

Re: Here, Steve... WAS:Re: Chung has died and returned with proof WAS:Re: The Bullshit Parade

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2004-08/0853.html>

From: Steve Marcus (*smarcus_spamout__at_cox.net*)

Date: 08/14/04

Date: Sat, 14 Aug 2004 14:42:33 -0400

I'll top post to note that you have edit my post (both some of what I wrote and some of what you wrote, thereby destroying the context. The gentle readers who may be interested will have to dredge up my post in order to read what you had written and what I wrote in reply. The fact that you had to do that editing in order appear justified in spewing your crap below shows a couple of things:

1. My position is far closer to being accurate than your position.

2. And you know it.

Have a nice day, Bobbie boy.

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 "Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message news:10hsc4vdd62i502@corp.supernews.com...

> Steve Marcus wrote:

>

> > "Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message

> > news:10hr04mebja3952@corp.supernews.com...

> >

> >> Steve Marcus wrote:

> >>

> >>> "Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message

> >>> news:10hq9s6fq0neg10@corp.supernews.com...

> >>>

> >>>> Steve Marcus wrote:

> >>>>

> >>>>> "Bob (this one)" <Bob@nospam.com> wrote in message

> >>>>>

> >>>>>> I think it's nothing short of hilarious how the Chungish

> >>>>>> Army flies out of the woodwork when he does one of his

> >>>>>> so-frequent bonehead posts. Welcome back. Can't say as

> >>>>>> I've missed you, but I wasn't aiming, so nothing lost.

> >>>>
> >>>> And I think that you are one of the biggest a-holes on
> >>>> Usenet by continuing to attack Dr. Chung simply because you
> >>>> are in the business of selling food,
> >>>
> >>>> Um, I don't have any restaurants any more. Haven't owned one
> >>>> for almost a decade.
> >>>>
> >>>> If you believe that's the reason (as though there's only
> >>>> one!) I dispute Chung, then you are cursed with an inability
> >>>> to see Chung in the real light of his actions. Your
> >>>> observation is too superficial and trivial for serious
> >>>> discourse.
> >>>
> >>> Nonsense. I don't read what Dr. Chung writes to venerate Dr.
> >>> Chung. I read what he writes because he's discussing
> >>> cardiology. What he says is a jumping off point; one can
> >>> investigate and determine whether what he's written is write,
> >>> wrong, or a little of both.
> >>
> >> No one is talking about veneration. You impute neutral
> >> implications to Chung's posts, and that's simply inaccurate. He
> >> has offered "advice" that was categorically wrong.
> >
> > Proof?? And not just proof of error; proof of intentional error is
> > required.
>
> The proof was offered at the time of the posts. Intent is irrelevant.
> A bullet hole is a bullet hole deliberate or accidental. The
> intentional component kicked in after Chung was shown the facts and he
> denied them.
>
> Your bullshit is just as evasive and diversionary as your hero
> Chung's. You want it all delivered to suit your red herring
> conditions.
>
> Here's the bottom line. You don't like my taking Chung to task for his
> phoniness and his fraudulent postures and presentations. Tough. Get
> used to it.
>
> As long as you try your weaseling to establish conditions under which
> you think I ought to function, your desires are doomed. It appears
> from your self-excusing prattle that you somehow think you have some
> exclusive grasp on propriety, some exclusive grasp on the realities
> here. You try to slip-slide away and take Chung with you. No dice.
>
> I suggested you killfile me. You say no. So be it. If you don't know
> my name, it's because of your own density. It's been posted here
> several times just this week alone. I stopped using it because of all
> the spam I was getting.
>
> As you say, "My purpose in posting was to tell you, and anyone else
> who read the post, what I think of you and why. Which I've done."
> Sauce for the goose...
>
> > Everyone, from doctors to chefs, make mistakes. My point is that
> > any error he makes _posting on Usenet_ is irrelevant; he isn't
> > prescribing, his discussing and recommending. I've often posted
> > that anyone who takes _any_ medical information via Usenet and just
> > follows it is an idiot.
>
> I wasn't talking about medical advice. Read what it says.

>
> >> I haven't looked at any numbers of how many of his posts are
> >> about cardiology versus what others are, but I daresay that it's
> >> not as many as your comment implies.
> >
> > My impression is just the opposite.
>
> No shock there.
>
> > Particularly in the days
> > before there were more posters of your "quality" posting personal
> > attacks directed against Dr. Chung than there were posters just
> > asking medical related questions, whether generally or directed to
> > Dr. Chung. Certainly he's posted more non-cardiology posts since
> > you and others decided that you had nothing better to do than to
> > come on sci.med.cardiology and attack Dr. Chung, and I included
> > here attacks on him for the 2 lb diet and attacks directed at his
> > proselytizing. I note that the proselytizing did not exist until
> > he was being bombarded with attack posts and I suspect it to be a
> > defense mechanism that he uses to continue to try helping people by
> > posting rather than just spending his free time doing something
> > else.
>
> See, Steve, this is the kind of crap your whole post is filled with. I
> came originally to SMC because MU_nbeam and Chung trolled a low-carb
> group I was reading. I replied to their foolishness and found myself
> in a crosspost extravaganza fueled by their concurrent and deliberate
> hatreds. Their malicious and scurrilous posts filled with elemental
> nastiness for no discernible reason beyond their crippled desires to
> generate responses. Any response is a success to a troll.
>
> There's no help in MU_sh and no effort to do anything more than to
> troll and spam. Chung supports and endorses it all.
>
> >> A great number of them are merely exercises in his personal brand
> >> of hypocrisy and fraud. You seem to simply not notice them.
> >
> > And you seem to be able to read minds. How the hell do you know
> > what I notice?
>
> Obviously, I don't; But if you had even the remotest sense of balance,
> you'd comment on what others do and say as you have here. I assume,
> based on your near irrationality, that either it zooms over your head
> or you simply excuse it for your own less than candid reasons.
>
> > In fact, I observe from reading your posts that you
> > believe his proselytizing to be hypocrisy, thereby demonstrating
> > that you don't understand the meaning of the word "hypocrisy."
>
> hypocrite, n. One who pretends to be what he is not; especially, one
> who pretends to be pious, virtuous, etc. without really being so.
>
> Chung is a demonstrated fraud. Proven.
>
> >>> On the other hand, what the value of what you post to
> >>> sci.archaeology
> >>
> >> I don't post to sci.archaeology.
> >
> > My mistake. Of what value are your posts to sci.med.cardiology?
>
> At least the value of this post. What is its value?

>
> It's a pity that, like Chung, you seem to see the world in absolutes.
> So I'm either a hero or a villain. Very reasonable.
>
> >>> is zero, that's zip, nada, ziltch, bupkus, nought, nil. All
> >>> you are looking for is a reaction (either from Dr. Chung, or
> >>> from others). In short, you are a freakin' troll.
>
> The reaction I look for is a diminution of the bullshit level and the
> fakery quotient. I don't look for long threads or protracted discourse
> on any given topic.
>
> So does your desire to kindle reactions with your attacks in the
> groups trolling? Obviously you're looking to generate reactions. You
> say so at the end of your tiresome post. Isn't that trolling by your
> lightweight definition?
>
> >> In short, you are less than diligent in your reading, friend
> >> Steve. Perhaps you missed the whole deal with Chung saying that 2
> >> pounds of bread contains 4000 calories.
> >
> > Depends on the bread, doesn't it?
>
> No. It doesn't. And in any event, Chung said "bread." No bread with
> napalm in it. No bread baked from collapsed atomic nuclei. Just bread.
> When presented with technical information from the USDA nutrient
> database and other scientific sources that was way different than
> Chung's numbers, he refused to say where his came from and insisted
> that he was right. Same deal with how many calories in 2 pounds of
> potatoes. Note the connection with two pounds and his diet. These are
> his figures. Once again, he offered a number that was several times
> the reality. Correct figures were showed to him by several people and
> Chung regarded all as merely attacks and dealt with them all that way.
> Still insists his numbers are correct.
>
> >> Perhaps you missed his telling everyone that 325 mg of aspirin is
> >> the minimum for safety.
> >
> > In fact my own cardiologist had prescribed exactly the same dosage,
> > for exactly the same reason, and I have been following that advice
> > since 1995. Recently, my cardiologist reduced the dosage for other
> > reasons. But in the intervening time, I specifically asked about
> > new studies that arguably show that 81 mg is equally effective, and
> > was told that the issue was indeed debatable, but as I was
> > tolerating 325 mg quite nicely, then there was no point to cutting
> > the dosage. My cardiologist then stated, "325 mg is an adult
> > dosage of aspirin while 81 mg is a child's dosage. You are an
> > adult, aren't you?"
>
> Your cardiologist isn't abreast of the latest research info.
>
> I hope you answered his question honestly. How long have you been
> taking the 81's?
>
> >> Perhaps you missed his talking about caloric usage for running 5
> >> miles. There are more such egregious blunders. I replied to all
> >> those things because they were factually wrong and provably so
> >> and might lead people who accepted his words into problems.
> >
> > I may have missed this last one. But again, so what if Dr. Chung
> > "blundered"? His post would have been on topic for the newsgroup
> > to which he posted, and would have been nothing more than a

> > starting point for people wishing to learn about the point in
> > question, not a prescription.
>
> But the "facts" were wrong. Demonstrably, provably, absolutely wrong.
> And, as you suggest, they were a starting point. And it was carried
> further by others giving the correct numbers while Chung continued to
> insist that his numbers were correct and he again refused to offer his
> sources. After a few such episodes, it starts to look like a pattern.
>
> > Or do you believe that if Dr. Chung
> > were to post that all statin users should stop taking their drugs
> > immediately and instead take a mixture of honey and salt three
> > times daily, that anyone here would do so because of the "Dr." in
> > front of his surname? Only an idiot would do so. For my part, I
> > would do some independent research, and if it looked at all like
> > Dr. Chung might have a point, I would ask my doctor.
>
> Don't be completely ridiculous.
>
> >>>> and Dr. Chung happens to recommend a 2 lb diet approach.
> >>>>
> >>>> I am critical of Chung for his absurd "diet" as well as his
> >>>> fraudulence. His deliberate malice. His quackery. His
> >>>> mistakes that he refuses to correct. His sanctimonious use of
> >>>> his preposterous "faith" as a weapon and means to heap scorn.
> >>>> His smug arrogance. His lousy advice about calories and his
> >>>> belief that dieters should be lied to about caloric content
> >>>> and usage.
> >>>>
> >>> Dr. Chung's diet isn't absurd. What's absurd is the position
> >>> that those who interpret it as recommending that the daily 2
> >>> lbs of food consist of any food (2 lbs of ice cream, or 2 lbs
> >>> of bread, or 2 lbs of steak, etc.) and do not understand that
> >>> it is directed primarily at morbidly obese people who typically
> >>> consume too many calories by consuming enormous quantities of
> >>> food each day.
> >>>>
> >> Sorry, Steve. You need to follow along a bit better. EITHER you
> >> restrict your diet to 2 pounds of food irrespective of what it is
> >> OR you minimize calories taken in. If the diet calls for BOTH as
> >> you say Chung's must, then it's the calories that are the index,
> >> not the weight. That being the case, his "diet" is using the
> >> wrong indices.
> >>>>
> > Learn how to read, and how to think. Do you seriously believe that
> > there are people walking around who do not understand that one
> > needs to diet by restricting caloric intake?
>
> Hey, Steve, if you're going to argue for Chung's "diet," be sure to
> read what it is before sticking your foot in your mouth. He says,
> Chung says, that 2 pounds is the only index. Chung yesterday posted
> that two pounds was the criterion.
>
> > The point is, as I
> > wrote above, that the 2 lb diet is addressed to quantity, and it
> > is true that for a morbidly obese person, 2 lbs of ice cream
> > daily is an improvement over 3 lbs a day, and may even be a first
> > necessary step to getting that person to restrict calories by
> > restricting intake. Once one learns to restrict quantity, and one
> > engages one's brain to select healthier foods to make up that
> > quantity, one will lose weight, by reason of measuring the intake,
> > not worrying about counting the calories.

>
> You're building an edifice that isn't part of Chung's "diet." You're
> changing it from what gets preached here. It's fine if you want to see
> it that way, but that's not the gospel according to Chung.
>
> > If you read Dr. Chung's diet any other way, you either need
> > remedial reading classes, or you are being disingenous.
>
> Hey, Steve. Fuck yourself. You're dead wrong about this. Absolutely
> wrong. You're changing it from what Chung says it is.
>
> >> Chung doesn't restrict it to morbidly obese people or even just
> >> obese people. He and MU_cus both say they eat 2 pounds of food a
> >> day and both claim not to be obese at all. He has said that 2
> >> pounds of food should be enough for *anyone*.
> >
> > See above. You are simply being disingenous in how you read and
> > understand Dr. Chung's posts, or you are pretty stupid.
>
> Eat shit and die, lackwit. I read what was on the screen without
> manufacturing excuses and secondary conditions like you're trying to
> do. Chung says *everybody* should live on 2 pounds of food a day. No
> age limit. No size limits. No activity limits. No food limits. 2
> pounds for everybody.
>
> >> I note you avoid comment on "His deliberate malice."
> >
> > I detect none.
> >
> >> His quackery. His mistakes that he refuses to correct.
> >
> > A mistake does not equal quackery.
>
> Perhaps in your brilliant mental acuity you noticed that they were
> separate thoughts. Quackery period new thought ... His mistakes that
> he refuses to correct. See how they're different?
>
> > Nor would several. It/they
> > constitute(s) human error. (One of the principal qualifications I
> > demand of my physicians is that they be human beings.) I see
> > damned few errors, and no quackery in Dr. Chung's posts.
>
> Why would you with all this vast brainpower you think you bring to the
> issues? I can see why it gets past you.
>
> >> His sanctimonious use of his preposterous "faith" as a weapon and
> >> means to heap scorn.
> >
> > As noted above, I dislike his proselytizing, but I don't see it as
> > heaping scorn, I see it as a defensive reaction to the attacks, and
> > as a justification to keep spending time posting and thereby
> > providing people with information from which they might at least
> > ask their doctors an intelligent question, as opposed to simply
> > doing something else with his free time.
>
> See how generous you are with your interpretations? For a sufficiently
> dimwitted quantity of generous.
>
> >> His smug arrogance.
> >
> > He's got an M.D. degree and practices medicine. He ought to be
> > proud of that. I don't confuse his pride with smugness.

>
> Obviously. But you certainly are confused about a lot else.
>
> >> His lousy advice about calories and his belief that dieters
> >> should be lied to about caloric content and usage."
> >
> > I don't regard his advice as lousy. What I regard is lousy is your
> > ability to read and to think, or alternatively your honesty is
> > lousy.
>
> <LOL> And you're exhorting others to learn to think? The irony just
> flashes past you.
>
> >> That's all ok with you?
> >
> > See above.
> >
> >>>> People are free to read Dr. Chung's posts, or not.
> >>>>
> >>>> As they are with yours and mine.
> >>>>
> >>>> Have you met MU? You might want to have the same talk with
> >>>> him. I know he'll listen with all the care and attention your
> >>>> lecture deserves.
> >>>>
> >>>> What does any other poster have to do with my comments, or with
> >>>> the fact that your posts are off topic for the newsgroups in
> >>>> the headers of this thread, and certainly for cardiology and
> >>>> medical newsgroups?
> >>>>
> >> Funny how what you've written so parallels the messages of MU_le.
> >> Even sounds a good bit like it, you know?
> >
> > Really? So I post using my name, and provide an e-mail contact
> > address, because in my spare time I post anonymously from an e-mail
> > posting service? As I said, learn to think Bob; thinking is an
> > important trait.
>
> See what I mean by evasions? Good example.
>
> >> Au contraire. My comments have to do with your forgiveness or
> >> ignoring others who perpetrate the original sins and focus on me
> >> alone. If the principles and the descriptions you offer are
> >> terrible things, then you ought to apply them to *all* who
> >> violate your codes of behavior. Otherwise, your motives become a
> >> bit suspect.
> >
> > Now you're telling me when I'm permitted to reach the point of
> > getting fed up? I got fed up with you Bob. I called you on it.
> > Don't presume to tell me what to do.
>
> Nah. I'm telling you you're dogmatically full of shit. You turn a
> blind eye to Chung and MU_rr and their actions. Fine enough, if that's
> how your integrity works. But it ought to be consistent if indeed you
> consider yourself to be honest. That it isn't. That you aren't.
>
> >> When Chung gives out flawed information, and he has repeatedly, I
> >> feel perfectly entitled to correct it. I'm sorry you don't see
> >> any benefit to it, but based on your comments above that show a
> >> profound lack of understanding of what Chung's "diet" is about,
> >> I'm not sure you've followed anything very well.
> >

> > This sort of strawman crap is getting tiring, Bob. I've posted
> > enough specifics to show just who, as between you and Dr. Chung,
> > is the problem here.
>
> Steve, you can't be this stupid and tie your own shoes. You've given
> nothing specific about anything. What you've done is rant and rave
> some of the most elaborately one-sided baloney on usenet. You refuse
> to deal with Chung's errors as anything but harmless bagatelles. You
> rightly cite his overuse of his credentials and seem to miss the
> notion that as long as he speaks ex cathedra, he has a larger
> responsibility than the likes of you or me. He presents himself as an
> authority and abuses that position with pettiness and malice. And
> swaggering superficiality. It doesn't really matter whether you see it
> that way or not. Your prerogative.
>
> > Rest assured that I had no expectation that
> > my post would persuade you to quit behaving as you do. But I
> > suspect that it might have the effect of persuading some folks to
> > ignore the venomous crap that you spew.
>
> You have high hopes, for a muddy, extremely biased thinker.
>
> Unfortunately, I suspect it will demonstrate the shallowness of your
> thinking, the arbitrariness of your condemnations and the
> self-excusing posture for your "noble" attacks.
>
> >> Learn to use your killfile.
> >
> > I don't believe in self-censorship. As an adult, I'm capable of
> > reading stuff as I choose, and ignoring stuff posted by people whom
> > I know to post content-free posts. My purpose in posting was to
> > tell you, and anyone else who read the post, what I think of you
> > and why. Which I've done.
>
> Yes you have. Do you feel more like a grownup now? Big tough Steve
> takes on the archvillain of usenet and doesn't get hurt and only wets
> his pants slightly. Grrrrrrr...
>
> Pour yourself a cup of tea and try to calm down. This anxiety isn't
> good for you.
>
> >> Have a very lovely day.
> >>
> > Likewise.
> >
> >> Bob
> >>
> > Steve
>
> No, I'm serious. Have a wonderful day. Maybe one of the best days
> you've ever had. Really. A very satisfying conversation with a
> long-time friend. Maybe a nice sandwich. A wonderful day. Maybe
> discover that your prescription prices have dropped significantly.
>
> Ite missa est.
>
> Bob
>