



Dan
Calabrese

The Associated Press, which practiced so-called “accountability journalism” until George W. Bush left office, now does little more than parrot the line of Democrats in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

[Today's missive on ObamaCare by Richard Alonso-Zaldivar](#) is one of the most egregious examples yet. The bold passages are my doing:



All propaganda.

There's no clear course for Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., to steer legislation through Congress to President Barack Obama. You can't **make history** unless you reach 60 votes, and don't count on Republicans helping him.

But Reid is determined to avoid being remembered as another Democrat who tried and failed to **make health care access for the middle class a part of America's social safety net**.

“Generation after generation has called on us to fix this broken system,” he said at a recent Capitol Hill rally. “We're now closer than ever to getting it done.”

His bill includes **\$848 billion** over 10 years to gradually expand coverage to most of those now uninsured. It would ban **onerous insurance industry practices** such as denying coverage or charging higher premiums because of someone's poor health.

Most people covered by big employers would **gain more protections** without major changes. One exception would be those with high-cost insurance plans, whose premiums could rise as a result of a tax on insurers issue the coverage.

Good grief. Let's take them one-by-one:

1. The AP has constantly described ObamaCare as “historic” in its headlines and leads, clearly signaling the belief of its writers and editors that socialized medicine represents some sort of manifest destiny for the nation.
2. Social safety net, eh? Access for all, eh? Never mind the current proposals still leave more than 20 million uninsured. And in journalism, word choices are important. Why use the term “safety net” as opposed to, say, entitlement? Because the latter term brings to mind out-of-control costs, while the former just makes you think of happily swinging in a hammock enjoying life.
3. What is \$848 billion? That's the number Reid claims the plan will cost over 10 years. It is a fraudulent number insofar as it leaves out any number of other costs, including a necessary increase in reimbursement for Medicare doctors, which will cost at least \$200 billion. Many organizations have done their own studies and concluded the costs will be much, much higher. The Cato Institute has pegged the cost at \$6 trillion! But the AP simply reports Reid's figure as unassailable gospel. Accountability journalism!
4. Who says denying coverage to the sick is an “onerous practice”? Insurance companies have to weigh risk against cost. If everyone can get coverage regardless of their health, then everyone's costs will go up. Refusing to simply grant everyone coverage on the same level, regardless of health, is a sensible business decision. Make such decisions illegal, you may do many things, but one thing you will certainly not do is control costs, which is what Obama and Reid claim will happen, and what the

AP simply accepts unquestioningly.

5. By the time the AP gets to telling us about all the additional protections we'll gain, it's basically just writing a marketing brochure for ObamaCare.

The AP doesn't think there's any controversy about the awesomeness of ObamaCare. That question is long-since settled in their mind. The only news story, as they see it, is the battle to get it passed, and that's why they're so upset that there's no guarantee of 60 votes.

Poor Democrats! It's hard to make history, even with the AP cheering you on every step of the way.

[Become Dan's friend on Facebook.](#)

[Become a fan of The North Star National on Facebook.](#)

To book Dan as a speaker, [contact Lourdes Swarts](#) at Speakers Access.

3 tweets	2 shares	Digg	If you enjoyed this post, please consider leaving a comment or subscribing to the RSS feed to have future articles delivered to your feed reader.
retweet	Share	submit	Posted in Dan Calabrese

One Response to "Heartbroken AP mourns ObamaCare's possible defeat"

- 
Craig Kinnear:
[29 November 2009 at 4:28 pm](#)

Let's take Dan's points one at a time:

1. The use of "historic" to describe the Health care bill. We can all site different numbers, but the CBO's numbers show that the bill would result in a 90% or so coverage rate. That would put the bill on a par with the original Medicare legislation, which I would argue, WAS historic.
2. The difference between "social safety net" and "entitlement" is simply semantics. It isn't a true "entitlement since only the lowest income people will be receiving a 100% subsidy for health insurance and since the "public option" is just that..an option.
3. Actually, \$848 billion (Over ten years) is the non-partisan CBO's number. To claim AP bias because they use the number is like claiming liberal media bias when they report on deaths during the Iraq war.
4. A primary reason that health insurance is so expensive is that young, healthy people do not buy it so they're not in the risk pool. That's why there is a mandate for coverage. If the risk pool is evenly distributed among older, less healthy people and young healthy people, rates would be lower, all other considerations being equal. People without insurance go to hospital emergency rooms when they're sick or injured which adds to the cost of our hospital bills and insurance rates as well. Requiring insurance companies to cover everyone regardless of health status would save us all money.
5. I'm not sure I even know what this point is.

Leave a Reply

Name (required)

Mail (will not be published) (required)

Website