

COVER SHEET

Witness: First Witness Statement of [redacted] HN329 [redacted] as supplemented 1

Exhibits: None

Date Statement Made: 11th April 2019

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

2 Witness: [redacted] HN329 [redacted] / HN329

3 Occupation: [redacted] HN329 [redacted]

Address: c/o Metropolitan Police Service, Directorate of Legal Services, Empress State Building, London SW6 1TR

On 17th September 2018, I made a statement of 312 paragraphs which read as follows:

1. I have been asked to provide a witness statement for the purpose of assisting the Undercover Policing Inquiry. In preparing this statement I have sought to answer all the questions asked of me in the Rule 9 request dated 17th May 2018 and received by me on 25th July 2018.
2. I have referred throughout this statement to a number of documents provided to me by the Undercover Policing Inquiry.
3. A significant amount of time has elapsed since my deployment with the Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) and my career within the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) came to an end. This has meant that I am not able to recall in any great detail, if at all, many of the answers to the questions asked. Where I have been able to provide an answer, I have done so to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Personal Details

4. My full name is HN329 and I was born on

5

Police career before serving with the Special Demonstration Squad

5. I remember that I joined the Metropolitan Police Service in the late 1950s

6

6. My probation finished two years later. Shortly thereafter – I cannot remember the exact date – I saw an advertisement to join Special Branch published in police orders. The requirement was to have either a language or shorthand.

7. I applied for the vacancy and by the early 1960s – I cannot recall the exact date – I had joined Special Branch as a Detective Constable. I have been shown my Central Record of Service (Doc A: MPS-0722824) which records that I joined Special Branch on a temporary posting in

8

9. the early 1960s. This would accord with my recollection. It was common practice at the time to join initially on a temporary posting, after which there would be an interview before you were made permanent.

7. I do not remember when my posting was made permanent. Again, my Central Record of Service (Doc A: MPS-0722824) suggests this took place about

10. 18 months later. This would make sense but I do not personally recollect the date.

8. When I first joined Special Branch I was attached to

11

I think there were about a dozen of us at the time. Our role was

12

9. To the best of my knowledge, my only postings within Special Branch before I moved to the Special Demonstration Squad were C Squad carrying

13

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

out Communism related enquiries [REDACTED] I cannot recall 13

the dates of my transfers. I cannot now remember how long I spent on each squad with the exception of [REDACTED]

14

10. I do not remember precisely when I joined the SDS. I have been shown a document (Doc B: MPS-0724119) which records my date of joining as 1968 15

1968

I have no reason to believe that this date is inaccurate but I cannot remember it.

11. Prior to joining the SDS, I did carry out covert work whilst posted to C Squad carrying out Communism related enquiries. In some cases, the enquiry involved identifying whether a particular individual's details were still current. In other cases, I made enquiries about individuals not previously known to the police, by engaging in covert work, in the sense that I did not reveal that I was a police officer and, if needed, would use a made up story to explain why I was interested in obtaining a particular piece of information. I did not use a covert/false identity. For the most part, I was not asked to give any name. When I knew that I could trust the person I was talking to, if needed, I would identify myself as a police officer and give my real name and work telephone number.

Special Demonstration Squad: formation

12. At the time of its formation, I do not recall the name 'SDS' being used. To me, the Unit was referred to as 'The Hairies' because a number of undercover officers grew their hair and beards. I do not recall where or with whom this name originated.

[REDACTED]

13. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the SDS was set up to prevent a recurrence of the violence that took place at the Grosvenor Square demonstration in March 1968. The police were completely unprepared to deal with that demonstration and the public generally knew that law and order had broken down in the Square. It was common sense that demonstrators would not inform a smartly dressed police officer whether they intended to be violent, whether or not they revealed that they were police officers. Since Special Branch was responsible for providing information as to the security of the State, it was plain that better information was needed. How that was to be achieved was decided by people more senior than me.

14. At the time of joining the SDS in 1968, I did not know that Chief Inspector Conrad Dixon was responsible for the formation of the Squad.

16

15. I understood my role to be broadly similar to that which I had carried out in my previous postings within Special Branch in that I would be required to gather intelligence. The key difference was that I would have to do so using a cover identity and I could not reveal that I was a police officer.

Selection for the Special Demonstration Squad

16. I do not know how I was selected for the SDS. If I were to guess, it is possible that it was at CI Dixon's request. All officers joining Special Branch were allocated a Sergeant for supervision and mentoring purposes. My assigned Sergeant was CI Dixon. I never asked him whether this was how I came to be on the Squad. It was irrelevant to me; it was just a new posting that I was being transferred to. It was common for people to be moved around the Branch.

17. I do not remember who told me I was going to be transferred to the SDS.

18. To my knowledge, no one spoke to me about the role or the impact that it would have on me or my family. I was married at the time and my wife was not spoken to either.

Training and guidance in the Special Demonstration Squad

19. I was deployed straight away. I did not receive any training for the role, whether formally or informally. To me, it was exactly the same Special Branch work as I had been carrying out previously for other Squads. It was finding out information by listening to what people were saying and attending meetings.
20. To my knowledge, I never received any specific advice, guidance or instruction about the ethical or legal limitations placed on my role over and above that which I knew applied generally by virtue of being a police officer.
21. I do not remember being given any specific advice or guidance on how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of others including whether or not officers were prohibited from entering into sexual relationships whilst deployed undercover.
22. The same is true for participating in criminal activity. On one occasion during my deployment, myself and the other SDS officers were taken to see the-then Deputy Assistant Commissioner responsible for Special Branch, Ferguson Smith, who reiterated that we were not expected to carry out any illegal activity, but this was something we knew in any event.
23. Likewise, I would never have provoked or encouraged others to participate in criminal activity whilst I was undercover.
24. Outwith these general limitations, I never received any further advice, guidance or instruction about such matters as what to do if arrested; what to do if brought

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

before a court; or what to do if I came into possession of legally privileged information.

- 25. I never received race equality training.
- 26. To the best of my recollection, I did not receive any training or guidance once I was deployed.
- 27. I do not remember ever having had sight of Home Office Circular 97/1969 in relation to informants who take part in crime.

Undercover identity

Cover name

- 28. I adopted the cover name John Graham. There was no guidance or instruction on how to pick a name; [REDACTED]

17

- 29. I do not know that I ever used my full cover name with anyone. I was just referred to as John.
- 30. I did not have a nickname and I was not known by any other names whilst deployed undercover.
- 31. I did not use a deceased child's identity or any aspect of the same when constructing an undercover legend. Likewise, I did not use any aspect of any other person's identity.

Assumed background

- 32. My undercover persona was not sufficiently developed to include a background other than what I set out below.
- 33. I have been asked whether the method of creating my identity accorded with that set out at Doc B: MPS-0724119 under the heading 'Identity and

Background Material'. I do not recall ever having to submit an autobiography. The only supporting documentation I was ever provided with in my cover identity was a rent book as part of my cover accommodation, which I address in greater detail below.

34. It is right that I never carried my warrant card. I cannot recall being told not to go to Scotland Yard but as a matter of practice and common sense I assumed I was not supposed to go anywhere near police premises in order to avoid compromising my cover. For the same reasons, I did not have any contact with uniformed officers.

Cover employment

35. I never had cover employment of any kind: I cannot recall that it was something that I was asked or encouraged to arrange in the preparation of my undercover identity. If anyone had asked, I would have told them that I moved second hand cars between garages. I never actually performed this role or received any payment. I never had an employer or any documentation in support of this aspect of my legend.
36. I cannot recall if anyone ever asked me about this aspect of my legend whilst undercover.

Cover accommodation

37. As part of my cover identity, I took out a bedsit somewhere in NW6. I cannot now recall the exact address but it was behind one of the main roads in the area.

38. I think I did this on the recommendation of CI Dixon so that I had a cover address should I require it, but I cannot now remember any specific conversation to this effect.
39. I believe I found the accommodation through an advertisement in a newspaper, possibly in the Evening Standard. I contacted the agency advertising the bedsit, provided my cover name and took possession of it. I assume I attended the agency's office to collect the keys but I have no independent recollection of this.
40. I cannot recall how the accommodation was paid for. I assume I paid for it and claimed it back through expenses with CI Dixon's authorisation, but I cannot now remember.
41. I did not intend to use the bedsit for living in. I did not furnish it and it did not contain any of my personal possessions. I remember I went in one day and realised that there was a leak above the bed. In reality, I lived at my usual home address.
42. To the best of my knowledge, I never told anybody about the bedsit, nor did I give out the address or bring anyone back to it. It was not shared with anyone, whether a fellow undercover officer or a member of my group.
43. During the course of my deployment, the only time I recall staying somewhere other than my usual home address overnight was in the course of a visit to Sheffield with my target group. On that occasion, we all stayed in the same place sleeping on the floor in sleeping bags. I address the Sheffield trip further below.

Legend building

44. My ordinary appearance was clean shaven with short hair. I altered my appearance whilst undercover by growing a beard, more to fit in than to avoid

being recognised, although that was a benefit. I do not believe I ever discussed this with my managers.

45. I usually wore a khaki-coloured anorak-style jacket that had a leopard print woolly lining, corduroy trousers and Hush Puppy shoes.
46. I did not visit any places or people in order to prepare myself for the role, nor did I live as 'John Graham' for any time before I started attending meetings. To me, John Graham was just an identity that I would have used had I been asked.
47. I did not use a vehicle in my cover identity. At the time, I had my own private car which I drove, together with a full driving licence in my real name. I believe the SDS had a Unit car but that it was principally used by the senior officers. I do not know if this was an unmarked car booked out from Scotland Yard Central Operations (CO) or whether it was privately rented.

Deployment

Infiltration of groups

48. My target group was the Vietnam Solidarity Committee (VSC). This was an umbrella organisation, which was principally composed of smaller groups that were loosely organised geographically. I have seen intelligence reports that mention that I attended the Camden, Kilburn and Willesden, and Hampstead branches. My recollection is that I principally attended the Camden branch, but all of these groups were fluid in structure and 'membership'. I use membership here in an informal sense to refer to the people that routinely attended. Many of the same individuals would attend each of these meetings. Over time, some of these groups ceased to exist or started up again. This happened organically, usually through the distribution of leaflets notifying people that a new group was being set up and encouraging attendance.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
49. There was no formal membership; there was no requirement to provide your details and as far as I know there was no record of membership or indication of membership like a membership card. Generally, meetings were not structured. Someone would act as the chairman but this was done on an informal basis and would vary from meeting to meeting. I do not recall any formal officers being appointed, for example a treasurer. There were some individuals that attended regularly and took more of a role in the group; others came and went.
50. I remember [Privacy] and his wife, [Privacy] were more prominent individuals. He was part of the Steering Committee responsible for planning the October 1968 demonstration and would relay the information obtained from those meetings to the local branch.
51. I simply started attending meetings. These were public meetings that anyone could attend. I do not remember how I found out about the time and place for the first meeting I attended. I presume it was through leafleting; I recall that following the March 1968 Grosvenor Square demonstration there was a lot of leafleting and I imagine (but do not know) that Special Branch would have known the identities of the prominent individuals.
52. I imagine I was notified about further meetings at the last one that I attended.
53. I do not consider myself as having been a member of any other group, even in an informal sense. I have been shown Doc B: MPS-0724119 which suggests I also deployed into the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation (RSSF) but I have no recollection of this group, the individuals involved, or its aims. I may well have attended some of their meetings or reported on them if they attended meetings of the VSC.
54. I have considered the reporting provided to me in connection with my deployment, and to the best of my recollection, it accurately reflects the

reporting I provided. I stress, however, that all of these events took place over 50 years ago and my memory of that time is poor. I cannot recall any groups, individuals or periods in respect of which there is a significant quantity of missing intelligence reports.

Tasking

55. I do not recall who originally tasked me to attend meetings of the VSC.
56. To my knowledge, there was no change in tasking during my deployment.
57. Tasking was organic. I attended the meetings and events that my group attended. There was no need for me to be given a specific instruction to attend my group's next meeting; I simply went as a matter of course. I would report on anything that took place at the meeting and the identities of anyone that attended, as far as I was able to ascertain them. For example, if at a meeting a demonstration was mentioned that was being organised by another group, I would report the details as it was possible that it could have public order consequences.
58. Additionally, if there was an event or demonstration that needed covering by someone on the Unit it was possible that you would be sent along to provide a report on it even if it was not anything to do with your group. Other times a fellow undercover officer may ask you to cover something that their group was involved in because they were unable to attend.
59. Such specific tasking, as there was, usually took place face-to-face at the daily or nearly daily meetings at the SDS' premises. I remember CI Dixon attended most of these meetings and that is when we discussed who would provide coverage in respect of which upcoming events. Other undercover officers would

also provide information as to their groups and activities. At the time of my deployment, I estimate that there were approximately 12 members of the Unit.

60. To my knowledge, I was not told how long I would be on the SDS. There was a general assumption that, in light of the reason why the Unit was set up, it would be disbanded at the end of the October 1968 demonstration. This evidently did not transpire. I was not involved in any discussions about the continued existence of the SDS after the October 1968 demonstration. I assume those discussions took place at management level and above.

Management and supervision

Managers and administrative staff

61. I have refreshed my memory from the structure of the SDS as set out at Doc B: MPS-0724119 p.7. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the ranks provided. However, I understood Phil Saunders to have held a higher rank than Detective Inspector. He may have been promoted at some stage during my deployment but I cannot recall if and when this would have taken place.
62. The SDS was not hierarchical in nature. No one sought to impose their rank on anyone else and we were all treated as equals. It was more discursive; you would attend the SDS flat and discuss what was happening.
63. I understood CI Dixon to be the head of the SDS on the operational side. He would also attend meetings and I viewed him as the commander in the field. The best word I can use to describe his managerial style is avuncular. He was friendly and courteous to everyone. You did what he told you to do but it was always done in a nice way. I believe his aim was to obtain intelligence that would help prevent disorder at the next demonstration.

64. I do not know precisely what DI Saunders' responsibilities were but I understood them to be supervisory in nature. I believe that he was essentially based in the office. I cannot remember the division of responsibilities as between him and CI Dixon.

18 65. HN332 was, I believe, a Detective Inspector. I cannot remember what
19 DI HN332's role was on the Unit; I believe that he also attended some of the same meetings as I did but I do not know why he attended or whether his role differed from mine. I cannot remember when DI HN332 left the SDS and
20 whether that was before or after my own departure.

66. Bill Furner was a member of the back office staff who held the rank of Detective Constable. To my knowledge, he was based at Scotland Yard and was responsible for the collation of the intelligence reports that came in. I cannot remember when he was on the SDS or when he left. I do not recall ever seeing him attend the SDS flat.

67. I recall that Arthur Cunningham was the Chief Superintendent. I never saw him at the SDS flat and I only saw him during his involvement in my departure from the Unit, which I address in greater detail below.

68. Finally, I recall an officer called Riby Wilson who, I believe, was a Detective Inspector. Whilst he was not actually a member of the SDS, he would come to some of our meetings. Owing to the passage of time, I cannot remember his responsibilities. My best recollection is that he worked in a back office capacity out of Scotland Yard.

Management and supervision: general arrangements

69. Of the managers, I had routine contact with CI Dixon and DI HN332 They were
21 responsible for the day-to-day running of the Unit and were usually present at

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

the SDS flat, which I describe further below. I would attend the flat on a daily or near-daily basis together with the other undercover officers.

70. There would be informal meetings with managers. The purpose of these meetings was to monitor the progress of deployments and check in on coverage of certain events. Generally, undercover officers were afforded great latitude meaning that we used our initiative rather than awaiting specific directions as to what to do and where to go. I do not recall my reporting ever being questioned.

71. Such contact as I had with CI Dixon and Di [HN332] would be face-to-face. I do not recall communicating with them by any other means. I do not specifically recall there being a phone in the SDS flat but there must have been one.

22

72. I recall from my time on other squads within Special Branch that it was customary practice to have a message book. The book was a written record of any messages left for individual officers that came in either via telephone call (whether work related or personal) or in person from another officer at a time when that individual was not available. Whenever you attended the squad offices, you would check the message book for anything marked for your attention. I cannot recall whether this practice was adopted by the SDS but there must have been some system for recording messages.

73. There were no arrangements for monitoring welfare during the course of my deployment.

Premises

74. The SDS operated from a flat in the [West London area] I cannot now remember its exact address.

23

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
75. The flat was effectively used as our operational headquarters as we were supposed to stay away from Scotland Yard. I do not know how it came to be acquired by the Unit, whether through private rental or other arrangement. I thought of it as Joan Hillier's flat because I remember that she kept some of her personal possessions there.
76. I believe all officers on the Unit were provided with keys, but I cannot specifically remember being given one. I have assumed this to be the case because all officers could freely come and go from the flat and, absent keys, there was no guarantee that on any one occasion someone would be present to let you in.

Pattern of life whilst undercover

77. During the currency of my deployment, I was only ever on duty in my cover identity as opposed to my real identity. Given the passage of time, I cannot comment on the division of time between on and off duty.
78. The time I spent on duty and my working hours were fluid. I would attend the meetings I needed to attend, whether they took place in the evening or on the weekend. I do not believe that we were ever required to work set hours. The SDS did not make use of a rota or shift pattern in the same way that other Special Branch squads would.
79. My working life on the SDS did not differ greatly from that during my other Special Branch work. I was carrying out effectively the same role as I had on C Squad in terms of intelligence gathering albeit in a cover identity and with a disguised appearance.

Pay and overtime

80. Serving on the SDS did not affect my take home pay. My basic pay was the same as if I had been serving on another squad in Special Branch.
81. I was paid overtime. I believe that the arrangements at the time in Special Branch generally were that for more than 4 hours over time you would receive a mealtime allowance. The overtime was recorded on a brown card which a senior officer would sign. As far as I can recall, the arrangement was the same whilst I was on the SDS. I cannot recall who signed my overtime card whilst on the SDS.
82. I do not believe the overtime would have added a great deal to my income.
83. I do not recollect any other factors affecting my take home pay.

Approach to documents

84. As part of my witness pack, I have been provided with a copy of a number of intelligence reports relating to my deployment at Doc B to Doc U, Doc X to Doc AM. Before I address each of the documents individually, I make the following observations which are of general application.
85. Owing to the passage of time, I have no independent recollection of any of the meetings or events referred to within these reports. As such, I cannot comment on what interactions, if any, I would have had with other individuals present at those meetings whether before, during or after the meeting. This includes interactions with any other officers present, save that as a matter of good practice I would not have attended the meeting with anyone other than my group nor would I have acknowledged or interacted with other officers had I spotted them as this would have risked compromising my cover.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
86. Where a report has listed me as an officer present I assume that I attended the meeting. I would have attended these meetings in my cover identity.
87. Where a report records that the meeting was private it would have been open to anyone to attend who knew about it. I imagine that 'private' refers to a meeting which was not publicised, for example through leafleting, but was decided upon and announced at an earlier meeting. It does not denote a closed meeting as none of the meetings I attended were closed.
88. There was no admissions process for meetings. I cannot recall being asked to 'sign in' at a meeting or to give my cover name in order to gain entry. In any event, I was never provided with any documents to prove my affiliation with the VSC: there were no membership cards and I never paid any membership dues. I assume, but do not know, that other officers gained admission to these meetings in precisely the same way.
89. Where a report records the attendees at a meeting, where applicable, the Special Branch Registry file reference appears alongside those names. I assume that these references were supplied with the assistance of DC Furner after he was made aware of the contents of the individual reports.
90. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of any of these reports. The author of any report would record what took place and not what he or she surmised. Where they expressed an opinion, this would be made clear on the face of the report. There was no advantage to be gained by making things up.

Reporting on the Vietnam Solidarity Campaigns North-West London Ad Hoc Committee

91. The North-West London Ad Hoc Committee was not a formal group or subgroup of the VSC but a group of people from the branch that would come

together at the request of the driving forces for separate meetings in order that certain matters or plans could be made, discussed and pushed forwards. By driving forces, I mean those that were most committed to keeping the organisation going. Anyone could turn up to the Ad Hoc Committee meetings and this was often where all the trouble was caused. There were so many disagreements about the approach: some, like the Maoists, would advocate violence and others would advocate for a peaceful demonstration. Whilst individuals such as [Privacy] and [Privacy] were the driving forces, they would co-opt people as they needed them. In general, I would have attended the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meetings in order to obtain information about who was there and who was driving it.

92. As far as I am aware, there were no elections to the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee: those who wanted to attend did attend and those who wanted to be part of the organisation of events would put themselves forward. At no stage did I stand for election or put myself forward for positions of responsibility within the VSC. It was not something I was going to get involved in.
93. I do not know how the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meetings differed from the Branch meetings as I recall the topics of discussion being much the same. Generally, there was agreement amongst attendees at our branch meetings about the approach to matters such as demonstrations. We would then attend the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee to discuss the same matters and present our branch view. There was greater disagreement at these Ad Hoc Committee meetings due to the greater number of attendees and diversity in the groups attending. Verbal disagreements always broke out at the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meetings due to the differing aims of

the groups attending and sometimes it felt like these disagreements came close to violence, though I do not recall that violence ever broke out.

94. I cannot remember what became of the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee. It dissolved not through lack of interest but apathy, I suppose. I have no idea if it continued after the October demonstration. I imagine that it still existed inasmuch as someone said, "what are we going to do now?" After the October 1968 demonstration had taken place there was nothing to plan, so it fell apart. The groupings were so fluid that the same people attended all of the various meetings: if someone was forming a committee in another location, whether or not you were officially a member, you would still go.

95. I have been shown Doc C: MPS-0722099 pp.46-47, which is a routine meeting report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 5th September 1968.

96. I note that the report records that Detective Sergeant R Wilson and Detective Constable TN0032 were also present. I assume that they were sent along, 24 perhaps by Special Branch, to cover the meeting not knowing that the meeting was already covered by the SDS. I do not know whether either of these officers used a cover identity when they attended.

25 97. I do not believe DC TN0032 was a member of the SDS; I knew him as a Special Branch officer. The reference to DS Wilson may refer to Ray Wilson, again an officer that I knew from Special Branch and I do not believe was on the SDS. I am also aware of a Riby Wilson but he is unlikely to be the officer referred to because Riby Wilson was, to the best of my recollection, a Detective Inspector in 1968.

98. The report is signed by DI Saunders. It was general practice on Special Branch that the person who signs the report is the author of the report, unless the

report has been 'phoned in' and typed up by another individual. In this case, I do not know the circumstances in which the report was written or whether DI Saunders was also present at the meeting. These are matters outside my knowledge.

99. Once a report is signed it goes up the chain of command. DI Saunders would have passed the report to CI Dixon. In this instance it is apparent from the face of the report that CI Dixon was acting on behalf of the Chief Superintendent, who at the time would have been Arthur Cunningham. The report would then be passed to Special Branch Records and, I imagine, placed on the file. This is what I understand by the reference to "S.B.(R)".

100. I understand "P.A" to mean 'put away'. What follows is the reference to a Special Branch Registry record. I have never seen the phrase "*dummy*" before. I cannot comment on what that may mean.

101. The reference to "*the meeting at A will be covered by the demonstration squad*" is a reference to the fact that the officers from the SDS would have covered this meeting, that is attended the meeting and provided a report as opposed to another Special Branch squad.

102. Having looked at the document, the reference to "*Box 500*" suggests that the report was copied to the Security Services. I had no interaction with the Security Services nor did I have any responsibility for determining whether or not any report was disseminated to them.

103. I have been shown Doc D: MPS-0722099 pp.56-57, which is a routine meeting report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 18th September 1968.

104. I have identified that CI Dixon and DI HN332 were also listed as officers present at the meeting. I do not know why either of them attended the meeting.

27

28

It may have been in order to establish a cover identity to provide them with credibility when they wanted to be in the field as opposed to in the office. I recall both CI Dixon and DI HN332 were deployed, although not frequently. I believe

29

HN332 did as well. I believe both of them used cover identities but I cannot recall what those cover identities were. As I have already set out above, identification was not a prerequisite to gain entrance to meetings and it was only ever as part of discussions that the question of names ever arose.

105. I believe the author of the report was CI Dixon as he has signed the report, however, I do not have any specific knowledge or recollection of this.

106. I have been shown Doc E: MPS-0722099 at pp.63-64, which is a Special Report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee street meeting on 21st September 1968.

107. The report is signed by me so I assume that I wrote it although I have no independent recollection of doing so. I know that I would not have signed a report written by anybody else.

108. I assume that I typed the report up on the typewriter at the SDS flat. I certainly would not have gone to CO to type it. I would have submitted the report to CI Dixon and it would have been for him to decide to whom it should be disseminated thereafter.

109. I cannot comment on the different format of the report. It is possible that the reports reproduced at Doc C and Doc D were prepared on blank paper because there was an absence of official stationery and/or no decision had been made as to how reports by the SDS would be prepared. This is purely speculation on my part.



110. Given that I wrote the report, I assume I attended the meeting and therefore participated in the street performance referred to therein. I do recall participating in a street performance once during my deployment but I cannot recall when that would have been and therefore whether it is the performance that is referred to within this report. The performance that I remember taking part in lasted no more than five minutes; I think I played a dead body and I would have taken part as a result of being asked to do so by my group.

111. I have been shown Doc F: MPS-0722099 pp.124-125, which is a routine meeting report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 25th September 1968.

30 112. The report has been signed by DI HN332 and I assume therefore that he is the author.

113. I note the reference to A Squad, C Squad and D Squad at the conclusion of the report. At the material time, I understood A Squad to deal with administration, C Squad with Communism related enquiries and D Squad with naturalisation. I would assume that C Squad interest in this report meant that they probably had an interest in students that were at the Hornsey College of Art.

114. I have been shown Doc G: MPS-0722099 pp.116-117, which is a routine meeting report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 2nd October 1968.

115. I am listed as one of the officers present and so I assume on that basis that I was present at the meeting.

116. The number of people in attendance at the meeting would have been counted by the officers present. Where there was a low number of attendees, this was relatively easy to achieve. Where there was a large number of people present, the officer writing the report would often consult the other officers present at the

meeting to ensure that any identifiable individuals had not been forgotten. At the end of the reports, we would list the people that came to notice and/or we were able to identify.

117. I have been shown Doc H: MPS-0738435, which is a routine meeting report regarding the North-West London Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 16th October 1968.

118. I am listed as one of the officers present. I believe the author was CI Dixon as he has signed the report.

119. I note that the report has recorded the “*source of information*” as “*informant*”. This would have related to how the SDS or Special Branch came to know about the existence of the meeting, rather than what took place at the meeting. I do not know who the informant would have been.

Special Report on the Durham Vietnam Solidarity Committee

120. I have been shown Doc I: MPS-0722099 pp.175-176, which is the Special Report regarding a meeting of the Durham VSC on 13th October 1968.

121. I assume that I authored the report as my signature appears at the end. I would not have signed a report that I had not written.

122. I very much doubt that I attended this meeting. To the best of my knowledge and recollection, I never went to Durham whilst I was deployed undercover with the SDS.

123. I have no recollection of where the information contained in this report came from. Having reflected on this document, it is interesting that so many people present were identified, which leads me to conclude that it is more likely than not that the information came from a police source.

[REDACTED]

124. I imagine there would have been information sharing with and from other police forces. I am aware from my time as a Special Branch officer that it was common practice that local Special Branch from other forces would share relevant intelligence with the MPS' Special Branch. I assume that this is how I came to know about the activities of the Durham VSC.

125. The use of quotation marks could mean that I received the quoted section as part of a written report which I have reproduced verbatim.

126. I do not recognise the names [Privacy] and [Privacy] these individuals are not known to me. The information contained within the report that each of them has come to the notice of Special Branch previously would have come from searching the Special Branch records for mention of their names. I do not believe that I physically carried out the searches in relation to these individuals as I would not have attended CO myself whilst deployed undercover. It is more likely that the searches were carried out by a member of the SDS back office, such as DC Furner, or at the instruction of someone from the SDS office.

Reporting on the Hampstead Vietnam Solidarity Committee

127. I have been shown Doc J: MPS-0722099 pp.201-202, which is a routine meeting report regarding the Hampstead VSC meeting on 13th October 1968.

128. The Hampstead branch of the VSC may have been considered geographically separate from the others but the same individuals would turn up at all of these meetings. For example, [Privacy], [Privacy], [Privacy] and [Privacy] they all knew each other.

[REDACTED]

129. I do not know why I attended a Hampstead meeting. I assume that it was because the same individuals as those attending my group meetings in Kilburn and Willesden were attending.

Reporting on the Kilburn and Willesden Vietnam Solidarity Committee

130. I have been shown the document at Doc K: UCPI0000007684 which is a routine meeting report regarding the Kilburn and Willesden VSC meeting on 5th December 1968.

131. I assume that I authored the report as my signature appears at the end. I would not have signed a report that I had not written. I assume on that basis that I also attended the meeting.

132. The report is also signed by DI Saunders. There could be a number of reasons why he signed it instead of CI Dixon. It could be, for example, that DI Saunders was running the office and CI Dixon was out in the field, or that CI Dixon was on holiday or elsewhere at that particular time. The second signature is only required from the person to whom the report is submitted to show they have received and reviewed the document.

133. I cannot recall any specific interest by Special Branch in the Rhodesian Ad Hoc Committee. I assume that the foundation of the group was recorded in my report because it was discussed at the meeting.

134. I have been shown the document at Doc L: UCPI0000007685 which is a Special Report regarding the Kilburn and Willesden VSC meeting on 17th December 1968.

135. I assume that I authored the report as my signature appears at the end. I assume on that basis that I also attended the meeting but, as before, I have no independent recollection of this.

[REDACTED]

136. I assume that I reported on the activities of the Medical Aid for Vietnam Committee because it was discussed at the meeting. It may be that the Medical Aid for Vietnam Committee was of interest to [REDACTED] Privacy as he was a doctor, but I do not know.

137. Likewise, I assume that I reported on the planned demonstration at Brent Town Hall because it was again mentioned at the meeting. Had there been a plan or expectation of violence expressly mentioned at the meeting, I would have recorded it in my report. I assume from the likely numbers of 200 people in attendance and their willingness to burn a flag that there was a possibility of considerable disorder. It is also possible that attendees at the event, like the Maoists who I knew could be violent, would engage in disorder by throwing a brick or tearing down a gate. This would therefore have been relevant information for uniformed police.

138. I have been shown the document at Doc M: [REDACTED] UCPI0000007686, which is a routine meeting report regarding the Kilburn and Willesden VSC meeting on 2nd January 1969.

139. I assume that I authored the report as my signature appears at the end. I assume on that basis that I also attended the meeting but, as before, I have no independent recollection of this.

140. I assume the LSE Graduates Association's activity was reported on purely because it was an associated demonstration mentioned at the meeting. It was reported in case anything came of it.

141. I do not remember attending the demonstration at Brent Town Hall on 8th January 1969.

Reporting on the Camden Vietnam Solidarity Committee

142. I have been shown the document at Doc N: [UCPI0000007688], which is a routine meeting report regarding the Camden VSC meeting on 12th February 1969.
143. The report is signed by Joan Hillier on my behalf. I cannot now recall why she would have signed the report in my place. I assume that I attended the meeting and authored the report. I do not know why I would have submitted it unsigned. It is unlikely that I 'phoned in' the report, meaning that I do not think that I dictated my report to Joan Hillier over the phone.
144. It appears to me that the report was signed by "*R Wilson*" as acting Chief Inspector. I assume, given the rank, that this refers to Riby Wilson. He would have signed the report in the absence of the usual Chief Inspector.
145. I attended a Camden VSC meeting in much the same way as I attended the Hampstead VSC meetings: it was all the same people that attended the meetings, just with a different branch name.
146. I have been shown the document at Doc O: [UCPI0000007690], which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 19th March 1969.
147. This report has again been signed by Joan Hillier on my behalf. As before, I do not know why this is the case. I assume that I was present at the meeting on 19th March 1969 but I have no independent recollection of the same.
148. The report is again signed by "*R Wilson*" as acting Chief Inspector. The comments I have made above in relation to Doc N apply equally here.
149. I have been shown the document at Doc P: [UCPI0000007692], which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 26th March 1969.
150. The report has been signed by Bill Furner on my behalf. I would have written the report and attended the meeting although I have no independent recollection of doing so. There are no other officers listed as present at the meeting so it is likely that I would have been the sole officer in attendance.

151. I do not recall what the VSC Working Committee was: I never became involved in this.
152. I assume the CND was reported on because it was discussed at the meeting. I assume that the report would have been passed to Special Branch for the information of uniformed officers so that whichever division was covering the meeting would have sufficient numbers there to patrol it.
153. I have been shown the document at Doc Q: UCPI0000007693, which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 2nd April 1969.
154. This report was signed by CI Dixon and so I assume that he would have written the report rather than me. I accept I was at the meeting given that I am listed on the report although I do not recall it. Anything that I may have contributed to the report would have been to refresh CI Dixon's memory.
155. I have no idea why both CI Dixon and I attended the meeting, as opposed to just one of us. It may have been that it was given out as a special meeting, or it may have been that one or other of us did not have anything to do and, so, rather than doing nothing you went along to the meeting.
156. I am not sure why there is a reference to the apparent sexuality of one of the individuals included in the report. This document was written 50 years ago when the attitude to homosexuals was different. I can think of two possible explanations as to why it was included. Firstly, it is an identifying means, just like red hair is an identifying feature. Alternatively, it may have been information for the Security Services who might use the information. I would imagine that CI Dixon included this in the report, rather than me.
157. I have been shown the document at Doc R: UCPI0000007697, which is a Special Report regarding the Camden VSC dated 16th May 1969.

158. My name appears at the bottom of this report and therefore I assume that I authored it.
159. I cannot say whether the information in the report was obtained by me whilst undercover as I cannot recollect how it came to my knowledge. It may have come direct from Privacy or another source such as a magazine, as a result of an announcement at a meeting, someone telling it to me or seeing it in writing somewhere. What I can say is that it is information that I acquired.
160. I have been shown the document at Doc S: UCPI0000007699, which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 26th May 1969.
161. I imagine I wrote this report as it has my name on it, but I do not know or understand why it was not signed by me. As I wrote it, I assume that I attended the meeting although I have no recollection of doing so.
162. After the October 1968 demonstration had taken place, there were discussions about removing the association with Vietnam from the title of the group. Those attending still wanted to protest but they did not know what to protest about. I would guess that they were waiting for some issue to arise with which to affiliate themselves.
163. Special Branch would have been interested if any of the causes or events were likely to cause public disorder. This could not be properly assessed until the cause or issue was identified. For example, there would have been significant interest in a group that decided to destroy capitalism or burn down the stock exchange.
164. I have been shown the document at Doc T: UCPI0000007700, which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 4th June 1969.
165. As CI Dixon has signed the report, I believe that he wrote it. I am listed as one of the officers present at the meeting and I assume therefore that I attended.

[REDACTED]

166. I do not know why the report recorded information about the Israeli Revolutionary Action Committee: I assume it was discussed at the meeting. I do not know if the group was of special interest to Special Branch but I note the reference to a telephone message to Special Branch which may suggest that the intelligence was phoned in from somewhere.

167. Similarly, I do not know why the Zionist Federation in Britain was reported on. What was being discussed at the meeting was political and actions against a visiting Prime Minister, so I assume it was reported on because of the possibility of violence and disorder as a result of what was said at the meeting. It was the possibility of violence and disorder that was being reported on, rather than the group.

168. Generally speaking, there was no filtering of the information included in reports. Everything that took place or was said at a meeting was included because it might be of potential interest to those reading the reports or because there was a possibility of disorder. For example, a demonstration might be of interest regardless of the particular group organising it and so uniformed officers would be sent if available.

169. I have been shown the document at Doc U: UCPI0000007701 which is a routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on what appears to be 16th June 1969, though the document is difficult to read.

170. This report is signed by me and so I would have written the report. I would have been present at this meeting although I have no recollection of the same.

171. I would have submitted the information that I learned at the meeting. I cannot recall given the passage of time whether there was any public order concern about the Liberation Tour: there may well have been no concern about public disorder at the stage at which the report was written, but you do not know what

could happen; the position may well change and so it would have been reported because of the possibility of disorder.

172. I have been shown the document at Doc V: , which is an edition of Red Camden dated 8th June 1969.

173. I understood the Camden VSC to want their people in power rather than the Conservative or Labour government which they regarded as capitalist, imperialist etc. They were revolutionary inasmuch as they wanted a change of government but they were not going to obtain this through violent means. I base this view on my assessment of the branch meetings that I attended and this certainly applied to the Camden and Willesden branches. Anyone that I knew at those meetings was not capable of achieving their aim by force although they may well have joined in with a more established group. Much of the content of publications such as Red Camden was simply pie in the sky rhetoric.

174. I read publications like this at the time of my deployment and would routinely submit them with my intelligence reports. The practice was to submit three intelligence reports: the original and two copies. Accordingly, the practice was to collect three copies of any publication so that one copy could be attached to each report submitted.

175. In respect of all of the documents at Doc W: [UCPI0000007694] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 9th April 1969), Doc X: [UCPI0000007695] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 16th April 1969), Doc Y: [UCPI0000007696] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 14th May 1969), Doc Z: [UCPI0000007698] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 11th June 1969); Doc AA: [UCPI0000007702] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 16th July 1969); Doc AB: [UCPI0000007703] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on what appears to be 6th August 1969); Doc AC: [UCPI0000007704]

[REDACTED]

(routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on 13th August 1969); Doc AD : [UCPI0000007705] (routine meeting report of the Camden VSC meeting on what appears to be 20th August 1969), the position is as I have set out previously. Due to the passage of time, I have no independent recollection of attending these meetings but I assume that I was present based on the fact that the reports of these meetings state that I was present.

Reporting on the Vietnam Solidarity Committee

176. I have been shown the document at Doc AE: [MPS-0738583], which is a routine meeting report of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign October 27th Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 17th September 1968.

177. I am again listed as one of the officers present and I assume therefore that I attended the meeting although I have no recollection of the same.

178. I do not know why there are so many officers listed as present at the meeting. I assume that we all attended because it was a large public meeting and there were a number of groups in attendance.

179. Of the officers said to be present, I do not remember DS [TN0033] as a member of the SDS and I am sure he was never at the SDS flat. I knew him from my time in Special Branch [REDACTED] he ran the administrative side of D squad. I do not know why he would have attended the meeting.

180. The vote on the issue of the demonstration would have involved the Maoists. I do not remember whether or not I voted in the ballot. I would imagine that I did if I attended the meeting with my group as it would have risked compromising my cover and would have appeared odd if I sat there and did not vote with them.

181. I do not recall if any of the other officers said to be present participated in the vote: I imagine that they would have done for the same reason.

[REDACTED]

182. I have been shown the document at Doc AF: [REDACTED] MPS-0738436 which is a Metropolitan Police Telegram from me to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch dated 23rd October 1968.

183. The telegram was signed off by Sergeant [REDACTED] He would have been the Special Branch Sergeant on reserve at the time. There would always be a Detective Inspector around until about 10pm and a Sergeant and Police Constable on reserve. When something was phoned in, a note would be made of it and it would then be filed in the admin tray if nobody was there to review it. If something came in late at night and it was urgent, the senior officer present would get someone out of bed to deal with it.

33

184. I assume the telegram was sent to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch and not an SDS manager because the information was of the sort that would be provided to uniformed officers by Special Branch. The SDS would know about demonstrations, but it was not for the SDS to police demonstrations in the way that uniformed officers did.

185. The telegram would have been formally addressed to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch as a courtesy and as someone to send it to: I assume it is referring to the Chief Superintendent of A Squad. A Squad, as I have mentioned before, was administration. The telegram would have been passed from the reserve room to Chief Superintendent A's office, which happened to be next door. The Chief Superintendent and Chief Inspector were responsible for deciding where the message would be sent: they would look at it and, based on its contents, send it on to the relevant squad. For example, if it was a matter about Communists, it would be sent to the Superintendent of C Squad.

186. I assume that I was out on the ground and I telephoned this information through for Special Branch to notify uniformed police as necessary. I do not know why I

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

'phoned in' the information rather than dealing with it normally by writing a report at the SDS flat. I assume the information was fresh in my mind at the time, or perhaps I was with someone who said that I had better phone it in. Alternatively, it may have been that it was close to the event and so it would have been actioned sooner if I telephoned it in.

187. I do not know if it was common that the information went outside the SDS.

188. I have been shown the document at Doc AG: [UCPI0000005799], which is a Special Report dated 19th May 1969 regarding the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign Conference in Sheffield on 10th and 11th May 1969.

189. I believe that this document corresponds to the conference in Sheffield that is referred to at Doc O: [UCPI0000007690]. I assume that I am the author of this report as my name is typed at the end although I have not signed it.

190. I do recall attending a conference in Sheffield, which I assume is the same conference mentioned in this report as I only remember attending one conference in Sheffield and I would have submitted a report following my attendance at the conference. Owing to the amount of time that has passed since the event, I remember very little about the conference.

191. Within our group, [Privacy] was active in the VSC on a national level. He sat on various organising committees and it is likely that knowledge of the conference within the Camden VSC came from him. I would have been invited to attend the conference. I assume that CI Dixon authorised me to attend the conference otherwise I would have had to find an excuse to give my group to explain my non-attendance. I would not have gone to the conference and incurred the subsequent expense had I not been given permission.

[REDACTED]

192. I assume that I was given permission to attend the event because there was interest in continuing to obtain intelligence on the activities of the group after the October 1968 demonstration.

193. I have been shown the document at Doc AH: UCPI0000005801, which is a Special Report dated 26th July 1969 regarding a meeting of the VSC Working Committee on 24th July 1969.

194. I assume I am the author of the report as my name appears at the end although it has not been signed by me. I do not know and cannot recollect why I did not sign the report.

195. I cannot recall if I attended the meeting on 24th July 1969. However, the level of detail in the report makes me think I was at the meeting as I do not know from where else I would have obtained information with this level of detail.

196. I cannot comment on why Special Branch held files on particular groups as this was a decision taken by others, presumably much higher ranking than me.

197. The International Marxist Group (IMG) was of interest because they were communist, politically opposed to the government of the day and anti-establishment. 50 years ago, because of the Cold War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the fear that there was going to be a world war, communism was of paramount interest and so there would have been reporting on anyone who might be a communist.

198. The YCL was of interest for the same reason because they were seen to be opposed to the government of the day and because of their association with the Communist Party.

199. I do not know why International Socialism (IS) was of interest but I assume that it is because either Special Branch or the Government wanted to know more about them.

[REDACTED]

200. Ultimately, any group that came to notice as a result of causing trouble, for example throwing bricks through shop windows and actions of that sort, would have been reported on if they were anti-establishment in a political sense. It may well be that a particular group is completely harmless but we would be asked to find out what their objectives were. A file would then be opened for the reports that were prepared to be collected.

201. I cannot remember what the relationship was between the VSC and the IMG: I have a feeling that the IMG were the principal movers of the VSC. The VSC was the umbrella organisation which was joined by other groups sympathetic to the cause of the Vietnamese people. However, different organisations within the umbrella of the VSC had different approaches. For example, some groups were there to cause trouble and advocated the use of violence over peaceful protest. There were always issues between the groups, as evident in the reports, about organisations that joined and then tried to control and influence the direction. They all hated each other.

202. I cannot remember what the relationship was between the VSC and the YCL. Communists would join the VSC because they saw the cause as an opportunity to embarrass the government and/or generally viewed it as a good cause to support. The Vietcong were communists so the YCL were also supporting their own people.

203. I cannot remember what the relationship was between the VSC and IS. As far as I can recall individual members of IS thought that the VSC was something worth supporting. A lot of people would turn up to VSC meetings including a lot of otherwise politically unaffiliated individuals, for example people who simply knew Vietnamese people through their local community.

204. I cannot remember what the relationship was between the VSC and the RSSF.

205. I cannot recall if any one group had more influence within the VSC than another.

206. I never contributed much to the donations at meetings. I probably put some pennies in, but that was it.

207. I have been shown the document at Doc AI: UCPI0000005802, which is a Special Report dated 9th September 1969 regarding the VSC Working Committee meeting on 6th September 1969.

208. I assume I am the author of the report as my name appears at the end although it has not been signed. I do not know and cannot recall why I did not sign the report.

209. I cannot remember attending this meeting, but I assume I attended it as my name appears at the end of the report. I cannot recall how I would have obtained this information if I did not attend the meeting.

210. I imagine that whilst it is called the Working Committee, it was open to anybody who chose to turn up. I recognise the names of those in attendance as names that have featured in other reports in my witness pack as having attended other VSC meetings.

211. I would have attended the meeting to obtain information such as that which is contained in the report. I would not have volunteered to take on a position of responsibility like secretary or anything of that nature.

212. I imagine that the Communist Party would have supported the VSC for the reasons I have already set out above.

Reporting on other protest groups

213. I have been shown the document at Doc AJ: MPS-0730765, which is a routine meeting report of the Action Committee of the Anti Imperialist Solidarity Movement meeting on 3rd November 1968.

214. I assume that I authored the report as my name and signature appear at the end. As such, I assume that I attended the meeting although I do not recall doing so. In particular, I do not recall attending a meeting in Blackfriars.

215. I cannot recall why I attended this particular meeting. I assume that it is because I would have been directed to do so by my superiors. It is possible that I went on my own initiative as I thought it could be interesting, but I cannot remember. Had I had the leaflet referred to in the report in my possession, it may have given some indication as to the interest in the meeting. From reading the report, I would surmise that the interest in the meeting was based on the Anti Imperialist Solidarity Movement's plans to fill the vacuum after the *"IS/IMG/VSC clique had abdicated their leadership of the emerging militant forces."*

216. I do not know what the Action Committee was or what its relationship was to the VSC other than what is set out in the report.

217. I cannot recall if I was ordered or instructed to report on groups other than the VSC. As detailed above, I did not receive any training for my deployment. In any event, reporting on other groups would have been no different to reporting on the VSC.

218. I have been shown the document at Doc AK: MPS-0730768, which is a routine meeting report of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign meeting on 11th November 1968.

219. Although I did not write the report, I am listed as one of the officers present and I assume therefore that I attended the meeting. I do not know why numerous

officers were in attendance but I would guess that they were present representing their different groups. For example, I recall that [redacted] HN326 [redacted] was deployed in anarchist groups. It was a big meeting and I imagine we would each have found out about the meeting from our respective groups.

34

220. I do not believe that DS [redacted] TN0034 [redacted] was a member of the SDS. He may have been sent to attend the meeting by Special Branch. I knew him from my time in Special Branch but I do not remember which squad he was in.

35

221. I assume the report contains information about the forthcoming demonstration of Aborigines in Australia and the forthcoming trial of Obi Egbuna because they were future activities discussed at the meeting. It was common practice to report on what was said at the meeting without filtering the intelligence obtained. All events at which there was a possibility of disorder were reported.

222. The same is true for the report recording information about the forthcoming meeting of the IMG. In addition, I recall that the IMG were the group trying to keep the VSC going and so there would have been an interest in keeping apprised of their future activity.

223. I cannot recall if I was ordered or instructed to report on groups other than the VSC. As detailed above, I did not receive any training for my deployment. In any event, reporting on other groups would have been no different to reporting on the VSC.

224. I have been shown the document at Doc AM: MPS-0722099 p.217, which is the first page of a routine meeting report of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign meeting on 20th December 1968.

225. I note that the second page of the report is missing from the witness pack. As a result, there is no signature page and it is not possible to ascertain who authored the report. I do not recall whether or not I wrote this report.

226. I assume that more than one officer attended the meeting because of the number of people that are identified in the report. This would have been difficult for one person to achieve alone.

36 227. I do not recall DC HN321. He may have been on the SDS but I do not know.

228. I have been shown the document at Doc AL: MPS-0722099 p.216, which is a Metropolitan Police Telegram from me to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch dated 20th December 1968.

229. I have found it difficult to read this telegram owing to the quality of the copy shown to me. If my name appears in the 'from' section, then I assume that I 'phoned in' the information. Owing to the passage of time, however, I have no recollection of doing so.

37 230. [REDACTED] would have been the reserve Sergeant who took the message. I do not know why the message was sent to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch rather than a manager on the SDS. It may be a question of time inasmuch as if the demonstrations were the next day there would not have been enough time for me to write a report and for action to be taken beforehand: I would not have had access to a typewriter unless I went back to the flat and at 10pm I would be going home. I may also have had a day off the following day. Once I phoned the message in, it would be up to the reserve Sergeant, or whoever received the message, to decide what they wanted to do about it.

231. The demonstration being planned by the Action Council for Anti Imperialist Solidarity, the meeting and march planned by the Australian and New Zealanders against the Vietnam War and the march and occupation planned by the Zimbabwe Action Committee were all reported upon because I assume they were discussed at the meeting. As I have previously said, I would report on

everything that was discussed at a meeting I attended without filtering that information. There was always the possibility that any one of these planned events could result in public disorder.

232. I cannot remember anything about the Australian and New Zealanders against the Vietnam War or their members.

233. I cannot remember anything about the Zimbabwe Action Committee or their members. The group may have just involved the two people who turned up at this meeting.

Public order

234. Other than one incident, I do not recall witnessing any public disorder. The incident I am referring to, if you can even call it public disorder, took place at a public meeting in Australia House. I attended the meeting as part of the VSC, I think with either the Camden or Willesden and Kilburn branch. I cannot now recall what the meeting was about or when the meeting took place, save that it was during my deployment.

235. At the meeting, an attendee stood up and spoke forcefully in support of his own position. Those who were running the meeting warned him to sit down else he would be removed from the meeting. He would not sit down. When security intervened to remove him, a number of those in the audience, including myself, vocally intervened and repeatedly shouted, "let him speak!" We were all thrown out of the meeting and in the course of being removed I was punched by one of the security guards.

236. I never participated in any public disorder whilst on my deployment with the SDS.

Violence

237. Whilst serving undercover with the SDS, I did not witness any violence to people or property nor was I involved in any violence to people or to property other than as set out above in relation to the events at Australia House.

Subversion

238. I understood the role of Special Branch to be carrying out enquiries concerning the security of the State, in other words gathering intelligence on activities that sought to undermine the *status quo*, the government of the day and the political establishment.

239. I now know that some of my reporting was copied to the Security Services. I can tell this from the references 'Copy to Box 500' which appear on the intelligence reports that I authored or in which I am mentioned. I do not know why those particular reports were passed to the Security Services. I had no involvement in that decision making process or in the dissemination of the reports. I had no direct contact with the Security Services during my undercover deployment.

Sexual relationships

240. I did not engage in any sexual activity in my undercover identity.

Other relationships

241. I did not form close personal relationships with any individuals during my undercover deployment. The only social interactions I can recall with individuals from my group is occasionally having drinks in the pub and, on one occasion after the end of my deployment, I recall that I took one girl out to dinner. I

cannot remember who she was, other than that she attended the same VSC branch meetings as I did. I cannot remember when the dinner took place or where we went. I had arranged the dinner prior to my deployment ending and I did not want to cancel the arrangement as I thought this was impolite. I recall that I turned up clean-shaven and she was disappointed by my lack of facial hair. Nothing untoward or inappropriate took place between us: this was not my intention [see supplement to this paragraph at paragraphs 301-309 below].

242. I did not assume any position of trust with any of the people with whom I interacted as an undercover officer.

Criminal justice

243. I did not participate in any criminal activity whilst I was deployed undercover.

244. I was never arrested, charged, tried or convicted of a criminal offence whilst serving as an undercover police officer.

245. I did not provoke, encourage or cause any person to participate in any criminal activity whilst I was deployed as an undercover police officer with the SDS.

Other legal or disciplinary proceedings

246. I was not involved in any way in my undercover identity in any legal proceedings.

247. I was not involved in any way in my undercover identity in any complaint against a police officer or in any disciplinary proceedings involving a police officer.

Legal professional privilege

248. To my knowledge, I never received or became aware of any legally privileged information whilst I was deployed as an undercover officer. The sole caveat I

[REDACTED]

would place on this is that if the content of such information was discussed at a meeting I attended, I would have included it in a subsequent report. I cannot, however, recollect this ever being the case.

Elected politicians

249. To my knowledge, none of the individuals on whom I reported were elected politicians. It is possible that had an elected politician attended one of the meetings on which I reported, the fact of their attendance would have been included in my subsequent report. I cannot however recollect this ever being the case.

The use to which my reporting was put

250. I have seen that the circle of individuals to whom my reporting was disseminated was recorded on the face of my reports. I had no involvement in deciding who would be the recipient of my intelligence. I assume that decision would have been made by senior managers such as CI Dixon or DI Saunders, but once the report was forwarded to Special Branch it would have been disseminated or filed according to the usual Special Branch procedures and would not have had anything to do with the SDS.

251. I understood that if the content of the report involved the security of the State, it would be copied to the Security Services. Other recipients may include the particular unit or squad within the MPS responsible for planning the necessary police response to combat a forthcoming event or demonstration referred to within that report. This is my best understanding but is not something I ever asked of senior officers or recall being told.

[REDACTED]

252. Other than as set out above, I do not know how widely within the MPS or to which external agencies my intelligence reports would have been circulated, if at all.

253. I believe my reporting, in combination with the reports obtained from other undercover officers on the SDS, was successful in preventing confrontations at the October 1968 demonstration. The intelligence provided was able to identify which groups within the demonstration would be keen to provoke confrontation and those that were interested in a peaceful march. The police response being kept out of sight prevented any confrontation breaking out. I recall that the march started at Charing Cross and followed a path along Blackfriars, the Strand, Trafalgar Square and my group ended up in Hyde Park. The length of the route meant that those participating were worn out by its conclusion.

254. After the demonstration, I believe that the contribution made by my reporting was to help assist the police in determining the resources they would need to have in place in order to prevent public disorder.

Exfiltration

255. I cannot recall when my deployment ended. I do not recall a specific rule that deployments should last no longer than 12 months.

256. There was no formal withdrawal process. I simply stopped attending meetings for the reasons I set out below. I never explained to any member of my group why I was no longer coming to meetings nor do I recall ever having had any further contact with members of my group other than the dinner I have mentioned above.

257. I made no further use of my cover name.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

258. I was withdrawn from the SDS following a disagreement with DI Riby Wilson. I cannot remember when I was withdrawn, but I believe the disagreement took place at a time when DI Saunders was away on holiday. DI Wilson tasked me with attending a meeting in my undercover identity of which the SDS required coverage. It so happened that I had already been delegated by a member of my group to attend a different meeting taking place at the same time. I explained to DI Wilson that I could not attend the meeting he wanted me to attend. I cannot recall the exact circumstances, whether it was an opposition group or otherwise, but there was a good reason at the time as to why I thought it was a poor idea for me to attend. DI Wilson issued me with an ultimatum: either I attended the meeting or I was thrown off the SDS. I refused to attend and DI Wilson sought approval for my removal from the field from Chief Superintendent Cunningham. I explained my reasons to Chief Superintendent Cunningham in person at Scotland Yard but the end result was the same. He backed up DI Wilson's decision.

Senior management and oversight bodies

259. The only senior manager I recall visiting the SDS was the then-Commander of Special Branch Ferguson Smith. I believe he attended the SDS flat on a few occasions, possibly for lunch, to see how we were doing.
260. I do not believe that Chief Superintendent Arthur Cunningham ever attended the SDS flat.
261. To the best of my knowledge and belief, no one from any outside body with any form of regulatory or oversight responsibility for policing ever visited the SDS.
262. I did not receive any form of commendation for my work on the SDS.

Deployments of contemporaries

263. I recall Joan Hillier. I associate her closely with the SDS flat, which I believe was rented in her name and in which she stored some of her personal possessions. She was one of two female officers on the SDS at the time and I believe that she acted as the girlfriend of HN330 another undercover officer, whilst he was deployed in his cover identity. I remember that at one meeting at which we were both in attendance I was struck by her appearance as it made her stand out: she was well put together in contrast with many of the other women who attended these meetings.

264. I do not remember anything else about HN330's role on the SDS.

265. I recall the name HN332 but I do not recall him as being on the SDS.

266. I recall HN331 as a member of the SDS. He must have used a cover name, as we all did, but I do not remember what it was. He was associated with another undercover officer, HN68 as I remember the both of them were arrested for fly posting. I cannot recall into which field or which group HN331 was deployed: I have a vague recollection that it was Irish but this is based solely on his association with HN68 who was deployed in that field. I believe HN68 was on the SDS at the same time as me but I cannot recall when he started or concluded his deployment.

267. To my knowledge, 46A was not a member of the SDS but was a member of Special Branch. It is possible that he was a member of the back office but I did not have any interaction with him whilst I was deployed undercover.

268. I recall two individuals with the surname Wilson: Riby Wilson and Ray Wilson. I have mentioned Riby Wilson above and the role that he played in my withdrawal from the field. I believe that he was a Detective Inspector.

269. I do not recall Ray Wilson being a member of the SDS. I believe he was a Sergeant in Special Branch.

270. I recall Dave Fisher as a fellow undercover officer on the SDS. I do not know the cover name that he used.

47 271. I have mentioned HN332 already. I do not know the cover name that he used. If we attended the same meetings whilst deployed undercover, we would not acknowledge each other. We would sit separately at meetings.

272. I do not recall Helen Crampton as being on the SDS although I have seen documents to suggest that she was. I do not know what her role on the SDS was or what her cover name would have been.

48 273. I recall HN294 I knew him as a member of Special Branch, rather than the SDS. If he was on the SDS, I think he was a member of the back office because I do not remember ever seeing him in the field. I cannot now recall his rank.

274. I have mentioned CI Dixon already. He must have had a cover name but I do not know what it was.

275. I recall Mike Tyrrell as a fellow undercover officer on the SDS. I do not know the cover name that he used. I believe he was involved with anarchist groups but I cannot recall which ones.

49 276. The only fellow undercover officers I remember having been arrested were HN68 50 HN331 for fly posting, as I have already mentioned. I believe that I learned of their arrest the following day when they informed DI Saunders. As far as I know, they attended court in their cover names, paid a fine and were told never to do it again.

277. It is possible that David Fisher was also arrested in a matter unrelated to HN68 51 and HN331, but I cannot recall the details.

278. To my knowledge, no fellow undercover officer was involved in any incident of public disorder, violence or other criminal activity during the period of my deployment.

279. I cannot comment on whether a fellow undercover officer reported on legally privileged information whilst I was deployed as I was not privy to the reports of other officers.

280. Similarly, I cannot comment on whether a fellow undercover officer reported on the activities of elected politicians whilst I was deployed. The only circumstance in which I can imagine this happening is if an elected politician attended a meeting, however I have no specific recollection or knowledge of this ever taking place.

Post deployment

Period immediately post-deployment

281. As above, I cannot recall when my deployment ended. After the end of my service with the SDS, I resumed my policing career within Special Branch. I do not believe I took any time off. I cannot recollect being debriefed by anyone after my deployment.

Post Special Demonstration Squad police career

282. Owing to the significant amount of time that has passed since the conclusion of my posting with the SDS, I have had difficulty recollecting which parts of my career with the MPS took place before or after my time on the SDS. I know that I remained within Special Branch until my retirement from the MPS in the late 1980s.

53

283. To the best of my knowledge, I was posted to the following squads after my deployment with the SDS. Other than where set out below, I cannot recollect

the order in which these postings occurred or when in time they took place. Where I have provided dates by reference to events, I have obtained these dates from publicly available information and I do not recall whether my posting covered some or all of these periods.

284.

54

285. I also recall that I served on C Squad both before and after the SDS carrying out Communist related enquiries.

286.

54

Details of other Special Branch postings are set out.

287.

288.

289. These were all ordinary Special Branch postings on which my role on the SDS had no influence.

[REDACTED]

290. Working as an undercover officer on the SDS did not have any long-term effect on my welfare. I enjoyed my time in Special Branch and I saw the SDS as simply one part of that overall picture.

291. My rank on leaving Special Branch and the MPS was Detective Constable.

292. I retired after 30 years' service in the late 1980s.

55

293. [REDACTED]

56

Undercover work in the private sector

294. I was never given any instructions or guidance of any kind about working undercover in the private sector or using any aspect of my cover identity in the private sector before I left the MPS.

295. After leaving the MPS, I never carried out any undercover work for any organisation in the private sector.

Any other matters

296. There is no other evidence which I am able to give which is of relevance to the work of the Undercover Policing Inquiry. Where I have been able to provide any contextual or relevant information in addition to that asked for in the Rule 9, I have done so at appropriate stages throughout this statement.

Request for documents

297. To my knowledge, I do not have any documents or other information in my possession which would be potentially relevant to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

298. In providing this witness statement, I have not refreshed my memory from any document other than those contained in my witness pack.

Diversity information

299. I am male and white English.

Supplementary matters

300. I have been asked to provide a supplementary witness statement for the purpose of assisting the Undercover Policing Inquiry. In dealing with these supplementary matters I have sought to answer all the questions asked of me in the second Rule 9 request dated 10th September 2018 and received by me on 17th September 2019.

Other relationships

301. Further to paragraph 241 above, I wish to add the following about the girl I took out to dinner. Due to the passage of time, I do not remember anything about the girl's identity. I did not know, and do not know, how old she was: at no stage did I come to learn her age and I am not able to approximate it.

302. I do not remember who prompted the arrangement to go to dinner. At the time we made the arrangement, I was still on the SDS and deployed into the VSC. As stated at paragraph 241 above, the girl attended the same VSC branch meetings as I did. Our arrangement to go to dinner was simply a continuation of our interaction in that group setting. It was purely social: there was no sexual intention.

303. I was removed from the Squad between making the arrangement to go to dinner and the dinner itself. I refer to paragraph 258 above, where I have set

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

out the circumstances in which my deployment ended and I was removed from the SDS. When we made the arrangement to go to dinner, I did not know that I would be off the Squad by the time the dinner was to take place.

304. My intention when we went to dinner was to have dinner. Due to the passage of time, I cannot remember any details of the dinner including where we met or where we had dinner.

305. I did not make the girl aware of my real identity, including the fact that I was a police officer, because it would have revealed my earlier presence in the group as an undercover police officer. There was no question of my real identity becoming known purely because I attended dinner clean-shaven: to me, the two matters were not related. There was nothing about my changed appearance which would give rise to the belief that I was a police officer.

306. I do not know if those who managed me in the SDS knew about the dinner. I doubt that they did because I do not recall telling anyone about the dinner. It was inconsequential.

307. I did not see the girl again after we went for dinner.

308. I do not know whether one-on-one meetings during or after a deployment were commonplace amongst undercover officers deployed by the SDS. I would not know if they were commonplace because it was never discussed: everyone was involved in their own group.

309. I never had a one-on-one meeting with anyone else, other than that which I have described above. To my knowledge, social interactions in the pub, which I mention at paragraph 241 above, were never arranged or prompted by me. They resulted from the meetings which I attended. Generally, they would take place after a meeting and would be attended by those who had attended that meeting. I was not interested in staying and drinking with my target group: I only

attended in case something which had come up at the meeting was further discussed or enlarged upon.

Deployment of contemporaries

310. I am not aware whether any of my contemporaries, whilst deployed, provoked, encouraged or caused a third party to commit a criminal offence.

311. I am not aware whether any of my contemporaries, whilst deployed, engaged in sexual activity with others in their cover identity.

312. In any event, I consider it very unlikely that the above happened. This was not how I knew the SDS to operate in 1968.

Further supplementary matter

313. On 25th March 2019, I telephoned the officers at Operation Motion because further matters had come to mind in relation to the questions I was asked regarding Doc Q which I address at paragraphs 153-156 above.

314. Since making my earlier statement, I have reflected on the reason why I was asked why the apparent sexual orientation of one of the individuals who attended the meeting was recorded in the report. This question stood out to me. Further to my comment in paragraph 156 above that this report was written 50 years ago when the attitude to homosexuals was different, I now recall that this report was written around the time of the change in the law in relation to homosexuality and the decriminalisation of homosexual acts in private. Peoples' attitudes were slow to change and I expect that this comment was a result of these old attitudes persisting. Whilst I expect this information would not be relevant or reported on today given modern attitudes, it may have been relevant at the time.

315. Further to what I have said at paragraphs 155 and 156 above, I am confident I did not write this report. Had I written this report, my signature would have been the first signature on the report where CI Dixon's signature is. Generally speaking, where multiple officers were present at a meeting or a demonstration, it would have been the responsibility of the more senior officer to write the report.

I believe the contents of this statement to be true.

57

Signed

HN329

Dated

11.4.19