



Episode 1,327: The Green New Deal Is Insane

Guest: Alex Epstein

WOODS: I mean, come on, this Green New Deal? How am I not going to talk to Alex Epstein about this? The thing is taking off not legislatively — certainly it's not going to get signed into law, but wow, it went from zero to being widely discussed in almost no time at all. So what I'm going to do is link on the show notes page, which is TomWoods.com/1327, to the actual Green New Deal program as it's been laid out, so that people can look through it for themselves. It's interesting that it's not just about energy; there's also a lot of stuff about gender and racial justice and living wages and jobs for all. And one of the points that Bob Murphy and I were making, Alex, is that if you really thought in your heart of hearts that the world was going to end — as Ocasio-Cortez just said the other day, the world's going to end in about 12 years — if you really thought that wouldn't you say, "Look, the thing I would love to see in the world is all the racial and gender justice I can get, but right now, with the world about to end, I really have to put everything on the back burner and just focus on not letting the world." So when you then come out with 87 social welfare goals that you also have, it makes me doubt that you — like if there were an asteroid coming to earth, and you were also talking about, "You know, I think the minimum wage should be \$27 an hour," we would think you were a lunatic. *Well, okay, we'll deal with that later, but right now, there's an asteroid coming.*

EPSTEIN: Yeah, whenever somebody talks about a problem and they're in a position of having political power or seeking political power, there's always the question of: are they really concerned about the problem and the most efficient way of solving it, or is the problem for them a solution to their desire to have more power? And for the test that you applied, which is a focus test — are they actually focused on the most existentially threatening problem in their own view — that's a good test. My own test for the energy and climate stuff in particular, I just wrote on Twitter about this, and I forget exactly what I said, but in effect, my simple test is: do you avidly support the decriminalization of nuclear power? Because if you believe that nuclear power should be banned and that's the most scalable form of non-carbon power, then clearly, you're not serious. And it's probably a surprise to nobody that Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the whole Green New Deal are advocates of the banning the continued — not even just the criminalization, but the full banning of nuclear power in favor of solar and wind. So that, to me, is just an instant reveal, if the other 80 things weren't, that there's a desire for power here, not to solve a specific problem.

WOODS: Let's say a brief word about that, if we may. I remember when I was growing up in the '80s, I lived in Massachusetts, which is not too far from the Seabrook nuclear power plant in New Hampshire. So we heard an awful lot about nuclear power in my day, and a lot of it very negative. I was in the gifted and talented class at school. We got a tour of the Seabrook

nuclear power plant. It sure seemed pretty good to me. I didn't have any problem with it. But we were hearing stories about Three Mile Island from years earlier, and the impression was left with us that nuclear power is unsafe and, secondly, we don't really know what to do with the waste. And so that's how they plausibly claim that they really do care for human welfare, and it's because of that care that they don't want to have nuclear power. Is there a good answer to that?

EPSTEIN: Well, yeah, the answer to that is to actually look at the nature of nuclear power and how safe it is, with the waste as one aspect of its safety. So the easiest way, when you have a technology that's been around for a while at any kind of scale — and with fossil fuels and nuclear, we have those with hydro, we have that kind of data — we can look and see, okay, which technologies are the safest per unit of energy generated? So per unit of energy generated, how many people die? And nuclear power is by far, by far the safest. And the physics of it are because nuclear power cannot explode like the other forms of energy can. Obviously, fossil fuels can combust, and then hydro can't explode in that way, but a dam can explode, which might be the most dangerous possibility of all. All these things are really good technology, so they shouldn't be banned for that reason, but it's particularly ridiculous that nuclear is singled out.

And the reason is because the hypothetical mechanism of its danger is something that's kind of harder to understand and has been misrepresented. So meltdown is represented as, *Oh, this is the scariest thing in the world*, versus no, I'd rather be next to a facility that could meltdown, which would give me days and days and days to react versus one that can explode, where I'd be dead immediately. So that's the fundamental of it. And then the nature of the waste is just, this is not anywhere near the most hazardous substance that we deal with. And without getting into all the specifics of the waste, the fact that we have been dealing with it for decades and decades and decades, and nobody is really having a problem, that's an indication that there is no fundamental safety problem. And thus, for anyone who's familiar with these issues, the safety is just a rationalization for attacking nuclear, which fundamentally, the green movement is against, because it's A) a very effective source of industry, which they tend to be against, and then B) it's one that involves manipulating nature in a fundamental way, and the green movement is a deeply technophobic movement, despite its pretenses. That's a whole subject, but essentially, their core idea is we shouldn't change nature. So they particularly object when we figure out how to change nature at fundamental levels.

WOODS: I'm looking at the plan, and we won't go through all seven of their goals; I want to just go through the key ones and the ones that you would want to discuss in particular. But I can't help mentioning something right below the seven goals. It's, frankly, downright Soviet, the kind of language that we encounter in this plan, because it says: "The plan for a Green New Deal shall recognize that a national, industrial, economic mobilization of this scope and scale is a historic opportunity to virtually eliminate poverty in the United States, and to make prosperity, wealth, and economic security available to everyone participating in the transformation." That's a bizarre statement.

So in other words, they're saying: here we have an extraordinary world historic emergency, which you would think, therefore, in order to combat it, we're going to have to expend an enormous amount of resources, and we're going to have to be temporarily satisfied with a lower standard of living. They're claiming that by expending all these resources, we'll get richer. So this would be like, again, if an asteroid were hurling toward earth and they all said,

"Oh, preparing for the asteroid is going to make us richer." And then let's say the asteroid just burned up in the atmosphere, they'd be disappointed because they'd say, "Well, I guess we're going to be poorer now that we don't have to plan for the asteroid coming." This just shows we're not — there's no way we can be dealing with people who are just dispassionately assessing evidence and thinking according to sound theory, right? I mean, I'm sorry for going on this soliloquy, but I just look at that, what am I supposed to draw from that?

EPSTEIN: There's a definite excitement that people have about the prospect of disaster. And you can see the number-one analogy that's being used right now is World War II. So the idea is, well, we need another World War II. That's exciting to people, because it's, well, this is some higher cause that we can all get involved with, and we can get status, and someday, someone will call us the greatest generation, and whatnot. Leaving aside all of the wrong views about World War II that I think people have, in fact, this is an occasion where there's just an enormous, almost incalculable loss of human life. And not only that, but a huge amount of resources, as you're indicating, to deal with, the whole war. So this is not something where — this is the opposite of something where we want it to happen, and thus if it is happening or if there's anything like this happening, there should be a deep amount of sadness and really trying to figure out, okay, how do we make the best of a horrible situation. But again, there's this issue of: is somebody concerned about the problem because they're really concerned about the problem, or is the problem for them an opportunity for them to get control?

WOODS: Let's go through now some of these. But the very first one is — it's hard to decide actually which one of these is the most ambitious, but it says the first goal is "dramatically expand existing renewable power sources and deploy new production capacity with the goal of meeting 100% of national power demand through renewable sources." Now, remember, their target window here is to accomplish all these goals in ten years. Can you comment on the plausibility of that particular goal?

EPSTEIN: Sure. It's interesting, this issue of 100% renewable, because it's something — I do a lot of work in the messaging around energy, and it's interesting that this has polled very highly. And I think one reason is because it sounds aspirational, versus just being complete coercion, because "100% renewable," what does that mean? That just means that we are band-aiding one particular form of energy technology — which usually refers to just solar and wind because they're usually against hydro, let alone nuclear and fossil fuels — and then we're forbidding everything else.

So what do we know in life, when you mandate one technology in a field and you ban the others? Well, you always have the phenomenon of you — so let's say in the realm of building, we mandated renewable wood. We say every building has to be wood. Well, what's going to happen is you lose out on all the situations where much better materials would be the solution. And then you can often be stuck with something really bad, like skyscrapers made out of wood. Probably not a good idea, all sorts of fire hazards.

The status of solar and wind right now is pretty comparable to the status of wood as a building material. In fact, it's much less often actually the best solution, because it has this fundamental problem of what's called the intermittency problem, which, because the sun and the wind are not available most of the time and because when they are available, they're available very erratically, they have to depend on basically 100% life support from a reliable energy system, usually coming from fossil fuels. And then you're paying for the reliable energy

system, the unreliable energy system, and then you're using the reliable energy system inefficiently, because you're basically running it like stop-and-go traffic. You're constantly adjusting your burning of the fossil fuels up and down to account for the erratic production of the wind and solar.

So it's just a complete mess, and everywhere this is used, it dramatically increases prices. So in Germany, you have 5%, let's say, around 5%, maybe a little less, of total energy coming from these sources, and yet your electricity prices for consumers are doubling. So this is something where, in general, it's a horrible idea to mandate any technology, let alone mandate the worst technology that has dramatically negative consequences on a small scale, let alone mandate it on an impossible scale. That is, there is no technological solution whereby solar and wind and batteries with those combined can somehow deliver power to a modern economy. So you're literally mandating something that is currently impossible and, at much smaller scales, incredibly destructive.

WOODS: All right, let's go down to — well, I've got to get to the greenhouse gas one, so let's skip down to four and five. I'll read them together: "eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from the manufacturing, agricultural, and other industries, including by investing in local scale agriculture and communities across the country," and "eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from, repairing and improving transportation and other infrastructure, and upgrading water infrastructure to ensure universal access to clean water." So when you hear that, what do you think?

EPSTEIN: Well, we'll maybe just step back and think about what's going on here, because what's unique about the country we live in is there's just this — or at least the founding of it — is that there's this recognition that the way human beings should organize socially is that they should be free, which means that they should not coerce each other. They should live on the basis of voluntary interaction. And thus, when they're able to do that, all sorts of amazing things follow. But the core of it is that they are allowed to act on their own ideas, and then others are allowed to act on their ideas, and then we can interact when it makes sense and not interact when it makes sense. And in general, that makes life go really, really well. Unfortunately, there is not much of a discussion of freedom as a principle of social organization today. And unfortunately, it's not happening with the Republicans, and although I think the current administration has actually done, I think, its best things in energy, there's not a pro-freedom discussion.

And the reason I'm bringing this up is because when problems occur, there's no longer in people's mind the possibility that the real problems are occurring because of a lack of freedom. It's only that the problems are occurring because of a lack of sufficient control by a particular bunch of status-seeking political types. So the whole premise of this thing is that freedom is not a value, that freedom is inappropriate, that it's unimportant, and thus, that anybody with any idea for how anybody else can improve has every right and even should be admired in terms of dictating everything in their lives. Because what you just read is really translated into: Cortez and others should be totalitarian. This is just a set of totalitarian rules, and it's important to classify it that way.

So, yeah, some of these totalitarian rules are based on just absurdity, and some of them could be done, but would be costly. But the whole framework of this is that your life does not belong to you, it belongs to us, and we're going to dictate all of these things. And my view of when you have a serious problem, the totalitarian approach is not the way to approach it. If

you had a serious problem, let's say, what CO² emissions, you would want to find what's a pro-freedom approach to deal with it. So I just reject the whole premise of this thing that, when we have a problem, we should be looking toward this totalitarian solution. And of course, when people do have a totalitarian solution, it will always be insanely irrational, because it is insanely irrational for any small group of people to try to dictate the actions of hundreds of millions of other people.

WOODS: Let's say, though, you had a situation where — let's take these folks at their word. Let's just assume that they actually believe the situation is as catastrophic as they say. And they'll say it's very nice for Alex Epstein to tell us about how nice it would be to have non-coercive solutions, but you know, when we fought the Nazis, we didn't have a non-coercive solution. We drafted people into that army, and we fought, and so likewise, we're going to have to draft all our industrial resources and our people into this fight. What is the plausible alternative, they would say.

EPSTEIN: Well, so with the freedom philosophy, the idea is, when you have problems that require government — I definitely believe those problems exist — but you categorize those problems fundamentally as rights violations, that somebody is violating somebody else's rights. And there is at least a hypothetical possibility of these kinds of collective or aggregate rights violations, that is, where people alone doing something, it doesn't do much, but in the aggregate, there's some sort of big shared risk. So this would be with CO² levels, that if CO² levels at a certain level are dangerous for everybody. But then the focus is: okay, yeah, how do we deal with that, while also dealing with every other aspect of human flourishing? Because lowering CO² levels is not an end in itself; it's at best a means to an end of human beings having better lives. So human beings having a better lives in all these different areas requires a whole bunch of freedom of thought and freedom of action, so that we can be really productive.

So the key would just be to figure out, okay, how do you isolate the CO² issue as a rights violation and have the government in some way restrict that, while not completely destroying or getting involved in everything else? And these are the kinds of — depending on how serious it was, you'd have to think of different things. But what you would need to happen, really, in terms of results is you would be looking for the emergence of a low-cost source of non-carbon energy. That's the only way you would really do it. And the biggest potential there is nuclear power, and that's, of course, the one that these totalitarian green movement people are against. So you could talk about what would be the different ways to do it if you had tasked to you, but the key is you'd want to set it up in a way where free minds could pursue the absolute best non-carbon courses of action, because that's the key to reducing anything, and also having human flourishing. And instead here, they're forbidding people from pursuing nuclear power, and then they're mandating that they pursue this kind of green power. So you do not want a totalitarian mindset when you have these big problems.

WOODS: Another one of the features they've got here is "funding massive investment in the drawdown of greenhouse gases." Do you know what they're talking about there?

EPSTEIN: It's too ambiguous, because it could mean a bunch of things, because when you're talking about greenhouse gases, you can talk about reducing their production, or then you could talk about somehow capturing them in the atmosphere.

WOODS: Right, yeah.

EPSTEIN: So "drawdown" is ambiguous, and it could refer to either these. But I just want to point out how insane this is to say — I mean "insane" is too charitable — but that there's no recognition of the value of energy to human life in this and the fact that you have billions of people in the world who have almost no energy right now, and that itself is a crisis, and that's part of the broader, still-present crisis of poverty that capitalism, to the extent it exists, is alleviating. So there's no recognition of the value of energy, and then there's no recognition of the value of nuclear power or the challenges that exist with these intermittent forms of energy. I just want to make clear: these have never worked, like as in they have never worked, ever, in terms of providing people cheap, plentiful, reliable energy. And they're not particularly even promising in that. But it's really, really bad to even mandate 70 years in the future something that has never worked, but to talk about it as 10 years in the future, it's so homicidal, that nobody can take it seriously. It almost has that protection, that it's so insane, that people can just say, "Oh, well, your heart's in the right place, and yet it's not practical," versus from my perspective, taking away people's energy is not having your heart in the right place.

WOODS: Well, I guess we need to say something about the elephant in the room here, because what they're all going to come back with is: climate change, climate change, climate change, and this is a big problem. And of course, they've made clear what the range of allowable opinion on that is, and so if you even hesitate in supporting a radical program like this, they're probably inclined to call you a so-called "climate denier." They have a whole Orwellian apparatus of language prepared to be used against you. So I think I'd like to ask you — I realize this is a topic you've had to talk about over and over and over again, but I mean, it must be like interviewing Led Zeppelin and asked them about "Stairway to Heaven," you know? *I am begging you not to ask me this*, but, I have to.

EPSTEIN: Oh, I'm happy to talk about it.

WOODS: All right, tell me the way you think about climate change and what's the correct way we should look at that question, about the problem that we face to extent there is one, and what should be done about it, to the extent that anything should be done about it.

EPSTEIN: Okay, so I'll just tell you, here's how I think of the broader issue. So the concern is that there's this ubiquitous product in our civilization, namely fossil fuel energy, and it's potentially having significant negative impacts on our environment. That's kind of the situation. And particularly, people are concerned about rising CO² levels from CO² emissions from that form of energy. So that's certainly a legitimate kind of thing to investigate, particularly because, in a laboratory at least, increasing the CO² level leads to a certain amount of warming — although, importantly, it leads to a declining level of warming. That is, each molecule of CO² warms less than the last. So it's a legitimate thing to explore this.

But then if you're exploring it, and you're exploring different policies to deal with it, I think what you need to do is you need to look at, okay, with different policies, they're going to have two major effects. One is, when we're legislating on energy, one is the policies are going to affect the amount of energy that's available in the world. And then two, is they're going to affect the amount of CO² that exists in the atmosphere. I think anyone who's concerned at all about CO² emissions would say: okay, well, we want policies that increase the amount of energy available and that decrease the amount of CO² in the atmosphere. So I think it's important to think in this way, even if you don't think CO² is that big a deal. And I don't personally think it's that big a deal, but I think that if you are thinking about it, you really

have to think about, okay, what policies are going to lead to a lot of energy availability while decreasing CO² emissions? That should be the kind of priority, and that's why I keep going back to nuclear. If you're serious about this, then nuclear power should be fundamentally exciting. And there aren't that many fundamentally exciting things, because we don't have that many even plausible ways of generating energy. So that's, how I think of the policy piece of it.

Morally, I integrate all of this stuff. Whether it's energy of availability or CO² levels, I integrate this all under the perspective of human flourishing. So the question is: how do fossil fuels affect the amount of energy available, how do they affect CO², and then how does all of that put together affect human flourishing? And the short version of it is, is that people dramatically underestimate the value of energy availability. So like energy being cheap, plentiful, and reliable, that makes every industry more productive. That makes every human being more empowered. It's so fundamentally valuable to quality of life that people don't appreciate the degree of it. And it's particularly important and neglected with regard to environment, because having a lot of energy allows us to take a naturally hostile environment and make it a lot more friendly. And in the realm of climate, it allows us to take a naturally dangerous climate and make it far safer. So when we're looking at the impacts of fossil fuels, we don't just look at the impacts of CO² on the livability of our climate; we have to look at the impact of having a lot more energy on the livability of our climate.

And what I talked about in *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels* is that, if you look at how safe climate is actually becoming or how dangerous it's becoming, it actually becomes safer and safer and safer as we use more fossil fuels. So as we make more energy available, and we increase the amount of CO² in the atmosphere, over time, there's a dramatic trend toward climate becoming safer, let alone the rest of life becoming good. And the reason is because it's so important to the livability of the climate to have a lot of energy, and the impact of CO² on the climate is real to some extent, but it's just pretty insignificant. So it's sort of like discovering a cure to a disease. Like if you discover a cure to a disease and the cure makes the disease 10% more prevalent or even 50% more prevalent, but you can cure it, then that's great. You still want the cure. And energy isn't a large part of the cure to climate danger. Even if we are making the climate slightly more hostile with CO² — and I don't think that's provable, but even if we are — our ability to master the climate, natural or manmade changes, is so great that it completely overwhelms it. So my view is that, if you care about climate livability — and that's what I care about from a human flourishing perspective — you should want us to be producing more energy and more energy from fossil fuels. So climate change can be real, but it can still be insignificant in comparison to the benefits of fossil fuels. That's what I think.

WOODS: How do you feel like the general — this is an oddball question, but would you describe yourself as an objectivist?

EPSTEIN: Sure.

WOODS: Okay. Do you think that libertarians, whom no doubt you have a lot of interaction with, are correctly explaining the situation with fossil fuels and energy in general, or they are they missing the point? Are they too wonkish? What do you think the problem is?

EPSTEIN: Well, I think the problem is the same with everyone, although in different forms, which is that they're not looking at environmental issues from within a human flourishing

perspective. So certainly in the objectivist view and in my view, environmental quality is an aspect of human flourishing. And it's not really an objectivist term, but it's more or less Ayn Rand's idea, is the individual should flourish and achieve happiness, should survive in a very deep and successful and profound way. And the idea is the environment is not something above human flourishing. So environmental issues should be thought of as part of human flourishing. And the thing is that when you put environment above human flourishing, you run into all of these different kinds of problems, because then, in effect, you have a godlike thing that we are supposed to sacrifice to. And we act like, oh, the climate is an end in itself, and it's bad to impact the climate, versus from a human flourishing perspective, our impact on climate, that's just one impact among many. And the key thing is we should impact climate as much or as little as necessary to improve human flourishing more broadly. That's the moral perspective on it.

So if you give me a trade, and I say, okay, we can make it over the next hundred years, like three degrees warmer on average and storms are a little more frequent — this is all hypothetical — but everyone has a lot more energy and everything in life is better, including they're way more comfortable, because they can deal with any kind of climate much more easily, I regard that as a great thing from a human flourishing perspective. But from a naturist or green perspective, you just think it's wrong to change anything. So the whole focus is: no, we shouldn't be changing anything; let's stop changing things. And those people tend to be indifferent to all the benefits of changing nature and to be apocalyptic about changing nature, and also to just have this be the way, that we have this duty not to change it. I think that, in general, libertarians tend to be way too morally conventional. They don't tend to think about moral issues enough — this very broad generalization — but as a result, they have become conventionally environmentalist, in the sense of believing that we should be minimizing our impact on nature as a moral goal. And I don't believe that's a moral goal. We should be maximizing human flourishing as a moral goal, and that includes maximizing our positive impact on nature and minimizing our negative impact.

WOODS: All right, Alex, one final thing, and that has to do with one of the reasons that somebody like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez might have appeal or, frankly, even Donald Trump might have appeal, is that, however flawed they are, they're trying to hold out some kind of a hopeful message, that they've got some great world they're trying to bring us to. And if our response is just, "Well, that's a crummy idea. That will never work," it just doesn't have the same effect on people [laughing]. So what can we do to shape our message so that we're not just that cranky old uncle, but we have something that's inspiring too?

EPSTEIN: This is a really important thing to think about. Over the past couple years, I do a lot of consulting work on communications, and I've developed a little framework I call arguing to 100. and you can just imagine an X axis in front of you, and it goes from -100 to 100, with a 0 in the middle. 100 is the highest good, and -100 is the lowest evil. And my contention is that, in most discussions, the person who defines 100 and -100 will win.

So for example, leaving aside the merits or demerits involved, President Trump reframed the whole axis, the whole debate from a debate where 100 was equality and -100 was inequality. He really turned it from one where 100 was American greatness, "make America great again," and that -100 was American decline. And you can see he made so much progress with that. There are a whole bunch of other examples. If you look at someone like Martin Luther King, Steve Jobs, they all do their own version of arguing to 100. And with the green movement, they have this argument to 100, and Green New Deal is an instance of this, where the ideal,

where 100 is minimizing our impact on nature, and then -100 is something like having a lot of impact or polluting. It's pretty vague what they think the -100 is, but it certainly involves fossil fuels. So anything we go in the direction of fossil fuels is -100.

And my view about what's right and also what's effective is that we should be thinking of different 100s that are based on human flourishing, based on how can we make life as good as possible for as many people as possible. And this certainly applies to all kinds of different arguments for freedom, because freedom is ultimately good, because it's the right social conditions for human beings to flourish. So I'd just recommend in general that people think about: what is my 100, and how does that connect to human flourishing? And I hope that that perspective leads people to a lot of innovation in messaging, but not a kind of, like, ad-agency, superficial type thing, but really thinking about: no, what are my values, and how can I communicate those in a way where the realization of those values is inspiring?

So in the realm of energy, for example, we might talk about something like empowerment, human empowerment, American empowerment. Policy-wise, we might talk about energy freedom or energy liberation. But whatever it is or whatever combination of things, we should really be thinking about, okay, what's our 100 that we are really excited about, and then what's our -100 that we think is really bad and destructive, not let someone else frame it and then say, "Oh, no, your 100 won't work." I call that arguing to 0. You just try to shoot holes in their 100, or you try to plug holes in your -100. That's arguing to 0, and that's a losing approach. And if you're right, then it's an immoral approach to let the immoral side frame and win the debate.

WOODS: Tell us something about the podcast that you had, I don't know for what the situation was, but more or less discontinued or had just gone out to use for a while that has been resurrected – and by the way, has such a clever title, given the subject matter: *Power Hour*. Who thought of that?

EPSTEIN: I think I thought of it. I started *Power Hour* in 2011, and one of the goals was to be able to meet all sorts of different people in energy, because I had been doing work on it for a few years, but nobody knew who I was. And I thought if I had a podcast, maybe I'd get to talk to people. And that was true to a shocking extent. I'm still amazed that people would come on this podcast that had no following at the beginning. And the original concept was for me to be able to ask energy experts and different kinds of environment expert different questions, so that I could learn and so listeners could learn. And it was really, really useful, but I don't know, I got tired of the format of it, and I could also learn the things on my own much more easily.

So then I took time off podcasting, and then I started something which I still have, called *The Human Flourishing Project*, which is a little podcast about human flourishing. And I do that every week. But I thought with *Power Hour*, I wanted to bring it back, and in particular, I wanted it to bring it back because I thought that the human flourishing perspective and the pro-freedom perspective I had was really necessary on a week-to-week basis for certain energy developments. And then it's also relevant to me because I'm redoing *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels*. It's being completely overhauled for release later this year, *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels 2.0*, and thus it's a fun way to talk about some of those concepts and make sure that I'm really connected to these different things, whether it's the Green New Deal or carbon tax or all these other things that are coming up.

WOODS: Well, that's tremendous. So how do people — obviously they can just type in "Power Hour" over on iTunes, but how do they follow you, what's your website, stuff like that?

EPSTEIN: Yeah, I think if you just search "Power Hour, Alex Epstein" on iTunes, that'll work. The easiest way to follow my stuff is just to go to IndustrialProgress.com and then to sign up for our newsletter, which if you like what I said today, there's a good chance you'll like that. That's probably the easiest way. And then, of course, I'm on all the social media channels, which you can just search for "Alex Epstein," and there aren't that many Alex Epstein's, so you'll find me. But if I had a choice, I would have people go on the newsletter and get those updates every week.

WOODS: All right, you're smart to get people on your newsletter list. That is exactly what they should do, so I'm going to recommend they do that. So I'll have links to this stuff for everybody's convenience at TomWoods.com/1327. All right, well, let's see what happens. Unfortunately, AOC, as they're calling her, has a lot of ambition and a lot of media sympathy, so we'll just have to work all the harder. So thanks for what you're doing, Alex. We appreciate it.

EPSTEIN: Thanks a lot, Tom.