Dems’ agenda more about control than climate

In 2019, under President Trump’s administration, the United States led the rest of the world in clean air. The World Health Organization reported that fine particle pollution in the United States was six times lower than the world average and seven times lower than China. In addition, they were far lower than in other industrialized nations, including France, Germany, and Russia. This is fantastic news for Americans, to COVID-19 mandates and lockdowns and the type of information Americans consume on social media — Democrats promote themselves as the ultimate authority. However, they’ve outdone themselves with their climate change agenda, which is less about saving the environment and more about controlling how Americans live their lives.

California got the ball rolling when Governor Gavin Newsom signed an executive order mandating that all new cars and passenger trucks sold in the state must be zero-emission vehicles by 2035. So much for freedom of choice; Californians are being maneuvered into driving electric vehicles, as the alternative is being artificially phased out.

Due to blackouts caused by what Newsom called “unreliable solar and wind power,” California, which used to be a major producer of oil, had to import oil from neighboring states. This was not a wakeup call: California continues to close nuclear and fossil fuel plants in favor of “renewables.” Californians pay the second highest energy rates in the nation, yet they are hostage to a grid which can’t keep up with demand.

And it’s not just consumers: the agriculture sector, which generates $471 billion annually in California, is also in the cross hairs of the electric-or-bust movement. California is a prime example of controlling citizens through an agenda. Expect more blue states to follow. Massachusetts did, enacting a bill that will outlaw the sale of gas-powered vehicles by the year 2035. Practical? Sensitive to the real-world needs of Americans? That means little to those who wave the green flag.

Democrats utilize climate change as another wasteful expenditure outlet. The Inflation Reduction Act, enacted this August, allots about $370 billion for climate and energy-related action. John Podesta, a seasoned Washington insider and chairman of Hillary Clinton’s unsuccessful 2016 presidential campaign, oversees funding management. Much of the spending would go to new or expanded tax credits to promote clean energy generation, electrification, energy efficiency and wider adoption of electric vehicles.

Who does this benefit the most? Not Americans. Democrat climate change policies benefit China significantly. China already controls more than 80% of all manufacturing crucial to solar panel production and could soon produce more than 95% of the world’s polysilicon and wafers. Seven of the top ten wind turbine manufacturers are Chinese. Furthermore, China is the world leader in electric vehicle production and produces 80% of all lithium-ion batteries. And Chinese energy companies are the fastest growing customers of American natural gas exports, purchasing nearly half the gas that U.S. companies agreed to ship in the last year, according to Politico.

We’re turning off the spigot for Americans, while helping China literally fuel its economy.

Democrats are dealing Americans a bad hand with their Green New Deal agenda.

Rasheed Walters is an entrepreneur, political commentator and historian. He is a member of Project 21 and resides in Boston. Follow him on Twitter @rasheednwalters.

Iran’s nuclear issue out of spotlight, for now

By Doyle McManus

After more than a decade of U.S. policy focused on preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, arms negotiations have been shoved off center stage.

The long-running dispute over nuclear weapons has been displaced by a more immediate drama — the rapidly spreading uprising against the Iranian regime.

“Our focus every day, and the world’s focus, is what’s happening in the streets of Iran,” Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken said last week. “We support what Iranians are asking for,” he said, saying they wanted “to be heard, to be able to make their views known peacefully, and not to have this terrible repression.”

U.S. negotiator Robert Malley added a blunt assessment of the prospects for a revived nuclear arms deal, one of President Joe Biden’s long-term foreign policy goals: “It’s not on the agenda.”

Instead, the U.S. confrontation with Iran has become broader and deeper — a conflict on more than one front.

The United States and other big powers have been working for almost two years to revive the 2015 nuclear deal with Iran that President Donald Trump canceled in 2018. The deal put a ceiling on Iran’s uranium enrichment program, which produces the basic ingredient for nuclear weapons, in exchange for lifting economic sanctions.

By August, officials on both sides said they were close to agreement. But Iran raised new demands, stalling the deal, U.S. and European officials say. Then, in September, Iran’s streets erupted in protest after a 22-year-old woman, Mahsa Amini, died in police custody. She had been arrested by Tehran’s morality police for allegedly wearing her headscarf immodestly.

Angry demonstrations against the regime began among women and girls, and spread quickly. Protesters in Tehran set fire to police stations and called for the overthrow of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the country’s supreme leader. Police arrested thousands and announced that protesters would be put on trial — some on charges that carry the death penalty.

President Joe Biden said the uprising was unprecedented in the era of the Islamic Republic.

“There is a widespread willingness of young Iranians to go to the streets and demand a change of the system ... and they're completely undeterred by the use of force,” said Suzanne Maloney of the Brookings Institution.

The Biden administration reacted almost immediately, condemning the repression and calling on the United Nations to monitor the Tehran regime’s actions:

The United States also relaxed sanctions that restricted exports of communications technology to Iran, to allow Google and other companies to provide tools for protesters to communicate securely.

The uprising has one more effect on U.S. policy: It has made it politically impossible, at least for the moment, for the administration to relax nuclear sanctions.

If the Tehran regime suddenly agreed to sign the stalled nuclear deal, the U.S. would be required to lift many of its economic sanctions against Iran. Billions of dollars in frozen assets would flow into Iran’s treasury, and Iran would be free to sell oil in the world market.

“You would have to consider whether you were providing a lifeline to a regime that is under fire from its own population,” Maloney said.

That leaves Biden administration officials trapped in a dilemma.

They still want a nuclear deal with Iran; they just don’t think they can conclude one now, with a regime under siege by its own citizens. The nuclear agreement may be off the agenda for now. But the problem it was intended to solve hasn’t gone away.
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