

Re: New York Times: Free Drug Samples? Bad Idea, Some Say

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2007-05/msg00029.html>

- *From:* "Pete" <pete@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 2 May 2007 17:22:57 -0400
-

Kurt Ullman wrote:

In article <f1alkf01mam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "Pete" <pete@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

That's the whole point Jeff. If they find a cure, they will lose their continuing profit which they get from all the maintenance type drugs that people take long term. That is where they get most of their money from. It is a basic concept of the dog eat dog capitalistic world we live in.

Well then go ahead and cure a disease. Let me know how well it works. Cancers get cured, most infections (non-viral) get cured, etc. There are many that get cured, even many cancers. Polio prevented and cured before hand. Most of the rest are waiting on ways to redo the body (for example rewire the brain and correct chemical imbalances for schizophrenia) before cures can be effected. For some reason you are holding the pharm companies solely responsible for the state of the art in medicine and our knowledge of physiology, etc.

I didn't want to get into a discussion on this last part of my post, and I just tossed it in as kind of an aside for some levity. But I don't understand your logic on this, and doubt whether very many people would agree with you. I see no incentive for big Pharma to try to cure a disease and get a one time profit (so to speak) – it's not logical, even though it is rather inhumane. Like I said, this has been discussed at length in many ng's for years, as you are well aware of.

Of course there is a reason to cure. It ain't one time. I get a disorder of some sort. It is cured. But there are always more with this disorder coming up behind me. You think the advent of penicillin took away all cases of sore throat in kids?

Re: New York Times: Free Drug Samples? Bad Idea, Some Say

Kurt...I figured someone would say something like that, and was going to mention it, but figured most people would know that is not the "kind of cure for a disease" that we are talking about here. A sore throat is usually a simple disease process (unless there is a more serious underlying cause for it) that may be cured, or cleared up by antibiotics, or just go away naturally with salt water gargling, and letting the body's immune system do it's job.

And for the more serious and difficult to solve disease processes (that the Pharma's do not want to try to cure, but do want to try to keep them at bay), I also figured someone like you would mention the people coming up from behind, if there was a cure. But there is a tremendous difference between the people coming up from behind and being cured, and those same people taking lifelong "brand name" (ie expensive) drugs instead, if they were not cured. The total sale for the lifelong medication will far exceed the cost for the one time cure (by a magnitude of 100's to 1000's of times, depending on how long the person lives). And even when the drug eventually goes generic, there will be newer drug to replace it, that will say it is better, blah blah blah.

Penicillin is probably the greatest single drug discovery to date, but that is not what we are talking about here. I'll stand on what I said. The big Pharma's do not want to find cures for the puzzling and difficult to solve disease processes, when they can make way more money controlling symptoms by long term maintenance use of their drugs. There is no doubt in my mind that this is true, and I believe it is basic common sense and logic, and a simple result of real world economics (unfortunate as it is).

Pete

.