

The Obama Timeline – Part II

The Doomed Presidency

November 2013

On November 1 a temporary increase to the food stamp program expires. According to USA Today.com, “a family of four that gets \$668 per month in benefits will find that amount cut by \$36.” (Some might argue that a family of four should be able to buy an adequate amount of groceries for \$632 per month—especially when many recipients of such aid *also* receive housing subsidies from the government, free medical care via Medicaid, and various other taxpayer-funded benefits. The truth is that a fair number of American families who do *not* receive welfare benefits spend less than \$600 per month on groceries. Nevertheless, Obama, his fellow Democrats, and the mainstream media will demand that Congressional Republicans vote to restore the temporary benefit increase. On October 31 CNN’s Jake Tapper noted that Obama borrowed money from the food stamp program to pay for a portion of Michelle Obama’s anti-obesity campaign.) [50611, 50613]

A shooting at Los Angeles International Airport leaves a Transportation Security Agent dead and three others injured. The shooter, a “young, white male,” 23-year-old Paul Anthony Ciancia, is reportedly shot in the mouth by police and taken to a hospital. (More than a few conspiracy theorists will note that his last name spells, “CIA N CIA.”) [50551, 50552, 50558, 50594, 50616, 50617]

After the shooting incident, Los Angeles police chief Patrick Gannon tells reporters, “We practiced to this [sic] not more than three weeks ago. We took every one of our officers, our patrol officers, and a couple of hundred officers from the Los Angeles Police Department and we practiced the exact scenario that played out today, we played out today. And I, and I was talking to the officers involved in this particular incident a few minutes ago, and they said that that training was critical to how they responded to this, so they’re well-trained officers.” (Gannon’s statement that they “practiced the exact same scenario” will be noted by conspiracy theorists, who will charge that the incident was staged in order to help justify gun control legislation.) [50601, 50958]

Adding fuel to any conspiracy fire is a report from Breitbart.com: “Just a few months before the shootings at LAX on Friday, LAX administration removed armed police from their stations at TSA checkpoints, according to the *Los Angeles Times*. After 9/11, LAPD officers and airport police were armed and placed at checkpoints; months ago, they were moved to ‘roving patrols.’ According to airport police officer and president of the Los Angeles Airport Peace Officers Association Marshall McClain, staffing concerns led to the change. McClain said officers would respond within one or two minutes to crises, and added that while armed officers were in Terminal 3 during the shooting incident, they were not at checkpoints. ‘Our officers performed valiantly,’ McClain stated, adding that the shooter carried an AR-15 in a bag through the ticketing area before pulling it out to

muscle his way through security checkpoints.” (Some might wonder why the police would reduce its presence at the airport and then practice responding to a scenario which might be made worse by that reduced presence.) [50603]

White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters that Obama has been “briefed” on the airport shooting. (Obama was purportedly not briefed on the NSA spying on world leaders, the fact that Healthcare.gov was nowhere near ready for implementation, the security problems in Benghazi, Operation Fast and Furious, the IRS treatment of conservative groups, the Department of Justice’s seizing of Associated Press telephone records, the spying on Fox News reporter James Rosen, that his shovel-ready jobs were not shovel ready, that his \$787-billion “stimulus” bill would not stimulate the economy, that Americans were not clamoring for electric cars, and a multitude of other issues, but he *is* told about a shooting—no doubt because it gives him an opportunity to push for gun control. Obama, of course, was also famously unaware that his pastor, Jeremiah Wright, was delivering inflammatory sermons, that his pals William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn were bomb-making domestic terrorists, or that the biography distributed by his literary agent listed his birthplace as Kenya.) [50588]

In the White House, Obama meets for almost two hours with Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, after which Obama states, “Unfortunately al-Qaeda has still been active and has grown more active recently. We had a lot of discussion about how we can work together to push back against that terrorist organization that operates not only in Iraq, but also poses a threat to the entire region and to the United States.” According to Politico, “Maliki was in Washington this week to ask for more weapons and intelligence assistance from the Obama administration, following a recent escalation of violence. September and October were the deadliest months in Iraq in five years, with 979 deaths in each month, according to the United Nations. The UN estimates that 7,000 civilians have been killed in Iraq since the start of the year.” [50602]

The Obama Timeline tries again to obtain premium information from Healthcare.gov and receives the message, “Important: Your account couldn’t be created at this time. Call the Marketplace Call Center at 1-800-318-2596. TTY users should call 1-855-889-4325.”

At CNBC.com Lawrence Kudlow writes, “May I ask this question? Why is it that Americans don’t have the freedom to choose their own health insurance? I just don’t get it. Why must the liberal nanny state make decisions for us? We can make them ourselves, thank you very much. It’s like choosing a car, buying a home or investing in a stock. We can handle it. So why must the government tell me and everyone else what we can and cannot buy? ...Here’s what else I don’t want: As a 60-something, relatively healthy person, I don’t want lactation and maternity services, abortion services, speech therapy, mammograms, fertility treatments or Viagra. I don’t want it. So why should I have to tear up my existing health-care plan, and then buy a plan with far more expensive premiums and deductibles, and with services I don’t need or want? Why? Because Team Obama says I have to. And that’s not much of a reason. It’s not freedom. ...And I just love it when they tell me that so many of these existing plans are substandard ‘bad apples.’ Do [Obama] and his people not know that insurance at the state level is one of the most

regulated areas of the economy? [Yet] They're blaming insurance companies, not their own new regulations. The stupidity of that is hilarious. Do they really think salesmen are out selling these policies off the back of trucks? No, this is federal coercion at its worst. And that's why the public is turning against it. It's not freedom. ...All this is the inevitable result of massive central-planning exercises to control the economy. That's not freedom. No amount of rescue legislation is going to change this. It's the elections of 2014 and 2016 that will allow citizens to reject this Soviet-style planning. But I'll reference my conservative colleagues in the media once again: Obamacare represents the greatest-ever expansion of the liberal entitlement-state dream. And you know what? That dream is crumbling and dissolving before our very eyes. And that is freedom." [50597]

MyWay.com reports, "Germany's top security official said Friday he will try and find a way for Edward Snowden to speak to German officials if the former National Security Agency contractor is willing to provide details about the NSA's activities including the alleged surveillance of Chancellor Angela Merkel's cell phone." [50563]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Editors of The Associated Press condemned the White House's refusal to give photojournalists real access to ...Obama, who prefers to circulate press release-style pictures taken by his own paid photographers. These official photographs are little more than propaganda, according to AP director of photography Santiago Lyon. The AP has only been permitted to photograph [Obama] alone in the Oval Office on two occasions—both in his first term—and has never been allowed to photograph [Obama] with his staff in the office. The AP generally receives access when foreign leaders are visiting, but at other times the White House relies on its own photographers to take pictures and distribute them to the press. Previous administrations were less strict about photos, undermining Obama's frequent claim that he strives to run 'the most transparent administration' in history." [50564]

TimesOfIsrael.com reports, "Israel is fuming with the White House for confirming that it was the Israeli Air Force that struck a military base near the Syrian port city of Latakia on Wednesday, hitting weaponry that was set to be transferred to Hezbollah. Israel has not acknowledged carrying out the strike, one of half a dozen such attacks widely ascribed to Israel in recent months, but an Obama administration official told CNN on Thursday that Israeli warplanes had indeed attacked the Syrian base, and that the target was 'missiles and related equipment' set for delivery to Hezbollah in Lebanon. Israel's Channel 10 TV on Friday night quoted Israeli officials branding the American leak as 'scandalous.' For Israel's ally to be acting in this way was 'unthinkable,' the officials were quoted as saying. A second TV report, on Israel's Channel 2, said the leak 'came directly from the White House,' and noted that 'this is not the first time' that the administration has compromised Israel by leaking information on such Israeli Air Force raids on Syrian targets. It said some previous leaks were believed to have come from the Pentagon, and that consideration had been given at one point to establishing a panel to investigate the sources. Channel 2's military analyst, Roni Daniel, said the Obama administration's behavior in leaking the information was unfathomable. Daniel noted that by keeping silent on whether it carried out such attacks, Israel was maintaining plausible deniability, so that Syria's President Bashar Assad did not feel pressured to respond to the attacks.

But the US leaks ‘are pushing Assad closer to the point where he can’t swallow these attacks, and will respond.’ This in turn would inevitably draw further Israeli action, Daniel posited, and added bitterly: ‘Then perhaps the US will clap its hands because it will have started a very major flare-up.’” [50569]

Lost in the headlines about Healthcare.gov glitches and the high cost of ObamaCare policies is the fact that American businesses will face, starting in 2014, an “Annual Fee on Health Insurers,” and a “Transitional Reinsurance Program Contribution Fee.” Many businesses—particularly smaller businesses—have *no idea* they will soon be hit with these expenses. One business owner tells *The Obama Timeline* that his company will be hit with an annual fee of \$30,825—in addition to the \$900,000 or so he now pays for health insurance for his employees. He asks, “How many employers, in my situation, will simply cough up \$30,825.00? How may will raise the price of the widget they manufacture? How many will fire an employee worth \$30,825.00? How many employers will simply drop coverage and pay the employer mandate fine delayed for 2014 but which will rear its very ugly head less than a year from now? How many will or have raised employee shares of premiums to mitigate these new fees? ...As an employer providing quite good coverage, and having done so since 1980, I wish I had a dollar for each time I yelled ‘liar’ or ‘that’s not true’ since the ObamaCare debates were gaining traction years ago. Had the absolute truth been told to the American people, we would NOT be in the situation we are in. But then my expectation is unreasonable, to expect the TRUTH from a politician.” (For a business with 51-150 employees, the annual ObamaCare fee added by Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois is 3.25 percent of the premium. Small businesses will be stuck with the fee, but organized labor has been pushing the Obama administration to exempt union plans.)

The business owner also notes that the group policy covering his employees will be up for renewal in mid-2014. At that point, he expects the premiums to increase dramatically—and the 3.25 percent ObamaCare fee will, of course, then be applied to that higher rate. He is also concerned about 2015, when the delayed employer mandate kicks in. If any of his competitors cancel their group employee insurance, they will have a distinct price advantage. That may force him to drop coverage for his own employees (to let them fend for themselves at Healthcare.gov), because his competitors will be able to undercut his prices in an effort to force him out of business. He concludes, “Only a few will admit that ObamaCare is destined to fail but designed to lead to total control of healthcare by government. Ask the folks what ‘single-payer’ really means [communism]. I weep for the future.” (ObamaCare is, of course, designed to fail. It will drive smaller insurance companies out of business with escalating costs, while forcing the few remaining large companies to raise their premiums to almost unfathomable levels to stay in business. The government’s “solution” will then be to nationalize the entire industry and impose a “single payer” system run entirely by the government. And with ObamaCare, Obama has seen to it that the only alternative to single-payer will be to bail out the insurance companies that lose billions because of his legislation. Obama is betting that the voters will prefer socialism to another bail out. Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky (D-IL) has admitted as such on several occasions. Her husband, Robert Creamer, penned a book—while in prison for 16 counts of bank fraud and defrauding charitable

organizations—that outlines how Democrats can implement national health care. Creamer’s *Stand Up Straight! How Progressives Can Win* is essentially the outline of ObamaCare, and was endorsed by Obama political guru David Axelrod and Greg Galluzzo—of the leftist community group the Gamaliel Foundation, where Obama got his start as a paid political activist.) [50883, 50884, 50901, 51623, 51942, 51944]

DiscoverTheNetworks.org has noted, “*Stand Up Straight!* advanced the notion that the Democratic Party could win a permanent majority in Congress by doing the following: passing a national health care bill, thereby turning more people into wards of an ever-expanding government, and of the party that works to grow government; and giving amnesty to all illegal immigrants, thereby creating, virtually overnight, a large new constituency of Democratic voters. ... Creamer’s book advocated a ‘public plan’ that would guarantee every U.S. resident’s [*resident’s*, rather than *citizen’s*] ‘right’ to health care; this plan eventually would serve as a model for the ‘public option’ in subsequent legislative proposals by Congressional Democrats. In addition, Creamer laid out a ‘Progressive Agenda for Structural Change,’ which included a ten-point plan to set the stage for implementing universal health care: ‘We must create a national consensus that health care is a right, not a commodity; and that government must guarantee that right.’ ‘We must create a national consensus that the health care system is in crisis.’ ‘Our messaging program over the next two years should focus heavily on reducing the credibility of the health insurance industry and focusing on the failure of private health insurance.’ ‘We need to systematically forge relationships with large sectors of the business/employer community.’ ‘We need to convince political leaders that they owe their elections, at least in part, to the groundswell of support of [sic] universal health care, and that they face political peril if they fail to deliver on universal health care in 2009.’ ‘We need not agree in advance on the components of a plan, but we must foster a process that can ultimately yield consensus.’ ‘Over the next two years, we must design and organize a massive national field program.’ ‘We must focus especially on the mobilization of the labor movement and the faith community.’ ‘We must systematically leverage the connections and resources of a massive array of institutions and organizations of all types.’ ‘To be successful, we must put in place commitments for hundreds of millions of dollars to be used to finance paid communications and mobilization once the battle is joined.’ ‘To win,’ added Creamer, ‘we must not just generate understanding, but emotion—fear, revulsion, anger, disgust.’” [50885, 51942, 51944]

Obama issues an Executive Order calling for a government-wide effort to prepare for global warming. WashingtonTimes.com reports, “The action orders federal agencies to work with states to build ‘resilience’ against major storms and other weather extremes. For example, [Obama’s] order directs that infrastructure projects like bridges and flood control take into consideration climate conditions of the future, which might require building structures larger or stronger—and likely at a higher price tag.” Obama’s order establishes a “task force,” headed by seven Democrat governors, to make recommendations. (Apparently unaware of Obama’s “global warming” scare tactics, Antarctic sea ice grew in September to 7.51 million miles—the greatest area ever recorded by satellite technology, according to NASA.) [50583, 50599, 50639, 50961]

The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals strikes down ObamaCare's birth control mandate. Judge Janice Rogers Brown writes in her ruling, "The burden on religious exercise does not occur at the point of contraceptive purchase; instead, it occurs when a company's owners fill the basket of goods and services that constitute a healthcare plan. They can either abide by the sacred tenets of their faith, pay a penalty of over \$14 million, and cripple the companies they have spent a lifetime building, or they become complicit in a grave moral wrong." Newsmax.com notes, "According to the Thomas Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, some 74 lawsuits with over 200 plaintiffs representing hospitals, universities, businesses, and schools have been filed challenging the mandate on grounds of religious liberty. Rulings in the circuit courts have so far been mixed, leading legal analysts to predict the issue will reach the Supreme Court." (It is almost a certainty that the issue will reach the Supreme Court.) [50592, 50593, 50605]

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius travels to Memphis, to push ObamaCare enrollment—which she apparently thinks warrants more attention than fixing Healthcare.gov. At the event, she is presented with a gift from State Senator Brian Kelsey: a copy of the book *Websites for Dummies*. Also at the event, Congressman Steve Cohen (D-TN) complains about the critical questions directed at Sebelius. The annoyed Cohen says, "Change is hard. Get over it. ...[T]he Affordable Care Act is the law." [50584, 50585, 50620, 50621]

CNN.com reports on a "Healthy Ho's Party" organized by a San Francisco area "sex worker" to "encourage other sex workers [prostitutes] to enroll in the new insurance exchanges. ...Nearly 40 men and women attended and almost all of them filed enrollment paperwork." (Prostitutes, of course, work for cash and do not report all—if any—of their income for tax purposes. They can therefore buy insurance via the ObamaCare web site and list a low income in order to receive taxpayer subsidies.) [50590]

At AmericanThinker.com William L. Gensert writes, "With ObamaCare's ascendancy and impending crash, America will be on the cusp of transformational action. The misery the ACA [Affordable Care Act] will bring to almost every American cannot be overestimated in its ability to incite anger—and, anger has consequences and repercussions. The failure of the ACA has the potential to make 2014 a wave election for Republicans. In 2016, we may see a true conservative as president. America put men on the moon. Now, with 3-½ years and a half a billion dollars, we can't even build a website. This is how much Barry and his ilk have degraded the brand. We used to be the shining light on the hill. Now, we are darkness at the end of the tunnel. Barack Obama has been the worst thing that has ever happened to the Oval Office, and in the end, ObamaCare will seal his fate as a [failure]. ...Ronald Reagan gave us 25 years of prosperity and freedom. It's high time we fight to get that back. Before the last election, I told friends that if Barack Obama won reelection, his second term would destroy the Democratic Party and progressivism for a generation. By the end of his reign, Americans are going to be so tired and soured on Obama, his anointed successor will not stand a chance of becoming the nation's next president." [50598]

“...If you think people hate the website, wait until they get a load of ObamaCare itself. If I did not have such a visceral dislike for the man, I would almost feel sorry for him... it’s going to be a long three plus years for Barack Obama. ...It is altogether possible there will be more people uninsured in 2014 than there were uninsured in 2009 when the ACA passed on a purely partisan vote, promising universal coverage. With every cancellation letter received, an angry American will remember Obama telling the nation repeatedly: ‘[I]f you like your insurance plan, you will keep it.’ Republicans, having made a futile stand in attempting to defund ObamaCare, have immunity. Barack owns this baby. They can spend most of the next year in the run-up to the midterm elections picking apart ObamaCare with impunity—control of the Senate is within their grasp. The shutdown of our government, while seemingly detrimental to Republicans in the short run, will be a blessing going forward. The MSM [mainstream media] did conservatives a favor by making sure every American knew that the Republicans shut down the government in an attempt to defund ObamaCare. As the ACA touches the lives of every American and the anger builds, they will remember who tried to stop it. The nail in the coffin of progressivism is ObamaCare. After all, it is a law that penalizes almost everyone, while simultaneously ruining the nation’s healthcare system. So staggering will its failure be, and its failure is inevitable, Hillary Clinton may be forced to run in 2016 as a small-government conservative.” [50598]

At Townhall.com Caroline Glick notes the incredibly unreasonable negotiating demands of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in a position paper, leaked to the media, that PLO negotiator Seab Erekat gave to Israeli Justice Minister Tzipi Livni. “In a nutshell, the paper requires Israel to destroy itself demographically, democratically, militarily, legally and politically and that it relinquish its water supply. Six months after it does all these things, the Palestinians will agree to sign a peace treaty with it. The Palestinian document claims not only all of Judea and Samaria, (except for 1.9 percent of the territory that Israel can keep in exchange for money and more land within sovereign Israel), and eastern, northern and southern Jerusalem. It demands the northern Negev, the Hula Valley, Latrun and the Elah Valley. And it demands them all free of all Jewish presence. They demand that Israel relinquish its rights under international law to Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem by agreeing that they are ‘occupied.’ They demand full control over the airspace over Judea, Samaria, Gaza and Jerusalem, and over the waters off the Gaza coast. They demand an end of air force over flights of those areas. They demand control over all the underground aquifers, and over the electromagnetic spectrum. Moreover, the Palestinians are demanding that Israel allow 5 million foreign-born Arabs the right to freely immigrate to its remaining territory. They refuse to accept Israel’s right to exist and claim they have sovereign rights over all of Israel.” [50606]

Glick correctly observes, “The Palestinian document reveals that there is no chance whatsoever that the current negotiations will lead to peace. PLO chief Mahmoud Abbas and his cronies don’t want peace. They want to destroy Israel.” Glick also correctly observes that “just as Obama has blamed Israel for Palestinian intransigence and radicalism for the past five-and-a-half years, so he will blame Israel for the failure of the current talks. So as unpleasant as it will be to be blamed, the best thing Israel can do is expose Palestinian bad faith to minimize the price it will pay when it is blamed. ...The

thing is, [Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin] Netanyahu must know that Obama will blame Israel no matter what the Palestinians say or do. So perhaps the ‘strategic interests’ [Obama] is threatening are more strategic than simply blaming Israel for scuttling phony peace talks. Maybe Obama is telling Netanyahu that if he fails to keep faith with the fake talks, Obama will tip Iran off to an impending Israeli strike on its nuclear facilities. Here, too, Obama has a track record. According to former national security adviser Giora Eiland, Netanyahu was poised to attack Iran’s nuclear installations in the fall of 2012, but Obama pressured him into standing down. It is hard to believe that Obama’s was a soft sell. ...[T]he argument for exposing the nature of Obama’s threats becomes more compelling by the day. Congress still plays a supervisory role in foreign policy. And the American public supports Israel deeply. There is a strong probability that if the nature of Obama’s threats is revealed, he will be forced to rescind them before Israel becomes the foreign corollary to the Americans whose health insurance Obama canceled.’ [50606, 50624]

MyCancellation.com posts daily updates of health insurance cancellation letters and stories from Americans losing coverage because of ObamaCare. (A September 23, 2013 letter to a Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Carolina customer named Roseanna quotes her a premium of \$593.33 per month for the “new Blue Advantage Bronze 5500” plan—to replace her old plan, that cost her \$101.40 per month.) Twitter suspends the account several times for no apparent reason, and without advance notice. [50608, 50686, 50703, 50769, 50770]

Senator Max Baucus (D-MT), who on October 30 criticized Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) for proposing legislation that would delay ObamaCare’s individual mandate until Healthcare.gov is proven reliable, tells KYAA’s Scott Fredricks, “If it looks like Humpty Dumpty’s not getting put back better together... then maybe we should look at start thinking about delaying the penalties. It’s not right to penalize people for mistakes that the government’s made because the exchanges aren’t working.” (Over just two days Baucus, one of the chief architects of ObamaCare, moves from dismissing the thought of delaying the mandate to considering it. Baucus is retiring and not running for reelection in 2014—largely because he knows he has no chance of winning.) [50628, 50629, 50645, 50648]

The Fox News Channel’s Jim Angle relates that he called the telephone number for assistance with Healthcare.gov, gave his name and address, and was put on hold. “The guy comes back and says, ‘You appear to be in the media.’” Angle, who says he called from an unlisted telephone number, asks, “How did they know? I have no idea but he wouldn’t answer questions.” Angle is told “an advanced resolution specialist” would call him back in a few days. Examiner.com reports, “Newsbusters’ Tom Blumer said that based on the way Angle told his story, the only way the call center operator could have determined he was a likely media member was by ‘cross-checking his given address against an existing list or directory of media members’ home addresses. If that’s the case, wow. Talk about paranoia.” [50615]

On November 2 ObamaCare sticker shock stories continue, with the Associated Press reporting, “Dean Griffin liked the health insurance he purchased for himself and his wife three years ago and thought he’d be able to keep the plan even after the federal Affordable Care Act took effect. But the 64-year-old recently received a letter notifying him the plan was being canceled because it didn’t cover certain benefits required under the law. The Griffins, who live near Philadelphia, pay \$770 monthly for their soon-to-be-terminated health care plan with a \$2,500 deductible. The cheapest plan they found on their state insurance exchange was a so-called bronze plan charging a \$1,275 monthly premium with deductibles totaling \$12,700. It covers only providers in Pennsylvania, so the couple, who live near Delaware, won’t be able to see doctors they’ve used for more than a decade.” Griffin observes, “We’re buying insurance that we will never use and can’t possibly ever benefit from. We’re basically passing on a benefit to other people who are not otherwise able to buy basic insurance.” “Because of the higher cost,” notes the AP, “the Griffins are considering paying the federal penalty—about \$100 [actually, \$95] or 1 percent of income next year—rather than buying health insurance. They say they are healthy and don’t typically run up large health care costs. Dean Griffin said that will be cheaper because it’s unlikely they will get past the nearly \$13,000 deductible for the [ObamaCare] coverage to kick in.” [50612, 50677, 50740]

Healthcare.gov is shut down for overnight maintenance for about 12 hours on November 2-3. Site spokeswoman Joanne Peters states, “The HealthCare.gov tech team is performing extended maintenance this weekend to improve network infrastructure and make enhancements to the online application and enrollment tools.” [50614, 50625]

Kathleen Murphy, a Democrat running for the House of Delegates in Virginia, advocates forcing doctors to accept Medicaid and Medicare patients. (Because of the abysmally low reimbursement rates for treating Medicaid and Medicare patients, many doctors refuse to accept them. Murphy’s “solution” to the problem is to force those doctors to lose money for providing their services. Few should be surprised if Democrats in the House and the Senate eventually make the same recommendation, as ObamaCare causes increasing numbers of physicians to limit their patients or retire.) [50644]

A North Carolina resident, Justin Hadley, informs the Heritage Foundation of a security breach in the ObamaCare web site. After his Blue Cross Blue Shield policy was canceled, Hadley accessed Healthcare.gov and was able to register. The site then provided him with downloadable letters intended for people he did not know—two residents of another state. One of the two, Thomas Dougall, had accessed the web site but had decided not to purchase insurance. Not only was Dougall not aware his personal information was being displayed to others, he had never received the ObamaCare letter. Heritage.org reports, “After learning of the privacy breach, Dougall spent Friday evening trying to contact representatives from HealthCare.gov to no avail; he spent an hour waiting on the telephone and an online chat session was unhelpful. He also wrote to Senators Lindsey Graham (R-SC) and Tim Scott (R-SC), along with Representative Joe Wilson (R-SC). ‘I want my personal information off of that website,’ Dougall said. ...Heritage cybersecurity expert Steven Bucci, director of the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, said users of HealthCare.gov are leaving their personal

information unsecured. ‘Once it goes out over the system, it is vulnerable,’ Bucci said. ‘There appears to have been a singular lack of concern for security. The site needs to receive and transmit sensitive personal information, yet it has less than state of the art security. ...Functionality and security have to be the hallmark of programs like this one. The site has failed on both counts and has further weakened the confidence of the American people.’” Meanwhile, Hadley learns he will have to pay 92 percent more to retain a similar policy from Blue Cross Blue Shield, and refuses to return to Healthcare.gov. He asks, “If I have their information, then who else has my information now?” [50619, 50683, 50775, 50778]

According to *The Seattle Times*, “In [the state of] Washington, most of the 290,000 people covered by insurance plans they purchased on the individual market received letters this fall telling them that their plans are going away. Bill Fullner has reached his breaking point. It started with the letter from his health-insurance company informing him it was canceling his plan and offering him a new one that’s nearly twice as expensive. Then the 60-year-old retiree from Mount Vernon heard about more people like himself with canceled plans and soaring premiums. Finally, he spent hours on the phone and computer trying—and failing—to find a new option that he likes. ‘This whole experience has converted a lifelong Democrat into a foot soldier for the Republican Party,’ Fullner said. ‘Obama stated that if we were happy with an insurance plan that we currently had, we would be able to keep it. I feel that [Obama], who I greatly admired and supported, has lied to the public.’ ...[A]ll 90,181 people with insurance coverage from Regence BlueShield have learned their plans will be canceled, as did all 60,000 people covered by Group Health Cooperative. Some 77,000 people with LifeWise Health Plan, a subsidiary of Premera Blue Cross, also learned their plans were being scrapped.” (Just *days* before the implementation of Healthcare.gov, on September 26, Obama lied to an audience, “The Affordable Care Act is here to stay. And so today, I want to speak plainly, clearly, honestly, about what it means for you and for the people you care about. Now, let’s start with the fact that even before the Affordable Care Act fully takes effect, about 85 percent of Americans already have health insurance—either through their job, or through Medicare, *or through the individual market* [italics added]. So if you’re one of these folks, it’s reasonable that you might worry whether health care reform is going to create changes that are a problem for you—especially when you’re bombarded with all sorts of fear-mongering. So the first thing you need to know is this: If you already have health care, you don’t have to do anything. In fact, for the past few years, since I signed the Affordable Care Act, a lot of you have been enjoying new benefits and protections that you didn’t before even if you didn’t know they were coming from Obamacare.”) [50651, 50652, 50926]

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, “One former senior administration official said that as the [ObamaCare] law was being crafted by the White House and lawmakers, some White House policy advisors objected to the breadth of ...Obama’s ‘keep your plan’ promise. They were overruled by political aides, the former official said.” Marc Thiessen, former chief speechwriter for George W. Bush, writes, “I cannot imagine a scenario in which the fact-checkers or White House policy advisers would tell us that something in a draft speech was factually incorrect and that guidance would be ignored or overruled by

the president's political advisers. This whole episode is a window into a fundamentally dishonest [administration]." [50636, 50653, 50730]

At NYPost.com Kyle Smith writes, "How Americans see ...Obama changed in an important way this week. It's because there is a huge difference between lies and bulls--t. ...Even when Obama made seemingly specific promises like, 'I want to go line by line through every item in the federal budget and eliminate programs that don't work,' he left himself wiggle room. He still wants to do that, no doubt. He's just too busy filling out his March Madness brackets and golfing. ...He said he would close Guantanamo but that was just campaign blather for suckers—an applause line, not a serious policy proposal. ...This week was something new. It was the week Obama was revealed to be a stone-cold liar. Some 10 million Americans are going to lose their health insurance as a direct result of the Affordable Care Act. On June 15, 2009, Obama said, in one of hundreds of similar statements, 'No matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise to the American people: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health-care plan, you'll be able to keep your health-care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.' This wasn't just bulls--t. This was a lie. This was a direct, specific detail that left no wiggle room. It couldn't be excused as 'campaign rhetoric' because he wasn't running for anything in 2009. It wasn't a gassy generality. It wasn't a pie-in-the-sky platitude. It was credible, concrete and important. ...This week White House flack Jay Carney absurdly said Obama was 'clear about a basic fact...' that you could keep your insurance 'if it was available.' He sounded like a Publishers Clearinghouse letter saying 'you just won 10 million dollars if you have the winning number.' And it wasn't what his boss said. There is no escape. What Obama said wasn't true and that's all there is to it. To the American public, he is a different man than he was last week. People can handle bulls--t, but not dishonesty. We don't like that. His approval rating touched an all-time low this week in the NBC/WSJ poll, and that was before his deception became the news of the week. Obama has rebranded himself as a liar, forever. He will carry this new label to his grave." [50662, 51442]

During a halftime ceremony at a University of Missouri football game, fans boo a reference to Obama when members of the Missouri National Guard swear an oath to "obey the orders of the president of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me." [50742]

At AmericanThinker.com Raymond Ibrahim writes, "*El Watan*, one of Egypt's most widely circulated and read newspapers, has published a report discussing the Muslim Brotherhood's influence over the United States, especially in the context of inciting pro-Brotherhood policies against Egypt's popular June 30 Revolution, which resulted in the ousting of Muhammad Morsi and the Brotherhood from power." The report identifies Muslims Brotherhood "cells" in the United States, and lists the names of some of the group's American operatives. They include Dr. Ahmed Ismat al-Bendari, president of the Islamic Society of America, Dr. Amru Abbas, member of the Egyptian Foundation in Michigan, Dr. Muhammad Amru Attawiya, member of the Organization of Islamic Relief in the United States, and Dr. Tariq Hussein, member of the Council on American Islamic Relations Council (CAIR)." [50672]

On HBO, Bill Maher admits that Obama lied when he said, “You can keep your plan” and that ObamaCare would not have passed had he not told the lie, but suggests the lie was justified because it was for a worthy cause. Democrat National Committee chairman Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-FL) says, “It was not a lie, let’s just be very clear. Let me knock that down right away.” Wasserman Schultz dismisses the fact that millions of Americans will lose their insurance, ‘We’re still arguing over minutiae.’ [50701]

On November 3 *The Washington Post* states the obvious, “Americans who face higher insurance costs under ...Obama’s health-care law are angrily complaining about ‘sticker shock,’ threatening to become a new political force opposing the law even as the White House struggles to convince other consumers that they will benefit from it. The growing backlash involves people whose plans are being discontinued because the policies don’t meet the law’s more-stringent standards. They’re finding that many alternative policies come with higher premiums and deductibles. ...Marlys Dietrick, a 60-year-old artist from San Antonio, said she had high hopes that the new law would help many of her friends who are chefs, actors or photographers get insured. But she said they have been turned off by high premiums and deductibles and would rather pay the fine. ‘I am one of those Democrats who wanted it to be better than this,’ she said. Her insurer, Humana, informed her that her plan was being canceled and that the rate for herself and her 21-year-old son for a plan compliant with the new law would rise from \$300 to \$705. On the federal Web site, she found a comparable plan for \$623 a month. Because her annual income is about \$80,000, she doesn’t qualify for subsidies. A cheaper alternative on the federal exchange, she said, had a premium of \$490 a month—but it was an HMO plan rather than the PPO plan she currently has. ‘I wouldn’t be able to go to the doctor I’ve been going to for years,’ she said. ‘That is not a deal.’ And both the HMO and PPO exchange plans she examined had family deductibles of \$12,700, compared with her current \$7,000.” (Dietrick, like many Democrats, wrongly believed Obama’s something-for-nothing promises. Dietrick is perhaps an artist because she lacked the math and reality skills to become an accountant.) [50688]

The New York Times editorial board, in a desperate attempt to save Obama from his own lie, claims he “clearly misspoke” when he said, “If you like your plan, you can keep it.” The astoundingly partisan *Times* writes, “Congressional Republicans have stoked consumer fears and confusion with charges that the health care reform law is causing insurers to cancel existing policies and will force many people to pay substantially higher premiums next year for coverage they don’t want. That, they say, violates ...Obama’s pledge that if you like the insurance you have, you can keep it. Mr. Obama clearly misspoke when he said that.” (Apparently Obama “misspoke” dozens of times over a three-year period, or his teleprompter repeatedly malfunctioned. Blogger David Burge tweets, “Gee, I hope I don’t misspeak on my taxes this year.” David Freddoso tweets, “Capt. Renault clearly misspoke when he said that. He was not in fact shocked that there was gambling going on at Rick’s Cafe.” James Taranto: “on the other hand, when was the last time anyone paid this much attention to a NYT editorial?” Note that the *Times* “miswrote,” “...if you like the insurance you have...” Obama did not say *insurance*; he said *plan*. The *Times* is clearly attempting to change Obama’s promise so that he looks

less like a liar: you may have lost your specific *plan*, but you can still get some form of *insurance*—even if it is not what you want.) [50631, 50632, 50633, 50636, 50682, 50690, 50697]

The *Times* justifies the higher premiums Americans will face, stating, “Starting next year, all plans sold in this country will be required to provide 10 essential benefits, including some, like mental health and substance abuse treatment and maternity and newborn care, that are not now part of many policies. And premiums may well rise, in part because insurance companies must accept all applicants, not just the healthy.” (Some of those “essential benefits” are, of course, “not now part of many policies” because the people who bought those policies did not want them. The *Times* apparently believes elderly women and all men must pay for maternity and newborn care coverage, and that Americans who neither drink nor use drugs must pay for substance abuse treatment coverage anyway.) [50632]

The *Times* claims, “Premiums are apt to come down for older patients and sicker patients with chronic illnesses. Premiums will likely go up for younger, healthier patients. Even so, analysts at the Kaiser Family Foundation believe that most people will actually pay less next year, because those with modest incomes will qualify for federal subsidies and many poor, uninsured people will be eligible for Medicaid.” (The *Times* neglects to mention that those who end up paying less for coverage will save money only because *everyone else will be paying more*—through taxes and the inflation caused by printing money to cover the federal deficit.) [50632]

While *The New York Times* provides excuses for Obama, *The Oklahoman* writes, “An NBC/Wall Street Journal poll out this week showed only 42 percent of Americans approve of [Obama’s] job performance—a 5-point drop from early October. Of those surveyed, 51 percent disapprove of his performance, which is tied for Obama’s all-time high disapproval. For the first time in the poll’s history, Obama’s personal approval ratings were lower than his disapproval numbers—41 percent approved on a personal level, 45 percent disapproved. Apparently, Americans have grown weary of five years of Obama’s aloof, divisive and always intensely partisan ways. They were on display Wednesday in Boston where [Obama] said Republicans were ‘grossly misleading’ regarding Americans being dropped from their health insurance plans because of his health care law. Really? It wasn’t Republicans who promised Americans that they could keep their health plans if they liked them. That was Obama, who said it repeatedly before and after the law was passed. Now Republicans, rightfully so, are calling him out because people on the individual market are being told their plans are being dropped because they don’t comply with Obamacare. [Obama’s] advice to those folks? ‘Just shop around in the new [Healthcare.gov] marketplace,’ he said in Boston. ‘That’s what it’s for.’ No wonder his numbers continue to plummet.” [50641]

The Fox News Channel’s Greta Van Susteren comments on the *Times*’ editorial, “Whether you like Obamacare or not—it is absurd to say [Obama] ‘misspoke’ when he said ‘if you like the insurance you have, you can keep it.’ [Obama] said this not once, not twice, but multiple times and it was part of the Obamacare supporter talking points. You

say it one time and it could be misspeaking—but when it is part of your mantra, and your talking points... repeated over and over and over again... well, the rest of us just are not that stupid. That is not misspeaking. Misspeaking is the slip of a tongue—not part of your repeated talking points. Even the New York Times in its Editorial calls ...Obama's talking points a pledge—how can a repeated pledge be something you accidentally said? When ...Obama repeated the remark, he was 1. uninformed or 2. mistaken about his own policy and the impact of it or 3. [he] was lying. Take your pick... but that is not the point of this blog posting. The point of this blog post is to point out how pathetic the NY Times Editorial Board looks trying to describe this as 'misspeaking.' Does the Board think the American people are that stupid? Misspeaking? As a criminal defense lawyer, and consistent with my client's Constitutional rights, I have had to argue some pretty absurd things (e.g. the government's failure to prove my client's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt after he voluntarily confessed to police) but the NY Times tops anything I have had to argue with its editorial below! Misspeak? Really? Am I wrong?" [50666, 50667]

The Ulsterman Report comments, "The drop in Barack Obama's personal approval is of particular importance here. For the last five plus years, a majority of Americans have refused to link [Obama's] repeated political failures to the man. That has now changed as his Obamacare debacle is impacting them personally, more and more voters are now willing (FINALLY) to openly admit that Barack Obama is himself, a deeply flawed and incompetent leader at best, or a leader willingly pushing the country to the brink (and beyond) of fiscal disaster. In 2010 there was a significant anti-Obama/anti-Big Government backlash that resulted in one of the most lopsided conservative Midterm Election victories in the nation's history. 2014 is looking more and more to be the same, though this time, the Senate may finally be wrested from the decrepit and palsied hands of Harry Reid and his Democrat Party majority." [50642]

Freedom Watch and Judicial Watch founder Larry Klayman emails supporters to remind them of a November 19 "Reclaim America Now" rally in Washington, D.C.'s Lafayette Park to demand the resignations of Obama, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), and House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH). Klayman reports that some of the speakers will include "the widows and parents of those who died at Benghazi; other military families whose sons or daughters have been sacrificed based on Obama's Muslim outreach, which favors protecting the Islamic enemy over our own troops; those who have been audited and harassed by the IRS, spied upon by the NSA, victimized by illegal immigration, or persecuted by ObamaCare; and those who feel that the U.S. Constitution is being trampled on as a matter of course and that their freedoms are being subverted and destroyed." Klayman writes, "Knowledgeable and concerned Americans know that the United States is in great danger. Barack Hussein Obama has driven the country into the ground, and the political opposition has allowed this to happen. The nation is on the verge of economic, social, and strategic collapse, as the people's grievances are being continually ignored. Short of violent revolution which we hope to avoid, civil disobedience in the style of Mahatma Gandhi in India, Lech Walesa in Poland, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela in South Africa, and most recently, democracy-minded Egyptians in Tahrir Square, must be employed urgently before the nation goes under for the count." [50622, 50623, 50719, 50903, 51060, 51061]

At Townhall.com Christine Rousselle points out that only about 42,000 of Vermont's 626,000 residents lack health insurance—yet the state spent \$170 million for its ObamaCare exchange web site—or about \$4,000 per person. But, “Vermont’s exchange, healthconnect.vermont.gov, is nearly entirely non-functional, and the vast majority of prospective customers have found themselves unable to actually purchase the insurance plan they selected. Vermont Gov. Peter Shumlin assured Vermonters that the site would be functional on Nov. 1, but as of today, Nov. 3, the only thing on the website is an error message.” [50626, 50737]

Obama’s job approval/disapproval rating falls to 40/53 in the Gallup. [50630]

On ABC’s *This Week*, Obama advisor Dan Pfeiffer says, “Let’s talk about [Obama’s] promise first, okay. If [Obama] didn’t intend to keep this [“You can keep your plan”] promise why would he have gone out of his way to put a provision in the law [that] specifically says that if you have a plan before ObamaCare passed you can keep that plan? Now if your plan has been downgraded or canceled, you can’t.” (Pfeiffer’s statement is akin to saying, “If your car hadn’t been stolen, you’d still have your car.”) Pfeiffer also admits “that the first [ObamaCare] enrollment numbers which will be released later this month are not going to be what we want them to be. There’s no question about that. And if we get that website working as we expect we [will] do by the end of this month, then I think we’re going to be in a good place. The good news here is the history of programs like this ...is that people sign up toward the end.” [50634, 50635, 50650, 50658]

Meet the Press host David Gregory asks former Obama campaign guru David Axelrod, “[T]his is about political practice and leadership. If you believe all those things, and you want to get the very best health care, you were in the White House. You were advising [Obama] on the kinds of things he should say. Why did not you, or somebody else, say to him, ‘Mr. [Obama], don’t say, ‘No matter what you’re gonna keep your health care plan.’ Was that bad practice? ...But that’s why you’re there!” Axelrod replies, “Well, hindsight is 20/20. ...There is a small group of people David—the vast majority of Americans, that statement will hold true for. For this small group of Americans, it hasn’t. But, the calamitous thing here is that the website wasn’t up because many of those people who ...have to transition are going to get better insurance for less money but they just can’t tell that now because they can’t get on the website.” Journalist Bob Woodward: “David, this could be rectified, I remember early in the Obama [administration] when you were there and there was some dispute about a cabinet nomination and [Obama] came out and said, ‘I screwed up.’ Why not just be straightforward. ...[H]e said, period, this is absolutely, everyone’s going to keep their insurance. Why not correct it?” Axelrod: “I don’t think there’s any shame in saying, we didn’t anticipate this one glitch, we grandfathered ...a lot of policies, we didn’t anticipate this one glitch, but many of those people are gonna get better health care for less money when this website is up and running and they can select it.” [50654, 50699, 50720]

Former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney tells NBC's David Gregory, "I think [Obama] failed to learn the lessons that came from the experience in Massachusetts. First of all, the Massachusetts experience was a state-run plan. The right way to deal with healthcare reform is not to have a one-size-fits-all plan that's imposed on all the states, but recognizing the differences between different states and their populations. States should be able to craft their own plans to get all their citizens insured and to make sure pre-existing conditions are covered. ... And there's some other differences. In Massachusetts, we phased in the requirements, so that there was a slow rollout. That way you could test the systems as you went along to make sure there wouldn't be glitches. And perhaps the most important lesson [Obama], I think, failed to learn was, you have to tell the American people the truth. And when he told the American people that you could keep your health insurance if you wanted to keep that plan, period—he said that time and again, he wasn't telling the truth. I think that fundamental dishonesty has really put in peril the whole foundation of his second term. ... We could talk about the technical differences between the Massachusetts plan and the federal plan, but the key, I think, that has really undermined [Obama's] credibility in the hearts of the American people, is that he went out as a centerpiece of his campaign and as a centerpiece of Obamacare over the last several years, saying time and time again that fundamental to his plan was the right people would have to keep their insurance plan. And he knew that was not the case. He could know it by looking at Massachusetts and seeing people there lost insurance. He could have learned those lessons and told the people the truth, but he didn't. He told people they could keep their plan. And, you know, it was NBC News that said, look, some 6 million people are going to lose their insurance. That's not some little number. That's 6 million American people." [50687]

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) tells MSNBC that Obama is a man "of great vision, of great knowledge, of great judgment." [50661]

On *Face the Nation*, host Bob Schieffer says, "I'm thinking, I guess it's a little unfortunate they [the Obama administration] didn't let the NSA, uh, put together the website for ObamaCare, because if we talk about... how wonderful and these great [NSA] capabilities [sic]. I mean, I have never seen anything that flopped the way this thing did." Schieffer asks Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), "[Obama] said in the beginning that one thing was that if you liked the health care program you had, you could keep it. We now know there was debate within the administration before he said that as to whether that was actually a promise that could be kept. Should [Obama] not have made that statement?" Feinstein's laughable response: "Well, as I understand it [she voted for ObamaCare but is not sure what is in it], you can keep it up to the time—and I hope this is correct, but this is what I've been told—up to the time the bill was enacted, and after that, it's a different story. That part of it, if true, was never made clear." (In other words, "If you like your plan and we *don't* pass ObamaCare, you can keep it.") [50657, 50693]

Also on *Face the Nation*, Congressman Mike Rogers (R-MI) says, "Here's the problem [with Healthcare.gov]. They're trying to change a tire on a car going 75 miles an hour down the expressway. That's not the way cyber security works. And unfortunately, both [Senator] Dianne [Feinstein (D-CA)] and I both [sic] know the real threats to these

systems when you have nation states, organized crime groups and criminals trying to get information that is now available on these websites. They need to take the site down, stabilize it—meaning they can't continue to add [program] code... Amazon would never do this. ProFlowers would never do this. Kayak would never do this. This is completely an unacceptable level of security." [50680]

On *State of the Union*, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich points out that ObamaCare punishes married couples with higher health insurance premiums than they would pay if they simply lived together unmarried. "It's both an anti-marriage and pro-divorce provision. I don't think anybody even knew it was in there." (According to the Heritage Foundation, "the anti-marriage penalties increase sharply as a couple ages. The discriminatory anti-marriage penalties are particularly severe on middle-class 'empty nester' couples. Many of those couples would pay an effective tax of \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year for the right to remain married. For example, a 60-year-old couple, each earning \$30,000 per year, would receive \$10,425 per year less in benefits [ObamaCare subsidies] if they marry or remain married. Simply by divorcing and then living together, the couple can boost their post-tax, take-home income by nearly one-fourth. Similarly, a 50-year-old couple, each earning \$20,000 per year, would receive \$5,114 less in benefits each year if they marry or remain married. By divorcing and then living together, the couple could increase its income by more than \$50,000 over a decade.") [50700]

Senator Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) also appears on *State of the Union*, and host Candy Crowley says, "I want to play for you something [Obama] said Wednesday in Boston about the opposition to his Affordable Care Act: 'Unfortunately, there are others that are so locked into the politics of this thing that they won't lift a finger to help their own people because if they put as much energy into making this law work as they do in attacking the law, Americans would be better off.' Now, he is saying in a sort of nuance[d] way what other Democrats are saying right out there which is that you—all [Republicans] would rather defeat [Obama] and ObamaCare than help your constituents. Have you helped your constituents who called to your office looking for help? And do you think Republicans are vulnerable on this that they have tried so hard and so many times to derail it, but now the criticism looks like nothing but politics? Ayotte responds, "Well, Candy, my constituents are writing me, but how can I help them when it's the situation of their getting cancellation notices because of the way that ObamaCare is drafted when they can't access the website because it's such a mess? So, absolutely, I want to help my constituents. But again, I would say to [Obama], why doesn't he call a timeout on this, understanding that it's not working right now? This was passed on a party line basis. Why not convene a group to see how can we work together, issues like the 29-hour workweek, issues like if you—people being denied their current plans, issues like rising health care costs, all of which are unfortunate. I'm hearing the opposite from my constituents. I want to help them, but obviously, the administration in the way this is being rolled out is a mess. So, it's time to call a time out." (HotAir.com's Ed Morrissey comments, "What exactly is the argument here—that Republicans have been proven correct about what a clusterfark ObamaCare would be, and so their opposition was therefore nothing but politics? Er, doesn't the multi-layered failures of the scheme demonstrate that opposition was substantive all along? The website and the skyrocketing

premiums show that the ACA should have been derailed years ago, and that the White House has been repeatedly dishonest for years about its impact and their ability to manage it. Why would that make Republicans vulnerable? Why should they attempt to rescue a system that doesn't work when they had no investment in it at all? The idea that Republicans will be vulnerable in 2014 for refusing to ride to Obama's rescue, rather than Democrats be vulnerable for their own failures and years of dishonesty, sounds like wish-casting from the White House or concern-trolling from the DSCC [Democrat Senatorial Campaign Committee].") [50739]

Debka.com reports, "Tehran did its utmost to conceal the mystery blast which last week struck the heavy water reactor under construction at Arak in western Iran. It is revealed here for the first time by Debkafile's intelligence and Iranian sources. The explosion, whether accidental or not, will delay for a second time the reactor's first test with real fuel. Tehran informed the International Atomic Energy Agency in August of a previous holdup. The cause of the blast and the extent of the damage it caused have not yet been established. According to the partial information initially reaching our sources, it occurred inside the reactor building when preparations were underway for a test scheduled for this month with artificial fuel and light water. The site of the explosion may have been the large coolant containers and the pressure gauges attached to the reactor's core." (AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller observes, "If the Israelis are involved, expect the Obama administration to leak all the deets [details]. The NSA is spying on Israel, too, don't ya know.") [50637, 50638]

TheDailyBell.com interviews Gerald Celente, publisher of the *Trends Journal*, founder and director of the Trends Research Institute, and author of *Trend Tracking and Trends 2000*. Celente observes, "Look at the latest economic data showing job growth. It was much lower than anyone expected. That's always the line they use, 'lower than expected.' Lower than expected by whom? Not by me because I know what jobs they're creating. ... They lost about 8 million jobs since the great recession hit and they created 7 million, but that doesn't account for all of the new people entering into the workforce. They're at zero; they're still down 7, 8 million jobs, and the jobs that were lost—this is a fact, not speculation—the jobs that were lost during the recession were middle-income paying jobs. The jobs that have been created are low-income paying jobs—waiters and waitresses, health services, bartenders, people who work for Amazon and Walmart stocking shelves and shipping orders. Those are the majority of the jobs; 95 percent of the jobs created in the last year are part-time jobs. That's how the economy's going. And it's only even going at this level because interest rates are at record lows and [so are] mortgage rates—as soon as they go up the real estate market goes down—so it's a fake correction... there's no recovery. [W]hen the tapering [of the Federal Reserve's expansion of the money supply] ends the decline begins. ... They're going to have to pull back because of the devaluation. The dollar's under pressure already. But what I've been saying is they're going to wait until after the holidays and then they're going to have to do something to stop the devaluation of the dollar. They cannot keep printing all of this money." [50640, 50674, 51316]

“...They’re in a trap and it’s a tapering trap, the quantitative easing trap. They can’t keep printing more money because it’s going to devalue the currency. And by the way, this is complicated, because it’s not only the United States that’s doing it; most of the central banks are doing it. China, the Europeans—they’re all pumping money into their systems to keep them afloat. They’re all in a trap. A time comes when you just can’t keep doing it anymore. You can only take heroin so much before it kills you. This is monetary methadone and it’s not going to cure the problem so they’re going to have to stop. When it stops, that’s when we go back into a recession and/or a depression. Is it [already] a depression? Is it a depression if you live in Greece or Spain or Portugal? Is it a depression if you’re among the over 12% unemployed in Italy? When you look at John Williams’ ShadowStats[.com], in the U.S. we’re looking at about 22 percent unemployment. So yes, it’s a depression for a lot of people. And then again, median household income in the U.S., accounting for inflation, is 10 percent below 1999 levels. That’s a fact. So if you’re earning 10 percent less for your family than you were in 1999 and the costs have skyrocketed since then, particularly in healthcare, food, rent, property, gas and other costs, do you think you’re living in a depression?” Celente warns that the future unemployment picture will be “Lower paying jobs, less benefits, more temporary jobs and I think the question at the end is rather than going forward in the U.S. it should be what’s going forward in Slavelandia, because that’s what it’s become. You get out of college and you’re an indentured servant. For the rest of your life you have to pay off your debt for your degree in worthlessness, for the most part. There are degrees that are worth something but not a lot of them. Where are you going to work? Name the company—Macy’s? Starbucks? You can become a barista. Are they going to start teaching Shipping & Handling 101 in college? What are they going to do? Who are you going to work for? What are you going to do—stock shelves? This is better than slavery because when they had the plantation you had to take care of the slaves. Now you can just use them up and send them home. It’s kind of like Bangladesh right here in the good old USA.” [50640, 50674, 51316]

On *Fox News Sunday*, host Chris Wallace is joined by Obama health care advisor Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel and the American Enterprise Institute’s James Capretta, who argue about whether Obama kept his “You can keep your plan” promise and whether ObamaCare will be a failure. [50645, 50647]

Republican strategist and former George W. Bush advisor tells program host Wallace, “These [ObamaCare] problems are going to continue. These problems were known in advance, and they hoped to skate by them. ...We’re going have a lot more people on Medicaid than were anticipated, a lot fewer people with private insurance... a lot fewer healthier, younger people subsidizing the coverage of older, less-healthy people.” [50659]

Also appearing on *Fox News Sunday* is Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) who says he will block all Obama nominees for executive positions until Benghazi survivors testify before Congress. “I shouldn’t have to do this—to make these threats. ...I don’t think it’s over the top to find out what happened to four dead Americans. I don’t think it’s over the top to talk to survivors. The State Department interviewed these survivors [but won’t allow

them to testify before others]. ...[But] The only way this will work is if my GOP colleagues get behind me and Democrats too and support my request to find out exactly what happened.” [50681, 50696]

Newsmax.com reports, “Insurance brokers across the country say small business clients are hurrying to reset their insurance policy renewal dates to Dec. 1 to beat the huge premium hikes they fear will hit them on Jan. 1 when Obamacare takes full effect. The brokers told USA Today that 60 percent to 80 percent of their small business clients who have 50 employees or fewer want to renew their policies early to keep their costs lower. Larger companies, who employ more than 50 full-time workers, can’t adjust their renewal dates. ...Some agents say they’re seeing increases of 30 percent up all the way to 100 percent on companies’ premiums, especially if their workers are younger. According to Obamacare rules, companies are limited charging older people more than they charge younger workers, so premium prices are rising to make up the difference [sic].” (ObamaCare prohibits insurers from charging older customers more than three times what they charge younger customer. As a result, the companies are forced to overcharge young policyholders.) Paul Nachtwey, vice president of employee benefits at Beachwood-based Todd Associates, comments, “It will be bad out of the gate, and it will only get worse.” [50660, 50738]

Obama campaigns for Clinton money raiser and corrupt Democrat gubernatorial candidate Terry McAuliffe in Arlington, Virginia. Obama says, “You’ve seen an extreme faction of the Republican Party that has shown again and again and again that they’re willing to hijack the entire party and the country and the economy and grind progress to an absolute halt if they don’t get 100 percent of what they want. You cannot afford to have a governor who is thinking the same way. ...That’s a practical job. They [sic] can’t afford to be an ideologue.” (Neither Obama nor McAuliffe uttered the word “ObamaCare” during their speeches.) [50649, 50689, 50706, 50721]

Radio talk show host Mark Levin suggests that the GOP establishment wants Democrat McAuliffe to win in Virginia and Republican Chris Christie to win in New Jersey so it can claim that only “moderate” Republicans can win and the voters should steer clear of conservatives and Tea Party candidates. “Better to try to clear the field of conservatives who threaten the ruling class and its preferred nominees. Better to protect the RINO investment in big government than beat Hillary. The conservative grassroots is to be crushed and dispirited. So, that’s the game. Still, recent polls show Cuccinelli closing fast. This makes the Left and RINOs very nervous. The rest of us are cheering, and hopefully helping, the underdog. We identify with him, not the sleazy McAuliffe, his radical donors, and the ruling class. We won’t retreat. We won’t give up. We will fight for the last vote. What a sweet victory it would be! But make no mistake, this is one of many, many battles to come, win, lose, or recount. What these people will never understand is that for most of us this isn’t about politics per se but preserving what’s left of our society, Constitution, and individual free will. It is about our families and our way of life. It is about who we are as Americans. We are not surrendering to this because we will not sit quietly while the ruling class continues to destroy our nation. We fight against growing oppression as many did before us. And we will fight like hell through the

constitutional process. We will continue to learn, we will take names, and we will battle these people and groups at every turn, and in every election. We are not going anywhere. And as the ruling class catastrophe continues to unfold, as with ObamaCare, the monstrous debt, and suffocating regulations, and with the cycle of unsustainable spending and confiscatory taxing, the coerciveness of the ruling class and its federal agencies will only intensify. There will be a commensurate backlash. The sleeping giant that is the American people is only beginning to awaken. It is only a matter of time until more people are roused to join this all important constitutional fight. We fight to hold Virginia today and we fight on thereafter.” (Meanwhile, Democrats are helping fund the campaign of a phony Libertarian candidate, Robert Jarvis, in an effort to take votes away from the Republican, Cuccinelli.) [50649, 50689, 50706, 50721, 50725, 50726]

Breitbart.com reports that the book *Double Down*, by Mark Halperin and John Heileman, includes a passage describing how Barack “Nobel Peace Prize” Obama told his aides he is “really good at killing people.” (The assumption is that Obama was referring to drones, rather than people who “knew too much”—like Donald Young, the gay choir director at the Chicago church Obama attended and who was murdered in December 2007.) According to TheHill.com, the book reveals that “The White House wanted to invite congressional leaders to Camp David to improve relations among top officials, but the first lady’s East Wing staff shot down the idea.” [50655, 50656, 50718, 50918]

TheBlaze.com reports, “The Israeli government conveyed ‘bitter protests’ to the White House this weekend over the Obama administration’s reported leak of who was behind last week’s air raid on a Syrian base near the port city of Latakia. Words being used by the media and officials speaking anonymously in Israel to describe what they perceive as a breach in trust on the part of the U.S. include ‘fury,’ ‘scandalous,’ ‘baffled’ and ‘unthinkable.’ According a Sunday report in the Israel newspaper Yedioth Ahronot, Israeli officials told their American counterparts that the leak could risk a military escalation that could ‘endanger the security of Israel and the region as a whole.’ ... Israeli broadcasters made a point on [November 1] of reporting that a White House official was behind the leak. Army Radio fingered Obama’s White House as being behind the leak, while Channel 2 News said the leak ‘came directly from the White House,’ according to a Times of Israel report. ... ‘It is unclear why the US would leak such information, as it could increase the pressure on Syria to retaliate against Israel,’ the Jerusalem Post wrote after the first reports on CNN and the Associated Press were published.” AtlasShrugs.com quotes an “unnamed respected foreign policy expert”: “The reason for the WH leak of Israel’s operation is that Obama wanted to signal the Iranians that US was not part of the attack against Tehran’s major state proxy, Syria. The US is like a lap dog to the Iranian regime.” (*The Obama Timeline* believes Obama doesn’t care if Syria—or Iran—attack Israel, and that he would be more than happy if Israel were destroyed.) [50663, 50709]

Author and columnist Michelle Malkin tweets, “Tomorrow is a national day of mourning & protest. Tweet your cancellation notice to @whitehouse - use #myhealthplandied.” [50665]

According to TheHill.com, “Obama will travel on [sic; to] Dallas on Wednesday to thank neighborhood canvassers and navigators helping residents to enroll in ObamaCare, the White House said late Sunday. A White House official said Obama will visit Temple Emanu-El to meet with volunteers from Dallas Area Interfaith, a community group working on enrollment and outreach. During his Dallas trip, Obama will also attend a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee fundraiser that was postponed in early October due to the government shutdown.” (The visit to ObamaCare workers makes the trip “official business,” allowing Obama to get the taxpayers to pay for the flight expenses.) [50669]

At WSJ.com cancer patient Edie Littlefield Sundby—who says she voted for Obama—writes, “Everyone now is clamoring about Affordable Care Act winners and losers. I am one of the losers. My grievance is not political; all my energies are directed to enjoying life and staying alive, and I have no time for politics. For almost seven years I have fought and survived stage-4 gallbladder cancer, with a five-year survival rate of less than 2% after diagnosis. I am a determined fighter and extremely lucky. But this luck may have just run out: My affordable, lifesaving medical insurance policy has been canceled effective Dec. 31. My choice is to get coverage through the government health exchange and lose access to my cancer doctors, or pay much more for insurance outside the exchange (the quotes average 40% to 50% more) for the privilege of starting over with an unfamiliar insurance company and impaired benefits. ... Since March 2007 United Healthcare has paid \$1.2 million to help keep me alive, and it has never once questioned any treatment or procedure recommended by my medical team. The company pays a fair price to the doctors and hospitals, on time, and is responsive to the emergency treatment requirements of late-stage cancer. Its caring people in the claims office have been readily available to talk to me and my providers.” [50670, 50740, 50979]

“... You would think it would be simple to find a health-exchange plan that allows me, living in San Diego, to continue to see my primary oncologist at Stanford University and my primary care doctors at the University of California, San Diego [UCSD]. Not so. UCSD has agreed to accept only one Covered California plan—a very restrictive Anthem EPO Plan. EPO stands for exclusive provider organization, which means the plan has a small network of doctors and facilities and no out-of-network coverage (as in a preferred-provider organization plan) except for emergencies. Stanford accepts an Anthem PPO plan but it is not available for purchase in San Diego (only Anthem HMO and EPO plans are available in San Diego). So if I go with a health-exchange plan, I must choose between Stanford and UCSD. Stanford has kept me alive—but UCSD has provided emergency and local treatment support during wretched periods of this disease, and it is where my primary-care doctors are. Before the Affordable Care Act, health-insurance policies could not be sold across state lines; now policies sold on the Affordable Care Act exchanges may not be offered across county lines. What happened to [Obama’s] promise, ‘You can keep your health plan?’ Or to the promise that ‘You can keep your doctor?’ Thanks to the law, I have been forced to give up a world-class health plan. The exchange would force me to give up a world-class physician. For a cancer patient, medical coverage is a matter of life and death. Take away people’s ability to control their

medical-coverage choices and they may die. I guess that's a highly effective way to control medical costs. Perhaps that's the point." [50670]

In a WABC interview, veteran comedian Jackie Mason tells Aaron Klein that Obama "sounds more like a maniac in an asylum. He's saying things that nobody believes. He was always lying every day of his life. Every time he talks it was a lie. The only time he tells the truth is when you didn't hear from him. ... This is becoming so ridiculous, that even the biggest liar can't top himself. He looks at you straight in the face, and tells you that if you want your plan, you got your plan, you keep your plan. Now, a month-and-a-half later, you got no plan, you lost your plan, and he tells you [that] you still got a plan. ... He has a whole country walking around dizzy wondering who we're listening to. ... [H]ow come he's the only one in America who doesn't seem to know what's going on here? Never did I expect a guy like this, the head of a country, to blatantly lie to your face, and then not only lie to your face, then lie about the fact that he never lied. Then lie again about the next lie he told. ... You say to yourself, 'Wait a second. Who am I listening to? Was this guy actually elected...? A man who's completely out of his mind, who's out of touch with humanity, with America, who doesn't seem to know what's going on here? Does he read a paper? A guy like this should be locked up ... If he wasn't [in the White House], he'd be in jail or in a sanitarium. He wouldn't be outside talking to people in this condition. He would be considered a danger to his own his own health, to his own life. The latest is that it's only 5 percent of the people, only 15 [or] 20 million people who are going to lose their [insurance] plan. ... What if you shoot a guy? He's only one person out of 300 million. How come it's in the paper that you shot an innocent person and you go to jail for it? ... Since when do you destroy people and it doesn't count because it's too small a percentage?" [50675]

Klein also interviews former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, John Bolton, who states, "Israel, I think, now faces the fateful decision whether it will allow Iran to get nuclear weapons, thus constituting a true existential threat to Israel, or whether they will strike as the Israelis have done twice before against nuclear programs in the hands of hostile states. I don't think Israel has much time. Frankly, they should have done this years ago because we all know intelligence is imperfect and Iran may have a more developed capacity than we know about, perhaps in cooperation with North Korea." Bolton argues that Israel must act alone against Iran because Obama will not do so. "If there is anybody left in Israel who thinks that the U.S. will use military force against Iran's program, they really need to seriously re-examine their basic values. It isn't going to happen under the Obama administration. I'll just say it again. It isn't going to happen." (*The Obama Timeline* agrees. Obama has no intention of blocking Iran's nuclear program. His call for negotiations is meant to give Iran more time to develop its nuclear weapons. Obama either believes that a nuclear Iran will force Israel to make major concessions to the Palestinians, or that it will destroy Tel Aviv with a nuclear strike. Obama would accept either.) [50676]

The Healthcare.gov site announces: "The Health Insurance Marketplace online application isn't available from approximately 1 a.m. to 5 a.m. EST daily while we make improvements. Additional down times may be possible as we work to make things better.

The rest of the site and the Marketplace call center remain available during these hours.” [50680]

On November 4 *Morning Joe's* Mika Brzezinski responds to panelist John Heileman's statement that Obama “doesn't like to court people” and “doesn't like any of the... human kind of back-slapping side of politics Bill Clinton is so good at,” with the question, “So what you're saying is he's too smart for the job?” Heileman replies, “Well, I'm not exactly saying that, although I'm sure that's your gloss on it.” (The “progressive” Brzezinski is the daughter of former Jimmy Carter advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski.) [50698]

Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson notes that Democrats are “getting antsy” over the fact that the ObamaCare open enrollment period for 2015 will come in October 2014. At that point, insurers will announce new plans and prices for the coming year—prices which will certainly be higher than the already-high prices for 2014. Benson observes, “They're not upset about the near certainty of higher prices. They're upset that people will find out about them around election time. ‘What genius came up with that timetable?’ one frustrated Democrat sneered. That Democrat should look in the mirror.” [50679]

DailyCaller.com reports, “If Obamacare is fully implemented, 68 percent of Americans with private health insurance will not be able to keep their plan, according to health care economist Christopher Conover. Conover is a research scholar in the Center for Health Policy & Inequalities Research at Duke University and an adjunct scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. In an interview with The Daily Caller, he laid out what he estimates the consequences of Obamacare's implementation will ultimately be. ‘Bottom line: of the 189 million Americans with private health insurance coverage, I estimate that if Obamacare is fully implemented, at least 129 million (68 percent) will not be able to keep their previous health care plan either because they already have lost or will lose that coverage by the end of 2014,’ he said in an email. ‘But of these, ‘only’ the 18 to 50 million will literally lose coverage, i.e., have their plans entirely taken away. This includes 9.2-15.4 million in the non-group market and 9-35 million in the employer-based market. The rest will retain their old plans but have to pay higher rates for Obamacare-mandated bells and whistles.’” [50684, 50717, 50865, 50900]

DailyCaller.com also reports that the mainstream media has been interviewing MIT professor Jonathan Gruber, “who had a closed-door meeting with ...Obama in Boston last week to discuss Obamacare,” to defend the health care legislation. But none of the news organizations bothered to note that Gruber, a highly-partisan Democrat, was paid \$400,000 by the Department of Health and Human Services for “technical assistance in evaluating options for national healthcare reform.” [50685, 50695]

Obama greets the Chicago Blackhawks team at the White House to congratulate the players on their 2013 Stanley Cup victory. He then delivers a speech at an Organizing for Action propaganda team event.

While visiting Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, a reporter asks Secretary of State John Kerry, “I was wondering, what your take is on women driving in Saudi Arabia?” The gutless Kerry replies, “With respect to the issue of women driving here in Saudi Arabia, it’s no secret that in the United States of America we embrace equality for everybody, regardless of gender, race or any other qualification. But it’s up to Saudi Arabia to make its own decisions about its own social structure choices and timing for whatever events. I know there’s a debate. We actually talked about this at lunch. There’s a healthy debate in Saudi Arabia about this issue, but I think that debate is best left to Saudi Arabia, the people engaged in it, all of whom know exactly where we in the United States of America stand on this issue.” (Author and columnist Michelle Malkin comments, “These ‘progressive’ Democrats are all for championing women’s rights and international human rights when it suits them: at Hollywood soirees, Vogue photo shoots, fancy state dinners and black-tie award ceremonies. But stick their Hermes-wrapped necks out once in favor of basic human dignity and risk upsetting the mullahs to their faces? Never. This is Obama’s America: leading from the sidelines.”) [50905]

On the *Manning Report*, Reverend James David Manning interviews Mia Marie Pope—who knew Obama when he lived in Honolulu and called himself Barry Soetoro. Pope says Obama “always portrayed himself as a foreign student. ... That didn’t mean much to me then but, you know, that’s just what we knew about him. ... He wasn’t really close within my particular circle of friends, he was a little bit older than me, and he very much was within, sort of, the gay community. ... And we knew Barry as, just common knowledge that, you know, girls were never anything that he was ever interested in. ... It was clear to me that Barry was strictly into men. ... He and I really didn’t get along because one of his attributes that’s still evident today is that he was even a pathological liar back then. ... It was always some self-aggrandizing thing. ... It was always something to egotistically boost himself. ... He used to go around bumming cigarettes from people. ... He would turn it on, try to... see if he could get something off of you ... and then as soon as you’d be stupid enough to give him a cigarette he’d snap in an instant and walk away, to add insult to injury. So he didn’t actually have a lot of friends. He was just in the periphery. ... He seemed to be incapable of being genuine or telling the truth about anything.” Pope notes that Soetoro/Obama had access to cocaine, which was very expensive and difficult for teenagers to access, but “He would get with these older white gay men, and this is how we just pretty much had the impression that that’s how he was procuring his cocaine. In other words, he was having sex with these older white guys, and that’s how he was getting his cocaine to be able to free-base.” [50815, 50816, 50817, 50818, 50985, 51018, 51033]

Asked by Manning why she is coming forward with her information when most who knew Obama decades ago are afraid to do so, Pope replies, “One, I’m a Christian and I care deeply about my country, so there’s a certain anger that is within me about this individual destroying my country, so he’s not on my Christmas list. ... If he was doing a good job, regardless of what his past was, I wouldn’t be on the phone with you today, but... I’ve gotten to a point in my life where it turns my stomach when people take the low road and don’t stand up, tell the truth... I refuse to be a coward.” Pope says, “I actually called the FBI several times, exposing his using fake Social Security numbers,

and they did nothing. I told them about my past; nobody ever called me back; nobody ever wanted to get any further information, so I felt that I was being stonewalled—and this is several years ago...” Manning mentions Obama’s homosexual and cocaine encounter with Larry Sinclair. Pope says, “I am familiar with the Larry Sinclair story, and I am here to tell the listening audience that Barry Soetoro was smoking a cocaine pipe *long, long* before Larry Sinclair.” Pope states that Soetoro/Obama would dress up as a transvestite to attend showings of the movie, *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*. Asked if she fears for her life for coming forward with information about Obama, Pope says she is at peace with her decision and, “I absolutely will not be a coward and do like a lot of these people do. In other words, I believe if you submit to evil you’re serving it.” (Pope relates her story on the Pete Santilli program as well.) [50815, 50816, 50817, 50818, 51033]

CBSNews.com reports that “the Obama administration knew of the risks associated with the Obamacare rollout well before last month. Three years ago, a trusted Obama health care adviser warned the White House it was losing control of Obamacare. A memo obtained by CBS News said strong leadership was missing and the law’s successful implementation was in jeopardy. The warnings were specific and dire—and ignored. David Cutler, who worked on the Obama 2008 campaign and was a valued outside health care consultant wrote this blunt memo to top White House economic adviser Larry Summers in May 2010: ‘I do not believe the relevant members of the administration understand [Obama’s] vision or have the capability to carry it out.’ Cutler wrote no one was in charge who had any experience in complex business start-ups. He also worried basic regulations, technology and policy coordination would fail. ‘You need to have people who have understanding of the political process, people who understand how to work within an administration and people who understand how to start and build a business, and unfortunately, they just didn’t get all of those people together,’ Cutler said.” Cutler pointed out, “It’s very hard to think of a situation where the people best at getting legislation passed are best at implementing it. They are a different set of skills.” HotAir.com’s Ed Morrissey observes, “The White House didn’t heed this warning for the same reason they embarked on this project in the first place. The bureaucrats and the activists thought they were smarter than the markets, and smarter than the people who have actual experience in the private sector. It’s the same infection that creates the monumentally tone-deaf argument that people should be *happy* that the government forced them out of existing plans they chose for themselves in order to pay more for coverage that the consumers know they don’t need. It’s unbridled hubris, and it produced this inevitable Greek tragedy that also doubles as farce. Now, keep this in mind, too. Did the White House bring in ground-up business people and web-savvy firms to take over from the bureaucrats and the contractors who wasted \$400 million on a web portal that doesn’t portal anything? No—they brought in Jeffrey Zients, one of Obama’s economic advisers, and kept everyone else in place. With this background in mind, just how likely will it be that the November 30th deadline for full functionality will be met?” [50691, 50692, 50694, 51140]

Some observers point out anomalies in the EXIF data attached to the published photo of the Los Angeles Airport suspect. (EXIF data, or exchangeable image file data, is recorded

by digital cameras and includes things like the date and time of the photograph, camera model and serial number, shutter speed, etc.) The EXIF data of the published image of alleged shooter Paul Ciancia lying on the floor of the airport shows that the photograph was taken 14 hours *after* the incident. Additionally, the image was apparently altered with Adobe Photoshop CS3 software.

At CNN.com Jake Tapper reports, “Officials expressed concern that the next shoe to drop in the evolving story about the Affordable Care Act would be disappointment from consumers once they are able to get on the troubled HealthCare.gov website—disappointment because of sticker shock and limited choice, according to a new document obtained by CNN. ‘Mike [last name not provided] described a general concern of PM (Project Management): getting to the point where the website is functioning properly and individuals begin to select plans; the media attention will follow individuals to plan selection and their ultimate choices; and, in some cases, there will be fewer options than would be desired to promote consumer choice and an ideal shopping experience. Additionally, in some cases there will be relatively high cost plans,’ say the notes from the Obama administration’s Obamacare ‘War Room’ from one week ago. Project Management is a reference to those individuals in the Obama administration tasked with standing up [Obama’s] health care law at the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight.” [50702]

HotAir.com comments on Tapper’s “war room” report: “This is the big unexploded landmine in the ObamaCare mine field. There have been little booms about it here and there—the NYT story last week about rural counties suffering under O-Care is one, as was that U.S. News story about high-end hospitals being excluded from many plans on the exchanges—but it hasn’t fully detonated yet. That’s because most consumers are still comparison-shopping for plans, which means cost is foremost in their minds right now. Not until next year, after they’ve received their new coverage and begun making doctor appointments, will they start focusing on the shrinking size of their provider networks. It’s one thing to be told that you need to pay a higher premium and deductible because you’re getting more ‘comprehensive’ insurance. It’s another to be told that the ‘comprehensiveness’ you’re paying for includes a less comprehensive network than you used to have under your old, ahem, ‘cut-rate’ plan. That was the whole point of the op-ed by Edie Sundby that everyone’s linking today, in fact. Sundby’s complaint wasn’t that the price of her insurance has skyrocketed, it was that she was essentially being forced to choose between her doctor and her hospital because she couldn’t find a plan in California whose network included both. If you like your doctor, you can’t necessarily keep him/her. This is going to blow up. Not just yet—website woes and rate shock are of more immediate media concern—but it’s coming and the White House knows it.” [50704]

“...The point, though, is that horror stories about people losing their doctors en masse are still to come and the White House is preparing for them. Which makes me wonder: Given all the political agony that’s in store for red-state Democrats up for reelection next year, how much longer can they afford to stand by the law? Even if the website’s fixed tomorrow, they’re staring at a parade of horrors well into 2014. Rate shock is the story now; the next story will be whether O-Care can possibly hit its enrollment targets in order

to make the program sustainable. (This assumes that Healthcare.gov will begin operating smoothly soon. If it doesn't, the next story will be all about Democratic panic and Obama's bad options in minimizing the damage from a busted enrollment drive.) The next story after that will be people outraged at how their provider networks have shrunk. After that comes the March 31, 2014 deadline for enrollment; will the administration reach its target on that or will the deadline be extended, raising the risk of an adverse selection problem for insurers? And then, as a cherry on top, after a long summer of the GOP showcasing ObamaCare nightmare stories, insurers will release the 2015 rates next October and there'll be a new flood of small-business employees agonizing publicly about how high the premiums are on their new exchange-bought plans. It's nothing but sh*t sandwiches for Senate Dems until next November. How long before they lose their appetites?" [50704]

Politico reports, "The Senate voted 61-30 to advance legislation that would ban workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. The chamber could hold a final vote on the bill later this week though Republican leaders in the House have said they won't consider it." (The legislation would, among other things, make it next to impossible for an employer to fire a male employee who arrives at work in a dress and uses the women's bathroom. Senate Democrats, and a few liberal Senate Republicans, apparently believe that is a civil right.)

In *The Jerusalem Post*, Congresswoman Michele Bachmann writes, "In his address over a month ago to the UN General Assembly, ...Obama said that 'Israel's security as a Jewish and democratic state depends upon the realization of a Palestinian state.' He even inferred it had equivalent priority, while saying that 'the United States will never compromise our commitment to Israel's security.' Yet, only some weeks earlier, the administration, contrary to public assurances that it supported Israeli-Palestinian peace talks without preconditions, pressured Israel to free jailed Palestinian terrorists to bring the Palestinian Authority [PA] to the negotiating table. This pressure is symptomatic of a larger, fundamentally flawed approach that has failed the cause of peace. The administration rightly expressed concern that among the terrorists released by Israel was Al Haj Othman Amar Mustafa, who in 1989 murdered an American and former marine, Steven Frederick Rosenfeld. However, this begs the question why the administration has pressured Israel to free any terrorists at all. If it is unwise and unjust to free someone who murdered an American citizen, it is equally unwise and unjust to free someone who murdered non-American citizens. Indeed, why do we accept PA demands to free people who have committed the war crime of targeting civilians?" [50746, 50747]

"And why are we pressuring Israel at all? We have frequently pressured Israel to concede, including things it never agreed to in signed agreements, while ignoring the Palestinians' refusal to fulfill the vital concessions and reforms—arresting terrorists, outlawing terrorist groups, confiscating illegal weaponry, ending incitement to hatred and violence against Jews and Israel—they solemnly undertook in the 1993 Oslo and other signed agreements. It is not Israel that has declared war on its Arab neighbors since its inception in 1948. It is the neighboring Arab states which invaded Israel the day it declared independence. It is not Israel that refused peace talks following the first Arab-

Israeli war, it was its Arab neighbors. It is not Israel that refuses concessions. Under the 1979 Israeli/Egyptian peace treaty, it uprooted 4,000 Israelis and returned all of Sinai to Egypt, including the airfields it had built and the oil fields it had developed. We can't recall any other country that ever gave back territory won in self-defense, especially containing a reliable source of oil. ...Palestinian refusal to accept statehood in 1937, 1947, 2000 and again in 2008 suggests that destroying Israel, not building a Palestine, is the Palestinian goal. After all, the terrorist groups' hate education, glorification of suicide bombers and obscenely anti-Semitic mosque speeches by PA-salaried preachers continue to find a home in the PA." [50746, 50747]

Bachmann concludes, "The Obama administration has not called out this long, uninterrupted record of PA intransigence and extremism. It has, however, leaned heavily on Israel to make concessions. This is wrong. This is counter-productive. This harms peace prospects. This does not serve American interests. This is not America at its best. Above all, it is not the America that has declared under successive presidents... that it will stand by Israel when faced with threats, violence, extremism and non-acceptance. Israel faces all these right now. The time has come for the United States to cease pressuring Israel into unmerited, dangerous, one-sided concessions. The Obama administration must demand Palestinian compliance with all obligations committed to under the signed Oslo agreements, and make future diplomatic and financial support for the PA conditional on their verifiable fulfillment. We need—right now—a historic change in what has been a fundamentally flawed peace process. A change that would send a crystal clear message to the international community that no longer will the United States serve as a cudgel to beat and pressure Israel." [50746, 50747]

Obama defends his "If you like your plan you can keep it" lie, telling a sympathetic audience at Organizing for Action [OFA], "Now if you had one of these plans before the Affordable Care Act came into law and you really liked that plan, what we said was you can keep it *if it hasn't changed since the law passed.*" (Of course, he said no such thing in the past. He repeatedly said, "If you like your plan you can keep it. Period." He added no qualifiers. Interestingly, Obama uses the word "we" when he makes his claim about "what *we* said," rather than "what *I* said." The use of "we" is clearly intentional, and meant to deflect the blame for the lie away from Obama and to as many others as possible.) Senate Democrats up for reelection in 2014 will be less than thrilled to learn that Obama compounded his lie with another lie. They know ObamaCare may cause them to lose their jobs—and he arguably makes their campaigns even more difficult by not owning up to the problems. [50705, 50707, 50731, 50754, 50771]

Obama tells the OFA audience, "I know you're not happy about it because as long as the web site is not working the way it should, it makes it harder for you to help them get covered. And that's unacceptable and I'm taking responsibility to make sure that it gets fixed. And it will be fixed. We're working overtime to get it fixed. But in the meantime, as you go back to your home states, I just want to remind everybody that they can still apply for coverage by phone, by mail, in person. There was a time when the Internet didn't exist. It wasn't that long ago. A lot of programs like Medicaid still don't operate electronically. And so there are ways for us to still work to make sure that people are

getting the opportunity to buy affordable, quality health care.” (Obama neglects to point out that the worker handling the ObamaCare telephone or mail application still has to enter the information on Healthcare.gov. The backlog still exists. Additionally, even before the Internet one could ask Ford or Chevrolet how many cars they built each day and get an accurate answer, and McDonald’s could announce how many hamburgers it had sold. Yet Obama cannot—or will not—say how many Americans have bought ObamaCare policies.) [50710, 50727, 50780]

Brad Woodhouse, communications director for the Democrat National Committee, claims Obama spoke to a “packed house,” but photographs show otherwise. [50711]

Healthcare.gov experiences a 90-minute outage during the afternoon. [50729]

At Breitbart.com Joel B. Pollak writes, “If you thought Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel’s ‘mostly false’ performance on *Fox News Sunday* was bad, you would not be alone—but you had better get used to it, says one GOP lawmaker: Dr. Ezekiel is the future of Obamacare.” Congressman John Fleming (R-LA), “who appeared on CNN’s *State of the Union* Oct. 27 with Dr. Emanuel, calls his comments on health care ‘extremely false or grossly misleading. He [also] interrupts people, he jumps in there to advance what is really a lot of dishonest rhetoric on Obamacare,’ Fleming told Breitbart News. Fleming notes that bullying the interviewer is Dr. Ezekiel’s standard operating procedure. ‘He did the same with Megyn Kelly, too, on Fox News,’ he notes, pouncing on her suggestion that ...Obama had lied when he promised Americans that no one would have to give up their insurance for Obamacare. ‘Dr. Ezekiel represents the nexus between academia and the political world,’ Fleming observes. ‘This guy’s controversial, he’s said some controversial things about bioethics, about end-of-life care.’ (Dr. Emanuel’s support for expert rationing of certain health care treatments once fueled speculation about ‘death panels.’) ‘This is the guy who will be making health decisions about your future,’ Fleming said, referring to Dr. Emanuel’s role as Obamacare’s ‘architect.’ ‘He made a statement in our discussion [on CNN] about how great Romneycare is in Massachusetts, when in fact it has the highest costs in the nation and half of primary care doctors will not take new patients. He says there’s not a doctor shortage? Everyone knows there’s a doctor shortage, and it’s going to get worse. These are the kinds of painfully distorted answers he offers—and in the end you have to be a good citizen and do what you’re told, that it’s not our job to take care of you.’” [50708]

The Times-Picayune reports, “About 80,000 Louisiana residents will see their health insurance policies canceled in 2014 because they don’t meet new federal health-care standards, the state’s insurance commissioner said Monday. Jim Donelon said the Department of Insurance collected the information from health insurance providers last week in response to numerous requests for an estimate. The figure could account for close to half of the 165,000 people in Louisiana who hold individual health insurance plans that they pay for without the help of an employer or the government.” [50716]

DailyCaller.com reports that David's Bridal, which employs about 2,500 workers in 300 stores, has reduced employee hours to fewer than 30 per week and eliminated their health insurance coverage in response to ObamaCare. [50728]

The number of Americans who have received health insurance cancellation notices reaches at least 3.75 million—probably at least 50 times the number who have enrolled in an ObamaCare plan via Healthcare.gov. (Data from some states is not available. The 3.75 million figure is therefore low.) [50729, 50730]

CBSNews.com reports, “CBS News analysis found that the deadline for final [Healthcare.gov] security plans slipped three times from May 6 to July 16. Security assessments to be finished June 7 slid to August 16 and then August 23. The final, required top-to-bottom security tests never got done. The House Oversight Committee released an Obama administration memo that shows four days before the launch, the government took an unusual step. It granted itself a waiver to launch the website with ‘a level of uncertainty ...deemed as a high (security) risk.’ ...As a test, CBS gave one technology expert the real healthcare.gov username of a CBS employee, and within seconds, he identified the specific security question she used to reset her password. Sean Henry, the former assistant director of the FBI's cyber division, said the security issues need to be taken seriously. ‘If somebody's got the ability to look at a source code and able to reverse-engineer that and identify what somebody's personal questions are, that should be of concern,’ Henry said.” [50732, 50733, 51079]

A 49-state analysis reveals that health insurance premiums will rise, on average, 41 percent as a result of ObamaCare—a far cry from Obama's promise that they would decrease by an average of \$2,500 per family. (The analysis does not include Hawaii, which, notes HotAir.com's Mary Katherine Ham, “is so non-functional they could get no information off of it.”) [50735, 50736]

CNSNews.com reports, “The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, which runs the federal government's major health-care programs as well as the Obamacare insurance exchange, spent \$1,113,178,000,000 in fiscal 2013, according to the Monthly Treasury Statement for September, which was released last week. That sets a record for the most money ever spent by a federal agency or department in a single year.” In addition, the national debt increased by \$409 billion *in the month of October alone*, or about \$1,300 for every man, woman, and child living in the United States. [50743, 50744]

At PJMedia.com Paul Hsieh writes, “Many years ago, the writer Ayn Rand noticed a curious kind of backpedalling from the political Left. First, they'd claim that socialism would provide enough shoes for the whole world. But when economic reality caught up with them, and they failed to deliver on their promises, they'd turn around and claim that going barefoot was superior to wearing shoes. In modern parlance, those broken promises weren't a bug, but a *feature!* In the past few weeks, we've seen precisely this pattern coming from defenders of ObamaCare. For example: **Before: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. Now: Losing your insurance is good!** In a CNN op-ed, progressive activist Sally Kohn attempted to argue that ‘a canceled health plan is a good

thing.’ Basically, she claimed that the cancelled insurance plans weren’t that good anyway, and the government was doing those people a favor by making them buy insurance that government considered better, even if it costs more. **Before: You’ll pay less for insurance. Now: Paying more is good! ...Before: ‘Death Panels’ are just right-wing crazy talk. Now: ‘Death Panels’ are good!** In *Slate*, Adam Goldenberg declares, ‘Canada Has Death Panels—And that’s a good thing.’ Basically, when we all have to pay for one another’s health care, then patients should not be allowed to impose unlimited health costs on other taxpayers. Hence, the government has to decide who does—or does not—receive medical services. He explicitly argues that the government should ‘play God’ with citizens’ lives. For the good of society, of course. ... Lies and broken promises are bad enough. But when Obama administration apologists attempt to spin those as ‘good,’ they’re just insulting our intelligence. At least when the Mafia shakes down local shopkeepers, they don’t try to pretend that it’s for the victims’ own good. Or as we say here in fly-over country, ‘Don’t piss on my back and tell me it’s raining.’” [50745]

On November 5 wounded warrior Johnny “Joey” Jones, who walks with artificial legs and was photographed removing barricades from the World War II Memorial during the partial government shutdown, Tweets, “One time I was in AFG, and [Obama] was all, ‘if you like your legs, you can keep them’ ...Now I’m like, wtf?” [50713]

David Axelrod, Obama’s former campaign guru, mocks Governor Chris Christie’s weight in a Twitter message: “Ever see a large man shot from a canon [sic; cannon]? Watch Jersey launch [reelection] tonight, of GovChristie boomlet. But will he have place to land in this GOP?” [50712]

On MSNBC’s *Morning Joe*, leftist co-host is so frustrated by a video compilation showing Obama repeating, “If you like your plan you can keep it,” that she covers her face with several notes from her desk. Mediaite.com notes, “Even Chris Matthews couldn’t defend [Obama’s] promises about keeping health care plans, but later in the segment [Obama health advisor Dr.] Ezekiel Emanuel argued that it was the insurance companies, not ...Obama who should take the blame for the contradiction. ‘The law did not kick anyone off their plan, the law did not say you have to cancel those plans,’ he said. ‘Who’s making that change? The insurance companies.’” [50714, 50715]

White House tours resume on a limited basis: three days per week, rather than five. [50772]

U.S. District Court Judge James L. Robart rules that the court does not have “subject matter jurisdiction” to deal with evidence of Obama’s birth certificate forgery presented by Douglas Vogt in a “Notice of Commission,” and that a private citizen cannot enforce criminal statutes. (Robart incorrectly refers to Vogt’s evidence as a lawsuit, *Vogt v. Obama*. In fact, Vogt is *not* suing Obama; he presented evidence against Obama in order to prompt a grand jury review. Vogt presented evidence of felonies and treason against the United States, essentially to declare that he has done his duty as a citizen and cannot be convicted of misprision of felony or misprision of fraud. That is, the law permits the

prosecution of individuals who know a crime was committed and who do not report that crime. By referring to Vogt's charges as a lawsuit, Robart avoids having to deal with the grand jury provisions of the law. Montgomery Blair Sibley, who assisted Vogt with the filing, tells ThePostEmail.com that Robart violated Federal Rules of Criminal procedure Rule 6a, "which states that if the judge determines it's in the public interest, he must summon a grand jury. So the question is, 'Does the evidence that [Vogt] presented amount to public interest?' ...The fact that the judge refused to acknowledge that is, I believe, going to prompt [Vogt] to file a Motion to Reconsider, which then sets the table to take it on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and from there, on to the U.S. Supreme Court. ...The grand jury sits there five days a weeks, and all they have to do is give [Vogt] 30 minutes. Let him walk in, and if the grand jury says, 'You're a crackpot; take a hike,' then that's that. If they say, 'You know what... we're issuing subpoenas to Hawaii and the White House and Occidental College' and all the rest of them, and they get those returns back, because you can't stop a grand jury subpoena, then maybe the grand jury has something else to say in the form of an indictment or presentment. Why the judge is protecting Obama & Company from that very legitimate inquiry is the real question here." (If the forgery evidence is presented to a federal grand jury, a judge would also have to appoint a special prosecutor who is independent—because Attorney General Eric Holder would most certainly not cooperate and would attempt to protect Obama in any way possible.) [51297, 51313, 51314, 51314, 51576, 51578, 51886]

NDTV.com reports that Obama "secretly offered Pakistan in 2009 that he would nudge India towards negotiations on Kashmir in lieu of it ending support to terrorist groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba and Taliban, but much to his disappointment Islamabad rejected the offer. 'Since the 1950s Pakistan had wanted an American role in South Asia. Now it was being offered one. In the end, Pakistan would have to negotiate the Kashmir issue directly with India. But at least now [Obama] was saying that he would nudge the Indians toward those negotiations,' Pakistan's former Ambassador to the US Husain Haqqani writes in his book 'Magnificent Delusions,' which hit the stores today." (In other words, Obama offered to betray U.S. ally India in exchange for a temporary reduction of terrorism in Pakistan.) [50832]

Marilyn Tavenner, administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, testifies before the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) tells Tavenner, "The launching of the Affordable Care Act has been more than bumpy. I believe there's been a crisis of confidence created in the dysfunctional nature of the website, the canceling of policies, and sticker shock from some people. We read in *The Baltimore Sun* this morning that 73,000 Marylanders' policies will be canceled. So there has been fear, doubt, and a crisis of confidence." (Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius will appear before the Senate Finance Committee on November 6.) [50753, 50778, 50849, 50859]

CGI Federal, the Canadian firm that failed to deliver a working Healthcare.gov web site, is rewarded with \$7 million in federal contracts—to fix its own mistakes. [50752]

Obama's approval/disapproval rating falls to 39/53 in the Gallup poll. (Obama reached an all-time low of 38 percent twice in 2011. His approval/disapproval rating was 43/49 in early November 2010—when Republicans trounced Democrats in the mid-term elections.) At HotAir.com, Bruce McQuain notes that in November 2005, George W. Bush's approval/disapproval rating was 40/55, and asks why Obama's approval rating is now "in the toilet." "The answer seems to be 'cumulative.' Over the years, as we've gotten to know Mr. Obama, we've found we don't like him as much as we thought we might. We find he's petulant and sometimes petty. We have learned he doesn't like bad news, doesn't like to be blamed for anything and when he is he tries to pass the blame off to others. Or, in other words, we've discovered he isn't much of a leader, not a particularly good politician and seems to have no idea about what he's doing. We've seen our stock in the world plummet, the economy founder and his signature legislation—ObamaCare—is an unpopular disaster. You'll remember that the surge eventually worked in Afghanistan and that Bush's numbers rallied slightly. Frankly I see nothing on the horizon that might do the same for Mr. Obama. Pundits say the government shutdown will hurt Republicans. But that's been overshadowed by the ACA debacle. The economy continues to underwhelm, there are the NSA and IRS scandals, the Russians, Chinese and many others have absolutely no respect for this country's leadership and Democrats rightly fear the ACA will sink them in 2014 unless it is fixed and fixed quickly. Whatever you may say about President Bush, he was a leader. He made the unpopular decision to double down on Iraq and push the surge despite opposition both externally and internally. Mr. Obama shows no such leadership traits whatsoever. His is almost an absentee administration with his supposed 'hands off' management style (a euphemism for not doing anything). There seems to be no reason, given the facts of his 'governing style' to expect Mr. Obama's approval numbers to rally anytime soon if at all." (At the same time in their presidencies, Ronald Reagan's approval rating was 64 percent, Bill Clinton's was 60, and Dwight D. Eisenhower's was 58.) [50722, 50734, 50755, 50793, 50968]

Townhall.com's Katie Pavlich reminds readers that, in a Joint Session of Congress in 2009, Obama said, "If you misrepresent what's in this plan [the Affordable Care Act], we will call you out." Pavlich asks, "Now that millions of Americans are losing their health insurance thanks to Obamacare after ...Obama repeatedly promised they could keep plans they liked 'no matter what,' will he call himself out? Will Obama call out fellow Democrats who helped push a lie to the American people in order to get Obamacare passed? Doubt it." [50723, 50724]

On MSNBC, Democrat National Committee chairman Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-FL) tries to defend Obama's "You can keep your plan" pledge, saying, "At the end of the day, uh, uh, Americans were, were, were not, not only not mild, myzeld [sic; it is assumed she means "misled," but pronounces it "my-zelled"] by [Obama], the overwhelmingly majority of Americans are already insured, and what we're talking about here is insurance companies who [sic; that] chose not to keep the plan that they would, they could have grandfathered, and they chose to change the plan that they were making available to people that [sic; who] they already insured in the indiv... in the individual market. ...So no, there was nothing a... a... about what ...Obama or that I or any other

Democrats supporting the Affordable Care Act said, that was not true, and, it, it, it, and what is true is that the Republicans continue to do everything they can to stop people from getting quality, affordable, health coverage.” [50741]

The Wall Street Journal notes that the first wave of ObamaCare enrollments are fewer and older than what the administration needs for the program to succeed, and warns, “If the trend continues, an older, more expensive set of customers could drive up prices for everyone, the insurers say, by forcing them to spread their costs around. ‘We need a broad range of people to make this work, and we’re not seeing that right now,’ said Heather Thiltgen of Medical Mutual of Ohio, the state’s largest insurer by individual customers. ‘We’re seeing the population skewing older.’ The early numbers, described to *The Wall Street Journal* by insurance executives, agents, state officials and actuaries, are still small—partly a consequence of the continuing technical problems plaguing the federally run exchanges, experts say. HealthCare.gov, the federally run marketplace serving 36 states, is suffering serious technical problems that have prevented many people from signing up. But the numbers demonstrate a real-world fallout from the digital snafus: Less-healthy customers are more likely to persevere through technical obstacles to gain coverage, insurers say. Younger, healthier customers who feel less need for insurance—but whose widespread participation is important to the financial success of the system—could be quicker to give up.” [50748, 50749]

FoxNews.com reports, “Experiencing sticker-shock at the price of insurance on ObamaCare exchanges? That’s more likely if you live in a ‘red state’ that didn’t vote for Obama, according to price data compiled by the Heritage Foundation. In red states, premiums for 27-year-olds rose an average of 78% on ObamaCare exchanges, whereas in ‘blue states’ that voted for Obama, premiums rose a smaller 50%. Senate critics of ObamaCare say the difference is one way in which the bill is unfair. ‘It’s unfair, outrageous and unacceptable,’ Senator John Barrasso (R-WY), who is also an orthopedic surgeon, said in a statement to FoxNews.com. ‘After discovering that [Obama] broke his promise that Americans can definitely keep their coverage, many red state Americans are now finding out that their rates will soar under ObamaCare. This... proves once again that [Obama’s] health care law picks winners and losers across the country,’ he added. Health policy experts say the reason red states got hit hardest is that they had fewer regulations to begin with. ‘Think about it this way, what does ObamaCare do? ObamaCare imposes a one-size-fits-all regulatory scheme upon the insurance market. So if you’re in a lightly regulated state today, all of a sudden it’s going from a lightly regulated system to a heavily regulated system, and that drives up a lot of the costs,’ Avik Roy, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute who specializes in health policy, told FoxNews.com.” [50751]

FreeBeacon.com reports that gun company American Tactical Imports will be leaving New York “and will be investing \$2.7 million in its new facility and creating 117 new jobs in South Carolina. ATI’s announcement follows the decision of Kahr Arms to relocate to neighboring Pennsylvania, citing ‘uncertainty’ about gun laws following the passage of [New York’s gun control] SAFE Act. ...Meanwhile, Remington Arms is reportedly scouting locations in Tennessee for a new plant...” [50795, 50796, 50797]

CNSNews.com reports, “Since ...Obama took office in 2009, the amount of outstanding federal student loan debt owed to the government has skyrocketed, increasing by 463 percent. The balance owed currently stands at \$674,580,000,000.00 compared to \$119,803,000,000.00, where it stood in January 2009, according to the Financial Management Service’s latest monthly treasury statement.” [50750]

On *On the Record*, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) tells Greta Van Susteren that 85 percent of the ObamaCare enrollees in his state will not be paying for health insurance but will be new Medicaid recipients. (It is worth noting that as many Americans learn from Healthcare.gov that they are eligible for Medicaid, they are likely also to apply for food stamps. That will add several more billions to the federal deficit.)

New Jersey Governor Chris Christie wins an overwhelming reelection victory, which will place him in the front tier of potential 2016 Republican presidential candidates—although his moderate stance on many issues will hurt him in the early primaries and caucuses, which are in states that favor conservatives like Senator Rand Paul (R-KY). (One exit polls in New Jersey show Christie would lose to Hillary Clinton by four points, 48–44. Another shows Christie defeating Clinton, 50–43.) [50781, 50783, 50794, 50798, 50800, 50807, 50921]

In Virginia, ethically-challenged Democrat Terry McAuliffe barely squeaks by Republican Ken Cuccinelli—who gained about 10 points in the final weeks of his poorly-run campaign. Cuccinelli wins the married women vote by nine points, and the married men vote by six points. McAuliffe wins the unmarried votes by 31 points. (Even though Cuccinelli lost, opposition to the heavy hand of government and ObamaCare almost gave him a victory. The Republican National Committee was “less than enthusiastic” in its support for Cuccinelli, and New Jersey Governor Chris Christie refused to campaign for him. McAuliffe won with a massive 10-to-1 spending advantage on television attack ads, many of which falsely portrayed Cuccinelli as “anti-woman” and in favor of “outlawing contraceptives.” California billionaire Tom Steyer, a leftist with ties to the Clintons and Obama, reportedly spent \$8 million to help McAuliffe win. But the fact that the election was close means that Senate Democrats up for reelection in 2014 will most certainly be concerned about their own races if ObamaCare remains an issue. Additionally, McAuliffe was aided by the presence of Libertarian Party candidate Robert Sarvis on the ballot who took votes away from Cuccinelli. Had the race been solely between McAuliffe and Cuccinelli, the outcome may have been different. Another issue of concern for Democrats is that the anti-ObamaCare voters will be enthusiastic about going to the polls, while Obama himself will not be on the ballot to attract the pro-Obama minority voters. Anti-Obama voters will be at the polls, while the dwindling number of pro-Obama voters may stay home. The bad news for McAuliffe is that Republicans won 67 of the 100 seats in Virginia’s House of Delegates. McAuliffe’s background is neither governing nor leadership; he was Bill Clinton’s main money man, raising cash for his boss with schemes like charging White House guests to sleep in the Lincoln bedroom.) [50756, 50762, 50765, 50766, 50767, 50768, 50779, 50781, 50788, 50789, 50790, 50801, 50803, 50804, 50811, 50813, 50819, 50820, 50824, 50904, 50920, 51072, 51073, 51098]

Despite being a fan of the Boston Red Sox, Democrat/communist Bill de Blasio (who raised money for the Nicaraguan Sandinistas in the 1980s, toured the Soviet Union in 1983, honeymooned with his black, lesbian, nose-ringed wife in Cuba, served as an organizer for a Marxist political organization in Maryland, and once worked for the socialist New Party to which Obama belonged) handily wins the New York City mayoral race. De Blasio supports an end to police “stop and frisk” practices—which means the city’s crime rate will increase. He also supports two school holidays to honor Muslims, and tax increases—which are certain to drive more high-income residents out of the city. (According to Kevin D. Williamson at NationalReview.com, “[F]ewer than 100,000 New Yorkers pay half the city’s taxes, and 500 of them pay 15 percent of the city’s taxes. That is problematic in and of itself, but it’s not like everybody else gets off the hook—de Blasio’s [proposed] tax hike on those who make \$500,000 or more will have real consequences for people in less rarefied income brackets.”) [50773, 50781, 50782, 50784, 50812, 50830, 50872, 50912, 51049]

Republican Bradley Byrne wins a special runoff election in Alabama’s 1st Congressional District, replacing retiring Congressman Jo Bonner.

In Colorado, a \$950 million tax increase referendum fails by an almost two-to-one margin. (Supporters of the referendum spent \$10 million. Opponents spent a mere \$11,000—and were victorious.) Pushing the referendum before election day, Obama’s Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, said the tax increase would make Colorado “the educational model for every other state to follow.” (The taxes would be directed toward education.) [50820, 50822, 50863]

Vice President Joe Biden telephones Marty Walsh to congratulate him on his victory in the Boston mayoral race—and then discovers he called the wrong Marty Walsh. [50939]

Dr. Jim Garrow is interviewed by Geoffrey Grider on the Internet radio program, “Where’s Obama’s Birth Certificate.” Garrow, a “covert operator” (i.e., “CIA operative”) in the U.S. government for 45 years, states that Obama’s birth certificate is a “computer-generated forgery,” and “We know there is not record [of his birth] there at Kapiolani Hospital [in Honolulu, Hawaii].” ThePostEmail.com quotes Garrow: “Always follow the money. It doesn’t take a brain surgeon to find out what’s going on.” According to Garrow, Obama is a Muslim, Marxist, and a “paid operative of the Saudi government.” Garrow states he believes Obama was born in Kenya and used his Kenyan/British passport to travel to Pakistan in the early 1980s; Obama has sealed his college records because they show he received foreign student scholarships; and uses a stolen Social Security number (042-68-4425) issued in Connecticut (where Obama never lived or worked). Garrow also believes Novelist Tom Clancy and journalists Michael Hastings and Andrew Breitbart were murdered by the U.S. government. Garrow warns that Obama has “flooded every single government agency with his own communist sympathizers.” He also claims that Obama has been drumming out of the military those officers who have refused to agree to fire on their fellow Americans if they “refuse to give up their arms.” (The “purge” of high-ranking officers has reportedly resulted in almost 200 of

them being relieved of their command.) Retired Army Maj. Gen. Paul E. Vallely, former deputy commanding general of the Pacific Command, tells WND.com that much of the blame for the purge belongs to Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett, whose insistence on “political correctness” is negatively affecting all levels of military personnel. [50759, 50760, 50761, 50806, 50868, 50869, 51019]

At PJMedia.com Roger L. Simon writes, “I have no idea if Republicans will end their circular firing squad and unite sufficiently to right our country, but one thing seems abundantly clear from the events of the last weeks, including Tuesday’s election in which Terry McAuliffe barely eked out a victory over the unexciting Ken Cuccinelli. Liberalism in our country is in a more precarious position than ever. It may not even really exist. Liberalism as practiced in today’s America is a chimera, not actually an ideology but an alliance of interest groups controlled by elites for the preservation of their (the elites’) wealth and power. The interest groups often seem to be working against their own advantage by being so affiliated (e. g. African-Americans are in the worst shape in years under Obama), but not the elites who have been able to thrive. These elites are also able to appear altruistic to themselves and others while behaving in manners that are hideously selfish and atrocious to the common good. Liberalism is not so much an ideology in our society as it is a shield, a defense mechanism for a lifestyle. ...[T]he public is beginning to wake up to the emptiness (and to their pocket books). They are angry. It is up to the right now not to bobble the ball, not to get lost in internecine rivalries. If this is a libertarian moment, as some are saying, seize it, but seize it in a direct and clear manner. Know what you stand for. One of the reasons Obama could never be transparent is he doesn’t. He only stands for power—and he’s transparent enough about that. More people than ever in my lifetime now want less government (well, maybe except for some people in New York City who just elected that Sandinista-loving bozo de Blasio—they’ll learn when their property values start to tank). It’s up to us now to make it happen. All we have to do is overcome the illusion of liberalism. Since it isn’t there, it shouldn’t be all that difficult.” [50805]

Senator Mike Enzi (R-WY) appears on *The Kelly File*, and host Megyn Kelly plays a video of Enzi issuing various ObamaCare warnings on the floor of the Senate in *September 2010*: “Americans will eventually be forced to buy the kind of health insurance the federal government thinks you should have.” “Employers will be less likely to hire new workers and probably even lay off workers.” “Most businesses—the administration estimates between 39 and 69 percent—will not be able to keep the coverage that they have.” “This new regulation appears to ignore the impact it will have in the real world. It’ll drive up costs and reduce the number of people who will have insurance.” (Enzi, one of the few legislators who actually read the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, was correct on all points—but was ridiculed at the time and accused of fear mongering.) [50810]

On November 6 Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius testifies before the Senate Finance Committee. The Democrats on the committee are marginally more restrained in their complaints and soften them by reading letters from low-income constituents who will benefit from ObamaCare. Republicans counter those anecdotes

with the numbers of Americans whose policies are being canceled because of ObamaCare, and outrage over administration lies that people could keep their plans and that their premiums would go down by an average of \$2,500. Sebelius, whose own health insurance has not been canceled, says, “There is no excuse for what has been a miserable five weeks.” Senator Bill Nelson (D-FL) refers to “so-called” cancellations—as if the hundreds of thousands of Floridians who receiving cancellation notices had only received April Fools Day letters six months early. Sebelius admits that the enrollment numbers to be announced in mid-November will be lower than expected. [50757, 50763, 50785, 50786, 50787, 50799]

Questioned by Senator John Thune (R-SD), Sebelius admits that “Employer-based grandfathered plans will have the same caveats” as the individual health insurance plans. (In other words, many group policies will also be canceled by the insurance companies because of ObamaCare. The furor over canceled insurance will therefore carry into 2014 and election day.) [50764, 50809]

Sebelius also admits that it is possible for a convicted felon to become an ObamaCare “navigator.” (There is no requirement that navigators go through criminal background checks, even though they will be handling sensitive private information, including Social Security numbers and income. Of course, it is true that health insurance companies do not necessarily conduct criminal background checks for all employees, but consumers can sue those companies if their private information is abused; they cannot sue the federal government if it is abused by ObamaCare workers.) [50814]

NationalReport.net reports, “Merely hours after the close of a bitter and divisive Governor’s race in Virginia that saw Democrat Terry McAuliffe pull out a win over Republican Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, irregularities in voting data have emerged. According to mainstream media outlets McAuliffe supposedly defeated Cuccinelli in a razor-thin 47-46 percent victory to become the next Governor of the great state of Virginia. Immediately following the announcement, Cuccinelli’s office opened a full investigation into the legitimacy of the vote and quickly turned up surprising results. In 13 districts, multiple instances of intimidation at the polls were reported. Large black men wearing traditional Black Panther garb were reported lingering around polling places approaching older voters asking questions about who they intended on voting for. In Loudoun and Fairfax counties (traditional Democratic strongholds), election officials withheld submitting voter data in order to get an idea of whether to count absentee ballots or not. In an audit of the voter registration information, it quickly became apparent that MULTIPLE votes were cast by people who were either deceased or had long ago moved out of the district.” [50876]

KMOV.com reports, “The early findings of an ongoing review of the Illinois Medicaid program revealed that half the people enrolled weren’t even eligible. The state insisted it’s not that bad but Medicaid is on the federal government’s own list of programs at high risk of waste and abuse. Now, a review of the Illinois Medicaid program confirms massive waste and fraud. A review was ordered more than a year ago—because of concerns about waste and abuse. So far, the state says reviewers have examined roughly

712 thousand people enrolled in Medicaid, and found that 357 thousand, or about half of them shouldn't have received benefits. After further review, the state decided that the percentage of people who didn't qualify was actually about one out of four. ...A state spokesman insists that the percentage of unqualified recipients will continue to drop dramatically as the review continues because the beginning of the process focused on the people that were most likely to be unqualified for those benefits. But regardless of how it ends, critics say it's proof that Illinois has done a poor job of protecting tax payers money." Ted Dabrowski, a vice president of The Illinois Policy Institute think tank, states, "Illinois one of the most miss-managed states in country... [and these] findings shouldn't surprise anyone." (ObamaCare will add even more Illinoisans to the Medicaid rolls.) [50933, 50934]

At Townhall.com Michael Schaus writes, "Poor Jay Carney. As the official Press Tap-Dancer for the Obama Administration, it is his job to make the lies of his boss sound a little less nefarious. (Of course, I'm paraphrasing the job description.) And like many liberals who allow their utopian promises to paint them into an intellectual corner, Carney is resorting to verbal abuse, condescension, and arrogance. Yesterday's exchange between Jon Karl and the White House Press Jester is the latest example of Carney's habitual harassment of reporters who dare to ask ~~hard~~ questions. Maybe the White House has become so accustomed to the beltway media gleefully echoing the talking points distributed by Mr. Carney, that actual questions have become more of an annoyance than a regular occurrence in the Briefing Room. Regardless, the manner in which this White House scoffs, mocks, and belittles reporters who dare to ask pointed questions is indicative of an amateur administration struggling with the collapse of their signature initiative [ObamaCare]. ...Rather than answering questions (I thought that was actually his job description) the Press Secretary has adopted the tactics of discrediting the questioner. ...Defense of Obamacare's merits are apparently not an option anymore for Obama cheerleaders. Which explains the administration's employment of half-truths, outright lies, censored information, and verbal ridicule of any attempt at honest reporting. And the Administration's only career cheerleader, Jay Carney, has adopted this tact with reckless abandon. Then again, how else do we expect Carney to defend claims like 'you can keep your insurance if you like it' or 'you can sign up in as little as 25 minutes?' I guess insults and temper tantrums are the only thing left in his repertoire, given the ruined [administration] he is expected to defend on a daily basis. And if you think Carney is getting overly defensive now, just imagine if we had a press that was honestly dedicated to investigative journalism. Pretty soon we'd hear that the Press Briefings will be closed due to sequester budget cuts (darn Republicans)." [50774]

Also at Townhall.com, Rachel Marsden writes that "history will judge Obama on [his] actions, not [his] words. ...History records plane crashes, not turbulence—although those on the flight itself might chatter about it." (Arguably, history's judgment of Obama will be harsh regardless of whether it focuses on his words or his actions.) [50776]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, "A marketing firm with close ties to ...Obama and his political campaigns was given the lucrative job of designing Michelle Obama's 'Let's Move' anti-obesity logo without having to go through the government contract bidding

route. Judicial Watch reported the firm, Shepardson, Stern & Kaminsky, was awarded the \$100,000 job, in violation of federal contracting rules. And that's not just Judicial Watch's interpretation of law—federal officials admitted the deal was an 'unauthorized commitment,' in documents obtained by the government watchdog from a Freedom of Information Act request. ...In a written statement, Judicial Watch reported that the U.S. Department of Agriculture put together a 'request for ratification of an unauthorized commitment' as a means of making the deal legitimate. Judicial Watch also reported that records... indicate that federal authorities who awarded the company the \$100,000 job did so because the anti-obesity campaign was considered too important to delay for the normal bidding process." Judicial Watch learned, "One partner in the firm, Robert Shepardson, worked on Mr. Obama's political campaigns and then played a key role in designing the 'Let's Move' logo initiative. Another former partner in the firm, Marty Cooke, served as creative director for Mr. Obama's presidential run in 2008. And another partner, Rebecca Matovic, worked for the George Soros' Open Society Foundation, as well as the Gates Foundation and the Environmental Defense Fund. Moreover, Judicial Watch also found that the firm headed up the Obama for America's youth campaigns in 2008 and again in 2012. Prior to winning the Obama administration's favor, the firm had only worked one government contract—for the Department of Defense in 2002, for \$50,000." (The logo has an image of an apple in place of the "o" in "Let's Move," and the silhouette of a jumping girl as an ending exclamation point.) [50777]

KaiserHealthNews.org reports, "Weeks after denying [organized] labor's request to give union members access to health-law subsidies, the Obama administration is signaling it intends to exempt some union plans from one of the law's substantial taxes. Buried in rules issued last week is the disclosure that the administration will propose exempting 'certain self-insured, self-administered plans' from the law's temporary reinsurance fee in 2015 and 2016. That's a description that applies to many Taft-Hartley union plans acting as their own insurance company and claims processor, said Edward Fensholt, a senior vice president at Lockton Cos., a large insurance broker." (The waiver would save the labor union plans an estimated \$600 million—money that would otherwise go into a special fund to help protect ObamaCare from the "death spiral" caused by too few young, healthy enrollees in the scheme. The administration does not say how it will replace that \$600 million—but "middle class taxpayers and businesses" may come to mind.) [50791, 50792, 50802, 50860]

Politico reports that Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) "took an implicit swipe at newly reelected New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie Wednesday when he criticized the use of federal funding to air post-Sandy television ads. At a Senate hearing on Sandy recovery efforts, Paul asked Housing and Urban Development Secretary Shaun Donovan whether it was appropriate for Sandy aid money to be used to air the ads—and while Paul never named Christie, it was a clear reference to ads made by the state of New Jersey in which Christie appeared after the devastating Oct. 2012 hurricane. 'Some of these ads, people running for office put their mug all over these ads while they're in the middle of a political campaign,' Paul said at the hearing, per ABC News. 'In New Jersey, \$25 million was spent on ads that included somebody running for political office. Do ya think there might be a conflict of interest there?'" [50825, 50854]

At TakiMag.com Guy Somerset writes about Obama's apparent unawareness of just about everything that goes on in his administration, and observes, "One cannot be perpetually ill-informed or uninformed on every issue of any substance for the better part of a decade without having people conclude that Barack Obama is either a colorful cut-out made to dance and shuffle for the American people down the stairs of Air Force One, or he is an idiot. I do not believe Obama is a great orator. His speeches are lackluster, his cadence is Louisiana preacher circa 1940, and his style hackneyed. Never once have I heard the man say anything insightful or clever enough to alter my perception of anything. Those who are impressed only distinguish themselves as illiterate. Incidentally, the Barry Stutter (by which he stumbles, repeats, and pauses over the first syllable of words) is a very old linguistic technique of quasi-hypnotists. Its purpose is to commence a phrase, use quick repetition without completion, hesitate long enough for the listener to anticipate what is to come and thereafter continue, creating positive reinforcement in the audience. Onlookers hear what they were prepared to hear moments prior yet believe they thought it first. When Barack says what he conditioned them to expect, they feel intelligent. Since he is confirming what they 'already thought,' Obama is 'brilliant.' Politicians and newsreaders use this trick to exhaustion. ...I judge a man on his ideas, and Obama doesn't seem to have any, at least not of his own conception. All of which isn't a capital offense even as he shoves legislation under the Capitol dome. Moreover, being ordinary doesn't make one a moron. For all my criticism I do not believe Obama is stupid, but I do believe he plays the fool. As Barry plays dumb and his family vacations everywhere under the sun, we abide. This is our country and whatever he does, or allows to be done in his name, it is for us to live here under his laws. Meanwhile, he says he knows not about naught and we acquiesce in the lie. Between us, which is the dupe?" [50808]

At the White House, 15 Senate Democrats up for reelection in 2014 meet with Obama, Vice President Joe Biden, chief of staff Denis McDonough, and ObamaCare "technology czar" Jeff Zients. The two-hour, closed door meeting is not on the White House schedule. It can be assumed that the Senators give Obama an earful about the disastrous ObamaCare rollout and how it may destroy their political careers. According to DailyCaller.com, "[T]he plight of Democratic politicians didn't get much sympathy from [Obama], who offered only promises of more speeches and 'communications' efforts to sell a law that is causing massive losses of insurance coverage and skyrocketing premiums. A Democrat Party source tells Fox News, "There's a lot of pent-up frustration" among the vulnerable Senators. (Some Democrat strategists have urged Obama to step up his criticism of insurance companies, hoping to shift some of the blame for ObamaCare from those who voted for it to those who hope to gain from it. AT HotAir.com Bruce McQuain comments, "Ah, the life of a failed community organizer and his posse. Help create a monstrosity out of whole cloth and then, when it performs as poorly as critics said it would, find a 'villain' and blame them. Except right now you need the villain. Meanwhile your party is raising the volume on its protests about the awful rollout and its effect on their chances for re-election next year. What to do. What to do.") After the meeting, Senator Chris Coons (D-DE) urges others to give Obama some "breathing room" on ObamaCare. (A "deal" may have been reached in which the

Senators agreed to give Obama a little more time, in exchange for their being free to publicly bash the Affordable Care Act to keep them from losing more constituent support.) One meeting attendee is asked by Politico if Democrats are losing credibility. The response: “You [have] got to have it to lose it.” [50846, 50851, 50856, 50858, 50866, 50891, 51052]

It is worth noting that with many Democrats desperate for rollbacks of some portions of ObamaCare, the Republicans may have a significant negotiating advantage. If Democrats push for a one-year delay in the individual mandate, for example, the Republicans would be wise to agree only if the Democrats agree to additional other changes—such as permitting the sale of health insurance across state lines, and reform to reduce the cost of malpractice insurance to defend against frivolous lawsuits. Additionally, because ObamaCare passed with 60 votes in the Senate and would have failed with only 59, every Democrat Senator up for reelection will likely face a Republican attack ad blaming him or her for being the 60th vote.) [50925]

The CBS affiliate in New York reports on a married couple in Brooklyn that is considering getting divorced in order to get taxpayer subsidies for their ObamaCare health insurance. “The issue for [Nona Willis] Aronowitz and [Aaron] Cassara is that together as family of only two, they make more than the \$62,000 level to qualify for subsidies under the Affordable Care Act. But if they lived together unmarried, they would qualify for the subsidies and could literally save hundreds of dollars a month on their health care. A single person can qualify for subsidies if they make less than \$46,000 a year. ...Aronowitz, a freelance writer, and Cassara, who works as a freelancer in the film industry, lost their health coverage recently when Aronowitz was laid off. Critics of the Affordable Care Act have called the pricey decision couple faces the ‘marriage penalty.’ But the income levels for subsidies were set by Congress.” [50821, 50845]

The number of Americans whose individual health insurance plans have been canceled because of ObamaCare reaches 4.2 million.

At HumanEvents.com Ann Coulter writes, “So now it turns out Obama knew that 93 million Americans would have their health insurance canceled the whole time he was claiming, ‘If you like your insurance, you can keep it. Period.’ Obama lied. Period. ‘Hope and Change’ was actually ‘A Sucker Is Born Every Minute.’ ...Under the law, HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius is to determine what every health insurance plan must cover—and any plans that don’t are illegal. ...Our federal overseers, led by the arrogant and smug gender-feminist Sebelius, know what’s best for us. (Which is so nice of her since, as she recently pointed out, she doesn’t work for us.) Her idea of flexibility is not requiring Catholic priests to perform abortions. Not yet, anyway. ...Policies are being canceled because your old plan—the one you shopped for and liked—is now illegal. It doesn’t cover Sandra Fluke’s dental dams. Obama is blaming the insurance companies for discontinuing policies that he made illegal. (At least he isn’t blaming the cancellations on a guy who put a movie trailer on the Internet this time.) Isn’t it your basic duty as a caring human being to buy an expensive health care plan you don’t really want? Because who knows better about the health care needs of 310 million Americans than a smug

gender-feminist? Certainly not you. ...What if Americans don't want to spend weeks online figuring out their new insurance options? What if we don't want to provide the government with reams of personal information simply to be able to buy health insurance? What if we just want to pay our doctor directly for a yearly checkup? Why do we have to examine HHS regulations to find out how much that's going to cost us in fines and taxes? Under Obamacare, every day is tax day." [50823]

At left-leaning Politico.com, Alex Isenstadt marginalizes the late surge that almost gave Republican Ken Cuccinelli a victory in the Virginia governor's race, and even suggests ObamaCare may not have much of an impact in the 2014 mid-term elections. He writes, "No one's saying 2014 is [sic; will be] anything like 2010, when ascendant congressional Republicans used Obamacare to tap into a deep vein of anger that was hottest among the conservative grass roots but also extended to independent voters. There was resentment over Democrats who rammed the health care law through Congress with no GOP support as well as the deep recession and Wall Street bailout. Next year's midterm, so far, is shaping up to be a far more stable election with neither party benefiting from a wave." (Isenstadt neglects to comprehend that voters gave Republicans overwhelming victories in November 2010 based solely on the *concept* of ObamaCare. In November 2014 the voters will be responding to the *realities* of ObamaCare—canceled policies, higher premiums, needing to find new doctors and hospitals—and their anger will most certainly be greater than it was in 2010.) [50824]

WND.com reports, "Former Florida Congressman Allen West is calling for congressional oversight hearings into what he describes as an 'alarming trend' of dismissals and firings of high-ranking military officers by the Obama administration, firings that in a number of cases appear to be political. While he wouldn't assign a particular reason for the high rate of dismissals—and he declined to label them a 'purge'—West in an exclusive WND interview said oversight hearings need to be convened to determine why so many officers are being removed. West, who as congressman served on the House Armed Services Committee, said he recently had been in contact with Committee Chairman Rep. Howard 'Buck' McKeon [R-CA]—calling for hearings 'to determine exactly why' so many officers, especially senior officers, are being given the boot. 'McKeon needs to look at this problem,' West told WND. 'There needs to be transparency. It is important to get the truth.'" [50835]

The Associated Press reports, "US Secretary of State John Kerry has said that the United State will provide an additional \$75 million in aid to create Palestinian jobs and help them improve roads, schools and other infrastructure. US officials say the aid is intended to boost Palestinian public support for faltering peace talks with Israel by showing them tangible benefits from the process. Kerry announced the aid on Wednesday in Bethlehem, where he is meeting Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas. Kerry met the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Jerusalem earlier on Wednesday. The new aid brings the US contribution to a Palestinian infrastructure program to \$100 million." (AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller rightly comments, "In other words, it's a bribe.") [50831]

WashingtonPost.com reports that Tony Trenkle, “the chief information officer at the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the agency that built the Affordable Care Act’s online portal,” is leaving his position and returning to private sector employment—effective November 15. According to CBS News, Trenkle “was originally supposed to sign off on security for the glitch-ridden website before its Oct. 1 launch, but didn’t. Instead, the authorization on September 27 was given by Trenkle’s boss, CMS administrator Marilyn Tavenner. ...[S]ecurity assessments fell behind and the website never had the required top-to-bottom tests. Trenkle and two other CMS officials, including Chief Operating Officer Michelle Snyder, signed an unusual ‘risk acknowledgement’ saying that the agency’s mitigation plan for rigorous monitoring and ongoing tests did ‘not reduce the (security) risk to the ...system itself going into operation on October 1, 2013.’” HotAir.com asks, “Was he pushed out or did he resign in protest because they insisted on launching a site that he knew wasn’t secure? When asked whether he jumped or was pushed, HHS said simply that ‘Tony [Trenkle] made a decision that he was going to move to the private sector.’ Memo to [House Oversight and Government Reform Committee chairman] Darrell Issa: *Subpoena this man*. ...Tell me if this sounds ...plausible: Tavenner asks Trenkle to sign and he politely refuses. The site’s not secure, after all, and not only is it not secure but trying to repair it on the fly is bound to create even more security holes. Because he’s a good soldier and wants the site to work, though, he sticks around for another month and does his best to help fix things. A month later, for reasons as yet unknown, he finally abandons ship.” [50857, 50929, 51055]

While in Israel, Kerry says, “Let me emphasize at this point the position of the United States of America on the [West Bank] settlements is that we consider them... to be illegitimate.” (On Israel soil, Kerry demands that the Israelis stop building houses and apartment buildings in Israel. AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller writes, “Jews living in the Jewish homeland are not settlers; their homes are not ‘settlements.’ Obama is brash in his respect for Islamic anti-semitism. He was raised on it. His hatred of Israel and his history of forging antisemitic alliances is meticulously detailed in my book, *The Post-American Presidency: The Obama Administration's War on America*. Now it is yielding stinking, rotting, poisonous fruit.”) Meanwhile, according to WND.com, “Israel’s largest newspaper, Yedioth Aharonot, has reported that Kerry is using the EU [European Union] sanctions to blackmail Israel into complying with talks aimed at creating a Palestinian state that would include the West Bank and eastern Jerusalem. The newspaper claimed that Kerry ‘told the [Israeli] prime minister that he heard from his European friends ...that if the negotiations fail, Israel can forget about participating in the European research and development program ‘Horizon 2020.’ ‘And that will only be the beginning. ...More and far weightier actions to boycott Israel will follow. They are already being prepared. This will cause incalculable damage to the Israeli economy.’” [50833, 50834, 50836]

On *Special Report*, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer observes, “Look what happened last night in Virginia. ObamaCare single handedly—only a slight exaggeration—turned what should have been a landslide into a cliffhanger. [Ken] Cuccinelli was behind by double digits after the shutdown really hurt him in northern

Virginia, where there are a lot of government workers. He was way behind. He decided to gamble it all in the last week attacking ObamaCare. He came to the point where by 10:00 last night, he was actually ahead in the count, and then he lost narrowly. That's all due to ObamaCare. And this is not new. Four years ago in Virginia and New Jersey, Obama campaigned for the Democratic candidates for governor and they both lost. And the issue was the beginning of the Tea Party revolt, the issues were the stimulus, high taxation, high spending and it was ObamaCare. So this is now the second time ObamaCare is striking and it's going to continue to strike. It petered away after the last time because it was all in theory, it wasn't happening, it was suspended. But it's happening now. And unless they stop the avalanche here, the Democrats are going to get buried in this." Krauthammer calls ObamaCare "a political disaster. But the geniuses, the economists—if you hear [Obama health care advisor] Ezekiel Emanuel say on *Fox News Sunday* this was designed—you had to get people out of the individual insurance market, generally people of some means, you put them in the exchanges, they overpay and you use the subsidy. This was not an accident. What they never understood is how disastrous it would be politically. But economically, that's the way they make it work." [50847]

Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) tells *On The Record's* Greta Van Susteren, "If this [ObamaCare disaster] doesn't turn around pretty quickly ...Obama's going to lose his second term. Democrats are going to bail out in droves before the next election, and his signature issue's going up in flames if he doesn't fix this. ...He can't ride this out. He fundamentally misled the American people about something that was reassuring to hear." [50848]

Obama attends two high-roller fundraisers in Texas to raise money for the Democrat Senatorial Campaign Committee. Before the fundraisers, he addresses a "healthcare event" (planned to make it possible to bill the taxpayers for the trip), saying, "To finish the job, now what we've got to do is sign up those folks who don't have health insurance and improve insurance for those who are under-insured, who don't have very good insurance, and have been subject to the whims of the insurance company. ...And that's the challenge that we've got over the next month, three months, six months, next year. And if we get that done—when we get that done—then we will have created a stable system in which there's no reason why people shouldn't be getting health care in this country. ...And the website is already better than it was at the beginning of October, and by the end of this month, we anticipate that it is going to be working the way it is supposed to, all right?" [50858, 50864]

At the first of two Texas fundraisers Obama says, "The way the political system works right now, it is biased and skewed away from common sense. The electorate has gotten more polarized, the media has gotten more polarized. Being extreme, being controversial tends to get you on TV and get your name out there. If you're just being sensible and saying, well, let's try to work together across the aisle, then you know you're going to live in obscurity. ...[W]e've got to liberate those reality-based Republicans from some of the extreme impulses in that party. But if they don't see a cost for those kinds of strategies, then they'll keep doing it. And the only way to extract a cost when it comes to politicians is during election time." At his second fundraiser Obama says, "The only way

that we can realign our politics so that it matches up with the decency and goodness of the American people is if elections matter, and we're able to both deliver a message and organize ourselves so that folks who aren't acting responsibly pay a consequence, and that we're lifting up and rewarding candidates who are serious about the challenges this country faces and are willing to work together in a spirit that is constructive in order to deliver for the American people. ...I have to say that I'm a proud Democrat and am committed to the values that the Democratic Party represents, but I'm also interested in getting the Republican Party back in a functioning state. Because this country has two parties, and we need both of them operating in a way that allows us to move forward. And I think that will eventually happen. Voters have an ability I think to help parties self-correct, although sometimes it takes more than one cycle to do it. But in the meantime, we can't just be standing still." [50858, 50864]

Obama's ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, addresses the United Nations Association of the USA 2013 Global Leadership Awards in New York City. Power says, "Hi everybody. You know life has changed when you're hanging out with Jane Fonda backstage. There is no greater embodiment of being outspoken on behalf of what you believe in—and being 'all in' in every way—than Jane Fonda. And it's a huge honor just to even briefly have shared the stage with her." (FoxNews.com reminds readers, "Vietnam veterans have long held a less charitable view of the Oscar-winning actress, who in her younger days took her anti-war activism to North Vietnam, where she posed with Viet Cong soldiers at a missile battery and earned the derisive nickname 'Hanoi Jane.'" Ned Foote, president of the New York State Council of the Vietnam Veterans of America, says, "We all hate her.") [50878, 51026]

At the Country Music Association awards, singers Brad Paisley and Carrie Underwood mock ObamaCare and HealthCare.gov. The lyrics to their song: "ObamaCare by morning; why's this taking so long? I'm gonna wind up with hemorrhoids; if I sit here [at Healthcare.gov] 'til dawn; we'll have cataracts and dementia; oh, this is gettin' on my last nerve; ObamaCare by morning; over six people served." (Most in the audience howl with laughter over the song, sung to the tune of the classic, *Amarillo by Morning*. On the Internet, leftists—who generally hate country music and its emphasis on America, faith, and family—react with predictable outrage, even charging racism, while conservatives offer additional suggestions for country music parodies: "Much Too Young To Owe This Much Debt" "Mamas, Don't Let Your Babies Grow Up To Be Community Organizers" "Man, I Throw Like a Woman" "Jarrett Take the Wheel" "I Can't Stop Taxing You" "All My Nemesis Live in Texas" "I Was Always On My Mind" "You're Once, Twice, Three Times as Shady" "God Bless the NSA" "All My Axis Live On Taxes" "I Walk the Lie" "Take This Plan and Shove It" "You Picked a Fine Time to Leave Me Blue Shield" "Stand By Your Plan." *The Obama Timeline* suggests: "They Stopped Covering Her Today" "Your Failin' Heart" "Czars in Low Places" "Plan Finer's Daughter" "I Will Always Cover You" "I Am A Man, Uncovered Tomorrow" "Can the Coverage Be Unbroken?" "I'm So Angry I Could Cry" "Make the Law Go Away" and "You Picked a Fine Way to Screw Us Kathleen.") [50826, 50827, 50828, 50829, 50843, 50862, 50867, 51053]

Jay Leno quips, “Obama saw gravity today. Not the film, his poll numbers, not good. The latest polls show ...Obama’s approval rating down to 39 percent And Toronto Mayor Rob Ford’s approval rating went up to 49 percent. How does this make Obama feel? He’s better off smoking crack than passing ObamaCare. He would have been up ten points. Would have been ten points higher! Actually, have you noticed [Obama] backtracking a little bit on this whole deal? Like at a fundraiser earlier this week ...Obama said, ‘No, no, no.’ What he promised was that you could keep your health care plan if it hasn’t changed since the law has passed. You know, he’s such a good speaker, he almost believed it himself. And then his pants caught fire. That’s when I knew. When I saw... when the pants caught fire.” [50871]

On November 7 Victor Davis Hanson writes at Townhall.com, “It is hard now to believe that Obama’s banal ‘hope and change’ ever set a nation on fire. Certainly by 2013, we have come to snore when Obama for the nth time laces his teleprompted rhetoric with ‘make no mistake about it’ or ‘let me be perfectly clear.’” [50838]

Also at Townhall.com, Katie Pavlich posts an 18-minute video, *ObamaCare, Deconstructed*, that “deconstructs nearly every single lie told about ...Obama’s signature piece of legislation from the time Obamacare was signed into law in 2010 until now.” [50839, 50840]

Some users access Healthcare.gov and are greeted with garbled text, such as, “???ffe.ee.myAccount.login.header???” [50875]

Julie Bataille, Medicare spokesman, tells reporters the Healthcare.gov fixes are themselves uncovering more problems: “Essentially what is happening is people are going through the entire process. As we have fixed certain pieces of functionality, like the account creation process, we’re seeing volume go further down the application. We’re identifying new issues that we need to be in a position to troubleshoot.” [50910, 50911]

The Washington Post gives the Obama administration “three Pinocchios” for trying to shift blame to the insurance companies for canceling policies that ObamaCare forces them to eliminate. [50931, 50932]

The Senate votes 64–32 to approve the “Employment Non-Discrimination Act”—legislation that bans workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. (The legislation faces opposition in the House, where critics warn that it will lead to abuses where men dress as women, insist on using women’s restrooms at the office, and cannot be fired by their employer.) [50870]

The Food and Drug Administration announces it will force the food industry to phase out artificial trans fats—even though the average American consumes only about one gram per day and the amount has decreased steadily over the last two decades. The Associated Press notes, “Trans fats are used both in processed food and in restaurants, often to improve the texture, shelf life or flavor of foods. Though they have been removed from

many items, the fats are still found in some processed foods, including in many baked goods like pie crusts, biscuits and ready-to-eat frostings that use the more-solid fats to keep consistency.” [50914]

Breitbart.com reports, “Though Sen. Rand Paul (R-KY) never once mentioned the word ‘abortion’ in his address at Liberty University last week—a speech that caused MSNBC’s Rachel Maddow to become apoplectic—the Associated Press, immediately targeted Paul’s speech as a crusade against abortion. ...AP’s headline blared: ‘Rand Paul warns eugenics on horizon unless conservatives stand up against abortion rights.’ That story was republished in papers like the *Washington Post* and other outlets, prompting papers such as the *Lexington-Herald Leader* to wrongly report that Paul spoke on abortion, which he did not. The publication has since issued a correction. ...Speaking to 10,000 college students at the Liberty University arena, Paul spoke about the intersections of freedom and virtue, and how a free society requires virtue, especially in a world in which technology is advancing at a rapid clip. Paul spoke thoughtfully on his reflections about eugenics, emerging genetic technologies and advancements that will allow for manipulation and the search for human perfection. All of that was ignored by the media.” Paul said, in part, “Imagine a world in which disease and disability are eliminated: no meningitis, no Down’s Syndrome, no cleft palate, no cerebral palsy. Man is able to select against these disabilities. Each individual’s biological future can be predicted by looking at their DNA.” Paul observed that advances in technology can lead to “great progress in combating disease” but warned, “keep an eye on who controls the technology,” and asked, “Will we be sorry when we eliminate those with premature deafness such as Beethoven?” (*The Obama Timeline* believes that the mainstream media will do its best to misrepresent Paul—and any other Republican who may appear to be a potential presidential candidate who dares to challenge the presumed Democrat nominee, Hillary Clinton.) [50992]

WashingtonPost.com reports, “More than a month after the launch of Delaware’s health insurance exchange, officials report only four Delawareans enrolled for insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act. As of Tuesday, Delaware’s marketplace guide organizations reported four enrollments, 31 enrollment applications completed and 218 accounts created for possible enrollment. Four community organizations were hired to provide marketplace guides, using a \$4 million federal grant.” [50841, 50842, 50853]

In an interview with NBC News, Chuck Todd asks, “I’ll start with health care. It’s probably the most quoted thing or re-quoted thing you have said... ‘If you like your health care plan, you can keep it.’ ...At this point, though, it’s obviously something—a promise that has not been able to be kept. Just today, the *Denver Post*—250,000 people in Colorado are seeing health insurance policies cancelled. Some of those people liked those policies. And they can’t keep them. What happened?” Obama responds, “Well, first of all, I meant what I said. And we worked hard to try to make sure that we implemented it properly. But obviously, we didn’t do enough—a good enough job—and I regret that. We’re talking about five percent of the population—who are in what’s called the individual market. [The percentage is actually about eight, not five, and it represents about 25 million Americans.] They’re out there buying health insurance on their own. A

lot of these plans are subpar plans. And we put in a clause in the law that said if you had one of those plans, even if it was subpar—when the law was passed, you could keep it. But there’s enough churn in the market that folks since then have bought subpar plans. And now that may be all they can afford. So even though it only affects a small amount of the population, you know, it means a lot to them, obviously, when they get—this letter cancelled.” (Obama most certainly did not “mean what he said,” because he knew all along that millions of Americans would lose their private health insurance policies: *that was the point of ObamaCare, to force them to buy coverage at the federal exchanges.* Further, although the law was passed with a clause to allow existing plans to be grandfathered, that clause was almost immediately stripped of all meaning by *intentional* regulations designed to reduce the number of such plans to as few as possible. Obama is here compounding his lies with more lies.) [50861, 50879, 50906, 50913, 50915, 50927, 50957, 50975, 51343, 51383]

Todd gently pushes Obama for an apology, and Obama issues what many will consider a “non-apology apology” (or a Nixon-like, “modified limited hang-out”) for his ObamaCare lies. He says, “You know, uh, uh, uh, I regret very much that, uh, what we intended to do... that, you know, we weren’t as clear that we needed to be...” (Obama was, of course, clear. There is nothing *not* clear about the statement: “If you like your plan you can keep it. Period.”) “I am sorry that they [Americans who lost their health insurance], uh, are finding themselves in this situation based on assurances they got from me.” (It is not Obama’s *assurances* that caused people to be “in this situation;” it is *his* massively flawed *legislation*. He does not admit that his assurances were false. His “apology” is like saying, “I’m sorry you broke a leg when I pushed you down the stairs,” rather than, “I’m sorry I pushed you down the stairs.”) Obama continues, “We’ve got to work hard to make sure that, uh, they know, uh, we hear ’em and that we’re gonna do everything we can, uh, ta [sic; to] deal with folks who find themselves, uh, in a tough position as a consequence of this.” (Some might ask why Obama should apologize for forcing Americans to give up insurance policies he has claimed were inferior, “bad apple,” junk policies. Does he no longer believe they are junk policies? If so, Obama should apologize to the insurance companies for criticizing their products.) Obama also tells interviewer Chuck Todd, “I’ve been burned by the web site” and then corrects himself, saying the “American people have been burned.” (The “it’s all about me” Freudian slip is revealing, and further confirms Obama’s legendary defensiveness and inflated ego.) Obama’s “apology” was quickly scheduled by the White House—and almost certainly prompted by his meeting with desperate Senate Democrats the day before. [50861, 50879, 50906, 50913, 50915, 50927, 50957, 50975]

Asked if he still has “full confidence” in Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius, Obama responds, “I think Kathleen Sebelius under tremendously difficult circumstances over the last four and a half years has done a great job of setting up the insurance markets so that there’s a good product out there for people to get. Kathleen Sebelius doesn’t write [programming] code, she wasn’t our IT [information technology] person. I think she’d be the first to admit that if we had to do it all over again, that there would have been a whole lot more questions that were asked in terms of

how this thing is working.” (At Townhall.com Katie Pavlich remarks, “Sebelius [had] better watch out, there’s a bus headed her way.”) [50908, 50916]

At NationalJournal.com leftist Ron Fournier writes, “I’m sorry, too... I’m sorry you campaigned for reelection on the famous false promise: ‘If you like your health care plan, you’ll be able to keep your health care plan. Period.’ I’m sorry your aides debated whether to tell the full truth (that people could keep their insurance only if it hadn’t changed and if it met your standards) and decided instead to institutionalize the lie. I’m sorry that when Americans recognized the deception you tried to reinvent history: “What we said was you can keep it if it hasn’t changed since the law passed.’ No, no, no, no, no—that’s not what you guys said. I’m sorry you didn’t trust Americans with the truth. I’m sorry that the Democratic Party’s decades-old chase toward universal health care is now at risk because your law—your legacy, sir—is off to such a miserable start. The online networks don’t work and the people you need bought into the system, particularly young Americans, can’t access the market and now may never trust it... or you.” [50976]

According to HotAir.com, there have been “nearly 11,000 enrollees” in Minnesota. “However, the picture is far from rosy as the enrollment to date represents only about 1% of the total projected for the first year. Even worse, 84% of the initial enrollment has been in Medicaid so the ultimate viability of the Minnesota exchange is still very much in question.” [50853]

Also at HotAir.com, Erika Johnsen notes, “Democrats have had plans in the works to make a minimum-wage increase [to \$10.10 per hour by 2015] a major issue ahead of the 2014 midterms, and now that ObamaCare is floundering so spectacularly and the prospects for centering their campaigns around it are wearing thinner by the day, they definitely need to get the wheels in motion on a bright-and-shiny new initiative they can determinedly tout to their perturbed constituents.” Johnsen calls the proposal “that old fallback of the Democratic playbook: *Republicans must really hate poor people, because that is literally the only possible explanation they could have for being opposed to such a simple, zero-repercussions gesture.* That minimum wage increases are among the most superficially simple yet intellectually cheap populist faux-giveaways that in the long run actually harm the people they were ostensibly meant to help the most, and are in fact wildly counterproductive to the goal of encouraging and economic growth and employment... will not be mentioned, and indeed vehemently avoided. Get excited.” (More than 30 percent of minimum-wage workers are part-timers aged 16–19. While it is true that one cannot readily raise a family on a minimum-wage job, few would argue that teen-agers are the sole breadwinners of many families.) [50855, 51032, 51737, 51941]

FoxNews.com reports, “The problem-plagued ObamaCare website was only equipped to handle 1,100 users a day before it was launched, documents released by the House Oversight and Reform Committee reveal. The Obama administration has repeatedly insisted that the website’s repeated crashes were due to unexpectedly high traffic. U.S. Chief Technology Officer Todd Park said on Oct. 6 that the website was expected to draw around 60,000 simultaneous users but instead drew many more, around 250,000. However, a Healthcare.gov testing bulletin from Sept. 30, the day before the site’s

launch, states that the website began to run into trouble with far fewer users. ‘Currently we are able to reach 1,100 users before response time gets too high,’ the bulletin states.” (Park should have been fired on October 2, at which point it was obvious to everyone that the web site for which he was responsible was a total failure. But by allowing him to keep his job, Obama ensures that Park will not—at least in the short term—speak out against others in the administration.) [50873, 50874]

FoxNews.com also reports, “Tucked inside nearly 11,000 pages of the Affordable Care Act is a little-known provision that doles out three months of free health care to individuals who choose to default on their premiums. People who receive the federal subsidy to be part of Obamacare will be allowed to incur a three-month ‘grace period’ if they can’t pay their premiums and then simply cancel their policies, stiffing the doctors and hospitals. Their only repercussion is that they have to wait until the following year’s open enrollment if they want coverage on the exchange.” Congressman Louie Gohmert (R-TX) states, “It will help break the system. This is a huge piece of evidence to show this can’t work, you will break the system and bankrupt people involved. The hospitals, doctors and insurance companies will be left holding the bag. There will be disagreements over who will pay for what. Lawyers will get involved because we are talking about a lot of money.” [50877, 51043, 51044]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “It took 11 years, but Judicial Watch recently received a response to a 2002 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request that revealed another major missed opportunity by the Clinton administration to prevent the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attack, which is part of perhaps the most catastrophic failure in the history of U.S. intelligence. ... In early 2000, the documents informed America’s top intelligence analysts that al Qaeda had devised a sophisticated plan to hijack a commercial airliner departing Frankfurt International Airport between March and August 2000. The terrorist team was to consist of an Arab, a Pakistani and a Chechen, and their targets were U.S. Airlines, Lufthansa and Air France. The document pieces together an intricate plot directed by a 40-year-old Saudi, Sheik Dzabir, from a prominent family with ties to the House of Saud. It revealed that al Qaeda had actually penetrated the consular section of the German Embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan, relying on a contact referred to as ‘Mrs. Wagner’ to provide European Union visas for use in forged Pakistani passports for the terrorists. These revelations came from an unidentified source that provided U.S. authorities with copies of Arabic letters containing precise information about the al Qaeda plot. It was all laid out in minute detail. So, how did the Clinton administration respond? In the incriminating words of the intelligence information report, advanced warning of the plot ‘was disregarded because nobody believed that Osama bin Laden or the Taliban could carry out such an operation.’ Perhaps that explains why, for 13 years, the report was classified ‘secret’ and hidden from public view until Judicial Watch forced its release in August of this year.” [50894, 50895]

In a television interview broadcast in Israel, Secretary of John Kerry threatens the Jewish state, saying, “Failure of the [so-called “peace talks” with the Palestinians] will increase Israel’s isolation in the world. The alternative to getting back to the talks is a potential of chaos. I mean, does Israel want a third intifada? I believe that if we do not resolve the

issues between Palestinians and Israelis; if we do not find a way to find peace, there will be an increasing isolation of Israel. There will be an increasing campaign of delegitization [sic] of Israel that's taking place on an international basis. That if we do not resolve the question of the settlements and who lives where and how and what rights they have; if we don't end the presence of Israeli soldiers perpetually within the West Bank, then there will be an increasing feeling that if we cannot get peace with a leadership that is committed to nonviolence, you may wind up with leadership that is committed to violence." (IsraelNationalNews.com explains, "'Intifada,' an Arabic term meaning 'shaking off the yoke,' has been used to describe a violent uprising in 1987–1993 and a murderous terror war in 2000–2009 that killed 1,178 Israelis, 70% of them civilians, in over 20,000 attacks that included 144 suicide bombings. The 'West Bank' is the term that was used to refer to the Biblical heartland of Judea and Samaria when it was under Jordanian occupation, in 1949-1967." Kerry is essentially threatening Israel: "Give in to Palestinian demands or expect to be attacked." Or, "Your choice is to commit national suicide or to be murdered.") [50969, 50970]

CBSNews.com points out that it is not just individual health insurance policies that are being affected by ObamaCare, because a "Cadillac tax" on generous employer-provided group policies takes effect in 2018. "In 2018, the rule will impose a 40 percent excise tax on employee benefits exceeding \$10,200 for individuals and \$27,500 for families. In 2013, the average employer-sponsored for individuals cost \$5,884 and the average family plan cost \$16,351. The impact of the tax is concerning to labor groups that have fought with employers for good benefits. 'Yes, if you like your plan, you can keep it, unless you have great benefits,' Lindsay McLaughlin, legislative director for the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, told CBSNews.com." (The information is not "news," of course, but the mainstream media glossed over many of the negative aspects of the Affordable Care Act when it was being debated in 2010.) [50888, 50889]

On *Special Report* Charles Krauthammer observes that Obama "now is toxic. The thing is called *ObamaCare*. There's no running away from it. It's got his name on it. You see [Obama], and you think about the policy, and you know it's a disaster. And the problem for the Democrats is, they are hostage to a bunch of geeks working right now late into the night trying to fix a system—which is not just the glitches we talked about. The architecture, the underlying structure of it is wrong. I think the likelihood of it being fixed, working like you would expect from any normal commercial private website normally by December 1, is pretty small. And the pressure on the White House will become irresistible. If it isn't up and running smoothly and perfectly, they're going to start with postponements and then the whole thing starts to unravel." [50882]

On *The Kelly File*, cancer patient Bill Elliott tells host Megyn Kelly his \$180 per month insurance policy has been canceled and he cannot afford the \$1,500 per month replacement policy—with a \$13,500 annual deductible—that complies with ObamaCare. Elliott says he may go without insurance, pay the ObamaCare fine, and "let nature take its course, because I'm not gonna put a burden on my family to pay this \$1,500, and, what good is it gonna do? ... So, whatever happens, I believe I'm doing the right thing, I've thought it out, and I've prayed about it, and I'm not gonna let this \$1,500... I'm not

gonna pay it and, to me, it's saving my family money and they'll have money to spend instead of throwing it down the drain like ...Obama is wantin' us to do." (Elliott has since been informed that he is being audited by the IRS—back to 2003. Elliott's insurance agent, C. Steven Tucker, is also being audited. According to FrontPageMag.com's Daniel Greenfield, Elliott's meeting with the IRS is scheduled for April 2014... "Assuming he lives that long. ...Would the IRS actually go after a cancer patient, who had voted for Obama initially, just for appearing on FOX and now being sharply critical of Obama and suggesting that he resign for his health plan lie? Under the current insane state of affairs, where the IRS was used to silence the opposition, it's unfortunately entirely possible. The fact that we are even having this discussion shows how badly Obama has undermined confidence in government institutions and the rule of law.") [50950, 51829, 51830, 51831, 52279]

At an event in Des Moines, Iowa, Texas Governor Rick Perry says, "Today we're watching this new national health care law literally unravel before our eyes. [Obama] said no one would lose their health plan—except, of course, the millions of Americans who will. To quote Rush Limbaugh, next he'll be saying, 'If you like your guns, you'll be able to keep 'em.'" [50953]

On November 8 a massive typhoon strikes the Philippines. Leftists and environmentalists (without proof, of course) promptly blame the storm on "global warming"—apparently unaware that typhoons pre-date SUVs and power plants. [50890, 51092]

CBN.com reports, "According to Egyptian newspaper *El Watan*, a group of Egyptian lawyers has submitted a complaint charging ...Obama with crimes against humanity at the International Criminal Court. The complaint charges Obama of being an accessory to the Muslim Brotherhood, which incited widespread violence in Egypt both before and after the June 30 Revolution. Along with Obama, the complaint reproduced by *El Watan* mentions several Brotherhood members by name, beginning with the leader of the organization Muhammad Badie, and other top ranking leaders such as Mohamed al-Beltagy, Essam al-Erian, and Safwat Hegazi, adding that 'Obama cooperated, incited, and assisted the armed elements of the Muslim Brotherhood in the commission of crimes against humanity in the period from 3/7/2013-8/18/2013, in the Arab Republic of Egypt.'" (At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller observes, "History will not be kind to Barack Hussein Obama, who aided and abetted regimes and jihad militias committing systematic genocide of non-Muslims in Muslim countries overthrown by Islamic supremacist revolutions. Why isn't this on the front page of the New York Times?") [50892, 50893, 50943, 50951, 51064]

UnitedWithIsrael.org writes, "We must share some tragic news regarding Iran. Today, Iran's deputy foreign minister said that the P5+1 world powers, including the United States, have 'accepted the framework' of proposals made by Iran in the Geneva talks. The agreement would 'slow down' elements of Iran's nuclear activity in return for the easing of sanctions on Iran. [Israeli] Prime Minister Netanyahu said the Geneva proposals 'would ease the pressure on Iran' in return for empty concessions that would still 'allow Iran to retain the capabilities to make nuclear weapons.' He called this a 'mistake of

historic proportions' which must be completely rejected." Netanyahu states that he reminded Secretary of State John Kerry that he (Kerry) had said, "No deal is better than a bad deal," and warns, "The deal that is being discussed in Geneva right now is a *bad* deal. It's a *very* bad deal. Iran is not required to take apart even *one* centrifuge, but the international community is relieving sanctions on Iran for the first time after many years. Iran gets everything that it wanted in this stage, and it pays *nothing*. And this is when Iran is under severe pressure. I urge Secretary Kerry not to rush to sign, to wait, to reconsider, to get a good deal—but this is a bad deal, a very, very, bad deal. It's the deal of the century for Iran; it's a very dangerous, bad deal for peace in the international community." (While Kerry and Obama seem eager to give Iran what it wants, the Iranian government broadcasts a program about its military capabilities that includes a computer animation of missiles strikes on Israel.) [50896, 50897, 50909, 50923, 50928, 50938, 59042, 50954]

Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) comments on the alleged deal with Iran: "If the reports are correct, this is a terrible deal, and it is dangerous for America. The prospect of Iran acquiring nuclear weapon capacity is the gravest national security threat we face, yet it appears that this 'deal' does not require Iran to dismantle even a single centrifuge or turn over even a single pound of enriched uranium. To lift economic sanctions on Iran in exchange for an amorphous promise to pause their immediate efforts to acquire nuclear weapons makes no sense whatsoever. It is almost surely unverifiable, and lifting the sanctions will only encourage Iran to surreptitiously continue to develop nuclear weapons—weapons that, if acquired, pose an existential threat to America and our allies. The United States should negotiate from a position of strength, not weakness. We should have insisted on good-faith measures before meeting with the Iranians directly, such as the release of Pastor Saeed Abedini and the acknowledgment of Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. Prime Minister [Binyamin] Netanyahu has taken the extraordinary step of condemning what is happening in Geneva as a 'very, very bad deal.' ...Obama should not abandon our friend and ally Israel, and he should not cut a deal that endangers the national security of the United States." (Laughably, a "senior administration official" told reporters on November 7, "For the first time, we believe Iran is ready to move this process forward quickly. For the first time, we're not seeing them just use this as a way of buying time. I do see a potential for the outline of a first step. It can be written on a piece of paper or probably more than one. I hope this can be sooner rather than later." Of course, there is no doubt that Iran is trying to buy time, as well as reduce sanctions. The administration is either lying or incredibly naive.) [50909, 50928, 51682]

At PJMedia.com Roger L. Simon comments on the coming Iran deal: "What motivates Obama in his 'dialogue' with Iran is the same thing that motivates him in everything: his own glory. With Obamacare what mattered is that national healthcare reform be associated with him; the details, as we now painfully learn, are unimportant. With Iran, it matters little if the mullahs ultimately have nuclear weapons or not, only that ...Obama himself be perceived as the one who has solved the situation. The good news is that the Iranians may be too fractious a society themselves to make a real deal (and then quietly go about building what weapons of mass destruction they desire the way the North Koreans have been able to do.) But I wouldn't count on it. Remember [Iran President

Hassan] Rouhani was one of Ayatollah Khamenei's few approved candidates. In fact, the Iranians seem to rotate 'moderates' (Khatami) and 'hardliners' (Ahmadinejad) in order to manipulate outside pressures. I'm not sure which I prefer. The 'hardliners' are more publicly noxious, but the 'moderates' are probably more dangerous. As important as Obamacare and other economics issues are, let's hope Congress is paying very close attention to these Iran negotiations." With Obama "becoming increasingly defensive with each passing day [he] is likely to do something erratic and dangerous. We cannot let him. Otherwise it will certainly be 'Israel alone.' Maybe it already is." (According to TheDailyBeast.com's Eli Lake, the Obama administration has been secretly reducing its "blacklisting" of individuals and companies that have been doing business with Iran in violation of the sanctions, possibly as a way of "greasing the skids" in advance of a deal.) [50938, 50941, 50954, 50971]

At WashingtonTimes.com Cheryl K. Chumley writes, "For all the tough talk on the international front the United States has quietly been easing some of the financial restrictions on Iran, a new investigation reveals. But, as one source suggested, the talks may have backfired—and now the White House is feeling vulnerable. The White House actually softened sanctions right after [Obama] took office, The Daily Beast reported. That's quite a shift from what's been making the rounds of global media in recent months—that the United States has been talking tough about the need for Iran to give up its nuclear weapons development dreams and allow inspectors free access to uranium-enrichment facilities, or else face more financial clamp-downs and sanctions. ...But The Daily Beast's investigation reveals that such talks may have been all for show—that the two leaders [Obama and Iranian President Hassan Rouhani] had actually reached consensus months ago, and that consensus included a U.S. loosening of sanctions. ...But the quiet dealing may have backfired for Mr. Obama... Iran has been selling significant amounts of oil on the black market, profiting big from illegal revenues." Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, comments, "Sounds like Obama decided to enter the Persian nuclear bazaar to haggle with the masters of negotiation and has had his head handed to him." [50972]

Senators Charles Grassley (R-IA) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) report that, according to insurance companies CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield, Kaiser Permanente, UnitedHealthcare, and Aetna, only *five* people in Washington, D.C. have enrolled in ObamaCare policies. (There are about 100,000 residents in the area who lack health insurance.) Grassley states, "A lot of Americans are getting cancellation notices from their current health care plan but they haven't been able to enroll in a new plan. The limbo and uncertainty are stressful for them, as they've been describing in emails to my office. The chaos imposed on so many people is reason to at least delay the individual mandate, if not outright appeal it." Hatch states, "With numbers like these, it's no wonder the Obama administration hasn't wanted to release how many people have signed up for ObamaCare. With data from D.C.'s four participating health plans in, there's been a whopping five people enrolled in the city's exchange. That's right—five. Whether it's significant problems with the website, people being forced off the coverage they had or skyrocketing costs, these numbers are even more proof of what a disaster ObamaCare is and why it should be delayed." [50898]

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius announces new ObamaCare regulations that will require all health insurance policies to cover mental health and addiction benefits on an equal footing with medical benefits. According to HeraldTribune.com, “the rule would ensure that health plans’ co-payments, deductibles and limits on visits to health care providers are not more restrictive or less generous for mental health benefits than for medical and surgical benefits. Significantly, the regulations would clarify how parity applies to residential treatments and outpatient services, where much of the care for people with addictions or mental illnesses occurs.” Forbes.com adds, “So while Obamacare is driving up the cost of a policy for many Americans by 50 percent to 100 percent, the new mental health rules will make coverage even more expensive—though it’s difficult to know by how much. . . .Furthermore, the mental health mandate could mean that millions of additional health policies will be canceled because Obama just expanded what’s considered qualified coverage.” [51046, 51047]

Former MSNBC host Dylan Ratigan expresses surprise that his health insurance policy has been canceled. He tweets: “I bought a catastrophic health policy for \$170/mo when I left MSNBC. Obamacare cancelled the policy. New rate \$600/mo. Thnx Mr. [Obama]!” “Interesting discussion... many seem to think paying a high deductible in exchange for low cost catastrophic should be outlawed? I disagree.” “Serious question... do you guys think simple catastrophic coverage should be outlawed? If so, why?” “I have been a long time advocate of catastrophic... Struck me as interesting that that is illegal now.” [50907]

The Department of Labor reports that 204,000 jobs—many of which were part-time and low-paying—were added in October, while the unemployment rate increased to 7.3 percent. The civilian work force actually *declined* by 720,000 in October, and the participation rate fell to 62.8 percent—the worst since the 1970s. (The workforce participation rate is the percentage of able-bodied Americans of working age who are working or who looked for work within the last four weeks.) The participation rate for women is 56.9 percent. A record 91,541,000 Americans age 16 or older who could work are *not* working and have not looked for a job in the last four weeks. (The number was 80,507,000 when Obama entered the White House.) The youth unemployment rate (ages 16-19) is 22.2 percent. [50924, 50935, 50936, 50937, 50945, 50946, 50978, 51041, 51082, 51139]

On his radio program Rush Limbaugh says, “I rarely do this, but I want to make an appeal. I want to make an appeal to Media Matters, the Daily Kos, the Democrat Underground, Organizing for America, Think Progress, the Poynter, every one of you left wing websites. You have your monitors out there, and you listen to this program each and every day, and you live and breathe for those things that you can take out of context and post about me, and then have your buddies in the mainstream media run with it and create all kinds of controversy and angst. I am making an appeal. I am going to say something I want you to repeat—Media Matters, Think Progress, Americans for Democratic Action, Students for a Democrat Society, the Black Panthers, the New Black Panthers, all of you. Who am I leaving out? Daily Kos, Democrat Underground, I don’t want to leave anybody

out. I want to say something, and I'm begging you to quote me. Americans had to lose their healthcare plans in order to for Obamacare to work. There was never any intention for anybody to keep their current plan. The only way Obamacare could work, as designed by Obama and the Democrats, is precisely because people would lose their plan. It had to happen that way. The only way Obamacare could work, the only way Obama could reform the healthcare system the way he wants to reform it is, precisely if everybody lost their plan." [50917]

"There was never, ever any intention that you keep your plan, whether you liked it or not. You were lied to, blatantly, strategically, tactically and purposefully. [Obama] knew that the only way to sell you on his reform was to lie about it, and that was to put you off guard and to relax any tension that you might use to oppose it by telling you that if you like yours, you can keep it, no big deal. Nothing's going to happen to you, which tells us that the vast majority of the American people like their plans and didn't want anything to change. And that's why all Hell's breaking loose now. But the simple fact is that for ObamaCare to become what he wants it to become, you were never going to keep your plan. You were never going to be allowed to keep your plan. It had to happen this way. By the way, this term 'single payer,' that does not properly describe what it really is. In fact, describing what Obama wants and what the Democrats want as single payer might actually be a disservice, because it sounds really clean. Single payer: You go to the doctor, and one agency pays for it. No insurance company, no middlemen, no forms. You go to the doctor and you submit it to the government, single payer. That's not what it is. Single payer is no more than communism. Maybe socialism, communism, the government owns the means of production, and they're not going to do that, but they will own the behavior of the hospitals, and they will own the behavior of the doctors by virtue of how they are paid. But this is pure collectivism. It is total government control over every aspect of your life. That's what single payer is. It's not convenient. It's not an improvement. It is an overwhelming loss of individual liberty and freedom, and I'll just say it one more time: You had to lose your plan to get what he wants." [50917]

Limbaugh also comments on Obama's "apology" for his "you can keep your plan" lie: "So the media started having heart palpitations late yesterday afternoon. [Obama] apologized. Finally, [Obama] apologized. He had an interview with F. Chuck Todd on NBC, and [Obama] apologized for lying to you. That's what they said. But he didn't really do that, folks. He didn't take any responsibility for his actions. All he said was that he's sorry you misunderstood him. He's sorry that your misunderstanding has made you unhappy. He did not apologize, nor is he sorry for lying to you when he said you could keep your policy and your doctor and your premiums would come down an average of \$2,500. Now, he wants people to think that's what he did. And the media is dutifully reporting that Obama apologized for this. But we parse the words of politicians here. 'Cause we think it's important. Others accuse us of nitpicking. This isn't nitpicking. It's simply getting it right. It's just simple truth seeking, truth telling, and accuracy. We got [sic] the sound bites. You can hear, judge for yourself. He doesn't take any responsibility. In fact, I think the real killer comment—we got [sic] this coming up—I don't know if anybody else has pointed this out to you. They might have. But the real telling comment here, I mean this is Limbaugh Theorem stuff. Obama, in one of these sound bites in his

apology, 'Yeah, I got burned by a website.' As though here I am, I'm [in the White House] and I farmed this ObamaCare website out, and I got burned by all these incompetent boobs that don't know what they're doing. I got burned. You didn't, I'm the one that got burned. I'm the guy that looks bad. I'm the guy that's really harmed here. That's what he said. That's basically the summation of this. He's ticked off he got burned, because you do not embarrass the Dear Leader like this. You end up in a jail or dungeon if it's possible. You just don't do this."

Limbaugh observes, "Essentially what he says here is that he is sorry you believed him. ...He did not apologize for lying. He didn't even get close to apologizing for lying! ...Some people might say, 'Come on, Rush,' about Obama's apology. 'I think it is important to get the truth in this. He's not apologizing for what he said, folks. He's not apologizing for anything that's happened. He's not apologizing for what he did. He's not apologizing for ObamaCare at all. He's apologizing for how you misunderstood him. He's sorry that you believed him. He employed the Limbaugh Theorem and claimed he's a victim too. It was predictable even before he said it. You know, when I heard that he was gonna go on NBC and apologize, I knew what he was gonna do. He was gonna set himself up as a victim. He is victim number one, by the way, in this country. He sets himself up as an outsider. He's not really governing and all these other people are gonna have screwed something up. ... 'I was burned by a website,' meaning, 'Everything in this plan's cool! It's the greatest thing under the sun. It's just the stupid website doesn't work. 'I got burned by a website. I'm only here having to apologize because of that stupid website.' But most of all, he acts like he didn't have anything to do with the situation that people are, quote, 'finding themselves in.' Yes, he didn't have anything to do with it. It's your problem. He's really sorry that you believed him. It's like all these athletes that get caught. They say, 'That's not me. You know, the person that stole that car and ran it into the bridge abutment with an alcohol level of 5.7, that's not who I am.'" [50952]

The CBS affiliate in Charlotte, North Carolina reports that the state's "largest insurer is having its share of problems with the Obamacare website. Internal emails obtained by WNCN-TV show that Blue Cross Blue Shield show that only 1,000 people had filled out applications as of October 15th. In fact, only one person was able to successfully use Healthcare.gov to enroll in the new exchange. But even that single person has not paid, which means the enrollment is not complete. The emails suggest the 'payment re-direct option' on government servers isn't working. Blue Cross Blue Shield found the entire system is so filled with glitches that the company decided not to upload data because it was afraid false information might enter its computer system. And the emails reveal a scammer was using the insurer's name to try to obtain personal information." [50922]

House Oversight Committee Chairman Darrell Issa (R-CA) issues a subpoena to Obama administration technology official Todd Park requiring him to testify at a hearing on the ObamaCare implementation on November 13. Issa writes, "Millions of Americans have lost their health insurance and are rapidly approaching a point where they must prepare for the possibility of having no health insurance on January 1, 2014. They deserve your sworn testimony before their elected representatives about what went wrong—not simply the media outlets that White House officials have deemed an appropriate use of your time

away from working on the website project.” (A July 3, 2010 Obama administration press release quoted Park: “This website is unlike any government website you have ever seen or used before. It was developed with significant consumer input and is remarkably easy to navigate. This is despite the sheer volume of content it offers consumers: billions of health care choices through the insurance finder and more than 500 pages of new content, all of which is designed to grow with ongoing consumer feedback and as our health care system improves.”) [51118]

The VA Viper blog reports that a North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) contractor “lost his job after six erroneous traffic alert messages went out over the... Traveler Information Management System, or TIMS on Wednesday [November 6]. ...The alerts sent out... warned drivers to ‘stay home’ because of ‘women drivers, rain, ObamaCare.’ Other messages warned of ‘bad drivers.’ ...The contractor was let go immediately for this action. NCDOT said it will take additional steps to prevent this type of incident from happening again.” [50940]

Carl Gallups, host of Freedom Friday on Florida’s WEBY, tells listeners, “While I am not an official spokesperson for [chief investigator] Mike Zullo and Sheriff [Joe] Arpaio in the Cold Case Posse, I am in contact with them almost every day. And here is what I can tell you at this point: The investigation has never gone silent and it has never stopped. Mike Zullo and I have been telling you for months that this investigation took a deeper turn some time back. Well, it not only took a deeper turn, but it has now become much, much deeper—deeper than you could ever imagine. ...The implications of what has been uncovered, with hard documentation and evidence, are absolutely astounding; it’s beyond monumental. ...I would not expect a detailed comment from Mike Zullo or Sheriff Arpaio for a while. This is simply too big to let even a hint out about what they now know. I can also tell you that based upon what I know, the birth certificate issue has been 100 percent settled. I cannot tell you how we know, but we know now without any argument or shade of doubt, the birth certificate posted on the White House web site is a 100 percent fabrication. ...[T]his entire affair is now much bigger than the birth certificate. It’s now much bigger than you have ever imagined. As soon as I am at liberty to say more I will. Until then, America is going to have to be patient and pray and trust. ...Trust me, this is huge, it is so monumentally huge.” (Disclosure: *The Obama Timeline* has provided the Cold Case Posse with information about Obama’s past and has spoken with Mr. Zullo, but is not privy to the newest information noted by Mr. Gallups. The *Timeline* does agree that Obama’s birth certificate is a forgery and that it is only a matter of time before the truth is known and widely reported.) [50944, 50949, 50959, 50960, 50981, 51012]

Obama’s approval/disapproval rating falls to 41/53 percent in an October 30–November 6 Pew Research Center poll. On the issue of healthcare, his rating is 37/59; the economy: 31/65; immigration policy: 32/60; threat of terrorism: 51/44; foreign policy: 34/56. [50947, 50962, 50977]

Obama’s Healthcare.gov “fixer,” Jeffrey Zients, tells reporters the web site is “a long way from where it needs to be.” [50948]

On Fox News, Judge Andrew Napolitano reports that the Affordable Care Act permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services to *waive* existing federal anti-kickback laws as they relate to the health care industry. (It is illegal, for example, for a company that makes medical equipment to pay a hospital a bribe or kickback for agreeing to buy its products rather than those of its competitors. ObamaCare gives Obama appointee Kathleen Sebelius the power to waive those prohibitions as she sees fit. There is no justification for giving Sebelius that power. It is an invitation to fraud and increased hospital costs.) [51014]

NaturalNews.com reports, “[A] recent survey by Watchdog.org has found that many top hospitals across the nation will no longer be accessible to the average person with a new ‘eligible’ plan. In fact, many major hospitals are being excluded from Obamacare coverage altogether, which means that millions of previously covered individuals will have to settle for subpar care at other ‘in-network’ facilities. Based on the results of the survey, most of the nation’s top hospitals, including renowned facilities like Case Medical Center in Cleveland, Ohio, will only be accepting insurance from one or two companies included as part of Obamacare. This means that all the other insurance plans offered on the Obamacare exchanges will be ineligible, and many patients will be required to go to other facilities, even if their previous insurance plans were accepted by these same hospitals. ... Much of the reason for this oversight is due to the fact that public information about which Obamacare insurance carriers will be considered eligible at various hospitals has been scarce. Some hospitals, it turns out, still do not even know themselves which plans will be accepted, let alone members of the general public having access to this information. In other words, there is major turmoil on the horizon for patients who try to use their ineligible insurance coverage at these hospitals.” Josh Archambault, a senior fellow at the Foundation for Government Accountability, states, “In many cases, consumers are shopping blind when it comes to what doctors and hospitals are included in their Obamacare exchange plans. These patients will be in for a rude awakening once they need care, and get stuck with a big bill for going out-of-network without realizing it.” [50963, 50964]

The CBS affiliate in Denver reports on the 250,000 Coloradoans losing their health insurance, and interviews an Obama supporter, Cathy Wagner, who “championed ObamaCare”—until her own policy was canceled because of the law. Wagner says, “I was so hopeful that this plan was gonna move us forward, but in fact I think it’s moving us backward. ... I was really shocked [by the cancellation letter]. All of my hopes were sort of dashed, like, oh, my God, ... Obama, this is not what we hoped for, it’s not what we were told.” “For the same coverage,” notes CBS4, “she [will] pay 35 percent more and have a higher deductible.” [51021]

The New York Times reports, “A government subsidy, little known outside health policy circles but critical to the hospitals’ survival, is being sharply reduced under the new health law. The subsidy, which for years has helped defray the cost of uncompensated and undercompensated care, was cut substantially on the assumption that the hospitals would replace much of the lost income with payments for patients newly covered by

Medicaid or [ObamaCare-mandated] private insurance. ...The cuts in subsidies for safety-net hospitals... that deliver a significant amount of care to poor, uninsured or otherwise vulnerable patients... are set to total at least \$18 billion through 2020. The government has projected that as much as \$22 billion more in Medicare subsidies could be cut by 2019, depending partly on the change in the numbers of uninsured nationally.” (That is, the Affordable Care Act calls for reduced payments to hospitals that provide free care to the indigent, under the assumption that that the individual mandate and federal subsidies will create millions of new insured customers to make up the difference. But if the government estimates prove to be incorrect, the hospitals will end up with reduced revenues and even more uninsured patients.) “Some experts say the cuts in hospital subsidies are part of a larger problem: government programs like Medicaid do not pay enough to cover the actual costs of care. The cheapest private insurance on the new health care exchanges, the Bronze Plan, covers just 60 percent of costs, leaving low-income people who buy it with a lot of out-of-pocket costs that hospitals worry the patients will not be able to pay. ...Hospitals in Georgia are trying to hang on. Rural hospitals rely heavily on the subsidies and as many as 15 could close in the coming months, their trade association estimated, costing jobs in economically depressed parts of the state.” [50984]

According to a Gallup poll, only 18 percent of uninsured Americans have even bothered to access Healthcare.gov or one of the state counterparts. [50965, 50966]

NBC reporter Chuck Todd, who elicited Obama’s “non-apology apology,” tells radio talk show host Hugh Hewitt, “You know, he does not believe he lied on this, and that’s the sense I get. I mean, I think that that’s—he’s taken issue with that before with folks off the record, and I got it’s a sensitive issue, felt like he did not sit there and say he intentionally lied. He said that he wanted to, he thought he was going to be able to keep this promise. I thought what was revealing in that answer, when I asked him that direct question about this, was this a political lie that you started to believe it, was he talked about well, you know, it turns out we had trouble in crafting the law.” (Pathological liars have a remarkable ability to convince themselves that they are not liars. As noted in Part I of *The Obama Timeline*, Obama’s mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, was known by many for her outlandish lies—told with a perfectly straight face and as though she believed them.) [564, 50997]

While key Democrats and some in the media try to defend Obama’s lie, Fox News and various web sites note a February 2010 video of a “Health Insurance Regulation Bipartisan White House Summit” exchange between Congressman Eric Cantor (R-VA) and Obama. Cantor charges, “I don’t think that you can answer the question in the positive to say that people will be able to maintain their coverage, people will be able to see the doctors they want, in the kind of bill that you’re proposing.” Obama replies, “Well, let, let me, since you asked me a question, let me respond. Um, the eight to nine million people that you refer to that might have to change their coverage, uh, keep in mind, out of the 300 million Americans that we’re talkin’ about, uh, would be folks who the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, estimates would, would find the deal in the exchange better, would be a better deal. So they, yes, they would change coverage because they’ve got more choice and competition. So let’s just be clear about that.” (In

February 2010 Obama *publicly admitted* that eight to nine million Americans with individual health insurance policies would lose their coverage—yet for more than three years afterward he continued to promise, “If you like your plan you can keep it. Period.”) [50998, 50999, 51000]

Pollster John Zogby discusses Obama’s apology with Newsmax.com, calling it “little” and “late.” “Basically, it was a ‘gotcha’ moment. He had said on several occasions, and he made it clear, that those with existing plans needn’t worry. Then, as the program rolled out, after the glitches, this was like a one-two punch—and this was the second punch, which was that he had misrepresented. The apology was like, if I beat you up to a pulp, and then I say I’m sorry that you were beaten up to a pulp. ...He made an assurance, and he wasn’t able to provide that assurance. So let’s just call that a misrepresentation. It still doesn’t help. He hurt himself. ...Politically or governmentally, it’s not in his best interest to say, ‘I really messed up. I lied. ...I didn’t know what I was talking about. [He] does have to generate some confidence and also stir in people a sense that, ‘Hey, I know what I’m doing.’ That’s the best possible spin on this. But the problem for him is coming after the fallout from the disastrous rollout. This, at very best, comes under the category, ‘Who needs this?’ The bottom line is that the misrepresentation certainly did not help him—and it certainly played into the arguments made against ObamaCare. ...What will stir confidence is if the website glitch is truly taken care of and people are able to sign up. And, if there is a remedy for anyone losing their plan. But right now, where we stand... the apology is certainly not enough.” [50967]

Author and columnist Charles Krauthammer remarks that Obama is “not the Superman he said he was—and he’s not even a competent governor. He leads from behind on foreign policy, and he doesn’t lead at all on domestic. The apology he offered was no apology at all. He apologized for the dislocation people are feeling, but he needs to apologize for misleading the country into believing that the vast majority of Americans who are happy with their healthcare would be left alone—and it turns out that this is exactly what people like me have been arguing for five years. It is a complete disaster.” [50967]

Congressman Fred Upton (R-WI) says, “People are losing their doctors. These are people with pre-existing conditions. Maybe they’ve survived cancer, a whole number of different things. An apology isn’t enough, not to the people that I’ve spoken to.”
Congressman Tom Cole (R-OK) says, “[Obama] promised the American people that his law would provide plans that save families of four at least \$2,500 on healthcare. Now, families are expecting higher costs or losing plans that many already found satisfactory. Why should Americans believe [Obama] on ObamaCare now? They cannot, they should not—and they will not.” [50967]

KMOV reports that a Missouri woman, Lisa Martinson, forgot her Health care.gov password and when she called the government’s customer service number she discovered that her personal information, including her Social Security number, had been given to three other people. She states, “I just want my information that’s on there right now to be gone right now. And nobody can do that.” [50988]

DailyCaller.com reports, “Private insurance companies that cover patients with government funds under the Medicare Advantage program have quietly started to dump doctors and patients because of Obamacare budget cuts. ...[I]n 2014, New Jersey Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield is eliminating all zero-premium plans with prescription drug coverage and all but two of its other plans with monthly fees. New Jersey Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield spokesman Tom Vincz tells the Daily Caller that ‘due to rising health care costs and cuts to Medicare Advantage we had to make these product changes.’ ...Federal payments to Medicare Advantage HMOs will decrease seven to eight percent in 2014, according to one prominent health care industry analyst. Overall, the Affordable Care Act slashes Medicare Advantage funding by \$156 billion in ten years, a reduction that Democrats and many journalists long insisted would not harm patients. Republicans, however, have continually warned of dire consequences. Now, insurance companies, feeling squeezed, are nixing doctor contracts and patient plans to save money. Medicare Advantage plans are being dropped all over the country. Nearly 4,000 UnitedHealthCare Medical Advantage members in Hawaii will have their plan terminated next year, according to the Honolulu Star-Advertiser. UnitedHealthCare Medical Advantage is also eliminating two plans in Broward County, Florida. ...Noted Obamacare critic Betsy McCaughey tells the Daily Caller that the cancellation of contracts decreases costs for Medicare Advantage HMOs by reducing doctor utilization. Fewer doctors available will make it harder for patients to get appointments. ‘This is happening all over the country,’ McCaughey said.” [51027]

The *CBS Evening News* reports that three 20-year-old programmers in San Francisco spent a few weekends and late nights solving a major problem with Healthcare.gov, developing their own web site—as a public service—that provides Americans with ObamaCare health insurance rates without their having to enter personal information like their Social Security numbers. Their site, <http://www.thehealthsherpa.com/>, does almost everything healthcare.gov was supposed to do CBS notes, “You can't actually enroll on the HealthSherpa site, but they do provide contact information for companies offering the plans. Users who find a plan they like can go directly to the insurance companies without ever using Healthcare.gov.” [51004, 51005, 51006]

Dr. Milton Wolf, one of Obama’s cousins on his mother’s side and a 2014 candidate for the U.S. Senate in Kansas, appears on *Hannity* and slams both Obama and ObamaCare, saying that although you cannot choose your family, you can “choose to rise up and stop your family from destroying America.” Wolf calls Obama’s “you can keep your plan” promise “a lie,” and says, “We talk about access to healthcare. Well, the surest way to keep a patient away from a doctor is to make things too expensive. And that’s exactly what Obamacare does. They call it the Affordable Care Act? But not a word of that is true. It’s not affordable and it does not provide care.” [50993, 53370]

Obama travels to New Orleans, Louisiana, where he tries to shift the focus off ObamaCare. He tells his audience, “I know if there’s one thing that members of Congress from both parties want, it’s smart infrastructure projects that create good jobs in their districts.” Obama also pushes immigration reform, and touches briefly on ObamaCare.

He says, “I know health care is controversial, so there’s only going to be so much support we get on that on a bipartisan basis—until it’s working really well, and then they’re going to stop calling it ObamaCare. [Then] They’re going to call it something else.” (The delusional Obama apparently believes he can wait out the ObamaCare storm and that all will eventually be well.) Republican Governor Bobby Jindal responds to the visit with a statement, “We will not allow ...Obama to bully Louisiana into accepting an expansion of Obamacare. ...The dysfunction of the website and [Obama’s] broken promises on being able to keep your health plan are just the tip of the iceberg in regards to the problems with this law.” [50986, 51133]

Obama attends a fundraiser in Miami, Florida—and then decides to change his schedule to include golf in Fort Lauderdale the next day, rather than an evening flight back to Washington, D.C. (WhiteHouseDossier.com comments, “Nice. Obama is undoubtedly paying his own green fees, but taxpayers must foot the bill for the huge presidential entourage that remained overnight in Miami instead of returning [to] Washington Friday.”) [50973]

On November 9 author Ann Coulter appears on *Fox & Friends* and quips, “Obama’s apology is like Bernie Madoff apologizing for his investors losing money.”

Obama plays golf at Grande Oaks Golf Club in Fort Lauderdale—his 150th golf excursion since entering the White House, and his 39th of 2013. (DailyCaller.com reminds readers that Obama’s golf game has not improved much over the years, posting a video of one of his lousy swings and quoting golf instructor Butch Harmon: “If I had the opportunity to give [Obama] some help, I would advise him to make a better turn on his backswing, both with his hips and his shoulders... Right now there’s no wind-up, and then there’s a lot of un-windup... He tends to pull across and slap at shots... It doesn’t look like he has a lot of power.”) [50973, 50974, 50995, 51002, 51664]

At Townhall.com Phil Kerpen reports that Oregon’s ObamaCare exchange web site “is now so bad Governor John Kitzhaber is saying: ‘Until that aspect of the website is working, they will not be able to enroll online.’ The ‘aspect’ of being able to enroll people is kind of the whole game. Kitzhaber is urging Oregonians to apply with paper forms.” Colorado’s site “is also in bad shape. ‘It’s painful. It’s odious. It’s embarrassing to have to go through all these questions that are not necessary if they’re going to get kicked out anyway,’ said Nathan Wilkes, a board member of the Colorado exchange. After spending \$178.9 million of federal taxpayer money, Colorado is now planning to replace its deeply troubled website with a brand new one by next October. Delaware has 890,000 people and an estimated 95,700 uninsured—and its failed website has enrolled four people. But at least that pitiful failure ‘only’ cost federal taxpayers \$12.9 million. That’s a bargain compared to Vermont, which is about two thirds the size of Delaware in population, but has managed to squander 13 times as much. Vermont has a total population of 620,000 people, of whom 55,600 are estimated to be uninsured. Yet federal taxpayers have been forced to pony up \$168.1 million to Vermont’s exchange. That’s over \$3,000 per uninsured Vermonter just to set up a website through which additional tax dollars will flow. ...Even the one supposedly successful state exchange, Kentucky,

has cost federal taxpayers a bundle: \$253.2 million. And how much ‘success’ did that quarter-billion bucks buy? While 280,000 people there have lost their existing coverage, in the first month only 5,891 people enrolled in private health plans through the exchange [\$42,980 per enrollee]. All told taxpayers are out about \$5 billion for a bunch of websites that range from disappointment to debacle. It’s time to put the law on pause and figure out if there’s anything worth salvaging before we squander even more money.” [50980, 51093, 51401]

According to a Rasmussen poll, “Fifty-three percent (53%) now view Obamacare unfavorably, with 42% who have a Very Unfavorable opinion of it. Seventy-one percent (71%) believe it’s at least somewhat likely that [Obama] or senior officials in his administration were aware long before the law began being implemented that health insurance costs would go up for some Americans, contrary to what they said publicly. ...Seventy-five percent (75%) of voters now say Congress is doing a poor job. That’s Congress’ highest negative rating in more than seven years of regular tracking. ...As for the Judicial Branch – Sixty percent (60%) of voters think most U.S. Supreme Court justices have their own political agenda. ...Americans are even suspicious of the supposedly independent Federal Reserve. Only 34% have a favorable opinion of the nation’s central bank, and 74% want to audit the Fed and make the results available to the public. ...[O]ne-in-four consumers (24%) said their personal finances are getting better, but 43% think they’re getting worse. ...Only 19% of Americans now believe the job market is better than it was one year ago. Looking ahead, 36% believe the unemployment rate will be higher one year from now, the highest level of pessimism all year.” [50982]

BeforeItsNews.com reports, “Two U.S. admirals—including the director of naval intelligence—are under investigation as part of a major bribery scandal involving a foreign defense contractor, Navy officials announced Friday night [November 8]. Vice Adm. Ted Branch, the service’s top intelligence officer, and Rear Adm. Bruce Loveless, the Navy’s director of intelligence operations, were placed on leave Friday, and their access to classified material was suspended, the Navy said in a statement. Both admirals are being investigated for their ties to a Singapore-based defense contractor, Glenn Defense Marine Asia, whose chief executive was arrested in September on charges that he bribed other Navy officers into giving him classified information in exchange for prostitutes and cash. This is going to seem odd for me to say but since when did the top brass start policing itself? Know what I mean? Granted this does involve intelligence sharing. I don’t know, it all just seems weird. This comes as at least a dozen other top officers have been purged from the military by Obama. This is either one of two things. One, it is what they say it is, purging corruption from the top brass is a must and I have no doubts that corruption is rampant. Or two, this is a political purge. The kind of political purge that is carried out in tyrannical regimes the world over for centuries. Hard to tell in the land of the free but both I think are possible.” [50991]

France proves it is not as gullible as Obama, as FoxNews.com reports, “Negotiations among world powers to temporarily curb Iran’s nuclear program appeared to stall Saturday when France questioned whether the proposal went far enough, after Israel’s strong objections to such an agreement. The concerns cast doubt about whether an

agreement can be reached during the current round of negotiations in Geneva. ...French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius said there were 'several points' in the initial deal with which his country is not satisfied and told France-Inter Radio France does not want to be part of a 'con game.' He did not specify, but his comments suggested France thought a final draft of any first-step deal was too favorable to Iran, echoing concerns raised by Israel and several prominent U.S. legislators." According to Reuters, Fabius said France could not accept a "sucker's deal." Other reports claim the French are denying that they nixed the deal, and that the Iranians would not sign anything unless it is first approved by "Supreme Leader" Ali Khamenei. Nevertheless, the Obama administration prematurely—and foolishly—hinted to the media that an agreement had been reached. [50994, 51023, 51042, 51242]

After the Allen West Foundation Veteran's Motorcycle ride, which ended at the U.S. National UDT-Navy SEAL Museum in Ft. Pierce Florida, Dr. Dorothy Narvaez-Woods, widow of Navy SEAL Ty Woods, addresses the crowd. Former Congressman Allen West reports, "Her speech articulated the code of the warrior, the US Navy SEAL, and she spoke of the hurt and pride she felt equally at the moment of being notified Ty had lost his life in Benghazi. The words she spoke which garnered her a standing ovation were, 'I knew that at the moment of decision Ty did not say, 'at this time what difference does it make?'" Her mother and father sat before me and I gave her young son one of our Allen West Foundation coins. While inside the museum I made a simple promise to Dorothy relating to 2016, and I plan on keeping it." [50996]

At WeeklyStandard.com Noemie Emery writes, "In March 2010, Barack Obama placed a giant bet on the docility and stupidity of the American people, when he decided in the face of three huge electoral warnings to force his health plan down the unwilling throats of the American people. And by November 2013, it was clear he had lost. It was not going to work. It would never be popular. And it was falling apart on its own. The HealthCare.gov website unveiled on October 1 had immediate problems, which were quickly revealed as the tip of the iceberg, as many worse things lay below. ...If the act does go down, the tip of the spear may belong to Edie Littlefield Sundby, a California woman with stage-four cancer, kept in remission these past seven years by a crack team of doctors, whose services she is shortly to lose. Her op-ed, running in the *Wall Street Journal*, went viral on Monday, November 4, and had wide circulation over the Internet, on talk radio, and on cable TV. 'Thanks to the law, I have been forced to give up a world-class health plan,' she wrote. 'For a cancer patient, medical coverage is a matter of life and death. Take away people's ability to control their medical coverage and they may die. I guess that's a highly effective way to control medical costs. Perhaps that's the point.' ...As lies go, 'If you like your plan, you can keep it' is right up there with 'I am not a crook' in the annals of presidential mendacity, and way above the Bill Clinton threshold, as other people's lives, health, and financial arrangements were not affected by whether or not he had had 'sexual relations with that woman.' ...Obama had to have a great deal of contempt for the American people to think he could pull this off without consequence, just as he needed it in the first place to think he could push the bill through against the will of the country without repercussions that were entirely justified. ...Furious voters are besieging their elected representatives. Democrats, especially those running in 2014,

must fear facing opponents quoting Edie Littlefield Sundby. Obama is a lame duck with an approval rating now around 40, and he can no longer save them. However this ends, it will not go well for [Obama]. He built it. He owns it. And now it's all his." [51001]

On *The McLaughlin Report*, host John McLaughlin asks panelist Pat Buchanan, "Question. Do either of these [ObamaCare reform] bills stand a chance of passing Congress? And if one does reach [Obama's] desk, will [he] veto it? I ask you, Pat." Buchanan responds, "If [Obama] is not in on it, he will veto it. But I don't think it's gonna reach the president's desk, to be very honest. [Senator] Mary Landrieu [D-LA], herself, repeated [in the past] that you can keep your healthcare plan and that's being used against her. And I think this is a defensive move [on her part]. But, John, let me just say one point. If there is [sic; are] anything like 76 million healthcare plans voided, not only is ObamaCare dead, there's [sic; there are] gonna be guillotines set up at Farragut Square [in Washington, D.C.]" [51040]

On November 10 Michael Goodwin writes in the *New York Post*, "Poor Barack Obama. Ending his fifth year as the world's most powerful man, he is running out of scapegoats and fairy tales. Blaming George W. Bush has lost its punch, and the ObamaCare debacle is shredding the myths he is competent and honest. Still, before he rides off into that sunset of self-pity and low poll ratings, he ought to invite his remaining friends over for a heart-to-heart. That way he can tell The New York Times that its fanatical support does him no favors. Instead, it feeds his arrogance and reinforces his belief that he can solve any problem with another speech. The unflattering truth doesn't stand a chance—until it is too late. ...From the broadcast networks to MSNBC and most large papers, Obama got the benefit of every doubt. The double standards were a daily disgrace so routine, they mostly provoked a shrug instead of outrage. The ObamaCare debacle is the exception that proves the rule. Wall-to-wall complaints are forcing the media to report that the law's Web site is a lemon and that its rules are causing millions of people to lose insurance plans they liked. The mainstream media is acting only because the story is too big to ignore. Had it been mildly skeptical sooner, it could have exposed the law's destructive rules and prevented the disaster. ...Then came the [*New York Times*'] coverup: 'Mr. Obama clearly misspoke' when he made those promises, the editorial said, before dismissing the problems as an 'overblown controversy.' ...The episode graphically illustrates how the Times has harmed the nation by reflexively protecting Obama, facts be damned. Instead of just expressing its own liberal views, the editorial page serves as the propaganda arm of the administration, the Jay Carney of print media. Its daily drumbeat of shrill partisanship leaves it indistinguishable from Dem party hacks who spend their waking hours demonizing Republicans. ...ObamaCare is such a direct hit on so many people that it could change everything. If predictions are accurate that tens of millions of families will lose their current insurance policies, Obama and the Democratic lemmings will be seriously damaged. The [media] lapdogs and cheerleaders won't get off easy, either. Not when their crime was covering up his." [51013]

The Investment Watch blog lists "10 facts about the growing unemployment crisis... that will blow your mind." "#1 The percentage of working age Americans with a job fell to 58.3 percent in October." "#2 The U.S. economy lost 623,000 full-time jobs last month."

“#3 The number of American women with a job fell by 357,000 during the month of October.” “#4 The average duration of unemployment in October 2013 was nearly three times as long as it was in October 2000.” “#5 The number of Americans ‘not in the labor force’ increased by an astounding 932,000 during October.” “#6 The number of Americans ‘not in the labor force’ has grown by more than 11 million since Barack Obama first entered the White House.” “#7 In October, the U.S. labor force participation rate fell from 63.2 percent to 62.8 percent.” “#8 If the labor force participation rate was still at the same level it was at when Barack Obama was elected in 2008, the official unemployment rate would be about 11 percent right now.” “#9 Even if you are working, that does not mean that you are able to take care of yourself and your family without any help.” “#10 In January 2000, there were 75 million working age Americans that did not have a job. Today, there are 102 million working age Americans that do not have a job.” [51415, 51416]

At Townhall.com Mark Baisley describes a new book, *Betrayed, The Shocking True Story of Extortion 17 as told by a Navy SEAL's Father*, which provides details of the loss of 17 Navy SEALs when their helicopter was shot down in Afghanistan. “The book details the events of August 6, 2011 in Afghanistan surrounding the shooting down of an American Chinook helicopter that held the evocative name of ‘Extortion 17.’ A high-value Al-Qaeda leader was pinned down in a village by U.S. Army Rangers. Three hours into the intense ground engagement, Extortion 17 was tasked to carry seventeen SEALs into the battle with the onerous task of capturing the Al-Qaeda leader alive. ...As the Chinook approached its destination, the enemy could be seen running into a building with a tower that gave them an advantageous shooting position. The two Apache escort helicopters had all the visibility and firepower to resolve the battle before Extortion 17 delivered the SEAL team. But the Apaches were denied permission to attack. Under the Obama Administration’s new rules of engagement, no strike could be made on that building without assurance that no civilians were inside. The enemy knows these rules, which is why they run into buildings where civilians may be located. Under the protection of Obama rules, the enemy set up on the tower of the building and shot down Extortion 17 using three rocket-propelled grenades. The Chinook fell to the ground in a tremendous explosion, killing all 30 people on board.” [51007]

“...One question asked... was why, even in the minutes following the shoot-down of Extortion 17, America’s massive firepower was withheld. Three-star Admiral Robert Harward explained to the parents that a drone strike wasn’t used because, ‘we need to win their hearts and minds.’ Evidently, this policy of social politeness on the battlefield motivated the Obama Administration to relegate authority over American troops under Afghanistan command one year before the Extortion 17 crash, the greatest loss of U.S. military SEALs in a single incident. ...While George W. Bush was in office, we were treated to a steady drumbeat of casualty reports. But the silence of American media over the past five years has covered up the fact that far more of our troops have been killed and injured under the Obama Administration’s rules of engagement. ...In his most recent weekly message ...Obama recognized veterans, saying, ‘...I will make it my mission to make sure that America has your back.’ I encourage every American to have our veterans’ back by reading the book *Betrayed*... The steep reality is that history judges.

Kindly or harshly, a didactic perspective will ultimately have its say.” (Some believe that the SEAL victims included members of the team that supposedly killed Osama bin Laden, and that they were intentionally targeted to keep them from revealing information about that operation.) [51007, 51008, 51009]

On CNN’s *State of the Union*, Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-FL), the chairman of the Democrat National Committee, insists, “Democratic candidates will be able to run on Obamacare as an advantage in 2014.” Host Candy Crowley notes that several hundred thousand Floridians have lost their health insurance in recent weeks, and Wasserman Schultz—who has referred to health insurance cancellation notices as mere “transition notices”—replies, “It is a real significant distortion to say that hundreds of thousands of people are getting cancelled. What’s actually happening is that they are very likely to get a better plan for less money.” [51015, 51025, 51035, 51099]

Crowley also interviews Republican National Committee chairman Reince Priebus, who says ObamaCare “is going to be toxic for the Democrats. And believe me, we will tattoo it to their foreheads in 2014. We will run on it. And they will lose because of it.” [51036]

Also on *State of the Union*, Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) comments on France’s efforts to stop the proposed deal to reduce sanctions on Iran: “Thank God for France and thank God for push back. The French are becoming very good leaders in the Mid East. ...My fear is that we’re going to wind up creating a North Korea-type situation in the Mideast, where we negotiate with Iran and one day you wake up... and you’re going to have a nuclear Iran.” Senator John McCain (R-AZ) tweets, “Vive la France! France had the courage to prevent a bad nuclear agreement with Iran.” (French-speaking Secretary of State John Kerry is no doubt annoyed as can be that his deal with Iran fell through and that Graham and McCain are pleased about it.) [51017]

Graham also says, “a new round of sanctions will be coming from the Congress. The Congress will define the end game because we’re worried about the end game, not some interim deal. You can’t trust the Iranians. ...[T]he Israelis are apoplectic about what we’re doing. I’ve never been more worried about the Obama administration’s approach to the Mideast than I am now.” [51020]

On *Meet the Press*, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN) says, “I do know that on both sides of the Capitol, on both sides of the aisle right now, people are really looking at what the next steps ought to be. All of us want to see diplomacy. That is the best way to resolve this issue. But we’re also concerned about an administration that seems really ready always to jump into the arms of folks and potentially deal away some of the leverage we have. ...I think this week sitting down, talking with Secretary Kerry is going to be an important element of what we do. We know the sanctions have gotten us here, and we’re worried we’re dealing away with our leverage.” (Republicans and Democrats alike are concerned that Kerry and Obama are giving away the store with Iran by offering to pull back sanctions in exchange for nothing more than vague promises that will most assuredly be broken.) [51020]

Also on *Meet the Press*, Secretary of State John Kerry says, “I’d say a number of nations, not just the French, but ourselves and others, wanted to make sure that we had the tough language necessary, the clarity in the language necessary, to be absolutely certain that we were doing the job and not granting more or doing something sloppily that could wind up with a mistake. This is serious business, and I think every country came there, this is the first time that the P5 had come together with this kind of a serious set of possible options in front of it with a new Iranian government. Remember, that this has changed since the election, this is a new overture, and it has to be put to the test very, very carefully. So, I think there was unity there, David, with respect to getting it right. We always said, ...Obama has been crystal clear, ‘Don’t rush, we’re not in a rush, we need to get the right deal.’ No deal is better than a bad deal, and we are certainly adhering to that concept.” (In other words, “I was ready to cave in, but France saved me from myself, so now I’ll pretend that I agreed with them all along.”) Host David Gregory asks Kerry if he is being “skeptical enough about a man [Iranian President Hassan Rouhani] who has been called a wolf in sheep’s clothing, who wrote a book in which he talked about how they can continue work on their nuclear program while they gain confidence of the West.” An annoyed Kerry responds, “David, some of the most serious and capable, expert people in our government, who have spent a lifetime dealing both with Iran as well as with nuclear weapons and nuclear armament and proliferation, are engaged in our negotiation. We are not blind, and I don’t think we’re stupid. I think we have a pretty strong sense of how to measure whether or not we are acting in the interests of our country and of the globe, and particularly of our allies like Israel and Gulf states and others in the region.” (In other words, “I am not as stupid as everyone thinks I am.” Kerry is, in fact, quite stupid if he believes Rouhani—who was involved in the 1983 barracks bombing in Beirut, Lebanon that killed 299 U.S. Marines and others—is “moderate” and can be trusted to comply with any nuclear agreement. Under “moderate” Rouhani, the number of public executions by hanging have jumped dramatically.) [51030, 51034, 51892, 52304]

On *Fox News Sunday*, George Will comments, “Well, it is one thing for Bill Clinton to say, I feel your pain. It is another thing for Barack Obama to say I feel your pain that I have caused. And for him to say it was caused by a situation, that’s the word he used in the operative sentence, we, this week, marked the one year anniversary of his reelection. Has there ever, with the exception of Richard Nixon in 1973 been a worst first year of a second term? A Pew survey this week is, approval of his performance on health care—health care is his signature issue, disapproval 59 percent. That is a little bit less of the 60 percent disapproval on immigration and 65 percent on the economy. And now the Democrats are going to get to vote on some things, maybe, or at least [Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [D-NV] will have to stop them in the Senate. Here is, for example, the ‘If You Like Your Plan You Can Keep It Act’ from Senator Ron Johnson. It is four pages long, which makes it 902 pages shorter than the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. And these are opportunities for discomfort for the supporters of the Affordable Care Act.” [51031]

At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “The Obama administration was using its vastly diminished influence to pressure the leaders of the Perm 5+1 (United States, Russia, China, the United Kingdom and France, plus Germany) to sign off on Iran’s

nuclear proliferation program. The deal was a monumental disaster of historic proportions. Literally, a global game changer. Nothing happens for decades, and then decades happen in a day. Boom. Obama's plan allows Iran to keep enriching uranium, spinning their centrifuges, and building advanced new centrifuges, without having to dismantle a single centrifuge. End game. [Israeli] Prime Minister [Binyamin] Netanyahu, the only rational voice at the kool-aid party, said, 'Iran gets everything that it wanted at this stage and pays nothing. And this is when Iran is under severe pressure. I urge Secretary Kerry not to rush to sign, to wait, to reconsider, to get a good deal. But this is a bad deal, a very, very, bad deal. It's the deal of a century for Iran; it's a very dangerous and bad deal for peace and the international community.' Still, Obama mindlessly and aggressively sought to back Iran's nuclear jihad. Until the French stepped in, that is. The French. It's just. unbelievable. The French are doing what our media won't. Calling a sucker a sucker." [51023]

According to WDAY 6 in North Dakota, the state has seen only about 30 people sign up for ObamaCare, while, "Three insurance companies are doing business in the marketplace: Blue Cross Blue Shield, Medica, and Sanford. Those 3 companies say more than 35,000 people are, or will be, losing their existing health insurance, because of ObamaCare." [51016]

Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel orders the U.S. Pacific Command to assist the Philippines in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan. [51022, 51037]

Time.com reports, "Iranian officials said Sunday the country made progress with world powers during 'serious' talks over Tehran's nuclear program, but insisted the nation cannot be pushed to give up uranium enrichment as negotiations move into tougher ground over ways to ease Western concerns that Iran could one day develop atomic weapons. The remarks on enrichment repeat past declarations on the country's 'right' to produce nuclear fuel, which is a key element of the talks over its scope. But President Hassan Rouhani and his top envoys seek to assure hard-line critics that Iran will not make sweeping concessions in the negotiations, which ended without agreement in Geneva early Sunday and are scheduled to resume next week. ...Iran insists it does not seek nuclear weapons and says its reactors are only for electricity and medical applications. In an address to parliament, Rouhani said uranium enrichment is a 'red line' that cannot be crossed. 'Nuclear rights in the international framework, including uranium enrichment, on its soil' are not negotiable, Rouhani was quoted as saying by the semiofficial ISNA news agency. 'For us red lines are not crossable.' ...Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has criticized what he considers readiness by the six powers to be too generous to Tehran for not enough in return. The U.S and others are considering easing economic sanctions in return for a possible suspension in 20 percent enrichment. Speaking Sunday before a weekly cabinet meeting, Netanyahu said he had spoken over the weekend with the leaders of the U.S, Russia, France, Britain and Germany, pressing them to not reach a hasty deal. 'I asked them to delay and I'm glad they did. I do not fool myself—there will be an agreement. I hope it will not be an agreement at any price—a good one, not a bad one.' He said Israel would 'do all we can to convince the powers and the world leaders to avoid a bad agreement.' Rouhani said Iran is similar to other

countries and ‘we are not ready to accept discrimination, at all.’ ‘We have told the other party that threats, sanctions, humiliation and discrimination will not lead to an answer,’ said Rouhani.” (Rouhani’s “red line” comment is, of course, aimed at Obama and his inability to enforce his own red line over chemical weapons use in Syria.) [51029, 51030]

On *60 Minutes*, reporter Lara Logan issues a correction on an October 27 Benghazi story which relied on misleading information from Dylan Davies, a British contractor who falsely claimed to have been present the night of the attack on September 11, 2012. [51039]

On November 11, Veterans Day, Obama places a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery. Obama also honors a group of black veterans at the White House. (While everyone in the group no doubt deserves being honored, it is unclear why Obama could not find any white veterans to honor.) [51240]

On NBC’s *Today* program, Sarah Palin responds to combative leftist Matt Lauer’s admiration for Obama’s “apology,” saying, “What apology? What apology? He kind of acknowledged a bit that there is a broken website. The broken web site is the least of America’s worries. This broken web site, I think, is symbolic of a broken administration—takeover of one-sixth of our economy and this socialized medicine that’s being crammed down our throat, that’s what’s broken.” Lauer defends Obama: “Five percent of Americans can’t keep it because it doesn’t meet the standards of the new health care law. If it turns out, Governor, that they end up—those five percent of people—with a better health insurance policy, do you think they’ll forgive him for the broken promise?” Palin: “But where do you get this five percent? It’s not five percent. It’s most Americans will not be able to keep the health care policy and programs that they had desired and the new programs that are being forced down our throat are unaffordable. People who are being told today if you—and some of them are still being told—‘Well, if you like that insurance policy and that coverage, you still will be able to keep it. It’s just going to cost you a little bit more.’ That’s the point, if it’s going to cost you more, then it’s not the same policy. ... When you stand in the middle of the road, you’re going to get hit on both sides of the road. We need to take a stand, especially on this ObamaCare, and support those who are just fulfilling their campaign promises. So many politicians ran for reelection and for election saying they would do anything in their power to de-fund the state of socialized medicine program called ObamaCare. [Senators] Ted Cruz [R-TX], Mike Lee [R-UT], some of these guys were actually fulfilling their campaign promises and they ask for debate. That’s why they stood up. They took the stand, [and] fought for us to debate the issue of ObamaCare.” [51038, 51083]

On MSNBC’s *Morning Joe*, Democrat political strategist James Carville comments on Obama’s plummeting poll numbers: “I think the best thing he can do is take a toke on the mayor of Toronto’s crack pipe, because his [approval] numbers are about 48.” Carville adds, “[But] I think we can stop putting the nails in the coffin here. We can admit that there’s some real, deep, fundamental problems with [Obama]. But I think we’re throwing the dirt here too soon. The deficit is dropping as a percentage of GDP faster than any time since World War II. He saved the auto industry. Health care costs are flattening better

than any time in the last 20 years. Teenage pregnancy is at an all-time low.” (The deficit is dropping only because it could not continue at the pace Obama had been increasing it for four years; Obama did not save the auto industry; the taxpayers saved General Motors, and Obama handed Chrysler to Italy’s Fiat at a discount; and teen pregnancies are most certainly not at an “all-time low”—but even if they were, what that would have to do with Obama is not explained by Carville. An article in the left-leaning Politico about the Carville appearance is followed by brutal anti-Clinton and anti-Obama comments by readers.) [51050, 51051]

At Forbes.com Steven Hayward, visiting scholar at the University of Colorado, writes, “Prediction: even if HealthCare.gov is fixed by the end of the month (unlikely), Obamacare is going to be repealed well in advance of next year’s election. And if the website continues to fail, the push for repeal—from endangered Democrats—will occur very rapidly. The website is a sideshow: the real action is the number of people and businesses who are losing their health plans or having to pay a lot more. Fixing the website will only delay the inevitable. ...Senate Democrats endangered for re-election will lead the charge for repeal perhaps as soon as January, after they get an earful over the Christmas break. They’ll call it ‘reform,’ and clothe it in calls for delaying the individual mandate and allowing people and businesses to keep their existing health insurance policies. But it is probably too late to go back in many cases. With the political damage guaranteed to continue, the momentum toward repeal will be unstoppable. Democrats will not want to face the voters next November with the albatross of Obamacare. ...The hazard of the moment is that a compromise ‘reform’ that drops the mandate and attempts to restore the insurance status quo ante could leave us with an unfunded expansion of Medicaid and a badly disrupted private insurance market. Republicans should avoid both the political traps and a new fiscal time bomb by being ready with a serious replacement policy, based on the premium support tax credit ideas that John McCain advocated (poorly) in 2008. While anxious liberals are in dismay, they should recognize that Obamacare may well have achieved its chief purpose of making universal or at least greatly expanded health coverage a fixture of American social policy. The cost to liberalism may prove fatal, however.” [51045]

At the leftist web site DailyKos.com, University of Pennsylvania dentistry student and Obama supporter M. Convente whines that because of ObamaCare he and his fellow students “now have to cover pediatric dental even though none of us are even eligible to use that benefit. ... Our committee [the Student Health Insurance Advisory Committee] is quite progressive when it comes to benefits offered (full prosthesis replacement, gender reassignment surgery, etc.) and low deductible (we’re at \$300. That’s not a typo—three hundred). And yet even for us, at least in the college health insurance market, the ACA has truly been the ‘law of unintended consequences.’ Health insurance is nuanced like crazy, and sadly most people don’t have the time and/or capacity to really understand the gritty details. Relying on marketing slogans, some of which turned out not to be so correct, is turning out to be problematic. I should write a diary about how the ACA is affected [sic; affecting the] college health insurance market. We’re [in] a unique situation since the overwhelming majority of our population is young and healthy. Now that students can buy individual plans (or stay on their parents’ insurance), we’re likely going

to be looking at serious adverse selection since our benefits [sic; premiums] are so great, so only students with known health issues will purchase our plan.” [51588]

Convente’s statements are laughable. The students don’t like having to pay for dental coverage for children they don’t have—but they don’t seem to mind that every other American without children is in the same situation because of ObamaCare. And while they don’t want to pay for dental care, they are proud to brag that they support covering gender reassignment surgery. Converting male students to females is apparently higher up on the “progressive” priority list than taking care of a child’s teeth. Yes, the Affordable Care Act has “unintended consequences”—thousands of them, in fact. So do most laws—especially those that exceed 2,000 pages and are accompanied by more than 30,000 pages of regulations. Convente and his fellow students may want to take a class in basic economics. Yes, most people “don’t have the time and/or capacity to really understand the gritty details,” and neither did Convente. That is precisely why many reasonable and responsible legislators opposed the Affordable Care Act. Convente makes the understatement of the year when he writes, “Relying on marketing slogans, some of which turned out not to be so correct, is turning out to be problematic.” In other words, “Believing Obama’s lies was not a good idea.” As far as writing a diary about how ObamaCare is negatively impacting health insurance for college students, he should have considered examining those issues before voting for Obama. Convente has also apparently just figured out that college students are “young and healthy” and that is precisely why Obama wants to force them into the ObamaCare exchanges. He needs their premiums to pay for the health care of the non-young and the non-healthy. One does not need a college degree to have understood that was part of the ObamaCare plan, but Convente’s education seems to have done him few favors in that regard. Finally, he discovers the concept of adverse selection, concluding that “only students with known health issues” will purchase the suddenly-expensive insurance. (*The Obama Timeline* suggests that readers with dental problems seek care from professionals not named Convente.) [51588]

The *Chicago Tribune* editorial board—which has apparently forgotten that it endorsed Obama in 2008 and in 2012—excoriates his signature “achievement,” writing, “Democratic leaders forced the law through Congress without a single Republican vote. The architects of Obamacare brushed aside sharp warnings from tech wizards that the computer system wasn’t tested and ready. They piled hundreds of pages of last-minute regulations on insurers. They forced insurers to cancel policies by the thousands because those policies fell short of the soup-to-nuts coverage required by the law. The American public is having a credibility-shattering debate about [Obama]: Did he not bother to learn the details of the law before he told us we could keep our doctors and our insurance, or did he know the truth and flat-out lie? Political consequences from the early failure of Obamacare are likely. But far more important are the *personal* consequences for American consumers. There are early indications that many young and healthy people are opting not to buy insurance. There are two likely reasons: It’s nearly impossible for anyone to sign up, and the cost is prohibitive for people who have modest incomes but don’t qualify for subsidies. If this continues, you’ll hear the phrase ‘death spiral’ more and more. That’s the term insurance execs use to describe what will happen if young and

relatively healthy people don't pay into the system while older people with greater health care needs sign up. If that happens, increased costs will vastly outstrip increased revenues, putting enormous financial pressure on the whole scheme.” [51097, 51461]

“...People don't need an apology—heartfelt or, as this one appeared, grudging. They need to know their health coverage isn't in jeopardy. Republicans, and a growing number of Democrats, are pushing bills to save existing insurance plans. Bipartisan support is growing for a delay in the individual mandate. The Obama administration wants an administrative fix so it can avoid legislation that might open the door to other changes to the Affordable Care Act. [Obama] had better recognize he's in no position to sidestep Congress. He's losing the confidence of the public and leaders in his own party. ...The odds against a fundamental restructuring of the law are steep, given the deep distrust Republicans and Democrats have for each other. But that's what will be needed. A bold reboot, a Manhattan Project for health care reform that starts fresh with some basic principles. An essential first step: Accept that government doesn't know what's best for everyone. That people can decide what coverage they need and can afford. A strong marketplace offers choices for every wallet. Obamacare's rules curtail those choices. Why, for instance, should only people under age 30 be eligible to purchase lower-cost 'catastrophic' insurance? Pinching Americans' coverage choices is one big reason this law doesn't work. Republicans will have to be constructive. They've talked 'repeal and replace,' but the public has no idea what they would offer as a replacement. Democrats will have to avoid being defensive. It was a mistake to attempt such a massive government intrusion on a marketplace and a mistake to do so without anything close to a public consensus.” [51097]

The CBS affiliate in Seattle reports that Oregon's online ObamaCare enrollment system, Cover Oregon, “still doesn't work, and the exchange has yet to enroll a single person in health insurance.” [51048]

According to WashingtonPost.com, when the Obama administration releases figures on October ObamaCare “enrollments” it will include not just Americans who have purchased and paid for health insurance via Healthcare.gov, but “will count people who have purchased a plan as well as those who have a plan sitting in their online shopping cart but have not yet paid. ...[T]he Wall Street Journal, citing anonymous sources, said insurance companies have received about 50,000 private health plan enrollments through HealthCare.gov. Even combined with state tallies, the figure falls far short of the 500,000 sign-ups the administration initially predicted for both private sign-ups and those opting for the expansion of Medicaid.” The Obama administration is also likely to count as ObamaCare “enrollments” new Medicaid applicants who used Healthcare.gov to discover they are eligible for free, taxpayer-funded health care. [51054, 51065, 51074, 51089, 51095]

Rush Limbaugh tells his radio audience, “Here's the thing—if you believe nothing [else] of what I say, if you believe nothing of what I say—believe this. What people do not understand is that as far as Obama is concerned, ObamaCare is working perfectly right now. It is happening exactly as it was drawn up. It is happening exactly as it was

designed. ...I mean, I'm sure that they would love it if you would happily give up your current policy, if you'd happily pay higher costs so that other people can be insured. I'm sure they'd like that, don't misunderstand. But the chaos, the confusion, the fact that you've got nowhere to go other than the exchange now, that's exactly as designed. They don't want an option where you keep your plan available to you. This is why the nature of Obama's lie is so profound and huge and personal and impeachable, if you ask me. This lie, that you can keep your plan if you like it and keep your doctor, folks, that's fraud. It is arguable now who committed the greater fraud, Bernie Madoff or Barack Obama? Madoff defrauded a few. This is defrauding the entire country. [Obama] lied to the entire country on the most important thing to people, their health care and their current plan, and remember, now, I want to try this one more time. His number one selling point that he repeated over and over again for three solid years was: 'You like your plan, you keep it.' There's an obvious question that derives from that. 'Well, then why change anything?'" [51080]

Investigative journalist James O'Keefe's Project Veritas releases undercover video of ObamaCare navigators advising people to lie about their income and smoking habits in order to pay less for health insurance and receive higher than justified taxpayer subsidies. One navigator is caught saying, "You lie because your premiums will be higher [if you tell the truth about your smoking]. Don't tell them that. Don't tell 'em." Others says, "Don't get yourself in trouble by declaring it [your income] now," and "Yeah, it didn't happen. Never report it." (One navigator is later fired and three are suspended as a result of the video. O'Keefe promises there will be more.) [51056, 51067, 51076, 51104, 51111, 51131]

KMOV in St. Louis reports, "Illinois is among states expanding Medicaid under ...Obama's health care law. It's the state, not the federal government, that's overseeing efforts to enroll new Medicaid clients—and state officials have come up with some effective ways to do it. For instance, Illinois offered 'express enrollment' to people already receiving food stamps. The state sent a letter in late August to 123,000 food stamp recipients, and received 46,000 Medicaid applications in response." (Taxpayers will now have to provide free medical coverage for an additional 46,000 Illinois residents—a number which far exceeds the number of new paying customers for ObamaCare in that state.) [51057]

A Russian warship docks in Alexandria, Egypt ahead of what Fox News calls, "one of the highest level visits by Russian officials to the country in decades." (The visit would not be taking place had Obama not abandoned ally Hosni Mubarak. Obama's action helped usher in the Muslim Brotherhood and its takeover of the Egyptian government. Their eventual removal left the nation in chaos and led to Egypt slowly turning away from the United States and toward Russia.) [51062, 51063, 51144]

According to KaiserHealthNews.org, a computer problem led 8,000 residents of Washington state to believe they were entitled to more generous ObamaCare subsidies than the amounts to which they were actually qualified. All 8,000 "will soon receive letters informing them that the price they are expecting to pay for health insurance

purchased on the new online exchange marketplace is incorrect. ...The mistake could mean a lot of work for people who already went through the process of choosing a health plan, as well as for brokers and in-person assisters who helped them. ...Some people will probably have to go through the selection process all over, said Chris Free, an insurance broker at Rappport Benefits Group in Tacoma, who has been advising clients on enrolling in the health plans available through the exchange. 'People may have selected plans that are no longer in their budget' once their tax credit is recalculated, Free said. For those clients, 'we'll need to sit down and help them re-evaluate their decision,' he said." [51084]

At Reason.com Peter Suderman writes, "Over the weekend, several reports suggested that, despite continued assurances that Healthcare.gov, the problem-plagued online insurance enrollment portal run by the federal government, would be running smoothly for most users by the end of the month, it increasingly looks likely that the deadline will be missed. ...Anyone who wants to purchase insurance that kicks in at the beginning of next year must complete enrollment by December 15. If the system isn't working smoothly at least a couple weeks prior to that rapidly approaching date, then large numbers of people simply won't have a chance to sign up. ...The administration is looking for workarounds. But the ideas now being floated mostly reveal how bad the potential options are—and how desperate federal officials are for any sort of quick fix. According to a *Washington Post* report that ran over the weekend, one of those options would involve relying on the insurers to handle enrollment directly. ...But they can't complete all the steps, because they can't connect with the federal government system that determines whether an individual is eligible for government subsidies. Even if they could connect with it directly, it's not clear that the subsidy calculation system is working reliably enough to be useful. So the insurers have suggested a temporary measure: Let the insurers estimate the subsidies on their own. Any estimates that are too low would be reimbursable, and any estimates that are too high, the insurers would get to keep. In other words, the federal government, backed by taxpayers, would be on the hook for their bad estimates." [51085, 51096]

"Can this possibly be legal? Can the administration seriously be considering this idea, which is potentially costly and politically disastrous? Imagine how Democrats will feel about turning over the central operations of the health law to insurers. Imagine how Republicans will react to a plan that could cost more, and will serve as an implicit admission that the exchanges simply won't work without a major overhaul. That it is even being discussed suggests how dire the outlook is for the law's near-term functionality. ...This could still be turned around, perhaps even soon. But it's time to start considering the worst-case scenarios: that the exchanges continue to malfunction, that plan cancellations go into effect, that insurers see the political winds shifting and stop playing nice with the administration, and that significant numbers of people are left stranded without coverage as a result. Rather than reforming the individual market, which was flawed but did work for some people, Obamacare will have destroyed it and left only dysfunction and chaos in its wake." [51085, 51096]

Bill Clinton tells an interviewer, “I met a young man this week who has a family, two children, bought in the individual market place. His policy was cancelled and one was substituted for it that doubled his premium. ...And I said, but are your co-pays and deductibles the same? He said, ‘No, they’re much, much lower.’ So he said, ‘In the years when I *use* health care I might actually save money.’ But he said, ‘You know, we’re all young, and we’re all healthy.’ So, I personally believe, even if it takes a change in the law, [Obama] should honor the commitment the federal government made to those people [who lost their health insurance because of ObamaCare] and let them keep what they got [sic].” [51068, 51105, 51112, 51113, 51116, 51119, 51124, 51135, 51136, 51141, 51146, 51147, 51153]

Clinton displays his exceptional political skills in his statement. He manages to criticize ObamaCare by noting doubled premiums for one young family, while also mentioning that *if the family gets sick* the lower deductibles and co-pays might make the change to ObamaCare worthwhile. Thus, he can deflect criticism from those who say he is condemning the legislation. Different people hear different things: some hear Clinton say, “Yeah, he’s right! My premiums have doubled!” while others hear him say, “Yeah, he’s right! ObamaCare is worth the extra cost!” Even Clinton’s “honor the commitment” statement refers to the federal government, rather than to Obama directly. Thus, Clinton essentially says, “*Obama* should keep *his* promise,” without actually using those words. Of course, neither the government nor Obama can effectively keep the “keep your plan” promise—and Clinton knows it. He manages to distance himself, and Hillary Clinton, from Obama and his health care disaster, shrewdly aiding her efforts to capture the White House in November 2016. (It remains to be seen, however, what the Clintons will do to resist the push to move the Democrat party even further to the left by the likes of Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), media leftists, and others who believe the Clintons are puppets of Wall Street. Meanwhile, Hilary Clinton’s approval rating has fallen, from 56 percent in April to 46 percent in October. Even among Democrats, the decline was from 88 to 76 percent, and her favorable/unfavorable rating among young voters is underwater at 38/53. Benghazi has taken its toll—and the full truth is not yet even known.) [51068, 51105, 51112, 51113, 51116, 51119, 51124, 51135, 51136, 51141, 51146, 51147, 51153]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer says, “Look, this [ObamaCare fiasco] is the Gulf oil spill—drip, drip, drip—with [Obama] being utterly helpless, except that Obama is the one who drilled the well. ...I think, as damaging as the web site problems are, I think much more damaging is what his numbers are with people rating him on job approval and whether they have a favorable opinion of him. It has dropped like a stone, and the reason is, he was caught in an obvious deception. ...[H]e compounded it when he said, ‘Well, you know, we’re really sorry about all those people who have lost their insurance, it’s because we didn’t craft the law appropriately.’ That is precisely the opposite of the truth. ...They crafted the law precisely, in a complicated way, in order to maximize the number of people who would lose insurance. ...And [Obama] said exactly the opposite. This is one deception after another, and if it turns out they can’t get the web site up by the end of the month... that’s going to be another pledge or promise that is unfulfilled.” [51071]

Sharyl Attkisson reports on the *CBS Evening News*, “Henry Chao, HealthCare.gov’s chief project manager at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), gave nine hours of closed door testimony to the House Oversight Committee in advance of this week’s hearing. In excerpts [CBS News] has obtained, Chao was asked about a memo that outlined important security risks discovered in the insurance system. Chao said he was unaware of [a] September 3rd government memo written by another senior official at CMS. It found two high-risk issues, which are redacted for security reasons. The memo said ‘the threat and risk potential to the system is limitless.’ The memo [written by Tony Trenkle, a CMS official who is retiring on November 15] shows CMS gave deadlines of mid-2014 and early 2015 to address them. But Chao testified he’d been told the opposite. ‘What I recall is what the team told me, is [sic] that there were no high findings.’” (DailyCaller.com asks, “Is Chao lying, incompetent, or both? He can be both, but he can’t be neither. One or the other, at the least. But you can trust them! Why would they say so if it weren’t true?”) [51078, 51086, 51132, 51149]

On November 12 former Muslim Brotherhood member and now peace activist Walid Shoebat posts a column by Sadek Raouf Ebeid, an American physician and Egyptian Air Force officer. Ebeid writes that he has “filed a case with the Egyptian Attorney General, Mr. Hisham Barakat, requesting the eventual placement of Barack Obama’s elder brother, Malik Obama, on the wanted list... The Shoebat Foundation... has published photos & indisputable evidence that a gentleman by the name of Malik Obama, is serving as the right arm of General [Omar Hassan Ahmad] al-Bashir [Sudan’s brutal, murderous president]. Photos of Malik Obama participating in an al-Bashir-sponsored organization are now on the desk of Egypt’s A.G., Hisham Barakat, which seeks to question Malik. Soon after the case was filed, ElGanzory was permitted to serve Malik Obama with papers. He did so at the Kenyan embassy. Recently, after being called back to the embassy, the papers were returned to ElGanzory with a message that Malik is not in Kenya at this time and could not be served. ElGanzory was told Malik is in the U.S. I expect the next course of action to be that papers will be presented to the American embassy so that Malik can be properly served. The Egyptian judicial system will not be intimidated by who Malik Obama’s brother is.” Ebeid notes, “The International Criminal Court has already indicted al-Bashir in 2008 & 2010 on charges related to terrorism, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Egypt’s AG case 1761 has already highlighted the close ties & working relationship between Malik Obama and Omar al-Bashir. ...I concede that no one should hold a younger brother responsible for his elder brother’s crimes or affiliations (the first brother being Barack and the second being Malik). Unless, of course, we have convincing evidence that Barack has also supported his elder brother Malik, in any form or manner. ...Malik Obama has already received unprecedented tax-exempt status, in a record time, from Obama’s IRS administration. ...Will one brave congressman have the courage to open an inquiry re the Malik Obama case?” (El-Bashir has been indicted on charges of war crimes; Malik Obama has aided el-Bashir; Barack Obama has aided Malik Obama by having the IRS grant his phony fund-raising foundation prompt tax-exempt status. Arguably, therefore, Barack Obama is guilty of aiding and abetting a war criminal.) [51058, 51059, 51064, 51066, 52750]

According to a Rasmussen poll, “just 35% of Likely U.S. Voters now believe the trouble-plagued health care law is good for America. Fifty-five percent (55%) consider it bad for the country. Only two percent (2%) think it will have no impact. ...Fifty-five percent (55%) also at least somewhat favor repealing the law, while 41% are opposed. This includes 43% who Strongly Favor repeal and 31% who Strongly Oppose it.” [51069, 51070]

RedAlert.com reports that some college students and graduates are being informed they are losing their upcoming internship positions because of ObamaCare—which does not differentiate between interns and other workers and therefore forces employers to provide them with health insurance. [51233]

Heritage.org reminds readers of a 2009 statement made by Obama: “My guiding principle is, and always has been, that consumers do better when there is choice and competition. That’s how the market works. Unfortunately, in 34 states, 75 percent of the insurance market is controlled by five or fewer companies. In Alabama, almost 90 percent is controlled by just one company. And without competition, the price of insurance goes up and quality goes down.” Now, because of ObamaCare, “In the vast majority of states, the number of insurers competing in the state’s exchange is actually less than the number of carriers that previously sold individual market policies in the state.” In Alabama, 96 percent of the counties will have only one insurer selling health insurance in the ObamaCare exchange. The law has therefore made the situation worse, rather than better. Additionally, consumers had a multitude of policies to choose from, even where there were few companies selling insurance in their areas. Now the consumer has only four options: ObamaCare’s bronze, silver, gold, and platinum plans. (Obama’s 2009 statement was a lie and he knew it. He mentioned “competition” and the “market” not because he believes in them, but because he knew Americans wanted to hear those words.) [51075]

White House press secretary Jay Carney, asked about Bill Clinton’s comment that Obama should honor his promise about Americans being able to keep their health plans, responds, “As you saw [Obama] say in an interview with NBC last week, the answer is, yes, [he] has tasked his team with looking at a range of options, as he said, to make sure that nobody is put in a position where their plans have been canceled and they can’t afford a better plan even though they’d like to have a better plan.” (Rush Limbaugh translates Carney’s response for his radio audience: “It sounds like they’re gonna give everybody who’s been canceled a subsidy. That’s where they’re headed. I think that’s what they’re gonna end up doing—and you wait, because Obama does not want this repealed. He’s not gonna sit there for that. He’s not gonna let any Democrat talk him into repeal. So what they’ll come up with is a taxpayer subsidy in order to buy off these people before 2014. You know dead to rights that’s what’s gonna happen.” In other words, Obama may propose that Americans who lost their insurance because of ObamaCare would go to Healthcare.gov and buy a replacement plan, with the taxpayers picking up the difference in the premiums. If the old plan cost \$500 per month and the new plan cost \$800 per month, the government would subsidize the \$300 increase. Obama could thus force millions of people into the ObamaCare system. But because the

plan would be horrendously expensive, the bribes could not be continued. After one year, the subsidy would end and those who bought the ObamaCare policy would be stuck paying the higher premiums—conveniently for the Democrats, *after* the November 2014 elections. The Republicans would be wise to reject such a proposal—and they likely will. If Obama attempts to impose such a “fix” without Congressional approval, he will risk impeachment.) [51112, 51113, 51127]

Kansas state Senate Majority Leader Terry Bruce tells DailyCaller.com, “The joke around the capitol is that the rollout on ObamaCare is so bad that even Keith Sebelius would be calling for her [Kathleen Sebelius’] resignation.” (Keith Sebelius, a former U.S. Congressman from Kansas, is the late father-in-law of Kathleen Sebelius; she is married to Keith’s son K. Gary Sebelius, a federal magistrate judge. Kathleen Gilligan Sebelius is the daughter of the late Jack Gilligan, who served as a U.S. Congressman and governor of Ohio.) Bruce adds, “Obviously her reputation has been tarnished because she has been so close to this [ObamaCare] implementation.” Kansas state Representative Scott Schwab comments, “The scars that she caused cut so deep that it caused her father-in-law’s great friend [Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS)] to ask for her resignation. You’ve got to be trying to be incompetent to have Pat Roberts call for your resignation when he has that much love for your father-in-law. It’s sad. Pat had a lot of loyalty to Keith Sebelius, and that relationship even transcended his relationship with [former Senator Bob] Dole. For him in his last term in the Senate to have to call for Keith’s daughter-in-law’s resignation, it’s sad.” [51077]

DailyCaller.com reports, “A California company whose CEO has ties to ...Obama was granted nearly \$1.3 million to provide health-care navigator services in California and Illinois, despite past allegations of misconduct. The East Los Angeles Community Union, known as TELACU, was granted \$980,000 from Covered California, the state’s Obamacare health-care exchange. The company, which is a nonprofit organization with for-profit subsidiaries, was also awarded a \$294,000 grant to provide navigator services for the state of Illinois, though the company has since declined that contract. Despite being awarded the grants, which requires navigators to inform the public about their health coverage options under Obamacare, the company has been accused of bribery and influence peddling. ...Despite the bribery accusation, last year Obama appointed [TELACU CEO David] Lizarraga to a key position on the Community Development Advisory Board, which falls under the control of the U.S. Treasury Department. The board advises the director of the Community Development Institutions Fund on community development project decisions. According to OpenSecrets.org, TELACU and TELACU Industries employees gave \$55,750 to political campaigns in 2012, including \$10,250 to Obama. According to FollowTheMoney.org, in 2006 company employees contributed \$1,000 to Rod Blagojevich, the former Illinois governor who is in prison for corruption.” [51080]

CNN congressional correspondent Dana Bash reports that some House Democrats are ready to sign on to a Republican bill to allow Americans to “keep their health plans if they like them” if the White House does not come up with a different solution by the end of the week. Bash states, “What is clear is that the political pressure and the political

desire from Democrats to at least do something is growing by the minute. What is going to happen in—this week—on Friday [November 15] is House Republicans are going to put a piece of legislation on the House floor for a vote that will at least, in some way, shape, or form, suggest that people can keep their health care. I just talked to a senior congressional Democratic source who said that they believe this is almost a de facto deadline for the White House to come up with a fix. Because, if they don't, you're going to see more and more Democrats defy the White House and vote for this Republican bill in the House." [51087, 51088, 51135]

HotAir.com comments on Bash's report: "The 'Keep Your Plan Act' is [Congressman] Fred Upton's [R-MI] bill, which [White House press secretary] Jay Carney spent a few minutes attacking at today's press briefing because it would make canceled plans available to *all* consumers, not just the ones who'd been enrolled in those plans before. That would be a disaster for the insurance industry. Healthy people would flee the new, more expensive [ObamaCare] plans for the resurrected cheaper ones, leaving no one in the new risk pool except sick people with very expensive treatments. That means either heavy losses for insurers, steep premium hikes next year to make up the difference, or some sort of federal bailout (congrats, red-state Democrats!)—or maybe a little of all three. You'll have the same problem, though, albeit to a lesser extent, even if Upton's bill is amended so that it applies only to people who'd been enrolled in a particular plan before it was cancelled. You can't run a two-tiered healthy/sick insurance system. If the risk pools aren't merged, replete with higher rates for the former, you can't pay for the latter. I understand why the GOP would back Upton's bill. It's a slam dunk politically, grinding Obama's face in the consequences of his lie. This is the Democrats' mess; Reid and the Senate can/will kill the bill if they like. I can't understand why House Democrats, aware of the adverse selection problem that's lurking here—and the political humiliation for the White House—would sign on, *unless* they've already reached a point of such pure terror over the 'if you like your plan' backlash that they're willing to kneecap ObamaCare six weeks out of the gate. Did they ... not understand that millions of people were going to face cancellations and higher premiums under the law's redistributive scheme? Of course they did." (Of course, just as it is wrong to force Americans to buy insurance they may neither want nor need, it is wrong to force insurers to roll back months or years of work in coming up with new plans to comply with ObamaCare. There simply is no easy solution to the problems caused by ObamaCare. Whatever Obama now does or does not do, he will be excoriated—and justifiably so.) [51087, 51088, 51094, 51103, 51138]

Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA)—who is not even up for reelection in 2014—announces, "I have decided to cosponsor Senator Mary Landrieu's (D-LA) legislation: 'Keeping the Affordable Care Act Promise Act.'" (Interestingly, Feinstein's announcement comes one day after Bill Clinton makes a public statement that Obama's "you can keep your plan" promise should be kept. Some might argue that Clinton's statement gives Democrats "official" permission to disagree with Obama. Clinton, of course, is worried not about Obama—but about protecting Hillary's presidential viability in 2016. If that means undercutting Obama, he will do so.) Democrats now find themselves in a lose-lose situation. If they don't vote to roll-back ObamaCare, they'll

lose independent voters (and some irate Democrat voters) in 2014; if they vote to stop ObamaCare, they'll lose votes from their leftist base—and campaign cash from wealthy “progressive” donors. In any event, neither Congressman Upton’s proposed legislation nor Landrieu’s will address the problem. The government cannot force insurers to “uncancel” policies that it made them cancel. Some insurers may have the technical ability to do so, but they would find that only the sickest former customers would take advantage of the offer. [51087, 51110, 51116, 51135, 51138, 51153]

Obama’s approval/disapproval rating falls to 39/54 in a Quinnipiac University National Poll. Among women, his ratings are 40/51; men: 37/58; Republicans: 6/91; independents: 30/63; Democrats: 79/14; white voters: 32/62; black voters 75/15; Hispanic voters: 41/47; age 65 and older: 36/59. Only 44 percent of those polled believe Obama is trustworthy. On other issues, Obama is also underwater, with ratings of 38/53 on foreign policy, 35/53 on immigration, 32/62 on the federal budget, 36/60 on health care, and 38/59 on the economy. Two-thirds of those polled say ObamaCare will make their health care worse, and 73 percent want the individual mandate delayed. Meanwhile, Senator Kay Hagan (D-NC)—who won her seat by riding Obama’s coattails in 2008—falls from a 12–17 point lead over two possible 2014 challengers to two-point leads, and falls *behind* another by one point. ObamaCare is certainly the primary reason behind the decline—which is why she has called for “a complete, thorough investigation to determine the causes of the design and implementation failures of HealthCare.Gov.” Also according to the poll, Republicans have caught up with Democrats on the “generic ballot” question, with both parties getting 39 percent “if a Congressional election were to be held today.” (One month earlier, the Democrats had a 43-to-34 percent advantage.) [51090, 51091, 51100, 51102, 51108, 51122, 51130, 51140, 51150, 51154, 51208]

FoxNews.com reports that the White House “has refused to allow Chief Technology Officer Todd Park to appear at a Wednesday [November 13] hearing on systemic problems with the online home of ObamaCare, including crashes, data insecurity and corrupted information. The stated reason from Team Obama is that Park is too busy fixing the crash to explain how it happened. House Oversight Committee Chairman Darrell Issa (R-CA) said in a letter to the White House tech boss that it was unacceptable for Park to find time for press interviews but not for the hearing.” Ranking committee member Elijah Cummings, (D-MD) “and a group of three technical experts are denouncing Issa’s call for Park to explain himself to Congress.” Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) says, “If [Obama] has time to play golf and Kathleen Sebelius has time to go to cocktail parties, then Todd Park ought to have time to come tell the people he works for why they got such a poor product after spending over a half a billion dollars in three years.” [51101]

Democrats continue to distance themselves from Obama, with Congressman Kurt Schrader (D-OR) saying in an interview that Obama’s “keep you plan” promise was “very misleading. ...I think next year at the election time, people are going to want to know, was I able to sign up? And what is the shape of the benefit package I’m going to get and how much is it going to cost me, at the end of the day? I think this will, the sign-up period and problems and the horrendous problems that are going on right now will be

way in the past. I think [Obama] was grossly misleading to the American public. I know right away as a veterinarian, I have my own business, that my policies got cancelled even before the Affordable Care Act. I know that I would change policies on a regular basis, trying to find the best deal for myself and my employees. But a lot of Americans, a lot of Oregonians, have stayed with the same policy for a number of years and are shocked that their policy got cancelled. So I think [Obama] saying you could stay with it and not being honest that a lot of these policies were going to get cancelled was grossly misleading to the American public and is causing added stress and added strife as we go through a really difficult time with health care.” (In 2010, Schrader’s campaign web site had the statement, “If you are insured and happy with your coverage, nothing changes.” Hot Air.com comments, “To be fair, we should welcome Schrader on board the reality train if he’s willing to acknowledge the mess this has turned into. (And was always destined to be.) But at the same time, I don’t think you get a free pass to begin chucking tomatoes when the wind shifts without owning the fact that you were part of the crew selling the rotten fruit in the first place. This seems awfully convenient timing for somebody who is worried about earning another term in office next year with an angry electorate banging on the doors. Politics makes for strange bedfellows, but Congressman Schrader is jumping from bed to bed a little too quickly. Own the mess you helped create and then help us clean it up, sir.”) [51106, 51119, 51137]

Senate Republicans block Obama’s nomination of radical feminist and pro-abortion judge Nina Pillard to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. (Democrats predictably claim she was blocked because she is a woman. Republicans counter that they blocked her because of her leftist ideology.) [51107]

Secretary of State John Kerry meets with members of the Senate Banking Committee behind closed doors. (Democrats and Republicans alike generally prefer even tougher sanctions on Iran, while Kerry and Obama have been watering them down in an effort to persuade them to negotiate away their nuclear weapons program.)

California’s insurance commissioner states that one million residents of the state have been sent health insurance cancellation notices. Those one million people will now be forced to buy ObamaCare coverage which, for many of them, will be inferior and more expensive than the plans they just lost. At Investors.com Betsy McCaughey notes, “In California, a Blue Cross plan on the exchange covers 47% fewer doctors than Blue Cross subscribers in California currently get. In New York, only a quarter of physicians have decided to take exchange insurance, because the payments are so low. Why so low? Because insurers know the low-cost plan will be king in nearly every exchange. All the plans offer the ‘essential benefit package.’ Customers currently have no other way to compare than on price.” [51109, 51121]

Breitbart.com reports, “The Restaurant Opportunities Center in New York has abruptly withdrawn as an Obamacare Navigator for New York state. In documents obtained by ROC Exposed under NY’s Freedom of Information Act, ROC provides no explanation for suddenly pulling out of the program it had signed on to in April. Curiously, ROC NY continues to advertise itself as a navigator on its website, telling site visitors even today

that ROC is ‘here to help you navigate the options’ and ‘help you and your family enroll’ in a ‘low-cost or free health insurance plan through the Affordable Care Act.’ ROC is a labor union front group established as a nonprofit ‘worker center,’ which allows it to skirt federal labor laws in its disruptive protests of non-union restaurants. ...On October 2, the public learned that the contact person for ROC’s navigator program is a self-identified ‘undocumented worker [illegal immigrant].’ Six days later, ROC had withdrawn from the taxpayer-funded program.” [51114]

In *The Wall Street Journal* Peggy Noonan writes, “In the past month [the Democrats have] dealt with the [ObamaCare] disaster through talking points. That’s what parties in duress do, have kids in the back room write press releases based on the pushback guidance of combative consultants. Those talking points have gone, more or less, from ‘heavy demand caused the website to crash’ to ‘the website will soon be fixed’ to ‘every big program has bumps at the beginning’ to ‘wait till the American people see their benefits!’ to ‘not that many policies have been cancelled’ to ‘not that many premiums have gone up’ to ‘not that many people will lose their doctors.’ Not one of the talking points has worked. Because incoming data, day by day, kept washing over them and sinking them. The new talking point is that ObamaCare was damaged and fell due to Republican ‘sabotage.’ Republicans on Capitol Hill refused to vote for it, refused to like it and support it. They tried repeatedly to repeal it and defund it. And all this is true. But it is not sabotage. This is *opposition*. The Republicans thought the ACA a bad piece of work, a bad bill that would make things worse, not better. Still, Republicans should take the sabotage charge seriously, because it is not a claim aimed at the consideration of the American people but of history. Democrats are admitting with this charge that ObamaCare is a disaster. They no longer want to argue that it is not. They are arguing that it is a disaster brought about by Republicans. That will be what they argue for history and feed their journalistic historians. ...[But Obama] decided not to act on the accumulated presidential wisdom of the ages, which is: Get the other party in on all big things. Give them a stake in it, use them for cover, show you have bipartisan juice, that you are truly national and not only the leader of one party, show you can wield your mighty power across the aisles. Get them bragging they passed it, with your leadership. Make them co-own it so that when certain parts don’t work, and certain parts won’t, they have deep motives to help you fix it. Instead, a perfect storm of misjudgment, immaturity and lack of historical perspective, and a perfect storm of shortsighted selfishness (it’s all ours, it’s not even a little bit yours) brought forth a perfect storm of a health-care disaster.” [51155]

At FoxNews.com Peter Schweizer reports on some of Obama’s cronies and campaign fundraisers and how they stand to reap profits from their investments in health care firms. “For those on the left who thought that ObamaCare would mean large health insurance companies might get their comeuppance, they might want to look at UnitedHealth. Wall Street analysts expect the giant to see its stock price rise 40 percent over the next two years, thanks to expanding profit margins. The company has also won big contracts to help implement the rollout. Quality Software Services, Inc., a major contractor for Healthcare.gov, is a subsidiary of UnitedHealth. One of President Obama’s most reliable fundraisers in both 2008 and 2012 was Anthony Welters, executive vice president of

UnitedHealth. He raised more than \$500,000 for the 2012 election, according to opensecrets.org. ...Also poised to do well is Obama bundler David Friedman, founder of Sandy River Health Systems, which works in health care, nursing homes, and long-term care. Friedman raised more than \$500,000 for Obama's re-election in 2012. Obama bundlers who are private equity investors also stand to make a mint. Obama bundler Jay Snyder (he raised more than \$500,000) heads up HBJ Investments, which was founded by his father. HBJ invests in health care medical companies and pharmaceuticals positioned to cash in on ObamaCare." [51142]

"...Bundler Robert Pohlada (who bundled more than \$500,000 for Obama in 2012) is the head of Pohlada Companies, which has a subsidiary called Arcadia Solutions, a software company that is selling software to hospitals and doctors affected by healthcare reform. ...Another big Obama fundraiser who stands to profit from the ObamaCare debacle is Alexa Wesner of Austin Ventures. The investment firm has big stakes in Emerus Hospital Partners, LLC, ESO Solutions (which offers software to the health care industry), and Explorys, Inc., which hopes to leverage "big data" in the health care sphere. Wesner bundled over \$500,000 for Obama in 2012." Schweizer concludes, "ObamaCare may be a disaster for the millions of Americans whose health insurance plans are being canceled, the millions of Americans who cannot use the government's website, and the taxpayers forced to foot the bill for the boondoggle. But make no mistake—at least one group of Americans loves ObamaCare: [Obama's] big money backers and cronies who stand to bag millions of your tax dollars amid the mess." [51142]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, "Two months before enrollment began in the Obamacare exchanges, the administration's top health care official heaped praise on WebMD for launching an online resource to help Americans navigate the complex law. The consumer health care site had the occasional nice thing to say about Obamacare, too. ...But what neither Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius nor WebMD mentioned at the time was that the company, which millions of Americans regularly read for health news, also stood to earn millions of dollars from a federal contract to teach doctors about Obamacare. The contract documents, reviewed by The Washington Times, reward WebMD handsomely. For instance, the fee schedule offers dozens of products, including: As much as \$126,826 for a single 5,000-word review article on scientific advances in a clinical topic. Up to \$68,916 for a four-minute video from an opinion specialist. More than \$140,000 for an eight-question online quiz. WebMD says it doesn't believe it had an obligation to disclose to its broad consumer base its \$4.8 million contract with the government." [51117]

A YouGov.com poll shows that Fox News is the most trusted source of information about ObamaCare, with 19 percent. "Friends and family" come in second with 17 percent; Obama garners 11 percent; National Public Radio 10 percent. All other sources, including Congressmen, CNN, NBC, CBS, and Obama administration officials, rate less than 5 percent. [51170]

At PJMedia.com David Steinberg points out that it is incredibly easy to apply for Medicaid via Healthcare.gov, even for those who are not eligible. "The applicant is then

given a 90-day period to clear up the identification problem. This ‘enroll first, confirm later’ regulation, combined with the ACA’s easing of verification requirements, allows anyone, from a computer anywhere in the world, to successfully auto-enroll for 90 days of Medicaid by entering fraudulent information about being a certain category of legal alien living in the United States. There is no guarantee that state governments will take action to cancel these enrollments at the end of each application’s 90-day period if identification is never provided. The cancellation of unverified enrollments is left to each state’s available manpower and political will. At the end of the 90-day period, if states do indeed ask the applicant to produce identification or to have the enrollment canceled, the applicant is allowed to ask for an extension of the 90-day period. The applicant can get the period extended for significantly longer. Obamacare does not allow any information entered into Healthcare.gov to be used for legal action against illegal immigrants. Like ‘catch and release,’ an applicant could attempt to fraudulently enroll repeatedly.” [51148]

On *The O’Reilly Factor*, columnist Charles Krauthammer comments, “[I] think this whole thing [in-fighting within the Republican Party] is... very much blown up by the liberal media because it’s a great dramatic story. But here’s the fundamental contradiction. I think this analysis is wrong. It’s fundamentally wrong for this reason: The difference between what are being called the hard right and the moderates, the RINOs [Republicans In Name Only] and the true believers, is really one over tactics rather than over ideology and objectives. Let me give you one example. Is there a disagreement—a fundamental disagreement between one faction and another—over [Congressman] Paul Ryan’s radical reform of Medicare? I would say no. What we’re talking about is whether it was a good idea to shut down the government. Whether it’s a good idea to adopt a tactic here, a tactic there. On objectives you tell me what is the fundamental difference between the so-called moderates and radicals. I don’t see it. We all agree—let me just say one thing. We [Republicans] all agree on limited government. We all agree on restoration of individual rights. We all agree on liberty being the central ideal. We agree on restoration of individual responsibility and initiative. Where’s the big difference? ...[W]e have not just Obamacare unraveling, not just the Obama administration unraveling, not just the Democratic majority in the Senate— but we could be looking at the collapse of American liberalism. Obamacare is the big thing for them—the biggest in 100 years. And this is a moment when we have to be calm. We have to understand what holds us together on the right. We have to watch and explain why the failure of the left is happening. And if we do that, we will win.” [51126]

On *The Kelly File*, host Megyn Kelly asks Fox News senior political analyst Brit Hume to comment on Senator Dianne Feinstein’s commitment to support the “Keeping the Affordable Care Act Promise Act.” Hume replies, “This is as bad a political disaster as I’ve ever seen, and Dianne Feinstein is the wonderful example of just how bad it is. She’s not up for reelection... but her state does have a million people who’ve lost their policies... [and] she’s hearing about it. [Feinstein claims her office received more than 30,000 complaints about cancellations.] Every senator in the place is hearing about it, as is every member of the House. This is a very, very big deal, and they are looking for something to get them disassociated, if they can, from this problem. ...The problem is that people are losing their coverage, *and* that the people who have succeeded in getting

on the web site and checking the prices have been horrified at what they see. And this is only going to get worse.” Asked how Obama can “dig his way out of this,” Hume says, “I don’t know that he can. ... This whole ObamaCare scheme depends upon people migrating away from their old, less expensive policies, into new, supposedly better... policies that cost more. ... This is devastating to the Democratic party; it’s a tremendous opportunity for the Republican party because the Republicans all voted... right down to the last member, against it. So they’re well-positioned on this. It would be very wise for the Republicans, however, to be ready themselves... with a conservative plan... to put in place to replace ObamaCare so that they’re not just “the party of no.” [51115, 51153]

Also on *The Kelly File*, Kelly asks one of ObamaCare’s chief architects, David Cutler, “[Y]ou’re saying they can’t get on the website. I understand that. But I’m asking a more fundamental, important point which is these cancellations. I mean, the individual insurance market is essentially going away. Was that foreseen? Was that understood by you, by [Obama], the team putting this law together that it would happen?” Cutler replies, “It was foreseen that there would be a lot of transition from policies that were less good into cheaper, better policies through the exchanges but that would be because individuals saw it and wanted to do that rather than they were being pushed and couldn’t see what was in front of them.” Kelly: “So when you saw all these cancellations start popping up in the past few weeks and then it was tied back to this [regulatory change] that Kathleen Sebelius had pushed through shortly after ObamaCare became law, were you surprised? Did you say to yourself, wait a minute, this is not how it was envisioned or did you say, yeah, this is about how we saw it going down?” Cutler: “No, this is absolutely not how it was envisioned because what was envisioned is that people would be able to see the new premiums and see the new coverage. And many people would say, you know what, I actually don’t want this old policy because I could get better coverage for cheaper.” (That is, the Obama administration naively believed that millions of Americans would welcome the opportunity to pay more for their health insurance.) [51140]

On November 13 *The New York Times* calls Obama’s “you can keep your plan” pledge “an incorrect promise.”

The *Daily Mail* reports, “Al-Qaeda terrorists held a massive military rally just a few miles from the U.S. State Department compound in Benghazi, Libya during the summer of 2012 and called for the murder of U.S. diplomats, it was revealed today. And the U.S. government knew about it by August, a full month before the attack that left the American ambassador and three others dead, official papers state. Black al-Qaeda flags were out in full force at the June 7-8 event, a two-day rally including 300 armed men gathered in Benghazi’s Al-Tahrir Square. Just days later on June 11, bombers targeted the Benghazi U.S. mission, blowing [a] 40-foot hole in the installation’s perimeter wall. The larger attack [in which four Americans, including ambassador Christopher Stevens, were killed] came three months later. ... The unclassified August report, issued under an agreement with the Defense Department’s Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office, coincided with a State Department warning, telling U.S. citizens to avoid traveling in Libya. But during the same time the agency refused to provide Ambassador Chris Stevens and his team with long-requested additional security.” [51298]

The Washington Post reports, “Software problems with the federal online health insurance marketplace, especially in handling high volumes, are proving so stubborn that the system is unlikely to work fully by the end of the month as the White House has promised, according to an official with knowledge of the project. The insurance exchange is balking when more than 20,000 to 30,000 people attempt to use it at the same time—about half its intended capacity, said the official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to disclose internal information. And CGI Federal, the main contractor that built the site, has succeeded in repairing only about six of every 10 of the defects it has addressed so far...This inside view of the halting nature of HealthCare.gov repairs is emerging as the insurance industry is working behind the scenes on contingency plans, in case the site continues to have problems. And it calls into question the repeated assurances by the White House and other top officials that the insurance exchange will work smoothly for the vast majority of Americans by Nov. 30.” [51152]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “Spam filters, overflowing browser histories and web caches on the computers of Americans trying to sign up for Obamacare are now being cited for why consumers can’t complete their applications for federally-sanctioned health insurance. In a new blog post and webpage, the Obamacare fix-it team said that they are tracking down those who tried but failed to sign up over the past six weeks to urge them to try again. In some cases, however, the team said that account confirmations are getting caught in spam filters. ‘If you haven’t received your account verification email, check your inbox and your spam folder for an email from us with the subject line ‘Marketplace account created,’ said the a new tip page on healthcare.gov. Another tip suggested that Americans take better care of their computers and clean out their cache if they want Obamacare’s HealthCare.gov site to work best. ‘If pages appear to load slowly, please be patient. Sometimes, it helps to clear out the web browser’s history and cache, close the browser completely and try again,’ said the website.” [51634, 51635, 51636]

The Obama administration releases the first “official” ObamaCare enrollment numbers: 106,185 Americans have “signed up” for coverage—where “signed up” means they have gotten far enough at Healthcare.gov to choose a plan, but have not necessarily paid for it yet. (They may still change their minds, because the plan they selected is merely in their online “shopping cart.”) Townhall.com reports, “Only 27,000 of Obamacare enrollments came through the federal exchange. The rest, 79,000+ have received their coverage through state exchanges. ...In a conference call with reporters, [Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen] Sebelius said, ‘The marketplace is working; people are enrolling,’ and ‘We can reasonably expect these numbers will grow substantially over the next five months.’ ...Naturally, the HHS enrollment site where official numbers are posted, has crashed.” Meanwhile, the number of Americans who have received plan cancellation notices exceeds five million, and about 400,000 additional people have enrolled in taxpayer-funded Medicaid. [51120, 51123, 51125, 51145, 51151, 51158, 51159, 51160, 51162]

ABC News reveals that the young woman whose vaguely ethnic and smiling face appeared on Healthcare.gov as “the face of ObamaCare”—until the site was savagely

ridiculed—is a legal immigrant from Columbia named Adriana. (Author Ann Coulter quips, “Adriana’s going to have to make a sex tape next week to get her reputation back. ...I love that she’s an immigrant. I’d say that, you know, Obama was giving... a job that should have gone to an American to an immigrant, except she wasn’t paid. So he’s just exploiting an immigrant laborer and blew an opportunity to create at least one job.”) [51128, 51180]

Obama meets with various religious leaders to discuss “comprehensive immigration reform” (that is, amnesty for illegal immigrants). [51156, 51157]

Obama also meets with outraged House Democrats, in a closed-door meeting at which they blast officials for the disastrous ObamaCare rollout. (RollCall.com later reports, “[T]he impatient rank and file [Democrats] want solutions, not just an apology, from [Obama]. ‘There’s a brewing revolt among Democrats,’ said one member of the House Democratic Caucus who spoke on the condition of anonymity in order to describe the scene at Wednesday’s closed-door meeting, where members vented their frustration at White House officials for the rocky rollout of the Affordable Care Act. ...Even progressive Democrats and staunch allies of leadership had strong words for the White House officials dispatched to meet with House Democrats on Wednesday morning, according to sources in the room—and the White House is sure to hear another dose of angst Thursday, when aides meet with Senate Democrats. ...’I think in diplomatic terms we had a frank discussion,’ said [Congressman] Rep. Jim Costa (D-CA). ‘I think there was a lot of frustration and, in some cases, anger vented towards the White House for their continued ham-fisted approach. It’s not just their credibility that’s on the line, but it’s our credibility.’ ...Many Democrats had kept their concerns about the health care law to themselves because they were promised that the political price of passing a piece of monumentally controversial legislation would be worth it in the end. No more.”

Congressman Jim Moran (D-V) remarks, “I never said that [if you like your plan you can keep it], my colleagues never said that. [Obama] doesn’t have to run again. I don’t know why he has to make such grandiose claims, I mean, I support him, but some of this stuff is gratuitous rhetoric that’s not helpful.” Moran also says Healthcare.gov will not be fixed by the end of the month: “They are not going to meet the November 30th deadline, I would bet anything on that. If I had a farm I’d bet the farm on that.”) [51173, 51188, 51189, 51192, 51193]

After the meeting, one Democrat says, “It’s ugly. There’s no way Obama and [House Minority Leader Nancy] Pelosi [D-CA] will let their legacy [ObamaCare] go down in flames. I just wouldn’t want to be from a swing district right now. Or anything that closely resembles one.” Congressman Steve Cohen (D-TN) says White House officials are “telling us all about actuarial tables and all about how the process would work and all of this is fine and great and it would be great in a classroom and you would get an A on your test, but this isn’t about getting an A on your test, this is about [campaign] ads.” [51193]

Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA), who opposes legislation to help people keep their canceled insurance plans, says, “We don’t want to continue those bad policies. People had policies

that were good for them as long as they were healthy. It's not even a short-term fix. It's not the way to go. Let's stick to what we've got. They're fixing the website—people can still sign up with paper or phone... And it's going to get even better. So I don't see any problems.” (Harkin's insurance has not been canceled.) [51189]

Former Secret Service agent Dan Bongino, author of *Life Inside the Bubble* and a Republican candidate for Congress in Maryland, tells the *New York Post*, “We're in a very dangerous place right now. There are so many scandals going on right now with this administration, any one of them in my opinion could be absolutely catastrophic for what this country stands for. ...That scandal [ObamaCare] in itself is a huge deal. We are in such a dangerous place with this administration, they use this government as a shiny new toy—this little red ball they just got—because they are so inexperienced with it. That wasn't necessarily the case with the Clintons, and I was pretty much enmeshed in Hillary's Senate campaign. Although I disagreed with a lot of their political positions... . I can't tell you that they thought government was a weapon exclusively to intimidate their enemies. But this administration constantly seems to use government [as a weapon] because they are inexperienced with it—it's like giving a kid a Bowie knife and saying, 'Have fun.' They gave this administration which has no experience the reins of government and they have just gone wild. ...Protecting President Clinton, I never found his speeches to be toxic, like if you disagreed you were his mortal enemy. With Obama, you are not just his political enemy, you are his real enemy if you disagreed. I couldn't listen to it any more.” [51129]

At FreedomOutpost.com, John DeMayo writes, “It must be difficult for a mentally unhealthy [politician] to watch his signature legislation, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act... go down in flames; especially for America's crown prince of arrogance, Barrack Hussein Obama. ...Obama has never had to face failure in his life. Adversity perhaps, but not failure. ...Obama has spent his life running away from his failures by seeking temporary and risky pleasures that fed his fragile ego and gratified his desire to be happy: Exotic travel, drugs, homosexual encounters, Islam. All collide with common man causes and a playboy appetite; all disturbing and conflicted excesses; all difficult for anyone to make sense of. I have always believed that ...Obama is mentally ill. Many Americans are more comfortable accepting him as the anti-Christ or pure evil. For those Americans who have never dealt with a high functioning and severely mentally ill person, let me warn you, they can appear to be the very essence of evil and destruction from time to time. Then again, they can make you believe you are loved as well. In fact, the high functioning mentally ill, live out on a constant limb, running between depression and excess to an occasional stop on a splintered branch called anxiety. A paramount fear of abandonment guides them to execute direct attacks against the things they wish to preserve and keep most. They are prolific liars and masterful agitators. They are relentless. Moreover, they cannot exist without a constant supply of the mood enhancers required to make them feel comfortable within their own skin.” [51306]

“...Each day this man is allowed to continue to re-invent the laws designed to restrict his behavior, America becomes more dangerous; weaker and more divided. Each day Obama is disappointed becomes another day he attacks those that continue to hold our nation

together, even if they are on his team. ...How will he hold onto his party's loyalty when they no longer want him around? Obama has outlived his usefulness. He is now a liability, and he knows it. Now that he is no longer getting his way, now that his legislative agenda is falling apart, his condition will deteriorate. His behavior will become more erratic and unexplainable, and he may even become suicidal. What will Democrats do if Obama becomes suicidal? These are the kind of times in which mysterious deaths usually occur. It would not be the first time." (*The Obama Timeline* believes that Obama is mentally disturbed and abuses drugs. How he might react if his approval ratings continues to plummet and legislators in his own party turn against him cannot be predicted. *The Obama Timeline* also believes that prominent Democrats will turn against Obama the moment they realize that he will be more of a hindrance than a help to their chances of retaining the White House in 2016. If they believe he will prevent Hillary Clinton from winning the nomination and the presidency, they will do their utmost to remove him from power.) [51306]

Radio host Hugh Hewitt interviews MIT's Jon Gruber, one of the ObamaCare architects. Hewitt asks, "So is Hillary [Clinton] ObamaCare's grandmother...?" Gruber replies, "Well once again, I think ObamaCare is not single payer. It's not socialism. And look, you can look at my record. I've not come out in favor of single payer socialism. I don't think it's the right system for America. And that's not what ObamaCare is. Hillary is not—Hillary, basically, she did endorse what became ObamaCare in the 2008 elections, 2008 primaries. She endorsed that. But prior to that, she had a very different plan. She had a plan which was much more interventionist. The Clinton—that's the irony of Bill Clinton criticizing Obama for taking away people's health insurance. The Clinton health care plan was much to the left of ObamaCare. It would have more radically changed our health care system. ObamaCare is really, it's a big intervention, but it is much to the right of anything that's been tried before." Hewitt: "So Hillarycare would have had far more disruptive consequences for American health care than even Obamacare has?" Gruber: "The original Hillarycare as proposed in the early 90s would, absolutely, would have been much more disruptive." [51226]

According to *The Ulsterman Report*, Senator Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) "reportedly received a personal phone call from Barack Obama during which [he] all but begged [Reid] to keep Senate Democrats unified behind Obamacare despite the public relations nightmare it has become. It has just been reported Reid has called a special meeting among Senate Democrats following the phone call. Will Harry Reid hold the line, or will more Democrats break ranks?" (The better question may be, "Will Senate Democrats throw Obama under the oncoming bus before he pushes them further into its path?") [51134]

At HumanEvents.com author and health care expert Betsy McCaughey warns readers, "Don't believe" Obama's claim that "the insurance Americans can get on Obamacare exchanges is a better deal. ...On the exchanges, you may no longer be able to use the doctors and hospitals you prefer. Many exchange plans exclude the top drawer academic hospitals like Cedar Sinai in Los Angeles, the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota and New York Presbyterian in New York City. Instead, the law says that exchange plans must cover care

at ‘essential community providers ...that serve predominantly low-income, medically underserved individuals.’ (Sec. 1311c(1)C) That means clinics, public hospitals and hospitals largely serving the Medicaid community. ...Just as many doctors refuse to accept Medicaid, they are also refusing to accept exchange insurance. In California, a Blue Cross plan on the exchange covers 47 percent fewer doctors than Blue Cross subscribers in California currently get. In New York, only a quarter of physicians have decided to take exchange insurance, because the payments are so low. Why so low? Because insurers know the low-cost plan [ObamaCare’s “bronze plan”] will be king in nearly every exchange. ...Cancer patients whose plans are cancelled are getting whacked the hardest. They are losing access to the specialized cancer hospitals and oncologists treating them. And they will get meager help, if any, paying for innovative cancer drugs that cost thousands of dollars.” [51143, 51544]

According to a Fox News poll, 50 percent of Americans believe Obama lied when he said Americans could keep their health plans; 40 percent believe he did not know he was lying. Sixty-five percent want Benghazi investigations to continue. [51164, 51167, 51181]

Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett says, “There isn’t an American who isn’t going to be touched in a positive way by the Affordable Care Act. Change is difficult. Even change for the better is difficult.” (Jarrett does not explain why having your insurance policy canceled or being forced to pay more for a replacement policy with higher deductibles is “change for the better.” It is bad enough that Jarrett is either a monumental liar or delusion. What’s worse is that she is Obama’s closest advisor.)

Breitbart.com posts “you can keep your plan” promises made by Senators Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Kay Hagan (D-NC), Mark Begich (D-AK), Michael Bennett (D-CO), Patty Murray (D-WA), Tom Harkin (D-IA), Charles Schumer (D-NY), Dick Durbin (D-IL), Harry Reid (D-NV), and Max Baucus (D-MT). [51183]

Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson writes that “desperation mentality is contagious, and it’s exceedingly risky for Democrats. Last night’s Quinnipiac poll shows public support for an Obamacare delay swelling to 73 percent. Rasmussen shows that a similar percentage believes people ought to be able to keep their existing plans, in accordance with Obama’s violated vow. Will [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid [D-NV] and [House Minority Leader] Nancy Pelosi [D-CA] give their caucuses a free pass to approve these populist ‘solutions?’ If they don’t, all hell breaks loose. If they do, and these measures pass both chambers in one form or another, what does Obama do? Vetoing any legislation along these lines will look wildly out-of-touch and unreasonable. He and his party will take another beating. But if he acquiesces under immense political pressure, he certainly must still know that the results would be non-viable. This creaky mess can’t just be stopped on a dime at the very last minute; the wheels are in motion, and have been for some time. Plans have been outlawed, cancellation notices have been sent, and people have been signing up for new coverage—either through the exchanges or Medicaid. Insurance companies have spent months preparing for the new regime; reverting back to the old system involves much, much more than flipping a switch.

Whether it's even remotely possible to reverse course before December 15 (the deadline to ensure coverage starting in the new year) is up for debate.” [51153]

“The House Republicans’ [Congressman Fred Upton’s] version of this bill would trash the administration’s excessive mandates for a year, allowing plans that were made illegal by the law to continue. It also makes the old plans available to *everyone*, not just those who were previously enrolled in them. The [Senator Mary] Landrieu/[Dianne] Feinstein bill limits ‘keep your plan’ to newly-grandfathered, current and previous policy holders—but it actually goes further in another sense. It proactively *forces* insurers to allow those people back onto their previous plans if they so choose (as opposed to giving insurers the option to reintroduce the cancelled plans). Again I ask, would any of this be logistically feasible at this late stage? And what happens to the revenue streams upon which Obamacare’s fiscal health relies? Remember, relatively healthy and young people are being compelled to overpay for mandate-laden coverage *by design*. Those new revenues are essential to offset the steep costs associated with taking on millions of older and sicker Americans, many with pre-existing conditions.” [51153]

“...[I]f the young and healthy are able stay on their older, cheaper plans, where does all the necessary new money come from? Two readily apparent options: A tax increase, or a federal bailout of insurance companies. Either one of these would be positively radioactive politically. Absent either of those, insurance companies would jack up rates again to compensate, pulling the country around a major death spiral bend. There really are no good options left. Don’t forget, every single Senate Democrat voted against Republicans’ ‘keep your plan’ fix in 2010, when it might have made a difference. Today’s panicked reversal is only about optics. Problem: The illusion of a quick fix is quite likely to metastasize [sic; metastasize] into fresh nightmares in the coming months. How many of the Democrats who are frantic to vote for something—anything—to make their current problem go away actually grasp the severity of these problems? How many don’t care? Tick tock. The White House’s self-imposed deadline for Healthcare.gov is looming, and things aren’t looking good. Oh, and two more rounds of sticker shock are on the way over the next year. Panic time has arrived. What to do, Democrats?” [51153]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “Predicting the imminent collapse of the U.S. dollar, a Russian lawmaker submitted a bill to the country’s parliament on Wednesday that would ban the use or possession of the American currency. Mikhail Degtyarev, the lawmaker who proposed the bill, compared the dollar to a Ponzi scheme. He warned that the government would have to bail out Russians holding the U.S. currency if it collapsed. ‘If the U.S. national debt continues to grow, the collapse of the dollar system will take place in 2017,’ said Mr. Degtyarev, a member of the nationalist Liberal Democrat Party who was a losing candidate in Moscow’s recent mayoral election. ‘The countries that will suffer the most will be those that have failed to wean themselves off their dependence on the dollar in time. In light of this, the fact that confidence in the dollar is growing among Russian citizens is extremely dangerous.’ The bill would partially revive a Soviet-era ban on the dollar. It would prohibit Russians from holding dollars in the country’s banks, and banks also would be unable to carry out transactions in the dollar. However, Russians still

would be able to buy or sell dollars while abroad, as well as hold dollar accounts in foreign banks.” [51161]

At FoxNews.com Catherine Herridge reports, “In addition to the four Americans killed in the Benghazi terror attack last year, at least two other Americans were severely injured in the fighting that night, Fox News has learned. The injuries were sustained by U.S. personnel after mortars struck the CIA annex rooftop they were defending. Fox News is told that one former government contractor—who is expected to testify this week along with four other contractors in classified sessions on Capitol Hill—has had multiple surgeries since the attack and has still not regained full use of one arm. The blood loss after the attack was so severe that a source close to the contractor said it had been life-threatening.” [51165, 51213]

Congressman Mike Pompeo (R-KS) reports that all 30+ employees of the city government of Bel Aire, Kansas “have just received notice that because of the Affordable Care Act, their current insurance will no longer be available.” The Blue Cross Blue Shield plan will no longer be available, and the group policy will have to be replaced by more expensive individual policies because the employees no longer qualify for a group rate. (Under ObamaCare, group policies require 50 or more employees. HotAir.com asks, “Is [Obama] about to tell us that the Blue Cross Blue Shield plan which was purchased for the entire town government was some sort of ‘junk insurance’ which nobody would want anyway?”) [51185, 51186]

Twenty-one Republican Senators write Sylvia Mathews Burwell, director of the Office of Management and Budget, warning her not to issue regulations that would exempt certain labor union health insurance plans from an ObamaCare “reinsurance fee” tax that applies to other plans and businesses. The Senators state, “We ask that you not authorize the release of any regulation which would allow for such unfair treatment and to include this letter in the public record of any future rulemaking. It has been widely reported that labor unions recently sought an exemption from the reinsurance fee through Congress but were rightly rebuffed. To think that the Obama administration would consider such an action that benefits one group over another can only be characterized as cronyism at its worst. Self-insured plans—whether or not they also self-administer—are all facing the same dilemma of being forced to subsidize insurance companies participating in the new exchange. The regulatory process is meant to implement the law as written, not as the administration wishes it were.” [51256, 51257]

CampusReform.org reports, “Officials at one of the nation’s oldest and most elite historically black colleges are citing the Affordable Care Act (ACA) as the reason they have cancelled a school-wide affordable health care plan they had offered students. The official website for Bowie State, a Maryland public school less than an hour’s drive from Washington D.C., explains that Obamacare’s new regulations would force the cost of the insurance to rise from \$50 to \$900 a semester. ...According to an article in *The Bulldog Collegian*, Bowie State’s official student newspaper, the Director of the Bowie State University Wellness Center said that the university decided it would not be worth it to provide student health insurance at all given how expensive it would be to do so under

the new regulations.” (Student Eugene Craig III appears on *The Kelly File*, where he dares to criticize ObamaCare—for which he is later harassed by school administrators.) [51166, 51304, 51342, 51846, 51847]

According to Public Opinion Strategies surveys of franchise-owned businesses and non-franchise businesses with 40 to 500 employees, conducted for the International Franchise Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, “Sixty-four percent (64%) of business decision-makers in franchisee-owned businesses and 53% in non-franchisee owned businesses believe the ACA [Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare] will have a negative impact on their businesses. Many businesses are already seeing their health care costs increasing because of the law. To cope, 31% of franchise and 12% of non-franchise businesses have already reduced worker hours, a full year before the employer mandate goes into effect. Additionally, 27% of franchise and 12% of non-franchise businesses have already replaced full-time workers with part-time employees. Other cost control methods cited by survey participants included hiring only temporary help and cutting benefits and bonuses. Among businesses with 40 to 70 employees, 59% of franchise and 52% of non-franchise businesses plan to make personnel changes to stay below the 50 full time equivalent employee threshold. This accounts for 23% of all franchise and 10% of all non-franchise decision-makers surveyed. Large chunks of decision-makers say the employer mandate will mean they will drop health coverage, opting instead to pay a penalty for each employee. In effect, among this segment of businesses, the employer mandate will more than double the percentage of franchise-owned businesses and more than triple the percentage of non-franchise businesses that will not offer health coverage.” [51190, 51191]

Breitbart.com reports, “Two top Obamacare officials, including the person who has been called one of the law’s architects, have refused to testify before Congress next week. During a House Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing on Wednesday, [Congressman] Jim Jordan (R-OH) said the committee asked Nancy-Ann DeParle and Jeanne Lambrew to testify before the committee. He said the ‘letter we got back next week was, ‘they’re not gonna come.’ DeParle, who has since left the Obama administration, formerly directed the White House Office of Health Reform and has been called one of Obamacare’s architects. Lambrew has been the White House’s Deputy Assistant for Health Policy since 2011.” (As noted previously in this *Timeline*, DeParle was head of Medicare under Bill Clinton. After leaving the Clinton administration, she earned \$6.6 million working for companies suspected of defrauding Medicare—her job was apparently to help keep them from getting caught. Former Senator Robert Bennett (R-UT) once said, “[I]t’s my perception [that “health czar”] Nancy-Ann DeParle is calling the shots.” DeParle is on the board of the Woods Foundation, which received one of the first ObamaCare waivers. Obama and William Ayers once served together on the Woods Foundation board, and it was that Foundation that funded Obama’s first community activist job in Chicago. It was founded by owners of Sahara Coal, which was the major coal supplier to Commonwealth Edison—and whose CEO was Thomas Ayers, father of William Ayers.) [33, 204, 346, 1282, 1283, 5612, 5620, 17147, 17151, 17173, 17189, 20254, 51171]

FoxNews.com reports, “Republicans have a slim three-point advantage when Americans are asked about their vote preference for Congress in the latest Fox News poll. That’s an 11 percentage-point shift from last month when Democrats had an 8-point edge. The poll finds ‘if the Congressional election were held today,’ 43 percent of voters would back the Republican in their district and 40 percent the Democratic candidate. That’s a reversal from last month when 45 percent backed the Democratic candidate and 37 percent the Republican (October 20-22, 2013). [51187]

On MSNBC Chuck Todd interviews chief ObamaCare architect Dr. Jonathan Gruber. Gruber states, “Let’s start with understanding that we’re not talking about the vast majority of Americans. This law is really leaving those with employer insurance, those with government insurance alone.” (Gruber is lying. ObamaCare most certainly does *not* “leave alone” those who have employer-provided health insurance. The law’s mandates will, at the very least, increase the cost of insurance—and some of those costs will be passed on to the employees. In other cases, employers will not be able to afford to continue the policies and will simply cancel them—forcing employees to buy individual policies on the ObamaCare exchanges.) Gruber states that “about a third” of the people with existing individual policies “will end up paying more under this law, and... that is sort of the idea. ...That means that the genetic winners, the lottery winners, who’ve been paying an artificially low price because of this discrimination now will have to pay more.” (In this remarkable and disgusting statement, Gruber is calling healthy people who are not overweight and who do not smoke or drink to excess and who can get good, inexpensive insurance as a result, “genetic lottery winners”—rather than recognizing them for what they *are*: responsible people. A committed leftist, Gruber hates the fact that actions have consequences, and wants people who are responsible to pay more for insurance so that obese, alcoholic smokers who never exercise can pay less. *That* is the logic behind ObamaCare, and what Obama and his fellow Democrats hid from the voters—or were able to hide until they started receiving cancellation notices and premium increases in the mail. Gruber says the “solution” to people losing their insurance is not to let them keep their old, affordable policies, but to give them temporary tax credits so they can afford the higher-cost policies forced on them by ObamaCare. (In other words, “The government can print more money.”) [51228, 50253, 52164]

On *On the Record*, Senator John McCain (R-AZ), who just weeks earlier criticized Senators Ted Cruz (R-TX) and Mike Lee (R-UT) for fighting ObamaCare and said it was “not rational” to defund or repeal it, tells Greta Van Susteren it should now be repealed. “That’s exactly right,” says McCain. “That is total repeal in every other way. Because what ObamaCare is, is an experiment in social engineering—in other words, making healthy people pay more... in order to subsidize the health care for people that are older and unhealthy. That is the ultimate in social engineering.” [51172]

On *The O’Reilly Factor*, comedian Dennis Miller says, “This [ObamaCare] thing has got so crazy that the Reverend [Jeremiah] Wright lost his health care today and blamed the Jews. Listen, I don’t talk about politics with my friends because, you know what? Obama—Barack Obamas are a dime a dozen—debonair gifters, man. The good friends, they’re hard to come by. I will say this about Obamacare—I hope at this point Barack

Obama is simply a liar because, if he is this inept, you and I are Gary Lockwood and Keir Dullea way out past Jupiter with a defective Hal 9000 unit, my friend. We are screwed, and I would like to get home, all right? ...I will say, this as far as the press goes and as far as Obama goes, I'm kind of watching what I'm saying right now because I find when zealots, pet notions crater, they get nasty about it. It's my raccoons at the recycling bin at two in the morning. This is not the time to come in and tell all these people how stupid it is. History will show how stupid it's been. I would just say this to [Obama] in the nicest terms I can. Mr. [Obama], if you liked your apology, you can keep it, all right? How's that? All I know is I finally started reading some of ObamaCare last night to find out what it's about. I got to page 1297—preexisting conditions and it says everything is covered except, quote: 'Whatever in God's name Biden has,' end quote. ...Listen, man, everybody is cabbing off from this guy. The Clintons disengaged. She [Hillary] can't have the Hester Prynne stink on her. All the devotees are now Judas goating out of the scene. And I tell you what—I think ObamaCare is an unfair name for this thing. I don't think it's fair to the guy. I think this has to be *Barack ObamaCare* and laid down in history. This was his genius notion and I hope he travels through time with it."

On *Hannity*, author and columnist Ann Coulter comments that the ObamaCare problems are "far beyond the website. I don't care if they get the website up and running tomorrow. The point is they have made most insurance plans, and certainly most insurance plans that anyone would want to buy, illegal. You keep seeing them say, those were crappy plans. You don't want them anyway. Under Kathleen Sebelius, who is so flexible—'I don't work for you'—you have gay guys who will have to buy health insurance that covers maternity care. You have Mormons who have to buy insurance to cover gambling addiction therapy and sex change operations. We are being forced to pay for things we don't want. I'm out in California now... Everyone I have run into except two people have been thrown off health care because Blue Cross Blue Shield just completely pulled out of California. I know a lot of doctors, and they've told me that they just get notices from their insurance companies saying you are no longer allowed to be on our plan because they're the hardworking doctors. They want to keep the doctors who don't see many patients. So I think you're right, just to conclude this point, no matter how much the media loves Obama and they treat him like a cult figure, they not going to be able to hide these cancellation notices as they come in." [51180]

On November 14 NBC reporter Chuck Todd says on the *Today* program, "If you start messing around with this and trying to grandfather in some of these folks [who have lost their insurance], you undermine the whole premise of the [ObamaCare] law. The whole way insurance companies can make it affordable for somebody who has a preexisting condition is if they are forcing these younger and healthier people essentially to pay a little more. You know, that's the way, and this is the problem that [Obama] brought upon himself when they didn't make this clear. There are always winners and losers in any legislation. There is a small number of losers here if you want to count losing as in, having to pay more for your health insurance. Healthy people are going to pay more. That was always the intention, that was the only way you could make the law work if you wanted to bring down the cost for sick people." (Some might argue that the number of losers is not "small.") [51184]

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) meets with Senate Democrats and senior White House officials to discuss their ObamaCare strategy. (The meeting is described as “incredibly tense.”) [51192]

In an interview with Fox News, Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) says, “Are you going to believe what [Obama] tells you at 11:30 this morning? Twenty-seven different times he told you, you and I would never be having this conversation, because if you liked your insurance you could keep it. And for those who weren’t paying attention, he said, ‘period.’ ... This [Obama’s expected proposal] is not a legislative fix. If it were a legislative fix, he would be working with... the House Republicans... This is all about politics. He doesn’t want Republican to ride in on a white horse and save this abysmal ruling of ObamaCare, so he wants to do something administratively or through executive order. I just hope my fellow citizens are savvy enough to say, ‘Why should we believe you now?’” [51197]

Obama announces an “administrative fix” to the problem of canceled insurance plans, telling reporters insurance companies will be allowed to renew old plans even if they are out of compliance with ObamaCare. Obama states, “I completely get how upsetting this can be for a lot of Americans, particularly after assurances they heard from me that if they had a plan they like, they can keep it. To those Americans: I hear you loud and clear. I said we would do everything we can to fix this problem and today I’m offering an idea that would help do it. Already people who pre-date the Affordable Care Act can keep those plans if they haven’t changed, that was already in the law. That’s what’s called a grandfather clause that was included in the law. Today we’re going to extend that principle [to] people whose plans have changed since the law took effect so state insurance commissioners still have the power to decide what plans can and can’t be sold in their states but the bottom line is insurers can extend current plans that would otherwise be cancelled into 2014 and Americans whose plans have been cancelled can choose to re-enroll in the same kind of plan. We’re also requiring insurers to extend current plans to inform their customers about two things. One, that protections, what protections these renewed plans don’t include. Number two, that the [ObamaCare] marketplace offers new options with better coverage and tax credits that might help you bring down the costs. So, if you received one of these letters, I encourage you to take a look at the marketplace, even if the website isn’t working as smoothly as it should be for everybody yet. The plan comparison tool that lets you browse costs for new plans near you is working just fine. Now this fix won’t solve every problem for every person but it’s going to help a lot of people. Doing more will require work with Congress.” (Obama emphasizes that the renewals will be voluntary—which gives him and the Democrats a chance to blame the insurers for the disaster they created—and must be approved by the appropriate state insurance regulators. Obama’s “fix” conveniently lasts just long enough to get Democrats past the November 2014 mid-term elections.) [51168, 51169, 51174, 51176, 51196, 51234]

“We fumbled the rollout on this health care law,” says Obama. “We always knew these [health insurance] marketplaces, creating a place where people can shop and, through

competition, get a better deal for the health insurance their families need, we always knew that was going to be complicated and everybody was going to be paying a lot of attention to it. And we should've done a better job getting that right on day one, not on day 28 or day 40. ... This fix won't solve every problem for every person, but it's going to help a lot. Doing more will require working with Congress. I've said from the beginning I'm willing to work with Democrats and Republicans to fix problems as they arise." Obama says he cannot guarantee that the Healthcare.gov web site will be glitch-free by November 30: "Even if we get the site fixed, insurance is complicated to buy. It is not possible for me to guarantee that a hundred percent of the people going on the website will have a seamless process." Obama responds to reporter questions with long-winded, talking-points "filibusters" that will most certainly inspire little confidence in most people unlucky enough to watch the broadcast. Obama is not asked about, nor does he address, the issue of the millions of Americans who will be losing their employer-provided plans because of ObamaCare regulations. Asked about Healthcare.gov's problems, Obama says, "I was not informed directly that the website wasn't working the way it was supposed to." ("Directly" is Obama's lawyerly weasel-word. It is certainly the case that no web site *programmer* told him there were major problems, but that does not mean *no one* told Obama there were problems—or that he was not informed "indirectly.") [51168, 51169, 51174, 51176, 51196, 51227, 51234]

Obama is offering his scheme only to provide some cover for Democrats running for reelection in 2014. He does not actually want insurance companies to "un-cancel" plans and get their old customers back, because he needs them in the ObamaCare exchanges. (Nor does he have the legal authority to waive the requirement that policies comply with the Affordable Care Act.) But by proposing a temporary voluntary rollback, he can say he "did something," while hoping that the insurers actually do nothing. He can then blame the insurers for the cancellation of policies—but most Americans will continue to blame him and the Democrats who passed the health care legislation. (One health insurance industry insider says, "This doesn't change anything other than force insurers to be the political flack jackets for the administration. So now when we don't offer these policies the White House can say it's the insurers doing this and not being flexible." It is worth noting, of course, that the insurance industry liked ObamaCare when it thought it would mean millions of new customers and increased profits, and arguably does not now deserve much sympathy—after having thrown Americans under the bus in 2010 with its support for the legislation and the illegal individual mandate. It is also worth noting that Obama made his "fix" announcement without asking for input from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. They learned about it from watching the news.) [51200, 51613, 51614]

Additionally, Obama's call for a voluntary restoration of old policies will not help his fellow Democrats much. First, the insurers will generally not be able to restore the canceled plans (even if they wanted to). Secondly, the Democrats cannot run in 2014 on nothing more than Obama's words. They desperately need legislation on which they can cast a recorded vote—so they can tell their constituents, "*I voted to protect you.*" Obama's problem is that most Americans may have grown too skeptical of his words and policies to allow them to give him the benefit of the doubt. He sold ObamaCare as

legislation from which *everyone* would benefit: it would leave no American uninsured, save everyone money via reduced premiums, bend the health care “cost curve” downward, and lower the federal deficit. ObamaCare will accomplish none of those things—and most Americans have come to realize that. The voters now want only to be harmed as little as possible by ObamaCare. Obama’s “solution” only makes things worse. The sickest, poorest Americans will continue sign up for coverage via Healthcare.gov, but the younger, healthier customers will simply remain on their old plans for another year—if they are even able to do so. That will further increase the cost of the ObamaCare plans, and that will prompt massive premium increases in 2015—which will be likely announced in the fall of 2014, right before the November elections. Those higher rates will then be imposed on those who were temporarily allowed to remain on their old plans for one more year. Even worse for the taxpayers, the ObamaCare legislation provides for the federal government to cover the losses of insurance companies if they cannot make a profit in the Healthcare.gov exchange. Therefore, if Obama’s “fix” keeps healthier customers out of the exchange, the likelihood of insurers losing money increases—and the taxpayers will foot the bill. (If Obama and the Democrats think the voters are angry now, they will be even angrier in late 2014. But Obama has no choice but to attempt to finagle a temporary *administrative* fix, in order to avoid a *legislative* fix that he may not be able to reverse—and which may result in the revision of other parts of ObamaCare. He is therefore making a purely political move, believing it will help the Democrats retain control of the Senate. Beyond that, he can do little but hope that millions of Americans sign up for ObamaCare and make it successful. The likelihood of that is close to zero.)

Democrat Howard Dean, former Governor of Vermont, says, “I wonder if [Obama] has the legal authority to do this since this was a congressional bill [ObamaCare] that set this up.” (Of course, Obama does not have the legal authority to force insurers to sell a particular product, and Dean’s qualification is irrelevant. It does not matter whether Obama’s scheme is related to the passage of ObamaCare; he also cannot force a bakery to sell a particular kind of bread, regardless of whether “BreadCare” legislation was passed.) Judicial Watch president Tom Fitton states, “Obama isn’t a one-man Congress. Only Congress can rewrite the Affordable Care Act. This power grab is bound to be resisted... in the courts.” [51179, 51199, 51225]

Karen Ignagni, president and CEO of the America’s Health Insurance Plan (AHIP) organization, states, “Making sure consumers have secure, affordable coverage is health plans’ top priority. The only reason consumers are getting notices about their current coverage changing is because the ACA requires all policies to cover a broad range of benefits that go beyond what many people choose to purchase today. Changing the rules after health plans have already met the requirements of the law could destabilize the market and result in higher premiums for consumers. Premiums have already been set for next year based on an assumption of when consumers will be transitioning to the new marketplace. If now fewer younger and healthier people choose to purchase coverage in the exchange, premiums will increase and there will be fewer choices for consumers. Additional steps must be taken to stabilize the marketplace and mitigate the adverse impact on consumers.” (HotAir.com observes, “There’s a reason un-canceling canceled plans started out as a GOP idea: *It’s really bad for ObamaCare*. There’s no policy upside

for Democrats in supporting the idea; it's pure political CYA [cover your ass], and insanely myopic in that it'll only compound their political problem next year if AHIP's prediction is borne out and exchange plans become even more expensive. In that sense, it's an analog to HHS [the Department of Health and Human Services] refusing to bring in outside contractors who might have improved Healthcare.gov before launch for fear that Republicans might subpoena them and the White House would be politically embarrassed. The political embarrassment they've suffered from the website meltdown is far worse than the embarrassment they would have suffered from discouraging chatter before the site debuted. How strange that Democrats would have taken such a long view of health-care reform in 2010, risking their majority in the House to pass it, when now they wet their pants at the first signs of trouble during implementation.") [51174, 51203, 51253]

David Oscar, communications chair for the New Jersey Association of Health Underwriters, tells PJMedia.com's David Steinberg, "This [is] a new insanity. I do not know how the insurance carriers and federal government are going to be dealing with this [Obama proposal]. First, many states require a 60-day notice of a change in plan or a cancellation. It's November 15! How can they comply with this new element of federal law, and with their state laws? Second, do they really think carriers are going to be willing to recreate the old plans, while also being mandated to offer the new ones that comply with the exchanges? I have a large number of clients, small to medium-sized businesses, who would much rather renew their old policies on 12/1 than sign up with the newly mandated exchange policies. Everyone is going to want the old ones! You really expect the insurance carriers to willingly deal with the financial loss and legal headaches of switching back? It is going to be very difficult for carriers to honor this." (HotAir.com observes, "Of course it's going to be difficult. That's the point—the White House's hope, I'm sure, is that most insurers will ignore the 'fix' and refuse to un-cancel any plans. That would eliminate the extra risk of adverse selection to the exchanges *and* give O the scapegoat he's looking for. If insurers really want to screw him, they'll scramble to do just what he said: Un-cancel the plans, just as [Obama] requested, and then lay the resulting premium hikes next fall squarely at his feet, just in time for the midterms. Problem is, that means heavy losses for them potentially; as much as they'd like to retaliate, it might end up as a kamikaze mission. On the other hand, my pal Karl is urging me and other righties on Twitter not to get caught up too much in a war between Obama and insurers. That's exactly what the White House wants, after all. The more O can make it look like he's on the side of the people, with the big bad insurance companies treating him as a sworn enemy, the more it'll mitigate the political damage he's suffered from this. He's the guy who got reelected last year as a champion of the middle class, remember? He'd never do something that roundly screws middle-income people in the name of propping up some new Rube-Goldberg-esque redistribution scheme he's concocted. That's the insurers' fault.") [51253, 51254]

National Association of Insurance Commissioners president Jim Donelon issues a statement: "We share [Obama's] and Congress' concerns about policy cancellations and issues including gaps in coverage that may result from them, and fully understand the anxiety of the residents of our states who have received these notices. This anxiety is

especially heightened given the issues with the federal exchange. For three years, state insurance regulators have been working to adapt to the Affordable Care Act in a way that best meets the needs of consumers in each state. We have been particularly concerned about the way the reforms would impact premiums, the solvency of insurance companies, and the overall health of the marketplace. The NAIC has been clear from the beginning that allowing insurers to have different rules for different policies would be detrimental to the overall market and result in higher premiums. We have expressed these concerns with the Administration and are concerned by [Obama's] announcement today that the federal government would use its 'enforcement discretion' to delay enforcement of the ACA's market reforms in 2014 for plans that are currently in effect. This decision continues different rules for different policies and threatens to undermine the new market, and may lead to higher premiums and market disruptions in 2014 and beyond. In addition, it is unclear how, as a practical matter, the changes proposed today by [Obama] can be put into effect. In many states, cancellation notices have already gone out to policyholders and rates and plans have already been approved for 2014. Changing the rules through administrative action at this late date creates uncertainty and may not address the underlying issues. We look forward to learning more details of this policy change and about how the administration proposes that regulators and insurers make this work for all consumers." [51253, 51255]

At Townhall.com Derek Hunter writes, "Obamacare is supposed to fail—it's just supposed to take a few years as opposed to a few days. They thought if private insurance companies start to fold or if costs skyrocket five or 10 years down the road, progressives could say, 'Well, we tried a private-sector solution and it didn't work. Now we need to move to a single-payer system.' That would place the blame on greedy corporations for setting up a framework that couldn't work and let government emerge as the hero coming to the rescue. But the horse has dropped dead right out of the gate—too soon for it to be blamed on the private sector. And blame will go where it deserves—to the government. If people decide government can't even set up a semi-private system of health insurance, they are unlikely to let it run the whole system. This is progressive's biggest fear. It has to be avoided. Hence, [Senator Mary] Landrieu's legislation. ...But the promise [of her legislation] is hollow. Those cancelled plans are gone—killed by Obamacare. And most of them are not coming back. Healthcare law, in spite of how it's portrayed, is not something simple that a bill can make or break on a whim. Each state has regulatory boards that oversee all the plans in their states. Plans have to be submitted to prove they meet with each state's mandates, etc. More than that, there are contracts with doctors, hospitals and all manner of other vendors, and all that can't be undone on a moment's notice. There are too many moving parts, laws and regulations. ...If Landrieu's legislation, or any like it proposed by either Democrats and Republicans, become law, it won't bring back anyone's canceled plans. It may save some people who are still months away from their plans being canceled, but even that is doubtful. But what it will do is provide cover to Democrats feeling the crush of their constituents' anger. They'll be able to say, 'We tried, but those insurance companies wouldn't bring back those plans because they're greedy.' The media coverage would follow, and we'd be exactly where we are now, only with the 'problem solved.' ...There is no going back; there's only going

forward. And going forward means the collapse and/or overwhelming rejection of Obamacare by voters next year if Republicans don't fall for this cosmetic 'fix.'" [51175]

Author Mark Steyn, discussing Obama's press conference with radio talk show host Hugh Hewitt, says, "[I]t was a pitiful performance today culminating in that line 'what we are discovering is that insurance is complicated to buy.' Well, thanks a lot, genius. Maybe you should have looked into that before a guy who has never done anything in his life—never run a convenience store—decides he has the awesome super powers to governmentalize one-sixth of the economy. Thanks for finally figuring out that the real world is more complicated than your faculty lounge abstractions. At some point, you know, Americans who voted for this guy—voted for a guy who has never done anything in his life and has just been wafted onwards to the next do-nothing gig before he was ever required to do anything ought to cringe under the bed in embarrassment for voting for this guy twice. ...[H]e keeps using this line, oh he's 'only inflicting catastrophe on fewer than five percent of the population. That's because he unilaterally decided to suspend the employer mandate for a year. Otherwise, a lot of spouses and children, for example just to take the most obvious thing, would be getting kicked off employer-based plans round about now. Now obviously this is unbecoming to a republic, to any kind of theory of responsible government. One of the indictments of George III that you excitable revolutionary colonials made was that he was arbitrarily suspending laws that had been passed and refusing to implement them according to his regal whims. Obama, having wrecked people's lives by forcing insurance companies to comply with ObamaCare, is now ordering them not to comply with ObamaCare. I don't even think that's doable, but if it were doable then this would no longer be a free society.'" [51238]

Rush Limbaugh tells his audience Obama is "doing two things: He's telling the insurance companies, as a dictator would, what they can and can't do or what they must or must not do, or what they have to and don't have to do. He is suggesting... that if you have your plan now and you like it, you can keep it for one more year so that you don't get any angrier at Democrats than you are now and vote against them next November. ...If your plan has been canceled, he has just ordered the insurance company to make it available to you, so that you can go back and get that plan. The problem is that that plan was canceled precisely because it conflicts with his law, with ObamaCare. ...Remember, he's doing this not because he cares about you. He's not doing this because he's upset you've lost your plan. He's doing this because he's losing the media, and he's losing his fellow Democrats, and he's losing the proposition. ...This is such a disaster, folks. The original problem with this remains. This is so un-American, this whole thing, and now what's the 'fix?' The fix is for this guy to play dictator again and now command or compel the insurance companies to run their business the way he wants them to for the next year. This isn't America, folks." (Of course, Obama is not compelling the insurers to reinstate canceled plans; he is merely saying he will not enforce the Affordable Care Act provisions that make those plans illegal. But he knows full well that most insurers will be unwilling to reinstate plans that are technically illegal under federal law. Obama does not actually want them to reinstate *any* policies; he wants to force Americans to enroll in ObamaCare via Healthcare.gov. His "fix" to the problem he created is nothing more than political cover, designed to fool some voters into believing he "did something to help

protect them from the evil insurance companies,” and to reduce some of the anger directed at Democrats who are up for reelection in 2014.) [51239, 51616]

At her confirmation hearing, Janet Yellen, Obama’s choice to replace Ben Bernanke as Federal Reserve Board chairman, states her opposition to proposed legislation (Senator Rand Paul’s Federal Reserve Transparency Act) that would require an audit of the agency: “I would be very concerned about legislation that would subject the Federal Reserve to short-term political pressures that could interfere with that independence.” (In other words, “Just trust me and my money-printing schemes.”) Yellen says its is “important for the Fed to attempt to detect asset bubbles when they are forming”—yet does not comprehend that the agency’s “qualitative easing” program of expanding the money supply and pumping it directly into the stock market is creating a massive asset bubble. At LewRockwell.com Joseph Salerno, vice president of the Mises Institute, warns, “With the financial system still on shaky ground, this will lead to another financial meltdown and a U.S. government takeover of the financial system the like of which will make the last Wall Street bailout appear to be a minor intervention.” (One goal of the “qualitative easing” policy is to artificially drive up the value of all the bad debt owned by the banks.) [51178, 51214, 51316, 51933]

Senator Mike Johanns (R-NE) tells Yellen the Federal Reserve’s policy of keeping interest rates artificially low “are very, very hard on certain segments of our society. You know, explain to the senior citizen who is just hoping that a CD [certificate of deposit] will earn some money so they don’t have to dig into the principle what impact you’re having on a policy that says we’re going to—for as far as the eye can see or foreseeable future—keep interest rates low. They are hurt by that policy.” Yellen replies, “I understand that savers are hurt by this policy, but, you know, if we want to get back to business as usual and a normal monetary policy and normal interest rates, I would say we need to do that by getting the economy back to normal. ...[Savers] play many different roles in the economy” [but if they] “take into account the broader array of interests they have in a strong economy, they would see that these policies—even though they may harm them in one respect—are broadly beneficial to them as I believe they are to all Americans.” (In other words, Yellen will continue Ben Bernanke’s disastrous policy of expanding the money supply and bailing out Wall Street, even if it means hurting the average Americans, because her job is to serve “the collective.”) [51237]

Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR)—who is running for reelection in 2014—tells *The Oregonian*, “It was a significant failure to understand that the grandfathering [provision of the Affordable Care Act] had this flaw in it, and now that it’s recognized, we’ve got to fix it.” (Erika Johnsen writes at HotAir.com, “...*How* did he ‘fail to understand,’ not only that the ‘grandfathering had this flaw in it,’ but that it is indeed not a flaw at all? Did he and all of the other Democrats currently feigning surprise, befuddlement, and indignation really not understand that the law must force people to pay more for health insurance they don’t necessarily want/need in order to cover some of the costs of higher-risk participants? Because that’s kind of the point. ...[T]here were any number of very vociferous voices aptly warning that all of this would happen, to which Democrats willfully chose not to listen.”) [51258]

The Tennessee Valley Authority announces the closure of eight power plants, two coal-fired plants in Kentucky and six in Alabama. (The number of jobs that will be lost is not announced. At Townhall.com Heather Ginsberg notes, “Of course the Sierra Club was at the forefront of the battle to get these plants closed. They had a lawyer involved in the negotiations with TVA from the beginning. Obviously it doesn’t help anything that the EPA keeps putting stricter rules and regulations on coal powered plants.” The absurdity of the EPA rules is reflected in the fact that the power plants it wants shut down amount to no more than about 0.01 percent of the CO2 released into the atmosphere each year.”) [51231, 51232, 51302]

Congressman Pete Olson (R-TX) introduces a resolution calling for the impeachment of Attorney General Eric Holder for “the offenses of lying to Congress, refusing to comply with a subpoena, and failing to fulfill his oath of office.” [51286, 51335]

In an interview with InfoWars.com’s Alex Jones, Chicago radio talk show host Eric “Mancow” Muller relates that actor Harry Lennix told him he was hired to teach Obama how to walk, talk, read teleprompters, and act presidential. Lennix, who has known Obama for at least 15 years, told Mancow, “probably only Michelle knows him better than I do.” According to Muller, Lennix said Obama is “a rat bastard,” “very stupid,” and has been “taught to act like this.” In response to Mancow’s question, “How long did he know he was going to be president?” Lennix replied, “Well, he knew from 1998... and maybe earlier.” Mancow states that Lennix said “There’s nothing there... Obama was whatever you wanted him to be... He was Muslim with the next person that came over and talked to him... and he’s whatever you want him to be, but there’s nothing there. ...He’s an empty vessel. ...And perfect to be manipulated, a perfect puppet.” Jones notes that some people watch Lennix act and think he is imitating Obama when, in fact, Obama is imitating Lennix. [51210, 51211]

At NationalReview.com, Jonah Goldberg writes, “[E]very day [White House press secretary] Jay Carney looks even more like a little boy who put on his dad’s suit.” Goldberg also notes, “[T]he federal exchange has enrolled about 27,000 customers since October 1, which amounts to about half an enrollee for each Obamacare ‘navigator.’ (Someone in the White House is surely thinking, ‘Hey, let’s just hire another 14,000,000 navigators! Problem solved.’)” [51182]

In his *Morning Jolt* message, NationalReview.com’s Jim Geraghty writes, “The House is going to take up the Upton bill. It’s going to pass. It’s going to pass with just about every Republican vote, and in all likelihood, a heck of a lot of Democratic votes. Then it goes to the Senate, where three things can happen. [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid [D-NV] refuses to bring it to the floor for a vote. ...Every Senate Democrat will be asked, on the record, if they agree with Reid’s decision. They’ll have to denounce him. The second possibility is that Harry Reid allows the bill to go to the floor, and the Senate rejects it. ...Under that scenario, the 2014 midterms turn into a Democratic bloodbath that makes the 2010 midterms look like the good old days. Then there’s the third possibility... the Senate passes it... and it goes before Obama. And then Obama can either sign the

metaphorical gut-shot into law, or he can veto it. He's not going to sign it. Instead ...Obama will provide the most excruciatingly painful veto in recent memory, as he becomes the [person] who assured the American people dozens of times they could keep their plan, broke his promise, and then shot down the bipartisan legislation to keep his promise after he broke it. You think his approval rating is low now? He'll make Bush's second term look like a joyous series of unhindered triumphs." [51188]

KOMO-TV in Seattle reports, "Washington state's insurance commissioner says ...Obama's proposal on old insurance policies isn't a good deal for Washington citizens. Commissioner Mike Kreidler [a former Congressman] said Thursday he won't allow insurance companies to extend their old policies that didn't meet the requirements of federal health care reform. An estimated 290,000 Washington residents have received notices that their old insurance policies will be canceled." Kreidler, a Democrat, says, "Trying to do what [Obama] has proposed would be very disruptive to the insurance market in the state of Washington so no, we will not be allowing insurance companies to extend these policies. You'd have to go back and re-rate all of the policies, and the premises for what they originally proposed [as] rates would all change. ...I have empathy for these people [who lost their insurance], I certainly feel for them, but at the same time, people really have a chance right now to shop and compare various health plans and make some decisions that best fits themselves and their families in ways that could never do before. But if you wind up extending these current plans that are out there, you really disrupt the ability for that to happen." Vermont Governor Peter Shumlin says that his insurance commissioner will not allow insurers to extend current plans—even though his state's ObamaCare site, Vermont Health Connect, is not fully functional. Oregon regulators will also not comply with the roll-back scheme, even though its ObamaCare exchange has been unable to successfully enroll even one person.) [51194, 51195, 51241, 51291, 51292, 52054]

Politico reports, "Obama intends to nominate Vivek Hallegere Murthy to be the next surgeon general, the White House announced Thursday. He is the co-founder and president of Doctors for America, which began as Doctors for Obama in 2008. He is a hospitalist attending physician and instructor in medicine at Brigham and Women's Hospital at Harvard Medical School." According to WashingtonTimes.com, Doctors for Obama is "connected with the Center for American Progress [CAP], the major liberal think tank that has been stunningly successful in injecting its alumni into the highest levels of the administration. Dr. Murthy's connection with the center is now raising questions about his independence, particularly since the think tank has been traditionally reluctant to reveal its corporate backers, and little information exists about who is funding Doctors for America. Meredith McGehee, policy director of the nonpartisan Campaign Legal Center, said there should be greater transparency for the group whose co-founder is poised to become the country's top doctor. 'The donors to that organization have some expectation that their donations will keep them in the good graces of folks whether they're on their way in or out of government,' she said. Ms. McGehee said that's true for the Center for American Progress more broadly because the think tank has become a 'holding place for policy experts in waiting' to join the administration." [52888]

According to a Gallup poll, 55 percent of Americans disapprove of ObamaCare—up from 47 percent in late October. [51198]

Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson posts “Five [Obama] Quotes From the Catastrophically Awful Obamacare Press Conference.” (1) “What we’re also discovering is that insurance is complicated to buy.” (Obama and his ObamaCare team should have figured that out before they drafted legislation affecting hundreds of millions of Americans—and before he told audiences that using Healthcare.gov would be as easy as booking a plane ticket.) (2) “What we’re essentially saying is the Affordable Care Act is not going to be the factor in what happens with folks in the individual market.” (That is, “Blame the insurance companies, not me or ObamaCare.”) (3) “On the website, I was not informed directly that the website would not be working the way it was supposed to.” (Apparently Obama never asked, “How’s that web site coming, guys? You know, the one linked to my signature legislation that will earn me a prominent place in history?”) (4) “The marketplace offers new options with better coverage and tax credits that might help you bring down the cost.” (Then again, it might not.) (5) “It is not possible for me to guarantee that a hundred percent of the people... on this website will have a perfectly seamless, smooth experience. We’re going to have to continue to improve it, even after November 30th.” (One more broken promise.) [51201]

Desperate Democrats, less than thrilled with Obama’s proposal and news conference, continue to offer proposals to avoid the fallout from his “you can keep your plan” lie. Senator Mark Udall (D-CO) will reportedly introduce legislation allowing people to keep their existing health insurance plans for two years. Senator Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH) introduces legislation to extend ObamaCare’s enrollment period until May 31, 2014. [51202, 51236]

One unnamed House Democrat tells Politico, “I don’t know how he [Obama] fucked this up so badly.” [51218, 51219]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “The White House, under fire for botching the launch of Obamacare and jeopardizing upcoming Democratic elections, rejected a ‘perfect’ replacement for embattled Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, according to sources. Obama’s team was urged to consider former two-term Tennessee Gov. Phil Bredesen, a former health insurance executive who completely fixed the state’s beleaguered health care system set up during the Clinton years. ‘They are making a serious mistake saying no to him,’ said a knowledgeable source. ‘He completely turned around Tennessee’s system and he’s the perfect choice to fix Obamacare,’ added the source of the former Democratic governor and Nashville mayor. ...It is not clear how high up in the White House Bredesen’s allies pushed his name, though it didn’t matter since Obama has shown no inclination to dump Sebelius.” [51204]

In *The Washington Post* Charles Krauthammer writes that Bill Clinton’s call for Obama to “honor his commitment” to Americans whose health insurance policies have been canceled “marked the breaching of the dam. It legitimized the brewing rebellion of panicked Democrats against Obamacare. Within hours, that rebellion went loudly public.

By Thursday, ...Obama had been forced into a rear-guard holding action, asking insurers to grant a one-year extension of current plans. ...At stake is the new, more ambitious, social-democratic brand of American liberalism introduced by Obama, of which Obamacare is both symbol and concrete embodiment. ...For four years, this debate has been theoretical. Now it's real. And for Democrats, it's a disaster. It begins with the bungled rollout. If Washington can't even do the Web site—the literal portal to this brave new world—how does it propose to regulate the vast ecosystem of American medicine? Beyond the competence issue is the arrogance. Five million freely chosen, freely purchased, freely renewed health-care plans are summarily canceled. Why? Because they don't meet some arbitrary standard set by the experts in Washington. For all his news conference gyrations about not deliberately deceiving people with his 'if you like it' promise, the law Obama so triumphantly gave us allows you to keep your plan only if *he* likes it. This is life imitating comedy—that old line about a liberal being someone who doesn't care what you do as long as it's mandatory." [51212]

“Lastly, deception. The essence of the entitlement state is government giving away free stuff. Hence Obamacare would provide insurance for 30 million uninsured, while giving everybody tons of free medical services—without adding ‘one dime to our deficits,’ promised Obama. This being inherently impossible, there had to be a catch. Now we know it: hidden subsidies. Toss millions of the insured off their plans and onto the Obamacare ‘exchanges,’ where they would be forced into more expensive insurance packed with coverage they don't want and don't need—so that the overcharge can be used to subsidize others. The reaction to the incompetence, arrogance and deception has ranged from ridicule to anger. But more is in jeopardy than just panicked congressional Democrats. This is [Obama's] signature legislative achievement... the embodiment of his new entitlement-state liberalism. If Obamacare goes down, there will be little left of its underlying ideology. ...If it does fail, the effect will be historic. Obamacare will take down with it more than Mary Landrieu and Co. It will discredit Obama's new liberalism for years to come.” [51212]

At CNN.com Gloria Borger notes Obama's press conference statement, “Had I been informed, I wouldn't be going out saying, boy, this is going to be great. You know, I'm accused of a lot of things, but I don't think I'm stupid enough to go around saying, this is going to be like shopping on Amazon or Travelocity, a week before the website opens, if I thought that it wasn't going to work.” Borger asks, “How could he not have known? It's a real head-scratcher. Most powerful man in the world. Most important issue. Most politically explosive, particularly coming on the heels of the government shutdown. Consider the context: Republicans had just tried to defund Obamacare, and they lost in a heap of public humiliation. So the rollout of Obamacare had to be really impressive, because the Republicans had to be proven wrong. And yet, as the dry runs continued to produce red flags—over and over—[Obama] remained in his steely cocoon. If this were the presidency of George W. Bush or Ronald Reagan, the obvious theories would abound: The chief executive is disengaged. Or incurious. Or worse. But since Obama is none of the above, what gives? This much is clear, after speaking with both past and present senior administration officials: No one was really in charge, so no one knew for sure how bad the overall picture was. What's more, and—perhaps most telling—no one

wanted even to hint to [Obama] that this techno-savvy administration possibly had a website stuck in, say, 1995. ‘People don’t like to tell him bad news,’ says an ex-White House staffer. ‘Part of it is the no-drama culture.’” [51205]

James O’Keefe’s Project Veritas releases another undercover video showing ObamaCare navigators from a tax-exempt group called “Enroll America” suggesting that insurance applicants lie about income and other issues in order to get lower premiums—with the difference being subsidized by the taxpayers. The investigative group states, “Critics said the first video was an isolated incident so we decided to visit with even more navigators funded by your American tax dollars. What we found was disturbing and showed a clear pattern of fraud through the Obamacare navigator program.” DailyCaller.com later reports, “O’Keefe’s work also revealed that Enroll America might be working with the political action committee Battleground Texas, possibly sharing mined data between the two groups. O’Keefe’s footage was enough to prompt the legal advocacy group Cause of Action to write a letter to the attorney general of the state of Texas asking for an inquiry into Enroll America’s tax-exempt status. ‘There may be violations of Texas law as well, including but not limited to: the state False Claims Act; conspiracy to commit Medicaid fraud; and consumer fraud,’ according to the letter. ...[Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen] Sebelius admitted in testimony before a House ethics panel in June that she personally asked the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and H&R Block to contribute to Enroll America. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation owns more than \$1 billion across 13 million shares of stock in Johnson & Johnson, which is regulated by HHS.” (Enroll America is run by Anne Filipic, who previously worked for Sebelius.) [51206, 51235, 51936, 52501]

At WND.com Aaron Klein reports, “A little-known [public relations] group called the Herndon Alliance has been the driving force in branding Obamacare to the public. It was this group that advised President Obama to say Americans can maintain their choice of doctors and insurers under his health-care plan, WND has learned. The Herndon Alliance is openly partnered with a number of radical groups, including MoveOn, the National Council of La Raza and a slew of George Soros-funded activist organizations. It is also partnered with a ‘direct action’ group dedicated to the teachings of radical Saul Alinsky. The original research that informed Herndon’s blueprint for marketing Obamacare, WND has found, was concocted by the imaging guru for the late Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez. Herndon’s campaign was also based on survey data from progressive pollster Celinda Lake, whose information was central in President Obama’s 2012 campaign decision to turn contraception for women into a key election issue. Lake and Herndon have been providing strategy to Enroll America, the main organization pushing for the uninsured to sign up for Obamacare. Enroll America’s executive director, Ron Pollack, was a founding member of Herndon. The Herndon Alliance has been behind the marketing campaign for Obamacare since the inception of the legislation. Herndon is ‘the most influential group in the health arena that the public has never heard of,’ reported Politico in 2009. Politico reported that when Obama repeatedly announced Americans can maintain their ‘choice’ of doctors and insurance plans, ‘he is using a Herndon strategy for wringing fear out of a system overhaul.’ ...Lake’s firm, together with

Herndon, was one of the driving forces behind the progressive strategy to use contraception as an election issue in 2012.” [51207]

It is worth noting that, according to WesternJournalism.com, the Herndon Alliance is linked to a socialist consulting firm run by Michael Shellenberger called the Environics Research Group, also known as American Environics. One of Shellenberger’s clients was the late Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez. Shellenberger, along with communist Van Jones (Obama’s former “green jobs czar”), is on the board of the George Soros-funded Apollo Alliance, a front group that uses environmental issues to promote socialism. Also on the board are former Weather Underground radicals and domestic terrorists Jeffrey Carl Jones and William Ayers. Joel Rogers, another leftist political activist, heads the New York branch of the Apollo Alliance. Rogers founded the socialist New Party, which Obama joined on January 11, 1996. The Herndon Alliance’s treasurer is Phillippe Villers, who is also co-founder of Families USA—which received a \$1 million grant from the Obama administration to push ObamaCare. Families USA is linked to Enroll America, supposedly “non-partisan,” federally funded organization whose job is to persuade Americans to enroll in ObamaCare. (Families USA and Enroll America list the same New York City address and suite number as their headquarters.) Heading up Enroll America is Anne Filipic, who previously worked for Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. [52501, 52502, 52503, 52504]

According to a Gallup poll, “Americans’ views of the 2010 healthcare law have worsened in recent weeks, with 40% approving and 55% disapproving of it. For most of the past year, Americans have been divided on the law, usually tilting slightly toward disapproval. The now 15-percentage-point gap between disapproval and approval is the largest Gallup has measured in the past year.” [51251, 51252]

DailyMail.com reports, “The Obama administration has directly conceded for the first time that ‘in many cases,’ health insurance plans offered through government exchanges are more expensive than plans consumers bought before the Affordable Care Act became law—even when government subsidies are figured in.” [51246, 51247]

At Market-Ticker.org Karl Denninger writes that ObamaCare needs “100 times” the mere 106,185 people who have supposedly enrolled to be “stable.” “It won’t be. If they manage to get ten times this number in the next six weeks (the cut-off), which is looking to be a fantasy-land impossibility, the entire system will detonate within the first year and provided they force it to ‘survive’ premiums will see huge increases, likely double or more, a year from now. Let me remind everyone that nobody in the lower and middle class has the money to pay not only for the so-called ‘insurance’ under these plans which are running roughly twice what everyone is spending now but in addition if you use the so-called ‘insurance’ the deductibles are frequently double to ten times what you had before. There’s no fix for this folks. The stock market is ignoring a passed law that will cause these impacts starting January 1st and it’s utterly amusing to watch the S&P up 10 and the Naz [Nasdaq] skyrocketing today (not to mention the retailers) when you look at what this is going to do to people’s budgets coming into the new year with the holidays coming up. The numbers are even worse than I had expected they might be... especially

on the federal exchange side. Go ahead folks, bid it up into the end of the year because I have to chase this because everyone else has been doing so well. Oh boy...” (*The Obama Timeline* agrees. ObamaCare will not only collapse of its own weight, every dollar consumers spend in higher insurance premiums is a dollar *not* spent in other areas of the economy. A family that is forced to pay \$400 per month more for insurance than it had been paying will be spending \$400 per month *less* on something else. The businesses that provide that “something else” will lose sales and start laying off employees. Not only will ObamaCare be in a “death spiral,” so will the entire U.S. economy.) [51215]

At SHTFplan.com, Mac Slavo adds to Denninger’s pessimistic outlook: “We’ve got a serious problem on our hands and it’s one that many Obamacare apologists refuse to admit. The Patient Affordable Care Act is an unprecedented catastrophe in the making. ... The key problem is one of basic arithmetic. Remember, what this legislation does is it robs from Paul to pay Peter. This means that the whole system is essentially a pyramid scheme that depends on one group of people paying the premium for those who are the beneficiaries of this ‘free’ and ‘affordable’ insurance. As we know all too well, the new rates for those who have to pay into the system are double or triple their previous insurance premiums—and those newly minted rates actually stand to double again because there is not enough money in the system to provide coverage for everyone. We can sum this up in two words: Unmitigated Disaster. And just so we’re clear, we’re not talking about these issues rearing their head a decade or so down the road. We’re talking about mere *months before the whole thing falls apart*. The scary thing? When it crumbles, the broader economy goes with it. ... [T]hose who are fortunate enough to have jobs just got hammered with a doubling and trebling of their insurance rates, which for many American families have risen as high as an entire month’s mortgage payment. If you think this isn’t happening, you’re living in a dream world. Your politics are irrelevant to the outcome. What your savior in the White House says makes absolutely no difference. If you want to close your eyes and pretend like it’s not happening, then reality will hit you square in the face at a high rate of speed in the very near future. The collapse is dead ahead. It cannot be stopped. Expect 2014 to be a rough year for America.” [51216]

On MSNBC’s *The Cycle*, leftist Toure Neblett says, “Let’s just look at members [of the Senate] who are supporting this [Mary] Landrieu bill, right. Mary Landrieu from a red state. Senator Kay Hagan from a red state. Joe Manchin from a red state. Senator [Mark] Pryor from a red state. Senator Mark Begich from a red state. Do you notice anything? We see red state Democrats who are dealing with the challenge of living and governing in a gerrymandered world where sometimes they have to deal with what the folks on the right—very low support from the Republican side for this—what the folks on the right want.” (The witless Neblett does not explain how politicians can gerrymander an *entire state*. The borders of *Congressional Districts* can, of course, be drawn to favor one party over the other, but a Democrat already in a gerrymandered district does not have to “deal with the folks on the right” because his district does not have many in the first place. There is no such thing as a “gerrymandered *state*.” His argument is senseless.) Neblett also absurdly claims that Senator Diane Feinstein (D-CA) “sometimes just goes to the right and bucks her party from time to time so she’s kind of an outlier.” (Feinstein virtually always votes the party line. An “outlier” she is not.) [51223, 51250, 52165]

At FoxNews.com Catherine Herridge reports, “The terrorists who attacked the Benghazi consulate last year knew the location of the safe room where Ambassador Chris Stevens and his security team sought shelter, according to a congressman who spoke for 90 minutes with the diplomatic security agent severely injured in the assault. ‘He confirmed this—that it was a very well orchestrated, and well organized, almost a military operation, using military weapons and using military signals,’ the late Florida Rep. Bill Young said after meeting diplomatic security agent David Ubben at Walter Reed Medical Center last summer, when both were patients there. After Young’s death in mid-October, his widow, Beverly Young, gave Fox permission to use her husband’s comments about the Sep. 11, 2012 terrorist attack on the record. The congressman had originally spoken to Fox on background last summer. ‘He (Ubben) emphasized the fact that it was a very, very military type of operation they had knowledge of almost everything in the compound,’ Young explained. ‘They knew where the gasoline was, they knew where the generators were, they knew where the safe room was, they knew more than they should have about that compound.’” [51213, 51209]

FoxNews.com reports, “Israel’s Home Front Defense and Communications Minister Gilad Erdan struck back at [U.S. Secretary of State] John Kerry Thursday, further highlighting the widening gap between the U.S. and Israel when it comes to nuclear talks with Iran. Erdan told an audience at a security conference in Tel Aviv that he was ‘astounded’ by Kerry’s remarks earlier this week that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s objections to a proposed deal between six world powers and Iran was ‘premature,’ as no deal had yet been signed. ‘Netanyahu has to understand that no agreement was signed between Iran and the world powers and his adamant objections are premature,’ Kerry said. Erdan responded: ‘I have not heard such a claim for many years; this is a country that wants to destroy Israel and the conditions that will enable it to carry out its wishes. What do they expect from an Israeli prime minister? Not to cry out when the knife is in the hand, but only when it is across our throat? It is only thanks to the discussion about the terms being discussed in Geneva, behind closed doors, that we have received an additional delay of several days and perhaps even an improvement in the terms of the agreement. We must not be mistaken—an interim agreement will be a permanent agreement. All those involved in the agreement must understand that the moment Iran becomes a nuclear threshold state an arms race will begin in the Middle East and regional uncertainty will increase.’” [51274]

The White House threatens an Obama veto of Congressman Fred Upton’s (R-MI) “Keep Your Plan Act” which would allow consumers to buy health insurance policies that were canceled as a result of ObamaCare. (Upton’s bill would allow sales of those policies even to consumers who had been without insurance.) One astute Twitter message: “Obama schedule. 11/14/13: AM: Announce illegal change to Obamacare. PM: Threaten to veto legal change to Obamacare.” [51220, 51224]

Reporters ask Congressman James Clyburn (D-SC) if he will apologize for telling people they could keep their insurance coverage if they like it. Clyburn replies, “I don’t think there’s anything for us to apologize for.” House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)

responds with two lies: “There is nothing in the Affordable Care Act that said that your insurance company should cancel you,” and “Did I ever tell my constituents that if they liked their plan they could keep it? I would have if I’d ever met anybody who liked his or her plan. But that was not my experience. As far as the Affordable Care Act is concerned, what [Obama] said was completely accurate.” (WeeklyStandard.com points out, “[T]he Affordable Care Act says that plans created after March of 2010 must be cancelled, and the law also gave the administration the authority to write regulations that forced the cancellation of some policies that existed prior to March 2010,” and “Pelosi said in 2009: ‘If you like what you have, you can keep it.’ Pelosi’s website still states: ‘Keep your doctor, and your current plan, if you like them.’”) [51221, 51222, 51296]

A birthday party for Obama’s closest advisor, Valerie Jarrett, shuts down a portion of Washington, D.C. According to WesternJournalism.com, “many in the nation’s capital were inconvenienced for nearly five hours as a significant portion of R Street was shut down for the festivities. From the time Obama’s motorcade traveled to the destination, an organic hotspot called Restaurant Nora, around 7 p.m., much of the street remained inaccessible until nearly midnight. While reports show the Obamas and Jarrett were among those celebrating at the trendy eatery, diligent journalists in search of a photo opportunity left unfulfilled. After spending a couple of hours confined to an adjacent restaurant, members of the media were relegated to their vehicles for the latter portion of the event. Despite waiting in the rain for a chance to capture an image of the partying politicians, the special guests never made a public appearance. While he was living it up, spending the entire evening among friends in a posh environment, Obama tacitly informed ordinary citizens that their needs are unimportant. Just as in countless communities across today’s America, D.C. residents are trying desperately to provide for their families as this administration relentlessly attacks the American Dream. Shutting down an entire block for a private party only adds insult to injury. ...Increasingly, it seems the only outside opinion important to [Obama] comes from the woman for whom grinding D.C. traffic to a halt for five hours is deemed completely appropriate.” [51350]

On November 15 Obama meets with insurance company executives for more than an hour “to discuss changes that he has proposed to his signature healthcare law to address the outcry over insurance policy cancellations,” according to a White House official. (The insurance industry knows it will lose a fortune if young, healthy customers are not forced into the ObamaCare risk pool to cover the expenses of the drives of sick and elderly people who will be the most eager to enroll. HotAir.com notes that Obama’s solution will be “to buy them off” with the “risk corridor” provisions of ObamaCare, which essentially call for taxpayer bailouts of insurance companies that suffer losses because of the legislation.) [51217, 51244, 51273, 51362]

According to *The New York Times*, “The insurers, many of whom expressed anger that [Obama] had not consulted them before Thursday’s announcement, said they had come away from the meeting willing to work with the White House on the cancellation issue and still protect the financial viability of the new insurance marketplaces. They did not discuss in detail how [Obama’s] goal might be achieved. ...At the meeting, insurers emphasized their concerns that [Obama’s] proposal could actually lead to higher

insurance prices in 2015 and beyond by skewing the mix of customers in the new insurance marketplace. In other words, people who now have cheaper insurance—because their plans have fewer benefits—may still choose to keep them, rather than buying [sic; buy] the new policies. Generally, those people are thought to be younger and healthier.” [51272, 51273]

Obama also meets with members of his old political team: former campaign guru David Axelrod, 2008 campaign manager and former White House advisor David Plouffe, former head speechwriter Jon Favreau, and former national security spokesman Tommy Vietor. (Axelrod tells reporters it’s a “social visit.” It is, of course, a meeting to discuss how to deal with the ObamaCare fallout.) [51249]

Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson writes, “As [*National Review*’s] Jonah Goldberg says, the Obamacare schadenfreude is delicious. Conservatives experience no glee over the pain this failed law is visiting upon the country, but the utter panic spreading like a cancer among the bad actors who foisted it upon an unwilling public is, admittedly, quite sweet. It’s vindication for those who were slimed as smear-merchants, liars, or even racists for anticipating precisely what’s happening. Democratic Senators, who *certainly* knew better, are now feigning surprise over the inescapable results of the law they’ve championed. Some are straight-up claiming that they didn’t see any of this coming, while others are still forging ahead with legislative ‘fixes’ so they can pretend they’re doing something to rectify the myriad problems. But some problems cannot be spun or tweaked away. As it became clear that [Obama] was flailing badly during his press conference yesterday, vulnerable members began telling reporters that his ‘solution’—which threatens the sustainability of his entire law—wasn’t good enough. Thus, a struggle is about to play out in the upper chamber between Senators who desperately want to get their pandering on the record, and leadership, which wants to protect the White House and guard against potentially damaging Republican amendments. As that battle plays out, liberals in the media are handwringing. A *New York Times* news analysis summoned the worst insult imaginable to *Times* readers by comparing Obama to his predecessor. *Washington Post* columnist Ruth Marcus concluded her scathing piece with this blunt verdict: ‘...Can he recover? I’m sorry to say: I’m not at all confident.’” [51219]

KDVR.com reports that a man in Colorado who signed up for ObamaCare instead was informed that his dog, Baxter, had been given the insurance. (The name “Baxter” was entered as an answer to a security question, but somehow managed to end up as the name of the insured.) [51433]

The House of Representatives votes 261–157 to approve the Republican-sponsored Keep Your Plan Act; 39 Democrats defy Obama and join Republicans in passing the bill. Congressman Frank Pallone (D-NJ), votes against the bill and says, “It basically allows them to sell low-quality 2013 plans all through 2014, nothing else.” Congressman James McGovern (D-MA) calls the vote a “colossal waste of time.” But Congressman Ron Barber (D-AZ) says, “Let’s face it, millions of people right now have a canceled policy,” and people in his state are “beside themselves, because by December 31 they don’t have

health coverage, and they can't get on the exchange to find out what's available." [51229, 51230, 51261, 51266, 51275]

Although Obama would veto the Upton bill, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) will see to it that it never comes up for a vote in the Senate. Meanwhile, Senate Democrats are less than thrilled with Obama's solution. Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA) states, "I have a bill. There are other bills that have been filed. We're going to be working across the aisle. Anybody who wants to work with me or anybody else to fix it, I'll be willing." Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR) supports Landrieu's bill over Obama's voluntary call for policy renewals, which he says, "doesn't go as far as I'd like." Which, if any, bills Reid allows to proceed remains to be seen. [51245]

At HotAir.com Bruce McQuain provides the "three political reasons" that led to "Obama's capitulation" on canceled insurance policies. "One reason that drove the concession was the usual—an attempt to start shifting the blame [from Obama and the Democrats to the insurance companies]. Blame shifting is as natural to this administration as breathing is to the rest of us. While they take more heat, they can now pass some of it off to insurers who were simply following the law as the Democrats and the administration had written it. Now they're the bad guys. As you might imagine, the insurance industry is furious. ...Reason number two for the concession was Congressional Democrat panic. ...They're really not so much interested in a 'fix' as they are in enough time to avoid the consequences of the law in 2014. So they're very willing to grab this totally short-term political 'solution' by kicking the can down the road in order to weather the 2014 midterms. By the time this rears its ugly head again in full, they're hoping the elections will be over. ...[T]his isn't about people losing coverage. This is about Democrats losing office. ...And finally the third reason was a real need to get out in front of the [Fred] Upton bill in the House. ...But it's not going to happen. Obama has already said he'd veto the Upton legislation. There's a message there for Mary Landrieu as well. This was all about Barack Obama, as usual. It is a result of raw political calculation—his only seeming area of competence. He's now managed a political solution which serves him about as well as any solution can in the mess he and his administration have made of this atrocious law. He's found someone else to shift the blame too, he's quieted Democrats, at least for the moment and he's politically preempted a GOP move that would have seriously damaged his signature legislation and dumped his leadership and credibility ratings even lower. For him, this is about as good as it gets." [51243]

HotAir.com posts a video which will almost certainly be used by the GOP opponent of Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA) in the 2014 election campaign. In the video, a constituent asks Landrieu, "Would you be willing to accept 100 percent responsibility, 100 percent accountability for the failure or success of whatever you vote for?" Landrieu replies, "I do, already, because that's what I do every election. I mean I, you all have to—when I run for reelection you say to me 'Senator, we like what you've done and we voted for you, or we don't like what you've done and we voted against you.'" [51248, 51300]

The *Chicago Tribune* (which endorsed Obama in both 2008 and 2012) writes, “[W]hat Obama presented Thursday as a favor looks like one more mess for state governments, insurers and ... American citizens. Under the policy Obama articulated, the states and insurers aren’t required to do anything. The American citizens? Under Obamacare, they’re still required to have health insurance. Or pay a government fine. Note that [Obama’s] intent to enable the extension of policies his administration deems inferior also contradicts a key tenet of Obamacare: the guarantee that (almost) every private health plan in the nation must offer a lengthy list of mandated benefits. On some level, then, [Obama] plainly agrees with critics of Obamacare, this page included, that the law needs to be rewritten: He and his administration keep rewriting its major components—remember the mandate that sizable employers offer coverage in 2014?—as practicalities and politics demand. But in this country we don’t change bad laws by presidential fiat. We change them by having Congress rewrite them or by starting from scratch. Obama doesn’t want to reopen this law for fear that Republicans and some Democrats will substantially rewrite it. But that’s what has to happen. We understand why [Obama] and leaders of his party want to rescue whatever they can of Obamacare. On their watch, official Washington has blown the launch of a new entitlement program... under the schedule they alone set in early 2010. What we don’t understand is their reluctance to give that failure more than lip service. Many of the Americans who heard [Obama] say Thursday that ‘we fumbled the rollout of this health care law’ would have been pleased to hear him add: So we’re admitting it. This law is a bust. We’re starting over.” [51259]

It is worth noting some of the many items that must be covered by health insurance policies in order for them to be ObamaCare-compliant:

- Contraception, abortion-inducing “morning after” pill and vasectomies
- Maternity and newborn care (regardless of the gender or age of the policy holder)
- Mental health and substance abuse counseling and treatment
- Prescription drugs
- Pediatric services (even for childless couples and senior citizens)
- Behavioral health treatment
- Rehab treatment
- Dental and vision care
- Alcohol misuse screening and counseling
- Aspirin use to prevent cardiovascular disease for men and women of certain ages
- Blood pressure screening for all adults
- Cholesterol screening for adults of certain ages or at higher risk
- Colorectal cancer screening for adults over 50
- Depression screening for adults
- Diabetes (type 2) screening for adults with high blood pressure
- Diet counseling for adults at higher risk for chronic disease
- HIV screening for everyone ages 15 to 65, and other ages at increased risk
- Immunization vaccines for adults (doses, recommended ages, and recommended populations vary: hepatitis A, hepatitis B, herpes zoster, human papillomavirus,

influenza, measles, mumps, rubella, meningococcal, pneumococcal, tetanus, diphtheria, pertussis, varicella)

Obesity screening and counseling for all adults

Sexually transmitted infection (STI) prevention counseling for adults at higher risk

Syphilis screening for all adults at higher risk

Tobacco use screening for all adults and cessation interventions for tobacco users

Anemia screening on a routine basis for pregnant women

Breast cancer genetic test counseling (BRCA) for women at higher risk for breast cancer

Breast cancer mammography screenings every 1 to 2 years for women over 40

Breast cancer chemoprevention counseling for women at higher risk

Breastfeeding comprehensive support and counseling from trained providers, and access to breastfeeding supplies, for pregnant and nursing women

Cervical cancer screening for sexually active women

Chlamydia infection screening for younger women and other women at higher risk

Contraception: Food and Drug Administration-approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling, as prescribed by a health care provider for women with reproductive capacity

Domestic and interpersonal violence screening and counseling for all women

Folic acid supplements for women who may become pregnant

Gestational diabetes screening for women 24 to 28 weeks pregnant and those at high risk of developing gestational diabetes

Gonorrhea screening for all women at higher risk

Hepatitis B screening for pregnant women at their first prenatal visit

HIV screening and counseling for sexually active women

Human papillomavirus (HPV) DNA Test every 3 years for women with normal cytology results who are 30 or older

Osteoporosis screening for women over age 60 depending on risk factors

Rh incompatibility screening for all pregnant women and follow-up testing for women at higher risk

Sexually transmitted infections counseling for sexually active women

Syphilis screening for all pregnant women or other women at increased risk

Tobacco use screening and interventions for all women, and expanded counseling for pregnant tobacco users

Urinary tract or other infection screening for pregnant women

Well-woman visits to get recommended services for women under 65

Autism screening for children at 18 and 24 months

Behavioral assessments for children at the following ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years

Blood Pressure screening for children at the following ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years

Cervical dysplasia screening for sexually active females

Depression screening for adolescents

Developmental screening for children under age 3

Dyslipidemia screening for children at higher risk of lipid disorders at the following ages: 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years
Fluoride chemoprevention supplements for children without fluoride in their water source
Gonorrhea preventive medication for the eyes of all newborns
Hearing screening for all newborns
Height, weight and body mass index measurements for children at the following ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years
Hematocrit or hemoglobin screening for children
Hemoglobinopathies or sickle cell screening for newborns
HIV screening for adolescents at higher risk
Hypothyroidism screening for newborns
Immunization vaccines for children from birth to age 18 (doses, recommended ages, and recommended populations vary: diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, haemophilus influenza type b, hepatitis A, hepatitis B, human papillomavirus, inactivated poliovirus, influenza, measles, mumps, rubella, meningococcal, pneumococcal, rotavirus, varicella
Iron supplements for children ages 6 to 12 months at risk for anemia
Lead screening for children at risk of exposure
Medical history for all children throughout development at the following ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years
Obesity screening and counseling
Oral health risk assessment for young children ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years
Phenylketonuria (PKU) screening for this genetic disorder in newborns
Sexually transmitted infection (STI) prevention counseling and screening for adolescents at higher risk
Tuberculin testing for children at higher risk of tuberculosis at the following ages: 0 to 11 months, 1 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 14 years, 15 to 17 years
Vision screening for all children

Health insurance will necessarily be more expensive because bureaucrats in the Obama administration have mandated that *all* of the above items must be covered for an insurance policy to be ObamaCare-compliant—regardless of the gender, age, or parental status of the policy holder. (A woman may have been married to the perfect husband for 50 years, but her insurance nevertheless must cover “domestic and interpersonal violence screening and counseling for all women.” An elderly couple must pay for vision screening for the children they do not have. Thin people must pay for obesity counseling. Teetotalers must pay for “alcohol misuse screening and counseling.” Responsible and sane people must pay for “mental health and substance abuse counseling and treatment.”) [51869]

Bloomberg.com reports, “Philadelphia has 119 fire hydrants that cost about \$2,000 each waiting in a warehouse to be installed, yet they sit high and dry because federal regulators say their fittings might taint drinking water with lead. The City of Brotherly Love and communities across the U.S. face the specter of hundreds of millions of dollars in useless hydrants after a surprise ruling last month by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

[EPA] that requires fireplugs put in after Jan. 4 meet stricter standards for lead content, said Tom Curtis of the American Water Works Association in Denver. That means cities must scrap or retrofit inventory or buy hydrants and parts that some vendors aren't even making yet. Manufacturers and Curtis's group, which represents utilities that serve about 80 percent of Americans, are urging the agency to reconsider or at least allow more time to comply. American Cast Iron Pipe Co., one of the largest hydrant makers, is seeing some customers delay or cancel orders. 'This delivers a huge cost and probably no health protection,' said Curtis, the water group's deputy executive director. 'It needs to be rethought.' ...The plugs are typically made from cast iron with the cap visible above ground attached by a pipe to the underground water main. Components inside regulate flow, and brass parts and nozzle where a hose attaches can contain lead." (Fire hydrants are used, of course, for putting out fires—not for drinking water—yet the EPA wants hundreds of millions or dollars of hydrants in storage and not yet installed to be scrapped.) [51260]

Obama economic advisor Gene Sperling tells HuffingtonPost.com that the administration want to *again* extend unemployment benefits. He says, "We have always done so when unemployment is this high and would make little sense to fail to do so now when we are still facing the burdens of the worst downturn since the Great Recession. It is high bang for the buck for the economy, reduces poverty and helps workers who lost jobs due to no fault of their own get back on their feet." (Extending benefits will only lengthen the recession because it encourages people not to look for jobs until the extension of benefits runs out. Additionally, it does not help the economy because every dollar paid out in benefits first as to be taken from others in the form of taxes or inflation.) [51322, 51323]

Obama's Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, insults white suburban women during a speech to the Council of Chief State Schools Officers Organization in Richmond, Virginia. He says, "It's fascinating to me that some of the pushback [against the federal "Common Core" education program] is coming from, sort of, white suburban moms who—all of a sudden—[worry or discover] their child isn't [sic; children aren't] as brilliant as they thought they were and their school isn't [sic; schools aren't] quite as good as they thought they were, and that's pretty scary. You've bet your house and where you live and everything on, 'My child's going to be prepared.' That can be a punch in the gut." (For a Secretary of Education, Duncan's comment leaves much to be desired grammatically. He is also incorrect about the reasoning behind opposition to the "dumbed down" and unproven common core program. But the worst aspect of his statement is, of course, his reference to "white suburban moms"—which is most certainly designed to imply that critics of common core are racists. Duncan later offers a typical Washington "non-apology apology." It is worth noting that Duncan left the Chicago school system in a sorry state when he was picked by Obama to head the Department of Education. Obama's children, of course, attended an expensive private school in Chicago and they do so in Washington, D.C. as well. It is also worth noting that David Coleman, one of the architects of Common Core, was the co-founder of "Grow Network," an education program that began in New York City but which later entered into a contract with the Chicago Public Education Fund which, according to PolitiChicks.tv, "was created in 1998 by the Chicago Annenberg Challenge (CAC) board of directors, which included

Barack Obama as board chairman and communist Bill Ayers, as co-chair.”) [51325, 51330, 51347, 51369, 51425, 51592, 51649, 51650, 51683, 51687, 51692, 52783, 52823]

A third grade Common Core grammar exercise asks students to make various sentences less wordy. Among the sentences: “The commands of government must be obeyed by all,” “The job of a president is not easy,” “He makes sure the laws of the country are fair,” and “The wants of an individual are less important than the well-being of the nation.” (The assignment could easily have used sentences that have nothing to do with politics, yet the textbook uses the opportunity to promote leftist propaganda—and lies. A president’s job is *not* to ensure that laws are fair; his job is to enforce the law.” Further, the government does not issue “commands.” It passes laws which citizens can disobey if they conflict with the U.S. Constitution. Lastly, the U.S. Constitution provides for the protection of *individual* liberties and declares them sacrosanct. The Bill of Rights ensures that individual rights are *not* to be violated, regardless of how that may affect the “well-being of the nation.”) [51325, 51330, 51347, 51369, 51425, 51592, 51649, 51650, 51683, 51687, 51692]

At Townhall.com Guy Benson notes, “Three horrific polls bombarded [Obama] over the last week. National surveys from Pew, Quinnipiac and Fox News uniformly showed [his] approval ratings dropping to 40 percent and below, with disapproval leaping into the mid-50s. Obamacare has also taken a public opinion beating, for obvious reasons. The latter two polls also showed substantial gains for Republicans on specific issues, as well as on the generic Congressional ballot. Obama lost ground across all demographics, including several core groups within his base, like women and Hispanics. But perhaps the most striking erosion of trust has come among voters under the age of 35. Millennials twice backed Obama overwhelmingly at the polls, and have been one of the least likely cohorts to abandon him on a host of topics—through thick and thin. No more, it would seem. ...In the latest Q-poll, Obama’s overall approval rating is underwater by 15 percentage points (39/54). Among young voters, the gap is larger: (36/54).” [51262]

“...On Quinnipiac’s question of whether Obama is ‘honest and trustworthy,’ [his] reputation has plummeted among 18-29 year-olds to (43/51). ...Young voters told the pollster they’d trust Congressional Republicans over Obama on handling the economy by a ten-point margin, healthcare by a five-point margin, and the federal budget by a three-point margin. On the generic Congressional ballot, young voters split evenly between supporting a hypothetical Republican (37 percent) versus a Democratic candidate (36 percent). ...Within the Fox poll, voters under the age of 35 disapprove of Obama (40/53), and dished out double-digit negative marks for [him] on every issue polled, except for immigration—on which he was ‘only’ underwater by eight points. ...Remarkably, Republicans hold a generic Congressional ballot lead within this group (34/32); (40/38) including leaners. ...By a (44/50) margin, young people said Obama spends less time taking responsibility than he does blaming other people. A large plurality said they’d throw out Obamacare entirely and start from scratch. ...Obama’s credibility crisis is especially acute among younger voters. ...The overall public believes Obama knowingly lied (50 percent) about ‘you can keep your plan,’ as opposed to having made a mistake (40 percent). The split within the under-35 crowd is significantly more pronounced:

Thirty four percent said they believe he simply erred, while fifty-six percent were in the ‘knowingly lied’ camp. That’s a 22-point margin, compared to the general populace’s 10-point spread.” [51262]

At NationalReview.com Mark Steyn writes, “On Thursday, [Obama] passed a new law at a press conference. George III never did that. But, having ordered America’s insurance companies to comply with Obamacare, [Obama] announced that he is now ordering them not to comply with Obamacare. The legislative branch (as it’s still quaintly known) passed a law purporting to grandfather your existing health plan. The regulatory bureaucracy then interpreted the law so as to un-grandfather your health plan. So His Most Excellent Majesty has commanded that your health plan be de-un-grandfathered. That seems likely to work. The insurance industry had three years to prepare for the introduction of Obamacare. Now the King has given them six weeks to de-introduce Obamacare. ...The same [person] who had unilaterally commanded that people be allowed to keep their health plans indignantly threatened to veto any such law to that effect: It only counts if he does it—geddit? As his court eunuchs at the Associated Press obligingly put it: ‘Obama Will Allow Old Plans.’ It’s Barry’s world; we just live in it. ...[A]s with so many other things, Obama always gives the vague impression that routine features of humdrum human existence are entirely alien to him. Marie Antoinette, informed that the peasantry could no longer afford bread, is alleged to have responded, ‘Let them eat cake.’ There is no evidence these words ever passed her lips, but certainly no one ever accused her of saying, ‘If you like your cake, you can keep your cake,’ and then having to walk it back with ‘What we’re also discovering is that cake is complicated to buy.’ That contribution to the annals of monarchical unworldliness had to await the reign of Queen Barry Antoinette, whose powdered wig seems to have slipped over his eyes.” [51263]

“[Obama] is not smart enough to ensure that his website works; he’s not smart enough to inquire of others as to whether his website works; he’s not smart enough to check that his website works before he goes out and tells people what a great website experience they’re in for. But [he said at his press conference that] he is smart enough to know that he’s not stupid enough to go around bragging about how well it works if he’d already been informed that it doesn’t work. So he’s smart enough to know that if he’d known what he didn’t know he’d know enough not to let it be known that he knew nothing. The country’s in the very best of hands. ...[Obama] promised to ‘fundamentally transform’ America. ...But Obama is an incompetent, so ‘fundamentally transformed’ is a euphemism for ‘wrecked beyond repair.’ As a socialist, he makes a good socialite. ...Hey, relax: If you like your constitution, you can keep your constitution. Period. And your existing amendments. Well, most of them—except for the junk ones...” [51263]

On a legal technicality, a court throws out an Operation Fast and Furious lawsuit brought against the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) by the family of slain Border Agent Brian Terry. The court argues that because the family had already received death benefits under a program for relatives of slain law enforcement officers, it could not also sue the ATF for negligence and violation of its own policies and procedures. [51294, 51319]

David M. Drucker reports at WashingtonExaminer.com, “Obamacare includes a provision that allows the federal government to funnel taxpayer dollars to insurers that face the prospect of losing too much money under the new health care law, and conservative critics want to repeal it.” Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) “said the provision could amount to a bailout of the insurance industry, which stands to lose if the troubled Obamacare exchanges fail to enroll enough people to make the system financially viable. ...Rubio spokesman Alex Conant said the Tea Party-aligned senator and potential 2016 presidential candidate is concerned that the fix Obama proposed would increase the likelihood that insurance companies would need a federal bailout. And the existing law would effectively give Obama a blank check to deal with it, he said. ‘We need to protect taxpayers from having to bail out anyone as a consequence of Obamacare,’ Conant said in an email exchange with the *Washington Examiner*. ‘Rubio’s bill will fully repeal the ‘risk corridor’ provision in Obamacare, preventing a bailout.’” (HotAir.com comments, “Gooooood politics. I’m 90 percent sure it won’t pass, but last week I would have told you I was 100 percent sure. At the rate O and his boondoggle are melting down on the Hill, there’s no down side to trying to force Democrats to vote on all sorts of bills that would chip away at parts of O-Care. Worst-case scenario: They fail but with some Democratic support, which means a rolling PR disaster for the White House and a very small margin of error going forward lest the Democratic turncoats in Congress start thinking maybe it’d be better to repeal this thing and be done with it.”) [51267, 51268, 51269, 51275, 51362, 51784]

Lisa Myers, NBC senior investigative correspondent, reports, “Several insurance industry officials and state insurance commissioners expressed frustration Friday, saying they were ‘baffled’ by ...Obama’s assertion that the cancellation of millions of insurance policies occurred because a key provision of the Affordable Care Act didn’t work as expected. The administration was warned three years ago that regulations would have exactly that effect, they said. They said the widespread cancellations in the individual health insurance market—roughly 5 million and counting—are in line with what was projected under regulations drawn up by the administration in 2010, requirements that both insurers and businesses objected to at the time. Cancellations also are occurring in the small group market, which covers businesses with between two and 50 employees, they noted. ‘We have been saying for years that the requirements in the law were going to mean that people couldn’t keep their current plans and they were going to have to purchase coverage that was more expensive,’ said one high-level health industry insider who spoke on condition of anonymity. ‘We said these changes would disrupt coverage and increase premiums for consumers. And now everything we said is coming true and people are acting surprised.’” [51270]

At WashingtonPost.com Ed Rogers asks if Obama’s “Obamacare ‘fix’ [is] part of the Obama administration’s pattern of deceit or a product of its frequent delusion? A cursory discussion with almost anyone who knows anything about the insurance business would have alerted [Obama] to the fact that his proposal is unworkable. The initial take from experts on both the right and the left is that [Obama] did not fix anything yesterday. Insurance industry experts agree that the very idea that canceled health policies can be

renewed or extended for one year is laughable—especially with the cumbersome rules that would have to accompany any such temporary reinstatements or extensions. One must assume the White House consulted experts before ...Obama announced his plan. So we can rule out delusion. Surely this was an informed decision... right? Meanwhile, this is the administration that felt compelled to affirmatively announce twice on camera in the past week that they are ‘not stupid.’ Well, if Team Obama is so certain they aren’t stupid, maybe they think we are all the stupid ones. Or, maybe [Obama] thinks he can sell this to the American people—deceiving them at least until after the 2014 elections.” [51271, 51272]

Congressman Jared Polis (D-CO) complains that a big problem with ObamaCare is that it does not cover illegal immigrants, and suggests that passing amnesty legislation is the solution: “American citizens are essentially being forced to pay for the health care costs of people who are here illegally every day, until we pass comprehensive immigration reform. We’re wondering why rates are going up. ...It’s no surprise. When somebody doesn’t have insurance, their costs are shifted onto other people that do.” (Amnesty legislation could eventually place the immigrants under ObamaCare’s individual mandate requirement. But because most illegal immigrants have low-wage jobs or no jobs, they would either be entitled to subsidies to purchase insurance or be given fully free insurance via Medicaid. That would not solve any problems; it would merely place a greater financial burden on the taxpayers. Polis’ argument is nonsense. What he really wants is to turn illegal immigrants into Democrat voters.) [51289, 51290, 51365]

Debka.com reports that “Israel sent the White House in Washington a confidential document outlining blow by blow how and when Iran will attain a nuclear weapon if the Obama-Kerry strategy for dealing with the issue goes through. The document was addressed to the National Security Council headed by Susan Rice, *DEBKAfile* reports. Communications between the prime minister’s office in Jerusalem and the State Department have almost petered out since exchanges between Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and Secretary of State John Kerry sharpened in tone. Our Washington sources report that Rice and the NSC [National Security Council] have taken a critical stand against the State Department’s policies—not just on the Iranian nuclear question, but also on Saudi Arabia, the Arabian Gulf and Egypt. However, the Israeli document does not take issue directly with Obama administration policies per se. It confines itself to a dry account, step by step, of how the Iranian nuclear bomb program will continue to unfold if the administration’s secret proposition is accepted. Much of the document’s content is highly technical for the perusal of US experts. It concludes that by putting Iran’s nuclear program on hold for six months, as the administration claims, US diplomatic strategy will shorten its path to a bomb or warhead. The Israeli document also sought to rebut Kerry’s argument that Netanyahu has been attacking the US proposal without knowing its content. Washington and Tehran continue to use their back channels of communication to bypass their five fellow world powers before they meet in Geneva for the next round of negotiations with Iran on Nov. 20.” [51277, 51278]

Former Federal Trade Commission head Orson Swindle tells *NationalReview.com*’s Andrew Stiles that the Obama administration officials responsible for *Healthcare.gov*

would be “taken to the shed and horsewhipped” by federal regulators if they were working for a private company. Stiles notes that Obama’s “oft-repeated falsehood, ‘If you like your plan, you can keep your plan’—something the administration knew was untrue—would almost certainly be a textbook case of deceptive advertising, punishable under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits ‘unfair or deceptive acts or practice in or affecting commerce.’ This includes a ‘representation, omission or practice that is likely to mislead the consumer,’ such that the consumer would be ‘likely to have chosen differently but for the deception.’ Other examples of potentially deceptive practices include the apparently deliberate decision to withhold information from HealthCare.gov visitors as to the actual prices of the policies offered via the exchanges. In fact, users aren’t told how much those policies will cost until after they have created an account, which requires giving a slew of personal and financial information. ...Private companies engaged in HealthCare.gov’s kind of behavior would face severe consequences, Swindle tells National Review Online. ‘Businessmen would lose their businesses, salesmen would lose their licenses—that’s the kind of thing we are talking about here,’ he says. ‘The bottom line is that no private entity would be allowed to get away with what the Obama administration is trying to get away with.’” [51293, 51303]

Best-selling author, attorney, and radio talk show host Mark Levin plays recordings of Obama repeating his “If you like your plan you can keep it” lie, and tells his audience: “I have a question for you, it is a perfectly legitimate question. This man [Obama] and his party have destroyed healthcare for millions of Americans. You folks are not gonna get it back unless this entire system is withdrawn. Millions more of you are gonna fall under the same trap. Remember, he’s talking about one year to get them through the midterm elections. Millions of you who work for larger businesses—50 or more employees—you’re next, tens of millions of you. This [ObamaCare] is the greatest scam in modern American history. I talked about it last week. It is the greatest fraud in modern American history. There’s never been a Ponzi scheme like it. There’s never been a corporate crime like it—never, ever before. So let me put it to you this way: if this isn’t an impeachable offense, then what is? He lied repeatedly. He schemed repeatedly. His entire party did it. This is an attack on the American system from within. That’s exactly what it was. If this is not an impeachable offense, then what is?” [51351]

The Wall Street Journal reports that UnitedHealth Group is dropping thousands of doctors from its networks because of ObamaCare’s reductions in funding of the Medicare Advantage program. “Medicare Advantage, an alternative to traditional Medicare, combines hospital and doctor coverage and often includes prescription drugs and perks like gym memberships. Enrollment has more than doubled since 2004 to 13 million in 2012, which represents about 27 percent of Americans on Medicare. The federal government pays private insurers a per-capita fee to manage the benefits. The rate is currently about 12 percent more than the average Medicare patient spends annually. The Obama administration plans to cut those extra payments to insurers by about \$150 billion over the next 10 years” to help pay for ObamaCare. [51279, 51280, 51281, 51282]

On *Special Report* Charles Krauthammer slams Obama's "administrative fix" for his "you can keep your plan" lie: "[H]e pretended to want to restore the plans to people who lost them, because it is a sham. It was only intended to shift the blame [to the insurance companies]. His intent is for these plans *not* to be renewed. He knows how impossible it'll be. He knows how many of the insurers will refuse to do it. He knows how many of the state commissioners will refuse it. So he knows only a trickle will come back. And the reason he intends that is because if all these people are renewed, and they stay out of the exchanges, the [ObamaCare] exchanges will collapse. He needs the young and the healthy to pay [for] the extra stuff; they need them to pay the higher [premiums] than they would otherwise so they can subsidize the older and the sick. So his intent is that it shouldn't happen. If [Obama] hadn't done that, shift the blame without really changing what happens on the ground, who gets his policy or not, there would have been a hundred Democrats or 120 [voting for Congressman Fred Upton's bill]. That would've been a huge embarrassment, it would have been a collapse, and it would have been a complete—that would've happened, that's why he had to do the press conference. Because that would've been a rebellion against him and he would lose... complete control of the party and been a lame-duck less than a year into the second term. So I would say the 40 [the 39 Democrats who voted for Upton's bill] is a substantial number, but the problem is, the Democrats in the Senate, the ones who are really in trouble, and who need a bill so they can have a vote on the record that says, 'I voted to maintain the plans.' If they don't, their [Republican] opponents in the election next year are gonna play over and over their own statements, the Democrats' statements, 'If you like your plan you can keep it,' and they will all lose. So [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid has been holding out, but the pressure on him is gonna get enormous." [51295]

On the PBS *News Hour*, liberal host Judy Woodruff asks liberal commentator Mark Shields, "With [Obama] acknowledging yesterday that he was not on top of this [ObamaCare fiasco], Mark, he really didn't know all these problems, what could he be doing and saying at this point to get beyond this?" Shields responds, "It wasn't, 'This is mine and I'm gonna make sure that it never happens again. This is going to work.' Judy, this is beyond the Obama administration. If this goes down, if the Obamacare—if health care, the Affordable Care Act is deemed a failure, this is the end, ...I really mean it—of liberal government. Time and again, social programs have made the difference in this country. The public confidence for that will be so depleted, so diminished that I really think the change... the equation of American politics changes. ...The one thing that could save the Democrats, having given that apocalyptic assessment, is the Republicans. They are rooting for failure. They're just cheering for failure. There's not a sense of what we can do to make this work or, 'This isn't gonna work, but we're gonna come up with something better.'" (For some Republicans, of course, "something better" is liberty.) [51344]

On MSNBC, leftist Brit Martin Bashir calls former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin an "outstanding candidate" for the practice of defecating and urinating into her mouth and face. (Bashir later apologizes. He is not fired. Barack "call for civility" Obama has no comment.) [51423]

On November 16 Townhall.com notes Oprah Winfrey's use of the "race card" to defend Obama. Jeff Crouere writes, "During a recent BBC interview, Winfrey blasted U.S. Congressman Joe Wilson (R-SC) who called [Obama] a 'liar.' She also said that 'There's a level of disrespect for the office that occurs and that occurs in some cases and maybe even many cases because he's African American.' Obviously, these comments are pure hogwash. Regarding Obama, race is often at the forefront of the discussion, usually from his supporters, not his adversaries. His fans are always claiming that he is the victim of racism, when the evidence shows just the contrary. [Obama] has received preferential treatment from the media because of his race and liberal policies." (So, of course, has Winfrey. She also said in her BBC interview, "There are still generations of people, older people, who were born and bred and marinated in it, in that prejudice and racism, and they just have to die," She is not asked if Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson should be included in that categorization.) [51276, 51485, 51519, 51520, 51549, 51566, 51615, 51637]

More than 30,000 residents of Georgia sign a petition demanding that ObamaCare be repealed and that the University of Georgia stop training ObamaCare "navigators." [51735, 51736]

In the London-based Saudi daily *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*, 'Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rashed, the director of *Al-Arabiya*, writes, "[W]e are confident that Saudi Arabia does not have [nuclear] bombs or a nuclear military project. The question now is: If the United States allows Iran to build nuclear weapons, why [is it not] the right of Saudi Arabia, Iran's neighbor, to protect itself and do the same? This would allow Saudi Arabia to maintain the balance of power with Iran. The two countries that have been in conflict for more than three decades. A similar situation occurred when Pakistan acquired nuclear weapons in order to maintain the regional balance of power in light of India's nuclear weapon. From a theoretical, political and military perspective, Saudi Arabia will have to protect itself from the Iranian regime's nuclear program either with a nuclear weapon or via agreements that will maintain the regional balance of power and protect Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states. ...The ideal solution is to insist on preventing Iran from building nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, however, the involvement of ...Obama's government in six months of negotiations boosts Iran's confidence that it can force the international community to accept it as a nuclear country, despite all the offers, guarantees and promises made to stop this from happening." [51478, 51479]

At WashingtonExaminer.com Byron York posts a June 23, 2009 exchange between Congressman Tom Price (R-GA) and Christian Romer, who was then the chair of Obama's Council of Economic Advisers. (Romer was testifying at a hearing about the pending ObamaCare legislation.) Price asks, "You also mentioned, as other folks have, that [Obama's] goal—and it's reiterated over and over and over—that if you like your current plan or if you like your current doctor, you can keep them. Do you know where that is in the bill?" Romer responds, "Absolutely. And things like the employer mandate is part of making sure that large employers that today—the vast majority of them do provide health insurance. One of the things that's—" Price: "I'm asking about if an individual likes their current plan and maybe they don't get it through their employer and

maybe in fact their plan doesn't comply with every parameter of the current draft bill, how are they going to be able to keep that?" Romer: "So [Obama] is fundamentally talking about maintaining what's good about the system that we have. And—" Price: "That's not my question." Romer: "One of the things that he has been saying is, for example, you may like your plan and one of the things we may do is slow the growth rate of the cost of your plan, right? So that's something that is not only—" Price: "The question is whether or not patients are going to be able to keep their plan if they like it. What if, for example, there's an employer out there—and you've said that if the employers that already provide health insurance, health coverage for their employees, that they'll be just fine, right? What if the policy that those employees and that employer like and provide for their employees doesn't comply with the specifics of the bill? Will they be able to keep that one?" Romer: "So certainly my understanding—and I won't pretend to be an expert in the bill—but certainly I think what's being planned is, for example, for plans in the exchange to have a minimum level of benefits." Price: "So if I were to tell you that in the bill it says that if a plan doesn't comply with the specifics that are outlined in the bill that that employer's going to have to move to the—to a different plan within five years—would you—would that be unusual, or would that seem outrageous to you?" Romer: "I think the crucial thing is, what kind of changes are we talking about? [Obama] was saying he wanted the American people to know that fundamentally if you like what you have it will still be there." Price: "What if you like what you have, Dr. Romer, though, and it doesn't fit with the definition in the bill? My reading of the bill is that you can't keep that." Romer: "I think the crucial thing—the bill is talking about setting a minimum standard of what can count—" Price: "So it's possible that you may like what you have, but you may not be able to keep it? Right?" Romer: "We'd have—I'd have to look at the specifics." (This stunning exchange makes it clear that Price, a doctor understood that ObamaCare would result in Americans losing their health insurance policies. Romer obviously knew that as well, but dodged and weaved and lied to avoid admitting that reality.) [51349]

FoxNews.com reports, "Attorney General Eric Holder wants to appeal a recent judge's ruling that allows the House to continue with its contempt case, related to Holder's refusal to turn over documents concerning the Justice Department's failed Operation Fast and Furious gun-tracking program. Holder made the request Friday night to U.S. District Court Judge Amy Berman Jackson [an Obama appointee], asking that the Justice Department be allowed to put the case in front of a federal appeals court before Jackson makes any final decisions. In September, Jackson rejected the Obama administration's request to have the case dismissed. The GOP-led House voted last year to put Holder in contempt of court after ...Obama invoked executive privilege and Holder refused to turn over the documents." [51285, 51335, 51385, 51434]

Also at FoxNews.com, "Joseph Weber writes, "The widespread speculation this week on whether Massachusetts Sen. Elizabeth Warren could upstage Hillary Clinton's 'coronation' as the 2016 Democratic presidential nominee has rankled fellow party members but appears just fine with Republicans. Republicans suggest that Warren, among the Senate's most liberal or progressive members, could ride the recent populist wave and force Clinton further to the left—or at least slow her juggernaut and improve

their chances in 2016. ‘We’d welcome Elizabeth Warren to the race,’ Republican National Committee spokeswoman Kirsten Kukowski tells FoxNews.com. ‘It’s just another example of how Hillary will have a hard time making the sale within her own party, let alone the country.’” Ron Bonjean, former press secretary to former Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, comments, “Having a liberal, left-wing candidate like Senator Warren makes running much easier for any Republican candidate because the public will view her as extreme. She’ll be portrayed as a Massachusetts liberal out of touch with middle class families, especially in battleground states like South Carolina and Ohio. I doubt she would be able to identify with those voters.” (It was Warren from whom Obama lifted his “You didn’t build that” argument.) [51287, 51288]

WashingtonPost.com reports, “A day after he questioned ...Obama’s decision to unwind a major tenet of the health-care law and said the nation’s capital might not go along, D.C. insurance commissioner William P. White was fired. White was called into a meeting Friday afternoon with one of Mayor Vincent C. Gray’s (D) top deputies and told that the mayor ‘wants to go in a different direction,’ White told The Washington Post on Saturday. White said the mayoral deputy never said that he was being asked to leave because of his Thursday statement on health care. But he said the timing was hard to ignore. Roughly 24 hours later, White said, he was ‘basically being told, ‘Thanks, but no thanks.’” White was one of the first insurance commissioners in the nation last week to push back against Obama’s attempt to smooth over part of the botched rollout of the Affordable Care Act: millions of unexpected cancellations of insurance plans.” After Obama announced his illegal “fix” on November 15, White stated, “The action today undercuts the purpose of the exchanges, including the District’s DC Health Link, by creating exceptions that make it more difficult for them to operate.” White also expressed agreement with “a statement issued by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners that said the Obama order ‘threatens to undermine the new market, and may lead to higher premiums and market disruptions in 2014 and beyond.’ ‘We concur with that assessment,’ White said Thursday.” [51299, 51312, 51321, 51334]

At NationalReview.com Andrew C. McCarthy writes, “One laughs now remembering how Obama’s base, the anti-anti-terrorist Left and its lawyer legions, used to call Bush the ‘imperial president’ and thunder for his impeachment. Bush couldn’t hold a candle to our incumbent Caligula. He had no idea, for example, that presidents can just ‘waive’ inconvenient parts of congressional statutes... Not only is a president barred from writing or rewriting laws; he is required to enforce them as Congress has written them. The only exception is when he has a good-faith reason to believe they are unconstitutional, a claim Obama can hardly make about Obamacare while crowing that the Supreme Court has upheld it. (Actually, the Supreme Court invalidated half of Obamacare—the state Medicaid mandate—and rejected Obama’s Commerce Clause argument on the individual mandate, upholding it, at least for the time being, on a tax theory that Obama had indignantly disclaimed. But as we’ve seen, this is not a [person] who lets facts slow him down.) ...Obama claims a power to enforce laws selectively under the doctrine of ‘prosecutorial discretion.’ This is merely an allocation doctrine, however: a commonsense acknowledgment that finite resources make it impossible to enforce every law equally. An administration, for example, might say, ‘DEA [Drug Enforcement

Agency] has finite resources, so we're going to focus on heroin trafficking rather than marijuana possession.' This does not mean the administration is saying marijuana possession is no longer a crime; just that it has higher enforcement priorities and a limited budget. To the contrary, Obama has distorted the doctrine to claim, in effect, that illegalities he unilaterally chooses not to police are somehow no longer illegal—at least until the 'waivers' he grants expire. (I would call the waivers capricious, but there really is a rigor to them—they expire after Election Day to protect Democrats from political accountability.)” [51301]

“Prosecutorial discretion is the fig leaf Obama uses to rationalize his noxious decision to relieve corporations, political cronies, and members of Congress from their Obamacare burdens while the rest of us are crushed under ours. It is also the hocus-pocus behind his latest fix. Panicked by millions who've lost coverage, sinking poll numbers, and jittery Democrats, [Obama] is now purporting to allow insurance companies to ignore the law and reissue the policies Obamacare's mandates forced them to terminate. But here is the problem: This 'waiver' is irrelevant. Even if it were constitutionally proper for [Obama] to flout Congress in the executive branch's enforcement practices, all that means is that the Obama administration will give insurers a pass until 2014. The Obama 'waiver' does not change what Congress's law actually says, and therefore it has no bearing on the legal obligations attendant to the relationship between the insurer and the insured. As a practical matter, it is nearly inconceivable that insurance companies would be able to reissue the canceled health-care plans. ...But even if it could be done, the insurance companies would be insane to offer plans that failed to comply with the letter of the Obamacare statute. Similarly, the state insurance commissioners would be insane to permit them, and Americans would be insane to buy them. The policies would be legally unenforceable. ...The health-insurance companies, too, would be deluged with lawsuits by insureds who claimed that the policies were illegal and wrongly denied coverage for this or that treatment. The insurance companies themselves would get into the act, filing suits to be compensated for payouts they'd made based on the illegal policies. The Obama 'waiver' would avail them of nothing in a court, where a judge would be obliged to follow the law, not Dear Leader's enforcement preferences.” [51301]

“...Obama has no constitutional leg to stand on in violating—and, by his waivers, encouraging violations of—the Obamacare law. The insurance companies have no hope of immunity. ...Obama is fighting any congressional tinkering with Obamacare for fear that the unpopular law will be gutted. So there will be no legislative immunity for the health-insurance companies—which means there will be no meaningful immunity, period. Obama is a charlatan, but not a stupid one. He knows what he did on Thursday was a legal charade. His “waivers” are no more about law than Obamacare is about delivering quality health care. Thursday was a performance contrived to set the insurance companies up. With Americans boiling over coverage cancellations, Obama publicly called on the insurers to offer policies that he well knows his own law makes illegal and that his “waiver” is powerless to legitimize. He desperately hopes Americans will be gulled into blaming the insurance companies for the catastrophe he has wrought. He would have gotten away with it a year ago. He won't get away with it now.” [51301]

On the Tea Party Power Hour, host Mark Gillar interviews document expert Douglas Vogt, who discusses his legal actions against Obama and proof that Obama's birth certificate is a blatant forgery. Vogt has filed evidence of the forgery in accordance with "misprision of felony and treason" laws, which call for citizens to report acts of felony and treason. (The judge essentially ignored Vogt's argument and simply declared he had no standing to sue—even though Vogt is not suing and one does not need "standing" to report a crime. Arguably, the judge has committed misprision of felony and treason and is an accessory after the fact because he has seen the evidence presented by Vogt and has chosen not to present it to a grand jury.) Vogt explains to Gillar that the judge now "has the ultimate hot potato." Vogt also charges that NBC and MSNBC have been the strongest Obama supporters because their former parent company, General Electric, was bailed out by the Obama administration with its FDIC guarantee of billions of dollars in bad debt owned by GE Capital. General Electric therefore owes Obama expensive favors—which is why NBC reporter Savannah Guthrie lied about having seen Obama's original birth certificate and having "felt its raised seal." According to Vogt, the birth certificate forger is a woman who knew Obama "when they were kids in Hawaii." (If Vogt is correct, the forger is not Valerie Jarrett or Bernardine Dohrn—both of whom *The Obama Timeline* has considered candidates for the crime.) Vogt argues that the truth about the birth certificate forgery is not reported because the media—including Fox News—is controlled. Gillar notes that reporters who have seen forgery evidence compiled by Sheriff Joe Arpaio's cold case posse have told lead investigator Mike Zullo their editors have ordered them not to pursue the story because they will not permit it to be published or broadcast. [51313, 51314, 51315, 51576, 51578, 51886]

Radio talk show host, author, and columnist Monica Crowley addresses a Restoration Weekend audience in Florida. She relates that she had met a woman who "worked for one of the big three networks on the evening newscasts" (ABC, CBS, or NBC) who told her, "Monica, I've been in this business for 30 years and it's always been biased, it's always leaned to the left, but I've never seen anything like this. ...Every morning at 10 a.m. we have a staff meeting for what we're going to do for the evening news that night, and people literally say, out loud, 'How do we protect Barack Obama today?'" [52095, 52158]

Saturday Night Live lampoons Obama and ObamaCare with an "advertisement" for Paxil: "It feels like even your friends have turned against you. ...And it's beginning to affect your work. Ask your doctor for Paxil, second-term strength. The only anti-depressant strong enough for an embattled second term. So you can get back on your feet and start running the country again. With Paxil you'll feel like you're giving a speech at a college campus in 2008. Or getting [Osama] bin Laden, all over again. So you can turn those approval ratings upside down. And Paxil's second-term strength treats a whole range of symptoms, like Benghazi, the NSA scandal, the IRS scandal, the AP scandal, the Petraeus scandal, that time Jay-Z and Beyonce went to Cuba, and, of course, ObamaCare web site problems. Warning: Paxil is not covered by ObamaCare. We promised that it would be, but it's not. And for that we apologize..." [51332, 51338]

On November 17 Barack “I won’t rest until every American who needs a job has one” Obama plays golf, and then attends a college basketball game—where he is greeted with some boos from the crowd. [51309, 51664]

The *Times of Israel* reports, “Israel is working on coordinating plans for a possible military strike with Saudi Arabia, with Riyadh prepared to provide tactical support to Jerusalem, a British newspaper reported early Sunday. The two countries have both united in worry that the West [that is, mostly Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry] may come to terms with Iran, easing sanctions and allowing the Islamic Republic to continue its nuclear program. According to the Sunday Times, Riyadh has agreed to let Israel use its airspace in a military strike on Iran and cooperate over the use of rescue helicopters, tanker planes and drones. ‘The Saudis are furious and are willing to give Israel all the help it needs,’ an unnamed diplomatic source told the paper. The report comes as Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is in the midst of a blitz to lobby against a deal and cobble together an international alliance opposed to an agreement that allows Iran to continue enriching uranium. ...Should a deal be reached at talks set to resume in Geneva on Wednesday, according to the diplomatic source, a military option would be back on the table. Saudi tactical support, in lieu of backup from the Pentagon, would be vital for a long-range mission targeting Iran’s nuclear program. Saudi Arabia, a Sunni Muslim country across the Persian Gulf from Iran has long been at odds with Tehran, and fears a nuclear weapon would threaten Riyadh and set off a nuclear arms race in the region.” (At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller comments, “It is astounding. Consider how monumental the blunders of the jihadi stooge in the White House must be for an alliance of such divergent powers to align. Nothing happens for decades, then decades happen in a day. Israel is working with the Saudis, and France is considering the option of aligning with the Middle East powers—Israel, Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Egypt—which challenge ...Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry’s race for détente with Tehran.”) [51305, 51317]

On *Meet the Press*, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) refuses to admit that she promised Americans could keep their insurance plans—even after host David Gregory plays a 2009 video of Pelosi making that promise. Pelosi argues there wasn’t “anything in the law that said if you like what you had before 2010 you couldn’t keep it.” Gregory also plays Pelosi’s 2010 statement, “But we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it” and comments on the unintended consequences of ObamaCare as a result of the law being rushed through without Republican support. Her strange and convoluted answer: “No, what I was saying there is, we are [the] House and the Senate. We get a bill. We go to conference or we ping-pong it, and then you see what the final product is. However, I stand by what I said there. When people see what is in the bill, they will like it. And they will. And so, while there’s a lot of hoop-di-doo and ado about what’s happening now—very appropriate. I’m not criticizing. I’m saying it took a great deal for us to pass this bill. I said if we go up to the gate and the gate is locked, we’ll unlock the gate. If we can’t do that, we’ll climb the fence. If the fence is too high, we’ll pole vault in. If we can’t do that, we’ll helicopter in, but we’ll get it done. We had to pass the test of the courts, and we did. The first rollout in the first part of the first year of the implementation went very smoothly. The website did not work; that has caused problems

complicating people transitioning from those policies to the other. But, again, this is never thought to be easy. And the fact is, it doesn't matter what we're saying here: What matters? What happens at the kitchen table of the American people and how they will have more affordability, more accessibility, better quality care, prevention, wellness, a healthier nation honoring the vows of our founders of life, a healthier life. Liberty to pursue their happiness—not be chained by a policy.” (Leftist web site Politicususa.com claims Pelosi “guts David Gregory’s Republican talking points and ACA lies” and “shot down his BS. ...Nancy Pelosi gave Democrats a road map for handling media over the next couple of weeks. No retreat, no surrender, and no apologies for making the healthcare system better for hundreds of millions of people.”) [51307, 51311, 51327, 51328, 51333, 51337]

On *Fox News Sunday* Liz Cheney, who is challenging Senator Mike Enzi (R-WY) in the 2014 Republican primary, says there was “no way” Obama could not have known millions of Americans would lose their insurance because of ObamaCare. “There’s no question that he lied, and we’re all paying the price for it now. There’s no way he could not have known the truth.” [51310, 51329]

Also on *Fox News Sunday*, George Will remarks, “Well, I think Republicans have offered serious alternatives [to ObamaCare] all along. But right now—no, I mean, [Obama], his name is on it. He did it without any other votes, so live with it. One Republican put it brazenly, [Steve] Scalise of Louisiana—congressman. He said [Obama] is like a man who burns your house down and then shows up with an empty water bucket, and then delivers a lecture on how bad your house was before he burned it down. That’s an untenable position for [Obama] to be in. It was nine months ago, an official of the Centers on Medicaid and Medicare Services told a conference, what we want to avoid [is] a third-world experience. And we’ve had the third world experience. And what [panel member] Judy [Miller] rather delicately calls [Obama’s] accommodation looks to a great many of us to be illegal. What we’re told in grade school when we study civics is that in that building behind you are the two legislative chambers of the federal government, Senate and the House. It turns out there is a third, it’s called the White House press room, into which [Obama] can, on a whim, sashay and rewrite laws. It’s an extraordinary civics lesson.” [51326]

On ABC’s *This Week*, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) admits “we [Senators] all knew” insurance policies would be canceled because of ObamaCare. She says Obama “should’ve just been specific [with his “keep your plan” promise]. ...No, we all knew. The whole point of the plan is to cover things people need, like preventive care, birth control, pregnancy. How many women, the minute they get pregnant, might risk their coverage. How many women paid more because of their gender, because they might get pregnant. Those are the reforms.” (Gillibrand is mistaken, as Obama was *quite specific*. The problem was that he lied.) Democrat legislators seem to be separating into three camps: (1) The delusional Democrats, such as Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi (D-CA). (“No, *Obama did not lie*, and of course you *can* keep your plan—as long as it is not what we consider a ‘substandard plan.’”) (2) The frightened Democrats who are up for reelection in 2014, such as Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA). (“We had *absolutely no idea*

ObamaCare would cause people to lose their insurance, but now we need to do something about it.) (3) The safe Democrats who are not up for reelection in 2014, such as Gillibrand. (“We knew people would lose their plans, but that was the idea: to move them into much better plans for which they will eventually be eternally grateful.”) [51326, 51336, 51345, 51375]

FoxNews.com reports, “The U.S. Department of Defense reportedly hired an Afghan company with terrorist ties to do work on a NATO facility last year, according to the top official overseeing reconstruction efforts in the war-torn nation. The Army Times reports Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction John Sopko cited the contract with Zurmat Material Testing Laboratory in a Nov. 8 letter to Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel as part of a larger pattern resulting in \$150 million of Pentagon payments to various concerns with insurgent ties. ...The U.S. Commerce Department noted the relationship between Zurmat and insurgents in early 2012 by citing the company having supplied bomb-making materials to enemy forces, according to Army Times. Then—and in September of 2012—Marine Gen. James Mattis, who was at the time head of U.S. Central Command, reportedly requested the Pentagon ban the Zurmat Group, Zurmat Material Testing Laboratory’s parent company, from doing work in the region under his auspices. The U.S. Central Command, or CENTCOM, is responsible for military operations in much of the Middle East and Asia. But according to Sopko’s letter to Hagel, Zurmat still obtained a contract in November 2012 to do construction-related work at the Parwan Justice Center Complex, the site of a U.S.-run prison next to Bagram Airfield. According to Army Times, Sopko discovered the Zurmat contract during an unrelated 2013 investigation into shoddy work at the Afghan facility.” [51308]

Breitbart.com reports on continuing Muslim violence against Christians in Nigeria, where Christian men are murdered and Christian women are kidnapped, raped, and forced to convert to Islam. (The problem is no less severe in Syria, where Obama-backed rebels have raped, kidnapped, and executed Christians. AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller observes, “Christians from Egypt to Libya to Syria to Nigeria to Pakistan to Iraq and beyond are oppressed, subjugated, cleansed, slaughtered by Muslim supremacists under the sharia. And the West’s response? Denial, and obsession with imposing Islam in the public school and the public square, while destroying those of us who oppose jihad.”) [51525, 51526, 51533, 51534, 51535]

On November 18 Katie Kieffer reports at Townhall.com that the Obama administration is offering high school seniors \$30,000 per year in tuition and benefits if they plan on “majoring in computer science or computer/electrical engineering” and agree to work for the National Security Agency. The benefits include: “Housing and travel entitlements available during summer employment... Year-round salary... Guaranteed continued employment with NSA after graduation... Receive annual and sick leave and paid federal holidays... Health and life insurance... Participation in federal retirement plans.” Kieffer comments, “Seriously? This is what Obama is pushing on our young people? This is a complete joke. Young people should be encouraged to pursue careers in their field of interest that utilize their talents, not to troll Facebook, text messages and who knows what

else to keep America ‘safe’ ...er, wait, *not* to keep them safe from underwear bombers and marathon bombers.” [51320]

DailyCaller.com reports that the Obama “is giving wind power producers a pass by not going after them for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of federally protected birds and bats. But the feds have gone after fossil fuel and other companies that have killed these animals. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently has 18 open investigations into bird and bat deaths due to wind power operations, according to a service spokeswoman, with 14 of these cases involving the death of at least one golden eagle—which are federally protected under three different laws. Seven of these cases have been referred to the U.S. Justice Department for ‘potential prosecution.’ A spokesman with the Justice Department, however, told The Daily Caller News Foundation that there ‘have been no prosecutions to date under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the Bald and Gold Eagle Protection Act related to the deaths of migratory birds, including eagles, at wind facilities.’” [51324]

PhoenixNewTimes.com reports, “A prominent local activist for LGBT and anti-bullying causes has been indicted on more than a dozen charges of sexual conduct with a minor. Caleb Laieski, 18, has been nationally recognized for his advocacy, after overcoming anti-gay bullying that led him to drop out of high school. He was prominently featured in an anti-bullying documentary, earned a gig acting as a youth and diversity advocate for Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton’s office, and even met with ...Obama and Vice President Biden to talk about LGBT youth issues.” [52850]

At TheDailyBeast.com Josh Rogan writes, “Before Secretary of State John Kerry’s recent trip to Cairo, National Security Adviser Susan Rice told him to make strong statements in public and private about the trial of deposed President Mohamed Morsi. On his own, Kerry decided to disregard the White House’s instructions. The tension between the national security adviser and the secretary of state spilled over into public view in the past week, when Rice laid out her critical appraisal of the Egyptian government, which contradicted Kerry’s assessment that Egypt was ‘on the path to democracy.’ The now public rift has been simmering behind the scenes for months and illustrates the strikingly divergent Egypt policies the White House and the State Department are pursuing. ... ‘John Kerry doesn’t agree with Susan Rice on big portions of our Egypt policy, and he made a deliberate and conscious decision not to mention Morsi in his Cairo meetings,’ an administration official told The Daily Beast. ‘Susan Rice wasn’t happy about it.’” (Rice, like Obama, would like to see the radical Muslim Brotherhood back in power in Egypt.) [51570, 51571, 51572]

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey tells the Wall Street Journal CEO Council the U.S. military would meet “some defined obligations” to Israel if it strikes Iran’s nuclear facilities. “I feel like we have a deep obligation to Israel. That is why we are in constant contact and collaboration with them.” Dempsey also states, “If we had one of my Israeli counterparts sitting here, they would tell you that most of the Arabs living in Israel have a better life than the Arabs living in the rest of the region and that is true.” (AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller comments, “In the anti-semitic, post-American

world of Obama, this kind of talk is like an extraordinarily sweet and fragrant breeze off a steaming pile of O-dung.”) [51476, 51477]

At Breitbart.com Brian Cates writes, “The Times Of Israel is reporting that a team of negotiators led by [Iranian-born] White House adviser Valerie Jarrett [who some believe may still speak Farsi] has been conducting secret talks with Iran about it’s [sic; its] nuclear weapons program for the past year. The report states the deal submitted in Geneva earlier this month was a direct result of these secret year-long negotiations between teams headed by Jarrett and Iran’s Ali Akbar Salehi. That deal was ultimately rejected when France and Israel raised strong objections, and talks are expected to resume this Wednesday [November 20]. The White House was very quick to issue a categorical denial of the report. According to White House spokesperson Bernadette Meehan, ‘Those rumors are absolutely, 100 percent false.’ If this report is found to be accurate despite the administration’s fast denial, the fact that Jarrett is leading the U.S. negotiating team on Iran’s nuclear weapons program is very troubling. She does not appear to have any foreign policy experience or history of being involved in such high level negotiations of this nature.” (Jarrett, Obama, and Secretary of State John Kerry do not care whether they get a good agreement; they will settle for *any* agreement because it will make Obama look good in the short term, even if it results in the destruction of Israel and a massive Middle East conflagration in the long run.) [51331, 51703, 51868]

White House press secretary Jay Carney reduces the pledge to fix Healthcare.gov by the end of the month to an 80 percent promise, telling reporters, “I think the way to look at that figure is that of, say, 10 who go on the system, roughly two won’t get through the system.” [51339]

According to a Gallup poll, 56 percent of Americans believe it is not the responsibility of government to ensure that everyone has health care, but “Prior to 2009, a clear majority of Americans consistently had said the government should take responsibility for ensuring that all Americans have healthcare.” [51340, 51374]

WorldTribune.com reports that the Obama administration “has acknowledged a dispute with Saudi Arabia. The White House has assessed that the United States and Saudi Arabia disagreed on a range of issues regarding threats in the Middle East. A senior official cited Egypt, Iran and Syria. This marked the first admission by the White House of a Saudi feud with the United States. Saudi officials have warned that they would take independent action on a range of Middle East issues and support Egypt’s new military rulers. ...In an address to the Washington Ideas Forum on Nov. 13, Ms. Rice, regarded as close to Obama, addressed a key dispute between Riyadh and the United States. She said Saudi Arabia expected that Washington should support the new military-backed regime in Egypt in wake of the coup against its first Islamist president in July 2013.” (Rice and Obama are not, however, enthusiastic about the interim government in Egypt and would have preferred that the radical Muslim Brotherhood remained in power.) [51341]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “Staff at a U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services [CIS] field office in California were regularly pressured by senior officials to fast-track

visa applications from wealthy and well-connected foreign investors, causing security concerns so severe that the program was moved to Washington this year. Documents obtained by The Washington Times and whistleblower accounts from inside the CIS Laguna Niguel field office show that staffers, who said they were acting under orders from senior officials, often rushed or skipped altogether economic reviews of applicants to the EB-5 visa program, which doles out coveted green cards to foreign investors who sink \$500,000 or more into a U.S.-based business.” [51397]

FoxNews.com reports, “While millions of Americans are watching their individual policies get canceled due to ObamaCare regulations, the new health care rules are also having a major impact on college campuses. For decades, universities and colleges have offered students bare-bones policies. But because of the Affordable Care Act, those policies no longer cut it—and universities are forced to decide whether to offer significantly higher-cost plans or cancel coverage altogether. The new rules affect a broad swath of American schools, especially the small ones. At Bowie State University in Maryland, the cost of student health insurance policies went from roughly \$100 a year to \$1,800 a year. ...In New Jersey, students who enrolled in this past semester were the first class that had to shoulder the higher premium costs. Many community colleges in Bergen and Passaic counties were forced to cut student coverage altogether. ...According to the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, students at nine schools in the state saw the cost of their policies triple, Paul Shelly, a spokesman for the organization told North Jersey.com. ...Administrators at Lenoir-Rhyne University in North Carolina, Cornell College in Iowa and the University of Puget Sound in Washington also told students they would be dropping school-sponsored coverage. The three schools say student premiums would have gone up 10-fold.” [51342]

Senate Republicans block Obama’s nomination of Robert Wilkins to the D.C. Circuit Court.

DailyCaller.com reports, “An IRS official blasted Lois Lerner for her attempt to blame the agency’s targeting scandal on low-level employees in Cincinnati, according to newly released emails. ‘Cincinnati wasn’t publicly ‘thrown under the bus’ (but) instead was hit by a convoy of Mack trucks,’ wrote Cindy Thomas, former director of the IRS exempt organizations office in Cincinnati, in a May 10, 2013 email to Lerner obtained by the House Ways and Means Committee. Thomas wrote the email on the very day that the IRS targeting scandal broke when Lerner, a senior agency official based in Washington, D.C., admitted that her exempt organizations division engaged in improper targeting of conservative groups. Lerner initially claimed that the agency’s Cincinnati office was solely responsible for the practice. The New York Times went to bat for the administration, characterizing the Cincinnati office as a ‘backwater’ filled with ‘low-level employees.’ But Thomas wasn’t having it. ‘As you can imagine, employees and managers (in the Cincinnati tax-exempt division) are furious,’ Thomas wrote to Lerner. ‘Was it also communicated at that conference in Washington that the low-level workers in Cincinnati asked the Washington office for assistance and the Washington office took no action to provide guidance to the low-level workers?’ Thomas wrote. ‘...How am I supposed to keep the low-level workers motivated when the public believes they are

nothing more than low-level and now will have no respect for how they are working cases? The attitude/morale of employees is at the lowest it has ever been,' Thomas wrote." [51348]

Aaron Albright joins the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) as communications director; his duties will include defending Healthcare.gov. (DailyCaller.com notes that Albright recently issued a Twitter message, "I want to murder these SonyPS4 ads with their Lou Reed 'Perfect Day' song. fuck them." (Whether Albright will demonstrate similar "communication skills" when dealing with the media remains to be seen.) [51360]

In a 14-minute telephone call to members of his propaganda arm, Organizing for Action, Obama encourages them to continue supporting his agenda, saying, "I've never lost faith in our ability to get this done... you guys have lifted me up, and lifted each other up at every step of the way, and I know you're going to just keep on doing that. ... We have experienced discouragement and setbacks and naysayers every step of the way, but you know when you're on the right side of something, then it gives you energy, it gives you motivation. ... All the people out there who need help, everybody out there who is working hard but just finding that the system kinda feels rigged against him... that's got to motivate us." During the call, Obama claims "more than 100 million Americans" had signed up for ObamaCare via Healthcare.gov. According to the *Daily Mail*, "A weary-sounding Obama made his gaffe during the call, hosted by Organizing For Action, the nonprofit successor to his campaign organization Obama For America. The group claimed 200,000 people managed to listen, aided by an RSVP process that included a fundraising solicitation." [51346, 51354, 51357, 51380, 51430, 51431, 51589]

CNSNews.com reports that the Obama administration borrowed just over \$1 trillion in the six weeks after the start of the federal government's fiscal year 2014, which commenced October 1. "The lion's share went to payoff maturing securities the Treasury had sold before and had now come due. In total, according to the Daily Treasury Statement, the Treasury needed to redeem \$879,734,000,000 in maturing debt..." [51379]

At NYPost.com John Crudele reports, "Just two years before the [2012] presidential election, the Census Bureau had caught an employee fabricating data that went into the unemployment report, which is one of the most closely watched measures of the economy. And a knowledgeable source says the deception went beyond that one employee—that it escalated at the time ... Obama was seeking reelection in 2012 and continues today. 'He's not the only one,' said the source, who asked to remain anonymous for now but is willing to talk with the Labor Department and Congress if asked. The Census employee caught faking the results is Julius Buckmon, according to confidential Census documents obtained by The Post. Buckmon told me in an interview this past weekend that he was told to make up information [for the monthly "household survey"] by higher-ups at Census." (As noted previously in *The Obama Timeline*, in 2009 Congresswoman Michele Bachmann (R-MN) Fought efforts by Obama to place the Census Bureau under the direction of his then-chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel. A career

professional at the Bureau of the Census told the *Wall Street Journal's* John Fund “There’s only one reason to have that high level of White House involvement, and it’s called politics, not science.”) Rush Limbaugh says, “I’m ready for apologies from the drive-by media. I’m open, and I will graciously accept apologies from everybody who mocked me and ridiculed me and made fun of me for questioning the unemployment rate last fall before the elections.” (Former General Electric CEO Jack Welch commented on Twitter in October 2012, “Unbelievable job numbers [such as the almost impossible creation of 600,000 part-time jobs in September 2012]... these Chicago guys will do anything... can’t debate so change numbers.” On October 9, 2012 CNBC analyst Rick Santelli also questioned the suddenly lower unemployment numbers released just weeks before the election.) [1102, 1109, 1127, 1129, 1160, 1197, 1203, 1217, 1220, 1332, 1520, 2821, 3428, 4729, 51352, 51372, 51398, 51404, 51405, 51411, 51424, 51427, 51448, 51451, 51462, 51598]

The Obama Timeline finds it interesting that the report of manipulated unemployment data is surfacing a full year after the 2012 election, and suggests a *possible* (albeit quite unlikely) explanation: Democrat legislators are increasingly worried that Obama and ObamaCare will cause them to lose their House and Senate seats in the November 2014 mid-term elections, and Hillary Clinton is worried that if Obama remains in office and the economy continues to sour because of ObamaCare, the likelihood of her being elected president in November 2016 diminishes with each passing day. They all therefore need a way to get Obama out of office. They cannot use Benghazi, however, because releasing details about that fiasco in order to impeach Obama would also harm Clinton. Nor can they use the issue of Obama’s forged birth certificate—of which most of them are likely well aware—as that would also implicate many of them. They may, however, be able to use rigged unemployment figures as a way to oust Obama. Clinton operatives may have persuaded Census Bureau employee Julius Buckmon to come forward with information suggesting that unemployment data was rigged to help Obama win reelection—and that Obama knew about and authorized the scheme. Clinton and other key Democrats may believe (or even already know) there is enough information to sink Obama without any collateral damage to their own campaigns or Clinton’s. With the rising unpopularity of ObamaCare, they believe they can persuade enough Senate Democrats to go along with a conviction of Obama after the House votes to impeach him. (Desperate Senate Democrats would rather throw Obama under the bus than lose their own jobs.) Vice President Joe Biden then temporarily assumes the presidency—after having agreed to a deal in which he promises not to stand in the way of impeachment and not to challenge Clinton in the 2016 primaries. Biden gets the job he has long coveted in the only way remotely possible for him; Clinton’s path to the White House is made easier; and Obama cannot stop the process once the tide turns against him. (Obama cannot very well threaten Hillary Clinton with the release of damaging Benghazi facts because that will hurt him as well, and he cannot threaten Senate Democrats by saying publicly that they knew about his birth certificate forgery and remained quiet.)

WashingtonPost.com reports, “The Obama administration brought in a private consulting team to independently assess how the federal online health insurance enrollment system was developing, according to a newly disclosed document, and in late March received a

clear warning that its Oct 1. launch was fraught with risks. The analysis by McKinsey & Co. foreshadowed many of the problems that have dogged HealthCare.gov since its rollout, including the facts that the call-in centers would not work properly if the online system was malfunctioning and that insufficient testing would make it difficult to fix problems after the launch. The report was provided to The Washington Post by the House Energy and Commerce Committee. This risk assessment, which was encapsulated in a 14-slide presentation, was delivered to senior White House and Department of Health and Human Services officials in four briefings between March 28 and April 8, the committee said. HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius; Marilyn Tavenner, then acting administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS); and White House Chief Technology Officer Todd Park attended a session about the report on April 4 at HHS headquarters. Obama health policy adviser Jeanne Lambrew and then-White House Deputy Chief of Staff Mark Childress received a briefing April 8 at the White House.” (In April, Sebelius told a House committee that the web site roll out was “on track”—despite having been warned just days earlier that it was not.) [51353, 51373]

Minnesota’s Democrat Governor Mark Dayton announces that his state will not allow the extension of health insurance policies for another year, despite Obama’s call for insurers to do so, because of the disruption it would cause in the insurance market. [51355]

On *The Kelly File*, former federal prosecutor Andrew C. McCarthy points out that in defense of the Obama administration in the lawsuit *Priests For Life v. HHS*, the Department of Justice stated, “Even under the grandfathering provision [in ObamaCare], it is projected that... a majority of *group* health plans will have lost their grandfather status by the end of 2013 [italics added].” (This is more evidence that the administration has known all along that millions of Americans—with both individual *and* group health insurance policies—will be losing their policies. The Department of Justice is even using that fact to defend itself against a religious discrimination lawsuit.) [51364, 51383, 51400]

On the *Tonight Show*, Obama-supporting actress Whoopi Goldberg tells host Jay Leno, “I don’t understand how a 4-year-old can do a website and upload videos... and these guys [responsible for Healthcare.gov] can’t do jack.” [51356]

On November 19 DailyCaller.com reminds readers that “Obamacare eliminates a tax deductible for many Americans struggling with losing their existing health plans. Millions of Americans facing higher out-of-pocket costs after losing their existing health insurance will also be damaged by what is effectively a tax hike imposed under Obamacare. Before ...Obama’s health reform law went into effect, Americans could deduct out-of-pocket medical costs if they amounted to at least 7.5 percent of the individual’s annual income. ...But now under Obamacare, Americans can only deduct out-of-pocket medical costs if they amount to 10 percent of the individual’s income.” (The change is essentially a \$3 billion tax increase.) [51358]

The *Daily Mail* reports, “Newly released photos taken after the 2012 terror attack on U.S. diplomatic facilities in Benghazi, Libya show a car on fire, a burned-out building,

ransacked rooms, a devastated kitchen and Arabic-language graffiti... The conservative watchdog group Judicial Watch published the pictures online this week following the State Department's November 12 decision to release them under the terms of a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit the group filed in February. Judicial Watch released another set of similar photos, also the product of FOIA pressure, in June. ...Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton said the pictures will cast an even harsher light on the Obama administration's initial claims that the Benghazi attack was the product of a spontaneous protest gone bad. 'The new photos reveal a level of total devastation thoroughly belying Obama's original cover story that the carnage was perpetrated by a bunch of random malcontents upset over an unpleasant video,' Fitton said. 'The fact that we've had to wait nearly a year and file a federal lawsuit for basic documentary material of the attack shows that this administration is still in cover-up mode.' The State Department, however, has continued to withhold a set of videos that members of the agency's Accountability Review Board saw when they investigated the terror attack." [51481]

A small but enthusiastic crowd attends a "Reclaim America Now" demonstration in Lafayette Park, across from the White House. Freedom Watch founder Larry Klayman tells the audience, "We the People have had enough of the corrupt and incompetent ways of the Obama administration and its bipartisan political enablers. It is time for action, not words." Former Senator Gordon Humphrey (R-NH) states, "We are on the doorstep of tyranny, and that is not an overstatement. ...It is our goal to roll back this incipient tyranny and re-establish freedom for generations to come. ...We want accountability, Mr. [Obama], and, by God, sooner or later, we are going to get it." Other speakers include Retired Admiral James Lyons (who asks who "gave the order to stand down in Benghazi?"); Joseph Farah, editor and CEO of WND.com; Charles Strange (whose son Michael was killed in the SEAL Team VI Extortion 17 mission); former Graham County, Arizona Sheriff Richard Mack; and Reverend Michael Carl. [51421, 51436, 51629]

At Forbes.com St. John's University associate professor of economics M. Northrup Buechner writes, "Since ...Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law, he has changed it five times. Most notably, he suspended the employer mandate last summer. This is widely known, but almost no one seems to have grasped its significance. The Constitution authorizes [him] to propose and veto legislation. It does not authorize him to change existing laws. The changes Mr. Obama ordered in Obamacare, therefore, are unconstitutional. This means that he does not accept some of the limitations that the Constitution places on his actions. We cannot know at this point what limitations, if any, he does accept. ...The time will come when Congress passes a law and [Obama] ignores it. Or he may choose to enforce some parts and ignore others (as Mr. Obama is doing now). Or he may not wait for Congress and issue a decree (something Mr. Obama has done and has threatened to do again). ...If [Obama] can ignore the laws passed by Congress, of what use is Congress? [Obama] can do whatever he chooses. Congress can stand by and observe. Perhaps they might applaud or jeer. But in terms of political power, Congress will be irrelevant. Probably, it will become a kind of rubber-stamp or debating society. There are many such faux congresses in tyrannies throughout history and around the globe. Mr. Obama has equal contempt for the Supreme Court. In an act of overbearing hubris, he excoriated Supreme Court Justices sitting helplessly before him

during the 2010 State of the Union address—Justices who had not expected to be denounced and who were prevented by the occasion from defending themselves. Mr. Obama condemned them for restoring freedom of speech to corporations and unions.” [51834]

“...The direction in which Mr. Obama is taking us would make possible the following scenario. A Republican Congress is elected and repeals Obamacare over [Obama’s] veto. [Obama] refuses to enforce the repeal. The Supreme Court rules that [Obama’s] refusal is unconstitutional. [Obama] denounces that ruling and refuses to be bound by it. If [Obama] persists in rejecting all authority other than his own, the denouement would depend on the side taken by the Armed Forces. Whatever side that was, our national self-esteem would be unlikely to recover from the blow of finding that we are living in a banana republic. The shocking fact is that our whole system of representative government depends on it being led by an individual who believes in it; who thinks it is valuable; who believes that a government dedicated to the protection of individual rights is a noble ideal. What if he does not? Mr. Obama is moving our government away from its traditional system of checks and balances and toward the one-man-rule that dominates third world countries. He has said that he wants a *fair* country—implying that, as it stands, the United States is not a fair country—an unprecedented calumny committed against a country by its own leader. What country does he think is more fair than the United States? He has three long years left in which to turn us into a fair country. Where does he intend to take us? Mr. Obama got his conception of a fair country from his teachers. A fair country is an *unfree* country because it is regimented to prevent anyone from rising too high. Their ideal is egalitarianism, the notion that no one should be any better, higher, or richer than anyone else. Combined with a dollop of totalitarianism, egalitarianism has replaced communism as the dominant ideal in our most prestigious universities. Mr. Obama and his colleagues are the product of those universities, and they have their marching orders.” [51834]

“The most important point is that Mr. Obama does not consider himself bound by the Constitution. He could not have made that more clear. He has drawn a line in the concrete and we cannot ignore it. Those who currently hold political office, and who want to keep our system of government, need to act now. Surely, rejection of the Constitution is grounds for impeachment and charges should be filed. In addition, there are many other actions that Congressmen can and should take—actions that will tell Mr. Obama that we have seen where he is going and we will not let our country go without a fight. At the close of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Benjamin Franklin was asked what form of government had been created. ‘A republic,’ he replied, ‘if you can keep it.’ We are losing it. If Mr. Obama’s reach for unprecedented power is not stopped, that will be the end. Everyone who values his life and liberty should find some way to say ‘No!’ ‘Not now!’ ‘Not yet!’ ‘Not ever!’” [51834]

In a pre-recorded reading of the Gettysburg Address for the 150th anniversary of Lincoln’s speech, Obama omits the words, “Under God.” Obama says, “It is rather for us, the living, to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full

measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, [under God,] shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.” (There were several written drafts of Lincoln’s speech, but reporters at the event all recorded Lincoln as having said, “under God.” The White House claims Obama was simply reading a version that did not contain the words “under God.”) Obama stuns many observers by not appearing in person in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania for the commemoration of Lincoln’s famous speech (At PJMedia.com Rick Moran calls the slight “nearly incomprehensible.”) Others are probably happy he did not show up and attempt to make the event all about him. [51359, 51381, 51382, 51387, 51390, 51420, 51439, 51454, 51455, 51509]

Obama skips Gettysburg (even though event organizers had for two years expected him to be there), and appears instead at the annual meeting of the Wall Street Journal CEO Council—where he blames Republicans for the problems with the rollout of ObamaCare because they were “resistant to the idea of dealing with the uninsured.” Obama also says, “We are going to have to, obviously, re-market and re-brand [ObamaCare], and that will be challenging in this political environment.” (In other words, “We’re not going to change anything for the better, we’re just going to give it a new name and try to sell it better.” Perhaps ObamaCare will soon be called “SoetoroCare.”) Obama defends his spending with the laughable claim, “We are not lavishly spending on a whole bunch of social programs out there. And in many ways, a lot of these programs have become more efficient and pretty effective.” [51359, 51381, 51382, 51387, 51390, 51420, 51439, 51454, 51455, 51509]

Via Twitter, *National Journal’s* Ron Fournier asks White House advisor Dan Pfeiffer, “Serious question: what is on [Obama’s] schedule that is more important than Gettysburg anniversary?” Pfeiffer responds, “Oh, I don’t know, there’s this whole website thing that someone suggested might destroy the Dem Party.” [51509]

In a two-hour meeting with several U.S. Senators, Obama asks for more time to negotiate a deal with Iran over its steadily advancing nuclear weapons program. According to TheHill.com, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN) “said the administration made a strong case that a preliminary deal with Iran could be at hand, but some lawmakers worry it could offer Iran breathing room while failing to lead to a comprehensive deal on the program down the line. ‘They are very explicit about what they think they may be able to achieve,’ Corker said. ‘There’s a concern that whatever you do in the interim basis is the new norm,’ he added. Corker strongly suggested the Senate would not pass new sanctions before Thanksgiving, giving the administration crucial breathing space. Legislation that mirrors House-passed sanctions on Iran’s energy sector is stuck in the Democratic-controlled Banking Committee, and Senate leaders aren’t expected to allow it as an amendment to a pending defense bill. The sanctions passed the House 400-20 in July.” Corker also says, “People are concerned... that we’re giving up some leverage.” (Obama wants at least six months to continue negotiating, while most in Congress—in both political parties—believe that would simply give Iran six more months to continue enriching uranium while claiming not to be doing so.) [51432, 51445, 51450]

DailyCaller.com reports, “The Obama administration implemented a competitive bidding program that causes many Medicare patients to lose their existing health equipment providers, forcing seniors to rely on out-of-state companies that increase their medical costs and keep them waiting for essential services like oxygen. Between 80 and 90 percent of previously-eligible providers of medical equipment and services are now excluded from serving Medicare patients in bid areas, according to figures compiled by the nonpartisan homecare advocacy group People for Quality Care (PFQC) and provided to The Daily Caller. ... And while the competitive bidding, which ignores a host of other factors in pursuit of the lowest offer, saves some money up front, anecdotal evidence suggests it may end up costing more as seniors without proper preventive care end up using more emergency room services. ... The program saves money for the federal government by only allowing low-bid companies to provide Medicare patients with devices, supplies, and other services. PFQC’s telephone hotline has already yielded more than 2,500 complaints from Medicare patients losing their existing equipment and services providers and having to switch to government-contracted companies that are out of state and unable to respond in a timely manner to patient requests. Additionally, many Medicare-eligible providers are now going out of business due to the competitive bidding program. A North Carolina woman with breathing problems who registered a complaint with PFQC said that she lost her longtime medical devices and supplies provider when it did not receive a government contract under competitive bidding. The woman now has a new provider 40 miles away from her home, and she waits up to two weeks for her supplies. Additionally, she and her elderly husband lost their ‘hardship case’ discount when they switched providers, significantly raising their medical costs.” [51361]

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius visits Miami, Florida, where she visits with “navigators” helping people enroll in ObamaCare. While Sebelius praises the program, the Healthcare.gov web site fails. [51486, 51492]

White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters, “We’re on track to hit our [November 30] mark to make the [Healthcare.gov] website functionality [sic; functional] so that the vast majority of users” can enroll in ObamaCare. (The previous promise was that the web site would work for the “vast majority of users.” To the Obama administration, “vast majority” apparently means 80 percent—until it decides it means 60 percent.) [51363]

Carney is asked by ABC’s Jonathan Karl if Obama’s “you can keep your *doctor*” promise is still “operative.” Carney gives a rambling answer that avoids answering the question directly and places blame on insurance companies and Republicans: “Jon, [Obama] made clear throughout the effort to pass the Affordable Care Act and throughout the period in which—that continues to this day, in which Republicans have sought to repeal it, that the vast majority of the American people, those who have insurance through their employers, who have insurance through Medicare and Medicaid, will not see a change, and that includes to how [sic] their plans allow them to get access to different doctors. The reality of the insurance system that we’ve seen over the years is that these plans change all the time. So there are limits, if you’re building on the private insurance-based system that the

president is doing, using the model from a Republican governor of Massachusetts, as he did. There are—this is not a government-run insurance program. What is the case is that if you're purchasing insurance in the marketplace, you have a variety of options available to you, from less expensive plans to more expensive, more comprehensive plans. And as is the case in insurance markets and networks all over the country, the more comprehensive plans tend to have broader networks. So if you are looking for—if you want coverage from your doctor, a doctor that you've seen that in the past, and want that, you can look and see if there's a plan in which that doctor participates. And that reflects the way that the private insurance has long worked." [51407, 51408]

In a Washington Post-ABC poll of registered voters, Mitt Romney tops Obama 49–45 percent; Obama's approval/disapproval rating is 42/55 percent; opposition to ObamaCare reaches a record 57 percent; and 70 percent of those surveyed believe the nation is "on the wrong track." (The poll's D/R/I sampling is 31/24/37; only 24 percent of those surveyed were Republicans. A more reasonable sampling would have resulted in even lower numbers for Obama and ObamaCare.) The leftist web site DailyKos claims the poll shows "No big drop in Obamacare support." [51366, 51368, 51370, 51371, 51376, 51406, 51444]

According to the poll, 38 percent support the Tea Party movement and 53 percent oppose it; support is 43 percent among whites and 27 percent among non-whites. Male/female support for the Tea Party is 43/33 percent. The greatest amount of support is from college graduates; the least support is from those with post-graduate education. [51464, 51465]

Jessica Sanford, a Washington state resident who was cited by Obama in an October 21 speech as an example of someone who was helped by ObamaCare, is informed that the healthcare web site gave her an incorrect amount for her monthly insurance premium. According to CNN.com, what she thought would cost her \$198 per month will actually cost \$280 per month. She then learned that her taxpayer subsidy was miscalculated, and her premium will, in fact, be \$390 per month—which she cannot afford. Sanford writes on Facebook, "Wow. You guys really screwed me over. Now I have been priced out and will not be able to afford the plans you offer. But, I get to pay \$95 and up for not having health insurance. I am so incredibly disappointed and saddened. You majorly screwed up." (In fact, Sanford's tax penalty for not having insurance will be more than \$95. The penalty is \$95 or, *if greater*, one percent of income. If Sanford is ineligible for an ObamaCare subsidy, her income level might very well result in a penalty of \$400 or more.) [51367, 51474, 51544]

FoxNews.com reports, "The Nigerian group that took credit for freeing two kidnapped American sailors from a supply vessel last month claims the caper netted a \$2 million ransom. ... The sailors were grabbed by pirates Oct. 23 and taken ashore, where they were held for nearly three weeks. Although the State Department confirmed last week they were released, no names or details were revealed other than that a ransom was paid, according to Drew Bailey, a State Department spokesman." [51377, 51378]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “The Democratic National Committee is reducing ticket prices [by 50 percent] for a high-dollar fundraiser in San Francisco next week that features ...Obama, according to an email sent to donors Monday. Obama is set to appear at a luncheon at the SFJAZZ Center on Nov. 25 to benefit the DNC, but whether it’s a sign of donor fatigue or a general lack of interest, tickets have not been selling as expected. ...The event will be one of a handful of Democratic fundraisers [Obama] attends on his West Coast swing, but the tepid response so far could be an early indicator of waning interest in [Obama] and his public appearances, which until now appeared to be surviving the problems he’s been having with the rollout of his health care plan. ...[Obama] is slated to appear at 21 events on behalf of the DNC by month’s end.” [51384, 51396]

At Politico.com clinical psychologist Dr. Steven Berglas comments on Obama’s “weird jokes” at the expense of his wife: “I’m one of those quasi-Freudians who believe that jokes, like dreams and slips of the tongue, reveal repressed feelings, the emotional content of our lives that we would rather not address head-on. ...[The] seemingly offhanded remarks Obama has made about his wife—tell us a whole lot about both [Obama’s] self-esteem and his relationship with Michelle. ...[W]e might wonder whether [Obama’s] barbed comments about his wife suggest that he resents needing her. It’s hard to be a divorced politician, after all. If you believe that ‘a thing said in jest, is half confessed’ you’d have to conclude that much of what [Obama] says about his wife reveals at least some degree of contempt for her. ...[A] *Vogue* interview offers some clues. ‘Michelle grew up in a model nuclear family: mom, dad, brother,’ [Obama] said. ‘There’s just a warmth and a sense of belonging. And you know, that’s not how I grew up. I had this far-flung family, father left at a very young age, a stepfather who ended up passing away as well. My mother was this wonderful spirit, and she was adventurous but not always very well organized.’ The first lady, in other words, grew up in an *Ozzie & Harriet*-type family—the kind Obama has said he wishes he’d had, sometimes even distorting his history to convince himself that he did. In his autobiography, *Dreams From My Father*, [Obama] idealizes the man who married and then dumped his mother. *You can try to spin this all you want, but the fact is that a man who is abandoned in infancy by his father is psychologically scarred for life* [italics added].” (It is worth noting Obama’s reference to “a stepfather who ended up passing away as well.” That gives the impression that death was the cause of the separation. In fact, Lolo Soetoro did not die until 1987, more than 15 years *after* Obama was shipped back to Hawaii to live with his maternal grandparents. The suggestion that death separated him from his stepfather may have been a subconscious way for Obama to avoid recognizing the reality that his mother and stepfather had *both* deserted him.) [51410]

Berglas continues, “The key to understanding [Obama’s] less-than-charming jokes about Michelle is realizing that those who suffer compensatory narcissism dread emotional intimacy. To protect themselves against being hurt in adulthood as their abandoning fathers devastated them as children, they reverse their feelings. As in: ‘I don’t need or love that wonderful, talented, supportive woman; she’s a piece of crap.’ ...The chink in ...Obama’s ego that provokes his put-downs of Michelle is not terribly uncommon among politicians. The propensity to be suave with strangers and insensitive or hurtful to

intimates follows a twisted logic born of slights suffered when a boy is dependent upon, and trying to identify with, his father. When this hoped-for positive relationship—‘Dad adores me, I’m his Little Man’—fails to occur, the hurt is indescribable. Most boys recover and, in time, yearn for a romantic partner. However, when striving for that sort of attachment—feeling love and craving its return—a boy wounded by paternal rejection can panic: ‘What if she does to me what he did?’ The simplest way to guard against a repetition of rejection is never again to be as vulnerable as you were when Dad dumped you. How do you do that and still bond with a woman in ways that look as though you are fully committed? By distancing yourself from her, through put-downs—as other politicians have chosen—by dividing your loyalty with lovers or prostitutes.” [51410]

In testimony before the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Henry Chao, the chief Healthcare.gov project manager at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, says “60 or 70 percent” of the ObamaCare enrollment process remains to be created. Congressman Cory Gardner (R-CO) asks, “Well how much do we have to build today, still? What do we need to build? 50 percent? 40 percent? 30 percent?”: Chao responds, “I think it’s, uh, just an approximation, we’re probably sitting somewhere between 60 and 70 percent because we still have to build—” Gardner: “Wait, 60 or 70 percent that needs to be built, still?” Chao: “Because we still have to build the payment systems to make payments to insurers in January.” Gardner: “Let me get this correct. Sixty to 70 percent of Healthcare.gov still needs to be built?” Chao: “It’s not really about Healthcare.gov, it’s the federally-facilitated marketplace.” Gardner: “The entire system that the American people are being required to rely upon—” Chao: “Healthcare.gov, the online application, verification, determination, plan compare, getting enrolled, generating the enrollment transaction—that’s 100 percent there.” Gardner: “But the entire system is 60 to 70 percent away from being complete.” Chao: “There’s the back office systems, the accounting systems, the payment systems... they still need to be done.” (Chao later clarifies that 60 or 70 percent has been built and that 30 to 40 percent remains. In any event, individuals may be able to get into Healthcare.gov and select a plan, but the process for collecting their premium payments and passing them on to the insurance companies does not yet exist. Unless and until a payment is received, *the individual does not have insurance.*) [51386, 51391, 51395]

Also testifying before the committee is David Kennedy, founder of online security firm TrustedSec, who states, “Just by looking at the [Healthcare.gov] website we can see that there is [sic; are] just fundamental security principles not being followed, things that are basic in nature that any security tester, like myself or anyone that we hire to test these sites, would actually test for prior to being released. ... To be honest with you, I have not seen—and I’ve worked for Fortune 10, Fortune 50, Fortune 1,000 companies, as well as on the government side—I have not seen an application that pales in comparison to 500 million lines of code, including some of the largest applications you would ever see in the history of man.” FreeBeacon.com reports, “Morgan Wright, a cyber terrorism expert and CEO of Crowd Sourced Investigations, LLC., said attempting to fix one line of code could open up a ‘Pandora’s box.’ ‘You create an unintended series of cascading events you have no control over because you don’t have a grasp of what the code is actually doing,’ he said. ‘You think you’ve changed one thing, by doing that you’ve opened up a

Pandora's box of vulnerabilities on the other side.' ...Because of the sheer amount of code, it is impossible to conduct a complete end-to-end security assessment on the website, the panelists said. Just reviewing it for security risks could take six months. Fixing the flawed code will also be extremely expensive. The market value of high-end website code is about \$50 per line, Kennedy said." Congressman Mo Brooks (R-AL) asks, "Given Healthcare.gov's security issues, and assuming for the moment that you would be personally responsible for all damages incurred from your advice, would any of you advise an American citizen to use this website as the security issues now exist?" Every panelist responds in the negative. Congressman Lamar Smith (R-TX) states, "Unfortunately the personal information that has already been entered into Healthcare.gov is vulnerable to online criminals and identity thieves. ...Obama has a responsibility to ensure that the personal and financial data collected as part of ObamaCare is secure. It is clear this is not the case. There is only one useable course of action: Mr. [Obama], take down this website." [51398, 51452]

A soon-to-open Walmart store in Washington, D.C. receives more than 23,000 applications for about 600 jobs. [51388, 51389]

Bloomberg.com reports, "Potential shortfalls in enrollment for ...Obama's health-care overhaul would put a 30 percent dent in projections for U.S. prescription-drug sales in 2017, a report from IMS Health Inc. shows. That worst-case scenario would translate to \$320 billion in drug spending, according to the report. The best case is supposed to be \$460 billion, boosted by demand from the health law's expansion of insurance coverage and medical screenings, and removal of restrictions on pre-existing conditions." [51392]

FoxNews.com reports, "U.S. and Afghan officials reportedly have reached a tentative agreement on a critical security pact—which would include ...Obama writing a letter to the Afghan people acknowledging mistakes during the 'war on terror.' According to Reuters, an Afghan spokesman said Tuesday that Obama agreed to write the letter, to be presented with the draft security pact at a meeting of tribal elders later this week. The New York Times, citing a spokesman for Afghan President Hamid Karzai, reported that Secretary of State John Kerry proposed the letter in a conversation with Karzai." [51393]

NationalReview.com reports, "Multiple individual plans available on the D.C. health insurance exchange specifically cover elective abortion but not hearing aids, routine foot-care, and routine eye-care. One such plan... has a summary on the D.C. exchange's website titled 'Excluded Services & Other Covered Services.' It says enrollees can receive coverage for abortions performed for a non-medical reason, but not for a number of other services that could seem medically necessary. The plan also excludes coverage for some other procedures, including cosmetic surgery, bariatric surgery, and infertility treatment." (Depending on the plan one chooses, ObamaCare will pay to get rid of a baby, but not to help one have a baby.) [51394]

Richard Engel reports at NBCNews.com, "While many Americans have been led to believe the war in Afghanistan will soon be over, a draft of a key U.S.-Afghan security deal obtained by NBC News shows the United States is prepared to maintain military

outposts in Afghanistan for many years to come, and pay to support hundreds of thousands of Afghan security forces. The wide-ranging document, still unsigned by the United States and Afghanistan, has the potential to commit thousands of American troops to Afghanistan and spend billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. The document outlines what appears to be the start of a new, open-ended military commitment in Afghanistan in the name of training and continuing to fight al-Qaeda. The war in Afghanistan doesn't seem to be ending, but renewed under new, scaled-down U.S.-Afghan terms." [51399]

CNSNews.com reports, "Before the end of this year, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration will decide whether or not to begin the rulemaking process to mandate that newly manufactured cars include what is being called 'vehicle-to-vehicle' (V2V) communications technology that constantly broadcasts via radio wave the car's location, direction, speed and, possibly, even the number of passengers it is carrying." [51453]

FoxNews.com reports, "The U.S. Supreme Court has declined to block controversial Texas abortion restrictions that have been called some of the strictest in the country and have led a dozen abortion clinics in the state to stop performing the procedure. The court by a 5-4 vote denied a request by Planned Parenthood to block a ruling by the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, allowing key parts of the Texas abortion law to stay in effect while the lawsuit challenging the restrictions moves forward." [51402, 51443]

Fox News also reports, "A California-based solar company backed by several Obama supporters has been receiving millions in federal tax credits while losing \$322 million since 2008, raising concerns about the company 'becoming the next Solyndra.' Among SolarCity Corp.'s biggest investors is Elon Musk—the high-profile donor and fundraiser who co-founded PayPal and whose companies SpaceX and electric-car company Tesla Motors have received at least \$846 million in loans and startup money from the Obama administration." Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL), "the top Republican on the Senate Budget Committee, warned about SolarCity's financial standing in a letter Monday to the Treasury Department. 'There is concern that SolarCity might become the next Solyndra—a company propped on the back of the taxpayers,' Sessions wrote." [51403]

At Politico.com, WhiteHouseDossier.com's Keith Koffler identifies 10 people he believes Obama should fire over the Healthcare.gov fiasco: White House chief of staff Denis McDonough, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Director Marilyn Tavenner, CMS Deputy Chief Information Officer Henry Chao, CMS Chief Information Officer Tony Trenkle, White House Chief Technology Officer Todd Park, White House communications director Jennifer Palmieri, Jeffrey Zients (who is now heading up the "fix the web site" task force), White House health policy adviser Jeanne Lambrew, HHS Deputy Assistant Secretary of Information Technology Frank Baitman. [51409]

Investigative journalist James O'Keefe, of Project Veritas, sends Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius a Twitter message: "Might want to cancel your plans tomorrow, Sebelius. It's going to be a busy day. Project Veritas." (The message

implies that O’Keefe will be releasing new ObamaCare-related undercover video that will embarrass Sebelius and Obama.) [51419]

The White House posts a handwritten note by Obama about the Gettysburg Address. (It is assumed that a few graphology experts may come forward with an analysis of Obama’s writing. *The Obama Timeline* makes this unprofessional attempt: That there is little slant to Obama’s letters suggests he may be guarded with his emotions. His closed “e” formations suggests he is skeptical and not swayed by emotional arguments from others. The open bottom of Obama’s “s” formations suggest he would prefer a different career. The extreme points in his letters suggest he is intense and aggressive. The lack of crosses on a final “t” in a word suggests laziness. The round, closed “o” letters indicate a private person who does not share feelings. The varied slant of letters within words suggests a person who lacks contact with reality. The exceptional height of his “I” letters suggests an overinflated ego.) [51413]

On *Special Report* Charles Krauthammer remarks, “To quote [Obama], I’m not stupid enough to... not react when I hear [him] say, as we just heard him say, I was not informed *directly* that the website would—now what in God’s name does that mean, *indirectly*? The historian Bea Kristol was once asked if she read a certain book and she said, ‘Yes, but not personally.’ So what does it mean, he was *indirectly* told? How was he told? What did he hear? Look, what we’re having here is this sort of Clintonian way for him to protect himself in case there is a memo that comes out in which he was informed through another person. But what’s happening here is the unraveling of the cover-up. This is not a cover-up of corrupt misconduct; this is a cover-up of cosmic incompetence of the fact that they began to be told in March and nobody acted and nobody said. So, we now know the secretary of HHS knew, high officials in the White House knew, way back in December and then pretended in a hearing... later to Congress, it’s all working well. ...And then in the run-up, there’s all these reassurances and we know [Obama] had been briefed himself about that McKinsey study. So he knew, how much he knew, we are not sure. But this is a level of incompetence that is indescribable. And it stands to reason. [Obama] never ran anything. He was never a governor. He never ran a hot dog stand in his life and he presumed that his team could remake one-sixth of the American economy and this is what happens.” [51412]

On the *Tonight Show*, host Jay Leno asks George W. Bush why he doesn’t express public opinions about Obama. Bush replies, “I don’t think it’s good for the country to have a former president criticize his successor.” [51435, 51490, 51596]

On November 20 Obama’s approval/disapproval rating falls to 37/59 in a November 15–18 CBS national telephone survey. (In November 2005 George W. Bush’s rating was 35/47.) Only 31 percent of those surveyed approve of ObamaCare; 61 percent disapprove; 48 percent believe the law should be changed, while 43 percent believe it should be repealed. Only 7 percent want ObamaCare “kept in place;” even among Democrats the percentage is only 12 percent. Republicans in Congress have a 21/73 percent approval/disapproval rating. Democrats fare only slightly better, at 26/68. (The poll’s D/R/I weighting is 30/28/42.) [51414, 51426, 51437, 51459, 51466]

In Iran, “supreme leader” Ayatollah Ali Khamenei states what everyone except Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry, and *The New York Times* already knows: that Iran is using the negotiations to stall for time. Khamenei says in a speech to military commanders, “Some have translated [Iran’s] ‘heroic flexibility’ [in] stepping back from goals and values of the Islamic regime [to achieve a nuclear settlement] and some enemies based on this have claimed retreat by the Islamic Republic. ...The ‘heroic flexibility’ means an artistic maneuver and the use of different tactics to reach different goals and ideals of the Islamic regime.” [51493]

Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu meets with Russia President Vladimir Putin, hoping he can help resolve the Iranian nuclear issue. Netanyahu says, “This will be a peaceful, diplomatic solution of Iran’s nuclear issue just the way it has been achieved in Syria regarding its chemical weapons.” (In other words, Netanyahu has more confidence in Putin than he has in Obama.) “I think that we can draw serious conclusions from the resolution that the powers have reached on Syria’s non-conventional weapons. In the case of Syria, Russia and other powers quite justifiably insisted on full the disarmament of Syria. ...[T]he international community must definitely watch closely the implementation of the UN Security Council resolution by Iran, namely, to cease uranium enrichment, to dismantle the centrifuges, to withdraw the enriched material from Iran and dismantle the [plutonium] reactor in Arak.” [51786]

According to *National Catholic Reporter*, “Plans to move the U.S. embassy to the Vatican onto the grounds of the larger American embassy to Italy, though in a separate building and with a distinct entrance, are drawing fire from five former American envoys despite the tacit consent of the Vatican itself. Justified primarily on the grounds of enhanced security, the move is described by former U.S. Ambassador James Nicholson, who’s also a former Secretary of Veterans Affairs in the Bush administration and a former chair of the Republican National Committee, as a ‘massive downgrade’ in U.S./Vatican ties. ‘It’s turning this embassy into a stepchild of the embassy to Italy,’ Nicholson said. ‘The Holy See is a pivot point for international affairs and a major listening post for the United States,’ he said, ‘and to shoehorn [the U.S. delegation] into an office annex inside another embassy is an insult to American Catholics and to the Vatican.’” Former Vatican Ambassador James Nicholson tells CatholicVote.org, “It’s another manifestation of the antipathy of this administration both to Catholics and to the Vatican—and to Christians in the Middle East. This is a key post for intermediation in so many sovereignties but particularly in the Middle East. This is anything but a good time to diminish the stature of this post. To diminish the stature of this post is to diminish its influence. The State Department has for a long time wanted to do this. It came up when I was an ambassador. I explained the folly of this and it went away. But now they seem determined to do this. The perception is [with this action] that the United States is showing a lack of appreciation for the relevance of its diplomatic partner in the Vatican.” (The “enhanced security” excuse is nonsense. No one believes the facility is at any greater risk than any other embassy, and there are certainly no throngs of Muslims wandering around the Vatican.) [51700, 51701, 51702, 51713, 51757, 51768, 51769, 51772]

On CBS, newsreader Norah O'Donnell does her best to find a silver lining in Obama's dark cloud, saying Obama's "approval rating in our CBS News poll has dropped 15 points during his second term, but he is still more popular than his predecessor was back in 2005, 10 months into his second term. President George W. Bush had a 35 percent approval rating, compared to ...Obama's 37 percent." (Rush Limbaugh points out that it took five years of the media's non-stop Bush pummeling for his approval rating to fall to 35 percent, whereas Obama needed nothing more than a few weeks of ObamaCare to plunge to 37 percent.) [51473]

Obama visits the grave of President John F. Kennedy, two days before the 50th anniversary of his assassination. [51440]

Obama sends a Twitter message to his followers: "When your loved ones get together this holiday season, remember to talk to them about health insurance." (The message provides a link to a cult-like, insidious, propaganda video showing parents urging their son to buy health insurance, and a web page that states, "*This holiday season*, millions of Americans have a chance to get quality, affordable health insurance—many for the first time. If you have family members who are uninsured, you can play a big part in helping them find coverage that works for them. It might not always seem like it, but your family listens to you. So have the talk." The site then provides directions for how to do so, such as, "Start by asking: 'Have you thought about signing up for health insurance on the new marketplace?' Offer to walk them through it: 'Would you like to take some time with me to sign up right now?' Ask them to make a plan, and commit to it: 'When do you plan on signing up?' Don't forget to follow up: 'Have you signed up yet?'" Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson later writes, "Because nothing will save this law and liven up dinner conversations like a bunch of self-righteous snots lecturing their aunts and uncles about how Obamacare isn't nearly as terrible as statistics, media reports and personal experiences might indicate.") [50586, 50587, 51417, 51418, 51679, 51718, 51746, 51889, 51890]

At the White House, Obama awards the Medal of Freedom to 16 Americans. Among the recipients are impeached former President and accused rapist Bill Clinton; race-baiting talk show host Oprah Winfrey; country music legend Loretta Lynn; former *Washington Post* editor Ben Bradlee; former Chicago Cubs baseball great Ernie "Let's play two!" Banks; retired Senator Richard G. Lugar of Indiana; feminist and abortion advocate Gloria Steinem; former University of North Carolina basketball coach Dean Smith; the late Bayard Rustin, a homosexual black and former chairman of the Social Democrats USA (formerly the Socialist Party of America), who adopted his gay lover because they could not legally be married; and the late, gay astronaut Sally Ride. [51420, 51422, 51428, 51556, 51566]

National Border Patrol Council President Brandon Judd warns a House committee, "For the most part, when discussions on border security arise, the conversation tends to focus on the Southwest border. In no way do I want to detract from the importance of securing the Southwest Border, but I would be remiss if I didn't mention the ongoing threat of the

nearly unguarded Northern border to the safety of the American public.” (At Townhall.com Leah Barkoukis notes, “For example, the border crossing at Angle Inlet, Minnesota is based on the honor system. There are no permanent customs or immigration officials here. Instead, the government asks people who cross over from Canada to report themselves over a videophone.”) [51543]

Heritage.org points out that ObamaCare requires restaurants to post the calorie counts of *every item they sell*, and notes that Domino’s Pizza is among the many businesses that will have difficulty complying with the regulations—because there are *millions* of possible pizza combinations based on the variety of toppings it offers. Each restaurant may have to spend as much as \$5,000 to comply with the regulations. John Schnatter, founder of the Papa John’s pizza franchises, has also stated that pizza prices will go up because of ObamaCare. [51429, 51536]

Insurance regulators from several states meet at the White House and warn Obama that his ObamaCare “fix” would lead to higher insurance premiums. After the meeting, the regulators state that they “stressed their concern that different rules for different policies would be detrimental to the overall insurance marketplace and could result in higher premiums for consumers, without addressing the underlying concern of gaps in coverage.” (It is worth noting that regulators who are not allowing insurance companies to renew canceled individual policies are primarily in *Democrat*-run states—because it is the Democrats who *want* to force Americans into the ObamaCare exchanges. The states which have so far said they will not permit the renewal of canceled policies are: New York, Washington, Rhode Island, Vermont, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Indiana.) Insurance regulators from some states refuse to attend the meeting, writing in *The New York Times*, “We made this difficult decision not to attend due to the fact that we were either not invited to do so, or were invited but have declined, but in all cases we have serious reservations about both the process and the policy issues surrounding such an important meeting. Further, this meeting has not been discussed in any meaningful way with the entire membership of the NAIC [National Association of Insurance Commissioners] nor have we worked to build consensus among the members on what our positions will be in the meeting. As we all know, the NAIC is made up of a group of extremely knowledgeable insurance regulators with very diverse views on the Affordable Care Act. While we greatly appreciate the opportunity to meet with ...Obama, briefing the membership and working to build consensus on a meeting of this importance needs to occur prior to sitting down with him.” [51438, 51447, 51460, 51482]

TheHill.com reports, “...Obama’s relationship with congressional Democrats has worsened to an unprecedented low, Democratic aides say. They are letting it be known that House and Senate Democrats are increasingly frustrated, bitter and angry with the White House over ObamaCare’s botched rollout, and that the president’s mea culpa in a news conference last week failed to soothe any ill will. Sources who attended a meeting of House chiefs of staff on Monday say the room was seething with anger over the immense damage being done to the Democratic Party and talk was of scrapping rollout events for the Affordable Care Act. ‘Here we are, we’re supposed to be selling this to people, and it’s all screwed up,’ one chief of staff ranted. ‘This either gets fixed or this

could be the demise of the Democratic Party. It's probably the worst I've ever seen it,' the aide said of the recent mood on Capitol Hill. 'It's bad. It's really bad.' ... Democrats around Capitol Hill say there are lots of people to blame for the debacle that has engulfed them. But increasingly the anger is directed at one person only: Obama. 'Is he even more unpopular than George W. Bush? I think that's already happened,' said one Democratic chief of staff. ... 'They're freaking out, as they should be,' said one senior Senate Democratic aide, adding that the rollout continues to be 'a lasting mess.' ... 'People here want to be on the record showing support for fixing the problem,' the senior Senate aide said. 'He should understand that. For someone who served in Congress, people are surprised how little he understands Congress.' ... 'The only way [Obama] can really make it up to us is by fixing this s--t,' one Democratic House aide said." (What terrifies the Democrats is that the public has turned against them *despite* a mainstream media that continually criticizes and ridicules Republicans and conservatives. That is, the voters are "figuring out on their own" that Obama, his leftist ideology, and ObamaCare are failed and fraudulent. The Democrats realize they may have lost the propaganda war.) [51441, 51456]

Rocky King, the director of the ObamaCare health insurance exchange in Oregon, tells state legislators the online enrollment system in Oregon would be up and running on December 16 (one day *after* the deadline for individuals to sign up in time to be covered by January 1, 2014). King says, "We're not broken. It's just not done." (Oregon has had *no* successful ObamaCare enrollments.) [51446, 51491, 51550]

At NationalReview.com Andrew Stiles reveals some behind-the-scenes anecdotes about Obama's closest advisor, Valerie Jarrett, who is referred to by some White House staffers as the "Night Stalker" "on account of her general ruthlessness," "She Who Must Not Be Challenged" and Obama's "Rasputin." [51449]

At Townhall.com Sarah Jean Seman writes, "Taxpayers will be happy to know they not only fund abortions under the Affordable Care Act, they also help prostitutes stay healthy. Prior to Obamacare, brothel workers at the Moonlight Bunny Ranch in Nevada said they were unable to find coverage under their profession. ... Brothel worker Taylor Lee is very pleased with ... Obama's work: 'Having this profession, we aren't exactly offered group health insurance. I'm really for Obamacare, I'm excited.'" [51457]

FoxNews.com reports, "Secretary of State John Kerry announced Wednesday that he and Afghan President Hamid Karzai have reached an agreement on a critical security pact governing the presence of U.S. troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014. The document will be presented to a meeting of tribal elders for their approval on Thursday. 'I'm pleased to say that in a series of conversations with President Karzai over the course of this morning... that we reached an agreement as to the final language of the bilateral security agreement,' Kerry announced. The leaders are still looking for the endorsement of tribal elders for the document, which is not yet signed. Kerry, though, denied that there was any sort of 'apology' in the works, following reports on Tuesday that as part of the deal ... Obama would send a letter to the Afghan people acknowledging 'mistakes.'" [51458]

At TheBlaze.com Wayne Allyn Root writes, “I don’t mean to say, ‘I told you so’ ...*But I told you so.* In October of 2012, just before the election, we heard miraculous unemployment reports that made it sound like the economy was turning around. Hundreds of thousands of jobs were supposedly created. Happy days were here again. ‘Bravo Obama,’ said the adoring mainstream media. It was the biggest one month jobs increase ever. But I smelled a rat. I warned again and again in the media that ‘the books were cooked.’ I screamed this was pure fraud and the voters were being scammed. I accused Obama and his friends in the government employees union of fixing the election. Democrats and the mainstream media (I know, I repeat myself) called those charges ‘preposterous.’ They said it was impossible to fake jobs reports. Surprise, surprise, guess who was right? It turns out government employees faked the jobs reports to re-elect Obama. They wanted the man who protects their bloated salaries, obscene pensions, and corrupt unions, to be re-elected. They would stop at nothing to keep the gravy train rolling, so they made up reports about job increases out of thin air. The entire election was pure fraud. Based on fantasy. Americans walked into the voting booths hearing fresh news that indicated the economy was improving and jobs were dramatically increasing. It was all fake. The numbers were made up out of thin air by pro-Obama government employees. The voters of America made their final decisions based on pure fraud. ...But even that wasn’t enough. Still worried about his re-election chances, Obama ordered the IRS to distract, intimidate, persecute and destroy his political opposition—Tea Parties and conservative critics like me. Rather than spending time and money on stopping Obama, many conservatives were forced to waste our time, energy and money fighting IRS attacks.” [51462]

“...Then just when you think it can’t get any worse, it does. Think Benghazi. Never hesitant to commit fraud, Obama told a story about a nonexistent protest, over a movie no one in the Middle East ever saw. This fraud was either committed to cover up the disaster of Obama’s foreign policy, and provide cover for his statement that Al Qaeda was effectively crushed, or to provide cover for an administration giving arms to rebels who turned around and used those same guns to kill our own Ambassador and three other brave Americans. Either way if the truth about Benghazi was known, would America have re-elected Obama? Add it up. The 2012 Presidential election was stolen based on the cover-up of murder in Benghazi, a mafia-like conspiracy to use the IRS to silence free speech and destroy Obama’s political opposition, fraudulent health care promises, and fraudulent jobs reports. The Gambino crime family hasn’t got anything on Obama. In 2000 Democrats talked about a President getting elected under ‘illegitimate terms.’ Well look who perfected the art. Barack Obama committed pure fraud to win re-election. If this doesn’t rise to the level of impeachment, nothing ever will. So folks... what are we doing about it?” [51462]

“Stop Obama Now,” “Repeal ObamaCare,” and “Impeach Obama” signs are posted by protesters on a highway overpass in Encinitas, an extremely leftist neighborhood of San Diego, California. “Honk 2 Impeach” signs prompt many drivers to honk their car and truck horns. WesternJournalism.com notes, “The more honks of approval, the more rabid His [Obama’s] toadies became. CHP [California Highway Patrol] said their switchboard lit up immediately with many 911 calls from distressed Messiah adulators.”) [51467]

On *The Manning Report*, Atlah Ministries Reverend James David Manning says, “I believe, almost prophetically believe, that the CIA or some other governmental agency will kill, assassinate, Barack Hussein Obama. ...It is my belief that Obama will be assassinated because his purpose was fraudulent from the beginning, posted up, and ‘Manchurianed’ by the CIA and others... [and that] has all unraveled. ...[T]here will come a spirit across black America that will say that Obama is an embarrassment to Frederick Douglas, he’s an embarrassment to W. E. D. DuBois, he’s an embarrassment to Booker T. Washington, he’s an embarrassment to Shirley Chisholm, he’s an embarrassment to Barbara Jordan, he’s an embarrassment to Dr. [Martin Luther] King [Jr.], that Obama is an embarrassment to all of these forerunners that fought so hard... to advance the cause of black people here in America. [Obama] has set the credibility of black leadership back by a thousand years.” [51471, 51472]

By a vote of 228–192, the House of Representatives approves legislation that would speed up the procedural process for issuing oil and gas drilling permits. (The White House threatens an Obama veto.) [51495, 51502]

DailyCaller.com reports, “New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie would soundly defeat Hillary Clinton [46–38] in one 2016 swing state, according to a new poll by Quinnipiac University. Among voters in Colorado—a highly contested battleground state—Clinton is either tied with or slightly behind every potential Republican candidate, including Kentucky Sen. Rand Paul [47–44], Texas Sen. Ted Cruz [44–44] and Wisconsin Rep. Paul Ryan [45–43]. Christie is favored in Colorado over any other candidate from either party, with 48-29 percent saying he would make a good president. By comparison, 49 percent of those polled do not think Clinton would do a good job in the highest office, compared to 46 percent who think she would. Vice President Joe Biden fared even worse, with 66 percent saying he doesn’t have what it takes to run the country, compared to only 24 percent who think he would do a good job.” [51468, 51484]

Secretary of State John Kerry issues a statement honoring “the memory of lives lost to violence provoked by fear and hatred of transgender and gender non-conforming people. ...The sad truth is that in too many places, including the United States, transgender persons continue to face violence and discrimination on a daily basis. In too many cases, crimes against LGBT persons, including murder, are not thoroughly investigated or prosecuted. ...Each of these episodes threatens our common humanity.” (Some might argue that men dressing up as women threatens our common humanity. Whether Kerry will issue a statement honoring the memory of Christians and Jews murdered by radical Islamists around the world remains to be seen.) [51555]

FoxNews.com reports, “A top tech official for the ObamaCare exchanges said just days before the launch of the troubled health law website that people inside the White House were nervous the site would be unavailable after its launch and would be a big embarrassment, Fox News has learned. A Sept. 25 email chain from HealthCare.gov project manager Henry Chao, obtained by Fox News, suggests Obama administration officials had more fears than they let on publicly that the website would have problems

before its Oct. 1 launch. In the email to a number of apparent colleagues, Chao suggests the administration should design a more palatable way to tell the public that the website was not working in case it failed after the launch, saying that such a move could help prevent the media from ‘just ramping up the hyperbole about hc.gov [Healthcare.gov] not [being] functional.’ The email refers to a meeting the previous day, Sept. 24, that included White House Chief Technology Officer Todd Park and CMS chief Marilyn Tavenner. ‘When Todd Park and Marilyn was (sic) here yesterday one of the things Todd conveyed was this fear the WH has about hc.gov being unavailable,’ wrote Chao. ...In the email, Chao suggested the team should come up with a more palatable way to explain problems with the website so that the media did not pounce. ‘Can you think about a better way to convey to the public when the site is not available?’ wrote Chao. ‘I am picturing in my mind all the major print and online publications taking screenshots of [a system error message] and just ramping up the hyperbole about hc.gov not [being] functional.’” [51469, 51542]

Fox News also reports, “A new and independent analysis of ObamaCare warns of a ticking time bomb, predicting a second wave of 50 million to 100 million insurance policy cancellations next fall—right before the mid-term elections. The next round of cancellations and premium hikes is expected to hit employees, particularly of small businesses. While the administration has tried to downplay the cancellation notices hitting policyholders on the individual market by noting they represent a relatively small fraction of the population, the swath of people who will be affected by the shakeup in employer-sponsored coverage will be much broader. An analysis by the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, shows the administration anticipates half to two-thirds of small businesses would have policies canceled or be compelled to send workers onto the ObamaCare exchanges. They predict up to 100 million small and large business policies could be canceled next year.” (If premiums increase dramatically—which they almost certainly will—many employers will drop their insurance coverage, forcing employees to go to Healthcare.gov to buy higher-priced individual policies. For many employers and employees, the bad news will hit in October 2014, just weeks before election day.) [51470, 51497]

FreeBeacon.com points out that Obama and prominent Democrats are now going back to the term “Affordable Care Act,” and are refraining from saying, “ObamaCare.” [51505]

Breitbart.com reports that 40 Republican Congressmen “filed a ‘friend of the court’ brief in support of a legal challenge to the Affordable Care Act (‘Obamacare’) based on the Origination Clause that will be heard by the District of Columbia Federal Court of Appeals in early 2014. The case, *Sissel v United States Department of Health and Human Services*, was filed in the Washington, D.C. District Federal Court by the Pacific Legal Foundation on behalf of Matt Sissel, an Iraq war veteran who lives in Iowa, where he owns a small business, on July 26, 2010. The Origination Clause of the Constitution, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 1 states ‘All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.’ Not a word of the Affordable Care Act originated in the House of Representatives. Instead, using a legislative trick, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-

NV) took an innocuous bill that had passed the House unanimously on October 8, 2009 by a 416-0 vote, the Service Members Home Ownership Tax Act of 2009, removed every word of its text following the first sentence, and replaced it with the Affordable Care Act language.” [51510, 51511]

“On June 28, 2013, Judge Beryl Howell, an Obama appointee, ruled against Sissel...” asserting that ObamaCare’s “individual mandate is not a ‘Bill for raising Revenue.’ ...Even though [Chief] Justice [John] Roberts declared that the individual mandate was a tax in *NFIB v Sebelius*, Judge Howell ruled that the revenue raised by Affordable Care Act was ‘incidental’ to the law, and therefore was not covered by the Origination Clause. Equally baffling, Judge Howell ruled that the tactic of ‘gutting and replacing’ a bill, which Majority Leader Reid used to push the Affordable Care Act through, was in fact merely the issuing of an amendment, despite the fact that not a single word of the original bill was kept in the so-called ‘amendment.’ On July 9, 2013, the Pacific Legal Foundation appealed Judge Howell’s dismissal of *Sissel v United States Department of Health and Human Services* to the District of Columbia Federal Court of Appeals. ...The filing of the ‘friend of the court’ brief by the forty House Republicans adds an element of constitutional legitimacy to Sissel’s case. As the *Washington Times* reported on Sunday, the brief noted that ‘given that an Origination Clause challenge against a taxing bill of this magnitude has never before been mounted, it is imperative that this Court not sanction the lower court’s superficial analysis of the Origination Clause.’ ...Regardless of the decision made by the Court of Appeals, it seems likely that the losing party will appeal the case to the Supreme Court, which might take the case for consideration in the fall of 2014. This would set up the announcement of a decision in June 2015, three years after the *NFIB v Sebelius* decision, but still a full year and five months before the 2016 Presidential election.” [51510, 51511]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Nicole L. Hopkins reports that her mother was forced into Medicaid against her wishes by the ObamaCare exchange web site. Charlene Hopkins learned that her \$276-per-month insurance had been canceled, and the ObamaCare-compliant replacement plan would cost her \$415.20 per month—an amount she cannot afford. Nicole writes that the web site “presented her with a health-care option. That is not a typo: There was just one option—at the very affordable monthly rate of zero. The exchange had determined that my mother was not eligible to choose to pay for a plan, and so she was slated immediately for Medicaid.” Her mother then discovered that there was no “cancel” button at the web site: *she had been enrolled in Medicaid regardless of whether she wanted to be*. Charlene Hopkins states, “I just don’t expect anything positive out of getting free health care. I don’t see why other people should have to pay for my care, whether it be through taxes or otherwise.” (Hopkins knew she was eligible for Medicaid but wanted to pay her own way, even though it cost her \$276 per month, because she did not want to rely on others and because she had some say in her choice of doctors, hospitals, and coverage options. Because of ObamaCare, she has lost those options.) Nicole Hopkins concludes, “My mother grew up, one of six children, in a dairy-farming family in Wisconsin. ‘The way I was raised, taking government handouts is shameful,’ she said. Her siblings stayed in Wisconsin, but she set out on her own. Finding herself forced onto Medicaid is not a fate that she ever would have imagined. ‘I guarantee

I'm the only person in my family in this situation.' I'm proud to see the spiritedness and resolve that bears my mother up even now. Such character does not draw attention to itself: Its spark only catches the eye when oppression seeks to snuff it out." (Some may wonder why the web site does not allow an opt out or cancel function, but the answer is obvious: Obama *wants* as many people dependent on government as possible—even if it means imposing that fate on them.) [51498]

WashingtonPost.com reports, "New Yorkers buying a health plan on the state's new insurance exchange should read the fine print if they're interested in getting care at some of the city's top hospitals. Not all are participating in the new plans created by the Affordable Care Act. As of this week, not one of the plans for sale on New York's health benefit exchange would cover treatment at Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, one of the world's largest and most respected cancer hospitals. That could mean that the 615,000 individuals and 450,000 small business employees expected to eventually get their insurance through the exchange would have to go someplace else for treatment, or pay the bill out of their own pockets. Other premier city hospitals are in the networks of just a few of the new plans. NYU Langone Medical Center has signed agreements with four of the 19 insurers doing business on the exchange. New York-Presbyterian Hospital, which oversees the city's biggest hospital system, has signed agreements with six insurers." [51507]

Readers of *The Obama Timeline* point out an undated post at SecretsOfTheFed.com stating that attorney Orly Taitz "has some new information she received from the Social Security Administration. She has information that shows that Obama's mother Stanley Ann Dunham didn't formerly change her last name to Obama until 1963 when she was divorcing Obama Sr... Not February 1961 when she allegedly married him." According to Taitz, the Social Security Administration is "claiming that they cannot find records for Harrison (Harry) J. Bounel [who some believe is the original owner of the Social Security number Obama has been using]." The government previously claimed it would not release information about Bounel because of "privacy concerns"—an odd argument inasmuch as Bounel was allegedly born in 1890. [51475]

At TabletMag.com Lee Smith charges that Obama "and his allies are using the nuclear issue to drive a wedge between Israel and its U.S. interlocutors. ... The Obama Administration thinks it's close to signing a deal with Iran—one that will only defer, not prevent, the theocracy from reaching nuclear capacity—later this week in Geneva. While [Israeli Prime Minister] Benjamin Netanyahu has been busy denouncing the proposed deal on the Sunday morning talk shows, the administration and its allies have outflanked both the Israeli prime minister and America's pro-Israel lobby with a very nasty public campaign of its own—one that shows where the White House's true appetite for confrontation and conflict lies. ... [F]rom the point of view of the administration and its surrogates in the press, if you believe sanctions—rather than good will—is what got Iran to the table in the first place and further sanctions are likely to produce a better deal than relieving pressure on Iran, then you're a warmonger. If you believe that sanctions should not be lifted until Iran complies with U.N. Security Council resolutions and ceases all activity on its nuclear weapons program, then you're with Netanyahu and the rest of

those Israeli liars. ...If you're not 100 percent behind Obama, you just want to send American boys off to die for Jewish causes. ...One thing is clear: Whether or not the Iranians are courteous enough to wait for Obama to leave office before announcing they have a bomb, Obama's legacy will be to have broken the spine of America's pro-Israel lobby." (Meanwhile, Iran's Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calls Israel a "rabid dog.") [51480, 51531, 51532, 51590]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Business groups are crying foul over the National Labor Relations Board's decision to move forward with an investigation into Wal-Mart's labor practices. The NLRB, which referees disputes between companies, workers and unions, said they found merit in some of the charges against Wal-Mart while dismissing others. ...[A]t least one pro-business advocacy group worried that the Obama administration was looking out for union political allies. 'It should not be lost upon anyone, that this is one of the first official actions by the new general counsel Richard Griffin, who was previously an official within a union that had serial management problems, including connections to organized crime,' said Fred Wszolek, a spokesman for the Workforce Fairness Institute, in a statement. Griffin, who formerly served on the board of directors for the AFL-CIO's lawyers coordinating committee and was also general counsel for the International Union of Operating Engineers, was sworn in at NLRB on Nov. 4. ...The timing of the news release of the Board's decision was also of concern to Wszolek. The NLRB didn't officially release a statement until after 5 p.m. Monday. But prior to that release, reporters at left-leaning websites like ThinkProgress, The Nation and Salon had caught wind of the decision and reported it. AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka also trumpeted the Board's decision a couple of hours before an official statement was released. 'Next, the fact this issue came to light in an announcement made by the United Food and Commercial Workers, even before the new general counsel made public any information related to the matter,' said Wszolek who added that the timing confirms fears that 'union bosses are completely unchecked, pulling the strings in government.'" [51494, 51657]

On November 21 former Democrat Congressman Harold Ford, Jr. says on MSNBC's *Morning Joe*, "The [ObamaCare] web site problems, I thought, were, a week or two ago, were more isolated than they are. I happen to think it could be a more systemic challenge. There may need to be a greater honesty—not an honesty, I'm not saying people have been dishonest—but a greater acceptance they've got to step back and maybe shut the whole thing down. Limping along doesn't serve anyone's interest. ...I was with a big investor yesterday who said, you know the next big challenge he believes for this? He believes there are not enough doctors in the system. So, you get to 30 million people signed up, we don't have enough physicians to accommodate the flood of people that we want to have health insurance. ...So, I hope they are thinking through all of these things because these challenges are big, they're hurtful, but going forward may have more systemic challenges as well." [51514]

The Senate Banking Committee votes 14–8 to approve Obama's nomination of Janet Yellen to replace Ben Bernanke as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. (Several Republicans vote to approve her nomination. One Democrat, Joe Manchin of West Virginia, joins seven Republicans in voting against her. Like Bernanke, Yellen is a

proponent of expanding the money supply—printing money—to cover government debt. The result will eventually be massive price inflation.)

The Treasury Department announces it will sell all its remaining shares of General Motors stock by the end of the year, according to the *Detroit Free Press*. The action “frees the company from compensation limits, a government-imposed condition that CEO Dan Akerson says makes it harder to recruit new executives and to retain others. ...[T]he government’s exit is expected to make GM more attractive to the top talent in the industry and also to investors. On the news, GM shares rose 1% to close at \$38.12 on Thursday. The Treasury sale is estimated to leave taxpayers with a \$10-billion loss. ...In all, taxpayers lent \$49.5 billion to GM and as of Thursday had recouped \$38.4 billion. If GM’s stock stayed at its Thursday close of \$38.12 for the rest of the year, the Treasury would recoup another \$1.2 billion.” [51785]

The Democrat-controlled Senate violates its own rules—and more than 200 years of precedent—by voting 52–48 to modify filibuster procedures to keep Republicans from blocking Obama appointees. (Rule changes require a two-thirds majority—a practice the Democrats chose to ignore.) At Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson writes, “Democrats govern with an ‘ends justify the means’ mentality. They pioneered circuit court filibusters under [George W.] Bush, then changed the rules when Republicans used their own tactic against them. Rest assured that they will start threatening to nuke the legislative filibuster when it suits their needs. Maybe the GOP can play hardball and beat them to the punch next time they have a majority. ...[Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [D-NV] is acting with the explicit consent of ...Obama—who, as a Senator, voted to filibuster one of President Bush’s Supreme Court nominees. Senate Democrats came awfully close to pulling this move over the summer, but ended up balking at the eleventh hour. Having manufactured a judicial crisis—which Republicans allege is a transparent attempt to turn attention away from Obamacare—Reid and his caucus are taking another bite at the apple.” [51483, 51488, 51489, 51496, 51500, 51503, 51506, 51512, 51518]

Reid’s “nuclear option” action is, in the short run, meant to clear the way for three leftist Obama appointees to the D.C. Circuit Court, where all lawsuits related to federal actions are reviewed and where Obama has already lost several cases. Obama wants to “pack the court” to give himself a rubber stamp for his extreme policies. With enough leftists on the D.C. Circuit Court, Obama will bypass Congress and issue administrative rules and regulations to get around it. Obama cannot, for example, get Congress to pass “global warming taxes,” but he can have the Environmental Protection Agency issue strict regulations that have the same impact. Even if the rules are blatantly illegal, Obama will count on his newly-appointed leftist judges to rule that they are. (When the Republicans controlled the Senate, Obama, Reid, and then-Senator Joe Biden all spoke out against such a rule change—a change they now support. Reid said in 2005 that such a rule change would be “un-American.” Also in 2005, Obama said, “Everyone in this chamber knows that if the majority chooses to end the filibuster—if they choose to change the rules and put an end to democratic debate—then the fighting and the bitterness and the gridlock will only get worse.”) [51483, 51488, 51489, 51496, 51500, 51503, 51506, 51512, 51518]

After the vote, Reid says, "...I'm glad we changed it. It is a day of freshness for this great country of ours." [51553]

Reid's rule change also means that Obama has the freedom to fire Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen "Whatever" Sebelius and place all the blame for Healthcare.gov on her. Absent the rule change, Obama might leave Sebelius in place because her replacement would need 60 Senate votes for confirmation if the Republicans objected to her or him. Reid's power play means that Obama could name a rabid socialist to head HHS and the GOP could do nothing to stop the appointment. (Obama could name William Ayers to head the Department of Education and Bernardine Dohrn to an appeals court and would need only 51 Democrat votes to get them approved.) On the other hand, Obama may prefer leaving Sebelius in place, regardless of the amount of opposition against her. Until Obama appoints the 15 members of ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board, Sebelius is the *sole* decision-maker with regard to most Affordable Care Act (ACA) policies. Until the IPAB board is assembled, Sebelius is the "death panel"—and her decisions would need at least 60 votes in the Senate to overturn. (If Sebelius were to decide, for example, that Medicare will not pay for kidney dialysis for any patient over age 70, Senate Republicans would not be able to stop that policy from being implemented.) The IPAB terms last until the year 2020, and Obama's successor has no power under the ACA to remove an IPAB member. [51792]

It is worth noting that Reid and other Democrats argued that the rule change was needed in order to fill a vacancy in the D.C. Circuit Court because Senate Republicans had been holding up confirmation of Obama's nominee. But the reason for the vacancy was that the Democrats refused to allow President George W. Bush to replace John Roberts, who left the D.C. Circuit Court when he was nominated to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. (That is, the Democrats are angry that the Republicans fought back with the same weapon they had used. There would have been no vacancy had the Democrats not prevented Bush from filling it.)

The Reid action also makes some Democrat Senators expendable. Because Reid no longer needs 60 votes to block a filibuster, he not only does not need the occasional vote of a liberal Republican, he also does not need the votes of every Democrat Senator. With Vice President Joe Biden available to break any Senate ties, Reid can approve unpopular Obama appointees with only 50 votes. That makes Senators like Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Mark Pryor (D-AR), Mark Begich (D-AK), Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH), and Kay Hagan (D-NC) nonessential. (Additionally, the rule change will allow Reid to obtain approval for some *very* extreme judges. Republican candidates for the Senate will be quick to use the most controversial rulings of those judges in campaign ads against Senate Democrats: "*Can you believe that Judge X ruled that way? And because of Senator Y, Judge X is now on the D.C. Circuit Court. You can prevent this from happening again, by voting for Republican Candidate Z.*" The rule change is arguably an admission by the Democrats that they expect to lose the Senate in November 2014—and possibly the White House in 2016—and they want to get as many extreme leftist court appointments approved while they still have the power to do so.)

But Reid's rule change may actually end up causing Obama some grief. On MSNBC, HuffingtonPost.com's Ryan Grim notes as an example Congressman Mel Watt (D-NC), who Obama nominated to be director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency—which regulates Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Watt, however, has zero experience in mortgage finance, and it is believed that Obama chose him knowing that Senate Republicans would block his nomination. (They did just that on October 31.) The theory is that Obama picked Watt solely to please some activists on the far left. Grim comments, "When they named Mel Watt, I don't know if they ever actually expected him to get confirmed. Mel Watt is going to do some things to make people unhappy. He will probably make it easier for borrowers to refinance their loans, which is not good for a lot of investors who have a lot of friends in the White House as well." At Mediaite.com, Noah Rothman writes, "Perfect. A far-left judicial nominee, proposed only to keep the Democratic 'activist base' in line but who no one ever thought would be confirmed, will now fracture the Democratic Party by inflaming tensions between the left wing and the liberal donor class. ... This is yet another reason why it is more likely that Democrats in the White House and the Senate, motivated by the panic that overtook the party as the Affordable Care Act's implementation took a toll on their party's standing in the polls, is [sic; are] carelessly seeking to mitigate their losses by taking excessive risks. It is clear that the present strain of Democratic thinking is going to result in short-term gain only to be greatly offset by long-term, structural loss. But Democrats are no longer thinking long-term. They are rattled and are compounding mistake with even greater mistakes. Once this cyclical behavior pattern begins, it becomes difficult to reverse." [51564]

At HotAir.com Ed Morrissey points out that "the [Republican] minority won't be entirely without tools. The Senate depends on unanimous consent to dispense with a vast amount of tedium in parliamentary procedures in order to move efficiently on legislation. Unlike a filibuster, which takes 41 votes to sustain, one Senator can object to each motion for unanimous consent and tie up the chamber in endless bill readings and other non-essential business. It will add days or weeks to the most mundane tasks and could be used to keep plenty of [Obama] appointments tied up for lengthy periods, if applied universally. Reid might find himself out of the frying pan and into the fire after this stunt. Instead of speeding up the Senate, it might mire it for good in endless bickering. We'll see what happens, but... expect Republicans to retaliate—and expect them to end the rest of the filibuster as soon as they have the majority. After all, if it's not good for confirmations, why should it apply to legislation?" (If the GOP controls the Senate and the White House in January 2017 it could conceivably repeal ObamaCare with only 51 votes, rather than the 60 it would ordinarily require.) [51500, 51548]

Obama congratulates Senate Democrats on their power grab, saying, "I support the step a majority of senators today took to change the way that Washington is doing business. ... If you've got a majority of folks who believe in something, then it should be able to pass." (No reporter reminds Obama that "a majority of folks" would like ObamaCare repealed.) In 2005, when the GOP contemplated the "nuclear option," Obama said, "I urge my Republican colleagues not to go through with changing these rules. In the long run, it is not a good result for either party. One day Democrats will be in the majority

again, and this rule change will be no fairer to a Republican minority than it is to a Democratic minority. I sense that talk of the nuclear option is more about power than about fairness. I believe some of my colleagues propose this rule change because they can get away with it rather than because they know it is good for our democracy.” [51546]

According to Politico, “Obama personally called senators on Wednesday to back the move, and Reid ultimately won the vote on a slim margin, 52-48. Just three Democrats broke with Reid: the retiring Carl Levin of Michigan, the moderate Joe Manchin of West Virginia and the vulnerable Mark Pryor of Arkansas.” [51518]

After invoking the “nuclear option,” Senate Democrats quickly approve Obama’s nomination of Patricia Millett to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. (The vote is 55-43. Before Reid’s action, 60 votes would have been needed for Millett’s confirmation.)

Charles Krauthammer comments on the Democrat power grab: “I am extremely happy the Democrats are doing this because they are likely to lose the majority in the coming years. The Republicans will return the favor in spades in the future. The prospects are very strong that the Democrats will lose the Senate next year and there is an excellent chance of [them] losing the White House [in 2016]. When Republicans come into power, they’re going to include Supreme Court nominees [in the rule change]. That will be a devastating blow to the liberals on the court and to the liberals in the country. So I don’t think [the Democrats] will remember this day with any joy in the near future.” [51517]

At the White House, Obama, advisor Valerie Jarrett, and other White House staffers meet with leftist members of the media, including MSNBC’s Al Sharpton, Ed Schultz, and Lawrence O’Donnell, *The Washington Post’s* Ezra Klein, and the Fox News Channel’s Juan Williams. (It can be assumed they were instructed on how to “shape the message” for the coming weeks and months. Obama certainly does not need to “get them in his corner,” as they have been there from day one.) After the meeting, Williams suggests the “talking points” were: blame the Republicans, blame the insurance companies, and blame the media for the ObamaCare fiasco. Williams says, “I can tell you they are in full fight mode over the Affordable Healthcare Act right now. What you hear from these senior officials is they’re concerned about what happened with insurance companies; they wish the insurance companies hadn’t sent out the cancellation notices; and if they had, that they had simply call them renewals. They feel as if they had a major systems failure, a major management failure, and they’re trying to get back on track. Their big concern right now is with people who had those cancellation notices and making sure those people feel they have been taken care of. They feel they have to turn that around, as the first step in trying to repair the damage that’s been done to [Obama].” [51487, 51513, 51545]

Blaming the insurance companies comes easily to Obama. At Townhall.com Mona Charen writes, “In a 2010 radio address, Obama said one carrier was ‘systematically dropping the coverage of women diagnosed with breast cancer.’ The CEO of WellPoint, which had reason to believe [Obama] was referring to her company, responded that they

had provided coverage in the previous year to 200,000 breast cancer patients and had canceled just four policies for fraud or misrepresentation. If there had been a true epidemic of wrongly canceled policies, wouldn't there have been a slew of lawsuits and an outcry?" (Obama and other Democrats have done their best to make it appear as though policies have been routinely canceled because of pre-existing conditions. In most such cases, the policies have been canceled because the insured person neglected to inform the carrier of his condition when he purchased his policy—in order to get a lower rate. That is, the policy was not canceled because the customer had cancer, but because he committed fraud by hiding the fact that he had cancer.) Insurance carriers are heavily regulated by state agencies, and none could routinely cancel policies without a valid reason without those agencies coming down hard on them, or even revoking their licenses to operate. According to *Washington Free Beacon*, individual health insurance policies are dropped at the insignificant rate of about four-tenths of one percent. [51545]

California joins eight other states in announcing its rejection of Obama's "fix" to extend insurance policies. (More than one million California residents whose insurance policies have been canceled must now scurry to obtain ObamaCare insurance by January 1, 2014—or do without coverage.) [51504]

Obama's approval/disapproval rating plunges to 41/56 in a CNN poll. CNN polling director Keating Holland states, "The drop in Obama's approval rating comes entirely among suburbanites. Compared to the October CNN poll, positive views of Obama held steady among people who live in big cities and rural areas. But in the suburbs, his approval rating was 45% a month ago but has dropped to just 37% now." [51499]

On the Fox Business Channel, Democrat political strategist James Carville tells Bob Imus, "I look at these polls, and I gotta [sic] tell you, I think it's all self-inflicted. I think this [Healthcare.gov] rollout, which I think they gotta [sic] get right, was a disaster, it was a joke. And there was a way to talk about, you know, how many people would get to keep their health insurance in a way that wasn't causing this much trouble. ...I'm one of the few people who have believed, and continue to believe, that in the end this thing is gonna [sic] work pretty good [sic]. ...And I think [Obama] has himself to blame as much as anybody. I don't think he was done in, in this instance, by the Republicans, or done in by the media, or done in by anything. It was just... a massive mess-up that's cost him and cost the Democratic Party some grief. Maybe temporarily I hope, but it's certainly caused some grief out there." [51539, 51540, 51541]

EagleRising.com reports, "A shocking new piece of testimony has come out of the hearings on the Benghazi attack, and congressional Republicans are none too happy with what they've learned. [Congressman] Lynn Westmoreland (R-GA) recently gave an interview to CNN where he went over some of the information the House Intelligence Subcommittee has learned in its investigation into what went on that fateful September 11, 2011 [sic; 2012] night. ...The most important part of the interview comes buried at the end—*Westmoreland said the committee is looking into why a directive was released on August 11 telling the personnel in Benghazi that 'you are on your own.'* 'The compound itself is not set up for protection,' Westmoreland said, adding that the CIA

operatives said 'they couldn't believe those guys were over there as unprepared and unequipped as they were.' ...CNN also quickly papers over the fact that Westmoreland clearly articulates that 'everyone' (implying the White House, the State Department and the intelligence community) knew that it was a terrorist attack almost from the get go. 'I don't think there was any doubt that they knew it was a coordinated attack,' Westmoreland said." [51501]

Former Secretary of State George Schultz tells the BBC, "The Iranians are known as great rug merchants, not for nothing. They're good at this business of smiling, encouraging you on and then cutting your throat, so you have to be tough-minded, you have to be realistic. ...The guy who is anxious for a deal [that is, Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry] will get his head handed to him. ...The election of President Hassan Rouhani, a 'moderate' in the eyes of some, may provide a slight opening. But don't bet on it. At this point, strength in the form of sanctions is taking its toll. As with the INF negotiations [with the Soviets], the U.S. shouldn't be afraid to up the ante. Moreover, if Iran has no intention of producing nuclear weapons, then Tehran should cease all uranium enrichment and immediately allow international inspections for verification. Nuclear materials for power and research facilities are readily available and have been offered to Iran for such purposes for years." [51529, 51530]

At WashingtonPost.com Charles Krauthammer writes, "The only reason Iran has come to the table after a decade of contemptuous stonewalling is that economic sanctions have cut so deeply—its currency has collapsed, inflation is rampant—that the regime fears a threat to its very survival. Nothing else could move it to negotiate. Regime survival is the only thing the mullahs value above nuclear weapons. And yet precisely at the point of maximum leverage ...Obama is offering relief in a deal that is absurdly asymmetric: The West would weaken sanctions in exchange for cosmetic changes that do absolutely nothing to weaken Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Don't worry, we are assured. This is only an interim six-month agreement to 'build confidence' until we reach a final one. But this makes no sense. If at this point of maximum economic pressure we can't get Iran to accept a final deal that shuts down its nuclear program, how in God's name do we expect to get such a deal when we have radically reduced that pressure? A bizarre negotiating tactic. And the content of the deal is even worse. It's a rescue package for the mullahs. ...[The proposed deal] leaves Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact. Iran keeps every one of its 19,000 centrifuges—yes, 19,000—including 3,000 second-generation machines that produce enriched uranium at five times the rate of the older ones. ...The point is blindingly simple. Unless you dismantle the centrifuges and prevent the manufacture of new ones, Iran will be perpetually just a few months away from going nuclear. This agreement, which is now reportedly being drafted to allow Iran to interpret it as granting the 'right' to enrich uranium, constitutes the West legitimizing Iran's status as a threshold nuclear state. ...The mullahs are eager for this interim agreement with its immediate yield of political and economic relief. Once they get it, we will have removed their one incentive to conclude the only agreement that is worth anything to us—a verifiable giving up of their nuclear program." (Technically, the "agreement" in Geneva is only an "agreement to negotiate an agreement"—and the Iranians will take as much advantage of the delay as they can.) [51558]

According to the Media Research Center, “NBC News has completely censored any mention of the unfolding ObamaCare disaster for the last 72 hours. Not one word about the millions of Americans losing their health insurance nor the severe political damage that has been done to President Obama and the Democratic Party. In that same time period, both CBS and ABC reported on major developments regarding the new law, including revelations that much of ObamaCare's infrastructure was still unfinished and that the administration knew of serious problems with the HealthCare.gov website as early as March.” (NBC did, however, “find time for an entire segment on... Michelle Obama revealing her biggest fashion regret.”) [51559]

CNSNews.com reports, “In the fourteen fiscal years that preceded ...Obama’s inauguration in 2009, the tax receipts coming into the federal government’s Disability Insurance Trust Fund exceeded the benefits paid out, and the trust fund ran a surplus. In each of the five fiscal years Obama has [been in the White House], the trust fund has run a deficit as the number of people receiving disability benefits has surged. The Disability Insurance Trust Fund has never before run five straight years of deficits. In fiscal 2013, which ended on Sept. 30, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund ran a record deficit of \$31.494 billion, according to newly released data from the Social Security Administration. That followed deficits of \$8.462 billion in fiscal 2009, \$20,831 billion in fiscal 2010, \$25.264 billion in fiscal 2011, and \$29.701 billion in fiscal 2012.” (One of the main reasons for the shortage is the lack of jobs. When a person in his 50s loses his job and runs out of unemployment benefits, he suddenly develops a “bad back” or “depression” and applies for federal disability benefits—and the government generously pays them, partly to prevent them from being counted as unemployed.) [51508]

Politico reports, “Veteran House Democratic aides are sick over the insurance prices they’ll pay under Obamacare, and they’re scrambling to find a cure. ‘In a shock to the system, the older staff in my office (folks over 59) have now found out their personal health insurance costs (even with the government contribution) have gone up 3-4 times what they were paying before,’ Minh Ta, chief of staff to [Congresswoman] Gwen Moore (D-WI), wrote to fellow Democratic chiefs of staff in an email message obtained by Politico. ‘Simply unacceptable.’ ...Under the Affordable Care Act, and federal regulations, many congressional staffers—designated as ‘official’ aides—were forced to move out of the old heavily subsidized Federal Employees Health Benefits program and into the District of Columbia’s health insurance marketplace exchange. Others designated as ‘unofficial’ were allowed to stay in the FEHB program. Managers had to choose whether aides were ‘official’ or ‘unofficial’ by Oct. 31, and Ta said that wasn’t enough time to make an informed decision about who would benefit and who would lose out by going into the new system.” [51515, 51562]

At FoxNews.com Democrat pollster Patrick Caddell writes, “The rule of law has been replaced in Washington by ‘yes we can.’ The events we witnessed Thursday in the Senate, that is Majority Leader Harry Reid’s success at invoking the so-called ‘nuclear option,’ stripping the minority party of its primary power to block nominations, have become a stunning capstone to what has been already a steady erosion of a government of

laws down to a sort of semi-political banana republic. We are now living in a republic in which politicians do what they want without regard to tradition or the best interests of our country. ...The role of the Senate is to be a deliberative body. The rule of filibuster was overthrown Thursday by a change in the rules. It's a change which could never have even been conceived of before in our history, even in those periods when we've had total one party rule. ...But this is not a short term, temporary political matter. This is not just about the upsetting of short term political rules. It's much bigger and should be upsetting to any America who puts their country ahead of their party. For some time now we have been living in a period where a government operating on this slippery slope has been evident. Consider in recent months, the reports, which are yet unproven but appear look serious about the possible tampering with official unemployment numbers. In the past, even when the unemployment numbers have been gathered—and not always without error—the mere thought and the appearance that they were not published in good faith or tainted by politics never entered into the discussion.” [51516]

“...The most recent and jarring example is the Affordable Care Act where [Obama] has, despite the actual language of the law, assumed powers to exempt people, to change the meaning of the law. Of actual legislative statue. In a way that is stunning. Indeed, the most egregious was the Democratic and Republican leaders coming together to agree to ignore the language in the Affordable Care Act legislation and grant themselves and their staffs a special subsidy. Sadly, this is something very few people have bothered to speak out against. The slippery slide into semi-banana republicanism was not just a problem with ...Obama. You could see this disturbing trend emerge in the presidency of George W. Bush. And it has only accelerated from there. ...American self-government is under threat. And the American people no doubt know it. And something must happen. This is why an undeclared war now exists between the mainstream of American and the established political class of both parties. I feel, without question, that there will soon be open warfare between the great vast majority of the American people and this self-perpetuating and self-aggrandizing ruling class that is willing to put their ambitions and power above a government of the American people.” [51516]

At the Ace of Spades blog, “Fritzworth” writes, “I’m going to provide a simple demonstration of why Obamacare is so much different than all the tropes the Left uses to try to scare voters away from those eeeevil Rethuglicans. ...First, let’s visit the standard Left shrieking points. 1) How many of you know someone who died in Hurricane Katrina? (Just thought I’d get that out of the way.) 2) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who was a valid registered voter and who was denied the chance to vote due to Voter ID laws? 3) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who was unable to afford birth control due to a lack of health insurance? 4) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who was denied the chance to have an abortion, due to state regulations? 5) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who has been laid off due to the Federal budget sequester? 6) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who was furloughed during the brief Federal Government shutdown and then did not get back pay for the time furloughed? 7) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who was unable to find a meaningful job because of Right to Work legislation in the state where they live?” [51557]

“Now for the flip side: 8) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who had their existing health insurance policy cancelled as a result of Obamacare, and who are now looking at options that are more expensive and have higher deductibles? (My own hand goes up.) 9) How many of you know someone (including yourself) who works for a business whose health insurance coverage is either going to be eliminated or become more expensive as a result of Obamacare? Show of hands, everyone? Yep, what I pretty much thought. ...I am willing to bet that the vast majority of the voting population will answer yes to questions 8 and 9. And that is why, in spite of the Left’s desperate attempts to find some equivalents between the burgeoning Obamacare debacle and the sins of the Right (as they define them), it’s really no contest. Should be interesting.” [51557]

CNSNews.com reports, “On June 20, 2007, then-Senator Barack Obama (D-IL), who was seeking the Democratic presidential nomination at the time, hosted a ‘portrait session’ in his U.S. Senate office where he posed for and with Terry Richardson, a man already well-known, as the flyleaf of a coffee-table collection of his work put it, as the photographer who ‘took 1970s porn esthetic and made it fashion chic.’” Richardson’s pornographic 2004 book, *Terryworld*, “includes photos of oral sex; a nude model wearing a ‘slut’ crown riding a bike; a young man appearing to hang by a belt from a door; models urinating in the snow; a young woman with a large gold ball stuffed into her vagina; naked models with bags over their heads or their eyes darkened; a man with a toothbrush in his rectum; and Richardson with his teeth on a tampon string while it is inside a model’s vagina. It also includes a photo of an apparently naked Richardson engaging in some kind of physical contact with a sheep ...Obama’s ‘portrait session’ with Richardson in the Hart Senate Office Building was set up for *Vibe* magazine, which ran some of Richardson’s photos of Obama along with the cover article for its September 2007 issue.” (Whether Richardson took any pornographic but so-far-unpublished photographs of Obama is not known.) [51552, 51774]

At NationalJournal.com Ron Fournier reports that media photographers are becoming increasingly frustrated by White House efforts to block them from Obama events, forcing them to use images taken by official White House photographers. According to Fournier, *New York Times* photographer Doug Mills complained to White House press secretary Jay Carney, saying, “You guys are just like [the Soviet news agency] Tass.” A letter to Carney from the White House Correspondents Association states, “As surely as if they were placing a hand over a journalist’s camera lens, officials in this administration are blocking the public from having an independent view of important functions of the Executive Branch of government.” “The letter,” writes Fournier, “includes examples of important news events that were not covered by media photographers, and yet pictures were taken by the White House image team and widely distributed via social media. This happens almost daily. Unlike media photographers, official White House photographers are paid by taxpayers and report to the president. Their job is to make Obama look good. They are propagandists—in the purest sense of the word. ...Journalists understand that [Obama’s] family and national security events must be off-limits at times. Journalists also don’t object to the White House using social media; those are platforms as legitimate as televisions and print. The problem is that the Obama White House is simultaneously

restricting access of independent media while flooding the public with state-run media. Again, this is propaganda—utterly lacking a skeptical eye.” [51521, 51522, 51676, 51684, 51691, 51781, 51997]

FrontPageMag.com reports, “Unbelievably, the Obama administration finds itself embroiled in yet another scandal. ABC News is reporting that dozens of alleged Islamic terrorists with bomb-making skills may have been mistakenly allowed to take up residence in the United States, due to a flawed screening system. Hundreds of FBI specialists have been assigned to an around-the-clock investigation of FBI archives that contain 100,000 improvised explosive devices (IEDs) retrieved from Iraq and Afghanistan. The investigation was prompted by the 2009 discovery of a pair of al Qaeda operatives living as war refugees in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The men subsequently admitted in court that they were terrorists who had attacked U.S. troops in Iraq.” (AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller warns, “We have been importing jihadists for years now with Muslim immigration programs under the Refugee Resettlement program, diversity visas and religious visas. It’s always a shock to people when they first find out how Refugee Resettlement works. Instead of giving refuge to the religious minorities that are persecuted, oppressed and subjugated under the Shariah, we are opening the floodgates to Islamic supremacists and jihadists. And what most folks don’t know is that it’s the OIC-driven [Organization of the Islamic Conference] U.N. that decides who gets refugee status. And you are supporting them with your hard-earned money. Taxpayer dollars financing the invaders whose objective is to annihilate us.”) [51527, 51528]

On *Crossfire*, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich observes, “[T]his was one more step to give ...Obama even more power and even more control. ...And I think what struck me, I think this is a very historic vote. I don't think this is just a tactic. And if you watch [Obama’s] press conference today, the entire opening of the press conference is a litany of legislative problems. He doesn’t get to the [issue of court] appointments until after he goes through layer after layer of legislative problems, which signals to me he intends to unwind the entire filibuster by the time this is done. ...[T]he U.S. Senate as it once was may have died forever. The Founding Fathers realized that your opinion changes when your relative power changes. Filibusters helped make the U.S. Senate what they called the saucer that cooled the hot coffee coming from the House. And that was by design. As of today, that’s changed forever...” [51574]

On *The O’Reilly Factor*, *Time* magazine editor-at-large Mark Halperin blames Mitt Romney for the media’s failure to “scrutinize” ObamaCare, telling guest host Laura Ingraham, “[T]he problem for the Republicans in the re-election context was you nominated, Republicans nominated Mitt Romney, a guy who was not very well positioned, to say the least, to make the case against ObamaCare because he passed the healthcare plan in Massachusetts. Barack Obama knew he wasn’t going to run for re-election defending the program. Part of the flaws of the way the media works [sic]. If the candidates aren’t talking about it [it then] gets less coverage. No doubt a disservice was done to the country and to liberals. It didn’t get scrutiny on passage and then again when [Obama] was running for re-election. Our cover story in the magazine lays all this out just how deep [Obama’s] predicament is now politically and substantively [sic].” [51606]

Breitbart.com's John Nolte comments on Halperin's "why we didn't do our job" excuse: "One wonders how many moons Halperin can see from his planet. Romney did hit on ObamaCare, once during the most high-profile of all presidential election events—a presidential debate. But he was immediately pummeled by elite media fact-checkers. In fact, the media played whack-a-mole with Romney, repeatedly hitting him again and again and again whenever he dared criticize ObamaCare. By loudly screaming liar! every time he brought it up, the media intentionally turned ObamaCare into a liability for Romney to run on. And you can bet that was the plan. According to Halperin, just how many times did Romney have to bring up ObamaCare in order for the media to do its job? Was he just one mention away? Two? Four? ... [T]here is just no excuse—other than bias—for the media not scrutinizing ObamaCare as it was being proposed, written, and passed. Still, throughout all of that, including a grueling legislative process, the media refused to investigate the legislation or to take New Media's reporting seriously. In many cases, over the last few years, the media pushed back against ObamaCare critics as motivated by race. No, what happened here, and we all know it, including Halperin, is that the media wanted ObamaCare to pass and wanted Obama to win re-election. It was a cover-up, plain and simple, and it is one that continues to this day. The ObamaCare train wreck of cancellations is just beginning. The media knows this but still they refuse to report on it. Maybe if we got Mitt Romney to talk about it..." [51606]

On *Hannity*, Sean Hannity posts undercover video from James O'Keefe's Project Veritas in which an ObamaCare "navigator" from Enroll America, Christopher Tarango, is asked if he can provide mailing lists of enrollees for political purposes. The navigator initially says he cannot provide the information, but offers to talk to someone who might be able to help if he first shares "a few beers" with him. Tarango tells the undercover journalist, "I'm doing Enroll America right now. But I'm also, I shouldn't be saying this, but I'm also helping out with HD 50 [the Texas house district 50 campaign], so that's as partisan as it gets... I mean, there's a lot of talent that got sucked into Enroll America, but we are all Obama people." (Fox News later reports that the non-profit Cause of Action government accountability organization filed a complaint with the IRS, questioning the tax-exempt status of Enroll America—a status which require it remain non-partisan. DailyCaller.com later reports Tarango's resignation from Enroll America.) [51655, 51656, 51721, 52501]

The Obama administration announces that the start of the enrollment period for year two of ObamaCare will be delayed from October 15, 2014 to November 15, 2014—after the mid-term elections. The Department of Health and Human Services says the delay is "good news for consumers, who will have more time to learn about plans before enrolling." (Mostly, it is good news for Democrats up for reelection, because some of their constituents will not discover how much their replacement insurance will cost until more than one week after they cast their ballots. It is likely that the premium increase "sticker shock" in late 2014 will be worse than that of 2013 because the adverse selection of the oldest and sickest people signing up for ObamaCare, while the young and the healthy stay away from Healthcare.gov in droves, will boost insurance costs even higher. One Republican campaign strategist comments to the *Daily Mail*, "How nakedly political

can you get?” Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) says, “It is a cynical, political ploy by the administration to hide the additional sticker shock, the increased costs of insurance that are going to come next year. So for them to delay from a couple of weeks before the election to a couple of weeks after the election to me is just a naked effort...” [51523, 51537, 51538, 51547, 51560, 51565, 51580, 51582, 51586]

NBC’s *Meet the Press* host, David Gregory, appears on the Tonight show with Jay Leno. In a discussion about ObamaCare, Gregory says, “The huge question is... how do you get the architecture to work? How do you get young people to sign up for something that they don’t want? And as I talk to young people, when you have a tech problem like this, they’ll stay even farther away from it. ...When you run the government, there are huge constraints on you, and how you get these things up and running, and whether government can actually do this kind of technology. And this, by the way, is the argument that conservatives make, which is: This is why government should not be behind big, socially transformational programs like this. ...[ObamaCare is] predicated on this idea that older, sicker people are going to get taken care of, but younger people gotta [sic] pay the bill, and they gotta [sic] sign up first to pay the bill. And we just don’t know how this is all gonna [sic] turn out.” [51591]

On November 22 Algemeiner.com reports, “On a state visit to Moscow Wednesday, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu reportedly asked Russian President Vladimir Putin to assert himself over ...Obama as the main peacekeeper in the Iranian nuclear negotiations, just as Putin did over the chemical weapons in Syria, according to a report on Thursday in Russia’s Kommersant that cited unnamed diplomatic sources. Kommersant said the deal on the table today from the world powers in Geneva stipulates a six-month suspension of work on Iran’s nuclear facilities, in exchange for releasing \$3 billion of frozen assets in international banks and a reduction in sanctions that would provide Tehran with another \$10 billion. The newspaper cited a source close to the Israeli government as saying, ‘Netanyahu understands that the deal, insisted on by the United States, will be concluded,’ and he sees no way to influence Washington any further in the matter.” (Iran’s nuclear program is likely so far along that, even if Iran upholds its end of the bargain, it will simply start where it left off in six months and soon have a nuclear weapon—after having gained \$13 billion. At AtlasShrugs.com, Pamela Geller writes, “OMG. This is breathtaking—Israel was always punished for being the proxy of the US in region. America was the big Satan, Israel the little Satan. Now that Obama has thrown Israel under the nuclear bus, hellzapoppin. Poor Israel, diving for dear life, when they should be diving for pearls. Obama’s foreign policy failures are like an out-of-control snowball tearing down Mount Kilimanjaro. Just when you think it can’t get any worse... Egypt, Libya, Benghazi, Eastern Europe, Honduras, the Baltic states, Russia et al. And the King’s sniveling subjects in the enemedia are still polishing his knob.”) [51524]

At DailyCaller.com Sunny Lohmann comments on Obama’s statement that ObamaCare needs to be “remarketed and rebranded.” “So I have couple of ideas. In order to make ObamaCare untouchable to criticism, you rename the Affordable Care Act, ‘Equality Care for Minorities, and I Suppose the Rest of You Too Act.’ And if you rename

Healthcare.gov simply, ‘BlackCare.gov’—see, then everybody will say, ‘Oh, it must be good!’” [51550]

DailyCaller.com also provides “Six lessons Obama can learn from the Playstation 4 rollout.” “1. Have a good product...2. Know your market... 3. Have a good distribution plan... 4. Avoid a recall... 5. Have a good CEO... 6. You can’t force people to buy your product.” [51551]

In a YouGov.com poll, Ronald Reagan ranks the greatest of all presidents since 1900, with 32 percent. Franklin D. Roosevelt makes second place with 31 percent. Obama ranks as the greatest failure, with 37 percent of the vote, edging George W. Bush’s 32 percent and Richard M. Nixon’s 30 percent. [51801, 51802]

In Seattle, Washington, socialist city council member Kshama Sawant calls for the seizure of Boeing’s aircraft manufacturing facilities after the company suggests it may locate its Boeing 777X production in another state. She tells a crowd of union members at a rally, “The workers should take over the factories, and shut down Boeing’s profit-making machine.” She charges that such a move by Boeing would be “economic terrorism.” (Sawant is apparently too stupid to comprehend that the term “economic terrorism” more accurately describes her own threat, and that her Marxist call for the confiscation of private property will only tip the plant location scales away from Seattle. Obama has no comment, but Attorney General Eric Holder and Obama’s leftist appointees at the National Labor Relations Board will probably do their best to thwart any Boeing action with which they may disagree.) Sawant also says, “We can re-tool the [Boeing] machines to produce mass transit like buses, instead of destructive, you know, war machines.” [51579, 51583]

Heritage.org provides an example of government bureaucracy run amok: “GM is recalling 18,941 Chevy Camaros because the air bag warning label on the sun visor *may* peel. Seriously. The recall decision was made by the Executive Field Action Decision Committee, following a review by the Field Performance Evaluation Review Committee. So, pursuant to 49 CFR §573.6, the automaker submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) its determination of noncompliance for the requirement that the visor label be ‘permanently affixed.’ GM also issued a stop delivery order to dealers, and instructed them to inspect the label on each sun visor (‘using a finger nail, plastic card, or similar’ to determine proper adhesion). In the event a label is prone to peel, the entire sun visor must be scrapped and replaced.” (The cost of the recall is not known, but it will certainly be passed on to future customers in the form of higher prices.) [51717]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) unsuccessfully tries to enroll in ObamaCare using the Healthcare.gov web site. He states, “Earlier this afternoon, I sat down to try and enroll in the DC exchange under the president’s health care law. Like many Americans, my experience was pretty frustrating. After putting in my personal information, I received an error message. I was able to work past that, but when I went to actually sign up for coverage, I got this ‘internal server error’ screen. Despite multiple attempts, I was unable

to get past that point and sign up for a health plan. We've got a call into the help desk. Guess I'll just have to keep trying..." [51554]

DailyCaller.com reports, "The Energy Department has sold off its \$192 million loan guarantee to Fisker Automotive to Chinese billionaire Richard Li for \$25 million—the biggest taxpayer loss on a green loan since the failure of Solyndra. ...Including the \$25 million loan sale, the DOE has recovered only \$53 million of the original \$192 million disbursed—netting taxpayers a \$139 million loss." (The estimated loss is later increased to \$168 million.) [51561, 51610, 51678]

In the Gallup poll, Obama's approval/disapproval rating falls to 39/54 percent. [51563]

Forbes.com reports, "As if the Obama team needed more proof that Obamacare was challenged, the state market that they've flagged as a beacon of success is itself showing signs of faltering. Last night, California released enrollment and demographic data for the health plans being offered in its state Obamacare exchange. It shows that the enrollment, so far, is heavily skewed to older (and presumably sicker) people aged 45-64. ...The problem, of course, is adverse selection. If only older, and by inference sicker individuals sign up for Obamacare, it will force the program's costs—and in turn premiums—to rise. This will further discourage the younger, healthier members that the administration need's to enroll into Obamacare to make the scheme viable. The data released by Covered California (the California exchange) shows that, so far, 34% of total enrollment is comprised of people aged 55-64, the highest mix among age brackets. Another 22% of enrollees were aged 45-54. Therefore, 56% of California's total exchange enrollment in October was people aged 45-64. Yet California's total population of residents that are aged 45-64 is only 25%. This means that a dramatically skewed percentage of older individuals (relative to the state's total eligible pool) are the ones—so far—signing up for Obamacare." [51593]

DailyCaller.com interviews former Secret Service Agent Dan Bongino, author of, *Life Inside the Bubble: Why a Top-Ranked Secret Service Agent Walked Away From It All*. Bongino, who is running for Congress in Maryland, says, "It's a travesty, what's happened to the Department of Justice [DOJ]. It's an actual travesty. It's political malpractice at its worst. I don't think it's a coincidence that Lady Justice has got a blindfold on. That has not been the case for this administration. Think about the things they've wasted their time on. Political statements about the voter intimidation, Fast and Furious, hiding documents from Congress—the most recent scandal, and I think the most egregious, is going after Louisiana for the school voucher program. ...This Department of Justice is a Department of Injustice. It's just sad what has happened—I'm stunned that more people have not come forward. Because I get, phone calls, emails, texts from people all the time, who—I cannot express to you the level of frustration amongst federal agents and administrative employees. People are really fed up with this administration and the way they politicize things. I think the DOJ is just the tip of the spear." [51594]

Sharon Rondeau, editor of ThePostEmail.com, reports threats against her, Maricopa County, Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio, and cold case posse lead investigator Mike Zullo,

from someone who calls himself “an IT professional that [sic; who] became involved in the Obama presidential campaign, first as a staffer, then as a personal assistant in 2007-2008.” Objecting to those who have proven that Obama’s birth certificate is a forgery, the individual writes, “I don’t think you realize just who you’re messing with and the vast amount of trouble you can get into. ... You’re biting off way more than you can chew and I’d seriously reconsider the path you’re on, because it’s not going to end well for anyone who proclaims to be a ‘birther.’ ... If Arpaio and his sidekick Mr. Zullo show up in Hawaii again; I happen to know the Governor and several police precincts here are looking forward to welcoming them with an all-expense vacation in one of the jail cells here. ... We support [Obama] 100% and will do anything we have to protect him. (and I mean ANYTHING). ... If you don’t think we can do this, look what happened to Darren Huff, Walt Fitzpatrick, Terry Lakin and several other people we’ve had imprisoned. ... We own the media and the courts. It’s impossible for you to fight this.” (This is not the first threat against Rondeau, Arpaio, or Zullo. In October 2011 a Tennessee man, Adam Eugene Cox, wrote, “I plan to kill Joe Arpaio first. He will be filled with a thousand bullet holes before the year is out, I promise you this. He won’t fuck with Obama. He will be buried 10 feet under and his whole family will be murdered along with him. Don’t like it? Come stop me. Come die before me.” Cox was arrested. One of Rondeau’s readers observes, “There is an old saying from WWII bomber pilots, ‘You know you are over the target when the flack becomes the worst.’” The “Obots” are frightened and desperate—which makes them more dangerous.) [51567, 51568, 51569]

CNSNews.com reports, “The price of electricity hit a record for the month of October, according to data released Wednesday by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That made October the eleventh straight month when the average price of electricity hit or matched the record level for that month. The average price of electricity in October was 13.2 cents per kilowatt hour (KWH), up from 12.8 cents per KWH in October 2012—and up from 9.3 cents per KWH in October 2003. Americans now pay 42 percent more for electricity than they did a decade ago.” [51573]

Probably to the surprise of no one, a Wilson Perkins Allen Opinion Research survey shows that Obama would have lost to Mitt Romney had the voters known in 2012 that many of them would lose their health insurance because of ObamaCare. The poll question: “As you may know, millions of Americans have lost their insurance plans despite ... Obama’s promise that, quote, ‘if you like your plan, you can keep it.’ If you knew in 2012 that this promise was not true, would you still have voted for Barack Obama?” Twenty-three percent of those surveyed who voted for Obama in 2012 responded no. [51575]

On the *Freedom Friday* radio program, cold case posse investigator Mike Zullo tells host Carl Gallups the Obama birth certificate defenders “don’t know what we know; they don’t know what we have.” Gallups adds, “And that’s what’s killing them.” Zullo says, “I can’t go into” additional details about the investigation “but I can tell you that the magnitude is so great that Sheriff Arpaio has allotted [additional] resources from the Maricopa County Sheriff’s office... He is fully invested in this. ... When this information

is finally exposed to the public it will be universe shattering. This is beyond the pale of anything you could imagine.” [51577, 51578]

The Obama administration announces the delay of the cutoff date for ObamaCare enrollment to obtain coverage effective on January 1 from December 15 to December 23. (The change means little if the insurance companies cannot process the applications in such a short period of time—especially if the Healthcare.gov web site still lacks the ability to process premium payments. The change also means the website likely will not be fully operational by November 30, as had been promised.) [51581, 51582]

Connecticut becomes the ninth state to reject Obama’s health care “fix” to reverse insurance policy cancellations. (The other states are California, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington.) [51585, 51597]

On November 23 Townhall.com’s Mike Shedlock posts a letter from the owner of a California business: “My company, based in California, employs 600. We used to insure about 250 of our employees. The rest opted out. The company paid 50% of their premiums for about \$750,000/yr. Under Obamacare, no one can opt out without penalty, and the rates are double or triple, depending upon the plan. Our 750k insurance for 250 employees is going to \$2 million per year for 600 employees. By mandate, we have to pay 91.5% of the premium or more up from the 50% we used to pay. Our employees share of the premium goes from \$7/week for the cheapest plan to \$30/week. 95% of my employees were on that plan. Remember, we used to pay 50% now we pay 91.5% and the premiums still go up that much!! The cheapest plan now has a deductible of \$6350! Before it was \$150. Employees making \$9 to \$10/hr, have to pay \$30/wk and have a \$6350 deductible! They can’t afford that to be sure. Obamacare will kill their propensity to seek medical care. More money for less care? How does that help them? Here is the craziest part. Employees who qualify for mediCAL (the California version of Medicare), which is most of my employees, will automatically be enrolled in the Federal SNAP [food stamp] program. They cannot opt out. They cannot decline. They will be automatically enrolled in the Federal food stamp program based upon their level of Obamacare qualification. Remember, these people work full time, living in a small town in California. They are not seeking assistance. It all seems like a joke. How can this be the new system? Pelosi, pass the bill to find out what’s in it? Surprise! You’ve annihilated the working class.” [51584]

A Sonoma, California family whose health insurance premiums will increase from \$499 per month to \$1,252 per month as a result of ObamaCare tells Heritage.org it may do without insurance altogether—or come up with the additional cash by slashing its budget. Kay Joy suggests her family may do the following:

“Stop paying the extra payment on my mortgage: \$100/month
Stop eating out: \$150/month
Don’t go to the movies: \$36/month
Switch to getting a haircut every other month: \$15/month

Stop getting manicures: \$40/month
Stop charitable donations to Wounded Warrior and Habitat for Humanity: \$70/month
Stop saving for an annual anniversary getaway: \$60/month
No Christmas gifts to extended family: \$40/month
Quit buying beef at the grocery store: \$100/month
Teeth cleaning only once per year: \$30/month
Cancel all magazine/newspaper subscriptions: at least \$30/month
Cut DISH service to cheaper plan: \$50/month
Cancel land line phone service: \$70/month”

As *The Obama Timeline* has previously noted, the higher insurance premiums caused by ObamaCare will *necessarily* harm the economy, because every dollar spent on increased premiums is a dollar *not* spent on something else. If the Joy family is representative of what may happen across the nation, there will be layoffs of hair stylists, manicurists, hotel, restaurant, theater workers, and hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of others. [51663]

In his weekly Internet/radio address, Obama says, “Over the past couple months, most of the political headlines you’ve read have probably been about the government shutdown and the launch of the Affordable Care Act, and I know that many of you have rightly never been more frustrated with Washington. But if you look beyond those headlines, there are some good things happening in our economy. And that’s been my top priority since the day I walked into the Oval Office. ... Think about what we could do if a reckless few didn’t hold the economy hostage every few months, or waste time on dozens of votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act rather than try to help us fix it.” (At HotAir.com Ed Morrissey comments, “Well, golly, Mr. [Obama], think how prepared we might have been to discuss ‘fixes’ if you and the entire White House and HHS [Department of Health and Human Services] hadn’t lied to the American public all year long about the program’s readiness for the October 1st launch. Think about what we might have been able to do to avoid the cancellation of millions of policies if you hadn’t lied for the last three-plus years by insisting, ‘If you like your plan, you can keep your plan.’ Think about what we might have done on real cost-lowering reform had Democrats not shoved an unpopular massive government intervention onto the health-care sector through legislative chicanery in 2010. Think about what might have happened if we had found out what was in the bill before we passed it. Anyway, [Mr.] Pivot, good luck with this latest attempt to use the economy as a subject change away from your failures. Say, what is the civilian workforce participation rate these days, anyway? At a new 35-year low after 720,000 people left the workforce in October, I see.”) [51587, 51595]

At NYTimes.com John Harwood reviews the argument that ObamaCare is not the redistribution of wealth, claiming, “they designed the legislation to minimize the number of people likely to be hurt.” He then disproves that very point by noting, “The law, for example, banned rate discrimination against women, which insurance companies called ‘gender rating’ to account for their higher health costs. But that raised the relative burden borne by men. The law also limited how much more insurers can charge older

Americans, who use more health care over all. But that raised the relative burden on younger people. And the law required insurers to offer coverage to Americans with pre-existing conditions, which eased costs for less healthy people but raised prices for others who had been charged lower rates because of their good health.” Harwood adds, “In the end, America’s political culture may have made it unrealistic to expect a smooth public reception for the law, no matter how cleverly the White House modulated Mr. Obama’s language or shaped his policy to minimize the number of losers.” (By “political culture” Harwood means, “those nasty Republicans” did in ObamaCare and Healthcare.gov—and web site problems and lies had nothing to do with the lack of a “smooth public reception” and the mess Obama is now in.) [51630, 51675]

The New York Times also reports in some of the “tension and flaws” during the lead-up to the implementation of Healthcare.gov, writing, “On a sultry day in late August, a dozen staff members of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services gathered at the agency’s Baltimore headquarters with managers from the major contractors building HealthCare.gov to review numerous problems with ...Obama’s online health insurance initiative. The mood was grim. The prime contractor, CGI Federal, had long before concluded that the administration was blindly enamored of an unrealistic goal: creating a cutting-edge website that would use the latest technologies to dazzle consumers with its many features. Knowing how long it would take to complete and test the software, the company’s officials and other vendors believed that it was impossible to open a fully functioning exchange on Oct. 1. ...The online exchange was crippled, people involved with building it said in recent interviews, because of a huge gap between the administration’s grand hopes and the practicalities of building a website that could function on opening day. Vital components were never secured, including sufficient access to a data center to prevent the website from crashing. A backup system that could go live if it did crash was not created, a weakness the administration has never disclosed. And the architecture of the system that interacts with the data center where information is stored is so poorly configured that it must be redesigned, a process that experts said typically takes months. An initial assessment identified more than 600 hardware and software defects—‘the longest list anybody had ever seen,’ one person involved with the project said.” [51734]

“The acrimony between the Medicare agency and CGI had built steadily over the preceding months, the new interviews show. By late summer, teams of agency officials had parked themselves in CGI Federal’s headquarters in Herndon, Va., demanding on-the-spot reviews and demonstrations of new code that was never tested. Agency officials complained that CGI missed crucial deadlines and that it could not control other contractors, although the company said it had no power to do so. CGI and other contractors complained of endlessly shifting requirements and a government decision-making process so cumbersome that it took weeks to resolve elementary questions, such as determining whether users should be required to provide Social Security numbers. Some CGI software engineers ultimately walked out, saying it was impossible to produce good work under such conditions. ‘Cut corners, make date,’ said one specialist, who like most of the people interviewed for this article would not allow his name to be used

because the Obama administration has requested that all government officials and contractors involved keep their work confidential.” [51734]

According to the *New York Times*, Obama’s “signature initiative was effectively left under the day-to-day management of Henry Chao, a 19-year veteran of the Medicare agency with little clout and little formal background in computer science. Mr. Chao had to consult with senior department officials and the White House, and was unable to make many decisions on his own. ‘Nothing was decided without a conversation there,’ said one agency official involved in the project, referring to the constant White House demands for oversight. On behalf of Mr. Chao, the Medicare agency declined to comment. ...The Medicare agency was also growing frustrated with tension among contractors, noting that initial tests of parts of the system were being delayed because of ‘coordination issues’ between CGI and QSSI, which won another part of the job after losing the lead contractor role. Mr. Chao seemed to colleagues to be at his wit’s end. One evening last summer, he called Wallace Fung, who retired in 2008 as the Medicare agency’s chief technology officer. Mr. Fung said in an interview that he told Mr. Chao to greatly simplify the site’s functions. ‘Henry, this is not going to work. You cannot build this kind of system overnight,’ Mr. Fung said he told him. ‘I know,’ Mr. Chao answered, according to Mr. Fung. ‘But I cannot talk them out of it.’” (HotAir.com asks, “Anyone out there still think President Bambi was a blissfully ignorant little fawn about all this?”) [51733, 51734]

At WeeklyStandard.com William Kristol writes, “As we go to press, the Obama administration seems to be hurtling towards a bad deal with Iran. The administration will claim the agreement freezes and indeed sets back the Iranian nuclear program. But even the *New York Times* acknowledges that ‘only some elements are frozen, and rollbacks in the initial agreement are relatively minor’ and can be easily reversed. Furthermore, the ‘deal’ would mean the United States would retreat from its previous clear red line—one embodied in repeated U.N. Security Council resolutions—of requiring that Iran stop enrichment. It would allow Iran to move ever closer to nuclear weapons while getting significant sanctions relief. Some deal! In truth, it’s not a deal in the usual meaning of the term. It’s an accommodation. It’s a way for the Obama administration to avoid confronting Iran, and to buy time to acclimate the world to accepting a nuclear Iran. What will the Obama administration’s leading lights say when this becomes obvious? When he sees his grand diplomatic achievement crumbling around him, will Secretary of State John Kerry join his counterpart, Health and Human Services secretary Kathleen Sebelius, in sighing and exclaiming with pithy eloquence, ‘Uh-oh?’ Will ...Obama offer the same apology to the Israelis that he has to Americans who held insurance policies they liked: ‘I am sorry that they are finding themselves in this situation based on assurances they got from me?’” [51590]

“As the implementation of the Iran agreement goes the way of the implementation of Obamacare, will his reaction be to say, ‘We’re going to have to, obviously, re-market and re-brand?’ ...The American people can ignore Obama’s efforts to re-market and re-brand Obamacare, and instead insist on its repeal. But the American people won’t be able to repeal Iran’s nuclear weapons once Iran has them. ...[O]ne can’t be optimistic about their chances for success in scuttling the deal. And one can’t be optimistic that the Obama

administration will reverse course at the eleventh hour. Which means the last, best hope for stopping the Iranian regime from having nuclear weapons may well lie in a *deus ex machina* (if one may be permitted to use a pagan phrase for a Jewish state). It is Israel, not the great American superpower, that may well have to act to thwart Iran's nuclear ambitions. And so the democratically elected leader of Israel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, will have to weigh his choices, with the burden of history on his mind and the judgment of future generations in his thoughts." [51590]

FoxNews.com reports, "U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry, along with five other foreign ministers worked Saturday on the fine print of a draft agreement of an Iran nuclear deal. Diplomats refused to spell out details of the talks, held in a five-star Geneva hotel. But comments from both sides suggested negotiations focused on detailed wording that could be key in shaping an agreement that both sides could live with. As midnight approached, Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi described the talks as being in 'their 11th hour,' with most issues resolved but an agreement still elusive. 'We have agreed to 98 percent of the draft... but the remaining 2 percent is very important to us,' he told reporters without elaborating." [51599, 51600]

Meanwhile, *The Jerusalem Post* reports, "Iran is planning to construct two new nuclear power plants in the near future, the Fars News Agency quoted a senior Iranian nuclear official as saying Saturday. 'The Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) has put construction of the second and third (nuclear) power stations on its agenda due to the government's programs and the emphasis laid by the President (Hassan Rouhani),' Fars quoted AEOI Deputy Chief Hossein Khalfi as saying. Iran currently has one such operational nuclear power plant at Bushehr." [51601]

Obama announces a six-month deal in which economic sanctions on Iran are loosened. Iran essentially gives up nothing; it is allowed to keep its nuclear facilities and centrifuges but agrees to enrich uranium only to a five percent level. (Iran will retain the ability to restart its programs any time it chooses, because it is giving up no equipment or facilities.) Obama claims, "Today, that diplomacy opened up a new path toward a world that is more secure—a future in which we can verify that Iran's nuclear program is peaceful, and that it cannot build a nuclear weapon." Obama states, "For the first time in nearly a decade, we have halted the progress of the Iranian nuclear program." Obama brags that the tough economic sanctions imposed on Iran brought it to the negotiating table. (He does not mention that Congress demanded those sanctions and that he resisted them every step of the way.) He also states that negotiations with Iran will continue over the next six months, and sanctions will be re-imposed if Iran violates the agreement. (Obama's threat is meaningless. The current sanctions were incredibly difficult to put in place, and Russia and China will likely never agree to their re-imposition.) The agreement allows Iran to keep its plutonium reactor at Arak—despite the fact that plutonium serves no purpose other than the development of nuclear weapons. (Iran only agrees not to *operate* the Arak facility for six months. In fact, construction of the facility has not yet been completed, so the promise is to not do what it cannot do anyway—*while construction continues*.) [51602, 51603, 51604, 51607, 51608, 51617, 51619, 51620, 51621, 51632]

Some in the West may consider the agreement meaningful. What matters most, however, is what Israel, Saudi Arabia, and other nations in the region think. The likelihood is that they will be far less enthusiastic about the agreement than Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry. (Obama and Kerry did *not* use the negotiations to obtain the release of Saeed Abedini, an American clergyman held captive by the Iranians. On November 25 Fox News' Martha MacCallum asks, "Wouldn't it have been a fairly easy to make bringing the Pastor home part of the Iran deal?" Sarah Palin also asks, "Was the Christian pastor's release part of this weekend's 'historic' deal struck with Iran? If not, why not?..." According to the State Department, the issue of Abedini was not raised in the negotiations.) Kerry claims the deal does *not* grant Iran the right to enrich uranium, but the Iranians claim it does. (In fact, Iranian President Rouhani says, "Let anyone make his own reading, but this right is clearly stated in the text of the agreement that Iran can continue its enrichment, and I announce to our people that our enrichment activities will continue as before." Kerry states, "The first step, let me be clear, does not say that Iran has a right to enrich uranium"—even though the agreement specifically allows Iran to enrich uranium up to five percent. Further, Article IV of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—to which Iran is signatory—states, "Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty"—in other words, Iran is correct and Kerry's statement is irrelevant—or an intentional obfuscation.) [51602, 51603, 51604, 51607, 51608, 51617, 51619, 51620, 51621, 51632, 51639, 51641, 51642, 51647, 51651, 51654, 51682, 51708, 51709, 51773]

In addition to Abedini, Iran is holding two other Americans: former U.S. Marine Amir Hekmati, who Iran claims is a spy, and Bob Levinson, a possible CIA agent who has been held by Iran since March 8, 2007. No effort was made by the Obama administration to include the release of Abedini, Hekmati, or Levinson in its negotiations with Iran. (On November 26 Bridget Johnson notes at PJMedia.com, "Today, Levinson became the longest held U.S. hostage in history, passing Terry Anderson's 2,454 days in captivity at the hands of Hezbollah before being freed in 1991.") Although Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry made no effort to release the three Americans, they did reportedly release several Iranians as a "goodwill gesture." [51773, 51789, 51853, 51854, 51854]

At NationalReview.com Daniel Pipes, president of the Middle East forum, writes, "This wretched deal offers one of those rare occasions when comparison with [British Prime Minister] Neville Chamberlain in Munich in 1938 is valid. An overeager Western government, blind to the evil cunning of the regime it so much wants to work with, appeases it with concessions that will come back to haunt it. Geneva and November 24 will be remembered along with Munich and September 29. Barack Obama has made many foreign-policy errors in the past five years, but this is the first to rank as a disaster. Along with the health-care law, it is one of his worst-ever steps. [Secretary of State] John Kerry is a too-eager puppy looking for a deal at any price. With the U.S. government forfeiting its leadership role, the Israelis, Saudis, and perhaps others are left to cope with

a bad situation made worse. War has now become a much more likely prospect. Shame on us Americans for reelecting Barack Obama.” [51626]

Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, states, “I thank God that... the new government [in Iran]... was able to legitimize the Iranian nation’s nuclear program on the international stage and take the initial step in a way that the nuclear rights and the enrichment rights of the Iranian nation are acknowledged by world powers where before they had tried to deny them, and [the agreement will] open the way for future big strides in technical and economic progress.” (Obama and John Kerry may believe the agreement does not grant Iran the right to enrich uranium, but Iran believes otherwise.) [51662]

On November 24 Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu states, “What was achieved last night in Geneva is not an historic agreement; it is an historic mistake. Today the world has become a much more dangerous place because the most dangerous regime in the world has taken a significant step toward attaining the most dangerous weapon in the world. For the first time, the world’s leading powers have agreed to uranium enrichment in Iran while ignoring the UN Security Council decisions that they themselves led. Sanctions that required many years to put in place contain the best chance for a peaceful solution. These sanctions have been given up in exchange for cosmetic Iranian concessions that can be cancelled in weeks. This agreement and what it means endanger many countries including, of course, Israel. Israel is not bound by this agreement. The Iranian regime is committed to the destruction of Israel and Israel has the right and the obligation to defend itself, by itself, against any threat. As Prime Minister of Israel, I would like to make it clear: Israel will not allow Iran to develop a military nuclear capability.” [51607, 51618, 51648]

Israel’s Finance Minister, Yair Lapid, states, “We had a choice here between the plague and cholera. We were left alone explaining the truth, and all of our options were bad. I don’t understand how the French Foreign Minister can call an agreement that doesn’t involve the dismantling of one centrifuge a ‘victory.’ I can’t understand the world’s failure to notice the nineteen thousand Iranian centrifuges. Obviously a deal is better than a war, but not this deal. Netanyahu did everything he could and we all stand behind him on this.” (Some probably believe there is one promise Obama will keep: “If you like your centrifuges, you can keep you centrifuges.”) According to DailyCaller.com, Iran has “increased the number of centrifuges enriching uranium from 150 to over 19,000 today. It now has over 10 tons of low-enriched uranium—enough for several bombs—and has over a thousand ballistic missiles and, in collaboration with North Korea, is working on intercontinental ballistic missiles.” [51608, 51662]

Algemeiner.com reports, “Describing it as ‘the biggest diplomatic victory Iran has known in recent years,’ Israel’s Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman said that ‘the State of Israel will have to think things over.’ ‘This brings us to a new reality in the whole Middle East,’ he told Israel Radio. ‘We awoke this morning to a new reality. A reality in which a bad deal was signed with Iran. A very bad deal,’ said Israel’s Economy Minister Naftali Bennett. He painted a bleak picture of what may come to pass as a result of the arrangement. ‘If a nuclear suitcase blows up five years from now in New York or

Madrid, it will be because of the deal that was signed this morning,' he said. 'It is important that the world knows: Israel will not be committed to a deal that endangers its very existence,' Bennett added. In an interview with Israel's Channel 2, the country's Minister of Tourism Uzi Landau said that 'Iran has zero credibility but has been treated as an equal partner.' 'When the West comes to the table with intent to get a deal at any cost, it is obvious that the deal will be bad,' he lamented. 'Western leaders were influenced by their internal economic interests.' ...Amos Yadlin the former head of Israeli military intelligence said that Israel 'Will know in a few months if this was a new Munich (agreement wherein Nazi Germany was allowed to annex parts of Czechoslovakia) which will lead us to war, or a new Camp David which can lead to peace.' Uzi Rabi, Director of the Dayan Center for Middle East studies at Tel Aviv University was even more direct. 'Iran has prevailed,' he said, 'Rouhani has achieved his internal goals.' 'This deal sacrifices the long term interests of the West in exchange for the short term gain of getting Iran to agree not to cross the nuclear threshold for a few months,' he said." [51608]

Deputy Foreign Minister Ze'ev Elkin says, "The final text of the agreement while still bad, is better than the first draft. ...Those who claim that the agreement freezes the status quo are not telling the truth. The Western readiness to ease the sanctions will cause the global sanctions regime to start crumbling. Israel must maintain its military readiness and work to apply diplomatic pressure to influence the final deal with Iran." [51608]

Deputy Defense Minister Danny Danon tells Algemeiner.com, "This is an excellent deal for Iran, but unfortunately this agreement is extremely dangerous for the free world. The centrifuges are staying in place while the sanctions regime is dismantled. This is exactly the opposite result that peace-loving people had been hoping for. It goes without saying that all options remain on the table and that Israel has the capability—and the responsibility—to defend itself using any means necessary. ...The deal is great for Iran, and dangerous for the rest of the world. It neutralizes the sanctions, not the centrifuges." On WABC radio Danon tells Aaron Klein, "We were not part of the negotiations. We have not signed this agreement. And we will do whatever is necessary to protect Israel. ...We cannot allow ourselves to make a mistake. If it is a bad agreement and Iran is playing with the world, maybe the Western superpowers can afford to make such a mistake. It is not the case for Israel. ...We are not in a position of making a mistake or to gamble with our future. That is why I am saying it very clear. All options are still on the table. And if we see that Iran continues with the effort to build a nuclear bomb, we will do whatever is necessary to protect ourselves." [51608, 51618, 51653]

At WeeklyStandard.com former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton calls the Iranian deal an "abject surrender." He writes, "This interim agreement is badly skewed from America's perspective. Iran retains its full capacity to enrich uranium, thus abandoning a decade of Western insistence and Security Council resolutions that Iran stop all uranium-enrichment activities. Allowing Iran to continue enriching, and despite modest (indeed, utterly inadequate) measures to prevent it from increasing its enriched-uranium stockpiles and its overall nuclear infrastructure, lays the predicate for Iran fully enjoying its 'right' to enrichment in any 'final' agreement. Indeed, the interim agreement

itself acknowledges that a ‘comprehensive solution’ will ‘involve a mutually defined enrichment program.’ This is not, as the Obama administration leaked before the deal became public, a ‘compromise’ on Iran’s claimed ‘right’ to enrichment. This is abject surrender by the United States. In exchange for superficial concessions, Iran achieved three critical breakthroughs. First, it bought time to continue all aspects of its nuclear-weapons program the agreement does not cover (centrifuge manufacturing and testing; weaponization research and fabrication; and its entire ballistic missile program). ...Second, Iran has gained legitimacy. This central banker of international terrorism and flagrant nuclear proliferator is once again part of the international club. ...Third, Iran has broken the psychological momentum and effect of the international economic sanctions. ...Tehran correctly assessed that a mere six-months’ easing of sanctions will make it extraordinarily hard for the West to reverse direction, even faced with systematic violations of Iran’s nuclear pledges.” [51704]

Bolton asks, “Given such an inadequate deal, what motivated Obama to agree? The inescapable conclusion is that, the mantra notwithstanding, the White House actually did prefer a bad deal to the diplomatic process grinding to a halt. This deal was a ‘hail Mary’ to buy time. Why? Buying time for its own sake makes sense in some negotiating contexts, but the *sub silentio* objective here was to jerry-rig yet another argument to wield against Israel and its fateful decision whether or not to strike Iran. Obama, fearing that strike more than an Iranian nuclear weapon, clearly needed greater international pressure on Jerusalem. And Jerusalem fully understands that Israel was the real target of the Geneva negotiations. How, therefore, should Israel react? Most importantly, the deal leaves the basic strategic realities unchanged. Iran’s nuclear program was, from its inception, a weapons program, and it remains one today. Even modest constraints, easily and rapidly reversible, do not change that fundamental political and operational reality. ...[T]he international climate of opinion against a strike will only harden during the next six months. Capitalizing on the deal, Iran’s best strategy is to accelerate the apparent pace of rapprochement with the all-too-eager West. The further and faster Iran can move, still making only superficial, easily reversible concessions in exchange for dismantling the sanctions regime, the greater the international pressure against Israel using military force.” [51704]

“...The more time that passes, the harder it will be for Israel to deliver a blow that substantially retards the Iranian program. Undoubtedly, an Israeli strike during the interim deal would be greeted with outrage from all the expected circles. But that same outrage, or more, would also come further down the road. In short, measured against the expected reaction even in friendly capitals, there is never a ‘good’ time for an Israeli strike, only bad and worse times. Accordingly, the Geneva deal does not change Israel’s strategic calculus even slightly, unless the Netanyahu government itself falls prey to the psychological warfare successfully waged so far by the ayatollahs. That we will know only as the days unfold. Israel still must make the extremely difficult judgment whether it will stand by as Iran maneuvers effortlessly around a feckless and weak White House, bolstering its economic situation while still making progress on the nuclear front, perhaps less progress on some aspects of its nuclear work than before the deal, but more on others. ...So in truth, an Israeli military strike is the only way to avoid Tehran’s

otherwise inevitable march to nuclear weapons, and the proliferation that will surely follow. Making the case for Israel's exercise of its legitimate right of self-defense has therefore never been more politically important. Whether they are celebrating in Tehran or in Jerusalem a year from now may well depend on how the opponents of the deal in Washington conduct themselves." [51704]

The Obama Timeline agrees with Bolton's assessment. Obama wanted an agreement not to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program (which it will not do anyway), but to stop Israel from striking Iran's nuclear facilities. Obama's assumption is that Israel dare not strike Iran while an "agreement" is in place. But Obama fails to realize that for him the issue is only political and ideological, whereas, for Israel, the issue is the survival of the Jewish state. Yes, a preemptive strike by Israel will result in massive, worldwide condemnation. But a failure to strike may result in the destruction of Israel. Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu faces a difficult decision, and some observers suggest he will delay a strike. TimesOfIsrael.com reports, "Netanyahu is 'extremely angry' over the terms of the deal, under which Iran will be allowed to continue low-level enrichment of uranium for at least the next six months, a Channel 2 report said. It quoted an unnamed senior official in Jerusalem, who stated: 'In Geneva, Obama established Iran as a nuclear threshold state, and Israel, the prime minister has made clear, cannot live with Iran as a nuclear threshold state.' Israel, the report continued, regards the Geneva deal as 'a profound failure' by the Obama administration. However, one administration official said Sunday that no matter how furious Netanyahu is about the deal, Israel will let the US test out Iran's intentions over the next half a year. 'Bibi [Netanyahu] will hold his nose, but he'll let us have six months,' the official was quoted by Foreign Policy magazine as saying." (The Obama administration may believe Netanyahu will "hold his nose," but it may also be dead wrong.) [51705, 51706, 51707]

The *Times of Israel* also reports, "Having overseen an interim deal with Iran on its nuclear program, the Obama administration now intends to try to involve Iran in wider Middle East diplomacy, including an attempt to find a solution to the Syrian civil war..." (Iran has been supporting Syrian President Bashir al-Assad in the conflict, while Obama has been supporting the rebels and al-Qaeda terrorists trying to overthrow Assad. Why Iran, which has just bested Obama in the nuclear agreement, would want to help Obama in Syria is neither explained nor imaginable.) [51706]

Facebook founder and Obama supporter Mark Zuckerberg appears on ABC's *This Week* to push immigration reform. (Meanwhile, Breitbart.com reports, "Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) National Council president Chris Crane is calling on Zuckerberg to suspend his amnesty lobbying efforts until he meets with law enforcement. ...Crane believes that Zuckerberg and those other CEOs [who are pushing "reform"] are unaware of the effects pushing a bill like the Senate's 'Gang of Eight' immigration bill—or something like it from House GOP leadership—would have on the country's safety." Crane states, "Earlier this month, we sent a letter to the major CEOs pushing a comprehensive immigration plan asking that they meet with ICE officers. One of those on the letter was Mark Zuckerberg, who has invested considerable time and money to get proposed legislation like the Gang of Eight bill signed into law. Mr. Zuckerberg ignored

the letter and meeting request from ICE law enforcement and instead met with illegal immigrants. We therefore renew our request to meet with Mr. Zuckerberg and share firsthand the knowledge and experience of ICE officers and agents who witness every day the negative impact to public safety that occurs because ICE officers are prohibited from enforcing the nation's immigration laws. The first question I would ask Mr. Zuckerberg would be: why did you support a bill, S. 744, which legalizes aliens with extensive criminal records, including sex offenders, gang members and other violent and dangerous criminal aliens? Until Mr. Zuckerberg meets with officers and learns the truth about our immigration system, I would respectfully suggest he suspend his lobbying activities.” [51605]

While Zuckerberg pushes for more foreigners in the United States, more than 100 Mexicans cross illegally into California near San Ysidro. According to NBC's San Diego affiliate, they “pelted border control agents with rocks and bottles. ...[A] Border Patrol agent ordered the Mexican nationals to stop, but they continued walking into the U.S. Officials said the agent fired a PepperBall Launcher, but it did not deter the crowd. ‘They had their phones out so this group was out to spark an incident. That’s what they wanted to do,’ Border Patrol Union representative Gabriel Pacheco said. ...No one was arrested.” [51749, 51750]

On *Face the Nation*, Secretary of State John Kerry says, “You can’t get everything in the first step. You have to go down the process here. ” “The fact is that what we’ve done is lock components of their [Iran’s] program in place and actually roll some of them backwards.” [51652]

On *This Week*, Kerry absurdly claims, “There is no daylight between us [the United States and Israel] with respect to what we want to achieve at this point.” [51658]

On *State of the Union*, Kerry responds to Candy Crowley’s suggestion that Iran “is just gonna be North Korea, a country that agrees to stop its nuclear ambitions in order to get sanctions lifted and then secretly goes ahead and continues with its program. Why do you think Iran is not North Korea?” Kerry responds that the situations are different because Iran is “a member of the NPT [Nuclear Proliferation Treaty],” the Iranians “have engaged in a negotiation,” the Iranians have “committed to have daily inspections...” and “have publicly committed that they are not going to build a nuclear weapon.” (CNSNews.com later notes that North Korea was also a member of the NPT, engaged in negotiations, and said publicly they would not build a nuclear weapon. North Korea did not permit daily inspections; only three of Kerry’s claims are therefore lies.) “It’s not an issue of trust. As the old saying goes of Gorbachev and Reagan, ‘trust but verify.’ Verification is the key. ...Obama and I have said since the beginning, we’re not just going to verify, or trust and verify, we’re going to verify, verify, and verify. We have to know to a certainty so that Israel, Gulf States, ourselves—nobody can be deceived by what is taking place.” (Crowley does not offer to sell Kerry the Brooklyn Bridge.) [51677, 51681]

Also on CNN’s *State of the Union*, Congressman Mike Rogers (R-MI) says the Obama administration has “now given [the Iranians] a permission slip to continue enrichment.”

Former CIA Director General Michael Hayden calls the Iran agreement, “Practically the worst of all possible outcomes, because now what you have here is a nuclear capable state. ...I think frankly that is Iran’s bottom line, so what we’re negotiating on is how much time we’re putting between their nuclear capability and a nuclear weapon, a nuclear reality. And my fear is, this interim agreement, which doesn’t roll back much of anything at all, becomes a permanent agreement.” [51652, 51666]

Also on CNN, leftist Fareed Zakaria does his best to praise and defend the agreement with Iran. (At AtlasShrugs.com, Pamela Geller writes, “The media is in fifth gear, feverishly spinning this catastrophic defeat of Western hegemony the way Rumpelstiltskin would spin straw into gold. CNN’s Chief Muslim propagandist and plagiarist Fareed Zakaria’s tongue has been flapping harder than a ‘Death to America’ flag at an Iranian nuclear rally. Is American going to take its marching orders from a thieving stealth jihadist cheat or the leftwing jackboots in the media?” [51644]

On *Fox News Sunday*, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN), who is skeptical of the Iranian agreement, says, “I think you are going to see on Capitol Hill, again, a bipartisan effort to try to make sure that this is not a final agreement. ...This administration is long on announcements but very short on follow-through.” [51607, 51652]

GQ magazine lists Obama as number 17 in its list of “The 25 Least Influential People of 2013,” and comments, “He can blame Republicans in Congress all he likes and get away with it because congressional Republicans are the worst. But the fact remains that I have spent the majority of this man’s [administration] watching bad things happen, then hearing a thoughtful speech about how we gotta make sure the bad things never happen again, and then watching as nothing gets done. Next time there’s an election, I want Nate Silver to analyze the data and tell me who to vote for so that I don’t end up casting my ballot for a very eloquent hat stand.” [51611]

Coral Andrews, the executive director of Hawaii’s ObamaCare marketplace, resigns effective December 6. [51711]

Newsmax.com reports that the House Ways and Means Committee is considering a change to the tax code that “would allow advertisers to deduct only 50 percent of all ad expenses in the first year they’re incurred, and then amortize the remaining 50 percent over the next 10 years. ...Dan Jaffe, executive vice president of the Association of National Advertisers, said, ‘We take this more seriously than any other threat we’ve seen in many years. There simply is no economic or tax policy justification for the proposed changes.’” Money spent on advertising is a tax deductible business expense. By allowing businesses to deduct only half of the expense, the government would take in more corporate taxes. But, of course, many businesses would advertise less, and that reduction in revenue would cause the loss of jobs. The American Advertising Federation claims the change “could reduce ad sales by as much as \$446 billion a year and place 1.7 million American jobs at risk.” (The proposal is tantamount to cutting the tax deduction for mortgage interest in half. Although that would boost income tax revenue, it would also

have disastrous results: higher taxes would result in less consumer spending and lost jobs, as well as deflated housing prices.) [51612]

At AmericanThinker.com Elise Cooper writes that “a former high-ranking CIA official” states “that Korea should be a wake-up call to this administration, since there ‘is an obvious pattern here. The Bush administration was moving in a direction with Korea that was unwise, and now the Obama Administration is doing the same thing with the Iranians. The Iranians are not stupid and can look at history. This administration appears to be more concerned with coming to an agreement than protecting Israel’s interest. I would not go much farther before I would impose stronger sanctions. ...Frankly, I am a little nervous that the interim international deal will end up permanent, and it will enable the Iranians to be in striking distance of nuclear weapons. Time is not our friend here; it is Iran’s friend.’” Cooper notes that Obama “is creating an arms race in the Middle East since a nuclear Iran changes the whole atmosphere. Not only is Israel concerned, but so are the Saudis, Turks, and Jordanians. [Former federal prosecutor Andrew C.] McCarthy believes that nuclear reduction makes sense to countries around the globe only if the U.S. is willing to enforce it. ‘Obama wants to be the no nukes [leader], yet his policies are guaranteeing there will be an arms race in the Middle East.’” Jose Rodriguez, Jr., former director of the CIA’s National Clandestine Service and author of *Hard Measures*, warns, “I have always been concerned that this administration is more concerned about politics than actually stopping and verifying Iran’s nuclear program. The Iranians have been outsmarting us, outflanking us, and in the end getting what they desire. They have always controlled the tempo and the dialogue, and we have been the ones playing catch-up. When the sanctions are finally taking hold, the Iranians have decided on a tactical move to gain time and relief. Should Americans and Israel really trust [Obama] to do the right thing? I think not.” [51621]

Cooper concludes, “The Obama administration looks weak to Americans and the outside world in the way these negotiations are being handled. This emerging deal is pushing Israel in one of two directions: either they will be forced to take military action against Iran or they will have to live with a nuclear Iran, where every minute of the day, Israelis will have to be in constant fear of a second Holocaust. The Obama administration has not made it clear publicly what it is willing to accept. As the former CIA official stated, ‘we know Iran is involved in making a bomb. Are we going to demand they come clean on that and admit to it? My sense is no such thing.’” [51621]

The CBS affiliate in Connecticut reports, “Officials overseeing the Vermont Health Connect website confirmed Friday there was a security breach on the [ObamaCare] system last month in which one user got improper access to another user’s Social Security number and other data. ...The consumer, whom officials would not identify, reported that he received in the mail—from an unnamed sender—a copy of his own application for insurance under the state exchange. ‘On the back of the envelope was hand-written ‘VERMONT HEALTH CONNECT IS NOT A SECURE WEBSITE!’ This was also (written) on the back of the last page of the printed out application,’ said the incident report.” [51624]

Jewish leaders in the United States condemn the nuclear deal with Iran. World Jewish Congress President Ronald S. Lauder tells *Algemeiner.com*, “Iran must be judged by its actions, not its words and promises, because they are not worth the paper they are written on. Nothing in the deceptive behavior of Iran and its leaders in recent years should make the world believe that they will honor this agreement.” Rabbi Marvin Hier and Rabbi Abraham Cooper, of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, comment, “The sanctions had the Ayatollahs on the ropes and the U.S. and West let them win the round and perhaps the match. Iran has taken a page from their North Korean friends whose negotiations with the United States did nothing to stop Pyongyang from breaking out as a nuclear power when it suited them. Tehran has not been forced to destroy a single centrifuge.” Daniel S. Mariaschin, Executive Vice President of the B’nai B’rith, says, “The deal signed in Geneva does not go far enough in reversing Iran’s ability to produce a nuclear weapon. The high speed centrifuges will still remain in place, and it remains unclear whether Tehran will permit full or only ‘managed’ access to all of its nuclear facilities. Its long history of deception on inspections is cause for much skepticism on this point.” [51624]

Pamela Geller writes at *AtlasShrugs.com*, “The deal with Iran is a disaster. The consequences will be catastrophic. November 23 will be as infamous a day in history as the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand or October 1, 1938, when the Czech frontier guards left their posts and German troops occupied the Sudetenland. How is such a dramatic reversal of American foreign policy for freedom possible? How is it that the opening shot of WWII can go by without outrage, or at the very least, critical analysis? The media, the most powerful political organization in America. Israeli Minister of Finance Yair Lapid: ‘I can’t understand the world’s failure to notice the nineteen thousand Iranian centrifuges. We may be the only child in the room saying the king has no clothes but that’s what we must do.’ Obama’s catastrophic failures would not be possible without a politically driven media bent on advancing a pro-jihadist, leftist [White House occupant]. And he knows this. He knows that whatever he does will be praised and heralded by the enemedia. Power without accountability. Stealth war on America. The harassment and attrition of those in opposition of Obama by the IRS, the murder and cover-up of our Ambassador and attaches in Benghazi, Fast and Furious, Obamacare—all of it grounds for impeachment—were glossed over, ignored, or heralded by an enemedia.” [51646]

Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) expresses “disappointment” with the Iranian agreement “because it does not seem proportional. ...Iran simply freezes its nuclear capabilities while we reduce the sanctions. It was strong sanctions, not the goodness of the hearts of the Iranian leaders, that brought Iran to the table, and any reduction relieves the psychological pressure of future sanctions and gives them hope that they will be able to gain nuclear weapon capability while further sanctions are reduced. A fairer agreement would have coupled a reduction in sanctions with a proportionate reduction in Iranian nuclear capability. The goal of the administration is to eliminate all of Iran’s nuclear weapons-making capability by the end of the final negotiations; it is still my hope they can achieve that goal. ...As for additional sanctions, this disproportionality of this agreement makes it more likely that Democrats and Republicans will join together and

pass additional sanctions... I intend to discuss that possibility with my colleagues.” [51625, 51652, 51673]

Obama telephones Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and the White House reports, “The two leaders reaffirmed their shared goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Consistent with our commitment to consult closely with our Israeli friends, [Obama] told the Prime Minister that he wants the United States and Israel to begin consultations immediately regarding our efforts to negotiate a comprehensive solution. [Obama] underscored that the United States will remain firm in our commitment to Israel, which has good reason to be skeptical about Iran’s intentions.” (“Consult closely” with Israel apparently does not include discussing the terms of an agreement that will be detrimental to the Jewish state until *after* that agreement has been signed.) One Israeli legislator reports, “The prime minister made it clear to the most powerful man on earth that if he intends to stay the most powerful man on earth, it’s important to make a change in American policy because the practical result of his current policy is liable to lead him to the same failure that the Americans absorbed in North Korea and Pakistan, and Iran could be next in line.” [51628, 51712]

FT.com (*Financial Times*) reports, “Leading US banks have warned that they could start charging companies and consumers for deposits if the US Federal Reserve cuts the interest it pays on bank reserves. Depositors already have to cope with near-zero interest rates, but paying just to leave money in the bank would be highly unusual and unwelcome for companies and households. ... Executives at two of the top five US banks said a cut in the 0.25 per cent rate of interest on the \$2.4tn in reserves they hold at the Fed would lead them to pass on the cost to depositors.” (It is clear that Obama and the Federal Reserve *do not want Americans to save money*. The theory is that if they cannot even earn interest on a savings account, they will instead spend their money—thereby boosting the economy. Americans will, however, revolt if they have to pay to keep their money in a bank—or at least hide it under a mattress. But the banks have to pay a percentage of their deposits to the government in exchange for FDIC insurance. If the Federal Reserve pushes interest rates even lower, banks could actually *lose* money on customer deposits. The problem is caused by Federal Reserve actions that keep interest rates artificially low, and it does that in order to save the federal government from having to pay more interest on its massive debt. If interest rates were to rise to their natural, free market levels, Americans would earn more interest on their deposits—but the government’s annual deficits would balloon by hundreds of billions of dollars. The government and the Federal Reserve have together created a monster that cannot be destroyed.) [51627, 51767, 51808]

At WND.com Pamela Geller writes that in the Iranian deal, “We are paying \$7-10 billion in jizya, the tribute that subject non-Muslims are to pay to Muslims according to Islamic law. *Algemeiner* reported that ‘the deal calls for Iran to halt key parts of its nuclear program in exchange for sanctions relief said to be valued at approximately \$7 billion.’ The analogy between this and the Munich agreement is absolute: Neville Chamberlain hailed ‘Peace in Our Time’ after making massive concessions to Hitler for nothing in return. This agreement is just as bad. Worse, perhaps. Imagine if Hitler had nukes. All

Iran does is promise to limit centrifuge production and to hold off on the construction of a plutonium reactor, along with cutting back on enriching uranium for 20 percent by six months. A promise? From Iran? History has shown us that not only are these promises worthless, they are a device to stall for time while exacting painful concessions from the West. ...And what about after those six months? United Against Nuclear Iran, or UANI, CEO, Ambassador Mark D. Wallace, declared: ‘By not agreeing to dismantle a single centrifuge, Iran has not *rolled back* its nuclear infrastructure and with the many centrifuges that it is currently operating, Iran retains the ability to breakout and produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a nuclear weapon in as little as 2 months. At the same time, the carefully constructed sanctions architecture developed over decades has been *significantly rolled back*.’” [51632]

“...Obama has overturned the order of the world. His abdication of American hegemony created a vacuum. As Ayn Rand said, ‘The spread of evil is the symptom of a vacuum. Whenever evil wins, it is only by default: by the moral failure of those who evade the fact that there can be no compromise on basic principles.’ No longer able to hide behind America’s skirts, other nations are stepping up. Filling the void. Realignment on a global scale. ...Now Israel has started working with the Saudis, and France is considering aligning with Israel, Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Egypt, based on shared interests. Caroline Glick explains, ‘In seeking to block Iran’s nuclear weapons program, Israel has no lack of allies. America’s withdrawal has caused a regional realignment in which Israel and France are replacing the U.S. as the protectors of the Sunni Arab states of the Persian Gulf.’ Obama’s feckless, reckless and anti-freedom foreign policy has weakened the United States. Obama is a one-man wrecking ball. He has destroyed decades-long alliances, proving American an unreliable, fickle ally. Not only has he destroyed America’s word, her bond, he has taken our allies down with him, and in doing so, Tehran’s ayatollahs, Russia’s KGB state and Mao’s successors must take immediate steps to mitigate the damage Obama is causing. Congress could step in to clip his radical wings.” [51632]

“...Obama mindlessly and aggressively sought to back Iran’s nuclear jihad. The Iranians smell blood and the fetid odor of a weak American [leader]. Obama had been secretly negotiating *for months* to ease sanctions, and propose a deal giving Iran almost everything it wanted, for hollow and largely ceremonious lip service in return. And the result is further escalation. Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif crowed that the deal was ‘a big success for Iran’ and a sign that ‘all plots hatched by the Zionist regime to stop the nuclear agreement have failed.’ ...They’re emboldened by Obama’s sanction. Boosting Iran while blaming Israel—the jewicidals who helped put this saboteur in office while criticizing me for my forthright arguments opposing him are strangely silent. This shows the diminished role of American Jews and how Obama and his accomplices are using the nuclear issue to drive a wedge between Israel and its American defenders. ...A world devoid of American moral authority and the absence of the superpower force for freedom is a savage world. We have entered a dark age, a brutal world. Nov. 24 will go down in world history as infamously as did the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand and Oct. 1, 1938, when Czech frontier guards left their posts and German troops occupied the Sudetenland.” [51632]

At NationalReview.com James Jay Carafano calls the Iran agreement “Munich II. ...What just went down in Geneva is, in fact, a replay of the greatest diplomatic tragedy of the 20th century. The Munich deal rested on the ridiculous notion that Hitler could be satiated. The new pact builds on the equally ludicrous idea that Iran would give up the means to build a nuclear weapon that will serve as the tip of its foreign-policy spear. The saddest part of this negotiated fiasco is that everyone agrees why Iran came to the bargaining table. The sanctions worked; the mullahs had run out of cash, and Tehran determined that the easiest way to get the funds flowing was to get the West to back off. This is where the realists and the idealists part company. Realists knew that the sanctions were good for only one purpose: to weaken the regime to the point where it would collapse or be overthrown. They crossed their fingers, hoping that would happen before Tehran got a nuke it could turn on the West. Regime change remains the only realistic option to bombing or bearing the danger of living with a nuclear-armed Iran. Idealists, on the other hand, held that sanctions were the magic button for getting the Iranians to be reasonable. Once Tehran started on the path to accommodating the West (they theorized), the mullahs would realize that the benefits of collaboration and transparency outweighed the burdens of isolation and confrontation. ...The idealists’ assessment is delusional. They see a ‘freeze’ as a confidence-building measure, the first step in disassembling Iran’s weapons program. But where there is freeze, there can also be a thaw. Nothing in this agreement prevents Iran from just picking up where it left off. Nothing in this agreement affects Iran’s effort to improve its long-range ballistic missiles. Nothing can stop Iran from continuing to work on how to weaponize (build a bomb suitable to be put on a missile) a nuclear device in secret.” [51668]

“In return for getting precious little, the negotiators oppose Iran at the table gave up the one thing the mullahs really feared—a continuing squeeze on Tehran’s dwindling bank account. The only ‘fact’ offered so far to prove that the pact will lead to something other than a good deal for Iran is the blithe assurance that the deal was negotiated by really smart people who know what they are doing. ...Our White House likes this deal. But, our White House also thinks its policies in Iraq, Libya, Egypt, and Syria have been just super. The cold fact about the Iranian nuclear freeze is this: Any diplomatic deal that is not grounded in shared interests or a common sense of justice will surely fail. There is no evidence Iran shares either with the West. The negotiations with Iran bear too many similarities with the most spectacular failures in diplomatic history to leave any hope for optimism.” [51668]

At Heritage.org, James Phillips writes, “The deal that the Obama Administration struck at the Geneva talks yesterday amounts to a flawed agreement that risks reducing sanctions pressure on Iran over next six months in return for easily reversible Iranian pledges, some of which Iran has given before but subsequently reneged on. The deal requires Iran to curb some, but not all, of its nuclear activities over the next six months in return for about \$7 billion in sanctions relief. Significantly, Iran is not required to comply with U.N. Security Council sanctions that require a total suspension of uranium enrichment. Instead, Iran is allowed to continue enriching uranium to 3.5 percent levels, ostensibly for its nuclear power reactor at Bushehr, despite the fact that Russia already has committed to

fuel that facility. ...To force Tehran to make the necessary deeper concessions in a final deal, more—not fewer—sanctions are required. But Iran has warned that any further sanctions will prompt it to abandon the agreement. Despite that warning, a bipartisan coalition in Congress has announced that it will impose more sanctions. The Administration claims that the easing of sanctions will be reversible if Iran defaults on its obligations, but as long as Iran keeps the talks alive, it will be difficult to re-impose the sanctions without being accused of sabotaging negotiations. ...Recently, one of [Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin] Netanyahu's closest associates, former national security adviser Yaakov Amidror, told the *Financial Times* that Israel had the military capability to set back Iran's nuclear program 'for a very long time' and that there was 'no question' that Netanyahu would act unilaterally if necessary. If such a preventive strike occurs, Iran likely would strike back against both Israel and the U.S. In plain English, this means war." [51660]

PJMedia.com's Mike McNally quips, "Can't decide who's America's worst Secretary of State: the one who owes his career to his wife [John Kerry] or the one who owes her career to her husband [Hillary Clinton]." [51669]

Geostrategy-Direct.com reports, "Lebanon has reported a secret dialogue between the Iranian-sponsored [terrorist group] Hizbullah and the United States. Lebanese parliamentary sources said U.S. diplomats have begun contact with Hizbullah politicians in Beirut. They said the dialogue concerned stability in Lebanon as well as the next government. 'The United States is sending and receiving messages to Hizbullah through sympathetic third parties,' a source said. 'The dialogue has intensified over the last few weeks.' The dialogue was reported by members of the pro-Western March 14 coalition, driven out of power in 2011. The members, who did not want to be identified, said the U.S. dialogue with Hizbullah was part of the rapprochement by ...Obama with Iran." [51645]

Addressing members of Ohel, a Jewish charity for children and families, Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) says, "Democrats and Republicans are going to work to see that we don't let up on these sanctions, as this agreement did... until Iran not only gives up all nuclear weapons, but all nuclear weapon capability." [51673]

Obama attends a fundraiser in Seattle, Washington, where protesters demonstrate against drones and the Keystone XL pipeline. Obama tells the wealthy—\$32,400 per ticket—donors, "I'm not a particularly ideological person." (How many in the audience laughed is not known.) [51631, 51643]

Congresswoman Michele Bachmann (R-MN) addresses the Zionist Organization of America, and states, "It may be incumbent upon the Prime Minister [of Israel] to make a decision he has no desire to make, and that would be to bomb facilities, that must be bombed, in Iran." She claims the agreement "in Geneva had more to do with Israel than it had to do with Iran, because, you see, the decision that was made could be the biggest cudgel that [Obama], and that the nations of the world, could use to prevent Israel, the Jewish state of Israel, from defending not only herself, but her right to exist. ...A facade

has been [presented] that Iran is being real good guys right now. In other words, putting all the pressure on Israel, you cannot possibly strike now. Tell me, will they be able to strike after six months? You see, I believe now is when we do need to stand with Israel today, because Prime Minister Netanyahu may be forced very soon to do what the United States and other nations of the world have already said today with clarity what they will not do, and that... we should be grateful for.” [51819]

On November 25 *Time* magazine senior political editor Mark Halperin appears on *The Steve Malzberg Show* and admits that ObamaCare does contain a “death panel.” Malzberg says, “A lot of people said you weren’t going to be able to keep your health care, but also they focused on the death panels, which will be coming, call them what you will, rationing, is part of it...” Halperin replies, “No, I agree, and that’s going to be a huge issue, and that’s something else on which [Obama] was not fully forthcoming and straightforward.” Malzberg: “So you believe there will be rationing, a.k.a. death panels?” Halperin: “It’s built into the plan. It’s not like a guess or like a judgment. That’s going to be part of how costs are controlled.” [51797]

CNBC.com reports, “It could take a year to secure the risk of ‘high exposures’ of personal information on the federal Obamacare online exchange, a cybersecurity expert told CNBC on Monday. ‘When you develop a website, you develop it with security in mind. And it doesn’t appear to have happened this time,’ said David Kennedy, a so-called ‘white hat’ hacker who tests online security by breaching websites. He testified on Capitol Hill about the flaws of HealthCare.gov last week. ‘It’s really hard to go back and fix the security around it because security wasn’t built into it,’ said Kennedy, chief executive of TrustedSec. ‘We’re talking multiple months to over a year to at least address some of the critical-to-high exposures on the website itself.’ ...Another online security expert—who spoke at last week’s House hearing and then on CNBC—said the federal Obamacare website needs to be shut down and rebuilt from scratch.” Morgan Wright, CEO of Crowd Sourced Investigations, warned that Healthcare.gov is “not secure. We would not put our family on it. We wouldn’t tell anybody to get on it; not at this time, not in the near future. There’s not a plan to fix this that meets sniff test of being reasonable.” Wright tells CNBC he would not want the job of fixing the web site: “You [have] got a better chance of seeing God, because I wouldn’t take the job.” [51937, 51938]

The Obama administration releases \$8 billion in frozen Iranian assets, as part of the agreement reached only hours earlier in Geneva, Switzerland. [51698, 51699, 51719]

Hollywood filmmaker David Mamet appears on the Hugh Hewitt Show, where he excoriates Obama’s deal with Iran. Mamet says, “Well, I was born right after World War II and I’m a Jew. I’m a serious Jew. My grandparents didn’t leave Poland. Got killed, half of them got killed by the Nazis. Half of them got killed by Stalin and it’s clearly evident to me from the first that the [political] left is going to make Israel do it’s dirty work. It’s going to turn its back on Israel until, to save the west, Israel is going to have to strike at Iran and leave the cat sitting on the fence to say, ‘See, I told you so. Look at what they yits are up to this week.’” Mamet calls Obama “a tyrant. And I give him great credit. He’s always said that his idea was to reform [fundamentally transform] the United States.

And, you know, like many tyrants, like [Woodrow] Wilson and like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he believes that his way is the right way and that he's going to implement his vision of the world. He's acting in concert with his conscience. And I applaud him for it. I just disagree with everything he's done." [51851, 51852]

The *Chicago Tribune* writes, "If ...Obama and Democratic leaders think the outcry against Obamacare is fierce now, watch if millions more Americans get blindsided with the news that they'll be forced into these dysfunctional government online marketplaces. Some will face higher premiums or higher deductibles, and they'll be required to share private medical and financial information on a website with a questionable security firewall, opening them to fraudsters, hackers and cyberchaos. ...People who gain coverage through smaller employers are at risk of getting cancellation notices next year. Here's why: Many businesses with fewer than 50 employees buy coverage in the small-group market. These plans can temporarily keep offering coverage that didn't meet expensive Obamacare requirements. When that ends next year, though, many employers may cancel policies because Obamacare coverage will likely boost costs. ...Tens of millions of people who have coverage through large American companies aren't losers ...yet. The administration granted those businesses a one-year reprieve from the Obamacare mandate to provide coverage or pay penalties. That ends for 2015, and employers are already calculating what to do. Some may cut jobs, or employees' hours, to avoid offering costly insurance coverage. Other companies may dump everyone into the federal exchanges and pay penalties that are almost certain to be less than what coverage would cost. Some big employers have already joined privately run corporate health exchanges set up as alternatives to Obamacare. We expect that membership may swell in years to come, as many Americans become refugees from Obamacare. There's a lot more to learn about the consequences of this overreaching law." [51636]

The *Tribune* also notes, "Hospitals are bracing for financial turbulence as out-of-pocket deductibles climb and people find themselves liable for more of their medical bills before insurance kicks in... In the past, hospitals could count on insurers to pay 80 to 90 percent of the cost of services, leaving the rest to patients. For patients with high-deductible plans, however, the insurer's share drops to as low as 60 percent, with consumers on the hook for the balance. And if patients can't pay? Hospitals can write it off as bad debt or, in some cases, charity care. But many hospitals are already operating on thin margins. Add them to the list of potential Obamacare losers in waiting." (Hospitals that get stiffed with too many losses from patients who cannot meet their deductibles and out-of-pocket expense limits may simply opt out of the ObamaCare exchange policies, leaving even more Americans frustrated and angry.) [51636]

The Obama administration files a rule change in the Federal Register that would exempt many union health insurance plans from having to pay the ObamaCare "reinsurance fee" that applies to all other plans. Senator John Thune (R-SD) calls the exemption "crony capitalism at its worst. ...Unions are now experiencing the ugly reality of this law, and they want out." The administration claims the rule "would exempt any self-insured group health plan that does not use a third party administrator for claims processing or enrollment, not only union plans. The phrase 'self-insured, self-administered plans' is not

synonymous with multiemployer plans, or Taft-Hartley plans.” (The claim is simply an excuse. The wording of the revision was drafted primarily to exempt union plans from the fee. Exempting some plans from the tax likely means that the tax will be raised for the other plans, in order to make up for the lost tax revenue.) [51756, 51811]

Obama travels to San Francisco to promote illegal immigrant amnesty legislation. During his address at the Betty Ong Chinese Recreation Center, he is heckled by illegal immigrant Ju Hong (who was invited by the White House and placed on stage behind Obama) who calls on him to stop deportations via an executive order. Obama responds that an executive order is not the answer, he needs Congress to act, and the Republicans will not cooperate in passing amnesty legislation. (Some believe the “please be a dictator” heckler was planted in order to give Obama an opportunity to criticize the GOP. At NoisyRoom.net, Terresa Monroe-Hamilton writes that Hong is “an illegal alien from South Korea who recently graduated from UC Berkeley. Ju Hong came to the US with his family on a tourist visa and never left. He has Marxist ties. Ju Hong also listed himself as an outreach coordinator at the Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, as a legislative intern for San Francisco and as a senator at the Associated Students of the University of California. Marxists of a red feather...”) [51633, 51689, 51694, 51720, 51729, 51754, 51755, 51790, 52086]

After Obama’s speech, Pablo Alvarado, executive director of the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, states that Obama “has a credibility gap on the issue of immigration. His speech today is belied by his ugly policies of deportation and unprecedented immigrant criminalization. The dissonance between the president’s rhetoric and actions was made clear when courageous members of ASPIRE [Asian Students Promoting Immigrant Rights through Education] challenged [Obama], during his speech, to do more. As [Obama] approaches his 2,000,000th deportation, people are beginning to question whether his goal is, in fact, to ‘fix our broken immigration system,’ or whether instead his goal is to simply blame Congress and seek political advantage from the worsening status quo. Has [Obama] done everything he can, or is he merely taking ‘the easy way out?’ [Obama] can do more, and he knows it. By suspending deportations, ending his failed Secure Communities program, and expanding deferred action, [Obama] could help immigrants and compel Congress to take action.” [51720]

Comedian Dennis Miller quips, “BiBi... just think of it as one less phone call you gotta make when it’s go time.” (That is, “Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu need not bother giving Obama advance notice that Israel is launching a military strike against Iran’s nuclear facilities.”) [51638]

Heritage.org provides an ObamaCare “marriage penalty” example: “50-year-old non-smoker making \$35,000 per year would qualify for a sizable insurance subsidy, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation’s insurance subsidy calculator. The individual’s premium would be capped at 9.5 percent of income, resulting in an insurance subsidy of \$2,065 paid by the federal government. However, if this 50-year-old is married to another 50-year-old who also makes \$35,000 per year, the couple would receive no insurance subsidy at all. This couple would incur a marriage penalty of \$4,130 in one year—equal

to the \$2,065 that each individual could have received if they were not married. As Urban Institute fellow Gene Steuerle has said: ‘Our tax and welfare system thus favors those who consider marriage an option—to be avoided when there are penalties and engaged when there are bonuses. The losers tend to be those who consider marriage to be sacred.’ Obamacare sends a clear message that reliance on government is preferable to these traditional American values—work and marriage.” [51659, 51670]

DailyCaller.com reports, “The lone rape victim who testified before the Illinois Senate on behalf of a 1999 rape-victim protections bill is speaking out against the lone Illinois state senator who chose not to vote for it: Barack Obama. ‘I just couldn’t believe it. How could he do that? Thank God for the other [senators] who voted for it. They had a heart. They had compassion that Obama evidently doesn’t have,’ rape survivor Michelle Eppel told The Daily Caller after recently finding out that Obama was the one non-yes vote. ‘He doesn’t care,’ Eppel said. ... ‘How many issues does he push aside [in the White House] because he just doesn’t want to deal with it?,’ Eppel said. ‘The people want someone who will fight for them and protect them from harm. Why does he not do that? I do not believe a leader of our country should be someone who has no compassion for someone else as a human being... he doesn’t care... it’s like he’s giving permission for the perpetrators to keep going. He’s not even man enough to protect us. How heartless,’ Eppel said. The White House did not return a request for comment.” [51663]

DailyCaller.com also reports, “The Cleveland Clinic, which is ranked among the top four U.S. hospitals, is making layoffs and cutting its budget more than \$100 million as a direct result of the Affordable Care Act, the Daily Caller has learned.” Cleveland Clinic executive director of communications Eileen Sheil says, “The cuts for 2014, about half of those are related to the Affordable Care Act... We anticipate a reduction in workforce,” said in an interview with TheDC. The Cleveland Clinic is reducing its 2014 budget by \$330 million. ... We offered early retirement to 3,000 employees.” [51665]

The Obama administration states that HEal;thcare.gov will still not be fixed by November 30 (as it had promised), but should operate “much better.”

According to a CNN/ORC poll, only four out of 10 Americans believe Obama “can manage the federal government effectively,” and 53 percent “now believe that Obama is not honest and trustworthy, the first time that a clear majority in CNN polling has felt that way.” Additionally, 56 percent say Obama does not inspire confidence; 56 percent say they do not admire Obama; and 53 percent do not believe he is a strong or decisive leader. [51667, 51674, 51685, 51686, 51688]

At FoxNews.com William La Jeunesse writes, “ObamaCare may have backfired in its goal of making smoking so expensive that users quit, public health experts say, as sky-high insurance premiums force smokers to drop coverage altogether and lose smoking cessation programs along with it. ‘Tobacco surcharges are not proven to help tobacco users quit and there are major concerns that they will prevent people from getting health care coverage,’ the American Lung Association’s Jennifer Singleterry said. The ALA supports the Affordable Care Act, as does the American Cancer Society, but both oppose

the tobacco penalty because they believe it makes insurance unaffordable for smokers. ‘Charging tobacco users more in health insurance premiums, sometimes thousands of dollars more, studies have shown, will price smokers out of the market,’ says Singleterry. ...[ObamaCare] allows insurance companies to charge smokers up to 50 percent more than non-smokers for an identical policy, depending on the state and any subsidies the person might qualify for. For example, premiums for a 64-year-old non-smoker, according to the Kaiser Health Calculator, cost \$9,000 a year for a standard ‘silver’ insurance plan. The same policy for a smoker could cost \$13,600.” (Some smokers will simply lie on Healthcare.gov and say they are non-smokers. Others may simply go without insurance.) [51670]

WDBJ in Roanoke, Virginia airs a story about a Virginia Beach cancer patient, Debra Fishericks, who will lose her health insurance because of ObamaCare. Her employer, Atkinson Realty, has provided group insurance for its employees for at least 10 years, but because the policy does not comply with ObamaCare it will be canceled when it expires in June 2014. Fishericks states she cannot afford the high premiums she has found on Healthcare.gov. [51671, 51672, 51716]

KaiserHealthNews.org reports, “Officials in at least a half dozen states are pushing back against health plans in the new insurance markets that limit choice of doctors and hospitals in a bid to control medical costs. The plans don’t start offering coverage until January but they’re facing regulatory action, possible legislation, and in at least one case involving a high-profile children’s hospital, litigation. ...[C]riticism of limited networks has risen as consumers realize that, despite ...Obama’s pledge that they could keep their doctors, their Affordable Care Act insurance may not include the physicians or hospitals they’ve been seeing.” (Faced with the need to accept customers with preexisting conditions and other expensive ObamaCare requirements, insurers on the new exchanges have had to cut costs wherever they could in order to keep premium prices down. Restricted provider networks is one of those cost-cutting methods. Insurance regulators are, in response, pushing back. Arguably, they are saying, “You must include more doctors and hospitals in your networks, even if it means losing money in the process!” At NationalReview.com Greg Pollowitz writes, “You know, maybe Dems should’ve read this piece of garbage before they bet their party on it? Just a thought.” On the other hand, some argue that the crisis is giving Obama precisely what he wants: private insurers going out of business, increasing the demand for a “single payer” system.) [51722, 51723]

NBCNews.com reports, “A survey by the International Foundation of Employees Benefits Plans (IFEBP) released in August found that 16.8 percent of respondents had already started to redesign their health plans to avoid [ObamaCare’s] ‘Cadillac’ tax and 40 percent said they are considering action. A survey of Fortune 1000 companies by Towers Watson, a top benefits consulting firm, found a much higher number. Sixty percent of these major companies, which employ about 20 million American workers, say the looming excise tax is already having a ‘moderate’ or ‘significant’ influence on benefits decisions for 2014 and 2015. Though the tax doesn’t take effect for years, some companies are starting to make gradual changes now so as not to make dramatic changes

at the last minute. The tax will require a company to pay a 40 percent levy, starting in 2018, on the amount by which the total costs of health plans exceeds an annual limit of \$10,200 for an individual and \$27,500 for a family. ‘There are many factors that result in health care costs going up at certain levels,’ said Ron Fontanetta, a director at Towers Watson, ‘but there’s no question that we’ve seen some action on the part of employers in part because of the concern of a looming excise tax.’” (If health insurance premiums for an employee cost \$11,000, for example, not only would the employer have to pay that amount to the insurance carrier for the coverage, it would also have to pay a \$320 ObamaCare tax to the government—40 percent of the \$800 by which the policy exceeds \$10,200. The employer and the employee are essentially penalized for having insurance that is “too good.” The employers will likely respond by reducing the level of benefits, to keep the premiums at or below \$10,200.) [51730]

At HotAir.com Mary Katherine Ham comments on NBC’s report: “[T]ake heart, America. Brian Williams of the NBC Nightly News is on it, sending investigative reporters to look into the ‘fine print’ of Obamacare. Isn’t that something that would have been more useful four years ago? Now NBC’s found out that large companies—add ’em to the small companies and individual market plans—are also reducing benefits, raising co-pays and deductibles to cope with Obamacare’s new costs. So, if you have a catastrophic plan in the individual market, you’re losing the plan you may have liked for the privilege of paying more. If you had a middle-of-the-road individual market plan you liked, you’re losing that plan for the privilege of paying more often for fewer benefits. If you had a decent plan at a small employer, you’re likely to get dumped into the exchanges as mandate-heavy health care plans get too expensive for small businesses to afford. If you have a plan you like at a medium-sized employer, you’re likely to get dumped into the exchanges next year when the employer mandate kicks in, and your costs are already rising or benefits are going down. If you’re at a large employer with a very nice health insurance plan, sorry, you’re now going to have reduced benefits to avoid the ‘Cadillac’ tax. ...For the record, the idea that consumers paying more expenses themselves might help overall health costs by encouraging fewer unnecessary procedures is perfectly reasonable. The problem is we’re only encouraging it in people who already pay for their own plans without taxpayer help. When the taxpayer [or the employer] foots the bill... there’s little to no incentive to reduce spending. And, of course, in Obamacare as pitched, there were no losers.” [51731]

Politico reports, “Some Capitol Hill Democrats are preparing to launch broadsides against ...Obama if the Affordable Care Act website isn’t fixed by the end of the month. That will come in the form of more aggressive scrutiny in Republican-led oversight hearings, open advocacy for further delay in the enrollment deadline and individual coverage mandate, and more calls for a staff shake-up in the White House.” Congressman Bruce Braley (D-IA) says, “[Obama] and his team have repeatedly assured us that the system will be working by December 1. That’s when I start looking at what we have to do in our oversight function to hold the administration accountable for making it work.” One House Democrat “from a traditionally safe seat based in a major city” tells Politico he is not confident that the White House has a “Plan B.” He states, “I don’t sense that at all. When you think about it, a week after the October shutdown Democrats were

experiencing a euphoric high. We thought we had Republicans on the mat. We thought we were going to win back the House and then this rollout fails. Now, we need to be concerned, all of us, me included, that we aren't viewed as ineffective and kicked out of our seats." [51732, 51733, 51746]

Congresswoman Michele Bachmann (R-MN) comments on the Obama administration's nuclear deal with Iran, telling WND.com, "The major nations of the world have chosen to fail to thwart Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon. It is a blunder of such great proportion, history will record it's folly. ...Now Israel must secure not only her destiny, but she may have to save the world from an Islamic-inspired nuclear Armageddon. ...It's a moment of clarity for the Obama administration. In his press release, [Obama] referred to the Islamic Republic of Iran, not just as Iran. I don't believe they [his administration] have referred to the Jewish State of Israel. ...This is a moment of clarity. [Obama] has made it abundantly clear that, for all practical purposes, he and his team are perfectly content to see Iran join the very exclusive league of nations with nuclear weaponry. ...It's always been, in order to gain admission to that club, you had to be responsible. This is the most dangerous nation with the most dangerous weapons, acquiring them at the worst possible time, with stated intentions to use them to wipe Israel off the map and to use them against us, to bring about the defeat of the United States of America. ...[Obama has] completely changed the dynamic of the United States and our role in the world, reducing the U.S. as a world power, reducing the strength of the U.S. military, continually disrespecting and pulling the rug out from under our allies. ...I think this is a moment of moral clarity. We should have joy because now, after all the rhetoric we've had about [Obama] being supportive of Israel, now we have an opportunity to put it on the line. That's what we need to realize—what's going to happen now? What's the next step?" [51680]

Former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton calls the agreement an "abject surrender by the United States" because "Iran retains its full capacity to enrich uranium, thus abandoning a decade of Western insistence and Security Council resolutions that Iran stop all uranium-enrichment activities. ...Iran may have gained all of the time it needs to achieve weaponization not of simply a handful of nuclear weapons, but of dozens or more. ...[I]n truth, an Israeli military strike is the only way to avoid Tehran's otherwise inevitable march to nuclear weapons, and the proliferation that will surely follow. ...Obama, fearing that strike more than an Iranian nuclear weapon, clearly needed greater international pressure on Jerusalem. And Jerusalem fully understands that Israel was the real target of the Geneva negotiations. ...Tehran judges correctly that they have Obama obediently moving in their direction." [51680]

In response to Obama's push for amnesty legislation, Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) states, "America is not an oligarchy... A Republic must answer to the people. Congressional leaders must forcefully reject the notion, evidently accepted by [Obama], that a small cadre of CEOs can tailor the nation's entire immigration policy to suit their narrow interests." [51690]

According to CNSNews.com, "The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) spent approximately \$900 million over the last 5 years for behavior detection officers to

identify high-risk passengers but, so far, according to the General Accountability Office (GAO), only 0.59% of the passengers flagged were arrested and among those not one was charged with terrorism—zero.” [51742]

The price of fresh whole chickens reaches an all-time average high of \$1.54 per pound. [51743]

FoxNews.com reports, “Iran has pledged to chemically convert its cache of enriched uranium into a less dangerous substance as part of a deal struck on Sunday, but that conversion can be undone through a well-known process, experts tell FoxNews.com. The weekend deal reached by the U.S. and five other world leaders to curb Iran’s nuclear program in exchange for lifting some sanctions requires Iran to take uranium that had been enriched to 20 percent—most of the way to weapons-grade—and convert it into uranium dioxide (UO₂). But that process is readily undone, explained Charles D. Ferguson, president of the Federation of American Scientists.” [51693]

Congressman Mike Rogers (R-MI), chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, tells CNN Obama proceeded with his Iranian deal with “no formal notification” to the House or the Senate. “We have full access to every classified program, every covert action program, as we should in our role for oversight. It was concerning that they didn’t believe it was important enough to do this. It raises unnecessary suspicions about what was agreed to prior to the [negotiations].” [51695]

The Middle East Media Research Institute (Memri.org) posts Arab press reactions to the agreement with Iran: “Some call it an historic agreement leading to greater security—while others claim it’s a bad agreement leading to regional arms race.” “Saudi ‘*Al-Watan*’: The Countries Of The region Have Many Problems With Iran Besides The Nuclear Issue;” “Saudi ‘*Al-Sharq*’: We Fear That Iran Has Been Given Excessive Freedom Of Action In The Region In Exchange For Nuclear Concessions;” “Former *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat* Editor Tariq Alhomayed: A Regional Arms Race Is Now Wide Open (“We are faced with a bad agreement that more closely resembles a discussion of bad debts than a diplomatic agreement to defuse a crisis. It portends not only destruction and war, but also the advent of a wide-open nuclear arms race in the region. If Iran claimed that its nuclear program was for civilian purposes, what will now prevent other countries from attaining a similar program, that at any moment can turn into a full-fledged [military] nuclear program, as occurred in India and Pakistan?”); “Egyptian ‘*Al-Ahram*’: A Historic Agreement That Will Strengthen Regional Stability And Security;” “‘*Al-Quds Al-Arabi*’: The Agreement Paves The Way For A U.S.-Iran Alliance At The Expense Of The Arab Region;” “Syrian ‘*Al-Thawra*’: Iran Has Been Recognized As A Nuclear Power;” “Syrian ‘*Teshreen*’: A Victory For Iran, Which Claimed Its Nuclear Right By Force And Pushed The West Into A Corner;” “The Lebanese ‘*Al-Akhbar*’: ‘The West Has Capitulated—Iran Is Nuclear’; The Russia-Iran-Syria-Hizbullah Axis Has Grown Stronger;” “The Omani ‘*Al-Watan*’: The Agreement Proves That The West Recognizes Only The Strong And Capitulates When Faced With Determination;” “Qatari ‘*Al-Raya*’ And UAE ‘*Al-Khaleej*’: Similar Action Should Now Be Taken Against Israel.” (Not

surprisingly, the sentiments of the Sunni Muslims tend to disfavor the agreement, while the Shi'ite Muslims applaud the agreement.) [51696, 51697]

Obama attends a Democrat National Committee fundraiser at the San Francisco Jazz Center, where ticket prices are cut in half in order to promote attendance. (Harmeet Dhillon, the chairwoman of the San Francisco Republican Party, observes, “the health care thing is a huge problem for [Obama], and it’s not going away.”) Obama is again challenged by someone in the audience to use an “executive order” to stop deportations of illegal immigrants. He responds, “Somebody keeps on yelling, ‘executive order.’ I’m going to actually pause on this issue because a lot of people have been saying this lately on every problem, which is just, ‘Sign an executive order and we can pretty much do anything and basically nullify Congress. Wait, wait, wait. Before everybody starts clapping, that’s not how it works. We’ve got this Constitution, we’ve got this whole thing about separation of powers. So there is no short-cut to politics, and there’s no short-cut to democracy. We have to win on the merits of the argument with the American people, as laborious as it seems sometimes.” [51633, 51689, 51694, 51720, 51729, 51754, 51755, 51790, 52086]

PJMedia.com writes, “When Obama’s motorcade rocketed around San Francisco on Monday, very few locals even noticed his presence, and fewer still cared. The crowds awaiting him at each ... fundraiser were by far the smallest I’d seen in over five years of covering his visits here. Ticket sales to at least one of the events were so sluggish that prices had to be lowered to fill the empty seats. Out in the street, rubberneckers and protesters had dwindled to the bare minimum. This is what happens when a hero disappoints: you don’t turn on him in anger, but rather just tune him out and move on to other interests. Yet even with the small turnout, there was a theme amongst Obama’s protesters/supporters (supportesters?): They didn’t want him to *change* his political agenda — instead, they demanded that he assume dictatorial powers so that he could finally implement the radical plans with which they already agree. The message of the day was: *Stop dilly-dallying around, Mr. [Obama]: Ignore the Constitution and just make The Revolution happen, as you promised!* That message would be disturbing enough all on its own, but it becomes much more disturbing when you suspect (as I do) that many of these pro-totalitarian protesters were astroturfed. In other words: Is the White House scripting/encouraging/guiding protesters on the left to beg him to become a dictator? So that later, he can explain, ‘I had no choice—the people demanded it!’ Or is Obama simply telegraphing to his supporters that they should not be so disappointed when he throws in the towel and gives up even trying to achieve anything in his second term?” [51790]

At the San Francisco events, demonstrators protest against the Keystone XL pipeline. PJMedia.com observes, “[T]he anti-Keystone ‘protesters’ are not opposed to his agenda—they are in fact *part* of his agenda, bit players in the White House’s endless political theater, giving him cover to make unpopular decisions, citing public opinion (as evidenced by these ginned-up ‘protests’) to justify his one-sided actions: This explains how people who voted for Obama can be out in the street seemingly to protest ‘against’ him. Turns out this whole protest was nothing more play-acting for the cameras, a group

of faux protesters colluding with Obama to create a Potemkin ‘movement’ which he can then cite as justification for making an unpopular decision he already wanted to make anyway. ‘I had no choice—there’s a mass movement against this pipeline! I must bow to the will of the people.’ I find it very disturbing that actual grassroots protesters would be willing to dispense with the U.S. Constitution and welcome a dictatorship simply in order to get their way on this or that specific political issue. (It might seem like a good idea at first, but [in] that way lies tyranny.) Yet I find it even more disturbing that the Obama administration could be astroturfing (as in the case of the heckler) or at a minimum encouraging and facilitating (as with the anti-Keystone activists) the very ‘protesters’ who call on him to assume totalitarian powers.” [51790, 51791]

Obama attends a fundraiser at the home of billionaire Marc Benioff. He then flies to Los Angeles to attend to more fundraisers: one at the Beverly Hills home of Earvin ‘Magic’ Johnson, and another at the Beverly Park home of billionaire Haim Saban. [51633, 51689, 51694, 51720, 51729, 51754, 51755, 51790]

On November 26 *CBS This Morning* gets around to reporting on the fact that millions of American workers will lose their employer-provided group health insurance because of ObamaCare. (The segment includes statements from White House press secretary Jay Carney telling reporters that would not be an issue: “They don’t have to worry about or do or change anything.” “This conversation doesn’t apply to you.” “There is no change for you.”) [51716, 51753, 51776]

At HuffingtonPost.com, Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett writes, “A group of for-profit companies are currently suing to gain the right to deny employees access to coverage for birth control and contraceptive care, which are used by the overwhelming majority of American women in their lifetimes. Among the first cases to reach the Supreme Court is one filed by Hobby Lobby, an arts and crafts chain whose owners want to be able to take the option for birth control benefits away from their employees. We are confident the Supreme Court will agree that health decisions in this country should remain with individuals, in consultation with their doctors, families, faiths, and whomever else they personally trust. No corporate entity should be in position to limit women’s legal access to care, or to seize a controlling interest over the health care choices of women. To take that type of power away from individuals, and to let the personal beliefs of a woman’s boss dictate her health care choices would constitute a major step backward for women’s health, and self-determination.” (Jarrett is mistaken. Neither Hobby Lobby nor any other employer is seeking to deny access to contraceptives, abortifacients, or sterilization. They are merely asking the courts to confirm that the government is not justified in forcing *them* to provide or pay for them. Out of their own pockets, Hobby Lobby employees can provide themselves with as many contraceptives and abortifacients as they would like. Jarrett wants no “corporate entity... to seize a controlling interest over the health care choices of women,” but she seems to have no problem allowing a government entity to seize a controlling interest in those choices.) [51856, 51857]

NYTimes.com reports, “White House officials, fearful that the federal health care website may again be overwhelmed this weekend, have urged their allies to hold back enrollment

efforts so the insurance marketplace does not collapse under a crush of new users. At the same time, administration officials said Tuesday that they had decided not to inaugurate a big health care marketing campaign planned for December out of concern that it might drive too many people to the still-fragile HealthCare.gov. With a self-imposed deadline for repairs to the website approaching on Saturday, the administration is trying to strike a delicate balance. It is encouraging people to go or return to the website but does not want to create too much demand. It boasts that the website is vastly improved, but does not want to raise expectations that it will work for everyone.” (In other words, “Well, we promised the web site would be working by December 1, but we don’t really want too many people using it and proving that it really doesn’t work well.”) Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius says, “We are definitely on track to have a significantly different user experience by the end of this month. That was our commitment.” (Actually, the commitment was to fix the web site, not provide a “significantly different user experience.”) [51813, 51814, 51816]

Joel B. Pollak reports at Breitbart.com, “Last week, the Times of Israel reported that senior [Obama] adviser Valerie Jarrett had been leading talks with Iran in secret for a year before the formal negotiations in Geneva this month. While the White House denied the report ‘100 percent,’ the existence of back-channel talks has been confirmed by other reporting. The *Wall Street Journal* reported Sunday that ...Obama had ‘personally overseen’ the talks. Almost anything ‘personally overseen’ by ...Obama is likely to bear the heavy stamp of Ms. Jarrett, who is [his] closest adviser, despite a shocking track record of failure. In foreign policy, her most important mistake was her effort to dissuade [Obama] from proceeding with the raid on Osama bin Laden. It was one of the few times that ...Obama overruled her counsel—and one of his few successes. Jarrett’s involvement in Iran is cause for concern... [T]he major reason for concern about her role is simply that Jarrett has banished, and repulsed, most of the Obama administration’s most competent appointees from the White House. One of the most important departures was that of Dennis Ross, who was brought into the White House [in 2009] to advise [Obama] on the Middle East. Ross, who advocated a tough approach to Iran, is widely thought to have been marginalized by [Obama’s] inner circle. He left the White House in 2011, ostensibly because he had only promised to serve two years, but likely because he was not being utilized. Finally, it is worth noting that Jarrett, despite her expatriate origins, has little experience in international affairs, and is said to manage Obama’s policies through a domestic political lens. If she was as involved in the talks as reports suggest, that could be a major reason for [Obama’s] eagerness to sign almost any deal, even one the French rejected as too weak. In any other administration, she likely would have been ignored.” [51703]

The Supreme Court agrees to hear the case *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby*, which involves the ObamaCare mandate that businesses provide their employees with insurance that covers birth control, abortifacients, and sterilization. (A poll shows that 59 percent of Americans believe no businesses should be forced to provide such coverage.) Both the Obama administration and Hobby Lobby have pursued a Supreme Court appeal, which suggests that both sides believe they have a strong case and will win their argument. (Because the lawsuit involves a corporation, rather than an individual or a non-profit religious

organization, some argue that the Court may side with Obama. But similar lawsuits are in the judicial pipeline that *are* related to religious organizations.) Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) later comments that Obama “knows he’s not going to win this at the Supreme Court, but he won in 2012, and that was his real objective.” [51738, 51745, 51833]

In a CNN/ORC poll, Republicans leads Democrats 49–47 percent in a “generic” contest. (Just one month earlier the Democrats held a 50–42 percent lead.) [51724]

In an interview with Greg Hunter at USAWatchdog.com, former White House budget director David Stockman, author of *The Great Deformation*, says, “Much of the mainstream media is caught up inside the bubble... They have an extreme case of ‘recency bias.’ They can’t remember the events of a few years ago. ...Look at this bubble inflating all around us. ...The Russell 2000 is trading at 75 time reported earnings. People seem to forget that’s exactly where we were in 2007 and 2008. ...You are in a crony capitalism bankrupting mess. That is very disconcerting news to people inside the bubble.” Stockman warns that China is “sitting on this massive hoard of paper [U.S. debt] that they’re never going to be able to do anything with. They have huge distortions inside of their economy... as bad as anything we have. ...This is a symptom that this huge central bank game is nearing its end stage. When the Fed finally stops printing \$85 billion a month... we’ll have falling bond prices and rising yields, a crisis at the heart of the financial system, the \$12 trillion Treasury note and bond market. That’s when the day of reckoning will finally begin to unfold, and everybody will be caught up in it. ...This is not a viable system. It’s a house of cards... I think it will be a deflationary event... financial asset prices will collapse. ...As they see those assets go up in smoke, I think there will be a flight to a monetary asset that people will have some confidence in, and gold will be that asset.” [51710]

At Townhall.com Caroline Glick writes, “The negotiations with the Iranians that culminated in Saturday night’s agreement went on for a year. And yet, the final deal reflects Iran’s opening positions. That is, over the course of the entire year, American and European negotiators were not able to move Iran’s positions one iota. So what has the Obama administration been doing for the past year? Since Iran’s positions were the same all along, why didn’t they sign this deal a year ago? ...To ascertain the answer, it is worth considering [Israeli] Finance Minister Yair Lapid’s comments Sunday morning. Beyond noting the nuclear deal’s danger to Israel’s security, Lapid said, ‘I am worried not only over the deal but that we have lost the world’s attention.’ ...Over the past year, Obama has engaged in systematically weakening Israel’s position both regionally and in Washington. Regionally, the US has forced Israel into talks with the Palestinians that are engineered to weaken Israel strategically and diplomatically. The US has delegitimized Israel’s legal rights to sovereignty and self-defense, while effectively justifying Palestinian terrorism as a legitimate response to Israeli actions—which themselves were perfectly legal. ...The culmination of this long process of delegitimizing Israel as a warmongering, ungrateful ally and its supporters as turncoats who are forcing the US to endanger itself for the benefit of the Jewish state was the administration’s hysterical campaign against Israel and its supporters in the lead-up to Saturday’s signing ceremony

in Geneva. Everyone, from the White House to Kerry, accused Israel and its supporters of trying to force the US to fight an unnecessary war. When we consider Obama's decision to wait for a year to sign the deal that enables Iran to become a nuclear power in the context of his main activities over the past year, we understand his foreign policy. His goal is not to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power. It isn't even to facilitate a rapprochement between America and Iran. The goal of Obama's foreign policy is to weaken the State of Israel." [51715]

Obama tours the DreamWorks animation studios Glendale, California—where he tells employees the economy is getting better. Obama brags that in California, “thousands of people every single day who are getting health care for the first time” because of ObamaCare—but he neglects to mention that more than one million residents of the state have had their health insurance policies canceled. Obama tells the employees—who he apparently believes are all Democrats—“I put forward my plans to create new jobs and even the odds for the middle class and I put forward plans that give some Republicans some of the things they want in exchange for ideas that will create good jobs right now. So far they won't consider them. Some people have heard me say my list of top five movies, you know, *Godfather 1 and 2* have to be on it. But it turns out Marlon Brando had it easy because when it comes to Congress, there is no such thing as an offer they can't refuse. I just keep on coming back. I'm gonna keep on trying though. I am because we got [sic] no choice.” Obama also says, “Kindness,” says Obama, “covers all of my political beliefs. When I think about what I'm fighting for, what gets me up every single day, [kindness] captures it just about as much as anything.” [51725, 51726, 51779, 51783]

Sucking up to the movie-making audience, Obama says, “Believe it or not, entertainment is part of our American diplomacy. It's part of what makes us exceptional; part of what makes us such a world power. You can go anywhere on the planet and you'll see a kid wearing a 'Madagascar' T-shirt. You can say, 'May the force be with you,' [and] they know what you're talking about. Hundreds of millions of people may never set foot in the United States, but thanks to you, they've experienced a small part of what makes our country special. They've learned something about our values. We have shaped a world's culture through you. The stories that we tell transmit values and ideals about tolerance and diversity and overcoming adversity, and creativity that are part of our DNA. And as a consequence of what you've done, you helped shape the world's culture in a way that has made the world better. They might not know the Gettysburg Address, but if they're watching some old movie, maybe *Guess Who's Coming To Dinner* or *The Mary Tyler Moore Show* or *Will and Grace* and *Modern Family*, they've had a front row seat to our march towards progress.” (Some might argue that the United States would be respected more around the world if it promoted the Gettysburg Address and did not export *Will and Grace*.) [51788]

Obama also pushes for immigration reform, and says, “As I was getting a tour of DreamWorks, I didn't ask, but just looking at faces, I could tell there were some folks who are here not because they were born here, but because they want to be here and they bring extraordinary talents to the United States. And that's part of what makes America

special. And that's part of what, by the way, makes California special, because it's always been this magnet of dreamers and strivers. And people coming from every direction saying to themselves, you know, if I work hard there I can have my piece of the American Dream." (At Townhall.com Christine Rousselle writes, "Ummmm... Lets' do a fun thought experiment where we imagine the media's reaction to a Republican saying they can 'identify an immigrant' from just looking at someone. I feel like it wouldn't go over well.") [51793]

Senator Kay Hagan (D-SC), asked by a reporter about her "You can keep your plan if you like it" promise, replies, "You know, you look back at the insurance companies. For three years [they] sold these policies without telling the consumer that they would have to be cancelled." (CainTV.com comments, "Basically, what Hagan is saying is 'Don't blame me. Insurance companies never told you I was lying, so my lies were allowed to be presented as fact. Therefore, all of this is the insurers fault. They deceived people by letting them believe Democrat lies.' It's twisted, tortured, non-logic, but this insanity is an emerging narrative on the left.") [51714]

DailyCaller.com's Sunny Lohmann posts a statement on Facebook: "Today, after 16 months of intense and difficult negotiations with North Korea, we have completed an agreement that will make the United States, the Korean Peninsula, and the world safer. Under the agreement, North Korea has agreed to freeze its existing nuclear program and to accept international inspection of all existing facilities. This agreement represents the first step on the road to a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The United States and North Korea have also agreed to ease trade restrictions and to move toward establishing liaison offices in each other's capitals. These offices will ease North Korea's isolation."—President Bill Clinton October 18, 1994

Several Americans who were held hostage by the Iranians for 444 grueling days during the administration of Jimmy Carter comment on Obama's Geneva agreement. Clair Cortland Barnes, formerly with the CIA, states, "It's kind of like Jimmy Carter all over again." Retired Air Force Colonel Thomas E. Schaefer says, "My personal view is, I never found an Iranian leader I can trust. I don't think today it's any different from when I was there. None of them, I think, can be trusted. Why make an agreement with people you can't trust?" Sergeant Rodney "Rocky" Sickmann comments, "It just hurts. We negotiated for 444 days and not one time did they agree to anything... and here they beg for us to negotiate and we do. It's hard to swallow. We negotiate with our enemies and stab our allies in the back. That doesn't seem good." [51727, 51728]

In Nigeria, Muslims slaughter 37 Christians in attacks on four villages. (Obama has no comment.) [51763, 51764]

In his annual Thanksgiving message, Obama states, "Thanksgiving offers each of us the chance to count our many blessings—the freedoms we enjoy, the time we spend with loved ones, the brave men and women who defend our Nation at home and abroad. ...This tradition reminds us that no matter what our background or beliefs, no matter who

we are or who we love, at our core we are first and foremost Americans.” (Obama’s “no matter who we are and who we love” is certainly a reference to gays and lesbians.) [51775]

IsraelNationalNews.com reports, “Iran is now saying that the version of the agreement that was arrived at in Geneva differs than what the US has published. According to a report by Kol Yisrael (radio), a spokesperson for the Iranian Foreign Ministry said that the wording of the version that appears on the White House website is a one-sided interpretation of the agreement, and that parts of what were included conflict with what the agreement actually states.” FreeBeacon.com quotes Iranian Foreign Ministry Spokeswoman Marziyeh Afkham: “What has been released by the web site of the White House as a fact sheet is a one-sided interpretation of the agreed text in Geneva and some of the explanations and words in the sheet contradict the text of the Joint Plan of Action, and this fact sheet has unfortunately been translated and released in the name of the Geneva agreement by certain media, which is not true.” (Pamela Geller writes at AtlasShrugs.com, “As Americans, it’s hard to get our arms around so treacherous a commander in chief, a traitor to freedom and core American ideals. Obama lies. His entire [administration] is a lie. Obamacare. Lie. Fast and furious. Lie. IRS political harassment scandal. Lie. Benghazi. Lie. And the enemedia spins garbage into gold. Who do you believe? Iran or Obama?”) [51765, 51766, 51806, 51807]

Meanwhile, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani continues to treat the agreement as a victory for his country, stating, “[Uranium] Enrichment, which is part of our rights, will continue. It continues today and will continue tomorrow,” and “In regards to nuclear issue, I promise our people that [the] first lock has been opened. We have shook the foundations of the sanctions regime.” [51778]

At PJMedia.com Tom Blumer reviews how the Obama administration is eagerly adding Americans to the Medicaid rolls. He writes, “[W]hat Obamacare has done to Medicaid is a case study in greedy authoritarianism gone wild. ...[W]ith the asset test gone, the [Healthcare.gov] web site forces even well-off households into the program, as long as their ‘Modified Adjusted Gross Income’ is at or below 100 percent of the poverty level in states which have chosen not to take federal bribes to expand the program, and 138 percent in states which have. This has led to the following ‘you can’t make up something this stupid’ situation: ‘The father owns a \$5 million house—entirely paid for. His kids attend expensive private schools. He owns three cars, but because he has earned his fortune and has stopped working, and his wife’s new start-up business has yet to produce an income stream, he is considered by the HealthCare.gov website to have no income. The website put him on Medicaid.’ There are no other options. This—not ...Obama’s ‘if you like your plan-doctor-provider, you can keep your plan-doctor-provider’—is how HealthCare.gov has been designed to work.” [51741]

Politico reports, “The Obama administration today proposed new rules for tax-exempt political groups that would prevent organizations like Karl Rove’s Crossroads [Crossroads GPS] from tax exemption if they engage in candidate-related political activity. The proposal comes months after an inspector general blasted the Internal

Revenue Service for added scrutiny of so-called social welfare groups affiliated with the tea party movement, and recommended that the government clarify the rules for political non-profits.” (Many will expect that the new rules will be “selectively enforced,” with conservative groups being denied tax-exempt status while leftist groups retain theirs.) Attorney Jay Sekulow tells *The New York Times*, “This is a feeble attempt by the Obama administration to justify its own wrongdoing with the IRS targeting of conservative and tea party groups.” Rove states, “This is clearly an attempt by the administration to discourage conservative groups. I think it’s hypocrisy. ...It didn’t matter for decades when these groups, the 501(c)(4)s that were involved in politics, were primarily Democrat groups. It’s when conservatives began to mimic what Democrats and liberals were doing that it finally became a concern to the Democrats.” [51777, 51782, 51818]

In his *The Daily Rant*, Mychal Massie examines why Obama lies: “At first blush, the simple answer would be that he is the worst kind of human being—the kind who is willing to lie and betray without remorse as long as his lies and betrayal get him what he wants. He is a shell of a human being, consumed by the hauntings of his socio-inadequate childhood and the most dysfunctional, hate-filled, delusional, ersatz couple for parents a child could have short of being an offspring of a parentage between Idi Amin [a former brutal president of Uganda] and Emma Goldman [an anarchist who delivered a speech that inspired Leon Czolgosz to assassinate President William McKinley]. ...Obama lies, because he is a liar. He doesn’t only lie to cover his misdeeds—he lies to get his way. His lying is congenital and compounded by social-psychological factors in his life. ...Obama suffers from emotional instability that makes him a threat to our national security and that drives him to attempt elevating his self-esteem. He knows that he is the equivalent of an empty suit who found he could prostitute his skin color for free rides. But like most of his kind, when they find themselves in positions of prominence—they realize they are frauds and the secret haunts them. Add the dysfunctional parentage and family setting he grew up within and we understand that he lies as a means to make a damaged person puff himself up to be what he isn’t. Lying has become his first language because his true opinion of himself is one he cannot stomach. His grandparents forced him into a mentorship with Frank Marshall Davis who was a rabid communist and pedophile, and although it hasn’t been proven, if as I and others suspect, that led to young Obama being sexually molested—the feelings of worthlessness that would understandably bring about combined with a sense of betrayal by his grandparents (who brought Davis into his life) and feelings of abandonment by his biological parents, which allowed for the betrayal by his grandparents, which led to more feelings of abandonment, anger, and worthlessness. Resulting in an unstable and volatile person unfit for office. ...[H]e is a hardcore neo-Leninist, a hybrid communist—what else could we have expected?” [51758, 51759, 51760, 51761]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments on Obama’s excessive fundraising, saying Obama acts “as if his main job, his *only* job, is rhetorical and political: shore up the base and make speeches. It’s all rhetoric. He’s got a crisis of management. He’s got a system that doesn’t work. It’s his signature legislation. It’s sort of the heart, the symbol of the embodiment of his idea of a caring, progressive, central government. It’s a mess. And he’s now on the west coast [making speeches and raising money]. ...Obama says, ‘Well,

I don't write code.' It's not that people want him to write code, they want him to be in Washington, [to] organize his underlings, get a system going, in which he can make a promise that ObamaCare, that the web site will be up on December the first, and it'll actually happen. Is there anybody who believes it's gonna [sic] be up and running on December the first? And he's now on these trips. It's amazing to me. ...There is an element of this that's a bit like running a candy store. And he's never run anything. It's as if he's a bystander who makes speeches. I think it's rather remarkable. Who and where and what is happening here to actually make his idea, this conception he had, of ObamaCare, of health care, that encompasses everybody, to actually make it a reality?" [Kathleen] Sebelius? [51794]

Obama attends a fundraiser at the home of Hollywood producer Marta Kauffman. Barack "Humble" Obama claims, "Over the last five years, thanks to the leadership of [House Minority Leader] Nancy [Pelosi (D-CA)] and [Senate Majority Leader] Harry [Reid (D-NV)] and legislators who are here, we have accomplished as much, if not more, than [at] any time in our history." (From Obama's perspective, ending the military's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy apparently ranks right up there with winning World War II, and "doubling fuel efficiency standards" compares with ending the Cold War with the Soviet Union.) [51744]

Comedian Jimmy Kimmel quips, "As usual, [Obama's] motorcade made our normally miserable traffic even worse. He basically turned the west side of Los Angeles into the traffic equivalent of the ObamaCare web site. ...I guess he's here for the same reason he's usually here, to attend a few Democratic fundraisers and to go to In-and-Out Burger without his wife finding out. ...It seems like the only time [Obama] comes to L.A. is for money. He's like a college student who only comes home to do his laundry and steal leftovers from the fridge." [51770]

Obama's fundraising trip also raises the ire of celebrity Kelly Osbourne, who tweets from a traffic jam, "driving around for over an hour trying to get home because the 'president' is at a party on my street." "I come from a country of real royals and they don't even pull this shit for the Queen!" "Dear ...Obama please can I go home to feed my dogs & go to bed I promise I pose no threat to you. I just want to go home." [51840]

On November 27 Michelle Obama sends a "trolling for dollars" email that asks recipients to list what they are thankful for on Thanksgiving—and then directs them to an Organizing for Action donation page. [51739, 51740]

The administration announces another ObamaCare delay. According to *The Washington Post*, "The Small Business Health Options Program, know as the SHOP exchange, will not offer online enrollment until November 2014, a one-year delay from a launch that was initially planned for this October. Administration officials characterized the decision as one made necessary as they prioritized fixes to the individual health exchange, which the White House has promised will 'work smoothly for the vast majority of users' by Dec. 1. ...Small businesses will still have the option to purchase SHOP health insurance plans through a broker or agent, who will assist the employer with filing a paper

application.” (Of course, going through a broker or agent increases the cost of the insurance because a fee is tacked on. But many of the small businesses will not have to pay the fees: when they see the incredibly high premiums caused by ObamaCare, they will simply cancel their policies, leaving their employees to fend for themselves at Healthcare.gov.) [51747, 51748, 51795, 51796, 51809, 51812, 51855]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports that the Obama administration is imposing new rules of engagement (ROE) on Americans fighting in Afghanistan. Existing rules already require that U.S. troops “confirm that a Taliban fighter is armed before they can fire” at him. According to one new rule, which “Obama pledged in a letter to Afghan President Karzai,” “U.S. forces shall not enter Afghan homes for the purposes of military operations, except under extraordinary circumstances involving urgent risk to life and limb of U.S. nationals.” Obama’s “ROE are being viewed as extreme political correctness. Imagine you were a Marine fighting the Taliban, but you aren’t allowed to shoot at them unless you confirm they are armed. What this basically would mean you could be shot by a terrorist while trying to confirm they are shooting at you.” (Had the U.S. military followed Obama’s rules of engagement in World War II, Japan and Germany would have won.) [51799, 51805]

Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says, “What I don’t appreciate is when I hear remarks out of the White House spokesman that... if we’re pursuing sanctions [on Iran] we’re marching the country off to war. I think that’s way over the top; I think that’s fear-mongering. ... We have to worry about the hardliners in Iran, and it seems that the Iranians get to play good cop-bad cop, [Iranian President Hassan] Rouhani as the good cop, the hardliners as the bad cop.” [51817]

IranFocus.com reports that Congressman Brad Sherman (D-CA) “is lashing out at a provision of the nuclear deal with Iran that could make it easier for the country to repair its aging fleet of civilian aircraft. A little-noticed provision of the deal paves the way for U.S. companies such as Boeing and General Electric to inspect and repair Iran’s American-made planes inside Iran. But ... Sherman ... a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs panel and a hawk on Iran, says the planes could be used to promote terrorism and support Syria’s Bashar Assad. ‘America should exploit some of the vagaries in the agreement’s language and prevent Boeing from repairing Iranian aircraft until we have a final deal,’ Sherman said in a statement Tuesday. ‘Otherwise we will have made a permanent irreversible concession in a ‘temporary’ agreement.’” [51835, 51836]

NYPost.com posts a letter from Obama to a fifth-grade teacher in Texas, Thomas J. Ritter, who had complained, “I hesitated to write for fear of some kind of retribution... I watched you make fun of tea baggers and your press secretary make fun of Ms. [Sarah] Palin which was especially beneath the dignity of the White House... Do the right thing not the political thing. Suggest a bill that Americans can support.” In his response, Obama states, “I ... appreciate your concern about the toxic political environment right now. I do have to challenge you, though, on the notion that any citizen that disagrees with

me has been ‘targeted and ridiculed’ or that I have ‘made fun’ of tea-baggers ... [I] defend strongly the right of everyone to speak their mind—including those who call me ‘socialist’ or worse. I sincerely believe that the health care reform bill was the right thing to do for the country. It certainly wasn’t the smart ‘political thing!’ And I hope that in the months to come, you will keep an open mind and evaluate it based not on the political attacks but on what it does or doesn’t do to improve people’s lives. Sincerely, Barack Obama.” (Remarkably, Obama uses the offensive “tea bagger” in a letter claiming he has not used it—even though he most certainly has. Not so remarkably, the always-defensive Obama goes out of his way to claim he is not a socialist.) Ritter plans to auction the letter, stating, “I am selling the letter because I am just so disappointed, and this ObamaCare bill is wrong. [Obama] told me [only] what he thought I wanted to hear. The letter is just words on a paper. It doesn’t mean anything to me because Obama doesn’t mean any of it.” [51751, 51752, 51800, 51810]

At FoxNews.com Jim Angle reports, “Almost 80 million people with employer health plans could find their coverage canceled because they are not compliant with ObamaCare, several experts predicted. Their losses would be in addition to the millions who found their individual coverage cancelled for the same reason. Stan Veuger of the American Enterprise Institute said that in addition to the individual cancellations, ‘at least half the people on employer plans would by 2014 start losing plans as well.’ There are approximately 157 million employer health care policy holders. Avik Roy of the Manhattan Institute added, ‘the administration estimated that approximately 78 million Americans with employer sponsored insurance would lose their existing coverage due to the Affordable Care Act.’ Last week, an analysis by the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, showed the administration anticipates half to two-thirds of small businesses would have policies canceled or be compelled to send workers onto the ObamaCare exchanges. They predicted up to 100 million small and large business policies could be canceled next year. According to projections the administration itself issued back in July 2010, it was clear officials knew the impact of ObamaCare three years ago. In fact, according to the Federal Register, its mid-range estimate was that by the end of 2014, 76 percent of small group plans would be cancelled, along with 55 percent of large employer plans.” [51753, 51850]

DailyCaller.com reports, “Federal agencies are currently working on rolling out hundreds of environmental regulations, including major regulations that would limit emissions from power plants and expand the agency’s authority to bodies of water on private property. On Tuesday [November 26], the White House released its regulatory agenda for the fall of 2013. It lists hundreds of pending energy and environmental regulations being crafting by executive branch agencies, including 134 regulations from the Environmental Protection Agency alone. The EPA is currently crafting 134 major and minor regulations, according to the White House’s regulatory agenda. Seventy-six of the EPA’s pending regulations originate from the agency’s air and radiation office, including carbon-dioxide-emission limits on power plants. Carbon-dioxide limits are a key part of ... Obama’s climate agenda. The EPA is set to set [sic; set to establish] emissions limits that would effectively ban the construction of new coal-fired power plants unless they use carbon capture and sequestration technology. Next year, the agency will move to limit

emissions from existing power plants—which could put more older coal plants out of commission.” (Obama seems determined to close all coal-fired power plants. That will result in higher electricity prices, electricity shortages, and more lost jobs.) [51762]

Heritage.org reports, “Obamacare goes against two values that should be no-brainers: prioritizing American citizens over non-citizens, and prioritizing help for the disabled over assistance for able-bodied adults. ... Obamacare includes special provisions that allow many legal, non-citizen residents to qualify for federally subsidized insurance and, in so doing, offers these non-citizens more and better coverage options than American citizens. The law as implemented creates two inequities that put American citizens at a disadvantage compared with non-citizens. First, in states that expand their Medicaid programs, citizens with incomes under 138 percent of the federal poverty level will be automatically enrolled into Medicaid, while non-citizens will receive subsidies to purchase coverage in the Obamacare exchange. Several studies show that patients with Medicaid coverage have worse outcomes than the uninsured, and some Medicaid beneficiaries do not consider the program ‘real insurance.’ Yet Obamacare dumps millions of American citizens into this troubled program, even as it grants many non-citizens the opportunity to pick health plans of their choosing. Second, in states that do not expand their Medicaid programs, non-citizens will be able to purchase subsidized health insurance in the exchanges, while American citizens below 100 percent of the poverty line may not qualify for subsidized coverage at all. It simply doesn’t make sense to offer non-citizens more and better coverage options than American citizens. This potentially encourages immigration to the United States by those seeking to benefit from taxpayer-funded welfare programs, which increases the incentives for people not to become citizens, and thus full, integral members of our civic society.” [51771]

In a Quinnipiac poll, Obama’s approval rating plunges to a record low 34 percent in Ohio. His disapproval rating is a dismal 61 percent. Only 39 percent believe Obama is “honest and trustworthy.” The ObamaCare approval/disapproval ratings are 35/59. [51780]

Organizing for Action runs a television ad for ObamaCare in which a father and mother, at a Thanksgiving dinner table, advise their young son to sign up for health insurance via Healthcare.gov. “We love you no matter what,” says the father—but you’d better comply with the government mandate. (Charles Krauthammer later comments on *Special Report*, “It’s ridiculous. And it’s got a kind of creepy Soviet element here. The essence of the overbearing state is that they leave you no haven from politics. And there is no place that ought to be yours and outside of politics as the family table, especially with a large turkey on it and everybody gathered all over the country. And they want you to talk about their political agenda?” [51842]

With the November 30 deadline to fix Healthcare.gov approaching, HotAir.com comments, “[N]ot only hasn’t Obama done any sustained media tours to promote enrollment while the website is in limbo, he’s actually abandoning the big home-stretch overdrive push because, even now, it just can’t handle the load. Imagine how ‘fragile’ it must be, to borrow the [New York] Times’s word, for the White House to decide that the

prudent thing to do when they're desperate for more sign-ups is not to encourage people too much lest Healthcare.gov crash again and the resulting bad press scares people off for good. [*The Washington Post's*] Ezra Klein claimed yesterday that, even though O-Care will now almost certainly miss its target of seven million enrollments next year, that's no biggie; it's the mix of enrollments, young/healthy versus poor/sick, that will determine if the program can go forward. And that's true, sort of: If you're building a boat, it's more important to build one that can float than to build one that's really big. In this case, though, those two features aren't independent. If the White House falls way short of its target number, it'll likely be because too few 'young healthies' are enrolling, not too few poor and sick. They may very well hit their target for the latter group but badly miss the former. That boat won't float. And now here's the White House admitting, due to its technological self-sabotage, that it can't take aggressive action to minimize the risk of missing its young/healthy target next month. If I were a Democrat whose seat is up next year, the 'significantly different user experience' Sebelius is promising next week wouldn't suffice." [51813, 51814, 51815, 51816]

Breitbart.com reports that Afghan President Hamid Karzai told reporters, "I have demanded an end to all American attacks against Afghan homes and the beginning of a realistic peace process. Whenever the Americans meet these two demands of mine, I am ready to sign the agreement. And when these two demands are implemented, this agreement is in Afghanistan's interests. ... Last year, during my visit to Washington, in a very important briefing a day before I met [Obama], his national security adviser Tom Donilon, and senior White House officials, generals, and intelligence officials, the national security adviser [Donilon] met with me. He told me: 'The Taliban are not our enemies and we don't want to fight them.'" (Pamela Geller asks, "The Taliban are not the enemy? If not them, who? The Taliban aided and abetted Osama Bin Laden in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks on America. They are killing our soldiers (our brothers and sisters, husbands and fathers) in 'insider attacks.' They are bombing schools we built to educate girls. They are waging jihad, imposing the most brutal and extreme ideology on the face of the earth—the sharia—and they are not the enemy? If not them, who?") [57217, 57218, 57219]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer states, "It is a fact that for every one person who's acquired insurance through ObamaCare, 50 Americans have lost their insurance over ObamaCare. You do the math, and what you have here is a program that is a wrecking ball for the insurance system in the United States. And they keep postponing the day on which they're going to be held accountable. They have a website, which is a complete turkey, and they say, 'Well, it will be okay on December the first.' We now know it's not going to be okay on December the first. They have such confidence in the fix that they are urging their own allies to stay off the site because they're worried about it crashing at a fairly low level of activity—50,000 [concurrent users] is about a tenth of what you get on Amazon or other sites. So, look, this is a rolling disaster. There is no daylight in sight." [51822]

On November 28 Michael Warren writes at *WeeklyStandard.com* that Republicans will run on ObamaCare in 2014, while Democrats "will run away from it." "[A]s the news

about [Obama's] health care law goes from bad to worse—a faulty website and low enrollment gave way to higher premiums and a steady stream of cancellation letters—congressional Democrats will likely want to talk about anything but Obamacare on the trail. In fact, it's a number of Republican challengers who say Obamacare will work to their advantage next November. In fact, it's a number of Republican challengers who say Obamacare will work to their advantage next November. ...Polls reflect this growing anxiety over the effects of the law. A new survey from the *Washington Post* and ABC News found 39 percent of registered voters say a candidate's support of Obamacare would make them more likely to oppose that candidate, while just 23 percent say it would make them more likely to support that candidate. ...Bobby Schilling of Rock Island, Illinois, has seen all this before. In 2010, he defeated a sitting Democratic congressman, as many Republicans did that year, by running against the passage of Obamacare. Schilling lost two years later to Democrat Cheri Bustos in a redrawn district that put the Republican at a significant disadvantage. But next year, he's running for his old seat, and once again, the health care law is at the center of his pitch. 'This is going to be the number one issue in the campaign,' says Schilling. When he first ran, Schilling says, voters were angry at Democrats because of the way the bill passed the House: the backroom dealing, arm-twisting, and special favors. But now, the consequences of the law are starting to hit home. 'Because people are seeing it come to their mailbox, it's become real,' he says. One voter told Schilling his \$435 premium is shooting up to nearly \$1,400 next year, while his deductible will go from \$10,000 to \$12,000." [51787]

“...Nowhere are the consequences of Obamacare being felt more than in California, where the new state insurance exchange has not had the technical difficulties faced by the federal website. Covered California, the state exchange, boasted 31,000 enrollees in the month of October, according to the *Los Angeles Times*. But the *Times* also reported that one million Californians will lose their existing health insurance coverage next year. So while Obamacare is 'working' in the Golden State, not all California Democrats are celebrating it. Seven voted for the [Congressman Fred] Upton bill [to allow consumers to keep their existing insurance plans], including four who ran behind ...Obama in their districts in 2012. One of those Democrats is John Garamendi from Walnut Grove near Sacramento. Garamendi's Republican opponent, assemblyman Dan Logue, says making an issue of Obamacare is a 'cornerstone' of his campaign. 'This has been a big issue to voters here,' Logue says. 'They're absolutely stunned that it's been this bad.'" Even worse for Californians is that an additional two million residents are expected to go on Medicaid over the next two years, partly because of ObamaCare. Because Medicaid's reimbursement rates are so low—and its red tape is so cumbersome— many physicians cannot afford to accept any additional patients from the system. More poor people may soon "have insurance," but it will do them little good if they cannot find a doctor willing to treat them. [51787, 51820]

FreeBeacon.com reports, "A top Iranian military leader announced late Tuesday [November 26] that Iran has developed 'indigenous' ballistic missile technology, which could eventually allow it to fire a nuclear payload over great distances. Brigadier General Hossein Salami, the lieutenant commander of Iran's elite Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), made the critical weapons announcement just days after Iran and the West

signed a deal aimed at curbing the country's nuclear activities. Salami claimed that 'Iran is among the only three world countries enjoying an indigenous ballistic missile technology,' according to the state-run Fars News Agency. 'Many countries may have access to cruise missiles technology, but when it comes to ballistic missiles, I am confident that only the U.S. and the [former] Soviet Union could master this technology, and now we can announce that we own this technology as well,' Salami told Fars. ...Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton said Iran's ballistic missile announcement is no surprise. 'Iran's ballistic missile program has always been to provide the delivery vehicles for nuclear warheads,' Bolton said. 'The timing of the IRGC announcement is no coincidence.'" (AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller writes, "More egg (or is that yellowcake?) on Obama's face. The outplayed, outfoxed stooge in the White House will be the death of us all.") [51803, 51804]

Stars and Stripes reports, "The American commander of coalition forces in Afghanistan telephoned Afghan President Hamid Karzai to apologize for an airstrike that killed at least one Afghan civilian and badly wounded two others, a coalition official said Friday. Marine Gen. Joseph F. Dunford Jr. 'expressed deep regret' for the civilian casualties, the official said, and promised a joint investigation with Afghan officials into circumstances surrounding the attack Thursday. Dunford made the call late Thursday after Karzai angrily denounced the United States, saying it has repeatedly shown disregard for the lives of Afghan civilians." (Americans are still waiting for Karzai to apologize for the killings of U.S. troops by Afghan soldiers.) [51884]

FoxNews.com reports, "A self-proclaimed non-partisan organization has been given a \$1.1 million grant to establish a database of ObamaCare 'success stories,' as the Obama administration tries to rehab the law's image amid the rocky rollout. Families USA, which describes itself on its website as a non-profit dedicated to 'the achievement of high-quality, affordable health care for all Americans,' received the \$1,100,000 grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Oct. 4." (ObamaCare opponents might respond, "I'll see your one ObamaCare success story and raise you 10 ObamaCare horror stories.") According to Heritage.org, Families USA executive director Ron Pollack also "serves on the board of directors of Enroll America and was instrumental in the group's creation. Enroll America, recently the focus of undercover Project Veritas videos, is dedicated to signing up Americans for Obamacare. Meanwhile, the current president and CEO of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, is on ...Obama's Council on Fitness, Sports, and Nutrition. And a trustee member of the foundation, Nancy-Ann DeParle, served as White House deputy chief of staff for policy and previously as Obama's health care czar." [51821, 51839, 51936, 52501]

Obama complains about Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's "clamorous criticism" of the Iranian nuclear agreement and asks him to "take a breather." Meanwhile, according to WND.com, "An influential Iranian cleric has warned ...Obama not to include Israel in any nuclear negotiations because the Jewish state must be destroyed. 'What is visible is that Obama has agreed to include the fake Zionist regime (Israel) in future negotiations, said Ayatollah Mohammad Khatami, a member of Iran's Assembly of Experts. 'However, we firmly believe [Israel] must be wiped off the face of the earth

and we don't recognize [its existence].’ Khatami said according to IRNA, the official news agency of the Islamic Republic.” (Pamela Geller writes at AtlasShrugs.com, “It is increasingly clear that Israel was/is the real target of the Iran nuke deal in Geneva. And Obama was played like a card—the joker. This kind of annihilationist rhetoric has, up until now, been relegated to the utter fringe of the international discourse. Obama has sanctioned it and elevated it into the mainstream discourse by making a deal that legitimized these savages.”) [51826, 51827, 51860]

In an interview with DailyCaller.com columnist Charles Krauthammer says the war in Iraq “was won and we were in a position, if we had just negotiated a status of forces agreement, to have an ally in the region, to have a base, to train their air force—that would have changed the course of the future. Instead, a decision was made by the new [Obama] administration to evacuate, leaving a vacuum where Iran has come in, where al-Qaeda thrives and al-Qaeda actually has extended itself into Syria. This was all unnecessary—and all the result of the liquidation of a war that was won. So I think history is going to look at this a little bit differently than we do contemporaneously. This was a very high price—too much blood, too much treasure—for those intervening years, but I think in some sense what happened at the end [with the Bush administration’s military “surge”] was able to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, and then that was tossed away [by Obama].” [51841]

At WashingtonPost.com, New York University history professor Robert Zimmerman suggests amending the U.S. Constitution to allow Obama to run for a third term. Zimmerman’s laughable argument? That Democrat legislators now have “little to fear” in criticizing Obama because he cannot be reelected. If he could serve another term, writes Zimmerman, they would have to worry about “provoking [his] wrath.” (In other words, Zimmerman prefers that Obama be treated like a king or dictator.) Zimmerman also argues that Obama does not have to “fear the voters,” and “If he chooses, he could simply ignore their will.” (Zimmerman is apparently unaware that if Obama were to routinely ignore the will of the people and violate the U.S. Constitution, he could be impeached—a scenario he may, in fact, be perilously close to approaching.) Zimmerman asks, “And if the people wanted him to serve another term, why shouldn’t they be allowed to award him one? ...Barack Obama should be allowed to stand for re election [sic; re-election] just as citizens should be allowed to vote for—or against—him. Anything less diminishes our leaders and ourselves.” (Zimmerman is of course not suggesting that an election be held *now*—possibly because he knows Obama would lose in a landslide.) [51823, 51896, 52208]

Obama’s propaganda arm, Organizing for Action, sends a Twitter message: “Today [Thanksgiving Day] we’re thankful insurance companies now can’t deny coverage for important surgeries.” [51824]

LastResistance.com reports that Texas Attorney General Gregg Abbott has filed a lawsuit against the federal government over an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) rule implemented in April 2012 that prohibits employers from using a criminal record as a reason to not hire, not promote, or fire someone. “In other words, if a

financial institution rejects hiring a qualified applicant based on a criminal past of theft, bank robbery or embezzlement, the applicant could file a complaint with the EEOC [which] will then take legal action against the employer. Another example would be if a daycare rejects an applicant because of a past criminal record of child abuse, sexual molestation, or rape, the applicant could file a complaint against the employer which the EEOC will take up and [use to] go after the employer.” Abbott states, “Once again, the Obama administration is overreaching its legal authority by trying to impose hiring rules on states that violate state sovereignty and—in this instance—endanger public safety.” [51828]

Breitbart.com reports, “The National Chairman of the Communist Party, USA [Sam Webb] suggests supporters of The Affordable Care Act should accuse its detractors of being racists as a tactic to regain support for the troubled law.” (Webb is late to the game; ObamaCare supporters have shown a mastery of that technique.) [51832]

The Obamas enjoy Thanksgiving dinner at the White House. According to WhiteHouseDossier.com, the menu includes: turkey, honey-baked ham, cornbread stuffing, oyster stuffing, greens, macaroni and cheese, sweet potatoes, mashed potatoes, green bean casserole, dinner rolls, huckleberry pie, pecan pie, chocolate cream pie, sweet potato pie, peach pie, apple pie, pumpkin pie, banana cream pie, and coconut cream pie. [51848, 51849]

On YouTube.com, a family posts a video of their Thanksgiving get-together at which one relative, basically following the Organizing for Action “holiday script,” encourages everyone to enroll in ObamaCare. The group responds with laughter and ridicule. (Whether the video represents an actual attempt to persuade others to go to Healthcare.gov or is simply a staged effort to ridicule ObamaCare is not known. In any event, it is unlikely that many Americans allowed Organizing for Action to propagandize their Thanksgiving.) [51890]

On November 29 Obama and his wife meet with illegal immigration activists demonstrating on the National Mall. Politico reports, “They visited individuals taking part in Fast for Families to ‘offer their support for those who are fasting on behalf of immigration reform,’ a White House official told the pool report. The Obamas spoke with the activists for about half an hour.” According to the White House, Obama “told them that it is not a question of whether immigration reform will pass, but how soon. He said that the only thing standing in the way is politics, and it is the commitment to change from advocates like these brave fasters that will help pressure the House to finally act.” [51844, 51845]

On MSNBC’s *Andrea Mitchell Reports*, Congresswoman Gwen Moore (D-WI) does her best to promote ObamaCare, saying the “storms and the rain” of canceled policies and the many web site problems “really sort of obscures the rainbow.” Moore also says, “[The worst story is not the people who have been frustrated trying to get online. The worst news is that time and money and effort that could have been spent doing outreach to the young people we need to sign up has not occurred. I just spent Thanksgiving Day

and ran into at least two people who are under 34 years old, working full time, have no health insurance—one of them exhibiting signs of anemia, another exhibiting signs of high blood pressure—who not only have not tried to get on the website but really need to be educated about the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. ... We are spending all of our time talking about the catastrophic rollout instead of spending this money, this time, this effort, this media opportunity to let people know that, first of all, very many Americans will benefit from the Medicaid expansion that's occurred in many states.” (DailyCaller.com notes, “Moore is not a doctor of any kind, nor has she ever attended medical school. Her remarks instead seem to be the latest attempt by Democrats to shame and pressure young people into visiting the dysfunctional website and signing on to Obamacare's health-care exchanges.”) [51843]

ABC broadcasts a Barbara Walters interview of Obama and his wife. Walters tosses her typical softball questions, but does manage to mention Obama's problems with Healthcare.gov. He says, “I've gone up and down pretty much consistently throughout, but the good thing about when you're down is that usually you got [sic] nowhere to go but up.” With regard to ObamaCare as a whole, he says, “I continue to believe and [I am] absolutely convinced that at the end of the day, people are going to look back at the work we've done to make sure that in this country, you don't go bankrupt when you get sick, that families have that security. That is going to be a legacy I am extraordinarily proud of.” (Arguably, ObamaCare may force some Americans into bankruptcy even *without* their getting sick.) “Obviously my most recent concern has been that my web site's not working... and we're evaluating why it is exactly that I didn't know soon enough that [it] wasn't going to work the way it needed to. But my priority now has been to just make sure that it works.” (He is “evaluating” why he didn't know the web site was a disaster? The issue needs no evaluation. It needs only for him to ask his immediate underlings, “Why didn't you tell me?” Of course, it may be that he knew there would be problems and chose to continue anyway, in which case he will be “evaluating” for months and months—while he hopes the issue will go away.) Walters note that Obama is not considered trustworthy by many Americans, to which he responds, “I got re-elected in part because people did think I was trustworthy and they knew I was working on their behalf.” He defensively adds, “Very rarely [are] the good things that happen get the same attention as the things that aren't working so well [sic].” [51837, 51838, 51899]

Lobbying for Hillary Clinton in 2016, Walters asks about the possibility of a female president. Obama replies, “We have some amazing female [public] servants all across the country and there is no doubt that sometime very soon, we're going to have a female president. I'm confident that she will do a great job.” Walters asks if Michelle Obama would make a good president. Obama: “That's an easy question, but she is smart enough to know that she might not want to go through the process.” His wife says, “He has a level of patience and focus and tenacity and calm that just doesn't come by anyone. I definitely don't.” Obama addresses Americans who are struggling: “Every day I'm going to be working as hard as I can on your behalf. For all the challenges and all the polarization of our politics and the frustrations of Washington, this remains and will remain the greatest country on Earth. Americans, I think deep down, care about each other and want

to do the right thing, and we're going make sure that we do everything we can to help folks, who are out there working hard, trying to make it." [51837, 51838, 51899]

At NationalReview.com Mark Steyn writes, "In Geneva, the participants came to the talks with different goals: The Americans and Europeans wanted an agreement; the Iranians wanted nukes. Each party got what it came for. Before the deal, the mullahs' existing facilities were said to be within four to seven weeks of nuclear 'breakout'; under the new constraints, they'll be eight to nine weeks from breakout. In return, they get formal international recognition of their enrichment program, and the gutting of sanctions—and everything they already have is, as they say over at Obamacare, grandfathered in. Many pundits reached for the obvious appeasement analogies, but Bret Stephens in the *Wall Street Journal* argued that Geneva is actually worse than Munich. In 1938, facing a German seizure of the Sudetenland, the French and British prime ministers were negotiating with Berlin from a position of profound military weakness: It's easy to despise Chamberlain with the benefit of hindsight, less easy to give an honest answer as to what one would have done differently playing a weak hand across the table from Hitler 75 years ago. This time round, a superpower and its allies accounting for over 50 percent of the planet's military spending was facing a militarily insignificant country with a ruined economy and no more than two to three months' worth of hard currency—and they gave it everything it wanted. ...I am not much interested in whether 'the Supreme Leader' can be trusted. Prudent persons already know the answer to that. A more relevant question is whether the U.S. can be trusted. Israel and the Sunni monarchies who comprise America's least worst friends in the Arab world were kept in the dark about not only the contents of the first direct U.S.–Iranian talks in a third of a century but even an acknowledgment that they were taking place. The only tip-off into the parameters of the emerging deal is said to have come from British briefings to their former Gulf protectorates and the French getting chatty with Israel. A couple of days ago, Nawaf Obaid, an adviser to Prince Mohammed, the Saudi ambassador in London, was unusually candid about the Americans: 'We were lied to, things were hidden from us,' he said. 'The problem is not with the deal struck in Geneva but how it was done.'" [51853]

“‘How it was done’: Some years ago, I heard that great scholar of Islam, Bernard Lewis, caution that America risked being seen as harmless as an enemy and treacherous as a friend. The Obama administration seems to have raised the thought to the level of doctrine. What has hitherto been unclear is whether this was through design or incompetence. Certainly, John Kerry has been unerringly wrong on every foreign-policy issue for four decades, so sheer bungling stupidity cannot be ruled out. But look at it this way: It's been clear for some time that the United States was not going to take out Iran's nuclear facilities. That leaves only one other nation even minded to keep the option on the table: Israel. Hence the strange new romance between the Zionist Entity and the Saudi and Gulf cabinet ministers calling every night to urge them to get cracking: In the post-American world, you find your friends where you can, even if they're Jews. But Obama and Kerry have not only taken a U.S. bombing raid off the table, they've ensured that any such raid by Israel will now come at a much steeper price: It's one thing to bomb a global pariah, quite another to bomb a semi-rehabilitated member of the international community in defiance of an agreement signed by the Big Five world powers. Indeed, a

disinterested observer might easily conclude that the point of the plan seems to be to box in Israel rather than Iran. If it were to have that effect, the Sunni Arab states would be faced with a choice of accepting de facto Shia Persian hegemony—or getting the Saudis to pay the Pakistanis for a Sunni bomb. Nobody in Araby believes the U.S. can ‘contain’ Iran even if it wants to. And, since the Geneva deal, nobody’s very sure the U.S. wants to.” [51853, 51854]

TimesOfIsrael.com reports, “The secret back channel of negotiations between Iran and the United States, which led to this month’s interim deal in Geneva on Iran’s rogue nuclear program, has also seen a series of prisoner releases by both sides, which have played a central role in bridging the distance between the two nations, the Times of Israel has been told. In the most dramatic of those releases, the US in April released a top Iranian scientist, Mojtaba Atarodi, who had been arrested in 2011 for attempting to acquire equipment that could be used for Iran’s military-nuclear programs.” (Although the United States released Atarodi, the Iranians did not release any of the three Americans they are holding: pastor Saeed Abedini, former U.S. Marine Amir Hekmati, and retired FBI agent Bob Levinson. Obama’s method of negotiating appears to be: give the opponent what they want and demand nothing in return.) At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “The more we know, the more horrific the details of the US capitulation deal to Iran. It’s madness. Atlas reader RF declares, ‘Imagine if the Allies had made a gift of heavy water to Hitler after wiping his supplies of it out in the Telemark operation.’” [51854, 51880]

Investors.com reports, “As we shutter our ICBM squadrons and destroy our silos, Iran and North Korea are working on technology to deliver nukes Pyongyang already has and Tehran is a few centrifuge rotations from acquiring. As Bill Gertz of the Washington Free Beacon reports, groups of technicians from the Shahid Hemmat Industrial Group (SHIG), a unit in charge of building Iran’s liquid-fueled missiles, have made repeated trips to North Korea during the past several months, including as recently as late October, to work on a new 80-ton rocket booster being developed by the North Koreans. That booster is believed to be the foundation for a new heavy-lift missile with intercontinental range and capable of carrying a large nuclear warhead. It would be far more capable than Pyongyang’s Taepodong or Iran’s Shahab missile series. The booster was described by one official as a thruster for a ‘super ICBM’ or a heavy-lift space launcher. ‘It is completely new from what they have done so far,’ he added. The blog 38 North, part of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, disclosed last month that satellite photos showed an expansion at a North Korean launch site for a larger rocket.” [51918]

Healthcare.gov is shut down for repairs, from 9 p.m. November 29 until 8 a.m. November 30. [51859, 51861, 51862, 51865]

On November 30 Shoebat.com reports, “Muslims in a village of southern Minya province charged at Christian homes, and put 10 houses to the flames. They wounded 14 Christians, and the mob also took a 15 year-old girl and threw her down from the third floor of a building, injuring her severely.” (Obama has no comment.) [51881, 51882]

Meanwhile, the Associated Press reports, “Egyptian security forces firing tear gas and water cannons on Friday broke up anti-government demonstrations by Islamists defying a draconian new law restricting protests. Authorities are seeking to put down unrest by both Islamists and secular activists as a government-appointed assembly tries to finish a final draft on an amended constitution by early next week. The draft has raised criticism from democracy advocates for increasing powers of the military and president. Since a popularly backed military coup ousted [Obama-backed] Islamist President Mohammed Morsi in July, his supporters have been staging near-daily protests calling for his reinstatement. The rallies have often descended into street clashes with security forces or civilians.” [51882]

WJS.com reports, “Despite recent progress at HealthCare.gov, a raft of problems will remain beyond the Obama administration’s Saturday deadline to make the troubled federal insurance website work. The news isn’t all bad: Users say the site looks better, pages load faster, and more people are getting through to sign up for health plans. But technical problems still affect HealthCare.gov’s ability to verify users’ identities and transmit accurate enrollment data to insurers, officials say. The data center that supports the site faces continuing challenges, and tools for processing payments to insurers haven’t been built. Technical staff in Washington have been racing up to the end-of-November deadline. In their last public pronouncement on the effort, three days before the deadline, officials said they had much to do to get the site into a condition where it functions smoothly for a majority of users. ...Officials mixed optimism with caution. ‘November 30th does not represent a relaunch of HealthCare.gov,’ said Julie Bataille, a spokeswoman for the government’s Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, which operates the site. ‘It is not a magical date. There will be times after November 30th when the site, like any website, does not perform optimally.’” [51858, 51861, 51863, 51865]

The Obama Timeline attempts several times to access the “new and improved” HealthCare.gov and receives the message, “Oops! Page Not Found Sorry, the page you were looking for could not be found.”

There is arguably no way for the average American—or journalist—to know if HealthCare.gov has been “fixed” properly. The administration is attempting to be able to handle 50,000 concurrent users. (That may seem like a large number until one learns that on November 29 Walmart.com handled 400 million web page “hits.”) Mediaite’s Noah Rothman reports, “On Saturday, the White House reached the self-imposed deadline it set to ensure that HealthCare.Gov functions for at least 80 percent of visitors. While the White House is indicating that a number of goals it set for itself have been met, National Public Radio’s health policy correspondent Julie Rovner said she found verifying the Obama administration’s claims ‘frustrating.’ She added that the administration has not provided reporters with ‘independent access’ to the data they claim shows that they have largely repaired the federal insurance exchange portal.” (That is, the administration is saying, “Just trust us when we say it has been fixed.”) “We already do know that it’s working better than it was in October —that’s a pretty low bar to get over,” says Rovner. “The administration itself has all kinds of fancy metrics where it can tell the error rates,

how fast it takes pages to load, um, but people on the outside don't have our own independent access to that information, so we're gonna kinda [sic] have to take their word for how well it's working." [51870, 51887]

Fox News senior political analyst Brit Hume tweets: "My wife signed on to ACA website today. Found only plans from Anthem Blue Cross. How many of her doctors in top plan available? Zero." [51871, 51872]

John Nolte writes at Breitbart.com, "*The Washington Post* reports that the White House will announce Sunday that it has met its self-imposed deadline to fix the federal ObamaCare exchange known as HealthCare.gov. The *Post* also reports that, like everything else surrounding ObamaCare, this announcement is not even close to true." [51873]

On MSNBC, CNN correspondent Bob Franken, noting the Obama administration's attempts to shut out reporters and photographers and instead provide "official" White House reports, says, "Well, let's use the 'P' word here. This is propaganda when it comes from the White House: government covering the government. It's not what you're supposed to do in the United States of America. But we have an administration, every president gets to the point where he dislikes the press. It's that simple. And every administration tries to manipulate the press. But this is the most hostile to the media that has been in United States history. Not only do we have this thing where they're..." Host T. J. Homes interrupts: "The most hostile in history?" Franken: "The most hostile because first of all, we have the situation where they are in fact shutting out the press. And by the way, when they say you can't have every photographer in, they know full-well that there's a thing called a pool, which is to say you have one representative from each of the media that represents all of them and shares the pictures and the sound and all that kind of thing. So that's totally disingenuous, which is a polite word. But the reason I say most hostile is because of the Justice Department moves that they've made against the press. Obviously they have a contempt for the journalistic process. Those of us who are in journalism, of course, believe that it is vital if you're going to have informed electorate as opposed to one that's been propagandized." [51891]

Cyber-security expert Morgan Wright tells the Fox News Channel's Greg Jarrett the security risks from using Healthcare.gov are "still limitless," despite the fixes made to the web site. Wright explains why he thinks there are significant problem: "Number one they had 'Go Fever.' This is the lesson they learned [or, rather, failed to learn] from the [space shuttle] Challenger launch—the O rings. People were so fixed on a date, this thing was going to launch no matter what. And I think the second problem is lack of accountability and leadership. No one person was in overall charge of this project. In other words, they waited to put a captain on the ship until after the Titanic had hit an iceberg. That's not the time when you need a captain. You've got to have somebody there before with responsibility, accountability and authority to make changes, and there were too many turf battles going on for that to happen. ...Put it in perspective: Healthcare.gov has 500 million lines of code and they say maybe they can handle 50,000 people [simultaneous

users]. Facebook has only 20 million lines of code and they handle 727 million daily active users. You can do the math.” [51915]