



Written by [Staff](#) on October 6, 2020

Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Inside Track

Amazon Announces “Innovative” Automated Indoor Surveillance Drone



Youtube/Ring

Amazon is now offering customers “An Innovative New Approach to Always Being at Home.” The innovation: an indoor drone!

At an event held on September 24, the tech titan announced a slate of new devices, including one that it calls “The Ring Always Home Cam.” Here’s how the company’s press release described the home-based surveillance drone:

That’s why I’m excited to announce the Ring Always Home Cam, a new way to look after the home and provide multiple viewpoints with one device. This autonomous indoor security camera flies your chosen, personalized paths so that you can easily check in on your home for peace of mind – like whether someone left a window open or forgot to turn the stove off.

The Ring Always Home Cam also easily integrates with Ring Alarm – our home security system – charting a new path forward not just for how people use security cameras, but also for the benefits of a home alarm system. When Ring Alarm is triggered while in Away Mode, the Always Home Cam will automatically fly a set path to see what’s happening. You can easily stream video while the camera is in-flight via the Ring App, making sure that you’re in the know when it comes to everything happening at home.

Wow. Amazon has been promising drones for years, but who would have thought they’d have drones that fly around inside your house while you’re not home!

Will Ring employees be able to fly the drone around without the homeowner’s permission? Will hackers be able to take control of the Ring drone and spy on users of the device? Where will the videos and audio recorded by Amazon’s new indoor drone be stored? How long will they be stored? Will Amazon continue to give police access to the images without the obtaining of a warrant?

The Always Home Cam costs \$249.99 and is expected to launch next year.



Written by [Staff](#) on October 6, 2020

Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

No Fracking Permits by 2024, No Gas-powered Vehicles by 2035



AP Images

When California Governor Gavin Newsom mandated September 23 that all new cars and passenger trucks be zero-emission by 2035, he paid homage to the climate-change gods: “This is the most impactful step our state can take to fight climate change. For too many decades, we have allowed cars to pollute the air that our children and families breathe. Californians shouldn’t have to worry if our cars are giving our kids asthma. Our cars shouldn’t make wildfires worse — and create more days filled with smoky air. Cars shouldn’t melt glaciers or raise sea levels threatening our cherished beaches and coastlines.”

It’s a mandate, to be backed up by supportive legislation from compliant politicians in Sacramento, which means that it’s something free people would not choose to do on their own.

Newsom also asked the California legislature to end the issuance of new fracking permits by 2024.

The mandates predictably will cost California thousands of energy industry-related jobs. Said Rock Ziernan, CEO of the California Independent Petroleum Association, “Today’s announcement to curb in-state production of energy will put thousands of workers ... onto the state’s [already] overloaded unemployment program, [and] drive up energy costs when consumers can least afford it.”

Mark Green, writing for the American Petroleum Institute, said, “It’s difficult to see how the mandate won’t make life in California — already among the most expensive in the nation — more costly, hurting people least able to afford it.”

Western States Petroleum Association President Catherine Reheis-Boyd added: “Big ideas are only better if they are affordable for us all and can be backed by science, data and needed infrastructure. There are many questions about all of those concerns in the Governor’s orders. Dismantling our oil and natural gas industry right now means betting everything on alternative energy resources that we don’t have in place and a supporting infrastructure that’s far from being at the scale we need.”



Written by [Staff](#) on October 6, 2020

Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Trump Unveils “America First Healthcare Plan”



sanjeri/E+/GettyImagesPlus

After years of promising a replacement for ObamaCare, President Donald Trump unveiled his “America First Healthcare Plan” September 24 at an appearance in Charlotte, North Carolina. But far from replacing ObamaCare, the plan seeks to retain its most popular feature, the ban on denying health insurance to individuals with preexisting conditions, while making only modest changes to existing policies.

“Under the America First Healthcare Plan,” Trump said, “we will ensure the highest standard of care anywhere in the world, cutting-edge treatments, state-of-the-art medicine, groundbreaking cures, and true health security for you and your loved ones.”

Much of Trump’s speech, like the executive order he signed afterward, consisted of recounting his accomplishments with regard to healthcare. Some, such as repealing the individual mandate, are constitutional; others, such as grants for HIV treatment, are not.

Moreover, while Trump ran on repealing ObamaCare and supports a lawsuit to overturn it, his remarks seemed to suggest he had made peace with it. “ObamaCare,” he declared, “is no longer ObamaCare” because his administration has “managed it very well.” In fact, he said the American people can’t lose regardless of the outcome of the suit: A win would mean the end of ObamaCare, but a loss would mean the continuation of the new, improved ObamaCare.

Trump’s executive order states, “It has been and will continue to be the policy of the United States to give Americans seeking healthcare more choice, lower costs, and better care and to ensure that Americans with pre-existing conditions can obtain the insurance of their choice at affordable rates.”

Trump claimed the order was necessary because Democrats, whom he likened to “radical socialists and communists,” give lip service to protecting people with preexisting conditions, “yet preexisting conditions are much safer with us than they are with them.” Similarly, he asserted that he had “made Social Security stronger, better,” and that “as long as I’m President, no one will lay a hand on your Medicare.” In other words, vote Republican if you want efficient, well-managed socialism.



Written by [Staff](#) on October 6, 2020

Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Democrats Want to Limit Supreme Court Terms Through Legislation



mscornelius/iStock/GettyImagesPlus

Despite the U.S. Constitution providing for a life term for members of the federal judiciary, some Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives are calling for limiting the tenure of Supreme Court justices to 18 years, with a bill announced September 25.

Article III of the Constitution states, “The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their office during good behavior.”

The “Supreme Court Term Limits and Regular Appointments Act,” sponsored by Representatives Ro Khanna of California, Joe Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Don Beyer of Virginia, would allow the president to nominate two justices to the Supreme Court during each four-year term and would limit the tenure of a justice to 18 years. The three House members have “Freedom Index” scores of 24 percent, 22 percent, and 15 percent, respectively. The Freedom Index rates members of Congress on how their votes demonstrate fidelity to the U.S. Constitution.

This proposed law is a reflection of those low scores. Regardless of the merits of the proposal, it is *not* what the Constitution provides. And because of that, simple legislation such as this proposal by these three House Democrats cannot change the Constitution. Particularly egregious is the idea that every president would be allowed to nominate two justices to the Supreme Court during each four-year term. While one may argue that this would be a good policy (or not), such a proposal would require an amendment to the Constitution.

Representative Khanna said that his proposal “would save the country a lot of agony and help lower the temperature over fights for the court that go to the fault lines of cultural issues and is one of the primary things tearing at our social fabric.” Perhaps so, but again, this cannot be accomplished by mere legislation — it requires a constitutional amendment.

Regardless of the merits of their proposal to limit terms of office of Supreme Court members, such proposals require amending the Constitution. Changing our political structure through legislation is not what the Founders intended.



Written by [Staff](#) on October 6, 2020

Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

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.