

---

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Ree - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

]So, when you buy an item you may or may not have sales tax (wish I ]didn't). Is there an equivalent to our GST? (Goods & Services Tax) ]that gets charged by the federal govt when you buy something? ] ]Not that I know of, no. Certan items have a luxury tax from the Feds, like diamond jewelry. D.J. Oh well something like that ought to affect me right soon now! Like, never. (g) LOL Ree

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Ree - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

do have a tendency to Catastrophise (the technical term for the all-or-nothing thinking I tend to fall into) but they are learning ways to think their way out of it before they get too bad. Some of that is simply that they are too smart to fall into that kind of mislogic. Some of it is because I've been able to help them with techniques I've learned in therapy. Az I've learned some of those things too. Like rating your anxiety level, then reviewing the catastrophe feelings in terms of how likely they really are to be that bad and then reviewing the feelings again. Things are still stressful but the panic is more controllable. Ree

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Ree - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

Aramanth Dawe <ma...@westnet.com.au wrote in news:t0umh45t3ha70970gi3dkmse3ouc5h0ldk@4ax.com: <snip I have done Jury Duty before (at a time when my mental state was stronger) so I knew EXACTLY what I would have been letting myself in for had I gone in. I knew, from experience, that it would have been likely to cause me significant distress AND the person or people I was supposed to be serving to have a less than effective juror. All round NOT a good thing. Do I suck for taking my legal responsibilities seriously enough to have advised the appropriate department of my illness and ask them to relieve me of the role at this time? I would have said I did the RIGHT thing in this instance. To me, that isn't ducking your duty. Since your doctor agreed, I'd say your illness might be influencing your opinion on the need to tough it out. Cindy Wells (ducking jury duty to me includes a recently in the news juror who told the judge that there was a death in the family when the individual wanted a free day for fun. That behavior sucks, not yours.) Az Exactly. Ducking it is looking for an excuse to get out of it. Not having a valid medical reason why you can't do it. Imagine if one of your daughters had a valid medical reason for not being in school one day and someone accused them of ducking it and what you would say to them. I say this because you have a strong protective instinct toward your daughters, which is also the way you should start behaving toward yourself. So taking that as an example for how you should treat yourself is a good way to make it real since you need that protection too, all the more because someone not only didn't protect you when young but victimized you. Ree

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Ree - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

By guaranteeing, in a constitution, my health care, however, you are tasking someone ELSE to implement my right. It is, therefore, a fundamental violation of constitutional prerogative of THAT person. (person, here, having an extended meaning, as the SCOTUS has determined). There are several related rights in the Bill of Rights which do just that, however, so it's not without precedent. From the Sixth Amendment, the right to trial by jury (implies jurors), right to assistance of counsel. I agree that health care is different than those, however, and should not be considered a right.

Matthew, can you expand on why you do not consider it a right? Be as specific as you can, please. Why would it be? To say that it is a right is to say that a person needing health care has can place an obligation on another person to provide them with it. What exactly gives anyone that power? The same can be said about the right to counsel in criminal trials. This places an obligation on a lawyer to provide a criminal defendant with that service... No, it does not. It merely gives one a right to obtain counsel. In the case of ...if you cannot afford... , it places an obligation on GOVERNMENT. The government then honors this obligation by seeking legal expertise in the market and employing it to aid the defendant. Note that an indigent defendant does not have to pay for said legal expertise - if the defendant cannot afford a lawyer, the government has to provide one. As I stated. Constitutionally guaranteed rights usually task government to insure them. And it does so (in the way in which Summer ignored) by contracting, in a free market, for an employee to do this. Such action cannot be construed that the right to counsel has therefore obligated this employee. Nope, I didn't ignore anything. A right to healthcare would simply lead to the same sort of contracting

---

of someone to supply said healthcare. It looks to me like you're ignoring THAT. Time out. I think I may have identified one of our mutual problems. You seem (only seem

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Marten Kemp - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

If uncommon, hang the bastard. If systemic, start the revolution. Isn't that a bit, uh, inflexible? I like how you think, though. Rape should still be a capital crime. Forcible, maybe. Statutory, no. Not given the fubar way \*those\* laws get applied. An 18 yo and his 16 yo GF ain't at all the same thing as a 45-year-old and a 14-year-old. But the law has, and does

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Marten Kemp - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

]]And unless you've formally studied ethics, you DON'T understand them. ] ]Hogwash. ] ]I don't have to study ethics to understand that dumping patients out ]on the street is what assholes do. My thinking on the subject of ethics can best be summed up by this: The only place I see convoluted ethics questions are: 1) on a job interview questionnaire. 2) in a courtroom. The job interview is convoluted so the answers can be used to weed out job applicants. The court room questions are convoluted to either excuse something the defendant or prosecution knows is wrong, or confuse the jury, or both. I have seen convoluted questions on job interview questionnaires that had no answer in the multiple choice. Why? The grammar was wrong. There was no 'best fit' answer, which is the 'escape clause' used by lousy question writers. Here are the questions I would ask: 1) do you steal? yes no 2) do you report others for stealing? yes no 3) do you see dumping a hospital patient onto the street as murder? yes no. The answers are obvious to someone with ethics. I don't need a degree, nor extensive learning, to figure it out. D.J. The 3rd one isn't totally clear to me as it's not certain that the patient is going to die without treatment. I believe it's wrong to do it but the patient may not be likely to die without treatment. Depends what's wrong. True, but the Hippocratic oath says something like first, do no harm. I realize that applies to an individual doctor, but how can one of those individual doctors condone expelling a patient to the street - or permit the hospital to do the same? I do agree that it is not necessarily murder, but... ..it probably would meet the criteria for criminally negligent homicide.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Clothahump - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

That's likely to uncover a large basket of snakes because we have a large population of illegal and undocumented people here, and providing for all of them is likely to cause a lot of taxpayer's resistance. And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? If you think healthcare is an issue, then let's get the illegals out of it. Costs will come down like a falling brick. Would you mind showing where the article in question has anything to do with illegal immigrants? Or are you one of those people who thinks that ALL immigrants are illegal (or should be)? ===== I wasn't responding to the article. I was responding to the statement made directly before mine. And the only immigrants that I think are illegal are the illegal ones.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Canth - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

(Tonnie) Oh and our homicide % is way much lower than yours as well ;-? Tonnie, they won't believe you. You'll get some sort of statistics quoted that show how Europeans have much worse crime figures, and how we're all shaking in our shoes and hiding in our homes in fear. Well, THAT's just as bigoted as anything I've ever seen said about Europeans. Thanks, Jette. Especially as you bloody well should know how untrue that statement is. I'm not so sure, Denny. I've read plenty of posts, here and elsewhere (though probably more elsewhere than here), that make those sorts of claims. Not from \*you\*, but from an uncomfortably nontrivial number of other people. Yep, same here. In one of the groups (which I left btw) it was me and an Australian friend, fighting the rest (all

Americans) - we were really seen as dumbheads, and how could we doubt their great fantastic country <sig No matter if we provided links, examples etc. etc., THEY were right and we were wrong. No matter what the subject was. Yeah, well, as an American, I can tell you we get the exact same thing from the other direction, and have ever since I've been on-line. I mean, y'know, since we're \*just\* Americans, we couldn't \*possibly\* know \*anything\* compared to the rest of the \*enlightened\* universe. Personally, I'm to the point where I'm tired of hearing it, and don't much care who knows it. The problem is that we Americans - collectively, not individually - have sort of made our bed in that aspect, though. Regardless of its vast size and historically strong presence, the U.S. \*is\* only one country among many on this globe, and one of the younger crowd at that, yet its citizens have more often than not exhibited a tendency to think of the U.S. as something completely apart, a sort of standard to which the rest of the world must measure up, rather than as just one more integral part of a larger world. In large part, this comes from having been taught this from our earliest childhood, in school and at church, on television and in popular books and magazines, at the movies and on the news. This is perhaps even more true in the years since that big splashy Bicentennial in 1976, when jingoistic and nationalistic sentiment were whipped to high froth and frenzy 'round the clock. I was in early adolescence at the time, and remember it well. What most people seemed not to realize then, nor seem to realize now (generic most people, not the Patrons here), is that while when the U.S. was founded, it \*was\* something quite different, unique upon the earth, at least for the timeframe, a \*lot\* has happened in the past couple of centuries elsewhere on the planet, so that now we are simply the eldest of a rather significant number of fully democratic republics, and we ain't even eldest by all that much. That's right; we're \*not\* special, \*not\* superior except perhaps in firepower, cash, and land mass, and if (generic) you're the type of person who thinks those things are all that really matters, you haven't studied enough. See, while we may be ATM a superpower, we're not even the first there ever was (ISTR we calved off from an earlier one) and my guess is we might not be the last (history has a way of confounding nearly every predictor, and in any case, I'm no Hari Seldon). But how, you may ask, does this relate to Americans having made our bed with regard to the way we're often regarded by others? Well, consider this: we've got a populace weaned on the idea that this country is something inherently special and superior, perhaps even Chosen by God for some great Purpose(TM), and taught from the cradle that ours is the standard by which all others ought to be measured. A significant portion of said populace was given little if any instruction in geography while in school, and therefore not only cannot locate most other nations on a map, but also know very little about those nations. Likewise, they've had little to no instruction in any language other than English, and so never read anything about the rest of the world that hasn't been filtered through an American or at least Anglophonic lens. And we've got this huge chunk of land with damn near every type of topography and climate imaginable, all of it except for some little specks in the Pacific tied together with interstate highways, so most of the populace finds very little reason to travel outside the U.S. border (and even those who go to Canada as tourists often have a disturbing habit of forgetting that Canada is actually another country rather than just a huge cold extra state, while those who go to Mexico often spend the trip looking down their noses at the locals just like they look down on Mexican immigrants at home). Did I hear someone say insular? Exactly. And then this same bunch of insular Americans goes on the Internet and proceeds to tell people in other countries - countries 90% of them have never been in - how those countries fail in measuring up to the U.S., and in the process they display ignorance about any way of doing things that isn't the American way. In the process, they manage to make us \*non-insular\* Americans look pretty damn bad. Human nature being what it is, the bulk of the Europeans (because it's usually Europeans they've been talking to, though not always) get this funny idea that Americans tend to mostly be ignorant, uneducated, jingoistic boobs, because the vast majority of Americans to whom they have been exposed have come off that way. A few observations: -The USA is a large nation: third in area behind Russia and Canada. As has been noted it has almost every type of terrain. This size has contributed to the insularity - we only have two close neighbors and one of them kinda-sorta speaks English and isn't \*too\* different from us. -The USA is a populous nation: fourth behind China, India and the EU, and our population is highly heterogeneous. -The USA has one of the, if not \_the\_ oldest continually-existing governments in the world. My guess is that Britain would object strenuously to that statement, and a number of other nations would join in. My guess is most of Europe, Russia, Japan, and certainly China would lead the pack. \*snickers\* Martin just proved the point he was arguing against. I guess he is one of those Americans who believe history began in 1776. (;) In 1789 Britain had the same form of Constitutional Monarchy that it does today. Iceland's Althing was founded in 930CE and met continually until 1799 then resumed in 1844. However: Russia had a Czar. Japan had a titular Emperor and a Shogun. France had a King. Germany didn't exist, and neither did Italy. Spain had a King. Siam had a King (of course <grin). The Netherlands was a quasi-republic then got gobbled up by the French Empire. Poland had a King, and was later eaten by its neighbors. The Vatican has been ruled by a Pope for around 1000 years, but I'd submit that this is a special case. That's it for our system of government. As far as 'national culture' goes, ours is still evolving. If you are dating your government from 1789, then I submit that the Australian government is older. We have had the same form of Constitutional Monarchy since the Acts of Colonisation and certainly since the first settlement in 1788. We have not had external conquest or internal revolution or civil war at any point since then; all our changes of form have been the result of natural evolution. :) :) You also left out Sweden & Switzerland, whose governmental forms are the result of natural evolution over the same period.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Clothahump - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? If you think healthcare is an issue, then let's get the illegals out of it. Costs will come down like a falling brick. At least I don't have to complain about my understanding of English.. are you a foreigner or do you have problems reading? He has problems dealing with the reality of anything that doesn't fit his personal worldview or with which he disagrees. \_\_\_\_ Please don't make assumptions about what I think or don't think, especially when they are as ignorant as that statement.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Clothahump - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? If you think healthcare is an issue, then let's get the illegals out of it. Costs will come down like a falling brick. At least I don't have to complain about my understanding of English.. are you a foreigner or do you have problems reading?

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Barry Gold - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. In other words, not all rights held by the people (individually or collectively) are laid out in writing in the U.S. Constitution. In light of that, it is incumbent upon you to prove that such a right does not exist. Surely you didn't mean what you wrote. If I assert a right to kill Muslims and cite the 9th amendment, you wouldn't think that it's incumbent on somebody else to prove that such a right doesn't exist. The normative assumption in law is that an assertion isn't proven until evidence is presented to prove it. Then the result depends either on which side presents better evidence (preponderance of evidence in most civil cases) or proof beyond a reasonable doubt (in criminal cases). The 9th amendment \_has\_ been applied by the courts

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by saavik - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

I think this all boils down to the fact that, just as you acknowledged in part, Summer Storms has shown that the right to health care does exist by the terms of the Constitution. That you choose to call it the welfare clause shows a sly cunning for right wing agitprop on your part, against your own Constitution - shame on you. 1. You're wrong. Summer hasn't shown that a 'right to health care exists'

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by saavik - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? If you think healthcare is an issue, then let's get the illegals out of it. Costs will come down like a falling brick. At least I don't have to complain about my understanding of English.. are you a foreigner or do you have problems reading?

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by saavik - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

(Oz, on the bureaucracy that would spring up around a national healthcare) And every one of the non-professional

---

roles will be obtained from the same pool that provides the brain dead automatons at airport security checkpoints

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Tonnie - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? If you think healthcare is an issue, then let's get the illegals out of it. Costs will come down like a falling brick. At least I don't have to complain about my understanding of English.. are you a foreigner or do you have problems reading?

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Joyce of Pendle - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

I was playing around with MapPoint some time back, and realized that England, Scotland and Wales would fit inside the state of Montana (or of course Texas or Alaska) with plenty of room to rattle around. Maybe Disney World concierges should have a map of the US with a map of Great Britain (or France or Germany) superimposed to the same scale just to reset such folks' perception. Now there's a great idea! Yes, it would be great to see that widely available. Unofficially, I've taken satellite-view maps of GB and Texas, overlaid them, and matched Austin with Manchester, and London with Houston. The Channel coast of England is just shorter than the Gulf coast of Texas, the Isle of Arran (near Glasgow) matches up with San Angelo, and mainland Scotland fails to reach Amarillo. I've put the (rather rough!) experiment up at <http://www.boulsworth.co.uk/avril/map.jpg>

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by The TheatrElf - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

Barack Obama said that access to health care is a right. And he's wrong about that, as he is on so many other things. OK. Fine. Please present evidence to back this statement. Since you've stated it as fact, you should be able to present evidence to support it as fact. And please don't piss and moan that you've been challenged; if you can prove your statement, it puts this discussion on a solid footing.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by The TheatrElf - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

And I'll ask the question again - why does someone's illegal entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? You're changing the subject. The article in question did not mention anyone who had illegally entered the country. Every patient mentioned in the article was a legal resident of this country. BTW, I will remind you that unlike you, I actually worked in health care administration. And for the record, illegal immigrants are not responsible for the high costs of healthcare on a national basis. Their impact is extremely localized, and extremely minor on the national scale. The real primary cause of health care cost inflation is all the middle management we've added in the form of health insurance plans. Get rid of the useless middle-man, costs will come down.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Canth - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

(Tonnie) Oh and our homicide % is way much lower than yours as well ;-? Tonnie, they won't believe you. You'll get some sort of statistics quoted that show how Europeans have much worse crime figures, and how we're all shaking in our shoes and hiding in our homes in fear. Well, THAT's just as bigoted as anything I've ever seen said about Europeans. Thanks, Jette. Especially as you bloody well should know how untrue that statement is. -denny-

---

Denny, you know as well as I do, there's lies, damn lies, and statistics. (Usually attributed to Mark Twain). Rick (sometimes is a GentleRF and sometimes is not) No No. It's now Lies, Damn Lies, Statistics and Spreadsheets.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by John W. Vinson - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

I was playing around with MapPoint some time back, and realized that England, Scotland and Wales would fit inside the state of Montana (or of course Texas or Alaska) with plenty of room to rattle around. Maybe Disney World concierges should have a map of the US with a map of Great Britain (or France or Germany) superimposed to the same scale just to reset such folks' perception. Now there's a great idea! Yes, it would be great to see that widely available. Unofficially, I've taken satellite-view maps of GB and Texas, overlaid them, and matched Austin with Manchester, and London with Houston. The Channel coast of England is just shorter than the Gulf coast of Texas, the Isle of Arran (near Glasgow) matches up with San Angelo, and mainland Scotland fails to reach Amarillo. I've put the (rather rough!) experiment up at <http://www.boulsworth.co.uk/avril/map.jpg> COOL! So the Orkneys more or less match up with Amarillo? I knew they were both out in the end of nowhere... <g

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Barbara Bailey - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? You're changing the subject. The article in question did not mention anyone who had illegally entered the country. Every patient mentioned in the article was a legal resident of this country. You're very positive, but wrong. The article mentioned four people, two of whom were legal residents and two of whom were illegal residents; one had entered illegally, the other had come in on a temporary visa and overstayed its expiration.

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by The TheatrElf - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

entry into this country suddenly and miraculously entitle them to suck down our social services? You're changing the subject. The article in question did not mention anyone who had illegally entered the country. Every patient mentioned in the article was a legal resident of this country. You're very positive, but wrong. The article mentioned four people, two of whom were legal residents and two of whom were illegal residents; one had entered illegally, the other had come in on a temporary visa and overstayed its expiration. I will stipulate that I initially read the article back when it was posted, and since most of the discussion was in fact about the two legal residents, I had discounted the illegal immigrants mentioned in passing as being that - stories of illegals who were also dumped, but not the central issue of the story. But since the story IS primarily about the two LEGAL residents who were dumped, how is it intellectually honest to continue as if there were NOT two legal residents at the center of this discussion? I mean, if the article was only about illegals being sent back, then Clothahomp's argument would have merit - but that's not what the article is about. So I throw it back in your face: how is it acceptable to you that a person who has entered this country legally, taken up legal residence, paid their taxes, and worked as hard as any citizen, be stripped of their basic human rights simply because they fell ill or had an accident?

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Jette - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

Tonnie is in the Netherlands, as she has said in several places. \*I\* am in Scotland. If she was in Scotland she wouldn't be apologising for her English so often. Are you sure? ;) I've heard some Scottish brogues (is that the proper term for it?) that are damn near incomprehensible to my ear. Of course, there are a few American dialects (Cajun comes to mind) that can be just as difficult to my ears. Aye, but we dinnae apologise fur it. Ye talk tae us, ye take us as ye find us. Who was it that claimed you typed in English? ;) Dave I'm bilingual. English and Scottish? ;) Dave Yup :-D (my French is only just good enough to stumble with)

---

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Jette - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

<snip Almost everyone I have ever known who grew up (not just moved in) within a couple hundred miles of the Mexican border can speak a passable Spanish. I have also learned, in travels, that, if you make an attempt

=====

## diseases and conditions Don't fall ill in Arizona

Posted by Jette - 2008/11/18 04:01

---

However... two friends who spent a good deal of time (in France and Japan respectively) both noted that an American visitor who knows just a little bit of the local language will usually be welcomed and helped, just for trying; but by the time you're pretty fluent and clearly understand the language well, your mistakes may be much less tolerated. That's not my experience - long time ago I worked in Paris, my French wasn't really bad but I lacked experience, I did have some problems with my boss because of that, - at the end I told her to say it in Dutch, that helped to make her more tolerant ;o) Dutch can sound a wee bit like German. Even now, many French really really don't care for Germans :-)

=====