

The Military's Top Priority: Global Warming?

The Obama administration puts environmentalist ideology over defense needs

By Allen West and David Grantham

Summary: Some believe that the U.S. military should focus its attention on such threats as ISIS, Al Qaeda, and Putin's Russia. But the Obama administration sees Global Warming/"climate change" as the greatest threat facing the country. Now the armed forces are being instructed to include "green" thinking in every aspect of their operations. Soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen must go along or be considered derelict in their duty. Feeling safer yet?



The President, at the Coast Guard commencement, declares opposition to "climate change" beliefs to be dereliction of duty; the Great Green Fleet, running in part on animal fat.

The Pentagon is ordering the top brass to incorporate climate change into virtually everything they do, from testing weapons to training troops to war planning to joint exercises with allies. . . It orders the establishment of a new layer of bureaucracy—a wide array of "climate change boards, councils and working groups" to infuse climate change into "programs, plans and policies." . . . The directive is loaded with orders to civilian leaders and officers on specifically how counter-climate change strategy is to permeate planning.

—Rowan Scarborough, *Washington Times*, February 7, 2016

Setting our national defense priorities based on the latest liberal *problème du jour* is bad public policy, significantly impeding the defense of the nation. That is exactly what the Department of Defense is doing with its directive on Global Warming/"climate change."

The directive, "Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience," originated with Frank Kendall, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and

Logistics. [*Editor's note:* Kendall, a lawyer and a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, has served on the boards of directors of Amnesty International, the Tahirih Justice Center, and Human Rights First (formerly the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights). Prior to his appointment to his current job at the Defense Department, he was a prominent opponent of the use by the U.S. government and its allies of practices that some consider torture. He traveled to the Guantanamo Bay detention camps as a "human rights monitor" in the case of Al Qaeda paymaster Ibrahim Ahmed Mahmoud al Qosi and in other cases. Al Qosi, by the way, entered into a plea bargain in 2010 under which a military jury recommended he serve 14 years in prison. In 2012, the Obama administration sent him back to Sudan. In 2014, Al Qosi reportedly joined AQIP

(Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula), and in 2015 he appeared in an AQIP video. —SJA]

The directive requires our defense sector to incorporate "climate change impacts into plans and operations and integrate DoD guidance and analysis in

May 2016

The Military's Top Priority:
Global Warming?
Page 1

Obama's weather war
puts America at risk
Page 4

The Green Fleet, chicken fat,
and Hillary Rodham
Page 5

Green Notes
Page 8

Combatant Command planning to address climate change-related risks and opportunities across the full range of military operations, including steady-state campaign planning and operations and contingency planning.”

The Department of Defense directive is part of the overall view of the Obama administration that, as the directive states, “climate change constitutes a serious threat to global security, an immediate risk to our national security.” Under the directive, the Pentagon must incorporate consequences of “climate change” into every level of its operations. All-encompassing and far-reaching, the directive puts enormous pressure on officials of all levels and specialties to perform certain tasks in response to a concept that is ambiguous at best. That’s a major problem. Defense officials are expected to provide “deliverables”—tangible results—in pursuit of a policy that has no measureable outcomes.

Making the situation even more absurd, the administration has failed to show how this modification of Pentagon war-planning would actually affect the climate. The temperature has risen an estimated 0.8 degrees over the last 150 years as the earth has emerged from the period known as the Little Ice Age. No one has established that the addition of an extra level of review processes in military operational planning will prevent climate change. There has been no cost-benefit

analysis of this idea. Dakota Wood, senior research fellow on defense programs at the Heritage Foundation, said that he understands the intent behind the guidance, but that it includes “a wide variety of issues with no explication or context that enables the offices mentioned to differentiate and prioritize activities and efforts across time or intensity.” Despite this utter lack of clarity, the administration remains determined to mitigate the effects of climate change on civilization through military regulations.

Unfocused concern

In the glossary of the DoD directive, climate change is defined as “variations in average weather conditions that persist over multiple decades or longer that encompass increases and decreases in temperature, shifts in precipitation, and changing risk of certain types of severe weather events.” Climate change, defined that way, has been going on for billions of years. Even during the time of human civilization, the world’s climate system has shifted, sometimes dramatically. From the rise of the Egyptians to the fall of the Mayans, naturally occurring climate change has created and destroyed empires. It has altered geography, unleashed diseases, and diverted the course of human history—and it was doing so long before the invention of factories, power plants, or SUVs.

Clearly, natural climate change is not what this directive is meant to address. In this context, “climate change” refers to temperature increases that occur as human activities add greenhouse gases to the air. Such gases are a small part of the earth’s atmosphere, but they are critical in making the planet habitable—keeping the earth from becoming a frozen rock in space. The debate on this issue generally focuses on the degree to which human activity has changed the climate. Here’s the climate change argument: that greenhouse gases, particularly atmospheric carbon dioxide, have increased due to human activities, including the burning of carbon-based fuels (oil, coal, natural gas) along with the deforestation that ac-

companies economic development, and that these higher levels of greenhouse gases have caused and are causing Global Warming.

Interestingly, greenhouse gases make up no more than two percent of the earth’s atmosphere. And of that two percent, 95 percent is that greenhouse gas called water.

Carbon dioxide, the most often mentioned greenhouse gas, is about one part in 2,500 in the atmosphere and is exhaled naturally by humans and other animals. Human activities such as industry, power generation, and transportation contribute about 3.4 percent of annual carbon dioxide emissions. It is claimed that small increases in annual carbon dioxide emissions, whether from humans or any other source, can lead to a large carbon dioxide accumulation over time.

Climate change alarmists worry that Global Warming will cause droughts, floods, hurricanes of greater intensity, coastal flooding, and the extinction of polar bears and other species that cannot adapt to change. Neither the number nor the strength of hurricanes has increased outside the natural range of variability. Natural variability has produced both more frequent and longer droughts in the past than we experience today. And overall, worldwide weather-related deaths have declined dramatically over the past eight decades.

The war against “climate change” is actually about controlling human activity, particularly economic activity. As world leaders prepared to meet in Paris to negotiate a treaty that would supposedly help solve the problem, Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, said, “This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution.”

That “economic development model” to which she referred, the one we’re

Editor: Steven J. Allen
Publisher: Scott Walter
Address: 1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1480
Phone: (202) 483-6900
E-mail: sallen@CapitalResearch.org
Website: CapitalResearch.org

Green Watch is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity. Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

intentionally changing? That would be capitalism.

Solutions in search of a problem

The Defense Department directive requires the response of defense officials from every facet of the military structure. Those in acquisition of weapons systems and platforms, personnel training, surveillance, and reconnaissance up through the Joint Chiefs of Staff must collaborate “with allies and partners to optimize joint exercises and war games including factors contributing to geopolitical and socioeconomic instability.” The military has found itself expending manpower and money to find solutions for issues with no discernable problem or that have no measurable desired outcome put forth by the administration.

The nebulous search for outcomes and deliverables has led the U.S. military to engage in costly programs that provide no real sense of purpose and offer no solution that would likely have an impact on climate variations. For example, the U.S. government continues to push for energy production that is “cleaner”—actually, low-carbon or low-greenhouse-gas, which is not the same thing as “cleaner”—in places where U.S. military remains engaged in warfighting activity. Instead, of channeling money towards military operations, the Pentagon finds itself trying to satisfy the administration’s ambiguous “climate change” policy.

A November 2015 *Foreign Policy* report explained how a “compressed natural gas automobile filling station in Afghanistan that should have cost about \$500,000 ended up costing \$43 million, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR).” The problem was made worse because the natural gas station is unusable to most Afghans. Obviously, most cars in Afghanistan run on petrol (gasoline) or diesel, not natural gas. “SIGAR noted that the cost of converting a car to use natural gas is \$700 per car in Afghanistan . . . and the average Afghan citizen’s annual salary was \$670, according to the

World Bank.” This incident illustrates the massive gap in understanding that divides theory and implementation within the U.S. government.

The Pentagon also faces a statutory mandate from the National Defense Authorization Act of 2007 requiring it to “incorporate renewable energy in their DOD facility consumption, up to at least 25 percent of total usage by 2025.” On January 20, 2016, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Navy announced that the John C. Stennis Carrier Strike Group will be powered by more than 77 million gallons of “blended fuel that includes biodiesel produced from beef fat and tallow collected from Midwest beef packing plants.” A United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) press release called the ships the ‘Great Green Fleet.’ [See the article in this issue by Steven J. Allen.] The Obama administration has awarded contracts totaling \$16 million to three biofuel plants located in Illinois, Nebraska and California.

The goal of reducing the so-called emission footprint has little to no bearing on a nation’s ability to defend itself and its allies. Indeed, some experts argue that biofuels present more problems than solutions. Ike Kiefer, naval aviator and instructor at the US Air Force Air War College, wrote:

Imagine if the U.S. military developed a weapon that could threaten millions around the world with hunger, accelerate global warming, incite widespread instability and revolution, provide our competitors and enemies with cheaper energy, and reduce America’s economy to a permanent state of recession. What would be the sense and the morality of employing such a weapon? We are already building that weapon—it is our biofuels program.

He went on to explain that biofuels have “an anemic power density of only 0.3 watts per square meter.” According to Robert Bryce of *Bloomberg View*, comparatively, “modern solar photovoltaic panels are about 6 watts per square

meter, or 20 times more; an average oil well producing 10 barrels per day is 27 watts per square meter; and an average nuclear plant is more than 50 watts per square meter.” That is not all.

The low areal power density of biofuels cannot be overcome, because it’s due to the limits of photosynthesis. Chlorophyll is the preeminent converter of sunlight into energy, but it does so at its own pace. The low power density of biofuels means that vast expanses of land are needed to produce even small quantities of them. For example, Kiefer notes that if we wanted to replace all of the oil used for transportation in the U.S. with corn-based ethanol, it would require about 700 million acres to be planted in nothing but corn. That would be 37 percent of the continental U.S., and more than “triple the current amount of annually harvested cropland.

To make matters worse, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s own data showed that ethanol actually boosts key air pollutants by as much as seven percent. And the land needed to maintain production levels necessary to support a viable military force are simply outlandish. Supporters argued that by 2050, the United States will retrieve 23 percent of its total energy from “non-cropland biofuels.” Robert Bryce explains that such a goal would require that the U.S. government set aside “about 219 million acres of land, an area the size of Texas, New York and Ohio combined.”

The military cannot depend on such politically driven solutions that cannot succeed. America’s national security is at stake.

Former U.S. Rep. Allen West (R-Fla.) is a retired Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army, who served as a battalion commander in Iraq. He is the executive director and vice chairman of the National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA). Dr. David Grantham, a veteran of conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, is a senior fellow at NCPA.

Editor's note: In an article on the Capital Research Center website, Col. West and Dr. Grantham look at steps the U.S. military should take, instead of focusing on environmental follies: Deny the enemy sanctuary; interdict enemy lines of communication; win the information war; and reduce the enemy's sphere of influence. Go to [CapitalResearch.org](https://capitalresearch.org/?p=19053) (<https://capitalresearch.org/?p=19053>). —SJA

Obama's weather war puts America at risk

By Tim Maier

ISIS is not the Number 1 security threat facing America. Neither is Al Qaeda, or Iran, or Putin's Russia, or China's communist regime. Our nation's top national security threat is the weather.

President Barack Obama made that clear in November 2013 when he issued Executive Order 13653, which required the U.S. government to tackle climate change as an "urgent and growing threat to our national security." It created a Council on Climate Preparedness and Resilience, co-chaired by the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, with membership that includes the Deputy Secretary of Defense and his or her counterpart in the Army Corps of Engineers, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This put the military (and other national security professionals) on notice: You must accept the ideology of Global Warming/"climate change." If you're in the military and you fail to obey, you could be guilty of dereliction of duty, and you could have a short career.

Last year, in a commencement address at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy before 218 newly commissioned officers, the President warned against "denying it or refusing to deal with it."

Climate change is one of those most severe threats. This is not just a problem for countries on the coasts or for certain regions of the world. Climate

change will impact every country on the planet. No nation is immune. So I am here today to say that climate change constitutes a serious threat to global security, an immediate risk to our national security. And make no mistake; it will impact how our military defends our country. So we need to act and we need to act now.

After all, isn't that the true hallmark of leadership? When you're on deck, standing your watch, you stay vigilant, you plan for every contingency. If you see storm clouds gathering or dangerous shoals ahead you don't just sit back and do nothing. You take action to protect your ship, to keep your crew safe. Anything less is negligence. It is a *dereliction of duty*. So too with climate change. Denying it or refusing to deal with it *endangers our national security*. It undermines the readiness of our forces.

Chuck Hagel, then the Secretary of Defense, called climate change "a threat multiplier" that "has the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today—from infectious disease to terrorism." (The *Wall Street Journal* editorialized: "Americans who might die at the hands of the Islamic State won't care that Mr. Hagel is mobilizing against melting glaciers.")

ISIS vs. Mother Nature

What is the effect on the battlefield of such "green" thinking?

Consider: ISIS funds its terror organization by selling about \$40 million worth of oil a month, according to Reason magazine. Acting Treasury Undersecretary Adam Szubin said ISIS has earned \$500 million from oil sales since December 2015, along with \$500 million and \$1 billion from Iraqi and Syrian bank lootings and "many millions more" extorted from people under its control.

Yet, despite the importance of oil revenue to ISIS, "We didn't go after oil wells—actually hitting oil wells that ISIS controls because we didn't want to do environmental damage, and we didn't want

to destroy that infrastructure," former CIA deputy director and acting director Michael Morell told Charlie Rose in an interview on PBS.

(After the Paris attacks on November 13, the administration shifted its position and bombed more than 100 tanker trucks on November 16.)

The February 2016 directive infuriated Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who pointed out that the administration was more concerned about "climate change" than ISIS. "There is no strategy [to defeat ISIS], and anybody who says there is, I'd like to hear what it is," said McCain. "Because it certainly is not apparent. Right now we are seeing these horrible reports in Palmyra, they're executing people and leaving their bodies in the streets. . . . Meanwhile the President of the United States is saying that the biggest problem we have is climate change."

The Federalist Policy Project slammed the February 2016 directive: "What happened to fighting ISIS? What happened to restoring funding to a military that has the lowest troop levels with the lowest morale since before World War II? No. That's not important, apparently."

According to the "Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience" directive, the military can maintain its effectiveness only if "green" policies are observed, run by layers of "green" bureaucracy such as climate change boards, councils, and working groups. All of these groups are to be employed to infuse climate change into "programs, plans and policies."

The Department of Defense must "adapt current and future operations to address the impacts of climate change in order to maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military. Mission planning and execution must include anticipating and managing any risks that develop as a result of climate change to build resilience."

These ideas must be reflected in—

► Weapons buying and testing of weapons systems across the life cycle (in other words, considering environmental effects

over the long run)

- ▶ Training ranges and capabilities
- ▶ Fuel types and uses
- ▶ Defense intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance, and
- ▶ Defense education and training
- ▶ Joint training with allies to assess the security risks posed by climate change

Critics charge this directive creates an expensive national security nightmare while putting the lives of American troops in jeopardy.

Bankrupting the Pentagon

James A. Lyons, a retired U.S. Navy admiral who was the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, said, “The climate change proponents are cut from the same cloth as the social engineers who have never served in the military and never will, and who will never bear any of the responsibilities of the negative impact they have forced on our military forces. They particularly ignore the unnecessary military casualties suffered as a result of these ill-conceived directives. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should continue to take a strong position against these debilitating directives, which adversely affect our military forces’ readiness and capabilities. Nothing less is acceptable.”

He called it a financial disaster. “With the bloated bureaucracy we already have, we certainly cannot afford another one, particularly with the tight budget crisis we have,” Lyons wrote in the *Washington Times*.

Consider the effect of “green” thinking on one of the basic elements of military operations: fuel.

The RAND Corporation, a think tank that has long provided military advice to the U.S. government, reported that “the use of alternative, rather than petroleum derived, fuels offers no direct military benefits.”

Yet the Air Force will be forced to spend \$59 a gallon for renewable jet fuel and \$67 per gallon for F-22 Raptor fuel. The Navy will spend \$27 per gallon for biofuels and a whopping \$424 per gal-

lon for 20,000 gallons of “sustainable” diesel fuel.

The military was ordered to spend \$4 billion of its budget during a four-year span on biofuels, solar panels, and electric vehicles. Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, argued against that expenditure when the military is facing devastating cuts. The Pentagon needs to be fiscally responsible and not use fuel that costs four times as much as “fossil fuels,” he said.

Paul Driessen, co-author of *Cracking Big Green* and a contributor to *Green Watch*, called the February 2016 directive “sheer lunacy.” “It means bureaucrats and new layers of armed forces bureaucracies will waste time and money, and ignore real weapons and training issues. It means soldiers and sailors must now focus less on real natural and humanitarian disasters, and more on ‘climate refugee crises’ that exist only in computer models, ivory tower studies and White House press releases. It could affect combat readiness and morale, make our warriors less prepared for warfare, and put them at greater risk of injury and death.”

Timothy W. Maier served as managing editor of the Baltimore Examiner and editor of investigations at the American Media Institute.

The Green Fleet, chicken fat, and Hillary Rodham

By Steven J. Allen

Remember when Dylan sang at Clinton’s first inaugural [in 1993] in front of the Lincoln Memorial as fighter jets flew overhead in battle formation? Actor-activist Ron Silver saw those jets roar across the sky, and, recalling the ’60s days of rage in that same place, he was troubled. But (after all, he was invited) it soon passed. A sudden realization reconciled him to the scene: “Those are *our* planes now,” he thought.

—Thomas de Zengotita
in *Harper’s* magazine

When the Left is put in charge of the

military, the military will come to reflect left-wing values.

Many ideas for saving energy or for obtaining energy from alternative sources may have merit. It may be a good idea, say, to use roll-up solar blankets to power Marines’ GPS devices in Afghanistan, or to coat the hulls of ships with “anti-fouling” coatings to reduce drag from barnacles. But when the armed forces are required to carry out an agenda based on ideology, rather than science and logistics and the needs of the military, how can we be sure that any given policy is in furtherance of national security rather than politics?

Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) once noted the trade-offs involved in “imposing a green agenda on the Department of Defense”: “Which would you rather have? Would you rather spend \$4 billion on Air Force Base solar panels, or would you rather have 28 new F-22s or 30 F-25s or modernized C-130s? Would you rather have \$64.8 billion spent on pointless global warming efforts or would you rather have more funds put towards modernizing our fleet of ships, aircrafts and ground vehicles to improve the safety of our troops and help defend our nation against the legitimate threats that we face?”

The Obama administration has its own priorities, unfortunately—using the armed forces to promote environmentalist projects like the Great Green Fleet.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, a former governor of Mississippi and ambassador to Saudi Arabia, declared in 2009 that one of his goals was the creation of the Great Green Fleet, a carrier strike group that would run on “sustainable” forms of energy—actually, a combination of nuclear power and biofuel/standard fuel blends. (The term “sustainable energy,” which is ill-defined and inaccurate, generally refers to forms of energy not based on carbon.)

By the standard definition, a carrier strike group includes an aircraft carrier and the ships and planes that travel with it: at least one cruiser, a destroyer squadron

of at least two destroyers and/or frigates, and a carrier air wing of 65 to 70 aircraft. It may also include submarines, attached logistics ships, and a supply ship. There are currently 11 carriers—accordingly, 11 such groups—in the U.S. Navy.

The carrier strike group was dubbed the Great Green Fleet (GGF) in reference to President Theodore Roosevelt's Great White Fleet, which included 16 battleships and circled the world in 1907-09 to demonstrate that the United States had become a major power on the world's seas.

The GGF sailed in July 2012 during the RIMPAC (Rim of the Pacific) exercise, the world's largest international maritime warfare exercise, conducted with U.S. allies such as Australia, Canada, and Japan. The carrier, *USS Nimitz*, was nuclear powered. Otherwise, the group ran on a 50/50 mix of petroleum and biofuel derived from cooking oil and algae. The group is set to deploy fully this year.

Government officials openly proclaim that the GGF is intended to promote the biofuel industry. *National Defense* magazine reported in 2009: "Mabus is confident that if the Navy and Marine Corps create a demand for biofuels, the market will respond by increasing production and lowering costs." Mabus said, "A lot of these fuels are already out there. But there's no demand for them. . . . I'm hoping that by providing demand, it will incentivize industry." That's the standard rationale for crony capitalism, that, if the government declares winners and losers in a rigged marketplace—if it decides who gets rich and who goes broke—the benefits will eventually trickle down to the rest of society.

Federal Radio News noted in 2011 that "The Navy, along with the Agriculture and Energy Departments, want to build a domestic alternative-energy industry that can stand on its own two feet." Said Mabus: "The entire goal is to establish a viable private industry."

That year, Coral Davenport and Yochi J. Dreazen, in the *National Journal*,

focused on the supposed upside of military intervention in the development of sources of energy:

Renewable fuels are far more expensive than conventional ones, and it's not clear when (or if) prices will fall enough to compete with petroleum. The success of the entire effort depends on the Pentagon's ability to spur creation of an industry capable of producing enormous quantities of renewable energy despite largely unproven technologies and business models. The Defense Department "is in the process of playing a catalytic role with renewable energy," said Arati Prabhakar, a former director of microelectronics for DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency] who now chairs the Energy Department's Efficiency and Renewables Advisory Committee. "They won't be the biggest, most important market over time. But for the newest technologies, those first few percentage points of market share are tremendously important."

The rewards of sparking an industry that would transform the entire U.S. energy economy could be tremendous.

Of course, this approach leads to the system we have now, in which politicians (mostly liberal Democrats, plus some Republicans) depend for support on industries that can exist only with taxpayer subsidies and with mandates (requirements that certain products be used or that competing products be avoided). The richer that businessmen in those industries get, the more money they can kick back to supportive politicians; the more employees those business people have, the bigger the base of support they can provide those politicians.

Once the government starts handing out special favors, the favors and the lobbying metastasize. Consider the following, an actual press release, not a parody:

On April 5, 2016, the biofuel trade associations Advanced Biofuels Business Council, Algae Biomass

Organization, Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), Growth Energy, National Biodiesel Board, and Renewable Fuels Association sent a letter to House and Senate Leaders asking for a multiyear extension of advanced biofuel tax credits. The six organizations are specifically asking that the Second Generation Biofuel Producer Tax Credit, the Special Depreciation Allowance for Second Generation Biofuel Plant Property, the Biodiesel and Renewable Diesel Fuels Credit, the Alternative Fuel and Alternative Fuel Mixture Excise Tax Credit, and the Alternative Fuel Vehicle Refueling Property [credit] through the Protecting Americans From Tax Hikes Act of 2015 are extended before they expire at the end of 2016. Other energy production tax credits have been extended, and the biofuel trade associations argue that extending certain energy tax provisions and not others creates investment uncertainty across the energy sector, and puts biofuel producers at a disadvantage.

This mess was utterly predictable, as was the failure of various "alternative energy" projects such as Solyndra. Solyndra, a solar-panel company co-founded by a major Obama donor, received \$535 million in loan guarantees, but went belly-up, leaving taxpayers on the hook. Other failures include A123, Abound Solar, and Ener1, but countless other such ventures continue on life support—successful, one supposes, in the sense that someone in a persistent vegetative state for 20 years is alive. Today, after billions of dollars in losses to taxpayers, "alternative energy" companies are dependent on grants, mandates, special-interest tax breaks and other subsidies, and other forms of corporate welfare. Don't believe me? Threaten to take away that artificial support, and listen to them howl that you're destroying their businesses.

The success of "alternative energy" is always right around the corner, the lob-

byists and politicians promise. Soon, the businesses will be able to stand on their own, if we just fund them a little longer through our high taxes and high electricity rates. These predictions always fail. Usually, the “alternative” producers can’t even meet their goals with all the help we give them. According to the liberal Brookings Institution in a 2012 report, “In 2007, Congress set a goal of producing two billion gallons of advanced biofuels within five years. But today, firms can only generate around 40 million gallons of the stuff—98 percent less than the original plan’s total.”

Grease is the word

That 98 percent failure in the advanced biofuels program didn’t stop companies from pursuing the biofuels bounty that comes from the government’s push for a “green” military. For example, Tyson Foods, the Arkansas-based meat company known mainly for its chicken products, got into the biofuels business.

To cash in, Tyson partnered with two different companies—ConocoPhillips, co-processing Tyson’s vegetable, beef, pork, and poultry fat/grease with hydrocarbon feedstock, and Syntroleum, which refined vegetable fat and Tyson’s animal fat into diesel and jet fuel. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, the raw materials for the latter partnership came from “chicken fat, beef tallow, and a range of greases and oils . . . leftovers from Tyson’s meat-processing plants and other food-processing factories and restaurants.”

The Associated Press reported in 2007 that “Tyson Chief Executive Richard Bond said the joint venture with Syntroleum was part of Tyson’s effort to become a leading player in the renewable energy business.” The Tyson/Syntroleum project, known as Dynamic Fuels, attracted, for its bio-refinery in Louisiana, \$100 million in Gulf Opportunity Zone Bonds, issued through the Louisiana Public Facilities Authority.

The Tyson/ConocoPhillips deal was supposed to have the capacity to generate

175 million gallons of diesel annually. But it folded in mid-2009, when the dollar-a-gallon credit from taxpayers was cut to 50 cents, which meant that the venture was no longer economically viable.

Two years ago, REG [Renewable Energy Group] Synthetic Fuels acquired Syntroleum and Tyson’s share of Dynamic Fuels. According to a press release, “REG paid Tyson approximately \$16.5 million in cash at closing and retired approximately \$13.5 million of Dynamic Fuels’ indebtedness to Tyson. REG has also agreed to make up to \$35 million in future payments to Tyson tied to product volumes at the Geismar [Louisiana] bio-refinery over a period of up to eleven and a half years.”

TalkBusiness.net/*The City Wire* (Arkansas) reported that “Tyson Foods is getting out of the \$150 million Dynamic Fuels venture the company spearheaded beginning in 2007 and has not lived up to its potential. The plant, which has sat idle since November 2012, won’t be Tyson’s Foods’ problem much longer as the meat giant has agreed to sell its 50% stake to Renewable Energy Group for an estimated \$65 million.”

Some might consider Tyson’s “green” efforts ironic. Environmentalists call Tyson one of the top polluters in America—worse than such objects of environmentalist derision as International Paper and Koch Industries. An Environment America report covering 2010-14 blamed Tyson for “more than seven times” the water pollution released by ExxonMobil.

If you follow politics and find the name “Tyson Foods” rings a bell, it might be because of its connection to Clinton corruption. Tyson Foods was the largest employer in Arkansas when Bill Clinton was elected governor. The company had major political interests in the state on a wide range of matters, including weight limits on its trucks, state loans (some \$9 million during Clinton’s governorship), the placement of Tyson employees on state boards, and Tyson being allowed to dump feces in people’s water supply. In-

vestigators believe that, as Bill was rising to the governorship, his wife, then known as Hillary Rodham, used a commodities account to launder money from Tyson, making it appear that the money represented an impossible \$98,540 “profit” on a \$1,000 “investment” in commodities.

In 1994, when the commodities deal was exposed, Mrs. Clinton was publicly defended by a White House spokesman, John Podesta, who said, “There was no impropriety. The only appearance [of impropriety] is being created by the *New York Times*.” Podesta, who founded the left-wing/“green” Center for American Progress, now chairs the Clinton presidential campaign.

Across America, companies are seeking to profit from the injection of environmentalist corruption into military thinking. That Tyson Foods was one of these companies should come as no surprise. When it comes to dealing with politicians, Tyson really knows how to grease the skids.

Dr. Steven J. Allen (J.D., Ph.D.) is Vice President & Chief Investigative Officer of the Capital Research Center, and editor of Green Watch.

GW

The Capital Research Center is a watchdog over politicians, bureaucrats, and special interests in Washington, D.C., and in all 50 states.

Please consider contributing to CRC, to help us in our important work.

And please remember CRC in your will and estate planning.

**Scott Walter
President**

GreenNotes

There's a reason the **U.S. Constitution** includes the **Interstate Commerce Clause**, which takes away from states their power to set rules for business transactions across state lines. Without that provision, a single state could impose rules that benefit its own businesses or its own ideological causes at the expense of businesses and consumers in other states. It could do so even if that meant impeding the flow of goods and services nationwide. That's what's on the verge of happening now, with **Vermont's** GMO labeling law, set to take effect in July. With a few exceptions, the law requires that all food with "genetically modified organisms" (GMOs) be labeled as such. But, rather than target in-state sellers of food, the law is aimed at manufacturers of food, wherever they operate. Because the food supply chain is integrated regionally, nationally, and internationally, it's impossibly expensive to create a separate system for Vermont, so the law's effect reaches across state lines.

Today, genetic modification is critically important in food production. By 2014, GMOs accounted for 85 percent of corn, 95 percent of sugar beets and canola, and 91 percent of soy, and 75 percent of food of all types sold on the U.S. market. **James E. McWilliams** reported that year in the liberal **Slate** that a GMO label law, if effective, "means that food producers would have to cleave the food system's supply chain to segregate and audit GMO and non-GMO ingredients. This would require them to prevent cross-pollination between GMO and non-GMO crops, store GMO and non-GMO ingredients in different locations, establish exclusive cleaning and transportation systems for both commodities, and hire contractors to audit storage facilities, processing plants, and final food products." Plus, there are the costs of keeping track of all this, and of the inevitable lawsuits.

The Vermont law includes the sort of special-interest breaks that one would expect. Some 90 percent of cheese is made using the enzyme FPC (fermentation-produced chymosin), which is produced by GMOs, but, since the organism itself is killed, FPC gets an exemption . . . which works out great for the dairymen of, say, Vermont. The **Corn Refiners Association** complains that maple syrup is likewise exempt. (When **Colorado** considered such a law, **Denver's Channel 9 News** noted the exemptions: "Manufacturers would have to label GMO bread, but not GMO cheese. Soda, but not beer. Candy, but not gum.")

GMO labelling is the new fad in states where politicians are particularly science-challenged. **Politico** reported in March that "Other states—most notably, **Massachusetts**—are close to passing their own GMO labeling laws, and lawmakers in **Connecticut** are trying to remove the trigger provision in that state's law, which requires them to wait until enough nearby states enact similar legislation. Lawmakers in **Maine** are also looking to ease their law's trigger requirement and enact GMO labeling sooner."

As we've reported previously, GMOs are safe—safer than "natural" foods, which have been genetically modified over hundreds or thousands of years. Corn was developed by **American Indians** from a type of grass; cows were developed by **Europeans** and **Asian Indians** from the now-extinct aurochs; and so on, for all domesticated plants and animals. (For more information, see *Green Watch* March 2014 and September 2015.) Experts have estimated the cost of targeting GMOs in this way at somewhere between negligible and \$1,100 per family per year, depending on the effectiveness of the anti-GMO campaign that's tied to the labels. **Andrew Kimbrell**, executive director of the **Center for Food Safety**, proclaimed: "If we have it labeled, then we can organize people not to buy it."

Last year, the restaurant chain **Chipotle** sought to profit from customers' ignorance by announcing that it would go "GMO-free." There was backlash, even from some liberals. "By Feeding Bogus GMO Fears, Chipotle Treats Customers Like Idiots," read a headline from **Reason** magazine. **NPR** followed up with an article headlined, "Why We Can't Take Chipotle's GMO Announcement All That Seriously," arguing that the popular restaurant was merely trying to pander to supposedly health-conscious customers. The liberal website **Vox** responded to Chipotle's announcement with a story headlined "Chipotle will stop serving GMO foods—despite zero evidence they're harmful to eat." Perhaps Chipotle should have been more concerned about actual threats to health rather than imaginary ones. After six outbreaks of *E. coli*, norovirus, and salmonella at the chain's restaurants in the last half of 2015, comparable-store sales were down almost 30 percent in the first quarter of the new year, and the company's stock received eight ratings downgrades from Wall Street analysts in the year's first four months.