





Inside Track

"Climate Change" Is Stopping People From Having Children

With the United States already having a fertility rate that's below replacement level, and dropping, a new factor exacerbating this problem has become apparent: people reluctant to have children because of "climate change." Some are worried about having kids destined to live in a "kind of 'Mad Max' dystopia," as one woman put it. Others don't want to add to the planet little "carbon footprints" who'll grow into big "carbon footprints." All have things out of perspective.

The *New York Times* reported on this phenomenon on February 5, writing, "A 32-year-old who always thought she would have children can no longer justify it to herself. A Mormon has bucked the expectations of her religion by resolving to adopt rather than give birth. An Ohio woman had her first child after an unplanned pregnancy — and then had a second because she did not want her daughter to face an environmental collapse alone."

Before adding more perspective, note that these climate worrywarts would be well-served to consider that the anthropogenic global warming thesis is not, as its proponents assert, "settled science."

The *Times* writes that the climate-over-kids crew has a "sense of being saddled with painful ethical questions that previous generations did not have to confront." But we aren't unique today in being saddled with hardships or "ethical questions." What we are is uniquely spoiled, and uniquely comfortable and detached from the past so that our problems, real and imagined, seem large when viewed within it.

Do we really know the future? How much stock do we want to put in futurists' and doomsayers' predictions, with their terrible track record? Climate-over-kids women will soon be past their childbearing years. Most will realize that they let life pass them by and, worrying about a future unknown, sacrificed a future that definitely could have been: all their children's — and children's children's — tomorrows.

Stockton, California, to Test Universal Basic Income

Later this year, the city of Stockton, California, will begin giving a select group of poor residents \$500 a month in an experimental program to test the effects of giving people a universal basic income, or UBI. Though this initial program, which will run for a period of 12-18 months, will be funded by a million-dollar private grant from a tech group called the Economic Security Project, it will involve only 100 families in a city of 300,000 people where one in four residents lives below the official poverty line.

Dorian Warren, who co-chairs the Economic Security Project, told KPIX 5 news in San Francisco on February 1 that the goal in Stockton is to gather data on how having a basic income impacts people. "What does it mean to say, 'Here is unconditional guaranteed income just based on you being a human being?'" Warren asked.

In a January 29 interview with Ari Shapiro on National Public Radio, Stockton Mayor Michael Tubbs said about the guaranteed income plan, "So from now until June, we'll do a community engagement process to come up with the selection criterion for the families who will be selected. Those families will receive \$500 a month for the next year to 18 months with the idea to really elevate the story of working-







class people everywhere. People are working very hard and struggling and unable to make basic ends meet. So we were able to get a grant of \$1 million from the Economic Security Project to really test this idea."

Let the folks at Economic Security Project spend a million dollars of their own funds helping the low-income families of Stockton if they want — that is their prerogative in a free society. But what they and Mayor Tubbs have in mind in Stockton is just a test for a city welfare program that could eventually cost the taxpayers millions of dollars a year.

Fracking Pushes U.S. Crude Oil Production Over 10 Million Barrels

November's production of crude oil in the United States, according to the U.S. Energy Information Agency, not only exceeded October's by four percent, but rose to a level not seen in nearly 50 years: 10 million barrels per day (bpd). The agency went even further: At this rate daily U.S. crude oil production will exceed that of both Russia and Saudi Arabia by the end of next year.

As recently as 2011, the United States was only producing about 5.5 million bpd, compared to production by the Saudis and Russia at about twice that. But while those nations' production levels stagnated, fracking has caused U.S. production to grow at an annual rate of 10 percent.

The expansion by "Big Oil" into the Bakken Formation (in North Dakota, Montana, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba) and the Permian Basin (in Texas and New Mexico) could accelerate production at an even greater rate. ExxonMobil, for example, just announced it would be redirecting an additional \$35 billion into development and infrastructure over the next three years, and it plans to triple its Permian Basin production by no later than 2025.

Other oil companies — notably Royal Dutch Shell and Conoco — are exploring the Montney and Duvernay Formations in Canada. Montney has proven reserves of more than a billion barrels of crude, while Duvernay's reserves are triple that, at 3.4 billion. Chevron, Royal Dutch Shell, and the French energy giant Total all just announced new Gulf discoveries in early February.

As the price of crude rises, idle rigs in the United States are drawn back into operation. The total number of gas and oil rigs hit 947 last week, up from 712 a year ago. This total remains far below the roughly 1,700 rigs that were operational as of late 2014.

It won't be long before historians will record that the production record of 10 million bpd by the U.S. energy industry set last November was just one more step toward the nation's greatly increased world energy production and ultimate global dominance.

California Considers Mandatory Interviews of Homeschool Families

The *Orange County Register* reported February 3 that "Assemblyman Jose Medina, the Riverside Democrat who represents Perris in the state Legislature, told the *Press-Enterprise* that he is 'extremely concerned about the lack of oversight the state of California currently has in monitoring private and home schools.' He proposes an annual state inspection of homeschooling residences."

Medina's impetus for this proposal is the abuse allegedly committed by a couple — David and Louise







Turpin — from Perris, California, the district he represents. The Turpins are accused of harming their 13 children, who were found by authorities January 14 in the Turpins' home, by chaining them, refusing to feed them, and inflicting on them abuse of unconscionable severity.

Among the many proposals being bandied about by "concerned" legislators are involuntary home visits, involuntary interviews of the parents, involuntary interviews of homeschool children, and complete oversight of the homeschool community by state agents of several departments, including Child Protective Services.

In a statement issued after news broke of the efforts under way in California to stifle homeschooling in that state, Home School Legal Defense Association President Mike Smith called out the California assembly for the illogical and unconstitutional policy they are considering: "It makes no sense to assume that someone who makes a lawful choice — in this case, to homeschool — is more likely to act illegally. The principle that individuals are innocent until proven guilty has always been at the heart of the American tradition of liberty. Homeschooling parents around the country have demonstrated a high degree of success in raising and nurturing their children — giving them the tools to grow and flourish.... It would be inappropriate and unjust to regulate homeschool freedom because of this aberrant case."

Besides the illogical aspect of the planned denial of the right to raise one's children free from government interference and free from government approval, there is the fact that there is absolutely no evidence that homeschooled children are more often the victims of abuse than their public-school peers.

Pro-refugee Activist Admits She Was Wrong

German activist Rebecca Sommer was enthusiastic about the Muslim "refugees" entering Germany, but she has changed her tune. She says that the newcomers won't shed "their medieval view," are developing "parallel societies" within her country, and that if Germans "don't wake up quickly, the whole situation will end tragically."

After founding the organization Working Group Asylum + Human Rights in 2012, Sommer welcomed the huge 2015 influx of Muslim migrants into Germany. She and her 300 volunteers even provided German-language courses to help the newcomers integrate. As InfoWars reported February 5, "'At that time I wanted to help everyone and truly believed that all these people were fleeing hell and were in a state of complete distress,' Sommer told Polish weekly *Do Rzeczy*."

"With the initial hope that 'their medieval view was going to change with time,' Sommer soon realized that, 'Muslim refugees have grown up with values that are totally different[;] they have undergone brainwashing from childhood on and are indoctrinated by Islam and absolutely do not intend to adopt our values,'" InfoWars also informs.

"Among my past and present pupils, I can count on one hand cases of those who are, in my opinion, completely and successfully integrated," explained Sommer in a January 18 interview with the Polish website EuroIslam.

Sommer "also observed how the migrants, 'regard we infidels with disdain and arrogance,' after they began to refer to her as 'the stupid German whore,' a realization that she says has led other refugee volunteers to quit. Sommer now admits that despite her good intentions, she got it completely wrong and that Muslim migration poses an existential threat to the Germany [sic] way of life, a problem that







will only be exacerbated by the process of family reunification, where migrants will be able to invite their relatives to stay in Germany," InfoWars relates.

Perhaps Sommer would have been better off if she had listened to one particular orthodox Muslim: Dr. Mudar Zahran, a leader of the Jordanian Opposition Coalition and asylee currently living in the United Kingdom. In a 2015 interview, he stated that most of the so-called Syrian refugees entering Europe weren't actually from Syria, that most of those who were from Syria weren't from dangerous areas and didn't need refuge, that terrorists were among them, and that they were coming to Europe largely to leech off the welfare system. Calling the influx "the soft Islamic conquest of the West," Zahran warned that the Muslims should be kept out of Europe.

The results of not heeding such warnings are already apparent. Even liberal *Newsweek* reported January 3 that migrants in Europe are "linked to soaring violence and crime in Germany." The most notorious example occurred New Year's Eve 2015 when 1,200 women (whom we know of) were sexually assaulted by at least 2,000 migrant men in various German cities. As Sommer admitted in the EuroIslam interview, "The sexual molesting of [refugee aid] volunteers happens all the time, but none of us has ever reported such a case to the police because none of us wanted to be seen as an opponent of refugees and cause problems for the center."

Another result of the migrant influx is the development of "no-go zones," or what Sommer calls "Muslim parallel societies." These are areas in some European countries where authorities are often reluctant to enter and sharia law has to an extent supplanted civil law.

Sommer warned repeatedly in her EuroIslam interview of *taqiyya* — religiously sanctioned and encouraged lying in Islam — and says that while Kurds and others fleeing Mideast Muslims warned her of the tactic, she "did not want to listen to them."

Sommer told EuroIslam that she initially was confident the Muslims would integrate because "I placed great trust in our libertarian, equitable European values, and I naively thought that every person must delight in them and take them on." But consider that when summing up these "values," Sommer merely told EuroIslam that Germany needs refugees who accept "a secular state where women and men are equal before the law, where we eat pork, where they could even sunbathe naked on the beach. This freedom is very precious and very fragile." One may wonder, could she name even a few actual virtues?

Sommer laments that soon the Germans will have to "adapt" to Muslim norms. Well, this certainly could be a lesson in virtue, because they'd lose a lot more than shallow equality rhetoric, pork sausages, and nude beaches.







Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.