

Re: In Praise of Lyme Activists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2004-12/1029.html>

a_weisman_at_yahoo.com

Date: 12/30/04

Date: 30 Dec 2004 10:02:45 -0800

GregGerber@hotmail.com wrote:

> *derdrittemann2003@yahoo.com* wrote:

> > *Why antagonize people with this sort of thing?*

>

>

> *This is the problem in a nutshell –and not just in this limited vein*

> *vis a vis reds and blues. Look, Weisman, you do have interesting*

points

> *but you paint things with too broad a brush and leave out the grays.*

> *You take things that happened and build your case without a nod to*

the

> *evidence against it, as if you are a high school debate team*

president

> *trying to score a point instead of a seeker of all the truth. Even as*

> *you strive to deliver a complex argument you continually oversimplify*

> *by presenting only part of the evidence ––the part that supports your*

> *argument–– while leaving out the rest.*

Well as you've said more than once, it IS Usenet and one can only go into so much subtlety and nuance in usenet postings.

Listen greg, rather than the grand critiques of my critiques, why not be specific, as you are below? You're trying to paint with a broad brush here, and, well, suffice it to say that I don't share or acknowledge the validity of the above.

> *For instance regarding Phyllis, she protested strongly and vociferously*

> *to the Klempner results in the end.*

Where and when? At the risk of "Cluttering the newsgroup" show us.

Because if I had heard of her doing it, I wouldn't have said that she didn't.

I would simply have said that she signed off on it in the first place and that it was obvious with foresight not just hindsight that the

study SUCKED and was DESIGNED to screw us. But that is one thing and believe me it isn't just with hindsight that I criticize the study. MANY of us criticized it at the time.

Rita Stanley talked about that in a recent post, how our criticisms were dismissed as they typically are, which is one of my points about Lyme "leaders" and the fact that they don't accept input suggestions critique or criticism, they act unilaterally but purportedly on behalf of us all and anyone who disagrees is shunned and attacked and dismissed and silenced.

Except here where there is no censor!

But I would NOT have criticized her for not speaking out later if I knew that she had.

The fact that I don't know she did, says something about just how "loudly" she spoke out.

> *She was a tremendous aggravation to
> NIH when the reality of what went down hit her --it just took awhile,
> it was a learning curve, something Phyllis has spoken about with
great
> honesty and humility.*

Did she speak out PUBLICLY?

And what do you mean by "she was a tremendous aggravation to the NIH..."

What does that mean?

I doubt they really cared. Particularly if she never went public.

Who cares when a phyllis falls in the NIH and no one is there to hear it?

> *Anyone who notes that Phyllis did not speak out
> in the beginning of the Klemperer committee must acknowledge that she
> spoke out very loudly at the end.*

If anyone knew about it. I sure didn't.

And if no one knew then how can you say she spoke out "loudly"?

You'll have to be specific here greg because I have no idea what you're talking about.

It isn't a case of only presenting some evidence but ignoring the rest.

It is a case of not having any idea that there was anything else.

And I doubt anyone else did either despite your protestations about Phyllis' LOUD protestations.

If it happened only with the NIH, then HOW COULD I OR ANYONE ELSE KNOW ABOUT IT?

Show me a post made publicly, a letter to the editor of the NEJM, a protest that her name was used by Klempner, that SHE WAS GIVEN CREDIT FOR HELPING HIM, show me the protests by Phyllis.

- > *It is unfair and misleading to focus*
- > *on the beginning of her service without mentioning the end --and to*
- > *lead people unaware of the situation to conclude Phyllis went along*
- > *when in fact she became one of the most outspoken critics we have as*
- > *time went on.*

Where? When? To whom? In what forum? In What context?

Listen a lot of us have bashed the klempner study. If phyllis has been one of them, she ain't alone. But I haven't heard a peep.

And I resent the accusation that I am trying to be deliberately misleading.

If Phyllis did protest, well she deserves some credit for that. But it doesn't excuse signing off on it in the first place OR her pollyanish spin and lies on so many other topics including most recently the history of the ascension of "the pat" at LDA JERSEY!

- > *You cannot get at the truth if you leave out the part of the reality*
- > *that undercuts your thesis --this kind of arguing undercuts*
- credibility*
- > *and alienates those who would agree with you if you were only more*
- > *nuanced.*

But if I don't and didn't know then THIS is the unfair criticism greg.

- > *People who make mistakes have often also done good --those who were*
- too*
- > *trusting wise up.*

IF they learn from their mistakes but I see absolutely not one shred of evidence that they have in any instance but I see lots of evidence that they repeat the same mistakes.

- > *But but you rarely make a concession to the changes*
- > *people go through, or the upside of their service, or their*
- victories.*

Well greg they do plenty of self congratulating and self aggrandizing and patting themselves on the back and claiming credit while accepting

no blame so it isn't necessary for anyone else to do so.

- > *It is all about good and bad to you, and you see no in between. It is*
- > *all black and white to you, and the real aspect --the gray or the*
- > *"purple" of the situation and the individual and the event-- gets*
- lost
- > *in what often sounds like rhetoric.*
- >
- > GG

GRAY GRAY GRAY I see it greg, thanks for pointing it out!

Now the real issue is that what you say isn't accurate. What is true is that they make mistakes, repeat them, don't listen to others, don't accept welcome or tolerate critique, act insularly with secrecy and unilaterally while claiming to represent others.

It ain't "rhetoric" it is the TRUTH.

And by the way what is wrong with "rhetoric"

Main Entry: rhet-o-ric

Pronunciation: 're-t&-rik

Function: noun

Etymology: Middle English rethorik, from Middle French rethorique, from Latin rhetorica, from Greek rhEtorikE, literally, art of oratory, from feminine of rhEtorikos of an orator, from rhEtOr orator, rhetorician, from eirein to say, speak –more at WORD

Date: 14th century

1 : the art of speaking or writing effectively: as a : the study of principles and rules of composition formulated by critics of ancient times b : the study of writing or speaking as a means of communication or persuasion

2 a : skill in the effective use of speech b : a type or mode of language or speech; also : insincere or grandiloquent language

3 : verbal communication : DISCOURSE

Pronunciation Key

© 2001 by Merriam–Webster, Incorporated

Merriam–Webster Privacy Policy