Elections have consequences. As a former member of Congress and chairman of the Tea Party Caucus, no one knows that better than I do. And although every election is important, the Democratic Party’s takeover of the U.S. House of Representatives in 2018 is especially alarming. Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and socialist radicals like Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) are aiming to achieve what Barack Obama started: the fundamental transformation of the United States of America. Nowhere is this more evident than in Ocasio-Cortez’s “Green New Deal” plan—the most radical socialist proposal in modern congressional history.

The Green New Deal is appropriately named after the original “New Deal,” the big-government power grab imposed by President Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930s.
Under FDR, Democrats tripled taxes in seven years, and the government imposed an endless array of regulations, mandates, and even a secret police force to administer them. The economy limped along for the entirety of the 1930s, with an average unemployment rate of a whopping 17 percent and Americans more dependent on government than ever.

The Green New Deal would take government overreach to a whole new level. The program would eliminate all fossil fuels from the electric grid by 2030 and force families to use much more expensive and unreliable renewable energy sources. In addition to destroying hundreds of thousands of good jobs in the coal, natural gas, and oil industries, the Green New Deal would harm all Americans as higher energy prices raise the cost of all goods and services. Even the left-wing Brookings Institution noted in a 2014 study that wind power costs twice as much and solar three times as much as power from coal, natural gas, and oil.

Imposing renewable energy would punish lower- and middle-income families more than any other group. Pelosi, Sens. Bernie Sanders (I-VT) and Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), Ocasio-Cortez, billionaire environmental extremist Tom Steyer, and their friends in the left-wing news media can afford to pay more for electricity. But the millions of families living paycheck to paycheck can not. The poor often suffer the most when liberals create massive government programs.

The plan would also require a government-approved “upgrade” of all homes and businesses in the country—every home and business—to make them more “energy efficient” and add “comfort,” costing trillions of additional dollars. FDR could only dream of such power.

**Climate Change Delusions**

Supporters of the Green New Deal argue this wholesale economic destruction is necessary, because the world is about to descend into chaos created by catastrophic, man-made climate change. This fear-mongering has long been proven untrue by Heartland climate experts. As an international team of climate science and economic experts recently detailed in the newest edition of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change’s *Climate Change Reconsidered* series, higher global temperatures have historically been associated with greater economic growth and improvements in human health. When there is more carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere, plants generally grow faster, which means there’s more food available to feed the world’s expanding population of people and animals.

This is incredibly important because regardless of what we do in the United States, the rest of the world is going to continue increasing its fossil fuel use, more than offsetting any CO2 reductions we might make. Even if we were to commit economic suicide and pass the radical Green New Deal, total global CO2 emissions would likely still increase by billions of tons by 2030.

**Not-So-Secret Socialism**

Why, then, do Ocasio-Cortez and her allies propose this destructive plan? Because their real desire is to accomplish the Left’s long-time goal of moving the United States toward socialism.

This isn’t just a theory. Significant provisions of the Green New Deal reveal its true purpose of imposing socialism on an unprecedented scale. The plan would create a “basic income program” and federal jobs guarantee providing a “living wage” to everybody who says they want one. It would impose a federal-government-run, single-payer health care system, putting bureaucrats and liberal politicians in Washington, DC in charge of every American’s health care. It would encourage the Federal Reserve to unleash inflation and create a system of government-owned banks to “create” tens of trillions of dollars needed to fund these immense programs.

None of these proposals has anything at all to do with climate change. Ocasio-Cortez’s goal is to destroy your freedoms, not save polar bears—who are doing just fine, by the way.
Stopping Socialism
If we’re going to stop the catastrophic Green New Deal and the rise of socialism in the United States, supporters of individual liberty and free markets will have to work harder than ever. If America as we know it is going to survive the twenty-first century, we must act now.

While other organizations and media pundits merely complain about radical environmentalism, The Heartland Institute has led the charge in Washington, DC, state capitals across the country, and even internationally. Heartland is the go-to source for policymakers who want to know the truth about the climate—and these efforts are paying off.

When Steyer tried during the 2018 elections to impose upon Arizonans the same energy policies destroying California, Heartland experts were on the ground providing the public and lawmakers with the truth about the cost and unreliability of renewable energy. When environmental socialists attempted to pass carbon-dioxide taxes in multiple states, Heartland’s unmatched state-level team helped to kill these tax increases. And when the United Nations met in Poland in December to impose climate socialism worldwide, Heartland was there to organize opposition, join forces with the historic Solidarity labor union, and promote real climate science.

Other organizations might write an op-ed or two about socialism and the Green New Deal, but only The Heartland Institute is rising to this important challenge, just as we have in the war against climate alarmism. We’re launching an entire project dedicated to informing Americans—especially young people who have been indoctrinated by left-wing teachers, college professors, and the media—about the dangers of socialism. We’ve already produced dozens of socialism-themed articles and videos on StoppingSocialism.com, and our work has been featured on the Tucker Carlson Tonight show, Fox & Friends, One America News Network, Washington Examiner, FoxNews.com, and numerous other media outlets.

And this is just the beginning. With your help, we’re going to expand our project into the most effective anti-socialism campaign in the country.

The Green New Deal is a radical, dangerous, evil proposal, but support for it is growing rapidly. At least 40 members of the U.S. House of Representatives already back the plan, and four likely Democratic presidential candidates—Sens. Warren, Sanders, Cory Booker (D-NJ), and Kamala Harris (D-CA)—also publicly support most or all of it. Countless establishment news outlets have lauded the plan and turned Ocasio-Cortez into the Left’s newest media darling.

The Heartland Institute isn’t standing on the sidelines complaining about it. We’re going to defeat the Green New Deal and stop socialism with an ambitious, pro-liberty plan of our own. But we can’t do it without you. If we’re going to win America’s next great fight for freedom, we need your help. Go to heartland.org to learn how you can join the fight against socialism.

Tim Huelskamp, Ph.D. (thuelskamp@heartland.org) is president and CEO of The Heartland Institute.

©2019 The Heartlander is published quarterly for donors to The Heartland Institute. Nothing in The Heartlander should be construed as reflecting the views of The Heartland Institute or as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any legislation.

The Heartland Institute
3939 North Wilke Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60004
Phone: 312/377-4000
Web: heartland.org
Email: think@heartland.org

IDEAS THAT EMPOWER PEOPLE
HEARTLAND: By the Numbers

During the fourth quarter of 2018, The Heartland Institute ...

► Published eight print and digital monthly issues of Budget & Tax News, Environment & Climate News, and Health Care News.

► Produced 52 Research & Commentaries addressing issues in 28 states.

► Testified or submitted comments three times, bringing the year’s total to 41 times in 19 states.

► Signed three coalition letters.

► Contacted elected officials 191,790 times, including 7,891 one-on-one contacts by phone, email, or in person.

► Generated at least 41 broadcast, 913 online, and 177 print media hits reaching more than 37.1 million subscribers.

► Added 140 blog posts to Freedom Pub.

► Released 63 podcasts, attracting a total listening audience of 863,199 people.

► Added 18 videos to our YouTube channel. Videos on the channel attracted a total of 136,849 views.

► Attracted 2,976,643 impressions on our Facebook page.

► Achieved 223,088 impressions for our tweets, an average of 2,589 impressions per day.

► Hosted seven events attended by 712 people.

► Published and distributed four Policy Briefs, on hydraulic fracturing myths, sustainable investment fallacies, the Congressional Climate Solutions Caucus, and federal websites that promote climate alarmism.

► Released 33 issues of our weekly e-newsletters: Climate Change Weekly, Heartland Weekly, and The Leaflet.

► Spoke at 12 events, with a total attendance of 960 people.
Heartland set another new podcast audience record in the fourth quarter of 2018, with 863,199 downloads, including an all-time high monthly number of 293,946 in December. Our total for 2018 is more than 3.2 million downloads, achieving a growth rate far outpacing our projection. (See graph on page 4.)

Highlights

The *Budget & Tax News Podcast* was downloaded 90,617 times in the fourth quarter. A highlight from this quarter was Open The Books Founder and CEO Adam Andrzejewski joining the show to talk about the organization’s new campaign calling on President Donald Trump to take the lead in the “War on Waste.” Other great guests included South Dakota State Sen. Stace Nelson and investigative reporter Matt Kittle.

The *Environment & Climate News Podcast*, hosted by Senior Fellow H. Sterling Burnett, remains Heartland’s most popular. It was downloaded 218,830 times in the fourth quarter. Highlights from this quarter included a discussion with Senior Fellow James Taylor and Director of Communications Jim Lakely about Heartland’s successful counter-U.N. trip to Poland, where they joined forces with the influential labor union Solidarity to combat global warming alarmism. (See page 16.)

The *Health Care News Podcast*, hosted by Sarah Lee, was downloaded 174,887 times. Twila Brase, R.N, President of the Citizen’s Council for Health Freedom, talked about her new book, *Big Brother in the Exam Room: The Dangerous Truth About Electronic Records*. Jane Orient, M.D., joined the show to discuss solutions to the pre-existing conditions problem.

The *Voices of Vapers Podcast*, Heartland’s newest program, is hosted by State Government Relations Manager Lindsey Stroud. Recently, Stroud interviewed Guy Bentley, a research associate at the Reason Foundation, about tobacco harm reduction and regulations that are effecting the vaping industry.

Heartland’s *In the Tank Podcast*, hosted by Donny Kendal and (formerly) John Nothdurft was downloaded 96,528 times in the fourth quarter. This podcast, released every Friday, features work from think tanks across the country. This quarter, *In The Tank* featured work from the Tax Foundation, Reason Foundation, Center of the American Experiment, and scores of other free-market organizations. They covered topics as varied as socialism and the Green New Deal to America’s “dumbest drink laws.”
By Dr. Tim Huelskamp and James Taylor

For the first time since at least the 1940s, the United States is exporting more oil and petroleum than it imports, spurring economic growth. This accomplishment is due in large part to President Donald Trump’s decision to remove onerous Obama-era restrictions on oil production on federal lands, and it fulfills a long-stated public policy dream that only recently seemed achievable.

Just one decade ago, technological advancements in directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing—commonly called “fracking”—created a surge in U.S. oil production. Oil production from fiscal year 2009 through 2017 more than doubled on private and state-owned lands, thanks almost entirely to the fracking revolution. However, during the same period on federal lands, there was virtually no change in oil production. Although oil producers were able to better extract oil from leased federal lands, the Obama administration dramatically curtailed producers’ access to those lands. As a result, the percentage of oil produced on federal lands fell from 36 percent in 2009 to just 22 percent in 2017.

Something dramatic changed in 2017, though: President Trump started his first term in office and reversed Obama’s restrictive drilling policies. As a result, oil production on federal lands in 2017 increased dramatically. According to the federal Bureau of Land Management, revenue from oil and gas lease sales nearly doubled in the first year of the Trump administration compared to the final year of the Obama administration. The fracking revolution that significantly increased U.S. oil production and lowered oil and gasoline prices is now finally occurring on federally owned lands.

There are good reasons to believe the best has yet to come, too. In 2018, oil production on federal lands has increased compared to 2017, and it will almost certainly continue to grow as a result of the Trump administration’s encouragement and free-market reforms.
“[Fiscal Year] 2018 energy disbursements totaled $8.93 billion, which is an increase of nearly $2 billion since FY 2017 and an increase of $3 billion since President Obama’s last year in office. Production and revenues increased and the Department saw record-breaking sales,” the Department of the Interior noted in November.

Although some on the Left might try to rewrite history, it is important to remember the overall oil production gains of the past 10 years occurred despite the Obama administration’s best efforts to thwart them, not because of anything the Obama administration did. In addition to stifling oil production on federal lands, Obama routinely criticized oil as an energy source and even blocked U.S. energy producers from exporting oil to other countries. In 2015, Obama agreed not to veto congressional legislation allowing oil exports, but he only did so after Republicans agreed to authorize additional renewable power subsidies in return.

The Trump administration’s policies will have a tremendous positive impact on the U.S. economy for years to come. Saudi Arabia and other OPEC nations have been scheming for decades to create higher oil prices for Americans, even when it means higher gasoline prices for Saudi drivers. Why? Because higher oil prices bring overall net economic benefits to oil exporting nations. The best way to immunize the U.S. economy from the kind of oil price shocks that have previously sunk our nation into economic downturns and reduced American living standards is to ensure that the United States remains a net oil exporter. When OPEC nations restrict oil production and cause increases in global oil prices, higher prices at the pump will be offset by more foreign money flowing into the U.S. economy.

The next time you fill up your car at the pump, remember that the fracking revolution and increased domestic oil production are the primary reasons we no longer pay $4 per gallon for gasoline. Obama did his best to keep this progress from happening, but Trump is working to ensure the huge benefits associated with American energy dominance continue indefinitely.

Tim Huelskamp, Ph.D. (thuelskamp@heartland.org) is president of The Heartland Institute and a former member of Congress who represented Kansas. James Taylor (jtaylor@heartland.org) is senior fellow for energy and environment policy at The Heartland Institute.
By Chris Talgo
In 1886, Massachusetts became the first state to implement teacher tenure. At the time, teachers (primarily women) could be fired for several arbitrary “offenses,” such as getting married, becoming pregnant, dressing inappropriately, or even being out too late in the evening (even on non-school nights). Over time, more and more states enacted teacher tenure, citing academic freedom as a central reason.

However, in 2018, tenure is no longer necessary. Over the past century, tenure has transformed into an obsolete, protectionist racket that does more harm than good.

First and foremost, teacher tenure creates complacency because it guarantees job safety. Unlike almost every other profession, teachers are commonly awarded tenure very early in their careers, which virtually removes accountability and the incentive for excellent job performance. As a result, public schools are inundated with ineffective tenured teachers who put in minimal effort and fail to adequately educate students.

In 2016, the Thomas B. Fordham Institute released a report titled “Undue Process: Why Bad Teachers in Twenty-Five Diverse Districts Rarely Get Fired.” The authors found “in seventeen of our twenty-five districts, state law still allows teachers to earn tenure and keep it regardless of performance.” In its current iteration, tenure attracts and rewards mediocrity and reduces exceptional performance.

Besides creating a culture of classroom complacency, tenure also makes it nearly impossible to fire underperforming teachers. In fact, “In most districts and schools, dismissing an ineffective veteran teacher remains far harder than is healthy for children, schools, taxpayers—and the teaching profession itself,” according to the report. Unfortunately, tenure has created a rigid system rife with countless legal barriers that prevent principals from removing inadequate (and even dangerous) teachers in a timely manner.

As if incompetent teachers in far too many classrooms don’t pose enough of a threat to quality education, the time it takes to actually dismiss an inept teacher is appalling. Furthermore, the sheer cost of the process is a severe and totally unnecessary strain on state and local education budgets.

“In many districts, simply recommending
a tenured teacher for dismissal takes at least two years because the district must document both the teacher’s weak performance and its attempts at remediation, which may be indefinite in practice,” according to the Fordham report.

Even worse, in New York, firing a teacher takes “an average of 520 days from the date charges were brought to the date a decision was issued, at an average cost of $128,000. Proceedings addressing charges of pedagogical incompetence are even longer, spanning on average 830 days and costing on average $313,000,” according to a report by the New York State School Boards Association.

Additionally, tenure places seniority in front of all other factors (including performance) when staffing reductions must be made. This antiquated policy of “last-hired, first-fired” indiscriminately protects veteran teachers and punishes young teachers. Even worse, this backwards procedure cripples cutting-edge teaching methods and innovations—which are far more likely to be introduced and honed by young teachers.

Increasingly, misguided tenure supporters have stressed it as a safeguard for academic freedom and integrity. According to their reasoning, teachers are constantly at the mercy of local political officials and thus need protection from fleeting political pressures that could unduly influence their teaching methods (and content).

However, this argument is not credible in today’s standardized testing environment. In 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act federalized the American education system. In essence, this law incentivized local schools to adopt a plethora of national standardized tests by dangling billions to school districts. Hence, teachers have little to fear in terms of local political pressures to their teaching practices, because local officials no longer determine major curricular decisions.

In the years since No Child Left Behind, other so-called education reform measures such as Common Core and the Obama administration’s Race to the Top Fund have basically maintained the tenure status quo. In a campaign meant to increase teacher accountability, the Obama administration “incentivized states to embrace teacher-evaluation reform via Race to the Top … What happened next? Not much … we learned that 97 percent of America’s teachers are now deemed effective instead of 99,” according to the Fordham report. In other words, Obama’s Race to the Top failed to improve teacher accountability measures, and had almost no impact on diminishing tenure’s tentacles.

Tenure is an archaic and sclerotic system that blunts education innovation, teacher accountability, and student learning.

Chris Talgo (ctalgo@heartland.org) is a former public school teacher and editor at The Heartland Institute.
By Charlie Katebi

Over the past several months, Democratic candidates have vowed to defend Obamacare’s regulations on pre-existing conditions if they regain control of Congress. They argue these rules protect patients suffering from costly illnesses like cancer, diabetes, and multiple sclerosis, and they say Republicans and other supporters of consumer-driven health care want to heartlessly rip these protections away. However, contrary to these Democratic talking points, Obamacare caused far more problems than it solved for many vulnerable people.

On paper, Obamacare provides Americans suffering from pre-existing conditions with an iron-clad guarantee to health care. The law restricts insurers from rejecting patients based on their health, mandates insurers cover a wide array of medical benefits, and it prohibits them from charging sick patients higher premiums than healthy customers. But these mandates only tell part of the story.

Obamacare’s regulations effectively penalize insurers for providing quality coverage to vulnerable patients. Because the law forbids insurers from charging patients with expensive conditions premiums that are high enough to cover medical expenses, insurers have a gigantic incentive to deny them access to newer and more expensive medications. Over the past two years, economists from Harvard University and the University of Texas at Austin found insurers have responded to Obamacare rules by increasing out-of-pocket fees for medications, eliminating specialists from their networks, and adding others barriers to medical care.

Obamacare also harms people with expensive illnesses by driving young and healthy individuals out of the insurance market. Since the law mandates insurers charge healthy people the same premiums as sick individuals, premiums have increased nearly 140 percent, from $232 in 2013 to $555 in 2018. These premium increases have caused roughly three million people, many of whom are healthy, to drop their insurance, driving premiums for the remaining sick people even higher.

There is a better way to help patients with pre-existing conditions, and the Trump administration is hard at work putting...
these concrete solutions into action. On October 22, the Department of Health and Human Services released new guidance that empowers states with significantly greater flexibility to overhaul their health insurance markets beyond Obamacare’s failed approach. Under this new system, states will be able to offer individuals and families with an expanded array of affordable insurance options that are currently barred under Obamacare.

For instance, states could use the guidance to allow consumers to purchase plans without some of Obamacare’s expensive and often unnecessary “essential health benefits.” A 2017 analysis by HHS estimates that these reforms would slash premiums by up to 78 percent and expand insurance to over five million people by 2020. This would create a healthier and more stable risk pool for people with pre-existing conditions.

In response to President Donald Trump’s guidance, some Obamacare supporters have argued that insurers will use their new flexibility to price chronically ill patients out of coverage. However, the Trump administration is taking additional steps to safeguard the vulnerable. Since 2017, HHS has been working alongside states to establish publicly funded programs known as “reinsurance” to help insurers pay the medical bills for high-cost patients. Under this initiative, insurers identify patients with pre-existing conditions, and once these patients’ costs reach a certain threshold, the reinsurance program covers the remaining expenses.

Maine first pioneered reinsurance in 2011 to cover sick patients without raising premiums on everyone else in the individual marketplace. Shortly after these changes went into effect, the state’s largest insurer slashed annual premiums by $7,000 for the oldest and sickest enrollees. Most importantly, no one lost their coverage because of the program.

After seeing Maine’s reforms in action, the Trump administration has helped Alaska and Minnesota implement reinsurance programs of their own. In 2019, both states are expecting to see the average premiums in their insurance markets fall by more than 20 percent as a result of these programs. And another five states are also working with the administration to introduce reinsurance to their struggling health insurance markets.

Democrats want voters to think that the only way to protect patients with pre-existing conditions is by protecting Obamacare, a failed program that has unquestionably forced millions of people to lose their health insurance and forced health insurance costs to skyrocket. Fortunately, President Donald Trump has shown there are better solutions, and he is putting them into action.

Charlie Katebi (ckatebi@heartland.org) is a state government relations manager at The Heartland Institute.
By Edward Hudgins

Enjoy those gift packages delivered to your door this holiday season, because next year the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) might become the Grinch and charge much higher delivery fees!

This month, the Trump administration released a task force report titled the “United States Postal Service: A Sustainable Path Forward.” President Trump created the task force out of concern that USPS charges Amazon (and other companies) discount rates to deliver their packages that do not cover USPS costs and contribute to its huge deficit. In fiscal year 2017, USPS lost $2.7 billion despite bringing in revenues of $69.6 billion. This is part of a disturbing decades-long trend as businesses and consumers rely more on electronic communications for needs once served more by traditional first-class and other mail.

But the report errs seriously in recommending what amounts to a mechanism that will force USPS to charge higher rates on the companies that use USPS delivery services to satisfy consumer needs. USPS revenues from delivering packages for Amazon and other shippers have increased over the past decade. Package deliveries today contribute $7 billion over and above their costs to the USPS balance sheet.

E-commerce is an American success story. Its share of the retail market grew from about 8 percent in 2011 to 13 percent in 2017, or about $450 billion, and revenues are projected to reach $700 billion by 2022. Amazon and similar companies provide every imaginable good to consumers in a convenient and affordable manner. Consumers in less urbanized areas with fewer retail outlets than in big cities benefit especially from e-commerce. Companies in those areas with access to fewer local customers can sell anywhere in the country.

By law, the prices USPS charges such companies must cover all direct, attributable costs, such as the time a mail carrier spends delivering these packages, as well as a share of USPS overhead or “institutional” costs, such as for facilities and employees who must be paid regardless of the number of packages delivered. By law, package shippers
must cover 5.5 percent of USPS institutional costs, but in fiscal year 2017, they covered 23 percent. The Postal Rate Commission (PRC) certifies that USPS meets these pricing criteria. In May 2018, a U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that USPS was charging according to those criteria.

However, the task force bent over backwards to advocate a mechanism that could force USPS to artificially raise rates on companies like Amazon that already are carrying their share of USPS expenses. It suggests providing “full price transparency for all package services in order to reduce market distortion.” As of now, companies like Amazon negotiate confidential discounts based, for example, on the business volume they bring to USPS.

This is not “market distortion.” It is good business practice and a win-win for all parties. The recommendation seems to allow critics to argue “Amazon could be squeezed out of even more money.” Of course, increased shipping costs for Amazon would simply be passed along to Amazon’s millions of customers.

The report also proposes “the USPS and the PRC develop a new cost allocation model with fully distributed costs to all products, services, and activities.” Additionally, it suggests separating package delivery into a different balance sheet to prevent what it alleges could be cross-subsidies from the money-losing first-class services to the package-delivery services.

Unfortunately, these are nothing more than thinly veiled attempts to force companies such as Amazon to fork over more money to USPS. Moreover, charging e-commerce companies artificially higher rates in the long term will likely reduce USPS revenues because customers will likely decrease their use of Amazon and because Amazon and others would eventually build their own freestanding delivery system—less connected to USPS.

Yes, USPS has deep fiscal problems. However, USPS officials are working to put the agency back on sound fiscal footing. For example, USPS has implemented work sharing and contracted with more efficient private companies for logistics services such as sorting and transporting mail. The Task Force did appropriately support continuation and expansion of these activities. Yet, USPS is not out of the dark. It still needs to deal with out-of-control labor and pension costs.

If the USPS tries to bilk e-commerce companies that are making a huge contribution to the USPS balance sheet, it will be consumers and small businesses, especially in the U.S. heartland, that will be most harmed.

Edward Hudgins (ehudgins@heartland.org) is the research director of The Heartland Institute.
By Arianna Wilkerson
Government Relations Coordinator

The Heartland Heat Map (page 15) lays out our government relations team’s extensive education and legislative activities in the 50 states in 2018. We wrote and sent Research & Commentaries, Heartland’s signature analytical pieces on state-specific policies, to all 50 states. These pieces addressed specific issues facing a state, such as income tax reform in South Carolina and education choice scholarships in Nevada. Additionally, we conducted face-to-face meetings with elected officials in 18 states to discuss their legislative priorities, and our experts testified in 18 different states. In eight states, Heartland hosted events for legislators in or near their state capitol, to brief them on issues and to encourage them to join our Legislative Forum.

What this already-impressive map doesn’t show is a record count of how many times we engaged in a particular activity within a state, under reporting Heartland’s role in bringing about policy change. For example, we testified in Wisconsin four times in favor of bills that would expand direct primary care, reform civil asset forfeiture, and implement welfare reforms. We sent 11 Research & Commentaries to Pennsylvania lawmakers on topics such as loosening telemedicine regulations and establishing education savings accounts.

All this work added up to numerous legislative victories this year, such as the expansion of direct primary care in Florida, Missouri, and Nebraska; the passage of a comprehensive welfare reform package in Wisconsin; and the defeat of carbon taxes in at least 10 states. From Hawaii to Maine, Heartland logged more than 800,000 contacts with state elected officials on education, budget and tax, energy and environment, and health care issues.

In June 2018, Victory Enterprises, Inc. surveyed 500 randomly selected state elected officials, representing all 50 states. They found nearly 72 percent of those legislators surveyed recognize Heartland and 37 percent way we are “very” or “somewhat” valuable to them. Additionally, 78 percent of legislators read at least one of our newspapers, with 45 percent indicating a Heartland newspaper changed their opinion on a public policy issue.

Heartland’s dedicated staff and network of more than 500 policy advisors continue to work overtime to promote free-market solutions in all 50 states and Washington, DC. Our Government Relations Department is one of the aspects of The Heartland Institute that makes our organization unique among free-market think tanks. We treat state legislators like customers and with the utmost importance. Clearly, we hope all 50 states embrace individual liberty, but regardless of the political composition of a state’s legislature, Heartland is committed to educating and advising lawmakers in every political party and of all political persuasions.
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The Heartland Institute signed a historic communique with the Solidarity labor union at the latest U.N. climate conference, capping off a visit to Katowice, Poland in December 2018 to present non-alarmist climate science and policy.

The joint document signed with Solidarity called for the “restoration of the Scientific Method and the dismissal of ideological dogma at the United Nations.” Solidarity invited Heartland to join its statement after it hosted Heartland for a series of presentations on climate science and energy policy.

“The Silesian Region of Solidarity, the Secretariat of Mining and Energy of Solidarity, and The Heartland Institute express skepticism of the assertions of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that the world stands at the edge of a climate catastrophe,” announced the statement Solidarity submitted to the 24th Conference of the Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP24). “Solidarity and The Heartland Institute together stress that there is no scientific consensus on the main causes and consequences of climate change.”

No Science at U.N. Meeting
During COP24, the United Nations hosted absolutely no discussions of climate science. Instead, the delegates skipped straight to discussions on reducing carbon-dioxide (CO2) emissions below the levels committed to in the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement. This alarmist agenda came partially in response to a September 2018 report from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) claiming CO2 emissions must be net zero by 2050 to prevent a global warming catastrophe.

Negotiators also discussed increasing the annual $100 billion funding from Western democracies to the rest of the world mandated by the Paris agreement, to assist developing countries in their efforts to adapt to present and future harms allegedly caused by climate change.

Heartland Provides Science, Economics
In response, The Heartland Institute hosted a three-hour event in Katowice, which was livestreamed and has been viewed by more than 8,000 people. Scientists and climate experts presented scientific evidence indicating humans are not creating a climate crisis. Panelists also discussed the harm done to Europeans by left-wing energy policies, renewable mandates, and subsidies intended to fight climate change.

Dr. Craig Idso, chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, began the session by unveiling the newest report from the Nongovernmental
International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Fossil Fuels* (see story on page 11), of which he is a lead coauthor.

This new volume, which is approximately 700 pages long, features contributions from more than 100 scientists and includes more than 2,000 citations of data from peer-reviewed scientific literature. The volume documents that fossil fuels have delivered tremendous net benefits to the United States and the world and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

**IPCC ‘A Political Body’**

The IPCC is a political body, not a scientific one, and it promotes climate alarmism, says Idso.

“Climate alarmism is championed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a political body of the United Nations,” Idso said during his presentation in Poland. “Given what is compiled in the NIPCC reports and the thousands of peer-reviewed articles cited therein, I can tell you with complete confidence—there is absolutely no observational evidence that provides any compelling support for the contention there is something unusual, unnatural, or unprecedented about Earth’s current warming period.”

Dennis Avery, who formerly served as a senior analyst in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Department of State and is a policy advisor to Heartland, gave a presentation documenting how warmer climate periods have historically nurtured greater global crop production and net benefits for human health and welfare.

**Sun, Wind, Money**

Horst Ludecke, an emeritus professor of physics at the University of Applied Sciences of the Saarland, documented how solar variability has driven temperature and climate change throughout history. Ludecke cited research strongly indicating solar activity remains the primary driver of climate change today as in the past, with human CO2 emissions playing, at most, only a minor role in the ongoing natural recovery from the Little Ice Age.

Wolfgang Mueller, general secretary of the European Institute for Climate and Energy, discussed the disastrous impact Germany’s substantial monetary and legislative support for wind power has had on electricity prices. As a result of their government’s energy policies, Germans currently pay more than triple the price of electricity in the United States, Mueller noted.

James Taylor, a senior fellow at The Heartland Institute, concluded the event with a presentation arguing the United Nations’ climate agenda is more about taking money and power away from individuals and sovereign nations than reducing CO2 emissions.

“The U.N. climate agenda would not only strip Americans of tens of billions of dollars each year, but also much of our individual freedom,” Taylor said.
Our 34th Anniversary Benefit Dinner was a HUGE success! We served more than 400 guests, and Joe Walsh, a former member of Congress and Heartlander, kept everyone engaged and laughing throughout the evening.

Our featured speaker, Judge Andrew Napolitano, was, by all accounts, a resounding hit! The Judge’s unique combination of wit and wisdom, with a healthy dash of history thrown in, provided everyone with a refreshing perspective on the real “state of the union.”

We also presented the coveted Heartland Liberty Prize to our very own Joe and Diane Bast! For three decades, they selflessly devoted their lives to Heartland, and we owe them a debt of gratitude we can never repay.

Thank you!
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