

Re: The Tactics Of Jan Drew

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.dentistry/2004-11/3603.html>

Rich._at_.

Date: 11/17/04

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 2004 19:54:47 GMT

On Wed, 17 Nov 2004 18:01:07 GMT, "Dr Steve" <nospam@home.net> wrote:

>
> "The Webby" <nospamattmjatroepidemicnospam@san.rr.com> wrote in message
> news:nospamattmjatroepidemicnospam-4A5382.09523617112004@orngca-news03.socal.rr.com...
>> I have stayed out of the threads pertaining to amalgam issues because I
>> do not have any particular interest in the subject. I am not a
>> scientist and I do not claim to one on the internet or TV. But I am
>> particularly concerned about the postings that carry messages attacking
>> the character of people in this newsgroup.
>>
>> Am I dismayed? No, I am probably not dismayed in the strict sense of the
>> word. But I do feel as though I am being called upon to post in a
>> method that suggests I have an opinion about amalgam and safety issues
>> when I clearly am not "qualified" to have any "expert" opinion on this
>> subject. However, I am clearly qualified to know whether or not I am
>> telling the truth or whether my posts are dangerous to innocent people
>> who believe my lies (according to the postings of Jan Drew).
>>
>> So as I see it, there is more than one issue facing the newsgroup.
>> Exactly what these issues are is something that must be sorted out, I
>> think. Because as it is, this place is completely out of control (which
>> is not always such a bad thing in usenet) and everything that is
>> happening here that is related to "Jan Drew" is something that Jan Drew
>> is controlling. If we choose to ignore each and every post of hers, we
>> are making the choice as individuals but she is tempting the entire
>> newsgroup to behave as she desires; to behave as individuals rather than
>> a group.
>>
>> Is a "group" mentality a healthy thing in a newsgroup? I dare say, not
>> always, sometimes, or some of both. But anyway you look at the problem,
>> I think it is more dangerous that someone can get away with discrediting
>> the character of people than it is to suggest that amalgam issues are
>> what "Jan Drew" sees them to be.
>>
>> Comments?
>
> I would agree with you, but wonder what tactic would work best.

Mine:--))

> *Rich may be*
> *right from a psychological point of view.*

Mine is right from a practical/realistic standpoint. If you disagree please explain why.

> *I still think the best solution*
> *would be to have an open discussion where two sides can begin to understand*
> *the opposing point of view, but I see that SHNMNBM would never participate.*

If you think that the best solution is to have an open discussion with Jan Drew then with all due respect you may have lost touch with reality. I apologize if I misunderstood your comment. I don't know what the acronym SHNMNBM means.

But losing touch with reality can be an undesirable effect of long term engagement with JD.

> *Who knows if her inability to participate stems from anger, ignorance, fear,*
> *or bad programing.*

All of the above?

> *Would flooding a NG with useless messages have any*
> *effect besides making the NG useless for a month?*

Who is suggesting flooding this newsgroup with "useless messages". My suggestion is to repeatedly post Jan's own words that clearly indicate that she did not have mercury poisoning, that she now knows she did not have mercury poisoning, and that she deliberately changed her history to manipulate people into thinking that she did. If you think that repeatedly posting *that* is useless flooding we can agree to disagree.

Not only is it not useless but it is very important to keep unsuspecting scientifically naive people from acting on her lies and also useful in that it has the best chance of getting Jan to get so frustrated that she decides it is not worth it to stay here.

If you disagree with my assessment I would be very interested in hearing why.

Aloha,

Rich

>