
Now, It's Official!

Baucus, Newsweek Back Hitler Health 'Reform'

by Nancy Spannaus

Sept. 18—It's been eight months a-coming, but Sen. Max Baucus's (D-Mont.) weekly meetings with White House staff, and a bipartisan group of Senators on his Finance Committee, finally produced a "health care reform" bill on Sept. 16. And what have all these months of maneuvering produced? Precisely the same Hitler-modelled cost-cutting bill that *EIR* and the LaRouche PAC accused the Administration of promoting many months ago!

And, to add to the problems of the Administration, which is desperately trying to deny the genocidal reality of its favored health bill, one of its biggest promoters, the *Washington Post*-owned *Newsweek* magazine, has just produced a feature issue emblazoned with the bold cover headline, "The Case for Killing Granny."

No wonder that leading Democrats, from Sen. Jay Rockefeller (W.V.), to Sen. Ron Wyden (Ore.), to AFL-CIO President John Sweeney are already denouncing the Baucus bill; nor does it have a single Republican

supporter. While the President and his foot-soldiers are gearing up for a frenetic campaign to pass their “reform,” so far, it would appear that the Congress has gotten the message from their constituents, and it’s DOA.

Baucus’s Bill

Baucus’s bill, in its current form, has what Obama has personally demanded, again and again—a national health board, or “Medicare Commission,” to cut and deny treatments, tests, procedures, imaging, etc., and thus cost lives, in order to cut Medicare/Medicaid spending after the multi-trillion-dollar bailout of Wall Street. Congress would only be able to react by making equivalent or deeper cuts each year starting in 2013—or the Medicare Commission’s cuts would take effect.

Otherwise, the bill still has the myriad of other means of cutting insured medical care, which were spelled out in Baucus’s Sept. 9 draft. These include prohibiting payments for treatment of what it calls “preventable conditions”; eliminating the State Children’s Insurance Program (SCHIP) in 2013; cutting Medicare reimbursement schedules by 0.5% each year, beginning 2013; penalizing doctors, hospitals, and other health-care institutions by 5-10% of payments, for “excessive care” and “preventable admissions”; and the like.

Equally enraging to the public is the fact that the Baucus plan’s provisions would put trillions more into the coffers of the insurance companies, while costing more than millions of Americans can afford to pay, and taxing union-won health plans. This is no surprise, of course, because the bill was basically written by insurance company employees, as from UnitedHealth Group, who were hired by Baucus and others to share their “expertise” in writing a bill for their own murderous benefit.

Letting It All Hang Out

The *Newsweek* feature, to appear in the issue dated Sept. 21, follows the same train of thought, and throws it in your face. It attacks the very idea of using medical

science to extend life. “Until Americans learn to contemplate death as more than a scientific challenge to be overcome,” the lead article argues, “our health-care system will remain unfixable.”

“The idea that we might ration health care to seniors (or anyone else) is political anathema,” writes *Newsweek* editor-at-large Evan Thomas. “Politicians do not dare breathe the R word, lest they be accused—however wrongly—of trying to pull the plug on Grandma. *But the need to spend less money on the elderly at the end of life is the elephant in the room in the health-reform debate.* Everyone sees it but no one wants to talk about it” (emphasis added).

Thomas then proceeds to talk about it—and promote it—at great length, contending that there is no way we can get control of costs unless we find a way “to stop overtreating patients.” He launches into a long defense of the Dartmouth Atlas lies about “overuse” of medical care, and even gets around to discussing setting up a British-

model NICE-type panel to decide what—i.e., who—gets cut from medical treatment. (NICE is the Orwellian-named British National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence.) Arguing that our present system is unsustainable, Thomas writes that, eventually, economic reality may force the United States to adopt a system like Britain or Canada.

While claiming that talk of “death panels” is demagoguery, Thomas notes that end-of-life counselling does hasten death. “A study by the *Archives of Internal Medicine* shows that such conversations between doctors and patients can decrease costs by about 35 percent—while improving quality of life at the end.”

“Our medical system does everything it can to encourage hope,” Thomas complains. “And American health care has been near miraculous—the envy of the world—in its capacity to develop new lifesaving and life-enhancing treatments. But death can be delayed only so long....”

Thomas is right. But the first death is likely to be that of the Obama-Hitler health plan itself.



Carolyn Bunce

Sen. Max Baucus’s long-awaited “health care reform” bill is, as expected, modelled on the Hitler-style program of cutting those lives “not worthy of live” out of medical care. It’s already been judged, “Dead on Arrival.”