

RESEARCH

A A A | EMAIL | PRINT | SHARE

Napolitano pushes "civilian army" conspiracy theory with Ready Reserve Corps falsehoods

April 23, 2010 12:24 pm ET — 37 Comments

On April 23, *Fox & Friends* hosted Fox News judicial analyst Andrew Napolitano to advance his debunked conspiracy theory that the health care reform bill establishes a "paramilitary Ready Reserve Corps," whose purpose is unknown. In fact, the Ready Reserve Corps is a reserve unit of health professionals who can be called up to assist in times of a national emergency -- like Hurricane Katrina -- and is an expansion of a 200-year-old program.



EMBED

Fox & Friends fearmongers about a "paramilitary Ready Reserve Corps"

Baker: Health care bill "allows the president to force health care professionals into active military duty ... against the will of the health care worker." On Fox News' *Fox & Friends*, guest co-host Mike Baker claimed that a "questionable item in the [health care reform] bill allows the president to force health care professionals into active military duty against the will of the governor and against the will of the health care worker." Referencing President Obama's 2008 comments about "a civilian national security force," Baker asked, "Coincidence or something more sinister?"

Napolitano falsely claims that "we don't know" what the "paramilitary Ready Reserve Corps" will do. Napolitano suggested that Obama may be creating "a civilian corps just as powerful, just as well funded as the military" with "five pages in the 2,700-page health care bill that establishes something called the Ready Reserve Corps." Napolitano also claimed that "in these five pages is the authority for the president to take members of the National Guard" and put them into "this paramilitary Ready Reserve Corps." He added: "The president can only take them against the governor's will in time of insurrection. He can take them under this new law in peacetime against the governor's will, against their will. He can call them out of retirement and put them into this paramilitary Ready Reserve Corps." Co-host Steve Doocy asked, "To do what?" Napolitano replied, "We don't know." Napolitano later tied the Ready Reserve Corps to Obama's 2008 "civilian national security force" comments and asked, "Is this the sort of civilian version of the military that he called for in that clip that we just ran, which, by the way, was him in July of '08 on his way to the Democratic National Convention to claim the Democratic nomination for president?"

In fact, Ready Reserve Corps is "like to the public health service what the Army Reserve is to the Army"

In March, Cato's Cannon debunked Napolitano's conspiracy theory: Ready Reserve Corps "is sort of like to the public health service what the Army Reserve is to the Army." On the March 31 **edition** of Fox News' *Glenn Beck* -- which Napolitano guest-hosted -- the Cato Institute's Michael

[Search Options](#)

[my.MediaMatters.org »](#)

Related

PERSONALITIES: [Steve Doocy](#)
[Andrew Napolitano](#)

SHOWS: [FOX & Friends](#)

NETWORKS: [Fox News Channel](#)

ISSUES: [Health Care](#)
[Health Care Reform](#)

Push Back

Phone calls, emails and letters from the public do make a difference. Remember that to be effective you must be polite, and professional. Express your specific concerns regarding that particular news report or commentary, and indicate what you would like the media outlet to do differently in the future.

- **Fox News Channel**
 FOX News Channel
 1-888-369-4762
 1211 Avenue of the Americas
 New York, NY 10036
<http://twitter.com/foxnews>
- **FOX & Friends**
 Fox & Friends
<http://twitter.com/foxandfriends>
- **Steve Doocy**
<http://twitter.com/sdoocy>

MMtv »



Not surprising: *Fox & Friends* interviews "capitalist pig" sign owner, who credits them for the "overwhelming" response to his sign
 1 HOUR AND 20 MINUTES AGO



Carlson on 'Too big to fail': "Isn't that the whole idea of America, like trying to grow your company to become as big as possible?"
 3 HOURS AND 11 MINUTES AGO



Scarborough calls AZ immigration law "frightening," "offensive"
 3 HOURS AND 15 MINUTES AGO

Cannon **debunked** Napolitano's Ready Reserve Corps conspiracy theory by noting: "The people who serve in it are commissioned officers. They have to be approved by Congress. Their commissions have to be approved by Congress, and what the legislation would do is it would create a Ready Reserve Corps, which is sort of like to the public health service what the Army Reserve is to the Army. In the case of some pandemic, the president would be able to call for these reservists in order to help contain the spread of contagion."

FactCheck.org: Health care law "creates the ready reserve of individuals who can be called up for service by the U.S. surgeon general in times of need." FactCheck.org **reported** on April 7:

The truth about the new Ready Reserve Corps is a lot less interesting than the conspiracy theories. Before the law was passed, the Public Health Service, unlike other elements of the government's seven uniformed services, didn't have a "ready reserve" -- a cadre of individuals who could be called up involuntarily in times of need. What it had was a regular, full-time corps of 2,800 doctors, nurses, scientists and other medical professionals, which was the limit under law. It also had a reserve corps. But most of the individuals in the reserve corps, which was larger than the regular corps, were on extended active duty for the duration of their careers; in other words, they worked full-time, just like the regular corps, because they were needed, but the statutory cap prevented the service from bringing them into the regular corps.

The new law eliminates the personnel cap and brings the members of what used to be the reserve corps into the regular corps, which as a result now numbers about 6,600, according to an official at the Public Health Service who spoke to us on background.

And the law creates the ready reserve of individuals who can be called up for service by the U.S. surgeon general in times of need; the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina is often used as an example of an incident that might trigger a call-up.

The health care bill establishes "a Regular Corps" and "a Ready Reserve Corps for service in time of national emergency ... similar to the uniformed service reserve personnel." From the **Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010**:

SEC. 5210. ESTABLISHING A READY RESERVE CORPS.

Section 203 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 204) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. COMMISSIONED CORPS AND READY RESERVE CORPS.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT. --

"(1) IN GENERAL. -- There shall be in the Service a commissioned Regular Corps and a Ready Reserve Corps for service in time of national emergency.

[...]

"(c) PURPOSE AND USE OF READY RESEARCH.--

"(1) PURPOSE. -- The purpose of the Ready Reserve Corps is to fulfill the need to have additional Commissioned Corps personnel available on short notice (similar to the uniformed service's reserve program) to assist regular Commissioned Corps personnel to meet both routine public health and emergency response missions.

"(2) USES. -- The Ready Reserve Corps shall --

"(A) participate in routine training to meet the general and specific needs of the Commissioned Corps;

"(B) be available and ready for involuntary calls to active duty during national emergencies and public health crises, similar to the uniformed service reserve personnel;

"(C) be available for backfilling critical positions left vacant during deployment of active duty Commissioned Corps members, as well as for deployment to respond to public health emergencies, both foreign and domestic; and

"(D) be available for service assignment in isolated, hardship, and medically underserved communities (as defined in section 799B) to improve access to health services.



Carlson is "confused" about why AZ immigration bill is controversial
3 HOURS AND 19 MINUTES AGO



Luntz denies GOP messaging charge, says he's being "demonized," his work is "nonpartisan ... not political"
APRIL 25, 2010 1:32 PM ET



Sullivan renews sedition charges against Beck, Palin, and "the Fox News Republican National Committee Coalition Machine"
APRIL 25, 2010 1:12 PM ET

The Ready Reserve Corps is a part of the more than 200-year-old Commissioned Corps. The

Ready Reserve Corps is a supplement to the Commissioned Corps, which has existed in some form since 1798. From the [U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps](#):

The history of the U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps is the history of health defense in the United States. For more than 200 years, the U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps has been our Nation's frontline against the spread of disease from sailors returning from foreign ports, to immigrants entering the country, to communities affected by natural and manmade disasters. The Corps response to the health threats posed by Hurricane Katrina and other recent disasters underscores the value to our Nation of having a highly trained, multidisciplinary, and quickly mobilized cadre of medical professionals. Today, the Corps fights for better public health on multiple fronts. Corps officers are involved in disease control and prevention, biomedical research, regulation of food and drugs, mental health and drug abuse, health care delivery, and international health. As a vital part of the U.S. Public Health Service, the Commissioned Corps is an essential component of the largest public health program in the world.

The Ready Reserve Corps is not "as well-funded as the military"

The health care bill appropriates \$12.5 million per year for the Ready Reserve Corps. Contrary to Napolitano's suggestion that the "Ready Reserve Corps" could be "as well-funded as the military," in the "Funding" section of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, the bill appropriates "\$12,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 for the Ready Reserve Corps." From the [Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act](#):

"(d) FUNDING. -- For the purpose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Commissioned Corps under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 for recruitment and training and \$12,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 for the Ready Reserve Corps."

By contrast, the FY 2011 budget "provides \$548.9 billion for the Department of Defense." From the Department of Defense's [FY 2011 budget](#):

Funding Highlights:

- Supports access to medical care to the more than 9.5 million beneficiaries: active military members and their families, military retirees and their families, dependent survivors, and eligible Reserve Component members and families.
- Supports wounded warrior transition units and centers of excellence in vision, hearing, traumatic brain injury, and other areas to continuously improve the care provided to wounded, ill, and injured servicemembers.
- Continues to reform defense acquisition, reducing its use of high-risk contracts related to time-and-materials and labor-hours by 17 percent through the end of 2011, while modernizing key weapons systems to provide our troops with the best technology to meet battlefield needs, and eliminating or reconfiguring lower-priority acquisitions.
- Continues strong support for our men and women in uniform through a robust benefits package including pay increases that keep pace with the private sector.
- Includes \$33.0 billion for a 2010 supplemental request and \$159.3 billion for 2011 to support ongoing overseas contingency operations, including funds to execute the President's new strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- Prioritizes resources by ending or reducing several programs, including the C-17 aircraft, the Joint Strike Fighter Alternate Engine program, the Third Generation Infrared Surveillance program, and the Net-Enabled Command Capability program.
- Maintains ready forces and continues efforts to rebalance military forces to focus more on today's wars, and provides capabilities to deter or if necessary engage in future conflicts.
- Provides \$548.9 billion for the Department of Defense base budget in 2011, a 3.4 percent increase over the 2010 enacted level.
- Supports a reconfigured ballistic missile defense strategy, in line with the President's policy, to better address current threats.

Obama's 2008 remarks about a "civilian national security force" were in reference to service organizations

As *Media Matters for America* has [previously noted](#), Obama's 2008 remarks were in reference to an expansion of the Foreign Service, Americorps, and the Peace Corps, not a "paramilitary" group. From Obama's July 2, 2008, [speech](#) in Colorado Springs, Colorado:

Today, AmeriCorps -- our nation's network of local, state, and national service programs -- has 75,000 slots. And I know firsthand the quality of these programs. My wife, Michelle, once left her job at a law firm and at City Hall to be a founding director of an AmeriCorps program in Chicago that trains young people for careers in public service. And these programs invest Americans in their communities and their country. They tap America's greatest resource -- our citizens.

And that's why as president, I will expand AmeriCorps to 250,000 slots and make that increased service a vehicle to meet national goals like providing health care and education, saving our planet and restoring our standing in the world, so that citizens see their efforts connected to a common purpose. People of all ages, stations, and skills will be asked to serve. Because when it comes to the challenges we face, the American people are not the problem -- they are the answer.

So we are going to send -- we're going to send more college graduates to teach and mentor our young people. We'll call on Americans to join an Energy Corps to conduct renewable energy and environmental cleanup projects in their neighborhoods all across the country. We will enlist our veterans to find jobs and support for other vets, to be there for our military families. And we're going to grow our Foreign Service, open consulates that have been shuttered, and double the size of the Peace Corps by 2011 to renew our diplomacy.

We cannot continue to rely only on our military in order to achieve the national security objectives that we've set. We've got to have a civilian national security force that's just as powerful, just as strong, just as well-funded.

We need to use technology to connect people to service. We'll expand USA Freedom Corps to create online networks where Americans can browse opportunities to volunteer. You'll be able to search by category, time commitment, and skill sets; you'll be able to rate service opportunities, build service networks, and create your own service pages to track your hours and activities. This will empower more Americans to craft their own service agenda, and make their own change from the bottom up.

— J.V.B.

[EXPAND ALL](#) [EXPAND 1ST LEVEL](#) [COLLAPSE ALL](#)

[+ Add Comment](#)



by progressivevoicedaily (April 23, 2010 12:41 pm ET)

5

Seems as though the purpose is stated pretty clearly in this bill. What the hell, do these people not know how to read? Of course, they say lies banking on the fact that their audience won't read.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by bludog1 (April 23, 2010 12:55 pm ET)

4

5

It doesn't help when the president refers to himself as Commander In Chief when talking to newly naturalized citizens, which happened this week.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 1:18 pm ET)

8

8

I KNEW the WEASEL wasn't being honest with this post, and it took me about 1 minute to find out what was going on here.

President Obama called himself the Commander in Chief during a naturalization ceremony for two dozen new U.S. citizens, all of them members of the military.

So, he IS the Commander in Chief of the military, and the people he was speaking to were ALL in the military, and so what's wrong with what he said?

How does that perfectly appropriate comment from Obama have ANYTHING to do with the distortion from multiple rightwing sources that the Ready Reserve Corps has anything to do with a "civilian army" in the classic sense of the word "army"?

That's right, it doesn't. It's simply a distraction from the ACTUAL topic here - an attempt to derail the thread to another subject by what I strongly suspect is Wesley's sockpuppet - Wesley realized a while back that he had lost his credibility and so he tried to create a new identity, just like RightON tried that with the poster called Rational Conservative. Both efforts failed, because it's not the poster's name that's important - it's the content of the post that makes it a troll post, no matter the screen name.

Please don't feed this troll post - he's not actively interested in participating in a fair debate on the actual topic here.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by right ON (April 23, 2010 1:28 pm ET)

3 6

You phony. You have the nerve to accuse anyone else of multiple screen names and just throw out your scurrilous accusations with no proof, as with most all your accusations. Prove them Sue. And prove that I get paid to post here while you're at it. You can't. If you think anyone takes your word for anything, anyone with half a brain wouldn't.

As you were just exposed last week for having at least another active screen name when you answered yourself with a contradictory post. And anyone that hauls out "Screw You" to another poster has no interest in any fair debate, so get off your straw pedestal.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 1:38 pm ET)

5 4

Nope, I was NOT "exposed" last week.

I made ONE **post** refuting the spinning of the rightwingers - they distorted a remark from a lefty named Holdren. I made ANOTHER post addressing the ACTUAL point of the lefty.

Here's the first post.

We're supposed to somehow muzzle all the brilliant minds in other nations?

Or delude ourselves into thinking that unless we capitulate, no one can ever touch us? That we're invincible and untouchable as a nation?

Is that really the stance that the right wants to take?

Like I said, mocking and refuting the rightwing spin. Then I posted...

I think what he's saying is that we can't simply coast and expect to remain on top. That's all I read into his comments.

You're a liar. You can't win using facts, and so you make bogus personal attacks. My posts weren't "contradictory" at all. One addressed the bogus talking point, and one addressed the actual content and context of what Holdren had said! It's not my fault your reading comprehension often fails you and your personal animus clouds your vision!

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by right ON (April 23, 2010 1:46 pm ET)

4 3

Thank you for linking to it. I had forgotten where it was. Sorry Suzy, anyone reading the exchange between DellDolly and DellDolly knows that DellDolly forgot to logout of DellDolly so she recklessly posted as DellDolly thinking she had logged out of DellDolly.

Sorry DellDolly.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 4:50 pm ET)

3 3

Nope. Anyone reading that post can see that I addressed ONE issue with my first post, then another aspect of the same issue with my second. There's no contradiction in what I posted. None at all. That was a demonstration of your poor reading skills that YOU thought there was some contradiction that never existed, and based upon that faulty conclusion, you ran with the bogus point that you did.

It was never true, just like it was never true that I accused bintx of being a liar, nor any

of the other posts you linked to for a few days until you got tired of being called out for your dishonesty.

You're the sorry one, that's for sure. You are really teed off that I made you lose your credibility here, and that I ID'd you as a paid troll, and that I demolish the arguments of so many rightwing posters here, and discourage people from furthering the troll agenda of derailing thread. Too bad, so sad.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by right ON (April 23, 2010 4:52 pm ET)

3 3

I got exactly right, didn't I Sue? You know it. I know it.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 6:25 pm ET)

4 3

Huh? Your argument that I made contradictory posts has been debunked multiple times, every time you've brought it up, with me actually COPYING and PASTING the two comments in question on this thread, and somehow YOU think that YOU got something 'exactly right'?

Did you start drinking already?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by right ON (April 23, 2010 6:29 pm ET)

3 3

The more you protest, the guiltier you are. You know it, I know it. Just between us "personal attackers", what is the other screen name you post under around here?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 9:45 pm ET)

3 3

Yeah, sure. That may be YOUR pattern, but it's not mine. You MUST get paid by the post though, and you were short on your quota this week!

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 6:28 pm ET)

3 3

And I hope everyone remembers that Bludog, Wesley the Weasel's sockpuppet, tried to push a totally dishonest smear of Obama, and when I pointed out how horribly dishonest it was, RightON tried to distract everyone from THAT by making a bogus personal attack on me.

How unique - that RightON would defend the indefensible that came from his troll buddy's sockpuppet - NOT.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by bludog1 (April 24, 2010 7:48 am ET)

1 2

It might be useful to understand the reason the group was together: to celebrate their new citizenship. The fact that they happened to be military, therefore under the command of The Commander In Chief, was at best incidental to the event and the reason the president was addressing them. Therefore, my observation stands. Sorry. Dd.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 25, 2010 3:28 am ET)

1 1

Your observation stands?

Do you think that withstands ANY smell test? Because it doesn't, you fool.

You said

"It doesn't help (dispel the theory that the Obama Administration is desirous of a civilian army) when the president refers to himself as Commander In Chief when talking to newly naturalized citizens, which happened this week."

Actually, though, him describing himself as the military's Commander in Chief doesn't have anything to DO with that false meme! Because he wasn't talking to "naturalized citizens". He was talking to servicemen and women who had just become naturalized citizens.

And how convenient that YOU left that fact out of your depiction of what Obama did!

If you think that ANY of us think that it was an unintentional oversight, you're totally wrong.

Your "observation" doesn't stand. The reason that the President said that he's their Commander in Chief is SOLELY because they are military, and it NOTHING to do with their citizenship status. He was TALKING to them because of their change in citizenship status, but he said he was their CIC because of them being military members.

Yup, you're the same dishonest weasel whether you're using the screen name Wesley or Bludog.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 25, 2010 3:34 am ET)

1

WASHINGTON, April 23, 2010 – Two dozen U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, born in countries from Brazil to Tobago, stood before U.S. President Barack Obama in the White House Rose Garden today to take the oath of citizenship for the country they serve.

The naturalization ceremony was hosted by Obama, who was joined by Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano, and Alejandro Mayorkas, director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

The servicemembers hailed from nations such as Brazil, China, Colombia, England, Ethiopia, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago.

"It is a great honor to serve as your commander in chief and it is my greatest pleasure to be among the first to greet you as a fellow American," said Obama, following the oath of citizenship.

"Some of you came to America as children, holding tight to your parents' hands as you arrived in a new world," he said. "Some of you came as adults, leaving everything you knew behind as you pursued a new life. While your stories are your own, today, we celebrate the common spirit that lives within each of you -- the spirit that has renewed and strengthened America for more than two centuries."

The president told the new Americans -- each already serving the nation as members of the Armed Forces -- that being a citizen comes with responsibilities.

"Citizenship is not just a collection of rights, but it is also a set of responsibilities," he said. "Like so many others, these men and women met their responsibilities, they have earned their citizenship."

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by bludog1 (April 25, 2010 10:33 am ET)

1

It would be helpful if you actually read what you post: as I said, the event's purpose, as noted in the release you so nicely posted, was this: WASHINGTON, April 23, 2010 – Two dozen U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, born in countries from Brazil to Tobago, stood before U.S. President Barack Obama in the White House Rose Garden today to take the oath of citizenship for the country they serve.

The naturalization ceremony was hosted by Obama, who was joined by Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano, and Alejandro Mayorkas, director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

1. they were there to take to oath of citizenship; not for a military purpose. the fact that they were military was, as I said before, incidental to the purpose of the ceremony.
2 the ceremony was hosted by (President) Obama, and attended by Homeland Security Secretary and the director of US Citizenship and Immigration Services...not the military.

A simple, apology or, "I see, will suffice."

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by DellDolly (April 23, 2010 1:08 pm ET)

5

3

So, more than 2 weeks ago, Factcheck debunked this urban legend.

How can any legitimate news organization or any competent pundit NOT know this?

And I hope everyone remembers that it's Judge Napolitano.

You know, judges, triers of fact? People who help identify the truth with facts and evidence to protect our way of life?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by tman418 (April 23, 2010 2:32 pm ET)

I've heard this conspiracy theory going on since before Obama was even elected.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by a friend (April 23, 2010 4:13 pm ET)

4

I'm sorry, but how does the judge's stupid conspiracy talk add to the quality of our public discourse? The Right is so devoid of any substance, it is truly shocking to me. Do they really hate the country this much?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 23, 2010 5:10 pm ET)

1 7

So I'm the only one concerned about the Pres wanting a civilian force equal to our military? No one else here has a problem with the gov't forcing this ridiculous health insurance mandate down our throats & now forcing healthcare personal to participate in this "Obama Corp"?

This is some scary, scary stuff. Dude, where's my Constitution...

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 23, 2010 7:23 pm ET)

6

Most of us live in reality, and read the nice articles.

What kind of salary you figure you'd get with a population equivalent to our military on a 12.5 million yearly program budget.

Name a developed country with a less public health system than our new one. Tell us of all the troubles those with a more socialized systems have. The number looking to throw these systems out and replace it with a more public system.

We gonna force people to be commissioned officers in this organisation? neat trick.

And oh yah, you're bogus.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 24, 2010 5:26 pm ET)

5

Better question, why do you need a civilian force just as strong & just as well funded as our military? If it's just as well funded as our military commissioned officers they will be pretty well paid. Since we have had absolutely no job growth other than in government and considering this administration is hell-bent on destroying the private market, there's positions will start to look pretty good. Doctors have already seen a cut in pay due to the economy and some will see this as an opportunity to make up some of their losses. (Sad when even a doctor has to take on a second job to make ends meet!) Once you are solely reliable on the government for everything, then how anxious will you be to change it back to a republic where the free market allows for individual success and failure. Your very livelihood will be dependent upon a Democratic-run socialized form of government; this is exactly what the founding fathers were fighting against.

I personally don't really care about what public health systems other "developed" countries have because no other country has our medical care. We have the best medical care in the world when we lose that the entire world loses it as well. Besides, no other country has our Constitution, nor are they focused on the **individual** rather than the **collective**.

Again, where in the Constitution would either of these items be found. They can't!

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 24, 2010 9:55 pm ET)

2

Where have I stated, implied, or inferred anything about the manning or funding of this

organisation?

The 12.5 million figure is their yearly budget.

Versis 548.9 Billion for the department of defence. You can't show any support for your contention that these organisations are anywhere near each other in manning or resources. Or will be in any near decade.

Your sources on doctor pay, employment, and testimony of the founding father's positions on socialism?

Wall street has been doing well. Many business's recovering. Housing sales are way up. Employment is lagging. An unhappy but given thing. How badly do you want america to fail?

Best medicine money could buy. To bad if you couldn't afford it. In the ratings of quality of medical care we are rated at 37th internationally.

Qudos to the selling job the 100's of millions of dollars the Health Insurance companies spent propogandizing against health care reform. They certainly found a buyer in you.

I don't believe you are able to make any detailed comparison between the various constitutions in use world wide. Many good copies of our own.

All kinds of things not mentioned in the constitution. My favorite is the U.S. Airforce.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded ([April 24, 2010 10:20 pm ET](#))

2

The President himself said he wants a civilian force just as well funded as our military. That's a heck of a lot more than \$12.5 mil. Wall Street has been rebounding but with what? We are spending money to make money & just printing at a faster pace. We just continue to borrow from foreign countries and are at risk of losing our credit rating. This can only sustain for so long before the bottom truly falls out. The only job growth that has taken place in through the gov't. The private sector has not grown at all. If gov't gets their funding through taxpayers and the private sector is not growing & in fact declining, where will the money come from?

The majority of American's choose not to afford health insurance. I work in the health care field & see many who "can't afford health care or health insurance still afford things like i-phones, cable tv, nice cars, dinners out, etc. Besides, although a few may not be able to purchase ins & I agree we should provide a way to make it more affordable for people with special needs, but just because a few can't afford shouldn't required a complete transformation for the rest of us. This bill has never been about health care, it's always been about control.

It's kinda scary to think our President who took an oath to protect & defend the Constitution also feels like it is a bunch of negative liberties and states it doesn't go far enough to say what the government should do on your behalf? That is no where near the intentions of the foundation of the country but it sure closely resembles what Karl Marx says.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 ([April 24, 2010 11:14 pm ET](#))

2

You offer no support for your economic opinions.

Do go on about those resemblences.

Somalia is calling.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded ([April 25, 2010 12:04 am ET](#))

1

Do a little research and get back with me. check out <http://www.usdebtclock.org/> and tell me how secure our future is looking.

Exactly where do you think all this money is going to come from?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 ([April 25, 2010 12:58 am ET](#))

2

You first. With of course concentration on recent and present economic conditions. The viability of responses similar to those used post Great Depression, and how they were stepped back from to the detrimet of that

era's economic recovery.

Our future recovery.

What thing,or things have corporate america done to help economic recovery.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 25, 2010 1:24 am ET)

2

The reason it took so long to get out of the Great Depression was because of Roosevelt's progressive programs. Had he let the market fix it, it would have been a lot quicker recovery just like in the 1920's- the depression you never hear of.

You really want to see an economic recovery? allow the free market system to thrive. Stop all the increase in taxed and lift some of the regulations and you'll see people back to work. History as already proven this. Increase taxes, productivity and economic growth goes down. Decrease taxes and you'll see the growth we need. Growing the government has never improved living conditions, whereas the capitalism has always provided the atmosphere for ingenuity and productivity which in turn increases people's standard of living. All other forms of government controls the people and limits their ability. Socialism has never been an effective form of a productive government. Government=power; just how much do you want to give them?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ex-punk (April 25, 2010 2:33 am ET)

3

You have no business commenting on economics. The slowdown occurred in Roosevelt's attempt to get us out of the depression when he tried to pay off the deficit and stopped his progressive programs. When that made things worse we went back to spending money and soon found ourselves in WW2, which was even more spending. That worked. By the way, everything you have said is pretty much wrong. You should keep up with the news and try reading some books on subjects you like to spout off on. Currently we are cutting taxes for small business and the consumer class. The economists say that could take ten years or more to fix the damage caused by 30 years of Reaganomics. Free market and loosening of government restrictions caused the world wide recession during Bush2. Did you somehow miss that episode of conservative glory? The foreign countries ended their recessions much quicker due to more government spending than we have spent. Karl Marx had become irrelevant over the past 60 years. His basic argument was that capitalism will destroy itself due to corruption. I think Bush just boosted Marx's standing in history. Too bad for all of us.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 25, 2010 5:41 pm ET)

Two UCLA economists say they have figured out why the Great Depression dragged on for almost 15 years, and they blame a suspect previously thought to be beyond reproach: President Franklin D. Roosevelt...."Why the Great Depression lasted so long has always been a great mystery, and because we never really knew the reason, we have always worried whether we would have another 10- to 15-year economic slump," said Ohanian, vice chair of UCLA's Department of Economics. "We found that a relapse isn't likely unless lawmakers gum up a recovery with ill-conceived stimulus policies."- UCLA Newsroom
Do you really think government regulating prices in private industry would actually be a good thing. eliminate competition and I can cite more but there is only so much room. Reaganomics is what brought the country back from the brink of Carter. Can you imagine today having 22% interest rate? What was the income tax for the highest bracket? 70%? Oh well let those successful hard working people pay those taxes right? What was the job growth back then. Remember the gas lines? There used to be a slogan in Michigan, "Would the last one to leave Michigan please turn out the lights?" I hope you don't mind all this because we will be going back to it in the not so distant future. How else do you account the extra currency being printed without anything backing it.

what I find most amazing (although I shouldn't) is your first statement: "*You have no business commenting on economics*". Such a typical Leftist response to anyone with a difference view than yourself. Who do YOU think you are! Paul Krugman?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 25, 2010 8:03 pm ET)

A [response](#) to the UCLA study. Don't think Krugman has come out in agreement with the UCLA study. He's stated that he considered the stimulus too small.

I do see alot of links to the UCLA study. I don't see any critical thinking though those links. Mostly folks taking an opportunity to trash FDR and the NEW DEAL.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 25, 2010 11:16 am ET)

Expunk has the right of the history of the deression economics.

The financial rating companies show the latest results of an uncontrolled free market.

Exxon had another year of record profits and zero taxes. What kind of hiring are they doing these days. Or are they continueing their previous years financial strategy, whose principal expenditure is buying back their own stock?

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 25, 2010 5:52 pm ET)

"Did you know that 52 percent of Exxon is owned by mutual funds, index funds, and pension funds?" No. Nor did she know that about 2 million individuals own Exxon stock or that company insiders hold less than 1 percent of the company. According to the company's income statement, the amount of taxes it paid in 2008 was 2.5 times as much as its net profit. The \$45.2 billion profit figure makes a snappy headline, but the \$116.2 billion in taxes that it paid is relegated to a footnote" if that. Exxon's tax bill breaks down like this: income taxes, \$36.5 billion; sales-based taxes, \$34.5 billion; "all other" taxes, \$45.2 billion. Although the company doesn't mention royalty payments in its income statement, those payments are likely contained within the sales and "all other" categories- US News

Do you know the difference between profit & profit margin?

For the life of me I can understand how the Left continues to demonize the private market when they are what makes the country strong yet will put their blind faith in a corrupt politian and never think twice. When you want to hold people like Chris Dodd and Charlie Rangel to the same standard that you hold any corporation then you will start to have some credibility.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 25, 2010 7:39 pm ET)

They remain america's profit leader. Again what kind of hiring are they doing these days?

Because we don't demonize all of the private market. How many real leftys have you actually had real conversations with?

Conviction's of corruption against Dodd and Rangel when?

I do not consider you an arbiter of credibility.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by NoNannyNeeded (April 25, 2010 8:31 pm ET)

Thank God they remain America's profit leader. They're profit margin was only 6.9%, but at least they are helping keep the economy going & helping maintain people's retirement. Just because you are making a profit doesn't mean you are ready to add to your payroll. In this economy, a better question would be how many have they let go? With the govt

restrictions that have been placed on our energy industry and if this ridiculous Cap & Trade bill passes they are going to need all the money now they can get. I hate to tell you this but profit is a good thing! Without it, there is no business. BTW, why aren't people complaining about the cost of gas like they were when Bush was in office? Same prices, different Administration and it's not like the media is going to say anything!

Of course they will be no convictions, they won't eat their own. Dodd of course got a sweetheart deal on his mortgage & Rangel, even though he was chair of the Ways and Means Committee, he doesn't understand the tax laws he created. Due to an ethics inquiry he had to "temporarily" resign from his position as on the committee. Of course if you don't listen to any other news than MSNBC or CNN you likely wouldn't have heard about these. *Former Countrywide Financial loan officer Robert Feinberg says Mr. Dodd knowingly saved thousands of dollars on his refinancing of two properties in 2003 as part of a special program the California mortgage company had for the influential. He also says he has internal company documents that prove Mr. Dodd knew he was getting preferential treatment as a friend of Angelo Mozilo, Countrywide's then-CEO.-WSJ*

Rep. Charles Rangel failed to report as much as \$1.3 million in outside income including up to \$1 million for a Harlem building sale on financial-disclosure forms he filed between 2002 and 2006, according to newly amended records.

The documents also show the embattled chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who is being probed by the House Ethics Committee failed to reveal a staggering \$3 million in various business transactions over the same period.

This week, Rangel filed drastically revised financial-disclosure forms reflecting new, higher amounts of outside income and numerous additional business deals that had not been reported when the reports were originally filed.

In 2004, for instance, Rangel reported earning between \$4,000 and \$10,000 in outside earnings on top of his \$158,100 congressional salary.

But the amended filings show that after the sale of a property on West 132nd Street, his outside income that year was somewhere between \$118,000 and \$1.04 million. - New York Post

And Peolosi was going the end the culture of corruption!

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by ew eston8542983 (April 25, 2010 9:29 pm ET)

What's so good about Exxons profits. Do they concentrate or spread wealth in the population?

I gave up on national news by tv about three decades ago.

Yes I've heard of Dodd's deal. I'm not ready to condemn him due to it. Neither is the institution which he's part of. Somalia is making lewd gestures at you.

I've seen where the policies you advocate took us. I see nothing good in taking the country back to them.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by jcalton (April 25, 2010 2:35 pm ET)

The first time I heard this, I assumed he was (in his own ignorance) referring to the uniformed **Public Health Service Commissioned Corps** which is doctors wearing Navy uniforms, and dates back to roughly the civil war.

Now I'm not really sure what he's talking about...or rather, what he *thinks* he is talking about.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)

4/26/2010

Napolitano pushes "civilian army" cons...

[The Chris Matthews Show](#) [Andrew Sullivan](#) [Chris Wallace](#)
[FOX News Sunday](#) [Paul Krugman](#) [FOX & Friends](#)
[FOX Broadcasting Company](#) [Brit Hume](#) [The Nation](#) [Newt Gingrich](#)
[Twitter](#) [Gretchen Carlson](#)

[Get personalized rss or email alerts](#)



© 2010 Media Matters for America. All rights reserved.