AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 114–359

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ON ACCESS TO ENERGY AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 13, 2016

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

20–944 PDF WASHINGTON : 2016

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

DAVID VITTER, Louisiana
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
MIKE CRAPO, Idaho
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
ROGER WICKER, Mississippi
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska
MIKE ROUNDS, South Dakota
DAN SULLIVAN, Alaska

BARBARA BOXER, California
THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Rhode Island
JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, New York
CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts

RYAN JACKSON, *Majority Staff Director*
BETTINA POIRIER, *Democratic Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

Page

APRIL 13, 2016

OPENING STATEMENTS

Inhofe, Hon. James M., U.S. Senator from the State of Oklahoma 1
Boxer, Hon. Barbara, U.S. Senator from the State of California 3

WITNESSES

Nelson, Rev. Dr. J. Herbert II, Director, Presbyterian Church U.S.A. Office of Public Witness 5
Prepared statement 8
Breen, Michael, President, Truman National Security Project 17
Prepared statement 19
Sirico, Father Robert A., President, Acton Institute 23
Prepared statement 25
Scales, Robert, Major General (Ret.), Senior Military Analyst 37
Prepared statement 39
Responses to additional questions from Senator Vitter 47
Epstein, Alex, President, Center for Industrial Progress 48
Prepared statement 50
Responses to additional questions from Senator Vitter 53

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES ON ACCESS TO ENERGY AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2016

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in room 406, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James M. Inhofe (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Inhofe, Boxer, Barrasso, Capito, Crapo, Fischer, Rounds, Sullivan, Whitehouse, Gillibrand, Booker, and Markey.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. INHOFE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Senator INHOFE. Our hearing will come to order.

Today we have a very distinguished panel. They are all five distinguished, but the two on the right I just don't know as well as I know the other three.

Senator BOXER. Yes, because they are our witnesses.

Senator INHOFE. I know it. I know that, Barbara. And we are very happy that they are here.

First of all, the three that I have known before for a long period of time, Father Sirico and General Scales. General Scales, the reason for his military success is that he got his training at Fort Sill in Oklahoma. And Alex Epstein, whose book I have not finished, but I have it.

During the State of the Union address, the President said, "No challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change." Well, he is wrong. The far greater threat is what the Obama administration is implementing in the name of climate change. This Administration has spent significant time and taxpayer dollars promoting a sense of fear and urgency around climate change, exploiting any recent catastrophic event to justify Obama's economically devastating policies.

For example, his statement tying terrorism to climate change, those statements are not only dangerous, but demean the men and women who have pledged their lives to keep this country safe. His climate change policies aren't protecting this country; they are killing the coal industry, undermining our global competitiveness, putting thousands of Americans out of work while shipping their jobs overseas, and costing hardworking taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars that will take generations to pay down.

Rhetoric aside, President Obama's climate policies have nothing to do with the environment. The EPA did not even bother to assess whether the so-called Clean Power Plan, that is what he has been talking about over in Paris, and that is the centerpiece of the President's entire climate agenda, and the EPA didn't even bother to talk about that and what the source would be and how he would accomplish it. In fact, it costs hundreds of billions of dollars each year and has minuscule benefits that would be completely undone by a few months of economic activity in China.

The President's claims that his efforts are about protecting the health of this country or national security are equally disingenuous. In fact, they stand to undermine our economic well-being, which is the foundation of this country's domestic success and global respect. A Children's Health Watch study from May 2013 found that high energy costs can cause families to go without needed medical care and increase the risk of eviction and homelessness.

Recently there has been a fad to demonize fossil fuels. But fossil fuel development has been a game changer for economic opportunity around the world and also is integral from a strategic military perspective. Fossil fuels help lift communities out of abject poverty. The aggressive regulating by the Obama administration to promote his climate change agenda, such as the Climate Action Plan and the Paris Agreement, will do more to harm than good to vulnerable communities. Incidentally, we had a hearing on this yesterday and were able to get into this issue.

Of course, climate is always changing, we understand that. But whether you believe that it is man that is causing it or not, it is in our best interest, from any perspective, to continue to use fossil fuels because they are important to our economy, our military, and our quality of life.

But the existence of abundant fossil fuel resources in this country alongside American ingenuity and innovation have fueled our path to becoming the global powerhouse we are today. The American people understand the value of fossil fuels, which is why they have consistently rejected costly climate policies, and the Congress has acted accordingly.

Clearly, the true purpose of the President's climate policies have nothing to do with protecting the interests of the American people. Instead, they are meant to line the pocketbooks of his political patrons while promoting his self-proclaimed climate legacy.

So we appreciate all of you being here, and I want you to know we are going to have a much better attendance today. I think some of our colleagues want to wait until our opening statements are over before they show up. They have other things to do.

Senator Boxer.

[The prepared statement of Senator Inhofe follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Today we have a very distinguished panel to discuss the real impacts the President's climate policies are already having on the American people. In particular, I'd like to welcome Father Sirico, General Scales, and Alex Epstein for joining us.

During the State of the Union, the President said, "No challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change." He's wrong. The far greater threat is what the Obama administration is implementing in the name of climate change. This administration has spent significant time and taxpayer dollars pro-

moting a sense of fear and urgency around climate change, exploiting any recent catastrophic event to justify Obama's economically devastating policies. For example, his statements tying terrorism to climate change are not only dangerous but demean the men and women who have pledged their lives to keep this country safe. His climate change policies aren't protecting this country—they're killing the coal industry, undermining our global competitiveness, putting thousands of Americans out of work while shipping their jobs overseas, and costing hardworking taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars that will take generations to pay down.

Rhetoric aside, President Obama's climate policies have nothing to do with the environment. The EPA did not even bother to assess whether the so-called Clean Power Plan—the centerpiece of the President's entire climate agenda—would have any impact on the environment. In fact, it will cost hundreds of billions of dollars each year and have minuscule benefits that will be completely undone by a few months of economic activity in China.

The President's claims that his efforts are about protecting the health of this country or national security are equally disingenuous. In fact, they stand to undermine our economic well-being, which is the foundation of this country's domestic success and global respect. A Children's HealthWatch study from May 2013 found that high energy costs can cause families to go without needed medical care and increase the risk of eviction and homelessness.

Recently there has been a fad to demonize fossil fuels. But fossil fuel development has been a game changer for economic opportunity around the world and also is integral from a strategic military perspective. Fossil fuels help lift communities out of abject poverty. The aggressive regulating by the Obama administration to promote his climate change agenda, such as the Climate Action Plan and the Paris Agreement, will do more harm than good to vulnerable communities. Even the Pope has tried to turn climate action into an international moral imperative.

But whether you believe in climate change or not, it is in our best interest—from any perspective—to continue to use fossil fuels because they are important to our economy, our military, and our quality of life.

But the existence of abundant fossil fuel resources in this country alongside American ingenuity and innovation have fueled our path to becoming the global powerhouse we are today. The American people understand the value of fossil fuels, which is why they have consistently rejected costly climate policies, and Congress has acted accordingly.

Clearly, the true purpose of the President's climate policies have nothing to do with protecting the interests of the America people. Instead, they are meant to line the pocketbooks of his political patrons while promoting his self-proclaimed climate legacy.

I thank our witnesses for being here today and look forward to their testimony.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BARBARA BOXER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Senator BOXER. Thanks.

Well, I have to remind myself this is the environment committee, because listening to you, Mr. Chairman, it sounds like the pollution committee to me. Now, I would say if 9 out of 10 doctors tell you you need a heart operation, you wouldn't listen to the one outlier; you would get the operation. You wouldn't yell at the doctors and say they were liars and stupid and on somebody else's payroll; you would get the operation.

Well, 97 percent of respected scientists, respected scientists tell us there are dangers to climate change and that our activities are causing it, most of it. So let's stop all this posturing and attacking President Obama, who has a 50 percent approval rate. His approval rating is higher than Ronald Reagan's was at his time in the presidency, when the Republican Congress has 18 percent, and in addition to that, big majority support action on climate change.

People are smart. They don't care how you mock people. They know 2015 was the hottest year on record, and 15 of the 16 warmest years on record have occurred in the 21st century. Just this year scientists reported sea levels are rising many times faster

than they have in 2,800 years. The 2015 wildfire season was the costliest; just ask my State, with a record $1.71 billion spent. So we see that climate poses a risk to our national security.

How about the Department of Defense? We have a military expert here. He may disagree. But the Department of Defense's 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review linked climate change with national security: "Climate change poses a significant challenge for the United States and the world at large. The pressures caused by it will influence resource competition, place additional burdens on economic society and governance institutions. These effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad, such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions, conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence."

So don't say it is the President out of context who is talking about violence and terrorism. It is the Department of Defense.

Now, thank goodness we have an Administration that isn't cowed by the kinds of rhetoric that we heard from my Chairman, who I really like. But the fact is his words just don't make sense to me. The efforts undertaken as part of the President's Climate Action Plan include: new fuel economy standards for cars and heavy duty trucks; finalizing the Clean Power Plan, which will cut carbon pollution 32 percent.

And I would ask to put my whole statement into the record, and I will finish my last couple of minutes this way.

The American public understands the need to act. According to a New York Times poll, two-thirds of Americans support the United States being part of an international treaty to limit the impacts of climate change. So the Republicans on this committee are so out of step with the American people. It is unreal. A recent poll found 60 percent of American voters support the Clean Power Plan, and 70 percent of voters want their State to cooperate and develop a plan to implement these new standards.

While we face rhetoric like we heard on the floor, trying to go after the President's plans, the people are with the President, and the President's approval rates show that people think he is going in the right direction.

And there are benefits. I want to read you the benefits. Here is the point. Sometimes when there is a problem the solution brings other problems. In this case, the solution, reducing carbon pollution, has co-benefits, and they have been quantified. By 2030, just the Clean Power Plan alone will prevent 1,500 to 3,600 premature deaths because we are cleaning up the air, up to 1,700 heart attacks, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and how about this, 300,000 missed work days and school days by 2030.

Look, I often say this, if you can't breathe, you can't work. And when we take the carbon out of the air, we are taking all these other pollutants out of the air, and no one—and I don't think anyone has had this situation where a constituent comes up and says, Barbara, the air is too clean, please make it dirtier. No. They want me to continue to clean up the air because it has so many benefits.

So I haven't even gone into the number of clean energy jobs that await us, all kinds of good things. And yes, in the dislocations we have to be prepared to help those who are dislocated. But if we

took this attitude, we never would have moved to the automobile because all those people who drew the horse-drawn carriages would be unemployed. We can make sure that people are brought along.

So I am excited about what the President is doing, and I am not excited about my colleague's opening statement, but he did it probably even better than he has ever done it before. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Senator Boxer was not received at time of print.]

Senator INHOFE. Oh, thank you. That is very nice.

I want all of you to know that Barbara Boxer and I get along great on roads and highways and infrastructure and a lot of things.

All right, I am going to start over here with you, Reverend Nelson, and what I would like to ask you to do, we will have more members coming here. We do have staff present representing members, and I would like to ask you if you could hold to your 5-minute opening statement, it would be appreciated.

STATEMENT OF REV. DR. J. HERBERT NELSON II, DIRECTOR, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U.S.A. OFFICE OF PUBLIC WITNESS

Rev. NELSON. Hello, my name is Reverend Doctor J. Herbert Nelson II. I direct the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. Office of Public Witness here in Washington, DC. Chairman Inhofe and Member Boxer and committee members, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come to you today not only with 30 years of pastoral experience in a community that bore the harmful impacts of industrial pollution, not only as the director of the denomination's national advocacy office, but as a representative of an ecumenical Christian community that understands the urgent moral imperative to act on climate change and protect God's creation.

Psalm 24:1 and 2: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and those who live in it; for he has founded it on the seas, and established it on the rivers." We must discuss environmental policy in tandem with economic policy, the care of creation and all of creation, including our neighbors' health and economic well-being. It is central to our concern in addressing climate change.

I served as a pastor in a poor inner city congregation in Memphis, Tennessee, before coming to Washington, DC. I shared my home and my community with some of the most intense industrial pollution in this country from a chemical plant to a coal-fired power generating station and an oil refinery. Ours was a predominantly African-American community, which like so many low-income communities of color in our Nation, suffered disproportionately under the health burdens that oftentimes deal with the issues of industrial zones in our Nation. It was widely reported at the time that African-Americans were 79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial pollution was suspected of posing the greatest health danger.

Memphis residents were often sick and were forced to miss school and work because of chronic asthma caused by pollutants. I recall one activist I knew, Doris Bradshaw, who lived on land contaminated by near military storage facility. After her grand-

mother's untimely death from an aggressive cervical cancer, which doctors told her was environmentally induced, Ms. Bradshaw delved into her own investigation of the contaminants of the land and air. She was shocked to find a laundry list of chemicals that had been improperly disposed and stored there, and those responsible for the disposal had not been accountable.

I am certain that the CEOs and profiteers of those companies did not live in the areas where the air and water made their family ill. As pastor I conducted funerals of people who died before their time, made countless hospital visits for maladies my flock should not have had to endure, and engaged in organizing to bring justice to those afflicted by careless environmental practices. We seek an earth restored, where economic development is not paid for with the health of our most vulnerable sisters and brothers.

Presbyterians have established since 1981 that we have an ethical obligation to secure a livable planet for present and future generations. A report approved by the 218th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. entitled The Power to Change: U.S. Energy Policy and Global Warming states emphatically that we have both a spiritual and moral obligation and responsibility to address this issue of climate change.

In order to do this in the Reformed tradition, we believe that repentance is required. Repentance in our biblical understanding calls for individuals to stop the actions that are contrary to God's desires for sustainable human life and sustaining human life while turning to a new way of living that promotes what John 10:10 requires—a vision of an abundant life. With God's grace, we can receive the power to change.

The Presbyterian Church U.S.A. recognizes that there is no greater measure than God's provision for energy, the earth, the sun, and the wind. And therefore we speak very candidly about the issues of subsidizing the financial incentives away from fossil fuels extraction and toward renewable energy infrastructure in order to protect the affordable energy prices that many low-income families rely on that are inexpensive and that the way we should be stunned by the cost of human health reclamation of God's damaged creation were reflected in the utility bills of everyday Americans. We know not what we do.

I sit here today not just representing Presbyterian Church U.S.A., but I do represent faith leaders from across the Nation and also communities of faith from across the community, one of the 21 who have signed an agreement dealing with the issues of carbon emission. Given that my time is running out, I will submit my report to you and respectfully submit the letter that you already have, actually, and also other information regarding those who are supporting.

I know that there has been a great deal of concern regarding whether or not faith communities are standing with this particular issue. I am here to say that the petition that has been signed, the letters that have been given to you, we are seriously involved in this because it is not only a mandate of our holy books, but it is the way that we are called as responsible stewards of this earth to be caretakers for what God has given to us and to be assured that,

quite frankly, we have a planet to leave to those who are coming behind.

[The prepared statement of Rev. Nelson follows:]

Testimony of Reverend Dr. J Herbert Nelson II
Director, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Office of Public Witness

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

"Examining the Role of Environmental Policies on
Access to Energy and Economic Opportunity."

Hello, my name is Reverend Doctor J Herbert Nelson and I direct the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Office of Public Witness. Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Boxer, and Committee Members, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come to you today not only with 30 years of pastoral experience in a community that bore the harmful impacts of industrial pollution, not only as director of our denomination's national advocacy office, but as a representative of an ecumenical Christian community that understands the urgent moral imperative to act on climate change and protect God's great creation.

Scripture affirms: "The earth is the Lord's and all that is in it, the world, and those who live in it; for he has founded it on the seas, and established it on the rivers" (Ps. 24:1–2); The Christian affirmation of God's creation and love for the world means protection for all human, animal and plant life. It is apt, then, that we discuss environmental policy in tandem with economic policy, for care for *all* of creation, including our neighbors' health and economic wellbeing, is central to our concern in addressing climate change.

I served as Pastor of a poor inner city congregation in Memphis, Tennessee before coming to Washington, DC. I shared my home and my community with some of the most intense industrial pollution in the country from a chemical plant, a coal-fired power generating station, and an oil refinery. Ours was a predominantly African American community, which like so many low-income communities of color in our nation, suffered disproportionately under the health burdens of living in an industrial zone. It was widely reported at the time that Africans Americans were 79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial pollution was suspected of posing the greatest health danger[1].

Memphis residents were often sick and were forced to miss school and work because of chronic asthma caused by pollutants[2]. I recall one activist I knew, Doris

---

[1] Pace, David. "Minorities Suffer Most from Industrial Pollution." *Associated Press.* 12/14/2005. http://www.nbcnews.com/id/10452037/ns/us_news-environment/t/minorities-suffer-most-industrial-pollution/#.Vwqu72QrLjE
[2] Jia, Chunrong, Wesley James, and Satish Kedia. "Relationship of Racial Composition and Cancer Risks from Air Toxics Exposure in Memphis, Tennessee, U.S.A." Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2014 Aug; 11(8): 7713–7724. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4143828/#B5-ijerph-11-07713

Bradshaw, who lived on land contaminated by a nearby military storage facility. After her grandmother's untimely death from an aggressive cervical cancer, which doctors told her was environmentally induced, Ms. Bradshaw delved into her own investigation of the contaminants of the land and air. She was shocked to find a laundry list of chemicals that had been improperly disposed of and stored there, and those responsible for the disposal had not been held accountable[3]. I am certain that the CEOs and profiteers of those companies did not live in areas where the air and water made their family ill. As pastor, I conducted funerals of people who died before their time, made countless hospital visits for maladies my flock should not have had to endure, and engaged in organizing to bring justice to those afflicted by careless environmental practices. We seek an earth restored, where economic development is not paid for with the health of our most vulnerable sisters and brothers in Christ.

Presbyterians have established since 1981 that we have an ethical obligation to secure a livable planet for present and future generations. A report approved by the 218th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) entitled *The Power to Change: U.S. Energy Policy And Global Warming*[4] states emphatically that we have both a spiritual and moral responsibility to address the issues related to climate change. In order to do this in the Reformed tradition, we believe that repentance is required. Repentance in our biblical understanding calls individuals and nations to stop the actions that are contrary to God's desires for the sustainability of human life, while turning to a new way of living that promotes the John 10:10 vision of an abundant life. With God's grace, we can receive the power to change.

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) recognizes that there is no greater measure of God's abundant provision than that of the energy provided by the sun and wind. As such, our denomination has called for the removal of market barriers for broad based investment in renewable energy. We have already seen prices of renewables drop below the prices of carbon based energy sources in some areas[5], and believe it is part of our moral imperative to continue these development projects. We charge the federal government to continue to shift subsidies and financial incentives away from fossil fuel extraction and towards renewable energy infrastructure in order to protect the affordable energy prices that many low income families rely on. Our

---

[3]Freeman, Sarah Wilkerson. *Tennessee Women: Their Lives and Times.* University of Georgia Press, 2009. P. 415

[4]"The Power to Change: U.S. Energy Policy and Global Warming," approved by the 218th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 2008, http://www.pcusa.org/resource/power-change-us-energy-policy-global-warming/.

[5] Jacobs, Mike. "Where is Wind Energy Cheaper than Natural Gas?". *Union of Concerned Scientists.* October 18, 2013. http://blog.ucsusa.org/mike-jacobs/where-is-wind-energy-cheaper-than-natural-gas-276

denomination also recognizes that carbon based energy sources are artificially inexpensive, and that we would be stunned if costs to human health and reclamation of God's damaged creation were reflected in the utility bills of everyday Americans. We know not what we do.

At this time, I would like to make some specific remarks about the President's Climate Action Plan. Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Evangelical institutions have commented extensively on the importance of the President's Plan, including and especially the Clean Power Plan and curbing methane waste.[6] I will submit for the record more than two dozen statements by Catholic, Evangelical, Protestant, and Jewish leadership that express strong support for those two aspects of the Climate Action Plan. The Clean Power Plan will help communities like the one I pastored in Memphis to gather stakeholders and together, forge a path forward to make the transition to a much-needed clean energy future that will protect our community's health. In spite of the Supreme Court stay, as well as some states' decisions to stall progress, faith communities are forging ahead at the grassroots level to have the conversations on the ground about making inevitable and necessary changes in our energy economy, which will ultimately benefit all of us. We do this because we believe the only thing that will "put a stay" on climate change is swift, faithful action to heal and protect God's creation. Furthermore, because faith communities value good stewardship, we believe methane standards by EPA and BLM of new and existing methane pollution sources need to be swiftly completed. One only need visit Porter Ranch, California or any other community close to an oil and gas extraction site to see devastating impacts of careless, easily fix-able methane leaks. Currently, the methane pollution wasted by the oil and gas industry each year is enough to heat nearly 6 million homes each winter. Furthermore, millions in taxpayer money literally go up in smoke due to venting and flaring practices on our public lands. States, Tribes and federal taxpayers lose royalty revenues when natural gas is wasted – as much as $23 million annually in royalty revenue for the Federal Government and the States that share it, according to a 2010 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report.

Our advocacy does not end at our own borders, for we know well that energy decisions made by the US are amplified the world over. People of faith came out in unprecedented numbers to advocate for global climate action in the COP 21 Paris Climate Agreement. Collectively, we delivered nearly two million petition signatures to negotiators calling for a fair, ambitious, binding climate agreement. The agreement reached is a reflection of the powerful advocacy work of communities around the world. World leaders have finally recognized that the moral imperative for ambitious climate action — now and for decades to come — is strong. Yet, although the deal is an important step forward, it is insufficient. We commend negotiators for laying a strong foundation for climate change mitigation, and recognize that we in the United States have significant work to do to make good on

---

[6] National Religious Partnership for the Environment. http://www.nrpe.org/climate-statements.html

existing promises, as well as achieve the level of change necessary. As we continue to build on this agreement, we call on the United States to take leadership in keeping existing climate finance commitments, as well as planning for the social, political, and financial implications of climate-related loss and damage.

It is a matter of justice that developed nations who have put the most greenhouse gasses into the air take responsibility for developing nations' ability to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Developing nations need access to renewable energy infrastructure, as well as the tools to address climate impacts such as severe weather, droughts, and flooding. The Paris Agreement included some basic climate finance mechanisms which our communities can build on in future years. Since its inception, faith communities have vigorously supported the Green Climate Fund. Along with my testimony, I will submit for the record a letter released on Monday, April 11, 2016 that was signed by 115 faith organizations urging Congress to invest the President's recommended $750 million in the Green Climate Fund for Fiscal Year 2017. Along with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), some of the signers include the US Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Jewish Council of Public Affairs, the National Council of Churches USA, and the Evangelical Environmental Network.

This is not simply a Presbyterian concern; various communions and denominations from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to the Alliance of Baptists to the United Methodist Church to the Roman Catholic Church and Evangelicals have joined together in the common mission to care for God's creation. Many of these Christian traditions also hold theological principles reflected in Pope Francis's encyclical on the environment, *Laudato Si'*. *Laudato Si'* is one of two papal encyclicals that, because its subject matter is universally relevant, is addressed to all people, rather than only to Catholics. We affirm its echo of the great St. Francis' reverence for nature. At the same time, we join the Pope in the urgency of truth-telling: we humans are largely responsible for global warming and we have to find ways to reverse track.

With our Lord, we will stand with the "least of these" (Matt. 25:40) and advocate for the poor and oppressed in present and future generations who are often the victims of environmental injustice and who are least able to mitigate the impact of global warming that [is falling] disproportionately on them. ... [W]e implore our nation to accept its moral responsibility to address global warming. I thank you for the opportunity to testify and look forward to your questions.

The Reverend Dr. J. Herbert Nelson, II, serves as Director of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Office of Public Witness in Washington, DC. The Office of Public Witness is a prophetic office of the denomination and implements the social justice agenda of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) through advocacy with the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. The OPW also engages in a broad range of activities with Presbyterian congregations and structures, providing constituency education materials and arranging briefings and conferences. Nelson believes that grassroots organizing within the denomination is a major key to impacting the prophetic witness and political sphere in today's globalized culture.

Dear Member of Congress, April 11, 2016

We write to you as communities of faith to ask your support for the U.S. pledge to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the President's FY2017 budget request of $750 million for the GCF.

We come from different faith traditions, united across theological lines by our deep concern for humanity and all of God's Creation. We are guided by principles of stewardship, compassion and justice in confronting the moral crisis of our changing climate. The Green Climate Fund represents an important step in global cooperation needed to build a more resilient world and to move us along the path toward a low carbon future.

Our scriptures and religious texts call us to care for God's creation and our most vulnerable neighbors. We believe that climate change presents an unprecedented threat to all of Creation, but particularly to those living in poverty around the world.

We already witness the impacts of climate change in rising sea levels that threaten small island states, long-term drought and other weather extremes that impact the food security and political stability of Least Developed Countries, and melting glaciers that threaten the water supplies of major cities in the Global South. All of these impacts fall hardest on those with the least means to adapt—people and communities already struggling with poverty and hunger, who are also the least responsible for the greenhouse gas emissions causing earth's climate to change.

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) represents a new way forward in climate finance to build resilience and stability in the face of the unavoidable impacts of climate change. The core purpose of the GCF is to build the capability of developing nations to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions through low carbon development pathways and to adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.

To fulfill this purpose, the GCF is designed to be innovative, accountable, and compassionate. It is an independent entity with strong fiduciary standards. It is accountable to a board of directors with representatives from donor and recipient countries, including the United States. It includes high levels of transparency and accountability in its structure and governing principles to ensure proper use of its funds.

We are particularly heartened that half of the GCF funds are dedicated to adaptation needs, and with priority given to African nations, small island states, and Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the GCF represents a major commitment by the global community to help vulnerable nations build resilience to climate impacts. Such resilience will increase political stability and protect humble livelihoods of fishing and farming communities, with positive implications for related issues including migration and national security.

The GCF also builds on lessons learned from the World Bank's Climate Investment Funds (CIFs) and other international funds that have previously supported clean energy development and climate compatible development. Notably, the GCF's design allows for the use of innovative financial

instruments to tap the power of the private sector –including leading American companies – to help address climate change.

More than $10 billion in funding pledges for the GCF to date have come from countries representing diverse regions and income levels. In addition to the U.S. pledge of $3 billion, Germany, Japan, South Korea, France, Colombia, Peru, and Mexico are among the donors, demonstrating a global commitment among developed and developing countries to address climate change.

We fully support the President's request for $750 million for the GCF in FY2017 budget to continue efforts to build critical climate resiliency in states that are already facing eroded shorelines, super storms and longer periods of drought. The GCF's first set of eight projects were approved in December to build climate resilience for millions of people in vulnerable states including Bangladesh, Fiji, Malawi, and Central America. As we recently witnessed the impacts of Hurricane Winston in Fiji, we are reminded of how fragile existence is in countries with fewer resources than our own.

This investment in mitigation and adaptation is our moral obligation as a major contributor to climate change. It is also a sound investment in alleviating poverty, ensuring food security and building stability now and into the future. Fulfilling our commitments to the GCF also strengthens our credibility, trust, and leadership in the international community.

Addressing the harmful impacts of climate change upon the most vulnerable peoples and the future of all God's creation is the moral responsibility of our nation, and our sacred task as people of faith. We hope you will use your leadership role to support the U.S. pledge to the Green Climate Fund.

Sincerely,

National Organizations/Denominations:
Adorers, U.S. Region
Adventist Development and Relief Agency
Alliance of Baptists
American Baptist Churches in the USA
American Jewish World Service
Bread for the World
Catholic Climate Covenant
Catholic Relief Services
Central Conference of American Rabbis
Church World Service
Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life
Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach
Conference of Major Superiors of Men
Creation Justice Ministries
Disciples Center for Public Witness
The Dominican Sisters of Hope
Ecumenical Catholic Communion

The Episcopal Church
Evangelical Environmental Network
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs
Franciscan Action Network
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Green Muslims
GreenFaith
Interfaith Power & Light
Islamic Relief USA
Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States
Jewish Council for Public Affairs
The Justice & Witness Ministries of The United Church of Christ
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
Lutheran World Relief
Lutherans Restoring Creation
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns
Mennonite Central Committee U.S. Washington Office
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA
NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
Office of Social Justice, Christian Reformed Church in North America
The Presbyterian Church (USA)
Rabbinical Assembly
Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association
Reformed Church in America
School Sisters of Notre Dame Cooperative Investment Fund
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas' Institute Justice Team
Society of St Ursula – American Region
Union for Reform Judaism
Unitarian Universalist Association
United Methodist Caretakers of God's Creation
The United Methodist Church - General Board of Church and Society
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
Women of Reform Judaism
Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc
Young Evangelicals for Climate Action

State/Regional Organizations:
Arizona Interfaith Power & Light
Arkansas Interfaith Power & Light
Buffalo Diocese Care for Creation Committee
Charleston Jewish Federation

Colorado Interfaith Power & Light
Community Relations Committee of Jewish Federation of Greater MetroWest NJ
Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Silicon Valley
Delaware Ecumenical Council on Children and Families
Delaware Interfaith Power & Light
Earth Ministry/Washington Interfaith Power & Light
Faith Action Network – WA State
Faith Alliance for Climate Solutions (VA)
Flint Jewish Federation
Franciscan Sisters of St. Joseph
Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement
Georgia Interfaith Power & Light
Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart Earth Committee
Hoosier IPL
Illinois Interfaith Power & Light
Interfaith Climate Justice Community of Western New York
Interfaith Power & Light (DC.MD.NoVA)
Iowa Interfaith Power & Light
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Washington (VA, DC)
Jewish Community Relations Council of New Haven Connecticut
Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Collier County (FL)
Jewish Federation of Greater Charlotte
Jewish Federation of Greater Des Moines
Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia
Jewish Federation of the Bluegrass, KY
Jewish Federation of the Quad Cites (IL)
Jubilee Bay Area
Jubilee Oregon
Kentucky Interfaith Power & Light
Lutheran Advocacy Ministry in Pennsylvania
Maine Council of Churches
Maine Interfaith Power & Light
Massachusetts Council of Churches
Massachusetts Interfaith Power & Light
Michigan Interfaith Power & Light
Milwaukee Jewish Federation
Minnesota Interfaith Power & Light
Nebraska Interfaith Power & Light
New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light
New York Interfaith Power & Light
North Carolina Council of Churches
North Carolina Interfaith Power & Light

Oklahoma Interfaith Power & Light
Oregon Interfaith Power & Light
Pennsylvania Council of Churches
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Racine Dominicans
Rhode Island Interfaith Power & Light
Savannah Jewish Federation and Jewish Educational Alliance, Savannah GA
Sisters of Charity of New York
Sisters of O.L. of Christian Doctrine
Sisters of St. Dominic of Caldwell, NJ
SS Peter and Paul Care for Creation Committee, Hamburg, N.Y.
Sunshine State IPL
Tennessee Interfaith Power & Light
Texas Interfaith Power & Light
Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment
Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice in the National Capital Region
Utah Interfaith Power & Light
Vermont Interfaith Power & Light
Virginia Council of Churches
Virginia Interfaith Power & Light
Wisconsin Green Muslims
Wisconsin Interfaith Power & Light

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Reverend Nelson.
Rev. NELSON. Thank you so much.
Senator INHOFE. Mr. Breen.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL BREEN, PRESIDENT, TRUMAN NATIONAL SECURITY PROJECT

Mr. BREEN. Thank you, Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Boxer, and distinguished members of the committee. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come before you, first and foremost, as a fellow citizen with a shared concern for the security and the prosperity of our great Nation. Like many in the post-9/11 generation, I am no stranger to the costs and consequences of war. While I am currently the President and CEO of the Truman Project and Truman Center, I previously had the privilege to lead American soldiers in combat in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom and to train at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

National security leadership, on the battlefield or in Washington, means taking seriously the risks to those you are charged with protecting. As a combat leader in Afghanistan and Iraq, I often received intelligence that indicated lethal danger to my unit and my mission. Regardless of whether or not I personally believed in the conclusions drawn from that intelligence or the sources from which it came, I would have committed a serious error if I did not act decisively to minimize the risk.

America's military leaders have already come to understand that climate change is a risk to our national security. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, a document of military strategy, not partisan political design, identified climate change as an "accelerant of instability" that would place a "burden to respond" on the Department of Defense. The next review, in 2014, designated climate change a threat multiplier because its impacts "increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions."

Moreover, the Center for Naval Analysis Military Advisory Board, which includes 16 retired, high ranking military leaders including former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan and former Marine Corps Commandant General James T. Conway, recently argued in a report co-signed by former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff and former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta that "the nature and pace of observed climate changes pose severe risks for our national security."

Those severe risks include drought, famine, flooding, sea level rise, extreme weather events, mass migration, and increasingly intense resource competition. Each of these phenomena is currently fueling violence and instability around the world, and will for years to come.

According to the Department of the Navy, the United States receives a request for humanitarian assistance from somewhere in the world "on an average of once every 2 weeks." Given that our fiercest enemies prey on human misery, the United States cannot afford—strategically nor morally—to leave these calls for help unanswered. Unfortunately, climate change makes such requests all the more taxing on our military. Disasters are increasing in size, scope, and frequency, often ravaging the most fragile of commu-

nities and pushing feeble governments into chaos to the benefit of terrorists.

I am reminded of a senior Bangladeshi military officer I met years ago who recognized climate change as a threat to not only his nation's security, but its very integrity. A full one-fifth of Bangladesh's landmass would be under water with little more than a 3-foot rise in sea level, threatening to displace more than 22 million people into nearby India.

Our democratic ally has, in turn, planned for this eventuality by building an 8-foot fence along 70 percent of its 2,500-mile border. This creates the very real possibility of millions of Bangladeshis frantically fleeing a catastrophe only to be repelled from India by force. These nations fought a war over the same territory just decades ago.

NATO, along with senior leaders in our own military, have expressed concerns about prospects for conflict in the Arctic, where melting ice is giving way to new strategically valuable waterways. Russia has accordingly increased its military exercises and a number of military bases in use in the Arctic considerably since 2007. These newly open sea lanes will surely be a source of tension between the United States and an increasingly nationalist Russia.

I will close with a reminder that we are experiencing climate change on the home front as well. More than 11,000 and 50,000 men and women of the National Guard deployed to our own cities during Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina, respectively, leading relief efforts that cost our Nation a combined $151 billion in repairs and rebuilding.

Extreme heat and wildfires have halted live fire training exercises in Alaska and have required mobilization for emergency assistance throughout the country, such as in Idaho and Oklahoma. And sea levels rising at twice the global rate threaten, of all things, our own Naval Headquarters at Norfolk, Virginia. I repeat, rising sea levels threaten our largest naval base.

Climate change is a risk factor that makes many of the other threats we face both more likely and more dangerous from terrorist organizations that prey on fragile and failing states to rising resurgent major powers who are hostile to our values. Demanding that we act to address either the threat of climate change or the threat posed by a given enemy, but not both, is a deeply misguided false choice. The United States fought and won a two-front, two-ocean war on behalf of the world. Surely we can confront threats in both the short- and long-term now.

I urge the Congress to do what it has always done when our Nation has been tested throughout history: heed the threat, listen to the risk assessment our military leaders make, and grant them the tools they need to minimize risk to our service members, our citizens, our Nation, and our allies around the world.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Breen follows:]

Written Testimony of Michael Breen, President and CEO, Truman Project and Truman Center

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

Hearing on

Examining the Role of Environmental Policies on Access to Energy and Economic Opportunity

April 13, 2016

Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Boxer, and distinguished members of the Committee: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I come before you first and foremost as a fellow citizen with a shared concern for the security and prosperity of our great nation. Like many in the post-9/11 generation, I am no stranger to the costs and consequences of war. While I am currently the President and CEO of the Truman Project and Truman Center—a nationwide network of leaders and experts dedicated to improving America's national security — I previously had the privilege to lead American soldiers in combat in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and to work with refugee families on the ground in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and elsewhere.

National security leadership, on the battlefield or in Washington, means taking seriously the risks to those you are charged with protecting. As a combat leader in Afghanistan and Iraq, I often received intelligence that indicated lethal danger to my unit and our mission. Regardless of whether or not I personally believed in the conclusions drawn from that intelligence or the sources from which it came, I would have committed unpardonable error if I did not heed the warnings I was given, and act decisively to minimize the risk.

America's military leaders have already come to understand that climate change is a risk to our national security. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review—a document of military strategy, not partisan political

Printed in-house with volunteer labor.

design—identified climate change as an "accelerant of instability" that would place a "burden to respond" on the Department of Defense.[i] The next review, in 2014, designated climate change a threat multiplier because its impacts "increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions."[ii] Moreover, the Center for Naval Analysis Military Advisory Board, which includes 16 retired, high-ranking military leaders including former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan (ret.) and former Marine Corps Commandant General James T. Conway (ret.), recently argued in a report co-signed by former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff and former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta that "the nature and pace of observed climate changes pose severe risks for our national security."[iii]

Those severe risks include drought, famine, flooding, sea level rise, extreme weather events, mass migration, and increasingly intense resource competition. Each of these phenomena is currently fueling violence and instability around the world. If we remain on our present course, the overwhelming consensus of the scientific profession is that we can expect much more of this, simultaneously, everywhere in the world. The security implications of this reality are as clear as they are dire.

For years, we have discussed the risk of climate change in the abstract—as a possible eventuality for which we as a nation might prepare. But the days of speculation are over. Climate change is having an impact on our operations and our interests around the world in the present day.

According to the Department of the Navy, the United States receives a request for humanitarian assistance from somewhere in the world "on an average of once every two weeks."[iv] Given that our fiercest enemies prey on the human misery wrought by manmade and natural destruction alike, the United States cannot afford strategically nor morally to leave these calls for help unanswered. Unfortunately, climate change makes such requests all the more taxing on our military. Disasters are increasing in size, scope, and frequency, often ravaging the most fragile of communities around the world and pushing feeble governments into chaos to the benefit of extremists.

Printed in-house with volunteer labor.

Considering state fragility, I am reminded of a senior Bangladeshi military officer I met years ago who recognized climate change as a threat to not only his nation's security, but its very integrity. A full one-fifth of Bangladesh's landmass would be underwater with little more than a three-foot rise in sea level, threatening to displace more than 22 million people into nearby India.[v] Our democratic ally has in turn planned for this eventuality by building an eight-foot fence along 70% of its 2,500-mile border.[vi] This creates the very real possibility of millions of Bangladeshis frantically fleeing a catastrophe only to be repelled from India by force. Considering that these nations fought a war over the same territory just decades prior, I find it hard to imagine that a resurgent conflict in this strategic region would not have adverse implications for U.S. national security.

Climate change has the chance to facilitate or exacerbate great power conflict as well. At the same conference, I spoke with numerous leaders in NATO, the bedrock hard security organization of the U.S.-led international order. Along with senior leaders in our own military, they expressed their concerns about prospects for conflict in the Arctic, where melting ice is giving way to new strategically valuable waterways; indeed, the Northern Sea Route has seen a steadily growing number of passages since 2011.[vii] Russia has accordingly moved to develop anti-access capabilities in the region, increasing its military exercises and number of military bases in use in the Arctic considerably since 2007.[viii] These newly open sea lanes will surely be a source of tension between the United States and an ascendant nationalist Russia.

The possible range of first, second, and third order climate change effects around the world could make for a far lengthier testimony than time allows, so I will close with a reminder that we are experiencing climate change on the home front as well. More than 11,000 and 50,000 men and women of the National Guard deployed to our own cities during Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina (respectively), leading relief efforts that cost our nation a combined 151 billion dollars in repairs and rebuilding.[ix,x] Extreme heat and wildfires have halted live fire training exercises in Alaska, and have required mobilization for

Printed in-house with volunteer labor.

emergency assistance throughout the country, such as in Idaho, and—as recently as the time of preparing this testimony— in Oklahoma as well.[xi,xii,xiii] And sea levels rising at twice the global rate threaten, of all things, our own naval headquarters in Norfolk, Virginia.[xiv]

Perhaps most fundamentally, climate change is a risk factor that makes many of the other threats we face both more likely, and more dangerous – from terrorist organizations that prey on fragile and failing states, to rising and resurgent major powers who are hostile to our values. Demanding that we act to address either the risk of climate change or the threat posed by a given enemy, but not both, is a deeply misguided false choice. The United States fought and won a two-front, two-ocean war on behalf of the world; surely we can confront threats in both the short- and long-term now. I urge the Congress to do what it has always done when our nation has been tested throughout history: Heed the threat, listen to the risk-assessment our military leaders make, and grant them the tools they need to minimize risk to our servicemembers, our citizens, our nation, and our allies around the world.

The time for denial and delay is long since passed. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify—I look forward to your questions.

---

[i] http://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/features/defenseReviews/QDR/QDR_as_of_29JAN10_1600.pdf
[ii] http://archive.defense.gov/pubs/2014_Quadrennial_Defense_Review.pdf
[iii] https://www.cna.org/CNA_files/pdf/MAB_5-8-14.pdf
[iv] http://www.navy.mil/navydata/people/secnav/Mabus/Speech/USNI2013.pdf
[v] http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sea-level-could-rise-at-least-6-meters/
[vi] https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2003/07/30/indias-border-fence-extended-to-kashmir/39e3e816-9704-4a3b-8d6c-fd46123ce005/
[vii] http://www.arctic-lio.com/nsr_transits
[viii] https://csis.org/files/publication/150826_Conley_NewIceCurtain_Web.pdf
[ix] https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1923-25045-7442/sandy_fema_aar.pdf
[x] http://www.army.mil/article/44368/Hurricane_Katrina_response__National_Guard__039_s___039_finest_hour__039_/
[xi] http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/663734.pdf
[xii] http://www.armytimes.com/story/military/guard-reserve/2016/03/26/national-guard-black-hawk-helicopters-deployed-help-fight-kansas-wildfire/82293318/
[xiii] http://www.newson6.com/story/26372082/tulsas-army-national-guard-base-covered-in-fire-suppression-foam
[xiv] http://www.npr.org/2014/06/24/324891517/as-sea-levels-rise-norfolk-is-sinking-and-planning

Printed in-house with volunteer labor.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Breen.

Father Sirico, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF FATHER ROBERT A. SIRICO, PRESIDENT, ACTON INSTITUTE

Fr. SIRICO. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe, Senator Boxer, for the invitation to be with you today. I am the President of the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty. We study the interpenetration of ethics, theology, and market economics. I am also the pastor of a parish in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The recent promulgation of the encyclical by His Holiness, Pope Francis, Laudato Si', dealing with the care of our common home, has occasioned a great deal of discussion, so I would like to address myself to that and then some applications of how that might be seen in the real world and for your consideration in the development of policy.

It is important at the outset that I first affirm the goals that the Holy Father sets out in his encyclical, namely, "to protect our common home" and "to bring the whole human family together to seek a sustainable and integral development." The Pope is right to give attention to these matters, obviously. He is also right when he says that there is a need for an honest and forthright debate on these matters.

I would like to outline for you what the social teaching of the Catholic Church is, because as I have heard the discussion, there is a great deal of confusion over this. The Church's teaching authority claims that its Magisterium might be called a privileged insight into matters of faith and morals. The Church intentionally limits her specific competency to these areas, faith and morals.

This magisterial authority has always admitted to its limitations and to boundaries which may be obscure or at times touch up against certain matters outside of the Magisterium's immediate mission. This, of course, makes the task of properly interpreting these documents much more challenging and much more exciting.

The Church simply does not speak, nor does she claim to speak, with the same authority on matters of economics and science qua economics and science. In fact, the encyclical says, "on many concrete questions, the Church has no reason to offer a definitive opinion; she knows that honest debate must be encouraged among experts, while respecting divergent views."

A particularly fruitful part of the dialogue which Laudato Si' calls for, it seems to me, lies somewhere between its major title, Laudato Si', Praised be God, and its subtitle, On Care for Our Common Home. Here is what we know. We know that the riches of the earth which God created and have given to us are not simply placed at our disposal automatically. The reality of scarcity, which gives rise to the discipline of economics itself also tells us this. In paragraph 110 of Laudato Si', the Holy Father makes an important observation on what he calls the "fragmentation of knowledge." Put another way, no one can know everything.

One way that environmental degradation and even poverty might be described would be to say that it is evidence of a failure to know and to coordinate the things of value. After all, people don't generally degrade or discard what they see as having value. But they

first need to know it. This, of course, is precisely why centralizing knowledge and planning is inadequate, and indeed dangerous to yield a broad range of knowledge required to prevent the degradation of the economy, or for that matter, the environment.

Fortunately, the discipline of economics itself can enable us to confront what is called the "knowledge problem." The only way that knowledge can be obtained is through free signals called prices sent from across the economy by producers, consumers, buyers, and sellers.

Though reference to environmental issues has become common in many religious communities, environmentalism has come to mean more than getting rid of air pollution or cleaning up toxic waste dumps. Unfortunately, for many people of faith it has become their religion itself. It is one thing to recognize caring for nature as part of God's command, to honor what God has made; it is quite another to transfer that sentiment of worship to the creation itself.

I have submitted a much fuller examination of these questions, and I look forward, as well, to your comments. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Fr. Sirico follows:]

Rev. Robert A. Sirico
April 13, 2016
9:30 am
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
Examining the Role of Environmental Policies on Access to Energy and Economic Opportunity

Laudato Si'-
Free Markets and the Environment: Allies not Enemies

What follows is a version of a paper I presented at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross in Rome on a conference related to the promulgation and reception of the encyclical *Laudato Si'*.

Following the promulgation of Pope Francis' encyclical and the conference I have just identified, a rich dialogue and debate, for which the pope himself called, vigorously began. This gathering will, I hope, be seen as a continuation of that discussion and a response to the invitation of Pope Francis.

It is important that at the outset I first affirm the goals the Holy Father sets out in his encyclical: namely, "to protect our common home" and "to bring the whole human family together to seek a sustainable and integral development" for the planet. What Christian would want to deny these objectives? The pope is also right when he says there is a "need for forthright and honest debate" (no.15), because hoping and desiring is one thing while finding practical ways in which to achieve it is another. I trust that today's interventions will provide a continuation of that endeavor.

Prior to examining *Laudato Si'* itself I propose that we remind ourselves about the broader principles related to the nature of Catholic theology itself. Then, our study of *Laudato Si'* will be enriched by a clear grasp of what it means to speak authoritatively from the viewpoint of Roman Catholic ecclesiology. Thus, I propose the following questions:

What are the boundaries of Church teaching?
What is the authority of such teaching?
Are there differences in the means of such teaching?
What is the nature of Catholic *social* teaching in particular?

To explore these questions is to explore the concept of *Magisterium* as such.

Although often misunderstood and misconstrued, both by those inside and outside the Church, while the Church's teaching authority claims that its magisterium might be called a privileged insight into matters of faith and morals, the Church intentionally limits her specific competency to these areas.

We know that the whole magisterium is comprised of the bishops, and derivatively from them, bishops' conferences, who teach in union with the pope when reflecting on faith, morals, the authentic interpretation of Scriptures and the tradition of the Church.

This privileged status is predicated on the enduring gift of the Holy Spirit given by the Lord to the apostles which ensures that the message of the Christ entrusted to the Church is free of doctrinal error or indefectible.

As I have already noted, this magisterial authority has always admitted to its limitations and boundaries. The pope and bishops cannot infallibly predict the weather or call the winning numbers of a lottery (as much as some of you might wish to be able to from time to time).

It is also the case that the boundaries may be obscure or may touch up against certain matters outside the magisterium's immediate mission. This, of course, makes the task of properly interpreting these documents a more challenging and exciting endeavor, yet it does not weaken the Church's claim to competently and authoritatively proclaim the truth of morals and faith.

The Church simply does not claim to speak with the same authority on matters of economics and science *qua* economics and *qua* science as it does when pronouncing on matters of faith and morals. As stated in the *Compendium of Social Doctrine of the Church:*

> *"Christ did not bequeath to the Church a mission in the political, economic or social order; the purpose he assigned to her was a religious one. . . . This means that the Church does not intervene in technical questions with her social doctrine, nor does she propose or establish systems or models of social organization [93]. This is not part of the mission entrusted to her by Christ."* (*CSDC* no. 68)

These are of course distinctions, not separations. The two realms come close to one another at times because some *means and ends* can interpenetrate one another. Yet, to simply collapse say, theology into science is unnecessary, unhelpful and even, at times, perilous. As *Gaudium et Spes* states, "If by the autonomy of earthly affairs we mean that created things and societies themselves enjoy their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated by men, then it is entirely right to demand that autonomy." (*GS* no. 36).

The modes under which the Church has proposed her teaching are various.

One finds extraordinary and ordinary teaching of the popes by way of encyclicals, apostolic letters, allocutions, and homilies. Various documents of Vatican dicasteries secretariats and commissions, the teachings of bishops (either within their own dioceses or in national conferences), as well as the teaching of pastors to their parishioners and of catechists to

catechumen may all be seen as participating to various degrees in the Church's teaching mission and authority.

Our discussion relates to an encyclical which thereby enjoys a relatively privileged position within the hierarchy of official Catholic teaching. Encyclicals are authoritative teaching documents that command due respect and consideration from the faithful. At the same time, three considerations should be borne in mind. First, as an encyclical, *Laudato Si'* makes no general claim to infallibility as such. And in fact says, "on many concrete questions, the Church has no reason to offer a definitive opinion; she knows that honest debate must be encouraged among experts, while respecting divergent views." (*Laudato Si'* no. 61)

Second, the subject matter of *Laudato Si'*— climate science, economics and history do not fall into the areas of Church expertise except to the extent to which it addresses the normative dimensions and implications of these disciplines. Third, *Laudato Si'* must be read attentively to discern where Pope Francis is speaking from the core of Church doctrine, and where he is applying some prudent point of practical application of that core teaching to the day-to-day world.

With this understanding, we may now turn our attention to the encyclical itself.

Laudato Si' proceeds along two lines of thought in order to engage the challenge that it places before us: the first is a theological line of reflection which gets at the understanding of the human relationship with the created order and man's responsibility toward it. As an aside, I should mention that I was puzzled that the encyclical did not begin with the insights of Revelation on this subject and instead plunges immediately into making a series of empirical claims. Theology, rather than sociology or economics, is surely the starting place for Catholic reflection on matters temporal. The second line of thought relates to the practical question of *how* to attain the fulfillment of that responsibility.

Those latter sections of *Laudato Si'* that touch on the understanding that nature itself is revelatory of God's design underscore that here in creation, is a connection to its Creator and his intentionality. The same can be said for humanity itself; man is created in the *imago Dei*. Moreover, he is not only a part of the creation, as the encyclical makes clear, but is its very steward – that is to say, the way by which the created world is to be cared for and tended to.

The Poor

As the Holy Father has emphasized not only in *Laudato Si'* but in the whole of his pontificate thus far, the "tending" and care, must be especially attentive to the poor and most vulnerable amongst us for they too are creations of God, they too bear the *imago Dei*, and they too reveal

God to us. They are the ones through whom we encounter Jesus in, as it has been said, "distressing disguises" – they are the very "least ones" in and through whom we minister to Christ Himself (Matt. 25:40).

There are of course many ways to minister to the poor: by the proclamation of the Good News; in bonding with them in fraternal embrace of friendship and solidarity; and tending to their physical needs, particularly in dire circumstances. To enable people to be less poor and less vulnerable, more in charge of the direction of their own lives and to help them to flourish and prosper would, I believe, also be a fulfillment of this mandate.

The connection that *Laudato Si'* makes between care for the environment and the needs of the poor in particular and the economy more generally is critical to get right. If we fail at this connection, we will fail in realizing both objectives.

Theology and the sciences

As I have noted previously, it is important to underscore the distinction between the theological dimension of *Laudato Si'* and its empirical, scientific, and economic claims, which I would like to probe more deeply here.

A particularly fruitful part of the dialogue for which *Laudato Si'* calls, it seems to me, lies somewhere between its major title ("Praised be God") and its subtitle ("On Care for our Common Home"). Here is what we know: the riches of the earth which God created do not simply place themselves at our disposal automatically. If they did there would be no such thing as scarcity or even the need for rationing or conservation and thus, no need for the science of economics which enables us to allocate scarce resources, reduce waste and costs and other externalities. There would, in fact be no need for work itself, which is a calling entrusted to the human family even prior to the Fall.

The reality of scarcity, which gives rise to the discipline of economics itself, also tells us that people simply cannot fulfill all of their needs. From a theological perspective, the fact that man has eternity inscribed on his very nature (Ecclesiastes 3:11) is a reminder that beings built for eternity – that is designed for God himself – can never be completely fulfilled by the material world and that when humans settle for the trinkets and baubles of this life as though they were the goal of life, they not only commit the sin of idolatry (Romans 1:24), but they also promote a certain disorder in their own souls, in their world and in their environment.

But the rejection of substitutes for God – call it idolatry or consumerism – is not the same as rejecting the fundamental goodness of the material world. The only state of being where this

proper ordering exists is in that encounter of which Dante so movingly speaks at the conclusion of *La Divina Commedia*, as *"l'amor che move il sole e l'atre stelle"*.

But in *this* valley of tears, we are, unfortunately stuck with the need for such an ordering, and this is what economics is all about: It is precisely scarcity that gives rise to the need to economize. In some instances, this may be another way to describe conservation. To know how to conserve a thing involves knowing, at some level, the real costs associated with it. Frugality is not cheap, parsimonious or ungenerous. Frugality is based on knowledge of the cost of things and their proper use, which in turn is related to the scarcity of a thing.

Knowledge and the Division of Labor

In paragraph 110 of *Laudato Si'*, the Holy Father makes an important observation on what he calls the "fragmentation of knowledge" that he says "proves helpful for concrete applications." Put another way, no one can know everything. Hence we have a certain degree of specialization, and inevitably a division of labor. Among other things, this helps us to see how the market can be allied to the needs of the environment. In the setting of environmental problems, the division of labor allows people with different talents and abilities to apply them to issues of how we conserve and use resources in unique and productive ways that meet human needs *and* preserve creation.

Pope Francis cautions that this fragmentation can lead as well "to a loss of appreciation for the whole, for the relationships between things, and for the broader horizon…" This is certainly true. Many specialists today know a great deal about one or two subjects and nothing about anything else.

There is, then, a requirement for some coordination of information among various sectors so as to not lose sight of the whole. One way that environmental degradation and even poverty might be described would be to say that it is evidence of a failure to know and coordinate the value of things. After all, people do not generally degrade or discard what they see as having value, but they need first to know it. If we are going to effectively respond to the "technocratic paradigm" (no. 111) we do indeed need inter-disciplinary cooperation as well as actual knowledge of the relative availability of goods and resources, that is, their real scarcity or abundance.

This of course is precisely why centralizing knowledge and planning is inadequate to yield the broad range of knowledge required to prevent degradation of the economy and environment. People, workers, producers and consumers alike must be able to clearly see the connection between material goods and economic value.

The division of labor or any kind of hyper-specialization can become hegemonic and thus blind to the facts or truths outside its own competency. It is the classic case that to a hammer everything looks like a nail; and from a philosophical and theological perspective, a certain humility is required among various disciplines in respect for their relative autonomy. This insight becomes critical in the challenge of "caring for our common home" because when one discipline sees itself as the possessor of the whole truth of a thing, it becomes difficult if not impossible to meet objective needs that may fall outside its purview. These disconnections of various insights, as the pope observes, "make it hard to find more adequate ways of solving the more complex problems in today's world." (no. 110)

The good news is that the discipline of economics itself can enable us to confront this "knowledge problem".

This was, to a very great extent elaborated by the Nobel Laureate FA Hayek. He observed that the knowledge required for economic planning is not resident in any one source, but is dispersed throughout the whole of society, and that central planning, which proceeds upon the synoptic delusion is, in fact, a "fatal conceit".[1]

It is true that, for the needs of those who are impoverished and lack resources, knowledge will be required and some kind of concentrated social effort enacted for their benefit. But this process of discovery as to what the actual needs are and what real resources are available to meet those needs, as well as the relative tradeoffs that will be required to transform those resources into the goods required, is dispersed. The only way it can be obtained is through the free signals called prices sent from across the economy by producers, consumers, buyers and sellers. This is what is known as a market economy, which must be free in order to reliably communicate accurate information across all sectors of society.

The problem of *this* epistemic problem for human betterment may admittedly be seen in somewhat different ways. Moreover, this does not mean that market growth *by itself* can guarantee integral human development. Integral human development is much broader. However, one must also point out that the "hunger and poverty" Pope Francis confronts (no. 109), requires economic growth, and that means market economies.

The Market and Poverty

We know both from Scripture and the Church's magisterium that man is given primacy in the created order. This fact, however, also brings with it three important implications with regard to the environment: *first*, man is to use the resources of the earth responsibly as that they serve the

[1] F.A. Hayek, *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*, vol 1 of *The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*, ed. W. W. Bartley, III. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

common good; *second*, goodness and evil are not embedded in the material world itself but are brought to the material world by the choices we make about whether to follow the moral law; and, *finally*, the sanctity of life must be the primary concern of human political and economic organization. This is why Pope Francis and his immediate predecessors are quick to condemn any form of environmentalism which disregards or instrumentalizes human life (cf., *LS,* nos. 50, 60 and 90).

Here I must parenthetically note, that this constant concern of the Church for the dignity of human life from conception until natural death is somewhat compromised by the choice of a number of consultants to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences who might rightly be considered diametrically, energetically and intuitionally opposed to this core element of the Church's concern for the environment. Take, for example, Jeffrey Sachs. His commitment to what are euphemistically called "reproductive rights" is a matter of record.[2i] Leaving aside the intrinsic evils that are invariably associated with the "reproductive rights" agenda, the demographic problem faced by most of the world today is depopulation, not to mention the imbalance caused by population control programs in the number of females.

Putting, however, that to one side, we must recall that respecting God's created order does not mean that it cannot–or must not–be used for the benefit of humankind. Human survival and thriving depends on exercising responsible *dominion* over creation, by "tilling and keeping" the Garden. This occurs through (1) establishing regimes of property and (2) using material goods in ways that better the human condition–always with an eye toward the finality of human destiny. Indeed, in Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes,* we see the recognition of this fact. The Council Fathers pointed out that man seeks to harness the "immense resources of the modern world" for his own good.

So what has this to do with the market? The free economy, I would suggest, is better suited to attaining the material goals outlined in *Laudato Si'* than many of the means suggested by some commentators and, if I may respectfully suggest, even a better means than some of the policy suggestions contained in the encyclical itself.

After all, when Francis calls for care for the world that must be dynamic and flexible (no 144), we are obligated to ask if is there any institution in the world that is less dynamic and/or flexible than government bureaucracies. Contrast this with, for instance, free exchange, this can be seen as a major social link that unites peoples of the world.

Just as importantly and intimately related is the theological dimension. God did not intend that human beings struggle on their own to survive. Rather, we are called upon to cooperate together

[2] Stefano Gennarini, "Who is Jeffrey Sachs and Why Was He at the Vatican?" Center for Family & Human Rights, May 14, 2015. https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/who-is-jeffrey-sachs-and-why-was-he-at-the-vatican/

to utilize the world's resources. This cooperation of free exchange, which must be rooted in both a moral and juridical framework, should not be artificially limited by the boundaries of the city or nation state. Rather, it can and should be expanded to include all peoples of the world in their common project of advancing the material wellbeing of all and the common good.

The opposite of free trade is economic coercion in the form of protectionism and sanctions. Numerous citations of the Holy See and especially in the writings of St. John Paul II in particular, can be referenced to indicate a preference for free exchange at the national and international level. This might be called a form of "economic solidarity" which promotes development, conservation and technological advance.

Technology, Work, and Environmentalism

Environmental issues invariably raise the subject of technology. Here the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* reminds us that: *"The Magisterium's considerations regarding science and technology in general can also be applied to the environment and agriculture. . . .* In fact, technology "could be a priceless tool in solving many serious problems, in the first place those of hunger and disease, through the production of more advanced and vigorous strains of plants, and through the production of valuable medicines". (*Compendium*, no. 458).

In *Laudato Si'* (no.104) Pope Francis worries that great technological achievement gives humanity "tremendous power" and dominance and that nothing ensures it will be used wisely. This is true. A question, however, then arises: if nothing ensures that this power will be used wisely, does centralizing the control of its use into the hands of politics increase the likelihood of its wise use, or would, rather, dissipating control of power (by decentralizing it) better effect this end?

St. John Paul II, even while acknowledging the same concerns that Pope Francis will identify, namely that at times "man consumes the resources of the earth and his own life in an excessive and disordered way..." identifies that "at the root of the senseless destruction of the natural environment lies an anthropological error...." (*Centesimus Annus* no. 37) He goes on to observe that "[m]an, who discovers his capacity to transform and, in a certain sense, create the world through his own work, forgets that this is always based on God's prior and original gift of the things that are."

This raises the subject of the place now being assumed by the environmental issues in religious thought. Though references to environmental issues have become common in religious services, environmentalism has come to mean more than getting rid of air pollution or cleaning up toxic waste dumps. For many people, it has become their religion itself, even the essence of a faith that can lend credence to any number of troubling political measures. (*Caritas in Veritate* no. 48)

It is one thing to recognize caring for nature as part of God's command to honor that which God made. It is quite another to transfer the sentiment of worship from the Creator to creation. Unfortunately, some people would have us reorder our priorities and turn away from the Master whose garden we tend and keep. To focus upon the garden, serving it as though it were our ultimate end would be to serve the gift instead of the giver. We need to till and care for creation.

But surely there are good and bad ways to till and keep. There are ways that are more pleasing to God, ways that have a regard for the essential *telos* or end for which the material world was made. The land should not be permanently injured so it cannot produce for future generations. Resources should not be wasted, but used efficiently. The well-informed conscience can discern the difference between wise use and wasteful use, provided there are protocols and institutions in place that assist us in making economically well-formed judgments. Some of these include clear property titles and open markets.

Understanding these truths means returning the environmental debate to a focus on the wellbeing of the person and the institutions that promote economic development. Contrary to what most professional environmentalists argue, property rights are among the best ways of taking care of the earth. To be sure, free economies have their share of environmental problems. Many of these problems, however, could be solved by a more consistent delimitation and protection of property rights.

The Modern Economy and the Environment

Finally, I would like to turn to some of the claims made about the modern economy and environmental issues, as considered by *Laudato Si'*. In no. 165 of *Laudato Si'* Pope Francis makes a rather sweeping historical claim that invites comments and analysis. Here he says that "the post-industrial period may be remembered as one of the most irresponsible in history," in part due to such fossil fuels as coal, oil and gas.

At the very least it is worth looking at this period to get the broad picture of what occurred to the human family in order to see if, in fact, this was "one of the most irresponsible in history".

Consider some of these empirical reference points:

- Between 1800 and 1950, the proportion of the world's population living in dire poverty halved; and from 1950 to 1980 it halved again.[3]

[3] Fifty-two percent of the world's population lived in absolute poverty in 1981; by 2005, 25 percent did, according to World Bank figures. See, Daniel Griswold, *Mad About Trade: Why Main Street American Should Embrace Globalization* (Cato Institute, 2009), p. 127.

- The American farmer in 2000 "produced on average 12 times as much farm output per hour worked as a farmer did in 1950. The development of new technology was a primary factor in these improvements."[4]
- Environmental impact will naturally be mixed. Increased energy use driven by increased productivity (e.g., tractors) did increase greenhouse gas emissions. But further technological advances (more fuel-efficient engines, or alternative power sources) mitigated those effects.
- In general and weighing a number of environmental indicators (various measures of water quality and air quality), research has shown that "economic growth brings an initial phase of deterioration followed by a subsequent phase of improvement." This tipping point is around $8000 per capita income.[5] The US crossed this threshold between the years 1920 and 1940. Most European nations did so between 1940 and 1960. China and India are not yet there. In other words, the post-industrial economy results in environmental improvement—at least on some measures.[6]

It is the job of historians to help us see beyond our own time, in the hope that we can learn lessons that extend out of our own narrow experience and into counterfactual realities that are otherwise unobservable to us. In recent years, researchers have made enormous progress, using the most advanced research and statistical techniques, in deconstructing a past we did not experience. They have constructed large-scale indexes of human well-being that extend several millennia back in time, performed detailed statistical analyses of global rates of poverty and wealth relative to degrees of economic freedom, and carefully chronicled vital statistics that illustrate the relationship between material wealth and economic freedom. [7]

What this research has revealed to us is that the world before 1800 was unimaginably poorer than our own. World population by comparison to today was largely unmoved from the year 0 to the year 1800, and average world income per capita was static at about $500 per year (inflation adjusted).

---

[4] Keith O. Fuglie, James M. MacDonald, and Eldon Ball, *Productivity Growth in U.S. Agriculture*, Economic Brief No. 9, September 2007, US Dept of Agriculture Economic Research Service.

[5] Gene M. Grossman and Alan B. Krueger, "Economic Growth and the Environment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 110 (May 1995): p 353-377.*

[66] "Wealth and Health of Nations," Gapminder.org/world. Last accessed January 12, 2016.

[7] "The Economic History of the World in One Graph," *The Atlantic*, June 19, 2012, by Derek Thompson, writing about a study by JP Morgan. "Before the Industrial Revolution, there wasn't really any such thing as lasting income growth from productivity. In the thousands of years before the Industrial Revolution, civilization was stuck in the Malthusian Trap. If lots of people died, incomes tended to go up, as fewer workers benefited from a stable supply of crops. If lots of people were born, however, incomes would fall, which often led to more deaths. That explains the "trap," and it also explains why populations so closely approximated GDP around the world. The industrial revolution(s) changed all that." **http://theatln.tc/1vxxsKp**

Projects like the Gapminder have done even more detailed analysis to reveal just how much the world has dramatically changed over the last 200 years. Only 200 years ago, the average lifespan was 40 and the average income was $1000. In this time, human population has risen seven times, average income has gone up ten times, and the average lifespan has nearly doubled. There is not a single country in the world today that is as poor as all countries in the world today were in 1800.

These trends have completely changed our conception of what life on earth is like. And it has changed our expectations about what is possible. It has allowed us to imagine and even take for granted the possibility of material progress and prosperity for the masses of people. The "great divergence" that we see within all of these studies began at the Industrial Revolution and continue through the great age of liberalism of the 19th century. What made the difference is the subject of widespread debate among economists and historians. Was it institutional change, political change, technological change, or cultural change?

There is not one easy answer and the full truth most probably rests with a balanced understanding of the relationship between all of these factors. History and statistics alone reveal nothing about cause and effect; causal factors can only be discerned through good theory. But note that there is a common feature that people working in this area agree upon: human well-being is inseparable from the technological innovation and capital accumulation. I suggest that what occurred in the period following the Industrial Revolution is the very definition of what it means to be responsible.

Further, this dramatic increase in human well-being takes place in a way that is clearly and obviously inequitable: the rich get richer to a greater and faster degree than the poor climb from poverty. And yet, as you observe the long run trends, what you see is remarkable: rising wealth has benefitted the entire world community.

Imagine if there were some policy in place that could mandate that no progress can take place unless it can take place evenly across all countries and across all demographic groups. This equality in the pace of progress was seen to be a moral priority, even more important than long-run increases in human well-being in general. Imagine if this policy came to be implemented based on the view that it is better that no one group should become rich if all groups do not share equally in the blessings of rising prosperity. Under that rule, the outcome of history might have been very different.

As a world community, we would be one tenth as wealthy as we are, and our lives would be a little more than half as long. These are moral considerations we must face when we prioritize equality of sharing over the freedom to own. There is an additional consideration that is relevant to population, now 7 billion instead of the 1 billion of two hundred years ago. We escaped the

"Malthusian trap" through economic productivity based on the emergent institutions of capital ownership, investment, and trade. If those institutions are harmed, how would the capacity of the world's economy to feed, clothe, and heal a population of 7 billion be affected? Would the population ever have risen to the point it is today? These are questions worth asking.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Father Sirico. Thank you very much.

General Scales, it is nice to have you back.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT SCALES, MAJOR GENERAL (RET.), SENIOR MILITARY ANALYST

Mr. SCALES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much for inviting me again to address this committee.

During his graduation address to the Coast Guard Academy in 2015, President Obama shocked the defense community by declaring his new national defense priority: "So I'm here today to say that climate change constitutes a serious threat to global security, an immediate risk to our national security."

The Administration's newfound passion to connect climate change to war is an example of faulty theories that rely for relevance on politically correct imaginings rather than established historical precedent. The theories linking climate change to war come from a larger body of political thought that ascribes human conflict to what we call the "Global Trends" school. Advocates of the Global Trends theory argue that environmental scourges such as diminishing water supplies, urbanization, and the AIDS/HIV epidemic shape the course of human conflict.

But climate change is not a global trend because 3,000 years of the historical record of human conflict argues conclusively against any causal relationship between war and temperature. Let me be more specific. Never in the written history of warfare, from Megiddo in 1,500 B.C. to the Syrian civil war today, is there any evidence that wars are caused by warmer air. At best, climate change might, over centuries, contribute minutely to the course of warfare. The key word is contribute. Climate change will never cause wars; thus, it can never be actually a threat to national security.

It is interesting to note the hypocrisy within the scientific communities that argue for a connection between climate change and national security. Scientists generally agree on the long-term consequences of global warming. Radical environmentalists delight in excoriating the so-called "junk science" espoused by climate change deniers, but they are less than enthusiastic in questioning the junk social science that environmentalists and their Beltway fellow travelers use to connect climate change to war.

Where does the Administration get their facts about climate change and war? Well, first they contend that a warming planet causes drought, which leads to mass migration away from areas of creeping desertification. To be sure, rising temperatures, combined with overgrazing in places like Central Africa, have caused displacement of peoples.

But the misery of these peoples leads to, well, misery, not war. Tribes striving to exist in these often horrific environmental conditions have little energy left to declare war against a neighbor. The nations of Central Africa are in the grip of conflict started by Boko Haram in Nigeria and al Shabaab in Somalia. But these transnational terrorists are motivated to kill by the factors that have always caused nations, or entities masquerading as nations, to start wars, such as hatred induced by fear of alien cultures, reli-

gions, ideologies, economics, as well as social and ethnic differences.

But the myth of climate change as an inducement to war continues to curry favor among Washington elites. One source for connecting war to temperature comes from the political closeness between environmentalists and the anti-war movement. Their logic goes like this: Global warming is bad. Wars are bad. Therefore, they must be connected. Remember, prior to the 1991 Gulf War, environmentalists warned of a decade of global cooling that would come from burning Kuwaiti oil fields. More recently, environmental radicals argued against bombing ISIS oil trucks, fearing the environmental consequences.

Sadly, those in the Administration who lobbied against striking a legitimate military target because of imagined environmental damage caused by these strikes may in all likelihood have sustained ISIS by refusing to interdict their richest sources of income. The point is that in today's wars politically correct theories, when inserted into a battle plan, might well extend wars needlessly and get soldiers killed.

Our men and women in uniform are smart and perceptive. They can spot phoniness in a heartbeat. Think of a soldier in Afghanistan or Iraq, returning from a dangerous and exhausting mission, being obliged to listen to a senior defense official lecture them on the, well, revelation that fighting climate change is their most important mission. These men and women see the realities of battle all around them. The military threat of rising temperatures is not one of them.

Our young military leaders are already jaded and discouraged by an Administration that seems to be out of touch with their real-world, day-to-day life or death needs. Do we really think that they will become more confident about the wisdom of their leaders if they are obliged to turn away from ISIS and fight a war against rising temperatures? Somehow, I don't think so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Scales follows:]

United States Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works

Testimony of Major General (Retired) Robert Scales

April 13, 2016

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for inviting me to testify before the Committee on the relationship between climate change and war.

The Administration's passion to connect climate change to war is an example of faulty theories that rely for relevance on politically correct imaginings rather than established historical precedent or a learned understanding of war. The theories linking climate change to war come from a larger body of political thought that ascribes human conflict to "Global Trends". Advocates of the Global Trends theory argue that environmental scourges such as diminishing water supplies, urbanization and the AIDS/HIV epidemic shape the course of human conflict. Lately, thanks to legitimacy provided by the Obama Administration, climate change has become the most prominent of all the global trends that seek to

link global misfortunes to war. President Obama codified his embrace of this particular global trend during his graduation address at the Coast Guard Academy in 2015:

"So I'm here today to say that climate change constitutes a serious threat to global security, an immediate risk to our national security."

It's interesting to note the hypocrisy within the scientific communities that argue for a connection between climate change and national security. Scientists generally agree on the long-term consequences of global warming. Radical environmentalists delight in excoriating the so-called "junk science" espoused by climate change deniers. But they are less than enthusiastic in questioning the "junk social science" that environmentalists and their Beltway fellow travellers use to connect climate change to war.

Of course not all theories from Global Trends activists are off the mark. They have a legitimate argument when they warn of the consequences of pandemics on the course of warfare. The Greek historian Thucydides recounts that the great Athens plague of 430 BCE resulted in the retreat of the Athenian army and navy as well

as the death of the great Greek military leader Pericles. The Byzantium emperor Justinian's ambition to expand his empire to the West was shattered by the horrific Plague of 540 AD. A small band of Spanish conquistadors conquered all of central and south America in just few short decades because their conquests were preceded by Western diseases they carried with them from Europe.

However, no historical evidence exists that makes a "cause and effect" argument linking war to rising global temperatures. Where does the Administration get their facts about climate change and war? First, they contend that a warming planet causes drought, which leads to mass migration away from areas of creeping desertification. To be sure rising temperatures combined with over grazing in places like central Africa have caused displacement of peoples. But the misery of these peoples leads to, well, misery, not war. Tribes striving to exist in these often horrific environmental conditions have little energy left over to declare war against a tribal neighbor. The nations of Central Africa are in the grip of conflicts started by Boko Haram in Nigeria and al Shabaab in Somalia. But these transnational terrorists are motivated to kill by the factors that have always caused nations (or entities masquerading as nations) to start wars. These factors are timeless and immutable. First of course is hatred induced by fear of alien

cultures, religions, ideologies, as well as social and racial differences. The common spark for all wars is jealousy and greed amplified by centuries-long animosities and political ambitions. The catalyst for war is the ignorance of leaders that leads them to misjudge. Humans start wars believing they will be profitable, short, glorious and bloodless. These truths never change. None are affected in the least by air temperature.

But the myth of climate change as an inducement to war continues to curry favor among Washington elites. One source for connecting war to temperature comes from the political closeness between environmentalists and the anti war movement. Their logic goes like this: "global warming is bad. Wars are bad. Therefore they must be connected." Remember, prior to the 1991 Gulf War, environmentalists warned of a decade of global cooling that would come from burning Kuwaiti oil fields. More recently environmental radicals argued against bombing ISIS oil trucks fearing the environmental consequences. Sadly those in the Administration who lobbied against striking a legitimate military target because of imagined environmental damage caused by these strikes may, in all likelihood, have sustained ISIS by refusing to interdict their richest source of income. The point is that in today's wars politically correct theories when inserted into a battle plan

might well extend wars needlessly and get soldiers killed.

The passion of environmentalists to use policies and laws to interfere with our military is long and sordid. In the eighties my unit in the 82nd Airborne Division was denied maneuver and firing authority due to a trumped up allegation that the presence of soldiers in their own training areas might endanger woodpeckers. Our soldier's ability to train for war at the National Training Center at Ft Irwin California was continually impeded by environmentalists who claimed, falsely, that Army exercises were threatening the desert tortoise. Both of these claims turned out to be false. The woodpecker and the turtle are doing fine.

The three thousand-year historical record of human conflict argues conclusively against any causal relationship between war and temperature. Let me be more specific. Never in the written history of warfare, from Megiddo in 1,500 BC to the Syrian Civil War today, is there any evidence that wars are caused by warmer air. Nations simply don't go to war because the polar ice caps are melting. Other than our short lived and disastrous 1993 humanitarian effort in Somalia, human misery and global disasters have not been followed by shooting wars involving American combat forces. The bad taste left by the Somali expedition pretty

much makes any similar adventure in killing for humanitarian reasons extremely unlikely.

At best climate change might, over centuries, contribute minutely to the course of warfare. The key word is "contribute". Climate change will never "cause" wars. Thus it can never be an actual threat to national security. Because the administration has elevated climate change to the status of a primary threat, the military has become an unwitting agent for propagandizing the dangers of climate change to the American people.

There is nothing wrong with advocates of "global trends" theories cranking out new concepts, even the patently ridiculous ones cited above. The problem comes when silly ideas become strategies and influence how we fight and how we pay for wars. As we see today in Washington the process begins with a chorus of a-historical acolytes who preach loudly enough for concepts to become a political mantra then morph into defense theories that induce the Department of Defense to establish offices in the Pentagon and lines in the defense budget.

The Administration's contention that climate change is a national security threat would be just another example of mindlessly

applied political correctness if it were not for the potential impact of this silliness on our actual security. The military follows orders and intuitively embraces the spoken intent of their commander in chief. A politically correct embrace of climate change as a national security threat might in time cause our military to embrace alternative sources of energy before these technologies are proven. Should this happen our men and women in uniform might well be fighting a war with underpowered and poorly performing weapons. In its zeal to follow orders the military might deflect resources away from fighting the war against global terrorism to fight a contrived war against global warming. Every dollar spent on initiatives that don't apply directly to fighting the enemy and keeping our Soldiers and Marines safe on the battlefield is a dollar needlessly wasted. Again, no soldier should die in battle for the sake of political correctness.

Our men and women in uniform are smart and perceptive. They can spot phoniness in a heartbeat. Think of a Soldier in Afghanistan or Iraq returning from a dangerous and exhausting mission being obliged to listen to a senior defense official lecture them on the revelation that fighting climate change is their most important mission. These men and women see the realities of battle all around them. The military threat of rising temperatures is not

one of them. Our young military leaders are already jaded and discouraged by an Administration that seems to be out of touch with their real world, day to day, life or death needs. Do we really think that they will become more confident about the wisdom of their leaders if they are obliged to turn away from ISIS and fight a war against rising temperatures? Somehow I don't think so.

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
hearing entitled, "Examining the Role of Environmental Policies on Access to Energy and Economic Opportunity."
Wednesday, April 13, 2016
Responses to the
Questions for the Record for witness Major General Robert Scales

Senator Vitter:

1. **General Scales, in your testimony you state, "In the eighties my unit in the 82nd Airborne Division was denied maneuver and firing authority due to a trumped up allegation that the presence of soldiers in their own training areas might endanger woodpeckers. Our soldier's ability to train for war at the National Training Center at Ft Irwin California was continually impeded by environmentalists who claimed, falsely, that Army exercises were threatening the desert tortoise. Both of these claims turned out to be false. The woodpecker and the turtle are doing fine." Can you expand on this by discussing how our military forces are impacted when species protection efforts interfere with their ability to train?**

Most big military bases are environmental havens. They are usually open and rarely used. They cannot be commercially exploited. Many like Ft Sill. Elgin Air Force Base and Ft Hood have ranges that are off limits to humans but wonderfully open and safe habitats for many species. In addition military discipline keeps illegal poaching to a minimum.
Thus the environmental organizations should celebrate the habitats that military facilities provide. Instead, they constantly try to impede military operations in the name of environmentalism. Their motives, of course, are political. Environmental activists tend also to be anti-war activists and they seek use environmental laws to interfere with the ability of soldiers to train for war.

2. **General Scales, you state in your testimony that "Because the administration has elevated climate change to the status of a primary threat, the military has become an unwitting agent for propagandizing the dangers of climate change to the American people." Can you expand on this by discussing how members of the military react to being used to promote the Administration's climate change propaganda and agenda?**

Soldiers are often busy and overtasked fighting the war on terror. They know who the enemy is even though the Administration obfuscates and avoids telling them the truth. Does this politically correct attitude affect soldier's morale? To some extent it does. Soldiers look to the commander in chief to inspire and give direction. War is not a job. It's a calling. Those who offer to give their lives for a calling deserve to be told who they will face in war. It most certainly is not climate change.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you very much, General Scales.

Mr. Epstein.

STATEMENT OF ALEX EPSTEIN, PRESIDENT, CENTER FOR INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

Mr. EPSTEIN. The energy industry is the industry that powers every other industry. To the extent energy is cheap, plentiful, and reliable, human beings thrive. To the extent energy is unaffordable, scarce, or unreliable, human beings suffer.

And yet in this election year the candidates—especially the Republican candidates—have barely discussed energy. Thus, I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss the morality of energy policy.

When we evaluate energy policies, such as President Obama's efforts to restrict cheap, plentiful, reliable fossil fuels and mandate solar and wind, it is worth asking: Has this been tried before? The answer is much milder versions of the President's energy policy have been tried in Europe, and they have resulted in skyrocketing energy prices every time.

Take Germany. Over the last decade, Germany pursued the popular ideal of running on the unreliable energy from solar and wind. But since unreliable energy can't be relied upon, it has to be propped up by a reliable energy, mostly fossil fuels. The solar panels and wind turbines are an unnecessary and enormous cost to the system. The average German pays three to four times more for electricity than the average American. It is so bad that Germans have had to add a new term to the language: energy poverty.

The United States should learn from the failed German experiment. Instead, our President is doubling down on it. And just as ominously, he is calling for even the poorest countries to use unreliables instead of reliables. This, in a world where 3 billion people have almost no access to energy.

How could this possibly be moral? The alleged justification is that fossil fuels cause climate change and should therefore be eliminated. But we need to clearly define what we mean by climate change, because while nearly everyone, the 97 percent, agrees that more CO_2 in the atmosphere causes some climate change, it makes all the difference in the world whether that change is a mild, manageable warming or a runaway, catastrophic warming.

Which is it? If we look at what has been scientifically demonstrated versus what has been speculated, the climate impact of CO_2 is mild and manageable. The warming of the last 80 years has been barely more than the natural warming that occurred in the 80 years before that, when there were virtually no CO_2 emissions. From a geological perspective both CO_2 levels and temperatures are very low. There is no perfect amount of CO_2 or perfect average temperature, although higher CO_2 levels do create more plant growth and higher temperatures do lower mortality rates.

To be sure, many prominent scientists and organizations predict catastrophe, but this is wild speculation, and it is nothing new. Indeed, many of today's thought leaders have been falsely predicting catastrophe for decades. Thirty years ago NASA climate leader James Hansen predicted that temperatures would rise by 2 to 4 degrees between 2000 and 2010. Instead, depending on which temperature dataset you consult, they rose only slightly or not at all.

Thirty years ago, President Obama's top science advisor, John Holdren, predicted that by now we would be approaching a billion CO_2-related deaths from famine. Instead, famine has plummeted. More broadly, climate-related deaths, deaths from extreme heat, extreme cold, storms, drought, and floods, have decreased at a rate of 50 percent since the 1980s and 98 percent since major CO_2 emissions began 80 years ago.

How is it possible that we are safer than ever from the climate? Because while fossil fuel use has only a mild warming impact, it has an enormous protecting impact. Nature doesn't give us a stable, safe climate that we make dangerous; it gives us an ever changing dangerous climate that we need to make safe. And the driver behind sturdy buildings, affordable heating and air conditioning, drought relief, and everything else that keeps us safe from climate is cheap, plentiful, and reliable energy, overwhelmingly from fossil fuels.

Thus the President's anti-fossil fuel policies would harm billions of lives economically and make them more vulnerable to nature's ever present climate danger. Using more fossil fuels, along with other cheap, plentiful, reliable sources, such as nuclear and hydro, also opposed by most of the environmentalist movement, is a moral imperative.

Now, I realize that many of you have fought to restrict fossil fuel use, and it can be politically difficult to change one's stand, but if you continue on your current path you will cause billions of people to suffer unnecessarily. I hope you reconsider your position, and no matter how politically difficult it is, I hope you change your stand.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Epstein follows:]

Testimony of Alex Epstein, author of *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels*

The energy industry is the industry that powers every other industry. To the extent energy is affordable, plentiful, and reliable, human beings thrive. To the extent energy is unaffordable, scarce, or unreliable, human beings suffer.

And yet in this election year, the candidates, especially the Republican candidates, have barely discussed energy. Thus, I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss my moral evaluation of this administration's energy policies.

When we evaluate energy policies, such as President Obama's efforts to forcibly restrict fossil fuel use and mandate solar and wind energy,[1] it is always worth asking: Has this been tried before? And what happened when it was?

The answer is: much, much milder versions of the President's energy policy have been tried in Europe—and resulted in skyrocketing energy prices every time.

Take Germany. Over the last decade, Germany pursued the popular ideal of running on unreliable energy from solar and wind. But since unreliable energy can't be relied upon, it has to be propped up by reliable energy--mostly fossil fuels--making the solar panels and wind turbines an unnecessary and enormous cost to the system.[2] As a result, the average German pays 3-4 times more for electricity than the average American.[3] It's so bad that Germans have had to add a new term to the language: "energy poverty."[4]

The United States should learn from the failed German experiment; instead, our President is doubling down on it many times over. And, just as ominously, he is leading global initiatives that call for even the poorest countries to be forced to use unreliables instead of reliables.[5] This, in a world where 3 billion people have almost no access to energy and over one billion people have no electricity.[6]

How could this possibly be moral?

---

[1] UNFCCC submission of emission reduction targets by the US government
[2] Christensen Assoc. - German Experience with Promotion of Renewable Energy
[3] German Association of Energy and Water Industries - BDEW
DOE Energy Information Administration
[4] Der Spiegel
Handelblatt
[5] NRDC
[6] International Energy Agency

The alleged justification is that fossil fuels cause climate change and should therefore be eliminated. But this does not follow. As with anything in life, with fossil fuel's impacts we need to look at the big picture, carefully weighing both the benefits and the costs.

And to do that, we need to clearly define what we mean by "climate change." Because while nearly everyone agrees that more CO2 in the atmosphere causes *some* climate change, it makes all the difference in the world whether that change is a mild, manageable warming or a runaway, catastrophic warming.

Which is it? If we look at what has been scientifically demonstrated vs. what has been speculated, the climate impact of CO2 is mild and manageable. In the last 80 years, we have increased the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere from .03% to .04%, and the warming has been barely more than the natural warming that occurred in the 80 years before that, when there were virtually no CO2 emissions. From a geological perspective, both CO2 levels and temperatures are very low; there is no perfect amount of CO2 or average temperature, although higher CO2 levels do create more plant growth and higher temperatures lower mortality rates.[7]

To be sure, many prominent scientists and organizations predict catastrophe--but this is wild speculation and nothing new. Indeed, many of today's thought leaders have been falsely predicting catastrophe for decades. 30 years ago, NASA climate leader James Hansen predicted that temperatures would rise by 2-4 degrees between 2000 and 2010; instead, depending on which temperature data set you consult, they rose only slightly or not at all.

30 years ago, President Obama's top science advisor, John Holdren, predicted that by now we'd be approaching a billion CO2-related deaths from famine. Instead, famine has plummeted as have climate related deaths across the board. According to data from the International Disaster Database, deaths from climate-related causes such as extreme heat, extreme cold, storms, drought, and floods have decreased at a rate of 50%[8] since the 1980s and 98% since major CO2 emissions began 80 years ago.[9]

How is it possible that we're safer than ever from climate?

Because while fossil fuel use has only a mild warming impact it has an enormous *protecting* impact. Nature doesn't give us a stable, safe climate that we make dangerous. It gives us an ever-changing, dangerous climate that we need to make safe. And the driver behind sturdy

---

[7] Gasparrini et al (2015)
[8] CRED Em-Dat International Disaster Database
[9] Goklany (2011)

buildings, affordable heating and air-conditioning, drought relief, and everything else that keeps us safe from climate is cheap, plentiful, reliable energy, overwhelmingly from fossil fuels.

Thus, the President's anti-fossil fuel policies would ruin billions of lives economically *and* environmentally--depriving people of energy and therefore making them more vulnerable to nature's ever-present climate danger.

Policies that cause massive, unnecessary human suffering, including increased climate vulnerability, are immoral.

A moral energy policy is one that liberates all the energy technologies, including fossil fuels, nuclear, and large-scale hydro, and lets them compete to the utmost to provide the most affordable, reliable energy for the most people.

A moral energy policy is an energy freedom policy.

Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
hearing entitled, "Examining the Role of Environmental Policies on Access to Energy and Economic Opportunity."
Wednesday, April 13, 2016
Responses to Senator Vitter's Questions for the Record for witness Alex Epstein

1. Mr. Epstein, in your testimony you make reference to Germany's efforts to phase out the use of fossil fuels, and some of the impacts resulting from those policies. Can you briefly discuss what you anticipate the impacts would be if the United States embarked on the same path that Germany did?

Germany's mandates for unreliable energy from solar and wind are imposed in the name of phasing out reliable energy from fossil fuels. But, as I explained in my testimony, "since unreliable energy can't be relied upon, it has to be propped up by reliable energy--mostly fossil fuels--making the solar panels and wind turbines an unnecessary and enormous cost to the system. As a result, the average German pays 3-4 times more for electricity than the average American. It's so bad that Germans have had to add a new term to the language: 'energy poverty.'"

Germany's increasingly unaffordable electricity creates problems for consumers and businesses.

On the consumer side, an estimated 800,000 people have been cut off their electricity supply per year because they failed to pay the electricity bills, a growing trend in Germany.[1]

On the business side, businesses become less competitive (or nonexistent) if their energy costs increase too much. In a prominent example German chemical giant BASF recently relocated large parts of its European manufacturing to the United States in order to benefit from the now abundant and low-priced natural gas, a crucial commodity for the chemical industry, that the US shale boom produces.[2]

If the US were to copy Germany's massive forced spending on unreliables, our electricity prices would skyrocket, as well. But President Obama aspires to something far worse. Instead of merely mandating inferior, redundant energy sources, he wants to radically restrict reliable source. Discussions of 80% bans on CO2 emissions in the next several decades foretell energy scarcity that would make us envy Germany's energy poverty.

Imagine frequent power outages, $10 a gallon gasoline prices, choosing between food and heating, food shortages from expensive diesel fuel--the list of potential horrors goes on.

---

[1] Institute for Energy Research - Germany's Green Energy Failure - A Lesson for U.S. Policymakers, April 2014 [Link]
[2] William Boston - BASF Steps Up Investment in U.S., The Wall Street Journal, December 17, 2013 [Link]

2. Mr. Epstein, in your testimony you reference the President's leadership of "global initiatives that call for even the poorest countries to be forced to use unreliables instead of reliables. This, in a world where 3 billion people have almost no access to energy and over one billion people have no electricity." Can you provide additional detail on the some of the specific impacts that you anticipate will occur if we force poor countries away from fossil fuel use?

Since energy is our ability to use machines to improve our lives, energy is the resource that makes every other resource available, abundant, and affordable--from food to clothing to shelter to hospitals to free time to education.
Thus, access to affordable, abundant, and reliable energy is a necessary precursor to improvements in human health and prosperity.

Nowhere is this more visible than in the gap between the state of human life between developed nations with plenty of energy use per capita and underdeveloped nations with little use of energy per capita. World Bank data shows that while a lot of progress has been made in recent decades, there is still a significant deficit in life expectancy, infant mortality, undernourishment and many other indicators of human well-being present in underdeveloped nations compared to industrialized nations like the United States.[3]

While the problems in these countries are caused by several factors, not the least of which is a lack of political and economic freedom, bringing developing countries closer to the level of industrialized countries will require a lot of energy. The predominant fuel of choice is fossil fuel. A projection by BP estimates that the use of coal will increase by 10%, that of natural gas by 44%, and that of oil and other liquid fuels by 21% until the year 2035. Total energy consumption is estimated to rise by 33%.[4] And this is in a scenario where the undeveloped world will still be nowhere near our standard of living; to make more progress, more energy is necessary.

Instead of pushing for energy abundance for the undeveloped world, our leaders are pushing for neverending energy poverty. This will mean literally billions of human life-years lost and hundreds of millions, if not billions, of humans staying in abject poverty for decades to come that would otherwise be able to lift themselves out of it.

---

[3] The World Bank - World Development Indicators online database [Link]
[4] BP Energy Outlook [Link]

Senator INHOFE. Thank you very much, Mr. Epstein.

I am going to try something different here. Judging from our experience yesterday and some of the previous committee's hearings, our members seem to go over, so I am going to change our 5 minutes to 6 minutes and then really try to hold everyone to 6 minutes, if that is acceptable.

General Scales, you have heard the quote that I gave in my opening statement in terms of the President talking about the greatest threat facing us is not ISIS but is global warming. One time he made that statement was April 18th, and it was on that same that ISIL executed two groups of Christians, beheading 21 and shooting the other 9.

What do you believe is the greatest national threat, and how do we respond to these statements?

Mr. SCALES. Thank you, Senator. I believe the greatest threat, in a word, is Russia. They are the largest existential threat, the most aggressive nation-state that we face, and we are seeing a resurgence of aggression obviously in Ukraine and Syria and elsewhere led by Vladimir Putin.

But what makes this so difficult to deal with, Senator, is that the military today has a whole panoply of additional threats. You mentioned ISIS. How about the Chinese threat to the South China Sea? We haven't begun to speak about the Iranian nuclear threat, which will be on us soon, and what that implies.

So soldiers and sailors today are bombarded by a series of global threats and diminishing resources, and to my mind, at least, the additional distraction of focusing on climate change in the midst of all this is simply counterproductive.

Senator INHOFE. Now, would you say that, to focus on climate change, does this impact our ability to execute operations with our allies around the globe against ISIL?

Mr. SCALES. It is too early to say. I think, inevitably, this has to be true because, remember, there is only so much energy and so much money, and so many men and women to confront our global challenges today. If you have lawyers that are telling you what to bomb, rules of engagement that keep you from bombing, a media looking over your shoulder as you try to prosecute wars, young soldiers today are just overwhelmed by distractions from their mission, which is to defeat the enemy. And adding another layer to this, making them focus first on climate change as a threat is simply a distraction they shouldn't be obliged to endure.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you very much.

Father Sirico, let's talk a little bit about the impact of all these accusations on the impoverished communities, the poor communities. What impact would you say that the Administration's climate change agenda would have on these communities, the impoverished communities?

Fr. SIRICO. Well, I think it is fair to say that when you wage what is in effect a war on coal or fossil fuels, what you end up doing is increasing the cost of those resources. When you increase the cost of those resources, the poor are further impoverished.

Not only that, but it has an effect as well on the companies that are employing people and providing these resources. For instance, all the different bankruptcies or the layoffs on the part of the Pow-

der River Basin, for example, laid off 243 workers at the Black Thunder Mine. Peabody Energy laid off 235 miners at the North Antelope Rochelle Mine. The Alpha Natural Resources filed for bankruptcy in Virginia last summer. And the list could go on.

So I think that the rhetorical attack, the moral attack, and the regulatory attack, not to mention the various kinds of taxation that go into this, impede the ability of these businesses both to employ people and to provide resources at affordable prices for people, thus impoverishing their communities.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, a recent report from the U.S. Global Change Research Program claims that we will see a rise in extreme heat related deaths due to climate change. Yet in your testimony, on page 2, you state that higher temperature actually lowers mortality rates.

Mr. EPSTEIN. As I indicated it is very important to distinguish between what is demonstrated and what is speculated. So what is demonstrated is a steep decline in climate related deaths as we use more energy, including fossil fuels.

So what is going on with those predictions is they are based on climate prediction models that can't predict climate, and they are based on a false understanding of climate safety. Nature doesn't give us a safe climate; the primary cause of climate safety is the state of climate protection, industrialization, and technology. So billions of people around the world who don't have that, who are vulnerable to climate, that is what they need; they don't need a 1 degree cooler temperature.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Back to you, General Scales. The President's focus on climate change impacting our ability, now, a lot of us up here at this table spend time over there. We talk to people in the field; we talk to our commanders; we talk to the kids in the mess halls, and they have questions that we, quite often, are asked, and that is is his focus, the President, the commander-in-chief, on climate change impacting our ability to execute operations with our allies over there?

Mr. SCALES. Yes, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and one of the interesting things is I also talk to soldiers, as you know, and there is a growing sense in many ways of cynicism among our young men and women in uniform, particularly those who are deployed. They have so many conflicting stressors that keep them, as they would say, from doing their mission.

And when they are sitting in a mess hall in Kabul and they see the President saying, on television, that ISIS may not be our No. 1 enemy, climate change may be, and they just came back from a patrol with their Afghan allies, these young men and women turn to each other and say have our leaders sort of lost touch with the reality all around us? And then you stack that up with all the other things that we have talked about recently, and I am afraid that level of cynicism is what interferes with our ability to defend our country.

Senator INHOFE. I get that same thing.

Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. I would like to see if Sheldon Whitehouse would like to take my turn as first.

Senator WHITEHOUSE. With the Chairman's permission.

Senator INHOFE. No objection.

Senator WHITEHOUSE. I do have to get to a budget hearing at 10:30.

I guess I would say that I am just a little bit sad at what this committee has become. EPW, Committee on Environment and Public Works, it is beginning to look increasingly like the Committee on Eccentricity and Public Works.

We have a United States military that in repeated Quadrennial Defense Reviews, which are done by the career military, and in the national security strategy have singled out climate change as a problem for the future that will create the types of stresses that will draw conflict and draw our young men and women into conflict. I believe every single military official who has spoken about climate change, civilian or military, has agreed with that proposition.

Admiral Locklear ran our Pacific Command for years and said that the effects of climate change are more likely than any of the other scenarios that they commonly talk about to lead to conflict in the Pacific. In the years that I sat on the Intelligence Committee and in the assessments that I have seen since, it has been a consistent theme of our national security personnel in the intelligence community that this is a concern that we need to address.

I would note that with respect to Retired General Scales' comments, the timeframe we are dealing is not at all the timeframe of the history of warfare. The history of warfare goes back tens of thousands of years. We have had at least 800,000 years within a relatively safe, in our human experience, range of carbon in the atmosphere of 170 to 300 parts per million. Now we are at 400 and climbing. We are in unprecedented territory.

And when you look over that 800,000-year time over the association between temperature and CO_2, it is a very close association. And if temperature follows carbon dioxide, and there is a reasonable change that it will when it has done so for 800,000 years, then we are in for very substantial changes. Not just little changes, but big changes. Not just changes that would reflect the history of warfare, but changes that are really unprecedented.

And I kind of doubt that actually individual soldiers are being asked to address climate change. That is not their job; it is our job in Congress to set the terms for our economy so that we don't drive our soldiers into situations in which conflicts caused by climate change are putting them at risk.

Similarly, from the Catholic Church we have a pope who has written an entire encyclical about our responsibility to our climate, focusing on climate change. We have the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which has repeatedly and constantly and unanimously continued to say with a very strong voice that it is really important that we address climate change. Several Catholic bishops actually have come to Washington to meet with us and to urge this to happen. There was not very good turnout by our Republican colleagues for that, but they were here to speak to anyone who would come.

So we have these very, very strong signals coming from the vast majority of these great institutions, our military and our Catholic

Church, and what we hear in this committee are these extremely eccentric voices.

And we particularly, I think, have reason for concern about the presence here of the Acton Institute, which has something of an unfortunate record of fronting for industry groups. We are now dealing with climate change, but not long ago one of the health and safety issues that was predominant was tobacco, and people have used those wars, the tobacco wars. During those tobacco wars, the Acton Institute took money from the tobacco industry.

And if you look through the records that the attorney generals required to be made public in the settlement with the tobacco industry, you find a memo from the tobacco industry authored by Philip Morris that actually talks about its work with the Acton Institute to fight back against tobacco regulation. There is a list of organizations that they work with; the lead one is the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty.

How something for the study of religion and liberty gets into tobacco policy is another question entirely, but I am quoting from the document. First they call the Acton Institute, and I quote Philip Morris, "an esoteric policy group that focuses on illuminating the free market perspective." Second, they vouch for Acton in that Acton "has on several occasions written articles and op-eds opposing the use of cigarette excises as a funding mechanism for health care."

And here is the really interesting part. The author says "Acton is presently preparing, with our assistance," with our assistance, with the assistance of the tobacco industry, "a monograph for the Detroit News detailing arguments against sin taxes. I will be contacting them," the Acton Institute, "this week to elicit their assistance in rebutting the just released University of Michigan report that attacks industry projections of economic dislocation caused by prohibitive excise taxes."

When you are taking industry money and working with industry and doing what industry tells you, I have an issue with that.

My time has expired.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Senator Rounds.

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Father Sirico, you have pointed out that the Pope's encyclical and environmental stewardship reinforce the concern that society progress be balanced with a respect for nature and a concern about the most vulnerable populations. I come from a rural State where agriculture is the backbone of our economy.

I would like to know your opinion of how the free market can help support a wide variety of industries, particularly those like ag, in which those who tend to their land are the best environmental stewards we have. How can industries like agriculture help alleviate some of the concerns regarding vulnerable populations, and what should we do to make certain these industries are able to not only survive, but to thrive in this country?

Fr. SIRICO. Of course, the question of vulnerability has to do with a lack of access to resources, so the best kind of policies is to allow these, whether it is agricultural businesses or other businesses to be as productive as they can be within the rule of law, under the

rule of law, in order to provide goods and services that are accessible to vulnerable populations, at the same time increasing the likelihood and the opportunities that they have for employment in order to support their families.

Draconian legislation, general animus toward free market activities, the hindrance of competition, the placing of one's thumb, as it were, on a scale in terms of that competition by the use of various kinds of regulation all impede that knowledge flow that I spoke about earlier and speak about more extensively in my prepared remarks, that enables people to rise in their economic well-being. So I think that what the Government needs to do is ensure that law is fair and just and objective rather than partisan.

Senator ROUNDS. Major General Scales, in your testimony you warn about the consequences of having senior defense officials lecture our soldiers on the idea that combatting climate change is their most important mission. How does this mindset impact the men and women serving in the U.S. military and how does this detract from our national security in the face of ISIS and other security threats to our Nation?

Mr. SCALES. That is a great question, and it goes to the points made by Senator Whitehouse. First of all, let me say up front that the impression that he gives that this is a universal thought held within the defense community is ridiculous. I was on the Quadrennial Defense Review; I spent 6 weeks arguing with my colleagues about this, and in our version of the QDR we did not mention climate change.

Mr. Breen mentioned a report by 17 generals and admirals that climbed on board to this mantra about climate change. Well, those are friends of mine, so I called them the other day, over the last week, and I asked them, what are you doing, what is this all about? He said, well, our consensus was we will sign up to the dangers of climate change or the relationship between climate change and national security "as long as it doesn't cost us anything." I mean, why not?

And as far as Admiral Locklear is concerned, now retired commander of the Pacific Command, he made that as a sort of off-the-cuff comment about climate change in the Pacific, and he never went back to it again. He is now retired.

This is just part of America, Senator. I mean, it is like Y2K or it is like prohibition. We in our society have a tendency to jump on bandwagons because that is just what America does; it makes us to feel like part of the organization.

But the idea that only young soldiers are concerned about losing faith in their leaders over their profession of climate change is not true. I will assure you that many senior military, both active and retired, are concerned about this today.

Why? Because they fear that, to your point, that it will deflect us away from our primary mission, which is defend this country and kill the enemy; and second, it will cost us tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars. Go back to these generals and admirals and say, do you still ascribe with that thought if it is going to empty our national security budget of $200 billion? You will get a different answer.

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, in your testimony you mention that Germans have added the term energy poverty to their language. Can you explain what this means, and is energy poverty something that threatens the United States?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Sure. It varies from country to country, but basically it is the percentage of people for whom energy is almost a prohibitive percentage of their income. So with any kind of measure like this, where you are restricting a crucial life enhancing product, the more expensive you make it, the more you hurt poorer people in particular.

So we see even in the wealthier countries that lots of people can't afford their electricity bills or can't afford many other things that stem from electricity bills. We see manufacturers that are on the margin that could work in this country if natural gas is cheap.

But what happens if you ban fracking? Then those companies go out of business. And then, of course, internationally—and I think this is one of the greatest moral crimes—if you make energy more expensive or you prohibit or restrict people from getting energy from sources like coal, that is literally death. I tell a story in my book, the Moral Case for Fossil Fuels, about a young child who could have been kept alive with an incubator, but in the Gambia there are no incubators because of no reliable electricity.

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you very much.

Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, are you a scientist?

Mr. EPSTEIN. No, a philosopher.

Senator BOXER. You are a philosopher?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Senator BOXER. OK. Well, this is the Environment and Public Works Committee. I think it is interesting we have a philosopher here talking about an issue——

Mr. EPSTEIN. It is to teach you how to think more clearly.

Senator BOXER. Well, you don't have to teach me how to think more clearly.

[Laughter.]

Senator BOXER. You don't have to. Try running for the Senate on your platform.

Reverend Nelson, perhaps the most—well, this is the place to have a philosopher, not a scientist; it is perfect for this Republican——

Mr. EPSTEIN. You have to integrate the big picture data.

Senator BOXER. I am not asking you anything. I am telling you that all you have to know is you are a philosopher, not a scientist, and I don't appreciate getting lectured by a philosopher about science.

Now, I want to talk to Reverend Nelson, who never claimed to be a scientist or came up with all these figures and facts in his own mind. I just want to say to you you are the most eloquent person I have ever heard in all my years here, and I am so grateful to you for bringing your eloquence to this committee. What you are trying to tell us in a very calm voice and not an argumentative, nasty

voice is that we have a moral obligation to the least among us. Am I right on that point?

Rev. NELSON. We do, Senator. And I challenge the notion that somehow or another the Bible does not speak to this. I have with me, actually, a Green Bible, which the pages are marked and the passages are marked in green throughout this Bible that actually speak to the issues of the care of creation.

Senator BOXER. Well, I would appreciate it if I could have some copies of those passages.

Rev. NELSON. Certainly.

Senator BOXER. Because I think it is so important to people who claim to be religious to turn their back on this threat. It is shocking. When we know the co-benefits of going after carbon pollution, we are going to save 1,500 to 3,600 lives, 1,700 heart attacks won't happen, 90,000 asthma attacks in children won't happen, and we will restore 300,000 missed work days and school days.

It is a moral issue, and I just wanted to thank you because from the angry voices, and we have had them here, it is a beautiful thing, and obviously within you you have the security and the peace, and you have said it here, and it is very important and I so appreciate it.

And I appreciate the fact that Senator Inhofe allows us to pick a couple of witnesses.

Now, Major General, you disagree with the DOD, and you kind of made fun of them and said they are just saying it because they are getting on a bandwagon. So I am not asking you a question, but what I am hoping you would do, because you spoke for others and you demeaned them and said they are just saying they are doing it to get along, it doesn't cost anything, give me the names of those people so I can contact them, because this is a very important testimony here.

So you can't just get up. I can tell you anything. I could tell you I was visited by the greatest leader in all the world and said this. You know, you can say anything. I want specifics; that is why you are here.

Now, Mr. Epstein talked about the President mandating solar and wind. I would like you to send me those mandates. That would be important, because I don't know of them.

And Father, I appreciate your being here.

Fr. SIRICO. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. I looked up the Acton Institute because I didn't know much, and I know that my colleague said you have ties to the tobacco industry. Is it true that you received $315,000 from ExxonMobil since 1998?

Fr. SIRICO. Let me give you a broader——

Senator BOXER. No, I am asking. I don't have a lot of time. Is it true?

Fr. SIRICO. OK, I am going to be very brief.

Senator BOXER. No, no, yes or no.

Fr. SIRICO. The Acton Institute has existed for 26 years. I brought the numbers with me. From that time we have received under 5 percent of our funding from all corporations——

Senator BOXER. Father, that is fine.

Fr. SIRICO [continuing]. And 1 percent from Koch, .05 percent from Exxon——

Senator BOXER. Father. Father.

Fr. SIRICO [continuing]. And the numbers you have on tobacco are correct.

Senator BOXER. I am losing my time. You received $315,000 from ExxonMobil; you received funding from the Koch brothers——

Fr. SIRICO. Actually, it was $410,000. Your number is wrong.

Senator BOXER. Thank you for correcting the record, and we will show it.

Fr. SIRICO. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. The Koch Foundation, David H. Koch, $313,000 since 2003.

Fr. SIRICO. No, $895,000——

Senator BOXER. The Claude Lambe Foundation is another part of the Koch Brothers, $60,000.

Fr. SIRICO. Which was that?

Senator BOXER. The Claude Lambe Foundation, $60,000.

Fr. SIRICO. Yes.

Senator BOXER. That is connected with the Koch brothers.

Fr. SIRICO. An educational subsidy.

Senator BOXER. And I would ask unanimous consent to place into the record all the other donations from those who are fighting us on climate change, if I might.

Senator INHOFE. Without objection.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

[The referenced information was not received at time of print.]

Senator BOXER. Father, this was kind of interesting. The Acton Institute's strong support for Catholicism and free market economics has come under strain as Pope Francis has actively criticized global inequality and unfettered capitalism. In May 2014 the Pope's Twitter account posted a tweet, the Pope's, saying, "Inequality is the root of all evil." Joe Carter, a senior editor at Acton, tweeted in reply, this is to the Pope saying inequality is the root of all evil: "Seriously, though, what was up with that tweet by the Pontiff? Has he traded the writings of Peter and Paul for Economist Piketty?"

So do you disagree with the Pope when he says that climate change is one of the biggest issues, and we have to face it?

Fr. SIRICO. Senator, I am very grateful for your defense of the Pope. Perhaps not in all of his magisterial authority and the cherry picking of this or that——

Senator BOXER. I can ask you what I want. Do you disagree with the Pope on climate change? It is a simple yes or no.

Fr. SIRICO. When the Pope says things that have to do with science, he does not speak from the magisterial authority of the Church.

Senator BOXER. So you don't agree with him. OK, fine.

Fr. SIRICO. When he speaks on moral issues, such as abortion and contraception and the like, then he speaks on that——

Senator BOXER. So who is cherry picking? You're saying that when the planet is facing all these problems, it is not a moral issue. I don't agree with you.

Fr. SIRICO. I never said that. Where did I say that? Could you give me that quotation, Senator?

Senator BOXER. You just said it, sir.

Fr. SIRICO. I did not. I certainly did not.

Senator BOXER. Sir, you receive money from the Koch brothers, from Exxon, you disagree with the Pope——

Fr. SIRICO. I never said I didn't——

Senator BOXER [continuing]. And you tend to wear the cloth you are in front of us?

Senator INHOFE. OK, OK.

Senator BOXER. I think you ought to have a talk with Reverend Nelson.

Fr. SIRICO. Who is, by the way, not a scientist.

Senator INHOFE. OK, Senator Barrasso.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I ought to just not ask any questions and just let ask, anything else you want to say on my time, Father?

Fr. SIRICO. What I was trying to do is put into perspective the notion of how an institute is funded. And by the way it is not just an educational institute like ours; it is political campaigns like the Senator's.

Senator BARRASSO. So when Democrats make a pilgrimage to Tom Steyer's house in California, who promises $100 million to their funds, including members of this committee, that might be something that——

Fr. SIRICO. That might be something. I would have to look into that. I don't know what Soros gives and things like that. The point is that we exist for the purpose of helping people understand the moral foundations of the free economy, and it is a shame that one has to come to the U.S. Senate to make that case and to be opposed on it.

We go to donors and ask them to support that, and then because of political motivations this is distorted into insinuating that we are somehow being purchased by industry. We get less than 5 percent of our money from industry, and we are defending capitalism. I think we should get more money from industry because we are defending enterprise. So to distort it and make it sound like somehow we are going out like moral prostitutes to gain this support I think is disingenuous, at the least.

Senator BARRASSO. And the Pope is infallible on matters of faith and religion, but not on the matters of science and philosophy.

Fr. SIRICO. And does not claim, and does not claim to be infallible on science or economics.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Mr. Epstein, I would like to read to you something that came out from the Energy and Environment Climate Wire. It has to do with Wyoming. It is called Powder River Basin: Coal's Western Stronghold Faces Precarious Future. In the article, it says, "Overall, Wyoming coal production has decreased 14 percent since 2011. The economic consequences have been extreme." It goes through the fact that we continue to lose jobs, hundreds have been laid off again last week.

It says, "Even before these recent layoffs, the Wyoming Department of Workforce Services reported that Campbell County had ex-

perienced one of the largest jumps in unemployment across the State last year." Now, these, as you know, are real people, real jobs, good paying jobs providing for their families.

The jobs are being crushed because of political decisions made by this Administration that decided that coal was politically incorrect. People do not know where to go, how to get a similar job, the same pay, the same benefits, how to provide for their families.

So rather than making coal cleaner or burning it cleaner, or recognizing the benefits that coal provides not only to communities like Gillette that depend on it, but also to low-income communities across the country in terms of the cost of electricity, the Administration has basically toed the line from their big green activist groups and the elite special interests who pay millions and millions of dollars to candidates who support that viewpoint, my question is this: Is there a moral argument to be made that communities, coal communities shouldn't be crushed by their own Government to appease special interests?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Well, I disagree with the way people talk about jobs. It is perfectly legitimate for an individual or a community to lose jobs if it is out-competed by a superior product. What is happening here, though, they are being forced out of business despite creating a superior product, a life enhancing product, fossil fuel energy, that in its modern incarnation even coal today is some of the cleanest energy people have ever had access to. In North Dakota you have some of the cleanest air in the country and an enormous amount of coal-fired power.

I want to comment on the nature of the industry because it seems to be an easy way to score points to talk about somebody's affiliation with the industry. Now, I do not happen to be funded by anybody, since I am an independent speaker and writer, but I am very proud that I sell books to and give speeches to fossil fuel companies. These are companies that everyday have individuals who are taking action to make all of us alive.

And without being too rude about it, most of the people on this committee are quite into their years. Very few of you would be alive without cheap, plentiful, reliable energy. Everything you are wearing, whatever made it possible for you to get here is made possible by energy. And it is not just energy in general; you have to produce it cheaply, reliably, scaleably, efficiently.

And you can talk about, oh, I think that can be done via solar. The way to figure that out is to compete on the free market. But as long as your life is being made possible by the people of the fossil fuel industry, I think you should be grateful, and I think it is a crime, a moral crime that you are damning anyone by association.

And I wish Senator Whitehouse were here, because what he is doing to the free speech of those companies and anyone associated with them is unconstitutional, and I think he should apologize or resign.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much for the comments. I appreciate your being here. I appreciate your writings and appreciate you taking the time to be here.

Mr. EPSTEIN. Thank you. And I am serious. You violate the Constitute, you resign. I thought that was a policy in the United States.

Senator BARRASSO. General Scales, the Department of Defense, under this Administration, has spent millions of Department of Defense funds on alternative fuels, and they have done it in the name of climate change. Now, this is despite millions in funding for alternative fuel research and other departments of Government.

I think there is a thing that comes out each year called the Pig Book. It is about citizens against Government waste, and it talks about how the Navy, earlier in this Administration, spent in excess of $400 per gallon for about 20,000 gallons of algae-based fuel. Senator McCain frequently references this when he speaks.

How is this improving readiness, safety of troops, sailors, airmen, by paying $400 per gallon for biofuels and other similar climate related Department of Defense——

Mr. SCALES. Well, thank you, Senator. First of all, let me say that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines understand intuitively, because they are of that generation, that they need to be good stewards of the environment, like all the rest of our citizens; and the military has an obligation not to pollute the atmosphere or to spill oil in motor pools.

And I think, because the military is a disciplined organization, they do a remarkable job of—if you have ever been to a military installation like Fort Sill, you will see that they are very careful about protecting the environment.

But to your point, when it gets to the point where the efficiency of our weapons, the ability of aircraft to fly and ships to sail are impeded by this obsession of going to alternative means of propulsion, or when the cost gets so high that things like readiness and modernization and manning levels are affected by the diversion of attention and funds, then it becomes a problem; and most of the military people I talk to about this issue tend to agree with that. They agree, protect the environment as a priority; but as a national security not so much.

Senator BARRASSO. Well, and to your point, I would just say that I spent Thanksgiving with our Wyoming National Guard at Bagram Air Force in Northern Afghanistan, you know, north of Kabul, and the same things that you described that are occurring on the bases in the United States; our soldiers are doing the same job of protecting environment around the world.

Mr. SCALES. Right.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Senator Barrasso.

And for those who came in a little bit late, we extended our questioning time by a minute, to 6 minutes, in the hopes that everyone will stay within their 6 minutes. All right.

Senator Markey.

Senator MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

I have in my hand here the encyclical from Pope Francis, Laudato Si', on the care of our common home. This is the Pope's encyclical on the environment. He decided, in order to reinforce the message, to come to Capitol Hill. On Capitol Hill the Pope deliv-

ered a sermon on the Hill to the members of the House and the Senate, and to the American people.

As we all know, the Pope taught chemistry. The Pope taught chemistry. And here is what he said to us. He said, No. 1, the planet is dangerously warming, and the science is clear. No. 2, human beings are the most significant new contributor to the dangerous warming of the planet, and the science is clear. No. 3, since human beings are making this significant contribution to this problem, we have a moral responsibility to do something about it. The United States, as the historically largest contributor to greenhouse gases, red, white and blue CO_2 up in the atmosphere, that we have a responsibility to be the leader to reduce the risk to this planet.

Now, following on what Senator Whitehouse said, by the way, with whom I agree 100 percent, the issue then comes to why haven't we dealt with this issue? What has been the problem? Well, the problem is that there are groups out there in the fossil fuel industry whose business model, whose profit making model aligns totally with adding more CO_2 up into the atmosphere and denying the relationship between CO_2 and the dangerous warming of the planet. They make money the more they contribute to the problem. The Koch brothers are the tip of that huge iceberg, but it is massive.

Now, what is the evidence of that? Well, the evidence is that they have been the leaders in stopping the free market from working. They are the single greatest force fighting the free market in our country. Subsidies for the oil industry, 100 years old. Subsidies for the coal industry, 100 years old. Subsidies for the nuclear industry, 70 years old.

But try to get same level of subsidies for the wind and the solar industry, and these industries write letters to Members of Congress saying, please do not allow for the perversion of subsidies to infect the free market, even though their entire business premises are tax breaks from the Government.

So they are acting at a hypocrisy level that is historic in size. And the Pope came here to talk about that, to talk about this power which these industries have. Even as recently as 2005 the United States was only producing 70 total megawatts new added to the grid from solar. Seventy total.

And then we began to win, our side began to win; the tax breaks going on the books, the States having laws saying there had to be a portfolio, an amount of solar and wind that came to generate electricity. This year there is going to be 14,000 new megawatts of solar in 1 year. Only 70 total in 2005. For wind, 7,000 megawatts new. Almost nothing in 2005.

So we have finally begun to break out. We are finally beginning to win. And what happens out on the free market when the same subsidies are given to the new technologies? Peabody Coal Company today declared bankruptcy. That is a free market, ladies and gentlemen. Finally, the new sources of energy can in fact compete. Let the free market work.

Let the science also inform the decisions made with regard to what the effects are of using fossil fuels as a way of generating this electricity.

Same thing is true with the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, they all said, oh, we cannot increase the efficiency of our vehicles, even though we know that those tailpipes are sending greenhouse gases up into the atmosphere. Finally, finally the Congress acted and passed the law that said, no, you must increase the fuel economy standards.

Guess what happened? This year they are going to have the largest single sales of vehicles because the American people are finally realizing that they can have good cars with fuel efficiency and reduce the amount of greenhouse gases going up into the atmosphere. The free market, in other words, working.

And when Waxman-Markey, this bill that the Koch brothers and others spent upwards of $300 million to defeat in the Congress, even in that bill Henry Waxman and I added $200 million for the coal industry, for the coal industry, $200 billion for carbon capture and sequestration. Peabody Coal said no. Peabody Coal said no. They said no. OK? So even as you tried to help the workers, even as you tried to create a bridge, they said no.

So, ladies and gentlemen, from a national security perspective, this is dangerous. General Gordon Sullivan was my first witness on the Select Committee on Energy Conservation and Global Warming. Here is what he said. He was the Chief of Staff for the Army at Blackhawk Down Mogadishu. He said this in his testimony: one, he realized in retrospect that it was a drought that led to a famine that led to aid that had gone in, and now the gangs were now fighting in Somalia, and he had to order sending in Americans who got killed because of the impact of climate change in Somalia. This does have a national security impact.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Senator Markey.

Senator Capito.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the panelists for being here today.

Obviously, I come at this from a very different perspective, living in and being a native West Virginian, which has a lot of fossil fuels, a lot of coal, a lot of families. And when I hear my colleague cheering that a major corporation in this country has gone bankrupt, you know what I think about? The thousands of families who now don't know if they are going to be working, if they are going to have a paycheck. There is no off-ramp for them. Those employees have to come home today and wonder if they are going to be able to support their families.

This isn't something to cheer about. This is a human tragedy that I am living in my State of West Virginia. And they may get tired of hearing about the 10,000 jobs that we have lost in West Virginia, the county school systems that are now cutting 30 and 40 and 50 teachers because of the loss of population, the pessimistic, downtrodden pockets of poverty that have been created in certain areas of our country, Wyoming being one, four States in recession because of the policies.

You can say free market all you want. This is the policies that have been promulgated by this Administration that is maybe not the only cause, but one of the major causes of poverty creation in our own country. And I can't even talk about it, hardly, without ex-

pressing the disdain for the glee that I hear when poverty is being created, people are losing their jobs, families are being devastated. There is a better way to do this. There is a better way to do this.

So my questions are, Mr. Epstein, you talk about the moral case for fossil fuels, and you talk about I think a lot of the conversation goes around what this does in the international community, but I am concentrating, obviously, on what is going on in our own country. So how do you see this impacting a low-income, particularly Appalachia? I am sure you have done study on that and looked at that area of the country. We are deeply affected by this.

Mr. EPSTEIN. And again, the reason to have sympathy for the situation is that they are not being punished for doing something bad by the market. They are being punished for doing something good by people who believe that fossil fuels are evil. And I tried to give the big picture case why the exact opposite is true.

As I mentioned at the beginning, energy is the industry that powers every other industry. So when the price of energy goes up, the price of everything else goes up. When the price of energy goes down, the price of everything else goes down.

So every aspect of your life, you can't even isolate one because it is the cost of your food, the cost of your clothing, the cost of your shelter, the success of your business, your ability to take a vacation, the cost of all the different modern miracles, the cost of your healthcare. They are all tied to energy. Even things like scientific inquiry. If we don't have a machine-based civilization powered by cheap, plentiful, reliable energy, there are no universities. That is a modern development that came out of industrial fossil fueled civilization.

So whenever anyone talks about something that even increases the price of energy a little bit, yet alone Germany three to four times, yet alone the Obama policies, which would do much worse, you have to think about that is killing people, that is making them suffer, that is preventing them from being able to afford medical care, that is making their food more expensive. Every aspect of life is made worse.

But let's look at the positive. If we can liberate energy in this next election, we have an unbelievable opportunity to improve every area of life in this country.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you. I sat in the audience and listened to the Pope speak, and I was very appreciative of many of his words, and I thought he gave a very moving address to Congress and really to the Nation, and very appreciative of that.

And certainly I was paying close attention to what he was saying about clean energy and climate change because that has big impacts on where I live. But what I heard him say after he talked about his concerns, he adds on his concern for poverty and what the cost of high energy and the changes that we are making drastically can do and what the cost of poverty is at the same time. So I was very appreciative of what he had to say, and I saw it through a different lens, I think, because of where I live.

So very briefly, General, I know that the military has made a great emphasis with Secretary Panetta to move to green energy, and I think, as you know, we all know we can conserve and do better, and certainly the military is in that category.

But where I think we could make a better impact is to have longer timelines to develop more research, to use fossil fuels for jet engine. You can convert, and there is all kinds of research that could be occurring. Do you find that that is occurring within the DOD, or is it more of a drive to green energy, and that is it?

Mr. SCALES. I do think—I know in Fort Sill and places in the Southwest they are using both wind energy and solar on post to reduce the cost of energy. I know that the services are experimenting with alternative fuels. But the bottom line is simply this: so far, at least, a fighter plane or a ship or a tank simply can't be made efficient in close combat without the density of energy that is in liquid fossil fuels. You simply can't do it.

Now, I will also say that many of my colleagues are saying that in the long-term perhaps this will change. My concern is that if the commander-in-chief says to his soldiers, who obey orders, it is time to start thinking of other ways to propel a tank or an aircraft, it may cause something to happen before its time, and it may very well impede our ability to fight future wars.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you very much.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Senator Gillibrand has very generously agreed to swap turns with Senator Sullivan. Then we will go back and take care of the rest.

Thank you so much.

Senator SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank my colleague from New York. I am going to go preside here in a minute, so thanks for the flop. I want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for holding this hearing, and the witnesses.

I think this is a really great topic, and it is also great to have a little bit of a heated debate here. So I appreciate you doing this. I know sometimes it is not easy; you have members of the committee on both sides trying to go after the incentives for you to be up here testifying, and I am just going to say I assume you are all here on good faith, on what you believe, so I really appreciate that.

I also want to just echo what my colleague from West Virginia mentioned. I have the utmost respect for my friend from Massachusetts, but holy cow, if he is celebrating the bankruptcy and job loss of hundreds of Americans, we have something wrong going on here, in my view. We shouldn't ever be doing that.

I think she was very passionate about what she said and very persuasive, so I certainly hope nobody would—particularly on this committee—be celebrating the job losses and hard times that a lot of Americans—because of the policies of this Administration, certainly my State has seen that—are experiencing right now.

I just want to touch very quickly, and Father, maybe you can touch on this. We talk a lot about moral imperative. I have been someone who thinks that one of the biggest issues that we don't talk about here in this Congress, Democrats or Republicans, and it relates to these policies we are talking to, is that we can't grow our economy.

There is a debate on fossil fuels, Obamacare. We debate everything. There is one issue that is not debatable: the last 8 years, by any historical measure, have had some of the weakest economic growth in U.S. history. Never broken 3 percent GDP growth in the

entire Obama administration era. Last quarter I think we grew .1 percent, and nobody even says anything.

Is there a moral imperative to grow the economy and allow for free enterprise and free markets? That is what has made this country strong—strong traditional levels of American growth, 3, 4 percent GDP growth, Democrats, Republicans. We can't even come close to it.

So you know what they do in Washington now? They dumb it down. They don't say, hey, we need to get back to 3 percent GDP growth, or 4, which will create opportunities for families, particularly those on the lower ladders of the economic ladder. We just dumb it down and say this is the new normal. The new normal. We are going to now tell Americans that we can only grow 1 percent. Don't worry, you should be satisfied with that.

The secretary of the Treasury never comes out and says, don't worry, America, we grew it .1 percent GDP growth last quarter; I have a plan. No. They dumb it down and say we should just accept that, it is the new normal.

Father, what do you think of that?

I would also like Mr. Epstein to maybe weigh in on that one as well.

Fr. SIRICO. Well, I have no doubt that one of the green passages that are underlined in Dr. Nelson's Bible is the command of God to the newly created human family to multiply and have dominion over the world.

But the normative way in which we rise out of poverty is through human action; it is through human beings using their intellect, using their freedom, engaging their talents and their risk to produce from the fruits of the earth because we do not become better off by having natural resources in nature. We become better off by having those resources drawn from nature and placed at human service.

And the fossil fuel industry, it seems to me, has been one of those great resources of human betterment on this planet and the wealth of the United States historically, and indeed the world has been predicated on that.

I find it a dangerously mistaken notion to think, and this may come as a shock to the committee, that the Government is the source of wealth in this country, or the source of jobs. And I saw that mistaken notion of thinking when the Senator from Massachusetts assumed that tax exemptions or credits were tax subsidies.

If you want to resolve that whole problem and have a nice bipartisan approach, remove all of the subsidies and all of the credits from all of the industries and let them compete on the free market that Senator Markey, I think inadvertently, was endorsing.

Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Epstein, do you have a view on the issue of how we can't grow the economy, what that does for hope, what that does for poverty, what that does for the outlook of the American family?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I think one of the tensions on the committee on this issue is how do you weigh economic growth, and then how do you weigh these kinds of environmental considerations. And this is exactly the kind of consideration that is the subject of philosophy,

which Senator Boxer has said is unnecessary, although she thinks religion is necessary to evaluate science, which I don't get.

But what philosophy teaches us is how to look at the big picture, and with these issues the crucial concept, which is in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, is individual rights. We want the policies that protect the rights of individual to pursue their own flourishing without interference by others. So if you do it right, what you do is you set scientific, not speculative, but scientific thresholds for things like CO_2, where there is no relevant threshold right now for different kinds of air pollution, for other things.

So what you do is you liberate individuals to be as productive as possible while protecting each other's rights, and that is absolutely possible. And if that were done we would have a thriving economy because fracking really slipped by Obama. He didn't really know about it. If he had known about it, he would have probably tried to get it banned.

So our prosperity right now depends on the ignorance of our politicians, which is pretty scary. But imagine if we had been free to frack, if we are free to produce energy, we are free in every other sector of the economy while having rational rights protecting environmental laws, we will grow 5 or 10 percent.

Senator SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank again my colleague from New York.

Senator INHOFE. Yes. Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Go preside.

Senator Gillibrand, again, thank you very much for accommodating his schedule.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you. This is quite a hearing.

I have a copy of Pope Francis' beautiful encyclical on climate change. Pope Francis reminds us the impacts of climate change are often most acutely felt by those who are most vulnerable and who do not have the resources to adapt.

So, Reverend Nelson, can you talk a little bit about the effects that environmental degradation and resource scarcity has on communities like the one you serve in Memphis? Why do so many religious leaders believe that we have a moral imperative to address climate change?

And just in response to the last area of debate, on page 9 it says, "My predecessor, Benedict, likewise proposed eliminating the structural causes of the dysfunctions of the world economy and correcting models of growth which have proved incapable of ensuring respect for the environment." So just as a commentary on the last discussion.

Reverend Nelson, I would like your thoughts.

Rev. NELSON. Thank you. One of the great challenges in low-income communities is that many of them have had to bear the brunt of toxic waste, have had to deal with a number of issues regarding being located next to power plants that set off great emissions in the life of a community.

We have seen children who have developed all types of illnesses. And one of the greatest pieces in the community that I was in was the issue of asthma, which causes children to miss many days of school. That is never recorded in any kind of educational record; it

is basically at the end of their tenure in school, they miss too many days or they haven't been able to catch up with their work. So low-income children end up being further and further behind in the educational process due to a lot of these kinds of toxic problems that they are having with the environment.

And we are able to attribute—I think there is documentation across the board that has attributed that in most of these communities where there are heavy carbon emissions this is symptomatic of it, children not being able to make it to school and to be able to respond.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Yes, Reverend. I have the same problem in many places in my State. In the Bronx we have one of the highest asthma rates, and it is because of the density of transportation networks that don't rely on mass transit, as well as a lot of historic environmental degradation along with a lot of poor air quality.

We also see it not just in our cities and our country, but we also see it around the world. I would like to submit for the record a New York Times article specifically about Africa. And this is about what is happening in Zambia because most of their electricity is generated from a dam, from the Kariba, and it says, "But today, as a severe drought magnified by climate change has cut water levels to record low, the Kariba is generating so little juice that blackouts have crippled the nation's already hurting businesses. After a decade of being heralded as the vanguard of African growth, Zambia, in a quick, mortifying let down, is now struggling to pay its own civil servants and has reached out to the International Monetary Fund for help." So this is a world problem.

And I would like to submit that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Senator INHOFE. Without objection.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you.

[The referenced article was not received at time of print.]

Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Breen, I would like to talk a little bit about the Quadrennial Defense Review. It classified global climate change as a threat multiplier. Could you please discuss the impacts of resource competition, particularly those in the developing world, on political instability? Also talk about the impact of our own national security.

And I know, because I serve on the Armed Services Committee, we have hardened a lot of our bases so that we are energy independent, so we don't have to rely on Middle Eastern oil. We don't even have to rely on fossil fuels. So we have Fort Drum, for example, that is entirely able to be off the grid at any moment and be entirely self-sustaining.

So I see this military as understanding where the threats actually lie and responding to them through energy independence, through renewables. And if you talk to anybody on the battlefield, if they don't have equipment that can recharge remotely, and not have to have large trucks of gasoline and oil delivering to bases, it is such a risk for them that they are dependent on these supply chains. So if they can have portable supplies, portable batteries, portable solar energy, it is so much more effective for our military and our fighting forces worldwide.

So could you please comment on those thoughts?

Mr. BREEN. Sure. Thank you, Senator.

The military is without a doubt doing a lot of things to make itself more agile and more lethal on the battlefield with respect to energy. There is nothing abstract about this; I lived this firsthand as a 23-year-old lieutenant in Iraq fighting every night to get the fuel convoy into my perimeter I needed to run an inefficient gas generator. Today my colleagues have solar panels and tactical solar systems that run the same. They don't have to take the same kind of risks; they have taken action to reduce their logistical tail.

The fuel purchase, the fuel tests that the Senator alluded to earlier, that is intended to make sure that the Navy's fighter aircraft have combat capability with a broader range of fuel, so if something happens to the traditional petroleum fuel supply, they can operate on other fuels. That is about combat impact; that is about strategic flexibility.

But to your point about the Quadrennial Defense Review, I really do want to make this point. It is not just official policy of the Department of Defense that national security is a risk; it is not just the consensus of these 16 retired admirals and generals and many others who have no skin in the game, commandants in the Marine Corps, chiefs of staff of the Army who sign their names to this. I represent an organization with over 1,500 people who served on the front lines, soldiers and civilians.

What we have seen with our own eyes tells us these dynamics are real. When I was serving in Afghanistan the going rate to fire 107-millimeter Chinese rocket at me and my paratroopers was $10. The people taking that money were farmers whose crops wouldn't grow. Now, the guy giving them the money, that was the guy who we were in the country to capture or kill. He is not doing it because he is poor; he is a sworn enemy of the United States. But why are we making his job easier by failing to address the underlying conditions that allow him to recruit? And making my job harder by giving me more people to fight?

If you have walked those hills and lived those dynamics, there is nothing abstract or theoretical about the impact of flooding and drought and famine. Of course, people who can't feed their kids are going to turn to violence. And when they get organized in groups and start killing each other, that is called war.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say one thing. I am disturbed by a lot of the testimony I have heard today. If we are talking about religious values and Judeo-Christian values, we are talking about the Golden Rule, which is love one another as you would love to be loved; treat one another as you would like to be treated; love one another with all our hearts and souls. Individualism, as you talk about, has nothing to do with that basic Judeo-Christian value. That is why we care about what policies we pass as a Nation and how they affect one another. We cannot live isolated lives and not care about effects.

So when someone is talking about moving this country toward a renewable future, where we aren't polluting our neighbors' territories, our neighbors' States, anything burned in the Midwest, it dumps all the toxins on New York State. There are communities that have cancer in the numbers for children and women because of toxins, because of what we do somewhere else in the country.

So please, as we debate these issues, and we are going to talk about values, let's talk about our founding principles of this country. We have always believed that our democracy is strongest when we care about the least among us.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.

Senator Booker.

Senator BOOKER. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this hearing. I was a Mayor for 8 years of an inner city, and I had no time for philosophy besides reading, and I had the practicality of having to balance budgets and deliver services. I often talked to my Republican friends, who I worked in partnership with during my time, and said there was no government leader that cut government more than I did. I cut 25 percent of my work force while I was there; no government in New Jersey. The State, 21 counties, 565 municipalities. I partnered with big banks like Goldman Sachs, and unions to bring about Newark, New Jersey's biggest economic development boom in 60 years, bringing in billions and billions of dollars in development, new hotels, jobs, and the like.

I am a pragmatist, a fierce pragmatist. And what is outrageous to me is people who want to preach the free market. But what they are really defending is a perversion of the free market like at colossal costs. We know there are things called negative externalities when it comes to business, and the challenge we have right now is we are allowing businesses and corporations to pass on costs to society. This Government spends billions and billions of dollars, this committee, brownfields clean up, Superfund clean up. Billions of dollars. I applied for these grants from Government to clean up the costs of businesses who did not assume their costs.

I have one of the most polluted rivers in America in the Passaic River that we just approved billions of dollars to clean up the negative externalities of corporations that have, in a sense, going to philosophy, are poisoning the commons. The get all you can, pursue what you want philosophy is clearly destroying the commons in our country.

And this, Pastor, which you so eloquently write about in your testimony, is the agony that I see every single day, that in a global, knowledge-based economy, the most valuable natural resource any country has is not gas or oil or coal, it is the genius of our children. We are squandering that natural resource in ways that are greater than the oil spill in the Gulf Coast or any spill off the coast of California.

The No. 1 reason my kids miss school, the No. 1 reason my children in Newark, Camden, Passaic, Patterson miss school is because of the environmental toxins that cause them illnesses and ailments which our corporations outsourcing onto them, ranging from asthma to lead paint poisoning. I now have a city where nature has been so corrupted where I live, and I tell you right now, 100 Senators, I don't know anyone that goes back to their home in a census track that is in poverty.

So my community can't dig in their soil because it is poisoned with lead. We have to use planters above because of negative externalities from corporations. We can't fish in our water. All the clams, all the fish taken away. Can't breathe the air because of toxins in the air are causing epidemic asthma rates.

What happens to a people that have been divorced from nature because of these negative externalities? The costs are clear. We can measure this data in terms of what it means to have lost productivity of children. Millions and millions of lost school days and work days because of these environmental toxins. So I believe in the free market, but what we have right now is a perversion of that market. And what you are doing, what we can't measure is the lost genius of our children.

Now, I know Memphis. My brother lives in Memphis. Ain't that much different than Newark. And what is tragic to me is that the children of your city and my city, there is just as much genius there as in our wealthiest communities. That lost potential, that lost productivity, that lost artistry because of this philosophy that is a perversion of the free market.

It is insulting to me that we are letting these costs consistently be passed on. We are not a Nation of individual rugged individualism. Rugged individualism didn't get us to the Moon, it didn't map the human genome. It is our genius cooperation and partnership one to another. I know in our Declaration of Independence we recognize this interdependency, this need for each other when we talk about pledging to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. Sacred honor.

So, Pastor, in the 10 seconds I have left, God bless you for advocating true free market capitalism because the value of the children in your city, the environmental impact, what is it doing to the most precious resource God has ever created? Not coal in the ground, not gas released by fracking. The most valuable natural resource, what has it done?

Rev. NELSON. It is damaging whole communities of people. And I believe that as we read our holy books, the reality is that community is the beginning of formation and how we are formed not only in the home, but how we are formed in the extended community itself. And when we find individuals who are dying of cancer too early, when we are looking at matriarchs and patriarchs of families who are struggling with what it means to work and come home and develop all kinds of sicknesses and illnesses, it deals with not only the psyche of parents of children and how they raise them, but it also deals with the fabric of whole families.

We are struggling with what that means. It is not just the issue of the physical illnesses but also what it does to a person mentally, who cannot work, who cannot provide for their families, who are finding themselves struggling with energy and having sustaining energy in their own lives to be able to go to work every day and come home.

This has a devastating effect upon whole populations of people, but more importantly it has a devastating effect upon families. And when we talk about building family life and the life of the United States of America, one of the realities is when parents come home sick, when they come home struggling, when they can't work, and then when their children can't go to school, and they are poor and don't have the levels of assistance to either take care of those family members or those children, it puts a whole cycle of people in poverty and they remain there.

Senator BOOKER. Thank you, sir.

Senator INHOFE. I thank the panel.

Against my better judgment, my Ranking Member has asked for 3 minutes to close, and I will grant that as the Chairman of this committee, but it will be only 3 minutes, and I will be following with 3 minutes. Then we will be adjourning.

Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thanks.

I will never forget this hearing. First, we have a philosopher who wants Senator Whitehouse to resign, Senator Whitehouse who is working every day to stop carbon pollution and save lives. We have a philosopher telling us that Senator Whitehouse should resign.

Then we have Father Sirico, who is proud to ask for more money from polluting corporations right here at the Environment Committee. He asked for more money from polluting corporations. Then we have a retired general who turns on the DOD. We have a Republican Senator who compares taking political money from polluters to taking political money from environmental advocates.

And we have another Republican Senator, this is unbelievable, blaming President Obama for slow economic growth, when the average yearly job growth under President Obama is 1.3 million, OK, average yearly growth of jobs, compared to 160,000 year under George W. Bush, who actually didn't create one new private sector job.

Now, look, to many people's delight and some people's sadness, I won't be here that much longer, but I have to tell you this hearing—I thank my Chairman for it because we have a job to do. This is the Environment Committee. We need to get back to what our mission is. I was here when Republicans and Democrats worked together. I mean, Senator Booker is trying so hard to do it today, and he is making progress and all of us are.

But that was the norm. The days of John Warner, the days of John Chaffee, the days when we could look across the aisle and realize maybe we didn't have every Democrat, but we sure picked up a few Republicans, it is gone. It is gone. The very people who testified and said climate change is real, we have to do something about it, when I took the gavel, which was so lovely, in 2008, those people have all changed; they are gone. They either quit or they are not around. Why? The insidious role of dirty money in politics, sometimes it is secret, sometimes it is not so secret.

Father, I respect you. You are right there. Give me more corporate money. Oh, yes, I take money from the Koch brothers, just a little. Oh, I take money from Exxon, but it is just a little. How can you not have a compass inside that tells you it is not right, that there is a conflict there, when you testify on the environment in front of the Environment Committee and don't realize that you have a conflict?

So let's get back, Mr. Chairman, to the days when we had cooperation on this.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Senator Boxer.

Now I want to take my 3 minutes.

First of all, if you are talking about why is it you never hear from this side about Tom Steyer, who said he is going to put $100 million to try to resurrect the issue of global warming? Why is it we keep hearing the same thing from the individuals over here

that the science is settled, the science is settled, when in fact it is not settled?

Why is it we hear from people over here that when you have an increase in the emissions it produces warmer weather, when in fact, starting in 1895, that was the first time that they came along and declared and used the word another ice age is coming? Then that changed in 1918, then in 1945. It happens that we went into a cooling period in 1995. Now, 1995 was the year of the greatest increase in the release, this was right after the war, of greenhouse gases, and it precipitated not a warm period, but a cold period.

Last, I would say I was kind of going for memory, so I haven't looked it up, but I do know, and it seems to be truer today when I read I think it is Romans 1:25, when they said we will come to the point when we will be worshiping not the creator, but the creation. I think we have come to that point.

Now, I have a minute and a half left over, and I think perhaps, Father, you were attacked a little bit more than the rest. You take about 45 seconds.

Then the same with you, Mr. Epstein. And if there is anything left over, General, you got it.

Fr. SIRICO. Thank you, Senator. I am from Brooklyn, so I can take an attack. I can also give one, too. And let me just point out how, again, I want to be polite, the word is disingenuous to have people quote to me parts of a papal encyclical or a papal elocution like the sermon that was delivered here and only choose the parts that are not magisterial parts, certainly things that he said as a man who is reflecting on these things, but not those very parts that are key to his pontificate, namely the things having to do not just with life vis-à-vis the environment, but life in the womb, which you have opposed. And the disingenuity of all of this is of great concern to me.

The question that Senator Booker raises about externalities is an exactly precise and good question and is better resolved by a clearer definition of the right of private property; not by obscuring the right of private property or controlling it or taxing it but precisely to define it more clearly so that people are responsible for those externalities and the vulnerable don't suffer from it.

I respect the time.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

The time has expired. We are adjourned, and I thank very much our witnesses for coming and exposing themselves to this type of treatment.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m. the committee was adjourned.]

○