

## **Micheli: Climate change debate is about grabbing power, not solutions**

The Wyoming Tribune-Eagle (Cheyenne)

September 15, 2019 Sunday

Copyright 2019 Adams Publishing Group All Rights Reserved

**Section:** GUEST COLUMN; opinion; Pg. 9

**Length:** 721 words

### **Body**

---

The longer this Democratic presidential primary goes on, the more apparent it is that the radical left has taken control of the Democratic Party.

If anyone ever doubted that the Democrats have become the party of Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, all you need to do is watch the Democratic presidential debates for five minutes. No matter the issue, the answer is always the same - take power away from individuals and states and give it to the all-wise, all-knowing federal government.

Nowhere is this phenomenon more apparent than the way Democrats address **climate change**. Just take Elizabeth Warren as an example. Virtually every time Elizabeth Warren opens her mouth, she talks about the "existential crisis" of **climate change** and how it is going to take "big structural **change**" to address it.

Fine. Let's move past the argument of the level of threat from **climate change** for a moment - how does Elizabeth Warren plan to address **climate change**? She proposes to ban nuclear power, ban all leasing for oil and gas production on ALL federal lands and a nationwide ban on all hydraulic fracturing (fracking).

If you ever needed proof that Democrats are not serious about **climate change**, and that they do not believe any of the scary things they say about **climate change**, you should look no further than Elizabeth Warren's rhetoric. Clearly, she is far more concerned about virtue signaling to her radical base than doing anything to address the supposed "existential crisis" she claims is created by **climate change**.

Think about it: If we only have 12 years to avoid the dire consequences of **climate change**, there is one source of power that has zero carbon emissions. If we really cared about curtailing **climate change**, we should be building nuclear power plants just as fast as humanly possible.

I have said for a long time that I will take the left's fear mongering about **climate change** seriously when they start advocating to expedite the building of nuclear power plants. Until then, I discount everything they say.

But, if banning nuclear power wasn't enough, Elizabeth Warren next says she will ban all oil and gas development on all federal lands and then ban fracking. First, if we want to talk about an existential threat, banning fracking and banning all oil and gas development on federal land destroys Wyoming.

I have already explained multiple times that between 60% and 70% of the money that goes to the state of Wyoming comes from oil, gas and coal. Banning fracking and banning production on federal minerals is virtually the same thing as banning oil and gas production in Wyoming. Without coal, oil and gas, we have no money for roads, schools and basic public services. We also lose tens of thousands of jobs.

We will just become one large square museum, and people from New York and California can drive through once in a while, but virtually all of our state revenue and a massive amount of our jobs would be gone. Also, let's not ignore the fact that this proposal simply means that we once again become reliant on oil and natural gas from countries that hate us and want to do us harm.

Micheli: Climate change debate is about grabbing power, not solutions

Beyond that, however, by making such claims, Democrats once again show they are far more concerned about virtue signaling than addressing **climate change**.

Quick quiz: Guess which country has reduced its CO2 emissions more than any other country in the world? That is correct. Despite pulling out of the Paris **Climate** Accord, the United States has reduced its CO2 emissions more than any other country.

The reason is simple: It is because of American ingenuity and advancements in technology related directly to fracking. We have gotten so good at getting natural gas out of the ground that we have a huge abundance of this clean-burning natural resource.

Again, if we were serious about addressing **climate change**, we would be moving toward natural gas-powered cars, trains and long-haul trucks. If we were serious about **climate change**, we should be expanding the use of natural gas. This is an actual solution that could be implemented relatively easily.

Of course, the **climate change** debate has never been about solutions or doing things that actually address CO2 emissions, it is about grabbing power and scaring voters to try to win elections. Listening to any of the Democratic presidential candidates for five minutes proves that thesis.

## Classification

---

**Language:** ENGLISH

**Publication-Type:** Newspaper

**Subject:** POLITICAL PARTIES (91%); US PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES 2020 (90%); LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT (88%); EMISSIONS (78%); GOVERNMENT & PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (78%); GREENHOUSE GASES (78%); HEADS OF GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS (78%); POLITICAL DEBATES (78%); PRIMARY ELECTIONS (78%); US PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS (78%); PUBLIC LANDS (72%); matt micheli (%)

**Industry:** ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS (89%); ENERGY & UTILITIES (89%); HYDRAULIC FRACTURING (89%); NATURAL GAS & ELECTRIC UTILITIES (89%); NUCLEAR ENERGY (89%); OIL & GAS INDUSTRY (89%); NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS (87%); OIL & GAS EXTRACTION (87%); EMISSIONS (78%); ENERGY & UTILITY CONSTRUCTION (77%); PUBLISHING (74%); HIGHWAY FUNDING (50%); MUSEUMS & GALLERIES (50%)

**Person:** ELIZABETH WARREN (89%); ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ (73%)

**Geographic:** WYOMING, USA (94%); CALIFORNIA, USA (79%); NEW YORK, USA (79%)

**Load-Date:** November 13, 2019