

Re: The Tactics Of Jan Drew

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.dentistry/2004-11/3682.html>

Rich._at_.

Date: 11/17/04

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 2004 22:50:57 GMT

On Wed, 17 Nov 2004 22:37:20 GMT, "Dr Steve" <nospam@home.net> wrote:

>Hi Rich,

>

>*Just the usual internet communication troubles.*

No problem. I guess I have to brush up on my acronyms:--))

>> *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.*

Messages do not necessarily have to contribute to a discussion to be useful. Providing a public service announcement that Jan Drew lied about having mercury poisoning is a quite useful message that deserves repeating only because Jan insists on repeating her lie.

>

>

>> *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.?*

You can do that. But the more you post it and the less that you directly engage Jan Drew in any discussion the more effective it will be.

Just imagine. Dozens of dentists in this newsgroup completely ignore Jan Drew's posts except for posting proof of her lies. Imagine this occurring day after day, week after week and if necessary month after month. It would be even more effective if you change the subject header to reflect the topic. This would highlight the nature of the post and reinforce Jan's dishonesty.

Now imagine the result this would have on Jan Drew who is looking for attention and looking to demonize conventional dentists. Think about it. A more perfect approach I cannot conceive.

The major problem is that Jan Drew has cultivate the art of baiting people and it is unlikely that enough people could resist the impulse.

>

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

>

>*I agree she needs attention for some odd reason.*

Nothing odd for her needing attention. Would you want to associate with her in your private life?? Imagine what her life is like and then you will understand it is hardly odd that she needs attention.

> *Denying the attention is*

>*the best way of responding, but at the same time making sure any lay-people*

>*are aware of how contrivernal her views are and to know better than to run*

>*to the first "quack" who promises to cure their PN by removing amalgams.*

I could not agree more. That is precisely the approach I am suggesting.

Aloha,

Rich