



THE FOUNDATION

"On every unauthoritative exercise of power by the legislature must the people rise in rebellion or their silence be construed into a surrender of that power to them? If so, how many rebellions should we have had already?"
--Thomas Jefferson

RE: THE LEFT

"What has been most unsettling is not the congressmen's surprise [at the passions of the protesters] but a hard new tone that emerged this week. The leftosphere and the liberal commentariat charged that the town hall meetings weren't authentic, the crowds were ginned up by insurance companies, lobbyists and the Republican National Committee. But you can't get people to leave their homes and go to a meeting with a congressman (of all people) unless they are engaged to the point of passion. And what tends to agitate people most is the idea of loss -- loss of money hard earned, loss of autonomy, loss of the few things that work in a great sweeping away of those that don't. People are not automatons. They show up only if they care. What the town-hall meetings represent is a feeling of rebellion, an uprising against change they do not believe in. And the Democratic response has been stunningly crude and aggressive. It has been to attack. Nancy Pelosi, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, accused the people at the meetings of 'carrying swastikas and symbols like that.' (Apparently one protester held a hand-lettered sign with a 'no' slash over a swastika.) But they are not Nazis, they're Americans. Some of them looked like they'd actually spent some time fighting Nazis. Then came the Democratic Party charge that the people at the meetings were suspiciously well-dressed, in jackets and ties from Brooks Brothers. They must be Republican rent-a-mobs. Sen. Barbara Boxer said on MSNBC's 'Hardball' that people are 'storming these town hall meetings,' that they were 'well dressed', that 'this is all organized,' 'all planned,' to 'hurt our president.' Here she was projecting. For normal people, it's not all about Barack Obama." --columnist Peggy Noonan

LIBERTY

"So what has the White House told supporters to do when you run across those who spread 'disinforma-

tion' about the new attempt by the Obama administration to install the anti-competitive practices of a 'public option' into a federalized universal health care initiative? Report them. ... Pardon me for asking such an obvious question, but what concern is it to the President or his administration if private citizens have disagreements, discussions, and dissections of his proposed take over of the health care industry? Last I checked I had the constitutional right to do so. But now he wishes to turn one citizen against another? ... The mistake this White House continues to make, seemingly on a daily basis, is that they reveal very much what they truly think of freedoms of the American political process." --radio talk-show host Kevin McCullough

THE GIPPER

"The intellectual establishment [is] so busy demanding more power for government, more bureaucracy, regulation, spending and -- oh, yes -- more and more taxes, they forgot all about the secret of America's success -- opportunity for people, for all the people. ... Will we heed the pessimists' agenda of higher taxes, more bureaucracy, and a bigger welfare state leading us right back to runaway inflation and economic decay, or will we [take the] road toward a true opportunity society of economic growth, more jobs, lower tax rates, and rising take-home pay?" --Ronald Reagan

POLITICAL FUTURES

"For years, Democratic politicians said the health-care problem was about '47 million uninsured Americans.' Whatever the merits, many people were willing to do something for those with no health insurance. Suddenly, these voters discovered that ObamaCare is about them. When did that happen? Every policy wonk in America may have known this was always an everybody-into-the-pool proposal, and Mr. Obama has talked himself blue saying people could stay with the insurance they've got or the

doctor they've got, 'if you're happy with that' and don't like the public option. A lot of people simply don't believe this. How come? White House adviser David Axelrod said this week, 'Our job is to help folks understand how this will help them.' It could be they've already thought about that. For many people, the first six Obama months already have been an unsettling Dantesque tour through levels of government 'help' they never knew existed. Normally government activity flows by like unnoticed sludge, but Obama's celebrity got everyone watching. What people have seen is: an \$800 billion stimulus package designed by Congress, a \$4 trillion budget, massive outlays by an alphabet soup of Treasury and Federal Reserve programs, Barney Frank the symbol of Democratic goals, and then the federal absorption of GM, an American icon. After all this, ObamaCare looks like a bridge too far. They are proposing the biggest federal social program in a generation, which no one can understand (or explain), and which requires permanent federal tax increases starting with the wealthiest but threatening to engulf the middle class. The harder the White House and Democrats push this idea, the worse it could get for them. Americans may have arrived at the limit of how much government they want or will pay for. If Barack Obama can't sell more of it, no one can." --columnist Daniel Henninger

FOR THE RECORD

"Any serious discussion of government-run medical care would have to look at other countries where there is government-run medical care. As someone who has done some research on this for my book 'Applied Economics,' I can tell you that the actual consequences of government-controlled medical care is not a pretty picture, however inspiring the rhetoric that accompanies it. Thirty thousand Canadians are passing up free medical care at home to go to some other country where they have to pay for it. People don't do that without a reason. But Canadians are better off than people in some other countries with government-controlled medical care, because they have the United States right next door, in case their medical problems get too serious to rely on their own system. But where are Americans to turn if we become like Canada? Where are we to go when we need better medical treatment than Washington bureaucrats will let us have? Mexico? The Caribbean?" --Hoover Institution economist Thomas Sowell

GOVERNMENT

"The New York Times describes a key part of the House bill: 'Lawmakers of both parties agree on the need to rein in private insurance companies by banning underwriting practices that have prevented millions of Americans from obtaining affordable insurance. Insurers would, for example, have to accept all applicants and could not charge higher premiums because of a person's medical history or current illness.' 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? The reformers make vague promises about covering the increased demand by cutting other costs. We should know by now that such promises aren't worth a wooden nickel. The savings never materialize." --ABC's "20/20" co-anchor John Stossel

INSIGHT

"The Great Depression, like most other periods of severe unemployment, was produced by government mismanagement rather than by any inherent instability of the private economy." --economist Milton Friedman (1912-2006)

OPINION IN BRIEF

"The New York Times had an amazing front page story [Thursday] which I would have thought would have jumped to the top of every cable news cycle except for the Senate's confirmation of Justice Sonia Sotomayor. The headline of the story was: 'White House Affirms Deal on Drug Cost' by David Kirkpatrick. I want you to read the lead paragraph very slowly: 'Pressed by industry lobbyists, White House officials on Wednesday assured drug makers that the administration stood by a behind-the-scenes deal to block any Congressional effort to extract cost savings from them beyond an agreed-upon \$80 billion.' Whoa! Check Please! How can the words 'industry lobbyists' and 'White House' be in the same sentence? We have been told -- to the point of needing Compazine (an anti-nausea drug) -- that this ad-

ministration was, is, and will always be a lobbyist-free zone. Yet, here it is; in the newspaper of record. The White House had reached a secret deal with the pharmaceutical industry to put a ceiling on the amount of money the government could save by negotiating for lower drug prices. In the words of the NY Times, the White House 'had committed to protect drug makers from bearing further costs in the [health care] overhaul' but 'had never spelled out the details of the agreement.' Oh, here we are in graf seven: 'The new attention to the agreement could prove embarrassing to the White House, which has sought to keep lobbyists at a distance, including by refusing to hire them to work in the administration.' Embarrassing? Ya think...? It turns out that there is a quid pro quo for keeping the drug companies out of the rough and tumble world of free markets. Again, from Mr. Kirkpatrick's piece: 'Failing to publicly confirm [the drug lobby's] descriptions of the deal risked alienating a powerful industry ally currently *helping to bankroll millions in television commercials in favor of Mr. Obama's reforms.* [emphasis mine] So... let me walk through this. In strange world in which Obamaville is located, lobbyists are bad only if and until the White House needs them to do things like run ads in favor of nationalized health care and then lobbyists are good. So, what if the previously dreadful, greedy, self-serving oil companies sent their lobbyists in to cut a deal with Obama to support a cap-and-trade bill though heavy advertising? Might they trade for removing any caps on their profits? I think I'm beginning to get how this works. It works like ... Chicago!" --political analyst Rich Galen

FAITH AND FAMILY

"Our teenagers are more sexually active than any generation of youth before them. They also are consuming more pornography and compromising basic moral standards more often. It seems that many of them have lost not only their innocence, but their conscience, too. The plethora of negative and immoral behaviors glorified by a media world that's gone stark raving mad -- combined with graphic, non-judgmental sex education and a highly sexualized culture in general -- causes many of them to lose understanding of what is wrong and what is right. When a young child's sensibilities are constantly violated, and he begins to ignore the natural pangs of guilt after yielding to cultural pressures, he can end up being miserable, and begins to develop a hard heart and weak spirit. If we as parents blindly turn our own hearts away from them because we're

scared of confrontation, or because we're too lazy to do 'the hard stuff' like fight for their integrity, we have a hand in dooming their young spirits to inner torment. And, ultimately, if the pattern continues, to the loss of basic decency and sensitivity to evil. ... It's critical as a parent to take control and do everything in your power to make certain that the culture does not molest your child's young mind. Setting standards for media consumption can help avoid a lot of regrets, especially when it comes to the evil of pornography. But since we are all sinners, we also need to learn to recognize when our children might be feeling uncomfortable and guilty -- and offer them hope and a way out of their despair." --columnist Rebecca Hagelin

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"I am frustrated by the fact that the media have not been asking why our elected officials are once again pushing government controlled health care for our country and they themselves are being exempted from the program. I think the question that should be posed to all of our government employees and elected officials is 'If the proposed government takeover of health care is such a good idea, why are you exempting yourself from the program?' If this question was asked by the media repeatedly, I'm certain that the reform of our medical coverage as proposed by the administration would die a quick death." --Frankfort, Illinois

"In Friday's Digest, *The Patriot* quoted the White House Web site: 'These rumors often travel just below the surface via chain emails or through casual conversation. Since we can't keep track of all of them here at the White House, we're asking for your help. If you get an email or see something on the web about health insurance reform that seems fishy, send it to flag@whitehouse.gov.' Well, there seems to me to be a pretty simple solution to this proposal: Send every single thing you hear Obama or the House Democrats say to the site to flag as 'seem[ing] fishy.' If they don't get the point, at least its likely to flood and crash that server!" --Lexington, Kentucky

THE LAST WORD

"The right-wing extremist Republican base is back!" warns the Democratic National Committee. These right-wing extremists have been given their marching orders by their masters: They've been directed to show up at 'thousands of events,' told to 'organize,' 'knock on doors' ... No, wait. My mistake. That's the

e-mail I got from Mitch Stewart, Director of 'Organizing for America' at BarackObama.com. But that's the good kind of 'organizing.' Obama's a community organizer. We're the community. He organizes us. What part of that don't you get? When the community starts organizing against the organizer, the whole rigmarole goes to hell. ... Decrying the snarling, angry protesters, liberal talk-show host Bill Press ... says that 'Americans want serious discussion' on health care. If only we'd stuck to the President's August timetable and passed a gazillion-page health care reform entirely unread by the House of Representatives or the Senate (the world's greatest deliberative body) in nothing flat, we'd now have all the time in the world to sit around having a 'serious discussion' and 'real debate' on whatever it was we just did to one-sixth of the economy. But a sick, deranged, un-American mob has put an end to all

that moderate and reasonable steamrolling by showing up and yelling insane, out-of-control questions like, 'Awfully sorry to bother you, your Most Excellent Senatorial Eminence, but I was wondering if you could tell me why you don't read any of the laws you make before you make them into law?' The community is restless. The firm hand of greater organization is needed." --columnist Mark Steyn

Veritas vos Liberabit -- Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis! Mark Alexander, Publisher, for The Patriot's editors and staff.

(Please pray for our Armed Forces standing in harm's way around the world, and for their families -- especially families of those fallen Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen, who granted their lives in defense of American liberty.)