
THE ONE CLICK GROUP
www.theoneclickgroup.co.uk
Email mail@theoneclickgroup.co.uk

Freedom Of Information

Police Harassment In The Internet Era

Underbelly Health Politics

Updated February 2008

CONTENTS

Foreword by Martin J. Walker
Introduction
The One Click Smear Campaign
Dr Ellen Goudsmit and The TYMES Trust Charity
Police Raid and Arrest
Legal Comment
Conclusion

FOREWORD

By Martin J. Walker, Award Winning Investigative Writer

Following the publication in 1993 of my book [*Dirty Medicine*](#), which was mainly about the newly emerged Campaign Against Health Fraud, I was subjected to a series of dirty tricks, lawyers' letters and biased newspaper references to my work. Of course, when I reported these to anyone or tried to convince people of the veracity of my case, it was often seen as an extension of either my conspiracy theories or my more personal paranoia.

Fifteen years on, with the war against Iraq, with thousands of deaths caused by pharmaceutical drugs, with such scandals as the gathering number of children taken into care by social services for the flimsiest of reasons and with the campaign by vested interests to force through GM crops in Britain, it is possible that we are all somewhat wiser about the nature of conspiracies. You would not have to be politically naïve, however, to be shocked and surprised by the case of Jane Bryant and The One Click Group. It involves the psychiatric community, undoubtedly one of the most powerful networks in the contemporary developed world, pharmaceutical company agents, including one in particular who has spent the past decade harassing activists and professionals committed to alternative health, and, more unusually, it involves the police.

I well remember the years of investigation into the Metropolitan Police, the drug squad, the porn squad and then the robbery squad. There was always a sense during those enquiries that the truth would emerge and that, on a broader level, new regulations and codes of practice would evolve which would combat such institutional corruption. In a similar way, more recently, revelations of the

corruption of pharmaceutical companies and the science of corporate organisations have generated awareness in society of conflicts of interests, which should lead to change.

The one real difference between then and now, however, is that *then* the government were willing to listen and the media invariably enjoyed playing an investigative role, while *now* the government is deeply complicit in spin, and sadly investigative journalism is a dying art.

What has been happening within the world of ME for at least 20 years is worthy of investigation at the highest level, ending in a Royal Commission or a Judicial Inquiry. It involves the creation of fake illness categories in order to hide a massive number of seriously ill patients; the infiltration of voluntary sector patient groups by pharmaceutical and insurance agents; the abuse of social research methods, particularly epidemiology; lies, propaganda, media spin and stealthy misinformation campaigns against activists.

With the case of Jane Bryant and Angela Kennedy, and the arrival of four heavily-protected police officers on Bryant's doorstep one morning in April 2005, the covert nature of this conspiracy changed. For the first time, the State showed its hand clearly in what had up until then been an argument within the ME community.

Jane Bryant was charged with 'harassment', ironically under a law introduced to protect lone women from stalkers. With the law being used to *aid* stalkers and with the State and the NHS prosecuting, the battle to do away with dissent in the ME community has revealed itself as public policy. And when Jane was told by a senior police officer that, while she might not have broken any laws by campaigning for people with ME, she should have 'moderated her language', we know that we have stumbled into the contemporary equivalent of 1984.

Martin Walker
August 2005
[Slingshot Publications](#)

Updated February 2008

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION SUPPRESSION

INTRODUCTION

The ability of the internet to publish raw news and information that respective governments and powerful organisations would far rather be kept hidden has been one of its greatest assets since the inception of the worldwide web.

As but one example, recently subject to great confrontation has been [Wikileaks](#), an organisation devoted to disclosing confidential information. Founded by dissidents in China and journalists, mathematicians and computer specialists in the United States, Taiwan, Europe, Australia and South Africa, the Wikileaks goal

is to develop an uncensorable source for untraceable mass document leaking and analysis. Wikileaks could in time become a great, free and far speedier asset than the Freedom of Information Act.

In February 2008, a permanent injunction was placed on Wikileaks website's front door by the courts who do not understand how domain systems work and how quickly Web Communities can move to counter actions that they see as the suppression of free speech online. Shut the front door of an information website by permanent injunction and a series of back door mirror sites immediately materialise with their URLs (website addresses), streamed around the world in nano seconds by their supporters courtesy of the internet.

Another far more sinister form of suppression of free speech than the courts is the deployment of the police, used to arrest on spurious charges those who speak out on the internet. In China, Du Daobin was arrested for publishing articles critical of the government. In South Korea, a student was arrested for writing satire and poking fun at politicians. In Egypt, internet arrests are legion.

It would be a grave mistake, however, to believe that free speech police harassment and false arrest only occurs in countries notorious for their repressive human rights regimes. This happens in Britain too and far more often than you might think.

In the early hours of the morning on 26 April 2005, four heavily protected police officers crashed through my front door waving an arrest warrant with the object of closing the One Click health advocacy pressure group down for good. Many attempts had been made to shut down One Click. This police brutality was simply the culmination of a sustained campaign that has been ongoing since The One Click Group website was launched on 22 May 2004.

Having gained forced entry to my home, the police proceeded to threaten the forcible and immediate removal of my very ill son from my care into that of Social Services unless I signed a consent form under extreme duress for them to seize the One Click main computer.

What finally triggered my arrest was the One Click exposure of the psychiatric lobby collusion of selected ME/CFS charities in the production of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health Guidelines.

Published in December 2004, the [RCPCH Guidelines](#) have provided the template for psychiatric abuse of children labelled with ME/CFS and are in fact far worse than the CFS/ME NICE Guidelines published in August 2007 over which so much dissent has been expressed.

The specific ME/CFS charities in question who spearheaded my arrest and the persecution of my son with the objective of closing One Click down for good were The Young ME Sufferers Trust (TYMES Trust) charity run by Jane Colby and the MERGE charity now renamed and trading as ME Research UK run by Vance Spence. Spence got his Patron the Countess of Mar to do his dirty work. The conjoined forces of the Palace of Westminster police and those in my part of London were devolved by these people in a dedicated attempt to wreck our lives and to wipe One Click from the face of the internet. An avid supporter of this filthy debacle was Dr Charles Shepherd, Medical Adviser to the Myalgic 'Encephalopathy' Association charity and the pharmaceutical industry rep mentioned in the foreword by Martin J Walker.

Read how myself, Angela Kennedy and our children sustained a harassment campaign of many years duration resulting in police harassment, false arrest and the persecution of my child simply because One Click published evidenced information highly discomfiting for the psychiatric lobby and the pharmaceutical industry - two of the most powerful and deadly forces operating in the world today.

I would like to thank James Saunders of [Saunders Solicitors LLP](#) and his staff for their invaluable assistance down these many years starting in 2004. For their sound counsel and for the most perspicacious advice that they have provided to One Click throughout and for the firm's sterling assistance in dealing with the police, the Crown Prosecution Service and the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Without Saunders Solicitors LLP, it is doubtful that One Click would have survived this ordeal.

Things have moved on apace since those dark days in 2005. In 2008, One Click has readers/contributors from over 100 countries around the world. We have greatly widened our advocacy remit to include:

- * Biodefence and Biosecurity
- * Links between governments and the pharmaceutical industry
- * Government agencies such as the CDC, Georgia, USA, NICE UK et al
- * Secrecy of the UK Family Courts
- * Charities' malfeasance exposure
- * Iatrogenic death
- * Vaccine Politics
- * Medical research
- * Health trials, including miscarriages of justice
- * Prions and Prion diseases
- * Controversial illness

We not only break the news these days, we also make it. What was done to myself and my child in 2005 informs the way that the pressure group operates today.

These things build. The police action begins on page 8.

Jane Bryant
The One Click Group

THE ONE CLICK SMEAR CAMPAIGN

As readers will be aware, down the years since the One Click health advocacy pressure group began, there have been a number of direct personal campaigns of attack upon One Click representatives culminating in police action to get the website shut down.

To summarise briefly:

Destructive and vicious campaigns of personal denigration of the people who run One Click have taken place. These have included (but are not limited to) claims, both direct and in the form of innuendo of mental instability, secret agents for the psychiatric lobby, unfit mothers, terrorists and comparable to Al-Qaeda and the far right fascist group, the British National Party. Perpetrators of these claims

include the Myalgic 'Encephalopathy' Association charity/pharma rep Dr Charles Shepherd, Kate Stewart – (a woman operating under the Margaret Williams pseudonym), Stephen Ralph, Doris Jones, and various others.

ME/CFS charity/pharma rep Dr Charles Shepherd mounted a concerted and persistent effort to get Angela Kennedy sacked from her position as University Lecturer, making a number of allegations that turned out to be false.

An anonymous worldwide hate mail campaign has been waged against One Click by an anonymiser account user operating under the pseudonym of 'Hushman'. Collusion of the ME/CFS charities is evident in this hate mail campaign.

Jane Bryant's child, the website's Technical Director, has been subjected to vicious allegations, particularly from Kate Stewart/Margaret Williams who recently shot to prominence in the entirely manipulative and disgraceful role that she played in the fated [Gibson 'Inquiry'](#) on ME/CFS.

Vivienne Parry, the rent-a-mouth promoter of the psychiatric paradigm PRIME Project made it her life's work to smear One Click, so much energy did she devote to this issue on behalf of her paymasters, GUS (Great Universal Stores). ^[2, 3, 4, 5]

The litany of misdeeds performed in an attempt to suppress the evidence published on The One Click Group website is a truly horrendous catalogue.

The most serious attack that began against the One Click internet site in 2004 was the attempt by Dr Ellen Goudsmit, member of the British Psychological Society, who sought to invoke the authorities and get One Click Group Director Jane Bryant's child removed from her care.

Goudsmit subsequently changed tack and attempted to take legal action for 'defamation' against One Click; an effort that immediately foundered on the sword of truth. It is hard to take defamatory action against an organisation when what has been published about Goudsmit and her activities is perfectly true.

We introduce this suppression of freedom of information evidence-laden account with Goudsmit's actions that culminated in the type of police brutality more frequently found in China and Tibet, et al.

MISS ELLEN GOUDSMIT AND THE TYMES TRUST CHARITY

Deploying psychological warfare tactics and as a member of the British Psychological Society, one Dr Ellen Goudsmit elected to try to shut down the One Click health advocacy pressure group by mounting an action in an attempt to destroy a child, the group's young Technical Director. Suffering under the ill-health label of ME/CFS and Borreliosis since the age of ten with severe Mitochondrial Dysfunction, Goudsmit perceived that mounting an attack on a very ill vulnerable child could very well have a catastrophic effect on the group's ability to publish evidenced information and place it in the public domain.

Under the guise of concern for the child, on 6 September 2004 Dr Goudsmit sent an email to Jane Colby, Director of the TYMES Trust national ME/CFS children's charity using the official charity email address. In this vicious and entirely irrational email Goudsmit accused Jane Bryant of mental instability, that her child was at risk, that Bryant was on psychotropic medication and that Social Services should be alerted to protect the child. Goudsmit requested that the charity

Readers should note that TYMES Trust took legal advice from a barrister to get Goudsmit's identity removed from the [Goudsmit_email](#), whilst leaving that of Jane Bryant and her son extant. [7]

The TYMES Trust took these allegations seriously at the time and an investigation was made by the Board of Trustees.

With absolutely no evidence to hand – Goudsmit had never met or spoken to either Bryant or her child but was attempting to pull off the David Southall/Roy Meadow trick of entirely speculative remote psychoanalysis in her claim – the TYMES Trust charity found that there was obviously absolutely no case to answer.

However, instead of writing to Goudsmit to inform her accordingly and advising Goudsmit that if she had proof of such serious allegations, she should contact Social Services herself and provide the evidence, Jane Colby simply did nothing to protect either Jane Bryant or her son. She did not respond to Goudsmit in any way. Under the current climate of what is so frequently done to ME/CFS labelled children at the hands of Social Services, Colby purposefully let the family down extremely and dangerously.

The actions of Colby and her charity that had the power to so severely damage a child came as a particularly nasty surprise because Colby knew the Bryant family very well indeed. During the past few years, Bryant had done a great deal of work to assist Colby's charity in both the areas of the charity's strategic direction and publicly promoted persona. Bryant had been personally responsible for gaining a considerable amount of media coverage nationwide for this charity at Colby's behest. Colby had absolutely no excuse to behave as she did. Bryant had been conned, as had thousands of ME/CFS labelled patients in Britain.

This lack of protection for an ME/CFS labelled child TYMES Trust member was appalling, considering the protective function that TYMES Trust included as part of its remit. We still do not know how Goudsmit then interfaced with Social Services.

A complaint was made to the British Psychological Society about Goudsmit's actions. In its notorious and publicly discredited style, The British Psychological Society decided that as Goudsmit was not in a 'client/psychologist relationship', she could not be guilty of breaching client confidentiality, even though:

- 1.** Dr Goudsmit attempted to wreck a family's life by invoking and involving the authorities and by performing remote psychoanalysis of people unknown to her, inventing vicious and defamatory allegations.
- 2.** The TYMES Trust DID take Dr Goudsmit's allegations seriously and an investigation was made, therefore Dr Goudsmit's actions DID place both Jane Bryant and her son at risk of inappropriate intervention.
- 3.** Dr Goudsmit was expressing a 'professional' opinion about someone unknown to her without their consent. Indeed, as is clear from the contents of the email, Goudsmit was using allegations and innuendo about Jane Bryant's psychological health in the same context as her comments made to discredit Jane Bryant's actions as a known political and health advocacy adversary. It should be noted from the email contents that AT NO TIME does Goudsmit indicate in ANY WAY that this is not a personal, as opposed to professional, opinion. Goudsmit signs her email to TYMES Trust in her professional capacity as a psychologist.

Jane Bryant wrote to the British Psychological Society pointing out the discrepancies in their deliberations. In a political context where it is a sad and well known fact that many children labelled with ME/CFS are forcibly and inappropriately removed from loving and protective parents, this email from Goudsmit forms a scandalous episode in the continuing history of ME/CFS politics.

Goudsmit's activities set the scene for what was to come. In a subsequent attempt to get the One Click Group website shut down, Goudsmit tried to sue One Click for defamation. Her case never got past the first letter stage and everything published about this woman and her activities remain published on the website to this day.

POLICE RAID AND ARREST

[The MERGE charity has recently been renamed and is now currently trading under the title of ME Research UK. This is the title that will be used throughout this document].

In the early hours of the morning on the 26th April 2005, four police officers wearing bullet proof vests barrelled through the front door of Jane Bryant and her son's home waving an arrest warrant and attempted to drag her immediately down to the local police station. They [terrified Bryant and her son](#) (contemporaneous notes of the event).

They then forced her to sign a consent form under duress for the seizure and removal of her computer by threatening her with removal of her son by Social Services if she refused. They seized One Click's main computer and kept it for a number of weeks. During this incident police officers also attempted to bulldoze their way into the bathroom where her very ill son was having a wash, forcing him out. ^[8]

The next day Jane Bryant was arrested at Southall Police Station, her fingerprints and DNA taken and she was subjected to a police interrogation at her local police station. She was also set bail.

Bryant was arrested under the Harassment Act purely for publishing evidence and placing it in the public domain on The One Click Group website. The Harassment Act in Britain was designed to prevent physical stalking, not the prevention of the publication of evidenced material. During Jane Bryant's arrest and interrogation the police officer in charge of the case, one DS Bunkall, stated that the police recognised that using the Harassment Act in this way "was treading a very fine line." Indeed.

Angela Kennedy, a One Click co-worker at that time, was informed by the officer in charge of the case that she also was to be arrested. At no stage was Kennedy informed by the police precisely what the charges were against her. The police messed Kennedy around for several weeks, threatening arrest throughout. In the event, Kennedy's arrest never materialised.

As a direct result of the above police actions, the children of both women suffered severe illness relapse and both were absolutely traumatised by these events, as had been intended.

The above police action against two Mothers and their very ill children was instigated by a disparate, motley and secretive group spearheaded by Jane Colby

of the TYMES Trust (ironically, a charity for Child ME/CFS sufferers) who approached the Southall police and the [Countess of Mar](#), acting as Patron of the

ME Research UK (MERGE) who approached the Special Operations police service for the Palace of Westminster police (SO17). Mar was advised by SO17 that there was no criminal case to answer by One Click. ^[9] Unlike the Palace of Westminster police, the Southall police nonetheless continued with their actions.

As is clear from the documentary evidence in One Click and its solicitor's possession, both complaints were instigated as a result of the devastating, legitimate criticisms of both the ME Research UK and the TYMES Trust charities with regard to their collusion with the psychiatric lobby in the production of the damaging [RCPCH Guidelines](#). [The Vance Spence/MERGE correspondence](#) is particularly damning. ^[10, 11, 12, 13] Published in December 2004, the RCPCH Guidelines have provided the template for psychiatric abuse of children labelled with the ME/CFS diagnosis and are in fact far worse than the CFS/ME NICE Guidelines published in August 2007 over which so much dissent has been expressed.

One Click was informed by the police that others were involved in initiating the police action against the group, but these have never materialised. We know that Dr Charles Shepherd was fully aware of the police action against One Click because he referred to it in his copious emails penned.

We have since found out from the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) that the police did not consult them before taking action against Jane Bryant and Angela Kennedy, that the allegations made by Colby and Mar et al did not pass the evidential test and that there was no case to answer. In fact, the police did not consult the CPS until May 17th, the day they informed both Bryant and Kennedy that there was no case to answer. Furthermore, it has subsequently materialised that the CPS was never even made aware by the police of Angela Kennedy and any allegations against her.

Unbelievably, Jane Bryant and her solicitors were both telephoned by Detective Chief Inspector Smith, Head of the Southall CID and told on 9th June 2005 that the case was being 'reopened' because the complainants were unhappy with the outcome. The Crown Prosecution Service later confirmed as per the [CPS Fax](#) that the reopening of the case was completely untrue. ^[14] DCI Smith, a senior police officer, brazenly lied to Bryant and her solicitor as the evidence from the Crown Prosecution Service shows. On the 30th June, Smith telephoned Bryant again and during this conversation of which a tape recording was made, he personally threatened her.

It is not only repressive human rights regimes that use the police to attempt to suppress the most legitimate information being published on the internet. This is what happens in Britain today when going up against two of the most powerful groups in the world – the psychiatric and pharmaceutical industries.

LEGAL COMMENT

James Saunders, Senior Partner of [Saunders Solicitors LLP](#), said: "Having the Crown Prosecution Service available to advise the police at the earliest stages of an inquiry has been put in place and it is indeed strange that the police would not take advantage of this in the circumstances of this case. The object is to make what the police do apposite and here they have raided Jane Bryant's home, caused immense distress to the family and it turns out that it was all a mistake

since as the Crown Prosecution Service has stated, no crime had been committed. Had the police followed the correct procedure, they could have saved their time,

public money and saved Jane Bryant, Angela Kennedy and their sick children from considerable distress. One must wonder why the police elected to behave in the way that they did."

CONCLUSION

This story is about the use of undue influence and the persecution of two women and their children by the authorities and others with no just or reasonable cause. Although Jane Colby of the TYMES Trust charity and the Countess of Mar of the ME Research UK charity were the two named proponents in the police harassment, the buttons pressed and the strings pulled in this obscenity run far deeper and wider than this.

It is of importance to remember that these acts against One Click were taken with the pure objective of suppressing the evidence continuously published on the group's website, no other.

That the well-being of two children has also been placed at such grave risk by the behaviour of representatives of organisations claiming to have their best interests at heart compounds the horrific implications.

In countries with repressive human rights regimes, the police are frequently used to brutalise internet publishers into submission. This was done to two women and their children in Britain in 2005.

**The One Click Group
August 2005
(Updated February 2008)**

REFERENCES

1. The Stephen Ralph/Kevin Short Correspondence
<http://tinyurl.com/7zsar>
2. PRIME STARTS A SMEAR CAMPAIGN
<http://tinyurl.com/86cr5>
3. THE SCIENCE MEDIA CENTRE – PARRY and SIMON WESSELY
<http://tinyurl.com/9s37b>
4. THE PRIME MINUTES
<http://tinyurl.com/7seoh>
5. A considerable selection of additional PRIME material is to be found on The One Click Group website at <http://tinyurl.com/8u35c>
6. THE SHEPHERD ABUSE FILE
<http://tinyurl.com/cx77w>
7. THE GOUDSMIT EMAIL
<http://tinyurl.com/ca9vs>

8. THE POLICE ARREST

<http://tinyurl.com/cde2h>

9. THE COUNTESS OF MAR, THE ME RESEARCH UK CHARITY AND THE PALACE OF WESTMINSTER POLICE

<http://tinyurl.com/abvdp>

10. THE BRITISH CHARITIES EXPOSED – RCPCH GUIDELINES

<http://tinyurl.com/7cy42>

11. ME RESEARCH UK-RCPCH SPENCE-BRYANT CORRESPONDENCE

<http://tinyurl.com/7qkzj>

12. THE RCPCH GUIDELINES AND THE CHILD CHARITIES' CONDUCT

<http://tinyurl.com/9xoh8>

13. EVIDENCE OF ME RESEARCH COLLUSION WITH THE RCPCH

<http://tinyurl.com/8j52o>

14. CROWN PROSECTUION SERVICE FAX

<http://tinyurl.com/9h4m6>