

First of all *The Bogside Artists* have not and will not apologize to Rowling for what they have said. The Derry News had to, and did, much to their eternal shame. To understand the following "apology" to appease J.K. Rowling's lawyers you have to accept that the Derry News believed they were facing ruin if they did not comply. Shocking! The text of the actual apology is here reproduced in full (*in italics*) as it was printed in Dec/2008 and possibly dictated to them by Schillings.

Text in red is our commentary on the text of the 'apology' to "put the record straight".

"Last Monday's front and third page article, 'Harry Potter and the Bogside Artists' suggested that author JK Rowling's lawyers had complained to the Bogside Artists about a book called 'Travels with Li Po'. We accept that this is not true.

Well, wasn't exactly Rowling's lawyers per se. It was **Neil Blair** lawyer to Rowling's literary agency known as Christopher Little's ('discoverer' of Rowling) who was clearly acting on Rowling's behalf.

We have been asked to point out by Ms Rowling's lawyers that William Kelly of the Bogside Artists had alleged in a letter that this book had been plagiarised by Ms Rowling in her Harry Potter novels. So very true.... on both counts!

*Ms Rowling's literary agency wrote to Mr. Kelly refuting his claims and warning him that alleging that Ms Rowling had copied his work was defamatory and potentially actionable, and that he should desist from making such allegations. What they mean by "**Ms Rowling's literary agency**" (*how clever!*) is **Neil Blair** a lawyer and partner of the agency who was referred to in the Lexicon trial by Rowling herself as "MY LAWYER". **He** wrote to us. We have Mr. Blair's letter in front of us marked Private and Confidential with a suggestion that a copy be given to our lawyer as if that would somehow legitimize the nonsense it contained. Mr. Kelly has not desisted and will not be gagged by Mr. Blair or a legion of the same. Is Blair like his partner Little also avoiding scrutiny? Why didn't Schillings name him in this 'apology'?*

Ms Rowling's lawyers say that no complaint has been made about his book and Ms Rowling has never read Mr. Kelly's work, let alone plagiarised it.

A complete lie of course as William knows full well she read his 'work' and so does she. And he has made this statement in no uncertain terms on a blog for all to see. www.travelswithlipo.com and it has been there for many months!

In addition we accept that no-one on behalf of Ms Rowling has claimed that the term 'philosopher's stone' is owned by Warner Bros.

Really? Anybody reading Blair's letter would come to the same conclusion. A lawyer indeed whom we showed it to came to same conclusion as we viz; Warner Bros had copyright of the phrase "the philosopher's stone". We have written on several occasions to Warner Bros asking if they considered themselves to have copyright on the phrase "the philosopher's stone" and have received no reply.

We apologize for publishing false allegations and for not contacting Ms Rowling beforehand so that we might inform us of the true position.

Why should the Derry News have contacted Rowling? Why should Rowling's word take automatic precedence over William Kelly's or anybody else's for that matter? What is the "true position"? That's easy... the 'true' position is what Schillings and/or Rowling together with Blair and Little tell you, the gullible and deluded public, what the 'true' position is. A position that we have here confidently proved to be chicanery, sophistry or whatever other word you prefer to allude to willful deception.

We are happy to set the record straight."

No. Schillings can set whatever record they want. We, The Bogside Artists, are happy to have set the record straight.

To summarize:

*If we may digress for a moment into the philosophical consideration of words and their usages the above article is a classic example of "bewitching" or befuddlement and the diabolical use of language to achieve a spurious goal viz; to protect the interests of an author who feels it is not incumbent on her to prove *any* claim she has made or intends to make about 'her' alleged work. Their attitude can be summed up;*

*What was actually meant by the statements we made in the Derry News article is clearly secondary to whatever self-serving 'meaning' Schillings *decided to attribute* to the words we used. In other words, the position they take and a deceptive one at that, is quite simply; "Our interpretation of what you *might* have said is more acceptable, more true and right **than what you really meant**. Indeed, we know full well what you meant but we find it quite irrelevant to our purposes; so*

we take leave by ignoring your own words, to *decide* what could be construed from what you meant as that better serves our purpose to discredit you. We fully expect you, the editor of The Derry News to agree with what we have decided The Bogside Artists meant by their statements and to bend to our will to discredit them at home and abroad in deference to our client Ms Rowling's reputation."