

# Even the Liberals Are Jumping Ship

The force of the anti-Obama, anti-Congress uprising, evidenced by huge crowds at town hall meetings across the country, shocked elected officials, as the August recess put them in direct contact with constituents outraged by the economic and health-care policies of the Obama Administration. The upsurge also forced a number of pro-Obama liberal media pundits to examine their political axioms, in the face of the images of huge and raucous town meetings that broke into the Aug. 9 Sunday network TV talk shows, and they were compelled to acknowledge the legitimacy and rationality of the popular outrage.

Here are some of the more notable examples:

- *New York Times* columnist Frank Rich, a liberal media icon, in an op-ed titled, “Is Obama Punking Us?” wrote, “Mitch McConnell and John Boehner keep trying to scare voters by calling Obama a socialist. They’ve got it backwards. The larger fear is that Obama may be just another corporatist, punking voters much as

the Republicans do when they claim to be all for the common guy.”

- In a *Washington Post* headlined, “Anxiety Attack,” Kathleen Parker wrote that she had received a number of calls from liberal Democratic friends, who are unemployed and panicked. One is quoted, yelling at Obama, “Guess what, dude, I’m not ready for any more ‘change’ right now!” Writes Parker, “I’m not sure these protests are insignificant.” She cites a participant in one large Florida town meeting, saying about those who are showing up, “Basically, it’s a total disconnect from government, and government cannot influence their decisions unless they give them money; yet every giveaway reinforces their lack of faith.”

- “The Sunday Take” political column in the *Washington Post* mused that Obama is in trouble this August, and quotes one perceptive pollster: “We’re not having a fight over healthcare. There is a broad and underlying unease about the state of the economy and the country.”

There are also outright meltdowns from liberals who have yet to get the message:

- Lisa Robinson of the über-liberal Center for American Progress fears an “imminent fascist takeover” of the the United States by the mobs forming up at the town meetings.

- A *New York Times* op-ed by Sheryl Gay Stolberg, “Where Have You Gone, Joe the Citizen?” wails about the banishing of the Norman Rockwell-style “traditional town meeting,” by unruly mobs, etc.

## Obama’s Deal with ‘Big Pharma’

- William Greider, writing in the liberal political weekly *The Nation* Aug. 10, trashes President Obama’s concessions to the drug manufacturers: “People who believe in real health-care reform should not be nice about this. They must rise up and rebel against our popular new President’s outrageous concession.”

Greider calls this, Obama’s “Rancid Deal with Big PhARMA,” and opens saying, “So now we know why the President wants everyone to make nice in the health-care debate. His White House has cut a deal with Big Pharma that smells like the same old rotten politics that candidate Obama regularly denounced and promised to end. . . . The deal does not smell any better now that a Democratic president is embracing it. . . .

“Since PhARMA’s purchased Congressman Billy Tauzin (former R-LA) admitted to the deal in the Aug. 5 *New York Times*, the outrage among the Left (as op-

posed to the radicals) has been spreading. *Huffington Post* now sports a page, Healthcare Flashbacks, with no less than six video clips of candidate Obama condemning politicians’ bowing to drug companies, and that “This is the Change we have to make.”

## Writer Hits Obama Euthanasia

- Author and critic Lee Siegel, noted as an eloquent liberal spokesman, penned an attack on the Obama health-care plan Aug. 11, in the blog, *The Daily Beast*. Titled, “Obama’s Euthanasia Mistake,” Siegel writes: “Make no mistake about it, determining which treatments are cost effective at the end of a person’s life and which are not is one of Obama’s priorities. It’s one of the principal ways he counts on saving money and making universal healthcare affordable.”

He quotes Obama fudging and evading an answer to an interviewer’s direct question on whether a government board would enforce life-or-death decisions about “end-of-life care.”

Siegel shows that it is precisely the poor and vulnerable—the very people who are supposed to be served by the Obama “reform”—who would be the mortal victims of withdrawal of care. They “would be the only people forbidden access to expensive life-extending technology. The rich will always be able to afford it. . . . Such technology is a drain on the system? Then save money elsewhere.”

Although Siegel claims that attacks on the “living will” section of the plan are inaccurate, he admits that they are “uncomfortably close” to the truth. “An elderly or sick person would be especially vulnerable to the sophisticated ‘nudging’ of an authority figure like a doctor.

“Bad enough for such people who are lucky enough to be supported by family and friends. But what about the dying person who is all alone in the world and who has only the consultant to turn to and rely on? The heartlessness of such a scene is chilling.”

Siegel ends with a warning that the President must come clean with the people: “Let him . . . leave the sterile precincts of utilitarian social and legal theory behind. He should immediately and publicly declare his commitment to not placing economic hurdles in the way of people who want to prolong their life, or the life of their loved ones. In that way, . . . he would calm the fears of people who, far from being right-wing fanatics, are in clear-eyed possession of perhaps the only universal truth there is. No one wants to die.”