

Birth Control The Obama Way? Carbon Tax Credits Being Mulled Per Child On The Horizon?

From [Investor's Business Daily](#):

Cap-And-Trade For Babies?

Posted 10/19/2009

Earth: An environmental writer mainstreams an idea floating around the green fringe — save the earth by population control and give carbon credits to one-child families. Are we threatened by the patter of little carbon footprints?

It's long been a mantra on the left that people are a plague on the earth, ravaging its surface for food and resources, polluting its atmosphere and endangering its species. Now we are endangering its very climate to the point of extinction. Even the result of our breathing — carbon dioxide — has been declared by the EPA to be a dangerous pollutant.

Treaties like Kyoto and the upcoming economic suicide pact to be forged in Copenhagen have focused on the instruments and byproducts of our civilization. Now the focus is shifting increasingly to the people who built it.

New York Times environmental writer Andrew Revkin participated in an Oct. 14 panel discussion on climate change with other media pundits titled “Covering Climate: What’s Population Got To Do With It?” People who need people they are not.

Participating via Web cam, Revkin volunteered that in allocating carbon credits as part of any cap-and-trade scheme, “if you can measurably somehow divert fertility rate, say toward accelerating decline in a place with a high fertility rate, shouldn’t there be a carbon value to that?”

He went on to say that “probably the single most concrete and substantive thing an American, young American, could do to lower our carbon footprint is not turning off the light or driving a Prius, it’s having fewer kids, having fewer children.”

“More children equal more carbon dioxide emissions,” Rivkin has blogged, wondering “whether this means we’ll soon see a market in baby-avoidance carbon credits similar to efforts to sell CO2 credits for avoiding deforestation.” Save the trees, not the children.

Rivkin’s views are unfortunately shared by people with power and influence. Jonathon Porritt, chairman of Britain’s Sustainable Development Commission, believes that “having more than two children is irresponsible” and that people should “connect up their own responsibility for their total environmental footprint.”

Earlier this year, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi defended federal contraceptive initiatives as an effort to “reduce costs to the states and to the federal government.” For Pelosi, mother of five, the fewer the merrier.

Would this proposed carbon-credit carrot turn someday into a large stick? Would child exemptions disappear after the first child or worse?

After all, we have a White House communications director, Anita Dunn, who considers mass murderer Mao Zedong her favorite philosopher. China has its one-child policy, which it vigorously enforces.

This brave new world is not too far-fetched for science adviser John Holdren, who has advised taking population control to quite another level. He has at various times advocated forced abortion and sterilization and views people as a burden, not as the ultimate resource, as we do.

In a recently rediscovered book, “Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment,” co-authored with Malthus fans Paul and Anne Ehrlich, Holdren wrote that families “contribute to general social deterioration by overproducing children” and “can be required by law to exercise reproductive responsibility.”

Holdren envisions that a “Planetary Regime might be given responsibility for determining the optimum population for the world and for each region and for arbitrating various countries’ shares within their regional limits ... the Regime would have some power to enforce the agreed limits.” In other words, China on steroids.

The view that human beings are inexorably outstripping the globe’s capacity to sustain them is one of the most vivid, powerful and enduring economic myths of the modern era because the Chicken Littles who spread it forget one simple fact — with bodies come minds.

My end notes:

Population control by dangling carbon tax credits in front of American parents.

One child families a possibility?

Will male children carry more value than females? Will we see infanticide the likes of China; women having multiple abortions trying to conceive male offspring?

Is this what America has become?

Remember this one thing: *with bodies come minds.*

Has a percentage of America finally woken up to the Obama *agenda*?

Is there a study of HOW MANY Americans have changed their party affiliation?

From Democrat to Independent?

From Republican to Independent?

**What has been the increase in number of REGISTERED INDEPENDENTS over the past year?
Two years?**

Washington, D.C. will be undergoing *Change* all right. The incumbents will start to fear being *voted out of office*. Because America is starting to vocalize their disdain for the political gargoyles of Washington, D.C.