "We want them to go bankrupt."<sup>29</sup> Saule Omarova, who once identified as a young Socialist while studying in Russia, suggested a war on fossil fuels by utilizing the American government and the very banking system she would oversee to bankrupt companies.

Talk about picking winners and losers.

I believe that Democrats are so vengeful against the oil and gas industry mostly because they couldn't compete with the hundreds of millions of dollars that the oil and gas industry was forced to spend to defend itself over the last decade.

In 2020 alone, “oilies” spent \$112 million in lobbying. That is a pretty penny with which Democrats had to contend. As a reaction, I believe Democrats have determined they must “bankrupt” these oil businesses and put them out of business — forever — so they don’t have to fight them in Washington, D.C. anymore. Just like the tobacco companies.

I also believe that Democrats’ love of everything electric — electric cars, electric energy, and more — is derived from the very government control that their leaders have over the electric grid itself.

Think about it.

When Democrats control government, they control the electric power grid. When they can control the electric grid, they can control how much you use energy, and when.

Just look at the recent climate edicts from California Governor Gavin Newsom. He recently asked Californians to forgo using electricity in their homes between the hours of 4pm to 8pm every day, in order to conserve electricity. If Californians don’t? They’ll face power outages.

Therefore, it wasn’t really a “choice.” It was an order.

You know where else they control the power grid like this? North Korea.

Famous satellite imagery shows the stark difference at night between North Korea<sup>30</sup> and South Korea, with the former being almost entirely dark at night. It’s partially due to North Korea’s inability to keep up with the modern world over the last five decades; but, make no mistake, it’s all about authoritarian control.

Yes, I believe the real reason Democrats are rushing to get everyone off of fossil fuels and other traditional forms of energy is that they want to control the supply of the energy you will be limited to use on a daily basis.

As soon as Americans understand that this is more about money, political power and control than it is saving the environment, the

better they'll be able to fend off this impending attack on your wallet and your American way of life.

## **Conclusion**

The Green New Deal seeks to control every American's way of life as she knows it today, from which diapers moms purchase to which SUVs in which they choose to drive their kids to sports activities. Radical liberals like Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez want to rob women of their "choice" in virtually everything from how to heat your family's home in the winter, to when you turn your lights on in your home. Robbing American women of the ability to choose how to live their lives freely is wrong. Even worse, AOC and her powerful friends in Hollywood, fashion and big government are hypocrites who don't follow their own rules as they spend millions of dollars on lifestyles, travel and industries that destroy the planet according to their own definitions. This is America, and you are a free person. Buy what you want, drive the car that you want yourself and your children to be safe and comfortable in, be green if you choose, but don't let anyone tell you how to live your day-to-day life.

## **HOMEWORK**

- Read the book, "The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels" by Alex Epstein. In it, Epstein addresses the argument that fossil fuels are destroying our planet and our lives. He points out that human life, especially for the underserved in our society, has actually *improved* thanks to the advances of fossil fuels — especially fracking, which is far less invasive to Mother Earth. The book is full of examples you can share with the climate change warriors ironically idling their engines in the carpool drop-off line.
- Also sign up for free "Energy Talking Points" to be delivered right to you from Epstein. He provides powerful points about the energy crisis, why fossil fuels actually make the world a better place, and debunks radical environmentalists' arguments. Sign up at: [EnergyTalkingPoints.com](http://EnergyTalkingPoints.com)

## REFERENCES:

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Socialist “It” Candidates Rips Uber, then Rides Uber  
<https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/socialist-candidate-ocasio-cortez-uber/>
  - <sup>2</sup> Gas-Guzzling Car Rides Expose AOC’s Hypocrisy amid Green New Deal Pledge  
<https://nypost.com/2019/03/02/gas-guzzling-car-rides-expose-aocs-hypocrisy-amid-green-new-deal-pledge/>
  - <sup>3</sup> Gas-Guzzling Car Rides Expose AOC’s Hypocrisy amid Green New Deal Pledge  
<https://nypost.com/2019/03/02/gas-guzzling-car-rides-expose-aocs-hypocrisy-amid-green-new-deal-pledge/>
  - <sup>4</sup> Hollywood’s Waste  
<https://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-ct-onlocation-20140731-story.html>
  - <sup>5</sup> Fashion Industry Waste: 92 Million Tons of Textile Waste, per Second  
<https://www.fashionrevolution.org/waste-is-it-really-in-fashion/>
  - <sup>6</sup> Ellen MacArthur Foundation: Fashion Industry Waste  
<https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/a-new-textiles-economy>
  - <sup>7</sup> Clean Water Action: 8,000 Starbucks Cups Are Used per Minute  
<https://www.cleanwateraction.org/features/starbucks-and-our-plastic-pollution-problem>
  - <sup>8</sup> WIRED: Next-Gen Gaming is the Environment’s Worst Nightmare  
<https://www.wired.com/story/xbox-playstation-cloud-gaming-environment-nightmare/>
  - <sup>9</sup> How Much Waste Gaming Produces  
<https://www.dw.com/en/can-video-games-inspire-climate-action/a-57357630>
  - <sup>10</sup> U.S. Parks Service: Teddy Roosevelt and Conservation

---

<https://www.nps.gov/thro/learn/historyculture/theodore-roosevelt-and-conservation.htm>

<sup>11</sup> UC Berkeley Public Law Review Papers: “The Conservative as Environmentalist: From Goldwater and the Early Reagan to the 21st Century”

[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2919633#](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2919633#)

<sup>12</sup> Bloomberg: Green New Deal Will Cost \$93 Trillion

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-21/greening-energy-to-fight-climate-threat-may-cost-92-trillion>

<sup>13</sup> Bloomberg: For Supply Chain to Turn Green, It’ll Take \$100 Trillion

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/newsletters/2021-10-28/supply-chain-latest-shifting-to-green-will-cost-100-trillion>

<sup>14</sup> Heritage Foundation: It’s Not Just about Cost: The Green New Deal is Bad Environmental Policy, Too

<https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/its-not-just-about-cost-the-green-new-deal-bad-environmental-policy-too>

<sup>15</sup> FactCheck.org: Green New Deal Is Too Vague to Try to Estimate Its Cost

<https://www.factcheck.org/2019/03/how-much-will-the-green-new-deal-cost/>

<sup>16</sup> CATO Institute: Federal Government Cost Overruns

<https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/tbb-72.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Costs of Green New Deal Would Be Devastating

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/conservative-group-estimates-devastating-green-new-deal-would-drive-up-energy-costs-kill-jobs>

<sup>18</sup> World’s Most Polluted Cities

<https://www.iqair.com/world-most-polluted-cities>

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Embassy: “China’s Air Pollution Harms Its Citizens and the World”

---

<https://ge.usembassy.gov/chinas-air-pollution-harms-its-citizens-and-the-world/>

<sup>20</sup> China and India Had Nearly 300 New Coal Plants in the Works as of January 2021

<https://energytalkingpoints.com/1-in-5-myth/#fn-3>

<sup>21</sup> Remembering Solyndra

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/adamandrzejewski/2021/04/12/remembering-solyndra--how-many-570m-green-energy-failures-are-hidden-inside-bidens-instructure-proposal/?sh=2b67a63e2672>

<sup>22</sup> The Green New Deal Does Not, Strictly Speaking, Exist – The Atlantic

<https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2021/07/the-green-new-deal-doesnt-exist/619424/>

<sup>23</sup> Mike Bloomberg: Green New Deal Has “Zero Chance” of Passing

<https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/05/mike-bloomberg-says-green-new-deal-stands-no-chance.html>

<sup>24</sup> By Comparison: Obamacare Bill: 1,990 pages and more than 200,000 words

<https://computationallegalstudies.com/2009/11/08/facts-about-the-length-of-h-r-3962/>

<sup>25</sup> American Tax Cuts and Jobs Act

<https://www.republicanleader.gov/mccarthy-tax-cuts-and-jobs-act/>

<sup>26</sup> FDR’s New Deal

<https://www.history.com/topics/great-depression/new-deal>

<sup>27</sup> How Much Money Oil & Gas Companies Spent on Lobbying in 2020

<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/oil-lobbyists-use-rigged-system-hamstring-bidens-climate-agenda/>

<sup>28</sup> Similarities to The War on the Tobacco Industry

<https://www.eenews.net/articles/lawmakers-study-big-tobacco-perjury-before-big-oil-showdown-2/>

---

<sup>29</sup> Biden Treasury Nominee Saule Omarova on Oil Companies: “We Want Them to Go Bankrupt”

<https://nypost.com/2021/11/11/biden-treasury-pick-saule-omarova-wants-fuel-companies-to-go-bankrupt/>

<sup>30</sup> North Korea at Night: Satellite Imagery

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2725415/Nasa-satellite-images-North-Korea-secretive-space.html>