

Re: Steere/Yale MAJOR screw-up.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2004-07/0474.html>

From: A_Weisman (a_weisman_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 07/19/04

Date: 19 Jul 2004 07:45:34 -0700

derdrittemann2003@yahoo.com (derdrittemann) wrote in message news:<f2af2263.0407181039.dee5749@posting.google.com>...

> a_weisman@yahoo.com (A_Weisman) wrote in message news:<e55e6d97.0407180614.75dc8318@posting.google.com>...

>>

>> "No need to get so pissy".

>

> LOL. (Do you think that is "pissy")? Sarcastic, maybe... "pissy", or

> "prissy"? Never.

>

> (Just to clarify a few points here)...

>>

>>> (BTW...I didn't say Nietzsche was a nihilist, either, yet you

>>> proceeded to tell me why I was wrong about that...if you are going to

>>> set up the arguments AND respond to them...well)...

>>

>> "Ok so what DID you mean by "in my view, his works formed a part of a

>> culture that culminated in National Socialism. You really can't

>> divorce them in this way)."

>>

>> "I asked you to clarify. I can't imagine what you mean by that. And I

>> responded by asking if you meant that nietzsche was a nihilist. It is

>> a common (mis)interpretation of Nietzsche and in fact it is THE common

>> reason people associate him with Nazi germany".

>

> (That is not the ONLY reason).

>

> And then you proceeded to tell me that I was wrong about Nietzsche

> being a nihilist...even though I said no such thing.

>

> YOU said it.

>

> Do you realize you do this? You anticipate arguments people are NOT

> making...and then answer them.

> Very frustrating for those who are trying to communicate with you.

>

> Look...analogies to Nazi Germany are somewhat problematic to start

> with. Generally, analogies work when the comparison is to a situation

- > *where there is more or less an understanding, a consensus.*
- >>
- > *"So what did you mean"?*
- >
- > *Does it matter?*
- >
- > *(sigh).*

Yes it matters to me.

- > *Since you asked...it was a general observation that you should not*
- > *get too involved as many academics do...in an isolated defense of the*
- > *authors of the philosophical antecedents of Nazi Germany.*

And I don't consider Nietzsche a philosophical antecedent of Nazi Germany.

- >*The point*
- > *being, is that these views evolved from their authors being immersed*
- > *in a culture that would later become Nazism...and that they were*
- > *expressing viewpoints, undercurrents, philosophies, that were*
- > *"germane"(pun intended) to their experiences in that culture. In the*
- > *classroom, the cultural context is often missing and you look at the*
- > *substance only...in isolation. The anti-Semitism of the Nazi regime,*
- > *for instance, was rampant in Europe, and especially the "German"*
- > *states and Austria from at least the 15th century. Wagner and*
- > *Nietzsche both indirectly experienced this anti-Semitism. Wagner*
- > *espoused it. Nietzsche, as I understand it, was repelled by it...but*
- > *was highly critical of Judaism. (I am using anti-Semitism only as an*
- > *example, here. Personally, I do not believe it was a particularly*
- > *important aspect of the Nazi movement...but it is the one with the*
- > *most "currency" now).*
- >
- > *Specifically, I was remembering the "ubermensch"...(and its*
- > *intentional misinterpretation during WWII)...and NOT any accusation of*
- > *"nihilism". So...you jumped on the wrong dog, there.*

Well the overman or superman concept as expressed by Nietzsche had nothing to do with Aryan purity nor did it serve as a legitimate antecedent of any philosophy espoused by Nazis.

As to his placement in the cultural milieu that eventually became Nazi Germany, well if you check, until the 20th century, most philosophers came from Greece or Rome or later Europe, especially Germany and Austria.

I don't know. Do you reject Platonic thought because of the excesses of the Roman Empire? Do we reject Freud because he was German? Should we reject most of Western philosophy because of the political actions of the countries of origin of philosophers?

Do we reject 20th century philosophy because much of it had its origins in France?

Wow.

Look I don't think it is fair to reject Democracy because of Bush and Rumsfeld and Ashcroft.

Maybe you're right. This isn't worth discussing here. And there seems to be a long way between us here. I'm happy to defend Nietzsche though no matter what cultural milieu he happened to emerge from.

> *I was also trying to avoid a rather pointless and involved digression*
> *into the historical and philosophical underpinnings of Nazism...(while*
> *fascinating to me)...probably has damn little to do with*
> *Lyme.(Steere...on the other hand)? (THAT'S A JOKE,PEOPLE)!!!*

See I don't think most people do think that's a joke. But the problem is that the ones who express a fascist attitude are those who would advocate reporting each other to the state medical board because of a difference of medical opinion and they are on both sides of the LYme debate.

> > *"No it says at item four that "4. the DOCUMENTED or EXPRESSED influence*
> > *of Dr. Steere on other physicians or diagnostic centers."*
>
> *Yes. I did bother, thank you, to read that. What do you think the*
> *words "DOCUMENTED" and "EXPRESSED" mean?*

I think they refer to his ideas. It was made clear at the time that this did not mean or was in any way limited to consultations which would seem to be covered by points 1 and or 2.

You might read it as referring to consultations. And if there was a consultation that would be one thing. But that isn't what the author meant. This resulted in the filing of complaints by people whose doctors read and agreed with Dr Steere.

See the thing is that this actually happened. Talk about putting things in context---there IS a context here.

Numerous complaints were received by the Mass State Medical board. Most of them were from people who never were patients of Steere's and whose doctors never consulted with him and whose blood tests weren't done by him or his lab.

That is what actually happened.

> *My interpretation is that the author (sounds like a lawyer) is looking*
> *for something MORE than just INDIRECT involvement via any scholarly*
> *authorship...looking for, in effect a "consultation".*

The author is not a lawyer. Point 4 did call for complaints based on scholarly authorship. That was how it was meant and how Lymeland acted upon it.

By the way ALL of the complaints against Dr Steere were rejected as lacking merit and foundation.

> > *I'm NOT objecting to items 1-3. It is item 4 that is absurd because it*
> > *basically says that Allen Steere should be disciplined (or a complaint*
> > *made to the disciplinary authorities) because of Steere's ideas.*
>
> *That's YOUR (I believe mistaken) interpretation.*

Sorry my interpretation was how it was meant and acted upon and how most people read it.

> > > *Where does it say anything like that?...*
> >
> > *Dude, look at item 4.*
>
> *I did. "Dude". What do you think is meant by #4, "dude"?*

See above.

> > > *"Well what did you mean by "he is responsible for his ideas and the*
> > *influence of his ideas." And "he intends the influence" etc? I am NOT*
> > *trying to put words in your mouth. I am ASKING you what you do mean"?*
>
> *And I have said it now MULTIPLE, MULTIPLE times...ethically, morally,*
> *spiritually, philosophically responsible for what he says and*
> *does...and writes...and the impact it has...same as anyone else.*

What is meant by "the impact it has." What responsibility does he have for those who misread it? Misapply it? Or just happen to agree with it based on their independent thought? Is he responsible for people agreeing with him?

I'm not picking quibbles here.

This is important I think to how all this mess evolved. I agree with your statement that he has had a big imprint on the thinking about this disease (though I don't know if I'd agree that it is more than in other diseases or at least not all other diseases).

How did it come to be that so many others agree with this guy? At the time that he took credit for discovering Lyme, he was a relatively young guy with not much background or credentials. In fact he ended up getting more credit than his boss (Allan Barbour).

SO why do infectious disease doctors defer to this rheumatologist with a limited view of this infectious disease concentrating on

rheumatologic manifestations? HOW does it come to be that neurologists defer to him when much of the disease becomes neurological? When this is the only known etiology for demyelinating nerve disease? Why do dermatologists not "own" the rash? Why don't ophthalmologists "own" the ocular manifestations?

Why don't these folks read Steere's stuff with a more critical eye and parse his methods his ideas and his conclusions?

I don't get it I really don't.

And though I'm not ready to assign percentages of blame, aren't all of them to blame too? Aren't they agreeing with some bad science and bad logic and bad ideas? Where's the scrutiny? What is going on with Lyme disease?

Is there a RICO conspiracy and Allen is the great godfather of the Lyme mafia?

Seriously.

> *LEGALLY? Not so far as I know...either directly or indirectly. I am,*
> *however, certainly willing to entertain creative ideas in this regard.*

Like RICO conspiracies?

> > > *So far as the document itself goes...seems to me it is a legitimate*
> > > *attempt to notify potential class members...whether you agree or not*
> > > *that it was a good thing to do...seems legit to me.*
> >
> > *"They aren't "potential class members."*
>
> *Yeah...well...I wasn't really intending to use the phrase "potential*
> *class members" as you would when referring to a class action. More in*
> *its everyday sense...I admit it was confusing. Clearly, though, I*
> *understand that this was not an intended class action. (Maybe if you*
> *weren't so goddamned hypercritical I wouldn't have to get so "pissy").*

Well maybe if you didn't insist that I respond ONLY to the literal words written and not what I deem to be the fair implications I wouldn't respond to the words "class action notice" so literally?

See I'm NOT trying to respond to arguments not made. I AM trying to ferret out and explore some of what I think are fair implications of people's statements.

If they're not fair implications, well then people can say that. But sometimes I still disagree and think that people have said something which can be inferred to mean something beyond the statement and it is fair to respond to that. Because too often (and I'm NOT talking about you der) people say things and haven't thought them through especially

the implications of their statements. Or actions.

I know you find it annoying. Sorry. But that is all I'm trying to do, not set up strawmen arguments and knock them down.

> > *"Listen by endorsing this notion there is a whole new area of
> liability
> > > created. Now people aren't responsible for what they have done but
> > > what others do based on offering their opinions not on a specific case
> > > but as a general matter"?*
> > >
> > > *That's nice. Who is saying this?*
> >
> > *"Greatclod".*
>
> *Then address your arguments to the Cod.*

Well this was originally addressed to Clod. Talk about context. Yes this began with me responding to clod. You interjected selecting one sentence out of context to respond to. Well instead of telling you how annoying that was, I tried to respond. I guess that was a mistake. If you refer to the context this originally was about clod saying (paraphrasing here not quoting) that Steere is responsible for PCPs and people in "community medicine" whatever that means, reading only headlines or abstracts and that he is responsible that they don't "ferret out the details" of such materials.

> > > > *"Steere has a right to his opinion. So does Burrascano. The idea that
> > > > either should be disciplined for their opinions alone is something I
> > > > think is not only wrong but many steps down the road to intellectual
> > > > and actual fascism and I oppose it".*
>
> *Would you prefer we oppose him...not on the basis of his
> writings...but on his selection of ties? How he combs (what is left
> of) his hair?*

No. And I didn't say that.

But since you asked, I think that the way to "oppose him" is to respond to his ideas. NOT with insults or personal attacks. But with analysis, critique, studies and data of our own.

Which is not what we've done. We have responded with lots of insults and personal attacks. And threats. Frank.

> *In Steere's case...you should recognize that his works
> are believed by some to be the justification for undertreatment of
> Lyme. Undertreating a disease...is...as I understand it...a potential
> for disciplinary action.*

So? Democracy and freedom are thought by Bush to be the justification for unilateral preemptive democratic imperialism. I don't reject democracy or freedom because of his misinterpretations. Nor do I reject christianity because of his misinterpretation of that.

> *So...perhaps a bit more complex of an issue than your lofty disdainful
> pronouncements make it appear.*

That sounds a little pissy. And takes us right back down the road where you seem and I emphasize the word SEEM meaning APPEAR or at least I am reading what you're saying and the implications of it to mean that you do think he is responsible for what others do based on his scholarly opinion and writings.

And though I think there are substantial reasons to disagree with such a proposition here's one that is less "lofty" but still disdainful.

Demonizing Allen Steere is not an effective response to the power and influence of his ideas to the extent that they are even his.

It is exactly what Lymeland has done and only made ourselves look like fools. Yes we can hurl insults and personal attacks, we can psychoanalyze him (without ever meeting him and without having any training or background for doing so) but how does that refute his ideas?

Not very effectively. Not at all.

Critique his studies. Argue with the conclusions he makes based on the data. Show us where he has erred in methodology, in relying on unreliable tests, on extrapolating results, in his conclusions.

But calling him names? That reflects poorly on us and not on him.

And NO I am not defending him. Or agreeing with him.

As greg points out there are others who are probably much more dangerous in terms of their ideas and the rigidity of their approaches.

> > *"Well thanks. Except that greatclod IS making that argument. He IS
> > saying that PCPs aren't responsible for reading articles only
> > headlines and the headline writer is responsible for their sloth and
> > laziness and doltishness of pcps".*
>
> *I think that Cod is generally correct when he says PCPs don't really
> have the time to become experts on every nuance of Lyme.*

He isn't saying that. He's saying that we can't expect them to read beyond the word "Bullseye" that when the article that they do read says that only 40-60% get a rash and that many don't get a rash or that

the rash has many other presentations and so on that they're not responsible for the rest of that BASIC information. Not nuances but basic facts.

>nd, I also

- > think that Steere is guilty of acts of omission...by over-emphasizing
- > what is known...and under-emphasizing what is unknown and
- > controversial. I think he has been extremely misleading in that
- > regard.

Maybe so. And that might be a valid point. Do you have any SPECIFIC examples? One problem with clod is that he makes grand general pronouncements but doesn't give specific references. So you MIGHT have a point, what examples of such omissions and overemphasis can you point to?

- > > "And please clarify what you DO mean. Without being so pissy".
- >
- > Fine. Please refrain from arguing against what others are NOT
- > saying...and have the courtesy to read what they are actually saying
- > and respond to THAT.

I'll respond to what people are saying AND THE FAIR IMPLICATIONS OF THEIR STATEMENTS.

And generally say what I want. Subject to response. Preferably less pissy ones.

> It's VERY frustrating.

Sorry you're frustrated. Not my intention. But I won't confine myself to being so literal. And when people make grand pronouncements they are subject to far ranging interpretations. If you want to be more specific go ahead and then perhaps it is fair to be more literal in reading what you've said. NOT just you but others too before you take it too personally.