

ENTRY DATE: 2 February 2012:

No decision as yet by Judge Moloney. Meanwhile, at a further recent Milton Keynes court hearing in relation to Mr. McGrath's house, the court dismissed Nationwide's application to evict and it will not now be contingent on the outcome of the libel case, which news comes as an enormous relief for Mr. McGrath's family. The court understood only too well the financial impact the libel has had already. Importantly, the heavy-lifting in the libel case has been done (it is a decidedly vague, inchoate law, but we have done all we can to navigate through it) and the business we trust will now get back on track. It has taken more than a year out of the business plans for this company, but the enormity of the case against such formidable forces required our full attention. Of course, we must still devote time, finances and effort to it but the difficulty has been getting on top of so much contradictory legal precedent and law in general - it is vast - but that important phase is largely complete.

Given the number of weeks since the two-day strike out hearing called by defendants, and the number of issues involved, we anticipate so many areas of dispute that an Appeal is most likely, either from the claimants or defendants. We shall see. In any event, this company will now press on regardless with company plans. There's an awful lot of work to be done to repair the damage we have undoubtedly suffered, in one of the most difficult global business environments ever experienced.

We thank all those who have shown their support to date.

ENTRY DATE: 26 January 2012:

Day 76. Still no formal decision from Judge Moloney in what was billed by Defendants Amazon, Dawkins and Jones as a simple strike-out application on a claim that supposedly had no merit. The greatest libel lawyers in the country, a whole two days in court and now 76 days! This is quite extraordinary.

In the meantime, the satirical parody character Scrooby (@scroobytweets - aka Chris McGrath) satirised Vaughan Jones and his Libel Reform supporters Simon Singh, David Allen Green (Jack of Kent), and The Independent reporter Jerome Taylor, on Twitter.

Satirical criticism of their support for BNP supporter Vaughan Jones and their joint support for Libel Reform resulted in such clear hypocrisy it is worth recording: Libel Reform purports to protect free speech (when in reality it will strip the ordinary citizen and small companies of protection from lies, as both *Jameel* and *Kaschke* libel precedents invoked by lawyers in this strike-out application aim to do); and yet the humorous satirical criticism on Twitter, by a writer and artist, was shut down with a harassment threat! The faux liberal credentials were instantly exposed. What liberal attacks an artist's social critique with police involvement? The Libel Reform movement is out of control.

Chris McGrath was, however, immediately able to serve a truly legitimate harassment warning via the police on Mr. Vaughan Jones - more has gone on behind the scenes than we have the space to say - and it is hoped that further libellous and mendacious attacks on Chris McGrath will now cease. We intend to prosecute to the full extent of the law if this is not the case.

We also give notice to anyone or any newspaper that any further misrepresentation of the facts in this case will result in legal action. We say 'newspaper' because of course distortions were reported by both The Independent and The Daily Telegraph which recklessly misled the public in suggesting this libel claim was over a book review when they know full well that libel can only be entertained by a court when character and reputation have been impugned. Book reviews don't come into it.

Newspapers do not like Libel laws. [The Leveson Inquiry](#) is revealing the extent of newspapers' illiberal, immoral and even criminal credentials (phone hacking), even while they pose as liberals protecting free speech. Libel laws prevent newspapers from printing lies and distortions and so they are a hindrance. This is why both the The Daily Telegraph and The Independent seized the opportunity to present this case as ill-conceived and an example of bad U.K. libel laws, instantly sympathising with Vaughan Jones by reference to his family and inability to afford to represent himself - never mind his lies or the cost to reputation and character and the financial destruction faced by the claimants should they lose. Why was it not instantly reported that Chris McGrath is a family man with two children who also could not afford representation (at £350 per hour)? It is important that people see why newspapers take the slant they do on this most important of subjects - for without your reputation and character you are in trouble in society. This stuff matters.

U.K. newspapers want the freedom to tear people's lives apart without legal consequence -- Collateral damage in the pursuit of free speech! Jerome Taylor from The Independent appears to be in lock-step with the vanguard of this movement - on Twitter at least - to assist Libel Reform, which will benefit the newspapers immeasurably, to the detriment of us all. The bottom line in all this is that your rights are under attack, they truly are, and while you might not think you or your small company will ever be libelled, you never know and you should resist LibelReform.org in whatever way you can. Cyber bullies are behind it, it would seem. And they have the temerity to claim people reaching for libel law protection are the bullies (!), which is such a crass and bogus claim it's laughable. The disturbing truth is that Libelreform.org offers little more than a charter for liars, plain and simple. It aims to licence newspapers and bloggers with the freedom to trash the reputations of anyone they feel like. The only bulwark they cite is if malice is behind the attack, and as we are experiencing in this case against an obvious BNP supporter steeped in malice, that is easier said than presented to the courts.

One key question is this: should newspapers' and others' claims to Libel Reform's virtues - being free to challenge hypocrisy in public life, to challenge the rich, the powerful, the dangerous, the dictatorial, etc (we [understand the issues](#)) - be trusted when in return for their freedom the rest of us ordinary citizens and small companies suffer the consequences of such damaging lies without legal protection? Why are newspapers chasing oligarchs' lies and politicians' lies and so on more important than the millions of us who would remain unprotected were the current libel laws diluted further? *We* count more than newspapers. It is our freedom to be protected from libellous attack that matters more than press-freedom to challenge the rich and powerful. We, the people, come first - not newspapers, whose credibility is now in tatters in any case, mid-Leveson.

And in that mid-Leveson climate, one might ask what would there be to stop

newspapers from further distorting this case, for instance, to serve their own agendas, if we had the US system underpinned by [New York Times V Sullivan](#), which cements the First Amendment's law that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press"? There would be nothing to stop them, because it would be for those who are lied about to prove 'actual malice' on the part of the newspaper. That gives newspapers frightening power, which they seek to protect by reference to freedom of speech. It is the power to say: we can say what we like about you and you really have no realistic platform to challenge us. That's truly terrifying. And to hand that kind of power to newspapers in this country while the Leveson Inquiry has revealed what newspapers are really about? It doesn't bear thinking about.

Placing the burden on the claimant to prove 'actual malice' is a horrendous burden. The Americans' love of freedom of speech is admirable, but it is not so admirable when that freedom is handed to the powerful press without proper protections for the public. Our own experience has already proved onerous in dealing with the issue of malice even before the case is heard at trial, if it ever gets there, and it really is hard enough in the current legal climate to prosecute this case. But imagine the topsy-turvy world dreamt up by LibelReform.org in which the claimant must first prove their own case against an accomplished liar!

Surely only a fascist could peddle the idea that you get to lie about someone and make them prove the contrary. It is therefore a decidedly Orwellian future planned at LibelReform.org, and we aim to resist it. It is not free speech that is under attack but our fundamental human rights - in this case, the right to a fair trial and to not be lied about, and certainly not lied about with such malicious intent. What's worse is, there is no Legal Aid for libel cases, so you either have the money or you go it alone. We think LibelReform.org attacks the ordinary citizens and small companies of this country who are being threatened with open-season on the truth, with no help to defend themselves and a disgraceful attack on their character and reputation if they try to do so.

Libelreform.org therefore must not make it into the next or any Queen's speech. It is, counter-intuitively - since it springs from self-proclaimed liberals - a most illiberal movement. Libel Reform is *Illiberal* Reform and must be stopped, because it is surely illiberal to allow others to trample on the characters and reputations of others while offering next to no chance of countering those lies. It does have the feel of Nineteen Eighty-Four about it, it really does - an attack on the individual in preference for some supposed greater social good, as if the law of libel itself is a thought crime! -- Terrifying.

Margaret Thatcher once said: "[society? There is no such thing!](#)" and it was understood that she meant personal, selfish drives were what mattered. The Liberal wing behind LibelReform appear to take the opposite view: there is no such thing as the individual, only society matters. But Libel Reform seeks, it seems, to obliterate the individual, just as Nineteen Eighty-Four saw the individual obliterated in service to the state.

The middle ground is what counts. Society is individuals working for themselves, their neighbours, their community in an ever widening sphere of influence to create society and it works from the bottom up. When we allow it to work from the top

down, when we say society comes first and society is controlled by the state, and individuals are secondary to that, then we sleep-walk into a Nineteen Eighty-Four fascist state (perhaps first passing through an equally odious Socialist/Communist one - both equally anti-individual in preference for the state). That's the true legacy of Libelreform.org if it is allowed to happen and so we oppose it, vehemently. That they are prepared to back someone in Vaughan Jones with his views above should tell you all you need to know about what's really going on at Libelreform.org - it is a potential menace to us all. We urge you to raise it with your MP to oppose it root and branch.

Meanwhile, we still await the decision of the judge.

ENTRY DATE: 15 January 2012:

It has been 65 days since the two-day strike-out hearing in which Amazon, Richard Dawkins, The Richard Dawkins Foundation for Reason & Science and Vaughan Jones applied to have this case dismissed on the grounds that there is no case to answer -- 65 days and still there is no judgement, on a claim that supposedly has no merit. Clearly a nonsensical application, given the time that has elapsed, but it may yet win the day, such is the power of Amazon and Richard Dawkins, and such is the explosive nature of the pernicious ideology at the heart of this case.

The complication, of course, is twofold: in the two-day hearing, the Judge agreed with the claimants that in his view libel had indeed been committed and that it was absurd to suggest otherwise - so that this is a case of a clear libel, that much is established. Whether all the many words complained of were capable of bearing defamatory meaning would be further explored by the Judge once the hearing had ended. Also, whether Libel law provided sufficient protection for this company would be further deliberated upon; and, was it possible that Amazon, Richard Dawkins and his company could somehow be absolved in this case? These were all questions to consider. But there was no doubt that Chris McGrath was right to bring the case in the first place: he was libelled and that was that -- and yet, 65 days later and we remain no further forward. We now think something of a major scandal is at the heart of this case and we have had those 65 days in which to consider the merits of a public interest disclosure of all that has transpired - every document, every letter, every email.

From April to November 2011, Vaughan Jones continued to attack and libel the claimants without a single public response from the claimants themselves, and in that time so much damage has been caused and the libels themselves are in fact still in existence around the web that there seems no way of containing the issue or resolving it. A post-graduate supporter of the British National Party bent on lies and deceptions on something of an industrial scale, with the help and support of his fellow Far-Right supporters, is a nigh-on impossible attack to counter. The court has taken so long while this continues that its effectiveness is already deeply disappointing.

We, for our part, have highlighted on this page Vaughan Jones' support for the BNP in direct response to the continuing use of Chris McGrath's children by name - and the name of their school - around the web. Had Vaughan Jones not named them in his initial defamatory attack (for which, in open court, Judge Moloney called him

'nasty') and then deceitfully blogged about the case from April to November - inveigling such high profile names as Simon Singh and lawyer and blogger David Allen Green to support him - their names would not have come into it again, but they have and for that we name Vaughan Jones alongside all those who further continue to attack Chris McGrath in this way. Libel is one thing: sinister use of children is quite another.

The second complication is this very matter, that the claimants revealed in open court that Vaughan Jones was a supporter of the British National Party (which itself supports the hideous Ku Klux Klan goal of 'racial purity'). It would seem this second complication is all-important, for there can surely be no doubt that Amazon and Richard Dawkins have no desire to be associated with this odious value-system. It is surprising then that both sides stepped in to take control of the case against Vaughan Jones, who was kept silent in court, no doubt to avoid any catastrophic slip! Yet protect him they did. And they had the benefit of months of correspondence that showed them just how pernicious and damaging Mr. Vaughan Jones' values are, including his support for the BNP (which they naturally attempted to deny in court against all the evidence).

Their joint support in court for Vaughan Jones - with barristers for both sides speaking as one in defence of his actions -remains a most troublesome detail for their case, because not only was Vaughan Jones exposed as a supporter of the BNP, he was exposed as having lied to the court itself, and all defendants had used his testimony in support of their applications. As we maintained in court, the solicitors firms responsible, in knowing the character of Vaughan Jones prior to the hearing, recklessly colluded with Vaughan Jones in allowing the possibility of lies to be presented to the court: the odds were that he *would* lie and still they used him in defence of their own applications in which he *did* lie. The solicitors firms responsible will of course be reported to the Solicitors Regulation Authority, since this breaches their code of conduct. And all this at a time when we have the Leveson Inquiry and the Stephen Lawrence judgement, with racism, national character, conduct and moral probity under the spotlight. The whiff of scandal is unmistakable.

But Libel law appears to be so constructed as to be capable of withstanding even this disturbing set of circumstances. Having spent many months reviewing Libel law and its implementation, we find it is a standard tactic now, it seems, to make such a strike-out application as has been made here, in which the courts are first asked to weigh up the *importance* of the claimants before considering whether any of this matters at all: are they rich, famous or powerful enough to matter? And then the court is invited to weigh this consideration against the cost of a public trial, even if a libel has been committed, as here. Had we known that our relative insignificance mattered in Libel we should have been obliged to the courts had they let us know in advance of the cost of making the application!

That such a tactic is available to the rich, the famous and the powerful in defence of the rich, the famous and powerful - especially when fascism and racism swirls around a case - is troubling in the extreme and regardless of the outcome in this case, Chris McGrath will be seeking a full review of that ability to threaten ordinary citizens and small companies of this country with such an obvious abuse of their civil rights, if not their human rights -- and companies can indeed be libelled; whether they also have Human Rights remains to be seen. A company is a 'legal person' in law

and the Human Rights Act defends 'anyone', not necessarily merely any human. A company is a 'legal person' - one of the 'Rights' conferred upon it by 'Humans' - and so arguably it may also be regarded as a 'one' within the definition of 'anyone' in the 'Human Rights Act', so that small companies - indeed any company - across the U.K. should have a keen interest in the outcome of this claim (we suspect this may go to Appeal whether we win or the other side wins, such are the manifold complexities at its heart).

While Chris McGrath is capable of fighting his corner, even against such formidable opposition - we would not be 65 days beyond a two day strike-out hearing on a supposedly meritless case if this were not true - others, we know, will not be so fortunate, and it is they too who must now be protected against some of the most egregious abuses of power and influence currently in progress. Even if we win, and certainly if we lose, something is wrong at the heart of Libel law.

In the current application by the defendants, presented to the court in the November hearing, the standard wording used is shockingly pejorative: it's called 'an abuse of process' if it can be shown that someone is not rich, famous or powerful enough to warrant the cost of a public trial. That in itself is scandalous. An 'abuse' in this context would tend to suggest that the abuser is the claimant; in reality it means the abuse is against the public purse, but this distinction is lost in the emotive language used. 'Abuse' is quite the wrong word in a libel case, since the abuse is in the libel itself, not in the application to defend oneself, and nor is it a word the defendants face at any stage. But 'abuse of process' is the wording used in a strike-out application against ordinary citizens and small companies who seek to defend their good name and character, despite Libel law being framed by Parliament to protect reputation and character and rightly placing the onus on those who destroy or damage to prove their case.

The claimant is automatically right, upon Libel application, and the defendants are automatically wrong. That's the law, and it's the morally correct position, we think. Libel in the U.K. tackles lies against an individual or company. Those lies can also be aggravated by malice. In the U.K., the person suing is assumed to be in the right from the outset and it is for the defendant to establish any truth, if there is any, or claim fair comment, if any can be claimed, which is made difficult if not impossible if there is malice in the libel. LibelReform.org want to change that, so the burden of proof is on the claimant. While that may seem fair at first glance, we think it would be a disaster. Imagine having been attacked and lied about to such a pernicious degree by a malicious supporter of the British National Party and to then have to prove *them* wrong! It would be an unfair burden on an innocent victim of an attack.

For those who have claimed free speech is at stake, this is patent nonsense: free speech is not a licence to lie about companies and people to the detriment of their character and reputation, and certainly not to lie with malicious intent. If we go down that road, individual identity, character and reputation become impossible to protect and then become worthless, and only the state remains. The only society where that becomes true is, we think, in a Fascist state or a Communist state, both of which this country has fought against to its heavy cost. It is vital that Libel law remains robust in defence of character and reputation, but also that there should be no route for the rich, the powerful or famous defendants in such cases to circumvent the law by arguing claimants are not rich, powerful or famous enough to warrant

public money being spent on a trial, which merely signals that their civil and human rights are somehow of lesser importance. We do not want two-tiered justice in the U.K. This simply cannot be right in a Parliamentary democracy and we shall fight to ensure that no one faces this type of strike-out application again that strikes at the heart of the ordinary British citizen.

One final point: in court, arrayed against Chris McGrath, who acted for himself and the company, was a formidable team of solicitors and barristers, and in the gallery were, we now discover, a team of supporters of Mr. Vaughan Jones with equally pernicious Far-Right values who have taken it upon themselves to lie and misrepresent the proceedings to further libel the Claimants, such is the destructive malice in play. We have now reached a point where there are so many lies to tackle it is not possible to achieve an effective outcome without fully exposing all parties to the full glare of the truth of each and every step of proceedings. We simply cannot allow the power and might of Amazon and Richard Dawkins to ride roughshod over civil rights, especially when at the centre of the attack is such a deeply damaging system of values, such as is represented by a supporter of the BNP.

For those interested, we intend to create an archive of the claim at LibelReform.com in due course, fully documenting every twist and turn in the legal case for legal practitioners, students and legal historians and, of course, for the benefit of anyone who may be caught up in future in such a deeply destructive process against some of the most formidable liars in the country and some of the most powerful forces in the world.

In the case Chris McGrath is prosecuting against Nike, Inc., it is a matter of public record in the United States that an agent of Nike, Inc. now faces possible imprisonment for bringing lies into a civil court - we wonder if it is not also time to consider that same sanction in the United Kingdom.

ENTRY DATE: 12 December 2011

In a last minute reprieve, at 10:15 am this morning the Milton Keynes County Court recognised that the cost burden of the Libel case is entirely responsible for Mr. McGrath's current mortgage difficulties and that it would be unjust to evict Mr. McGrath and his family before the High Court Libel hearing decision is determined. Mr. McGrath and his family will therefore not face eviction tomorrow as expected.

We await the decision of the High Court.

ENTRY DATE: 1 December 2011

Satirist and Managing Director Chris McGrath and his wife and two children have lost their £300,000 house to Nationwide after failing to keep up with mortgage payments while tackling Amazon, Richard Dawkins & his charity and militant-atheist and fascist sympathiser, Vaughan Jones, in a costly libel case at the High Court in London. The family will be evicted and made homeless on 13 December 2011 while the case continues.

Chris McGrath wrote a satirical parody of conspiracy theories and the religion-versus-science debate under the pen-name 'Scrooby' while suspecting he may have had a terminal

illness, adding mocked-up, over-the-top press releases and favourable reviews in a dual parody of the deceits of the publishing world. He and his company came under attack on Amazon's website in September 2010 by Mr. Jones who later 'dragged' Chris McGrath and this company, McG Productions Ltd, to Richard Dawkins' website to be further attacked, a website Chris McGrath had never used. The book itself, [The Attempted Murder of God: Hidden Science You Really Need To Know](#), which reveals itself to be a parody written by Chris McGrath, had not been read or bought by Mr. Jones who simply 'ripped' into Chris McGrath's character and company with a series of reckless lies, driven by pure religious hatred and malice.

Chris McGrath and his family have been devastated by the attack and the subsequent court case, but both Mr. McGrath and this company acknowledge the debt this country owes to those who fought fascism in War II. The defence of his and this company's reputation and character against a militant-atheist sympathiser with fascism's truly frightening and despicable beliefs will continue, as it will continue against the publishers of that attack. A malicious, libellous attack borne of such destructive beliefs goes far beyond anything anyone or any company should have to endure.

We await the decision of the Judge following the Defendants' strike-out hearing of 10th/11th November 2011. As yet there is no decision as to how this case is to proceed, such is the complexity of the issues involved.

ENTRY DATES 17-20th November & 1.12.11:

Please turn to page 7: <http://edition.pagesuite-professional.co.uk/Launch.aspx?referral=mypagesuite&refresh=g19DR7x00E6p&PBID=f9677f4f-8c67-44df-a39a-0c673b8e69c3> - The truth behind this case will eventually be known and as a first step we are grateful to local reporter Sophie Scott for accurately reporting that the libel case is not due to a book review, but to a personal attack on Chris McGrath and an attack on this company.

We will add that one only has to look [here](#) (search 'vjohn82' - warning: explicit/adult content, then [here](#) to see the saved document) to begin to see what we have been struggling to deal with behind the scenes for the past 14 months, unable to say anything in our own defence while awaiting the recent hearing, while still coming under attack across the internet by a most vicious faction of society, one steeped in fascism. And this link shows just the tip of the iceberg, one that Vaughan Jones from Nuneaton has been busy trying to delete, as fast as we remind him of his horrendous system of values.

"And people wonder why we turn to the BNP"
Vaughan Jones, Nuneaton, 2008.

Well we do wonder, Mr. Jones. This country's grandfathers and great-grandfathers and grandmothers and great-grandmothers fought against fascism and millions died in the fight. Many other countries fought this scourge too. We are here today because of their sacrifice and this not-so-secret belief system is as repellent as it is possible to get; it is one that dishonours so many people.

Vaughan Jones is a man who championed free speech to gather support over recent months and conned Libel Reform into thinking his cause was just, but who it seems may now be looking to get an injunction to stop his true beliefs coming out! He is a man who lied to so many people, knowing we would not comment before the hearing, in which he hoped our case would be instantly struck out (it wasn't); he is a man so busy recently parading his left wing, Soviet-style '[comrade](#)' credentials to evade the mounting case behind the scenes that he forgot to delete his true fascist credentials that are only too plain. He has been too prolific in his hate to keep up with his subterfuge.

He claims Jewish descent -- again to try to evade the fascist charge, for how could one possibly be a fascist and a Jew? That's his reasoning that he hopes will hoodwink yet more people. He simply dishonours the millions who died at the hands of that repellent ideology and one only has to look [here](#) to see how fascism in this country has attempted to drive a wedge between Islam and the West by cynically marshalling a recruitment drive among the Jewish community (who have surely suffered enough in history). Some, it seems, fell victim to that fascist ruse for which we are paying a heavy price, despite Chris McGrath not being political or especially religious (though he is happy to acknowledge his firm belief in God): we wrote and published a satirical parody of religion versus science and of the marketing deceits surrounding the publishing industry and as a consequence we suffered a truly repugnant and vicious attack from a truly militant atheist steeped in fascist ideology.

We say this now even while we await the outcome of the judge's decision because we are now focussed on protecting Chris McGrath's children, who were - and whose school was - callously named by that faction in an attempt to intimidate and frighten the Claimants and Chris McGrath's family. Well, we are indeed frightened, but a quite different reaction to one that might have been expected from that faction will result from us.

Bringing innocent children into this was an unforgivable mistake.

ENTRY DATE: 30 November 2011

We await the Judge's decision on the libel hearing of 10th/11th November and meanwhile express our gratitude to the Thames Valley Police for their swift response to the evolving situation detailed below.

ENTRY DATE: 21 November 2011

It has been confirmed by the court that 28 November 2011 will be the earliest possible date before *all* the case papers have been given due consideration, such is the complexity of the case.

ENTRY DATE: 20 November 2011 & 1.12.11:

The Fourth Defendant ([@vaughanjones82](#) on Twitter) finds and deletes [another post, this time exposing his aggressive anti-immigrant sympathies](#) (deleted in the last couple of days but saved [here](#) for when the Google cache expires) - he wrote so many far-right posts he is unable to find them all. We did find them all and have copied them all for the court (search 'vjohn82'; warning: explicit/adult content). The context is all important and his sympathies are unmistakable:

Vaughan Jones says,

"If white people are becoming a minority in some boroughs of London why are there no support groups to tackle their issues? Double standards. Protect the interests of the immigrant population and f**k the indigenous."

We added the asterisks.

And recall:

"And people wonder why we turn to the BNP"

Vaughan Jones, Nuneaton, 2008.

We are under no illusion as to who this man is and what he represents. We gathered the evidence before he could delete it all and this is just the tip of the iceberg.

And we repeat: we have said nothing publicly before the recent hearing, but we say this now even while we await the outcome of the judge's decision because we are now focussed on protecting Chris McGrath's children, who were - and whose school was - callously named in an attempt to intimidate and frighten the Claimants and Chris McGrath's family. Well, we are indeed frightened, but a quite different reaction to one that might have been expected from that faction will result from us.

Bringing innocent children into this was an unforgivable mistake.

ENTRY DATE 17.11.11:

Having refused to remove the names of the children and school as requested and having broken the confidentiality of our letter to him, we reproduce the whole letter we sent to Dave Lambert, owner of MinistryOfTruth.me.uk, [here](#), so that everyone can see just who it is that we're talking about --

Vaughan Jones, Dave Lambert, Gottfrid Svartholm, your callous disregard for innocent children says it all.