

Re: What about VYTORIN?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2004-12/0571.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 12/02/04

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 2004 05:51:00 -0500

"outrider" <outrider@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:1101933706.121126.203650@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...

>

> *Your posts to me, your manner of addressing me, your language, is
> consistently abusive. I do not respond to abusive posts. I have noticed
> you don't take this approach with Rind. Harris. Or beachhouse.*

Ah, the infamous "ou're abusing me" defense. The second to last refuge of a scoundrel. And an admission that with respect to the merits of what I said re your refusal/inability to discuss anything that calls your position into question was quite accurate. So it has become quite clear that listener's post has pegged you precisely.

BTW, not that I need to justify anything to you, I didn't take that approach with the folks named above because I didn't see their posts until after reading your link to them. I don't read everything in this, or any Usenet group. However, when I did read Rind's post after you linked it, I wrote this re Rind's post:

"That's about as disingenuous a post as one is likely to read on Usenet."

Care to retract your comment about my approach? (I won't hold my breath.)

>

> *If you pay attention to what I do you'll see I do engage with people
> who correct me and inform me, but do not do so not abusively.*

You engage people whom you believe you can out shout.

>

> *I would no more engage in continuing dialogue with you Steve than I
> would with someone behaving abusively toward me in person.*

Nonsense. I posted a comment regarding Rind's post, and called into question his position and (by inference) your position. There was nothing abusive in what I wrote; certainly nothing directed at you personally. Instead of responding to my criticism of Rind's position (which is also your

sci.med.cardiology: Re: What about VYTORIN?

position), you chose to ignore it. When I followed up, you complained that you had a "right to educate" people. I then noted that you would do a heck of a lot more "educating" by discussing your position, and that your refusal to do so calls your motives for posting into question.

Your continued dancing around the issue of whether you'll discuss your position when called on it has reached the point where we can all see that, as they say, the emperor has no clothes. Unfortunately, you'll continue in your campaign to scare people away from potentially beneficial medications because you have a personal axe to grind. As I noted in an earlier post, by doing so, the statistics say that you are most likely to end up hurting far more people than you help. Perhaps you can live with that, but don't expect me (or others) to forego opportunities to correct that, if and when the mood strikes me (or us). If you think that's abusive of you personally, all I can suggest is that have a strange definition of abuse, and should therefore refrain from reading posts that reply to your posts so that your feelings won't be hurt.

>
>
> Zee
>
>

Steve

--
The above posting is neither a legal opinion nor legal advice, because we do not have an attorney-client relationship, and should not be construed as either. This posting does not represent the opinion of my employer, but is merely my personal view. To reply, delete _spamout_ and replace with the numeral 3
>
> Steve Marcus wrote:
>> "outrider" <outrider@despammed.com> wrote in message
>> news:1101912892.198936.38820@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...
>> > This is not about scoring points Steve. It's about education.
>>
>> True. However, *your posts make it appear otherwise*. You post
> *your*
>> position. Then you refuse to discuss it further. By eliminating the
>
>> discussion you limit the "education" on a given topic to *your* point
> of
>> view (which is congruent with the point of view of your sources).
> However,
>> *your* POV isn't always correct, no matter how many sources you might
> find
>> that seem to support it.
>>
>> >
>> > I'm under no obligation to respond to you or argue with you when we
>> > disagree.
>>
>> You are under no obligation to do anything at all.. However,
> assuming that

Re: What about VYTORIN?

sci.med.cardiology: Re: What about VYTORIN?

>> you have in fact undertaken to be in the education business, and that
> you
>> are not merely in the propaganda business, it would seem that you are
>
>> obligated to *discuss* your position. Which you refuse to do. The
>> implication of that refusal is ...?
>>
>> > Nor am I under any obligation to respond to every comment you
>> > make if I do respond.
>>
>> If "every comment" I make is a discussion of your position, your
> sources,
>> etc., then see above. Again, if you are trying to teach, you need to
>
>> discuss what you are teaching, because the mere fact that you expound
>
>> something doesn't make you correct.
>>
>> >
>> > You disagree with what Rind has said. Fine. Take it up with him. I
>> > don't disagree with what he said.
>>
>> Why don't you disagree with what he said? If you are in the
> education
>> business, that's the crux of the matter. Or do you expect Janis (and
>
>> others) to simply accept what *you* say? Wouldn't Janis learn a bit
> more,
>> and be a bit more confident of what she had learned, if there were a
>> thorough discussion rather than a simple ipse dixit?
>>
>> I can find credentialed sources that claim to be able to prevent
> and/or cure
>> cardiac problems by laying on hands. If I were answering someone's
> question
>> about that topic, would it be sufficient to cite those sources, state
> I
>> don't disagree with them and then ignore any comment that questions
> what the
>> sources say? Is that the philosophy of education to which you
> subscribe?
>>
>> > And I think he has made a good point
>> > that Janis (and anyone) should consider.
>>
>> Why? His point is that there are no "clinical endpoint trials" for
> Zetia.
>> However, there are clinical trials which demonstrate, rather
> conclusively,
>> the importance of LDL levels being low (yes, it's statistical data,
> and so
>> there will always be data points outside of the bell curve) and
> trials which
>> have yet to show that Zetia causes harm. Is it logical to test the
> drug for
>> 10 years to see if more than a statistically insignificant percentage
> of the
>> population might develop nonreversible side effects? After 10 years
> of
>> successful trials, should we then wait 20 years to be sure?
>>
>> >

Re: What about VYTORIN?

sci.med.cardiology: Re: What about VYTORIN?

>> > The article on Crestor discusses the drawbacks and benefits of all
> the
>> > statins. I think it's very balanced.
>> >
>> >
> http://www.medicationsense.com/articles/july_sept_04/crestor_truth.html
>>
>> Besides the point. I snipped the Crestor material because it was off
> topic
>> with respect to Janis' question.
>>
>> > Zee
>> >
>>
>> Steve
>> --
>> The above posting is neither a legal opinion nor legal advice,
>> because we do not have an attorney-client relationship, and
>> should not be construed as either. This posting does not
>> represent the opinion of my employer, but is merely my personal
>> view. To reply, delete _spamout_ and replace with the numeral 3
>