



**THE ONE CLICK GROUP**  
[www.theoneclickgroup.co.uk](http://www.theoneclickgroup.co.uk)  
Email [mail@theoneclickgroup.co.uk](mailto:mail@theoneclickgroup.co.uk)

# Freedom Of Information

## Police Harassment In The Internet Era

### Underbelly Health Politics

Updated March 2010, originally published August 2005

#### FOREWORD



**By Martin J. Walker, Author**

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**



**Updated March 2010, originally published August 2005**

## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION SUPPRESSION**



**One Click Group Director, Jane Bryant**

### **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. From litigation threats to the most brutal free speech suppression tactic.

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's coverage and exposure of the psychiatric lobby collusion of selected ME/CFS charities in the production of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health Guidelines. Frequently used as a licence to print money, charity corruption has been a forever interest of One Click.

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 and a Judicial Review undertaken.



**Jane Colby & the Countess Of Mar**

The arrest architects were Jane Colby of The Young ME Sufferers Trust (TYMES Trust) charity run by Jane Colby and the Countess of Mar, Patron of the MERGE

charity now renamed and trading as ME Research UK run by Vance Spence. 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 wipe One Click from the face of the internet. An avid supporter of this 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.

I would like to thank James Saunders of [Saunders Law Partnership](#) 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 Law Partnership, 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.

**Jane Bryant**  
**The One Click Group**

### **THE ONE CLICK SMEAR CAMPAIGN**

As readers will be aware, over the past four years since One Click as a group began, there have been a number of direct personal campaigns of attack upon One Click representatives. This has taken the concept of 'kill the messenger' to new heights.

Various attempts have been made on a continuous basis to get the One Click website shut down. The perpetrators of these attempts have included Dr Charles Shepherd, Myalgic 'Encephalopathy' Association charity Chair Christine Llewellyn (now deceased), previous AfME charity Chief Executive Chris Clark, psychologist Dr Ellen Goudsmit and AfME affiliates Colin Barton and Joe Marsh.

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 hate mail campaign has been waged against both Jane Bryant and Angela Kennedy by an anonymous poison pen hate mail hush mail account user, who has become known as 'HUSHMAN'. Evidence has shown that this anonymous hate mail campaign has been supported by Dr Charles Shepherd of the Myalgic 'Encephalopathy' Association charity.

A number of false claims have been made that the Technical director of One Click, Ben Bryant, a child sufferer diagnosed with ME/CFS who has now tested positive for Borreliosis, a chronic spirochaetal bacterial infection, has recovered from the illness. Would that this were indeed the case. These false claims breach a child's privacy and Human Rights. Ben has done his very best to assist global health advocacy with his technical expertise down these years, frequently compromising his health and well being to do it. These false and vicious allegations were made by Kate Stewart (pseudonym Margaret Williams) and the anonymous hate mailer 'HUSHMAN' to attempt to damage the political standing of Ben's Mother.

Psychologist Dr Ellen Goudsmit, close colleague of Dr Charles Shepherd whose links with the 'Wessely School' are notorious, attempted to take legal action for 'defamation' against One Click, while at the same time making what we consider to be false and defamatory allegations against both Jane Bryant and Angela Kennedy on the internet and in correspondence to third parties.

Vivienne Parry of the PRIME Project whose links with [Wessely and the Science Media Centre](#) are self evident, made a number of [unsubstantiated and defamatory claims](#) about One Click in a [PRIME meeting](#), the minutes of which were publicly reported at the instigation of Parry and her PRIME Cohorts. The Countess of Mar has been a dedicated supporter of the psychosocial PRIME Project.

Colin Barton has, with the assistance of the Co-Cure internet list, placed a post inciting others to attempt to make allegations about One Click to a government agency. Both Colin Barton and Joe Marsh have published Jane Bryant's home address on the internet. The actions by these men resulted in police intervention.

The above represents merely a small sample of what Jane Bryant, Angela Kennedy and their children have endured simply and purely because Bryant set up the One Click pressure group, published evidenced material and placed it in the public domain.

Since 2004, the One Click Group has been subjected to further ordeals at the hands of certain factions engaged in filthy politics.

Ellen Goudsmit, Psychologist, set in train the actions that resulted in the police battering at Jane Bryant's front door in April 2005, the police brutality towards her family, persecution and false arrest that followed.

### **ELLEN GOUDSMIT, PSYCHOLOGIST**

On September 6th, 2004, Dr Ellen Goudsmit sent an email to Jane Colby, Director of the TYMES Trust national ME/CFS children's charity using the official charity email address to do it in which Goudsmit accused Jane Bryant – the Mother of an ME/CFS labelled child whom she has never met or spoken to – of mental instability, that her child was at risk, that Bryant was on medication and that Social Services should be alerted. Goudsmit stated the following verbatim:



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 diagnosed children at the hands of Social Services, Colby let the family down extremely and dangerously badly.

The actions of Colby and her charity that had the power to so severely damage one of her child members during these events 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. One Click has files full of information in regard to Colby's attitude towards the psychiatrists, her views on Dr Charles Shepherd, Jill Moss and Mary Jane Willows of the AYME children's charity and others. This information provided by Colby includes the mysterious financial fracas that Colby maintains ensued during the set up of the AYME charity by the previous Chief Executive, Jill Moss.

This lack of protection for a TYMES Trust member, an ME/CFS child, is appalling, considering the protective function that TYMES Trust includes 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. Sadly, 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.** 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.
- 2.** The fact that no therapeutic relationship existed between Jane Bryant, her son and Ellen Goudsmit (they have never met nor spoken) makes Goudsmit's actions even MORE inappropriate: Jane Bryant was, in effect, being remotely, speculatively psycho-analysed by Dr Goudsmit, who was expressing a 'professional' opinion about someone 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 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.
- 3.** Goudsmit's actions are similar to the remote speculative psycho-analysing carried out by Dr David Southall, for which he was disciplined by the General Medical Council.

Jane Bryant has recently written to the British Psychological Society, pointing out the discrepancies in their deliberations. She will be seeking further redress. In a political context where it is a sad and well known fact that many children diagnosed with ME/CFS are forcibly and inappropriately removed from loving and protective parents as a result of continued inappropriate speculative psychoanalysing, this email from Goudsmit forms a scandalous episode in the continuing history of ME/CFS politics.

## **POLICE RAID AND ARREST**

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.

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.

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."

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. 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. 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. DCI Smith, a senior police officer, brazenly lied to Bryant and her solicitor as the evidence from the Crown Prosecution Service shows. On the 30<sup>th</sup> 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**

James Saunders, Senior Partner of [Saunders Law Partnership](#), 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

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.

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 March 2010)**