13 Scrailins

A Squeezing Out Suicides

A1 If legislatures wish to stop Jack Kevorkian ("Dr.Death") by outlawing assisted-suicides, then those laws should also apply to tobacco companies. Otherwise, we have a situation where: it's illegal to help pain-racked elders to die, but legal to help happy, healthy youngsters to die.

A2 (In the days before assisted-suicide became an issue, it is said that crusaders had tried to wipe out unassisted suicide by making it a capital offense. . . .)\footnote{Note added 1995: A cute play by Susan Smith's lawyer has been to generate court sympathy by saying she's so depressed that she's tried to commit suicide. I.e., don't kill her because: she wants to die. [See DIO 6 §4 A.]}

A3 Another way of interpreting Kevorkian's persecutors: it's illegal to end agony, but legal to cause it. Just the kind of logical consistency one expects of a nation whose laws are written by "legislator"-puppets, whose actions are responsive to those whose cash pulls the strings. (See, e.g., DIO 2.1 §1 §A5 & fn 5.)

A4 Why has a decent and selfless martyr such as Kevorkian been pilloried so often in the press - where lobbies can slant "news" so easily? Partial explanation: about 20% of all medical billings occur in the last 6 months of life. So Kevorkian is seen mediziv as confronting them with a stark choice, i.e., do doctors want to: [a] keep Hippocratically extending "life" when it turns into 1-way misery, or [b] take a 20% pay-cut and thereby endanger doctors' well-being, where yacht-deprivation is a critical risk-factor? [Mention of the suicidally-inclined permits a seamless segue to organized baseball\footnote{Note added 1995: Baseball and tennis are fading, evidently from insufcient violence to sate the tooboisie. DIO 1.2 fn3 asked readers to ponder the evolution of a network-TV ad that scouted at men who complain about soap-opera-addicted wives while they themselves watch 5 hours of wrestling. If the ad (as originally written) scouted at the situation of women who are widowed to football not wrasling, then it would probably be altered — for the simple reason that football has become so critical, to distinguishing network TV from smalltime TV, that it is beyond attack.] Thus, baseball & tennis are increasingly dependent upon celebrities. (The celebr-factor makes baseball vulnerable to strikes. Audiences will watch anyone box or play football. Not baseball, which is dead without its big-draw stars.) The trend has reached the point where even stars in the audience are used. But this can backfire.

B Shorts

B1 Gowdiamus. David Halberstam reports that a condition for baseball player Joe DiMaggio's appearance at any function is that he be introduced as: the greatest\footnote{Since leftists&rightists preach that making poverty, race, & class frictions atrophy requires education, then: why do their policies guarantee that the maximum number of children will be born to parents with the least education?} living ballplayer. This is presumably what triggered my favorite Gowdyism,\footnote{Curt Gowdy blurted out that DiMaggio was: "the greatest living ballplayer of all time".} when sportscaster Curt Gowdy blurted out that DiMaggio was: the greatest living ballplayer of all time.

1 [Note added 1995:] A cute play by Susan Smith's lawyer has been to generate court sympathy by saying she's so depressed that she's tried to commit suicide. I.e., don't kill her because: she wants to die. [See DIO 6 §4 A.]

2 [Note added 1995.] Baseball and tennis are fading, evidently from insufficient violence to sate the tooboisie. [DIO 2.1 §1 §B3 asked readers to ponder the evolution of a network-TV ad that scouted at men who complain about soap-opera-addicted wives while they themselves watch 5 hours of wrestling. If the ad (as originally written) scouted at the situation of women who are widowed to football not wrasling, then it would probably be altered — for the simple reason that football has become so critical, to distinguishing network TV from smalltime TV, that it is beyond attack.] Thus, baseball & tennis are increasingly dependent upon celebrities. (The celebr-factor makes baseball vulnerable to strikes. Audiences will watch anyone box or play football. Not baseball, which is dead without its big-draw stars.) The trend has reached the point where even stars in the audience are used. But this can backfire. While the Atlanta Braves were vainly fighting for their lives in the 7th game of the seemingly endless 1991 World Series, their owners-in-attendance (Tarzan & Jane Turner) were viewed by national TV audiences vainly fighting off sleep. So it shouldn't have required the 1994 strike to dampen buyers' enthusiasm for paying $100,000,000 for ball clubs. But all-day-set-obsessed men's tennis has ingeniously turned its draining internuminality to its ad: during the 1993 US Tennis Tonsils Open, CBS cameras kept sneaking up on players' girlfriends at ringside (usually W.Shields) to broadcast them yawning or nodding off, evidently with the idea of thereby enlivening the proceedings with candid-camera surprise-entertainment — i.e., using the spectacle of sleep to keep the TV audience awake.

3 [Note added 1995.] In a city known for dwelling charm & wraaling slums, Baltimore baseball shortstop & longstreaker (2131 straight games played), admirably-square Cal Ripken, is paid $40,000/hit: more than former-record-holder Lou Gehrig was paid in an average year. (World Series lifetime slugging averages: Rip: .167, Lou: .731.) If Rip played a full career at this rate, the cost would exceed $100,000,000, easily enough to attain major political office. Hmmm: the agent (R.Shapiro) who arranged Rip's 5-Year $30,000,000 contract is also the fiscal power behind Baltimore's mayor. What a clever way to grow money. If Rip's conscience is twinged by Ripoffing a poverty-stricken man (world's champ in teenage pregancy rates if not other sports), at least he's taking the right therapy: reading Ayn Rand, the very brightest rightist author-philosopher who (late in her career) used to go about with a dollar-sign emblem in her lapel. Now, how do you like the sound of a hitherto unspoken prediction: Senator Ripken? (Let's hope he doesn't end up with the dullest record in the Senate. He's already got it in baseball.) On the other hand, some Gowdy alterations of trite phrases were excellent. He wrote in his 1976 rewrite of an overworked&divisive reference to gentleman Joe Louis, whom Gowdy re-dubbed: "a credit to the human race."\footnote{On the other hand, some Gowdy alterations of trite phrases were excellent. He wrote in his 1976 rewrite of an overworked&divisive reference to gentleman Joe Louis, whom Gowdy re-dubbed: "a credit to the human race." (This was the worst DiMaggio joke since Joe D retired & wed a filmstar, an event which simultaneously retired the previous top compliment you could pay a pro: "the ballplayer's ballplayer"). [Note added 1995: Joe D has now survived him upon whom his mantle fell.]}
welfare, & race-preference schemes), the real GOP platform would instantly be revealed nakedly for all it actually is, namely, a money-is-the-root-of-all-good program to make the super-rich even richer. (Not a crusade which, unadorned with anti-welfare-loafer whipped-cream, is likely to attract more than 1% of the vote.) So, for the GOP to ensure that welfare-related diversions will continue indefinitely, two prerequisites must be met: [a] abortion, RU 486, & Norplant (& thus women’s freedom) must be suppressed, & [b] enough whipping-boy-Dems have to be kept in office to make it seem credible that the right-thinking GOP is (contra fn 21) doing its darndest to wipe out social degeneracy, but those sneaky Liberal incubi somehow9 keep foiling them. (Does the GOP really want Clinton out of the White House? It’s theatre-mysthology that will persist indefinitely until retired by electoral intelligence or (less unlikely) a violent coup.

B6 If Jesse Helms, the Republican Senator from Tobacco, is so much more upset at sex (e.g., the late R.Mappletrophe)10 than at his lovable weed’s continuing enslavement of kids and torture-massacre of millions of adults annually worldwide, then: why is Helms not horrified at the vital support which tobacco-ad funds regularly provide the glossy skinmags? (Losing this support — perhaps 1/3 of the latter’s ad-billings — would be crippling.) Mappletrophe doesn’t sully even a hundredth the number of innocent youngsters they do. (Which is exactly why the youth-targeting tobacco industry supports the glossies & not the artist.) So, we’re waiting for the kickoff of Jesse’s no-doubt imminent decency-crusade for an industry-wide tobacco-ad boycott of porn.

B7 TV news-Balance Unbalance. In the US, when it’s a matter of press-coverage or legal adjudication of cases such as those of TonyaH, MTLyson, or OSimpson (where, coincidentally, millions in profits are to be made), we’re told that every side — even the scumiest — is a fair hearing and a tidiously complex defense. (Which gives open, just image to The System.) Question: why isn’t this same fine, noble principle12 applied to: [a] politically incorrect heresies (persons & ideas), [b] modest-sized dissenting political parties, and [c] those who question the US’ religiosity?

B8 At the 1994/5/8-9 Dibner conference at M.I.T., I mentioned to Muffia capo Noel Swardlow my delight at his entirely original solution of some Hipparchan numbers. (See DIO 1.3 fn 277 & fn 280.) He replied with admirable modesty that it was a “lucky” hit. (See similar self-deprecation by Audrey Diller at DIO 4.2 Competence Held Hostage #2 p.55. See also DIO 1.2 D2 & fn 49.) But the comment reveals the very opposite of NS’ genial implication, and we may formulate a general principle regarding the process:

The cleverer a discovery is, the more the discoverer feels it was lucky.

C Germs

C1 The press loves the gun-control13 quick-fix. Except for the military.14
C2 Eternal frustration inevitably pushes US justice-seeking movements to paranoia.
C3 Death Row’s leading cause of death is: old age.
C4 If abortion is damned as “killing-the-unborn”,15 then: why isn’t celibacy16?
C5 Primitive pleasures are fleeting; optimistic intellectual curiosity isn’t.
C6 I am therefore I think.

D Questions & Answers

D1 Galahad question: Why do lawyers seem to be supermen when they are preventing moron-sterilizations (S3) and delaying murderer-executions, but virtually offers when suing tobacco companies? Answer: Even sharks have their 30 yr-losing-streaks? (Or: DOI 4.2 9 §R6?)

D2 TV ‘s news’ straightforward sole-permissible-options-& be-sure-to-vote) question: Which17 will alleviate the US poverty&crime-cycle. [a] Libs’ AFDC, or [b] Conservatives’ prisons&mass-religion (physical&mental jails)? Obvious answer: Neither. (Try §D4.)


D4 Upfront question: What’s the only prison that can stop crime? Answer: A condom.


10 Irony: the establishment view is the inverse of the truth. I.e., no sane US city-dweller today seriously expects to be protected (by police or courts) from a street attacker. By contrast, we do (even sharks have their 30 year-losing-streaks) — but: it’s OK (without 10 years of legal appeals) to attack — invariably with US media initial cooperation — big bad nations like Grenada, Libya, Panama. What large church is protesting this contrast? Those heroic Roman Church persons such as the Berrigans, who opposed the US war machine, have declined in public perception, as the hierarchy has lost its delight in GOP morality by focussing its potentially useful idealistic energies on abortion instead of war-prevention — i.e., on preserving microscopic zygotes rather than thinking, feeling persons. See fn 16 & DOI 4.2 9 §A1.)

13 If promoting abortion is such a brutalizing, murder-engendering way of life, then: [a] Why have all the shootings (so far) in the current US controversy been by the “pro-life” side? [b] Why are the nations where abortion is most forbidden? [c] Why (and how?) does mean fairness mean that every one of the planet’s more than 5 billion persons [in series] in parallel? — either opinion pure-fantasy? Should have equal access to placing his finger upon the discharge-button of a doomsday-magnitude nuclear bomb? (The only idea crazier than this is: faith that nuclear weapons won’t be built somewhere.)

14 Same for the establishment’s amusing claim (DOI 4.2 9 §X2) that the death penalty hardens society... but: it’s OK (without 10 years of legal appeals) to attack — invariably with US media initial cooperation — big bad nations like Grenada, Libya, Panama. What large church is protesting this contrast? Those heroic Roman Church persons such as the Berrigans, who opposed the US war machine, have declined in public perception, as the hierarchy has lost its delight in GOP morality by focussing its potentially useful idealistic energies on abortion instead of war-prevention — i.e., on preserving microscopic zygotes rather than thinking, feeling persons. See fn 16 & DOI 4.2 9 §A1.)

15 While TV ‘s news continues an endless debate between these two guaranteed-disaster options — a “choice” which must surely tickle Plunkitt’s shade (DOI 2.6 fn 23) — it (religiously) avoids reminding the public of either’s actual record. We’re still waiting for a single instance of TV ‘s news asking US pols to cite historical examples of nations such as the Berrigans, who opposed the US war machine, have declined in public perception, as the hierarchy has lost its delight in GOP morality by focussing its potentially useful idealistic energies on abortion instead of war-prevention — i.e., on preserving microscopic zygotes rather than thinking, feeling persons. See fn 16 & DOI 4.2 9 §A1.)

16 While TV ‘s news continues an endless debate between these two guaranteed-disaster options — a “choice” which must surely tickle Plunkitt’s shade (DOI 2.5 fn 23) — it (religiously) avoids reminding the public of either’s actual record. We’re still waiting for a single instance of TV ‘s news asking US pols to cite historical examples of nations where the suspicion thus lingers that mercantile & carnal talents have filled the void. (Lucky there’s none of that in the showbiz, yada.)
Gutting the Best Hope for Cutting the Poverty-Cycle

Margaret Sanger promoted birth control primarily in order to help the poor out of poverty. (No other social-improvement program can long succeed if population control fails.) However, modern political and religious leaders have outfoxed her (with ever-loyal media assistance): 18

E1 Doling out welfare-pittances to subsidize poverty, barely enough to keep ever-abundant that mortal potential scat-cheap labor-pool which US employers encourage, in order to beat down laborers' wage-demands. (Coincidence: the US' interest in spending govt funds on welfare only began shortly after birth control’s use became legal & effective.)

E2 Keeping RU 486 (mifepristone, aka “The Death Pill”) from US women for a decade regardless of whether the President is (purportedly) feminist or no. (How much longer is it going to take for women to suspect of the depth of conspiracy against this issue?) Note the provocative circumstance that RU 486 has been systematically kept from the citizenry of only one top nation, the US — which also just-so-often happens to be the nation most unremittingly targeted by the foetus-hugger anti-abortion lobby. 19

E3 Virtually banning from guvprop and from TV 'snews (excuse our redundancy) discussion of how birth control and/or abortion can occur in any context but that of individual rights — not as part of a social-repair strategy. 20

DIO 2.3 ¶75 & DIO 4.2 ¶9 fn 44. According to Willyspeak and Newspeak, the only permissible policies for dealing21 with the US’ bastard-tidalwave are more-of-ineffectual-same: Dem postnatal [i] AFDC,22 [ii] rehab,23 and [iii] deadbeatdad-harassment; 24 and-or GOP prenatal [i] punitive-example25 AFDC shrinkage & [ii] insanely quixotic just-say-no-to-sex attempts to stifle poverty-area youngsters’ natural erotic drive.

E4 The Making-Murderously-Inclined-Women-Into-Moms Movement [MMIMM]. How can TV 'snews take seriously a GOParty that claims to be anti-welfare even while it fights abortion? — a crusade that effectively forces unwanted children upon unwilling parents (for-their-own-good and-or as punishment for carnality), and then affects perplexity at slums’ immorality. In this connection, we note that, by their own abortion-is-muder logic, intercoder-pro-lifers are insisting that pregnant potential murderers MUST become mothers, whether they like it or not — a highly efficient prescription for creating child abuse & one pinnioned at the mass-finds of the deaths of children-cut off in this issue? Note the provocative circumstance that RU 486 has been systematically kept from the citizenry of only one top nation, the US — which also just-so-often happens to be the nation most unremittingly targeted by the foetus-hugger anti-abortion lobby. 19

E3 Virtually banning from guvprop and from TV 'snews (excuse our redundancy) discussion of how birth control and/or abortion can occur in any context but that of individual rights — not as part of a social-repair strategy. (See DIO 2.3 ¶77 & DIO 4.2 ¶9 fn 44. According to Willyspeak and Newspeak, the only permissible policies for dealing with the US’

Question that effectively wonders just who really designs US inner-city-disaster programs: Why is it that the very leftists, who swiftly realized that pouring money into late 1940s China wasn’t helping the Chinese, have — even after 40 years — failed to translate that lesson into inner city action? (DIO 2.1 fn 429) Barnett is currently inspiring Congressmen to continue such policies, [a] the allegedly-intended-beneficiary poor, or [b] the corrupt warlords? (See fn 44. According to DIO 2.1 fn 429)

18 §B3. DIO particularly stresses societal, not just individual, birth control for this reason — and because arguing its need (& the social consequences of ignoring it) is now almost as banned from popular US media as it has been under explicitly theocratic dictatorships.

19 This has reached the point where [E3] young men can now be held legally hostage for eighteen years at the whim of a deceitful sex-partner who wishes, e.g., to prey with holey condoms — whether she is seeking to bind the man (out of love) or to drop out of school to motherhood-as-a-paying-job (out of stupidity). If the father-to-be doesn’t want the child, why can’t the govt tell the mother-to-be that it’s up to her to either. Support. Aabort. Or Society that did not want more low-prospect children would entertain that approach. Instead, such an obvious & central idea isn’t even mentionable. (In 25) in the US’ self-congratulatory Free Press. (And poverty continues to expand, as “leaders” shake their heads in mock perplexity.) I note that during the pivotal semicentennials (of this almost priest-like letter-of-the-natural-law lack of perspective), ACLU (which never objects to US media toddler-control in the connection) regards promotion of such an option as an application of unwarrented force upon the woman. By contrast (DIO 4.2 ¶9 fn4), ACLU does NOT see point-of-IRS-gun forced-taxation (to underwrite the growth of massive semi-literate & poverty, which ACLU has been so instrumental in inflicting on the US) as applying unwarranted force upon the榄vable provident-securely-middle class — the monotonic shrinking of which does not alarm pseudo-clueless ACLU in the least, even though this is THE major longterm US threat to civil-liberties (ACLU’s own middle-name: fn 25. ACLU’s no-bad-means-to-good-ends fleet is equally pristylie, as is the ability to set that smokescreen aside the inalienable one nation’s game to go, & forthwith to nauseic a marriage of foreigners, even by the formerly-storncened middle-classers one then depends heavily upon to manage such dirty work.

20 At least Newt’s orphanage-proposal faces (& hopes to sevr) the self-perpetuating & cyclical nature of welfare-subsidized poverty. But it still falls short of asking why we must tax into [relatively] low-fertility profitably-loving middle-class parents, in order to support the issue of unprovident parents? I.e., the welfare-moms-(vs-orphans debate is “since neither option can stem the US’ ongoing massive tide of careless parents’” unplanned children) as phony as the parallel Dems-vs-GOP “debate”. Just as the US needs a genuine: DIO 2.3 fn 23 3rd party, so it also gets a serious 3rd option on poverty — simply placing the discouragement of unloved-child-creation ahead of marrying-for-foreigners’ birth: fn 17, 19, & 25.

21 [Note added 1995.] According to 1995/99 SelBS-News, it was a “historic” occasion: the Senate changed everything about welfare. (E.g., time-limits.) Everything except, of course, the one unlikable item which, if not changed, will mean that nothing has changed: bastard-subsidization, the radical-revolutionary opponents of which were called “socially unrealistic”, while “moderate” was the label for the same-old “it’s not-the-babies fault-so-gotta-fund-our” kids bastard-lobby. (Starring the senator whose wisdom has been improving New York for decades now: DIO 1.1 ¶2 fn 7.) I.e., a national TV 'snews network characterizes those pushing continued tax-subsidization for the welfare-breeder-moms profession as: “moderate”. Note the ironically perverse upshot of the GOP’s improbable marriage-of-mer��nances between welfare-fooler-haters & foetus-huggers: if welfare for the jobless is now shrunk, then even more tragically poor folk (than previously) will, in short-term-thinking desperation, feel limited-option-cor nerred into having kids just to get AFDC-pittance-cheques, hoping to fend off the wolf-at-the-door; thus, the slum-occupied teapoy of pre-doomed poverty-infants (with parents just that forward-thinking they may get even wrier. This is “historically-moderate”? (Well, the pol responsible for the final bill is named: Dole.)

22 AFDC.

23 [Note added 1995.] According to 1995/99 SelBS-News, it was a “historic” occasion: the Senate changed everything about welfare. (E.g., time-limits.) Everything except, of course, the one unlikable item which, if not changed, will mean that nothing has changed: bastard-subsidization, the radical-revolutionary opponents of which were called “socially unrealistic”, while “moderate” was the label for the same-old “it’s not-the-babies fault-so-gotta-fund-our” kids bastard-lobby. (Starring the senator whose wisdom has been improving New York for decades now: DIO 1.1 ¶2 fn 7.) I.e., a national TV 'snews network characterizes those pushing continued tax-subsidization for the welfare-breeder-moms profession as: “moderate”. Note the ironically perverse upshot of the GOP’s improbable marriage-of-merﬁnances between welfare-fooler-haters & foetus-huggers: if welfare for the jobless is now shrunk, then even more tragically poor folk (than previously) will, in short-term-thinking desperation, feel limited-option-cor nerred into having kids just to get AFDC-pittance-cheques, hoping to fend off the wolf-at-the-door; thus, the slum-occupied teapoy of pre-doomed poverty-infants (with parents just that forward-thinking they may get even wrier. This is “historically-moderate”? (Well, the pol responsible for the final bill is named: Dole.)

24 At least Newt’s orphanage-proposal faces (& hopes to sevr) the self-perpetuating & cyclical nature of welfare-subsidized poverty. But it still falls short of asking why we must tax into [relatively] low-fertility profitably-loving middle-class parents, in order to support the issue of unprovident parents? I.e., the welfare-moms- vs-orphans debate is “since neither option can stem the US’ ongoing massive tide of careless parents’” unplanned children) as phony as the parallel Dems-vs-GOP “debate”. Just as the US needs a genuine: DIO 2.3 fn 23 3rd party, so it also gets a serious 3rd option on poverty — simply placing the discouragement of unloved-child-creation ahead of marrying-for-foreigners’ birth: fn 17, 19, & 25.

25 [Note added 1995.] According to 1995/99 SelBS-News, it was a “historic” occasion: the Senate changed everything about welfare. (E.g., time-limits.) Everything except, of course, the one unlikable item which, if not changed, will mean that nothing has changed: bastard-subsidization, the radical-revolutionary opponents of which were called “socially unrealistic”, while “moderate” was the label for the same-old “it’s not-the-babies fault-so-gotta-fund-our” kids bastard-lobby. (Starring the senator whose wisdom has been improving New York for decades now: DIO 1.1 ¶2 fn 7.) I.e., a national TV 'snews network characterizes those pushing continued tax-subsidization for the welfare-breeder-moms profession as: “moderate”. Note the ironically perverse upshot of the GOP’s improbable marriage-of-merﬁnances between welfare-fooler-haters & foetus-huggers: if welfare for the jobless is now shrunk, then even more tragically poor folk (than previously) will, in short-term-thinking desperation, feel limited-option-cor nerred into having kids just to get AFDC-pittance-cheques, hoping to fend off the wolf-at-the-door; thus, the slum-occupied teapoy of pre-doomed poverty-infants (with parents just that forward-thinking they may get even wrier. This is “historically-moderate”? (Well, the pol responsible for the final bill is named: Dole.)

26 AFDC.
F  Trillions vs. Peanuts

The US military officially spends about 1/4 trillion of our tax-dollars per annum. (And its favorite GOP pols unfaithfully wish to increase this paltry sum, so that the poor Pentagon can do more than — as now — just barely scrape by.) Why this monster outlay? Facts:

F1  Nobody is invading the US. Except Mexico.
F2  Foreign spies (e.g., Russian, Israeli) can buy a billion-dollar US weapon’s plans for ordmag 1% of 1% of the funds we were taxed to pay for it. (I.e., c.$100,000.)
F3  And the US pols who rule the weapons’ use can themselves be bought-controlled by foreign bribes, for similarly trivial outlays. (Ever wonder why Japan: [a] doesn’t bother with massive military junk, & [b] is more prosperous than those nations who do?)

G  Who Says Our Taxes Are Wasted? Three Trilling Adventures

It should comfort all of us to learn that three difficult US problems can be solved by annually spending, on each, merely about a trill apiece: $1,000,000,000,000.

G1  We know [DIO 6 §4 §C7] that a defense-lawyerclan-subsidy trill can ensure that no one will ever go to jail again — so long as he’s good-looking. And, as part of the US’ medical trill (§G3), we can guarantee all citizens the plastic-surgery they need to get handsome enough to survive any jury’s fussiness in such a critical department. (How to pay for the needed surgery? Simple, since we’re not going to need prisons ever again, we can cancel all the current cruelly-anticrime era’s outstanding orders for prisons and instead devote the funds to the doctors-of-beautification.)

G2  And, of course, we ought to throw another trill/year at the Pentagon (§F). Look at it this way, wouldn’t you spend anything to ensure that Clinton not only rules us but the whole world?

G3  Finally: most medical plans the gov’t is now mulling over will cost several thousands of dollars per year per insuree. Multiplying by the number of US citizens, we find that proper medical care will cost the US ordmag a trill a year. Now, finally, we can close in on the true unspecked goal (of expending ever-more-astronomical portions of gov’t treasure upon medical care): no one will ever again die. Instead, at roughly age 100, we’ll just transform permanently (§A4) into immortal senility — wedded forevermore to artificial hearts & whatever.

G4  A striking addendum to §G3: the US is the most totally & aggressively religious of all technologically advanced nations. The great majority of its citizens will swear to any pollster that they do verily believe in the standard Christian bye-bye-skypie: eternal life. The deal being that, as soon as they die (if suitably confessed & blessed by an establishment-religion priest), they join Jesus in heaven and become angels who live in eternal bliss forever after. Despite the purported attractiveness & much-vaunted ethereal beauty of said vision, the US citizenry appears prepared to spend a trillion dollars/year to pay our doctors to forever bar us from entering this heavenly goal of our lives. Instead, we will linger on, for eternity, upon our soiled Earth. As ever-undead vegetables. Well, if the US is going to go bankrupt, at least it’ll be for an upbeat vision of the future.

G5  We can put this more succinctly and thereby face starkly what happens to logic when there is a conceptual conflict between two potent lobbies (in this case, medbiz & godbiz): the US is outspending all nations, in order to stay out of the Holy-Heaven paradise which it, above all nations, allegedly longs for.

27 The medical establishment frequently gets roasted in these pages. However, [a] DR is not a proponent of kook “alternate” medicinal treatments. [b] He is well aware of the benefits of US medical research, which is the best anywhere in history. (In addition, only a very flush lobby can take on the tobacco industry — so even the fat in medbiz has at least one key side-benefit. Note a bit of ironic justice: the more people tobacco slowly tortures to death, the richer its medical-lobby enemy gets.)

28 D.Hammett Maltese Falcon NYC 1929 Chap.19: “Spade laughed [at fasttalking Gutman’s glittering promises]. ‘I know you’ll give me millions later . . . but let’s stick to this now. Fifteen thousand?’ ”