

The Gilfoyle case

- [Post a comment](#)
- [Recommend \(1\)](#)
- [Print](#)
- [Email](#)
- [Share](#)

•

- [Follow stories about](#)
- [Letters to the Editor](#)
- [Opinion](#)

[What's this](#)

December 24 2010 12:01AM

Should there not be a swifter method of amending matters when experts admit their error?

Sir, With regard to the release of Eddie Gilfoyle and the gagging order, I feel that there should be wider debate on suicide notes and the expert study of such documents, and also, perhaps another look at the functioning of the parole system ("[Gilfoyle is silenced as price of freedom](#)", Dec 23).

I say this because in February 2008 Professor David Canter admitted that he was wrong in considering Paula Gilfoyle's note as being a fabrication. Given that juries are naturally swayed by expert evidence and that the guilty are swiftly taken down, should there not be a swifter method of amending matters when experts admit their error?

After all, in the case of suicide, the classic specialist on the subject, Emile Durkheim, admitted that finding a common denominator in suicidal situations is minimal.

Personally, I feel that in matters of forensic linguistics, there should be a consensus from a panel of experts in all cases.

Stephen Wade
Lincoln