

## Re: In Praise of Lyme Activists

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2004-12/1028.html>

---

*a\_weisman\_at\_yahoo.com*

**Date:** 12/30/04

Date: 30 Dec 2004 09:45:45 -0800

Greatcod wrote:

- > *Compete with what? Everything you and Weisman have contributed of*
- > *value, that wasn't some sort of ad hominum slur, could be put into a*
- > *couple of paragraphs...*

And one would require an electron microscope to examine the contributions that you have made. Other than ingorant self righteous moralizing, what have you EVER contributed?

- > *He is the King of Narcissistic Assholes, and you are the Crown Prince.*

LOL Do you even know what narcissism is? If not, look in the mirror.

- > *His job here is to demean and discourage Lyme Activism,*

It is a real mistake to confuse criticism and critique with demeaning and discouraging.

Just because there are ideas about how to do things differently (better and more succesfully perhaps) doesn't mean that anyone is trying to work against the cause.

See that is one of your (many) main points of confusion.

Critique is a POSITIVE thing.

"Our critics are our friends. They show us our faults." --- Benjamin Franklin

But your insistence on self aggrandizement and self congratulations which are functions of EGO stand in the way of soliciting ideas which might actually help. EGO EGO EGO

You want to hear ONLY what you want to hear. You cannot accept criticism for what its worth. THus you are doomed to repeat mistakes rather than learn. You are doomed to insular thinking, incestous

thinking, and the resulting ideas are born with birth defects.

And YES I am trying to discourage the current form of Lyme activism because it is damaging destructive driven by anger rather than thought, it is unsuccessful and doomed to remain so, it has consistently made things WORSE not better.

So yeah I am AGAINST it.

> *because they,*  
> *especially Kathleen, are getting close to the ugly truth.*

The ugly truth is that Kathleen was (and probably still is) a terribly profoundly mentally ill person whose ideas about RICO conspiracies were off base legally and factually and were born not of knowledge or rational thought but of her mental illness.

ALL OF YOU should be ASHAMED for having encouraged and enabled her.

Your inability to recognize it for what it is, even now, is astounding!

Bottom line: She wasn't honest with you either. And her case wasn't about Lyme. It was about her mental illness. Her children weren't a Lyme cause, she isn't a Lyme martyr. And it isn't clear that her mental illness even had anything to do with Lyme disease if she even had Lyme since she admitted to having been mentally ill for DECADES, since her teens or early 20s.

Doesn't it bother you that she LIED and didn't say her hearing was about criminal charges?

You are a lost cause.

I really think that as much as she needed serious psychiatric help, you do too! Look she was mentally ill and really almost certainly not responsible for her actions. But you? Well you're ignorant and self righteous (a really bad combination, ignorant AND arrogant) but sane enough to be responsible for your actions which amount to cruelty. Kathleen tried to use you but you're trying to use her.

Close to the ugly truth?

That's the ugly truth. The ugly truth is Kathleen's mug shot. It is her psychiatric history. It is the truth of the charges AGAINST her. It is her cruelty towards her children, her attempts to poison them against their father and family members. The ugly truth is that you're a self righteous moron.

> *Seat at the Table, we want a seat at the table. Gee, how profound.*

sci.med.diseases.lyme: Re: In Praise of Lyme Activists

Look I NEVER said "Seat at the table." Personally I think a seat at the table means NOTHING. I think it is an easy way to be coopted, just like we were with our "seats at the table: with the NIH and the Klemperer study.

Thanks again Phyllis!