

Re: In Praise of Lyme Activists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2004-12/1012.html>

From: zipzip (mcpucho_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 12/29/04

Date: 29 Dec 2004 12:02:21 -0800

a_weisman@yahoo.com wrote:

- > *Funny thing in all the time since WNV hit the scene and got so much*
- > *attention, publicity and funding for research, I can't find one*
- single
- > *WNV support group or disease advocacy organization. Not one.*
- >

was just talking about that with my ENT (who is ambiguous on Lyme because of all the uncertainty surrounding it btw)

- >
- > *What bothers me and destroys our credibility is the LymeNUT sort of*
- > *mentality which takes the position that EVERYTHING is Lyme,*

not true... sometimes it's not Lyme but unsubstantiated candida (which can be horrible if you ACTULLY have it) or the ubiquitous mercury toxicity.

- >*that everyone with Lyme requires endless treatment w antibiotics, that*
- LLMDs
- > *can do no wrong and that mainstream doctors are uniformly "ducks" and*
- > *can do no right!*

it's a farfetched hypocripsy. has nothing to do with being a "duck" or LLMD but a smart doctor who takes his hippocratic oath to heart and keeps up on medical research. i mean really how many general doctors read what is printed in journals? i'm sure a low percentage.

it's academia for the most part. and with medical science (as it becomes less medicine in the traditional sense and more science) changing so rapidly it is all the more imperative.

- > *What is amazingly amusing is when they post things wondering how many*
- > *doctors read that cybernuthouse called the FLASH board, always*
- certain
- > *that "the enemy ducks" are surveilling them and wanting to know the*

- > *names of LLMDs and wanting to know their scary secret plans so they can*
- > *plot to defeat them. One time I saw them wonder how many people from*
- > *Harvard were reading the site? LOL*
- >

very scary, and hush hush secret. don't tell oxford insurance!

- > *The place is an intellectual trailer park; their leader is an anonymous*
- > *nutcase, they are a bunch of ill informed extremists and quack remedy*
- > *advocates, and their huggy huggy nonsense is a thin veneer over their*
- > *truly hostile insular extremist moronic mentality.*

97.5% true, it is not a gathering of intellectualism, but a promotion, in the 80th percentile, of sterotypical DSM group–think, but the same could be said for the majority of modern america, if not humans in general.

but for all their ill–informed notions most intentions are good (huggy huggy nonsense). it is an interesting sociological dynamic to say the least. the main problem is the spread of misinformation, mostly based on bad sources and unwarranted personal opinoin.

as for being a "veneer over their truly hostile insular extremist moronic mentality" (excellent articulation btw) it is indicative of any "cult" like behavior. like w. bush said "either your one of us, or your one of them"