

AARP response distorts letter

Written by Gerald Matzke, Gothenburg
Thursday, 11 August 2011 14:34 -

My last letter has been distorted by the Nebraska state president of the AARP.

His “party line dogma” and wrongheaded assertions do not follow his own request, from in his last letter to the editor, to “cut the spin and have an honest conversation about...Medicare.”

So let’s have that “honest conversation.” Let’s start with AARP’s motivation for supporting a health care plan that will bankrupt the already fragile economy, drive doctors away from providing care to seniors and cause hospitals, many in small communities, to close.

Why is Mr. Eppler and the AARP so high on “reducing bloated subsidies to private Medicare Advantage plans”? Well according to a report to the House Ways and Means Committee entitled, *The AARP America Doesn’t Know*, it’s about making lots of money.

As Medicare Advantage is phased out, Medigap sales will necessarily increase. And according to this report, “This will have a direct, significant and positive impact on the future profits at AARP.”

The report continues, “The Democrats’ health care law, which AARP strongly endorses, could result in a windfall for AARP that exceeds over \$1 billion during the next 10 years.”

So now it appears that “strengthening Medicare for today’s seniors and future generations” is not the real story. It’s really about strengthening the AARP.

Now let’s “cut the spin.” Eppler doesn’t believe that a “bribe” could happen. He misrepresented my letter saying that I “refer(s) to a purported ‘bribe’ in the Affordable Care Act.” This is not correct. I was talking about Ben Nelson, before there was Obamacare.

Ben Nelson took a “hand-out,” an “inducement,” a “carrot,” a “sweetener,” a “kickback,”

AARP response distorts letter

Written by Gerald Matzke, Gothenburg
Thursday, 11 August 2011 14:34 -

whatever you want to call it. To “entice,” “persuade,” “buy off” or “induce,” however you want to say it, him to be the 60th vote that gave America Obamacare. Ben Nelson, therefore, personally gave us the un-affordable care act, that a super majority of voters in America did not want.

That quid pro quo: Ben Nelson’s vote for a, yet seen, \$17 billion payment to Nebraska (the Cornhusker Kickback) is what stinks about Washington.

Mr Eppler’s, statement on how the ACA will, “...Change how Medicare pays doctors and hospitals...,” shows that he doesn’t understand what’s at stake.

Mr. Eppler asserted, in his last letter, the ACA was needed, “(to) extend the solvency of the Medicare Part A...”. In an Aug. 4 editorial, the Wall Street Journal clearly states the opposite. In part it said that, “Medicare’s Prospective payments are low enough that further reductions may jeopardize access to care and in many cases threaten the viability of hospitals.”

Obamacare may very well kill small town hospitals and will drive doctors from providing care to seniors. Certainly, it will make it nearly impossible for small communities to recruit newer physicians to replace the aging doctor population. Why do so many voters in the U.S. understand this and you and the AARP don’t? Oh that’s right...\$1 billion over the next 10 years. No “spin,” just facts.