

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

## Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2005-04/msg00276.html>

---

- *From:* "a\_weisman@xxxxxxxx" <a\_weisman@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 6 Apr 2005 11:47:00 -0700
- 

Frank de Groot wrote:

- > <a\_weisman@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
- > [news:1112804411.470453.279650@xx](mailto:news:1112804411.470453.279650@xx)
- >
- >> Not criminal in the legal sense. Criminal as in amoral. Not criminal as
- >> in violating any criminal statute.
- >
- > When an insurer tells a test manufacturer to make their tests less reliable
- > (less sensitive) "or else", isn't that racketeering?

No that isn't racketeering. Look it up. As you say STFW google.

- >> What do the test manufacturers get out of it?
- >
- > Continued orders from the insurers.
- > They are at gunpoint.

Sure frank. Insurance companies are holding test manufacturers at gunpoint.

Sure thing.

How do you spell PARANOID?

- > But the insurers don't choose the labs, the doctors do (with some
- >> exceptions but usually it is the doctor who chooses a lab if the
- >> insurer requires them to but not a particular lab).
- >
- > There are only a handful of test manufacturers for all those labs.

And that is part of the conspiracy?

- > I had a 3-hour phonecall with a german lab worker who told me that their WB
- > was deliberately made much less sensitive.

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

Well gee frank. I feel sorry for the german lab worker. I guess with proof like that you can take your case to court. Maybe you'll be lucky enough to drawn Judge KathLOON DickINSANE? And win your case.

> Noone ever gave a reason, but they did admit it, only after questioning.

Whatever frank.

>> Lyme testing is unreliable from all labs.

>

> That's exactly my point.

No. Your point was that KathLOON was right and this was RICO. Check the message I was responding to. THE one that YOU wrote. You said it is criminal and is racketeering and is RICO and that KathLOON freshly ensconced right back in the psychiatric ward of the prison is right.

Go plead your case to her.

> Those tests are \*deliberately\* inaccurate.

See you're not even making as good a point as KathLOON. Her point is that the STANDARD FOR INTERPRETATION was the fraud. And though it isn't legally a fraud, it pretty much is scientifically. So is the two step testing method. Of course, it is as far from there to being a RICO case as the earth is from Pluto. Or alpha centauri.

>> It isn't a conspiracy that the tests suck. Some things are hard to test

>> for accurately.

>

> Bullshit.

Now THAT'S a persuasive argument! Let me respond: bullshit to the infinity power plus 1. So I have out-persuaded you and won the argument.

> I tested positive. Then I needed to be re-tested. Negative.

Oh well with proof like that you might even win in front of Judge Lisa!

Did you ever consider that there are many reasons for such results? The antibody response varies over time? With treatment? That there is and always has been great variability in test results, results aren't easily reproduced? Both inter and intra laboratory variability?

Serologic tests for Lyme disease. Interlaboratory variability [see comments]

<http://www2.lymenet.org/domino/abstract.nsf/8c703fae46ce57c28525670a0009ab7e/7265a8f7aa0a5ad5852565030005>

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

Title: Serologic tests for Lyme disease. Interlaboratory variability  
[see comments]

Authors: Luger SW, Krauss E

Source: Arch Intern Med 1990 Apr;150(4):761-3

Organization: Department of Pathology, University of Medicine and  
Dentistry of New Jersey, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School,  
Piscataway.

Abstract:

The serologic test for the detection of antibodies to *Borrelia burgdorferi* is the most frequently used laboratory method for the diagnosis of Lyme disease. However, the insensitivity of the assays and the interlaboratory variability are frequent problems. To determine the extent of this variability, one aliquot of serum from each of nine patients with a history of Lyme disease was sent to nine reference laboratories, including national, university, state, and local hospital laboratories. A second aliquot of the original serum was submitted 2 weeks later. Wide variability among laboratories was observed, ranging from a university laboratory that detected antibody to *B burgdorferi* (IgG or IgM) in 18 of 18 specimens, to a state laboratory that detected antibody in only 8 of 18 specimens. Detection of IgM specific antibodies showed similar variability (range, 2 to 10 of 18). There were eight instances of a fourfold or greater change in titer between the aliquots sent 2 weeks apart, although only three of these were an increase in titer. These results indicate the need for standardization of the assays and the availability of national reference material. It is recommended that the results of serologic testing should not be relied on as the sole criteria in making the diagnosis of Lyme disease.

Keywords:

Antibodies, Bacterial, ANALYSIS, *Borrelia burgdorferi*, IMMUNOLOGY, Comparative Study, Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay, STANDARDS, Fluorescent Antibody Technique, STANDARDS, Human, Laboratories, STANDARDS, Lyme Disease, DIAGNOSIS, Reproducibility of Results, Support, Non-U.S. Gov't

Language: Eng

Unique ID: 90225915

- > The lab technician didn't trust it and decided to "develop" the WB longer.
- > Presto, positive.

And your point is? How does that prove racketeering and RICO (which requires more than a single act of racketeering FYI).

- > She called the manufacturer, who told her: "We decreased the sensitivity of the development fluid".

Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?

Whatever.

---

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: eugeneshapiroisapig

- **References:**

- ◆ **suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Frank de Groot
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: a\_weisman@xxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: a\_weisman@xxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Greatcod
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: eugeneshapiroisapig
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: a\_weisman@xxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Martijn
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Frank de Groot
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: a\_weisman@xxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**  
◇ From: Frank de Groot

- Prev by Date: **Re: Pathogen inactivation technology: cleansing the blood supply.**

- Next by Date: **Re: killer doctor**

- Previous by thread: **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**

- Next by thread: **Re: suck out pathogens with a mini-pump?**

- Index(es):

- ◆ **Date**

- ◆ **Thread**