RALPH NADER RADIO HOUR EP 279 TRANSCRIPT

Steve Skrovan: Welcome to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. My name is Steve Skrovan along with my co-host David Feldman. How are you today, David?

David Feldman: Good. Welcome back from your vacation.

Steve Skrovan: Thank you very much. Daddy's back. Now everything's going to be okay. I want everybody to calm down. And we also have the man of the hour, Ralph Nader. Hello, Ralph.

Ralph Nader: Hello, everybody.

Steve Skrovan: Great to have you here today, Ralph. And we have another great show today. The theme is energy. Specifically, we're going to be talking about the Green New Deal. First up, we'll be talking to someone who is one of the architects of the Green New Deal. Her name is Rhiana Gunn-Wright. She's the Policy Director at the think tank New Consensus where the plan was developed. And it's kind of a Manhattan Project aimed at transforming our energy system, if you haven't heard so far yet. The goals are essentially net-zero emissions while creating highwage jobs in the renewable energy sector. And Green New Deal legislation was introduced in Congress by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Senator Ed Markey. And it was quickly tagged "socialism" by the corporate right who began shouting how the Green New Dealers wanted to take away their hamburgers. And it was also deemed "pie in the sky" by corporate Democrats who worry about, I'm sure, alienating the fossil-fuel industry. And what many people don't know or may have forgotten, is that Ralph was an essential driver of not only the formation of the EPA, Nixon was always given credit for that; he just singed it because of the public pressure. But Ralph is also behind the Clean Air and Water Acts. So, the stakes are even higher now as the climate crisis approaches a point of no return. And we're going to delve into what the Green New Deal really means and how it can be achieved.

 That's just the first half of the show. We continue on this theme with our second guest, David Freeman. David Freeman was actually our first-ever outside guest on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. We have spoken to Mr. Freeman who is an expert on all forms of energy generation, having once run the Tennessee Valley Authority. And on this program, we've talked to Mr. Freeman mainly about nuclear power issues. Today, we're going to get his insights into the renewable energy economy and how that fits into the Green New Deal. And this is just me, but it's interesting to note that Ms. Gunn-Wright is 29 years old and David Freeman is 93 years old. So, the problem seems to be all the people in between those two ages. They're the ones with the real power and the ones that we need to convince.

And as always, we will cut away for a minute in the middle to catch up with our *Corporate Crime Reporter*, Russell Mokhiber. But without any further ado, let's take a deep dive into the Green New Deal. David?

David Feldman: Rhiana Gunn-Wright is the Policy Director for New Consensus, a think tank based in Chicago. A Rhodes Scholar, Ms. Gunn-Wright has also worked as a policy analyst for a number of organizations including the Detroit Health Department, and as a policy intern for First Lady Michelle Obama. At New Consensus, she recently co-authored the research paper entitled "The Green New Deal: Mobilizing for a Just, Prosperous and Sustainable Economy." It was

published in January of this year. Welcome to the Ralph Nader Radio Hour, Rhiana Gunn-Wright.

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Thank you. It's such a pleasure to be here.

 Ralph Nader: Welcome, indeed, Rhiana. When this resolution on the Green New Deal was introduced by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and longtime legislator and progressive. Senator Ed Markey, it outlined the 10-year mobilization plan with 5-key pillars. And, of course, the critics of the Green New Deal didn't understand that everything is connected to everything else. And you can't just deal with one pillar when there are four pillars not addressed, that can sweep the rug from under the fifth pillar. So the description for our listeners of the Green New Deal, and you can see how connected everything is, it's achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions, creating millions of good, high-wage jobs, investing in US infrastructure in industry, including weatherization of buildings, by the way--talk about jobs; securing clean air and water, climate and community resilience--that's local economies, cooperatives; healthy food, access to nature, and a sustainable environment for all, while promoting justice and equity in vulnerable communities. That's the description and you can see how it all fits together. Instead of one little regulation here and one little recycling there, the big picture is now before the American people. And what's amazing about it is that it envisions exactly the kind of efficiency and equity that our democratic society pretends to foster. It envisions a reset of a wasteful and inefficient economy-we'll get to that later--with an efficient and a healthy economy. I mean that should be a nobrainer, right? But we'll see in our conversation, listeners, why the vested interests prefer a wasteful economy as well as an economy that does damage because that produces a lot of profits. So how do you view the public reaction, Rhiana, to the Green New Deal?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: I actually think, overall, it's been really great. The really interesting thing is to see how much more quickly, I think folks that we either sort of earnestly or derisively call "everyday people," grasped the Green New Deal and grasped how the issues are connected. It seems like a lot of the strife that we've gotten has tended to be from sort of more, I don't know if I would call them establishment types, but sort of honestly, people whose job it is to think about these issues. And the idea that we would be talking about these things in a way that's intersectional, in a way that's interconnected, and then trying to deal with climate not just from a silo place, but as a sort of all-encompassing issue that requires some movement on all these different fronts. That's where we actually got the most grief. And I was a bit surprised, I have to say, by how much I think folk that I would think of often as very serious, struggle to really understand the foundation of the Green New Deal and what we're trying to do.

Ralph Nader: Well, what's interesting about the reaction that I observe is that there's a huge lack of knowledge among many members of Congress. It's deliberate, many of them Republicans, of course, and it recalls a statement that Ronald Reagan once made in Texas when he basically said, America grew great by producing energy, not by saving it. And that makes the real point here that once you demolish the arguments of the omnicidal waste in inefficiency industry around the world, you get down to why are they resisting it so much? Because you know corporations are supposed to be efficient, right? Corporations are supposed to not be damaging innocent people, right? They're supposed to be absorbing the rule of law. Well it's because when you waste a lot of energy in your car, you're having to buy more gasoline. When the Defense Department wastes all kinds of money with bloated contracts with Lockheed Martin, that's a lot more profit for Lockheed Martin. When you have fewer incidence of cancer and respiratory ailments, less is spent on doctors, drug companies, and hospitals--less sales, less profit. That's why I think it needs to be described as a historically necessary reset of the whole

political economy, and the emphasis on political because you've got a lot of work to do with members of Congress. I have so many questions to ask you here, Rhiana. First of all, when you put out a platform the way you did, the next step is building a coalition. You've had a lot of environmental groups and I hope labor, civil rights and other groups on board. Can you describe how that's developing?

100

101102

103

104 105 106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123124

125126

127

128

129

130

131132

133

134

135

136137

138139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Yeah. So, the Green New Deal was always intended to be backed by a big coalition and that's in part just because of the political realities of where we are right now as a country. We have one party that holds most of the power in state and federal government that has been intransigent on climate. They have denied that climate change is happening, and so the idea . . . I think we started from an idea that any effort to sort of build a policy that would appeal to them, when the entire approach to climate in the climate crisis is that it doesn't exist, isn't going to work because the scale of the problem is just too big and we didn't want to spend energy there. So, the only way that anything was going to get passed or get movement was through a large coalition. And so, the way I think that we formulated it was actually really thinking a lot about inside-outside organizing, and having different groups doing different things. So, sort of at the center of the Green New Deal is a bit of a triangle, so you have Sunrise is doing a lot of the movement part of it, really talking to communities, really engaging with the Youth Climate Movement; being a part of the Youth Climate Movement, interacting with some of the more traditionally green groups, the traditionally environmental groups. You have Justice Democrats that is all focused on electoral work. So, getting candidates to run on the Green New Deal, to talk about the Green New Deal, to get folks who are already elected, to talk about the Green New Deal whether because they're afraid of being primaried or whether it's because they just are really interested in the issue. And then you have New Consensus where I work that's working on the policy – the how do we actually accomplish these things bit of it. And our process is still also based on inside-outside. So, instead of just building a traditional think tank where you have a ton of inside expertise then you just work internally, we work a lot in consultation and cooperation with other groups because we believe that solutions exist and it is a matter of knitting together those solutions--making them a system. And honestly, consensus started on this little place of yes, this is about climate, but it is again, like you said, about resetting our economy because the ways that we have structured our economy, particularly since Reagan on, have been really problematic and really hurtful for Americans, and particularly Americans of color, which again is connected to racism and all of these other things. So, we've done a really good job of building and fortifying the structure that we have. And again, climate change is not just the result of burning fossil fuels. The fact that we can burn fossil fuels relies on having places that we can poison, which relies on us having people that we think of as less worthy or less deserving than other people who we can essentially dump our pollution on, right? All of these things are connected, and so with the climate crisis, I think we saw both an opportunity to stop, to the extent that's possible, the climate crisis, but also use it as a real time to think about how are we structuring our economy, how are we structuring our society, and how do we want to structure it to have the outcomes that we say all the time that we want--well actually deserve, because regardless, that's a really interesting thing about climate crisis and having to transition away from fossil fuels, which is that when you are transitioning your energy source, you change everything. It doesn't matter if you are just focused on the energy source; everything changes because it is the foundation of your economic system! So, a lot, I think of, if there is genius in the Green New Deal, I think a lot of the genius is recognizing in a way that folks have failed to recognize, I think, for a very long time--that addressing climate change will require economic transformation. And taking that on fully and trying to think about and prepare for a transition to the economy that

Americans deserve, and that millions of Americans have continued to say, year after year, that they want and that they want us to get to.

148

149 150 151

152

153154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171172

173

174

175

176 177 178

179180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188 189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

Ralph Nader: You know the knock on the Green New Deal is, oh, who's going to pay for it? That's the most laughable criticism I've ever seen. I can tell you 10 ways to pay for it. First of all, you increase the level of taxation of corporations who are registering record profits to the level of 1960s. If it just goes to the 1960s, which was a prosperous decade, it would be hundreds of billions of dollars a year, that's number 1. Number 2, you get rid of the hundreds of billions of dollars a year of corporate welfare, what I call corporate socialism--handouts, giveaways, bailouts--half of what Washington does every day; it's called government-guaranteed corporate capitalism, that's the second. The third way to do it is to show that people already are patronizing Green New Deal local businesses. They're all over the place. They're businesses that deal with recycling locally, businesses that deal with weatherization locally, businesses that deal with local energy production, businesses that deal with community health clinics that focus on prevention and don't gouge their patients. YES! Magazine, by the way, is the great chronicler. And I'm sure that magazine out of Seattle is a great supporter the Green New Deal. So, I think that's got to be much more forcefully conveyed to Congress. And you know, it is about Congress, isn't it? 535 men and women who, I've said again and again, put their shoes on every day like all of us, and a majority of them can make the Green New Deal move on a fast railroad track. So, let me put this question to you. It's all about focus. It's not just about local mobilization that goes into the ether; it's local mobilization that goes to your two senators and representatives. To what extent do you see street rallies...I was just down at Capitol Hill and there was a big series of police cars escorting a big rally down there on climate disruption. We shouldn't use the word climate change; it's far too benign--climate crisis, climate catastrophe. And I said to a friend, you know, there's only 2/300 people there; you're going to see half a million people. This is rallies that are going all over the world led by very young people like Greta of Sweden. But I think the first wake-up call to Congress is surround it with hundreds of thousands of people again and againpeople who then go into the Congress, go into the corridors, go into the offices of the senators and representatives, and make it happen. What do you think of the street-demonstration level and how can it be increased?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: I mean I think that there have been, like you said, so many powerful and gigantic, honestly, demonstrations about climate across the world and in the U.S. I mean the climate strikes, the school walkouts were just a couple months ago, and then Sunrise hosted a Road to GND [Green New Deal] tour where I was in D.C. and there were over, there had to be over 500 people there at the event at night on a Sunday. And so direct action as we've seen has worked. The reason that the GND catapulted to national attention was a sit-in in Speaker Pelosi's office, right? The reason that the DNC is even talking about hosting a climate debate is, yes, because of public pressure, but it's also because activists from Sunrise slept on the steps of the DNC for three night demanding a debate. So direct action is powerful. And I think that we need more of it, right? The reason we need more people going into offices, we need more people writing, we need more folks in the street always, but I think part of what we're thinking about with the Green New Deal is also how do we move some of the energy, like you said, again in Congress, because I think one of the sad and really sort of troubling things, particularly with this administration, is that they seem pretty immune. And increasingly, I think Congress itself, being particularly immune to, like, mass action, and just really resistant or maybe ignores public pressure. I think Congress, right, and representatives are more movable and clearly, we've shown this, but I think it's interesting that the pressure has largely moved the media conversation and had moved some reps, but hasn't necessarily moved Congress. And I think you don't just see it as

a Green New Deal; you see it across the board where you have Medicare for All polling really well, the Green New Deal polling really well, taxing corporations and the uber-wealthy really well, but you don't see Congress moving on this thing. So, I think it also is getting back to and we are trying to always think about how to navigate what seems to be a growing gap between public sentiment and pressure and the actions of elected officials.

197

198

199

200 201 202

203

204205

206

207

208

209

210

211212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220221

222223

224 225

226

227

228229

230231

232

233

234

235

236

237238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

Ralph Nader: Yeah. And you know, the one hearing they had on the Green New Deal, the Democrats in the House, left the Green New Deal advocates defenseless. I mean it was attacked mercilessly by the forces of darkness, and it got a bad press. So, here's my suggestion: you represent a younger generation, Rhiana, and I've noticed that a lot of people in your age group, don't know about the old environmental advocates who can provide incredibly powerful arguments from experience that they've had over the decades. And we're having David Freeman right after we conclude our discussion with you to demonstrate my point. But you know, of course, about Project Drawdown by Paul Hawken where he has a hundred ways to reduce greenhouse gases, a hundred ways, and he ranks them. For example, dealing it with refrigeration was number one. Of course, planting trees is way up there, too--recent study on that. But I find that all of these efforts, just are sort of Lone Ranger efforts; they need to aggregate--the sum is always greater than its parts and much more powerful when it's brought to bear on Congress--one senator at a time, one representative at a time. The most successful citizen lobbies, not that we necessary share their pursuits, are the NRA and AIPAC. They don't deal with demonstrations. All they do is personal, laser-beam lobbyists on the members of Congress--by name and their staff. And who's their lawyers? Who's their doctors? Who do they hobnob, who do they play golf with? And that's what begins to change these users of our constitutional authority, or shall we say, abusers of our constitutional authority. What kind of connections are being made with the older generation here? Amory Lovins—he's the one who started the movement on soft energy. I don't see his participation out of Colorado. Paul Hawken, David Freeman, I'm sure Bill McKibben is connected with you, but there are a lot of other people locally who've been at this fight for years. They need to be marshalled; what do you think about that? What's going on?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Absolutely. I think you're completely right. I mean I think we started making some of those connections, so whether it's with Amory Lovins from the Rocky Mountain Institute or Bill McKibben at 350, are having those conversations and we are talking. I think that they definitely could be bigger and more robust and should be, because even though it's largely in the moment right now, sort of, seen as, and in lots of ways, is a youth-led fight, this is an intergenerational fight as well, right? The people who have power right now are not young people. And so, the people that you move are generally not young people when you're talking about who's in power, but also the climate crisis affects us all. And there, like you said, are a lot of lessons to be learned from fights that were won and fights that were lost that we're still seeking to learn. So, I think we are trying to do a much better job of that. I will say that part of it is also that the Green New Deal, and we have spent a lot of time, in this sort of element of it, especially at New Consensus, is that the Green New Deal also needs to and needed to attract constituencies that don't consider themselves sort of traditional environmentalists. And we have spent a lot of time on that because again, we need to be getting people to understand the connections between how the economy works now, the changes for the climate that we see, and why it matters to them. And so we have actually spent a lot of time talking to, I think, not the usual suspects, whether that's community and economic development groups, whether that's groups that are involved in immigration, whether that's businesses, folks who are at city and local governments who might not have worked on environment before but are interested in thinking about how the Green New Deal can jumpstart their local economies. So, we spent a lot of time

there, and I think that that has been really valuable. And so, I think we spent some time there, and now we are trying to sort of branch out and start to make some more of these intergenerational connections particularly traditional environmentalists.

Ralph Nader: What I like about the New Consensus where you're working, and the policy director--we're talking to Rhiana Gunn-Wright--is that the leadership is starting to come from minority groups, from lower-income people who, of course, absorb the biggest silent violence of pollution--we call pollution; it's really silent violence. It's killing them. The mortality levels, the worst pollution happens to be where poor people live, where people of color live, where incinerators are in the dumps and everything, and that's called the "environmental justice movement". I know your background, Rhiana, has been in addressing the issues of structural poverty and criminal justice, which I call criminal injustice, and it's good that that kind of new energy is what's needed because you know Exxon-Mobil has often hired black people to become vice presidents, as tokens. And the corporate beverage industry has blocked referendum after referendum for recycling bottles or for putting a tax on soft drinks because they marshalled the local organizations saying you're just trying to make poor people pay more for a refreshing drink, and they vote against these things, so you're going to turn that completely around. And so, this is a whole new source of energy that is good. Just let me give you an example--when corporations say they can't afford the Green New Deal, really? Here's how I answer it, "You know you better convert to conservation of energy--to renewable energy". And some of the big companies like Google and others are making an attempt to that, obviously. And I say, "You say you don't have money; oh, but you spent 7 trillion dollars last year on stock buybacks, which didn't convert anything to solar energy or efficiency-didn't produce any jobs, didn't do anything but increase your pay. Now you're going to be under a rule of law that says you're never going to waste the shareholder money and the consumer dollars that represent that seven trillion. You're going to reset your own corporation so you can obey the lifesaving health and safety standards of our society and our world. It's over, corporations! No more stock buybacks." By the way, Rhiana, until 1982, the Securities and Exchange Commission banned stock buybacks as being stock manipulation by insiders. And that was what Reagan did. And so, we can bring it back. You can see how all of these arguments put into place--you can't believe the powerful arguments of Amory Lovins against nuclear power and fossil fuels, and David Freeman. So, this whole effort can accelerate tremendously. And now before we conclude, before we get questions from David and Steve, how do people reach you?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Oh, so people can reach me on Twitter if they want, sort of like, real-time responses. And my handle is just @rgunns, R-G-U-N-N-S. But they can also reach us at New Consensus, <u>info@newconsensus.com</u>.

Ralph Nader: Good. And by the way, all over the world, solar energy and wind power is beating the heck out of new fossil-fuel generation of electricity.

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Yes, absolutely.

246

247248

249250

251252

253254

255

256257

258

259

260261

262

263

264

265

266

267268

269270

271272

273

274

275276

277 278 279

280

281

282 283

284

285 286 287

288

289

290

291

292 293 294 **Ralph Nader:** It's cheaper, it's safer, it's more community-based, it's more healthy; it's more conducive to small business. The arguments are overwhelming. And luckily, the corporations are sitting on massive hordes of cash that they don't know what to do with other than to buy back their stock. So, turn that one against them. Steve, David, any comments [for] this extraordinary group out of Chicago--the New Consensus?

Steve Skrovan: Yeah, it's amazing. I've actually got two questions, Rhiana. One is technical and one is more political. First, the technical one; so aside from the political problems to be solved and the movement building, you wrote a section of the policy paper--what was the thorniest issue you had to resolve in formulating the Green New Deal? Just technically or maybe it was a problem of how do we communicate this very complicated idea? What was the most difficult problem for you to solve?

 Rhiana Gunn-Wright: So, I think it was probably twofold. The first is there are sort of so many things that need to happen in the economic transformation. So, one of the sticky things was figuring out what are the social elements that are most necessary for the economic mobilization to be successful? And I say that because a lot of people think that the Green New Deal is just like a progressive wish list, so they look at particularly the second half where we outlined in the resolution, where we talk about a jobs guarantee and universal healthcare, education and training as sort of the progressive boondoggle. But the truth is those things were chosen because we were trying to think about what are the labor conditions now, how are families set up, how will that change if you enter into a mobilization where ideally you end up with full employment? But even on your way there, what is necessary for people to thrive and how do you structure that equitably, and how can you be thinking about the social-safety net that you're building, also in terms of reinvesting in communities that have been disinvested in. So basically, policy has disempowered a lot of people; how do you use it to empower them. And so that comes down to sort of how you turn income into wealth if you're trying to deal with the racial wealth gap. So that was sticky, and then I'll say the other thing that was sticky, was sequencing. So, you'll notice that the resolution, the first part of it is what we call sort of projects. It lays out these things that we need to do whether it's building a super grid, decarbonizing transportation, etcetera, to get to net zero emissions. And that was actually tough, because when we started at New Consensus doing the background research for the Green New Deal, we had to scope it because it had been a long time since someone asked, 1) how do you have an economic mobilization in modern times, right? We haven't done it since World War II at nearly the scale that the Green New Deal is calling for? Then 2) so how do you structure the economic mobilization; what do you actually need to do to get to net zero emissions? And a lot of people had asked these questions in sort of a fractured way, but hadn't imagined how do you do that as sort of a cohesive program, and so that was sticky figuring out how do you sequence things. What do you want to include in this mobilization and not? Do you want to have a supergrid or do you want to work through regional markets or utilities? Those sort of like nitty-gritty questions were sticky.

Ralph Nader: That's exactly what David Freeman is so informed about from his own experience running four utilities. He's also shut down six nuclear plants, Rhiana, and he dismisses the carbon tax as a diversion and a decoy. And he basically says we have to directly get mandates phasing out fossil fuels. And he has a 30-year plan to phase them out completely. And of course, public power comes in on this, and the socialism question, oh, feed that to some of these guys. Just feed it. They'll knock it out of the ballpark. You got corporate socialism now. You got corporate control of the government that develops how public budgets are spent, huge subsidies for fossil fuel. I was just looking at a headline to see what's going on around the country; there's a lot going on. Friends of the Earth calls for \$250 million weatherization effort for Memphis, Tennessee. That's how specific they're getting with the city council; how many jobs region by region, neighborhood by neighborhood. Unfortunately, we're almost out of time. Any other comments or questions, David?

Steve Skrovan: Yeah, my second question was the political one, which is you were a policy intern for Michelle Obama and the Obamas obviously hold a lot of sway still in the Democratic Party. Where are they on the Green New Deal? Do you have any insight into that?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: I don't, honestly. We have not spoken to them, so I don't know.

Ralph Nader: That's an answer all by itself, isn't it, Rhiana? They should be all over the Green New Deal. They have the highest ratings of any political couple in the United States. And I maintain they're not using it. They're not using the capital. And here's Barack Obama watching Donald Trump who thinks climate disruption is a hoax, which I assume he will until the waves lap up and overtake Mar-a-Lago in Florida, his mansion. He's completely dismantling, and I mean completely, Obama's work on environment, and there's hardly any opposition. You got any last minute observations on that one?

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: I don't. I mean honestly, I respect the Obamas, and having worked in the White House for one summer, I can't imagine how tired they are after eight years. So, I can't lie and be like, I would be out here doing everything on my own. I might take a nap or all of that. So, I don't know, but I do think there's certainly still time for them to get involved and for them to decide where they are. And so, I think right now personally, I'm just giving them space to recuperate and see what they do.

Ralph Nader: Well, you know they have had good and deserved vacations and they've traveled around and relaxed and had a lot of fun after working so hard. But I think the explanation for the question as to why they're not on the ramparts, is because Donald Trump is a dirty player. He's an intimidator; he's a vicious verbal combatant and they don't need that in their lives.

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: I think that also makes sense, yeah.

Ralph Nader: And, of course, they've got to overcome that because the fate of the world is too serious not to have people who can command the media, to be in the arena. Thank you very much, Rhiana. We've been talking with Rhiana Gunn-Wright, the Policy Director of this very exciting new group in Chicago, New Consensus. And we hope that you'll listen to the interview with David Freeman on the podcast so that you, and he, and others of different generational background, can get together and maximize the laser-beam focus on 535 lawmakers on Capitol Hill. Thank you, Rhiana.

Rhiana Gunn-Wright: Absolutely.

Steve Skrovan: We have been speaking with Rhiana Gunn-Wright, Policy Director at the think tank, New Consensus. We will link to her work at ralphnaderradiohour.com. We're going to take a short break. When we come back, we welcome back old friend, David Freeman, as we continue our discussion about the Green New Deal and how those goals can be achieved through renewable energy. You are listening to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*; back after this.

Russell Mokhiber: From the National Press Building in Washington, D.C., this is your *Corporate Crime Reporter* "Morning Minute" for Friday, July 12, 2019. I'm Russell Mokhiber. On the heels of the EPA's June approval of a bee-killing pesticide, the White House said it would stop collecting data on declining honey bee populations, potentially making it impossible to analyze the effects of the chemical and the administration's other anti-science policies on pollinators. The USDA [United States Department of Agriculture] cited budget cuts when it said last week that it would indefinitely suspend data collection for its Honey Bee Colonies report,

which has been compiled every year since 2015. The report helps scientists and farmers assess the decline of honey bees, which are responsible for pollinating one in every three bites of food taken by humans. For the *Corporate Crime Reporter*, I'm Russell Mokhiber.

Steve Skrovan: Thank you, Russell. You know, it's just not young people who are promoting the Green New Deal. Our next guest is a veteran who has served for decades in the battle to generate clean, efficient and safe energy.

David Feldman: David Freeman is an engineer, an attorney, and an author who has been called in eco-pioneer for his environmentally conscious leadership of both the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Sacramento Municipal Utility District [SMUD]. He's also a noted anti-nuclear activist and the author of a number of books on energy policy including *Winning Our Energy Independence*. Welcome back to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*, David Freeman.

David Freeman: Glad to be introduced. My latest book is *All-Electric America*, which we could make happen and eliminate fossil fuels and the nuclear power altogether.

Ralph Nader: Let's get right down to it. You're the only person on earth, David Freeman, who shut down nuclear power plants. As head of many electric utility companies, you not only ran the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority] and the SMUD, you ran the L.A. Utility; you've run a utility in upstate New York, you have the most concrete program on getting away from nuclear and fossil fuels that I have read, which we'll get right down to. But just to inform our listeners, how many nuclear plants have you shut down?

David Freeman: Well, we shut down at eight in the Tennessee Valley while they were under construction. But if you think it was fun to fire five, six, seven thousand people in the home of atomic power down there in Tennessee, you don't know. As a matter of fact, Ralph, as I recall, you praised me for doing it, and in Republican East Tennessee, that didn't help one bit.

Ralph Nader: Do you know what's interesting? Nuclear power as you say, is on its way out. I remember when the Atomic Energy Commission predicted 1,000 nuclear plants by the year 2000.

David Freeman: Oh, yeah, Congressman Chet Holifield, from California; they had a joint committee on atomic energy. People have forgotten that nuclear power was the kind of like ice cream in terms of public opinion. He was going to put a nuclear plant every 50 miles along the coast of California. And I'm proud of the fact that with Friends of the Earth, we succeeded in making California nuclear-free by 2024 when they promise to shut down every nuclear plant in the state. And that's not going to happen in the entire nation. But let's get to what the really future is all about and . . .

Ralph Nader: Right. Let's get to the demands that you are making for public policy. Go ahead.

David Freeman: Well, it's not really hard. If something is poisoning life on earth like fossil fuels and nuclear power, in this country, we have a culture of outlawing something that's poison. And so, I'm just proposing simple, straightforward laws that would say give them a few years of lead time. We cut back parts of your consumption 5% a year starting now. We tell the automobile industry they've got a couple of years to retool and start making ultimately zero-emissions cars, and we tell every household that within a certain amount of time, they've got to retrofit and stop using fossil fuels for heating and substitute heat pumps; we can have an all-renewable electric America. And the beautiful thing about it is it's cheaper. You don't need to be

an economist to figure this thing out. If a fuel is free, like solar and wind and storage, then it's just a matter of capital. Capital has never made cheaper than it is nowadays. So, investments in solar and wind will be inflation proof, and over time, much lower. In addition to that, an electric car is 99% efficient. And the internal combustion engine, I don't know, maybe 35% efficient. So, the switch to clean energy is a giant step forward in efficiency and over time, will actually reduce the total cost of energy. And then if you want energy independence, there's nothing more homegrown than our own sun and wind. And we won't have to go to war in the Middle East worrying about oil. And this is a side benefit. The air in the cities will finally be clean and we can stop drilling anywhere including in the Arctic where we're messing things up something awful. So, the benefits of doing this are so enormous. It's like taking out an insurance policy where, instead of paying a premium, you get a dividend every year.

Ralph Nader: Well, you know, the bad news is that the Florida electric-utilities--private corporations--want to control solar energy and want to block people by burdening homeowners from putting the solar panels on. So, Florida is like lagging behind 13 states in solar energy. You've pointed out that solar energy and wind power is winning all over the world on the basis of cost. It is undercutting fossil fuels and nuclear power big, big time. So, tell us what's going on in Memphis, Tennessee as an example.

David Freeman: Well, I'm volunteering with Friends of the Earth these days and we launched the campaign last Saturday in Memphis, Tennessee for a massive efficiency program starting with the low-income people. People don't realize that Memphis, Tennessee in the Tennessee Valley, served by TVA, has got the worst energy burden of any city in the country. Twenty-five percent of the citizens of Memphis pay 25% of their after-tax income on their utility bill. It's a function of the fact that TVA's rates have gone up, up, up, up; was a waste of money on nuclear power plants that they couldn't finish and coal plants that are woefully inefficient. And so, the rates are now not low rates, they're just kind of average; the houses are dilapidated and they haven't had an efficiency program since I left back in '84. So we're pursuing that, but more important than that, the City of Memphis is now seriously and publicly considering leaving the Tennessee Valley Authority because we've shown to them, that they can just go right across the river--they're right there on the Mississippi--and have access to all solar and wind power in the middle of America where actually the red State of Texas has got a big chunk of wind power nowadays. And the old New Deal, TVA, the centerpiece of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal that was 100% renewable in the 30 years with hydro-power, is now just stuck with coal. They're not stuck with it, but they're just holding on to their old coal and gas and nuclear plants. So, Memphis is threatening to leave TVA and I've met with the mayor several times and the utility manager and they are going through the process of deciding whether to leave the Tennessee Valley Authority. And we're down there, kind of leading the charge because TVA is now, you know, environmental criminal number 1 in terms of utilities. Most of the private companies that are regulated are being forced to do at least a little bit toward moving toward solar. TVA is doing a tiny bit.

Ralph Nader: And what's the plan in Memphis--an actual economic plan?

David Freeman: The economic plan is they give TVA five years notice. And, under their contract, they're free to buy their power from across the river or right in the city. And so, we're urging them to put . . . and they're doing a serious public study that we're participating in to figure out what the cheapest sources would be if they left TVA. And of course, energy efficiency is, by far, the cleanest and cheapest kilowatt hour you can get--the one that you don't generate, so, we have a public campaign underway and we've got a lot of support from the local groups,

including obviously, the minority organizations that comprise the bulk of the people in Memphis. So, this is our effort to combine environmental justice with really putting pressure on the TVA to change their way(s).

Ralph Nader: We're talking with S. David Freeman. Let me just tell the listeners what your books were. By the way, David Freeman is advisor of presidents going back to Jimmy Carter, advisor of governors--from Jerry Brown [in CA] to Mario Cuomo in New York. He wrote a book called Energy: The New Era, in 1974 and one called Winning Our Energy Independence; then one that is very solution-oriented called All-Electric America: A Climate Solution and the Hopeful Future, in 2016. And, one of my favorites, his autobiography called The Green Cowboy. Now, David, I know people who are skeptical are saying what happens when the wind isn't blowing and the sun isn't shining?

David Freeman: We have a device that is kind of well-known; it's called a battery. We've been storing electricity for years. We know how the modern batteries are much less expensive and they are a commercial product, so, you take the sunshine when it shines, the wind when it blows, and you store some of it, and then you use it at night or when the wind is not blowing. So, you're going to have a perfectly reliable power system made up of solar, wind, and storage. And the plain truth of the matter is, economically, these base-load plants are deader than a doornail. You know why? Because in the deregulated market that we have through most of the country, not in TVA, but through most of the country, the market price is determined by the lowest source. So, when the sun does shine and it's a lot of hours, and the wind does blow, the marginal cost is zero because there's no fuel cost. So then nuclear plant or the coal plant, which operates around the clock, is out of business those hours. If you subtract those hours from the nuclear plant, then the cost of nuclear plant, which is already very high, becomes astronomical. That's the reason I was able to persuade the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to agree to shut down their nuclear plant and build renewable energy to replace it and we reached the agreement with them about a year ago to do that. The world is changed!

Ralph Nader: By the way, that's the last operating nuclear plant in California--that you got Pacific Gas and Electric agreeing to shut down.

David Freeman: That is correct, that's correct.

Ralph Nader: You see, people, the technological answers have been on the shelf for years; they've been in pilot projects for years. There's no matter of well, we have to invent something that nobody's figured out how to invent--energy efficiency, solar, wind power, geothermal-they're here. They're used here and there around the world. The issue, isn't it, David, is political power. We have to have people power overcome the fossil-fuel corporations, [i.e.] power in Congress and elsewhere, right?

David Freeman: Yeah. But, Ralph, now that we have a bunch of political people that are playing in the Green New Deal, they say they're for it, and I have suggestions for legislation to prove that they're for it because talk is cheap. But we need to pass laws that just outlaw one year at a time, the fossil fuel plants, and the nuclear plants, and that's the only way it's going to happen. An attack on energy at this stage of the game, is a nudge; it's a nudge, people. Maybe if you really want to, maybe you'll do a little bit more clean; it's way too late for that. You know, I divide the world, Ralph, into two categories now. I'll leave you out of it, but there are the dumb deniers of climate and then there are the intelligent deniers. They are the folks who can make the

good speech about how horrible the climate crisis is and then propose absolutely nothing that is going to make...that mother nature will notice. I mean all these things that we've been doing in the past that seem so brave are just not enough now. Sure, we should get Harvard to divest from investing in fossil fuels. Of course, we should, but that is totally insufficient right now. We need to be talking of passing a law, effective very, very soon, saying that Detroit can make only zero-emission cars. I mean when Pearl Harbor hit us, and I was alive then, we didn't diddle around; we told the automobile industry to stop making cars all together; we ordered them to. So, they started making tanks and airplanes and we won the war. We don't need to do anything that dramatic now. We just need to get them to start mass producing a different kind of car that they're advertising already.

Ralph Nader: We're talking with David Freeman. Apropos a previous program, which I described as "the Worst is First and the Best is Last"--listen to this, listeners--Have you been invited to testify before Congress in the last few years? Have you been on national TV, NPR and PBS S. David Freeman? You only know more about energy as a lawyer and engineer; you've run electric utilities, written studies, advised politicians at high levels. You only know more about energy than any of these people who are called up on Capitol Hill bloviating on behalf of Exxon-Mobil or Peabody Coal or whoever's paying their freight these days. Have you been invited to testify? Have you been on national TV and radio?

David Freeman: I'm still hoping for an invitation. I might get one. Bernie called me for my book on Facebook yesterday.

Ralph Nader: Well, there's presidential candidates who are very congenial to your message. They're going to be talking all over the country on their campaigns--Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders and others--so we're making headway there. And, of course, some of them are in the Congress. And when they go back . . .

David Freeman: Yeah, but, Ralph, not any of them have come out in plain English and talked about the need to mandate laws to outlaw the stuff.

Ralph Nader: Yeah, you're right. They're talking about a carbon tax, which is a decoy, right?

David Freeman: Yeah, and so I label them as part of the intelligent deniers. But we need someone that... if we don't propose laws to outlaw this stuff during the campaign, we're not going to have them in 2021 even if we win. And we went through eight years of doing nothing with Obama on this issue.

Ralph Nader: David, what do you think of the Green New Deal and the young people that are mobilizing and marching all over the world calling for an end to fossil fuels and [for] solar energy and wind power? We just interviewed Rhiana Gunn-Wright, who is one of the drafters of that resolution that was put into the Congress a few months ago called the Green New Deal. What's your view of that and the movement?

David Freeman: Well, I think is they've done more to raise discussion of this issue than I have in 40 years. So, my cowboy hat is off to them. And actually, I have a meeting with Rhiana next week and I'm going to try to talk her in AOC into coming out and talking about mandates.

Because there's no point, I am the old New Deal. I mean the old New Deal was really green. The hydro-power is . . . I grew up in Chattanooga, Tennessee. It was an electrically heated homes that stopped me from shoveling coal and getting asthma. So, I know that this can be done. And so, I

- feel a personal connection to these young people. I think that they need a 93-year-old guy to raise their average age and get this movement going! So, I'm going to meet with them next week.
- Ralph Nader: Well, that's very encouraging. And listeners, if some of you get that AARP Magazine that claims to have 19 million subscribers--the biggest magazine in the world, tell
- them to put S. David Freeman on the cover instead of some 60-year-old movie star who looks
- 597 like he or she is 57.

Steve Skrovan: You only downgraded it three years from 60 to 57. They want more than that, 600 Ralph.

David Freeman: Ralph, you and I are younger than some of these old folks.

Ralph Nader: The old saying, "the only real aging is the erosion one's ideals" [Richard T. Blumenthal]. And you will never age, S. David Freeman. Before we close, David, Steve, do you have any comment or question?

Steve Skrovan: Well, as you know, Ralph, I've been working on a nuclear documentary for many years now, and so actually, we interviewed Mr. Freeman a few years ago. So, all of this is, it's very supportive of what I believe in. And like I said in the beginning of when we just started talking about the reactions that people have about, hey, what about this new technology or what about that new technology? And Mr. Freeman's answer is, "where is it"? I mean the environment couldn't be more economically friendly and yet it's not here, so let's bury it, literally and figuratively.

David Freeman: Ralph, can I just say one final comment?

Ralph Nader: Sure.

David Freeman: I'm 93, but so are you, and so is everyone who's listening to me on the issues we're talking about. The hour is very, very late. If we pretend that we believe the climatologists on climate, then we're all 93 and we better get with it and we better go for the jugular. It's too late for capillary solutions. We need to pass laws that outlaws this stuff. And we need to start advocating for them right now, not yesterday!

Ralph Nader: And on that note, it's the Congress, people. Whether you like it or not, the mandates will come from the Congress if you mandate your senators and representatives to do their job to save the country/the planet, for future generations. That is not an understatement. Thank you very much, S. David Freeman, for your decades of work and to be continued on future shows.

David Freeman: Well, thank you for having me.

Steve Skrovan: We have been speaking with the Green Cowboy S. David Freeman. We will link to his work at ralphnaderradiohour.com. I want to thank our guests again, Rhiana Gunn-Wright and of course, David Freeman. For those you listening on the radio, that's our show. For you podcast listeners, stay tuned for some bonus material we call the Wrap Up. Transcript to the show will appear on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* website soon after the episode is posted.

David Feldman: Subscribe to us on our *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* YouTube channel. And for Ralph's weekly column, it's free, go to nader.org and have it delivered directly into your inbox. For more from Russell Mokhiber, go to corporate crimere porter.com.

- Steve Skrovan: And Ralph's new books are the fable, *How the Rats Re-Formed the Congress*; to acquire a copy of that, go to ratsreformedcongress.org, and *To the Ramparts*: *How Bush and Obama Paved the Way for the Trump Presidency, and Why It Isn't Too Late to Reverse Course*. We will link to that also.
- David Feldman: The producers of the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* are Jimmy Lee Wirt and Matthew Marran. Our executive producer is Alan Minsky.
- Steve Skrovan: Our theme music, "Stand up, Rise Up" was written and performed by Kemp
 Harris. Our proofreader is Elisabeth Solomon.
- **David Feldman:** Join us next week on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. Thank you, Ralph.

648

Ralph Nader: Thank you, everybody. And I hope this program helped connect the two generations of Rhiana and David on the Green New Deal.