

A promise not to be kept

The following is excerpted from the President's message to Congress on a national health program:

"There were enumerated in a proposed Economic Bill of Rights certain rights which ought to be assured to every American citizen.

"One of them was: 'The right to adequate medical care and the right to achieve and enjoy good health.' Another was the 'right to adequate protection from the economic fears of sickness.'

"Millions of our citizens do not have a full measure of opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health. Millions do not now have protection or security against the economic effects of sickness. The time has arrived for action to help them attain that opportunity and that protection."

I'd say anybody, regardless of their party affiliations, would be hard pressed to find fault with the President's words.

Isn't it high time that something be done to keep a lid on not only the cost of medical care, but also the cost of being insured just to gain access to adequate health care?

Sure it is.

But it won't happen.

Why?

Because it's never happened. And it's not meant to happen.

The above statements were not uttered by the present White House resident, but by Harry Truman Nov. 19, 1945.

So what's changed in 62 years?

With all the medical technological advancements, the thing that's most likely to kill Americans today—and certainly in the future—is the inability to afford health care.

Somehow, as time moves forward, the ability of citizens to maintain coverage slides backward.

Is there a conspiratorial element in this?

Yes.

What we are now witnessing is the subtle beginnings of a culling of the population, which will result in, literally, a survival of the fittest.

The ultimate objective is the realization of the generations-long elitist dream of a global population reduction and a propagation of the species that will yield only humans with superior genetic material.

This dream has long been championed by many luminaries—or, rather, *illuminists*—such as the Rockefellers, Erasmus and Charles Darwin, Francis Galton, H.G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, T.H. Huxley, Aldous Huxley and, more recently, creeps like Prince Phillip, Ted Turner and a host of doomsday scientists—like Jacques Cousteau—and radical anti-human environmentalists.

But more about them in a subsequent article.

An article in the Dec. 1, 2006, edition of The New York Times provides a glimpse into the way the access of health care—or of quality health care—will be implemented:

"Ignoring doctors' orders may now start exacting a new price among West Virginia's Medicaid recipients. Under a reorganized schedule of aid, the state, hoping for savings over time, plans to reward "responsible" patients with significant extra benefits or—as critics describe it—

punish those do not join weight-loss or antismoking programs, or who miss too many appointments, by denying important services.

“The incentive effort, the first of its kind, received quick approval last summer from the Bush administration, which is encouraging states to experiment with ‘personal responsibility’ as a chief principle of their Medicaid programs. Idaho and Kentucky area also planning reward programs, though more modest ones, for healthful behavior.

“In a pilot phase starting in three rural counties over the next few months, many West Virginia Medicaid patients will be asked to sign a pledge ‘to do my best to stay healthy,’ to attend ‘health improvement programs as directed,’ to have routine checkups and screenings, to keep appointments, to take medicine as prescribed and to go to emergency rooms only for real emergencies. . . .

“Those signing and abiding by the agreement (or their children, who account for a majority of Medicaid patients here) will receive ‘enhanced benefits’ including mental health counseling, long-term diabetes and management and cardiac rehabilitation, and prescription drugs and home health visits as needed, as well as antismoking and anti-obesity classes. Those who do not sign will get federally required basic services but be limited to four prescriptions a month, for example, and will not receive the other enhanced benefits. . . .

“‘What if everyone at a major corporation were told they would lose benefits if they didn’t lose weight or drink less?’ said a co-author of the editorial, Dr. Gene Bishop, a physician at Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia.

Denying mental health aid to those who do not sign seems especially counterproductive, Dr. Bishop said in an interview.

“‘If you think about the people least able to do simple things like keep appointments and take all their medications,’ she said, ‘people least able to do simple things like keep appointments and take all their medications,’ she said, ‘people with mental health and substance abuse problems are right up there.’”

Although corporations and employers have a right to secure a healthy workforce, they may and probably will take it too far.

Healthy practices don’t necessarily prevent people from contracting major diseases such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, MS, leukemia and, certainly, can’t prevent them from being the helpless victim of a car crash that will adversely impact the quality of their lives for the rest of their lives.

And how much of a person’s privacy will be invaded in an employer’s drive to secure a healthy workforce?

And, by the way, just who—using what kind of assessment—determines a healthy lifestyle?

Currently Johnson & Johnson is requesting its employees to subject themselves to extensive physical examinations and in-depth questionnaires about their health histories and lifestyles. If employees submit, they receive a \$500 voucher that will be applied to their health costs. If they don’t submit, their paychecks will have \$500 incrementally deducted from them.

In the future, will employment be determined as much by one’s health as one’s intrinsic talents and experience?

How will this policy impact those who have incurred physical and mental challenges through no fault of their own?

Is this the first salvo in—as is suggested by the title of Edwin Black’s powerful book—the *War against the Weak*?