**Hot Fusion Finally?**

A major milestone has been breached in the quest for fusion energy.

For the first time, a fusion reaction has achieved a record 1.3 megajoule energy output – and for the first time, exceeding energy absorbed by the fuel used to trigger it.

Although there's still some way to go, the result represents a significant improvement on previous yields: eight times greater than experiments conducted just a few months prior, and 25 times greater than experiments conducted in 2018. It's a huge achievement.

Physicists at the National Ignition Facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will be submitting a paper for [peer review](https://www.sciencealert.com/science-peer-review).

"This result is a historic step forward for inertial confinement fusion research, opening a fundamentally new regime for exploration and the advancement of our critical national security missions. It is also a testament to the innovation, ingenuity, commitment and grit of this team and the many researchers in this field over the decades who have steadfastly pursued this goal," [said Kim Budil](https://www.llnl.gov/news/national-ignition-facility-experiment-puts-researchers-threshold-fusion-ignition), director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

"For me, it demonstrates one of the most important roles of the national labs – our relentless commitment to tackling the biggest and most important scientific grand challenges and finding solutions where others might be dissuaded by the obstacles."

Inertial confinement fusion involves creating something like a tiny star. It starts with a capsule of fuel, consisting of deuterium and tritium – heavier isotopes of hydrogen. This fuel capsule is placed in a hollow gold chamber about the size of a pencil eraser called a hohlraum.

Then, 192 high-powered laser beams are blasted at the hohlraum, where they are converted into X-rays. These X-rays implode the fuel capsule, heating and compressing it to conditions comparable to those in the center of a star – temperatures in excess of 100 million degrees Celsius (180 million Fahrenheit) and pressures greater than 100 billion Earth atmospheres – turning the fuel capsule into a tiny blob of plasma.

And, just as hydrogen fuses into heavier elements in the heart of a main-sequence star, so too does the deuterium and tritium in the fuel capsule. The whole process takes place in just a few billionths of a second. The goal is to achieve ignition – a point at which the energy generated by the fusion process exceeds the total energy input.

The experiment, conducted on 8 August, fell *just* short of that mark; the input from the lasers was 1.9 megajoules. But it's still tremendously exciting, because according to the team's measurements, the fuel capsule absorbed over five times less energy than it generated in the fusion process.

This, the team said, is the result of painstaking work refining the experiment, including the design of the hohlraum and capsule, improved laser precision, new diagnostic tools, and design changes to increase the speed of the implosion of the capsule, which transfers more energy to the plasma hotspot in which fusion takes place.

"Gaining experimental access to thermonuclear burn in the laboratory is the culmination of decades of scientific and technological work stretching across nearly 50 years," [said Thomas Mason](https://www.llnl.gov/news/national-ignition-facility-experiment-puts-researchers-threshold-fusion-ignition), director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

"This enables experiments that will check theory and simulation in the high energy density regime more rigorously than ever possible before and will enable fundamental achievements in applied science and engineering."

The team plans to conduct follow-up experiments to see if they can replicate their result, and to study the process in greater detail. The result also opens up new avenues for experimental research.

The physicists also hope to work out how to further increase energy efficiency. A lot of energy is lost when the laser light is converted into X-rays inside the hohlraum; a large proportion of the laser light instead goes into heating the hohlraum walls. Solving this problem will take us another significant step closer to fusion energy.

In the meantime, though, the researchers are tremendously excited.

"Achieving ignition in a laboratory remains one of the scientific grand challenges of this era and this result is a momentous step forward towards achieving that goal," [said physicist Johan Frenje](https://climate.mit.edu/posts/mit-makes-key-contribution-national-ignition-facilitys-historic-fusion-experiment) of MIT's Plasma Science and Fusion Center.

"It also enables the exploration of a fundamentally new regime that is extremely difficult to access experimentally, furthering our understanding of the processes of fusion ignition and burn, which is critical for validating and enhancing our simulation tools in support of the stockpile stewardship.

"In addition, the result is historic as it represents the culmination of many decades of hard work, innovation and ingenuity, team work on a large scale, and relentless focus on the ultimate goal."

**Decentralization of Government**

**Across the pond, Poland and the European Union find themselves deadlocked over a question about judicial primacy.**In early October, Poland’s Constitutional Tribunal sparked controversy when it ruled that EU law does not [supersede](https://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/blog/) national legislation.
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At stake in the EU-Poland legal dispute, was Poland’s decision in [2018](https://www.cnn.com/2018/07/20/europe/poland-supreme-court-reform-bill-intl/index.html) to rein in its judiciary and establish a disciplinary chamber to remove judges. Before these reforms were undertaken, the Polish judiciary was largely viewed as corrupt and inefficient, possessing vestigial features of the previous Communist order, when Poland was a member of the Warsaw Pact. What initially started out as a mundane domestic reform soon transformed into an international controversy.

**The European Court of Justice (ECJ) took exception to Poland’s reforms and ruled that EU law takes precedence over Polish law.** The ECJ’s ruling did not deter Poland, though. Back in March, Polish prime minister Mateusz Morawiecki [brought the case](https://constitutionnet.org/news/polands-prime-minister-asks-top-court-decide-if-constitution-has-primacy-over-eu-law) before the Polish Constitutional Tribunal, subsequently leading to the Polish tribunal’s controversial ruling in October. Following the October ruling, the EU commission had [choice words](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_21_5142) for Poland’s superior court and reaffirmed its EU-law-über-alles stance.

**Possessed by a universalist spirit, the EU ramped up the pressure on Poland**by slapping it with a daily fine of [€1 million euros](https://www.euronews.com/2021/10/27/poland-must-pay-daily-fines-of-1-million-over-its-controversial-judiciary-reforms-ecj-rule) (slightly over $1.1 million) until the Law and Justice (PiS, Prawo i Sprawiedliwość) government modifies its judicial legislation to align with EU standards.

The Poles remain intransigent. They know what is at stake. Having gone through a series of partitions in the late [eighteenth century](https://www.britannica.com/event/Partitions-of-Poland) in addition to being placed under the Soviet Union’s thumb via the Warsaw Pact in the twentieth century, Poles’ skepticism toward supranational entities and hostile external actors is justified. The former Soviet satellite will not compromise on its sovereignty both as a matter of principle and national identity.

**The current tension between Poland and the European Union offers a glimpse of the new kinds of struggles nation-states are confronting in contemporary times.**The erosion of national sovereignty is becoming the norm throughout the West as governments grow and political planners find every way possible to build superstates. The EU represents the most significant trial run of such a utopian project. Despite its failed attempts to create a United States of Europe so far, Eurocrats remain committed to their fantastical vision.

The biggest obstacles central planners in Brussels face are the former Soviet satellite states, which have grown skeptical of the EU’s pie-in-the-sky project for the Old Continent. As the largest member of the [Visegrad Group](https://www.visegradgroup.eu/about" \t "_blank), Poland has established itself as an opposing pole to Brussels-style globalism.

Poland’s judiciary reforms are part of a broader set of [populist measures](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/the-not-so-new-populism-farage-le-pen-orban/) that span restricting the [resettlement of Middle Eastern migrants](https://www.euractiv.com/section/justice-home-affairs/news/poland-rejects-southern-europes-push-for-mandatory-relocation-of-migrants/) within Europe to standing up for [traditional cultural norms](https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2021/10/21/poland-european-union-lgbt-homophobia-mateusz-morawiecki/) that have irked the bien-pensants all the way from DC to Brussels.**For its defiance of conventional Western political norms, Poland has earned the**[**illiberal democracy**](https://www.theweek.co.uk/108714/is-it-time-european-union-took-on-hungary-poland-illiberal-democracy)**label, accompanying its fellow Visegrad Group member Hungary in receiving this dubious distinction.**

The curious thing about Poland’s fracas with the EU is that Poland doesn’t want to leave the EU, at least not for now. According to various Polish polling firms’ [findings](https://notesfrompoland.com/2021/08/03/support-in-poland-for-leaving-eu-highest-in-over-a-decade-finds-poll/), support for leaving the EU has never exceeded 20 percent. Since joining the EU in 2004, Poles have generally held the supranational union in high esteem. Further, Poland heavily relies on intra-EU trade for its exports. Trade with EU members accounts for [80 percent](https://european-union.europa.eu/principles-countries-history/country-profiles/poland_en) of Polish total exports. Even Prime Minister Morawiecki [reiterated](https://notesfrompoland.com/2021/07/20/no-risk-of-polexit-from-eu-says-polish-pm-amid-brussels-row/) that a “Polexit” is not in the cards at the moment.

However, political intentions can change. Eurocrats fail to recognize that the EU’s initial popularity was predicated on reasonable benefits such as free trade between member states, liberalized travel within the EU, and greater diplomatic integration to prevent the kinds of fratricidal wars that devastated the Old Continent during the first half of the twentieth century. The 2016 Brexit vote showed the world that the EU’s power is not yet monolithic and that with the right amount of political will, EU member states can go their separate ways.

**The more the EU micromanages Polish internal affairs and punishes Poland for the simple act of exercising sovereignty, the more likely it is to entertain the idea of exiting the EU altogether—a potentially devastating blow to the Eurocrats’ quixotic political project.**

**The Stockton Batman**

We’re not sure if there was an eerie bat silhouette cast across the Stockton, California sky, but a capped crusader answered a call for justice. Two teenagers were recently stabbed to death near Salas Park in the California city of Lodi.

Police eventually apprehended 29-year-old Randall Allenbaugh and charged him with double homicide. However, it’s how they caught Allenbaugh that’s the highlight of the story. A local news site, 209 Times, posted a video by an unknown person telling how he caught Allenbaugh.

The video is of a mystery vigilante known only as the “Stockton Batman”. In the November 16 video, the masked crusader shows the suspect being arrested. He tells an engaging story of how he deduced that the man arrested was the person police wanted for murder.

The Stockton Batman describes how he uncovered different pieces of evidence pointing towards the suspect. Suspicious items were uncovered in a nearby bathroom trashcan. The gallant vigilante then told about how he found the suspect wondering around covered in blood.

The self-proclaimed superhero detained Allenbaugh until police arrived to arrest him. Earlier in the day, police had discovered the bodies of one male and one female dead. The two victims were found near the railroad tracks just north of Harvey Lane in Lodi.

The next notification sent to police was of a possible third stabbing victim. However, it turned out to be Allenbaugh. Police quickly determined that Allenbaugh was their suspect in a double homicide, not a victim.

Allenbaugh was booked on double murder charges and is being held without bond. Even though Allenbaugh and the two victims knew each other, there is still yet no motive for the crime. A murderer was taken off the streets, but the person responsible vanished into the night.

The identity of the Stockton Batman is still unknown. Four years ago, CBS-13 did an interview with an unnamed, masked vigilante for justice. This mysterious person said that he had nailed hundreds of criminals. He took great pride in his citizen’s arrests.

This person said he grew in Stockton and was disappointed at how bad the area had grown. He said that “things weren't always this bad when I was a child.” No one is 100 percent positive this is the same masked vigilante, but he fits the narrative.

As liberal bureaucrats continue in their attempts to strip law enforcement officers and the U.S. legal system of essential powers, criminals will become increasingly emboldened. Without an abrupt reversal of these crazy policies, vigilantism may be the only way to keep us safe.

Police officers are trained to fight crime. Prosecutors and criminal investigators are educated in how to legally hold lawbreakers accountable. When we restrict their abilities, we all suffer. If Americans don’t take back our country, we may all have to rely on “Batman” to save us.

**Roe V Wade**

In 1973, the right of individual states to set abortion laws was stripped away. The foundation for Roe vs. Wade, the legal precedent adjudicated by the U.S. Supreme Court on January 22, 1973, deemed it a woman’s constitutional right to obtain an abortion.
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Across the decades, pro-life advocates have questioned who speaks to the rights of the unborn. The 1973 landmark ruling has divided the nation for over 40 years. Recently, newly enacted legislation in strongly conservative states has intensified a debate that has never stopped.

A key foundation for Roe vs. Wade was how “viability” is determined. In 1973, the scientific ability to determine at what point during pregnancy there was viable life was limited. Advances in medical technology have altered these 50-year-old pretenses about what constitutes life.

With this as one of the primary driving forces behind their decisions to change legislation, states such as Mississippi are rewriting abortion laws. The Mississippi legislation is now in front of the United States Supreme Court.
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By all early indications, the fervor on both sides of the abortion debate is still exceptionally intense. One important argument, when medical professionals attempt to determine viable life, is the ability to feel pain in an unborn child.

This issue was introduced during arguments before the court. Throughout the decades-long debate over abortion rights, frequently the liberal left has resorted to unexplainable opinions and cockamamie theories about why everyone should believe in pro-choice.

There are few on the radical left who will honestly consider that abortion may be killing a living human being. If they had their way, abortion would be legal up until the day of delivery. It is not only an insane argument; it is cruel.

As the court considered the phenomenon of fetal pain, one liberal-leaning justice continued the left’s tendency to lean on the illogical. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor chose a rather bizarre path to justify her probable support for striking down Mississippi’s abortion legislation.

The Obama-era appointee compared unborn babies to brain-dead people. Sotomayor’s argument against the ability to feel the sensation of pain, as determination for a viable life, used a ludicrous comparison.

She argued that any ability to feel particular stimuli was also found to be common in patients that have been medically ruled brain-dead. As with virtually every liberal argument to permit widespread legal abortions, the question for the court is not about “sensation to various stimuli”.

The question never fully answered, despite a 7-2 ruling on Roe vs. Wade in favor of legal abortions, is the federal government’s right to make a law about such an issue. This has been the substance of the most heated abortion debates across the last four decades.

States insist that under the U.S. Constitution, each individual state has the exclusive right to set abortion legislation. Most legal scholars have all adhered to this position, despite their political leanings or feelings about abortion in general.

Ethics and theology professor Andrew T. Walker expressed the argument succinctly. Walker said, “The question is not, ultimately, over pain, but whether the Constitution grants the right to terminate innocent life.”

South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham went further. Graham questioned Sotomayor’s insistence that she could override the evidence supported by a majority within the medical community.

Graham argued that “It is well-established medical practice to provide anesthesia to the unborn child regarding medical procedures performed before 24 weeks.” The S.C. Senator astutely asserted that if there is no fetal pain, then why is anesthesia administrated to the unborn?

Again, in this debate, to scientifically establish at what point a fetus should be presented as a viable life, is important. States feel advances in medical science have dramatically changed this. Most believe a pregnancy is far too advanced at 24-weeks to legally kill the living fetus.

Mississippi’s new legislation specifically targets that 24-week question. Under Mississippi law, it will be illegal to get an abortion after 15-weeks. According to liberal U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor, this doesn’t matter. It’s about pain and the definition of brain-dead to her.

Moreover, to some degree, Justice Sotomayor’s opinion might be understandable. Nevertheless, what any jurist on the U.S. Supreme Court thinks about abortion is pointless. The federal government has no cause to allow one human to kill another living creature.

Our constitution explicitly sets distinct parameters on this type of federal government overreach. Roe vs. Wade was an ill-founded federal precedent. Regardless of new medical evidence determining viable life, it still does not matter.

Justice Sotomayor, and the rest of the liberal left, can have whatever opinion they wish about pain inside the womb. One striking fact still remains. The United States Government has no right to exercise control over a state’s right to determine its own laws.

Invariably, the ruling, expected later next summer, should uphold Mississippi’s, and all other states’ abortion legislation. Furthermore, it’s time to erase Roe vs. Wade for what it is; a death sentence, unconstitutionally executed by the U.S. Federal Government against the unborn

**Solitary Confinement**

or months, the Australian government has hastily imprisoned people it deems to be a risk of contracting or infecting others with COVID-19 and forced them into isolation in state-sanctioned quarantine camps.

According to 26-year-old Hayley Hodgson, who spent weeks in a quarantine camp despite the fact that she never tested positive for COVID-19, being locked up in this manner is “like you’re in a prison.”

“It’s horrible. It’s a horrible feeling,” Hodgson [told Freddie Sayers of UnHerd.](https://unherd.com/thepost/inside-australias-covid-internment-camp/) “You feel like you’re in prison. You feel like you’ve done something wrong. It’s inhumane what they’re doing. You are so small, they just overpower you. And you’re literally nothing. It’s like, ‘You do what we say, or you’re in trouble, we’ll lock you up for longer’. Yeah, they were even threatening me that if I was to do this again, ‘We will extend your time in here.’”

Hodgson reportedly moved from one end of the country in Melbourne to Darwin on the other end to escape totalitarian COVID measures enacted by the Australian government but quickly found herself as a prisoner in her state’s “quarantine camps” even though she did not have the virus.

Australian officials first confronted her after one of her friends tested positive. Investigators found Hodgson by running her scooter license plate. They interrogated her and asked if she had been tested since she was a “close contact” of the now-COVID-infected friends. Hodgson, who had yet to get a COVID test, lied and said she had already been swabbed.

“So then the police officers blocked my driveway,” Hodgson recounted. “I walked out and I said, ‘What’s going on, are you guys testing me for COVID? What’s happening?’ They said, ‘No, you’re getting taken away. And you have no choice. You’re going to Howard Springs. You either come with us now, and we’ll put you in the back of the divvy van. Or you can have a choice to get a COVID cab.’ … I just said, ‘I don’t consent to this. I don’t understand why I can’t just self-isolate at home, like a lot of other people are doing.’ And they just said, ‘We’ve just been told from higher up where to take you. And that’s all that there is.’”

Hodgson said she was told she would be released after testing negative for COVID-19, but when she arrived at the facility, she was escorted by figures in hazmat suits to a room where she would stay for 14 days with meal deliveries occurring just once daily. She was reportedly tested three separate times during her detention but was forced to stay in isolation

Hodgson said that when she tried to leave her cabin cell to walk outside, she was threatened with a $5,000 AUD fine for not wearing a face covering. The facility also reportedly offered her drugs such as Valium “to calm her down.”

“She has since lost her job at a store, which was on a casual basis. At no stage was she reminded of her rights or put in contact with a lawyer,” UnHerd reported.

Australian officials established the Howard Springs quarantine camp near Darwin last August with the intent of imprisoning anyone they believed to be possibly infected with COVID-19 and forcing them into isolation. Despite the fact that the Northern Territory where Howard is located has not seen a COVID death, the old mining camp-turned-unofficial prison can hold up to 2,000 people at one time.

Just this week, Australian police [recaptured three people](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-59486285) who attempted to flee the COVID camp. The trio of escapees tried to jump the fence after testing negative for the virus one day prior.

**Pelosi’s Pot of Piss**

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s weaponized committee on Jan. 6, 2020 has subpoenaed phone records from private citizens, say Republicans familiar with the investigation.

“That committee has moved forward with issuing subpoenas to telephone companies,” a Republican aide told The Federalist. “Our understanding at this point is they have not subpoenaed member information, but they are subpoenaing telephone records of private American citizens.”

The reveal follows a [CNN report](https://www.cnn.com/2021/08/30/politics/january-6-phone-records-members-of-congress/index.html) in August that the House Select Committee requested telecommunications companies maintain phone records of members on Capitol Hill and of former President Donald Trump’s family. Republicans say none have been formally subpoenaed.

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy threatened companies that comply with a records turnover to Democrats’ partisan probe. Doing so, McCarthy said, would be “in violation of federal law and subject to losing their ability to operate in the United States.”

“A Republican majority will not forget and will be ready to hold them fully accountable under the law,” McCarthy wrote.

On what exactly such accountability would look like, Ohio Republican Rep. Jim Jordan described as curtailment of broad protections offered under Section 230, a provision of the 1996 Communications Decency Act shielding major firms from third-party liability.

“We should pass it and show the American people where we want to go,” Jordan said in reference to the “[Protect Speech Act](https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/BILLS-117hr3827ih)” proposing Section 230 reform. Despite no chance of a presidential signature under a Biden White House, Jordan said its support in the House would showcase GOP commitment on issues of censorship, punishing telecom companies in process.

Jordan also said Republicans ought to “speed up the path to get antitrust cases to the Supreme Court,” noting conservative Justice Clarence Thomas has [signaled](https://thefederalist.com/2021/04/05/clarence-thomas-provides-legal-roadmap-to-tearing-down-social-media-censorship/) a desire to break up big tech monopolies.

Pelosi’s Select Committee Chair Bennie Thompson, D-Miss., did not respond to The Federalist’s inquiries about the probe’s subpoena of phone records from private citizens. Of the 45 subpoenas the committee has issued, a vast majority have [targeted](https://thefederalist.com/2021/09/30/liz-cheney-house-democrats-target-americans-for-exercising-right-to-protest/) private citizens who merely exercised their free right to protest.

On Wednesday’s call, Indiana Rep. Jim Banks, who is leading the Republican investigation into the Capitol riot with Jordan, railed at Democrats’ committee as “all based on a conspiracy theory.”

“According to the committee, January 6 was an inside job,” Banks said. “It was an attempted coup disguised as a political rally that was secretly orchestrated by President Trump and his closest advisors. That is a lie and…. it’s crazy.”

Reuters [reported](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/exclusive-fbi-finds-scant-evidence-us-capitol-attack-was-coordinated-sources-2021-08-20/) in August the FBI found “scant evidence” the riot was coordinated.

The Select Committee’s targeting of private citizens through subpoenas, however, which has no legislative purpose in violation of House norms, threatens to hinder individual civil liberties through congressional intimidation.

“For them to be hauled in front of this partisan committee is just a chilling impact on what we have on speech,” Jordan said.

After Banks and Jordan, appointed by McCarthy to serve as the Republicans on the Select Committee, were [kicked](https://thefederalist.com/2021/07/21/nancy-pelosi-kicks-ranking-republicans-jim-jordan-jim-banks-off-partisan-jan-6-commission/) from the official House probe by Pelosi and replaced with NeverTrump crusaders Liz Cheney, R-Wyo., and Adam Kinzinger, R-Ill., the pair launched their own investigation focused instead on Capitol security failures under the speaker’s leadership.

“They weren’t prepared for what happened that day, they weren’t equipped for what happened, they weren’t trained,” Banks said of the Capitol Police, describing a “systemic failure.”

Even worse, Pelosi [waited](https://dailycaller.com/2021/02/27/sources-nancy-pelosi-sergeant-at-arms-paul-irving-national-guard-capitol-riot/) to approve the deployment of the National Guard.

“Why didn’t she have the National Guard there as was offered by the White House?” Jordan asked, citing those types of questions as the reason the speaker kicked McCarthy’s appointees from participation with the select committee [run by Cheney](https://thefederalist.com/2021/07/27/liz-cheney-leading-pelosis-weaponized-jan-6-committee-tells-all-you-need-to-know-about-the-partisan-probe/).

Because House rules mandate ranking members be appointed by the minority party, Cheney merely serves as vice chair, having been appointed by Democrats. Banks, chair of the prominent Republican Study Committee and a respected Navy officer, was given the ranking member appointment but Democrats rejected it for the first time in House history.

Now the probe, already skirting House rules to promote a political narrative amplified by Democrats ahead of the 2022 midterms, is [colluding](https://thefederalist.com/2021/10/27/exclusive-biden-fbi-joins-pelosi-in-blocking-gop-from-investigating-january-6/) with federal agencies to block GOP oversight led by Banks. In October, the FBI refused to give Republicans access to the same material offered to Democrats.

“We respectfully refer you to the Select Committee regarding issues of access to records and information,” the agency wrote in response to requests from members of Congress who have legal oversight over the federal police agency.

**Double-Shot Deaths**

Millions of people have died from this virus across the globe. COVID has changed everyone’s lives. It has been the worst global health crisis in more than a century.

As people begin to try to return to normal, a huge debate is who needs or should get shot. The mainstream media refuses to discuss any narrative that is not specifically in support of vaccines. There is little to no conversation about naturally acquired immunity.

According to the talking heads in the media, including senseless political figures, the inability to stop the spread of COVID is because of the unshot. That is proving to be far from true. In fact, data from a United Kingdom study may prove the complete opposite.

The recent news from one COVID research study has shocked the medical community. Another alarming aspect of the data is the age group it targeted. A graph pointing at the final statistics is astonishing.

In the under-60-years-of-age population in the UK, more people are dying from COVID that have been double shot than those with no vaccination. This completely negates any senseless push for mandatory vaccinations.
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These newly released eye-popping statistics further cement the idea that the decision to get shot must be a personal one. There is now an increasing risk of adverse effects from getting the shot. Furthermore, people who are shot are still dying.

The statistics do not lie. Otherwise healthy people are recovering from COVID with little to no complications. In addition, there is solid research indicating that naturally acquired immunity to COVID may be far more robust than any vaccination.

Soon, there will be prescription medications available that could be a game-changer as well. However, in the United States, Joe Biden continues to press on with his tyrannical federal vaccine mandates. He has already implemented a mandate for federal workers.

Biden’s unconstitutional mandate would force all companies with 100 or more employees to guarantee they are all shot or face harsh financial penalties. Honest, hardworking Americans will either submit to the authoritarian mandate or lose their jobs.

How will the administration react when they discover the vaccine is clearly not necessary for everyone, let alone potentially more deadly than the virus itself? This new data out of the UK is alarming. However, it may save more lives than any vaccine. At the very least, it should sound the end to any and all unnecessary vaccine mandates, including those proposed by Joe Biden.

Well, it seems some pretty harsh comments by a 52-year-old New Brunswick cardiologist may have turned around on him. In July 2021, Dr. Sohrab Lutchmedial verbally assaulted unvаccinated people. He referred to them as selfish.

However, Lutchmedial took his level of condemnation for people, who were only making a personal decision for themselves, to a disgusting level. In a tweet, Lutchmedial professed that, “For those that won’t get the shot for selfish reasons – whatever – I won’t cry at their funeral.”

We don’t take pleasure in anyone dying. One would think that a medical professional would have enough professional integrity to feel the same. Obviously, Lutchmedial felt personally compelled to tweet such a disgusting suggestion.

Ironic or not, a week ago, Lutchmedial died in his sleep. The cardiologist received his third CΟVID vаccination in late October. His family and friends are in shock. There is yet no medical determination of what caused his death.

It would not be surprising to find that if his death was at all related to the CΟVID shot, it will not be talked about in the mainstream media. Lutchmedial’s death by itself, especially for a healthy 52-year-old doctor, is eerily odd, especially so close to receiving a clot shot.

What is even eerier is the idea that his insensitive tweet fell just shy of hoping for the death of anyone who wasn’t shot. His tweet didn’t actually say that in so many words, but to make such a disgusting comment says little for his professional integrity. One thing is true; it’s always wise to watch what you say, or tweet. It might come back to haunt you.

**Parents Accused of Manslaughter**

The parents of the 15-year old who killed four of his classmates and wounded several others with his father’s recently-purchased pistol are now facing charges of their own. Earlier today, Oakland County Prosecutor Karen McDonald announced that James and Jennifer Crumbley have both been charged with involuntary manslaughter for, in essence, [allowing their son access to a firearm](https://abcnews.go.com/US/michigan-school-shooting-suspects-parents-charged/story?id=81525654) when they should have been aware that he was a danger to himself or others.

On Nov. 29, a teacher saw [name redacted by Bearing Arms] researching ammunition in class, the prosecutor said. The teen’s parents were called and emailed but they didn’t respond to school officials, she said. However, according to the prosecutor, Jennifer Crumbley texted her son about the incident, writing, “lol, I’m not mad at you, you have to learn not to get caught.”

According to McDonald, the morning of the shooting, [name redacted]’s teacher saw a note on his desk which alarmed her. McDonald said the note was “a drawing of a semi-automatic handgun pointing at the words, ‘The thoughts won’t stop, help me.’ In another section of the note was a drawing of a bullet with the following words above that bullet, ‘Blood everywhere.'”

“Between the drawing of the gun and the bullet is a drawing of a person who appears to have been shot twice and bleeding,” she said. “Below that figure is a drawing of a laughing emoji. Further down the drawing are the words, ‘My life is useless,’ and to the right of that are the words, ‘The world is dead.'”

[Name redacted] was removed from the classroom and his parents were called to the school, McDonald said.

By the time a counselor obtained the drawing, the teen had allegedly altered it, McDonald said.

“At the meeting, James and Jennifer Crumbley were shown the drawing and were advised that they were required to get their son into counseling within 48 hours,” she said. “Both James and Jennifer Crumbley failed to ask their son if he had his gun with him or where his gun was located and failed to inspect his backpack for the presence of the gun, which he had with him.”

The parents left school while [name redacted] returned to class, likely with the gun in his backpack, McDonald said.

Once news broke of a shooting at the school, McDonald said Jennifer Crumbley texted her son, “[Name redacted], don’t do it.”

James Crumbley called 911 to report that a gun was missing from his house and said he believed his son may be the shooter, McDonald said.

Authorities determined James Crumbley’s semi-automatic handgun was stored unlocked in a drawer in his bedroom, McDonald said.

So, are these charges warranted? Over at HotAir, my friend and colleague Ed Morrissey notes that this may be the first time that the parents of a shooter have been charged with manslaughter, but I’m aware of at least one other case where the parent of a juvenile faced [felony charges](https://www.pal-item.com/story/news/crime/2020/10/08/dennis-shooters-mom-receives-probation-neglect-convictions/5928703002/) over her role in her son’s attack on a school.

I think a case for criminal negligence *could* be made here, especially given that the suspect’s mom texted her son and told him “don’t do it” when she first learned of the shooting at Oxford High School. That, along with the specifics of the previously unknown “incidents” that led to the parents and suspect meeting with the school the morning of the attack, suggests that they not only had cause for concern, but that they *were*concerned about their son’s behavior.

But when exactly should they have known something was terribly wrong with their child? The Oakland County prosecutor is trying to draw some connections that wouldn’t have necessarily been cause for alarm at the time, like the suspect getting caught looking up ammunition in school.

Jennifer Crumbley’s reaction of “lol, don’t get caught” seems chilling in retrospect, not to mention her social media post about [the two of them](https://www.insider.com/oxford-school-shooting-gun-apparent-christmas-gift-prosecutor-says-2021-12) “testing out his new Christmas present,” but if any of my kids had been caught doing the same while they were in school I wouldn’t have leapt to the conclusion that they were planning on killing their classmates, especially if I’d just taken them shooting the weekend before. And of course, if I had any concerns about my child shooting up his school, we wouldn’t be going target practicing at all.

Did the parents just not give a damn about their son’s behavior, or were they genuinely clueless until they got to school that morning?

The big question is whether or not these parents had reason to believe that their son was going to harm anyone, but there’s also the issue of the school district’s responsibility here. McDonald says that the parents never asked their son if he had brought a gun to school nor searched his backpack after they met with school officials that morning, but the school counselor was also apparently unconcerned enough that he allowed the suspect to return to class. The school resource officer who was on campus was never asked to come to the meeting to search the suspect’s backpack or pat him down for weapons, even after the contents of his note were known to school officials.

In retrospect these decisions were obviously the wrong call, yet the school superintendent has also been adamant that “no discipline was warranted” based on the suspect’s actions prior to opening fire. If that was true for the suspect’s time in school, does that also apply to his actions at home? Were there really enough warning signs for the parents to have known that their son was apparently planning to murder his classmates?

I don’t think we know yet, though investigators may have more details that haven’t been released to the public. I do know that if my wife and I had been called to the school and presented with the same note that the suspect drew in class, I wouldn’t have been leaving without him. And my thoughts wouldn’t have been about trying to protect the school from my kid, to be honest. It would have been about trying to protect him from himself.

That’s the biggest red flag to me as far as the parents’ actions are concerned at the moment, though if it comes out that, yes, there was genuine cause for alarm before the suspect’s dad even purchased the gun, I would absolutely question the wisdom of leaving it accessible to the teen. I’m not in favor of storage mandates, in part because I’ve covered plenty of stories where minors have had to access their parents’ firearms in order to [protect themselves](https://abcnews.go.com/US/kendra-st-clair-oklahoma-girl-12-shoots-intruder/story?id=17524438), their [siblings](https://www.wsaz.com/content/news/Teenager-saves-sisters-from-intruder-526277011.html), or [other family members](https://abc7.com/goldboro-police-goldsboro-break-in-s-william-street-shooting-12-year-old-shoots-at-home-intruders/10339097/) from intruders and home invaders, but I also believe that its incumbent on us as parents to make sure that if our kids are in trouble, we don’t ignore or downplay the problems that they’re having. Not because “it oughta be a law,” but because that’s what moms and dads (regardless of our gun ownership) are supposed to do.

By the way, McDonald declared just hours after the shooting that the attack demonstrates the need to [“revisit our gun laws”,](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/dems-renew-push-gun-control-bills-oxford-shooting-81498404) but during today’s press conference she tried to do some damage control for injecting politics into her role as a prosecutor by insisting that these charges aren’t politically motivated.

It seems to me the charges against the parents will come down to “what did they know and when did they know it?” Michigan does already have a law imposing criminal liability on parents if their minor child gains access to a gun and uses it in a crime, and I think that’s probably a better fit than involuntary manslaughter here based on the evidence to date. We’ll see what other evidence comes out, but I think Ed Morrissey is right that when all is said and done it’s going to be hard for a jury to not hold the parents at least somewhat responsible for the murderous and evil actions of their child.

**Flash Rob**

Footage of flash-mob style looting events has been going viral. You don’t have to look very far on social media to run into some video showing people destroying businesses as well as stripping the goods from those locations as if locusts descended upon the land. Normal, run of the mill boosting, theft, and robbery just not fun anymore? No, people have taken to this newer destructive practice. An [opinion](https://www.miamiherald.com/opinion/opn-columns-blogs/leonard-pitts-jr/article256234457.html) piece in the *Miami Herald*hits the nail on the head.

Why would they do this? That question rises inevitably from a new wave of so-called flash-mob robberies, thieves by the dozens invading retail stores to simply take what they want. It’s happened in California, Illinois, Minnesota and Maryland. Retailers ranging from Nordstrom to 7-Eleven have been hit. For some, the search for answers will be an invitation to uncork pet theories about poverty, permissiveness or punishment. But none of those things is unique to this era.

Think about it: This model for robbery has always been available to enterprising thieves. It’s simple math. What can one or two security guards do if 60 people decide to just walk in and loot the place? Granted, advances in communications technology make that easier to organize now than it once would have been, but still, a crime wave like this theoretically could have happened in 1985 or 2002. It makes sense to wonder why it didn’t. What is it about this particular era that has inspired this particular trend?

Here, then, is another pet theory: The social covenant has shattered.

Leonard Pitts, the author of the piece, goes on to explain how we’ve completely abandoned things that were corporal to society. Norms, either based in law, or just “you don’t do that”isims, are being shattered because the public at large has allowed that to happen.

Meaning the thousand unspoken understandings by which a society functions, the agreements to which we all sign on without a word being spoken. Some are encoded in law, others just encoded in us. Either way, they are rules — “norms” might be a better word — people usually obey even when they could get away without doing so.

Whenever footage of these looting events surfaces, remembrance of the Rooftop Koreans comes to mind. To refresh everyone’s memories on who or what the Rooftop Koreans were, we need to turn the clock back to the 90’s. During the riots in Los Angeles groups of property owners set themselves up, armed, on the roofs of their buildings to protect them. The what of the Rooftop Koreans can be equated to perseverance and rugged American individualism. The people involved took the matters into their own hands. It was a matter that they [pretty much had to](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/roof-koreans-meme-know-real-story_n_5ee110a1c5b6d5bafa5604f3) as reported in a retrospective at the *Huffpost*.

Chang said those who share the meme owe it to the Korean American business owners in the photos to do a deeper dive into the history of the 1992 Los Angeles uprising ― and what led them to take up arms to begin with.

“Without any political clout and power in the city, Koreatown was unprotected and left to burn since it was not a priority for city politicians and the LAPD.”

– Edward T. Chang, a professor of ethnic studies at UC Riverside

The nearly weeklong unrest that occurred in Los Angeles in the spring of 1992 left more than 60 people dead and more than 1,000 injured, and it caused an estimated $1 billion in damage, about half of which was sustained by Korean-owned businesses.

We’re dealing with a very similar abandonment today, but on a much larger scale. Pitts makes a very solid point in closing his piece.

Surely the opportunistic looting that marred last year’s largely peaceful protests for racial justice helped influence them. But that’s hardly the only — or, arguably, even the most corrosive — transgression of social norms we’ve seen in recent years. To the contrary, we’ve seen police and other authority figures exempt themselves from mask and vaccine mandates — and dare mayors and governors to do anything about it. We’ve seen ex-public officials thumb their noses at congressional subpoenas. We’ve seen a seditionist mob breach the U.S. Capitol and be lionized for it by certain members of Congress and the media. And we’ve seen a president who delighted in shattering norms, refusing to provide his tax returns, flouting the emoluments clause of the Constitution, openly politicking on government property . . . the list goes on. And on.

In 2021 America, we’re at a point where the Rooftop Korean needs to come back. The concept of them. That we’re on our own and need to take care of our own. Looters and rioters will eventually stop if they’re greeted with the muzzle of several firearms when they barge into someone’s business. Shots don’t need to be fired.  If the police forces are not going to stop these events from happening, for whatever reasons, and prosecutors are not going to press charges on those caught, what recourse does Mr. and Mrs. America have? The concept of using force to protect property is one that can be debated until the sun comes up. What’s important to note on that subject is we do have armed guards guarding our money, so why should private businesses have to deal with such shenanigans? When the law abiding citizen makes such a stand, all of this will slowly disappear. I don’t think we need a stronger case for the Second Amendment than that. No one else’s going to protect these businesses.

**Flying With Guns**

Traveling with a gun can be extremely problematic unless you simply drive everywhere. Hopping on a plane, for example, requires you to check any firearms in your baggage. Further, you have to declare it when you check your luggage, meaning everyone who handles that bag is going to know there’s a gun in there.

If you’re like me, that makes you less than comfortable about flying with a firearm.

Why? Because [it makes it easier for people like this](https://www.miamiherald.com/news/business/article256238017.html).

A former Southwest Airlines baggage handler was sentenced Tuesday to six months in prison after pleading guilty to knowingly possessing or receiving stolen guns.

Federal prosecutors said Mark Hunter of St. Louis was charged after a passenger traveling through St. Louis Lambert International Airport reported that a pistol had been reported stolen from his luggage.

Federal agents investigated and found seven reported thefts of guns from luggage checked on Southwest over a five-month period in 2020.

Honestly, how can anyone be surprised something like this happens?

As I noted, they require you to declare your firearm is in the bag, to begin with. Locks aren’t exactly difficult to get around when you’re talking about luggage, especially when you’ve got a fair bit of time, and since you know which bags to hit, it’s not overly difficult for a would-be criminal to act.

And let’s be honest, I’ve known some of the people who try to get jobs at airports. While most are fine, upstanding people who are simply looking for good work at a good wage, there are also some who you wonder how they’d let them into the secure part of an airport with a ticket, much less pay them to be there.

They might not have a criminal history, but that’s only because they haven’t been caught yet. (In fairness, the exact same thing can be said about some in every line of work out there.)

Nothing about this is surprising, especially since we’ve seen airlines [all but installing neon signs](https://bearingarms.com/jessiejohnson/2017/08/13/this-airline-seems-to-be-trying-to-get-your-gun-stolen-n30701) to tell the world your bag has a firearm in it.

In a world where that’s going to happen, guns are going to get stolen. People are going to take advantage of any situation they get as it is, but if you make it easier, it’s going to happen far more often.

Now, I get that airlines aren’t going to just start letting people carry guns onto planes. I don’t think it would be a problem but the folks who make the rules do and since they don’t really answer to me, there’s not much hope in hell of that changing.

But that doesn’t mean airlines shouldn’t be very careful about our luggage. If I can’t carry my gun on my person, then the airlines had damn well better keep an eye on their people to make sure something doesn’t get taken, whether it’s a firearm or something else.

Of course, let’s also remember that if they can take something like a gun out of a bag, what all can they slip in one?

**Asian Blockade Update**

We broker the story on the Asian Blockade here about two months ago. The long-term anchoring of container ships from China off the coast of California is a clever blockade to slow down the cash flow to the CCP. The CCP has been running their global takeover off the backs of the Chinese people. They require money and lots of it.

President Donald Trump had them on their knees back in 2019. That is why they released the bioweapon and seized control of Hong Kong. They needed the cash. They were broke. Now, they need the cash of Taiwan. The only difference is that Taiwan can fight back, and they have American weapons and special forces helping them.

That is why the Asian Blockade was implemented by the America Special forces. The unions on the West coast are helping out. Slowing down cash flow to the CCP has caused them to default on their bond market. Now, the CCP is using new, high-tech weapons.,

The China Communist Party (CCP) has seized computer servers involved in live tracking of commercial ships off the China coast.  This caused 85% of live ship tracking to go offline, leaving shippers and consignees without real-time information on the progress of commercial deliveries.

The Automatic Identification System (AIS) is an international standard for ship-to-ship, ship-to-shore, and shore-to-ship data communication approved by the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

After [China’s Personal Information Protection Law](http://www.npc.gov.cn/npc/c30834/202108/a8c4e3672c74491a80b53a172bb753fe.shtml) (PIPL) came into effect on Nov. 1, it requires companies that process data to get approval from the Chinese government before letting personal information leave Chinese soil. The CCP interprets this law to apply to satellite tracking of commercial ships!

Prior to the seizure of AIS computer servers in China, upwards of 100,000 ships were being tracked at sea off China's coastline.  Once the servers were grabbed, only 15,000 vessels could be tracked, via other services.

According to a CCTV 13 News program “[Focused Interviews](https://tv.cctv.com/2021/11/01/VIDEtdHrPuZxzjswz6PMtSgI211101.shtml?spm=C45404.PhRThW8bw020.EToagw7mjlwm.3)” on Nov. 1, since 2020, Chinese security sectors have been investigating foreign-related maritime data companies and radio enthusiasts based in Beijing, Shanghai, Shandong, and other places.

In addition, Chinese security agencies found out more than 700 self-built AIS base stations on important islands along the coastline. The security officials “seized a large number of base station equipment, intercepted more than 10,000 GB of outgoing maritime data, promptly cut off the data leakage channels, and required relevant organizations and individuals to rectify and eliminate hidden dangers.”

Wu Chengbin, a clerk for the Security Office of the Department of Political Affairs at the Southern Command in China, said, “Some of the land-based base stations were set up in our important military ports and sensitive areas. The scope of the base station searching signal covers our key military areas. They can collect information about the movements of our ships. Such information can be provided to foreign countries in real-time. It can be used by their military and intelligence departments to study the navigation trajectory of our ships and analyze our naval deployment and activity patterns. **Those will result in the leakage of our military intelligence.”**

By their own admission, China views commercial ship tracking as "military intelligence." This leads many in government around the world to wonder if China plans on using commercial vessels to invade Taiwan, or perhaps to launch attacks upon other countries FROM what appear to be commercial vessels.

By shutting down the AIS system, no one will be able to see which (if any) commercial ships are leaving MILITARY ports.  These vessels could be loaded with onboard missile systems, and sent off the coasts of other countries to launch a first strike.

The fact that China has done this amidst the troubles surrounding Taiwan, is greatly disturbing.   It may be a harbinger of trouble coming by the CCP which, if nothing else, many people view as sneaky.

**Sperm Donation Industry is About to Change**

Let’s talk about how to make money by selling your sperm. Like, how this *actually* works.

Popular media sends a strong message: Selling your sperm is a lucrative and simple way to make money when you’re low on cash. And it’s not short on gags about the subject to make sure you feel totally weird about the whole thing.

With COVID-19 still a concern, there’s been chatter about the price of “unvaccinated sperm.” We’ll get to that later in this post, but here’s the main takeaway: Sperm donation centers don’t use vaccination status as a criteria for donation, so this won’t make a difference in how much you can earn.

There’s no need to feel weird about sperm donation, despite the many jokes about the process. Sperm banks support thousands of families who struggle with infertility and parents who want to conceive without a partner.

In a span of 30 years, an estimated 120,000 to 150,000 babies were born of anonymous donor insemination, according to an unpublished study by the American Association of Tissue Banks, [reported by Cryogenic Laboratories](http://www.cryolab.com/blog/?p=842). That’s 4,000 to 5,000 births per year that happened because of sperm donors.

But the process isn’t nearly as simple or fun as the gags might imply.

Don’t expect to pop into your local sperm bank, make a contribution and walk out with a check that afternoon.

Here’s everything you need to know about the process and requirements to donate sperm to figure out whether it’s the right move for you.

**COVID Considerations for Sperm Donation**

Sperm donation centers are medical facilities and are subject to recommendations and mandates from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and state and local health agencies.

Stay up to date with those recommendations so you know what to expect regarding mask requirements, social distancing, capacity restrictions and other measures the centers might take to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

**Is Vaccination Required to Donate Sperm?**

The FDA hasn’t added a vaccine requirement for sperm donation, and it doesn’t require COVID-19 screening, either, because [it doesn’t classify COVID as a relevant disease](https://www.fda.gov/media/142774/download) in reproductive tissue donation. That’s because respiratory viruses aren’t transmittable through reproductive tissues like sperm.

As private facilities, some sperm donation centers might have their own requirements in place to protect their staff and participants. Some centers might request or require proof of vaccination, or require COVID screening, for example, from people who enter the clinics.

The [CDC recommends COVID-19 vaccination](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/planning-for-pregnancy.html) for everyone at least 12 years old, including people who are trying to get pregnant — including those who provide the sperm. It notes there’s no evidence that the vaccine effects fertility, and in the vast majority of cases, antibodies aren’t transmitted to reproductive tissue.

**Rumors about Sperm and Vaccinations**

Recent rumors have suggested “unvaccinated sperm” could be worth a lot of money in the near future, but they’re just that: rumors.

Most important to note here is that all sperm is “unvaccinated sperm,” because vaccines don’t effect reproductive tissues, according to the FDA. Because vaccines don’t effect DNA, sperm or fertility, there won’t be a difference between sperm from donors who received a vaccine and those who didn’t, so you probably won’t see a soaring unvaccinated sperm price.

And because potential vaccination requirements would be related to staff health in clinics and not to the screening process for sperm donors, it’s not likely sperm donation centers will even record whether a donor was vaccinated — so recipients won’t have the option to use that as a criteria.

We can’t say how niche perceptions of the COVID-19 vaccine will affect one-to-one sperm donations with known donors. Misinformation about the vaccine’s effects could mean some families will look for unvaccinated sperm donors outside of donation centers.

**How Much Do You Get Paid to Donate Sperm?**

The phrase is a little confusing — sperm donation isn’t a charitable act.

You do, in fact, earn money. (Not nearly as much as its counterpart, [egg donation](https://www.thepennyhoarder.com/make-money/side-gigs/complete-guide-to-egg-donation/?aff_id=329&aff_sub3=syndication_make-money/side-gigs/how-much-do-you-get-paid-to-donate-sperm/), but it won’t take nearly the toll on your body, either.)

Like everything else about becoming a sperm donor, the amount of money you make varies depending on the sperm bank or donation center you work with.

Here are some examples of compensation models:

* Donors through the [Seattle Sperm Bank can earn](https://www.seattlespermdonor.com/blog/earn-extra-money-this-year-donating-sperm) up to $1,000 per month at $70 per approved donation — $50 when you deliver and $20 when it’s approved.
* Donors through the [Sperm Bank of California earn](https://donors.thespermbankofca.org/) $125 per approved sample, with most donors earning between $400 and $600 per month.
* Donors through the international sperm bank chain [Cryos earn](https://www.cryosinternational.com/en-us/us-shop/become-a-donor/become-a-sperm-donor/your-compensation/" \t "_blank) up to $40 per donation — $20 for every ejaculate delivered, plus another $20 if it’s approved.

Sperm banks also offer free fertility test results, physical exams and blood testing as long as you remain a donor, and some even provide a free annual physical after you stop donating.

Some clinics have more complicated contracts that require you to keep up steady visits and provide regular donations if a recipient chooses you as their donor. That arrangement could affect when you’re paid.

“Just to make sure you follow through [with your visits], your paychecks are kept in escrow by the sperm bank until the end of the contract,” Cracked contributor [Sean Berkley](http://www.cracked.com/article_19497_6-terrifying-things-nobody-tells-you-about-donating-sperm.html) wrote about his sperm donation experience in 2011.

Many sperm banks now pay monthly or per visit, however. Like any other side hustle, get details on compensation before you sign any contracts or make any commitments.

**3 Things to Consider Before Selling Your Sperm**

Take some time to understand all the information before you set your sights on sperm donation as your next side hustle. You might be surprised by some of these details.

**Do You Qualify for Sperm Donation?**

Each sperm bank has its own list of physical requirements for donors, but they’re all fairly similar.

Most donation centers require donors to be:

* At least 5’7” tall and up to 6’6”.
* Between 18 and 40 years old (none accept donations from minors).
* Height and weight proportional.
* In good overall health, based on general physical health screenings and fertility tests.
* College graduates, enrolled in college or military veterans. Some banks pay more if you have a Ph.D. or attended an Ivy League school (because recipients pay more for those donor qualities).
* A non-smoker and non–drug user.
* Able to provide a biological family medical history.

Even if you meet a clinic’s basic requirements, you’re not guaranteed to be accepted.

Sperm banks are for-profit organizations, and like any business, they aim to provide what the market demands.

That means your sperm might be subject to the same kinds of biases you encounter among people face-to-face. In addition to the explicit requirements listed above, you could be denied because of supply and demand at a clinic based on things like your skin color, hair color and eye color.

Based on FDA regulation, potential donors are denied if they’ve ever had sex with “another man.” (The regulation doesn’t address potential nonbinary or transgender women donors.)

You could also be denied for genetic health issues, such as blood clotting disorders.

Some sperm banks will tell you why your application is denied, but some might not. You might want to know that information before you apply, so you’re not left wondering.

**Donor Offspring Limits**

Donation centers are regularly updating policies and practices to address ethical questions that come up about sperm donation and assisted reproduction.

Every few years, it seems, a news story reveals another serial sperm donor with hundreds of offspring. Check the details, though — in many of these cases, the donor worked with the recipient privately (a.k.a. a “known donor”), not through a donation center.

Most donation centers set a limit on the number of births or recipients per donor.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which [regulates sperm donation](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/safety-availability-biologics/what-you-should-know-reproductive-tissue-donation) (and other organ and tissue donation), doesn’t set a legal offspring limit. Instead, the American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM) sets guidelines for the industry and recommends a limit of 10 births per population of 850,000 (roughly the size of Seattle).

Many donation centers set limits well below the ASRM guideline — around 25 families in the U.S. per donor is a common maximum.

**Anonymous vs. Open Identity Donation**

The FDA requires clinics to keep some donor information for medical purposes, but it doesn’t regulate anonymity. You’ll make that choice based on the clinic you choose.

Ask the donation center about its policies, and be crystal clear about your options and long-term obligations before you donate. Donor arrangements include:

* **Anonymous:**Neither the donor nor the recipient get identifying information about each other. You likely won’t even know whether a recipient conceived using your sperm.
* **Semi-open:** You and the recipient get some information about each other, but not identifying details or contact information. The clinic is usually a go-between to pass correspondence between you and the recipient. You might learn whether the recipient had a baby using your sperm and even get baby photos. Or you might just stay open to possible contact in the future from the child once they’re an adult.
* **Open:** You and the recipient have each other’s contact information and communicate directly, maybe even meeting in person. Ideally, you and the recipient determine together how much ongoing communication you’ll have and whether or not you’ll have contact with the child. But the child could always decide to contact you on their own sometime in the future.

Here’s the catch: Technology, as it often does without trying, has thrown a bit of a wrench in this situation.

Increasingly accessible [family-tree DNA testing](https://www.thepennyhoarder.com/save-money/family-tree-dna/?aff_id=329&aff_sub3=syndication_make-money/side-gigs/how-much-do-you-get-paid-to-donate-sperm/) has made some curious (or unsuspecting!) donor-conceived children privy to their genetic roots — even when donors and recipients agreed to anonymity.

Many countries, including the U.K., have removed the option for anonymity in recent years by legislating a donor-born child’s right to find their biological father (i.e. the source of their donor sperm) after they turn 18.

A few days ago, this story emerged.

The COVID-19 mRNA vaccine from Pfizer Inc [(PFE.N)](https://www.reuters.com/companies/PFE.N) and BioNTech SE does not damage sperm, according to a study by Israeli researchers. They collected sperm samples from 43 male volunteers before and roughly a month after the men were vaccinated. None of their sperm parameters - volume, concentration, or motility - had changed significantly after vaccination, the researchers reported Monday on medRxiv ahead of peer review. "These preliminary results are reassuring to the young male population undergoing vaccination worldwide," the researchers said. "Couples desiring to conceive should vaccinate, as vaccination does not affect sperm," whereas previous studies have shown that coronavirus infection does affect sperm adversely.

There are some things conspicuously missing:

Genetic content before and after.

Reverse transcription errors are most likely in haploid cells.

The function and health of the testes is not supported by motility and density of sperm.

**Blood Donations**

aiser Health News wrote on Tuesday that health care professionals have been encountering a problematic situation: Some patients who have resisted [COVID-19](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/coronavirus) vaccines are demanding blood transfusions only from unvaccinated donors.



Blood centers tell Kaiser Health News unvaccinated people have requested blood for transfusions only from unvaccinated donors. In this photo, a healthcare worker fills a syringe with Pfizer Covid-19 vaccine at a community vaccination event in a predominately Latino neighborhood in Los Angeles, California, August 11, 2021.ROBYN BECK/AFP/GETTY IMAGES

Almost 60 percent of the U.S. population is now fully vaccinated, which means a large portion of the country's blood supply comes from donors who have gotten the shots. Kaiser Health News—the newsroom for the healthcare-focused non-profit Kaiser Family Foundation—reported that there have been instances of COVID skeptics (or of people who don't trust the science behind vaccines) demanding blood transfusions using blood from vaccinated people.

[American Red Cross](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/red-cross) spokesperson Emily Osment told Kaiser her organization has heard from unvaccinated clients who said they feared vaccinated blood would be "tainted." She added they worried vaccinated blood could then transmit COVID vaccines into their bodies.
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"We are definitely aware of patients who have refused blood products from vaccinated donors," Dr. Julie Katz Karp, Transfusion Medicine Program Director at Philadelphia's Thomas Jefferson University Hospitals in Philadelphia, also told Kaiser.

**READ MORE**

1. [Over 3,000 Fake Vaccination Cards From China Intercepted in Memphis](https://www.newsweek.com/over-3000-fake-vaccination-cards-china-intercepted-memphis-1619512)
2. [Funeral Home Says COVID Patients Making Up Over Half of Business Since July](https://www.newsweek.com/florida-funeral-home-says-covid-patients-making-over-half-business-since-july-1620140)
3. [95% of Religious Leaders Will Get COVID Vaccine While Congregants Resist](https://www.newsweek.com/95-percent-religious-leaders-will-get-covid-vaccine-while-many-congregants-still-resist-1619733)
4. [55 Percent of Americans Support Vaccine Requirements to Return to Office](https://www.newsweek.com/55-percent-americans-support-vaccine-requirements-return-office-poll-1620125)
5. [How Will Businesses Enforce Proof of Vaccinations?](https://www.newsweek.com/more-cities-requiring-indoor-vaccination-proof-how-will-businesses-enforce-mandates-1619289)

Unfortunately, anyone not wanting blood from vaccinated donors may not have a choice. Blood centers don't keep data regarding donors' vaccination status, or even if they've been previously infected with COVID, Kaiser wrote.

The [Food and Drug Administration](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/fda)also does not require blood products to be identified in any manner related to COVID infections or vaccinations since respiratory viruses—such as SARS-CoV-2—aren't believed to be transmitted through blood.
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Dr. Michael Busch of the Vitalant Research Institute told Kaiser Health News that estimates from samples show a large proportion of blood from donors come from vaccinated donors—as much as 60 percent to 70 percent of the blood donated.

When you factor in people who have also been infected with COVID at some point, Busch said that brings the number up to 90 percent of current donors have COVID antibodies in their blood.

"Less than 10 percent of the blood we collect does not have antibodies," Busch told Kaiser.

Blood with COVID antibodies has been proven to be healthy and as suitable for transfusions as blood without antibodies. Jessa Merrill, the Red Cross director of biomedical communications, told the outlet that even with antibodies present in much of the collected blood for transfusions, any concerns about other agents possibly present in vaccines are unfounded.

"While the antibodies that are produced by the stimulated immune system in response to vaccination are found throughout the bloodstream, the actual vaccine components are not," Merrill is quoted as telling Kaiser in an email.

Dr. Geeta Paranjape, medical director at Carter BloodCare, cited examples to Kaiser of people refusing blood from vaccinated donors. She said a Texas father asked his son receive blood exclusively from unvaccinated donors for his surgery. In another instance, she said a mother worried about her newborn receiving transfusions using blood from vaccinated donors.

"A lot of people think there's some kind of microchip or they're going to be cloned," Paranjape said.

Donated blood is tested for transmissible diseases before it is distributed to hospitals. Donors are also questioned regarding their health prior to giving blood.