

Re: Urgent notice on Congressional letter

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2005-01/0794.html>

derdrittemann2003_at_yahoo.com

Date: 01/15/05

Date: 15 Jan 2005 13:03:51 -0800

A.W.:

(I am having trouble again replying to specific points...as I am not being allowed the option of editing text)...

Two thoughts:

Yes, if I understand correctly, the PCR positive issue is important to me, at least, NOT because of any substantive impact it may have had (or not)...but for what it may suggest about the "state of mind" of the study designers...

...and I think that it is entirely possible, if not probable...that this really shows clearly how the study was setup to demonstrate "autoimmunity", exactly.

BUT...having said that, I think you have to keep in mind that this is entirely conceivable within the framework of "academic bias"...and is not an indication of any "fraud" or deliberately deceptive conduct...and that it is critical to keep those concepts separate.(At least without very, VERY specific "proof"..."smoking gun" stuff).

In other words, separate out the PCRs because they are actually carrying active infection...whereas we "know" that the others are autoimmune cases...and inclusion will simply lead to erroneous and misleading results...there may be no intent to consciously deceive...and I personally doubt it...HIGHLY. (I also doubt that any attempts to pursue this through FOIA will lead exactly nowhere).

Also: I would urge everyone to consider that although the LDF language was NOT a "law"...if handled properly, followed-up on through Committee hearings...the failure of NIH to follow Congressional directives could, in theory, have some impact.The problem was, as you point out...in claiming an inordinately enthusiastic interpretation of what had been "achieved"...AND...in NOT following up properly.

I also, am learning quite a bit here, but only as to "what is wrong with this picture". Not really interested in the "blame game",

Re: Urgent notice on Congressional letter

here...but some of that is inseparable and the active participants haven't exactly helped themselves, here. And...you have to ask yourself...yes, hindsight is 20/20...but were these outcomes "forseeable" at the time...and I would suggest that, yes, some of the consequences were surely anticipated by some.

I also will be interested to see what Greg is talking about...but I would suggest that if it is this difficult to retrieve...uhhh...? You have to have some degree of "notice".

(ALSO: I am not enjoying the new format, as you seem to be...I, for instance, saw something the other day...imbedded in one of these quotations...about Brorson saying that cystic forms would NOT respond to PCR...and that seemed interesting in light of what we are considering...

...and now...where in the hell did that go? Can't bleeping find it...)

I can see fine after the damn thing is posted...with browser set high as Frank suggested...but the composition size print sucks donkeys.