



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

July 2009

Will We See a States' Rights Showdown With the White House Over Obamacare?

by UNWO Editors

The Executive Vice President and News Director for IRN/USA Radio News, Mr. Chuck Bates, has written in this publication in recent issues on the matter of states' rights and state sovereignty. Now, as health care "reform" generates alarm across the country when voters learn what is actually in the bills before Congress, the matter of state sovereignty has taken on even greater urgency. An increasing number of voters believe a federal takeover of healthcare in this country would, for many reasons, be a calamity for them personally, and for our national economy.

Some state lawmakers who oppose President Obama's efforts to implement a national healthcare plan believe the end result will be socialized medicine. A government-run plan ("public plan" or "public option") will squeeze out private insurance companies, which must make a profit to stay in business. There is no way they can compete with a government plan that has no requirement to make a profit. As private insurers leave the market, consumers will be left with no choice of plans, no control over how their healthcare dollars are spent—and no control over the quality of healthcare they receive.

"A Disaster for Texas"

Texas Governor Rick Perry has suggested that he would consider invoking states' rights protections under the 10th Amendment to resist the president's so-called "healthcare reform," a plan that Perry believes would be "disastrous" for Texas. In late July, Governor Perry predicted in an interview with Mark Davis of Dallas radio station WBAP that Texas and a number of other states might resist the federal health mandate. He said he is "ready for the fight if this administration continues to try to force their very expansive government philosophy down our collective throats."

"It really is a state issue, and if there was ever an argument for the 10th Amendment and for letting the states find a solution to their problems, this may be at the top of the class," Perry said. "A government-run healthcare system is financially unstable. It's not the solution." Perry added that the government plan is another example of the Obama administration's massive takeover of the private-sector economy, and he hopes our leaders will look for solutions that don't "dig our country further into debt." ("Perry Raises Possibility of States' Rights Showdown with White House," *Star-telegram.com*, July 25, 2009)

Other States Considering Similar Initiatives

Fox News reported in late June that other states have similar concerns. Under Arizona's Health Care Freedom Act, passed by the state legislature in late June this year, a voting initiative will be placed on the 2010 ballot that, if passed, will allow the state to opt out of any federal health care plan. Five other states—Indiana, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota and Wyoming—are considering similar initiatives for their 2010 ballots.

Arizona state Rep. Nancy Barto, who sponsored the measure, said, "Our health care freedoms are very much at risk by health care reforms proposed in Washington, D.C. We needed to act as a state to protect our citizens and ensure that they will always be able to buy their own health care and not be forced into a plan they don't want."

Dr. Erick Novack, chairman of Arizonans for Health Care Freedom, which promoted the Arizona ballot measure, said, "Protecting the rights of individuals to be in control of their health and health care must be a fundamental component of health care reform."

Christine Herrera, director of the Health and Human Services Task Force for the American Legislative Exchange Council, says the group's 1,800 state legislator members have endorsed a resolution opposing a Medicare-modeled federal health plan and a national health insurance exchange—two concepts that have been proposed in Washington.

Some state legislators are raising constitutional concerns. Wisconsin state Rep. Leah Vukmir says the real goal of a federal takeover of health care is not competition in the health care industry, but rather, “a federal power grab that flies in the face of the 10th Amendment.”

Largely Symbolic—or More Than That?

Paul Bender, professor of constitutional law at Arizona State University, pointed out that Congress has broad powers to regulate interstate commerce, which would certainly include something as big as health care. He added, “It’s hard to imagine Congress passing anything that would be plausibly challengeable under the Tenth Amendment, but it’s certainly theoretically possible” (“State Lawmakers Considering Move to Opt Out of Federal Health Care,” *FoxNews.com*, June 25, 2009).

A constitutional challenge to federal healthcare reform may turn out to be largely symbolic. Still, as a number of states follow Arizona’s lead, American voters are recognizing the importance of states’ rights as a constitutional tool to protect their freedoms from encroachments by a too-big, too-powerful federal government.

Resistance to Obama’s takeover of healthcare in this country may be a first big step for an awakened citizenry that is beginning to understand some of the dangers we face from our own government.