

## Re: American health care best? No...Most expensive? Yes...Ranked 12th

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2004-07/0264.html>

---

*From:* Steve Harris sbharris\_at\_ROMAN9.netcom.com (sbharris\_at\_ix.netcom.com)

*Date:* 07/05/04

Date: 4 Jul 2004 18:34:31 -0700

> "Dr. Andrew B. Chung, MD/PhD" <andrew@heartmdphd.com> wrote in message  
news:<40E698A8.3554@heartmdphd.com>...

> >

> > *Christ's second commandment would be more effective.*

>

> *What, you think these gang bangers haven't heard it?*

>

Chung:

Christ is more effective than either you or I in our white coats and stethoscopes. What do you think?

COMMENT:

I'll tell you what I think. I think Santa Claus is more effective than Christ, because I've seen kids do things for him that they'll never do for Christ.

The problem with Christ is that he's just basically Santa for adults. By rumor, he's making a list and checking it twice, gunna find out who's naughty and nice, and one day he's coming to town. `Cept until then he's awfully scarce, you notice? Has an unlisted phone number and email and even mail (hell, Santa can be reached at North Pole, Alaska, not far from Fairbanks-- I've been there and he seemed nice enough). Christ doesn't seem to have my email address, even though he should. And he never visits me (come on, he doesn't need a chimney). And he must be really shy about photos, because although other people SAY he visits them, they never seem to have a handshake picture, like they do with the President. And I'll bet they'd pay money for it, too. "Me and Jesus the Christ. Taken in St. Peter's square, 7/1/01. Glowing autograph. \$479.95. Less than airfare to Rome!"

You know, I think the Christ is actually a made-up person, just like Santa and the Tooth Fairy. What do you think? Like the Loch Ness Monster, Bigfoot, and those little gray aliens with bug eyes, the

living Jesus is never around when you really need him to show up to settle an argument. That's really fishy. If he'd just hold a telephone like Howard Hughes once did, or better yet video, he could do a lot of scotch those rumors that he's actually been dead for some time. And if Jesus is still alive, I'll bet he looks better than Hughes, and isn't addicted to codeine, so it could be fun. We could bring in Dan Rather, some loaves and fishes, and have a better audience percentage than the last superbowl.

CHung:

*>I agree there is more confusion when you blur the distinction between  
>economic systems with political systems.*

*>It is one thing to let people know that you have a better mousetrap  
to >sell more mousetraps.*

*>It is another thing to come up with a catchy jingle or ad campaign to  
>sell more inferior product.*

COMMENT:

Is it the jingle and ad campaign you object to, or the inferior product?

I suppose you don't object to ad campaigns like your website, where you claim to have an "edge" due to "preventive cardiac techniques exclusive and proprietary to my practice?" Yeah? Well, an edge over who? Other cardiologists who don't have these exclusive techniques? Well, it wouldn't be an edge at all unless you were claiming your "proprietary" and "exclusive" techniques were better than everyone else's, now would it? If somebody else's techniques are better, then you're engaged in false advertising. If your own are better than anybody else's, how come you don't have the Nobel Prize? And failing that, WHERE'S YOUR PROOF? I must've missed your last authoritative survey in Circulation or the NEJM.

The problem here is you're hoist with your own petard. You object to people advertising any but the best product, but you've done it yourself, right here. You have no evidence. Which means you're full of baloney. I think that's all logical.

*> Or at least, they all try to. None of  
> them are perfectly effective. I see no point in you even making the  
> comment, when it applies not only to capitalism but also to socialism  
> and Communism.*

*>*

*> You bring up "free markets" out of the air. Who said anything about  
> "free markets." ??*

*>Most people associate advertising with free markets. Are you now  
>claiming that you did not bring up advertising,*

>Dr. Harris?

COMMENT:

COMMENT

I brought up advertising. We have to have a word for what we're talking about when you talk about "making people want things." People may associate advertising with free markets—I don't know. They may associate smoke with coal locomotives. So what? When you have a coal locomotive you usually have smoke. The reverse isn't usually true.

> *You bring up the term as though it was synonymous*

> *with capitalism. It's not.*

>*I bring it up because it is associated with advertising.*

COMMENT:

And smoke is associated with coal locomotives. It doesn't not follow that where there's smoke there's a coal locomotive.

Harris

> *Free market implies a market in which*

> *trades are supervised by some kind of governing trade authority, which*

> *prevents open theft and also adjudicates and guarantees fairness and*

> *nonviolent conflict resolution in the case of trade disagreements.*

Chung;

>*Would suggest you stick with the definition:*

<http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=free+market>

Main Entry: free market

Function: noun

an economic market operating by free competition

COMMENT:

Would suggest you don't post definitions too brief to be meaningful.

The one above is too abbreviated to be very useful, and just re-uses, without comment, one of the words in the phrase to be defined. That's not very helpful. It assumes you know the prerequisites and requirements of "free competition." I merely listed them out. They apply to everything from pro-football to the Olympics to a flea market or bazaar.

Chung:

> > *Though it [advertising/marketing] does not define it, you have to admit that it is a feature of*

> > *American-style capitalism.*

Harris;

> *It's a feature of every kind of political system. They show goods and*

- > *services in newspapers and on TV. I guarantee you they do it in Cuba*
- > *and Sweden, and they did it in the old USSR. My point is: so what?*
- >

Chung:

You started with the view that "capitalism gives people what they want" and I countered with capitalism using advertising/marketing to convince people to buy (or eat) what they don't need (creating markets where none previously existed).

COMMENT:

You haven't been paying attention. First of all, the distinction between what people merely want and what they really need, is meaningless. It's a matter of individual taste. I've seen people die rather than violate their values, and indeed I've seen them die rather than violate their standard of what kind of life is the best to live. There's no arguing with any of this, so long as they don't use force to makes me or somebody else go along.

Second, although capitalism may be good at giving people what they want, the idea that capitalism is somehow specially gifted at creating wants where none existed before, is hogwash. Most non-casual interactions between animals and animals, between animals and humans, and between humans and humans, and which don't involve the use of force, instead involve some kind of advertising. That's often how people finally know what they want, and how to get what they want. And yet most human interaction (counting both public and private) is not economic, even in a capitalist society. You want to get married? You'd better create a market for yourself where none existed before (very few people carry perfect police-sketches of the mate they're looking for around with them, until one they finally, by total luck stumble upon the suspect). You even want to get your kids to go to bed without threat of violence? Then you'd better figure out how to shape pre-existing child-wants into YOUR wants. This is not capitalism. Capitalism isn't responsible for most of this kind of thing in the world. Capitalism didn't make the anglerfish's lure, nor the peacock's tail.

Send me your address, Dr. Chung. I'll have the Mormon missionaries come out and convince you that a Book of Mormon is just what you need, and therefore should be just what you want. And right now there are Christian missionaries trying to do the same to Hindus and to Russian atheists.

Capitalism doesn't run the world, Dr. Chung. The need for dominance, power, control, and successful reproduction run the world. Capitalism is merely one of the minor techniques we humans have for accomplishing these goals. But it's not the most important one, by far.

SBH