

## Re: The Tactics Of Jan Drew

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.dentistry/2004-11/3678.html>

---

**From:** Dr Steve (*nospam\_at\_home.net*)

**Date:** 11/17/04

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 2004 22:37:20 GMT

Hi Rich,

Just the usual internet communication troubles.

>  
>> *Rich may be right from a psychological point of view.*  
>  
> *Mine is right from a practical/realistic standpoint. If you disagree  
> please explain why.*

Not enough disagreement to argue over. I do see your point.

>> *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.*

I think this would be best in an ideological way of thinking. I realize SheWhoseNameMustNeverBeMentioned would not cooperate, so it would be a waste of effort.

> *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.*

I never honestly believed for one minute she would engage in a real discussion on any point. I chose to archive proof that SWNMNBM would not discuss any topic. Hopefully, it reflects on her believability.

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

Nah! Not me.

>> *Who knows if her inability to participate stems from anger, ignorance,  
>> fear,*

>>*or bad programing.*

>

> *All of the above?*

Agreed

>> *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.*

The messages would be useless in that they would not be contributing to any ongoing conversation.

> *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.*

How about either a periodic FAQ type of posting, or just an agreed upon generic posting to any non-coherent postings of SWNMNBM.?

> *If you disagree with my assessment I would be very interested in*

> *hearing why.*

I agree she needs attention for some odd reason. Denying the attention is the best way of responding, but at the same time making sure any lay-people are aware of how controversial her views are and to know better than to run to the first "quack" who promises to cure their PN by removing amalgams.

> *Aloha,*

>

> *Rich*

>>

>