

In article <1993Apr9.172945.4578@island.COM> green@island.COM (Robert Greenstein) writes:

>In article <19493@pitt.UUCP> geb@cs.pitt.edu (Gordon Banks) writes:

>>One problem is very few scientists are interested in alternative medicine.

>So Gordon, why do you think this is so?

Probably because most of them come packaged with some absurd theory

behind them. E.G. homoeopathy: like cures like. The more you dilute

things, the more powerful they get, even if you dilute them so much

there is no ingredient but water left. Chiropractic: all illness

stems from compressions of nerves by misaligned vertebrae. Such

systems are so patently absurd, that any good they do is accidental

and not related to the theory. The only exception is probably herbalism,

because scientists recognize the potent drugs that derive from plants

and are always interested in seeing if they can find new plants

that have active and useful substances. But that isn't what

is meant by alternative medicine, usually. If you get into the Qi,

accupuntunce charts, etc, you are now back to silly theories that

probably have nothing to do with why accupuncture works in some cases.

Perhaps another reason they are reluctant is the Rhine experience.

Rhine was a scientist who wanted to investigate the paranormal

and his lab was filled with so much chicanery and fakery that

people don't want to be associated with that sort of thing.

Gordon Banks N3JXP | "Skepticism is the chastity of the intellect, and

geb@cadre.dsl.pitt.edu | it is shameful to surrender it too soon."