



- o [Home](#)
- o [Vault](#)
- o [Green Room TEST](#)
- o [About](#)
- o [Advertise](#)



Acai Berry Side Effects?

In Our Shocking Special Report We Investigate Acai Berry

[See the results...](#)



Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule

I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)

Is ObamaCare Romney's Waterloo?

posted at 5:40 pm on September 28, 2009 by Allahpundit

[Share on Facebook](#) | [printer-friendly](#)

Somewhere, Huckabee's gleefully rubbing his hands together and [nodding](#).

Three years ago, Romney was heralded for his innovative effort to institute near-universal health care in his state. But now that the issue has emerged as a partisan fault line and the Massachusetts plan has provided some guidance for Democratic reform efforts, Romney finds himself bruised and on the defensive as the GOP rallies around opposition to President Barack Obama's plans...

It's not just Romney's ballot box foes who are taking him to task over his signature accomplishment as governor. His health care program has been lacerated by prominent conservative bloggers and also by the Wall Street Journal, Forbes and National Review, the conservative magazine that endorsed him in the 2008 GOP presidential primary.

"It's Obamacare with the public option not included," said Michael Tanner of the libertarian-oriented Cato Institute. "It's pretty indistinguishable from what the president is proposing."...

Romney can rightfully boast that he got much what he aimed for, since less than 3 percent of Massachusetts citizens are currently uninsured. But critics insist that the cost of Romney's program has far exceeded the governor's estimates and have targeted the plan as a prime example of what not to do on the national level.

Even in Massachusetts there are signs of discomfort with the plan: A June Rasmussen Reports poll found that only 26 percent of Massachusetts voters thought the state's health care reform was a success.

The threshold question is how much of an issue ObamaCare will still be in two years when the primaries start hopping. Even if it passes, we supposedly won't start to feel the pain until 2013; if the economy's still in the toilet, Obama will be vulnerable and centrist Republicans might be willing to hold their noses on RomneyCare to nominate a guy with business and managerial expertise. The big problem for Mitt, I think, isn't that he passed statewide universal health care. He can spin that in numerous ways to distinguish it from ObamaCare, e.g., it was an amazing victory for small government to keep the public option out of a bill passed in the People's Republic of Massachusetts, it was passed in the fine tradition of state experimentation and would never be imposed nationwide by a good federalist like Romney, etc etc. The big problem is that he'll have to spin it at all, a calamitous fate for a guy whose conveniently timed conversion on abortion a few years ago has already convinced an [awful lot of Republicans](#) that his conservatism is opportunistic. Huckabee's going to have that same problem given his prior adventures in [nanny-statism](#) and [immigration](#) but to a lesser extent than Romney, whose reversal on the core plank of social conservatism has left him forever suspect to a lot of GOPers. The more the 2012 primaries are shaped as a test of who the truest "true conservative" is rather than a test of who has the most thoughtful/effective policy solutions (the answer may be the same in both cases), the more trouble Mitt's in. I know which way I'm betting.

Update: For precisely the reason just stated, I think the worst thing Mitt could do is repudiate RomneyCare before the primaries. His credibility is a bigger problem for him than the programs he passed; if he turns around and says, "in hindsight, I was wrong and wish we hadn't done it," it'll be a redux of his abortion reversal and he'll crash and burn. Best to defend the program however he can.



Acai Berry Side Effects?
In Our Shocking Special Report We Investigate Acai Berry
[See the results...](#)



Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule
I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule
[Get details...](#)

Blowback

Note from Hot Air management: This section is for comments from Hot Air's community of registered readers. Please don't assume that Hot Air management agrees with or otherwise endorses any particular comment just because we let it stand. A reminder: Anyone who fails to comply with our [terms of use](#) may lose their posting privilege.

Trackbacks/Pings

[Trackback URL](#)

- [The Loud Talker](#)
- [Late Night Links 9/28 < The Mug Rack](#)
- [Hard Starboard](#)
- [COACHEP » Blog Archive » Posts about Obama Health Care Failure as of September 29, 2009](#)

Comments

Comment pages: [« 1](#) [2](#) [\[3\]](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 9:22 PM

Government mandates is socialism. My money is mine. When the government taxes it, either directly or through mandates, then I am a slave to government...hence more socialism.

If we need government to protect ourselves against ourselves, then we are no longer free.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:27 PM](#)

doesn't Romney's plan mandate people to buy coverage? That is socialism.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:16 PM

Socialism is when the state mandates taking money out of people who work to pay off those "less fortunate" to buy their vote.

BTW when did hard work to succeed become something fortunate, as if someone lucks into it

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [9:28 PM](#)

If Palin is the nominee the VP won't be someone the right loves. It will be a more liberal Republican.

If Palin is the nominee, it won't matter who the VP is, because Obama will win in a landslide. Like it or not, that's the reality.

xblade on September 28, 2009 at [9:29 PM](#)

The other issue Buy Danish on how it opens the door...once government buys into the premise that they are responsible for health care...then that opens the door for more socialism.

Romney is not a marxist like Obama for sure, but he is a socialist. He is not a conservative, even though people like to make that claim.

Like I said, the conservative model is less government...more liberty. Tort reform, health savings accounts, getting patients to pay cash instead of using the insurance middleman to pay for everything...and allowing more competition...these are the things a real conservative would propose...

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:32 PM](#)

“Sheryl, Politico isn't the state run media, rather they are considered part of the new media.”

I realize that, that's why I qualified it by saying they were left leaning because they are.

Also, if memory serves me correctly, Mitt didn't want a mandate to buy insurance. Rather he wanted the plan set up so those who choose not to buy insurance post a bond to prove that they could pay for any catastrophic health issues they may have.

I mean how else do you get over the free rider issue, it's either that or mandatory insurance but it surely isn't socialism when a program is designed to get you to pay for what you use.....really that is just wrong to think that it's socialism.

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at [9:34 PM](#)

I'm thinking Pence has more charisma than Jindal; Jindal is very likable, though. Maybe a cabinet position.

Philly on September 28, 2009 at [9:35 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:28 PM

Fines, social engineering using tax breaks and tax hikes, and mandates are all designed to dictate what the no longer free individual must do to stay in the good graces of King George. Its soft tyranny, and that is the definition of socialism.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:37 PM](#)

The real conservative plan is tort reform, health savings accounts, and allowing people to buy coverage across state lines...ie more competition.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:25 PM

I agree with all of that (plus there need to be as few mandates as possible, portability, and the availability of a menu of competitive choices, including high deductible/catastrophic plans). But this doesn't solve the problem of the uninsured going to emergency rooms and sticking taxpayers with the bill, nor does it cure the problem with “pre-existing conditions”.

I don't see how those two situations aren't as (if not more) “socialistic” than a mandate that residents have at least minimum coverage.

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at 9:25 PM

Exactly.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [9:38 PM](#)

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at 9:34 PM

Proving that I can pay for it? What business is it of the government's? If I chose to not have insurance, that is my business!! How do you get over the free rider issue? Simple, you don't cover it. Give hospitals the authority as a private business to turn people away.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:40 PM](#)

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at 9:38 PM

Government shouldn't force hospitals to do anything...and government shouldn't pay for any services. Let the free market handle it.

For those who are poor, charities work!! But taxes are so damn high, that people don't feel the love (charity).

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:42 PM](#)

The other issue Buy Danish on how it opens the door...**once government buys into the premise that they are responsible for health care...then that opens the door for more socialism.**

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:32 PM

The government said that Mass residents were responsible for having health insurance.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [9:43 PM](#)

If Palin is the nominee, it won't matter who the VP is, because Obama will win in a landslide. Like it or not, that's the reality.

xblade on September 28, 2009 at 9:29 PM

Maybe. But Romney, Huckabee, Pawlenty or Gingrich would be absolutely annihilated. Like it or not, THAT'S the reality.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [9:44 PM](#)

"Sheryl, Politico isn't the state run media, rather they are considered part of the new media."

I realize that, that's why I qualified it by saying they were left leaning because they are.

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at 9:34 PM

Doresn't matter though if it's "new media" or "legacy media". If an outlet does little more than carry water for the DNC, it's "state-run".

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [9:47 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 9:43 PM

They didn't just say they were responsible, they said they HAD to have it. That's the problem. It's like this, we have the 2nd Amendment, but the government would be wrong to mandate that everyone HAD to buy a gun.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:48 PM](#)

How did Romney asking Massachusetts resident to be responsible for their health care got translated to the government is responsible for health care? He was asking people to take responsibility for their own life, is that not a conservative position.

Pollster here is dumping on Romney and calling him a RINO, to see now he graduated from being called a RINO to being called a socialist is unbelievable.

I hope every conservative voice here have \$250000 cash to pay for the care of a premature baby in the newborn ICU, or \$ 70000 for radiotherapy for early breast cancer (you can maybe charge those additional doctor's bill on your credit card) Medical care nowadays are very expensive. Cheap medical care are from the days when the doctors can offer you nothing but sympathy. Your model of paying for health care will work only the way Barry had told you: take an aspirin and go die.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [9:50 PM](#)

Of course, the reverse is also true. Most of the most rabid anti-Palin junk outside the lib community comes from Mittbots.

Really? I haven't seen it.

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 8:42 PM

You must not spend a lot of time at this site.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [9:50 PM](#)

Its people's responsibility to vote...should we mandate it? Fine people who don't prove they voted? Throw them in jail if they don't pay the fines? Just wondering at what point do you see it crossing the line

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:51 PM](#)

YES.

Off to the Cuda thread. The order to the trolls went out this morning.

Sapwolf on September 28, 2009 at [9:51 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:50 PM

Asking people to be responsible is not the same as mandating them to be responsible over their wealth. That is what health insurance is...its wealth insurance. It protects you from losing your fortunes because you got cancer or something.

Next thing I will hear, its "conservative" if government "asks" us not to smoke, drink or eat fatty foods...sheesh.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:54 PM](#)

Meanwhile, Palinistas (and Hucksters) see nothing but extreme negativity with Mitt and are vicious in their opposition.

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 8:42 PM

To paraphrase and adapt something from an article J. R. Dunn wrote at AT several weeks back, conservatives are friggin' tired of having Dem Lite empty suits shaken in their faces with the RNC saying "This is the guy!" and counting on the stupid rubes not to know the difference. It's not really Palin-worship at all, for most of us.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [9:54 PM](#)

Fines, social engineering using tax breaks and tax hikes, and mandates are all designed to dictate what the no longer free individual must do to stay in the good graces of King George. Its soft tyranny, and that is the definition of socialism.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:37 PM

Are traffic lights, speed limits, driving on your side of the street infrining enough on your freedom to be called socialism?

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [9:57 PM](#)

Should government force people to buy retirement insurance? Oh wait they already do, its called social security...no, that's not socialism /sarc

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [9:57 PM](#)

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:48 PM

If people don't have health insurance but need emergency or catastrophic care, very often it is their fellow citizens who get stuck with the tab. I don't see how that would apply to gun ownership.

It's understandable why people don't have insurance unless their employers offer it because it's ridiculously expensive. We need to bring the cost down, which was one of the things Mitt was trying to accomplish.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [9:59 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:57 PM

First of all, traffic laws are enforced on public roads...that you don't have to drive on...no one is mandating you buy a car and drive.

If you want to build a private road, and install a traffic light and speed signs...no one is going to fine you for running your red light.

Second of all...where traffic laws are socialistic...seat belt laws, helmet laws...again if the law's intent is to protect an individual from himself, then that individual is not free...and its soft tyranny by definition.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:01 PM](#)

Are traffic lights, speed limits, driving on your side of the street infrining enough on your freedom to be called socialism?

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:57 PM

Not everybody drives. Everybody has a body, though.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:02 PM](#)

“Give hospitals the authority as a private business to turn people away.”

Can't do that, it goes against doctors hypocratic oath plus it's immoral....you going to turn away a dying person after you prove they don't have healthcare? If that's you're “fix” then the conservative movement defined by you is in sad shape.

“But Romney, Huckabee, Pawlenty or Gingrich would be absolutely annihilated. Like it or not, THAT'S the reality.”

Are you looking into a crystal ball, wearing a caftan while writing this sentence or you just being hyperbolic for fun?

And I'm sure Rush would approve of “DNC water carrying media” to describe The Politico, as would I.

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at [10:03 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 9:59 PM

Tort reform, health savings accounts, more competition would bring prices down. The more you get the patient to pay for services, the more market forces can work for the consumer. Prices are high, because doctors play a game...they know the patient isn't paying directly, so over charge on services...that compensates for those individuals that don't pay at all. Its a game. Get people to pay directly, and prices will go down.

As far as fellow citizens getting stuck with the bill...I agree, tax money needs to stop paying for it. The premise is flawed, so you buy into government solutions when it a government problem!

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:05 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:50 PM

Why didn't Mitt issue a mandate that all families could have only the most absolutely healthful food and ban all tobacco and alcoholic products in order to stay as healthy as possible and not burden the health care system?

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:06 PM](#)

sheryl on September 28, 2009 at 10:03 PM

Its already the case Sheryl, the poor do not have the same care as the rich.
Its also called charity. If the hospital wants to handle gun wounds for free...it is free to do so, to have the government dictate “morality” based on politics...then we no longer live in a free society.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:09 PM](#)

That is what health insurance is...its wealth insurance. It protects you from losing your fortunes because you got cancer or something.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 9:54 PM

Health insurance also enable you to get medical care so that you do not pass your deadly infection to other people.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [10:09 PM](#)

How did Romney asking Massachusetts resident to be responsible for their health care got translated to the government is responsible for health care? He was asking people to take responsibility for their own life, is that not a conservative position.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 9:50 PM

But it's not the libertarian position, which is where a lot of the crazy outrage comes from. Tonight Beck was hinting that parents shouldn't have to immunize their children because the government has no right to make that demand. Beck is doing great work exposing radicals, but that position is irresponsible and dangerous.

You must not spend a lot of time at this site.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 9:50 PM

Ha! Who do you think spends more time here? Me or you?

Anyone want to vote on that?

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:09 PM](#)

Why didn't Mitt issue a mandate that all families could have only the most absolutely healthful food and ban all tobacco and alcoholic products in order to stay as healthy as possible and not burden the health care system?

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:06 PM

Because he wants loony Husketers to propose those kind of things.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [10:11 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 10:09 PM

Really? So if I buy health insurance, I am guaranteed good health?

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:11 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:09 PM

Parents shouldn't have to be required to immunize. You may think its irresponsible...others may disagree...as soon as we have government forcing needles into childrens arms, we are slaves.

Is it a smart thing to immunize?...make your case...don't force it.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:13 PM](#)

Because he wants loony Husketers to propose those kind of things.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 10:11 PM

No, really, why not? If he can mandate that everyone must buy insurance, why not everything else?

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:15 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 10:09 PM

Really? So if I buy health insurance, I am guaranteed good health?

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:11 PM

No. But at some point, it may buy you some sense and logic, if Barry or the Massachusetts state legislature mandates it.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [10:15 PM](#)

You must not spend a lot of time at this site.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 9:50 PM

Ha! Who do you think spends more time here? Me or you?

Anyone want to vote on that?

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:09 PM

OK, scan the Palin threads and the Romney threads from the past year and tell me which ones contain the more vicious "anti" stuff.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:17 PM](#)

Conservatives have to come up with a health care plan that takes care of denial of service due to pre-existing conditions, and catastrophic care. Otherwise, the public will side with the Democrats because they will provide a guaranteed, government program that will be craptacular in the skyrocketing costs, and horrendous care.

I like nation-wide insurance competitiveness, and some way to take care of the aforementioned problems.

[sDs61678](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:17 PM](#)

Prices are high, because doctors play a game...they know the patient isn't paying directly, **so over charge on services**...that compensates for those individuals that don't pay at all. Its a game. Get people to pay directly, and prices will go down.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:05 PM

Now you're making stuff up out of whole cloth, and you sound like Doctor Obama. "Greedy doctors cut off perfectly good feet to collect a fee!"

Have you ever seen what doctors get paid after insurance reduces their payment? And Medicaid/Medicare pays next to nothing to doctors.

Why didn't Mitt issue a mandate that all families could have only the most absolutely healthful food and ban all tobacco and alcoholic products in order to stay as healthy as possible and not burden the health care system?

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:06 PM

Off course much? To borrow from El Rushbo, it's an indisputable fact that everyone who eats carrots dies eventually. Which has nothing to do with having insurance.

Health insurance also enable you to get medical care so that you do not pass your deadly infection to other people.

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 10:09 PM

I don't know if it was intended, but that was good for a chuckle :)

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:20 PM](#)

Otherwise, the public will side with the Democrats because they will provide a guaranteed, government program that will be craptacular in the skyrocketing costs, and horrendous care.

sDs61678 on September 28, 2009 at 10:17 PM

No, they won't. Not while they stand to lose their own coverage. The Dems know the public doesn't want this crap. That's why it doesn't take effect for years.

I agree that the problems you mentioned have to be addressed, though.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:22 PM](#)

bayview on September 28, 2009 at 10:15 PM

Do you agree or disagree that we are no longer free if we are mandated to do something?

Do you agree or disagree that we are no longer free if we are fined or taxed if we do not do something?

Do you agree or disagree that we are no longer free if we are thrown in jail if we do not pay the fine or tax?

If the answer is we are no longer free, then you can be taught! What business is it the governments on what I chose to do with my property or with my life? As long as I am not infringing on another person's rights, I should be free to engage...be it intelligent or not (some would arguing investing in real estate would be a logical and intelligent thing to do, should government force people to buy homes—because its the sensible and logical thing to do?)

And if the answer is we are no longer free, then its tyranny...albeit soft tyranny, and I have made my case that Romney is a socialist.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:23 PM](#)

Why didn't Mitt issue a mandate that all families could have only the most absolutely healthful food and ban all tobacco and alcoholic products in order to stay as healthy as possible and not burden the health care system?
ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:06 PM

Off course much? To borrow from El Rushbo, it's an indisputable fact that everyone who eats carrots dies eventually. Which has nothing to do with having insurance.

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:20 PM

Your example is irrelevant. It's true that many of the people who eat lots of fried foods end up with clogged arteries that might not otherwise be clogged, thereby placing undue strain on the health care system. It would be wise then to mandate that no fried foods be eaten.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:26 PM](#)

OK, scan the Palin threads and the Romney threads from the past year and tell me which ones contain the more vicious "anti" stuff.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:17 PM

Oh please! To begin with the Romney threads attack him merely because he's a Mormon. Any Mittens attacking Sarah because of her religion? The complaints about Sarah are usually nasty stuff like, "She needs to learn to speak in complete sentences instead of run-on sentences", or "She needs some more experience under her belt before she runs for the Presidency" or "She might want to take some time off before she runs again for political office so all the trash that was thrown at her has time to dissipate".

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:26 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:20 PM

No, I am not like Obama...as he makes the argument that doctors are greedy therefore we need to cap their wages via nationalized health care. I am all for rich doctors. But I have been around plenty of doctors who charge me less when I pay cash then if I used insurance...and I am a study of human behavior. Fact is, prices have jumped when medicare passed...and fact is, when you don't pay directly you aren't careful with the spending...this is human nature...and fact doctors have charged 5 times the amount for a box of tissues, because my insurance paid for it.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:28 PM](#)

I am free enough to take my nightcap and say nighty, night,

bayview on September 28, 2009 at [10:32 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:26 PM

While that was the case at first, and there are still a few who still argue against Mitt because he's Mormon...it isn't the rule. FYI, I'm Mormon.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [10:32 PM](#)

Any Mittens attacking Sarah because of her religion? The complaints about Sarah are usually nasty stuff like...

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:26 PM

She's dumb, unelectable white trash. I've seen it too often. And I haven't said a word about Romney's religion, and it hasn't been mentioned that much in this thread. I couldn't care less if he's a Mormon, Muslim or atheist.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:33 PM](#)

There is no point giving the centrists any aid or comfort—they see a truce as a concession the issue really wasn't worth fighting for, so shut up about it forever.

Chris_Balsz on September 28, 2009 at [10:34 PM](#)

^ Actually, Romney's faith is more often brought up by his supporters in their unceasing desire to show that the reason he isn't in the White House right now is because of all those knuckle-dragging fundie socons.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:34 PM](#)

Your example is irrelevant.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:26 PM

Au contraire, your example was irrelevant. I was making fun of how irrelevant it was!

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:23 PM

So much hyperbole - you sound like you're preparing for the H.S. debate team. All taxes and/or fines that impact behavior are not a form of "soft tyranny". People who do certain things, like have children, get tax **cuts**. Is that tyrannical also? The government is rewarding behavior after all.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:36 PM](#)

Actually, Romney's faith is more often brought up by his supporters in their unceasing desire to show that the reason he isn't in the White House right now is because of all those knuckle-dragging fundie socons.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:34 PM

That is unadulterated baloney.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:37 PM](#)

Au contraire, your example was irrelevant. I was making fun of how irrelevant it was!

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:36 PM

Really? Irrelevant just because you say so? What's wrong with an anti-fried food mandate if it will relieve stress on the health care system?

Actually, Romney's faith is more often brought up by his supporters in their unceasing desire to show that the reason he isn't in the White House right now is because of all those knuckle-dragging fundie socons.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:34 PM

That is unadulterated baloney.

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:37 PM

Let the regular reader judge.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:40 PM](#)

Prices are high, because doctors play a game...they know the patient isn't paying directly, so over charge on services...that compensates for those individuals that don't pay at all. Its a game. Get people to pay directly, and prices will go down.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:05 PM

Now you're making stuff up out of whole cloth, and you sound like Doctor Obama. "Greedy doctors cut off perfectly

good feet to collect a fee!?”.

You shell out monthly to an insurance company that very carefully calculates how much you're likely to get back in services—and then charges you more. And you pay it whether you use it or not. Anybody who has worked for any level of care provider knows how innocent you are. The doctors really study up on how to bill!

By the way, when real citizens with addresses go to the hospital without insurance, they don't get a magical kiss from Uncle Sucker that wipes out their debt—they get a bill. A bill based on an insurance company paying 70% from piles of unused premium shekels. If that really burns you, make medical debt undischageable like student loans—another industry bloated by the unquestioned payola.

Chris_Balsz on September 28, 2009 at [10:42 PM](#)

I still think Romney would have handled the economy a lot better than Obama, whether he helped implement the health care plan of MA or not. He should have been the GOP nominee last year, not McCain! And after 4 years of Obama, we will need somebody to come in and fix this economic mess. Romney may still be relevant in 2012.

WyoMike on September 28, 2009 at [10:43 PM](#)

But I have been around plenty of doctors who charge me less when I pay cash then if I used insurance...
Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:28 PM

Well, duh! If the doctor gets paid immediately rather than having to wait months to be reimbursed after spending valuable time and resources processing paperwork it's worth it to offer a fee cut. But conversely that is not an argument that doctors rip you off because you (or your insurer) pays more if you use their services.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at 10:33 PM

It's not about what you've said! You made an assertion about other commenters which you cannot back up.

I've already had my nightcap, but it is time to turn in.

[Buy Danish](#) on September 28, 2009 at [10:46 PM](#)

It's not about what you've said! You made an assertion about other commenters which you cannot back up.

I've already had my nightcap, but it is time to turn in.

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:46 PM

I can back it up with an example from this very thread:

Romney will never be president, thanks to the stubborn religious right. He will split the party like Perot did. They will vote for Huckabee and we will have another four years of this crap.

cannonball on September 28, 2009 at 6:00 PM

I've seen I don't know how many posts just like that, only some much more crude, here over the past year.

ddrintn on September 28, 2009 at [10:50 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:46 PM

And yet conveniently overlooked the tissues that cost 5 times as much...another example my \$20 air mattress costs 75 bucks a night...paid several times over...because the insurance pays it. I'm not saying government should come in and regulate these prices...rather my case is they will be lower if we had market forces at play.

And thats the legal insurance requests...there are billions in insurance fraud..fraud that wouldn't exist if the person was paying directly...because when you are paying the bill you are more mindful in keeping the cashier honest.

Fact is, Romney didn't offer a conservative plan, he offered a socialistic one. Albeit less marxist than Obama's, but a forced mandate tyranny all the same.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [11:25 PM](#)

Buy Danish on September 28, 2009 at 10:36 PM

tax cuts for a certain group of people encourages certain kinds of behavior. The conservative would argue that we need a flat tax, or a national sales tax (or no tax at all)...instead of engaging the shell game of pitting one group against another.

And even if that behavior is a righteous one, the government being in the middle of it is socialism / soft tyranny. They make the claim that the government needs to be "fair" to those with kids...yet are busy adding debt my kids and grandkids have to pay...how about make government small enough that a reasonable 5% tax could pay for it? And another 4% for the state? and another 1% for your community? Poor, rich alike, pay 10%...then not only will you see economic growth...it won't matter who is in power...Instead the middle class pays 50% and the rich pay more...all the while our freedoms erode away.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at [11:34 PM](#)

Rational Thought on September 28, 2009 at 6:25 PM

Dude,

She could announce she is going to Hell tomorrow and I'd be at the rallying point at 5:00am in my asbestos suit and ready to rumble like Keanu Reeves in "Constantine".

She's the crusader.

Sapwolf on September 28, 2009 at [11:45 PM](#)

a tax "cut" is government refusing to take my own money from me.

a tax "credit" is a government payout of other people's, or invented, money. And yes, I oppose tax credits.

Chris_Balsz on September 29, 2009 at [12:26 AM](#)

ddrintn,

You are absolutely correct. Being a Huckabee supporter I have been on many sites this last year, and I hear that comment, "If it wasn't for Huckabee (or Soc. Cons.), we would have beat Obama with Romney." Of course, given that Romney supported the TARP and advised McCain to do the same (he stayed out of the news BTW, so people wouldn't know he was behind that). We found out because McCain said he was one of the economic advisers. Do you really think the American public would have been ready to vote for a rich, Wallstreeteer like Romney? Not in that horrific Wall Street crash where so many people lost so much money! I lost 38% last year..I know. The Mike Huckabee supporters were thrilled when Sarah Palin won the VP nod. She has very similar views as Mike Huckabee. People gave money and went out and campaigned because she was on the ticket. From Townhall, which used to be a BIG Romney site, all the LDS people yelled bigot all the time. Mike Huckabee doesn't like Mitt Romney because he doesn't have any principles. He will say whatever (panders) to the voters to get them to vote for him. Go over to [race42012.com](#) if you want to see the truth about what the Romney supporters are saying about him. He is "the Establishment Candidate". I believe that because they think we need to go with another moderate to win the election in 2012! Do you believe that? They didn't learn anything with McCain's moderate Republican ways. They still want the Independents and the moderate Dems, unfortunately, they think the Soc. Cons. will just fall in line and vote for Mitt Romney. They won't because his is untrustworthy. He can tell you he won't support Mandated healthcare, but his record tells a different story. They Rombots are the most vicious supporters on the net (except maybe a few Paul supporters). What you people on Sarah's supporters on Hot Air have seen, we saw them the same thing over and over during the 2008 primaries. Unfortunately, with Mitt Romney's money, he paid for many ads to distort Mike Huckabee's record. Don't think he wouldn't or probably already has distorted Sarah Palin's record if she was a big threat for him to win the nomination. He goes underground so you don't know it's really Mitt Romney doing it. For all of you who think John McCain is putting out the bad info about Sarah, I doubt it. I would bet it's from Romney.

Mike Huckabee is not a bigot of any religion. He did not push his religion in Arkansas when he governed. He knows that this country is built on Freedom of Religion.

VFT on September 29, 2009 at [12:36 AM](#)

The problem with Pawlenty is he's nice enough, and almost conservative enough, and I'd vote for him as a straight shooter in a pinch. But don't you think he's just a little mousy and wimpy? We need someone stronger and more charismatic.

Mitt's a goner. Pawlenty is weak. Let's all take a look at that young up-and-comer, very conservative, squeaky clean, handsome and energetic Marco Rubio.

marybel on September 28, 2009 at 6:17 PM

I think Marco Rubia will make a fine Senator from Florida. But we don't generally elect Senators as Presidents, and for good reason. No executive experience, NONE.

Being a Senator and being President are two skill sets. Two very different jobs. Obama is the first Senator in 50 years to be POTUS, and for good reason. (I doubt we'll make that mistake again for another 50 years.

We need someone with extensive executive experience, and that is Sarah Palin. She has almost two decades of real world executive experience, of real world decision making.

Couldn't care less about anyone else. No one else out there has the chops we need right now to take down Obama and fix this mess, but Sarah Palin.

gary4205 on September 29, 2009 at [1:01 AM](#)

Huckabee pardoned murderers.

scotash on September 29, 2009 at [1:04 AM](#)

Romney-Rubio 2012!

Romney-Rice 2012!

Romney-Rudy 2012!

Any combination that contains double R's works for me!

joncoltonis on September 29, 2009 at [2:10 AM](#)

VFT on September 29, 2009 at 12:36 AM

This post annoyed the crud out of me. I love Sarah Palin. But to say Mitt is not a social conservative...you are smoking something. To say that Huck is more conservative than Mitt? You are smoking something. To say that Huck didn't play the religion card? Give me a break.

Huck is a big government nanny stater as much as Mitt is, if not more, he is not Sarah Palin.

Attack Mitt on his socialism tendencies, and I will agree with you...ignore your own Huck's love affair with socialist tendencies only makes you out to be a hypocrite and truthfully I can see why people play the bigot card on you. There is no difference between Huck and Mitt, none...except religion.

Huck is also the biggest class envy guy I know that isn't a Democrat. No thanks, I will vote third party before I vote for Huck.

Conservative Voice on September 29, 2009 at [2:27 AM](#)

I recommend all 6 parts, but part [six](#) is the one I wanted to emphasize. Getting patients to pay directly is the best system...change insurance to handle the catastrophic issues like cancer, but everything else, let the patient pay directly.

Conservative Voice on September 29, 2009 at [2:42 AM](#)

VFT on September 29, 2009 at 12:36 AM

and for the record, his religious card playing was annoying...but it was his class envy that convinced me that in no way would I vote for him, he would be worse than Obama. At least with Obama people know he is a liberal...with Huck, the uninformed will think he is conservative.

Conservative Voice on September 29, 2009 at [2:45 AM](#)

Is ObamaCare Romney's Waterloo?

Heart-ache.

Dr. ZhivBlago on September 29, 2009 at [3:20 AM](#)

You wanna know why all of these arguments for Elmer Gantry and RomneyCare fall flat, just like the ones for Pawlenty and Jindal?

No one, Huckabee, Romney and any of the "boys" don't matter one single bit.

Here's why.

On ObamaCare:

Romney: slow down
Huckabee: slow down
All the rest: slow down

Sarah Palin: (and this is a DIRECT QUOTE) "Not no, but HELL no!"

This is the difference between a leader, and a bunch of lost RINOs.

On Cap and Tax:

Romney, Huck and "the boys": We need to find a smarter way to combat "climate change" (and leprechauns and runaway unicorns!)

Sarah Palin: We need to use ALL of our God given natural resources. We need an "all of the above" approach that includes nuclear power. "Natural gas is the future." We can explore and develop our own natural resource in an environmentally responsible way.

Sorry, America needs leaders, people who get it. People who have done it. People who instinctively know what is wrong, and how to make it right. That's Sarah Palin.

Oh, and Sapwolf, when Sarah marches into Hell (or anywhere else) I'll be right beside you!

gary4205 on September 29, 2009 at [4:05 AM](#)

Parents shouldn't have to be required to immunize. You may think its irresponsible...others may disagree...as soon as we have government forcing needles into childrens arms, we are slaves.
Is it a smart thing to immunize?...make your case...don't force it.

Conservative Voice on September 28, 2009 at 10:13 PM

Not immunizing your children is very irresponsible and dangerous. The whole point of immunization is something called 'herd immunity'. Vaccines do not work 100% for 100% immunized, but if you immunize a large enough portion of the populace, diseases do not have enough able hosts to take a hold and become pandemic. Take a look at places where the anti-vaxers become a significant chunk of the population, diseases all but eradicated for decades are suddenly taking hold. Whooping cough, for one example, is making resurgences in California and Britain around cities and towns where 30%+ of parents won't vaccinate their children due to fear from junk science (i.e. the bogus autism link study). Children are dying because their parents are being Luddites. Whooping cough is a horrible disease that is preventable with immunizations.

Sure its a sticky situation, but to me it is more of a moral imperative to vaccinate against these diseases. This is because if parent X doesn't vaccinate their child, that child can become a carrier of deadly diseases, and can then pass that onto others, some of them being the vaccinated in whom the vaccination doesn't work. How would you like your child to die because some ill-informed parent didn't vaccinate?

kerncon on September 29, 2009 at [5:34 AM](#)

The premise of RomneyCare is a good one. He tried to use the state government who, unlike the Feds, is empowered to implement a program. His approach was to increase competition at the level of individuals rather than businesses. This is the right direction. The problem for MA, is that the liberal state Congress he had to work with did nothing about torts and required hugely excessive restrictions on the types of policies that qualify.

MJBrutus on September 29, 2009 at [6:19 AM](#)

Allahpundit said:

He can spin that in numerous ways to distinguish it from ObamaCare, e.g., it was an amazing victory for small government to keep the public option out of a bill passed in the People's Republic of Massachusetts, it was passed in the fine tradition of state experimentation and would never be imposed nationwide by a good federalist like Romney, etc etc

Spin? And it's no problemo to you, AP?

Spins = Lies. [Note: The most evil, dangerous lie is the one that seemingly resembles the truth.]

No wonder why the Republican Party has been in deep sh*t.

TheAlamos on September 29, 2009 at [8:02 AM](#)

The premise of RomneyCare is a good one. He tried to use the state government who, unlike the Feds, is empowered to implement a program. His approach was to increase competition at the level of individuals rather than businesses. This is the right direction. ...

MJBrutus on September 29, 2009 at 6:19 AM

Ask the MA residents and learn more about the real issue on Romneycare.

Competition is the least of their current burdens and budgeting problems wrt RomneyCare.

Note that all Liberal policies are also supposed to be based on good intentions.

Next time, use the proven Test device for a good policy:

THE BEST POLICY DESIGN IS THE ONE THAT ADHERES TO LEAST GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION, IF NOT NONE WHATSOEVER.

RomneyCare is an epic fail.

TheAlamos on September 29, 2009 at [8:09 AM](#)

Another reason among many not to support Romney.

Huckabee has his own long list of reasons.

I've said it before and I'll say it again.

I'm done with faux conservatives. McCain was my last. Call me what you will. Compare me to a Kos Kid. I don't care. The faux conservatives are ruining America just like the Democrats. They just do it slower.

[Chris of Rights](#) on September 29, 2009 at [8:42 AM](#)

Dude,

She could announce she is going to Hell tomorrow and I'd be at the rallying point at 5:00am in my asbestos suit and ready to rumble like Keanu Reeves in "Constantine".

She's the crusader.

Sapwolf on September 28, 2009

Could you bring an extra asbestos suit; 46 regular?
I lent my to Ted Kennedy as a joke. I think it got buried with him.

SKYFOX on September 29, 2009 at [8:56 AM](#)

I lent my = I lent mine
Dammit!

SKYFOX on September 29, 2009 at [8:56 AM](#)

Are you kidding?

Romney did us a huge favor. He came up with a plan that showed it would work then handed it over to the Demcorats to run and IT FAILED.

Invaluable contribution to the fight against Socialized Medicine in any form.

Elizabetty on September 29, 2009 at [9:17 AM](#)

Whooping cough, for one example, is making resurgences in California and Britain around cities and towns where 30%+ of parents won't vaccinate their children due to fear from junk science (i.e. the bogus autism link study). Children are dying because their parents are being Luddites. Whooping cough is a horrible disease that is preventable with immunizations.

kerncon on September 29, 2009 at 5:34 AM

Interesting. Check out [this article](#) from the San Francisco Chronicle on whooping cough in California.

It seems most of the increase is probably due to improved reporting and improved diagnostic tools.

I'll quote the article

“Studies have yet to show any obvious reason for the increases. No significant outbreaks have been traced to the children of parents who oppose childhood vaccination. “We’ve looked, and we can’t see any obvious connection,” Woodfill said.

That's Celia Woodfill of California Health Services.

Thanks Kerncon for a perfect example of why NOT to trust government with coercive powers. It will only allow self-righteous zealots to force their will on the people regardless of the facts. You may believe what you wrote but it's obviously just your opinion and in your arrogance you're perfectly willing to shove it down our throats.

No thanks.

Free people have to be free to make their own decisions. Even if they are mistakes.

rcl on September 29, 2009 at [10:04 AM](#)

Comment pages: [« 1 2 \[3\]](#)

You must be [logged in](#) to post a comment.



Acai Berry Side Effects?

In Our Shocking Special Report We Investigate Acai Berry

[See the results...](#)



Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule

I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)



BREAKING: Mom Loses 52 lbs With 1 Rule!

I Cut Down 52 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)



Acai Berry Side Effects?

In Our Shocking Special Report We Investigate Acai Berry

[See the results...](#)



Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule

I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)



BREAKING: Mom Loses 52 lbs With 1 Rule!

I Cut Down 52 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)

GreenRoom

- [Outrage: Honor student beaten to death in Chicago](#)
- [Obama: Giving cookies to war criminals?](#)
- ["President of the World" or "Past Traditions..."](#)
- [Baucus' Plan or Why Not Copying Zimbabwe's Health Care System?](#)
- [Intelligence Lost](#)
- [ObamaCare astroturfers deliver bad news for Democrats](#)
- [Obamunism Infects the Washington Times](#)
- [If President Obama's health care town halls were put to music...](#)
- ["Acorn. Here to help!"](#)
- [Obama Ain't No FDR - He's Chirac](#)

Hot Links

- Right Channels
 - [Ace of Spades HQ](#)
 - [Andrew Marcus](#)
 - [BigGovernment.com](#)
 - [Doug Powers](#)
 - [Doug Ross @ Journal](#)
 - [Evan Coyne Maloney](#)
 - [Gateway Pundit](#)
 - [La Shawn Barber's Corner](#)
 - [Le-gal In-sur-rec-tion](#)
 - [Newsbusters](#)
 - [NRA News](#)
 - [Political Pit Bull](#)

- [Pundit & Pundette](#)
- [Real Clear Politics](#)
- [Slublog](#)
- [The Other McCain](#)
- [The Sundries Shack](#)
- Left Channels
 - [BloggingHeads TV](#)
 - [Evil Google Current](#)
 - [Little Green Footballs](#)
- War on Terror
 - [Blogging the Qur'an](#)
 - [Counterterrorism Blog](#)
 - [Jihad Watch](#)
 - [Masih TV](#)
 - [MEMRI TV](#)
 - [Michael Yon](#)
 - [NEFA Foundation](#)
 - [Zombie](#)
- Cartoons/Satire
 - [Day by Day](#)
 - [Doug TenNapel](#)
 - [Mallard Fillmore](#)
- Audio podcasters
 - [Ashbrook podcasts](#)
 - [Blogtalkradio](#)
 - [Instapundit](#)
 - [John Derbyshire](#)
 - [Power Line](#)
 - [Scrappleface](#)
 - [Shire Network News](#)
- Entertainment
 - [Happy Slip](#)
- Industry/Internet TV
 - [Ed Driscoll](#)
 - [Jim Treacher](#)
 - [Johnny Dollar](#)
 - [Olbermann Watch](#)
 - [Roger L. Simon](#)
- Hangouts
 - [Conservative Grapevine](#)
 - [Drudge Report](#)
 - [Lucianne](#)
 - [Memeorandum](#)
- Talkers
 - [KFI - Los Angeles](#)
 - [KVI - Seattle](#)
 - [Lars Larson](#)
 - [Laura Ingraham](#)
 - [Mark Levin](#)
 - [Michael Graham](#)
 - [Michael Smerconish](#)
 - [Mike Gallagher](#)
 - [Radio Vice Online](#)
 - [Rush Limbaugh](#)
 - [Sean Hannity](#)
 - [Tammy Bruce](#)
- Hot Air Affiliates
 - [¡No Pasarán!](#)
 - [Brian Maloney](#)
 - [David Lunde](#)
 - [Investigative Project](#)
 - [Jawa Report](#)
 - [Shire Network News](#)
 - [Suitably Flip](#)



Acai Berry Side Effects?

In Our Shocking Special Report We Investigate Acai Berry

[See the results...](#)



Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule

I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)



BREAKING: Mom Loses 52 lbs With 1 Rule!

I Cut Down 52 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule

[Get details...](#)

Feeds

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-



© 2006-2009 Hot Air Network, LLC | Designed by [The Blog Studio](#) | [Terms of Use](#) 