

Re: Side effects: drugs called statins

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2004-12/1402.html>

From: Happy Dog (*happydog_at_sympatico.ca*)

Date: 12/08/04

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 2004 02:29:21 -0500

<awthrawthr@yahoo.com> wrote in message

>>> *You're right, I won't post what you THINK is 'real' evidence. I'm
> not limited by your narrow window of acceptance. There is more in this
>>> world than all your philosophies including your blind faith in the
>>> lyin-tific method,*
>
>>*Soooooo, I should accept your adorable anecdotes as evidence. As for
>> "faith", I have little. And, on that, anyone making this claim is an
>> expert. So, again, you don't know shit.*
>
> *Who cares what you do? I don't.*

Then why respond? You enjoy the abuse? When asked for some real evidence you asked "how much bandwidth do you have?" Now you suddenly don't care?

>>> *I have cure myself many times of many different conditions. I have
>>> helped others do the same.*
>
>>*Liar, idiot. Pick one or both.*
>
> *Yeah, like you know me. You know my medical history. You know what I've
> done for other people who were sick.*

I *know* that your claims are so improbable that real evidence is required before any reasonable person believes that you can cure Stage IV cancer and impotence.

>
>>> *So I laugh when I see people like yourself who are still stuck in
> their belief systems.*
>
>>*The alternative is to believe your word. On Usenet. Right?*
>
> *You can depend on FDA-approved drugs all you want.*

Sounds like Pascal's Wager. Here's the problem:

You can't establish that your methods are any safer than FDA approved ones

sci.med: Re: Side effects: drugs called statins

because you haven't demonstrated that they work. So your challenge is bullshit. You're as boring as the religious nutcases who fail at grade school level logic.

>>> *It is the hallmark of the mediocre scientist to ignore a good
> anecdote.*

>

>> *Gee, can I quote you?*