

21st May 2005

Ellen's Discrepancies..... again.

Stephen Ralph

Hello there,

Having read Margaret Williams' "Rebuttal of misinformation about the London criteria"...

http://www.meactionuk.org.uk/Rebuttal_of_misinformation_about_the_London_criteria.htm

...does anyone know if Ellen Goudsmit has been asked to explain how people are supposed to know what she wants us to believe?

In the same post on 19th May 2005, on the one hand Ellen accepts that Margaret Williams is right about the Costa et al paper that was published in The Quarterly Journal of Medicine in 1995 and accepts that Costa et al cite the "ME Action" criteria as being those suggested by Dr Weir and that they make no mention of any "London" criteria (thereby acknowledging that there is a published reference to the "ME Action" criteria that does **not** relate to the "London" criteria), but just a few lines further on in the very same post, she says the complete opposite, saying "there is no single reference in any publication anywhere in the known universe which has referred to the ME Action criteria as being separate from the London criteria".

And then on 17th May 2005 on the e-group cfs-research, Ellen wrote that when the CMO's report stated that the London criteria were based on a definition by Ramsay and Dowsett in 1990, the report was right, yet just two days later, on 19th May 2005, Ellen wrote the exact opposite, saying that the CMO's report listed the date of the London criteria as 1990, which was incorrect and she had alerted people to this so-called error.

And it is Ellen who claims the moral high ground over Margaret Williams and Doris Jones, accusing **them** of basing their arguments on erroneous information, asking piously on 19th May 2005: "Is that the best they can do?" and commenting "No wonder we're in such a mess".

Something is certainly wrong somewhere and it's not difficult to see exactly where.

Sincere regards,

Stephen.

http://www.meactionuk.org.uk/Further_Articles.htm