



**Support Our Troops**  
They're still fighting for us.  
**Soldiers' Angels**  
**Wounded Warrior Project**  
**Fisher House: help military families**  
**Our Military**



They're doing good work. Check it out.

## **Tea Party Express—Official Tour Blog**

<http://teapartyexpress.wordpress.com/>

## **Another Failed Presidency**

by *Geoffrey P. Hunt, 31 Aug 2009*

...Barack Obama is failing. Failing big. Failing fast. And failing everywhere: foreign policy, domestic initiatives, and most importantly, in forging connections with the American people...

...All successful presidents have a narrative about the American character that intersects with their own where they display a command of history and reveal an authenticity at the core of their personality that resonates in a positive endearing way with the majority of Americans...

...But not this president. It's not so much that he's a phony, knows nothing about economics, is historically illiterate, and woefully small minded for the size of the task—all contributory of course. It's that he's not one of us. And whatever he is, his profile is fuzzy and devoid of content, like a cardboard cutout made from delaminated corrugated paper. Moreover, he doesn't command our respect and is unable to appeal to our own common sense. His notions of right and wrong are repugnant and how things work just don't add up. They are not existential. His descriptions of the world we live in don't make sense and don't correspond with our experience.

In the meantime, while we've been struggling to take a measurement of this man, he's dissed just about every one of us—financiers, energy producers, banks, insurance executives, police officers, doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, post office workers, and anybody else who has a non-green job...

**More:** [http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/08/another\\_failed\\_presidency.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/08/another_failed_presidency.html)

*(Hat tip: Tom L.)*

## **The Constitution and American Sovereignty**

by *Jeremy Rabkin, George Mason University, July-August 2009*

...Sovereignty wasn't an issue in the ancient world. Cicero notes that the ancient Romans had the same word for "stranger" as for "enemy." In the ancient world, people didn't interact with foreigners enough to think about their relation to them except insofar as it meant war. Nor was sovereignty an issue in medieval Europe, since the defining character of that period was overlapping authority and a lot of confusion about which authority had primary claims. No one had to think about defining national boundaries. This became an issue only in the modern era, when interaction between different peoples increased.

The first important writer to address sovereignty was Jean Bodin, a French jurist of the late 16th century. In his work, *Six Books of the Republic*, Bodin set out an understanding of sovereignty whereby the King of France represented an

independent political authority rather than owing allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor or to the Pope. In the course of developing this argument, Bodin also advocated religious toleration and insisted that a monarch can neither seize property except by law nor raise taxes except by the consent of a representative body. He was in favor of free trade, and he insisted on the monarch's general obligation to respect the law of nature and the law of God. His main practical point was that the government must be strong enough to protect the people's rights, yet restrained enough not to do more than that...

**Fascinating stuff:** <http://www.hillsdale.edu/news/imprimis/archive/issue.asp?year=2009&month=07>

## **An Ivy League Huey Long**

Washington is seriously unserious.

by *George Will, 29 Aug 2009*

...Barack Obama in August became a Huey for today, a rabble rouser with a better tailor, an unruffled and modulated tribune of downtrodden Americans, telling them that opponents of his reform plan—which actually does not yet exist—are fearmongers employing scare tactics. He also told Americans to be afraid, very afraid of health-insurance providers because they are dishonest (and will remain so until there is a "public option" to make them "honest"). And to be afraid, very afraid of pediatricians who unnecessarily extract children's tonsils for monetary rather than medical reasons. And to be afraid, very afraid of doctors generally because so many of them are so rapacious that they prefer lopping off limbs of diabetes patients rather than engaging in lifestyle counseling that for "a pittance" could prevent diabetes...

... The supposed means of paying for the president's \$1 trillion health-care plan include substantial Medicare cuts that will never happen, and the auction of carbon-emission permits that, instead, would be given away by the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation the House has sent to the Senate.

That legislation is a particularly lurid illustration of why no serious person nowadays takes seriously Washington's increasingly infantile bandying of numbers. The point of cap-and-trade is to impose a ceiling on the nation's greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions—primarily carbon dioxide. The legislation endorses the goal of holding the global carbon-dioxide level to a maximum of 450 parts per million by 2050. That. Will. Not. Happen...

...In 2005, the United States' carbon-dioxide emissions were 6 billion tons, so an 83 percent -reduction would permit about 1 billion tons—what America's emissions were in 1910, when the population was 92 million and the economy was one twenty-fifth of today's...

**Read it all:** <http://www.newsweek.com/id/214268>

## **Killer's release demands answers**

Did U.S. get to weigh in on his fate? Most of the dead were American.

by *Robert P. George, 30 Aug 2009*

...Like most Americans, I was shocked and appalled by this decision. It was allegedly made on grounds of "compassion" for a man who is said to be suffering from terminal cancer (albeit a killer who murdered more people than Charles Manson, Ted Bundy, Timothy McVeigh, and Jack the Ripper—combined). Questions have now arisen, however, as to whether the decision was influenced by other considerations. As British journalist Philip Stephens has written: "No amount of protestation will counter the impression that this was essentially a political decision—that Britain judged it in the national interest, diplomatic and commercial, for Col. Gadhafi to be indulged."..

...What did American officials know about the decision to free Megrahi and when did they know it? What, if anything, did our government do to try to prevent it? Remember, 180 of Megrahi's victims were our fellow citizens. President Obama had a right to be informed in advance of what Scotland was planning to do and a duty to do everything in his power diplomatically to prevent this outrage.

Not long ago, the president saw fit to insinuate himself into a dispute between a Harvard professor and a Cambridge, Mass., police officer over a disorderly conduct arrest. It was hardly an issue of national importance. The release by an ally of the murderer of 180 Americans is. If Obama did not pick up the phone and call British Prime Minister Gordon Brown to try to stop the release of Megrahi, then I want to know why he didn't. I hope you want to know, too.

**The column includes a biographical sketch of one of the victims, Valerie Canady:**

[http://www.philly.com/inquirer/currents/20090830\\_Killer\\_s\\_release\\_demands\\_answers.html](http://www.philly.com/inquirer/currents/20090830_Killer_s_release_demands_answers.html)

## **President Obama Should Pardon CIA Interrogators**

*by Debra Saunders, 30 Aug 2009*

When he served as deputy attorney general, now Attorney General Eric Holder gave a "neutral leaning positive" recommendation that led to President Bill Clinton's pardoning of gazillionaire fugitive Marc Rich, who was on the lam in Switzerland hiding from federal charges of fraud, evading more than \$48 million in taxes, racketeering and trading oil with Iran in violation of a U.S. embargo.

Holder also had a role in the 1999 Clinton pardons of 16 Puerto Rico independence terrorists—members of the bomb-happy FALN or the splinter group Los Macheteros—who had been convicted on such charges as bank robbery, possession of explosives and participating in a seditious conspiracy...

...As a candidate for the White House, President Obama left the door open for prosecuting alleged intelligence abuses, but straddled the controversy by noting that, if elected, he would not want to see his tenure consumed with what might be perceived "as a partisan witch hunt." Sorry, but there is no escaping that perception now...

...Inside the Beltway in 2009, there is more outrage that agents might have threatened to kill Khalid Sheikh Mohammad's kids to prevent a terrorist attack than at KSM for claiming to have beheaded Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl.

If Obama truly wants to move "forward," as his aides contend, he has the means—as Holder well knows. Obama could use the presidential pardon to immunize CIA interrogators from the threat of criminal prosecution and end the constant flogging of serial investigations. It's true, the CIA interrogators may lack the political connections enjoyed by Rich and the FALN guys. But maybe this once, Holder can overlook that.

**Full column:** <http://www.creators.com/opinion/debra-saunders/president-obama-should-pardon-cia-interrogators.html>

## **Bowing to the Dictator**

*by David Warren, 28 Aug 2009*

It is insulting to be told an obvious lie; more insulting when the lie is insisted upon, in the face of undeniable facts. Unfortunately, few of our contemporary politicians seem to grasp this, yet they do not always pay for it in the polls. It appears from this distance that at least Gordon Brown, the current U.K. prime minister, will not be returned to office when the British have their next chance to vote, and that his Labour Party will be annihilated. But I wish I could be sure.

Now, Brown had a great deal counting against him even before the British electorate, and media consumers worldwide, got to see the hero's welcome in Libya for the terrorist the British had released on "compassionate grounds." The prime minister apparently thought Moammar Gaddafi—the Libyan dictator who sent that terrorist on the Lockerbie mission, just before Christmas in 1988, to celebrate Ronald Reagan's retirement—could be relied upon not to crow at his success in humiliating the British government.

The lie—that the release of Abdel Basset Ali al-Megrahi had nothing to do with direct negotiations between Brown and Gaddafi (and others) last month—has not washed with anyone. It would now appear that Kenny MacAskill, the Scottish justice minister, was the naïve character left finding excuses for a deal already cut well over his head...

...Similarly, Gaddafi's open boasting about, for instance, the impending Muslim demographic takeover of Europe, shines with candour in comparison to western essays in political correctness. Like Lenin, Hitler, and every other totalitarian on whom he has modelled himself, Gaddafi long ago realized there was no need to hide his intentions. The "sophistication" of the west is such that if you openly state, "the capitalists will sell us the rope with which we hang them," our diplomatists will go to work explaining this away, while organizing another trade mission...

**More:** <http://www.ottawacitizen.com/Bowing+dictator/1929902/story.html>

## **I Will Follow Him**

*by JoeDanMedia*

**video:** <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xMZKNYalDvs>

*(Hat tip: Greg)*

## **Ted Kennedy's Soviet Gambit**

*by Peter Robinson, 28 Aug 2009*

...Kennedy's message was simple. He proposed an unabashed quid pro quo. Kennedy would lend Andropov a hand in dealing with President Reagan. In return, the Soviet leader would lend the Democratic Party a hand in challenging Reagan

in the 1984 presidential election. "The only real potential threats to Reagan are problems of war and peace and Soviet-American relations," the memorandum stated. "These issues, according to the senator, will without a doubt become the most important of the election campaign."

Kennedy made Andropov a couple of specific offers. First he offered to visit Moscow. "The main purpose of the meeting, according to the senator, would be to arm Soviet officials with explanations regarding problems of nuclear disarmament so they may be better prepared and more convincing during appearances in the USA." Kennedy would help the Soviets deal with Reagan by telling them how to brush up their propaganda.

Then he offered to make it possible for Andropov to sit down for a few interviews on American television. "A direct appeal ... to the American people will, without a doubt, attract a great deal of attention and interest in the country. ... If the proposal is recognized as worthy, then Kennedy and his friends will bring about suitable steps to have representatives of the largest television companies in the USA contact Y.V. Andropov for an invitation to Moscow for the interviews. ... The senator underlined the importance that this initiative should be seen as coming from the American side."

Kennedy would make certain the networks gave Andropov air time—and that they rigged the arrangement to look like honest journalism...

**Full story:** <http://www.forbes.com/2009/08/27/ted-kennedy-soviet-union-ronald-reagan-opinions-columnists-peter-robinson.html>

## Obama Officially Abandons Missile Defense in Europe

*Heritage Foundation, 27 Aug 2009*

According to the **Polish daily**, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, sources in the United States have confirmed that the Obama administration has made the decision to abandon our anti-missile shield in Poland and the Czech Republic. Unfortunately this news is not surprising at all. In March of this year it was **revealed** that President Obama "secretly" offered Moscow a grand bargain whereby it would **sacrifice missile defense sites in Poland and the Czech Republic in exchange for Moscow's help discouraging Iran's nuclear program**. Then in his **July summit** with Moscow, Obama reinforced his message that missile defense remains a bargaining chip that can be exchanged for his **college dream of a nuclear free world**.

This is a grave mistake for several reasons...

**The reasons:** <http://blog.heritage.org/2009/08/27/obama-officially-abandons-missile-defense-in-europe/>

This beautifully written 4600-word essay traces America's transformation from a country that celebrated hard work, thrift, integrity, self-reliance, and modesty to the one we endure today, filled with scores of millions of The Entitled.

## Whatever Happened to the Work Ethic?

The financial bust reminds us that free markets require a constellation of moral virtues.

*by Steven Malanga, Summer 2009 issue*

...After the Civil War, this secularized version of the Protestant ethic served as a lodestar for millions of poor immigrants, many from countries with little experience of free markets and democracy. Their assimilation into a culture that they recognized not as Protestant but as American reinvigorated the country, helping to set late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century America on a distinctly different path from much of Europe.

Many of these immigrants, ironically, absorbed their Franklinesque code from the American Catholic Church. Key members of the church hierarchy—notably, New York's brilliant, Irish-born first archbishop, John Hughes, who rose from poverty—lived by the ethic and understood its role in the country's success...

...By the end of the nineteenth century, the Irish had largely shaken off poverty and joined the American mainstream. Waves of Southern and Eastern European Catholics followed them, as well as Eastern European Jews—some 20 million immigrants between 1890 and 1925—who quickly replicated the success of the Irish in a country whose institutions emphasized and rewarded hard work, thrift, and self-improvement. Within a single generation, one study shows, the average early-twentieth-century immigrant family had achieved income and educational parity with American-born families, so that the children of these immigrants were just as likely to be accountants, engineers, or lawyers as the children of families rooted here for generations.

The breakup of this 300-year-old consensus on the work ethic began with the cultural protests of the 1960s, which questioned and discarded many traditional American virtues. The roots of this breakup lay in what Daniel Bell described in *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* as the rejection of traditional bourgeois qualities by late-nineteenth-century European artists and intellectuals who sought "to substitute for religion or morality an aesthetic justification of life." By the 1960s, that modernist tendency had evolved into a credo of self-fulfillment in which "nothing is forbidden, all is to be explored," Bell wrote. Out went the Protestant ethic's prudence, thrift, temperance, self-discipline, and deferral of

gratification...

The complete essay: [http://city-journal.org/2009/19\\_3\\_work-ethic.html](http://city-journal.org/2009/19_3_work-ethic.html)

## **In Honduras, while Obama backs the bad guy, the good guy does what good guys do**

by Jude Christodal, 28 Aug 2009

Honduran interim President Roberto Micheletti is acting like the true Honduran patriot he is. We saw his character in an **interview** with Chris Burgard weeks ago, but the Obama administration has only turned it's back on the man representing the laws and the interests of the Honduran people. This morning the Washington Times **broke the story**:

*"The interim president of Honduras has offered the man he replaced after a June coup the chance to return to the country on the condition that both renounce claims to the presidency, a negotiator said Thursday."...*

...Micheletti has repeatedly said that he would step down if that's what it takes to avoid bloodshed, and that if Zalaya would promise not to seek a return to power, so would he. Almost a George Washington moment, when you think about it. And here stands our American President, atop what was once the beacon of liberty throughout the world, telling the people of Honduras that they have to suck it up and endure the man who wants to rule them forever, throwing away their own silly little constitution.

Because he just knows better than them? Because he's a fan of the Leftist tyrants club? Because...?

Because he is wrong.

**Full story:** <http://hughhewitt.townhall.com/blog/g/a7e50219-201b-455e-b2ba-6f86382aceb8>

## **Justice Dept. to Probe 9/11 FDNY Actions**

by Scott Ott, 25 Aug 2009

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder today announced that in addition to appointing a federal prosecutor to **investigate allegations** of abuse during CIA interrogations of terrorism suspects, the Justice Department would probe the actions of the New York City Fire Department on September 11, 2001.

"While the vast majority of FDNY firefighters performed admirably that day," said Mr. Holder, "there have been reports that some of them shouted at people who were fleeing the World Trade Center Towers, and damaged property in violent ways that may have startled onlookers."

Emergency services advocates claim the firefighters were just doing their jobs, trying to save lives, and that in fact thousands of persons owe their current existence to the successful efforts of the FDNY.

However, Mr. Holder said, "the ends cannot justify the means. Justice must be done."

In related news, President Barack Obama announced today the creation of a new "elite fire fighting unit" which will report directly to the White House and follow a new, "more civil protocol" when responding to major disasters.

**More stories like this:** <http://www.scrappleface.com/>

## **Teddy Kennedy, In His Own Lying Words**

In 1965, during Senate debate of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, a.k.a. the Hart-Celler Act:

"I want to comment on what this bill will not do. First, our cities will not be flooded with a million immigrants annually. Under the proposed bill, the present level of immigration remains substantially the same.... Secondly, the ethnic mix of this country will not be upset.... Contrary to the charges in some quarters, [the bill] will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area, or the most populated and deprived nations of Africa and Asia.... In the final analysis, the ethnic pattern of immigration under the proposed measure is not expected to change as sharply as the critics seem to think.... The bill will not flood our cities with immigrants. It will not upset the ethnic mix of our society. It will not relax the standards of admission. It will not cause American workers to lose their jobs."

In 1986, concerning that year's grant of amnesty to 3 million illegal immigrants:

"This amnesty will give citizenship to only 1.3 million illegal aliens. We will secure the borders. We will never again bring forth an amnesty bill like this."

**More, from Tanstaaf:** <http://age-of-treason.blogspot.com/2009/08/ted-kennedys-legacy-genocidal.html>

July 1, 1987, when President Reagan nominated the distinguished judge Robert Bork to the Supreme Court:

"Robert Bork's America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, blacks would sit at

segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens' doors in midnight raids, school children could not be taught about evolution, writers and artists would be censored at the whim of government and the doors of the Federal Courts would be shut on the fingers of millions of citizens."

**More, from Scott Johnson:** <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/2009/08/024376.php>

## Resurrect the Raptor

by Steve Forbes, 19 Aug 2009

The Obama Administration has successfully killed the fabulous F-22 Raptor fighter aircraft. What a blunder...

...The problem is—assuming the F-35 sees the light of day in a timely manner—that this aircraft simply doesn't do the job in air-to-air combat that the F-22 does, nor does it have the F22's ability to penetrate sophisticated defenses. The F-22 is stealthier and faster and has greater range and considerably more firepower than the F-35. No potential enemy will be able to match the F-22.

Moreover, the F-22 is already in production. We will have manufactured 187 before the assembly lines shut down. The original plan was to build 750 of these planes. Killing the F-22 is false economy. While we face no Soviet-style threat today, who's to say what enemy may emerge a decade or so from now? The F-35 can be used for other functions, such as close air support for ground troops. In short, we should produce both types of aircraft. After all, the F-35 won't be in full production for at least another seven years. Doesn't prudence dictate that we continue with what we already have, thereby achieving at least something resembling economies of scale?...

**More:** <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2009/0907/opinions-steve-forbes-resurrect-the-raptor.html>

### **If you read nothing else today, read these words of C.S. Lewis and Victor Davis Hanson:**

"Of all tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their own conscience."

— C.S. Lewis

## Obama and 'Redistributive Change'

Forget the recession and the "uninsured." Obama has bigger fish to fry.

by Victor Davis Hanson, 26 Aug 2009

The first seven months of the Obama administration seemingly make no sense...

...Obama is not a pragmatist, as he insisted, nor even a liberal, as charged. Rather, he is a statist. The president believes that a select group of affluent, highly educated technocrats — cosmopolitan, noble-minded, and properly progressive — supported by a phalanx of whiz-kids fresh out of blue-chip universities with little or no experience in the marketplace, can direct our lives far better than we can ourselves. By "better" I do not mean in a fashion that, measured by disinterested criteria, makes us necessarily wealthier, happier, more productive, or freer.

Instead, "better" means "fairer," or more "equal." We may "make" different amounts of money, but we will end up with more or less similar net incomes. We may know friendly doctors, be aware of the latest procedures, and have the capital to buy blue-chip health insurance, but no matter. Now we will all alike queue up with our government-issued insurance cards to wait our turn at the ubiquitous corner clinic.

None of this equality-of-results thinking is new. When radical leaders over the last 2,500 years have sought to enforce equality of results, their prescriptions were usually predictable: redistribution of property; cancellation of debts; incentives to bring out the vote and increase political participation among the poor; stigmatizing of the wealthy, whether through the extreme measure of ostracism or the more mundane forced liturgies; use of the court system to even the playing field by targeting the more prominent citizens; radical growth in government and government employment; the use of state employees as defenders of the egalitarian faith; bread-and-circus entitlements; inflation of the currency and greater national debt to lessen the power of accumulated capital; and radical sloganeering about reactionary enemies of the new state...

...Usually such ideologies do not take hold in America, given its tradition of liberty, frontier self-reliance, and emphasis on personal freedom rather than mandated fraternity and egalitarianism. At times, however, the stars line up, when a national catastrophe, like war or depression, coincides with the appearance of an unusually gifted, highly polished, and eloquent populist. But the anointed one must be savvy enough to run first as a centrist in order later to govern as a

statist.

Given the September 2008 financial meltdown, the unhappiness over the war, the ongoing recession, and Barack Obama's postracial claims and singular hope-and-change rhetoric, we found ourselves in just such a situation. For one of the rare times in American history, statism could take hold, and the country could be pushed far to the left...

**The whole essay:** <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZWQ2NwJkN2M3ZmJjYWQwMDZlMwQyM2FjNWl4ZWJkNGI=>

## Remember 'No Controlling Legal Authority'?

The CIA probe shows once more that the law does not control this attorney general.

by *Andrew C. McCarthy*, 26 Aug 2009

...Investigations are about satisfying daunting legal standards, not mollifying an administration's political base. Here, there is not just reasonable doubt that the interrogators engaged in imminent threats, intended to commit psychological torture, and caused prolonged, severe mental damage to the terrorist detainees. There is virtual certainty that they did not. Clearly, that is why the professional prosecutors who probed these cases over the last several years opted not to bring charges.

When Al Gore clearly violated the law, Eric Holder found no controlling legal authority and shut down the case. Now, when the controlling legal authority clearly shows no violation of law, Holder has unleashed the prosecutors to go after the nation's most crucial line of defense against terror. That is shameful.

**Read the whole article:** <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NWRhNzAwYmYzMWExYTBIMTM2MjI2MjA4Y2JlODlwMTg=>

## Obama Proving Incapable of Terror Fight

by *Mark Davis*, 25 Aug 2009

...I suppose a presidential mouth that very nearly kisses the ring of Saudi royalty cannot be expected to speak truth to any evil cloaked in the Islamic faith...

...I can only imagine Attorney General Eric Holder choking back gasps as he heard of some detainees threatened with guns and power drills and others threatened with harm to family members.

Pardon my misdirected vexation. I'm still pretty worked up about my countrymen dying in various ways at the hands of the 9/11 hijackers. If, after careful evaluation of a suspect's value and demeanor, questioners thought a particularly intense method of interrogation would yield information that could save American lives, it is the height of moral idiocy to tell them not to do it.

The only thing more despicable is to prosecute them for it.

**More:** [http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/opinion/columnists/mdavis/stories/DN-markdavis\\_0826edi.State.Edition1.2744357.html](http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/opinion/columnists/mdavis/stories/DN-markdavis_0826edi.State.Edition1.2744357.html)

## Real Deal on FDR

A review of Burton Folsom's *New Deal or Raw Deal?: How FDR's Economic Legacy Has Damaged America*

by *Steve Forbes*, 19 Aug 2009

Following Barack Obama's election victory, *Time* magazine and others compared Obama with Franklin Roosevelt. The comparison was meant to be highly complimentary; however, it should serve as a serious cautionary note. Contrary to popular myth, FDR's economic policies were a disaster. They prolonged the Depression and made the U.S. an economic laggard compared with other nations during the dreadful 1930s...

**Continue:** <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2009/0907/opinions-steve-forbes-real-deal-on-fdr.html>

A wonderful explanation of the beauty—and wisdom—of the profit motive.

## Debate Shows How Little Obama Understands

by *John Stossel*, 26 Aug 2009

"Choice, competition, reducing costs—those are the things that I want to see accomplished in this health reform bill," President Obama **told** talk-show host Michael Smerconish last week.

Choice and competition would be good. They would indeed reduce costs. If only the president meant it. Or understood

it.

In a free market, a business that is complacent about costs learns that its prices are too high when it sees lower-cost competitors winning over its customers. The market—actually, the consumer—holds businesses accountable and keeps them honest. No "public option" is needed. So the hope for reducing medical costs indeed lies in competition and choice. Today competition is squelched by government regulation and privilege. But Obama's so-called reforms would not create real competition and choice. They would prohibit it...

**Read on:** <http://www.creators.com/opinion/john-stossel/competition.html>

## **Obama's Plan to Desecrate 9/11**

*by Matthew Vadum, 24 Aug 2009*

The Obama White House is behind a cynical, coldly calculated political effort to erase the meaning of the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks from the American psyche and convert Sept. 11 into a day of leftist celebration and statist idolatry.

This effort to reshape the American psyche has nothing to do with healing the nation and everything to do with easing the nation along in the ongoing radical transformation of America that President Obama promised during last year's election campaign. The president signed into law a measure in April that designated Sept. 11 as a National Day of Service, but it's not likely many lawmakers thought this meant that day was going to be turned into a celebration of ethanol, carbon emission controls, and radical community organizing...

...A coalition including the unsavory left-wing pressure group Color of Change and about 60 far-left, environmentalist, labor, and corporate shakedown groups participated in the call. Groups on the call included: ACORN, AFL-CIO, Apollo Alliance, Community Action Partnership, Deep South Center for Environmental Justice, 80 Million Strong for Young American Jobs, Friends of the Earth, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, Mobilize.org, National Black Police Association, National Coalition on Black Civic Participation, National Council of Negro Women, National Wildlife Federation, RainbowPUSH Coalition, Urban League, and Young Democrats of America...

**Continue:** <http://spectator.org/archives/2009/08/24/obamas-plan-to-desecrate-911>

## **Teddy Boy Finally Dies**

Cheated death, and his country, for 40 years.

*25 Aug 2009*

<http://www.fatboy.cc/index.htm>

**A Recession is when your neighbor loses his job.**

**A Depression is when you lose yours.**

**And a Recovery is when Barack Obama loses his.**

—The first two sentences were spoken by labor leader Dave Beck in 1954. The third was said (about Jimmy Carter) by Ronald Reagan during the 1980 presidential campaign.

I would have said "Schooled from the cradle in leftist fairy tales," but no matter. This is right on target.

## **Obama Screws Up Latin American Policy**

*by Mona Charen, 25 Aug 2009*

The lights are going out in Venezuela. The Chavez-controlled legislature passed an education bill on Aug. 13 that will extinguish the last glimmers of free thought in the country's classrooms. The law is such a caricature of revolutionary legislation that it almost seems like a joke...

...The new law stretches government power beyond the schools, permitting the state to suspend media outlets that negatively affect the public's "mental health."...

...Chavez is also saving elections from the "bourgeoisie" by gerrymandering districts before he next offers himself to the voters...

...The Venezuelan dictator cited the Italian communist theorist Antonio Gramsci on the importance of seizing control of a nation's key institutions in order to control the minds of the citizenry...



Hugo Chavez has invited Hezbollah into Venezuela, and chased most of the Jewish community out. He has sent advanced weaponry to the FARC communist insurgency that has been terrorizing neighboring Colombia for 40 years, and has spawned a bevy of imitators in Latin America. Next month, he will visit his good friend Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in Tehran.

And yet President Obama has been silent. It isn't as if he has a strict policy against criticizing other nations. He's been quick enough to condemn Israel for settlement policies and Honduras for ousting Chavez wannabee Manuel Zelaya.

No, the Obama administration has kept mum because Barack Obama, schooled in leftist fairy tales from the cradle, seems to believe that what the region requires from the United States is not leadership but contrition...

...Meanwhile, our beleaguered ally Colombia, which has done so much to stem the drug trade and to develop centrist and stable governance, still waits for ratification of the bilateral free trade agreement. And it will continue to wait...

**Read it all:** <http://www.creators.com/opinion/mona-charen/obama-screws-up-latin-american-policy.html>

## Retarding Recovery

by Steve Forbes, 19 Aug 2009

...This Administration truly believes that the private sector is a destructive, unguided missile that needs the constant and close supervision of Washington politicians. Without it we'd be subject to more disasters like the current financial crisis. In other words, Washington doesn't like the idea of venture capitalism because VCs and the entrepreneurs they fund, create and do things without anyone's permission. Before anybody can invest in anything, Washington, in effect, would like investors to have to go through the equivalent of an environmental impact statement: Entrepreneurs, executives and investors cannot be left to their own devices...

...The Obama Administration's weak-dollar policy, inherited from the Bush Administration, also inhibits productive, robust risk-taking. It's no coincidence that when Ronald Reagan and Paul Volcker ended the Great Inflation of 1968-82 venture capital exploded, and Silicon Valley took off like a rocket. The U.S., and then the global economy, began an extraordinary quarter-century of expansion and breathtaking innovation.

But the Obama-ites think the prosperity of 1982-2007 is suspect and that they must keep business entrepreneurial impulses firmly in check. Thus the howls from VCs and entrepreneurs are music to Washington's ears. Filling out forms will sidetrack venture capitalists. Even if they pick a winner, they'll have difficulty launching an IPO to cash out and redeploy their capital. Successful risk-taking will be punished with higher investment taxes...

**More:** <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2009/0907/opinions-steve-forbes-retarding-recovery.html>

Nonie Darwish is an American of Arab/Muslim origin. A freelance writer and public speaker, she runs the website [www.ArabsForIsrael.com](http://www.ArabsForIsrael.com). Her new book is *Cruel and Usual Punishment: The Terrifying Global Implications of Islamic Law*.

## Saving Rifqa

by Nonie Darwish, 24 Aug 2009

...The media's deafening silence on the threat of Sharia law, not least to apostates, risks encouraging a similar desensitization among Muslims living in the West.

There is a role for authorities to play, as well. The U.S. government must protect its citizens not only from the terrorism of jihad, but also from Islamic laws condemning Muslims to death and encouraging vigilante street justice. How can a former Muslim like Rifqa Bary, or like myself, live in peace in America when there are neighborhood mosques reading scriptures to their believers telling them to kill Muslims who have left the religion? Even if only 10 percent of Muslims in America follow Sharia as it is taught, the threat remains real...

**Read the rest:** <http://frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=36010>

## This is how Government does health care:

V.A. Glitch: 1,200 vets wrongly told they got fatal disease

[http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9A9D8SG0&show\\_article=1](http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9A9D8SG0&show_article=1)

## **This kind of pantywaist attitude will bring us another 9/11**

Obama spokesman announces interrogation unit

[http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9A9BLTG0&show\\_article=1](http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9A9BLTG0&show_article=1)

Next thing you know, they'll ask Jamie Gorelick to help them build "walls" between the FBI, the CIA, Homeland Security, etc.

## **What Is the Foundation Of Your Economic Beliefs?**

*by Bill Frezza, 24 Aug 2009*

What is the moral foundation of your economic beliefs? Do economic beliefs even require a moral foundation?

Do you find it natural to accept the varied religious beliefs of others even if they contradict your own? On the other hand, are you often at odds with people who espouse different economic beliefs and policies? Why, especially if the former forms the foundation for the latter?

Would you ever use the ballot box to force others to practice your religion or make them pay to build you a church? Why do you find it easy to do this with your economic beliefs, compelling others to foot the bill for the public policies you promote?

Do you believe that wealth is prima facie evidence of thievery? Of privilege? Do you think wealth can only be created off the backs of the poor? Is there a fixed amount of wealth in the world for all to share? If so, where did it come from and how has mankind been getting richer for the past 200 years? And if the poor wish to escape exploitation by the rich, why do they keep sneaking in to our country rather than out?

Do you admire highly paid sports figures yet disdain highly compensated business executives? Why? Does it matter whether the shareholders in the companies that employ these executives feel they are getting their money's worth? And if you're not a shareholder, what makes this issue your concern?...

**Continue:** [http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/08/24/what\\_is\\_the\\_foundation\\_of\\_your\\_economic\\_beliefs\\_97371.html](http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/08/24/what_is_the_foundation_of_your_economic_beliefs_97371.html)

## **Corporate Shills for Hope and Change**

*by Michelle Malkin, 21 Aug 2009*

Money from pharmaceutical firms and health care companies is dirty, evil and corrupting—except when key members of Team Obama are pocketing it. White House spokesman Robert Gibbs derides grassroots opponents of socialized health care as industry-funded lackeys with questionable motives and conflicts of interest. But what about the corporate shills at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue?

Two weeks ago, the White House embraced \$150 million in drug industry ads supporting Obamacare. This week, Bloomberg News reported that White House senior adviser and chief campaign strategist David Axelrod's former public relations firm, AKPD Message and Media, has raked in some \$24 million in ad contracts supporting Obamacare—along with another PR firm, GMMB, run by other Obama strategists.

The ads are funded by Big Pharma, the AARP, AMA and the powerhouse Service Employees International Union (whose Purple Shirts dumped \$80 million in independent expenditures to get Obama and the Democratic majority elected). In trademark Axelrod style, the special interest coalition adopted faux grassroots names—first under the banner of "Healthy Economy Now" and more recently as "Americans for Stable Quality Care."

Because, well, "Corporate Shills for Hope and Change" doesn't have quite the same ring of authenticity...

**More:** <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=33234>

## **A Rail Boondoggle, Moving at High Speed**

*by Robert Samuelson, 24 Aug 2009*

The Obama administration's enthusiasm for high-speed rail is a dispiriting example of government's inability to learn from past mistakes. Since 1971, the federal government has poured almost \$35 billion of subsidies into Amtrak with few public benefits. At most, we've gotten negligible reductions—invisible and statistically insignificant—in congestion, oil use or greenhouse gases. What's mainly being provided is subsidized transportation for a small sliver of the population. In a country where 140 million people go to work every day, Amtrak has 78,000 daily passengers. A typical trip is subsidized by about \$50.

Given this, you'd think even the dullest politician wouldn't expand rail subsidies, especially considering the almost \$11 trillion of projected federal budget deficits between now and 2019. But no, the administration has made high-speed rail a top priority. It's already proposed spending \$13 billion (\$8 billion in the "stimulus" package and \$1 billion annually for five years) as a down payment on high-speed rail in 10 "corridors," including Philadelphia to Pittsburgh and Houston to New Orleans. The White House promises fabulous benefits...

**Read on:** <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/08/23/AR2009082302037.html>

## **Much Ado About China**

*by Conrad Black, 22 Aug 2009*

Overblown announcements heralding the supposed coming of the Age of China have become a staple of journalistic futurism in recent years. When Maclean's magazine banners across the top of its cover "When China Rules the World," as it did last month—and it is not a Monty Python send-up of swarms of incomprehensible people in Mao suits—I know it is time to raise a peep of dissent.

Does any of this sound familiar? It was not even 20 years ago that the same was being said about Japan, when U. S. president George H. W. Bush went to Tokyo and was patronized by the Japanese prime minister for being at the head of a declining power. At an official dinner, the president vomited and returned to his embassy in an ambulance (but explained privately that his indigestion was the consequence of eating plain fish while facing Chrysler chairman Lee Iacocca for two hours). And it was only 15 years before—during the Carter doldrums, following the Kennedy assassinations and the debacles of Vietnam and Watergate—that the world was abuzz with predictions that the U.S.S.R. would surpass the United States...

...The theory of the inevitable rise of China is similar to the recent theory of the inevitable end of the U. S. as a mainly Caucasian country: It is based on the extrapolation of current statistics that will not continue, and that in the case of the Chinese economy, are a fiction anyway. China has a centrally directed economy, and calculates growth rates as a function of production, not spending; and production is deemed to occur when it is commissioned by the state. Thus, all Chinese predictions of economic growth are self-fulfilling...

...The rise of China is impressive and an objectively good thing, and the United States is labouring. But the U. S. has a functioning, if conspicuously imperfect, political and legal system, formidable resources, an incomparably productive work force, nearly four times China's GDP, and a popular culture that dominates the world. It must put its house in order, which will be painful, but a trifle compared to the challenges facing China...

**Read the rest:** <http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fullcomment/archive/2009/08/22/conrad-black-much-ado-about-china.aspx>

## **USMC vet David Hedrick rips Congressman Baird on ObamaCare**

*Clark County, Washington, 18 Aug 2009*

**Video:** [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_rRE5UK6NQU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_rRE5UK6NQU)

*(HT: Atlas Shrugs)*

## **No Health Care Reform Without Legal Reform**

*by Sarah Palin, 21 Aug 2009*

<http://www.facebook.com/notes.php?id=24718773587>

## **The Strange Case of the Obama Meltdown**

*by Victor Davis Hanson, 20 Aug 2009*

...Cap-and-trade, the mega-deficits, the apology tours, and the sleaze of some appointments and congressional grandees (cf. Rangel, Dodd, Murtha, etc.) were stimulants, but not in themselves enough to awaken the somnolent American people from their collective trance. Yet health care was like a shot of adrenaline that jolted the patient out of his slumber. Suddenly hope and change no longer worked like the swinging watch and "you're getting sleepy" lingo. Voters are feeling they've been "had" and were mesmerized into being used for an extremist agenda.

Who made the following decisions? 1) to propose a 1,000 page bill that no one had read, much less could explain?; 2)

to ram down the greatest change in the US economy in fifty years by the August recess?; 3) to talk loosely of the "uninsured" without knowing why they were not insured, how much it would cost to insure them, or whether they currently in fact find some sort of care?; 4) to reference Rahm Emanuel's doctor brother as a source of wisdom? 5) to demonize the health-care industry as greedy?...

...The Obama shotgun has blasted all sorts of magnum loads—town-hall and tea-party critics were un-American, Nazis, tools of the insurance industry, dupes, and Astro-turfers. Now the religious argument is thrown out at the 11th hour: those who doubt neo-socialist care are somehow un-Christian and uncaring. But that tactic evokes Trinity-Church politics, where religious piety rings false and serves political advantage. Did not the Christian Right get demonized for just that avenue of political mobilization? And because Obama assumed messianic pretensions, such a prophet suffers the wage of hypocrisy, given the growing reality that he is, on the presidential scale, rather mean spirited, highly partisan, too sensitive to criticism, and surprisingly ill-informed given the emphasis on his Ivy-League education and the whiz-kids around him (who wrote the error-plagued Cairo speech)...

**Read the whole thing:** <http://pajamasmedia.com/victordavishanson/the-strange-case-of-the-obama-meltdown/>

## Stupid Nation

Just how stupid do they think we are?

by Rich Lowry, 21 Aug 2009

The Obama team is saddled with a foundering health-care strategy. But it has a fallback plan—relying on the sheer dimwitted gullibility of the American public. How stupid do they think we are?

Stupid enough to think that a new \$1 trillion health-care entitlement is just the thing to restore the country to fiscal health.

Stupid enough not to know that almost every entitlement known to man has cost more than originally estimated, with a congressional committee in 1967 underestimating by a factor of ten Medicare's cost by 1990.

Stupid enough not to realize that it is through budget trickery—the taxes begin immediately, the spending is put off for a few years—that the program in the House shows "only" a \$239 billion deficit over the first ten years.

Stupid enough not to focus on how the gap between the House plan's revenue and spending steadily grows after the first ten years, making it a long-term budget buster.

Stupid enough to think increased preventive care will save the government money, just because Pres. Barack Obama constantly repeats it, despite all the independent studies to the contrary.

Stupid enough to believe that a program with no cost controls that can be discerned by the Congressional Budget Office will control costs...

**There are 16 more:** <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZWQ3Njk0OWNlZGNhZDVMOTFiNjJmYTRkNjMxNWJjYjI=>

Mr. Wilson is a former Scottish Office and Foreign Office minister.

## The SNP's Libya stunt has shamed my nation

Few Scots wanted to be the toast of Tripoli for releasing Megrahi, the Lockerbie bomber.

by Brian Wilson, 21 Aug 2009

...The vast global audience for the rantings of Kenny MacAskill, the Scottish Justice Minister, could have been forgiven for assuming him to be the spokesman for a sovereign state, albeit a tinpot one with curious moral values. Certainly no politician in a German Land or US state would have been left to go it alone with such a far-reaching decision while Berlin or Washington stayed silent.

But you only had to listen to MacAskill to understand the perspective from which he was operating, and it owed little to either the rights of the victims or the finer points of Scots law. He seemed to regard each question as a challenge to maximise use of the word "Scottish" in the answers. Scottish values, Scottish justice, Scottish compassion, Scottish way of doing things... To which he might have added Scottish naivety, Scottish shame...

Proof of the naivety lay in the scenes which greeted Megrahi on his return to Libya in the company of Colonel Gaddafi's son, arms raised in joint salute. MacAskill's protestations that Megrahi was sent home to die within three months—which remains to be seen—failed to take account of the fact that a lot of propaganda hits can be scored and a mountain of unnecessary additional grief caused within a lot less than three months. And that is exactly what the Libyans waltzed round MacAskill to achieve...

**Read it all:** <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/6069329/Lockerbie-bomber-The-SNP-cosying-up-to-Libya-has-shamed-my-nation.html>

This is outstanding stuff!

## **Fisking the Left-Wing Bias of Newsweek and the Southern Poverty Law Center**

*Hugh Hewitt, 21 Aug 2009*

On yesterday's program I asked Mark Steyn to listen to the opening segment of Newsweek's podcast, which featured two Newsweek editors talking to a Newsweek editor and a guy from the SPLC. Steyn called the Newsweek panel the "new death panel," but the fisking Mark delivers is not to be missed. The transcript is [here](#), but you really should listen to the [podcast](#) of Mark listening to the Newsweek podcast. As a big bonus, you'll also hear from Andrew Breitbart on Alinsky's Rule #12.

## **Bush Quietly Saved a Million African Lives**

*by Dr. Paul Kengor, 19 Aug 2009*

What if a president, on his own initiative, under no demands from staff or from supporters or opponents, set out to spend an unprecedented amount of money on AIDS in Africa, literally billions of dollars, at a time when the nation could not afford it, citing his faith as a primary motivation and, ultimately, saved more than a million lives?

Wouldn't the story be front-page news, especially in top, liberal newspapers? Wouldn't it lead on CNN, MSNBC, and the "CBS Evening News?" Might statues be erected to the man in the nation's more "progressive" cities?

What if the president was George W. Bush?

I pose these uncomfortable questions for two reasons: 1) President Bush did precisely that regarding the African AIDS tragedy; and 2) a study claims that Bush's remarkable action has indeed saved many precious lives.

And as someone who has closely followed Bush's humanitarian gesture from the outset, I'm not surprised that the former president continues to not receive the accolades he deserves—including even from conservative supporters—for this generous act...

**More:** [http://townhall.com/columnists/DrPaulKengor/2009/08/19/bush\\_quietly\\_saved\\_a\\_million\\_african\\_lives?page=full&comments=true](http://townhall.com/columnists/DrPaulKengor/2009/08/19/bush_quietly_saved_a_million_african_lives?page=full&comments=true)  
(Hat tip: Tom and JoAnn)

## **Hope and Change Has Become Predictable Liberalism**

*by Troy Senik, 21 Aug 2009*

...How could this have happened? Less than a year ago, the beltway consensus was that conservatism was dead and that future Republican national conventions would be held at a Denny's off the interstate. The answer is surprisingly direct. The simple elegance of the Obama campaign destroyed the president's ability to govern.

When it became clear last summer that Obama had defeated Hillary Clinton for the Democratic presidential nomination, the then-junior senator from Illinois was faced with a daunting prospect that few men have ever known: he had to illuminate a vision of America's future worthy of earning the trust that accompanies the presidency. That moment sowed the seeds of his current travails. For Obama chose the easy way out.

In a hour when the nation teetered on the edge of economic collapse, when we were fighting two wars abroad and an endless rearguard mission to protect the homeland, and when America's sense of self-assuredness was at its lowest ebb in decades, the Democratic candidate chose a message of sweet nothings. To his credit, it worked—despite being patently absurd. So low was his predecessor's public esteem and his opponent's capacity for rebuttal, that he managed to get elected on a two-word message: "Hope" and "Change." But it was fundamentally unsustainable.

What Obama failed to realize is that a Rorschach test no longer works when you give the painting a name. During the 2008 campaign, the concavity of his message allowed Americans of irreconcilable bearings to invest their common aspirations in him. But as the first act of his presidency has played out, he has shown himself to be anything but transcendent. Instead, he is an utterly predictable creature—a conventional liberal who mixes the weakness of Jimmy Carter with the ideological rigidity of George McGovern. And he is thus engaged in a conversation that the rest of the country concluded decades ago...

**Read it all:**

[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/08/21/obamas\\_health\\_care\\_plan\\_misreads\\_the\\_american\\_character\\_97950.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/08/21/obamas_health_care_plan_misreads_the_american_character_97950.html)

## Oh, my: MSNBC carefully crops shot of *black* man carrying AR-15 at health care rally to avoid skin color, so they can then rant and rave about "white people" showing up with guns when a "person of color" is president

by *Ace of Spades*, 19 Aug 2009

Oh no they di'n't.

Oh yes they did ([video](#)).

Allah is **outraged**, as is the **Newsbusters** which found this (or rather their partner/parent MRC).

Heads should roll for this. These bastards are screaming about racial tensions and they're deliberately falsifying video in order to create more racial tension for partisan gain and ratings?

Here's the [video](#) before the careful cropping. Which, you know, would have taken less care and effort to run. Cropping and repeating that one almost-still image took more time and effort than just running the real news.

So why did they take extra time? Well, falsifying news is harder than reporting it, so I guess *they must have their reasons...*

**More:** <http://minx.cc/?blog=86&post=291110>

A number of observers have said that if Karl Rove had been caught like this, he'd already be out of a job and under investigation by a special prosecutor. Also, Axelrod's connection to his old company is much closer than Dick Cheney's ties to Halliburton: \$2,000,000 closer.

### **Axelrod's profits: Uh, who's on the take from the drug lobby again?!?!**

by *Michelle Malkin*, 18 Aug 2009

I've reported several times over the last few months on Team Obama's hefty funding from the health care industry/drug lobby — see [here](#) and [here](#) — as well on the deep pockets behind the **Astroturf HCAN/SEIU/ACORN campaign**.

*Culture of Corruption* also homes in on the cozy cash deals involving **Michelle Obama, Valerie Jarrett, Susan Sher, and David Axelrod** to create faux grass-roots support for the University of Chicago Medical Center's patient-dumping scheme.

Now, Bloomberg's Timothy Burger brings news about Axelrod's latest health care conflicts of interest that will come as no surprise to those who have fully informed themselves of the Chicago way. While White House press secretary Robert Gibbs **assails** the motives of grass-roots activists by falsely smearing the movement as corporate-funded shills, Barack Obama's own senior adviser and chief Astroturfer raked in millions of dollars from **Big Pharma...**

**Much more:** <http://michellemalkin.com/2009/08/18/axelrods-profits-uh-whos-on-the-take-from-the-drug-lobby-again/>

### **In Government We Trust?**

The public's reaction to government health care is proving that Ronald Reagan was right.

by *Daniel Henninger*, 20 Aug 2009

...Oblivious to manifest failure, the liberal-progressive idea keeps itself afloat on intellectual water wings-insisting that most people still believe that if government commits itself to accomplishing a public good, it will more or less succeed despite the difficulties and inefficiencies of these great projects. Needed good gets done.

That civics-book faith in the good intentions of government has been on the bubble with a broad swath of the American people who don't know left from right but only public performance. The Obama health-care proposal arrived at a particularly bad moment to be asking voters to "trust us."...

...President Obama in his public pleas for the plan appears to be truly upset that his benign view of it isn't obvious to all. In his op-ed Sunday for the New York Times he said, "We'll cut hundreds of billions in waste and inefficiency in federal health programs like Medicare and Medicaid." Hundreds of billions? Just like that? This is nothing but an assertion by one man. **It's close to Peter Pan telling the children that thinking lovely thoughts will make them fly...**

**More:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203550604574358752883853802.html>

## **Don't like Obamacare? Here's an alternative**

*by Shawn Tully, 19 Aug 2009*

Unlike the House bill that fills 1,100 pages, my proposed health-care plan can be expressed in four simple bullet points. The marketplace, with more than 100 million consumers writing their own checks, will take care of the rest...

**Read it!** [http://money.cnn.com/2009/08/18/news/economy/obamacare\\_alternative.fortune/index.htm?postversion=2009081905](http://money.cnn.com/2009/08/18/news/economy/obamacare_alternative.fortune/index.htm?postversion=2009081905)

Mr. Hentoff is not exactly a right-wing ideologue. He thinks that J. Edgar Hoover, George W. Bush, and Richard Cheney somehow violated the Bill of Rights. He wrote the liner-notes for Bob Dylan's first two albums, for heaven's sake. But the totalitarian arrogance of Obama is more than he can stand.

## **I Am Finally Scared of a White House Administration**

*by Nat Hentoff, 19 Aug 2009*

...President Obama's desired health care reform intends that a federal board (similar to the British model)—as in the Center for Health Outcomes Research and Evaluation in a current Democratic bill—decides whether your quality of life, regardless of your political party, merits government-controlled funds to keep you alive. Watch for that life-decider in the final bill. It's already in the stimulus bill signed into law...

...No matter what Congress does when it returns from its recess, rationing is a basic part of Obama's eventual master health care plan. Here is what Obama said in an April 28 New York Times interview (quoted in Washington Times July 9 editorial) in which he describes a government end-of-life services guide for the citizenry as we get to a certain age, or are in a certain grave condition. Our government will undertake, he says, a "very difficult democratic conversation" about how "the chronically ill and those toward the end of their lives are accounting for potentially 80 percent of the total health care" costs.

This end-of-life consultation has been stripped from the Senate Finance Committee bill because of democracy-in-action town-hall outcries but remains in three House bills...

...As the Washington Post's Charles Lane penetratingly explains ("Undue influence," Aug. 8): the government would pay doctors to discuss with Medicare patients explanations of "living wills and durable powers of attorney ... and (provide) a list of national and state-specific resources to assist consumers and their families" on making advance-care planning (read end-of-life) decisions. Significantly, Lane adds that, "The doctor 'shall' (that's an order) explain that Medicare pays for hospice care (hint, hint)."

But the Obama administration claims these fateful consultations are "purely voluntary." In response, Lane—who learned a lot about reading between the lines while the Washington Post's Supreme Court reporter—advises us: "To me, 'purely voluntary' means 'not unless the patient requests one.'"

**Read it all:** <http://jewishworldreview.com/cols/hentoff081909.php3>

## **President Pantywaist in retreat:**

### **Barack Obama hoists the white flag over Stalinist health care proposals**

*by Gerald Warner, 17 Aug 2009*

...Obama has no interest in genuine health care reform: as a Senator he voted against all the moderate, achievable measures that were proposed. So far as he was concerned, the worse things got for 48 million uninsured Americans the better: it might persuade them to buy into his socialist scheme, the primary objective of which was not relief of suffering but expansion of Big Government.

Now that is in tatters. Politically, it is interesting to analyse why. Obama has no notion of cautious, consensual reform: he wants a Union of Soviet States of America and he wants it now...

...President Pantywaist has been found out and it will get worse. The one glimmer of realism he displayed was when he recently told an audience in Montana that, with regard to health care, he was "not in favour of the British system." Perhaps he had just seen the latest figures from the Office of National Statistics revealing that more than 30,000 people have died in England and Wales from hospital infections in just five years. Translated proportionately into American demographics, that would be 150,000 fatalities. Not the best advertisement for socialised health care.

There will be many more U-turns as reality overtakes Obama. His economic recovery plan, which cost nearly \$1 trillion dollars and masked 9,000 pork barrels, has removed his halo for even quite gullible voters. This will be a one-term presidency.

**More:** <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100006701/president-pantywaist-in-retreat-barack-obama-hoists-the->

**Fun Fact:** When Barack Obama presided over a "people's forum" in New Hampshire on August 11, the hundreds of citizens who were there got to speak a total of 1,161 words. Obama spoke 8,611.

An interesting 4300-word piece incorporating an interview with "The Prince of Darkness," Robert Novak, who died on August 18 at the age of 78.

### "What I've Learned"

by Barbara Matusow, 1 Nov 2008

<http://www.washingtonian.com/articles/people/9989.html>

## Health care debate confirms this is not the Barack Obama we elected

by Michael Goodwin, 19 Aug 2009

... Where is the appealing man we elected? Where is that Barack Obama? Let's find him quick because the whole nation is paying the price for this impostor's irrational exuberance. Or hubris. Americans, more of them every day, are growing disenchanted with the expansion of government and the massive pile of debt. Yet the President, certain he can change their minds if only he talks to them again, keeps trying to sell bigger as better...

... That the novelty is wearing thin is obvious. The danger is that the health care fiasco turns him into an unpopular and ineffective President. Those who say it can't happen should study a recent New York Times/CBS poll. Among the lowlights:

- \* 69% believe Obamacare will hurt the quality of their own health care.
- \* 73% believe they will have less access to tests and treatment.
- \* 62% believe Democrats' proposals would force them to change doctors.
- \* 76% believe Obama's changes will mean higher taxes for them.
- \* 77% expect their health care costs to rise.

All those findings run counter to the claims Obama makes. Even as he talks in vague ways about what exactly he favors, he promises the bill that emerges from Congress' sausage factory will be a magic elixir.

Writing in The New York Times, he guaranteed everything for everyone: "If you don't have health insurance, you will finally have quality, affordable options once we pass reform. If you have health insurance, we will make sure that no insurance company or government bureaucrat gets between you and the care you need. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan."

Those claims would be credible if they were a multiple-choice question, where only one is true. To say they can all happen at once is a crock, and the country knows it...

**More:** <http://www.nydailynews.com/opinions/columnists/goodwin/index.html>

## Conservatives Now Outnumber Liberals in All 50 States, Says Gallup Poll

by Terence P. Jeffrey, 17 Aug 2009

Self-identified conservatives outnumber self-identified liberals in all 50 states of the union, according to the Gallup Poll. At the same time, more Americans nationwide are saying this year that they are conservative than have made that claim in any of the last four years.

In 2009, 40% percent of respondents in Gallup surveys that have interviewed more than 160,000 Americans have said that they are either "conservative" (31%) or "very conservative" (9%). That is the highest percentage in any year since 2004.

Only 21% have told Gallup they are liberal, including 16% who say they are "liberal" and 5% who say they are "very liberal."

Thirty-five percent of Americans say they are moderate...

**Read the rest:** <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/52602>



## Obama Goes Postal, Lands in Dead-Letter Office:

by Caroline Baum, 18 Aug 2009

"UPS and FedEx are doing just fine. It's the Post Office that's always having problems."—Barack Obama, Aug. 11, 2009...

...Everyone makes a mistake or flubs a line when asked questions on the spot, including the president of the United States. We can overlook run-on sentences, subject and verb tense disagreement, even a memory lapse when it comes to facts and figures.

The proliferation of Obama's gaffes and non sequiturs on health care has exceeded the allowable limit. He has failed repeatedly to explain how the government will provide more (health care) for less (money). He has failed to explain why increased demand for medical services without a concomitant increase in supply won't lead to rationing by government bureaucrats as opposed to the market. And he has failed to explain why a Medicare-like model is desirable when Medicare itself is going broke.

The public is left with one of two unsettling conclusions: Either the president doesn't understand the health-insurance reform plans working their way through Congress, or he understands both the plans and the implications and is being untruthful about the impact...

**The gaffes and non sequiturs:** <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601039&sid=aJ01reSCujDQ>

## Obama Misread His Mandate

by Jay Cost, 16 Aug 2009

...All the strained comparisons of Obama to Franklin Roosevelt were a tipoff that many were talking themselves into the idea that the 2008 election created an opportunity for a substantial, leftward shift in policy. Yet the election of 2008 was not like the 1932 contest. It wasn't like 1952, 1956, 1964, 1972, 1980, 1984, or even 1988, either. Obama's election was narrower than all of these. FDR won 42 of 48 states. Eisenhower won 39, then 41. Johnson won 44 of 50. Nixon won 49. Reagan won 44, then 49. George H.W. Bush won 40. Obama won 28, three fewer than George W. Bush in his narrow 2004 reelection.

This makes a *crucial* difference when it comes to implementing policy. Our system of government depends not only on how many votes you win, but how broadly distributed those votes are. This prevents one section or faction from railroading another. It is evident in the Electoral College and the House, but above all in the Senate, where 44 senators come from states that voted against Obama last year. That's a consequence of the fact that Obama's election—while historic in many respects, and the largest we have seen in 20 years—was still not as broad-based as many would like to believe. Bully for Obama and the Democrats that they have 60 Senators, but the fact remains that thirteen of them come from McCain states, indicating that the liberals don't get the full run of the show.

For whatever reason, the Obama administration has acted as if those hagiographical comparisons to FDR were apt. It let its liberal allies from the coasts drive the agenda and write the key bills, and it's played straw man semantic games to marginalize the opposition. For all the President's moaning in *The Audacity of Hope* about how the Bush administration was railroading the minority into accepting far right proposals—he was prepared to let his Northeastern and Pacific Western liberal allies do exactly the same thing: write bills that excite the left, infuriate the right, and scare the center; insist on speedy passage through the Congress; and use budget reconciliation to ram it through in case the expected super majority did not emerge.

This might have flown during FDR's 100 Days. But this is not 1933 and Barack Obama is no Franklin Roosevelt...

**More:** [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/horseraceblog/2009/08/obama\\_misreads\\_his\\_mandate\\_1.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/horseraceblog/2009/08/obama_misreads_his_mandate_1.html)

## Healthcare rationing: Real scary

Concerns about government bureaucracies gaining oversight of your treatment are not misplaced. We need reforms, but the answer is not central planning.

by Newt Gingrich, 16 Aug 2009

...The most critical test of any reform proposal is whether it will empower individuals or impose on them. It is a fact that the leading bills in Congress would increase the power of government and decrease individual freedom. You cannot spend an additional \$1 trillion of taxpayer money and reduce the role of government. You will get new bureaucracies, more regulation, more complexity. That means you will have less control of your healthcare.

Disagree? Just read the versions of **healthcare legislation**: H.R.3200 in the House. One key proposal is to mandate an "essential benefit package" for every private insurance policy sold in the United States. Currently, individuals and employers usually make these coverage decisions. This legislation creates a new federal Health Benefits Advisory Committee that would decide instead. For example, if you are a single male with no children, the legislation still requires you to have maternity benefits and well-baby and well-child care coverage. You don't want or don't need that coverage? Sorry, you have to pay for it anyway...

**Continue:** <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-oe-gingrich16-2009aug16,0,3301006.story>

## Beware the Eggheads, Not the Skinheads

by George Jonas, 15 Aug 2009

...Set up a despotic dynasty, starve your people, break every agreement you sign, defy the resolutions of world bodies, develop and disseminate nuclear technology, test long-range rockets, keep a million under-fed dwarfs in arms, and top it off by abducting a couple of American journalists, and presto! You'll get the ex-leader of the free world — or maybe the ex-free world? — scurrying to the dismal seat of your dysfunctional parody of a dictatorship for a photo opportunity. There will be America groveling at the feet of North Korea in Pyongyang — in Pyong-effing-yang, no less. Isn't that something?

Or take the malodorous miasma of gall, social engineering zeal, anti-Semitism and Arabist agenda that emanates from the Obama administration. Foggy Bottom's haughty "we have made our views known to Israel" was confirmed recently by U.S. State Department spokesman P. J. Crowley. America's view, as formulated by America's newly desegregated White House, is that Jerusalem should be — segregated. The United States doesn't want an Israeli builder to construct 20 housing units in the Sheikh Jarrah district of east Jerusalem, a predominantly Arab neighbourhood.

"Think about that for a moment," wrote Jeff Jacoby in the *Boston Globe* recently. "Six months after Barack Obama became the first black man to move into the previously all-white residential facility at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, he is fighting to *prevent* integration in Jerusalem..."

...It's not Zionism that is racist; it's rampant liberalism, liberalism run amok. The United Nation's infamous Zionism=racism doesn't compute, but after the left's — not only the American or European, but even the *Israeli* left's — display of visceral aversion to Jewish settlements in the Holy Land, liberalism=racism isn't far off the mark...

**Read the whole blistering column:** <http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fullcomment/archive/2009/08/15/george-jonas-beware-the-eggheads-not-the-skinheads.aspx>

## Why Obama's Ratings Are Sinking

by Arthur C. Brooks, 17 Aug 2009

...Blaming a cabal of conspirators—a time-honored technique for leaders on the wrong side of public opinion—is paranoid and self-defeating. More importantly, it betrays a tin ear to the culture of most Americans—an independent, optimistic culture that is mistrustful of government nannying and intolerant of policies that mortgage our future.

Consider the evidence. Despite the vote in November, it is clear that when Americans are not in an abject panic, we dislike government fiscal promiscuity. The president's sinking approval ratings are due precisely to his administration's free-spending ways. In a July 2009 Gallup poll, the No. 1 reason for disapproval of the president's economic policies was, literally, "spending too much." In second place was the worry that the president is "leading the nation toward socialism" through government takeovers and bailouts.

What exactly is our problem with government spending? It is not just that we think it is wasteful and ineffective (although most recognize this to be true). Americans actually think the government makes it harder for people to get ahead in life...

...Citizens will put up with a lot—but not with anyone who imperils our future. There is practically nothing that lowers American happiness more than taking away our faith in a better tomorrow...

...Most Americans see their best future in the free enterprise system when (as a March 2009 Pew Research Center poll found) 70% of respondents agree that, "people are better off in a free market economy, even though there may be severe ups and downs from time to time." There is no evidence that more than a minority of Americans accept the idea that a \$17 trillion national debt, greater reliance on government for jobs and health, and hyper-progressive taxation offer the hope they deserve for themselves and their children...

**More:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204683204574354383543314054.html>

Nowadays, moonbats are more concerned about legislation concerning health insurance and gullible warming. Good! So are we.

## **For the Left, War Without Bush Isn't War At All**

*by Byron York, 18 Aug 2009*

...Not too long ago, some observers worried that Barack Obama would come under increasing pressure from the Left to leave both Iraq and Afghanistan. Now, it seems those worries were unfounded. For many liberal activists, opposing the war was really about opposing George W. Bush. When Bush disappeared, so did their anti-war passion.

**Full column:** [http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/For-the-Left\\_-war-without-Bush-is-not-war-at-all-8119694-53506047.html](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/For-the-Left_-war-without-Bush-is-not-war-at-all-8119694-53506047.html)

## **Anti-American Amigos**

Why is the Obama administration trying to help Hugo Chavez?

*by Mary Anastasia O'Grady, 16 Aug 2009*

...If Honduras has been able to neutralize Mr. Chávez, it's something to celebrate. A Chávez-style takeover of institutions in Bolivia, Ecuador and Nicaragua has quashed political pluralism, free speech and minority rights in those countries. There is now a heavy presence of Cuban state intelligence throughout the Venezuelan empire. Mr. Zelaya literally has become a fellow traveler of Mr. Chávez, leaving no doubts about the course he would put Honduras on if given the chance.

Among the theories making the rounds about Mr. Obama's motivations in trying to force Honduras to take Mr. Zelaya back, there is the hypothesis that this administration is tacking hard to the left. Mr. Obama has expressed the same views on Honduras as Sen. John Kerry (D., Mass.), who holds that the interim government must be forced to reinstate Mr. Zelaya and who has, over more than two decades in office, consistently allied himself with socialist causes in Latin America.

As a U.S. senator, Mr. Kerry has the luxury of treating Latin America like his playground, as Democrats have done for decades, foisting on it ideas that Americans reject. Venezuelans still recall how Connecticut's Chris Dodd played the role of chief Chávez cheerleader in the Senate while the strongman was consolidating power.

But Mr. Obama is the president and commander in chief, and millions of people in this hemisphere are counting on the U.S. to stand up to Venezuelan aggression. Playing footsie under the table with Mr. Chávez on Honduras while the Venezuelan is threatening the peace isn't going to fly in a hemisphere that prefers liberty over tyranny...

**The rest:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204683204574354550413462742.html>

## **Harry Reid's 'Evil' Moment**

*by William McGurn, 17 Aug 2009*

Remember when polite society treated a politician's use of the word "evil" as a sign that the old boy was dangerously lacking upstairs? We saw it in 1983... We saw it again in 2002...

...With all this history, you would think Harry Reid (D., Nev.) had ample warning. Nevertheless, the Senate majority leader invoked the e-word himself last week at an energy conference in Las Vegas, where he accused those protesting President Barack Obama's health-care proposals of being "evil mongers." So proud was he of this contribution to the American political lexicon that he repeated it to a reporter the next day and noted the phrase was "an original."

And then—nothing. No thundering rebuke from the New York Times. No outburst from Mr. Carter. In fact, it's hard not to notice that the good and gracious people who instinctively recoil at words like "evil" or "un-American" (the preferred term of Mr. Reid's counterpart in the House, Speaker Nancy Pelosi) have all been silent.

It would be easy to read something dark into Mr. Reid's characterization, and the yawn with which it has been greeted. In fact, what we have here is really the logical extension of the liberal assumption that they have a monopoly on brain power. In such a world, anyone who dissents, almost by definition, has to be stupid or evil or both...

...It's much the same with White House spokesman Robert Gibbs. In his press briefings, Mr. Gibbs seems to suggest that all hard questions about health care are based on "misconceptions." Really?

Is the Congressional Budget Office's finding that the House plan would significantly raise health-care costs a "misconception"? Was it a "misconception" that the now-abandoned section covering end-of-life issues had an in-built conflict of interest between lowering costs and providing care for the elderly? And is it a "misconception" that Mr. Obama's ultimate goal is a single-payer system, when Americans can watch him on earlier videos saying as much?...

**Read the rest:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204683204574356802422957272.html>

## The Panel

What death by bureaucratic fiat might look like.

by Andrew Klavan, 17 Aug 2009

"Well, we have your doctor's recommendation," says the chairwoman in a friendly tone. She peers over the top of her glasses as she pages through your file.

You have to clear your throat before you can answer. "He says the operation is my only chance."

"But not really very much of a chance, is it?" she says sympathetically. Over time, she's become expert at sounding sympathetic.

"Seventy percent!" you object.

"Seventy percent chance of survival for five years—five years at the outside—and even that only amounts to about 18 months in QALYs: quality-adjusted life years."

"But without this procedure, I'll be dead before Christmas."

You try to keep the anger out of your voice. The last thing you want to do is offend them. But the politicians promised you—they promised everyone—there would never be panels like this. They made fun of anyone who said there would. "What do they think we're going to do? Pull the plug on grandma?" they chuckled. The media ran news stories calling all rumors of such things "false" or "misleading." But of course by then the media had become apologists for the state rather than watchdogs for the people...

**More:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204683204574356241709682828.html>

## Our 'Gimme' Society

by Ruben Navarrette, 16 Aug 2009

Sometimes, I think America's national creed is: "gimme, gimme, gimme."

As in: "Gimme a bailout." With banks, insurance firms and automobile manufacturers getting a helping hand from the government, some Americans think they should get one too. I recently heard a radio ad that made just that point, telling listeners to enlist the services of a money management firm because "Wall Street firms are getting a bailout and you should too."

Like much of what plagues modern society, the push for individual bailouts centers around a sense of entitlement, about what people think they deserve—not because they've earned it but because they want a more comfortable, hassle-free life. It's also about the belief that government is the answer to all our problems—part nanny and part ATM.

Unfortunately, this mentality is also infecting young Americans...

**Continue:** [http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci\\_13059455](http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci_13059455)

## Drinking the Kool-Aid:

### Failing to lead, Hillary follows the President in placating the world

by Michael Goodwin, 16 Aug 2009

The video of Hillary Clinton peevishly snapping at a student questioner in the Congo was the meltdown seen 'round the world. But that undiplomatic moment was hardly her worst on the Africa swing. The real clunker came with her pathetic attempt to compare Nigeria's corrupt and violent 2007 elections to the contested 2000 American presidential results.

In equating the two, the secretary of state echoes President Obama's sour apologia tours around the globe. Either he's writing her speeches now or Clinton's drinking the White House Kool-Aid. Neither is appealing.

The bended-knee approach abroad shames America and reduces our great nation to the sum of its mistakes and failures. And it seems designed to create the misleading impression that Third-World kleptocrats and genocidal maniacs are, gee, just like us...

...Sadly, it fits neatly with her boss' "blame America" approach to foreign policy. Once he leaves our borders, Obama exhibits a bad habit of bad-mouthing his own country in ways that suggest we are no better than the rest of the world and are often the root of problems...

**Read on:**

[http://www.nydailynews.com/opinions/2009/08/16/2009-08-16\\_drinking\\_the\\_koolaid\\_failing\\_to\\_lead\\_hillary\\_follows\\_the\\_president\\_in\\_placating\\_.html](http://www.nydailynews.com/opinions/2009/08/16/2009-08-16_drinking_the_koolaid_failing_to_lead_hillary_follows_the_president_in_placating_.html)

## Public 'Option' and Death Panels Aren't Dead Yet

Over the weekend, there was a lot of chatter about the Democrats being ready to drop at least those two provisions from their ObamaCare bill(s). But there was also some chatter about the far-left Democrats (a sizeable constituency, to say the least) fighting back to preserve the Public 'Option.'

It's all just talk, at this stage. Nothing substantive has yet been done, for or against these two horrific provisions. Let's hope that ObamaCare opponents can just take another deep breath and resume the fight.

—Don John, 17 Aug 2009

## Nothing is as Liberating as Prosperity

by Janet Daley, 16 Aug 2009

When I first arrived in Britain from America in the 1960s, I was shocked by the class system. Not because such social divides were unknown in the US, but because there was an utterly different attitude here towards the possibility of moving on from the condition into which you had been born. It was not the poverty or the deprivation of British working class life that staggered me—there was plenty of that where I came from. It was the passivity and defeatism, the ineradicable sense of resignation, of people who believed it was inconceivable that they or anyone they knew should transcend their social and cultural limitations. I had never met people who said, when you encouraged their children to aim for university, "Don't go putting ideas in his head."

My memories of that time had faded over the years, but they were brought vividly back to life by last week's controversy over which political party is the truly progressive one. I was on the Left in those days, a veteran of the student revolution at Berkeley: indeed, one of the reasons I had become an expatriate was my disenchantment with America's capitalist values...

**Read on:** <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/janetdaley/6034804/Nothing-is-as-liberating-as-prosperity.html>

Dr. Gottlieb, a former official at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and a practicing internist.

## Obama and the Practice of Medicine

Why is the president convinced so many doctors and patients are making irrational decisions?

by Dr. Scott Gottlieb, 14 Aug 2009

On the defensive because of an increasingly skeptical public, President Barack Obama has recently spoken extemporaneously about his health plan. In doing so, he has revealed his lack of understanding about aspects of medical practice and the reasons for rising health-care costs...

**Continue:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204409904574350370729883030.html>

## Call Me 'Paranoid'

by Jonah Goldberg, 15 Aug 2009

...Under the plan discussed at President Obama's infomercial-esqe town halls, America would cut costs and expand coverage while avoiding rationing. Apparently, it's paranoid to think that's too good to be true.

Imagine you're in charge of bringing pie to a company picnic. You're planning to provide dessert for 100 people. Then, your boss says you need to hand out pie to 150. Fine, you say, I'll make more pies. But—oh no!—you can't because you've also been told costs must go down. OK, then you can cut slices of the existing pies smaller so everyone can have a piece. Wait! You can't do that either because you're not allowed to ration (i.e., give less to more).

According to Obama, the health-care pie will be sliced into more pieces, of equal or greater size than available now, for less money—all because government is so much better than the private sector at managing large projects. Such contradictions run through the talking points for ObamaCare...

**Life expectancy, counseling, and more:**

[http://www.nypost.com/seven/08152009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/call\\_me\\_paranoid\\_184613.htm](http://www.nypost.com/seven/08152009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/call_me_paranoid_184613.htm)

A Canadian arts writer debunks the sentimental lunacy.

## Hippie Dippy

Can we please stop mythologizing Woodstock?

by Greig Dymond, 14 Aug 2009

<http://www.cbc.ca/arts/music/story/2009/08/13/f-woodstock-40th-anniversary.html>

## Who Are You Going to Believe, Sheila Jackson Lee or Your Lying Eyes?

by David Forsmark, 15 Aug 2009

For once, Sheila Jackson-Lee was channeling Groucho Marx instead of Karl Marx.

But then who could swear she knows the difference? After all, this is the Houston congresswoman who, while on a visit to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, famously asked if the Mars rover could send back pictures of the flag planted by Neil Armstrong.

Houston, *you* have a problem.

Jackson-Lee also once brightened our moods in the wake of disaster, by complaining that hurricanes are only given "lilly-white names," and suggested that in the future the weather service should "try to be inclusive of African American names such as Keisha, Jamal and Deshawn."

Jackson-Lee is once again front and center thanks to this [video](#) of her talking on a cell phone while a constituent who is a cancer survivor asks a question.

So, when Lee appeared with CNN Newsroom's afternoon anchor Rick Sanchez—master of the inappropriate comment, prince of the emotional outburst, and king of the non-sequitur—hilarity, as they used to say in old movie reviews, was bound to ensue...

**Video, and more:** <http://newsrealblog.com/2009/08/15/who-are-you-going-to-believe-sheila-jackson-lee-or-your-lying-eyes/>

## A Modest Proposal for Health Care

by Rick Richman, 14 Aug 2009

...Here is a modest proposal for those who wish to remain in Washington for the 111th Congress that convenes in January 2011: Cobble together a tentative majority for a specific bill—and then *don't* pass it; instead, schedule hearings on it; put it out in written form, with a plain English explanation, so the public can read and comment on it; let experts testify in public about it; and only then put it to a vote. And hold a hearing at the same time on the Republican alternative.

Right now, the public is faced with an administration and a Congress insulting its intelligence. The president seeks to frame the debate as one between those who "want to do nothing" and those who will back his supposedly deficit-neutral, cost-saving, quality-preserving, long-overdue panacea that will cover everyone lacking insurance while changing nothing for those satisfied with what they have. He urges us to support whatever it is that will emerge from the backroom deals still in the process of being cut but that needs to pass right now, preferably a couple of weeks ago.

The debate is better described as one between those who want a wholesale revision of one-seventh of the economy, to be managed from Washington by those currently in charge of the post office, and those who want to enact reforms that will empower millions more individuals to purchase insurance from private companies through legal and tort reform, tax credits, and similar changes. But if the debate remains in its current caricatured form of a choice between (a) pie-in-the-sky and (b) doing nothing, the public will choose the Hippocratic pledge of first doing no harm...

**Read the rest:** <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/richman/76181>

## We Can't Talk About Immigration

A review of *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*, by Christopher Caldwell.

by Mark Steyn, 13 Aug 2009

...How does one express one's, ah, concerns about these issues? Caldwell cites a headline from his own newspaper, the *Financial Times*: "The Uneasy Cosmopolitan: How Migrants Are Enriching An Ever More Anxious Host." The "unease" seems principally on the part of the *FT*'s sub-editor: as his linguistic tiptoeing suggests, decades of multicultural squeamishness have stripped us even of a language with which to discuss the subject.

What benefit is it to France or French taxpayers to fund Islamic welfare imams? To pose the question is to miss the point. If you believe in mass immigration, you do so because it's a talisman of your own moral virtue. If the economic argument for immigration is reductive even when it's not plain deluded, the psychological one is not to be disdained.

On the one hand, mass immigration is the price posterity levies on old-school imperialists: "They are here because we were there," as they say in the Netherlands. But, if like Sweden you never had an imperialist bone in your body, they're still here: "They are poor because we are rich." And, if you're a small urbanized nation like the Netherlands, the "challenge" of immigration is just the usual frictions that occur when people from the countryside—in this case, the Moroccan countryside—move to the cities.

So it's the consequence of your urban planning, or your colonialism, or your wealth, or just plain you. We'll blame anything rather than confront the central truth—that when an old, relatively unicultural society admits in a short space of time a large, young, fecund population from somewhere else, you are setting in motion a process of transformation. Caldwell asks the obvious question—"Can you have the same Europe with different people?" and gives the obvious answer: no. "Europe is not welcoming its newest residents but making way for them."

In the end, that coy French euphemism for the, um, rioters of no particular socio-religious persuasion—"youths"—gets to the heart of the matter: youths are youthful, and ethnic Europeans aren't. In the heavily North African Paris suburb of Montfermeil, the Muslim children from the housing projects pass on their way to school each morning a neighbourhood of detached houses still occupied by French natives: they call it "*la ville des vieux*"—the old people's town.

**Full review:** <http://www2.macleans.ca/2009/08/13/we-can%E2%80%99t-talk-about-immigration/>

## They Think You're Stupid

by Don John, 14 Aug 2009

Here are three ridiculous columns by pompous, elite liberals—and my comment on each.

**Winston Churchill Was a Bolshevik**, by Joe Conason, 14 Aug 2009: When Churchill backed National Health, he didn't have the advantage we have: the retrospect of 60 horrific years of U.K. socialized medicine.

**When the Kooks Take the Stage** by Scot Lehigh, 14 Aug 2009: Never raise your voice to your betters, even when they're lying and trying to screw you.

**Republican Death Trip**, by Paul Krugman, 13 Aug 2009: As if any bill would come out and say there'll be a "euthanasia chute" in every oncologist's office.

Liberals always used to complain that conservatives weren't reflective and analytical enough, and incapable of "critical thinking." But now, plenty of conservative and centrist Americans are doing just that. Unlike most Congressmen, they've actually read the 1017-page bill known as HR 3200. They've reflected on it and analyzed it. Now they're criticizing it, out loud. *Really* loud.

The liberals don't like it one bit. They must still think we're stupid, because they insist that the bill says nothing about establishing "death panels" (for instance), or about doing away with private insurance and forcing everyone into a government plan. Well of course the bill doesn't come out and say those things. That would be really stupid. Our Congressweasels are smarter than that. When they're robbing people of freedom, they prefer stealth mode.

But "ordinary" non-elite people actually are capable of *figuring out the implications* of what the bill does say. You can peruse all 1,017 pages here: [http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111\\_cong\\_bills&docid=f:h3200ih.txt.pdf](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111_cong_bills&docid=f:h3200ih.txt.pdf)

Just a few of the things people have found in HR 3200:

- p. 16 Current insurance policies will be "grandfathered." But private insurance will become illegal, because when anything changes, the people involved must transfer to the public "option."
- p. 29 Care will be rationed.
- p. 42 Health Choices Commissioner will decides benefits for you.
- p. 58 Every person will get a national I.D. health card.
- p. 59 The federal government will have direct, real-time access to citizens' bank accounts, for purposes of collecting payments via Electronic Funds Transfer.
- p. 72 All private insurance plans must conform to federal guidelines. Anyone who does not buy acceptable insurance will be taxed 2.5% of his income each year.
- p. 195 Health bureaucrats will have access to all financial and personal records.
- p. 203 The tax imposed on p. 72 shall not be treated as a tax.
- p. 424 Advanced Care Planning designed to make sick old people give up and die.
- p. 838 Home Visitation Programs mandate visits by parenting "experts"

The biggest weasel-word defense of ObamaCare's thinly-veiled power-grabs comes from The Master himself. He says "Here's a guarantee that I've made. If you have insurance that you like, then you will be able to keep that insurance. If you've got a doctor that you like, you will be able to keep your doctor. Nobody is trying to change what works in a system. We are trying to change what doesn't work in the system."

My first question for President Obama would be: Why not just say "I guarantee"? But my second question is more important: HOW LONG will we "be able to keep that insurance"? Two months? Five months? A year?

## **A Weakening Will To Crush Terror**

*Investor's Business Daily editorial, 13 Aug 2009*

Terrorists have had lots to celebrate recently, as court rulings from Bangkok to Madrid wiped out years of work to stop them and raised doubts about treating the war on terror as a law-enforcement action.

Last Friday, a U.S. federal judge ordered the release of Sheik Mohammed al-Moayad, a Yemeni cleric convicted in 2005 of financing Hamas and trying to bankroll al-Qaida by as much as \$20 million. Al-Moayad had been sentenced to 75 years, but based on claims of improperly admitted evidence, a judge ordered him freed. Now set for deportation, he will likely kill again.

Then on Tuesday, a Thai judge ordered Russian arms trafficker Viktor Bout, a monster known as "The Lord of War" and "The Merchant of Death" for selling billions in illegal weapons to terrorists on four continents, set free instead of extraditing him to the U.S....

...On Thursday, Scottish Justice Secretary Kenny MacAskill was said to be considering the release, on "compassionate" grounds, of the only Libyan agent convicted of aiding terrorists in blowing up a Pan-Am jet over Lockerbie in 1988. Abdelbaset Ali al-Megrani has cancer, but at the time of his conviction, prosecutors assured victims he'd be put away forever.

Also Thursday, Spain's socialist government showed its low regard for anti-terrorist peacekeeping in Lebanon, where it has a leading U.N. role. Spain declared 51 Honduran volunteer troops unwelcome to help keep peace in that terrorist-threatened nation. Spain said it didn't recognize the Honduran government of Roberto Micheletti, which threw out dictator wannabe Mel Zelaya on June 28, and therefore the Hondurans were dispensable. Never mind protecting Lebanon.

Finally on Thursday, a judge in Khartoum, Sudan, dumped a death sentence for a terrorist who had murdered a U.S. diplomat and his driver last year, softening it to 10 years. The judge said the driver's family had forgiven the terrorist. So never mind the American.

All these acts have one thing in common: They are legal rulings. All show sophistic logic, disregard for broader consequences and a weakening will to fight terror. Most specifically, they ignore the political aims and severity of each terror act. Such rulings might be appropriate in criminal settings. But for terrorism, they only encourage more of the same...

**More:** <http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=335056161392994>

## **UN Chief's warning: The end of the world is nigh!**

*by Nile Gardiner, 12 Aug 2009*

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has such a low profile on the world stage that he's referred to as "**the invisible man**". Perhaps in an effort to boost his press coverage he's given **a speech** in Incheon, South Korea (hat tip: Drudge), that can only be described as a bizarre PR stunt, with the sort of cataclysmic environmental statements doled out in scientifically dodgy disaster movies like *The Day After Tomorrow* or the forthcoming *2012*.

In his address to the Global Environment Forum this week (read talking shop for unelected, overpaid bureaucrats), Ban warned of impending "droughts, floods and other natural disasters," as well as mass social unrest and violence—"the human suffering will be incalculable"—if the world's leaders did not "seal a deal" on climate change at a summit in Copenhagen in December. In the Secretary General's ominous words: "*We have just four months. Four months to secure the future of our planet.*"

In reality, the United Nations can't even maintain its own headquarters, manage its own books and keep its tens of thousands of peacekeepers under control, let alone save the world. The UN is an extraordinarily badly run institution, rife with corruption and mismanagement, that shields some of the most odious tyrants on the face of the earth. Surely it should be focusing on implementing some much-needed management reform, cracking down on rampant corruption within its ranks, and preventing its peacekeeping troops from raping refugees in war-torn places like the Democratic Republic of the Congo and southern Sudan.



If Ban Ki-moon really wants to make a bigger impact on the world stage he should condemn North Korea's barbaric enslavement of millions of its own people in forced labour camps, speak out against Iran's nuclear weapons program, fraudulent elections and mass violations of human rights, and stand up to tyrannical regimes from Pyongyang to Khartoum. He should also call for reform of the UN's ludicrous human rights organization, the Human Rights Council, which is no improvement at all over its disastrous predecessor the UN Commission on Human Rights.

The main threat to humanity at present is posed not by climate change but by dangerous madmen like Kim Jong Il and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, heading rogue regimes hell-bent on wiping their neighbours off the map. Not to mention the rise of militant Islam and a global terrorist network that seeks the destruction of the free world. As long as UN officials stick their head in the sand and ignore the world's real problems the body will remain an irrelevance.

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/nilegardiner/100006362/un-chief%E2%80%99s-warning-%E2%80%93-the-end-of-the-world-is-nigh/>

## **Flashback: When the Left Protested Bush, the Media Saw Only "everyone from grandmothers and students to veterans and mothers pushing strollers"**

*by Ace of Spades, 7 Aug 2009*

I cite this as an example, and I trust not even a liberal will dispute that when it came to anti-war protests, the protesters were *unfailingly* described as "just normal folks," spontaneously animated to gather without, apparently, any organization at all; somehow, it seems, they psychically intuited where their fellow "just normal folks" might be banging their drums and shaking their paper mache effigies of Bush and Cheney...

...On the other hand, when Obama opponents assemble (and that includes Democrats in good standing), the press strives to paint the protesters as not only weird and possibly dangerous ("carrying swastikas") but also deceptive, in that they're somehow "faking" their anger, or have been paid to be there.

Well, to be fair, some people are in fact **paid to be at these protests**. Some people belong to a hierarchical organization and are, in fact, part-time paid profession protesters, trouble-makers, and intimidators. Some people know exactly what to do and what to yell and who to push, because they do it every three or four months and it is, effectively, part of their job description.

But these people—these people—the media "forgets" to mention.

SEIU & Castor organize a townhall and announce it at the last minute as to reduce opposition voices. The townhall was packed 1/2 w SEIU people...

**More:** <http://minx.cc/?post=290660>

*(Hat tip: Jim D.)*

## **Obama's Senior Moment**

Why the elderly are right to worry when the government rations medical care.

*Wall Street Journal, 14 Aug 2009*

Elderly Americans are turning out in droves to fight ObamaCare, and President Obama is arguing back that they have nothing to worry about. Allow us to referee. While claims about euthanasia and "death panels" are over the top, senior fears have exposed a fundamental truth about what Mr. Obama is proposing: Namely, once health care is nationalized, or mostly nationalized, rationing care is inevitable, and those who have lived the longest will find their care the most restricted.

Far from being a scare tactic, this is a logical conclusion based on experience and common-sense. Once health care is a "free good" that government pays for, demand will soar and government costs will soar too. When the public finally reaches its taxing limit, something will have to give on the care and spending side. In a word, care will be rationed by politics.

Mr. Obama's reply is that private insurance companies already ration, by deciding which treatments are covered and which aren't. However, there's an ocean of difference between coverage decisions made under millions of voluntary private contracts and rationing via government. An Atlantic Ocean, in fact. Virtually every European government with "universal" health care restricts access in one way or another to control costs, and it isn't pretty....

...Yes, the U.S. "ration" by ability to pay (though in the end no one is denied actual care). This is true of every good or service in a free economy and a world of finite resources but infinite wants. Yet no one would say we "ration" houses or gasoline because those goods are allocated by prices. The problem is that governments ration through brute force—either explicitly restricting the use of medicine or lowering payments below market rates. Both methods lead to waiting lines, lower quality, or less innovation—and usually all three...

Read the rest: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203863204574344900152168372.html>

## ObamaCare Kills Health Competition

by Michael Tanner, 13 Aug 2009

...There's nothing *inherently* wrong with one company earning a large market share, but the lack of significant competition helps contribute to higher insurance costs and poorer service. Moreover, this market concentration hasn't necessarily flowed from consumer preference in a free market, but results in good part from barriers to entry erected by state insurance regulation.

Obama's answer to this problem is to set up a new government-run insurance plan to compete with private insurers. But such a plan will ultimately result in *less* competition, not more. A government-run plan would have an inherent advantage in the marketplace, because it ultimately would be subsidized by taxpayers. The government plan could keep its premiums artificially low or offer extra benefits, because it could turn to taxpayers to cover any shortfalls.

Plus, the government plan also could use its market power to impose much lower reimbursement rates on doctors and hospitals—Medicare and Medicaid do that now, to the point where they often pay *less* than cost. Providers would be forced to recoup the income lost thanks to the "public option" by raising what they charge to private insurance—driving up premiums and making private insurance even less competitive. In the end, the private-insurance market would be eviscerated, leaving millions of Americans with no choice but the government-run program. No choice. No competition.

To *truly* create more choice and competition, Obama should tear down the regulatory barriers to choice by letting people buy insurance from states other than the one in which they live...

**Complete column:**

[http://www.nypost.com/seven/08132009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/obamacare\\_kills\\_health\\_competition\\_184274.htm](http://www.nypost.com/seven/08132009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/obamacare_kills_health_competition_184274.htm)

## Concerning the "Death Panels"

by Sarah Palin, 12 Aug 2009

Even columnist Eugene Robinson, a self-described "true believer" who "will almost certainly support" "whatever reform package finally emerges," **agrees that** "If the government says it has to control health-care costs and then offers to pay doctors to give advice about hospice care, citizens are not delusional to conclude that the goal is to reduce end-of-life spending."

So are these usually friendly pundits wrong? Is this all just a "rumor" to be "disposed of," as President Obama says? Not according to Democratic New York State Senator Ruben Diaz, Chairman of the New York State Senate Aging Committee, **who writes:**

*Section 1233 of House Resolution 3200 puts our senior citizens on a slippery slope and may diminish respect for the inherent dignity of each of their lives.... It is egregious to consider that any senior citizen ... should be placed in a situation where he or she would feel pressured to save the government money by dying a little sooner than he or she otherwise would, be required to be counseled about the supposed benefits of killing oneself, or be encouraged to sign any end of life directives that they would not otherwise sign.*

Of course, it's not just this one provision that presents a problem. My original comments concerned statements made by Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel, a health policy advisor to President Obama and the brother of the President's chief of staff. Dr. Emanuel **has written** that some medical services should not be guaranteed to those "who are irreversibly prevented from being or becoming participating citizens....An obvious example is not guaranteeing health services to patients with dementia." Dr. Emanuel has also **advocated** basing medical decisions on a system which "produces a priority curve on which individuals aged between roughly 15 and 40 years get the most chance, whereas the youngest and oldest people get chances that are attenuated."

President Obama can try to gloss over the effects of government authorized end-of-life consultations, but the views of one of his top health care advisors are clear enough. It's all just more evidence that the Democratic legislative proposals will lead to health care rationing, and more evidence that the top-down plans of government bureaucrats will never result in real health care reform...

**More:** [http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note\\_id=116471698434&1&index=0](http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=116471698434&1&index=0)

## The Rubes of Engagement

by David Harsanyi, 12 Aug 2009

...If the government-run health bill doesn't pass, it won't be the result of anyone's voice being quashed. In fact, I would be curious to meet the herculean life-form that has the capability to "drown out" either President Barack Obama or Pelosi...

...Not long ago, ABC News aired a prime-time health care reform misinformercial directly from the White House. Not a single critic was allotted serious time to dispel this hourlong homage to munificent leadership. This, despite the fact that John Stossel, one of ABC News' most popular personalities (and one of the most effective opponents of government-run health care), was, I assume, available to question the president.

If Obama desired a vigorous debate, as he claims, he would debate vigorously. Instead, the president has launched snitch e-mails and a "reality check" section on the White House Web site, which allows the administration to conflate over-the-top accusations (e.g., "death panels"; the only thing being euthanized, of course, would be quality health care) with completely legitimate concerns (the "public option" and how it would displace tens of millions from their current doctors and insurance).

Now a "drowned-out" Pelosi has headed to the pages of the newspaper with the largest circulation in the nation to accuse the growing number of involved citizens who feel the health care agenda threatens their livelihoods and the country's future of acting "un-American." How's that for vigorous debate?

The problem for government-run health care proponents isn't that debate is being "drowned out" by fanatical mobs. Quite the opposite. Their problem is that too many people are finally listening.

**Full column:** [http://www.denverpost.com/recommended/ci\\_13039228](http://www.denverpost.com/recommended/ci_13039228)

## **Analysis: Press Largely Ignored Incendiary Rhetoric at Bush Protest**

by Bill Sammon, 12 Aug 2009

News outlets that are focusing on the incendiary rhetoric of conservatives outside President Obama's town hall meeting Tuesday ignored the incendiary rhetoric—and even violence—of liberals outside an appearance by former President George W. Bush in 2002.

When Bush visited Portland, Ore., for a fundraiser, protesters stalked his motorcade, assailed his limousine and stoned a car containing his advisers. Chanting "Bush is a terrorist!," the demonstrators bullied passers-by, including gay softball players and a wheelchair-bound grandfather with multiple sclerosis.

One protester even brandished a sign that seemed to advocate Bush's assassination. The man held a large photo of Bush that had been doctored to show a gun barrel pressed against his temple.

"BUSH: WANTED, DEAD OR ALIVE," read the placard, which had an X over the word "ALIVE."

Another poster showed Bush's face with the words: "F— YOU, MOTHERF—ER!"

A third sign urged motorists to "HONK IF YOU HATE BUSH." A fourth declared: "CHRISTIAN FASCISM," with a swastika in place of the letter S in each word...

**More:** <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/08/12/analysis-press-largely-ignored-incendiary-rhetoric-bush-protest/>

## **The Whole Foods Alternative to ObamaCare**

Eight things we can do to improve health care without adding to the deficit.

by John Mackey, 11 Aug 2009

...Many promoters of health-care reform believe that people have an intrinsic ethical right to health care—to equal access to doctors, medicines and hospitals. While all of us empathize with those who are sick, how can we say that all people have more of an intrinsic right to health care than they have to food or shelter?

Health care is a service that we all need, but just like food and shelter it is best provided through voluntary and mutually beneficial market exchanges. A careful reading of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution will not reveal any intrinsic right to health care, food or shelter. That's because there isn't any. This "right" has never existed in America

Even in countries like Canada and the U.K., there is no intrinsic right to health care. Rather, citizens in these countries are told by government bureaucrats what health-care treatments they are eligible to receive and when they can receive them. All countries with socialized medicine ration health care by forcing their citizens to wait in lines to receive scarce treatments.

Although Canada has a population smaller than California, 830,000 Canadians are currently waiting to be admitted to

a hospital or to get treatment, according to a report last month in Investor's Business Daily. In England, the waiting list is 1.8 million.

At Whole Foods we allow our team members to vote on what benefits they most want the company to fund. Our Canadian and British employees express their benefit preferences very clearly—they want supplemental health-care dollars that they can control and spend themselves without permission from their governments. Why would they want such additional health-care benefit dollars if they already have an "intrinsic right to health care"? The answer is clear—no such right truly exists in either Canada or the U.K.—or in any other country...

**The 8 things, and more:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204251404574342170072865070.html>

Barack Obama's worldview was shaped by the white-hating Jeremiah Wright and the freedom-hating Saul Alinsky. It's only natural for him to approve of such reprehensible human beings as Mary Robinson.

## **Mary Robinson's Medal of Freedom**

Anti-Americanism and anti-Israel activism win Obama's approbation.

by John Bolton, 10 Aug 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204251404574342152496390582.html>

**"Those who made and endorsed our Constitution knew man's nature, and it is to their ideas, rather than to the temptations of utopia, that we must ask that our judges adhere."**

— Robert Bork (Marine, originalist, Solicitor General, acting Attorney General, judge)

(HT: Tony C.)

## **Obama's Tone-Deaf Health Care Campaign**

Dorothy Rabinowitz, 10 Aug 2009

...Americans don't take well, for instance, to bullying, especially of the moralizing kind, implicit in those speeches on health care for everybody. Neither do they wish to be taken where they don't know they want to go and being told it's good for them.

Who would have believed that this politician celebrated, above all, for his eloquence and capacity to connect with voters would end up as president proving so profoundly tone deaf? A great many people is the answer—the same who listened to those speeches of his during the campaign, searching for their meaning.

It took this battle over health care to reveal the bloom coming off this rose, but that was coming. It began with the spectacle of the president, impelled to go abroad to apologize for his nation—repeatedly. It is not, in the end, the demonstrators in those town-hall meetings or the agitations of his political enemies that Mr. Obama should fear. It is the judgment of those Americans who have been sitting quietly in their homes, listening to him.

**Read the rest:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204251404574342653428074782.html>

## **20 Questions for Your Congressman**

by Robert Tracinski, 10 Aug 2009

The smear against small-government advocates who have confronted their congressmen at town hall meetings is that they are an "angry mob" who just want to shout down advocates of Obama's health-care bill. In fact, these protesters have come to the meetings to ask some tough questions—questions that should have been asked by the mainstream media. So when you head off to a local town hall meeting during the August recess, focus on asking good questions. I don't mean just rhetorical questions intended to make a point, but also real questions that require a substantive answer.

As a guide to help you prepare for your local town hall meeting, here are my suggestions for 20 questions you can ask your elected representatives about the economics, history, politics, and morality of Obama's health-care plan. If your elected representative will answer these questions, it will tell you a great deal about his principles (or lack of them) and his goals. It might also tell you about his method of making decisions: does he just repeat canned talking points, or does he really think about your questions? And if he *won't* answer your questions—if he doesn't have the guts to do anything but preach to the converted at union-sponsored rallies—well, that gives you all the answers you need right there, doesn't it?

But don't just ask these questions of your congressmen. Ask them of your friends and neighbors, of newspaper

columnists and reporters, of local doctors and businessmen and others in positions of influence. These are the kinds of questions we should all be thinking about and trying to answer, if we are going to subject this legislation to the scrutiny it needs before Congress votes on it...

**The 20 questions:** <http://www.intellectualactivist.com/php-bin/news/showArticle.php?id=1126>

## Hidden 'Reform' Costs: The Health Cops

by Adam Brodsky, 10 Aug 2009

...Who'd care about the taxpayers' health-care tab—if there were no nationalized health care to begin with?

"Preventable" costs are no reason to dictate lives but to avoid socialized medicine, like ObamaCare. That's not the nannies' goal, of course. The CDC report, notably, cites 24 intrusive "strategies":

- \* Making kids walk to school.
- \* Pushing moms to breastfeed.
- \* Cutting down entrée portions served in public venues.
- \* Creating more bike lanes and recreational areas.
- \* Discouraging sales of "unhealthy" foods.
- \* Offering incentives to stores to push farm produce.

If voters back such steps for their *own* health, of course, that's one thing. But to claim they're essential to save taxpayers bucks gets the logic backward—because, again, without nationalized health care, there'd be no nationalized costs. Folks would make their own choices—and just pay the consequences...

...Economist Gerald Prante goes further, asking: Rather than taxing fattening foods, why not tax *obesity itself*? Taxpayers could declare their height and weight on their 1040s, and pay an "obesity tax" based on the resulting Body Mass Index. And no reason to stop there. If the goal is to make each of us pay the health costs linked to our own indulgences, there's a more efficient way to do it: Simply make everyone pay his own medical bills—and scrap nationalized health care altogether.

Lifestyle dictators will have none of *that*, of course. They'd rather end personal financial responsibility for health-care costs and then claim government has a right to mandate how we live—since it pays the bills. Which is why a vote for government health care is a vote for government-run *life*...

**More:** [http://www.nypost.com/seven/08102009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/hidden\\_reform\\_costs\\_the\\_health\\_cops\\_183774.htm?page=0](http://www.nypost.com/seven/08102009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/hidden_reform_costs_the_health_cops_183774.htm?page=0)

## Introducing...Charles Blow!

What an appropriate name!

Don John, 9 Aug 2009

I'd never heard of this preening liberal until his August 7 *New York Times* column "Health Care Hulabaloo," in which he attacks the anti-ObamaCare protesters:

...Not only are anti-reformists showing up, they're terrorizing legislators with their tomfoolery when they do. Blinded by fear and passion, armed with misinformation and misplaced anger, they descend on these meetings and hoot and holler in an attempt to shut down the debate rather than add to it. I must say that this says more about them than it does about any forthcoming legislation. Belligerence is the currency of the intellectually bankrupt...

...A Daily Kos/Research 2000 poll released last Friday found that 28 percent of Republicans don't believe that Barack Obama was born in the United States and another 30 percent are still "not sure." That's nearly 6 out of 10 Republicans refusing to accept a basic truth. Then again, this shouldn't surprise me. According to a Gallup poll released last summer, 6 in 10 Republicans also said they thought that humans were created, in their present form, 10,000 years ago.

Let's face it: This is no party of Einsteins. Really, it isn't. A Pew poll last month found that only 6 percent of scientists said that they were Republicans...

But the problem is that it's all *ad hominem* (yes, Mr. Blow, Republicans can speak Latin). He never addresses the protesters' arguments at all—probably because he doesn't think they could possibly have any. He's haughty, dismissive, and prejudiced. But then, **one look** at Mr. Blow and I'm certain that he's not qualified to be a captain in the New Haven Fire Department.

It's not surprising that only 6% of scientists admit to being Republican. People in most academic fields have reason to fear that being labelled as a conservative will hurt, or even end, their careers. Today's American academia is controlled by



by H. Clay McEldowney, 6 Aug 2009

...But as legal action groups and gender activists are riding to the rescue of women's sports, there appears to be no similar savior for men's athletics. Although the law promises equal protection for both sexes, Education Secretary Arne Duncan has so far been silent on the cuts to men's teams. Parents, coaches and athletes would be right to ask: Aren't male athletes facing discrimination if their teams are being singled out?

Duncan wouldn't have to look far to fairly approach the question of allocating roster slots. In 2006, the Education Department offered schools an alternative compliance method: Survey the student body and then provide athletic opportunity based on the students' expressed interest.

Although that method would, at long last, give students a direct say in the way scarce athletic resources are apportioned, the NCAA immediately wrote to its members, warning them not to adopt it. Gender activist groups followed suit, suggesting they would sue schools that attempted a survey. The NCAA's patronizing [response](#) to students was that "[it] permits schools to use surveys alone...as a means to assess female students' interest in sports."...

**The rest:** <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/08/05/AR2009080503089.html>

## Weighing America and Finding It Wanting

David Kessler's anti-obesity crusade.

by Andrew Ferguson, 6 Aug 2009 (August 10 issue)

...His thesis is that sugar, salt, and fat—the lures with which the food industry entices Americans into obesity—are the new tobacco, ripe for the same regulatory regime that has bankrupted companies, upended livelihoods, and put the centuries-old custom of smoking on a fast track to ultimate extinction. In this view, the food industry, health care reform, and American eating habits are all tangled together, creating another opportunity to make us live more sensibly...

...Consider the humble cheeseburger. Use the word and all of us know what you mean. Kessler has a different idea. "In reality," he writes, "this dish is fat surrounded by layers of sugar on salt on sugar and salt." The "in reality" is sublime sleight of hand. Why is it more "real" to describe an object as a (selective) list of its components, rather than as the whole we're familiar with?...

...Rats, it turns out, like fat and sugar as much as we do. Scientists can condition them to crave some kinds of food over others, using cues like lights or noise—just as, Kessler says, the food industry has learned to use the texture of food, the sight of it and smell of it, to make our bodies release dopamine and generate activity in the frontal orbital cortex, which in turn sets off a craving that can only be satisfied by consuming its product. What's missing in this inexorable chain of cause and effect? Only everything we think of when we think of an individual person. Gently but unavoidably he compares the American eater to Pavlov's dog, secreting saliva at the ring of a bell or the flash of a garish menu at Chili's. He fails to point out what, at this late date, may require pointing out: The difference between Pavlov's dog and a human being is that one of them is a dog...

...Reducing a man to his biology has great advantages, at least to certain other kinds of people. It perfects the blame-shifting by removing individual responsibility—the very possibility of self-control—from the equation...

**Read it all:** <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/798lxiv.asp>

## Government Medicine Kills

by Deroy Murdock, 6 Aug 2009

...Breast cancer kills 25 percent of its American victims. In Great Britain, the Vatican of single-payer medicine, breast cancer extinguishes 46 percent of its targets.

Prostate cancer is fatal to 19 percent of its American patients. The National Center for Policy Analysis reports that it kills 57 percent of Britons it strikes.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [data](#) show that the U.K.'s 2005 heart-attack fatality rate was 19.5 percent higher than America's. This may correspond to angioplasties, which were only 21.3 percent as common there as here.

The U.K.'s National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) just announced plans to cut its 60,000 annual steroid injections for severe back-pain sufferers to just 3,000...

..."In 2008, the average Canadian waited 17.3 weeks from the time his general practitioner referred him to a specialist until he actually received treatment," Pacific Research Institute president Sally Pipes, a Canadian native, wrote in the July 2 Investor's Business Daily. "That's 86 percent longer than the wait in 1993, when the [Fraser] Institute first started quantifying the problem."

Such sloth includes a median 9.7-week wait for an MRI exam, 31.7 weeks to see a neurosurgeon, and 36.7 weeks—nearly nine months—to visit an orthopedic surgeon...

...Obamacare proponents might argue that their health reforms are neither British nor Canadian, but just modest adjustments to America's system. This is false. The public option—for which Democrats lust—would fuel an elephantine \$1.5 trillion overhaul of this life-and-death industry. Having Uncle Sam in the room while negotiating drug prices and hospital reimbursement rates will be like sitting beside Warren Buffett at an art auction. Guess who goes home with the goodies?

A public option is just the opening bid for eventual nationalization of American medicine. As House Banking Committee chairman Barney Frank (D., Mass.) told SinglepayerAction.Org on July 27: "The best way we're going to get single payer, the only way, is to have a public option to demonstrate its strength and its power."

Barack Obama seconds that emotion. "I don't think we're going to be able to eliminate employer coverage immediately," Obama told a March 24, 2007 Service Employees International Union health-care forum. "There's going to be potentially some transition process. I can envision [single payer] a decade out or 15 years out or 20 years out." As he told the AFL-CIO in 2003: "I happen to be a proponent of single-payer, universal health-care coverage... That's what I'd like to see."

And why a public option just for medicine? Wouldn't government clothing stores be best suited to furnish the garments Americans need to survive each winter? And why not a public option for restaurants? Shouldn't Americans have universal access to fine dining?...

**More:** <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=N2M0ODk0OTNkZjkwNGM4OGMyYTEwYWY3ODUzMzFiOTc=>

## Six Months In, Media Still Do PR For Obama

by Rep. Lamar Smith, 4 Aug 2009

...The national media seldom mention that the president's budget would double the national debt in five years and triple it in 10.

The media neglect to tell the American people that the president's cap-and-trade energy plan will cost families hundreds of dollars every year.

The media rarely hold the Obama administration accountable for job losses, even as unemployment hit 9.5% — the highest rate in 26 years.

Most recently, the national media have failed to fairly present both sides of the health care debate.

During a prime-time press conference last week, President Obama claimed his health care plan was "deficit neutral." The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office strongly disagrees, finding that the legislation would increase the deficit by \$239 billion over 10 years. But not one reporter questioned the president about the CBO's findings...

**More:** <http://ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=334275294897386>

## Why Revive the Cold War?

Russia and the U.S. were reducing their nuclear arsenals without 'arms control.'

by Douglas Feith and Abram Shulsky, 3 Aug 2009

...But depriving proliferators of such talking points won't affect their incentives to acquire nuclear weapons—or the world's incentives to counter the dangers that the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programs pose to international peace... All in all, the Obama administration's nuclear weapons policies appear confused and self-defeating...

...There is an important connection between proliferation risks and modernization. But the Obama administration seems to have it backwards. If the U.S. fails to ensure the continuing safety and reliability of its arsenal, it could cause the collapse of the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Countries such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Australia and others might decide that their security requires them to acquire their own nuclear arsenals, rather than rely indefinitely on the U.S. The world could reach a tipping point, with cascading nuclear proliferation, as the bipartisan Congressional Strategic Posture Commission warned in its May 2009 report.

The Obama administration's nuclear weapons policies—including its treaty talks with Russia—affect the way America's friends and potential adversaries view the integrity of the U.S. deterrent. The wrong policies can endanger the U.S. directly. They can also cause other states to lose confidence in the American nuclear umbrella and to seek security in national nuclear capabilities.

If that happens, the dangers of a nuclear war somewhere in the world would go up substantially. It would not be the



first time a U.S. government helped bring about the opposite of its intended result—but it might be one of the costliest mistakes ever.

**More:** [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204313604574328430978849134.html?mod=googlenews\\_wsj](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204313604574328430978849134.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)

## World Burns As 'Doc O' Fiddles

by *Ralph Peters*, 7 Aug 2009

This week, as President Obama's surrogates denounced worried citizens as a "mob," leftist leaders abroad cracked heads. More than a few Obamacrats may long for the same freedom of action as Venezuela's Hugo Chavez or Russia's Vladimir Putin.

To say nothing of North Korea's "dear leader," Kim Jong-Il, who made a former US president dance *real* close. Or Iran's "President" Ahmedinejad, who White House press secretary Robert Gibbs described as "elected." (Had a Bushie committed such a gaffe, it would've made headlines.)

Democracy advocates are driven into bunkers—and we get cash-for-clunkers. The only genuine concern shown by the Obama administration abroad has been for ousted *Chavista* ex-President Manuel Zelaya, who tried to turn Honduras into Little Venezuela.

What *really* happened this week, while domestic leftists (known for their own disruptive, abusive public protests) were attacking hard-working Americans who don't want their health care looted?...

**Read on:** [http://www.nypost.com/seven/08072009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/world\\_burns\\_as\\_doc\\_o\\_fiddles\\_183348.htm](http://www.nypost.com/seven/08072009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/world_burns_as_doc_o_fiddles_183348.htm)

## The left can't understand why people don't like Obamacare

by *Ron Smith*, 7 Aug 2009

...MSNBC's Chris Matthews worked himself into his characteristic spittle-laced frenzy while sputtering about the legions of protesters showing up to make meetings designed to sell Obamacare into "Town Hell" occasions...

...How dare these people adopt the tactics of the left, like the ACORN or SEIU organizers, and plan demonstrations of political dissatisfaction. The left would have us believe that such actions are illegitimate if performed by any other than their own supporters. This is amusing, as are the awkward attempts by Mr. Matthews and his like to suggest that those folks giving the health care reform backers from Congress a frosty reception as they try to sell their nationalized health care plans are shills for the health insurance industry.

Truth is, the health insurance industry is as silent as the shorter half of Penn and Teller. As the Wall Street Journal points out, "If anything, the health-care business lobbies are helping Democrats by keeping quiet and hoping their silence buys them survival as heavily-regulated utilities."

What's actually happening represents a rare political development—the arousal of what Richard Nixon dubbed "The Silent Majority," in this case by what they correctly believe to be a threat to their cherished right to choose their own doctors and exercise autonomy in matters relating to their medical well-being.

Everybody knows the current system is exceedingly expensive and that tens of millions of their fellow citizens are without health insurance, but a majority of Americans, in poll after poll, express satisfaction with their own coverage and share an understandable disbelief that government run health care is going to make things better.

It's trite to ask why one should think government could efficiently provide health care when it demonstrably can't do anything efficiently. As we know, trite can be true, and the evidence of governmental incompetence is overwhelming, even if it is ignored by people such as those who write newspaper editorials or host certain cable talk shows...

**More:** <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bal-op.smith07aug07,0,6337682.column>

## Dems' Plan Will Eliminate Health Insurance

by *Robert Tracinski*, 5 Aug 2009

...This is the line of attack the Democrats have chosen as they go into the August recess: private health-insurance companies are evil, and big government is here to save us from them.

According to the *New York Times*, President Obama is **planning** an "August offensive against the insurance industry." It is "a campaign of increasingly harsh rhetoric against the insurance industry" that is "intended to drive home the message that revamping the health care system will protect consumers by ending unpopular insurance industry practices, like refusing patients with pre-existing conditions."

That part about pre-existing conditions gives the game away. Health insurance companies refuse to cover pre-existing conditions for the same reason that you can't insure your automobile *after* you crash it. Insurance is a form of financing for the unexpected and unpredictable. It is not a mechanism to force somebody else to pick up the tab for expenses you have already incurred.

Do the Democrats even understand what insurance is? Over at *Mother Jones*, Kevin Drum muses that "Health insurance is a weird industry.... They don't do research, they don't perform surgeries, they don't change bedpans, and they don't make diagnoses. They're just middlemen. All they do is pay the bills.... But for some reason we're supposed to care about whether they continue to exist or not."

Get that? "All they do is pay the bills." Taking for granted the fact that someone else is going to somehow produce wealth and pay the bills, while you sit back and make petulant demands about how you want it to be done better and with fewer hassles—isn't that the whole leftist mentality in a nutshell?

Insurance is a form of *financing*. It is a contract under which a health-insurance company agrees to pay for medical bills that could run into the tens of thousands of dollars, if you are hit by a bus or are diagnosed with cancer, so that you don't have to pay for those bills out of your savings. For younger people, this means being able to pay for catastrophic care even if you haven't had time to build up tens of thousands of dollars in savings. For older people, this means not having your retirement savings or the equity in your home get wiped out by an unexpected illness.

So let's ask the question the left never asks: how is it possible for an insurance company to pay for these giant medical bills?..

**Read it all:** <http://phillipsphiles.blogspot.com/2009/08/dems-plan-will-eliminate-health.html>

## How to Fix the Health-Care 'Wedge'

There is an alternative to ObamaCare.

by Arthur B. Laffer, 5 Aug 2009

...Implementing Mr. Obama's reforms would literally be worse than doing nothing. The president's camp is quick to claim that his critics have not offered a viable alternative and would prefer to do nothing. But that argument couldn't be further from the truth.

Rather than expanding the role of government in the health-care market, Congress should implement a patient-centered approach to health-care reform. A patient-centered approach focuses on the patient-doctor relationship and empowers the patient and the doctor to make effective and economical choices.

A patient-centered health-care reform begins with individual ownership of insurance policies and leverages Health Savings Accounts, a low-premium, high-deductible alternative to traditional insurance that includes a tax-advantaged savings account. It allows people to purchase insurance policies across state lines and reduces the number of mandated benefits insurers are required to cover. It reallocates the majority of Medicaid spending into a simple voucher for low-income individuals to purchase their own insurance. And it reduces the cost of medical procedures by reforming tort liability laws.

By empowering patients and doctors to manage health-care decisions, a patient-centered health-care reform will control costs, improve health outcomes, and improve the overall efficiency of the health-care system.

Congress needs to focus on reform that promotes what Americans want most: immediate, measurable ways to make health care more accessible and affordable without jeopardizing quality, individual choice, or personalized care. Because Mr. Obama has incorrectly diagnosed the problems with our health-care system, any reform based on his priorities would worsen the current inefficiencies. Americans would pay even more for lower quality and less access to care. This doesn't sound like reform we can believe in...

Complete column: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204619004574324361508092006.html>

## "God, guns, guts, and American pickup trucks"

That's the slogan of Mark Muller, owner of a Missouri car dealership called Max Motors, which used to give its customers vouchers for handguns and now gives them vouchers for assault rifles. He's a calm and rational conservative who maintains that some people need such firearms for self-defense. He recently spoke to a CNN info-babe, and didn't knuckle under to her clueless conventional "wisdom."

**video:** <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=icHGSiT1jEw>

On August 5, Hugh Hewitt got him on the phone for about 5 minutes, starting at 18:53:

**audio:** <http://hughhewitt.townhall.com/TalkRadio/Show.aspx?RadioShowID=5&ContentGuid=c5439539-0ab5-46f3-8ed6-af3f3a3a097e>

It runs 4,300 words—but then, that's a reflection of how much malfeasance Holder and his minions have perpetrated in just 6 months.

## **Eric Holder's Justice Department**

It's all politics, all the time.

*by Jennifer Rubin, 1 Aug 2009 (August 10 issue)*

...It is therefore surprising that in the first seven months of the Obama administration, a series of hyper-partisan decisions, questionable appointments, and the inexplicable dismissal of a high-profile voter intimidation case against the New Black Panther party have once again fanned suspicions that the Justice Department is a pawn in partisan political battles.

Both in Congress and among a number of current and former Justice Department employees is a growing concern that the Obama administration is politicizing the department in ways the Bush team never imagined. A former Justice employee cautions that every administration has the right and the obligation to set policy. "Elections have consequences," he affirms. But he thinks that the Obama administration has gone beyond policy reversals and is interfering with prosecutorial decisions, staffing the department with unqualified personnel, and invoking privilege to thwart proper congressional oversight and public scrutiny...

...While the Bush administration was investigated for seeking out conservative lawyers and staff, the Obama administration has been given a pass for going to the other extreme and stocking Justice with ultra-left leaning partisans. Overt signs of political activity and support now are on full display throughout the department. While it was unheard of to display campaign literature or paraphernalia during the Bush years, in the Holder Justice Department "Yes we did!" signs are fully evident, as are copies of reverential Obama campaign posters...

...In looking at the totality of Holder's performance, the degree to which he has departed from his confirmation hearing rhetoric is glaring. Any demarcation between the Obama administration's political agenda and the impartial administration of justice is being eradicated...

**Full article:** <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/799hlime.asp?pg=1>

Simply unbelievable. This is what socialism leads to: a nation whose Empire spread Western culture around the globe for 200 years, a people who stood alone against Hitler for a year—now turned into docile slaves of the state. The families in question do appear to merit the government's attention. But surely there must be plenty of existing laws to address the matter. The problem is that the socialist state is unwilling to impose traditional consequences on families who who repeatedly disrupt their communities: the families could be evicted from public housing, and left to fend for themselves; or the parents could be sent to prison, and their children to orphanages or foster homes. These consequences may seem draconian, but they are extremely motivating, and thus wouldn't have to be imposed as often as one might think. They're what used to keep society functioning smoothly, back in the days when it was OK to be judgmental and to have community standards.

## **Britain To Put CCTV Cameras Inside Private Homes**

*by Charlie Sorrel, 3 Aug 2009*

<http://www.wired.com/gadgetlab/2009/08/britain-to-put-cctv-cameras-inside-private-homes/>

## **Sin Bins for Worst Families**

*by Alison Little, 23 July 2009*

<http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/115736/Sin-bins-for-worst-families>

## **Impossible Promises**

*by John Stossel, 5 Aug 2009*

...No more evil "cherry-picking." No more "discrimination against the sick." But that's not insurance. Insurance is the pooling of resources to cover the cost of a possible but by no means certain misfortune befalling a given individual. Government-subsidized coverage for people already sick is welfare. We can debate whether this is good, but let's discuss it

honestly. Calling welfare "insurance" muddies thinking.

Such "reform" must increase the demand for medical services. That will lead to higher prices. Obama tells us that reform will lower costs. But how do you control costs while boosting demand?...

...With the collapse of the socialist countries, we ought to understand that bureaucrats cannot competently set prices. When they pay too little, costs are covertly shifted to others, or services dry up. When they pay too much, scarce resources are diverted from other important uses and people must go without needed goods. Only markets can assure that people have reasonable access to resources according to each individual's priorities....

...The Times story adds: "They are committed to rewarding high-quality care, by paying for the value, rather than the volume, of [Medicare] services."

Value to whom? When someone buys a service in the market, that indicates he values it more than what he gives up for it. But when the taxpayers subsidize the buyer, the link between benefit and cost is broken. Market discipline disappears.

Listening to the health-care debate, I hear Republicans and Democrats saying it's wrong to deny anyone anything. That head-in-the-sand attitude is why Medicare has a \$36-trillion **unfunded liability**. It's not sustainable—and they know it...

**Complete column:** <http://www.creators.com/opinion/john-stossel/impossible-promises.html>

## The Great Irony Of Health Reform: Middle Class, Not Rich, Get Shaft

*by Jeffrey H. Anderson, 3 Aug 2009*

...Most Americans want consumer freedom. They want to be able to shop for health care value — for the best care, at the best prices. They'd like to have a lot more freedom to shop for such value than they currently have.

That's why Democrats are couching their proposed expansion of government-run health care in the language of competition and choice. Listen to the president as he pitches the centerpiece of that agenda — a "public option," a form of Medicare for all. He says it's merely a way to give Americans another choice: People can buy private health insurance, just like now, or they can instead choose the government option.

But millions of middle-class Americans who are currently happy with their employer-provided insurance would soon find that the choice isn't theirs to make. The government would make it cheaper for employers to contribute to the government-run option than to continue providing private insurance. Millions of employers would do the math and pick the government option. The "public option" would indeed provide a choice — for millions of employers, against the wishes of millions of employees...

...The "public option" would merely use government's coercive powers to dictate the prices and availability of services provided by others — by doctors, nurses, hospitals, etc. Private insurance cannot similarly fix prices and would be run out of business. Lower reimbursement rates, coupled with a dwindling pool of private insurers to whom to pass on costs, would mean lower incomes for medical professionals. The eventual result would be fewer people entering the medical profession. If you question this, do you think higher salaries attract teachers?

A two-tiered system would then emerge: The very rich would take their spots like first-class passengers on the Titanic, paying for fine care and not asking the price. The rest of us would take our spots in steerage class, awaiting the inevitable collision between government-run health care and the iceberg of budgetary disaster...

**More:** <http://ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=334188729255352>

## Soaking the Middle Class

*Detroit News editorial, 4 Aug 2009*

Having doubled the federal budget deficit in just six months in office, the Obama administration now says that the expanding deficit threatens the nation's fragile economic recovery and will require sacrifice to contain...

...The middle class is where the money is, and that's where the administration will have to go to get the cash to fund its programs. This would be a good time for those middle-income earners to think about how much they're willing to pay for Obama's ambitions. Congress is on summer vacation, and most members are back in their districts, presumably listening to constituents. They should be getting an earful from the taxpayers who will be saddled with the \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion 10-year cost of the administration's health care plan.

With Summers and Geithner already talking about broad tax hikes to cover the deficits the administration has posted so far, voters may want to seriously weigh how much more government they can afford. Likewise with the carbon cap-and-trade proposal that has already passed the House. It will cost the average household an estimated \$3,000 annually in

the form of higher prices for goods and services.

Everyone wants a cleaner environment and everyone wants health care reform. But how much of each taxpayers are able to pay for should be a major consideration as these policies are shaped.

This isn't the end of what Obama has on his wish list. He also envisions expanding social spending on everything from college tuition to housing, and can be expected to drive up the deficit further with additional economic stimulus outlays...

...Taxpayers should make sure Congress understands their tolerance level for higher tax bills before it resumes debate this fall on massive new spending programs. And the next time they come across a political candidate who promises them they can have a bright, new world that someone else will pay for, they should be a lot less gullible.

**All of it:** <http://detnews.com/article/20090804/OPINION01/908040310/1008/Editorial—Soaking-the-middle-class>

A White House spokeswoman, Linda Douglass, came forth on Tuesday and accused Matt Drudge and others of muddying the health care debate by taking [this video](#) of Obama out of context, and also (by implication) [this video](#) and [this one](#). Her argument, basically, was "Who are you going to believe: me, or your own lying eyes and ears?" Two splendid columns on the Obama regime's lame and counterproductive push-back:

## You Want Context? Drudge Will Give You Context.

by Mary Katharine Ham, 4 Aug 2009

...Linda Douglass, formerly a totally objective reporter with ABC News, appears in the below video in an attempt to debunk the first video. She does this by saying, essentially, "Obama's critics are lying about the President by using words that came directly out of his mouth on video. Now, here are some other things that Obama has also said on video more recently that are different from the stuff in the first video."

No kidding. Obama has said entirely different things at different times to different audiences? "As I've consistently said..."

**More:** [http://www.weeklystandard.com/weblogs/TWSFP/2009/08/you\\_want\\_context\\_drudge\\_will\\_g.asp](http://www.weeklystandard.com/weblogs/TWSFP/2009/08/you_want_context_drudge_will_g.asp)

## What Obama Actually Said

by Philip Klein, 4 Aug 2009

...The Drudge-linked video also includes the 2003 clip of Obama arguing that he favors a single-payer health care system to the AFL-CIO, as well as clips of Democratic Reps. Barney Frank and Jan Schakowsky arguing that offering a government-run plan (or "public option") will lead to single-payer over time. Taken together, I think this highlights Democratic double-talk on health care. When speaking to liberal audiences who want a single-payer system, Democrats will argue to them that offering a government-run plan within a government-run exchange is the politically pragmatic way of getting to a single-payer system over time. But when addressing the general public, they talk about the government plan merely as something that will provide people with "choice" and foster "competition." They don't get to have it both ways.

**Full column:** <http://spectator.org/blog/2009/08/04/what-obama-actually-said>

## Avoiding the Next Obama

by L.E. Ikenga, 4 Aug 2009

...My Igbo parents came to this great country from Nigeria. They arrived a few years after Nigeria's independence from Great Britain. In Nigeria, it was a time of unprecedented cultural and political turmoil, which allowed politicians very much like Barack Obama to continue to seep into Nigeria's political system. These politicians all promised a change from the past. And unfortunately, they ended up fulfilling their promises. What these politicians ended up changing was the very fabric of the African societies, which they had been taught to see as unsophisticated and inferior.

I call these men, who appeared all over Africa in the wake of independence, **African Colonial politicians** (ACP's). They were the direct offspring of the European Imperialists, imposing radical European leftist political theory on tribal cultures. ACP's and their unscrupulous followers were able to almost completely destroy many African cultures.

For the most part, these ACP's were intellectual frauds, completely unworthy of the honors bestowed upon them. But they sounded and looked good; so the people listened to them. With their fancy Oxbridge degrees, grandiloquent speeches given with perfectly accented "Queen's English," finely tailored European suits, and fabled family histories, ACP's took the masses by storm.

ACP's convinced their constituents that they were as dumb as baboons and did not have what it took to make good decisions for themselves and for the future. They made Africans feel embarrassed about their entire histories and conservative values. They persuaded Africans to follow the "European way" of doing things, and assured that this blueprint for progress was one that could not fail...

**Continue:** [http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/08/avoiding\\_the\\_next\\_obama.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/08/avoiding_the_next_obama.html)

## Utopia Versus Freedom

by Thomas Sowell, 4 Aug 2009

...If everything that is wrong with the world becomes a reason to turn more power over to some political savior, then freedom is going to erode away, while we are mindlessly repeating the catchwords of the hour, whether "change," "universal health care" or "social justice."...

...Let's go back to square one. The universe was not made to our specifications. Nor were human beings. So there is nothing surprising in the fact that we are dissatisfied with many things at many times. The big question is whether we are prepared to follow any politician who claims to be able to "solve" our "problem."

If we are, then there will be a never ending series of "solutions," each causing new problems calling for still more "solutions." That way lies a never-ending quest, costing ever increasing amounts of the taxpayers' money and—more important—ever greater losses of your freedom to live your own life as you see fit, rather than as presumptuous elites dictate.

Ultimately, our choice is to give up Utopian quests or give up our freedom. This has been recognized for centuries by some, but many others have not yet faced that reality, even today. If you think government should "do something" about anything that ticks you off, or anything you want and don't have, then you have made your choice between Utopia and freedom...

**Read it all:** <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NmVIODY0YzFiMzcxNzYwNGE2Nzg2ZTBhZTA2YTU0NjM=>

## Five Reasons why Obama will hike middle-class taxes

by James Pethokoukis, 4 Aug 2009

...Obama doesn't seem to think high taxes are harmful. Think about this: Not only was the top income tax rate a stratospheric 70 percent when President Reagan took office in 1981, the tax code was not indexed to inflation. A lethal combo for economic growth. But here's what Obama wrote about the Reagan tax cuts in *The Audacity of Hope*: "The high marginal tax rates that existed when Reagan took office may not have curbed incentives to work or invest, but they did distort investment decisions — and did lead to the wasteful industry of setting up tax shelters." That's it! Heavens, if Obama doesn't think the pre-Reagan tax code wasn't a disincentive to working, saving and investing, is there any tax system that he would find anti-growth?.

The belief in the need for higher, European-style taxes (like a VAT) fills the policy cloud that surrounds Obama. It's hard to overstate this. It's right up there with global warming. Obama knows he faces a looming fiscal crisis and higher taxes will be his weapon of choice...

**Full column; several good links, too:**

<http://blogs.reuters.com/james-pethokoukis/2009/08/04/5-reasons-why-obama-will-hike-middle-class-taxes/>

## Gay Marriage, Democracy, and the Courts

The culture war will never end if judges invalidate the choices of voters.

by Robert P. George, 3 Aug 2009

...If marriage is redefined, its connection to organic bodily union—and thus to procreation—will be undermined. It will increasingly be understood as an emotional union for the sake of adult satisfaction that is served by mutually agreeable sexual play. But there is no reason that primarily emotional unions like friendships should be permanent, exclusive, limited to two, or legally regulated at all. Thus, there will remain no principled basis for upholding marital norms like monogamy...

...Because marriage has already been deeply wounded, some say that redefining it will do no additional harm. I disagree. We should strengthen, not redefine, marriage. But whatever one's view, surely it is the people, not the courts, who should debate and decide. For reasons of both principle and prudence, the issue should be settled by democratic means, not

by what Justice Byron White, in his dissent in *Roe*, called an "act of raw judicial power."

**More:** <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204619004574322084279548434.html>

Mr. Lewis is a philosophy professor at Duke University. I like his philosophy.

## **What 'Right' to Health Care?**

*by John David Lewis, 2 Aug 2009*

...After 50 years of increasing government interventions, through a maze of agencies that now control half of all medical dollars in America, the financial mess is getting worse. But rather than simply presume that more programs and more coercions are the answer, should we not at least consider that the source of the problem may be those very programs and that the solution lies elsewhere?...

The advocates of government medicine are upholding health care as a moral right. Desiring to mandate this "right" by legislative fiat, they have been unwilling to face the cause and effect relationship between increasing government actions and rising prices. That is because the moral goal of equality, measured against the claims to a right to health care, has trumped the mere economic arguments.

As a result, calls for more and wider programs—to enforce the "right"—have continued, even as prices rise. This has led to even greater price distortions, which have fueled calls for more interventions, leading to higher prices and demands for more programs.

This vicious cycle is blinding people to the fact that the fundamental cause of the problem is the government interventions, which have caused the distortions.

**Read the entire column:** <http://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/columns/story/1630906.html>

Citizens outraged by his support for socialized medicine, and his global warming hysteria.

## **Protest against Rep. Tim Rishop (D-NY)**

*SaveAmerica1, 24 June 2009*

**video:** <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UOLs7Cybnqw>

*(HT: Drudge Report)*



**Barack Obama, Barney Frank, and Jan Schakowsky caught on tape, saying that their**

## "health care reform" is intended to eliminate private insurance

*NakedEmperorNews1, 2 Aug 2009*

video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p-bY92mcOdk>

video: <http://www.breitbart.tv/uncovered-video-obama-explains-how-his-health-care-plan-will-eliminate-private-insurance/>

(HT: *Drudge Report*)

## Crowd Explodes when Arlen Specter urges that we "do this fast"

*Panzramic, 2 Aug 2009*

video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J-Bpshk5nX0>

(HT: *Drudge Report*)

## Lloyd Doggett's meeting on Obamacare in south Austin, TX, 1 Aug 2009

*Dumpdoggett, 1 Aug 2009*

video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a8UjY3YDIwA>

(HT: *Drudge Report*)

## A Liberty Issue

Government health care would be wrong even if it "controlled costs."

by *Mark Steyn, 1 Aug 2009*

...Health care is the fastest way to a permanent left-of-center political culture. That's its attraction for an ambitious president: It redefines the relationship between the citizen and the state in a way that hands all the advantages to statist — to those who believe government has a legitimate right to regulate human affairs in every particular...

...On the price tag: It's often argued that, as a proportion of GDP, America spends more on health care than countries with government medical systems. But, as a point of fact, "America" doesn't spend anything on health care: Hundreds of millions of people make hundreds of millions of individual decisions about what they're going to spend on health care. Whereas up north a handful of bureaucrats determine what Canada will spend on health care — and that's that: Health care is a government budget item...

...You can make the "controlling costs" argument about anything: After all, it's no surprise that millions of free people freely choosing how they spend their own money will spend it in different ways than government bureaucrats would be willing to license on their behalf. America spends more per capita on food than Zimbabwe. America spends more on vacations than North Korea. America spends more on lap-dancing than Saudi Arabia (well, officially). Canada spends more per capita on doughnuts than America — and, given comparative girths, Canucks are clearly not getting as much bang for the buck. Why doesn't Ottawa introduce a National Doughnut Licensing Agency? You'd still see your general dispenser for simple procedures like a lightly sugared cruller, but he'd refer you to a specialist if you needed, say, a maple-frosted custard — and it would only be a six-month wait, at the end of which you'd receive a stale cinnamon roll. Under government regulation, eventually every doughnut would be all hole and no doughnut, and the problem would be solved. Even if the hole costs \$1.6 trillion.

How did the health-care debate decay to the point where we think it entirely natural for the central government to fix a collective figure for what 300 million freeborn citizens ought to be spending on something as basic to individual liberty as their own bodies?

That's the argument that needs to be won...

**The whole brilliant essay:**

<http://article.nationalreview.com/print/?q=YzlmYWZhMjZjZDAwYjMxOTZkZTNmODI5ZDAyZmExNDY=>

## Support Our Troops

They're still fighting for us.

**Soldiers' Angels**

**Wounded Warrior Project**

**Fisher House: help military families**

**Our Military**

## Be sure to read these superb pieces:

**Health Care Mythology** by *Clifford Asness*

**Just Make Stuff Up** by *Victor Davis Hanson*

**100 Stimulus Projects: A Second Opinion** by *Sen. Tom Coburn*

**The State Despot** by *Mark Steyn*

And here's what a **trillion dollars** looks like.



