

---

Subject: Re: A Lawsuit Against McDonald's That May Actually Make Sense?

Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Thu, 19 Oct 2006 10:55:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why would it be lying if this were true?

Quote:"No scientific research has consistently shown a connection," says Dr. Ami Klin, one of the country's leading autism experts and an associate professor at Yale University's School of Medicine. "It's a popular hypothesis, and something that is circulated among a group of individuals that have a grip on parents as to the importance of those things. But the reviews of that subject have not turned up any solid evidence."

If it's true that there is no real solid evidence, then I'm pretty sure McDonalds doesn't have to say "Well there's no solid evidence to support that such and such foods interacts with autistic folk. If a leading autism expert says that there is no solid evidence to suggest that it does anything bad, then I can't see why McDonalds would be at fault, if they were just listening to a leading autism experts statement.. I may be reading the whole thing wrong, but that's what I get out of it."

---