

Email correspondence from 2007 between myself and Jimbo Wales, founder of Wikipedia, regarding false claims of 'harassment' made there

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jimmy Wales" <jwales@wikia.com>

To: "Angela Kennedy" <angela.kennedy@virgin.net>

Cc: <mgodwin@wikimedia.org>

Sent: Monday, October 22, 2007 6:27 PM

Subject: Re: False allegations of 'harassment' on Wikipedia itself by Guy Chapman

Angela Kennedy wrote:

- > In fact, I have not been advised of any ALLEGED reasons for 'banning',
- > although I was advised that my 'legal threats' (even though I dispute
- > that I even made legal threats) were the reason I was blocked from
- > editing. The reason for the 'ban' have not been made apparent to me.

Under the traditions of Wikipedia which extend back to the beginning, I am entrusted to ban any users who I think are not helpful to the project, for any reason that I deem sufficient. Editing Wikipedia is not a right, it is a privilege, and it is one that, in your case, has been permanently revoked.

I wish you no ill will, but I am unable to countenance any further disruption of our project.

- > While, as the head of your organisation, you are perfectly at liberty to
- > ban me, my right not be libelled and defamed is equal. The reason that
- > this matters is because of potential damage to my good name and
- > reputation in the real world, caused by false allegations or
- > insinuations on Wikipedia, a public domain.

As I have already done, I will endeavor to remove information which is in fact libelous of you, though I have seen nothing of the sort yet. Additionally, I am often willing, strictly as a courtesy, to go further and remove information which may be making you unhappy in some way.

The particular statement you have been concernd with today has been blanked.

Please go in peace.

--Jimbo

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jimmy Wales" <jwales@wikia.com>

To: "Angela Kennedy" <angela.kennedy@virgin.net>

Cc: <mgodwin@wikimedia.org>

Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2007 5:26 PM

Subject: Re: Further defamatory comments by Guy Chapman made today

Angela Kennedy wrote:

- > Regarding the permanent ban: does this extend to my children and my

> children's children?

It extends to anyone acting on your behalf or on behalf of your organization.

--Jimbo

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jimmy Wales" <jwales@wikia.com>

To: "Angela Kennedy" <angela.kennedy@virgin.net>; "Mike Godwin"

<mgodwin@wikimedia.org>; "JzG" <guy.chapman@chapmancentral.co.uk>

Sent: Saturday, October 20, 2007 9:20 PM

Subject: Re: Further defamatory comments by Guy Chapman made today

Angela,

Strictly as a courtesy to you in the interests of resolving this amicably, I have deleted the page in question.

Please know that you, "*****" and everyone associated with you and your organization are permanently banned from editing Wikipedia under any circumstances.

--Jimbo

Angela Kennedy wrote:

>

> Dear Mr Wales,

>

> Further to my email to you this afternoon, Guy Chapman has been making
> further defamatory comments about me, and in the context of a hidden
> process in which I am apparently being discussed in possibly defamatory
> and/or libellous terms.

>

> In posts he has made on MEAgenda's talk page, Guy Chapman has said the
> following:

>

> Sorry, but that's complete nonsense. I have barely touched the
> Wessely article in months, and had never heard of him prior to One
> Click's posting of their blatantly defamatory article way back. *You
> need to draw a distinction between what Angela Kennedy says, and
> what might be regarded as truth by anybody with both feet on the
> ground.* *You know about two thirds of the story, but the other third
> is not going to be discussed openly because it is the subject of
> private communications between certain individuals and the Wikimedia
> Foundation and its representatives.* For the record, I did not
> contact Prof. Wessely about this, he contacted me, and he did so I
> think because he did not want to bother Jimmy. He was very polite
> and stated his case calmly. Up to now, you have also stated your
> case calmly. I hope you'll go back to that. *Guy
> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:JzG>* (Help!
> <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:JzG/help>>) 14:14, 20 October 2007

> (UTC)
>
>
> * Don't get too stressed, please, I'm looking to sort this out. I
> don't think you are the problem. *Since I am one of Angela
> Kennedy's past targets they seem to think I might have some
> influence.* We'll see what can be done; in the mean time do please
> stay calm. Thanks. *Guy
> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:JzG>* (Help!
> <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:JzG/help>>) 14:10, 20 October
> 2007 (UTC)
>
> Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:MEagenda
> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:MEagenda> "
>
>
> Again, Guy Chapman is making defamatory comments that might potentially
> also be considered libellous.
>
> Questions that immediately spring to mind are:
>
> 1. In what context has he ever been a 'target' of 'mine'? I have never
> harassed Guy Chapman in any way. I have had a very few encounters with
> him and others publicly on the Simon Wessely talk page in 2006. That is
> the sum of my direct engagement with him. Indeed, I remind you of your
> undertaking to remove comments made by him and others, against myself
> and Jane Bryant in 2006, from the Simon Wessely talkpage, because of
> their defamatory nature. I do have copies of our correspondence.
>
> 2. His claim that *"You need to draw a distinction between what Angela
> Kennedy says, and what might be regarded as truth by anybody with both
> feet on the ground. "* is an insult implying that I am untruthful as
> well as unreasonable.
>
> 3. I am most worried that there is an apparent secret process by which
> Guy Chapman and others, both within Wikipedia and possibly outside of
> Wikipedia, are potentially discussing me in terms in which Guy Chapman
> can use to bring my name further into disrepute in the way he has done
> above (by casting aspersions on my truthfulness and reasonableness) by
> innuendo: *You need to draw a distinction between what Angela Kennedy
> says, and what might be regarded as truth by anybody with both feet on
> the ground.* *You know about two thirds of the story, but the other third
> is not going to be discussed openly because it is the subject of private
> communications between certain individuals and the Wikimedia Foundation
> and its representatives.*
> * *
> In the circumstances, I must now ask you to provide me an answer to this
> question: what claims are being made about me within correspondence
> between Wikipedia editors, Admins, other "certain individuals" and the
> Wikimedia Foundation and its representatives".
> * *
> While demonstrably libellous and defamatory comments against me are in

> situ in Wikipedia, I reserve the right to pursue action, to ensure my
> good name and reputation is not continued to be brought into disrepute,
> by those publishing on Wikipedia, or elsewhere.

>

> Yours sincerely

>

> Angela Kennedy

A Kennedy

29th September 2013.