

Wannabe conservatives endorse socialized medicine

Posted by [pmulshin](#) July 26, 2009 21:19PM

A reader sent me a copy of [this interview](#) of former New York lieutenant governor Betsy McCaughey talking about socialized medicine.

"This is truly scary - listen!" the reader said.

I listened. And it really is scary. Fred Thompson and Betsy McCaughey both support the idea that the government should force hard-working taxpayers to pay for a virtually infinite number of treatments for people who aren't working and are on the federal dole.

Listen as McCaughey says, "This bill is half paid with by a \$500 billion cut in health-care services for seniors."

Like a typical socialist, McCaughey spins this as if it's a *bad* thing. And Thompson mutters his consent.

But anyone who believes in the free market would call for the total elimination of the failed Medicare program, not just a small cut in it.

Instead, McCaughey incredibly calls for even more money to be spent on Medicare than the liberal Democrat Barack Obama intends to spend. This would require raising taxes on younger working people to provide a system of socialized medicine that will be bankrupt by the time they are eligible for it.

If you want to get the free-market alternative to this socialist rhetoric, go to [this site](#) and read Texas Congressman Ron Paul's approach to Medicare:

"The Medicare 'trust fund' is already badly in the red, and the only solution will be a dramatic increase in payroll taxes for younger workers," Paul writes.

Paul calls for not just a few cuts in Medicare, but its total abolition.

He's right. It's time to reject the approach of people like McCaughey and Thompson who advocate socialized medicine and who want to bankrupt the nation with infinite government-subsidized services.

Categories:

Comments

ThomasReid says...

President Obama wants the federal government to spend more on healthcare. However, he wants to reduce spending on senior citizens and use the savings from his proposed cuts to Medicare to pay for healthcare for illegal aliens, etc.

PM: Good point. But it has nothing to do with the subject at hand. Please stick to the question of whether Republicans should support Medicare.

Posted on 07/26/09 at 10:36PM

madinnj says...

The article you referenced only says that Paul states - "A good start would be for Congress to repeal the **Medicare prescription drug bill.**"; but not all of Medicare.

Researching further, it was noted that the Libertarian Republican caucus endorsed the following "The federal entitlement to Medicare should be abolished, leaving health care decision making regarding the elderly at the state, local, or personal level."

So the statement that he wants to **abolish Medicare** is sort of half right since he and his colleagues want to transfer the responsibility to the states. Since he is a Libertarian he almost has to advocate against anything that the Constitution doesn't explicitly charge the Federal government with doing.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 2:09AM

befootball says...

You say, ". . . *Support the idea that the government should force hard-working taxpayers to pay for a virtually infinite number of treatments for people who aren't working and are on the federal dole.*"

This comment may not be on point to the crux of your column but it addresses a specific quote.

Whether you mean it or not, the above statement implies that you believe that if people without health care are intentionally choosing to not have it. I am not necessarily endorsing an Obama health care plan but I am sick and tired of the GOP acting like those without health care are choosing to live that way. Not everyone is capable of having the traditional 9 to 5 with benefits. Someone has to tend bar at the cocktail parties we attend and someone needs to serve the lunch we get when we go out to eat. Those employers are not offering health care.

And whether you realize it or not, the people choosing those jobs do it because they need to. I worked in HR for a little while and even when the economy was doing well in the 90's, I'd put one ad out for two secretarial positions and would receive over 200 applications. And now, I talk to a friend who still works in HR and he receives upwards of 250 resumes for the position of janitor in an office building which happens to offer health benefits. People applying for these jobs often hold Master's degrees

I take no issue with a free market whatsoever. But it needs to be realized that many people do not make it and someone will have to lose out even when they try. So whatever plan you support, does that mean they should suffer when they get sick because the lack adequate health insurance? Absent a real plan, that seems to be the attitude of today's GOP.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 9:32AM

JeffCon says...

We do not live in a free market. Health Care industry is very tightly controlled. Doctors, nurses, medicine, are all strictly regulated, as are hospitals, clinics etc. In NJ, insurance itself is so regulated that our Medical Insurance costs as much as 40% than similar policies in surrounding states. As a Conservative, I cannot condone regulating the system to keep people out of it.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 9:56AM

pezro says...

Medicare and Medicaid are failed money pits. Any time the gov't sticks its nose in the free market to subsidize in the name of "fairness", everyone suffers.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 11:17AM

tweck says...

Clueless liberal alert

Watch as this clueless liberal argues that socialized medicine is not socialistic.

Priceless.

PM

Paul, your adherence to the right-wing "socialism" talking point is truly funny, and indicative of pretty much everyone on the right who is brainwashed into fits of paranoia about "socialism".

God forbid the government institutes a plan to use your tax money to help get medical care for poor people who can't afford to pay for insurance.

How TERRIBLE, I know, how truly frightening and horrible, helping out people who can't help themselves. Hair-raising, even! Like a good horror movie that really makes you jump!

You're probably going to die of fright when we institute a compassion-based universal health-care system that lowers costs and assures treatment for everybody.

You people are so frightened by the idea of the profit-motive not being the main guiding force behind every single service available to people in this country.

The fact is, the profit-motive does NOT have to be the overriding principle guiding EVERYTHING.

I'm all for healthy capitalism and the creative entrepreneurial spirit being the primary economic reality in the united states, but it's important to keep in mind that the U.S. was not founded purely on capitalism, and capitalism is not the only potential way to deliver services to people.

Some services are better off socialized, without the profit motive, and controlled for the betterment of society and the people by not-for-profit entities such as government, and there is nothing to be afraid of.

Corporations have driven health-care into the ground by mining the industry for personal profit at the expense of peoples' health and ability to get care, and their practices have resulted in many, many, many people dying unnecessarily, just so insurance executives can live lives of endless luxury and wealth.

This practice of feeding on the misery of others is abusive and evil, and we can no longer afford to have the insurance industry leeches controlling our lives.

That's the truth. You can make all the excuses you want, and come up with all kinds of twisted language to try to dispell it as somehow false, but that won't change reality.

If you have better ideas about how to reform health insurance without involving the government or the profit-motive, I'd love to hear it.

I have a lot of respect for Ron Paul, but he's so far off-base on this he couldn't be more wrong.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 11:42AM

roycooper78 says...

This comment was removed as a violation of the following item in my comments policy:

2. I can't stand commenters who write, "You're not a real conservative." If you know of some conservative thinker such as Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Oakeshott et al., whose views disagree with my own, feel free to quote those views. Hint: Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity don't count. If you see them as conservative thinkers rather than entertainers, this is not the blog for you. There's a whole vast Internet specifically designed to appeal to people like you. I encourage you to find your niche. It is not here

Posted on 07/27/09 at 11:43AM

tweck says...

Paul, do you read the whole comment, or are you just reacting to an assumption you made after a quick skim?

In paragraph 8 of my diatribe, I very specifically said, "Some services are better off socialized, without the profit motive, and controlled for the betterment of society and the people by not-for-profit entities such as government, and there is nothing to be afraid of. "

So I'm more than willing to admit that a single-payer system would be "socialism", and basically indicated right there that a government healthcare system is socialism.

I simply don't believe that Socialism is inherently a bad thing, the way you obviously do.

There's nothing wrong with taking a few beneficial and proven aspects of socialism and employing them in our country.

We can't just be one thing. It's about using the best ideas, meaning taking the best aspects of all ideologies and employing them to benefit the people, be they Capitalist or Socialist. Or any number of other ideological standpoints.

There's good to be found in ideas from all different perspectives.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 1:22PM

neilwied says...

Normally I only rag on politicians, but tweck has tweaked me. He has bought into the whole Democrat ObamaCare line. He sounds like he read his lines off the morning minutes on CSPAN.

He talks about a compassion-based universal health-care system that lowers costs and assures treatment for everybody. Anybody who thinks that those two things are possible at the same time is not playing with a full mental deck. He should try reading the Samuelson column in the Monday SL. I wonder how he does on his personal finances.

Then he gets into an irrational rant about insurance companies (about which he appears to know nothing). I was a health care consultant to both large and small organizations for over 30 years. I dealt with dozens of health insurance companies and I can tell you that they do pretty much what their customers (employers mostly) want. Most organizations with over 100 employees are self-insured, using insurance companies as claim administrators. The employers decide what gets covered and what does not. There's no underwriting profit there, just administrative fees.

Furthermore, over 100 million people are covered by Blue Cross/Blue Shield organizations under both insured and self-insured plans. Most BC/BS organizations are non-profits, although a number would like to go for profit in order to be able to access capital markets.

For smaller groups that are insured and individuals, the competition is fierce. Many smaller employers change insurance companies almost every year to avoid rate increases. In New Jersey the legislature has required the companies to add so many bells and whistles to their policies that they are just about unaffordable.

The idea of insurance companies "feeding on the misery of others" is so far from the truth as to be laughable if it didn't demonstrate such ignorance. It sounds like a Congressional Democrat's wet dream.

tweck, get a life, but don't make it in finance.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 1:26PM

Rebelforce says...

Wannabe conservatives calling for government action in providing affordable healthcare insurance for American citizens? BAH!! HUMBUG!! If Americans can't afford health insurance they had better die and decrease the surplus population.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 3:37PM

miketernal says...

tweck:

Actually, the United States was founded on capitalism. And capitalism is the most efficient way to deliver services to people.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 4:15PM

Rebelforce says...

Owning a lot of slaves was also an efficient way to deliver services to people under capitalism.....but times and circumstances change.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 5:03PM

devsfan25 says...

Reagan wasn't a fan of socialized medicine but in 2009, it is political suicide to suggest taking away peoples Medicare.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 5:09PM

Rebelforce says...

Bottom line is, this country just had an election with the Democratic party running on "Change" and the Republican party on "more of the same" and the Democrats routed and humiliated the Republicans.

Not only did the Republican nominee get his butt kicked handily, but the Democrats accomplished it with a black candidate with little experience and whose middle name is "Hussein" (as in Sadaam).

In case you missed the message, after 8 years of Bush neo-Con Republicanism, Americans had had enough and were voting for change, specifically in the area of U.S. healthcare and foreign policy.

How can the United States of America claim to be a great country while tens of millions of its citizens can't afford or can't get health insurance and are one illness away from financial disaster? You don't have to be a liberal Democrat to feel some (forgive the word) empathy for those Americans who live in dread of losing their health insurance and then getting sick in America.

Posted on 07/27/09 at 8:27PM

DrEricABlair says...

Rebelforce:

How is that "change" working out for you?

Posted on 07/28/09 at 12:56AM

patriots4u says...

It has been proven that socialized medicine doesn't work in this country, and that a better approach works.

Read my blog titled Health Care Reform - What works, What Doesn't.

Posted on 07/28/09 at 11:31AM

patriots4u says...

Sorry, error on my link. I hate that you cannot preview in the same window here.

[My blog](#)

Posted on 07/28/09 at 11:33AM

Footer