Information about One Click

Margaret Williams

13th January 2005

It is clearly pointless to expect reasonable dealings with One Click: it does not matter how rationally people respond to the distortion they publish because One Click's inevitable response is yet more verbal abuse. One Click seems to feed gluttonously on any response and twist it into "venom"; "libel" and "evil behaviour" etc and One Click's rash conclusions, inflammatory assertions and misinterpretation are then broadcast to everyone as gospel.

One Click's behaviour is becoming increasingly preposterous and it is little wonder that those who run One Click have become known as the "terrorist team".

However, in the light of certain implausible and astonishing assertions that are currently emanating from One Click, it seems reasonable to put certain facts on public record.

In relation to the risible concoctions by One Click and its assertions about "sinister implications", "covert surveillance", allegations of breach and violation of Ms Bryant's son's human rights, and of using a child as "collateral damage", here are the simple facts.

The information that her son was much better was provided by Ms Bryant herself.

During two of her many telephone calls, on one occasion when she was speaking from her landline, she herself volunteered the information that her son was playing outside in a park, at which I expressed surprise and pleasure that he was well enough to do so. She stated that thankfully, he was much improved.

In another telephone call, Ms Bryant suddenly said that she had to end the conversation because it was nearing 3.45pm and she had to go and pick up her son from school. Again, I expressed pleasure and surprise that he was well enough to be attending school, to which Ms Bryant replied that her son was very much better.

For the record, the "Hushman" email to Ms Bryant was sent to me by Ms Bryant herself, who confirmed in writing that she was sending it to the "media", from which I understood that she had no wish to keep it private and as far as I was aware, it was already in the public domain.

Thus the source of the information quoted in "One Click Too Far?" was One Click itself but even so, One Click has attempted to construe it as something "sinister", which is absolute nonsense.

It is perhaps relevant that One Click itself confirms that on no less than five occasions, others have expressed doubts about One Click's integrity.