

ISAM 2014  
16TH INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF ADDICTION MEDICINE ANNUAL MEETING  
2–6 OCTOBER 2014  
YOKOHAMA, JAPAN

SY30-3

**THE USE OF SOPHISMS IN SUSTAINING DISULFIRAM**

**D. F. Zullino**<sup>1,2</sup>, G. Thorens<sup>1,2</sup>, S. Rothen<sup>1,2</sup>, S. Achab<sup>1,2</sup> and A. Restellini<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Addictology, University Hospitals of Geneva, Switzerland and

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Geneva

Disulfiram's use is not supported by scientific evidence but nevertheless largely advocated and used. This would be less odd in case of lacking or just preliminary evidence. What is peculiar in the case of disulfiram's prescription is its persistence against evidence.

Hence arise the question how it is possible that its use can be supported, i.e. by what type of arguments.

The goal of an argument is to persuade, the goal of logic and argumentation is additionally to persuade for good reasons. In this sense, a good argument would give good reasons to believe the conclusion.

Fallacies are bad arguments, either because they have weak logic, or because they rely on a false premise. Sophisms are intentionally used fallacies, an attempt to persuade opponents that a specific conclusion is true, by means other than by proposing relevant evidence.

Proponents of fallacious arguments may use them either because they are incapable or because they are unwilling to accept their arguments to be fallacious.

We therefore formulate the hypothesis that the frequency use of fallacious arguments within our otherwise supposedly evidence based discipline may be indicative of (a) a scientifically immature discipline, and/or (b) a moralistically intermingled discipline.