
COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY'S OPENING STATEMENT

Contents

- [Part 1 – Overview](#)
- [Part 2 – Tranche 1 Phase 1](#)
- [Appendix 1 – Groups reported on by the SDS as set out in the Annual Reports 1969 to 1974s](#)
- [Appendix 2 – Phase 1 undercover officers and Phase 1 managers](#)

PART 1 – OVERVIEW

Introduction

1. This Inquiry has been set up as a result of profound and wide-ranging concerns arising from the activities of two undercover police units. First, the Special Demonstration Squad (“the SDS”) which existed between 1968 and 2008. Second, the undercover element of the National Public Order Intelligence Unit (“the NPOIU”) which existed between 1999 and 2010. Our terms of reference are wide enough to encompass all undercover policing by English and Welsh police forces in England and Wales since 1968 but we shall be concentrating primarily upon the activities of these two units.
2. It has emerged that, for decades, undercover police officers infiltrated a significant number of political and other activist groups in deployments which typically lasted for years. The information reported by these undercover police officers was extensive. It covered the activities of the groups in question and their members. It also extended to the groups and individuals with whom they came into contact, including elected representatives. Reporting covered not only the political or campaigning activities of those concerned but other aspects of their personal lives. Groups mainly on the far left but also the far right of the political spectrum were infiltrated as well as groups campaigning for social, environmental or other change. For example, these included groups that were campaigning for racial or sexual equality as well as those campaigning for nuclear disarmament.
3. Information about family justice campaigns and those participating in them was reported. Mark Ellison QC, who led the Stephen Lawrence Independent

Review, found that: there was SDS “deployment into activist groups that sought to influence the Stephen Lawrence family campaign”; that information reported back to the SDS, as a result of that deployment, included personal details about Dr and Baroness Lawrence¹; and there was: “an MPS spy in the Lawrence family camp”².

4. The SDS reported on Duwayne Brooks, the victim and vulnerable witness who survived the murderous racist attack which claimed Stephen Lawrence’s life. Mr Ellison found that the reporting on Mr Brooks included information about the divisions that had occurred between Mr Brooks and the Lawrence family, the way in which Mr Brooks was going to approach his defence to serious criminal charges, and his expectations and intentions in a civil action against the MPS: lines of reporting which Mr Ellison concluded should have been terminated³.
5. The reporting of undercover officers refers to trade unions and to the trade union activities of some trade union members. There are concerns about why such information was recorded and what it was used for; in particular, whether it was passed to those who blacklisted workers.
6. We will be receiving evidence that a number of the undercover officers who served with the SDS and NPOIU engaged in sexual activity in their cover identities. Several formed long term sexual relationships. In some cases, the officer did eventually reveal their real identity. In other cases they did not do so. At least one fathered a child with a woman who did not know that her partner was an undercover police officer. In many cases the deception has had devastating consequences.
7. Failures properly to inform the court or the defence about the involvement of undercover police officers are already known to have caused miscarriages of justice. Further miscarriages of justice are feared to have occurred.
8. There are allegations that undercover officers participated in the commission of serious criminal offences, including participating in the 1987 fire-bombing of Debenhams by the Animal Liberation Front.

¹ Stephen Lawrence Independent Review, at section 4.1.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287030/stephen_lawrence_review_summary.pdf

² Stephen Lawrence Independent Review, Volume 1, at p.264

³ Ibid. Section 5.2 at pp.36-37

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

9. For a substantial part of its existence, SDS undercover officers based their assumed identities, to at least some extent, on the particulars of a deceased person, usually a deceased child. We will be receiving evidence that this practice spilled over, to a limited extent, into the NPOIU.
10. There is evidence that some former undercover officers used their skills and contacts to work in the private sector, including in at least one case continuing to operate under the same assumed identity as he had in the NPOIU.
11. The impact of conducting long term undercover operations of the sort conducted by the SDS and the NPOIU on the mental health of some undercover officers appears to have been considerable. In some cases, particularly those in which the undercover officer has been involved in a long term deceitful sexual relationship, the officer's family has also suffered.
12. The events, and findings, that I have just outlined give rise to many questions. To identify but a few: what exactly happened? How did these events come to pass? How widespread were they? Who knew about them? To what extent were they authorised, encouraged or accepted and by whom? Which groups were infiltrated? Why? How were targets selected? Was targeting influenced by racism or sexism? Was infiltration of the groups concerned justified? In which cases? If it was, was the extent of reporting and the duration of the deployments justified? In what circumstances, if any, might the use of the undercover tactic to infiltrate political and activist groups be justified? If so, subject to what boundaries, management and oversight?
13. The Inquiry will be seeking out the truth, publicly wherever that is possible, so that the full facts become known and appropriate recommendations can be made for the future conduct of undercover policing. We will be using documents, witness statements and oral evidence, tested where necessary, to establish what happened and why.

The Road to a Public Inquiry

14. This is not a public inquiry set up immediately upon the first revelations about the activities of the SDS or the NPOIU's undercover arm. It follows a series of revelations, consequent investigations and some civil litigation. The fact that Special Branch deployed undercover police officers to spy on the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, prior to the massive anti-Vietnam War demonstration that took place in London on 27 October 1968, was published in the press at the

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

time. In 2002 the BBC broadcast a short series of documentaries entitled “*True Spies*” which contained, amongst other things, interviews with former members of the SDS. However, it was not until 2010 that public concern began to grow. I shall not attempt a comprehensive account of the work of activists, a whistleblower, investigative journalists, the courts, or the various formal investigations which preceded the setting up of this Inquiry; however, I will recite some of the salient events which led to the then Home Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Theresa May, announcing on 12 March 2015 that there would be a statutory public inquiry chaired by Sir Christopher Pitchford. The written version of my opening statement will be posted on the Inquiry’s website. It contains hyperlinks to all of the reports that I am just about to refer to, as well as footnotes identifying the many other documents that I will cite today.

Chronology of the Salient Events Leading to the Setting Up of the Undercover Policing Inquiry 2010-2015

Date	Event
14 Mar 2010	<p>The Observer published an article regarding the role of Officer A (now known to be Peter Francis) within the Special Demonstration Squad (“SDS”).</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/mar/14/undercover-police-far-left-secret</p>
21 Oct 2010	<p>The Indymedia website identified Mark Kennedy as an undercover police officer, based on his confession to activists.</p> <p>https://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2010/10/466477.html</p>
9 Jan 2011	<p>The Guardian published its first article about former undercover police officer Mark Kennedy, in connection with the CPS’ decision not to proceed with prosecutions against activists in connection with protests against the Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station.</p>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/09/undercover-office-green-activists
11 Jan 2011	<p>Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary ("HMIC") announced that it will conduct a review of the National Public Order Intelligence Unit ("NPOIU") with which Mark Kennedy had served. The review was to cover operational accountability, authorisation and proportionality.</p> <p>https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/news/releases/release-002-2011/</p> <p>https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/news/releases/release-006-2011/</p> <p>https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/npoi-review-terms-of-reference/</p>
13 Jan 2011	<p>The Guardian published an article which, amongst other things, raises the question of links between Mark Kennedy and commercial investigator Global Open.</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/12/second-undercover-police-officer</p>
19 Jan 2011	<p>The Guardian published articles about Jim Boyling, "Lynn Watson" and "Mark Jacobs".</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/19/undercover-policeman-married-activist-spy</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/19/undercover-police-officer-lynn-watson</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/19/undercover-police-officer-mark-jacobs</p>
22 Jan 2011	<p>The Guardian published an article in which a former SDS officer (now known to be Peter Francis) asserts that promiscuity was used as a tactic by undercover officers in activist groups and that sexual relationships were sanctioned for both male and female officers.</p>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/jan/22/undercover-police-cleared-sex-activists
Jul 2011	<p>The Court of Appeal quashed the convictions of 20 activists on the grounds that Mark Kennedy had arguably acted as an agent provocateur.</p> <p><i>R v Barkshire and Others</i> [2011] EWCA Crim 1885; [2012] Crim LR 453</p>
15 Oct 2011	<p>Former SDS undercover officer and manager, Bob Lambert, is publicly confronted by activists. The Guardian published the story the next day.</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/oct/16/academic-bob-lambert-former-police-spy</p>
Oct 2011	<p>Operation Soisson, a review and investigation into the alleged misconduct and criminality of undercover officers engaged in by members of the SDS is commenced by the Metropolitan Police Service. This later became Operation Herne, led by the then Chief Constable of Derbyshire Police, Mick Creedon⁴.</p>
6 Dec 2011	<p>A report by retired Court of Appeal judge Sir Christopher Rose into the conduct of the prosecutions which followed a protest at the Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station was published.</p> <p>https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2011-12-06/debates/11120641000012/Ratcliffe-On-SoarPowerStation</p>
20 Jan 2012	<p>The Guardian published the fact that two undercover police officers had had children with activists.</p>

⁴ The decision to transfer responsibility for the investigation from the MPS (DAC Gallan) to the Chief Constable of another police force appears to have been taken on or about 7 Feb 13 (see para.25 Home Affairs Select Committee's 2013 interim report on undercover policing).

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/jan/20/undercover-police-children-activists?newsfeed=true
2 Feb 2012	<p>HMIC published its Review of National Police Units which provide Intelligence on Criminality associated with Protest.</p> <p>https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmicfrs/media/review-of-national-police-units-which-provide-intelligence-on-criminality-associated-with-protest-20120202.pdf</p>
11 Jul 2012	<p>Home Secretary Theresa May commissions Mark Ellison QC to investigate allegations of corruption relating to the investigation of Stephen Lawrence's murder and whether the Metropolitan Police Service had evidence of corruption that it did not disclose to the Lawrence Inquiry.</p>
5 Feb 2013	<p>The Home Affairs Select Committee takes evidence about undercover policing. On 26 Feb 13 it publishes a critical interim report on undercover policing.</p> <p>https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/83/home-affairs-committee/news/70862/committee-hear-evidence-on-undercover-policing/</p>
24 Jun 2013	<p>Peter Francis appears on Channel 4's Dispatches programme.</p>
The next day	<p>Paul Lewis and Rob Evans publish their book <i>Undercover - The True Story of Britain's Secret Police</i>.</p>
27 Jun 2013	<p>Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary ("HMIC") publishes an update on progress against the recommendations of its 2012 report on "the national police units which provide intelligence on criminality associated with protest" following a review conducted in April 2013.</p>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/media/national-police-units-which-provide-intelligence-on-criminality-associated-with-protest-progress-review.pdf
The same day	The then Home Secretary, Theresa May, commissioned Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) to inspect the effectiveness of the arrangements in place in all police forces to carry out, manage and scrutinise undercover operations.
Jul 2013	Theresa May expanded Mark Ellison QC's terms of reference to include the investigation of Peter Francis' allegations that the SDS gathered evidence with which to smear the family of Stephen Lawrence.
16 Jul 2013	Operation Herne published its first report, entitled <i>Use of Covert Identities</i> .
6 Mar 2014	Operation Herne published its second report, entitled <i>Allegations of Peter Francis (Operation Trinity)</i> .
The same day	Theresa May's made an oral statement to the House of Commons presenting the findings of the Ellison review. She informed the House that she had decided that a judge-led public inquiry into undercover policing and the SDS was necessary. https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-ellison-review
10 Mar 2014	The Permanent Secretary to the Home Office commissioned Stephen Taylor to conduct an independent review of the Home Office's knowledge of SDS activities.
Jul 2014	Operation Herne's published its third report, entitled <i>Special Demonstration Squad Reporting: Mentions of Sensitive Campaigns</i> .

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	https://www.met.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/foi-media/metropolitan-police/priorities and how we are doing/corporate/operation-herne---report-3---special-demonstration-squad-reporting-mentions-of-sensitive-campaigns
14 Oct 2014	HMIC published the report of its inspection of undercover policing in England and Wales. https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/an-inspection-of-undercover-policing-in-england-and-wales.pdf
12 Mar 2015	Theresa May published Stephen Taylor's independent review. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/investigation-into-links-between-special-demonstration-squad-and-home-office
The same day	Theresa May established the Undercover Policing Inquiry as a statutory public inquiry and appoints Lord Justice Pitchford as its Chairman. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/home-secretary-announces-statutory-inquiry-into-undercover-policing

The Inquiry's Terms of Reference

15. The Inquiry's first Chairman, the late Sir Christopher Pitchford, formally opened the Inquiry on 28 July 2015 with a statement, setting out the Inquiry's terms of reference, explaining how he intended to proceed and inviting applications for core participant status⁵. The Inquiry's terms of reference are as follows.

"Purpose

⁵ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Opening-Remarks.pdf>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

1. *To inquire into and report on undercover police operations conducted by English and Welsh police forces in England and Wales since 1968 and, in particular, to:*
 - i. *investigate the role and the contribution made by undercover policing towards the prevention and detection of crime;*
 - ii. *examine the motivation for, and the scope of, undercover police operations in practice and their effect upon individuals in particular and the public in general;*
 - iii. *ascertain the state of awareness of undercover police operations of Her Majesty's Government;*
 - iv. *identify and assess the adequacy of the:*
 - a. *justification, authorisation, operational governance and oversight of undercover policing;*
 - b. *selection, training, management and care of undercover police officers;*
 - v. *identify and assess the adequacy of the statutory, policy and judicial regulation of undercover policing.*

Miscarriages of justice

2. *The inquiry's investigations will include a review of the extent of the duty to make, during a criminal prosecution, disclosure of an undercover police operation and the scope for miscarriage of justice in the absence of proper disclosure.*
3. *The inquiry will refer to a panel, consisting of senior members of the Crown Prosecution Service and the police, the facts of any case in respect of which it concludes that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred as a result of an undercover police operation or its non disclosure. The panel will consider whether further action is required, including but not limited to, referral of the case to the Criminal Cases Review Commission.*

Scope

4. *The inquiry's investigation will include, but not be limited to, whether and to what purpose, extent and effect undercover police operations have targeted political and social justice campaigners.*
5. *The inquiry's investigation will include, but not be limited to, the undercover operations of the Special Demonstration Squad and the National Public Order Intelligence Unit.*
6. *For the purpose of the inquiry, the term "undercover police operations" means the use by a police force of a police officer as a covert human intelligence*

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

source (CHIS) within the meaning of section 26(8) of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000, whether before or after the commencement of that Act. The terms “undercover police officer”, “undercover policing”, “undercover police activity” should be understood accordingly. It includes operations conducted through online media.

7. *The inquiry will not examine undercover or covert operations conducted by any body other than an English or Welsh police force.*

Method

8. *The inquiry will examine and review all documents as the inquiry chairman shall judge appropriate.*
9. *The inquiry will receive such oral and written evidence as the inquiry chairman shall judge appropriate.*

Report

10. *The inquiry will report to the Home Secretary as soon as practicable⁶. The report will make recommendations as to the future deployment of undercover police officers.”*

It has, regrettably, proved impossible to comply with the three-year timeframe anticipated in the terms of reference. The Home Secretary has been kept informed of progress.

Preliminary Steps

16. This is a particularly complicated public inquiry, not only because of the breadth of our terms of reference but also because of the inherent difficulties of inquiring *publicly* into *secret* policing of *private* lives. We have a very large number of core participants. The vast majority of the documents produced to the Inquiry by state bodies bear high security classifications. Much of their content refers to the private lives of individuals, whether it be their political beliefs or their personal affairs. A great deal of time and effort has been spent preparing to publish documents in a form that does not harm the public interest or interfere unnecessarily with the privacy of those to whom they refer. We have undertaken numerous preliminary steps in order to arrive at today’s opening of the evidential hearings.

⁶ It is anticipated that the inquiry report will be delivered up to three years after the publication of these terms of reference.

17. The Inquiry first invited and then considered applications for core participant status, holding an oral hearing on 7 October 2015 which was followed by a ruling on 21 October 2015⁷. 380 applications were initially received, of which 198 were granted. Since the expiry of the Inquiry's original deadline for applications, many more late applications have been received and considered. At present, the Inquiry has 233 core participants. Some are individuals. Others are groups or organisations. One, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner's Designated Lawyer's Officers, includes 113 current and former police officers legally represented by the Designated Lawyer's Team ("the DL"). Core participants have been divided into the following categories⁸.

- 17.1. A – Police Institutions
- 17.2. B – Government
- 17.3. C – Designated Lawyer Officers
- 17.4. D – Political organisations and politicians
- 17.5. E – Trades unions and trades union members
- 17.6. F – Relatives of deceased individuals
- 17.7. G – The family of Stephen Lawrence, Duwayne Brooks OBE and Michael Mansfield QC
- 17.8. H – Individuals in relationships with undercover officers
- 17.9. I – Miscarriage of Justice
- 17.10. J – Justice Campaigns
- 17.11. K – Political Activists
- 17.12. L – Social and Environmental Activists
- 17.13. M – Families of Police Officers

18. All core participants are entitled to make an opening statement and we shall be hearing their opening statements for the rest of this week and on Monday and Tuesday of next week. It is one of the ways in which those involved in the events that we are charged with investigating have a voice in the Inquiry's proceedings. There will be further opportunities at the start of each tranche or phase of the Inquiry's work for those directly affected by the evidence in that tranche or phase to make a further opening statement informed, at that stage, by advance sight of the hearing bundle.

⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/160921-ruling-core-participants-number-1-reissued.pdf>

⁸ For the current list of core participants, see: <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/core-participants-list/>

19. Applications for funding for legal representations were considered at a hearing held on 4 November 2015. Further applications and the administration of awards made pursuant to s.40 of the Inquiries Act 2005 have been dealt with on paper since then.
20. A ruling was given on 16 January 2016, following a “minded to” note and written submissions, about the standard of proof that will be applied⁹. Sir Christopher decided on a flexible and variable standard of proof. That means that the starting point for most decisions of fact should be the civil standard, the balance of probabilities, but the Chairman should not be bound by it because: depending on what the issue is, it will be more useful if, having examined the evidence, the Chairman expresses his state of certainty or uncertainty upon it with such accuracy as he can.
21. Following a hearing, held on 27 April 2016, and a ruling issued on 26 May 2016, an undertaking was requested from the Attorney General in order to enable witnesses to give their evidence to the Inquiry without fear of self-incrimination¹⁰. The Attorney General provided an undertaking in the following terms by letter dated 28 August 2016¹¹.

“It is undertaken that, in respect of any person who provides evidence or produces a document, information or thing to the Inquiry, no evidence he or she may give to the Inquiry, whether orally or by written statement, nor any witness statement made preparatory to giving evidence, nor any document, thing or information produced by that person to the Inquiry:

- (i) will be used against him or her (or their spouse or civil partner) in any criminal proceedings (whether present or future or on appeal from a conviction); or*
- (ii) will be used when deciding whether to bring such proceedings, except proceedings where he or she is charged with giving false evidence in the course of this Inquiry or with having conspired with or procured any other person to do so or is charged with any offence under section 35 of the Inquiries Act 2005 or having conspired with or procured others to commit such an offence.*

It is further undertaken not to use in criminal proceedings (whether present or future or on appeal against conviction) against that person (or their spouse or

⁹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/160113-Standard-of-Proof-ruling-including-annexes.pdf>

¹⁰ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/160526-ruling-undertakings.pdf>

¹¹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/160828-letter-AGO-to-UCPI-undertaking.pdf>

civil partner) any evidence itself which is the product of an investigation commenced as a result of the provision by that person of any evidence, document, thing or information to the Inquiry.

For the avoidance of doubt, this undertaking does not preclude the use of a document and/or information and/or evidence identified independently of the evidence provided by that person to the Inquiry.

22. After two days of oral submissions and extensive written submissions, on 3 May 2016, Sir Christopher issued an 85 page ruling which considered the approach to be taken to determining applications for orders imposing restrictions on the disclosure and publication of any evidence or documents given, produced or provided to the Inquiry¹². The care taken by the Inquiry at that stage on this issue reflected its importance to the levels of openness with which we can proceed.
23. The approach to the disclosure of the identities of deceased children used by undercover police officers was considered at an oral hearing held on 22 June 2016. A ruling followed on 14 July¹³. For the reasons explained in the ruling the Inquiry has had to adopt a cautious approach to the release of the relevant identities prior to the completion of the evidential hearings. The evidence obtained by the Inquiry about the use of deceased children's identities in the construction of undercover identities is to the effect that it was not immediately adopted as a standard practice by the SDS. It became standard practice a few years later and its commencement will be examined in the Tranche 1 Phase 2 hearings which will take place next year.
24. The Inquiry subsequently issued a public notice to the parents or close relatives of children born between 1938 and 1975 who died in childhood, who wished to know whether the child's identity was used by the police to create an undercover identity¹⁴. Such persons were invited to contact the Inquiry. The Inquiry has also proactively contacted the relatives of persons whose particulars are believed to have been used by SDS undercover officers. As a result of this process, 20 families have been informed, for the first time, that at least some aspect of their relative's identity was used by an undercover police officer. In all but one of these cases the deceased person was a child¹⁵. In a

¹² <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/160503-ruling-legal-approach-to-restriction-orders.pdf>

¹³ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/160714-ruling-deceased-children.pdf>

¹⁴ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/161102-public-notice-deceased-children.pdf>

¹⁵ HN12 used aspects of an adult's identity when creating his cover identity. Francis Bennett and Honor Robson are surviving relatives of Michael Hartley and core participants.

further case the subject was still alive when the SDS officer created his undercover identity¹⁶.

25. The Inquiry sought witness statements from appropriate persons within the Metropolitan Police Service to explain matters relating to the documents being provided to the Inquiry by the MPS. The process is intended to provide assurance that the disclosure exercise is being conducted in an appropriate manner and serving its intended purpose. Some of these assurance statements have been published. The first was posted on the Inquiry's website on 29 April 2016. Overall, 7 assurance statements, produced by six police witnesses, have been published by the Inquiry. They are as follows.
 - 25.1. The witness statements of Detective Superintendent Neil Hutchinson, Police Team Senior Officer for the Assistant Commissioner Directorate of Professionalism's Public Inquiry Team ("AC-PIT")¹⁷.
 - 25.2. The witness statement of Jeffrey Lamprey, Data Standards Lead for the National Counter Terrorism Policing Headquarters¹⁸.
 - 25.3. The witness statement of Kenneth Neale, Data Protection Officer and NSBIS Administrator for the National Counter Terrorism Policing Operations Centre¹⁹. NSBIS is a police database.
 - 25.4. The witness statement of Temporary Detective Superintendent Michael Killeen, Head of Intelligence, National Counter Terrorism Policing Operations Centre²⁰.
 - 25.5. The witness statement of Rob Cox, Head of Information Assurance and Accreditation for the National Counter Terrorism Policing Headquarters²¹.
 - 25.6. The witness statement of Detective Inspector Alistair Pocock, Public Inquiry Liaison Team ("PILT")²².

The Inquiry has sought and received similar assurance witness statements from senior officers within all the regional police forces setting out how they have retained their material and how they have carried out their searches for evidence relevant to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

¹⁶ HN298 used aspects of Michael Scott's identity.

¹⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Hutchison-WS-R9-8-and-R9-12.pdf> and <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Hutchison-WS-R9-10a.pdf>

¹⁸ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Lamprey-WS-1.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Neale-WS-1.pdf> (NSBIS is a police database).

²⁰ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Killeen-WS-1.pdf>

²¹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Cox-WS-1.pdf>

²² <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Pocock-WS-1.pdf>

26. On 22 September 2016, Sir Christopher issued a ruling in which he concluded that it would be inappropriate to make any request for undertakings concerning disciplinary proceedings relating to former police officers, long retired. He did so in the context of the Policing and Crime Bill and fears expressed on behalf of Mark Kennedy that it might have retrospective effect²³.
27. The Inquiry held a significant hearing on 5 and 6 April 2017 to consider an application by the MPS for an extension of time in which to make applications for anonymity in respect of former members of the SDS and to change its approach to anonymity applications. The occasion was also used to afford core participants the opportunity to make submissions on the approach of the Inquiry to its work in light of the fact that it had become clear that the Inquiry would not be able to report within 3 years of its start date as anticipated in the Terms of Reference. In a 59 page ruling issued on 2 May 2017 the Chairman extended time for making anonymity applications but declined to change the Inquiry's approach.
28. Following extensive discussions with core participants the Inquiry issued a Disclosure Protocol and a Restrictions Order Protocol on 30 May 2017²⁴ in order to make clear how these matters were to be dealt with insofar as they related to the MPS. These were the last decisions made by the Inquiry's original Chairman who, sadly, was forced to step down by serious ill health. The Restrictions Order Protocol has recently been updated to reflect changes in both law and practice, particularly in relation to privacy²⁵.
29. Sir, you made your opening statement orally on 20 November 2017²⁶. In particular, you emphasised that your priority is to discover the truth. You said: *"In the last sentence of paragraph 17 of his opening remarks, Sir Christopher said "The Inquiry's priority is to discover the truth." That is my priority. It is only by discovering the truth that I can fulfil the terms of reference of the Inquiry. I am determined to do so. In making procedural decisions about the conduct of the Inquiry I will do nothing which I can legitimately avoid which makes fulfilment of that intention more difficult. I will also make no decision whose purpose is not to fulfil that aim"*.

²³ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/160922-ruling-undertakings-retrospective-disciplinary.pdf>

²⁴ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/20170530-restriction-statement-and-protocol.pdf>
<https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/20170530-disclosure-statement-and-protocol.pdf>

²⁵ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/20200722_restriction_protocol.pdf

²⁶ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/20171120-Chairman-statement.pdf>

30. In a series of decisions which began on 3 September 2017 you determined anonymity applications relating to former members of the SDS in accordance with published procedures. The making of those applications and their determination proved to be a very considerable undertaking. It involved the submission of applications, supported by risk assessments and, in some cases, the reports of medico-legal experts. Significant redaction work was required before any part of the applications and supporting evidence could be made public. Oral hearings were held in November 2017, February 2018 and May 2018. A series of “minded to” and final decisions accompanied by Counsel to the Inquiry’s explanatory notes were published by the Inquiry. The procedure was streamlined in 2018 having first given core participants the opportunity to comment on a proposal for change²⁷. The principal result of the SDS anonymity exercise is that the Inquiry has been able to publish the cover names of 69 former SDS undercover police officers.
31. Significant uncertainty arose as to the correct interpretation of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 in the context of a public inquiry. At an oral hearing held on 20 November 2017 oral submissions were heard, following the receipt of written position statements and the publication of several notes by you and Counsel to the Inquiry. A ruling followed on 27 November recording your decision to invite the Secretary of State for Justice to lay before Parliament an amendment to Schedule 3 to the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions) Order 1975²⁸. An amendment to the legislation was made with effect from 24 June 2019 permitting the Inquiry to consider spent convictions where necessary to fulfil the terms of reference²⁹.
32. A Witness Statement Protocol was issued on 22 January 2018 before the Inquiry embarked upon the process of obtaining evidential witness statements from former members of the SDS and from those affected by their actions³⁰.
33. The Inquiry devised and implemented a process for conducting the large scale exercise needed to prepare documents for provision to state witnesses, non-state witnesses and hearing bundles. A part of this process involved permitting state bodies an opportunity to apply to restrict publication of documents, or passages of text within them. Pursuant to the process set out in the

²⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/20180222-Chairman-note-separation..pdf>

²⁸ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/20171129-ruling-ROA-1974.pdf>

²⁹ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2019/1051/article/2/made> and <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2019-06-05/debates/37F77B20-4281-434C-962C-DD1BAEEDD8D4/RehabilitationOfOffenders>

³⁰ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/20180122-witness-statement-protocol-v1.0.pdf>

Restrictions Protocol, and in order to promote transparency, Open Grounds for Restriction were published by the Inquiry on 15 March 2018³¹. In order to demonstrate how the process would work, an important sample document, the SDS' Tradecraft Manual was published in redacted form on 19 March 2018³². Although many applications have been capable of agreement, a number of closed hearings have been held at which you, Sir, have determined applications that could not be agreed between counsel.

34. The Inquiry conducted a strategic review, announced in 2017 and culminating in the publication of a document in May 2018 which set out progress up to that point, the Inquiry's intended future approach and the reasons for rejecting alternative approaches³³. It was followed, on 18 May, by a forward looking oral hearing designed to permit core participants to raise with the Inquiry how the approach set out in the Strategic Review could be executed most effectively³⁴.
35. On the same day as the hearing you also issued a statement on private meetings and public hearings. In particular, this statement set out the basis upon which you would meet separately and privately with non-state core participants, former undercover officers, their managers or, in each case, their surviving immediate relatives. Since then a series of such meetings have occurred³⁵.
36. An important aspect of the Inquiry's preparatory work has been the preparation of issues lists to guide our investigation and, in particular, the gathering of evidence. Our approach has been to publish a series of lists, each relating to a specific part of the Inquiry. In each case, Counsel to the Inquiry ("CTI") have prepared a draft list on which core participants have been able to comment in writing. The Chairman has then made a decision and the Inquiry has published the list. The first completed list was published on 5 July 2018. To date, the following lists of issues have been published.

³¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180315_open_grounds_for_restriction.pdf See also the later Note produced by Counsel to the Inquiry, published on 17 May 2018 providing further clarification https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180419_CTI_note_open_generic_restriction_orders.pdf

³² https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180319-TC-Documents_Final_Version.pdf See also the accompanying Schedule of Redactions https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180319_tradecraft_redactions_schedule_FINAL.pdf

³³ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/20180510-strategic_review.pdf

³⁴ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180518-Hearing-Transcript-Strategic-Review-full-day.pdf>

³⁵ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180518_Chairman_statement.pdf

- 36.1. Module 1 SDS Issues³⁶
 - 36.2. Module 1 NPOIU Issues³⁷
 - 36.3. Module 1 Other Undercover Policing Issues³⁸
 - 36.4. Module 2(a) SDS Issues List³⁹
37. I shall return to the issues lists in more detail later on.
38. In relation to the NPOIU, the Inquiry is conducting a similar anonymity exercise to that which it has conducted in relation to the SDS. The first ruling on applications to restrict the real and/or cover names of former NPOIU undercover police officers was made on 30 October 2018⁴⁰. The Inquiry will be publishing the cover names of 6 of the 17 principal NPOIU undercover officers. The exercise is continuing. We are part way through dealing with applications made in respect of NPOIU cover officers and have invited applications in respect of relevant NPOIU managers.
39. Complex issues arise in relation to the application of data protection and privacy laws to the work of the Inquiry, particularly following the coming into force of the General Data Protection Regulation (“the GDPR”) and the associated Data Protection Act 2018 (“the DPA 2018”). Two hearings were held to receive oral submissions on these issues on 31 January 2019 and 25 March of that year. Following these hearings you made a written statement on 11 April 2019 explaining the approach which the Inquiry would follow to reconcile its obligations to fulfil the terms of reference – in particular, to get at the truth about undercover police deployments – with its obligation to respect the data protection rights of those affected by the deployments⁴¹. A second data protection and privacy statement followed on, 21 August 2019, which dealt with the approach to be adopted to the disclosure of documents and witness statements made by former undercover officers to non-police, non-state core

³⁶ [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180705_list_of_issues_module_one_SDS_final.pdf)

[content/uploads/2018/07/20180705_list_of_issues_module_one_SDS_final.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180705_list_of_issues_module_one_SDS_final.pdf)

³⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/publications/national-public-order-intelligence-unit-module-one-issues-list-2/>

³⁸ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/20190221-Other_Undercover_Policing-Module_One-List_of_issues.pdf See also the accompanying Explanatory Note https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/20190221-explanatory_note-Other_Undercover_Policing-Module_One-List_of_i....pdf

³⁹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf See also the accompanying Explanatory Note https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_explanatory_note-san.pdf

⁴⁰ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20181030-NPOIU_anonymity-ruling_1_and_Minded_to_2.pdf

⁴¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/20190411-Chairmans_Statement_on_Data_Protection_and_Privacy.pdf

participants and civilian witnesses, for the purposes of taking statements from them⁴². The approach kept to a minimum the privacy redactions which had to be applied to documents provided for the purposes of enabling a witness to make an informed witness statement.

40. A specific issue arose as to the approach to be taken to the provision of photographs of undercover police officers taken contemporaneously to their deployments both to civilian witnesses and the public. That issue was the subject of a public statement posted on the Inquiry's website on 29 January 2020⁴³. The Inquiry has been provided with some such photographs, dating from the very earliest days of the SDS, to which we return further below.
41. On 14 September 2020, in the interests of transparency, the Inquiry published the internal guidance we use when applying redactions to documents for reasons of privacy⁴⁴. This document reflects the practical application of the approach to privacy set out in the Restrictions Protocol.
42. On 14 October of this year, you issued a statement explaining the approach that you will take to ensuring compliance with the Investigatory Powers Act 2016⁴⁵. Most recently, on 22 October, we published Counsel to the Inquiry's disclosure note, which explains our approach to documents and witness statements in Tranche 1, including an outline of the Phase 1 hearing bundle⁴⁶.

Substantive Investigation

Modules, Tranches and Phases

⁴²<https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/20190821-chairmans-second-statement-on-data-protection-and-privacy-san.pdf> See also the annex and accompanying explanatory note as well as CTI's note explaining a refinement to the approach published on 18 November 2019: <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/20190821-index-annex-to-chairmans-second-statement-on-privacy.pdf> and <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/20190821-explanatory-note-to-annex-second-privacy-statement-san.pdf> and <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/20191118-counsel-note-privacy-and-data-protection-npscps-and-civilian-witnesses-san.pdf>

⁴³ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/20191118-counsel-note-privacy-and-data-protection-npscps-and-civilian-witnesses-san.pdf> See also the subsequent Chairman's Note dealing with specific handling arrangements <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/20200407-chairmans-second-statement-photographs.pdf>

⁴⁴ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/20200911-Internal-Privacy-Guidance.pdf> to be read with <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/20200911-Internal-Privacy-Guidance.pdf>

⁴⁵ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20201014-chairmans-statement-IPA-2016.pdf>

⁴⁶ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20201022-T1-Disclosure-Note.pdf>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

43. The work of the Inquiry has been divided into modules, tranches and phases. From the outset, the Inquiry has divided its work into three modules.
 - 43.1. Module 1 includes the examination of the deployment of undercover officers in the past, their conduct, and the impact of their activities on themselves and others.
 - 43.2. Module 2 includes the examination of the management and oversight of undercover officers, including their selection, training, supervision, care after the end of an undercover deployment and the legal and regulatory framework within which undercover policing is carried out. It is subdivided into three parts.
 - 43.2.1. Module 2(a) includes managers and administrators from within undercover policing units.
 - 43.2.2. Module 2(b) includes senior managers higher in the chain of command as well as police personnel who handled intelligence provided by undercover police officers.
 - 43.2.3. Module 2(c) includes a number of other government bodies with a connection to undercover policing, including the Home Office.
 - 43.3. Module 3 includes the examination of current undercover policing practices and of how undercover policing should be conducted in the future. For this final part of the Inquiry it is intended that you, Sir, will be joined by panel members appointed by the Home Secretary.
44. The scale of our task is such that it was decided to split the Module 1 and 2 hearings into 6 tranches. The starting point for the content of each tranche is as follows, subject to minor adjustments which we are making for a variety of reasons.
 - 44.1. Tranche 1 – The SDS 1968-1982
 - 44.2. Tranche 2 – The SDS 1983-1992
 - 44.3. Tranche 3 – The SDS 1993-2008
 - 44.4. Tranche 4 – The NPOIU
 - 44.5. Tranche 5 – Other undercover policing
 - 44.6. Tranche 6 – Senior managers, intelligence handlers and other government bodies
45. So far as former SDS undercover officers are concerned, each has been allocated to a tranche according to whether his or her start date fell within the period covered by the tranche (unless there is some reason to investigate the deployment out of sequence). However, the approach to managers or administrators within the SDS is different. They are allocated to a tranche

according to the date when they completed their managerial or administrative posting. In this way we have sought to ensure that, save in exceptional cases, we will receive evidence about undercover officers before those who managed them.

46. For the purposes of Tranche 6, senior managers are those who sat above the undercover units in the chain of command but who had managerial responsibility for them. In the case of the SDS, this means those managers in the chain of command from the rank of Superintendent up to the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis.
47. The slowing effect that the current pandemic has had on our work has been such that to avoid further delay to the start of evidential hearings, it became necessary to subdivide Tranche 1 into three phases. Phase 1 focuses on evidence relating to 27 officers, most of whom deployed undercover; those affected by their deployments, especially 3 activists from whom we have obtained witness statements; and 4 managers from the very earliest years of the SDS. It also involves evidence relating to higher levels of management, the involvement of the Home Office and, to a limited extent, the Security Service during this formative period. I shall return to introduce Phase 1 in greater detail shortly. Phase 2 involves the remaining Tranche 1 undercover officers and some of those affected by their deployments. Phase 3 will cover the remaining evidence from, or relating to, Tranche 1 managers.
48. It remains your intention, Sir, to produce an interim fact finding report following the conclusion of Tranche 6. Panel members will then be appointed before we proceed, in Module 3, to consider current and future undercover policing.

Progress

49. Phase 1 witnesses who can give evidence in public are due to be called between 11 and 19 November, that is to say next Wednesday through to a week on Thursday. Preparations for Phases 2 & 3 are ongoing. Public Phase 2 hearings are now likely to take place in March or April next year and Phase 3 public hearings as soon as practicable thereafter. In addition to the public hearings, the Inquiry will also be arranging closed hearings at which evidence which cannot be given publicly will be received from Tranche 1 witnesses: in particular from some of the officers whose real and cover names cannot be published.

50. The Inquiry's Tranche 2 investigation involves 36 former UCOs and 14 former managers. 28 of the former UCOs are expected to be able to provide a witness statement. The remainder are either deceased, excused due to ill health or both overseas and declining to co-operate. 16 of these former officers have been granted anonymity. Witness statements have been received from 7 former UCOs and are awaited from a further 6. Requests for a witness statement with a supporting bundle of documents are in various stages of preparation for the remainder. Our investigation of the 8 officers who cannot provide a witness statement has been completed and the resulting documents are entering the restrictions order process to be prepared for publication. The impact of the pandemic on our capacity and that of the third parties involved means that delays are anticipated to the further preparatory steps required for a hearing. We currently anticipate that Tranche 2 hearings will commence in the first half of 2022.
51. Work continues on Tranches 3 & 4, although the Inquiry's resources are necessarily being concentrated primarily on Tranches 1 & 2. In Tranche 3, following investigation, the first rule 9 requests for witness statements from former UCOs are being drafted. In Tranche 4 that stage should be reached shortly. The number of persons who can safely work in the Inquiry's offices, and those of relevant third parties, is limited by the need for social distancing. Much investigative work cannot be done from home because of the need to work on classified documents. Social distancing is affecting our capacity across all tranches but is particularly detrimental to the later tranches. We currently anticipate that T3 hearings will commence in the first half of 2023.
52. Significant work has been undertaken on Tranches 5 & 6. However, it is currently paused pending work on earlier tranches.

Arrangements for the Evidential Hearings

53. Planning for evidential hearings began some time ago. In August 2018 the Inquiry published a consultation document relating to the administration of evidence hearings⁴⁷. You responded, Sir, with your preliminary conclusions which were set out in your statement dated 19 December 2018⁴⁸. Statements specific to the arrangements for Tranche 1 were made on 7 April 2020 (realting

⁴⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/20180830-PUBLIC-CONSULTATION-ON-THE-APPROACH-TO-THE-ADMINISTRATION-OF-EVIDENCE-HEARINGS-1.pdf>

⁴⁸ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/20181219-Chairman_statement-conduct_of_evidence_hearings.pdf

to special measures for witnesses), 29 May 2020 (containing proposals in response to the pandemic) and 23 July 2020 (following written submissions on the proposals)⁴⁹. In addition there has been a considerable amount of liaison between the Inquiry Legal Team (“ILT”) and core participants. You have also considered and decided a number of specific applications for reasonable adjustments to be made to enable core participants to participate in the hearings. Very considerable work has been done behind the scenes by the Inquiry’s Hearings Team and many others, too numerous to identify separately, to enable the Inquiry to start today. Together they have overcome the formidable challenges presented by the pandemic. We are grateful to them all.

54. I now turn specifically to Phase 1 of Tranche 1.

⁴⁹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/20200414-chairmans_statement-special_measures.pdf and https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/20200529_Chairmans-statement-T1.pdf and https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/20200723_chairmans-second-statement_t1-hearings.pdf

PART 2 – TRANCHE 1 PHASE 1

Introduction

1. The evidence that we have obtained for Phase 1 of Tranche 1 (“Phase 1”) concerns events preceding the formation of the SDS, the formation of the SDS, its activities in the earliest years of the unit’s existence and the decisions which led to the SDS continuing to exist beyond the specific purpose for which it was originally formed. The documents suggest that the SDS’ original purpose was the supply of advance intelligence relating to the mass demonstration staged by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign on 27 October 1968 (“the October Demonstration”)⁵⁰. In fact, the SDS went on to exist for four decades and to provide long term intelligence on a wide range of targets. It transformed from a unit formed to provide intelligence relating to a specific forthcoming event, in what was then the near future, to one which continually gathered intelligence about the activities and intentions of numerous groups. How did the SDS come into existence? Was undercover policing to gather intelligence about the October Demonstration justified? How and why did the SDS’ existence become long-term? Were the long-term deployments which evolved justified? Did the SDS become political police? We suggest that these are the central, high-level questions, in this era. They are supplemented by numerous other questions about how the unit operated, what it did and why.
2. The formative period with which we are dealing in Phase 1 is one in which a high concentration of SDS officers served. Some of the earliest officers served for only a few weeks or months. There is a noticeable trend towards longer deployments after that.
3. There will be a good deal of evidence in Phase 1 of how the SDS operated in the early years. However, there is no evidence in the documents, or witness statements that we have obtained, of any specific sexual relationship between an undercover officer, in his or her undercover identity, and a member of the public. Nor is there any evidence in the documents that it was official practice to use a deceased child’s identity in this early period. There will be evidence that both of these things occurred in Phase 2 of Tranche 1.
4. The documents and witness statements obtained by the Inquiry contain no evidence that any Phase 1 SDS officer infiltrated right wing groups. The SDS’

early work was entirely targeted at left wing or Irish-related groups. There will be some evidence of infiltration of the far right in Tranche 2.

Issues

5. Two of the Inquiry's published issues lists are, in very large part, relevant to the Phase 1 investigation. First, the Module 1 Special Demonstration Squad Issues List, which is directed at the SDS's undercover officers. Second, the Module 2(a) Special Demonstration Squad Issues List, which concerns unit level management of the SDS.

- 5.1. The Module 1 SDS Issues List itemises 158 issues grouped under the following 21 headings:

- 5.1.1. The establishment of the SDS
- 5.1.2. Size, organisation and composition of the SDS
- 5.1.3. Recruitment, selection and training
- 5.1.4. Legend building
- 5.1.5. Targeting and initial authorisation
- 5.1.6. Relationships
- 5.1.7. Participation in or encouragement of crime
- 5.1.8. Criminal proceedings
- 5.1.9. Infringement of legal professional privilege
- 5.1.10. Reporting generally
- 5.1.11. Reporting on justice campaigns
- 5.1.12. Reporting on The Stephen Lawrence Campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE
- 5.1.13. Reporting on Elected politicians, political organisations and political activists
- 5.1.14. Reporting on trade unions and trade union members
- 5.1.15. Reporting on social and environmental activists
- 5.1.16. The prevention and detection of crime
- 5.1.17. Management, supervision and oversight
- 5.1.18. Withdrawal from deployment
- 5.1.19. Management of post-deployment conduct
- 5.1.20. Debriefing
- 5.1.21. The welfare of undercover officers and their families

- 5.2. The M2a SDS Issues List specifies 219 issues grouped under the following 30 subheadings⁵¹:

⁵¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 5.2.1. The establishment of the SDS
- 5.2.2. The function of the SDS
- 5.2.3. Size, organisation and composition of the SDS
- 5.2.4. Management and supervisory structure and function
- 5.2.5. Selection and recruitment
- 5.2.6. Training and guidance
- 5.2.7. Legend building
- 5.2.8. Targeting and authorisation
- 5.2.9. Role of supervisors and managers – generally
- 5.2.10. Reporting on justice campaigns
- 5.2.11. Reporting on the Stephen Lawrence campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE
- 5.2.12. Reporting on elected politicians, political organisations and political activists
- 5.2.13. Reporting on trade unions and trade union members
- 5.2.14. Reporting on social and environmental activists
- 5.2.15. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards relationships between undercover officers and their targets or those upon whom they reported
- 5.2.16. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards participation in, or encouragement of, crime by undercover officers
- 5.2.17. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in criminal proceedings
- 5.2.18. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in civil proceedings
- 5.2.19. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards infringement of legal professional privilege by undercover officers
- 5.2.20. SDS record keeping
- 5.2.21. Whistleblowing
- 5.2.22. Withdrawal from deployment
- 5.2.23. Debriefing
- 5.2.24. Management of post-deployment conduct
- 5.2.25. The welfare of undercover officers and their families
- 5.2.26. The prevention and detection of crime
- 5.2.27. Interaction between SDS managers and those responsible for overseeing its operation
- 5.2.28. Dissemination of intelligence
- 5.2.29. Interaction with the Security Service
- 5.2.30. Disbandment of the SDS

- 5.3. In eliciting evidence we will not draw bright lines between modules, tranches and phases. The officers in Phase 1 have evidence to give which goes to their own actions, managerial issues within the SDS and, sometimes, beyond. Some of the evidence in Phase 1 will overlap with Phase 2, Tranche 6 and, to a lesser extent, other parts of the Inquiry. Nor will we draw bright lines between the different issues lists or treat them as we would pleadings in adversarial litigation. They are a tool to direct and inform our work, not an artificial boundary.

Sources of Evidence and Publication

6. Witness statements have been obtained from 18 former SDS UCOs for the purposes of Phase 1. 8 of these witnesses will be giving oral evidence during the oral hearings which commence next Wednesday. They will be called in broadly chronological order and their witness statements published on the Inquiry's website at the start of the session in which the witness will be called. Any documents referred to in evidence and not already published will be published as soon as possible after the hearing. The witness statements of those not giving oral evidence will be summarised by junior counsel to the Inquiry. These summaries have been scheduled to accord, broadly, with each officer's place in the chronology of events. The witness statement and documents associated with such officers will also be posted on the Inquiry's website immediately afterwards.
7. Witness statements have been obtained from 3 civilians who were reported on by the SDS: Tariq Ali was a prominent figure in the VSC and a leading activist throughout Phase 1 and beyond; Ernest Tate was also a leading figure in the VSC; Dr Norman Temple was a member of the Irish National Solidarity Liberation Front ("the INLSF"). Mr Ali and Dr Temple are due to give oral evidence; Mr Tate is unable to do so. His witness statement will be read by Mr Menon QC at the appropriate juncture and published on the Inquiry's website, together with the associated exhibits. Mr Ali and Dr Temple have been scheduled to give evidence before the undercover officers who spied upon them. Mr Ali will be the Inquiry's first witness. Their witness statements and exhibits will be published on the Inquiry's website at the start of the sessions during which they give evidence.
8. In addition to the written and oral evidence of the witnesses, a significant number of documents will also be put into evidence. Written evidence which the Inquiry is publishing today falls into the following categories:

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 8.1. First, open source documents from the period: press cuttings, film clips and the obituaries for the founder of the SDS, Conrad Dixon.
- 8.2. Second, documents passing between Special Branch and the Home Office, including periodic reports of the SDS' activities, spanning the years 1969-1974. These document the unit's activity, from the SDS' corporate perspective. They also record the grounds on which continued funding was sought by Special Branch from the Home Office and the Home Office's approval of these requests. It was through this mechanism that the SDS continued to exist. We regard them as very important documents. I will speak to them in more detail later.
- 8.3. Third, the contents of a Special Branch file entitled "SDS Demonstration Squad Policy". These refer mainly to the SDS' financial affairs in the period 1968-1973 and flatly contradict information in the public domain to the effect that the SDS, upon its foundation, had a budget of £500,000. The documents refer to figures (excluding salaries) of a few thousand pounds per annum. There is also a significant paper written by Conrad Dixon, dated 26 November 1968, entitled "Penetration of Extremist Groups". It records DCI Dixon's thoughts on the running of a unit such as the SDS and appends details of the SDS' organisation at the time. I will return to it later.
- 8.4. Fourth, documents in the SDS Policy File which, if accurate, demonstrate that the undercover tactic had been used by Special Branch before the foundation of the SDS. These documents concern Woman Patrol Pelling, a Special Branch officer who operated undercover in the 1920s, and infiltrated the Communist Party of Great Britain.
- 8.5. Fifth, Home Office Circular 97/1969 on Informants who Take Part in Crime and the Home Office's Terms of Reference for Special Branch dated April 1970. The former document, about which we will hear evidence in due course, contains official guidance from the Home Office to police on the participation of informants in crime. It is not specifically directed at undercover officers: no specific guidance on the participation of undercover police officers in crime has been found from this era. The latter document covers all special branches nationally and is pertinent because of the references to their role assisting the Security Service in the defence of the realm. In particular, their role in countering subversion.
- 8.6. Sixth, documents relating to the extent to which the SDS assisted the Security Service. The relationship between the two is an important line of inquiry. Five documents evidencing the relationship between the

SDS and the Security service are available for publication and admission into evidence in Phase 1. The Inquiry has received a witness statement from the Security Service and further documents. The extent to which this evidence can be put into the public domain is presently under consideration. Such of this information as it is safe to publish will be made public later in Tranche 1.

- 8.7. Seventh, documents from the Metropolitan Police's Special Branch files concerning the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. These documents date mainly, but not entirely, from 1968. The approach which the Inquiry has taken to such documents has been first to prepare for publication two entire Special Branch files. The first relates to the VSC in the period June to August 1968. The second relates to the VSC in the period August 1968 to January 1969. The contents of these files between them cover the period immediately before and after the formation of the SDS. The unit formed on 30 or 31 July 1968. They show that Special Branch was receiving intelligence about the VSC's activities from numerous sources, not just undercover police officers. They assist in understanding what intelligence Special Branch was gathering about the VSC and in making a comparison between the pre- and post- SDS intelligence picture that Special Branch had obtained. Secondly, there is a report by Chief Inspector Dixon following the public disorder that occurred at the VSC's mass demonstration held on 17 March 1968. Obtaining intelligence to prevent a recurrence of such disorder appears to have been the reason for the creation of the SDS. Third there is a series of reports by Chief Inspector Dixon, dated from 21 August 1968 to 22 October 1968 concerning intelligence about preparations for the October Demonstration. They contain information which appears to have come from a number of sources, including by then, the SDS' undercover police officers. Finally, there is a selection of documents from other VSC related files which we considered necessary for the purposes of the investigation. I will be returning specifically to some of the more significant documents from the VSC files later.
9. Any Phase 1 documents not published either today, or during the course of the oral hearings, will be published at the end of the hearings. Publication is being staged to ensure fairness to those witnesses who are giving oral evidence. The end result will be that the entire Phase 1 bundle for the forthcoming hearing will be put into the public domain.

10. Those directly affected by actions of the Tranche 1 undercover police officers have been provided with a copy of the Hearing Bundle in advance.

Political and Geopolitical Context

11. Phase 1 takes us back more than half a century to 1968 and it may assist to provide some contextual background. The World was in the middle of The Cold War. Government was concerned about communism, particularly, but importantly for our purposes, not limited to the Soviet version. The United States was deeply involved in an increasingly unpopular war in Vietnam, one of the biggest of the regional conflicts in which Superpowers intervened, on opposing sides, during the Cold War. That conflict was the subject of the mass demonstrations and public disorder on the streets of London which led to the formation of the SDS.
12. Public disorder and discontent amongst students was widespread in Europe, notably in Paris. There were fears, in official circles, that the same was occurring in London and could grow out of hand⁵². In far left circles, some at least, were hoping that it would do so. The Communist Party of Great Britain was not an instigator of mass protest. It was advancing its aims through a different strategy. We shall hear evidence that Maoist and Trotskyist groups were organising demonstrations, as were other groups, at a time of heightened political consciousness. Those who attended such demonstrations often included members of other groups, including anarchist groups, or the general public. Some sought lawful, orderly, protest. Others did not. The aims and methods of different groups and their ability to organise peaceful protest, or to incite disorder, as the case may be, will be a matter for evidence. We shall be hearing conflicting accounts. Trotskyist, Maoist and Anarchist groups are prominent amongst the SDS' targets throughout the Tranche 1 period.
13. The late 1960s and early 1970s were a period of rapid social change with an active civil rights movement. There was activism and protest against racism including, notably, apartheid South Africa. The same was true of gender equality, including what was then called women's liberation. In Northern Ireland the civil rights movement protested against the inequalities arising from religious sectarianism. A number of such groups were directly infiltrated by the

⁵² MPS-0730066/6 - The Times, 5 September 1968 – “Police and leaders of the peaceful demonstrators share the view that October 27 could bring the most violent upheaval in Britain for many years. Some senior officials believe that they are faced with a situation potentially as violent as the student demonstrations in Paris and Berlin earlier this year”.

SDS and many others were reported on peripherally. There will be evidence that groups on the far left supported these causes and were influential within at least some of them to varying degrees. We will be examining whether the influence of such groups, or the methods of protest used by civil rights activists, were capable of justifying undercover officers spying upon them. If so, did they justify the undercover policing that actually took place?

14. In 1969 what became known as “The Troubles” began in Northern Ireland. Sectarian violence escalated. In August 1971 the introduction of internment without trial, including the treatment of some detainees in ways which were later held by the European Court of Human Rights to have been inhuman and degrading, caused anger and resentment⁵³. The killing of innocent civilians by British paratroopers on “Bloody Sunday” in January 1972 caused further anger and controversy⁵⁴. Violence escalated further. Tensions in Northern Ireland spilled over onto mainland Britain, for example in the terrorist bombing of Aldershot barracks in 1972, or the bombing of public houses in Guildford and Birmingham in the autumn of 1974. Some of the Phase 1 SDS UCOs infiltrated groups campaigning on Irish-related matters. Some of the groups concerned were anti-sectarian. Others were sectarian in outlook. The Troubles may be important to the Inquiry’s work because the desire for intelligence about groups campaigning on the mainland, on Irish-related issues appears, on the face of the documents recovered, to have been at least one of the maintaining factors in the continued existence of the SDS after 1968.
15. There were significant industrial disputes during the Phase 1 period, particularly the 1972 miners’ strike and controversial legislation in the form of the Industrial Relations Act 1971. It was a period in which there was concern, in official circles, about the influence that groups on the far left were having within the trade union movement and a growing militancy in industrial relations which was to come to a head in the late 1970s and early 1980s. On the documents and witness statements obtained for Phase 1 there is no evidence that any trade union was specifically infiltrated by the SDS. Nor is there evidence of direct contact between the SDS and blacklisting organisations. However, there is reporting of the interest which some of the groups which were infiltrated had in industrial relations. There are also reports which refer to specific industrial disputes and to the trade union credentials of some individuals whom SDS officers came into contact with whilst deployed. We will be investigating whether there were indirect contacts between the SDS and blacklisting

⁵³ Ireland v United Kingdom (1979-1980) 2 EHRR 25

⁵⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/report-of-the-bloody-sunday-inquiry>

organisations later in the Inquiry with managers and those who disseminated SDS intelligence.

16. So far as Government during the Phase 1 period is concerned, Sir Harold Wilson was the Labour Prime Minister until 19 June 1970 and then again from the 4 March 1974. Sir Edward Heath was the Conservative Prime Minister during the intervening period. There are occasional references to the Labour Party in the Phase 1 evidence although there is no evidence that the Labour Party was ever infiltrated or a target of the SDS.
17. The Home Secretaries during the Phase 1 period were Sir James Callaghan (until 19 July 1970), Sir Reginald Maudling (20 July 1970 - 19 July 1972), Lord Carr (19 July 1972 - 4 March 1974) and Sir Roy Jenkins (5 March 1974 onwards). The Home Secretary is accountable to Parliament for ensuring the Queen's peace within all police areas and for the role that the police play in ensuring national security.
18. The documents that we are publishing today demonstrate that the Home Office was well aware of the existence of the SDS and approved its continued funding, periodically, throughout the Phase 1 period. There is evidence that the Government of the day was very concerned about the October Demonstration. It includes material which suggests that, as Home Secretary, James Callaghan was personally consulted about the proposed arrest of an activist against whom evidence had been obtained by a member of the SDS⁵⁵. Although the evidence does not suggest that he knew that to be the case.

The Metropolitan Police, Metropolitan Police Special Branch and the Special Demonstration Squad during Phase 1

Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis

19. The key police personalities involved, for the purposes of the Phase 1 evidence, at senior management level, are as follows. The Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis were: Sir Joseph Simpson until 20 March 1968; Sir John Waldron from March 1968 until April 1974; and Sir Robert Mark from April 1974 onwards.

Assistant Commissioners

⁵⁵ See HN323's deployment, as described in Appendix 2

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

20. The post of Assistant Commissioner “C” (that is Crime) was filled by Peter Brodie between 1966 and 1972 and then Colin Woods between 1972 and 1975.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner

21. At the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissioner and occupying the post Head of Special Branch, was Ferguson Smith between 1970 and 1972; followed by Victor Gilbert between 1972 and 1977.

Commander

22. Ferguson Smith had previously been Commander Special Branch, whilst holding the rank of Commander, between 1966 and 1970. Other significant personalities at the rank of Commander are John Lawlor, who was in charge of policing at the March and October 1968 VSC demonstrations which are important to understanding the genesis of the SDS, and Matthew Rodger who was a Commander between 1970 and 1972.

Chief Superintendent

23. At the rank of Chief Superintendent, significant documents are signed by Arthur Cunningham in the period 1968 to 1972. HN332, who is more significant for his role as head of the SDS at lower ranks, also occupies this rank in 1972.

Superintendent

24. Superintendents who appear in the documents are TN0039 and J Lawrenson.

Chief Inspector

25. Within the SDS itself, during the Phase 1 period, the managers were as follows⁵⁶. Chief Inspector Conrad Dixon led the unit from its foundation in July 1968 until approximately July 1969.
26. Dixon was succeeded by Phil Saunders from July 1969 until August 1971. During the first part of this period, until March 1970, Saunders appears to have been an Acting Chief Inspector. During this period he may have shared the role with Detective Inspector Riby Wilson. Thereafter Saunders is recorded as a Chief Inspector. Before taking command of the SDS, Saunders had served in the SDS, from the unit's formation, as a detective inspector.
27. Chief Inspector Saunders was himself succeeded by HN332 in August 1971⁵⁷. HN332 commanded the SDS, briefly, until early 1972. Like Saunders, he too

⁵⁶ Managers often held multiple ranks within the unit. For ease of reference they have been referred to once below.

⁵⁷ See MPS-0730219, p18.

had served as a detective inspector in the SDS from the unit's inception. It appears that HN332 was an SDS detective inspector until at least July 1969⁵⁸.

28. The SDS' next leader was HN294, between 1972 and 1974. He commenced his service in the SDS, when holding the rank of Detective Sergeant, in December 1969⁵⁹. He served as a Detective Inspector from March 1970⁶⁰ and is recorded as being Acting Chief Inspector from mid-1972⁶¹ onwards, until his promotion to Chief Inspector by 1974⁶².
29. Finally, for the purposes of Phase 1, Chief Inspector Derek Kneale commanded the SDS between 1974 and early 1976. His significance in Phase 1, is that he signed the 4 February 1975 SDS annual report. He served briefly as a Detective Inspector in the SDS before promotion to Chief Inspector.

Detective Inspector

30. Detective Inspector Riby Wilson was involved with the SDS from its inception in an administrative capacity. Between February and December 1969, he countersigned a number of SDS reports on behalf of the Chief Inspector, or as Acting Chief Inspector.

Administrators

31. The officers with essentially administrative functions feature in the evidence. First, Detective Sergeant Roy Creamer, who appears to have served in the SDS between July 1968 and July 1969⁶³ ⁶⁴. Second Detective Constable William Furner, who appears to have served between July 1968⁶⁵ and at least December 1969⁶⁶. Finally, Detective Sergeant David Smith. There is some evidence to suggest that he was involved from an early stage in an

⁵⁸ UCPI0000005800

⁵⁹ MPS-0739232

⁶⁰ MPS-0729093

⁶¹ MPS-0728970

⁶² MPS-0728975

⁶³ MPS-0733955; MPS-0733954 telegrams dated 27/10/68; MPS-0734308 Report on meeting of Earls Court VSC signed by Sergeant Creamer; MPS-0733943.

⁶⁴ MPS-0724119 p9

⁶⁵ MPS-0733955; MPS-0733954 telegrams dated 27/10/68; MPS-0734308 Report on meeting of Earls Court VSC signed by Sergeant Creamer; MPS-0733943.

⁶⁶ MPS-0733221

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

administrative capacity⁶⁷. It appears he may have returned to the unit later, signing reports as an acting Chief Inspector⁶⁸.

Undercover Officers

32. The SDS officers whose deployments have been included in Phase 1 are set out in the table below. Officers in bold text have provided witness statements. Officers whose nominal is asterisked are scheduled to give oral evidence. Cover names are stated where known and not restricted.

<i>Nominal</i>	<i>Name (cover name in inverted commas)</i>
HN218	Barry Moss, "Barry Morris"
HN68	"Sean Lynch". He is deceased.
HN331	Real name restricted, cover name unknown. He is deceased.
HN323	Helen Crampton, cover name unknown. She is deceased.
HN327	Dave Fisher, cover name unknown. He is deceased.
HN334	"Margaret White"
HN318	Ray Wilson, cover name unknown. He is deceased.
HN329*	"John Graham"
HN330	"Don De Freitas"
HN321	"William Paul Lewis"
HN335	Mike Tyrell, cover name unknown. He is deceased.
HN322	Real name restricted, states that he did not have a cover name

⁶⁷ MPS-0733715 & MPS-0733720: two telegrams signed by DS D Smith in August 1968 with information received from HN68

⁶⁸ UCPI0000011756; UCPI0000017005; UCPI0000009877; UCPI0000011759; UCPI0000017007; UCPI0000017009; UCPI0000008349; UCPI0000010900; UCPI0000014736; UCPI0000008831; UCPI0000011771; final report dated 16/11/73 UCPI0000015707

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

HN328*	Joan Hillier, states that she did not have a cover name
HN326*	"Douglas Edwards"
HN333	Real and cover name restricted
HN135	Mike Ferguson, cover name restricted. He is deceased.
HN336*	"Dick Epps"
HN340*	"Alan Nixon"
HN346	Jill Mosdell, cover name unknown. She is deceased.
HN339	"Stewart Goodman"
HN349	Real and cover name restricted
HN45	"David Robertson"
HN347*	"Alex Sloan"
HN343	"John Clinton"
HN338	Real name restricted, cover name unknown. He is deceased.
HN348*	"Sandra"
HN345*	"Peter Fredericks"

The SDS Name

33. Throughout our written submissions and in this opening statement we have referred to the SDS as such for convenience. In fact, its title changed over time, even during Phase 1. In the early documents, particularly at working level, various names are used. For example Demonstration Squad, Demo Squad, Special Squad or Hairies. In higher level official documents, the unit is referred to as the Special Operations Squad. Noticeably so in communications with the Home Office from at least December 1968. It may be that nothing turns on the name but we observe that the "Demonstration Squad", or similar, aptly describes what the unit first did when gathering intelligence about the October Demonstration. The title Special Operations Squad better describes a unit with a wider remit, which is what those using that name wanted it to become and what it quickly did become after the October Demonstration.

The Security Service and Special Branch

34. In 1968 the Security Service's role was defined by the 1952 Directive issued by the then Secretary of State for the Home Department, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe ("the Maxwell Fyfe Directive") which, in material part, stated as follows:
*"The Security Service is part of the Defence Forces of the country. Its task is the Defence of the Realm as a whole, from external and internal dangers arising from attempts of espionage and sabotage, or from actions of persons and organisations whether directed from within or without the country, which may be judged to be subversive of the state"*⁶⁹.

35. Lord Harris of Greenwich defined subversion in the House of Lords on 26 February 1975:
"Subversive activities are generally regarded as those which threaten the safety or wellbeing of the State, and which are intended to undermine or overthrow Parliamentary democracy by political, industrial or violent means." [Official Report, House of Lords, 26 February 1975; Vol.357, c.947.]

36. That definition originated from the Security Service's Director F in 1972 and was incorporated into an F Branch instruction in January 1973⁷⁰.

37. Special branches, including Metropolitan Police Special Branch, had a role assisting the Security Service to counter subversion. Formal written evidence of that responsibility, within the Phase 1 period is to be found in the Home Office Terms of Reference for Special Branch, dated April 1970⁷¹. The whole document needs to be considered but perhaps the most important passages read as follows.

"2. Function
"Special Branch is responsible for acquiring security intelligence, both secret and overt (a) to assist the Chief Officer in the preservation of public order, (b) as directed by the Chief Officer to assist the Security Service in its task of defending the realm from attempts at espionage and sabotage and from actions of persons and organisations which may be judged to be subversive of the security of the State.

"3. Tasks

⁶⁹ *Defence of the Realm, The Authorised History of MI5*, Christopher Andrew, p.323. Penguin.

⁷⁰ *Defence of the Realm*, p.591

⁷¹ UCPI0000004459

“(d) In consultation with the Security Service to collect, process and record information about subversive or potentially subversive organisations and individuals

“(f) To investigate any subversive background to demonstrations and breaches of public order and, in consultation with the Security Service, to certain industrial disputes.

“(m) To maintain such records as are required and ensure the security of their content”.

And, in an explanatory annexe, we have noted:

“3. Function

“It is important that Special Branches should have a clear idea of what constitutes “persons and organisations which may be judged to be subversive of the security of the State”. Broadly speaking these are any organisation or individual whose purpose is the undermining or overthrow of the established democratic order”.

[Original emphasis]

38. There is extensive reference in SDS intelligence reports and associated minute sheets to their being copied to the Security Service. Higher level correspondence, to which I shall return later, also suggests a close working relationship between the SDS and the Security Service. We are not investigating the Security Service but it will be necessary to explore the relationship between the two bodies in order properly to understand the SDS. We shall also be seeking to establish what, in practice, was considered subversive, or potentially subversive, by Special Branch and, especially, the SDS.

The 17 March 1968 Demonstration

39. On 17 March 1968 the VSC organised a mass demonstration involving a march from Trafalgar Square to Grosvenor Square, the site of the embassy of the United States of America. It was a protest against American involvement in Vietnam and appears to have been a response to the North Vietnamese Government and the National Liberation Front calling for mass demonstrations of solidarity throughout the World on or about 19 March 1968. That date was claimed to be the 18th anniversary of the first mass demonstration against the

involvement of the United States of America in the Vietnam War⁷². The demonstration ended in a riot. We are grateful to ITV for providing a copy of a contemporary television news report of the event. It provides an impression of events on the day and an indication of how it was presented on television at the time⁷³.

[SHOW MARCH 1968 VIDEO – DOC006]

40. Amongst the documents that we are publishing today are newspaper clippings found in Special Branch files which relate to the demonstration and public disorder on 17 March 1968. Unfortunately, despite best efforts, the copy quality is poor⁷⁴. Consequently, they have been transcribed and copies of the transcript will accompany the clippings published later today. They demonstrate how the event was portrayed in the media. It was a momentous event both politically and for the policing of public order.
41. Six documents, retrieved from Special Branch files, which pre-date the 17 March 1968 demonstration are being published by the Inquiry⁷⁵. They indicate that Special Branch was seeking to obtain in advance as much intelligence about activists' plans for the demonstration as possible. Intelligence was obtained from multiple sources. Special Branch was aware that the demonstration was likely to be on a very large scale. It was also aware of the potential for violence and even of some of the tactics that might be used. For example, there was intelligence that some activists intended to break through the police cordon at Grosvenor Square. However, the documents also indicate that the intelligence gathering tactics used had their limits. One of the documents relates to a VSC meeting held at Toynbee Hall, London E1, attended by 60 people but described as private. The Special Branch Sergeant and Constable who attended were recognised and asked to leave⁷⁶. Another report concerns a meeting of the VSC Ad Hoc Committee, held at a public house, which the reporting officer had not been able to enter. I quote from the report: "*The meeting was held in an upstairs room at the premises and in view of the mode of dress of those present and the fact that they arrived in groups and appeared to be known to each other, I deemed it inadvisable to try to obtain admittance*"⁷⁷. The evidence that we have obtained about the SDS

⁷² MPS-0730081

⁷³ DOC001

⁷⁴ MPS-0746711 and MPS-0746712

⁷⁵ MPS-0730079, MPS-0730080, MPS-073081, MPS-0730082, MPS-0730083 & MPS-0730075

⁷⁶ MPS-0730079

⁷⁷ MPS-0730083

indicates that it filled the gap in Special Branch's intelligence gathering capability by securing regular entrance to private meetings. The issue to be explored is whether it was justified in doing so.

42. A report dated 17 March 1968, signed by Detective Superintendent Gilbert, summarised the background to the demonstration and events on the day from Special Branch's point of view⁷⁸. It is clear that both disorder and violence had been anticipated. Advance intelligence had led to coaches being stopped and arrests made for possessing offensive weapons. The utterances of speakers at the demonstration, including Tariq Ali, had been monitored: (and I quote) *"but nothing of an apparently actionable nature was said"*. One of those speakers Reg Taylor, is reported as saying: (and I quote from the report) *"...that as an A.E.U. shop steward and a member of the Ruislip constituency Labour Party, he had assisted in the passage of several resolutions, favoured at trade union level and Labour Party Conference, protesting against the Vietnam War"*. I highlight that as an example of pre-SDS Special Branch reporting which refers to a trade unionist and a mainstream political party, in the course of policing the March 1968 demonstration. References such as these are found in the later reports of SDS undercover officers.

43. The report moves on to provide an account of the disorder which followed. The presence of a contingent of German demonstrators appears to have made a particular impression on police. It is described as follows.

"It was particularly noticeable during the march that, whilst the general standard of cohesion between the numerous political groups was very low, the organisation of the German contingent was sufficiently competent to enable them to act as a "ginger-group" for the occasion. They set a pattern for others by linking arms and the poles of their banners, holding the shoulders of persons in front and encouraging other demonstrators to form a solid block of two or three hundred and surge forward as a mass".

44. We note that Tariq Ali takes issue with the police account of the behaviour and impact of the German contingent. Wherever the truth lies on that issue, there is no doubt that internal police reports emphasised their impact. In addition to their mention here, two reports specifically concerning the role of foreign demonstrators are amongst the documents obtained by the Inquiry⁷⁹. There is

⁷⁸ MPS-0730076

⁷⁹ MPS-0730077 & MPS-073078

also a Special Branch report on a meeting of “*Camden Human Rights Year*” held on 26 April 1968 to discuss “*Protest – Grosvenor Square and After*” which records a member of the Executive Committee of the VSC stating that future policy would be (and I quote): “*to resist police by linking arms as continental demonstrators do, and to ensure that anyone arrested was immediately rescued. He recognised that this implied the use of more violence than CND had been prepared to use, but it had achieved results in drawing attention to the Vietnam issue*”⁸⁰.

45. Detective Superintendent Gilbert described events in Grosvenor Square in the following terms:

“As the demonstrators approached Grosvenor Square from North Audley Street the leading column immediately broke into a run and attempted to breach the police cordon drawn up across the road leading to the U.S. Embassy. Uniformed police, who had strong reserves at their disposal prevented this, and succeeded in funnelling the column along the North side of Grosvenor Square.

By this time the demonstrators numbered some 10,000 people, and by sheer weight managed to force their way into the gardens. Encouraged by this they showed that they intended to use every means in their power to assault the U.S. Embassy.

Sticks, banners, bags of paint, fireworks, clods of earth and missiles of varying kinds were hurled at the police and towards the Embassy, where despite the fact that the crowd was held by police at a line not nearer to the building than about fifty yards, about 12 windows were broken (possibly by persons firing ball bearings by means of catapults from the rear of the crowd). Concerted and sustained attacks were made upon the police lines for a period of one hour. Many persons were arrested and several police officers injured.

The demonstrators were slowly pushed back and Grosvenor Square and the streets leading from it were clear by about 7pm.”

46. Gilbert concluded that:

“To-day’s activity emphasises that the Vietnam issue is one upon which younger elements of the militant Left Wing and Student Groups will demonstrate with terrifying ferocity, particularly when guided by foreign groups such as the Germans, who to-day comprised some 120 adept

⁸⁰ MPS-0733957

agitators (who nevertheless contrived to avoid being arrested). On this occasion only firm and resolute action by a strong force of police prevented serious damage to the United States Embassy”.

47. Chief Inspector Dixon wrote a slightly later report, dated 2 April 1968, about the March 1968 demonstration. Like Detective Superintendent Gilbert’s report, it acknowledges that Special Branch had some intelligence that the protest might become violent. It states that police officers had gained entry to some of the private meetings at which different activist groups had discussed their plans for the event. No violent intentions had been expressed at those meetings. The sources of intelligence available to Special Branch in March 1968 will fall to be compared with what the SDS later produced in order to establish whether and to what extent the SDS added to the public order intelligence picture. The unit’s annual reports and Special Branch’s requests to the Home Office for funding assert that a considerable contribution was made.
48. A number of other aspects of Chief Inspector Dixon’s April 1968 report deserve mention.
 - 48.1.1. There is reference to “*Come Armed*” having been overprinted onto advertisements for the demonstration⁸¹.
 - 48.1.2. The scale of the disorder is illustrated by reference to the number of criminal charges brought by police following arrests on the day: 303 charges comprising of 52 assault on a police officer, 71 threatening or insulting behaviour, 14 carrying offensive weapons⁸². We note, however, that these figures do not tell us how many individuals were charged or how many were actually convicted. A supplementary report, dated 4 April 1968 provides some of that information. By that point in time 239 people had been prosecuted, of whom 9 had been sentenced to imprisonment, 171 fined and 18 conditionally discharged. 41 cases were still pending⁸³.
 - 48.1.3. The scale of disorder is further illustrated by casualty figures: 171 police officers are stated to have been injured and 42 civilians to have received hospital treatment.
 - 48.1.4. Two of the civilian core participants giving evidence in Phase 1 are specifically mentioned: Ernest Tate and Tariq Ali⁸⁴. Mr Ali

⁸¹ Para.5 – also mentioned in Gilbert’s report

⁸² Para.6

⁸³ MPS-0730912

⁸⁴ Paras. 10 & 11

is the subject of a dismissive assessment of his roles in the VSC and the demonstration which are at odds with his public profile. Both were clearly the subject of Special Branch's and CI Dixon's attentions before the formation of the SDS. All that appears to have changed, when the SDS was formed, is the introduction of an additional means of gathering information about them: the undercover tactic.

- 48.1.5. At paragraph 16 there is reference to a solicitor, including the comment that he is (I quote) a "*well-known defender of left-wingers*". This is a precursor to references in SDS reporting to lawyers and, on occasions, the advice that they have given.

The Formation of the SDS

49. Special Branch continued to gather information about the VSC after the March 1968 demonstration, as it had before that event, using the same methods. There are documents in the VSC material that we are publishing which evidence that fact⁸⁵. There is, however, very little exactly contemporaneous material to record the formation of the SDS.
50. The SDS appears to have formed on either 30 or 31 July 1968. CI Dixon's report entitled "Penetration of Extremist" groups, dated 26 November 1968, at Appendix B, records CI Dixon's own start date and that of a number of others as having been 31 July 1968⁸⁶. A memorandum from Chief Superintendent Cunningham to Commander Special Branch, dated 20 May 1969, states that the unit was formed on 30 July 1968. Perhaps more importantly that document constitutes an official record of the initial purpose of the unit and the methods that it was to use to achieve its purpose. They are recorded in the following terms.

"The Squad was formed on 30th July, 1968, with the object of obtaining information relating to the demonstration held on 27th October 1968. It was envisaged that information concerning the demonstration would be obtained from publications, informants, police sources, technical devices and undercover police officers.

"In the event, the last method proved to be the most successful..."⁸⁷

⁸⁵ See especially MPS-0722098 but also MPS-0733957, MPS-0733958 and MPS-0734307

⁸⁶ MPS-0724119

⁸⁷ MPS-0728973 (at p.14 of 18 within the Opus file, paras.2-3 – the pages are unfortunately mixed up within the electronic file)

51. The documents that we have seen and are publishing are consistent with the original intention that the SDS would use multiple methods with which to gather intelligence. We have also formed the impression, to be tested in evidence, that undercover policing very quickly became the dominant method of intelligence gathering. The transition from a unit formed to gather intelligence about a demonstration, using multiple methods, including undercover policing, to an undercover police unit appears to have been very rapid.
52. Two further documents are worth introducing. First, a report dated 30 July 1968, signed by Dixon, about a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee for the 27th October Demonstration held between 7.30pm and 10.15pm, at Toynbee Hall, Commercial Road, London E1 on the same day⁸⁸. The document states that the meeting was chaired by Tariq Ali and that Ernest Tate spoke at it. Acting on what he had heard there, Dixon afterwards went to inspect the nearby offices acquired by the Ad Hoc Committee. It reads:
- “At one stage during the evening it was revealed that Ed Guiton was the Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee and that it had offices at 120 Commercial Road, E.1. I took the opportunity of examining this address the same evening and found it to be three floors of empty offices above a sewing-machine shop. A “To Let” sign still hung there, and there were no signs of life. It would appear the Committee has acquired the premises, but has not yet moved in”.*

This document is arguably the SDS’ first report. Whether or not that is the correct analysis, it is typical of CI Dixon, based upon what we have read, to have been so “hands on” as a leader.

53. The second document is a Security Service file note, dated 2 August 1968. It records a meeting between persons known as Director F, F.1 and F.4 of the Security Service with Commander Ferguson Smith, Chief Superintendent Cunningham and Chief Inspector Dixon, at Scotland Yard (I quote) *“about arrangements to cover the demonstration in Grosvenor Square on 27th October”*⁸⁹. The meeting was held on 1 August 1968, either one or two days after the creation of the SDS. The account given in this document about the formation of the unit reads as follows.
- “The Head of Special Branch told us that he had recently attended a high level meeting under the chairmanship of Mr. Brodie in which plans were drawn up to handle the V.S.C. demonstration on 27th October in*

⁸⁸ MPS-0738693

⁸⁹ UCPI0000030045

Grosvenor Square. The intention was to use 5,000 uniform police and Special Branch were very much on trial in that they were required to provide all the necessary information in advance for the benefit of the uniform branch and where possible to provide evidence for some prosecutions. Chief Inspector Dixon had been put in charge of a special Special Branch squad to co-ordinate the intelligence for this operation”.

54. The above passage not only records the formation of the SDS, it also evidences the gravity with which preparations for the October Demonstration were being taken more widely.
55. The remainder of the file note demonstrates the prior existence of a close working relationship between both Special Branch and CI Dixon personally, on the one hand, and the Security Service on the other. It also shows an intention on the part of both Special Branch and the Security Service for the SDS to work closely together. Relevant passages from the note read: *“It was agreed in principle that one of Mr Dixon’s squad should be attached to the Security Service team...where he would be able to see the [information] ...and plan such use as could be made of it...”* and *“It was agreed that F.4 would continue their co-operation at its present level which would pose no problems in that [identity redacted] and Mr. Dixon were already working closely together ...against Trotskyist and Anarchist targets”.*

The October Demonstration

56. A great deal of Special Branch effort clearly went into gathering intelligence about the October Demonstration in the preceding months. Prominent amongst the documents obtained from the MPS and made public by the Inquiry today is a series of 10 reports written by CI Dixon between 21 August and 22 October 1968⁹⁰. Each contains an update about the intelligence obtained and Conrad Dixon’s analysis of the situation. It comes from a variety of sources, including SDS undercover officers. A good deal of the content relates to public order concerns but there is also discussion of the political affiliations of the organisers and the subversive agendas of some participating groups. On the face of the reports both Special Branch’s roles in policing public order and counter

⁹⁰ Bundle, Tab F, Reports by HN325 prior to October Demonstration sub-folder. In chronological order: MPS-0730061, 0730065, 0730066, 0730063, 0730064, 0730095, 0730096, 0730084, 0730091 & 0730092.

subversion seem to have been on Dixon's mind. Not only that, they were linked. In his report dated 10 September 1968, CI Dixon wrote.

"Indeed, the more vociferous spokesmen of the left are calling for the complete overthrow of parliamentary democracy and the substitution of various brands of "socialism" and "workers control". They claim that this can only be achieved by "action on the streets", and although few of them will admit publicly, or in the press, that they desire a state of anarchy, it is nevertheless tacitly accepted that such a condition is a necessary preamble to engineering a breakdown of our present system of government and achieving a revolutionary change in the society in which we live".

and

"In the past few months a number of revolutionary leaders have produced study papers on this demonstration. The theme is common: it is said that the anti-Vietnam war protest movement is merely part of the continuing struggle to bring about world-wide revolution, and that this demonstration can only be regarded as a skirmish before the larger battle. The figure of 100,000 demonstrators began to be bandied about; there was general agreement that this number of militant demonstrators would bring about a total breakdown of law and order".

57. The major events in the planning of the demonstration are covered including a planning meeting of the National Council of the VSC held in Sheffield on 7 September 1968 (which was attended by an SDS undercover officer) and the large meeting held by the VSC Committee at Conway Hall on 17 September 1968 (which was attended by numerous SDS officers, including managers).
58. Significant events such as the VSC disowning the avowedly militant Earl's Court and Notting Hill branches are recorded. So too is the formation of a rival Maoist-led organisation, the October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam (which I shall refer to as the "October 27th CSV"). Both of these branches and the October 27th CSV were infiltrated and reported on by a number of SDS undercover officers.
59. There is mention of a conference attended by the Home Office, Metropolitan Police and Security Service at which arrangements to ensure the physical security of buildings along the route of the demonstration were discussed. The minutes of that meeting survive and are being published today⁹¹.

⁹¹ MPS-0742196 The minutes are dated 24 September 1968 and refer to a meeting dated 20 September 1968. CI Dixon's report dated 23 September 1968 (MPS-0730095) refers (at p.3) to a conference on 21 September

60. Different VSC branches and ad hoc committees (official and unofficial) are listed and changes, such as the formation of the Havering branch noted. The moderate Havering branch was the subject of infiltration by two SDS officers acting as a couple: HN330 alias “Don DeFreitas” and HN334 alias “Margaret White”.
61. Key personalities are identified and discussed, including Tariq Ali and Ernest Tate. Mr Ali is once again referred to in uncomplimentary terms.
62. Brief reference is made in the penultimate report, dated 16 October 1968, to a document entitled “*The potential of a militant demonstration*”. CI Dixon wrote: “Recent press report[s] have highlighted the fact that this branch has obtained a copy of the leaflet entitled “*The potential of militant demonstration*”. There has been a tendency to link this leaflet with the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, but it should be noted that the leaflet is “Black Power” in origin. We obtained our copy at a V.S.C. meeting, but there is no evidence that V.S.C. elements encouraged its distribution, or approved the contents”.
63. The leaflet in question was obtained by the SDS and, in particular, HN323 Sergeant Helen Crampton. The contents were such that the distributor was prosecuted. Sergeant Crampton gave evidence for the prosecution, in her real identity, in proceedings which led to the conviction and imprisonment of the defendant⁹².
64. The terms in which CI Dixon refers to this leaflet demonstrate, on this issue, a nuanced understanding which appears to be the result, at least in part, of SDS undercover activity. It is not the only example of CI Dixon being well informed enough to be able to put alarming information into context. In his 5 September 1968 update he wrote: “The “*Evening News*” and “*Times*” reports are unnecessarily alarming in their presentation of the facts of the situation. They categorically state that certain groups have manufactured Molotov Cocktails from electric light bulbs, have acquired a cache of small arms and have made plans to occupy certain public buildings. There has been fairly comprehensive coverage by Special Branch of the activities of the most extreme of the

1968. However, the subject matter of the minutes corresponds with the description of the conference given in Dixon’s report.

⁹² See the summary of HN323’s deployment in Appendix 2 for further details.

groups involved in the forthcoming October demonstration. This has produced information that individuals in certain groups have talked about the possibility of making Molotov Cocktails and occupying public buildings, but no firm plans to execute these have so far been made”.⁹³

65. By the time of the October Demonstration, CI Dixon appears to have had a detailed understanding of who would be demonstrating and what their intentions were. He knew that, whatever revolutionary aspirations some of them might have had, the organisers were publicly promoting a peaceful demonstration and that newspaper coverage had exaggerated the likely form and scale of violence. He also believed that a minority of those attending, the Maoists and anarchists, would not shy away from confrontation. That is what in fact occurred. For consideration is the role played by the use of undercover policing in obtaining this comprehensive intelligence picture? Was use of the tactic necessary? Was it proportionate? What did Special Branch need to know? Could it have reasonably expected to obtain such information without the use of the undercover tactic?
66. The documents from Special Branch’s VSC files help to establish in more detail what Special Branch knew and how. It is clear from them that Special Branch was gleaning information from multiple sources both before and after the formation of the SDS. For example, there is evidence of information being submitted from regional police forces and obtained from sensitive sources. Information was still being gathered by ordinary Special Branch officers using their traditional methods. Information in the public domain, especially newspaper reports, was being collated. After the formation of the SDS, these sources were supplemented by the information which SDS undercover police officers reported back. This is partly evidenced in the documents being released today and will be supplemented by the evidence which will be called or published during the forthcoming oral hearings.
67. A Security Service file note, dated 29 August 1968, suggests that there was a two-way flow of information between it and Special Branch during the period leading up to the demonstration⁹⁴. The note records a visit by F.4 to meet Superintendent Lawrenson, Superintendent Cunningham and Chief Inspector Dickson [sic]. The meeting concerned “coverage” of London University and “various polytechnics”. Each party promised to assist the other and to keep in close touch. I quote from the report:

⁹³ MPS-0730066/3

⁹⁴ UCPI0000030046

"Cunningham offered to assist us in any way that he could as regards obtaining information from colleges...He made this offer quite genuinely and sincerely and in return I assured him that we would pass on any information we obtained ...that I thought would assist them in their law and order problem at demonstrations. He suggested that when we had finished our meeting I might like to get together with Dickson and arrange certain details. This we did.

"Briefly, Special Branch have set up a special squad under Dickson, bearded and unwashed males and scruffy females, who are participating in demonstrations where they make contact with students and then hope to turn them and use them as short-term informers. They are meeting with some success. Any information which they pick up this way which they think might be of interest to us will be passed on. Cunningham is obviously worried about the October demonstration and this is one of the reasons why he wanted to see me. I assured him that we would pass on information ...in the same manner we had done for the March Grosvenor Square demonstration.

"...We promised to keep in close touch with one another..."

68. In the result, the October Demonstration did not involve the same level of violence and disorder as had occurred on 17 March 1968. The Maoists broke away from the main demonstration, as planned, and marched to Grosvenor Square. There was some violence and disorder there. However, the main demonstration passed off with little trouble. On the police side, Chief Superintendent Cunningham wrote a lengthy report on events the following day⁹⁵. He wrote: *"In fact, although disorder ensued, for the most part on the South side of Grosvenor Square and in South Audley Street, the demonstrators were never able to break the police cordon at that junction and very much less violence occurred than had been anticipated"*.
69. On 29 October 1968, the American Ambassador, David Bruce wrote in the following terms to Commander Smith to thank Special Branch for the role it had played in events⁹⁶. He wrote:
- "I have been informed of the outstanding intelligence effort by your Branch relative to the events which culminate on October 27th.*
- "I would appreciate it if you would express my gratitude to your staff for their supremely efficient work which undoubtedly contributed greatly to the splendid performance of the uniformed police"*.

⁹⁵ MPS-0730093

⁹⁶ MPS-0742200

[SHOW FILM CLIP OF THE OCTOBER 1968 DEMONSTRATION
DOC007]

70. It is clear that, in official circles, Special Branch took its share of the credit for what was regarded as the successful policing of the October Demonstration.
71. Others take a different view. Tariq Ali's position was that if the police stayed away trouble would thereby be avoided⁹⁷. CI Dixon was dismissive of that assertion and understood other activists to have thought disorder inevitable⁹⁸.
72. The National Council for Civil Liberties felt that the change of police tactics from the use of cordons, horses and truncheons "*was wholly successful as far as the main march was concerned*"⁹⁹. It deprecated the use of undercover police officers.
73. Ernest Tate's evidence will be that it was the VSC which deserves credit for the overall good discipline and peaceful nature of the main demonstration. He refers to the account given in Chapter 17 of the second volume of his memoir.
74. We will be examining this issue further during the hearing when, amongst other things, we will be exploring in more detail what each SDS officer in this period actually did.
75. A curious feature of the evidence that we have obtained is that the use of undercover officers by Special Branch was published in the press, immediately after the demonstration. On 29 October 1968, Percy Hoskins and Alain Cass wrote in the Daily Express¹⁰⁰:
"Under the direction of the Commissioner, Sir John Waldron, and Assistant Commissioner Peter Brodie, in charge of Special Branch, an enormous undercover operation was mounted to penetrate the secrets of the organisation behind the march.
"...Throughout the country hundreds of detectives, 50 in London alone, were assigned to prepare dossiers on each of the extremist groups.
"Men were infiltrated into many of them. No sooner was a plan laid than the operations headquarters at Scotland Yard knew about it.

⁹⁷ See, for example, press cuttings dated 3 October 1968: MPS-0742228, MPS-0742231 & MPS-0742232. See also para.44 of Tariq Ali's witness statement: UCPI0000034187

⁹⁸ MPS-0730084 - report 9 October 1968.

⁹⁹ Morning Star, 29 November 1968, MPS-0746714

¹⁰⁰ MPS-0746713

“The undercover men were so effective that once a detective actually chaired a meeting of revolutionaries. One man was present at nearly every meeting of the official Ad Hoc Committee, the organisation involved in the national and international planning of the march”.

“By mid-September the police knew enough to advise the Home Secretary that he could let the march go ahead safely. A conference was then held to work out a detailed plan for the day”.

76. The source of the information is unknown, although anyone contemplating the continued existence of the SDS would surely have hesitated before informing the media.
77. The Morning Star also covered the story but from a different editorial perspective¹⁰¹. Its piece on 26 November concluded: *“The use of police spies and provocateurs to infiltrate working class and democratic groups in Britain goes back centuries. How much longer will it go on Mr Callaghan?”* The Morning Star was not the only one asking the Home Office for how much longer the SDS would continue to operate.

The Continuation of the SDS after October 1968

Funding

78. Within a fortnight of the October Demonstration Conrad Dixon had produced a memorandum setting out (and I quote): *“...the basic requirements for a long-term operation of this type involving penetration in depth of these organisations”*¹⁰². Assistant Commissioner Brodie wrote to the Home Office on 21 November 1968 seeking funding for the cover accommodation used by SDS undercover officers¹⁰³. Consideration of periodic requests for funding for accommodation, vehicle and other costs become the vehicle by which the Home Office, for all practical purposes, appears to have decided whether or not the SDS should continue in existence throughout the Phase 1 period.
79. The fact that more than funding lay behind these decisions is evidenced in the documents. A memorandum signed by Commander Smith records that he and Assistant Commissioner Brodie went to the Home Office on 13 December 1968 to meet James Waddell, Deputy Under Secretary of State, and David Stotesbury: *“One of the items discussed concerned the Special Operations Squad under Chief Inspector Dixon”*. The memorandum states that the Home

¹⁰¹ MPS-0746714

¹⁰² MPS-0724121

¹⁰³ Referred to in MPS-0724116. The letter will be disclosed but is not currently in the bundle.

Office was, at that stage, only cautiously supportive of the continuing existence of the SDS. It reads as follows¹⁰⁴.

“Mr. Waddell expressed his appreciation of the value of the work of the Squad in relation to the demonstration of 27th October and said how valuable it had been in helping him to keep the Home Secretary abreast of developments. He saw there was a good case for its continuance, but he asked that we keep the reasons for its existence under review as he did not think that it should be a permanent feature of the Branch. It was agreed that the events of the next six months might quite well provide an indication as to whether it was worth while carrying on with the work of the Squad. We promised to bear this in mind”.

80. A written response from Mr Waddell, authorising the expenditure sought “*until about mid-summer 1969*”, was issued on 16th December 1968¹⁰⁵. The letter expressed a reservation in the following terms.

“It appeared to me that experience during the period before the October demonstration fully justified the extra effort which had been made by special branch officers and that it would be right to facilitate their work in the way proposed in your letter for a further period which would at least take us past the coming Spring. I also felt, however, that in an enterprise of this kind there is always some slight danger of innovations like the one we are considering becoming an accepted part of the scene, so that discontinuance might be thought to be a drastic change: hence the suggestion that we ought to look at the matter again mid-summer”.

“I was glad to have the assurances you gave me about the close working between yourselves and the Security Service on this particular enterprise”¹⁰⁶.

81. On 27 May 1969 Assistant Commissioner Brodie sought a further extension of funding from the Home Office until the end of 1969¹⁰⁷. The request was made on the basis that Special Branch did not consider “*we are out of the wood yet*” and that it was necessary to have undercover officers in place before trouble began. The groups being infiltrated were said to be “*very much more security minded*” and Special Branch “*would not be able to achieve our present patiently won position in a short space of time*”. The Assistant Commissioner C, Peter Brodie concluded: “*The Commissioner is firmly in favour of our Squad’s operations and Commander Smith tells me that the Security Service fully*

¹⁰⁴ MPS-0724117

¹⁰⁵ MPS-0724116

¹⁰⁶ The paper evidence corroborates the continuing relationship between the SDS (in the form of CI Dixon) and the Security Service. See the Security Service’s Note for File dated 17 January 1969: UCPI0000030766

¹⁰⁷ MPS-0728973

support our view that it be allowed to continue. The product of the Squad is shared with them, of course, and [regular] consultation takes place between that service and our own officers”.

82. The request for funding was granted by the Home Office in a letter from David Stotesbury dated 6 June 1969¹⁰⁸. The Home Office continued to have reservations. In this letter, the specific concern ventilated was stated to be the unconventional nature of the accommodation. Mr Stotesbury put it as follows.

“In reviewing the matter again towards the end of the year you will, I know, bear in mind the reservations expressed in the second sentence of the second paragraph of Waddell’s letter of 16th December. One of the factors that troubles us, is that if the provision of this accommodation goes on for too long, its existence is likely to leak out into the press and lead to criticism of the Home Secretary. It is the unconventional nature of the accommodation, rather than the activity, which we feel may be more difficult to justify if public questions are asked”.

83. There followed a series of annual requests for funding by the Metropolitan Police and approvals of the same from the Home Office¹⁰⁹. James Waddell’s letter dated 21 December 1970, approving funding for 1971, merits specific mention for two reasons. First, the Home Office express continuing concern that revelation of the accommodation arrangements could be a source of acute embarrassment for the Home Secretary. Second, this letter evidences the personal approval of the then Home Secretary, Sir Reginald Maudling, for the continued funding of the SDS. The material passages read as follows.

“You will remember that when you were talking to Philip Allen and me about other matters last week we spoke about the accommodation arrangements made for a number of Special Branch officers. Peter Brodie’s letter to me of 30th November seeks authority to continue these unusual arrangements.

“You emphasised the value of the information which has been obtained through these officers and assured us that a careful watch would be maintained to guard against disclosure. Plainly, the arrangements could, if made known in the wrong quarters, be a source of acute embarrassment to the Home Secretary.

“We have in the light of these assurances, consulted the Home Secretary and I now write to let you know that the arrangements may be continued for a further year, up to a cost of £4,000 for the year”.

¹⁰⁸ MPS-0724109

¹⁰⁹ MPS-0724130

84. For 1970 and 1971 funding was granted for the calendar year¹¹⁰. From financial year 1972/1973 onwards, it was granted by the financial year¹¹¹. That administrative step might of itself be thought to be evidence that the SDS was taking more permanent root. The grant of authority once again impressed upon Special Branch the Home Office's desire for the funding arrangements to be kept secret. It stated:

"I would, however, like to repeat what has been said before on this subject. Plainly, in present circumstances, it is extremely important to have the sort of advance information which will enable the force to prevent crime and mitigate violence; but it is equally important to take special care that nothing about the arrangements becomes known. I would be grateful if in January or February 1973 you would again get in touch with us so that we have plenty of time to consult the Home Secretary before the end of the period we are now covering."

85. The final authority in the Phase 1 bundle, dated 9 April 1973, continued in a similar vein. It did not question the value of the information being obtained by the SDS but security clearly remained on the minds of those at the Home Office.

"I certainly accept that the information obtained through the arrangements is valuable particularly at the present time and I welcome your assurance that the Commissioner and you are satisfied about the security aspects..."¹¹²

Annual Reports

86. Behind the financial correspondence between the Metropolitan Police and the Home Office lie police reports about the activities of the SDS. They appear to be written to support, or provide information with which to support, the funding requests and may need to be read in that light. However, subject to that caveat, these reports are important evidence in seeking to understand what happened.
87. The first report is dated 20 May 1969 and is in the form of a memorandum from Chief Superintendent Cunningham to Commander Special Branch. Thereafter the reports are signed by SDS managers and become an annual product linked to the funding request.

¹¹⁰ See MPS-724100 for the 1971 authorisation

¹¹¹ See MPS-0728971

¹¹² MPS-0724161

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

88. The reports follow a broadly similar format covering the composition of the SDS, a review of activity over the reporting period, including a summary of the groups being targeted and, usually an indication of the volume of SDS reporting. There is also a forward-looking section.
89. Of note in Chief Superintendent Cunningham's May 1969 report are paragraphs 3 and 4 which expressly address the SDS' transition from a unit formed in response to the October Demonstration to one with a broader purpose. They include this passage:
"...Following the 27th October, it was agreed that the Squad should continue to operate, and it was then possible to look at the larger canvass of the political scene, to establish what the new aims should be and to see how these compared with the results being achieved..."
90. Chief Superintendent Cunningham went on describe the aims and results he claimed were being achieved. The relevant passage reads as follows.

<u>Aims</u>	<u>Results</u>
(a) <i>To supply information about the intentions of left-wing extremists on the occasions of public demonstrations.</i>	<i>Accurate forecasts of numbers, intentions and mood of the demonstrators was, and is, being supplied.</i>
(b) <i>Identification of those who engage in preliminary planning or who take part in such demonstrations.</i>	<i>Identifications at outdoor public demonstrations have ranged from 12% to 50% over the past nine months. At indoor meetings and conferences up to 100 of the participants have been identified.</i>
(c) <i>Obtaining evidence and identifying suspects in relation to breaches of the law before, during and after demonstrations.</i>	<i>One successful prosecution has been obtained for incitement, four have been secured for offences allied to riot, etc., and four cases are still pending.</i>
(d) <i>Gathering and recording information for long-term intelligence purposes</i>	<i>New entrants to the extreme left-wing political scene are being identified and recorded within weeks of their manifesting an interest in extremist</i>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

affairs. Personal descriptions are obtained by officers working within groups and this material is submitted personally or passed to officers engaged on normal enquiry work. A balanced view is thus obtained of these individuals from two aspects. New groups are being dealt with similarly. (Over 200 information reports, and over 1,000 minor meetings attended, in addition to the coverage at major demonstrations.)

91. The passage above suggests that the SDS was identifying and reporting on individuals on some scale for a unit comprising, at that time, of 14 police officers.
92. Chief Superintendent Cunningham's report evidences that the unit was adapting to life without a major demonstration of the kind that the October Demonstration had been. He wrote:
"Disorderly demonstrations are diminishing, due to some extent to superior intelligence supplied by the Squad. At the present time emphasis of the Squad's work is shifting somewhat in that more information is being obtained in relation to (c) and (d) above than hereto-fore".
93. We have not recovered intelligence to corroborate the claim that more information in relation to breaches of the law, or evidence of the same, was being obtained. However, the evidence that we have found, and which will be adduced during Phase 1, does demonstrate that the SDS was gathering and recording a great deal of information on individuals and on groups which was then filed on a long-term basis.
94. The report addresses the publicity that the SDS had received in the press. It does so in terms which overlook the objection taken by the National Council of Civil Liberties and the Morning Star (to which I have already referred) to the use of undercover police officers at the October Demonstration. Special Branch evidently and rightly concluded that the SDS had survived the press coverage. Chief Superintendent Cunningham wrote:
"Activities of the Squad received some press publicity immediately prior to the 27th October, but no solid facts emerged and publicity soon

subsided. There has been no criticism of these undercover methods by the public, by extremists or by the civil liberties groups. No officer has been exposed as a “police spy” and the precautions taken are such that this is not now regarded as a likely contingency”.

95. The superiority of the undercover tactic is also asserted:
“Both by volume and worth the end product of the officers engaged on this type of work compares very favourably with that of officers engaged on normal enquiries. Moreover, in certain sensitive areas information is being obtained which could not be secured by the most skilful Special Branch officer using orthodox methods”
“Such information is only made available to trusted members of groups with a checked history of commitment and activity, and members of the Squad have been able to build up reputations over the months and to be in a position to receive information when it is disseminated”.

96. As for the size of the SDS during the Phase 1 period, according to the annual reports, it varied between 11 and 17 between May 1969 and February 1975. There was usually, but not always, a Chief Inspector in charge. At the time of the November 1969 and February 1972 reports, the most senior officer was an inspector.

97. The SDS’ targets, as recorded in the annual reports, broaden and change over time. For example, Irish-related groups become more prominent once The Troubles begin. The Anti-Apartheid Movement and Stop the Seventy Tour are targeted. Other groups associated with then current issues are also reported on: e.g. in 1971 Action Bangla Desh about which HN345 will give evidence. A justice campaign, The Shrewsbury Two Defence Committee, is specifically mentioned in the report dated 4 February 1975 as having been penetrated (and I quote) “to a lesser degree”¹¹³. A full list of the groups referred to in the SDS’ annual reports, during the Phase 1 period is set out in Appendix 1 to the written version of this opening. It will fall to be compared with the evidence of the witnesses and their reporting. In this area, we suggest that it is important to distinguish between groups which are infiltrated and groups which are not directly infiltrated but which are reported on. In this second category, there is a wide range between, on the one hand, groups which are the subject of a significant amount of reporting and, on the other, groups which appear simply to be mentioned in passing.

¹¹³ In this regard see also the analysis of HN343 and his reporting on the Shrewsbury 24 campaign in Appendix 2

98. Within the body of the annual reports, some Black groups are identified as targets that the SDS wished to infiltrate but had not been able to. HN332's report dated 18 November 1971 stated:
- "The Black Power and allied organisations remain an obvious problem, although officers have been concerned in organisations having close liaison with such groups, e.g. The North London Alliance with the Black Unity and Freedom Party; International Marxist Group with the Black Defence Committee".*
99. On the same theme, HN294's 14 February 1973 report stated, at paragraph 6:
- "...Coloured and foreign organisations, because of their exclusivity, continue to be resistant to penetration, due to the shortage of ethnically qualified officers: when such groups solicit the support of less racially selective organisations, for their demonstrations, however, they become immediately, if temporarily, more susceptible".*
100. In the same report HN294 makes clear that he felt that the SDS did have the capability to infiltrate other groups, namely The Communist Party or extreme right wing groups, if that was required. He wrote:
- "The Communist Party and right wing extremist groups, who in recent times have not posed much of a threat to public order, are not covered by the SDS, but there are no technical reasons why they could not be, should the position deteriorate".*
101. Overall, the impression created by the reports is that, as the mid-seventies approached, the SDS was becoming steadily more established. It was infiltrating, or at least reporting on, a wide range of left-wing groups. The unit was confident enough to assert that it had the capability to go further. Its existence was known to and had been approved by successive Home Secretaries and Commissioners of Police for the Metropolis.

Penetration of Extremist Groups

102. Returning to November 1968, for a moment. When the SDS was making its pitch for its continued existence, Chief Inspector Dixon wrote the paper entitled *"Penetration of Extremist Groups"*¹¹⁴. It is described as a study paper and

¹¹⁴ MPS-0724119

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

reads as his blueprint for the SDS' future operation. Dixon argued that using undercover police officers had three advantages. In his words:

“(a) The information gained in this way is more accurate because the information-gathers are trained observers.

“(b) The delay occurring when the authorities have to wait for public announcements, or reports of informants, is eliminated.

“(c) We are able to make much more accurate assessments of future trends and developments”.

103. Chief Inspector Dixon advocated a unit of between 12 and 20 in size. He espoused detailed daily supervision to ensure that officers concentrated on the “right” areas of inquiry. Recruitment by personal approach was recommended. So was the use of supervising officers on *“certain delicate assignments in groups where great experience is required”* and *“as liaison officers with the parallel organisation in the Security Service”*.
104. As to length of deployment CI Dixon wrote: *“..it should be the rule that an officer serve for no longer than 12 months, unless there are special circumstances why he should be retained for a longer period”*.
105. So far as evidence gathering and female officers were concerned, he opined: *“When we are in a position to obtain evidence about a serious offence arrangements have to be made so that it is obtained by an “uncommitted officer”, and thus avoid compromising the undercover man. An “uncommitted officer” is an essential part of the unit; women officers fill the role extremely well and can be taken to public or private gatherings where the evidence is obtainable with little risk of denunciation”*.
106. The way in which HN323 Sgt Helen Crampton was used appears to be consistent with the role of an “uncommitted officer” described above. We will be exploring this issue in evidence but, on the basis of the paper evidence we have obtained, HN323's use in this way appears to have been uncommon. HN328 WDC Hillier is marked, in appendix B to Penetration of Extremist Groups, as having been an “uncommitted” officer. However, we shall hear evidence from HN328 that that is not the role that she fulfilled.
107. On the subject of premises, CI Dixon argued that an unmarked office, cover accommodation for undercover officers and an office at New Scotland Yard were all required.

108. As to cover identity, there is no suggestion that a deceased person's identity should be used. Rather the proposed method involved the preparation and refinement of an "autobiography". Warrant cards were not to be carried and contact with uniformed officers is discouraged.
109. So far as activity undercover was concerned, CI Dixon was emphatic. He wrote:
"A firm line must be drawn between activity as a follower and a leader, and members of the squad should be told in no uncertain terms that they must not take office in a group, chair meetings, draft leaflets, speak in public or initiate activity".
110. Some of CI Dixon's thinking was followed long after he had left the unit: for example, the size of the unit and the use of an unmarked office and cover accommodation. Some of his advice, notably the two issues on which he used the firmest language, was not followed religiously. First, length of deployment, which soon grew regularly to exceed 12 months. Second, the extent to which SDS undercover officers sometimes participated in group activities. The extent to which this happened and why it did so, will be explored in evidence.
111. Appendix B to Penetration of Extremist Groups provides a useful snapshot of the composition of the SDS as at 26 November 1968. It also sheds light on the continuity of the SDS after 27 October 1968. In particular, its contents indicate that the SDS was operating on the basis that it was going to continue, even before Special Branch had secured funding from the Home Office for continued accommodation. Two of the then officers are recorded as having recent start dates that had fallen after 27 October 1968. A third officer is listed as a first reserve. Some of the existing officers are marked as being due to be retained well into 1969.

The Police Witness Statements

112. The Inquiry's rule 9 requests for witness statements made to SDS officers follow a standard template, under the headings which are reproduced in the witness statements. Standard questions are supplemented by bespoke questions. This approach has been adopted to ensure that all issues are covered, to provide breadth of evidence where that is necessary and to facilitate analysis of the witness statements. Those following the Inquiry will be able to consider the evidence themselves once we have published the statements and the contents of the witness statements are, of course, subject to the oral evidence of those witnesses who are to be called. However, it may

be of assistance to give an advance indication of the following features which will emerge from the witness statements.

- 112.1. Most Phase 1 SDS undercover officers were Detective Constables but a few were Detective Sergeants.
- 112.2. Many worked in parts of Special Branch, either before or after their SDS service, which gathered information about the same groups as were targeted by the SDS, namely B & C Squads.
- 112.3. Only one statement maker had done conventional undercover police work prior to joining the SDS.
- 112.4. Most were invited to join following a personal approach, although some of the earliest officers describe being allocated to the unit.
- 112.5. Both married and single officers were well represented in the SDS at this stage in its history.
- 112.6. No officer recalls formal training being provided by the SDS.
- 112.7. There is little evidence of specific guidance being given to undercover officers by the SDS on involvement in people's private lives, sexual relationships, criminal activity or respecting legal professional privilege.
- 112.8. SDS undercover officers in this era generally do not appear to have practised living in their cover identities before reporting.
- 112.9. Most, but not all of the officers, describe being directed to a target by SDS managers.
- 112.10. None states that he or she participated in public disorder at demonstrations.
- 112.11. None states that he or she was involved in serious crime whilst deployed. Most state that they did not commit any form of offence whilst deployed.
- 112.12. The majority did not witness any violence.
- 112.13. With the exception of one officer who was prosecuted for drink-driving, none state that they were involved in criminal proceedings in their undercover identity.
- 112.14. Some officers recall the unit being visited by senior police officers.
- 112.15. None states that he or she worked undercover in the private sector.

Introduction to Intelligence Reports and Photographs

113. It may also assist if we display some representative examples of the intelligence reports and photographs obtained during our investigation taken from the Phase 1 Hearing Bundle.

Photographs

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 113.1. MPS-0735443 – This is a photograph of HN325 CI Conrad Dixon
- 113.2. MPS-0735445 – This is another photograph of HN325 CI Conrad Dixon
- 113.3. MPS-0735447 – This is a photograph of HN1251/371 DI Saunders and DC Furner
- 113.4. MPS-0735438 – This is a photograph of HN327 DS Fisher and HN318 Sgt Ray Wilson
- 113.5. MPS-0735442 – This is a photograph of HN323 Sgt Helen Crampton
- 113.6. MPS-0735439 – This is a group photograph. The people to the right of HN334, in the middle row, are believed to be DI Riby Wilson and DS Roy Creamer.

Reports

- 113.7. MPS-0738583 – This is a report on a large public meeting of the VSC's October 27th Ad Hoc Committee. It is signed by CI Dixon and dated 18 September 1968. It is an example of a report on a large and significant public meeting attended by numerous members of the SDS, including managers and an administrator.
- 113.8. UCPI0000007931 – This is a report on the International Socialist's April 1972 Annual Conference, signed by HN343 whose cover name was "John Clinton". It is an example of a lengthy report on a major event in the calendar of a large target group.
- 113.9. MPS-0731855 – This is a minute sheet and an associated intelligence report. The intelligence report (at page 2) is dated 7 December 1971 and signed by HN343 "John Clinton". It records the results of an election to the National Committee of the International Socialists. The minute sheet (at page 1) records senior management praise for this information. It states that it was: "*Very useful information which highlights the function of the Special Demonstration Squad and reflects credit on [HN343]*". It is an example of SDS reporting that was considered valuable at the time by senior officers.
- 113.10. UCPI0000015671 – This is a report in HN321's name. His cover name was "Bill Lewis". The report is dated 6 August 1969 and is about the International Marxist Group's summer camp which was held on a

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Scottish camp site. It is an early example of an SDS officer travelling beyond the jurisdiction during the course of his deployment and (at paragraph 13) of submitting photographs of activists.

- 113.11. MPS-0739236 – This is a report of HN45, whose cover name was “David Robertson”. It is dated 27 February 1971 and concerns Abhimanyu Manchanda and his then partner Diane Langford. It is an example of a report about the financial affairs and home life of prominent activists.
- 113.12. MPS-0731911 – This is a report in the names of HN330, whose cover name was “Don De Freitas” and HN334 whose cover name was “Margaret White”. It concerns the Havering branch of the VSC and is dated 5 October 1968. It is an example of a report which touches upon the political activity of a person within a mainstream political party.
- 113.13. MPS-0731845 – This is in HN343’s name. His cover name was “John Clinton”. It is dated 18 November 1971 and is about an individual. It refers to the Clerical and Administrative Workers Union in the context of the proposed activity of members of the International Socialists within that trade union.
- 113.14. UCPI0000007908 – This is another report of HN343’s, this time dated 9 August 1973. It concerns membership figures for the International Socialists, including geographical breakdown and details of the trade union membership of new recruits. It is an example of reporting on recruitment to a target organisation.
- 113.15. The above example does not include the names of individual recruits. Many reports about recruitment that we have seen do include names. For example, HN338’s report dated 19 February 1973 is a report on 3 persons who had applied for information about, and expressed an interest in the politics of, the International Marxist Group. They were the subject of a report on the basis of these actions: UCPI0000008831.
- 113.16. UCPI0000026518 – This is a report of HN338’s. His cover name is unknown. The report is dated 13 December 1971 and concerns a meeting of the Notting Hill Black Defence Committee. It is an example of reporting on anti-racist activism.
- 113.17. UCPI0000021998 – This is a report of HN45’s. His cover name was “David Robertson”. It is dated 3 February 1971 and concerns a

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

meeting of a Maoist group, following the visit of a delegation to China, but in which reference is made to the race of some of those attending and to industrial relations issues.

113.18. UCPI0000010570 – This is another report of HN45's, this time dated 16 February 1971. It submits a leaflet prepared by the Women's Liberation Front. It is an example of a report submitting a document and of the gathering of intelligence about activism on the issue of sex equality.

113.19. UCPI0000005823 – This is a report of HN338's, dated 25 June 1971, on a meeting of the editorial board of the publication "Indo-China". It is an example of an SDS undercover officer reporting on journalistic activity and, possibly, attaining a position of influence within activist circles.

113.20. UCPI0000015700 – This is another report of HN338's, this time dated 18 April 1973 and concerning a large public meeting organised by the International Marxist Group, the International Socialists and the Socialist Labour League. The topic for the meeting was: "Police oppression and victimisation". It is an example of the SDS reporting on activism critical of the police.

113.21. Finally, UCPI0000017021 is a report signed by HN343, dated 14 January 1974, relating to a large Socialist Worker Rally in benefit of "the Shrewsbury 24" and their families. It is an example of the SDS reporting on the activities of a justice campaign. The reference to Eric Tomlinson is a reference to the man better known to most as the actor Ricky Tomlinson.

Consideration of Individual Deployments

114. The Counsel Team has prepared Appendix 2 to the written version of this opening statement in which we consider the written evidence relating to each of the SDS officers involved in Phase 1. We hope that it will assist those involved in and those following the Inquiry. In particular, Recognised Legal Representatives proposing lines of questioning in accordance with our rule 10 process need not repeat the issues that we raise in the appendix in relation to any given witness. Witnesses will see from the appendix the areas on which we will be seeking their further assistance, although questioning will not necessarily be limited to these issues.

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

The Witnesses from whom we shall be hearing oral evidence

115. We shall be hearing oral evidence from the following 10 witnesses in Phase 1. What I say now about their role is, obviously, subject to the oral evidence that they will give.

Witness	Role
Tariq Ali	The activist leader in the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and a prominent member of the International Marxist Group during the Phase 1 period.
HN329 "John Graham"	He infiltrated the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign in 1968 and 1969.
HN328 Joan Hillier	She attended meetings of the VSC's Notting Hill branch in October 1968 and then discharged administrative duties until 1969.
HN326 "Douglas Edwards"	He reported on the West Ham Anarchists, the Independent Labour Party, the Dambusters Mobilising Committee and Tri-Continental between 1968 and 1970.
HN336 "Dick Epps"	He infiltrated various groups between 1969 and 1970.
HN340 "Alan Nixon"	He infiltrated Red Circle and reported on the International Marxist Group, the Irish Solidarity Campaign and the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. He was active between 1970 and 1972.
Dr Norman Temple	A member of the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front.

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

HN347 "Alex Sloan"	He infiltrated the INLSF in 1971 and reported on Dr Temple.
HN348 "Sandra"	She infiltrated the Woman's Liberation Front (latterly the Revolutionary Women's Union) between 1971 and 1973.
HN345 "Peter Fredericks"	He operated in 1971 and will give evidence about the Black Power Movement, the Black Defence Committee, Operation Omega, Action Bangla Desh and "Young Haganah".

Counsel to the Inquiry

1 November 2020

APPENDIX 1 – GROUPS REPORTED ON BY THE SDS AS SET OUT IN ANNUAL REPORTS 1969 TO 1974

These groups are set out as they appear in the Annual Reports together with the classifications given to them by the report writer where this is specified.

Chief Superintendent Cunningham's Report dated 20 May 1969

Maoists
Anarchists
International Socialism
International Marxist Group
Vietnam Solidarity Campaign
Independent Labour Party
People's Democracy
Save Biafra

Detective Inspector Saunders' Report dated 07 November 1969

People's Democracy
Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign
Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association
Independent Labour Party
Action Committee Against NATO
Tri-Continental Committee
Britain Vietnam Solidarity Front
Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist League
Maoists
Vietnam Solidarity Committee (under various guises)
Group '68
International Socialism Group
International Marxist Group
Students
Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation
Anarchists
National Convention of the Left

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Chief Inspector Saunders' Report dated 18 November 1970

Irish Solidarity Campaign (formerly Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign)

Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association

Independent Labour Party

New Socialists

Agitprop

Peace Action (an amalgam of Action Committee Against NATO and Chemical and Biological Warfare Action Group – CABWAG)

Friends of Korea

Maoists:

- Britain Vietnam Solidarity Front
- Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist League

Vietnam Solidarity Committee

International Socialism

International Marxist Group

Spartacus League

Red Circle

Anti-Apartheid Movement

Dambusters Mobilising Committee

Women's Liberation Front

Action Committee Against Racism

(Information less full but of value is also obtained on peripheral organisations including the Black Defence Committee, students and anarchists)

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Chief Inspector HN332's Report dated 18 November 1971

Irish Solidarity Campaign
Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association
Sinn Fein (London)
Anti-Internment League
International Socialists
International Marxist Group
Spartacus League
Red Circle
Vietnam Solidarity Campaign
Friends of China
Marxist-Leninist Workers Association
North London Alliance in Defence of Workers Rights
Women's Liberation Front
St Pancras & Camden United Tenants Association
Hackney United Tenants Ad-Hoc Committee
Claimant's Union
Anti-Apartheid Movement
Action Committee Against Racism
Dambusters Mobilising Committee
Women's National Co-ordinating Committee
Action Bangla Desh
Afro-Asian American Association

(Information has also been forthcoming on the Black Defence Committee, Black Unity and Freedom Party, Schools Action Union and the Palestine Solidarity Campaign)

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Detective Inspector HN294's Report dated 14 February 1973 (Annual Report 1972)

Anti-Internment League
Irish Solidarity Campaign (now Central London AIL)
Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association
Irish Civil Rights Association
International Socialists
International Marxist Group
Red Defence Group
Vietnam Solidarity Campaign
Friends of China
Marxist-Leninist Workers Association
Schools Action Union
London Alliance (in Defence of Workers Rights)
Revolutionary Women's Union
Women's Liberation Movement
Claimant's Union
'Commitment' Group
Croydon Libertarians
Ceylon Solidarity Campaign
Action Committee Against Racism

(Information has also been provided on the Northern Minority Defence Force, the Black Unity and Freedom Party, Palestine Solidarity Campaign, the Black Defence Committee, the Stoke Newington Eight Defence Group, Justice for Rhodesia Campaign and 'Indochina')

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Chief Inspector HN294's Report dated 06 March 1974 (Annual Report 1973)

Irish or pro-Irish organisations:

- Anti-Internment League

Trotskyists:

- International Socialists
- International Marxist Group
- Workers Revolutionary Party (formerly Socialist Labour League)

Anarchist – alternative society groups:

- Claimants Union

Maoists:

- Indo-China Solidarity Committee

Stop the Apartheid Rugby Tour (SART)

Groups penetrated to a lesser degree:

- Irish Civil Rights Association
- Croydon Libertarians

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Chief Inspector Kneale's Report dated 04 February 1975 (Annual Report 1974)

Pro-Irish organisations

Trotskyist groups:

- International Socialists
- International Marxist Group
- Workers Revolutionary Party

Maoists

Anarchist, alternative society and racist:

- Revolutionary Communist Group
- Freedom Collective
- Lower Down
- Pavement
- Claimants Union
- Battersea Redevelopment Action Group
- Stop All Racist Tours (formerly Stop the Apartheid Rugby Tour)

Groups penetrated to a lesser degree:

- Fight On
- Big Flame
- Liberation
- Shrewsbury Two Defence Committee

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

APPENDIX 2 – PHASE 1 UNDERCOVER OFFICERS AND PHASE 1 MANAGERS

Phase 1 Undercover Officers

[HN218 Barry Moss / “Barry Morris”](#)

[HN68 – “Sean Lynch”](#)

[HN331 – Notting Hill VSC - 18 August to 4 December 1968](#)

[HN323 – Helen Crampton](#)

[HN327 – David Fisher](#)

[HN334 – “Margaret White”](#)

[HN318 – Raymond Wilson](#)

[HN329 – “John Graham”](#)

[HN330 – “Don De Freitas”](#)

[HN321 – “William Paul Lewis”](#)

[HN335 – Mike Tyrell](#)

[HN322](#)

[HN328 – Joan Hillier](#)

[HN326 – “Douglas Edwards”](#)

[HN333](#)

[HN135 – Michael Ferguson](#)

[HN336 – “Dick Epps”](#)

[HN340 – “Andy Bailey” or “Alan Nixon”](#)

[HN346 – Jill Mosdell](#)

[HN339 – “Stewart Goodman”](#)

[HN349](#)

[HN45 – “David Robertson”](#)

[HN347 – “Alex Sloan”](#)

[HN343 – “John Clinton”](#)

[HN338](#)

[HN348 – “Sandra”](#)

[HN345 – “Peter Fredericks”](#)

Phase 1 Managers

[HN325 – Conrad Dixon](#)

[HN1251/HN371 – Philip Saunders](#)

[HN325](#)

[HN332](#)

[HN294](#)

Phase 1 Undercover Officers

HN218 Barry Moss / “Barry Morris” – Earl’s Court and Notting Hill VSC and October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam – 6 August to 24 September 1968

1. HN218 Barry Moss adopted the cover name “Barry Morris”. He did not apply for anonymity. He served as both a UCO and, later, a manager in the SDS. He provided a witness statement to the Inquiry. He is not being called to give oral evidence in Phase 1 of Tranche 1. A further witness statement is being requested for the purposes of Phase 3 of Tranche 1 and Mr Moss is also likely to be approached for evidence in Tranche 6. The Inquiry’s investigation has located 12 reports linked to DC Moss’ service as an undercover officer with the SDS. They date between August to September 1968 and cover events stated to have taken place between 6 August and 24 September 1968. Eight of the reports relate to the meetings of 5 different bodies: The Joint Committee of Communists (1 report); the Earl’s Court branch of the Vietnam Solidarity Committee (3 reports); the Notting Hill branch of the Vietnam Solidarity Committee (3 reports); the October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam (3 reports); and the Vietnam Solidarity Committee’s Ad Hoc Committee (1 report of a very large meeting). The content of the reporting seems to suggest that DC Moss mixed with Maoist activists of the period.
2. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN218’s reports and witness statement.
 - 2.1. DC Moss was a member of Special Branch for several months before he was told he was joining the SDS. He remarks *“I didn’t opt into it and I don’t think it occurred to anyone there that we could opt out”*¹¹⁵. During his time with Special Branch he recalls attending public meetings of the Communist Party in Barnet and South Hertfordshire with the aim of identifying individuals present at the meetings. He is able to draw a comparison between the roles of an officer in the SDS to that of Special Branch; identifying the main difference as actually joining groups, rather than merely attending public meetings¹¹⁶. Once in the SDS DC Moss was able to draw on his experience as a member of Special Branch to know what to look for and would consult Special Branch records to gather additional information¹¹⁷.
 - 2.2. On the question of oversight and management in the SDS, HN218 describes a greater degree of freedom. He was tasked by Conrad

¹¹⁵ Witness statement para.8

¹¹⁶ Witness statement para.6

¹¹⁷ Witness statement paras.26 & 27

Dixon, who told him which group and fellow ‘traveller’ groups were of interest. Once in a group officers were largely left to their own devices¹¹⁸. HN218 states that *“the ultimate objective was gathering information on the October demonstration and it was left to us how we did that within the parameters which were checked by senior managers”*¹¹⁹.

- 2.3. At this early stage of the SDS, Barry Moss recalls that he would probably have reported for duty at Scotland Yard each morning, in his real identity¹²⁰. He found a cover flat, merely to have an address he could write on attendance lists at meetings; he never lived at the flat. He would use his own vehicle, in his own name, to drive to and from the meetings¹²¹.
- 2.4. In relation to tasking, HN218’s recollection is that he joined the Maoist British Vietnamese Solidarity Front (BVSF). He does not recall joining the VSC however accepts the reports that bear his name, included in the hearing bundle¹²².
- 2.5. 5 of the 8 meetings on which HN218 reported are recorded as having been private (the report on the Joint Committee of Communists¹²³, one of the three reports on the Earl’s Court VSC¹²⁴ and all three of the reports on the October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam¹²⁵). Examining whether there was justification for attendance at private political meetings will be an important part of the Inquiry’s work.
- 2.6. DC Moss’ report on the meeting of the Joint Committee of Communists held on 7 September 1968 (referred to above) records speakers expressing their political opinions on matters such as China’s Cultural Revolution and education. It also records a proposal to “take over” the Revolutionary Socialist Students’ Federation (“RSSF”). He is recorded as the only undercover officer present.
- 2.7. DC Moss was not the only undercover police officer at the three meetings of the Earl’s Court VSC upon which he reported. HN68 “Sean Lynch” and HN331 were also at the meeting on 9 September 1968¹²⁶. DS R. Wilson and TN32 were at the meeting on 12

¹¹⁸ Witness statement para.24

¹¹⁹ Witness statement para.34

¹²⁰ Witness statement para.31

¹²¹ Witness statement para.18

¹²² Witness statement para.22

¹²³ UCPI0000005842

¹²⁴ MPS-0733965

¹²⁵ MPS-0733969; MPS-0738583; MPS-0733974

¹²⁶ MPS-0733965

September 1968¹²⁷. HN335 Mike Tyrell was at the meeting on 23 September 1968¹²⁸. The meeting of the Notting Hill VSC on 11 August 1968¹²⁹ was attended by DS Fisher and an A/WDC, in addition to Barry Moss. In his witness statement HN218 accepts that some meetings were attended by more than one officer. In relation to the meeting on 11 August 1968, he comments that he, DS Fisher and the A/WDC would not have acknowledged one another. DS Fisher attended with a different group and the A/WDC would have attended as a Special Branch officer, not SDS¹³⁰.

- 2.8. There is stated to have been discussion at the meetings of 9 and 23 September 1968¹³¹ as to which route members of the Earl's Court VSC would follow at the demonstration on 27 October 1968. For consideration is how important it was for Special Branch to seek to obtain such information and what other sources of such intelligence were available to it?
- 2.9. At the public meeting of the Earl's Court VSC on 12 September 1968 and the public meetings of Notting Hill VSC on 6 and 11 August 1968¹³² there is recorded as present "*Adequate uniform coverage*". We will seek to explore how and why both uniformed and undercover officers attended the same meetings. Barry Moss, in his witness statement, suggests that there was a need for both uniformed and SDS officers to be present at some meetings, as they were fulfilling different purposes¹³³.
- 2.10. The public meeting of Notting Hill VSC on 6 August 1968 (referred to above), attended by uniformed officers and HN218 was described by him as raising nothing "*of particular interest to Special Branch*"¹³⁴. It is an example of a practice that we have sometimes seen in SDS reports of the writer stating that all or a part of a meeting's proceedings were not of interest to Special Branch. We shall be exploring what officers understood to be of interest to Special Branch and how they came to that understanding. DC Moss completed a further report on 7 August 1968, in which he reported following five members of the Notting Hill branch to an individual's address. He provides a detailed description of

¹²⁷ MPS-0733969

¹²⁸ MPS-0733978

¹²⁹ MPS-0722098/197-8

¹³⁰ Witness statement para.40

¹³¹ MPS-0733965; MPS-0733978

¹³² MPS-0733969; MPS-0722098/160-161; MPS-0722098/197-198

¹³³ Witness statement para.41

¹³⁴ MPS-0722098/160-161

- each. One individual is recorded as having no trace. Another has no Special Branch record and is recorded as a student at Oxford¹³⁵.
- 2.11. Two of the three private meetings of the October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, reported on by DC Moss, took place in a pub, the Union Tavern, King's Cross. The third was held at a private address. The first meeting, that of 15 September 1968, concerned the formation of the Committee¹³⁶. The second and third, on 22 and 24 September 1968¹³⁷, are both recorded as covering, amongst other things, the route which the Committee's followers should take at the 27 October 1968. In particular, at the meeting on 24 September it was decided to break away from the main demonstration to target the American Embassy.
- 2.12. The report of the meeting of the October 27th CSV held on 24 September 1968 records, amongst other things, the fact that arrangements had been made to speak privately to a journalist from the New Statesman. Was it necessary to record such information? Should undercover reporting on a group's contact with the free press be regarded as an intrusion of particular sensitivity?
- 2.13. The public meeting of the VSC's October 27th Ad hoc Committee on 17 September 1968¹³⁸ is reported to have been a large meeting attended by 250 people. Nine police officers are stated to have been present including two of the SDS' senior officers, Chief Inspector Dixon and HN332, then a Detective Inspector. Why did so many officers, including such senior officers, attend this meeting? The significant occurrence at the meeting, according to the report, appears to have been the vote against a proposal made by Maoists to march to Downing Street on 26 October 1968 and then to Grosvenor Square on 27 October 1968.
- 2.14. The single Special Report, dated 19 September 1968¹³⁹, is an example of activist literature being submitted by a UCO (of which the Inquiry Legal Team has seen many examples) and, in this case, has the additional feature that the document in question was attributed by DC Moss to a core participant, Ernest Tate (addressed at paragraph 81 of Mr Tate's witness statement: Mr Tate does not recall writing the document).

¹³⁵ MPS-0722098/170-171

¹³⁶ MPS-0733972

¹³⁷ MPS-0733974; MPS-0733929

¹³⁸ MPS-0738583

¹³⁹ UCPI0000005782

- 2.15. DC Moss withdrew from the SDS prior to the 27 October 1968 Demonstration, as he was to attend an accelerated promotion course commencing on 6 October 1968¹⁴⁰. He was to be replaced by HN335, DC Tyrell. Barry Moss recalls that DC Tyrell attended a meeting of the Earls Court VSC on 23 September 1968 posing as his 'best pal' and thereby introducing him to the group¹⁴¹.
- 2.16. By the time he left the SDS in late September 1968, DC Moss had attended public meetings, banner making sessions and instructional classes. He does not think that he witnessed subversive activity whilst undercover; *"the group I joined wasn't really trying to overthrow the government, they just wanted a big demonstration"*¹⁴². He does recall two pieces of information which *"were probably passed on for use in policing"*; the possibility of protestors carrying ball bearings to use on police horses and women being told to flirt with officers on the front line to try and win them over¹⁴³.
- 2.17. Barry Moss states that he was aware, most likely before the event, that HN68 was going to be arrested for either fly-posting or being drunk and disorderly (on this he is unsure). There was a discussion in the SDS office about how the arrest would be managed; HN68 was to accept the arrest, offer no resistance and plead guilty¹⁴⁴.
- 2.18. HN218 returned to the SDS as Detective Chief Inspector in February 1980. He remained in this role for one year before being promoted to Superintendent. He retained responsibilities for the SDS whilst a replacement DCI was recruited, ceasing the role in December 1981. Later, in 1995, HN218 became Commander of Operations in Special Branch whose remit at that time included the SDS. He became head of Special Branch in October 1996¹⁴⁵.

HN68 – "Sean Lynch" – International Socialists (Camden) 6 August 1968 – Notting Hill VSC 14 August 1968 to 4 December 1968 – Groups campaigning about Ireland, especially Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign, Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association and Sinn Fein 15 May 1969 – 30 January 1973

¹⁴⁰ Witness statement para.44

¹⁴¹ Witness statement para.46

¹⁴² Witness statement para.57

¹⁴³ Witness statement para.68

¹⁴⁴ Witness statement paras.12 & 79

¹⁴⁵ Witness statement paragraph 88. Between late 1969 and 1970 HN218 returned to SB undertaking routine enquiries on all of the main squads. It is likely that it was during this time he produced the report concerning an individual connected to the Anti-Apartheid Movement at MPS-0728485.

3. HN68 is deceased. A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name¹⁴⁶. He used the cover name “Sean Lynch”. His was the first long term SDS deployment. The evidence obtained indicates that he joined the SDS upon its formation on 31 July 1968¹⁴⁷. He then infiltrated the Notting Hill Branch of the VSC between at least 6 August 1968 and 4 December 1968¹⁴⁸. Thereafter, the reporting recovered by the Inquiry suggests that “Sean Lynch” transferred his attentions to groups involved in campaigning on matters relating to the political situation in Northern Ireland. This reporting starts with a report about the London Branch of People’s Democracy dated 17 May 1969 but comprises mainly of reports on the Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign (“ICRSC”) and the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (“NICRA”). There are also reports on Sinn Fein, People’s Democracy, the London Federation of Anarchists, Clann na h'Eireann and the Irish Civil Rights Association. HN68’s deployment into Irish groups appears to have been considered sufficiently important for “Sean Lynch” to have been kept ‘in the field’ for more than 4 years. For consideration is the extent to which this deployment contributed to the decision to maintain the SDS in existence beyond the immediate public order crisis of 1968. As is set out below, some of the reports concern firearms and the provision of funds to the Irish Republican Army. There is also other information likely to have been of at least some interest to those policing Irish related terrorism. Was the desire for intelligence on groups campaigning on Irish matters considered to be particularly important? The 1971 Annual Report described the infiltration of Sinn Fein amongst the SDS’s most significant achievements¹⁴⁹.
4. The following observations and questions arise from a consideration of the documents relating to HN68 contained in the Hearing Bundle.
 - 4.1. There is a single pre-SDS report in the bundle, dated 16 July 1968, which appears to illustrate the difference between ordinary Special Branch tactics and those of the SDS. The report records HN68 being refused entry to a private meeting of the VSC’s October Ad Hoc Committee¹⁵⁰. In contrast, HN68 clearly secured entry to many private meetings during his undercover deployment.

¹⁴⁶ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf> and <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/20170803-Minded-to.pdf>

¹⁴⁷ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Annex B, MPS-0724119.

¹⁴⁸ There is, additionally, an outlying report on the Chairman of the Notting Hill VSC dated 20 August 1969 and a report on a meeting to set up a new VSC group in London E17 dated 15 August 1968.

¹⁴⁹ MPS-0728971, para. 7

¹⁵⁰ MPS-0734309. See also the associated report dated 5 August 1968 at MPS-0734307. The report is signed by HN68 and DI Saunders (and is therefore SDS) but it relates back to HN68’s pre-SDS work.

- 4.2. HN68 attended a meeting of the International Socialists' Camden Branch on 6 August 1968 at which HN334 was also present¹⁵¹. The majority of HN68's reports on the VSC relate to meetings at which other undercover officers were present, usually HN331. In contrast, almost all of HN68's reports relating to Irish matters are by him alone¹⁵².
- 4.3. The influence of Maoists within the Notting Hill VSC was reported by HN323 Sergeant Helen Crampton following a meeting on 14 August 1968 at which she and HN68 were present. The report also recorded a threat of violence to "grasses" in keeping with the militant attitude portrayed in SDS reports of this branch¹⁵³.
- 4.4. Further evidence of the militant attitudes held by at least some of the Notting Hill VSC are recorded in a report dated 23 October 1968 at which one activist is reported to have said: *"If there's any trouble with police horses, the most effective way to deal with them is to put a needle in a cork and jam it in the horse's nose. I know this is cruel but it is very effective"*¹⁵⁴. Someone is also recorded as recommending: *"You should have a stone or even a bit of wood in your fist, so if you hit a copper it would be that much harder"*.
- 4.5. HN68's reporting on groups campaigning on Irish issues was wide ranging, covering socialist, civil rights and republican groups. A small number of the reports contain some evidence relating to firearms, although none of it appears to have been specific or actionable.
 - 4.5.1. The report dated 21 August 1969 concerns a visit to Northern Ireland by members of the London Federation of Anarchists who are recorded as stating that Catholic fighters in Belfast were looking to the United Kingdom for assistance because the IRA had provided them with only a handful of pistols¹⁵⁵.
 - 4.5.2. The report dated 4 December 1969 concerns a proposal to obtain firearms which is recorded as having been made by an ICRSC member. However, the report does not give the impression that the plan was being seriously considered¹⁵⁶.
 - 4.5.3. The report dated 2 April 1970 records a speaker at an ICRSC event as implying the civil rights movements in Northern Ireland

¹⁵¹ MPS-0733716. The meeting concerned racial equality.

¹⁵² By way of exception, the report dated 19 June 1970 (MPS-0732197) is signed by HN135 and notes that "Sean Lynch" was present.

¹⁵³ Report dated 14 August 1968, MPS-0722098 p.203-206.

¹⁵⁴ MPS-0722099, pp.198-199

¹⁵⁵ MPS-0736146

¹⁵⁶ MPS-0739936

had obtained firearms which would be used, if necessary, in self-defence¹⁵⁷.

- 4.5.4. The report dated 13 May 1970 asserts that Gery Lawless told a meeting that he had acted as go between in a plot to supply “young socialists” in Londonderry with firearms and training from the Republic of Ireland’s Forsa Consanta Aitula¹⁵⁸.
- 4.6. The reporting on the Terence McSwiney Cumann of Sinn Fein asserts that it was sending money to the Irish Republican Army¹⁵⁹.
- 4.7. The report on NICRA’s Annual General Meeting on 8 November 1971 records a suggestion at a social event that the Bethnal Green branch of NICRA had ceased to be interested in civil rights and had “*become a cell of the Provisionals*”¹⁶⁰. It is impossible to tell from this and subsequent reporting whether or not this information was accurate. At a more general level, the report dated 22 September 1971, if accurate, records that the majority of those present at a meeting of the Hammersmith branch of NICRA were “*clearly in favour of the Provisionals*”¹⁶¹.
- 4.8. HN68’s reporting includes reports of individuals, as is typical of SDS reporting. One example is that of a report on a Sinn Fein member stated to have travelled to Ireland in order to take “*an active part in the fighting in Ulster*”¹⁶².
- 4.9. Many of HN68’s reports refer to the Member of Parliament Bernadette Devlin in the context of her support for the ICRSC. There are also references to John Ryan MP (in his capacity as a speaker)¹⁶³ and Douglas Hulme MP¹⁶⁴. None of these reports give the impression that the Member of Parliament was the specific target of the undercover operation.
- 4.10. A series of three reports dated 25 June 1970, 26 June 1970 and 27 June 1970 record that NICRA proposed a march to protest against the imprisonment of Bernadette Devlin MP to be held on 26 June 1970¹⁶⁵; that the protest went ahead but 6 of the protesters were arrested¹⁶⁶;

¹⁵⁷ MPS-0739888

¹⁵⁸ MPS-0732172

¹⁵⁹ Report, 21 July 1972, MPS-0732172

¹⁶⁰ UCPI0000016070, penultimate paragraph, p.2/5

¹⁶¹ UCPI0000016065

¹⁶² MPS-0728658, dated 24 July 1972. For other examples of reports on individuals see the reports dated 20 August 1969, 15 October 1970 and 20 October 1970.

¹⁶³ MPS-0739888

¹⁶⁴ UCPI0000016057

¹⁶⁵ UCPI0000016118, para.9

¹⁶⁶ UCPI0000016116

and that all six were convicted, following guilty pleas at Bow Street Magistrates Court on 27 June 1970¹⁶⁷. It is clear from the last of the reports that “Sean Lynch” was amongst the six protesters to be brought before the Court and convicted. He was convicted of an offence contrary to s.121 Highways Act 1959: obstructing free passage of the highway. According to the report he was one of five men who sat in Piccadilly and brought traffic to a standstill. The report dated 27 June 1970 does not appear to be an SDS report and there is nothing in its content to indicate that the Court was informed that one of the defendants was an undercover police officer. This is an early example of an SDS undercover officer being convicted in his cover name together with members of his target group in circumstances where the Inquiry has no evidence to indicate that the Court knew the true facts.

- 4.11. The evidence is that the above incident was not “Sean Lynch’s” only brush with the law during his deployment. The report dated 22 February 1971 from Commander Rodger to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service records that HN68 had been reported for participating in a street collection for Sinn Fein. He had been doing so together with two other men¹⁶⁸. The document evidences senior Special Branch managers intervening to direct the course of the local police officer’s handling of the events (to mark a HORT2 relating to HN68’s cover vehicle as in order and to recommend a caution for the street collecting offences) and to keep Special Branch “*in the background*”¹⁶⁹.
- 4.12. HN329, in his witness statement, at para.276 states that HN68 was convicted of fly posting in cover identity.
- 4.13. There are many examples of reports about forthcoming activities, including demonstrations and marches amongst HN68’s report, as is the norm in SDS reporting¹⁷⁰.
- 4.14. The first report specifically about NICRA is that dated 15 September 1969 and the first report specifically about Sinn Fein is dated 22 February 1971. All of the 1972 reports concern Sinn Fein. It therefore appears that “Sean Lynch” used his credentials as an ICRSC activist to

¹⁶⁷ MPS-0732204

¹⁶⁸ MPS-0735864

¹⁶⁹ See summary in respect of DCI Saunders

¹⁷⁰ For example, see the telegrams dated 7 August 1968 (MPS-0733716) following the meeting of the Camden International Socialists on 6 August 1968; the reports on the ICRSC dated 6 June 1969 (UCPI0000008642), 13 June 1969 (UCPI0000008652) and 3 July 1969 (UCPI0000008657); or the reports on NICRA dated 25 June 1970 (UCPI0000016118) and 5 July 1971 (UCPI0000016057).

move first into NICRA and then into Sinn Fein, with the later seemingly of most interest to the SDS.

- 4.15. HN68's reporting on the ICRSC continued up until the dissolution of the group (which became the ISC) in October 1970. The final report on the ICRSC is notable in that it records a financial dispute between "Sean Lynch" and Gery Lawless, a dominant figure in the group¹⁷¹. This is early evidence of minor involvement in a target group's activities. We have noted two subsequent instances recorded in later reports. First, according to the report dated 31 July 1972, on 28 July 1972 at a meeting of the District Committee of the London Branch of Sinn Fein (Provisionals) Sean Lynch proposed a new Chairman who was unanimously agreed¹⁷². Secondly, according to the report dated 30 January 1973 relating to the inaugural meeting of the Irish Civil Rights Association (London) held on 26 January 1973, "Sean Lynch" unsuccessfully proposed a person to take over as Chairwoman¹⁷³. We will be exploring during the course of the Inquiry the extent to which SDS undercover police officers influenced the course of their target group's activities.
- 4.16. In August 1971 there is a change in the way that HN68's reporting is produced. Up to that point, HN68 usually signs the reports. Thereafter the reports are generally signed by an SDS manager but HN68's presence is recorded because "Sean Lynch" is stated to have been present.
- 4.17. The SDS Chief Inspector's name on the reports changes between August and September 1971. Saunders is the Chief Inspector up until the report dated 24 August 1971. By the time of the next report, dated 22 September 1971, the position has been occupied by HN332. This assists in establishing the managerial chronology.
- 4.18. A minute sheet entry, dated 28 October 1970 records senior management praise for HN68 and HN340's report on the founding conference of the ISC¹⁷⁴.
- 4.19. In a report that is much later than all others, Sean Lynch is stated to have been present at a mass picket during the course of the Grunwick industrial dispute in 1977¹⁷⁵. It is not clear whether this is the same Sean Lynch (although the file reference numbers match) or, if it was HN68, whether he was still serving in the SDS.

¹⁷¹ See MPS-0732342 dated 21 October 1970

¹⁷² MPS-0739324, para.4

¹⁷³ MPS-0737801, para.6

¹⁷⁴ MPS-0738137 which we link with conference report at MPS-0738146.

¹⁷⁵ UCPI0000011215, dated 1 November 1977

- 4.20. HN68 returned to the SDS in a management role at Detective Inspector rank between 1981 and April 1983.

HN331 – Notting Hill VSC - 18 August to 4 December 1968

5. HN331 is deceased. Publication of his real name has been restricted¹⁷⁶. Investigations to date have not revealed his cover name (if he used one). The evidence currently available to the Inquiry suggests that he was a founder member of the SDS who joined the unit on 31 July 1968 and infiltrated the Notting Hill Gate branch of the VSC and anarchists¹⁷⁷. He appears to have served in the unit until a few weeks after the 27 October 1968 demonstration. The Inquiry has located 24 intelligence reports and 3 telegrams linked to HN331. The intelligence reports are dated between 19 August and 5 December 1968 and relate to events recorded as occurring between 18 August and 4 December 1968. All but one of these reports concerns the activities of the Notting Hill branch of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. The other report relates to a meeting aimed at reviving the Earl's Court branch of the same campaign. The telegrams all date from October 1968. Two concern the intentions of student activists at the London School of Economics ("LSE"). The other telegram concerns the intention of German student activists to join in the 27 October Demonstration.
6. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the intelligence reports linked to HN331.
- 6.1. HN331 appears to have worked closely with HN68 "Sean Lynch". They are both recorded in the intelligence reports as attending all of the meetings reported on, save for the meeting of the Notting Hill VSC held on 18 August 1968 which HN331 appears to have attended alone¹⁷⁸. Why did they do so?
- 6.2. On some occasions, HN331 and HN68 are recorded as having been accompanied to meetings by other members of the SDS. In particular, HN328 Joan Hillier is stated to have attended public meetings of the Notting Hill VSC with them on 9, 16 & 30 October 1968. We will seek to explore why she did so, in particular in connection with the concept

¹⁷⁶ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

¹⁷⁷ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B – MPS-0724119

¹⁷⁸ MPS-0734315

- of an “uncommitted” officer recorded at p.3 of the document entitled Penetration of Extremist Groups¹⁷⁹.
- 6.3. At the private meeting concerning the revival of the Earl’s Court VSC, no fewer than 4 of the 24 people recorded as being present at the meeting appear to have been police officers: HN68, HN331, TN32 and Barry Moss¹⁸⁰.
 - 6.4. When not signed by either HN331 or HN68, the reports are often signed by either Joan Hillier, Helen Crampton, or HN334, another female officer, which suggests a clerical component to the work of early female members of the SDS. We will be seeking to explore how female members of the SDS were used at this stage of the SDS’ existence.
 - 6.5. The reports are usually countersigned by HN325 DCI Conrad Dixon the officer then in charge of the SDS.
 - 6.6. Seven of the Notting Hill VSC meetings and the meeting about the Earl’s Court VSC are recorded as having been private. The remaining meetings were public and that of 15 October 1968 appears to have been partially filmed by the BBC¹⁸¹. At many of the public meetings other police officers are recorded as being in attendance. Why did SDS officers attend meetings at which other police officers were present?
 - 6.7. From a public order perspective, the reports portray the Notting Hill branch of the VSC as a militant branch (cf. the reporting on the Havering branch by other officers – see HN334 below). The most stark example of such reporting is that contained in the report of the public meeting held on 16 October 1968 at which the Chair of the meeting is reported as suggesting that those who would be taking part in the demonstration on 27 October 1968 should come armed with one wet and one dry handkerchief for protection against tear gas; banner poles made of hard wood for protection against police truncheons; and the following for protection against police horses: pen-knives for use on the soft underbelly, needles and pepper on the eyes and “jumping jack” fireworks to make the horses rear¹⁸² (see further HN328 below on this issue). The report also refers to a planned ruse to swap banners with the Hornsey branch of the VSC in order to try and make it more difficult for demonstrators to be identified by the police. How timely, accurate

¹⁷⁹ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B – MPS-0724119

¹⁸⁰ MPS-0733965

¹⁸¹ MPS-0733941 (15 October 1968). A representative of the BBC was also at the meeting of 9 October 1968, MPS-0739187.

¹⁸² Intelligence report dated 16 October 1968, MPS-0730070. See also MPS-0722099 pp.44-45 & pp.198-199.

and valuable was such intelligence to the Metropolitan Police Service and could it have been obtained by other means?

- 6.8. There is reporting on more than one occasion of discussions about the route that the Notting Hill VSC should take on 27 October 1968 and, in particular, whether to follow the official route or to break away to Grosvenor Square. How important was understanding the intentions of individual VSC branches to arrangements for policing the demonstration¹⁸³?
- 6.9. Attendance at Notting Hill VSC branch meetings is recorded as varying between about 10-50 people.
- 6.10. The reporting refers to discussions about criminal litigation against members of the group and/or local people (including an individual's campaign against conviction) but not in terms which appear on their face to have violated legal professional privilege¹⁸⁴.
- 6.11. There is reference to another group, the Notting Hill People's Association but in terms which are clearly ancillary to reporting on the officer's actual target, the Notting Hill branch of the VSC¹⁸⁵. This sort of incidental reporting on an individual, group or organisation is very common in the SDS reporting seen by the Inquiry Legal Team.
- 6.12. The Notting Hill branch of the VSC is reported as having campaigning interests beyond protesting against the Vietnam War. They are recorded as being involved in a housing related campaign and there is reference to an anti-racist speech¹⁸⁶. The reporting of early members of the SDS who infiltrated the VSC commonly covers not just their anti-Vietnam War activities but their other activism as well. Why?
- 6.13. The first telegram is one dated 17 October 1968 in which HN331 immediately reports to the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch the passing of a motion by the LSE's Students' Union to occupy the building on 25 October 1968¹⁸⁷. One can infer that this was regarded by the officer as urgent and important intelligence -notwithstanding that it was more than a week before the planned occupation was due to commence.
- 6.14. The second telegram, dated 25 October 1968, reports information received from HN331 that approximately 150 German students intended to join the Notting Hill VSC at Temple Underground Station on 27 October 1968 and remain with the group throughout the

¹⁸³ MPS-0733930, MPS-0733980, MPS-0733965 (Earl's Court branch).

¹⁸⁴ For example, MPS-0734316, MPS-0733980 and UCPI0000005793.

¹⁸⁵ UCPI0000005793

¹⁸⁶ For example, MPS-0730758 (housing).

¹⁸⁷ MPS-0733940

demonstration¹⁸⁸. The Police's perception of the contribution made by German students to the public disorder which occurred in March 1968 may have made the intentions of German students of particular interest to the Special Branch.

- 6.15. The third telegram, dated 27 October 1968, and timed at 0115hrs, reports on the plans of students gathered at the LSE for their participation in the VSC demonstration later that day. It includes reporting of core participant Tariq Ali, who is stated to have pleaded strongly for the students to avoid Grosvenor Square. It also reports that the students did not want violence¹⁸⁹. This evidence corroborates the stated intentions of the organisers of the demonstration to avoid Grosvenor Square and to promote a peaceful demonstration.
7. HN329 states that HN331 was arrested for flyposting and suggests that he and HN68 were both convicted and fined, in their cover identities, as a result¹⁹⁰. We will be exploring the relationship between the SDS and the courts throughout our investigation.

HN323 – Helen Crampton. Notting Hill VSC - August 1969 to February 1969

8. HN323 Helen Crampton is deceased. There is no restriction over the publication of her real name and her cover name, if she had one, is unknown. The first report in her name, a report of a meeting of the Notting Hill VSC she attended with HN68, is dated 14 August 1968 and had left the SDS by the end of February 1969. Documents linked to her show that HN323 attended meetings of the Notting Hill VSC and undertook a number of other general duties but her principle role appears to have been as a witness in criminal proceedings taken against a member of Black Power and VSC supporter for the offence, primarily, of incitement to riot. Following this individual's conviction HN323 was transferred back into ordinary Special Branch duties.
9. The nature of HN323's role appears to fit CI Dixon's description in the Penetration of Extremist Groups of the SDS officer to be used for evidential purposes: *"When we are in a position to obtain evidence about a serious offence arrangements have to be made so that it is obtained by an "uncommitted" officer, and thus avoid compromising an undercover man. An "uncommitted" officer is an essential part of the unit; women officers fill the role*

¹⁸⁸ MPS-0722102_001

¹⁸⁹ MPS-0733981

¹⁹⁰ HN329 first witness statement, para.276

*extremely well and can be taken to public or private gatherings where the evidence is obtainable with little risk of denunciation”*¹⁹¹.

10. An analysis of the documents linked to HN323 give rise to the following observations and questions:

- 10.1. HN323 attended a meeting of the Notting Hill VSC on 14 August 1968 with HN68. The purpose of the meeting was to elect an Ad Hoc committee for the demonstration in October. Abhimanyu Manchanda was present and addressed the meeting¹⁹².
- 10.2. There are two reports signed by HN323 of surveillance activities first in respect of reports of a meeting to be held by Tariq Ali¹⁹³ the second in respect of an anticipated VSC street meeting¹⁹⁴. Neither event took place.
- 10.3. On 9 October 1968 HN323 attended a meeting of the Notting Hill VSC at which she was handed two documents by an activist at the meeting. One of these was entitled ‘The Potential of a Militant Demonstration’ and contained a description of how to build a Molotov Cocktail and a diagram of a home-made grenade¹⁹⁵. These documents became the subject of scrutiny by CI Dixon who described them as of the “*most virulent type*”. He discussed them with the Acting Superintendent of E Squad and they were in turn considered by the Special Branch Commander, the Commissioner and finally the Director of Public Prosecutions¹⁹⁶. The date for executive action against this activist was given similar consideration at a high level. A manuscript note on a Special Branch minute sheet indicates that the Home Secretary was consulted¹⁹⁷. The question of bail was also considered by the Commissioner. A memorandum written by the Assistant Chief Constable to the Commissioner states “*if we brought all our big guns to bear, we might well succeed with such an application; for him to be out on bail would, of course, be most embarrassing*”. The individual concerned was in due course tried at the Central Criminal Court before

¹⁹¹ MPS-0724119

¹⁹² MPS-0722098 p204

¹⁹³ MPS-0722098 p229

¹⁹⁴ MPS-0722099 p28

¹⁹⁵ The leaflets are enclosed with a copy of HN323’s witness statement at document reference MPS-0739152. See MPS-0739330 for a police document setting out possible offences committed and a summary of the available evidence for submission to the DPP.

¹⁹⁶ MPS-0739147

¹⁹⁷ Ibid page 5-7. See MPS-0739149 for confirmation that the activist was not in fact arrested until after the October demonstrations to avoid creating a focal point of the use of violence “*on the grounds that he had been made a martyr in the cause of revolution*”.

Mr Justice Hines QC and convicted of incitement to riot for which he received a custodial term of two years¹⁹⁸. HN323 gave evidence at the trial and was thereafter recommended for commendation. The commendation recommendation reads: *“at trial [the defendant] called four member of the Notting Hill VSC as defence witnesses and Miss Crampton’s knowledge of these men as of valuable assistance to Crown Counsel in deciding the method of his cross-examination of these witnesses”*. The Chief Superintendent, in endorsing this recommendation writes: *“A/WDS Crampton had a difficult and dangerous role to play and acquitted herself with considerable distinction. She has, of course, now been transferred from the demonstration squad to ordinary Special Branch duties”*¹⁹⁹. The Inquiry will be examining the extent to which an evidential as opposed to an intelligence role was pursued in the SDS over the years that followed and how this was achieved.

HN327 – David Fisher – VSC 11 August 1968 to 30 October 1968, including Notting Hill VSC: 11 August 1968 to 10 September 1968; and Croydon VSC: 24 September 1968 to 30 October 1968

11. HN327 David Fisher is deceased. There is no restriction over publication of his real name and his cover name, if he had one, is unknown. The 15 reports linked to him indicate that he served in the SDS only briefly reporting on the VSC for purposes related to the 27th October 1968 demonstration. The first SDS report attributed to him is dated 11 August 1968 and the latest report that is attributed to him is dated 31 October 1968. He appears to have reported on or attended meetings of the Notting Hill and Croydon branches of the VSC and of the October 27th Ad-Hoc Committee.
12. An analysis of the documents linked to him gives rise to the following observations:
 - 12.1. HN327 attended 2 meetings of the Notting Hill VSC in August and September 1968 and then 3 meetings of the Croydon VSC in October 1968. The reason for this branch transition is unclear.
 - 12.2. All the meetings he attended were attended by at least one other SDS officer. He and HN318 DS Ray Wilson (not to be confused with Detective Inspector Riby Wilson) attended VSC meetings of the

¹⁹⁸ See MPS-0739150 for Special Branch report on the court proceedings.

¹⁹⁹ MPS-0739149

Croydon branch together²⁰⁰. The October 27th Ad-Hoc Committee meeting was attended by other officers including senior management²⁰¹. The October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam meeting was attended by HN327 and two other SDS officer, including DI Saunders²⁰². The Notting Hill branch VSC meeting on 11 August 1968 he attended with HN218 and a female police officer²⁰³ and that of 10 September 1968 he attended with HN318 DC Wilson and DC Furner²⁰⁴. DC Furner is recorded as having a clerical role and this report therefore demonstrates that in the early days of the SDS, administrators were not entirely confined to the back office²⁰⁵.

- 12.3. During the meeting of October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam on 3 October 1968 it is reported that, contrary to plans being discussed by the 27 October Ad Hoc Committee of the VSC, Manchanda advocated that the main target of the demonstrations be Grosvenor Square²⁰⁶
- 12.4. Both Notting Hill VSC meetings (dated on 11 August 1968 and 10 September 1968) are described as public. Each of these describe there being adequate uniform coverage. What was the purpose of undercover officers attending public events which were attended by uniformed officers?
- 12.5. All 3 Croydon VSC meetings (7 October 1968, 14 October 1968 and 30 October 1968) are listed as private and attendance ranged from 7 to 20 people, 2 of whom in each case were members of the SDS.
- 12.6. The Croydon branch of the VSC does not appear militant in nature: the meeting of 30 October 1968 indicates a satisfaction with the lack of violence displayed on 27 October Demonstration and a desire to work on gaining the support of the Trades Union section of the populace²⁰⁷.
- 12.7. HN327 is the author of a report setting out the results of inquiries in to an individual who reportedly boasted of visiting a flat where bombs and guns were being stored for use at the October Demonstration²⁰⁸. On 15 August 1968 regarding a telephone call received in Special Branch

²⁰⁰ MPS-0722099/159; MPS-0722099/176; MPS-0722099/203

²⁰¹ MPS-0738583 meeting attended by CI Dixon, DI Saunders, HN318 DS Wilson, DS Creamer, HN218 and HN329 as well as HN327.

²⁰² MPS-0733939 meeting attended by DI Sander and DS Wilson as well as HN327.

²⁰³ MPS-0722099/198. See also summary in respect of HN218.

²⁰⁴ MPS-0722099/96

²⁰⁵ MPS-0724119 at Annex B

²⁰⁶ MPS-0733939

²⁰⁷ MPS-0722099/203

²⁰⁸ MPS-0738736

alleging that weapons were being prepared for the VSC October Demonstration.

- 12.8. HN327 is the author of two reports concerning core participant Tariq Ali (dated 17 October 1968 and 18 October 1968²⁰⁹). The later of these reports concerns the outcome of inquiries into the identity of an “intimate contact” of Tariq Ali at a Teacher Training College.
- 12.9. HN327 also attended a meeting of the LSE Students Union where a motion was passed to occupy a university building in support of the October Demonstration. This is reported in a police telegraph to the Chief Superintendent Special Branch²¹⁰. There is sporadic reporting on the activities of students throughout the life of the SDS.

HN334 “Margaret White” – Camden International Socialists – 6 August 1968 & Havering VSC: 30 September 1968 to 29 October 1968

13. HN334 “Margaret White” has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry. Publication of her real name is the subject of a restriction order²¹¹. There is some uncertainty about precisely when she joined and left the SDS. She may have joined the SDS at, or very soon after, its formation. HN334 is recorded as having attended a private meeting of the Camden branch of “International Socialism” on 6 August 1968, with HN68 whom the documents suggests was a member of the SDS at that time²¹². Further documents which the Inquiry has obtained, together with HN334’s own recollection, indicate that she was certainly serving with the unit and attending meetings of the Havering VSC between 30 September 1968 and 29 October 1968. She does not appear on the list of the unit’s personnel in the document entitled “Penetration of Extremist Groups”, dated 26 November 1968, suggesting, in accordance with her recollection, that she left the unit shortly after the 27 October 1968 demonstration. Unlike HN328, HN334 does appear to have attended private meetings of activists and to have used a cover name like her male counterparts. However, as with others during this era of the SDS, she does not appear to have attended activist meetings alone.
14. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement and documents associated with HN334.

²⁰⁹ MPS-0734595; MPS-0734594

²¹⁰ MPS-0733940

²¹¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20191009_HN334-Real-only-RO.pdf

²¹² Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B

- 14.1. HN334 was a Detective Constable in Special Branch prior to joining the SDS. During that time she attended political meetings, she recalls that these were the same sort of meetings she attended when on the SDS. The distinction she draws between the two roles is that when attending the meetings as a member of Special Branch she would not say she was a police officer but if asked who she was, would give her name. When subsequently attending meetings as an undercover officer in the SDS her *"identity needed to be completely secret"*²¹³.
- 14.2. In her witness statement HN334 explains that she was deployed to her target group, the Havering branch of VSC, with a partner, HN330. They were instructed to act as girlfriend and boyfriend²¹⁴.
- 14.3. There are four documents dating from early August 1968. The first is a report, dated 2 August 1968, about an individual and her correspondence (which is stated to have been attached to the report) in connection with the funding of an Art College's October Revolution Account²¹⁵. It evidences the fact that Special Branch obtained mail to gather information, whether or not it was through the SDS, although SDS reports submitting personal correspondence are rare in the Tranche 1 era. The Inquiry Legal Team has generally come across a lot of reports upon individuals amongst SDS papers and we will be exploring why, what was done with such reporting and whether it was justified.
- 14.4. The remaining three documents dating from August 1968 all arise from attendance by HN68 and HN334 at a private meeting of the Camden Branch of the International Socialists. There is a report of the meeting itself, dated 6 August 1968, the subject of which was recorded as being "The Negro Struggle in America"²¹⁶. If this is an SDS report then it is the earliest which records information about activism in support of racial equality that we have found. As reported, the meeting also covered issues relating to industrial relations and the Vietnam War: speakers urged attendees to join a march by (mainly BAME) strikers and attend a demonstration at a cinema against the screening of "Green Beret" a film about the Vietnam War. 6 of the attendees were reported as having worn VSC badges which might suggest a particular interest on the part of the officers in the VSC. The Inquiry Legal Team has come across many examples in Tranche 1 of reporting which includes

²¹³ Witness statement para.11

²¹⁴ Witness statement para.21

²¹⁵ MPS-0735144

²¹⁶ MPS-0733716

references to campaigning on issues of race equality and industrial relations. We will be exploring why, what was done with such information and whether it was justified. HN334's recollection is that she was not deployed into the Camden branch of International Socialists, or any group other than Havering VSC, whilst an undercover officer for the SDS. She suggests that she attended such meetings as a result of specific tasking and in plain clothes²¹⁷.

- 14.5. There are two reports which are ancillary to the report on the meeting of 6 August 1968. First, a Metropolitan Police Telegram from HN68 to the Chief Superintendent Special Branch, dated 7 August 1968, which communicates the information about the imminent march and demonstration referred to in the sub-paragraph above²¹⁸. The words "Special Squad" have been added in manuscript and then struck out. This is an example of one of several different ways in which the SDS appears to be referred to in the early years of its existence. The telegram is also an example of how information obtained by the SDS was disseminated within Special Branch. The markings on this document recording that it was copied to A8 and the Superintendent of C Branch.
- 14.6. The second ancillary report, dated 8 August 1968, relates to the vehicles that were observed being used by those attending the meeting on 6 August 1968, including their registered owners. The documents obtained by the Inquiry from this period show that reporting about vehicles and their registered owners is not uncommon. This is but an example. It follows that a member of the public's name as the registered owner of a vehicle could be recorded on Special Branch files simply because the vehicle was used to convey an activist to a meeting of socialists. Why was such information recorded, how was it used, and was it justified?
- 14.7. There are four reports relating to the Havering branch of the International Socialists, which is stated to have incorporated the Havering VSC. Three concern meetings which are stated to have been held in private on 30 September, 5 and 29 October 1968²¹⁹. The fourth, dated 19 October 1968, submits the leaflet which Havering VSC had had printed for the purposes of the 27 October 1968 demonstration²²⁰. All of the meetings are reported as having been

²¹⁷ Witness statement para.44

²¹⁸ MPS-0733720

²¹⁹ MPS-0731906, 0731911 and 0735148.

²²⁰ MPS-0733745 (covering report) and 0733746 (leaflet).

small: the first two had 9 attendees and the third 11. The first is stated to have taken place in a private residence (the impression given by the documents seen by the Inquiry Legal Team from the Tranche 1 era is that SDS officers often attended small meetings of activists in private homes, particularly where the group or branch in question was small). The second took place in the King's Head public house, Romford and the third in the Edwin Lambert Hall, Romford. Pubs and halls are typical of the venues attended by SDS officers reporting in Tranche 1 (and beyond) according to the reports that we have seen. The reports of the two meetings that pre-date the 27 October 1968 demonstration record information about Havering VSC's preparations for the event: discussions about the composition, printing and distribution of leaflets; lines to take with the press; elections for the post of Secretary and Treasurer; and the likely maximum size of the Havering contingent on 27 October 1968 (maximum 100). Save for the assertion that the branch would "*perhaps*" fly post, there is no evidence of any intention to break the law, or even a militant attitude, in the officers' portrayal of Havering VSC's preparations for 27 October 1968. As has already been observed above in relation to HN331, this contrasts with the portrayal in other SDS reports of the Notting Hill VSC branch's avowedly militant preparations. How useful was such information, from branch level, for the purposes of arranging policing for the 27 October 1968 demonstration? Did the need for such information justify the deployment of undercover officers into private meetings? The report on the meeting held on 29 October 1968 contains the officer's account of the views of members of Havering VSC about the demonstration. What purpose did that serve and why was it considered necessary to continue reporting after the 27 October 1968 demonstration?

- 14.8. HN334 attended the 27 October 1968 demonstration in her cover identity as a member of Havering VSC. She assisted with making a Havering branch banner. Her stated recollection of the demonstration is that she 'marched with the group under the banner'²²¹.
- 14.9. In addition to reporting information about preparations for the 27 October 1968, a feature of the reports is that they record information about the political activity of an individual within the Labour Party. The report on the 30 September 1968 meeting records that the host also held a position within a ward branch of the Labour Party. The 5 October 1968 meeting records that the same person announced his

²²¹ Witness statement para.90

resignation from the Labour Party. Why was information of this nature included in a report about preparations for a demonstration? Should it have been?

- 14.10. The final five documents all appear to relate to HN334's work in Special Branch after leaving the SDS. They are included because they relate to groups on which the SDS did report and appear to be examples of the non-SDS sources of intelligence available to Special Branch on these groups.
- 14.11. HN334 submitted a number of photographs of early members of the SDS taken, she believes, shortly after the 27 October 1968 demonstration.

HN318 – Raymond Wilson – VSC 5 September 1968 to 20 November 1968; including North West London Vietnam Ad Hoc Committee: 5 September 1968; Notting Hill: 10 September 1968; Croydon: 7 October 20 November 1968; Earls Court: 12 September 1968; Vietnam Solidarity Campaign October 27th ad-hoc Committee: 17 September 1968; and Libertarian Left: 8 September 1968.

15. HN318 Raymond Wilson is deceased. There is no restriction over publication of his real name and his cover name, if he used one, is unknown. Documents linked to him indicate that he joined the SDS at an early stage (the first SDS report which records his presence at a meeting is dated 6 September 1968) and his deployment came to an end shortly after the 27 October Demonstration (the final report that can be linked to him is dated 20 November 1968). He can be distinguished from his near namesake DI Riby Wilson by their respective ranks: the gisted Central Record of Service²²² states that Raymond Wilson was promoted from Sergeant to Inspector on 7 July 1969. He was therefore DS Wilson for the duration of his SDS deployment. The majority of his reporting concerns the VSC covering a number of different branches: North West London VCS Ad Hoc Committee, Notting Hill branch, Croydon branch, Earls Court branch and 27 October Ad Hoc Committee.
16. An analysis of the documents linked to HN318 gives rise to the following observations:
 - 16.1. Prior to his SDS reporting, there is one report dated 27 July 1968 concerning his attendance with another officer at a meeting of the IMG New Left Review²²³. It appears that the meeting was public as an admission fee was charged. The report notes that there was “adequate

²²² MPS-0722800

²²³ MPS-0738327

uniform coverage outside the hall", implying that he was present in plain clothes. Core participant Tariq Ali is listed as an attendee at this event.

- 16.2. As with other officers of this era, with one exception, HN318 attended meetings with other SDS officers. On 10 September 1968 HN318 attended a meeting of the Notting Hill VSC with HN327 and DC Furner²²⁴. A report dated 12 September indicates his attendance at public weekly meeting of Earls Court VSC together with HN218 and another officer²²⁵. He was one of several officers including CI Dixon who attended the meeting of the VSC October 27th ad-hoc Committee, described as public and attended by 250, which included 8 SDS officers²²⁶. He was one of 3 SDS officers in attendance at a meeting of October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, a public meeting attended by 60 others²²⁷. He attended 3 private meetings of the Croydon branch of the VSC with HN327 on 7 October 1968²²⁸, 14 October 1968²²⁹ and 30 October 1968²³⁰. All three meetings are listed as private and attendance ranged from 7 to 20 people. DS Wilson attended a further meeting at the Croydon branch on 20 November 1968.²³¹ This is the only example of him attending an event by himself.
- 16.3. The Croydon branch of the VSC does not appear militant in nature: the meeting of 30 October 1968 indicates a satisfaction with the lack of violence displayed on 27 October Demonstration and a desire to work on gaining the support of the Trades Union section of the populace²³².
- 16.4. A report dated 6 September 1968 indicates that HN318 attended a meeting of the North West London VSC Ad Hoc Committee on the previous day with Wilson attended with HN329 and another officer²³³. This is described as a public meeting attended by 80 people. The speaker at the meeting voiced his preference of avoidance of the US Embassy during the October Demonstration. It is noted that Manchanda "*who had been silent throughout*" and "*10 Maoists*" left the hall once the meeting had been in progress for about an hour. A

²²⁴ MPS-0722099/96-97

²²⁵ MPS-0733969

²²⁶ MPS-0738583 meeting attended by CI Dixon, DI Saunders, HN327 Dave Fisher, DS Creamer, HN218 and HN329 as well as HN318.

²²⁷ MPS-0733939 meeting attended by DI Saunders and HN327 as well as HN318.

²²⁸ MPS-0722099/159-160

²²⁹ MPS-0722099/177-178

²³⁰ MPS-0722099/203-204

²³¹ MPS-0722099/219-220

²³² MPS-0722099/203

²³³ MPS-0722099/46-47

handwritten note at the bottom in what appears to be CI Dixon's hand states that a future meeting will be "*covered by the demonstration squad*".

- 16.5. During the meeting of October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam on 3 October 1968 it is reported that, contrary to plans being discussed by the 27 October Ad Hoc Committee of the VSC, Manchanda advocated that the main target of the demonstrations be Grosvenor Square²³⁴.
- 16.6. On 8 September 1968, DS Wilson attended a private conference of the Libertarian Left with another officer²³⁵. The meeting was attended by representatives from the Socialist Current, the Lewisham Anarchists, London Solidarity Group, Fulham Anarchists and the East London Libertarians. The groups represented discussed whether they would take part in the demonstration on 27 October and if so, as part of a libertarian contingent or as individuals. It is reported that most appeared opposed to "*senseless violence*".
- 16.7. HN318 is the author of a police telegram dated 28 May 1969 informing the Chief Superintendent Special Branch that he has just been informed by Tariq Ali that a French presidential candidate will be addressing a meeting on 31 May 1969. This implies direct contact between Tariq Ali and HN318. This is not an SDS report and therefore demonstrates that other areas of Special Branch also had an interest in Tariq Ali²³⁶.
- 16.8. By 1971, it would appear that DS Wilson was no longer deployed as part of the SDS but was working elsewhere in Special Branch. A minute sheets bearing his name dated 21 May 1971 encloses an SDS report authored by HN68 dated 20 May 1971 on Sinn Fein²³⁷. This demonstrates the dissemination of SDS intelligence through other units of Special Branch. The Inquiry will be exploring the working relationship between the SDS and wider Special Branch.

HN329 "John Graham" – VSC 5 September 1968 to 6 September 1969, including Northwest London VSC Ad Hoc Committee 5 September 1968 to 16 October 1968; Hampstead VSC: 30 October 1968; Kilburn and Willesden VSC: 5 December 1968 to 2 January 1969; and Camden VSC: 12 February 1969 to 20 August 1969

²³⁴ MPS-0733939

²³⁵ MPS-0733967

²³⁶ MPS-0738361

²³⁷ MPS-0728844

17. John Graham has provided a witness statement. He is due to give oral evidence. His real name is the subject of a restriction order²³⁸. On the evidence obtained to date it appears that he joined the SDS on 12 August 1968²³⁹, within a fortnight of the unit's formation. Over 30 documents have been obtained and linked to him. These documents indicate that he operated in north and northwest London, reporting on meetings of the VSC. At branch level he reported on:
 - 17.1. North West London VSC Ad hoc Committee (6 reports on meetings or activities held between 5 September 1968 and 16 October 1968); then
 - 17.2. Hampstead VSC (1 report on a meeting held on 30 October 1968)²⁴⁰; then
 - 17.3. Kilburn and Willesden VSC (3 reports on meetings held between 5 December 1968 and 2 January 1969); and then
 - 17.4. Camden VSC (16 reports on meetings held between 12 February 1969 and 20 August 1969).
18. He also reported on large national level meetings of the VSC held on 17 September 1968, 22 October 1968, 11 November 1968 and 20 December 1968²⁴¹, a meeting of local groups held in Sheffield on 10-11 May 1969²⁴² and two meetings of the VSC's Working Committee held on 24 July 1969 and 6 September 1969 respectively²⁴³.
19. There is a single report on the Foundation of the Anti-Imperialist Solidarity Movement on 3 November 1968²⁴⁴ and a solitary report dated 13 October 1968 about the Durham VSC. HN329 states that he very much doubts that he personally attend the Durham meeting²⁴⁵. We note that in the former report, the racial mix of attendees was recorded. Why?
20. The Inquiry's investigation has found no reports which can be linked to HN329 specifically on the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation, referred in the risk assessment as having been the subject of peripheral reporting, although

²³⁸ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf>

²³⁹ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B, op. cit.

²⁴⁰ MPS-0722099 pp.201-202, this report states that the Kilburn branch would be reforming.

²⁴¹ MPS-0738583, MPS-0738436, MPS-0730768 & MPS-0722099 pp.216-217

²⁴² UCPI0000005799

²⁴³ UCPI0000005801 and UCPI0000005802

²⁴⁴ MPS-0730765. See also witness statement paras.213-217

²⁴⁵ MPS-0722099 pp.175-6; and HN329 witness statement, paras.120-126

there is passing mention of the group in the reports which have been obtained²⁴⁶.

21. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement and documents associated with HN329.
 - 21.1. The apparent length of “John Graham’s” deployment is about the 12 months normal maximum period recommended in “Penetration of Extremist Groups”.
 - 21.2. HN329’s witness statement suggests that he was posted to the SDS rather than invited to volunteer. He is not the only very early SDS UCO to describe this route of entry into the unit but thereafter entry appears to have been voluntary. We will be exploring whether he and others were given any choice in the matter.
 - 21.3. Like other Tranche 1 Phase 1 former UCOs, HN329 does not recall any formal training. However, he does recall being taken to see DAC Ferguson Smith together with other SDS officers²⁴⁷. Why did this occur? He also states that DAC Smith visited the SDS when he was Commander Special Branch²⁴⁸.
 - 21.4. HN329 states that SDS undercover officers were generally afforded “*great latitude*” by managers²⁴⁹. The extent to which this was the case, the reasons for it and the consequences are all matters that we propose to examine. This officer recalls attending the meetings and events that his group attended. An example of an activity other than one of the numerous meetings, is evidenced by the report dated 23 September 1968 which records a street performance in Kentish Town²⁵⁰.
 - 21.5. “John Graham” was sometimes the only UCO recorded as present at activist events but on others he was not. He is recorded as being one of a number of police officers present at the large national level VSC meetings, several of whom were in the SDS. Both HN329 and Conrad Dixon are stated to have attended the North West London VSC. According to the reports, HN329 attended all of the Kilburn & Willesden meetings alone and the Camden meetings usually alone. Occasionally, Conrad Dixon is also recorded as being present at Camden VSC events. How and why this was so is to be explored. Did these officers

²⁴⁶ The RSSF is recorded, in addition to the VSC, as part of HN329’s duties in MPS-0724119. HN329 now has no recollection of the group: witness statement para.53.

²⁴⁷ Witness statement, para.22

²⁴⁸ Witness statement, para.259

²⁴⁹ Witness statement, para.70

²⁵⁰ MPS-0722099 pp.63-64

attend separately, or together? HN329 states that he operated alone, even at events at which other undercover police officers were present²⁵¹.

- 21.6. HN329 recalls that both Conrad Dixon and, HN332 were deployed, albeit not frequently, despite being managers²⁵². He cannot recall their cover names.
- 21.7. Of note is the report of the VSC 27th October Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 17 September 1968²⁵³. It was a large and significant event that the report states was attended by 250 people. If the report is accurate, then no fewer than 9 of the attendees were police officers, many of them members of the SDS, including its two most senior officers Chief Inspector Dixon and Inspector Saunders. HN329 states that he imagines that he voted at the meeting, in order not to compromise his cover identity²⁵⁴. The voting figures in the report, if correct, indicate that the police officers present could not have affected the outcome of the main ballot conducted at the meeting, but the potential for undercover officers to influence the course of events within political groups is an issue that we will be investigating.
- 21.8. “John Graham” moved sequentially from the North West London VSC to the Kilburn & Willesden branch and then to the Camden VSC. Why did he do so?
- 21.9. Most of HN329’s reports record the meetings that he attended as public. In relation to those that are marked private, it is not always clear what distinguishes them from very similar reports of meetings which are recorded as public. Is there an explanation? HN329 states that none of the meetings were closed but some were not advertised²⁵⁵.
- 21.10. The local meetings of the VSC that “John Graham” infiltrated varied in size and some were quite small. Attendance at the North West London VSC Ad Hoc Committee meetings was recorded at between 20 and 80. 45 persons attended the Hampstead VSC meeting attended by “John Graham”. At the Kilburn & Willesden VSC meetings attendance varied between 5 and 17. The Camden VSC meetings had a recorded attendance of between 13 and 30. How closely did he interact with and get to know the other attendees and why? What influence, if any, did he have on the activities of these groups?

²⁵¹ Witness statement, para.85

²⁵² Witness statement, para.104

²⁵³ MPS-0738583

²⁵⁴ Witness statement, para.180

²⁵⁵ Witness statement, para.87

- 21.11. John Graham appears to have written an article for the bulletin “Red Camden”. Why and in what circumstances did he do so and what did he seek to achieve in writing what he did?²⁵⁶
- 21.12. Towards the end of his deployment, “John Graham” reported on two meetings of the VSC’s working committee²⁵⁷. The first of these was held at a private residence and both are recorded as involving relatively few people. How did “John Graham” come to be in a position to report on these meetings? What role, if any, did he play in the work of this committee?
- 21.13. “John Graham” often reported on the fact of, plans for or attitudes towards forthcoming activist events. Examples range from a report that a party is to be held, through plans for small local demonstrations to plans for much larger demonstrations. Why was this information recorded and what purposes did it serve? Was it necessary and justified?
- 21.14. Amongst the forthcoming activist events that were reported on were those linked to anti-racist campaigning²⁵⁸. Why were such events included in reports?
- 21.15. HN329’s reports, in common with others, sometimes record descriptions of individuals that alight upon specific personal characteristics, e.g. “*withered right hand*”²⁵⁹. Why was this done?
- 21.16. HN329’s reports, again in common with some others, include information about a child²⁶⁰. Why and in what circumstances did the SDS report about children?
- 21.17. There is a reference in the report of the meeting of the Kilburn & Willesden VSC held on 17 December 1968 that refers to the fact that members of the Labour Party, amongst others, would be attending a demonstration²⁶¹. Why was the activity of members of a mainstream political party reported?
- 21.18. The Telegram dated 23 October 1968 refers to The Demo Squad and is one of a number of different titles which appear to have been used, rather loosely, in the early days of the SDS²⁶². Did the SDS have an

²⁵⁶ UCPI0000007701

²⁵⁷ UCPI0000005801, UCPI0000005802

²⁵⁸ MPS-0730768

²⁵⁹ MPS-0738435. See also UCPI0000007693 for a reference to a person’s sexual orientation which HN329 addresses at paras.156 & 313-315 of his witness statement.

²⁶⁰ UCPI0000007693, UCPI0000007694 and UCPI0000007697

²⁶¹ UCPI0000007685

²⁶² MPS-0738436

established official title at this stage in its history?²⁶³ The title “The Demonstration Squad” does fit with what appears to have been the original principal purpose of the SDS, namely to obtain intelligence about the forthcoming VSC demonstration.

- 21.19. There are four documents containing references to NPNSCPs in “John Graham’s” reporting. Tariq Ali is recorded as a speaker and Ernest Tate as having been present at the VSC event held at Conway Hall on 11 November 1968²⁶⁴. It is stated that Tariq Ali was nominated in his absence, at a VSC meeting on 22 October 1968, to speak at the culmination of the 27 October 1968 demonstration²⁶⁵. Both Tariq Ali and Ernest Tate are mentioned in the report dated 24 December 1968 relating to the VSC meeting 4 days earlier²⁶⁶. Ernest Tate is recorded as having been the leaseholder on the VSC’s offices at 120 Commercial Road in a report on a Camden VSC held on 19 March 1969²⁶⁷.
- 21.20. Unlike the meetings of some other branches (see HN331 and the reports on the Notting Hill VSC above) the meetings that “John Graham” attended are not recorded as having been the subject of other policing arrangements. Why was this and did it make any difference to the way in which the SDS operated?
- 21.21. HN329 states that he took a “girl” from his group out to dinner after his deployment ended²⁶⁸. The Inquiry requested a further statement about this event which “John Graham” describes as purely social with no sexual intention²⁶⁹. HN329 does not recall telling his managers about the event.
- 21.22. There is often a lag of a day, sometimes more, between the date of “John Graham’s” report and the event reported on. This feature is common to some but not all reporting of other contemporaries. Why was this? What was the process for the production of his reports? HN329 recalls there being a typewriter at the SDS flat and assumes that he used it to write reports²⁷⁰. Perhaps most significantly, for the purposes of the issue of justification, HN329 states “*Generally speaking, there was no filtering of the information included in the*

²⁶³ See further HN329 witness statement, para.12 (HN329 recalls only the name “The Hairies”); MPS-0722099 pp.46-47 (refers to “the demonstration squad”); and MPS-0722099 pp.56-57, 124-125 (“demo squad”).

²⁶⁴ MPS-0730768

²⁶⁵ MPS-0738436

²⁶⁶ MPS-0722099, p.216

²⁶⁷ UCPI0000007690

²⁶⁸ Witness statement, para.241

²⁶⁹ Witness statement, paras.301-309

²⁷⁰ Witness statement, para.108

*reports*²⁷¹. The content of many of the reports that the Inquiry Legal Team has read appear to us to be consistent with this observation. Whether our impression is correct, together with how and why this practice was adopted, is an issue that we will be investigating.

- 21.23. On a specific issue of report interpretation, HN329 states that the use of the letters “PA” means “*put away*”²⁷². The acronym is often found at the bottom of reports, or on minute sheets in the context of where the report should be filed.
- 21.24. HN329 served in Special Branch’s C Squad (Communists) both before and after he served in the SDS. Accordingly, he may be able to assist the Inquiry as to how SDS and C squad interacted, how SDS reporting was used by C Squad and whether there was a need for it. His statement already contains evidence that compares his “ordinary” Special Branch duties with those which he undertook in the SDS²⁷³.
- 21.25. On the wider question of Special Branch’s role in countering subversion and the SDS’ part in discharging that role, HN329 states that: “*Special Branch was responsible for providing information as to the security of the State*” and, later: “*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*”.²⁷⁴
- 21.26. The impression given in HN329’s statement is that the proportion of the time that he spent undercover was less than that of later officers. He lived at home (except when he went to Sheffield) and was undercover only whilst attending his target group’s activities²⁷⁵. He does not recall overtime adding a great deal to his basic pay²⁷⁶. We will be exploring the significance of the depth to which UCOs were immersed in their undercover role on their actions, welfare and reporting.
- 21.27. HN329 assists in distinguishing the two R Wilsons referred to in the Tranche 1 papers by confirming that Riby Wilson was a Detective Inspector whilst he (HN329) was serving in the SDS²⁷⁷. He further assists by identifying early members of the SDS in the photographs obtained by the Inquiry. In particular, in one photograph images of Dixon, Saunders, Crampton, Tyrell and Fisher can all be seen²⁷⁸.

²⁷¹ Witness statement, para.168. See also para.221

²⁷² Witness statement, para.100

²⁷³ Witness statement, paras.13 & 15

²⁷⁴ Witness statement, paras.13 & 200

²⁷⁵ Witness statement, para.44

²⁷⁶ Witness statement, para.82

²⁷⁷ Witness statement, para.144

²⁷⁸ MPS-0735439 viewed with HN329’s witness statement dated 27 August 2019

21.28. HN329's recollection is that HN68 and HN331 were both arrested for flyposting. He states that "*as far as I know*" they attended court in their cover names, paid a fine and were told never to do it again²⁷⁹. If this was the case, then they are early examples of SDS officers appearing before courts, and being convicted, in the cover identities. What is not clear is whether the Court knew anything about the real identities of the men before it.

HN330 "Don De Freitas" – Havering VSC 26 September 1968 – 29 October 1968

22. HN330's real name is the subject of a restriction order. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry. HN330 has confirmed that he used the cover name "Don De Freitas"²⁸⁰. The evidence we have gathered indicates that he served briefly in the SDS between at least 26 September 1968 and 29 October 1968. These are the dates of the first and last SDS reports that the investigation has produced and are confirmed by the evidence received from HN330. The documents suggest that he infiltrated the Havering branch of the International Socialists just as they were setting up the Havering branch of the VSC. He then reported on the Havering VSC until just after the 27 October 1968 demonstration. He appears to be one of the SDS' undercover officers whose service with the unit ended soon after the October Demonstration: he is not listed as being in the unit in the 26 November 1968 paper entitled "Penetration of Extremist Groups". There are 5 meeting reports associated with HN330 which evidence his infiltration of the Havering VSC²⁸¹. Two further documents have been obtained from the period which indicate that HN330's duties in the SDS were not restricted to infiltrating Havering VSC. The first is a telegram concerning intelligence that a person was seeking to obtain ingredients to make smoke bombs for use at the demonstration which HN330 was asked to enquire into and then report. The second is a report concerning the plans of anarchists from University College, Swansea to attend the 27 October 1968 demonstration which was signed by HN330. It is not clear whether he obtained that information as a result of his undercover activity or otherwise.

23. HN330 served in Special Branch both before and after his posting to the SDS. For comparative purposes, we have included a number of documents in the

²⁷⁹ Witness statement, para.276

²⁸⁰ Witness statement para. 13

²⁸¹ It is not clear from a sixth document, because the year of the document has been obscured, whether it relates to this period: MPS-0731905.

bundle which evidence this service. There are 4 documents which pre-date the SDS. The first of these refers to the core participant Tariq Ali and demonstrates Special Branch's existing interest in him. The remaining three concern a demonstration at Powis Square on 25 May 1968, which led to arrests, and in which the Notting Hill branch of the VSC are stated to have been involved. Three documents post-date HN330's service in the SDS and evidence his involvement in monitoring the Anti-Apartheid Movement between July 1969 and June 1970.

24. The following observations and questions arise from our analysis of the documents associated with HN330 "Don De Freitas" and his witness statement.

24.1. The special report dated 13 May 1968 records information about a forthcoming talk "Will Britain see a Revolution" by Tariq Ali to the Havering Young Liberals which was placed on the VSC file and copied to the Security Service²⁸². It is an example evidencing the interest that Special Branch had in the VSC before the SDS, its gathering of information about the VSC and Tariq Ali before the SDS and the sharing of such intelligence with the Security Service. It also gives rise to the question whether HN330 infiltrated Havering VSC because of previous work in the Havering area.

24.2. HN330 attended the demonstration in Powis Square, Notting Hill on 25 May 1968. The demonstration appears to have been about a local issue albeit that the report states that it was organised by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign²⁸³. It shows pre-SDS police and Special Branch interest in the local VSC, Black Power, the Notting Hill People's Association (and its predecessors). An accompanying telegram relays further details to Special Branch, including the details of those arrested, charged and due to appear in the Magistrates' Court. There are many similarities between this and SDS reporting. The main differences appear to relate to how and when intelligence was gathered. In particular, detailed prior knowledge of the demonstration in this instance appears on the face of the report to have come from leaflets handed out in Portobello Road market by the VSC and there is no suggestion of undercover infiltration of the sort practised by the SDS. SDS reporting, on the other hand, often evidences the use of the undercover tactic to obtain prior knowledge of forthcoming demonstrations and planning for them.

²⁸² MPS-0731919

²⁸³ MPS-0731918

- 24.3. It appears from the series of five reports about the Havering International Socialists and Havering VSC that HN330 initially attended a public meeting of Havering IS held on 26 September 1968, which had been advertised by leaflets distributed in Romford Market²⁸⁴. At that meeting a VSC committee was appointed and agreed to meet in private. HN330 (accompanied by HN334 “Margaret White”) then attended subsequent private meetings of the Havering VSC reporting on its preparations for and then its reflections upon the 27 October 1968 demonstration (see HN334 above).
- 24.4. Within meeting reports submitted on 30 September and 5 October 1968²⁸⁵, HN330 records information concerning a member of Havering IS/VSC who held a position within a local branch of the Labour Party. Within his witness statement HN330 explains; “*MI5 would have been particularly interested in [the person] possessing a particular role in a local Labour Party; it was part of their remit, as I understood it, to consider whether there was any infiltration of legitimate left wing political organisations by extremists, hence why it would have been noted.*”²⁸⁶ The extent to which concerns such as this motivated or justified police reporting on elected representatives or members of mainstream political parties, will be an area of interest throughout the Inquiry.
- 24.5. The three reports connected to HN330 and relating to the Anti-Apartheid Movement all concern public events. The first was a speaking event at The Round House, Chalk Farm urging a boycott of South Africa and an end to the Rhodesian rebellion²⁸⁷. The second was a demonstration (or “poster parade”) outside South Africa House demanding the release of political prisoners in South Africa²⁸⁸. The third was a demonstration against arms sales to South Africa on Parliament Street and Whitehall, including the presentation of petitions to 10 Downing Street²⁸⁹. The slogans used by participants at this event were recorded and it is stated that: “*Details of the signatories to the petitions will be submitted in due course*”. All three reports were copied to the Security Service. These reports seem to demonstrate Special Branch’s interest in the Anti-Apartheid Movement and a desire to understand who was supporting their cause, as is strikingly exemplified

²⁸⁴ MPS-0733932

²⁸⁵ MPS-0731906 and MPS-0731911.

²⁸⁶ Witness statement para. 29

²⁸⁷ MPS-0736021

²⁸⁸ MPS-0731914

²⁸⁹ MPS-0731915

by the intention to provide details of the signatories to the petitions. A similar practice of recording which individuals were involved in the activities being monitored is clear in the Tranche 1 SDS reporting that the Inquiry Legal Team has reviewed. This is a practice that we shall be seeking to explore further.

HN321 “William Paul Lewis” – International Marxist Group 18 Sept 1968 to 26 July 1969 – Lambeth VSC 7-14 February 1969

25. HN321’s real name is restricted²⁹⁰. He is believed to have used the cover name “William ‘Bill’ Paul Lewis”. HN321 lives abroad and is cooperating with the Inquiry. The difficulties involved in getting a classified witness bundle to him were such that the Inquiry ultimately concluded that it was not proportionate to take that course. Instead, he was provided with a redacted bundle and an abridged, non-classified, rule 9 request for a witness statement. The Inquiry has very recently received a witness statement from HN321 in response to this request.
26. The evidence obtained about HN321’s deployment suggests that he joined the SDS on 18 September 1968²⁹¹ which is also the date of his first report. His last report is dated 30 September 1969, broadly in line with the 12 month maximum proposed in the paper “Penetration of Extremist Groups”. Most of his reports relate to the International Marxist Group (“IMG”) and reporting on this group spans the entire period of his deployment. HN321 recalls that he would have submitted reports at least weekly on the IMG throughout his deployment, and therefore suspects that much of his reporting is missing²⁹². In addition there are three reports on the Lambeth VSC: two relating to weekly meetings held on 6 and 13 February 1969 and then a report about the branch generally which is dated 18 March 1969. There are two documents in relation to other parts of the VSC, both dating from early in “William Lewis” deployment. They are a telegram dated 26 October 1968 which is stated to have followed a meeting of the Southwest Ad Hoc Committee and a report on a VSC meeting on 11 November 1968.
27. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the above documents associated with “William Lewis” and his witness statement.
 - 27.1. HN321 recalls attending an initial meeting in September 1968 to set up the SDS, called by Conrad Dixon and attended by around 30 others.

²⁹⁰ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf>

²⁹¹ Penetration of Extremist Groups, op. cit.

²⁹² Witness statement para. 40

He remembers being invited to volunteer for a new squad, the details of which would remain secret. He later learnt that *“the objective was to gain intelligence about the planned demonstration in October 1968, but it was largely left to the discretion of the individual undercover officers to figure out how to obtain that intelligence.”*²⁹³

- 27.2. The documents suggest that “William Lewis” service with the SDS was in fact focused on infiltration of the IMG. Most of his reports are reports on IMG events. Others appear to be connected to the IMG: HN321’s report dated 18 March 1969 portrays the Lambeth Branch of the VSC as having been increasingly dominated by the IMG.
- 27.3. Only one of “William Lewis” reports and the telegram pre-date the original focus of the SDS’ attention: the 27 October 1968 demonstration. The majority of the reports associated with HN321 post-date that event. HN321’s deployment may therefore be significant in the evolution of the SDS from a unit initially focused on the 27 October 1968 demonstration to one which was infiltrating and reporting on left wing groups more generally.
- 27.4. HN321 recalls that he was not tasked at any group, but rather attended a demonstration and later a meeting which he subsequently discovered was a meeting of the IMG. He states *“I told Conrad about this development and he told me to go to further meetings as the IMG was on a list of organisations the SDS were interested in.”*²⁹⁴
- 27.5. HN321’s first report concerns a public event (at which a socialist candidate for the Presidential election in the United States of America, Fred Halsted, spoke)²⁹⁵. The core participant Ernie Tate is identified as present at the meeting. Thereafter, the majority of events covered by HN321’s reports are private. They culminate in reports about the IMG 1969 summer camp. The picture appears to be of a transition from an officer whose initial task for the SDS was of the same kind that was being conducted by other parts of Special Branch (attending activist events in plain clothes) but who then used the undercover tactic to attend private meetings and ultimately inveigled his way into the IMG sufficiently to attend and report on its summer camp.
- 27.6. The telegram dated 26 October 1968, timed at 18:25hrs²⁹⁶, appears to communicate information of obvious significance to policing of the following day’s demonstration: *“At a meeting today of the South West*

²⁹³ Witness statement para. 12

²⁹⁴ Witness statement para. 34

²⁹⁵ MPS-0731633

²⁹⁶ MPS-0730774

ad hoc committee at Brixton, the suggestion was again raised that the Police car park at Vauxhall Bridge should be entered during the night, and the police coaches sabotaged". This appears to be the kind of timely intelligence that the SDS is said to have been set up to provide, although HN321 notes in his witness statement that he does not think that members of the IMG would have actually carried out this threat²⁹⁷.

- 27.7. Much of the content of the reports associated with "William Lewis" relates to campaigning activity other than the Vietnam War. Examples of the other issues reported on include Northern Ireland²⁹⁸, racial equality²⁹⁹, the Middle East³⁰⁰, IMG affairs (including the group's recognition as the British Section of the 4th International)³⁰¹ and women's rights³⁰². Why was such information being recorded, was it needed for a legitimate purpose and was use of the undercover tactic to obtain it justified? Was infiltration of the IMG by an undercover police officer justified?
- 27.8. The introduction to HN321's report on the Lambeth VSC suggests that his attendance at their meetings was the result of a specific request for information on this local branch: the report begins with the words "*Chief Superintendent's minute of 24.12.68 directs that a comprehensive report be submitted on the Lambeth branch of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign*"³⁰³, and includes details of core participant Ernest Tate. Evidence of such a specific request for information from a senior officer is quite rare in this era. We will be exploring why this is.
- 27.9. In a Special Report dated 25 August 1969³⁰⁴ HN321 submits a recent list of persons stated to be known to be members of the IMG, which includes the name of core participant Tariq Ali. HN321 also recalls an occasion when he was able to record the details of around 80 members of the IMG, information which was subsequently passed to the Security Service³⁰⁵. Information about the membership of target groups is a recurring feature of the documents that we have reviewed in Tranche 1. How and why was such information obtained and reported? Was it necessary? Was it a justified use of the undercover tactic?

²⁹⁷ Witness statement para. 61

²⁹⁸ MPS-0731634

²⁹⁹ MPS-0730768, UCPI0000007689

³⁰⁰ MPS-0731635

³⁰¹ UCPI0000015699, UCPI0000015670

³⁰² UCPI0000015671

³⁰³ UCPI0000007691

³⁰⁴ UCPI0000015673

³⁰⁵ Witness statement para. 52

- 27.10. On the question of subversion HN321 notes “*IMG and others on the far left, were subversive in that they had political ideologies that caused them to believe that the people would be better off if the government was overthrown by a left wing Marxist or Trotskyist government. Part of the job of the Special Branch was to identify those involved in those organisations*”³⁰⁶. Whether this justified the infiltration of, or the level and extent of reporting undertaken on such groups is an issue the Inquiry will explore.
- 27.11. There is a series of three reports on the IMG’s 1969 week long summer camp held between 26 July 1969 and 2 August 1969³⁰⁷. As observed above, these documents appear to illustrate the depth to which HN321 had infiltrated the IMG by the end of his year with the SDS. A particular feature of this event was that it is stated to have taken place on a camp site in Scotland (the Ardgarten Camp Site, Arrochar, Dunbartonshire). It appears that HN321 attended personally using his cover vehicle³⁰⁸, making this an early example of an SDS officer crossing a national boundary within the United Kingdom in the furtherance of an undercover operation which began in London. A further feature of this reporting is that it included the submission of photographs of those attending, some of which HN321 states he has retained to this day³⁰⁹.
- 27.12. HN321 recalls that “*there were one or two occasions of my contemporaries being arrested, I was never arrested.*”³¹⁰ HN321 is unable to recall their identities, but remembers being told a colleague had been arrested while deployed and some subsequent discussion at a SDS meeting about whether the charges would be dropped. This potentially accords with the evidence, received from HN329, that HN68 and HN331 were arrested in their cover identities. This is important early evidence of the attitude taken towards interaction with the courts by UCOs and their managers.

HN335 Mike Tyrrell – Maoist or Maoist influenced groups 19 September 1968 to 5 February 1970 (Earl’s Court VSC, October 27th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, South East London Ad Hoc Committee, British Vietnam Solidarity Front, March 9th Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation).

³⁰⁶ Witness statement para. 76

³⁰⁷ UCPI0000015671, UCPI0000007885 and MPS-0738321

³⁰⁸ Witness statement para. 32

³⁰⁹ Witness statement para.132

³¹⁰ Witness statement paras.19 and 117

28. HN335 Mike Tyrrell is deceased. The Inquiry's investigations to date have not revealed his cover name, if he used one. The documents obtained by the Inquiry suggest that he joined the SDS on 18 September 1968 and was due to serve in the unit for one year³¹¹. All of the reports associated with him concern groups which were either Maoist or influenced by Maoists. They concern meetings which took place between 19 September 1968 (the day after DC Tyrrell joined the unit) and 27 October 1969³¹². There is then a single Special Report on a vehicle obtained by the British Vietnam Solidarity Front dated 5 February 1970³¹³. Documents from DC Tyrrell's personnel file suggest that he intended to emigrate to Australia in April 1970 and left the Metropolitan Police Force after 5 years' service (which expired on 22 February 1970)³¹⁴. It seems possible that DC Tyrrell was retained by the SDS for a few months longer than originally anticipated because of his plans to leave the MPS.
29. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the documents connected with DC Tyrrell obtained by the Inquiry.
- 29.1. DC Tyrrell's first report concerns a public meeting of the Earl's Court VSC held on 19 September 1968 which he appears to have attended alone. There is a second report on this group relating to a further public meeting on 23 September 1968 (at which HN218 "Barry Morris" was also present) and an October 1968 telegram about the route which this group intended to take at the 27 October 1968 demonstration³¹⁵. Thus, all of the evidence about DC Tyrrell's reporting on this branch of the VSC pre-dates the 27 October 1968 demonstration.
- 29.2. There are two reports concerning the October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam relating to what are recorded as a private meeting of 20 people on 22 September 1968 (at which HN218 "Barry Morris" is stated as being present)³¹⁶ and a public meeting of 60 people on 20 October 1968, part of which was filmed by Independent Television³¹⁷. Both meetings concerned preparations for the 27 October 1968 demonstration. We note that at the later, public, meeting

³¹¹ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B, op. cit.

³¹² MPS-0738834 and MPS-0736413

³¹³ MPS-0736408

³¹⁴ MPS-0722809 (gist) and MPS-0739154

³¹⁵ The telegram MPS-0733956 records an intention to approach Grosvenor Square from the east (Brook Street or Grosvenor Street) and not the north (Duke Street) as the 27 October Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam later publicly announced was its intention according to HN335's report dated 22 October 1968 MPS-0733951.

³¹⁶ MPS-0733974

³¹⁷ MPS-0733951

- the Committee was openly stating that it intended its followers to break away from the main demonstration and head for Grosvenor Square.
- 29.3. There is a single report on the South East London Ad Hoc Committee that concerns a public anti-Vietnam War meeting stated to have been held on 11 October 1968 in Catford³¹⁸. HN322 is also recorded as being present.
 - 29.4. There are four meeting and four special reports relating to the BVSF. The four meeting reports concern private meetings held on 15 and 28 October and 19 December 1968. In relation to the first of these meetings, there are two nearly identical documents: one is entitled circulating copy and does not have distribution details³¹⁹. The earlier meeting concerned the forthcoming 27 October 1968 demonstration and the next concerned reflections on that demonstration and outline plans for future demonstrations³²⁰. It appears that some early indication of future demonstrations, without specific details may have been obtained by the SDS as a result of the attendance of DC Tyrrell at this private meeting. The final meeting report concerns a Committee meeting of the Earls Court BVSF³²¹.
 - 29.5. The four special reports span the period 17 December 1968 to 5 February 1970 and report, respectively, on: (a) plans to organise a demonstration at the US Embassy in March 1969³²²; (b) the formation of a new branch of the BVSF and committee for the then forthcoming demonstration on 9 March 1969³²³; (c) a meeting to mark the anniversary of the 27 October 1968 demonstration³²⁴; and (d) the BVSF's procurement of a van³²⁵.
 - 29.6. There is a single report on the Foundation of the Anti-Imperialist Solidarity Movement on 3 November 1968, which HN335 appears to have attended along with HN329³²⁶.
 - 29.7. The Inquiry has published two examples of reporting by HN335 on the Revolutionary Socialist Students' Federation; prospective details of a demonstration organised by the group against "*police brutality*" in December 1968³²⁷ and a report of a routine meeting of the London

³¹⁸ MPS-0731925

³¹⁹ MPS-0736481 and MPS-0733949

³²⁰ MPS-0736479

³²¹ UCPI0000014319

³²² UCPI0000014318

³²³ MPS-0736470

³²⁴ MPS-0736413

³²⁵ MPS-0736408

³²⁶ MPS-0730765

³²⁷ UCPI0000005785, prepared by HN322 on his behalf.

RSSF on 11 June 1969 with HN135³²⁸. The Inquiry has also obtained evidence that HN335 attended and reported on a RSSF conference held in November 1968. A further document, a temporary minute sheet, refers to forthcoming events on 4, 8 and 9 November 1968³²⁹. It states that these events will be covered by the “demonstration squad”. The document is signed by DCI Conrad Dixon which suggests that this was the name that he was using for the SDS at that time.

HN322

30. HN322 served in the SDS for a short period of time in the early months of its existence. Publication of his real name has been restricted³³⁰. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry dated 14 September 2018. He did not use a cover name and was never deployed undercover. He was not deployed to any particular group although, had he remained a member of the SDS for a longer time period, he may have been intended for the South East London VSC³³¹. A small number of intelligence reports have been discovered which can be linked to him dealing with the South East London Ad Hoc Committee of the VSC³³², the British-Vietnam Solidarity Front³³³ and the Revolutionary Socialist Student Federation³³⁴. Some of these reports are reports written on behalf of HN335, Mike Tyrell.
31. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement and intelligence reports linked to HN322:
 - 31.1. He was approached by Conrad Dixon and asked if he wanted to join the SDS³³⁵. He was married with children at the time. Neither he nor his wife were informed of the impact of the deployment on their private lives and when he discovered it would entail long periods away from his family he requested transfer out of the SDS³³⁶.

³²⁸ UCPI0000005788

³²⁹ MPS-0736478

³³⁰ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/20180220-ruling-SDS-anonymity.pdf>

³³¹ Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B – MSP-0724119

³³² MPS-0722099/163-164 which he attended with HN335; MPS-0731925 is the circulating copy of the same report.

³³³ MPS-0733949 report written for HN335; MPS-0733950 report written for HN335; UCPI0000014318 report written for HN335; UCPI0000014319 report written for HN335.

³³⁴ UCPI0000005785

³³⁵ HN322 witness statement, para.28

³³⁶ HN322 witness statement, para.31-32

- 31.2. He recalls being given no formal training for his role in the SDS³³⁷.
- 31.3. During his brief period of service in the SDS he was tasked to “*attend, observe and report back on a few different meetings*”³³⁸. He recalls attending meetings of the VSC. He observes that as a member of Special Branch he had attended meetings in plain clothes in order to gather intelligence and “*as I did exactly the same thing whilst in the SDS, there is nothing about that period that makes it stand out in my memory*”³³⁹. The Inquiry will explore to what extent during this period the work of the SDS could be distinguished from the work undertaken by Special Branch officers.
- 31.4. During his brief deployment he was managed by Conrad Dixon, DI Saunders, DI Wilson and HN332 although he has no recollection of whom he reported to directly.
- 31.5. He recalls attending Scotland Yard after meetings to type up and submit his reports³⁴⁰.
- 31.6. He states that he was given little direction about what he should be doing and describes the SDS as lacking formality and supervision³⁴¹.

HN328 Joan Hillier – Notting Hill VSC – 2 to 30 October 1968

- 32. HN328 Joan Hillier did not apply for any form of anonymity and has provided the Inquiry with witness statements dated 6 November 2018 and 19 February 2020. She is due to give oral evidence. HN328 joined the SDS upon its creation on or about 31 July 1968. Her precise leaving date is unclear but the available evidence suggests that it would have been no later than 31 July 1969³⁴². She is amongst the first female officers to have served in the SDS and the Inquiry will be examining how such officers were used by the SDS during this period in its history. On the basis of the evidence obtained to date, she is also the only surviving member of the SDS to have attended meetings of the Notting Hill VSC in the autumn of 1968. This branch of the VSC is of interest to the Inquiry in relation to investigation of the issue of justification: it is portrayed in SDS reports in terms which suggest that at least some of its members posed a particular risk to public order on 27 October 1968 (see also HN68, HN323,

³³⁷ HN322 witness statement, para.32ff

³³⁸ HN322 witness statement, para.42

³³⁹ HN322 witness statement, para.5

³⁴⁰ HN322 witness statement, paras.47-48

³⁴¹ HN322 witness statement, para.63

³⁴² Penetration of Extremist Groups, Appendix B, MPS0724119. There is also a reference to Hillier in a report of HN68's dated 20 August 1969 but not in terms that mean she was necessarily still in the SDS at that time: UCPI000007768.

HN327 and HN331's reporting)³⁴³. Finally, HN328 appears to be in a position to compare ordinary Special Branch activity in relation to the VSC with that of the SDS: the evidence obtained to date indicates that in the months immediately preceding the formation of the SDS she attended relevant meetings incognito whilst a member of Special Branch's B Squad.

33. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of Joan Hillier's witness statement and the intelligence reports linked to her.

33.1. The meeting reports in Joan Hillier's section of the Hearing Bundle fall into four clear categories. First, there are reports which pre-date the formation of the SDS. The first, dated 4 April 1968 relates to a public VSC meeting at which core participant Tariq Ali is recorded as a speaker and core participant Ernest Tate is recorded as present³⁴⁴. The second, dated, 23 May 1968, relates to a public meeting of the separate British Vietnam Solidarity Front ("BVSF")³⁴⁵. The third, dated 30 May 1968 identifies speakers at a BVSF event³⁴⁶. Joan Hillier attended the first meeting with a Sergeant (who also later joined the SDS, HN299/342). She states that this was because she was then new to Special Branch. She attended the second meeting alone. The format of these reports is the same as those later used by the SDS. The Inquiry is comparing these and other pre-SDS reports with the SDS' reporting in order to investigate the extent to which the SDS' early work and reporting differed from standard Special Branch practice. How much more intrusive was it? Was it more useful for public order and/or counter subversive purposes? Was it necessary? Could the information have been obtained in other ways? Was the reporting justified? Was use of the undercover tactic justified?

33.2. The second category of reports includes reports on weekly public meetings of the Notting Hill VSC held at Essex Church Hall on 2, 9, 16 and 30 October 1968³⁴⁷. At all of these meetings Joan Hillier is listed as present, together with HN68 "Sean Lynch" and HN331. All of these reports are signed by Helen Crampton and countersigned by DCI Conrad Dixon. Joan Hillier's recollection, as recorded in her witness statement, is that she attended meetings of the Notting Hill VSC with

³⁴³ MPS0730070; see also MPS-0730758 (post 27 October 1968 demonstration meeting at which committing arson against landlords is recorded as having been advocated instead of "stupid demonstrations").

³⁴⁴ MPS-0732692

³⁴⁵ MPS-0732693

³⁴⁶ MPS-UCPI0000014312

³⁴⁷ Mps-0739188, MPS-0739187, MPS-0730070 and MPS-0730758

Helen Crampton³⁴⁸. Joan Hillier states that she can recall some of the disturbing comments recorded in the report of 16 October 1968 regarding the use of pen knives, needles, fireworks and pepper for use on the police horses³⁴⁹. However, she states that such tactics were not, in the event, used by demonstrators on 27 October 1968. It is of note that Joan Hillier does not appear to have gone undercover in the same way as her male colleagues. In particular, she does not seem to have attended any private meetings or adopted a specific cover identity. She did, however, alter her appearance by wearing a wig³⁵⁰.

- 33.3. The third category relate to the Notting Hill VSC, during September and October 1968 but are signed by Hillier on behalf of other officers (Tyrrell and HN331)³⁵¹. These partially overlap with the reports in which she is positively recorded as being at meetings of the same group. Taken together, the reporting appears to demonstrate that HN328 was concurrently performing administrative duties as well as attending some meetings of the Notting Hill VSC.
- 33.4. The fourth category of reports comprises of documents spanning the period 13 February – 20 August 1969³⁵². Most of these reports relate to the BVSF in some way although others refer to various branches of the VSC. Joan Hillier signs off these reports but, on the face of the reports, and to her recollection, she did not attend the meetings in question. Nor was she the source of the information recorded about the individuals where the reports report on individuals. She states that after October 1968 her role was an administrative one, and the documents obtained are consistent with such a role.
- 33.5. The earliest SDS report amongst HN328's documents is a report on individuals connected with the Highgate and Holloway branch of the VSC dated 23 August 1968 and relating to a meeting held on 6 August 1968³⁵³. It is signed by Joan Hillier but does not evidence her attendance at that meeting.
- 33.6. Joan Hillier states that she does not recognise the role of an "uncommitted" officer within the SDS, notwithstanding that she is recorded as having that duty (as well as being a liaison with the HQ

³⁴⁸ Joan Hillier's witness statement, para.30

³⁴⁹ Joan Hillier's witness statement, para.31

³⁵⁰ Joan Hillier's witness statement, para.30

³⁵¹ MPS-0733947; MPS-0733977

³⁵² MPS-0732691, MPS-732690, MPS-732689, MPS-0732699, MPS-0732688, MPS-0732694, MPS-0732971, UCPI0000007768, UCPI0000007689, UCPI0000007688

³⁵³ MPS-0722098, at p.186

flat) at the end of Appendix B to the document entitled Penetration of Extremist Groups³⁵⁴.

- 33.7. Joan Hillier states that she did not volunteer for the SDS. On the basis of the evidence that the ILT has seen to date, that is unusual but not unique.

HN326 “Douglas Edwards” VSC - West Ham Anarchists – Independent Labour Party – Dambusters Mobilisation Committee – Tri-Continental – November 1968 to October 1970

34. Publication of the real name of HN326 “Douglas Edwards” is restricted³⁵⁵. He has provided witness statements and is due to give oral evidence. HN326 joined the SDS in November 1968³⁵⁶. He reported on a number of groups during the course of his deployment which lasted a little less than two years. We note three things in particular. First, the use of the Independent Labour Party (“ILP”) as a stepping stone by which to gain access to other groups. As such, it appears to be an example of a tactic used by a number of SDS officers and a theme to which we will return. Second, it seems that the groups infiltrated by HN326 presented a low level of threat which is relevant to the issue of justification and will be explored. Third, HN326 provides evidence of the process by which he recalls the information that he provided was written up into the reports found in the Hearing Bundle.

35. The following specific observations and questions arise from HN326’s reports and witness statements.

- 35.1. There is evidence that HN326 attended a VSC meeting on 12 November 1968 shortly after joining the SDS³⁵⁷. There is then a series of 3 reports, spanning the period 25 September 1970 to 6 October 1970, relating to the VSC’s preparations for its autumn 1970 campaign³⁵⁸. There were some at those meetings who, if the reports are accurate, promoted chaos, disorder and attacks on American interests. However, HN326 states that it was: “*very much the minority who wanted violence and disorder*”³⁵⁹. The 6 October 1970 report

³⁵⁴ Witness statement, para.14

³⁵⁵ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf>

³⁵⁶ MPS-0724119

³⁵⁷ MPS-730768 (filed under Tariq Ali’s documents in the bundle) & HN326 first witness statement para.83.

³⁵⁸ UCPI0000005813, UCPI0000005814 and UCPI0000005816

³⁵⁹ Witness statement para.103

states: “...*the majority of those present favoured an orderly demonstration*”³⁶⁰.

- 35.2. Between 22 January 1969 and 29 April 1969 there are 3 reports related to HN326’s infiltration of the West Ham Anarchists³⁶¹. They give the impression of a small militant group, capable of minor offending but not in itself a serious threat. HN326 describes some violent behaviour on the part of anarchists but states that he and his supervisors ultimately concluded that this infiltration was “*a waste of time*”³⁶². At that point, HN326 moved on to infiltrate the Independent Labour Party. We will be examining how and why targeting decisions such as these were made as we progress through the Inquiry.
- 35.3. HN326 states that “*..it was decided that I would join the Independent Labour Party so as to have “a handle to swing” into other groups. By this I mean that I could use my membership of the ILP as a means of going to almost any other meeting*”. He continues: “*The SDS did not have any real interest in the ILP: it was merely a vehicle for obtaining information. Through my membership of the ILP, I targeted Tri-Continental, the Dambusters Mobilising Committee (“DMC”) and linked anti-apartheid groups which were causing a lot of problems at the time*”.³⁶³
- 35.4. Notwithstanding HN326’s recollection that the ILP was of no real interest to the SDS, his intelligence about the ILP was written up and filed and a number of examples of such reporting are in the bundle. They include a detailed report on the organisation, affairs and internal politics of the group which stated that it was: “*...on the whole content to work within the framework of conventional politics*”³⁶⁴. If accurate, they portray a struggle within the group between moderate and more militant members. Some of the latter had come to the notice of the police in a public order context³⁶⁵. Strikingly, the group is reported as having been trying to organise a debate with the National Front, an event which the International Socialists are reported as wishing to disrupt. HN326 describes the proposed event, perhaps unsurprisingly, as having been: “*a public order concern*”.

³⁶⁰ UCPI0000005814

³⁶¹ UCPI0000008160-2

³⁶² First witness statement, paras.50-51; see also MPS-0728973/7 at para.5 (7 November 1969 Annual Report which is consistent with HN326’s evidence).

³⁶³ First witness statement, paras.51-52

³⁶⁴ UCPI0000008203 (quotation from para.2)

³⁶⁵ UCPI0000008203

- 35.5. HN326 was appointed to the role of Treasurer of the Tower Hamlets branch of the ILP, an early example of an SDS officer accepting office in a group³⁶⁶. Why did SDS officers do so (in this case particularly when the group is said to have been of no real interest to the SDS)? What impact did doing so have on their access to information? What influence did they have within the group?
- 35.6. “Doug Edwards” developed a sufficiently close relationship with Terry Liddle and the woman who was to become his wife as to be invited to their wedding. He attended the event³⁶⁷. This appears to be an early example of an SDS officer becoming more involved in the private lives of activists, outside of their political activities. We will be exploring this aspect of SDS activity.
- 35.7. “Doug Edwards” attended a meeting of the Action Committee Against NATO (“ACAN”) on 5 November 1969. The resulting report is dated 10 November 1969³⁶⁸. It is another group to which HN326 gained access via the ILP. The activity reported appears to be legitimate political activity. What is striking is how small the meeting appears to have been: the Chair and two other persons were present. The report is also an example of a document which names a number of other groups because they were mentioned at the meeting. Such references are one of the ways in which the SDS came to report upon so many groups in total. HN326 states that he can recall very little about how he came to infiltrate the group³⁶⁹. There is a reported link with Tri-Continental (referred to in the long quotation above) which is stated to have been funding the hire of Conway Hall for ACAN.
- 35.8. There are a number of reports in the hearing bundle on the DMC, a group campaigning against the Corra Bossa Dam project in Mozambique for reasons connected with the campaign against apartheid in South Africa. The first report in HN326’s folder is that dated 11 December 1970. It bears his name. The others do not and most bear HN339’s name. HN326’s recollection is that he did infiltrate the DMC and that HN339 must have done so after he did³⁷⁰. Taken together, if accurate, the reports paint a picture of a group that planned protests such as sit-ins and the disruption of the annual general meetings of large companies supporting the dam project in question.

³⁶⁶ Witness statement, para.133

³⁶⁷ Witness statement, para.164

³⁶⁸ UCPI0000008209; on attendance at very small meetings, see also UCPI0000008212

³⁶⁹ First witness statement, para.127

³⁷⁰ First witness statement, paras.136-147

- 35.9. Amongst HN326's reporting are the usual reports on individuals³⁷¹, forthcoming events³⁷² and potential public disorder³⁷³.
- 35.10. HN326 explains that he recorded information in manuscript and handed it in. He did not type up the reports that bore his name, would not necessarily have seen them after they had been typed and would not be the source of all of the information contained in them³⁷⁴. The phrase "reliable source" was used rather than explicitly stating that the information had been obtained (in the case of his reporting) from an SDS officer.
- 35.11. Despite the evidence to suggest that many of those with whom "Doug Edwards" mingled did not pose a threat, HN326 does recall having being involved in frightening and violent episodes of public disorder³⁷⁵.
- 35.12. On the question of subversion, HN326 states: *"I would not say that the activity I witnessed when I was undercover was subversive, but the groups I infiltrated were planning and plotting to do things that had the potential to be subversive. When they were discussing these plans and plots at meetings, they seemed rather dramatic and you could not necessarily tell whether they would follow through with them or whether the outcome might be dulled"*³⁷⁶. This passage touches on important issues that we will be exploring. What is subversive? Was use of the undercover tactic against those who were subversive and/or planning to be subversive and/or aspiring to be subversive justified?
- 35.13. HN326's statement also addresses the context in which decisions to infiltrate groups of left wing activists, perceived to be subversive, were made. He states: *"I note that the report records Tariq Ali talking about the possibility of a revolution. At the time, we were worried about these people and groups overthrowing the government-of-the-day. I assume this was the effect of the revolution about which he was talking. With hindsight, I think it was an entirely theoretical, nonsense revolution but at the time it would have seemed real hence why it was included in the report"*.
- 35.14. HN326 recalls a Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police visiting the SDS and, as such, contributes to a body of evidence that the Inquiry will receive to the effect that senior officers did know

³⁷¹ UCPI0000008162, MPS-0732317 and UCPI0000008213 (note that in the latter case, the subject, of whom it is stated an informant had opined: *"can in no way be regarded as militant"* is recorded as having first come to attention in 1963 for writing an article in *Socialist Leader* on Indian Peace Marches and most recently come to attention opposing the nomination of the proposed Parliamentary candidate for Bethnal Green). See further para.128 of HN326's witness statement.

³⁷² MPS-0739668

³⁷³ MPS-0736646

³⁷⁴ Witness statement, paras.73, 89, 99, 119-121 & 223-227

³⁷⁵ Witness statement, paras.152-155

³⁷⁶ Witness statement, para.157

of the existence of the unit and took an interest in it: *"I think he just turned up to thank us for the work we were doing and he brought us a bottle of whisky which was very well received"*³⁷⁷.

35.15. HN326 withdrew from his deployment in 1970 and worked in the SDS office into 1971.

35.16. HN326 helps to explain a source of potential confusion in the documents by confirming that there was both a Riby Wilson (with whom he served) and a Ray Wilson. The evidence adduced before the Inquiry will include references to both. They are often hard to tell apart when recorded as R Wilson unless their date or then rank distinguish them.

HN333 Left Wing Group 1968-1969

36. An order restricting publication of both HN333's real and cover names has been made³⁷⁸. The Inquiry has obtained two witness statements from him which, in amalgamated and redacted form, have been included in the T1P1 hearing bundle³⁷⁹. HN333's written evidence is that he infiltrated a left wing group that no longer exists for a period of 9 months between 1968 and 1969.

37. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement:

37.1. HN333 had attended the Grosvenor Square demonstration on 27 October 1968 as a plain clothes Special Branch officer prior to his deployment to the SDS³⁸⁰.

37.2. He was invited to join SDS when he was a junior, unmarried Special Branch officer. He was not informed of the consequences of his undercover deployment for himself or his family³⁸¹.

37.3. He was managed by DCI Dixon and DI Saunders.

37.4. He reports that secrecy was tight within the SDS and many within Special Branch had not heard of the unit³⁸².

37.5. He received no formal training to prepare him for his role in the SDS although once in the field SDS officers would discuss details of their deployments and share their experience and knowledge³⁸³. The Inquiry will

³⁷⁷ Witness statement, para.182

³⁷⁸ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf>

³⁷⁹ MPS-0740329

³⁸⁰ HN333 witness statement, para.7 & 117

³⁸¹ HN333 witness statement, para.15

³⁸² HN333 witness statement, para.12

³⁸³ HN333 witness statement, para.16, 120

be considering the genesis and growth of SDS operational practices and how these were disseminated across the SDS.

37.6. There was limited guidance given about the of cover name for undercover officers but at this time these were not the names of deceased children³⁸⁴. His background cover story/legend was rudimentary although it involved cover employment³⁸⁵. The Inquiry will explore the growing sophistication of legend building for undercover officers over the life of the SDS.

37.7. HN333 attended meetings and demonstrations with the group he infiltrated and gave verbal updates of relevant information to his superiors at the safe house. He was not responsible for writing intelligence reports³⁸⁶.

HN135 – Michael Ferguson – British-Vietnam Solidarity Front, Irish civil rights and anti-Apartheid groups - 10 February 1969 to 22 June 1970

38. HN135, Michael Ferguson, is deceased. His real name can be published but there is a restriction in place over publication of his cover name³⁸⁷. The documents obtained by the Inquiry suggest that he joined the SDS on 10 February 1969 and was re-deployed in June 1970³⁸⁸. Documents which can be linked to him indicate that his first area of reporting was the British-Vietnam Solidarity Front before he shifted focus onto the Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign and then to Stop the Seventy Tour (“STST”) during which his reporting contains regular references to Peter Hain. HN336 also reported on the STST, although to a lesser extent and in his witness statement has described HN135 as Lord Hain’s “*right hand man*”, a claim denied by Lord Hain. HN135’s reporting also contains references to Jonathan Rosenhead and Ernest Rodker whose evidence will be received in Tranche 1 Phase 2. He featured in True Spies as an example of the successful use of undercover tactics to prevent public disorder in his infiltration of the Stop the Seventy Tour campaigning group.

39. The following questions and observations arise from an analysis of the documents linked to HN135:

³⁸⁴ HN333 witness statement, para.22

³⁸⁵ HN333 witness statement, paras.23-27

³⁸⁶ HN333 witness statement, para.39, 50-52

³⁸⁷ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/20191029-sds_anonymity-ruling_16_san.pdf

³⁸⁸ MPS-0724135

- 39.1. He, like other officers in this era, appears to have attended BVSF events as part of a team: He attended meetings on 9 March 1969³⁸⁹ and 13 April 1969³⁹⁰ with HN336 (although the reports are signed on behalf of HN336 by HN328, Joan Hillier, in her administrative role – see summary in respect of HN328). HN135 and HN336 were also in joint attendance at the 2 day open conference of the BVSF over 26-27 April 1969³⁹¹. Abhimanyu Manchanda features in all HN135's BVSF reporting.
- 39.2. He appears to have a brief period reporting on the London Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation covering a private Routine meeting on 11 June 1969 (together with HN335)³⁹² and a conference of the RSSF on 22 June 1969³⁹³. According to the reports neither event yielded any information of particular interest to Special Branch. What was the purpose of such reporting? How were targeting decisions made during this era of the SDS?
- 39.3. HN135's BVSF reporting increasingly refers to the interest taken by the BVSF in Irish matters: on 18 July 1969 he reports that the North West London group of the BVSF is showing an increasing interest in Irish matters and all members are being encouraged to participate in Irish demonstrations wherever it is politically expedient to do so³⁹⁴; he reports on a demonstration organised by BVSF at which Ed Devoran spoke of Irish liberation and notes tension between the Irish audience and the Maoists activists³⁹⁵. It would appear that this shift of emphasis by the BVSF provided HN135 with the opportunity to shift his focus to the Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign, and in particular the Islington branch, which he began reporting in July 1969³⁹⁶.
- 39.4. The report dated 1 August 1969 of a meeting of the Islington branch of the ICRSC meeting refers to support being sought from trades unions for demonstrations in the form of token strikes³⁹⁷. The Inquiry will be considering the extent to which SDS officers were tasked to report on industrial unrest and in particular the involvement of trade unions in political activism.

³⁸⁹ MPS-0732690

³⁹⁰ MPS-0736439

³⁹¹ MPS-0736448

³⁹² UCPI0000005788

³⁹³ UCPI0000005789

³⁹⁴ MPS-0736433

³⁹⁵ MPS-0736430

³⁹⁶ UCPI0000008662

³⁹⁷ UCPI0000008678

- 39.5. It would appear that HN135 reached the inner circle of the Islington branch of the ICRSC with some rapidity: he appears to have attended the Steering Committee of the ICRSC as an Islington branch delegate in late August 1969³⁹⁸. He later attended the founding conference of the ICRSC as a delegate³⁹⁹. This rise to a position of prominence and responsibility is in direct contravention of the exhortation given in Penetration of Extremist Groups that field officers should be directed never to achieve any measure of responsibility within their target groups⁴⁰⁰. The Inquiry will be looking carefully at the increasing tendency of SDS officers to rise to positions of responsibility within their target groups. Why did they assume such positions? Did they influence the course of the groups they were infiltrating by assuming such positions? How did it affect what was reported? Were such intrusive tactics justified?
- 39.6. HN135 reports extensively on the ICRSC Islington branch nomination of a candidate in the 1969 Islington North by-election following the death of the Labour incumbent⁴⁰¹. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for SDS reporting on the legitimate political aspirations of activist groups.
- 39.7. HN135's reporting on the ICRSC became increasingly dominated by political infighting amongst factions in the campaign group which coalesced around Gery Lawless and he reported on its decline in number and purpose⁴⁰². The Inquiry will consider the purpose of undercover deployments in civil rights groups of limited public order risk and waning popularity.
- 39.8. The last few months of HN135's deployment appear to be given over to reporting on the STST including reports on the activities of Peter Hain. From the outset, it appears, he was able to report detailed plans for activist tactics. In a report of the meeting of the STST Ad Hoc Committee dated 9 December 1969, a meeting comprising just six people, including Peter Hain, he reports on their plans for disruption of the International match at Twickenham on 20 December 1969⁴⁰³. In a report dated 12 May 1970 he reported on the events at a Special Planning Group of the STST attended by 9 people⁴⁰⁴. In a report dated

³⁹⁸ UCPI0000008556

³⁹⁹ UCPI0000009671

⁴⁰⁰ MPS-0724119

⁴⁰¹ See for example UCPI0000008555; UCPI0000008569; UCPI0000008580; UCPI0000008583

⁴⁰² See for example UCPI0000008612; UCPI0000008616; UCPI0000008623 (decline in numbers)

⁴⁰³ UCPI0000008656

⁴⁰⁴ UCPI0000008607

14 May 1970 he reported on the detailed plans discussed by a 10 person strong meeting of representatives from the London groups of the STST for STST activist activity when the South African cricket team arrived at Heathrow on 1 June 1970 and for demonstrations at matches at Lords, Trent Bridge and Headingley⁴⁰⁵.

- 39.9. There is also an example of SDS reporting enabling proportionate policing response by dispelling myths of more extreme activist activity: HN135 reported on the closed session of the first conference of the STST on 7 March 1970 at which the broad strategy for activism during the Summer was discussed⁴⁰⁶. The effect of this report, set out in the Special Branch letter to the Home Office dated 12 March 1970⁴⁰⁷, was to quell rumours of STST activists armed with firearms at South African cricket matches.
- 39.10. The reporting of the first conference of the STST on 7 March 1970 also provides a comparison of the intelligence capabilities of the SDS and ordinary Special Branch units: the open session of the conference was attended by Special Branch who provided a detailed report⁴⁰⁸ but the Special Branch officer could not access the closed session, unlike an SDS officer as a trusted member of his target group.
- 39.11. The Inquiry has also found limited reporting from HN135 on the Anti-Apartheid Movement, although this does not appear to have been a group he infiltrated. In a report dated 21 April HN135 reports that whilst the AAM supported the general aims of the STST they were unlikely to offer anything other than token assistance because they opposed violent demonstration⁴⁰⁹.
- 39.12. At the conclusion of his service with the SDS HN135 was recommended for receipt of the Commissioners Commendation for his SDS work, Chief Inspector Saunders writing of him: *"it is no exaggeration to say that on occasions, while so employed, D/S Ferguson was the main, if not the only, source from which information of such high quality originated that police were able to anticipate and frustrate the machinations of demonstrators bent on provoking civil disorder"*⁴¹⁰.

⁴⁰⁵ UCPI0000014408

⁴⁰⁶ UCPI0000008660

⁴⁰⁷ MPS-0736199

⁴⁰⁸ MPS-0736190

⁴⁰⁹ MPS-0736253

⁴¹⁰ MPS-0724135

HN336 “Dick Epps” British Vietnam Solidarity Front - 18 February 1969 to 1 June 1969; Vietnam Solidarity Campaign (Camden Branch & April 19th / April 26th Ad Hoc Committees) – 1 October 1969 to 14 April 1970; Stop the Seventy Tour – 21 March 1970 to 13 May 1970; and International Marxist Group

40. Publication of the real name of HN336 “Dick Epps” has been restricted⁴¹¹. He has provided a witness statement and is due to give oral evidence. The oral evidence suggests that HN336 joined the SDS in early 1969⁴¹². His reports suggest a deployment that began in the British Vietnam Solidarity Front and then moved to the VSC where he appears to have infiltrated the Camden Branch. He also reported on the VSC Ad Hoc Committee organising the campaign’s April 1970 demonstration. Towards the end of his deployment “Dick Epps” infiltrated the anti-apartheid Stop the Seventy Tour. HN336’s evidence is that his tasking was generalised and he was given a great deal of discretion in his work. We will be exploring the consequences of these features of his deployment, which appear to be common to many officers.
41. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN336’s documents and witness statement.
- 41.1. HN336 states that he invented a backstory although his cover does not appear to have been deep. “Dick Epps” pretended to be a lorry driver but had no driving licence in his cover name. He hardly ever stayed the night in his cover bedsit. He also retained his warrant card, which he kept hidden⁴¹³. HN336 recalls earning overtime, seeing little of his family and signing into the SDS cover flat every day. He sometimes wrote his reports there⁴¹⁴. In the latter respect, he appears to differ from those officers who recall submitting manuscript notes which were typed up by others.
- 41.2. He describes his brief as being *“to gather intelligence that would assist the police with public disorder”*. Specifically he was *“asked to obtain information about groups who might be involved in future public disorder, their motivations, likely members, who the influential figures were, and demonstrations they were planning to hold”*. He further

⁴¹¹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180327-Final-ruling-following-21-March-hearing.pdf>

⁴¹² Witness statement, para.8. See also MPS-0724119 records HN336 as “first reserve” on 26 November 1968

⁴¹³ Witness statement, paras.35 and 42

⁴¹⁴ Witness statement, paras.82 and 85-88

states: *“I was not tasked with penetrating any particular group, and my tasking was never more specific than the general brief above”*⁴¹⁵.

- 41.3. As to how his brief was fulfilled in practice, HN336 states: *“We would just turn up to demonstrations, or meetings that would be advertised in newsletters and see what we could find out. No one ever said what we should do, you were just expected to find your way”*⁴¹⁶; *“It was a matter for your judgment if there was value in penetrating a group”*.
- 41.4. According to his statement, he made use of his prior experience working in Special Branch’s C Squad to inform his decisions as to which groups might be of interest and what information about the activities of each group would be of use for public order policing⁴¹⁷. Since SDS officers were recruited from within Special Branch, this observation may begin to explain why no formal training was provided. Were early SDS officers simply doing what they had been doing anyway for Special Branch but simply using the undercover tactic to obtain more information than they otherwise had access to?
- 41.5. As to the form of the reports, HN336 states that his reports were in accordance with how he had been taught within Special Branch to produce reports⁴¹⁸. This accords with the comparative examples in the bundle (in relation to other officers) of non-SDS Special Branch reporting. Was it the method by which information was being obtained in this era, rather than what was of interest, or how it was recorded, that distinguishes the SDS from the remainder of Special Branch?
- 41.6. HN336 recalls attending hundreds of meetings and demonstrations and telephoning Special Branch with time sensitive information in addition to submitting written reports. It seems likely, therefore, as with other officers, that the surviving reports obtained by the Inquiry do not constitute the totality of HN336’s actual reporting⁴¹⁹.
- 41.7. The reporting evidences “Dick Epps” infiltration of the BVSF, followed by Camden VSC. HN336 describes: *“After a few months I drifted away from the Maoist group and into the Camden Branch of the VSC”*⁴²⁰. From March 1970 onwards there are also reports about the Stop the Seventy Tour. HN336 describes his route into the STST as having been via a *“brief interlude”* in the Kentish Town Branch of the VSC, and *“a few”* meetings of the British Campaign for Peace in Vietnam

⁴¹⁵ Witness statement, paras.49 & 51

⁴¹⁶ Witness statement, para.52

⁴¹⁷ Witness statement, para.55

⁴¹⁸ Witness statement, para.101

⁴¹⁹ Witness statement, paras.77, 90 & 92

⁴²⁰ Witness statement, para.62

- although no reporting on either of these groups is in the bundle⁴²¹. Neither is there any reporting in the bundle on the IMG, which HN336 recalls occupied perhaps 3-5 months at the end of his deployment⁴²².
- 41.8. HN336 recalls seeing Tariq Ali at student meetings, stating: “*My impression was that he was the driving force behind the London student unrest*”.⁴²³
- 41.9. HN336 corroborates the evidence that Conrad Dixon himself operated as an undercover police officer: “*Conrad Dixon had been involved at the very start with [the Camden Branch of the VSC] as an undercover. They used to talk about him from time to time long after he had moved on. He used to dress as a yachtsman and he became a figure of fun*”⁴²⁴.
- 41.10. “Dick Epps” involvement with the STST was, according to HN336, limited to attending a few meetings and demonstrations⁴²⁵. HN336 describes the potential for violence and public disorder at STST demonstrations as being huge⁴²⁶. This is denied by Lord Hain⁴²⁷. He further states that the group got up to all sorts of well publicised antics: “*digging up the pitch at Lords, pouring oil over the wicket*”. These assertions are also denied by Lord Hain⁴²⁸. So too is HN336’s description of HN135 as Lord Hain’s “*right hand man*”⁴²⁹. With the exception of flyposting, HN336’s own reports on the STST do not record unlawful activity⁴³⁰.
- 41.11. HN336 appeared on the television documentary “True Spies”⁴³¹ using the pseudonym “Dan”. In his witness statement he stands by the account he gave of obtaining an impression of the keys to the IMG’s offices. The account in his statement indicates, at least, that it was thought by Special Branch that the Security Service would be interested in the impression.
- 41.12. On the issue of blacklisting, HN336 provides some peripheral evidence. He states that he was aware of the existence of the Economic League whilst serving in Special Branch and understood that the retiring Chief

⁴²¹ Witness statement, paras.65-69

⁴²² Witness statement, para.74

⁴²³ Witness statement, para.58. See also para.75

⁴²⁴ Witness statement, para.63

⁴²⁵ Witness statement, para.71

⁴²⁶ Witness statement, para.70

⁴²⁷ Lord Hain’s witness statement, para.67 (will be published as part of Phase 2)

⁴²⁸ Lord Hain’s witness statement, para.68

⁴²⁹ HN336 Witness statement paras.71-72; Lord Hain’s witness statement, paras.56 & 69

⁴³⁰ MPS-0736207, MPS-0736281, MPS-0736246, MPS-0736268 and MPS-0736346

⁴³¹ Witness statement, para.105-107; see also MPS-0009971 p.2

Superintendent of C Squad joined the Economic League. However, he also states that no relationship existed between the SDS and the Economic League⁴³². As someone who later worked on Special Branch's industrial desk, he may be able to assist the Inquiry as to whether it might have received intelligence from the SDS and how it was disseminated.

- 41.13. HN336's recollection is that C Squad routinely copied reporting to the Security Service. He states that he had a single informal meeting with someone from the Security Service, during his time with the SDS at which he was asked about the impact of protests in his field of deployment⁴³³.
- 41.14. HN336 describes an extensive management presence in the operation of the SDS notwithstanding his generalised tasking and solitary work⁴³⁴.
- 41.15. As is typical, many of HN336's reports contain information relevant to forthcoming public demonstrations likely to have been of interest to those responsible for policing such events. For example the report dated 7 May 1969 provides an estimate of the number (no more than 50) and demeanour (no suggestion of militant action) of Maoists likely to attend a forthcoming rally being organised by the Committee for Solidarity with the Palestinian People⁴³⁵.
- 41.16. A number of HN336's reports are joint reports. HN135 Michael Ferguson appears to have been infiltrating the BVSF at the same time and is named on most of HN336's reports about this group⁴³⁶.
- 41.17. The report on the BVSF's April 1969 conference attracted senior management interest evidenced by the Temporary Minute Sheet dated 8 May 1969⁴³⁷. The report, if it is an accurate record of what was said, also captures Mr Manchanda espousing violent revolution: *"Before coming to power, the proletariat and other revolutionary people should adhere to the principle of making revolution by violence, smashing the old state and seizing political power by armed force"*. This is relevant to the issue of justification. So too is what the report records about the level of threat of violent revolution then posed by the BVSF: *"Manchanda did not appear to hold out any immediate prospects of this uncomfortable eventuality taking place in England ..."*⁴³⁸

⁴³² Witness statement, para.114. See also para.166

⁴³³ Witness statement, paras.118-121

⁴³⁴ Witness statement, paras.142-146

⁴³⁵ MPS-0736448

⁴³⁶ MPS-0732690, MPS-0732689, MPS-0732971, MPS-0736439, MPS-0736449, MPS-0736446 and MPS-0736364.

⁴³⁷ MPS-0736445, MPS-0736446 and MPS-0736447.

⁴³⁸ Both quotations can be found in the penultimate paragraph of page 2 of MPS-0736446.

- 41.18. As is usual in SDS reporting, there are a number of reports on individuals⁴³⁹. They include an example of practice, which we have noted in a number of SDS reports on individuals, of including subjective assessments of the appearance of female activists: “*attractive features*”⁴⁴⁰. There is also an example of a subjective assessment based on race: “*slightly Jewish features*”⁴⁴¹. How and why did reports come to be recorded in such terms?
- 41.19. Two reports, dating from April 1969, expressly refer to the SDS as “the demo squad”⁴⁴².
- 41.20. There is a report, dated 5 May 1969, on activities to promote equal rights for women, in the context of the BVSF’s interest in that field⁴⁴³.
- 41.21. HN336’s reporting on anti-apartheid campaigning is mainly comprised of his reports on the STST but there is also a report on a forthcoming South Africa Freedom march and rally at which speakers would address the topic “*Liberation and Guerrilla Warfare in Southern Africa*”⁴⁴⁴.

HN340 “Andy Bailey” or “Alan Nixon” – North London Red Circle & Irish Solidarity Campaign (Central London Branch) – 21 July 1970 to July 1972

42. A restriction order prohibits publication of HN340’s real name⁴⁴⁵. There is some uncertainty as to his cover name but HN340 states that he now believes that it was “Andy Bailey”⁴⁴⁶. HN340 has provided a witness statement and is due to give oral evidence. The reports obtained by the Inquiry evidence infiltration of North London Red Circle at events which took place between 21 July 1970 and 25 April 1972⁴⁴⁷. There is also extensive reporting on the Irish Solidarity Campaign from its foundation at a conference held on 10-11 October 1970 until a meeting held on 9 June 1972⁴⁴⁸. HN340’s recollection is that he was directed to withdraw from his deployment shortly thereafter, in July 1972, because it was

⁴³⁹ Examples in the bundle include MPS-0732688, UCPI0000007772, UCPI0000007706 and UCPI0000014418

⁴⁴⁰ UCPI0000007706

⁴⁴¹ UCPI0000014418

⁴⁴² MPS-732971 & MPS-0736439

⁴⁴³ MPS-0736449

⁴⁴⁴ MPS0736018

⁴⁴⁵ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf
<https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/200180115-Minded-To-Note-3-November-tranche-applications.pdf>

⁴⁴⁶ HN340 witness statement, para.22

⁴⁴⁷ UCPI0000008179 and UCPI0000008953

⁴⁴⁸ MPS-0738663 and UCPI0000008516

feared that his cover identity had been compromised⁴⁴⁹. However, he remained in the SDS working on administrative duties until March or April 1973. Of particular note is the lack of evidence of violence, criminality or public disorder associated with the groups HN340 infiltrated. We will be exploring the issue of justification in particular.

43. The following specific observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN340's documents and witness statement.

43.1. HN340 does not think that the Inquiry has been able to recover all of his reporting⁴⁵⁰. Like a number of SDS officers of this era, HN340 recalls that he did not personally produce the reports in the Hearing Bundle⁴⁵¹. The documents fall to be considered with that evidence in mind.

43.2. HN340 states that he commenced his deployment by attending a large open meeting at the "*strong suggestion*" of his managers⁴⁵². There he recalls that he spoke to core participant Tariq Ali who suggested that he attend a meeting of the North London Red Circle ("NLRC"). It appears to be an example of an SDS officer deploying without a pre-determined target.

43.3. Tariq Ali's participation at a meeting of the NLRC is mentioned in a report dated 14 September 1970⁴⁵³. He is simply recorded as suggesting a public meeting to attract more members. Tariq Ali is reported on again in a report dated 16 August 1971⁴⁵⁴. On this occasion he is stated to have kept discussion at a NLRC meeting, following a talk, brief. There is no evidence that NLRC was involved in criminality, significant public disorder or acts of subversion. HN340 describes the group as a "*talking shop*". He was unaware of any criminality. On his account, the group had subversive aims but took no concrete steps to seek to realise those aims⁴⁵⁵. So far as violence is concerned, he states: "*violence would have been the last thing on many of their minds: sloganeering was about as far as things went*"⁴⁵⁶. An illustration of the topics of interest to NLRC can be found in the report dated 28 September 1970 at which there was discussion about a proposed series of talks on Israel, Black Power, Ireland, Trade Unions, The Death of the New Left and Why the Fourth International. HN340 regarded the group as a recruiting ground for the

⁴⁴⁹ Witness statement, para.111

⁴⁵⁰ Witness statement, para.38

⁴⁵¹ Witness statement, para.37

⁴⁵² Witness statement, para.34

⁴⁵³ UCPI0000008181

⁴⁵⁴ UCPI0000008923

⁴⁵⁵ Witness statement, para.81

⁴⁵⁶ Witness statement, para.87

Trotskyist International Marxist Group which he was eventually invited to join⁴⁵⁷.

- 43.4. There are several reports which record the NLRC's interest in campaigning for women's rights, supporting groups campaigning against racism and supporting industrial action⁴⁵⁸. Some reports on such activities expressly connect the cause with the group's revolutionary aspirations. For example, at a meeting on 10 August 1971 a speaker is stated to have asserted that: "*it was important that IMG activity within the unions ensured that they could better exploit any further potential revolutionary situation*"⁴⁵⁹. On the question of Ireland, at a meeting held on 24 August 1971, a speaker is recorded as stating that if the Provisional IRA commenced terrorist activities in England "*it would be the duty of all revolutionaries to render whatever assistance was asked*"⁴⁶⁰. The Inquiry will explore why reporting on such activities was considered necessary and whether it was justified?
- 43.5. Less than two months after joining NLRC, HN340 began to attend meetings of the Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign which in turn led to his attending the founding conference of the Irish Solidarity Committee⁴⁶¹. He then reported on this group for the remainder of his deployment. Why did he do so?
- 43.6. HN68 "Sean Lynch" was also at the same conference although, according to HN340's recollection, they acted independently whilst there: HN68 because of the Irish connection and HN340 because of the left wing connection⁴⁶².
- 43.7. HN340 states that he attended ISC meetings and demonstrations probably in the capacity of a NLRC member⁴⁶³. His attendance at many meetings of the Central London branch of the ISC is corroborated by the documents⁴⁶⁴. The meetings were typically held in a public house and attended by approximately 20 people. HN340 does not recall any serious disorder at the demonstrations. There is evidence which, if accurate, suggests that some speakers at ISC events expressed support for acts of terrorism and advocated either acquiring arms or establishing

⁴⁵⁷ Witness statement, paras.80 & 84

⁴⁵⁸ UCPI0000008179, UCPI0000008186, UCPI0000008913, UCPI0000008195, UCPI0000008919, UCPI0000008190, UCPI0000008943 (including a reference to core participant the NUM), UCPI0000008947 & UCPI0000008920

⁴⁵⁹ UCPI0000008923

⁴⁶⁰ UCPI0000008196

⁴⁶¹ MPS-0732319 & MPS-0738663

⁴⁶² Witness statement, para.58

⁴⁶³ Witness statement, paras. 62-63

⁴⁶⁴ Formerly Islington ICRSC, if MPS-0738663 is accurate

an armed wing. Support was voiced for the IRA on the ground that an IRA victory was seen as a necessary requirement for the creation of a revolutionary socialist state in Ireland⁴⁶⁵. However, HN340 states that the ISC was more willing to discuss than to act. He did not find any evidence that the group did in fact acquire weapons or set up an armed wing⁴⁶⁶. Nor did the group participate in any acts of violence to his knowledge whilst he was reporting on it⁴⁶⁷.

- 43.8. There is a detailed report on the 10-11 October 1970 Founding Conference of the ISC, together with annexes. The annexed documents portray a revolutionary, anti-imperialist movement which is seeking to mobilise in order to build support through demonstrations, rallies and speaking tours⁴⁶⁸.
- 43.9. HN340 attended the Red Europe 1970 Conference in Belgium, as did HN326. On HN340's account he was specifically directed to do so and was seeking to understand who was attending and whether there were plans for a demonstration in the UK. Investigating what HN340 did in Belgium falls outside our terms of reference but we note from this example that the deployment of SDS officers overseas began early in the history of the SDS⁴⁶⁹. The accounts of HN326 and HN340 differ in certain respects but not in respects which appear to us to demand resolution.
- 43.10. HN340 states that he attended some meetings of the VSC⁴⁷⁰. There is single report in the bundle, bearing his name, regarding a meeting held on 12 September 1970 at which Tariq Ali is reported as calling for left-wing unity and a successful demonstration at the end of October 1970⁴⁷¹.
- 43.11. As appears to have been the norm, HN340 reported on individuals. He describes the practice as "*second nature*" and as being for the purpose of "*building up a picture*"⁴⁷². His reports sometimes included particularly personal information. For example, that dated 1 September 1972 refers to affairs between members of the ISC, actual and anticipated⁴⁷³. HN340's explanation for so doing is that he was reporting on "*internal dynamics*" within the group⁴⁷⁴. Was such reporting justified?

⁴⁶⁵ Witness statement, para.76 UCPI0000007799 & UCPI0000008500

⁴⁶⁶ Witness statement, para.73 & MPS-0738216

⁴⁶⁷ Witness statement, para.74

⁴⁶⁸ MPS-0738146, MPS-0738147 & MPS-0738150

⁴⁶⁹ Witness statement, paras.42 & 48-52

⁴⁷⁰ Witness statement, paras.96-97

⁴⁷¹ UCPI0000005812

⁴⁷² Witness statement, para.64

⁴⁷³ UCPI0000008520

⁴⁷⁴ Witness statement, para.77

- 43.12. A number of the reports on the ISC refer to the then Member of Parliament Bernadette Devlin who was the Joint President of the group until her resignation during the course of the deployment. Most of the references relate to the Central London Branch of the ISC seeking to procure her services as a speaker. However, the report on the branch meeting of the Central London ISC held on 25 March 1971 records the late arrival of Bernadette Devlin MP and who she engaged in conversation: *“After the meeting, when most of the members had retired to the bar, Eamonn McCann arrived at about 10.45pm, accompanied by Bernadette Devlin MP. They spent a considerable time in conversation with [privacy], who had earlier been extremely critical of McCann especially in respect of an article written by McCann which had appeared in the Irish Times of 22 March 1971 (copy attached).”*⁴⁷⁵ We note the lack of a Special Branch reference relating to Bernadette Devlin MP at the end of the report and the absence of any detailed reporting of the substance of the conversation. Nevertheless, Special Branch has here recorded the movement and activity of a Member of Parliament in a political context. HN340 addresses this and the other reports which name Bernadette Devlin MP in his witness statement. Was the recording of her presence justified and were SDS UCOs adequately trained and instructed to deal with the possibility of encountering Members of Parliament?
- 43.13. In order to identify the group’s members, HN340 administered the tea fund of NLRC⁴⁷⁶. This falls to be contrasted with more weighty positions of responsibility assumed by some SDS UCOs later in the unit’s history.
- 43.14. Many of HN340’s reports contain information about forthcoming events such as demonstrations and rallies⁴⁷⁷. The Inquiry will explore whether their utility to the policing of public order justified the level of intrusion into the political activities and, in some cases, other aspects of the private lives of those reported on?
- 43.15. There is a single reference to core participant Piers Corbyn who is recorded as having attended an ISC meeting on 27 August 1971⁴⁷⁸.
- 43.16. Throughout his deployment, HN340 held the rank of Detective Sergeant. The majority of SDS UCOs were Detective Constables. Within the SDS,

⁴⁷⁵ MPS-0738245 & MPS-0738244

⁴⁷⁶ Witness statement, para.81

⁴⁷⁷ For example MPS-0738184, UCPI0000008836, MPS-0738290, UCPI0000007777, UCPI0000008935, UCPI0000008500, UCPI0000008504 & UCPI0000008506

⁴⁷⁸ MPS-0738288

his reports are generally signed off by DCI Saunders until 8 September 1971⁴⁷⁹, HN332 until 25 February 1972⁴⁸⁰ and HN294 thereafter.

- 43.17. Unlike some UCOs, HN340 does not recall his hours being very different from those he had previously worked in Special Branch⁴⁸¹. We will be exploring the extent to which HN340 lived his life undercover. His experience will fall to be contrasted with later SDS deployments which our investigations to date suggest were more immersive. What impact did the extent to which UCOs were immersed in their undercover identities have on their behaviour whilst deployed and their welfare?
- 43.18. As to the question of length of deployment, HN340 expresses the view that a 12 month cap would be unrealistic in relation to some targets. He points out that it was not until he had been deployed for 18 months that he was invited to join the IMG⁴⁸². This may be one reason why SDS deployments were increasing in length during this era.

HN346 Jill Mosdell – Stop the Seventy Tour, the Anti-Apartheid Movement and related groups – 16 April 1970 - February 1973

44. HN346 Jill Mosdell is deceased. The Inquiry have not been able to find whether or not she used a cover name. There is no restriction on the publication of her real name. She reported on the Stop the Seventy Tour, and in particular the North-West London branch which became the North and North-West London Action Committee Against Racism and then the Anti-Apartheid Movement.
45. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the intelligence reports linked to HN346:
- 45.1. This is an early example of a longer SDS deployment which spanned more than 2 years (see summary concerning HN45 for an expansion on this point).
- 45.2. HN346's provided detailed reporting on forthcoming pickets and demonstrations, for example the AAM pickets that took place to mark the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination⁴⁸³. There is also an example in her reporting of a telephone message left

⁴⁷⁹ MPS-0738290

⁴⁸⁰ UCPI0000007825

⁴⁸¹ Witness statement, para.44

⁴⁸² Witness statement, para.117

⁴⁸³ MPS-0737004, MPS-0737006, MPS-0737014

by her informing the Commander of Special Branch in connection that a planned picket organised by the Dambusters Mobilising Committee is cancelled but another by the AAM will go ahead and her reporting MPS-0737030⁴⁸⁴.

- 45.3. Whilst the bulk of her reporting appears to have focused on demonstrations and pickets there are reports which appear to have no such focus: HN346 reports on a fund raising event organised by the North-West London STST which took place on 25 April 1970. The event is described in her report as "*a purely social occasion*"⁴⁸⁵. In another report she gives information about a Christmas party given by the West London AAM⁴⁸⁶. In another she reports on the announcement by a supporter of AAM that from 12 March 1972 vigils will be held outside wherever the Peace Commission is sitting⁴⁸⁷. What was the value of such information to Special Branch?
- 45.4. Her STST reporting comes at a time when STST was widening its remit to more general anti-racist causes. She reports that in July 1970 the North-West London STST were discussing the possibility of infiltrating trades unions⁴⁸⁸, and later that this branch of the STST (in its new incarnation as the North and North West London Action Committee Against Racism) were to provide the militant action for the AAM, although not by fully integrating with the AAM⁴⁸⁹
- 45.5. In a report dated 14 September 1970 she reports that the South West London Action Committee Against Racism had plan to disrupt Magistrates Court proceeding involving Peter Hain in conjunction with the Young Liberals⁴⁹⁰.
- 45.6. It is unclear how deeply she penetrated her target groups but on 18 April 1972 she appears to have attended an executive meeting of the AAM with only 8 attendees⁴⁹¹. If her attendance at this meeting indicates that she had become a trusted member of her target group's inner circle, this is a pattern seen repeatedly and increasingly in SDS deployment over subsequent years.
- 45.7. Towards the end of her deployment it appears that she attended meetings together with HN45 whose deployment dates roughly correlate with hers. There are three reports co-signed by HN346 and

⁴⁸⁴ MPS-0737030

⁴⁸⁵ UCPI0000014420

⁴⁸⁶ MPS-0737656

⁴⁸⁷ UCPI0000008448

⁴⁸⁸ UCPI0000014425

⁴⁸⁹ UCPI0000014427

⁴⁹⁰ UCPI0000008245

⁴⁹¹ UCPI0000008450

HN45. One of these is a report concerning a meeting of the BVSF held on 10 January 1973⁴⁹². The meeting had 6 attendees only, of whom two may have been SDS officers (see summary in relation to HN45).

- 45.8. Another report co-signed by HN346 concerns a photographic exhibition organised by the Anti-Imperialist Co-ordinating Committee⁴⁹³. This report contains an example of the race of those who is referred to in a report being recorded. (See summary in relation to HN45).

HN339 “Stewart Goodman” 7 October 1970 to 18 February 1971 (at least) – Dambusters Mobilising Committee; 17 January 1971 to 26 October 1971 – Lambeth Branch of the International Socialists

46. HN339 has real name anonymity⁴⁹⁴. He used the cover name “Stewart Goodman”. There are 26 intelligence reports in his section of the Hearing Bundle linked to HN339 (all in Special Report format). The earliest is dated 7 October 1970 and relates to the Dambusters Mobilising Committee, the group to which most of his early reporting relates. HN339 recalls that he was primarily tasked to report on the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and that it is possibly through this group that he became involved with the Dambusters Mobilising Committee⁴⁹⁵. The Inquiry has obtained one report authored by HN339, dated 19 January 1971, which relates to a forthcoming conference to be held by the Anti-Apartheid Movement⁴⁹⁶. It is the only report relating to this group, although one further report has been obtained which relates to the Stop the Seventy Tour Committee⁴⁹⁷. The remaining reports all relate to the International Socialists (“IS”) and concern either the Lambeth Branch of IS or the group’s affairs at national level. They are dated between 9 February 1971 and 8 November 1971 and relate to events stated to have occurred between 17 January 1971 and 26 October 1971.

47. In addition a number of reports about the Dambusters Mobilising Committee bearing HN339’s name which also appear in HN326’s section of the hearing

⁴⁹² UCPI0000010247

⁴⁹³ UCPI0000010248

⁴⁹⁴ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/200180115-Minded-To-Note-3-November-tranche-applications.pdf> https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

⁴⁹⁵ Witness statement, para.29

⁴⁹⁶ MPS-0732551

⁴⁹⁷ UCPI0000014428

bundle. It seems likely that both officers were reporting on this group in some capacity by the end of 1970.

48. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN339's reporting and witness statement.

- 48.1. There is reference to a Member of Parliament in the report dated 19 January 1971 which provides details of a forthcoming Anti-Apartheid Movement conference to discuss arms sales to South Africa. Specifically, the report states that "Speakers will include Michael Barnes MP ..." ⁴⁹⁸ HN336 states that "*MPs giving their support to protest movements was potentially of interest to Special Branch*" ⁴⁹⁹. The Inquiry have found references to the speaking engagements of Members of Parliament to be relatively common amongst SDS reporting and will be exploring why such references to the political activities of democratically elected Members of Parliament were recorded and filed. The Inquiry will also be seeking to establish, later in the Inquiry, the use (if any) to which this reporting was put.
- 48.2. HN339 maintains that "*the modus operandi of IS was subversion; they wanted to overthrow the political system.*" ⁵⁰⁰ The reports about the International Socialists' April 1971 conference in London and October 1971 rally in Skegness, together with the group's literature associated with these gatherings, suggest that the group's aims fell within the Security Service's definition of subversion ⁵⁰¹. HN339's reporting is generally marked as copied to the Security Service.
- 48.3. The above intelligence evidences a particular interest on the part of IS in trade union activity. The Inquiry will be exploring how and why the SDS reported on trade union related matters and whether it was justified.
- 48.4. HN339's attendance at the IS autumn rally in Skegness provides another example of SDS officers operating outside of the Metropolis.
- 48.5. Several of the reports record internal dissent within the International Socialists arising from differences between the party's leadership and members of the "Trotskyist Tendency" ⁵⁰². Coverage of the internal politics of the groups infiltrated by the SDS is a common occurrence in SDS intelligence reports. Coverage of this particular issue is continued

⁴⁹⁸ MPS-0732551

⁴⁹⁹ Witness statement, para.31

⁵⁰⁰ Witness statement, para.52

⁵⁰¹ UCPI0000007923; UCPI0000007924; and MPS-0731841

⁵⁰² See the reports of the conference and rally (cited above) together with MPS-0735902, MPS-0735903 and MPS-0735904.

by HN343 “John Clinton” from within IS after HN339’s reporting ends (see below).

- 48.6. HN339 appears to have attended a mixture of public and private meetings of the Lambeth Branch of IS. The reports in the Hearing Bundle cover 2 public meetings, a meeting of the public sector employees’ cell, 2 business meetings and extraordinary branch meeting.
- 48.7. When attending branch meetings HN339 would have been mixing in groups of between 13 and 30 people, if the attendance figures cited in the reports are accurate. By contrast, the national events were much bigger. Approximately 600 people were stated to have attended the IS Autumn Rally at Skegness.
- 48.8. All of the reports are signed by HN339. The countersignatures indicate that up until May 1971 HN339 was being managed by Chief Inspector Saunders and his deputy HN294. From September 1971 onwards HN332 had taken over as the Chief Inspector and either he or his subordinate Detective Inspector Barry Moss (HN218) countersign the reports.
- 48.9. There is a gap in the reporting between the reports dated 12 May 1971 and 17 September 1971. It is unclear why this gap appears and HN339 is unable to provide an explanation.
- 48.10. There is some reporting of details of forthcoming demonstrations, albeit that they are not very specific⁵⁰³. The report dated 15 October 1971 contains an example of such reporting that has been side-lined and marked with a letter A⁵⁰⁴. The Inquiry will be seeking with other witnesses to confirm its understanding that such markings indicate that it was to be disseminated for the purposes of informing those responsible for the policing of demonstrations.
- 48.11. HN339 confirms that he became the Treasurer of Lambeth branch of IS⁵⁰⁵. This very early example of a UCO achieving such a position, will be repeated throughout Tranche 1. The Inquiry will examine to how such positions were compatible with the guidance provided that officers “*must not take office in a group*”⁵⁰⁶.
- 48.12. HN339 also recalls an incident when he crashed his car one evening after drinking with those he was reporting on. He recalls that he provided his real name to the police and informed them he was an

⁵⁰³ UCPI0000007922 – this document unusually contains two intelligence reports. The relevant report is the second report. MPS-0731837.

⁵⁰⁴ MPS-0731837

⁵⁰⁵ Witness statement, para.46

⁵⁰⁶ Penetration of Extremist Groups (MPS-0724119) p6.

undercover officer, and thinks he may have been prosecuted in his cover name. It is also possible that CI Saunders briefed the Magistrates in private that he was a UCO⁵⁰⁷. This is an early example of an SDS manager being aware of the prosecution of an UCO in his cover identity.

HN349 – anarchist groups

49. HN349 has provided a witness statement to the inquiry. Both his real and cover name are subject to a restriction order⁵⁰⁸. He joined the SDS in the early 1970s after a relatively short time in Special Branch.⁵⁰⁹ He was in the Squad for approximately one year, targeting anarchist groups in Central London. Due to the restriction order in force over the real and cover identities of HN349⁵¹⁰, the specific groups targeted by this officer have not been published.
50. The Inquiry has no contemporaneous reporting from HN349's deployment. HN349 provides evidence in his witness statement that he was unable to successfully infiltrate any of his target groups as he was not able to form any real relationships with the activists or gain their trust.⁵¹¹ As a result, HN349 was withdrawn from his deployment after approximately nine months.⁵¹²
51. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement:
- 51.1. HN349 was recruited to the SDS after meeting with a UCO who explained the nature of the role. He was married when he joined the Squad; he does not recall anyone discussing the impact that SDS work would have on his family life, and no managers spoke to his spouse.⁵¹³
- 51.2. There was no formal training given, however HN349 spent a period of time in the back office of the SDS before his proper deployment.⁵¹⁴ During this time he was able to read reports and get a feel for the information collected. He also met with some deployed UCOs at the SDS undercover flat before deployment on two or three occasions. HN349 believed that this time in the back office was part of the

⁵⁰⁷ Witness statement, paras.66-68

⁵⁰⁸ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

⁵⁰⁹ Witness statement, para.6

⁵¹⁰ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20181009-HN349_RC_RO.pdf

⁵¹¹ Witness Statement, para.24

⁵¹² Witness Statement, para.33

⁵¹³ Witness Statement, para.9

⁵¹⁴ Witness Statement, para.10

evaluation process.⁵¹⁵ He also spent time in the back office following his withdrawal.⁵¹⁶

- 51.3. In general, it appears that HN349's cover identity was less developed than other officers at the time.⁵¹⁷ The question arises as to what extent this impacted his ability to infiltrate his target group. HN349 did acquire cover accommodation, but never lived at the address.⁵¹⁸ He had no cover employment. There is no evidence to suggest that HN349 used the identity of a deceased child in creating his cover name. The Inquiry will explore the growing sophistication of legend building for undercover officers over the life of the SDS.
- 51.4. HN349 notes in his witness statement that there were no formal arrangements for welfare in the SDS, however he felt that issues could be raised with managers if needed.⁵¹⁹
- 51.5. After leaving the SDS, HN349 returned to Special Branch, where he often worked with intelligence obtained by the SDS. He states in his witness statement that after some time, most Special Branch officers were "*aware of the SDS and had an idea of the kind of groups they had infiltrated*"⁵²⁰. HN349 also states that he would have occasionally made requests for specific information from the SDS while in Special Branch.⁵²¹ The Inquiry seeks to explore the extent to which Special Branch was aware of the SDS and any influence there may have been on tasking.

HN45 "David Robertson" – Maoists, especially the British Vietnam Solidarity Front, Revolutionary Marxist Leninist League and related groups, 25 November 1970 to 6 February 1973

52. HN45 "David Robertson" has provided a witness statement. Publication of his real name has been restricted⁵²². He is due to give oral evidence. The reports in the bundle connected to HN45 relate to events that took place between 25 October 1970 and 6 February 1973. The reports concern the activities of

⁵¹⁵ Witness Statement, para.8

⁵¹⁶ Witness Statement, para.33

⁵¹⁷ Witness Statement, para.19

⁵¹⁸ Witness Statement, para.21

⁵¹⁹ Witness Statement, para.48

⁵²⁰ Witness statement, para.53

⁵²¹ Witness statement, para.53

⁵²² See <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/20171114-SDS-anonymity-Minded-to-2.pdf> and https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

Maoist activists. Many involve reporting on the prominent Maoist activist, Abhimanyu Manchanda. HN45 returned to the SDS in what he describes as an administrative role between 1982 and 1985⁵²³. We will be dealing with this subsequent service in Tranche 2.

53. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the reports and HN45's witness statement.

- 53.1. This is an early example of a longer SDS deployment which spanned more than 2 years. It can be contrasted with some of the very short SDS deployments that took place in 1968. The deployment significantly exceeded the 12 month maximum period advocated by DCI Dixon in 1968. We will be exploring how and why the length of SDS undercover deployments began to increase in this period.
- 53.2. Unlike many SDS officers, HN45 was single when he joined the SDS⁵²⁴. We will be exploring the extent to which the marital status of potential recruits mattered to the SDS and why.
- 53.3. HN45 states that he was specifically tasked to infiltrate Maoist groups, many of which were very small⁵²⁵. In particular, he states that his task was to find out what the Maoists groups were "*all about*", their plans, members etc.⁵²⁶ He specifically denies any remit to disrupt or distract the groups⁵²⁷. His written evidence is that his role was confined to gathering and reporting information. There is no contrary evidence in the documents.
- 53.4. HN45 recalls discussing with SDS undercover officers what they were doing and the methods they were using before he deployed⁵²⁸. He describes regularly attending the SDS flat to write up his reports and to attend meetings that he recalls being held weekly, on Wednesdays⁵²⁹. As to what occurred in the cover accommodation, HN45 describes exchanging good ideas. He states: "*I would have discussed my deployment with the other UCOs at the SDS flat*" and "*We would have had general conversations about what we were up to during our deployments*". He recalls his managers being present during these conversations⁵³⁰. The Inquiry will be exploring the role of the cover

⁵²³ Witness statement, para.109

⁵²⁴ Witness statement, para.8

⁵²⁵ Witness statement, para.28

⁵²⁶ Witness statement, para.32

⁵²⁷ Witness statement, para.34

⁵²⁸ Witness statement, para.12

⁵²⁹ Witness statement, paras.39 & 44

⁵³⁰ Witness statement, paras.40-41

accommodation in the operation of the SDS, including the sharing of ideas and practice, throughout our investigation.

- 53.5. HN45 does not recall working much longer hours than he normally worked in Special Branch. He states that the hours were a bit more unpredictable and variable but: *"I don't think that my working life was that different to [those] in the rest of Special Branch"*⁵³¹. This is consistent with the impression, which we shall be testing, that many of early SDS undercover officers were, in using the undercover tactic, simply extending what they had already been doing in Special Branch. Their deployments may be contrasted with those that came later who became much more involved in the lives of those with whom they were mixing. However, HN45 still became involved with the Maoists that he was targeting to the extent that he states that he babysat on one occasion for Abhimanyu Manchanda and Diane Langford⁵³².
- 53.6. In all but a few instances, there is no evidence to suggest that any SDS undercover officer, other than "David Robertson" was present at any of the events reported on. The exceptions are the reports dated 18 January 1973, 7 February 1973 and 9 February 1973 which bear the names of both HN45 and WPC Jill Mosdell. The 18 January 1973 report concerns a very small meeting: the Chair (Manchanda) and five other persons. We will explore which undercover police officers were present at the meeting and, if there were two, how and why this occurred at such a small meeting? HN45 explains how Jill Mosdell came to be present at paragraph 56 of his witness statement and states that his own presence at a meeting of so few people was: *"... not indicative of any special position of trust that I had obtained it is simply that some of these meetings were not well attended and they were happy to have any attendees that they could"*.
- 53.7. The report dated 22 January 1971 is relevant to a number of issues⁵³³. If it is accurate, it concerns a meeting of 14 persons held at Abhimanyu Manchanda's home. The object of the meeting was to plan the RMLL's activities for 1971, including those of three connected organisations: the Women's Liberation Front (WLF), the British Vietnam Solidarity Front (BVSF) and Friends of China. The report asserts that the RMLL was now going to concentrate its activities in the field of political agitation within industry. To that end three persons were directed to obtain employment at the Ford factory in Dagenham (para.4). The

⁵³¹ Witness statement, para.45

⁵³² Witness statement, para.76

⁵³³ UCPI0000010567

WLF is reported as having formed two new branches, including one deliberately situated in North London close to the factory run by Metal Box Co. which employed a large number of women (para.5). Other WLF members, all of whom were also members of the trade union SOGAT “*intended to try and organise women members of that union*” (para.6). Another RMLL activist, whose is recorded as being Indian is reported as now being able to devote more time to the RMLL, especially in the industrial field. This individual is recorded as stating that he had many contacts in various factories in London, particularly the Metal Box Co. “*which employed large numbers of Asians*” (para.7). They were all advised by Manchanda, if the report is accurate, not to draw the attention of the employers at the outset (para.8). Towards the end of the report is a brief paragraph recording conversation on the topic of “*involvement with coloured people*”. This single report therefore records information in relation to political activity connected with industrial relations, racial equality and women’s rights. These are matters which are reported on frequently in the reporting on the RMLL and connected groups. There was a specific SDS deployment into the WLF (see HN348). Reports on these issues are not confined to the reporting on Maoist groups and we shall be following such reporting throughout our investigation of the SDS and examining why it occurred. This report is also an example of the race of a person who is referred to in a report being recorded. This is another common feature of SDS reporting which we shall be following. There are other examples in HN45’s reporting, notably the report dated 7 February 1973: “*The meeting ...was attended by about 120 persons of whom at least half were Arabs and Coloureds*” (para.2)⁵³⁴.

- 53.8. A report dated 3 February 1971 concerns a large meeting of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)⁵³⁵. It is an example of a practice that we have sometimes seen in SDS reports of the writer stating that all or a part of a meeting’s proceedings were not of interest to Special Branch. In this case the reports of a delegation to China are recorded only very briefly and it is said of general questions from the floor that “*again nothing of particular interest occurred*”. We shall be exploring what officers understood to be of interest to Special Branch and how they came to that understanding. What was recorded in more detail was presumably believed to be of interest to Special Branch. In

⁵³⁴ UCPI0000010248 – see HN45 witness statement, para.59 for his explanation: “*This would simply have been a statement of fact and I tried to pass on as much information as possible*”.

⁵³⁵ UCPI0000021998

this case that included, amongst other things, a collection by members of the Post Office Workers Union to help in the then current strike and that: *“Most of the Post Office workers were coloured and from time-to-time gave the clenched fist “Black Power” salute.* Thus, this is a further example of reporting relating to industrial relations and those campaigning for racial equality.

- 53.9. There is reference in the report dated 11 February 1971 to a core participant, Dr Norman Temple. The report concerns the second annual conference of the Palestine Solidarity Committee. Dr Temple is recorded as having proposed a resolution expressing solidarity with the people of Ireland. He is also recorded as having stood unsuccessfully for a seat on the Executive Committee of the VSC⁵³⁶. Why was the SDS recording such details of an individual's political activities? Was it justified?
- 53.10. HN45 documents a split in the RMLL in March 1971 which arose, according to the reports, from a rejection of Manchanda's leadership⁵³⁷. He also then reports on the formation of a new group, by those disenchanted by Manchanda's leadership, called the Marxist Leninist Workers Association (“MLWA”). A series of reports on this group then follows, portraying it as a powerless and ineffective force⁵³⁸. Reporting on the internal politics of activist groups, including the dissolution of some groups and the formation of others, is something which the Inquiry Legal Team has frequently come across when considering SDS reporting. Why were such events reported on? Was there any justification for so doing?
- 53.11. A report dated 18 November 1971 appears to be a clear example of an SDS officer providing specific advance intelligence of a public demonstration⁵³⁹. In this case what is being reported is an attempt to organise support for a picket to be held outside Tottenham Magistrates' Court and to fill the court's public gallery with supporters of the accused: three members of the London Alliance in Defence of Workers Rights. The time and date of the event are included in the report. So too are the groups whose members are expected to attend: the London Alliance, Schools Action Union and Black Unity Freedom Party.
- 53.12. A memorandum dated 7 February 1972, from SDS manager HN332 to Special Branch's Commander Operations records that HN45 had been

⁵³⁶ UCPI0000010569

⁵³⁷ UCPI0000011741, UCPI0000011742 and UCPI0000010918

⁵³⁸ UCPI0000011746, UCPI0000014360 and UCPI0000014363

⁵³⁹ UCPI0000010935

invited to run Banner Books, a Maoist bookshop⁵⁴⁰. HN332 wished HN45 to assume this responsibility but only temporarily and gives four reasons: (a) to enhance HN45's legend; (b) to understand how the bookshop operated; (c) to obtain access to the bookshop's records and mailing list; and (d) to obtain a plan of and keys to the building⁵⁴¹. HN45's evidence is that he "...continued to attend the bookshop but was not otherwise involved in the running of it"⁵⁴². HN332's document appears to evidence examples of the sort of intelligence that the SDS was interested in and the reference to keys seems to afford some corroboration to HN336's account that he was asked to take an impression of the keys to the IMG's offices.

- 53.13. HN45's reports are not all strictly factual. Many contain an element of assessment or analysis. The clearest example is his report on the BVSF dated 5 May 1972 which comprises solely of an assessment of the then current position of the BVSF. This is an early example of an SDS undercover officer who, having built up an extensive knowledge of a group, provides his assessment of that group. Why were such assessments made and what were they used for?
- 53.14. All of the reports obtained in relation to "David Robertson's" deployment use the Special Report form. There are none submitted on the Meeting Report / Poster Parade form. It is not clear why this is the case. Special Report forms do not specifically record whether meetings were private or public. Consequently, in some cases it is not clear from the content of HN45's reports whether an event was public or private. However, three of the reports concern RMLL meetings that took place in a private home between January and March 1971⁵⁴³.
- 53.15. As to the level of threat of subversion posed by the Maoists, HN45 states: "*With the benefit of hindsight, I'm not convinced that the group posed a threat of subversion or revolution ...given how low the membership was ..*"⁵⁴⁴ In a similar vein, he asserts: "*The activity that I witnessed was subversive in the sense that the whole purpose of the Maoists was to subvert the political system but they could not actually achieve this as they did not have the means to do so and were largely pretty ineffective*"⁵⁴⁵.

⁵⁴⁰ MPS-0730516

⁵⁴¹ MPS-0730516

⁵⁴² Witness statement, para.61

⁵⁴³ UCPI0000010567, UCPI0000011741 and UCPI0000011742

⁵⁴⁴ Witness statement, para.54

⁵⁴⁵ Witness statement, para.72

- 53.16. In relation to violence and public order, HN45 states: *“I don’t remember seeing any Maoists committing public disorder while deployed but I may just have forgotten over the years”* and *“.my recollection now is that the Maoists were generally not violent”*⁵⁴⁶.
- 53.17. HN45 makes two points in connection with the overall level of threat of subversion, violence or public disorder posed by the Maoists he infiltrated which we will need to explore: first, the level of understanding at the time; and, second, the utility of proving a negative. He states: *“Although in hindsight the Maoist groups may not actually have posed a particular threat, this may not have been understood at the time and it was also important for the police to have negative intelligence so as not to waste police resources”*⁵⁴⁷. We note that in relation to the Maoist groups, justification will also need to be considered against the background of what is asserted to be changing behaviour. For example, the 1973 Annual Report states that the Maoist groups were undergoing a period of introspection as a result of the détente between China and the United States of America⁵⁴⁸ whereas in 1968, before China’s relations with the West shifted, they are portrayed as having been amongst the more militant activists.
- 53.18. As is usual, HN45’s reporting includes reports on individuals. In his witness statement, he explains: *“...one of the main reasons we deployed was to gather intelligence about who was involved in these protest groups”*⁵⁴⁹. The examples in the bundle include details of the personal finances, domestic arrangements and employment of individual activists⁵⁵⁰. The report dated 10 March 1972 is notable because the employment particulars reported are stated to have been provided in response to a request from the Security Service⁵⁵¹.
- 53.19. HN45 worked in Special Branch both before and after his service in the SDS. This included working in C Squad prior to joining the SDS. He states that will have read SDS reports during the course of his ordinary Special Branch duties but made no specific requests of the SDS for particular information⁵⁵². We will be exploring the extent to which the SDS’ targeting was the product of external requests and how its

⁵⁴⁶ Witness statement, paras.68-69

⁵⁴⁷ Witness statement, para.81

⁵⁴⁸ MPS-0728975, para.15

⁵⁴⁹ Witness statement, para.65

⁵⁵⁰ MPS-0739236 and MPS-0739238

⁵⁵¹ MPS-0739241

⁵⁵² Witness statement, paras.6 &112

“product” was used and disseminated by Special Branch throughout our investigation.

- 53.20. HN45 states that he was present at the first Grosvenor Square riot, before he served in the SDS, and describes the police as having been “*completely overwhelmed*” on that occasion⁵⁵³. His evidence corroborates other evidence to the effect that the authorities were not adequately prepared for events on that day.
- 53.21. HN45 appears to have been managed, within the SDS, primarily by Saunders and HN294. Some of his reports are signed by HN332.
- 53.22. There is unfortunately an error in the way that the documents have been scanned. The activist documents that accompany the report dated 16 March 1971 are out of order and include a document dated 28 March 1971 that should have been included in the scan of the report dated 31 March 1971⁵⁵⁴.
- 53.23. Finally, we note the Undercover Research Group’s online article about HN45 and, in particular, the allegation that an activist called Ethel was threatened by HN45. This is not an allegation that is accepted by HN45 and the Inquiry has concluded that in all the circumstances it is not proportionate to take further steps to seek to resolve this specific factual issue⁵⁵⁵.

HN347 Alex Sloan – Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front – 10 January 1971 to 27 June 1971

54. HN347 “Alex Sloan” has provided the Inquiry with a witness statement. Publication of his real name has been restricted⁵⁵⁶. He is due to give oral evidence. 23 intelligence reports connected with his reporting have been obtained. They are dated between 13 January and 27 August 1971 and refer to events which occurred between 10 January 1971 and 27 June 1971⁵⁵⁷. They all concern the activities of the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front (“INLSF”), a revolutionary socialist group which is reported to have had Marxist-

⁵⁵³ Witness statement, para.82

⁵⁵⁴ See UCPI0000011741 and UCPI0000011742 respectively.

⁵⁵⁵ <https://undercoverresearch.net/2018/05/25/dave-robertson-a-1970s-spycop-among-north-london-maoists/> / See paragraphs 85 & 88 of HN45’s witness statement for his account.

⁵⁵⁶ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180327-Final-ruling-following-21-March-hearing.pdf>

⁵⁵⁷ HN347’s recollection is that his deployment was confined to 1971 (witness statement: para.28) and therefore the risk assessment which supported his application for anonymity is at odds with both the reporting that has been obtained and the witness’ recollection.

Leninist connections, during this period. HN347's deployment was therefore relatively short and targeted at a specific single group. 16 of the reports refer to core participant Norman Temple making this an early example of a deployment in respect of which there is a core participant who had significant personal contact with a SDS undercover police officer.

55. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the reporting and the witness statements of HN347 and Norman Temple.
- 55.1. HN347 states that when he joined, there were 364 people serving in Special Branch which, if accurate, gives an indication of the size of Special Branch relative to the SDS⁵⁵⁸.
- 55.2. Unlike many of the Phase 1 former UCOs, HN347 does think that he created his identity as set out in the document "Penetration of Extremist Groups"⁵⁵⁹. He states that he did not use a deceased child's identity to create his legend and this evidence is consistent with that of his contemporaries⁵⁶⁰.
- 55.3. In contrast with some SDS officers, HN347 states that he had no scope to influence his own tasking (e.g. compare with HN336). Why was this?
- 55.4. HN347 describes attending weekly meetings at HN45's cover accommodation which he describes as akin to a safe house⁵⁶¹. It is not clear whether this is the same safe house that his contemporaries recall.
- 55.5. HN347 recalls life undercover as differing enormously from his ordinary duties because he did not go home between Thursdays and Mondays⁵⁶². However, he also states that he was not allowed to take overtime⁵⁶³. We will wish to explore how deeply involved "Alex Sloan" became with the members of INLSF. For his part, Dr Temple states: "*I did speak to him, but only in limited terms*". He also describes "Alex Sloan" as quiet and never part of the inner circle⁵⁶⁴.
- 55.6. The pattern revealed by the intelligence reports shows "Alex Sloan" regularly attending weekly meetings of the INLSF held first at the Marquis of Clanricarde public house (between 10 January 1971 and 7 March 1971) and then, slightly less regularly, at 83A Golders Green

⁵⁵⁸ Witness statement, para.9

⁵⁵⁹ Witness statement, para.23

⁵⁶⁰ Witness statement, para.18

⁵⁶¹ Witness statement, para.36

⁵⁶² Witness statement, para.44

⁵⁶³ Witness statement, para.45

⁵⁶⁴ Witness statement, para.17

Road, the home of an INLSF member being used as the group's headquarters⁵⁶⁵.

- 55.7. The meetings are either recorded as being private, or appear to have been so, a matter to be clarified in evidence. The meetings were small: attendance is recorded as varying between 9 and 26 persons, typically in the early 20s.
- 55.8. All of the reports are Special Reports in HN347's name. All but two are countersigned by DCI Saunders, the others are countersigned by HN294⁵⁶⁶. Dr Temple's impression is that the reports: "...*appear accurate in terms of their content*"⁵⁶⁷.
- 55.9. As well as regular meetings the INLSF ran political education classes but there are no reports arising from "Alex Sloan's" attendance at such classes.
- 55.10. In his witness statement, HN347 describes selling the INLSF newspaper as well as attending meetings and demonstrations⁵⁶⁸.
- 55.11. There is reporting about forthcoming events either organised by, or to be attended by, INLSF, for example pickets, demonstrations, a rally and a march. However, there is little evidence in the reports to suggest that these events gave rise to any public disorder. Whether the INLSF posed any threat to public order will be explored.
- 55.12. There is no evidence in the reports that the INLSF was involved in actual violence. Some contact with the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) is recorded as having occurred but this was the source of considerable controversy within the INLSF. It was denounced as nationalistic and a betrayal of revolutionary socialism⁵⁶⁹.
- 55.13. The reports do not suggest that the INLSF set out to commit criminal acts to further its political aims.
- 55.14. The INLSF appears to have had revolutionary aspirations but the reports do not suggest that it was a potent revolutionary force⁵⁷⁰.
- 55.15. HN347's reporting does include details of the inner workings of the INLSF which, if accurate, suggests that the group was in practice controlled by an inner circle of Marxist-Leninists⁵⁷¹. Dr Temple's witness statement also describes an inner group⁵⁷².

⁵⁶⁵ MPS-0739863

⁵⁶⁶ See also witness statement, para.34 which is consistent with the documents.

⁵⁶⁷ Witness statement, para.14

⁵⁶⁸ Witness statement, paras.43 & 70

⁵⁶⁹ UCPI0000007822

⁵⁷⁰ MPS-0739487

⁵⁷¹ MPS-0739321

⁵⁷² Witness statement, para.9

- 55.16. There is evidence that the INLSF sought to avoid the attention of Special Branch but, if accurate, it is not clear why it did so⁵⁷³.
- 55.17. HN347 reported upon a serious internal dispute within the INLSF which led to the expulsions. This event attracted specific interest and comment from senior MPS management⁵⁷⁴.
- 55.18. There is reporting that touches upon the justice campaign arising from the death of Stephen McCarthy⁵⁷⁵. Why was this activity reported on?
- 55.19. There is also reporting on INLSF activity supporting the campaign for racial equality and protesting against the police⁵⁷⁶. Why was this activity reported on?
- 55.20. One report includes content which appears to record legal advice and contemplated legal action against a senior police officer. There does not appear in this era to have been any restriction on the recording of legal advice received by activists which gives rise to questions about respect for the doctrine of legal professional privilege⁵⁷⁷.
- 55.21. The report dated 11 May 1971 is an example SDS reporting touching upon trade union membership. It records details of both an individual's INLSF activism and the fact that his studies at the London School of Economics were funded by a trade union scholarship⁵⁷⁸. The reasons for the SDS' interest in trade union connections is a matter which we are investigating.
- 55.22. The last of HN347's reports in the Hearing Bundle lists persons on the mailing list for the Irish Liberation Press, the INLSF's newspaper. It is striking that most of those named are recorded as persons who could not be identified or of whom there was no trace. We shall be exploring whether and to what extent that means that submission of this list meant that persons who had hitherto not come to the attention of Special Branch or the Security Service come to be named in a report filed by both organisations solely because they subscribed to this publication. Was such recording justified? HN347 states that although he was not specifically tasked to obtain membership or mailing lists, doing so was: "*obviously part of my remit*"⁵⁷⁹.
- 55.23. Of the many reports which refer to Norman Temple, notable examples appear to us to include those which include the police version of his

⁵⁷³ MPS-0739490 at para.4

⁵⁷⁴ MPS-0739470 & UCPI-0000007822

⁵⁷⁵ MPS-0739317 & MPS-0739483

⁵⁷⁶ MPS-0739479. See also MPS-0739317 and MPS-0739475

⁵⁷⁷ MPS-0739487

⁵⁷⁸ MPS-0739863

⁵⁷⁹ Witness statement, para.65

role in the events which led to the internal split within the INLSF, his position as Treasurer of the group, his membership of the Communist Workers' League (said to be the inner caucus of the INLSF), his contributions to group meetings on issues as diverse as reading from The Thoughts of Chairman Mao, what to do if arrested and his experiences selling copies of the Irish Liberation Press in Ireland⁵⁸⁰. Was such reporting of an individual's activism within the INLSF justified?

- 55.24. Dr Temple describes there being *"...a lot of talking (often from Davoren) about how we should overthrow the state and change things"* and states: *"References were often made within meetings of the need to use violence as a means by which to achieve revolutionary change, but I always took this to be just talk"*⁵⁸¹.
- 55.25. For question, in light of all of the above, is why the INLSF was targeted by the SDS? Was the infiltration of this group justified? HN347 states: *"It soon became obvious that the INLSF weren't a group that were going to carry out bombings or any other serious criminal activity"*⁵⁸². He further states that the group was not violent or subversive: *"The INLSF did not endorse, encourage, instigate, facilitate, or participate in violence during my deployment"* and *"The INLSF did nothing to subvert Parliamentary Democracy in the United Kingdom. It was a political, rather than a terrorist, group"*⁵⁸³. He does not recall witnessing any public disorder, violence or subversive activity⁵⁸⁴. Did events in Northern Ireland at the time justify infiltrating the INLSF? Dr Temple states that *"Ireland was definitely a hot political topic"* and *"I can understand why the police would be interested in the INLSF"*⁵⁸⁵. If so, should infiltration have continued once it had been confirmed that the INLSF was not involved in public disorder, violence or subversion?
- 55.26. HN347 was withdrawn after he was accused of being a police officer by members of his group, whom he describes as being very nervous about undercover police officers⁵⁸⁶. Dr Temple's recollection, as set out at para.19 of his witness statement, is that "Alex Sloan" did not simply slip away. Rather, he tried to disrupt the group by stating that he had been spied upon from both of the camps that then existed within the INLSF.

⁵⁸⁰ MPS-0739470, UCPI0000007822, MPS-0739474, MPS-0739319, MPS-0739321, MPS-0739483 and MPS-0739490

⁵⁸¹ Witness statement, para.11

⁵⁸² Witness statement, para.31

⁵⁸³ Witness statement, paras.48 & 49

⁵⁸⁴ Witness statement, paras.66-69

⁵⁸⁵ Witness statement, para.21

⁵⁸⁶ Witness statement, paras.77 & 80

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

We will be affording HN347 the opportunity either to confirm this account or to give his own version of events.

HN343 “John Clinton” - International Socialists – October 1971 to December 1973

56. Publication of HN343's real name is the subject of a restriction order⁵⁸⁷. He most likely used the cover name “John Clinton”⁵⁸⁸. He has provided a witness statement which will be adduced in evidence. He is not due to be called. “John Clinton” infiltrated the International Socialists. According to his witness statement he attended meetings of various different branches, particularly the Hammersmith & Fulham branch⁵⁸⁹. His reporting covers a wide range of issues and spans the period October 1971 to December 1973. According to his witness statement he joined the SDS a few months before he deployed⁵⁹⁰. He appears to have left the unit in 1974⁵⁹¹.
57. The following observations and questions arise from consideration of HN343's reporting and witness statement.
- 57.1. HN343 feels that the reporting recovered by the ILT does not reflect the totality of what he reported at the time. That will need to be kept in mind when deciding what conclusions can be drawn from it.
- 57.2. The witness statement contains a useful comparison between HN343's ordinary work within Special Branch in the course of which he states that he attended hundreds of meetings and demonstrations and his work in the SDS which gave him access to private meetings and “direct human intelligence”: “...*I had to be seen as a good comrade in order to be invited to the pub after meetings (which was often where you gathered the most useful information)*”.⁵⁹²
- 57.3. HN343's evidence contains much that is relevant to the questions: (a) why did the SDS infiltrate the International Socialists; and (b) whether it was justified to use an undercover police officer to do so. This includes evidence in what appear to be the International Socialists' own documents. We will be exploring this issue in oral evidence with other former SDS officers who infiltrated IS (later the Socialist Workers

⁵⁸⁷ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180327-Final-ruling-following-21-March-hearing.pdf>

⁵⁸⁸ See HN343 witness statement at para.213

⁵⁸⁹ HN343 witness statement, paras.52 & 60

⁵⁹⁰ HN343 witness statement, paras.30 & 71

⁵⁹¹ See witness statement at para.152. See also UCPI0000017021

⁵⁹² HN343 witness statement paras. 4, 13-14, 20 & 40

Party). Salient examples of the evidence on these issues from HN343's deployment include the following.

- 57.3.1. The position papers attached to the report dated 23 November 1971 (of respectively the "Trotskyist Tendency" and IS leadership) articulate revolutionary socialist ideals and aspirations⁵⁹³.
- 57.3.2. The documents and reporting relating to IS' 1972 Annual Conference evidence the connection between the group's revolutionary aims and its interest in specific issues such as industrial disputes, trades unions, race equality, sex equality, immigration, tenant's rights and social class. Understanding the links between revolutionary groups, such as the International Socialists and these causes appears to us to be an important line of inquiry when seeking the truth as to why SDS officers reported on campaigning on these issues for decades.
- 57.3.3. HN343's reporting on the 1972 Annual Conference, including preparations for it, is contained in his reports dated 18 January 1972, 10 March 1972 and 27 April 1972⁵⁹⁴. It comprises a mixture of documents stated to be IS' own internal material and HN343's account of the conference. The 18 January 1972 report submitted copies of the draft programme and a document entitled Political Perspectives for 1972 Conference. IS' revolutionary aims are readily apparent in this document. So too are the links between its ultimate revolutionary goal and issues on which it campaigned. For example, on industrial relations and trade unions it states: *"Revolutionaries have to recognise and take advantage of the tensions that exist between government / employers and the trade union apparatus. These can lead to the mobilisation of quite backwards sections of workers on a scale far beyond the powers of revolutionaries themselves. But we also have to recognise that at the same time the trade union bureaucracy will do its utmost to prevent a decisive confrontation between itself and the government / employers."*⁵⁹⁵ The strongly anti-racist section of the document entitled "Racialism" sets out thinking on the link between capitalism and racism, including

⁵⁹³ MPS-0731852

⁵⁹⁴ UCPI0000007937, UCPI0000007889 & UCPI0000007931

⁵⁹⁵ UCPI0000007937 at p.6 (of the Opus file), p.5 internally, 5th paragraph.

the statement that: *“Racialism will only be completely eradicated when capitalism is destroyed. But in our day-to-day work there are vital tasks to be undertaken”*⁵⁹⁶. It then sets out what the International Socialists stand for on the issue of race equality. A section on women’s rights analyses the then current position of women in society as: *“deeply rooted in the whole nature of capitalist society and is necessary for its survival”* before later concluding that: *“...the position of women is one of the most fundamental pillars of the system. Hence we must agitate for the democratic rights of woman in every area of her life.”*⁵⁹⁷

- 57.3.4. The 10 March 1972 report attached a copy of the Annual Report of IS’s National Committee for the forthcoming Annual Conference. The structure of the Committee’s sub-committees illustrates the issues on which IS was seeking to campaign, apparently with the ultimate goal of bringing about a socialist revolution. They included, amongst others, Youth, Student, Women’s, Irish, Immigration and Tenants sub-committees.
- 57.3.5. The 27 April 1972 report on the IS Annual Conference held between 1-3 April 1972 includes a long account of the proceedings. It portrays what appears to be a distant relationship between IS and mainstream politics. On relations with the Labour Party it recorded Tony Cliff in the following terms: *“He was sure future IS activity would attract many Labour Party members towards IS, although it should be emphasised that membership of IS entailed acceptance of IS discipline and operating within the bourgeois political structure only for propaganda purposes. Such persons would have to ensure that other Labour Party members were aware they had joined IS and of their reasons for doing so”*.⁵⁹⁸
 - 57.3.5.1. At p.6, para.28 the report summarises the report of the Industrial Sub-Committee including a long list of trades unions and industries in which IS fractions existed.
 - 57.3.5.2. In relation to young people paragraphs 42 and 43 summarise the report of the Youth Sub-Committee

⁵⁹⁶ UCPI0000007937 at pp.41-42 (of the Opus file), quotation at p.42, internal paragraph 7.

⁵⁹⁷ UCPI0000007937 at pp.42-43 (of the Opus file), quotations from internal paragraph 2. See also MPS-0735005, the report dated 17 November 1971 on a meeting of the Croydon branch of IS at which the then National Secretary, Duncan Hallas, spoke. According to HN343, there was general agreement that: *“more effort should be directed towards educating women as they represented huge potential support”*.

⁵⁹⁸ UCPI0000007931 p.3 para.15

recording that: *“it was hoped to build a militant youth section capable of acting in schools and in the sphere of youth unemployment”*. The same section further records a commitment to “youth work” within the Labour Party Young Socialists. We note this aspect in the knowledge that in relation to other SDS deployments we have come across reporting on children. We will be examining how and why reporting on children occurred and exploring whether there was any justification for it with other witnesses during the course of the Inquiry.

- 57.3.5.3. The section about the work of the Women’s Sub-Committee is at paragraphs 46-47 of the report. What is striking is how weak IS support for women’s rights is recorded as being: *“The whole debate was conducted in a minor key and it was significant that many male delegates took the opportunity to stretch their legs at that time”*.⁵⁹⁹ In exploring the issue of whether reporting on any given issue could have justified we will be examining not only on the nature of the issue (here a campaign for equality now long-since enshrined in domestic law) but also the potency of the group (even if revolutionary aspirations lay behind IS’s campaign for women’s rights, it appears to have had little if any revolutionary potency).
- 57.3.5.4. The connection between IS’s revolutionary goal and its campaigning against racism was made when the Immigration Sub-Committee reported to the conference, if HN343’s report is accurate. He summarised the speaker, Paul Foot, in these terms: *“Following recent police harassment, clearly shown in the Mangrove 9 and other trials, it was essential that IS had a realistic policy towards immigrant communities if they were to assist them in their struggle against racism and eventually bind them as an integral part of the revolutionary socialist struggle”*.⁶⁰⁰
- 57.3.5.5. IS’s stance on the question of Ireland is recorded at paras.52-55 of the report. If the report is accurate, the

⁵⁹⁹ See also MPS-0731851 on this theme: poorly attended meeting about women’s liberation.

⁶⁰⁰ UCPI0000007931 p.12 (Opus), paras.50-51.

Conference endorsed the group's official line which was of unconditional but critical support for the Provisional IRA. We note that the issue is recorded as having been divisive and that there was little support for PIRA terrorism in Great Britain. HN343 points out in his witness statement that the threat from Ireland related terrorism at the time was significant⁶⁰¹.

- 57.3.6. In addition to HN343's reporting on the April 1972 IS Annual Conference, many of his reports cover IS's activity in relation to industrial and trade union matters, campaigning for women's rights, immigration, tenants' rights and Ireland⁶⁰².
- 57.4. A number of HN343's reports concern the internal affairs of IS. Very early in his deployment HN343 reported on the outcome of the Special National Conference held in Birmingham on 4 December 1971 and, in particular, the decision to end the fusion between IS and the "Trotskyist Tendency". He thus completed reporting on this issue that had earlier been covered by HN339 "Stewart Goodman" (see above)⁶⁰³. It is a feature of the SDS' targeting of IS/SWP (and some other groups) that it sought to ensure continuity of reporting on the group.
- 57.5. A second example of HN343's reporting on the internal affairs of IS is his report dated 7 December 1971 relaying the results of recent elections to IS's National Committee⁶⁰⁴. We note this because of the accompanying praise from the Chief Superintendent recorded in the associated minute sheet: *"Very useful information which highlights the function of the SDS and reflects credit on [HN343]"*. That remark appears to be addressed to Special Branch's Commander Operations and the document was to be drawn to the attention of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner.

⁶⁰¹ HN343 witness statement, para.113

⁶⁰² See MPS-0731845, UCPI0000007897, UCPI0000007935, UCPI0000007938, UCPI0000017002, UCPI0000017012, UCPI0000017014, UCPI0000007920, UCPI0000017017 and UCPI0000017019-21 on trade union and industrial matters; MPS-0731848, MPS-0731851 and MPS-0735005 on women's rights; MPS-0731853, UCPI0000007939, UCPI0000016998, UCPI0000017022, UCPI0000017018 and UCPI0000017005 on immigration and anti-racism; MPS-0728859, UCPI0000007894, UCPI0000007958, MPS-0739209 and UCPI0000007986 on Ireland; and UCPI0000007895 and UCPI0000007934 on tenants' rights.

⁶⁰³ MPS-0731828 at para.4. See also MPS-0731852 & MPS-0731854 in relation to the split with the "Trotskyist Tendency".

⁶⁰⁴ MPS-0731855. Other examples of reporting on the internal affairs of IS include UCPI0000007891 (nominations for election to National Committee), UCPI0000007892 (elections to sub-committees following the Annual IS Conference), UCPI0000007897 (formation of International Socialists Information Service), UCPI0000007936 (formation / proposed formation of new branches), UCPI0000017015 (role of London Regional Committee), UCPI0000016999 (London Regional Committee establishing Commission of Inquiry to investigate the Fulham and Hammersmith branch), UCPI0000017017 (London Regional Aggregate meeting re. re-organisation and future work) and UCPI0000017018 (new IS branches).

- 57.6. A third example is a report attaching what appears to be an internal IS statistical report on new members recruited since its March 1973 Annual Conference. The report includes details of the trade unions to which the new recruits belong⁶⁰⁵.
- 57.7. HN343's reports contain intelligence relevant to the police of public order, as is typical of the SDS. For example, on 11 November 1972 he reported on the likely strength of IS support for the Anti-Internment League demonstration planned for the following day ("no more than 300 persons") together with details of the anticipated route and speakers⁶⁰⁶. In his witness statement HN343 states that he frequently witnessed disorder but that violence rarely came directly from IS members⁶⁰⁷. He provides a succinct appraisal, from the point of view of an undercover police officer, and in the political context of the time, of the SDS's contribution to the policing of public order at paragraph 175 of his witness statement: *"The MPS were, prior to the establishment of the SDS, completely unprepared to deal with the protests as it had very little intelligence to inform how its resources should be deployed. Resources deployed to deal with a demonstration would leave other areas of London under policed. By helping solve this problem my contemporaries and I made a very significant contribution to policing"*.
- 57.8. HN343's reporting refers to a number of justice campaigns with which the International Socialists were involved. For example there is a report on a demonstration in support of the "Stoke Newington 4"⁶⁰⁸. There is also a series of reports relating to IS' efforts to support the "Shrewsbury 24" justice campaign, including holding a rally attended by an estimated 900 people. We note these reports because one of the "Shrewsbury 24" was Eric Tomlinson, an applicant for core participant status. He is recorded as having been present at the rally⁶⁰⁹.
- 57.9. A report dated 28 November 1973(?) concerns IS's activity in relation to a Parliamentary by-election⁶¹⁰. In particular, it relates to IS's West London Region's involvement in the by-election, which is recorded as being aimed at opposing the far-right's involvement. The report includes an outline of IS' proposed campaigning activities. There is no

⁶⁰⁵ UCPI0000007908

⁶⁰⁶ MPS-0728859

⁶⁰⁷ HN343 witness statement, paras.122-129, especially 122 and 125.

⁶⁰⁸ UCPI0000008386

⁶⁰⁹ UCPI0000017019, UCPI0000017020 & UCPI0000017021 - Mr Tomlinson is better known to many as the actor Ricky Tomlinson. In the absence of more significant reporting about him, Mr Tomlinson has not been granted core participant status.

⁶¹⁰ UCPI0000017010 (year indistinct); see also UCPI0000017007, 17008 and 17009 for reporting on IS' Fight the Tories campaign in the autumn of 1972.

evidence of any restriction on the reporting of participation or campaigning in democratic elections evident in the documents relating to “John Clinton”. This is an issue that we will be following and exploring with other witnesses during the course of the Inquiry.

- 57.10. There are references in some of the reports to Members of Parliament. Bernadette Devlin MP is recorded as being expected to speak at an Anti-Internment League demonstration to be held on 11 November 1972⁶¹¹. She is also recorded as having opened and acted as a compere at a well-attended benefit concert held to raise funds for the benefit of strikers at a factory in Plymouth⁶¹². Michael Foot MP is recorded as being expected to speak at anti-racist demonstration organised by the Anti-Rhodesia Emergency Campaign Committee to be held on 13 February 1972⁶¹³. References of this nature are typical of the sort we have become accustomed to reading. HN343’s explanation for them is to the effect that his reports referred to them because they were speakers at the events in question and not because they were Members of Parliament⁶¹⁴.
- 57.11. As we have found normally to be the case, HN343’s reporting includes reports on individuals. For example, his report dated 10 November 1971 records on a recent recruit to the Croydon branch of IS. It includes the subject’s employment status and assessments of his intellect, propensity for violence and motivation for joining the group⁶¹⁵.
- 57.12. Typically for an SDS officer, this officer’s reporting contains references to many other groups which appear to arise in the context of his reporting on the International Socialists’ events, interests and activities⁶¹⁶. For example there is a reference to Amnesty International in the context of IS urging its members to support a demonstration being organised by the Anti-Rhodesia Emergency Campaign Committee in co-operation with the Anti-Apartheid Movement⁶¹⁷.
- 57.13. HN343 attended a wide range of events, both public and private, ranging from very small meetings attended by a handful of people to very large events attended by thousands⁶¹⁸.

⁶¹¹ MPS-0728859

⁶¹² UCPI00000017002

⁶¹³ UCPI0000007939

⁶¹⁴ HN343 witness statement at paras.147-8

⁶¹⁵ MPS-0731843. See also MPS-0739208 and MPS-0739209 for further reporting on an individual.

⁶¹⁶ See HN343 witness statement at paras.63-64 for his explanation as to how this occurred.

⁶¹⁷ UCPI0000007939. See also MPS-0731828, UCPI0000007894

⁶¹⁸ For example, 8 persons are reported as having attended the Croydon IS branch meeting held on 9 December 1972 (MPS-0731828). Approximately 2,500 persons are reported to have attended the IS National Industrial Conference held on 11 November 1973.

57.14. As to the management of HN343 within the SDS, his reports are usually countersigned by HN332 up until early February 1972⁶¹⁹ and thereafter usually by HN294. HN343 states that his deployment came to an end at his request and that management were supportive of him⁶²⁰.

HN338 – 4 May 1971 to 13 December 1973. Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 4 May 1971 to 11 May 1972; International Marxist Group 21 October 1971 to 13 December 1973 (particularly Notting Hill and West London branches); and Anti-Internment League 1 August 1972 to 5 March 1973

58. HN338 is deceased. The Inquiry has not been able to confirm HN338's cover name. Publication of his real name has been restricted⁶²¹. The Inquiry has obtained 46 intelligence reports associated with HN338 which have been included in the T1P1 hearing bundle together with 2 necessary minute sheets. The available evidence, in the form of 2 reports, suggests that it is possible that HN338 was operating with the SDS in April 1970 reporting on anti-apartheid activism⁶²². There is evidence, in the form of a Special Branch Memorandum dated 2 February 1971, that HN338 had obtained cover accommodation by early 1971⁶²³. The remainder of the reports relate to events in the period beginning on 4 May 1971 and ending on 13 December 1973⁶²⁴. It appears that HN338's SDS deployment spanned at least this later period. It is a deployment of medium length in comparison to other deployments which began around the same time and in keeping with the trend towards longer deployments that was developing at this time.

59. There are reports linked to HN338 on the VSC spanning a period of a year between 4 May 1971 and 11 May 1972⁶²⁵. Reporting on the IMG begins on 21 October 1971 and runs to 13 December 1973⁶²⁶. For a period of 7 months, between 1 August 1972 and 8 March 1973 there are reports concerning the AIL. The VSC, IMG and AIL are the main groups reported on. The evidence

⁶¹⁹ UCPI0000007941

⁶²⁰ HN343 witness statement, para.153

⁶²¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

⁶²² See MPS-0736224 and UCPI0000014400. Although the year is missing from the date on the second of these documents, our working assumption at this stage, based on the content of the document, is that it probably dates from 1970.

⁶²³ MPS-0730521

⁶²⁴ See UCPI0000005818 and UCPI0000015708.

⁶²⁵ UCPI0000005818 and UCPI0000005840

⁶²⁶ UCPI0000015677 and UCPI0000015708

suggests that IMG members were involved with both the VSC and AIL during this period. It is not completely clear whether HN338 infiltrated the IMG via the VSC or whether the whole deployment should be regarded as an infiltration of the IMG involving activity in other groups within which IMG members were active. The type of VSC meetings to which HN338 had access (small meetings of the VSC's Committee) and the nature of the discussions recorded in November 1971 (which describe a high degree of IMG control over the VSC), suggest that the latter may be the more probable explanation⁶²⁷. There are also two reports, over a year apart, on Agitprop⁶²⁸. In the later of these reports there is a suggestion of a link with the International Communist League (formerly the IMG). It therefore seems likely that this information may have come from the other groups reported on by HN338.

60. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the available reports.
 - 60.1. HN338's reports on the VSC suggest that he attended meetings of the VSC's Committee in two different public houses in North London on 4 May 1971⁶²⁹, 19 October 1971⁶³⁰ and 16 November 1971⁶³¹. According to the reports, these were small meetings of between 5 and 9 persons. It is not clear how HN338 got access to this committee. HN338's final report on the VSC, some months later, on 11 May 1972⁶³² concerned plans for a further such meeting due to be held on 16 May 1972.
 - 60.2. The content of the report of the VSC Committee meeting on 19 October 1971 concerns a planned demonstration due to be held on 6 November 1971. It portrays a group that was intending to be uncooperative with the police and hoping that a confrontation with the police would develop in front of the US embassy. If accurate, it appears to be useful intelligence for the purposes of public order policing. Some of HN338's other reports also contain information relevant to public order policing⁶³³.
 - 60.3. There is a report of a meeting of the editorial board of the publication "Indochina" dated 25 June 1971⁶³⁴. The meeting is stated to have involved 12 persons and to have taken place at a private flat. The

⁶²⁷ See especially UCPI0000005835

⁶²⁸ UCPI0000022386 and UCPI0000015693

⁶²⁹ UCPI0000005818

⁶³⁰ UCPI0000005832

⁶³¹ UCPI0000005835

⁶³² UCPI0000005840

⁶³³ For example UCPI0000008815 and UCPI0000010900

⁶³⁴ UCPI0000005823

discussion is recorded to have concerned future policy for the publication. We note this report in particular because it involves undercover reporting about journalistic activity.

- 60.4. HN338's penultimate report about the VSC is dated 17 April 1972⁶³⁵. It contains an up-to-date contact list for the members of the West London VSC. The reporting of membership or contact lists appears to have been a common feature of SDS reporting and we shall be investigating the reasons for that. Geographically, this report is consistent with a shift in HN338's activity, as recorded in the documents, from North London to West London, in early 1972. However, we have no further evidence of him reporting on, or infiltrating, the VSC in West London.
- 60.5. Prominent amongst HN338's reporting are his reports on 3 separate conferences: (a) the IMG/Spartacus League "Fusion Conference" in May 1972; (b) the AIL's October 1972 Annual Conference; and (c) the IMG's Annual General Conference in April 1973⁶³⁶. We have often found reports of conferences amongst SDS reporting. Of particular significance in this case are the laudatory comments of a number of senior officers recorded on a minute sheet in relation to the report on the 1973 IMG Annual Conference. They evidence the value attached to such reporting, the SDS and to an undercover officer who had, by that time, plainly developed a considerable understanding of the IMG⁶³⁷. The comments, which begin with the Chief Superintendent's and progress up the chain of command to the Assistant Chief Constable's, result in HN338 being recommended for a Deputy Assistant Commissioner's commendation. The comments also give an insight into senior officer's strategic thinking: they appear to show that the IMG was not, at that time, considered to be a current threat but that it had been and had the potential to be so again. They fall to be read with and compared to Tariq Ali's response to the same report which is set out in para.79 of his witness statement: *"I have to admit a certain admiration for his attention to detail and clear and concise explanations of the different tendencies. But was all this undercover work really necessary?"* Similarly, Piers Corbyn, at para.83 of his witness statement has opined: *"The report is well written...It is hard to see how any of this could justify infiltration by undercover officers, or Special Branch"*.

⁶³⁵ UCPI0000005838

⁶³⁶ UCPI0000015694, MPS-0728845 & MPS-0729047

⁶³⁷ MPS-0729093

- 60.6. The report on the AIL's October 1972 National Conference is a joint report signed by HN298, HN338 and HN301. HN338 appears normally to have operated alone. This is one of only two reports that are clearly joint reports⁶³⁸. We noted that the report itself, like some others, contains not only a factual record but also some comment and analysis. If it is an accurate record, some speakers appear to have spoken in support of the Provisional IRA, then an active terrorist organisation, which is relevant to the issue of justification. In this regard, there is a later report on the AIL, at which a Sinn Fein speaker also advocated violence, but which illustrates that the AIL's members were not wholly supportive of the speaker. In particular, it evidences the members' view that the conflict in Northern Ireland was a class war⁶³⁹.
- 60.7. Core participant Piers Corbyn is mentioned in a number of reports in connection with his political activism. These reports cover:
- 60.7.1. a meeting of the Notting Hill Spartacus League reported to have been held at Mr Corbyn's home on 19 January 1972⁶⁴⁰;
 - 60.7.2. a meeting of the Notting Hill IMG held on 29 March 1972 at which Mr Corbyn is stated to have spoken to a paper in which he used cyphers⁶⁴¹. HN338 provided a key to the majority of the cyphers;
 - 60.7.3. a joint meeting of the Notting Hill and West London branches of the IMG on 5 April 1972⁶⁴²;
 - 60.7.4. a meeting of the Notting Hill IMG in May 1972⁶⁴³;
 - 60.7.5. the May 1972 IMG/Spartacus League "Fusion Conference"⁶⁴⁴;
 - 60.7.6. a wide-ranging meeting of the West London International Communist League (formerly the IMG) held on 21 June 1972⁶⁴⁵;
 - 60.7.7. a leaflet attributed to Mr Corbyn which followed up a demonstration against racism⁶⁴⁶;

⁶³⁸ The 29 June 1972 report of the IMG / Spartacus League Fusion Conference is signed by HN338 and HN299/342. There is also an earlier report on the AIL, dated 1 August 1972, which is signed only by HN348 (MPS-0728922). It is not clear whether this is one of HN348's reports, a joint report, or a report based on HN338's intelligence. We have included it amongst HN338's documents because the subject matter is consistent with his known activity at the time, as evidenced by his other reports.

⁶³⁹ UCPI0000008059 (report dated 8 March 1973: see paras.6 & 7)

⁶⁴⁰ MPS-0732360

⁶⁴¹ UCPI0000008948

⁶⁴² UCPI0000008950

⁶⁴³ UCPI0000008954 – this report is of very poor copy quality.

⁶⁴⁴ UCPI0000015694

⁶⁴⁵ UCPI0000008797

⁶⁴⁶ UCPI0000008798

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 60.7.8. a meeting of the Notting Hill IMG at which Mr Corbyn is recorded as speaking about support for an industrial dispute⁶⁴⁷;
- 60.7.9. a meeting of the London Aggregate of the IMG held on 1 July 1972⁶⁴⁸;
- 60.7.10. a meeting at which concerns were said to have been raised about Mr Corbyn's leadership of the Notting Hill branch of the IMG⁶⁴⁹,
- 60.7.11. meetings of the West London IMG held on 30 August 1972⁶⁵⁰ and 13 September 1972⁶⁵¹
- 60.7.12. a meeting of the Notting Hill IMG on 20 September 1972⁶⁵²; and
- 60.7.13. the 1973 IMG Conference⁶⁵³.
- 60.7.14. a meeting of the West London IMG on 19 July 1972⁶⁵⁴.
- 60.8. Core participant Tariq Ali's political activity is referred to in four reports⁶⁵⁵. These include the reports on the May 1972 IMG / Spartacus League "Fusion Conference" and the 1973 IMG Conference in connection with his election to committee posts. He is recorded as a speaker at an IMG Vietnam rally held on 27 May 1972⁶⁵⁶ and as a speaker at a large public meeting held by the IMG, International Socialists and Socialist Labour League⁶⁵⁷. The subject of the latter meeting was "Police Oppression and Victimisation": it appears to be an example of intelligence gathering by a UCO in relation to protest against and concern about the police.
- 60.9. The IMG is reported as being active across a wide range of issues. These include racial equality, women's rights, involvement in industrial disputes and within trade unions. Many of the reports touch upon the IMG's activities in these fields.
- 60.10. There is a report on three individuals, dated 19 February 1973, that is of note in that it concerns three persons stated to have expressed an interest in the politics of the IMG and who were seeking more

⁶⁴⁷ UCPI000008799 – see also para.74 of Piers Corbyn's witness statement (to be published in Phase 2)

⁶⁴⁸ UCPI0000008130

⁶⁴⁹ UCPI0000008202

⁶⁵⁰ UCPI0000008813 (curiously, this report refers to Mr Corbyn having provided his apologies for absence (para.4) but also records him as present (para.9))

⁶⁵¹ UCPI0000008815

⁶⁵² UCPI0000008814

⁶⁵³ MPS-0729047

⁶⁵⁴ This document will be published as part of the Tranche 1, Phase 2 bundle.

⁶⁵⁵ An activist is referred to as having been compared to Mr Ali at a meeting at which Mr Ali was not present in a fifth report: UCPI0000008201 and para.77 of Mr Ali's witness statement.

⁶⁵⁶ UCPI0000015688

⁶⁵⁷ UCPI0000015700

information. It demonstrates that a person did not need to be an active member or supporter of a group in order to be the subject of an SDS report⁶⁵⁸. We will be following this theme as the investigation progresses. We are, for example, aware in Tranche 1 Phase 2 of an undercover officer, HN297, who appears from his own reporting to have gone a step further and actively recruited the persons upon whom he then reported.

- 60.11. One report, dated 27 April 1973, involves the Labour Party. In particular it concerns the terms on which the West London IMG might use the Hammersmith Labour Party's Committee Rooms. Reference to the Labour Party appears to be incidental to reporting on the West London IMG⁶⁵⁹.
- 60.12. There is a clear reference to the SDS, as such, in the minute sheet accompanying the report on the AIL dated 1 August 1972⁶⁶⁰. This is consistent with other evidence obtained by the Inquiry which suggests that this was the name by which the unit had become known by this point.

HN348 "Sandra" – Women's Liberation Front (latterly, Revolutionary Women's Union) – February 1971 to February 1973.

61. Publication of HN348 "Sandra's" real name is restricted.⁶⁶¹ She has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry and is due to give oral evidence. The Inquiry has obtained extensive reporting from her deployment which was focussed on a very small group interested in campaigning for and promoting women's rights. The Inquiry will examine why a group of this nature was targeted and, thereafter, reported on for two years. Although HN348 was not the first female officer deployed by the SDS, she appears to be the first example of a female officer tasked into a group in order to fit in. The reasons and justification behind this deployment will need to be explored.
62. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement and available reports.

⁶⁵⁸ UCPI0000008831

⁶⁵⁹ UCPI0000008295

⁶⁶⁰ MPS-0728922

⁶⁶¹ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/20180220-ruling-SDS-anonymity.pdf>

- 62.1. HN348 was invited to join the SDS by Peter Imbert, who later went on to become Commissioner of the MPS⁶⁶². She suspects that she was approached because she was a woman, and so could report on the women's movement⁶⁶³.
- 62.2. HN348 was tasked to report on the Women's Liberation Front ("WLF"). The report dated 22 January 1971, authored by HN45⁶⁶⁴, suggests that this group had come to attention of the SDS by this point, at the latest, through its links with the Revolutionary Marxist Leninist League. The report notes that a new branch was being established in North London⁶⁶⁵. The timing of this report is instructive, as HN348 begins to submit reports in her own name a matter of weeks later on this branch⁶⁶⁶. HN348 also comments that *"The Angry Brigade were linked to the women's movement and so were lots of other left-wing extremist groups that were latching onto it."*⁶⁶⁷ The Inquiry will need to consider to what extent this justified the initial infiltration of the WLF.
- 62.3. HN348 comments that *"the SDS was looking for links from smaller groups to really large organisations, such as the Irish movement....but I never found any links."*⁶⁶⁸ The Inquiry has obtained some evidence of reporting by this officer which contains details of individuals connected to Ireland or groups dedicated to Irish issues.⁶⁶⁹
- 62.4. A feature of some of the early reports authored by HN348 is the WLF's support for other small local campaign groups. One such group, the North London Alliance in Defence of Workers Rights, organised a number of demonstrations in the summer of 1971⁶⁷⁰. HN348 provided some prospective and retrospective intelligence on these demonstrations⁶⁷¹. She also provided intelligence on the group's ideology itself, reporting, *"it was generally agreed that only through the revolutionary overthrow of the existing establishment and by the setting-up of worker's power, could the majority escape exploitation and oppression."*⁶⁷²

⁶⁶² Witness statement para.8

⁶⁶³ Witness statement para.11

⁶⁶⁴ UCPI0000010567, referred to at paragraph 36.7 above.

⁶⁶⁵ Paragraph 5.

⁶⁶⁶ For example, UCPI0000026989, on 26 February 1971.

⁶⁶⁷ Witness statement para.11. Some, limited links between the RWU and the Angry Brigade can also be seen from UCPI0000008349.

⁶⁶⁸ Witness statement paras.34 and 35.

⁶⁶⁹ See UCPI0000026992, UCPI0000027025 and MPS-0728922.

⁶⁷⁰ UCPI0000027007, UCPI0000027006, UCPI0000025267, UCPI0000027020.

⁶⁷¹ Similarly, see UCPI0000011766 and UCPI0000008291.

⁶⁷² UCPI0000027013

- 62.5. It appears that indications were available from the very first reports provided by HN348 on the WLF, that the group's aims were primarily focused on social issues. A document titled 'Aims and Objectives' was appended to the first two reports obtained by the Inquiry for this officer⁶⁷³. This document lists the areas of interest for the group, inter alia, as promoting equal pay and opportunities for women, including maternity pay and access to contraception, and opposing discrimination against women (and children born out of wedlock) in the society.
- 62.6. HN348 attended and reported on the first Annual General Meeting of the WLF held on 6 February 1972⁶⁷⁴. Her report on this meeting suggests that it was attended by around 10 people, providing an indication of the influence of the group a year after she began reporting on it. The group's constitution was agreed at the meeting and listed 12 aims of the organisation. HN348 appears to have begun reporting on meetings of the Executive Committee of the WLF shortly after this meeting, on 16 February 1972⁶⁷⁵. At this smaller meeting it was agreed in principle that the group's name would be changed to the Revolutionary Women's Union ("RWU")⁶⁷⁶.
- 62.7. HN348 recalls using the first name "Sandra" during her deployment but states she does not remember what, if any, surname she used. Within the minutes to the Annual General Meeting of the WLF "*Sandra Davies*" is recorded as being appointed Treasurer of the group. HN348 states that she does not recall adopting this role but acknowledges, given the lack of other people called Sandra in the group, that she may have used this surname.⁶⁷⁷
- 62.8. Within a subsequent meeting report HN348 encloses a letter written by a member of the Executive Committee tendering their resignation⁶⁷⁸. The letter details the ideological divisions which had emerged within this small group and was discussed at subsequent meetings. "*Disruptive behaviour*" became a common theme at meetings⁶⁷⁹, resulting in three offending members being served with notices of official suspension⁶⁸⁰.
- 62.9. Another common feature of reports submitted by this officer is the low attendance at group meetings. Within a report of 8 May 1972, HN348

⁶⁷³ UCPI0000026988 and UCPI0000026989

⁶⁷⁴ UCPI0000010905

⁶⁷⁵ UCPI0000010906

⁶⁷⁶ Confirmed at a meeting on 17 February 1971 UCPI0000010908.

⁶⁷⁷ Witness statement para.23

⁶⁷⁸ UCPI0000010907

⁶⁷⁹ Both within the general group (UCPI0000010907) and the Executive Committee (UCPI0000008271).

⁶⁸⁰ UCPI0000010911 and UCPI0000010917

reports that the group was concerned about a lack of members and of “a general lack of enthusiasm towards activities”⁶⁸¹. Three days later HN348 reports that a meeting to “assemble as many as possible of the Socialist women involved in Women’s Liberation Movement to discuss the formation of a National Socialist Women’s Movement” was attended by two people⁶⁸². Why was a group which was attracting such small numbers, to pursue an agenda of social change, the subject of such a lengthy undercover deployment?

- 62.10. A campaign for better local nursery provision run by the RWU was frequently reported on by HN348⁶⁸³. On 15 June 1972 HN348 reports on a meeting of the RWU which was devoted to the discussion of a paper entitled “Nurseries for Working Women”⁶⁸⁴. HN348 notes “at present there appears to be very little militant action or campaigns being undertaken or being planned by the Revolutionary Women’s Union.”
- 62.11. Due to her involvement in the WLF/RWU, it appears that HN348 also provided reporting on Abhimanyu Manchanda and Diane Langford at around the same time they interacted with HN45⁶⁸⁵. The minutes to Annual General Meeting (above) record that they were expelled from the organisation.
- 62.12. In a report of 4 January 1972⁶⁸⁶ HN348 also recounted details of a letter which had been sent by the WLF to Banner Books – the bookshop which was being reported on by HN45 at around this time. The letter detailed an allegation that a member of the WLF had been having an affair with the husband of another member. By way of explanation HN348 says, “the accusation of an affair would also have been a potentially major event in the history of the WLF.”⁶⁸⁷
- 62.13. HN348 also reported on several conferences during her deployment:
 - 62.13.1. Around 6 months into her deployment HN348 appears to have attended the Women’s National Liberation Conference, held in Skegness on 15-17 October 1971. She provided a detailed (8 page) report into the events of the weekend⁶⁸⁸. Topics discussed in the programme of events included female sexuality, lesbianism, equal pay and sexism. It is also reported

⁶⁸¹ UCPI0000010913

⁶⁸² UCPI0000010914

⁶⁸³ See, for example, UCPI0000011752 and UCPI0000011755.

⁶⁸⁴ UCPI0000011753

⁶⁸⁵ See UCPI0000027021.

⁶⁸⁶ UCPI0000010931 – this report is of poor quality.

⁶⁸⁷ Witness statement, para.60

⁶⁸⁸ UCPI0000027017

- that the conference descended into minor violence on more than one occasion.
- 62.13.2. Soon after, HN348 also appears to have attended a conference on similar topics organised by the National Union of Students⁶⁸⁹.
- 62.13.3. In March 1972 HN348 reported on a Woman's Liberation conference held in Manchester⁶⁹⁰. She included information concerning the attendance of Angry Brigade sections, whom she described as *"far more prepared to become involved in open direct action and are self-confessed advocates of violence and disruption as a means of overthrowing the existing system of government. Many are emotionally unstable and quite paranoiacally opposed to men...Nevertheless it was evident that the majority of these women, particularly those occupied with the 'Angry Brigade' were not suffering from any physical or [indecipherable] aversion to the opposite sex as the majority appeared to have babies or young children. No doubt their attitudes are a consequence of broken marriages or unhappy relationships with men."*⁶⁹¹ HN348 was able to submit this detailed report along with around 50 pages of literature received at the conference. Once again, this also included mention of minor violence between attendees.
- 62.13.4. HN348 attended a Women's Liberation conference in Guildford on 3 June 1972. She described the attendees as *"a group of fairly moderate women with no particular political motivation who have recently been campaigning for nurseries in the Guildford area"*⁶⁹². She goes on to say *"the subjects discussed were of general concern to women with families – nurseries, community work, family clubs, education and liberation of women from household drudgery and isolation. Nothing was said of particular interest to Special Branch."*
- 62.13.5. HN348 also appears to have attended a National Women's Conference in Bristol on 9 and 10 September 1972⁶⁹³. This conference concerned contraception and abortion campaigns which were happening at the time.

⁶⁸⁹ UCPI0000008277

⁶⁹⁰ UCPI0000008274

⁶⁹¹ Paragraphs 34-35 of report. See also para.68 of HN348's witness statement.

⁶⁹² UCPI0000011768

⁶⁹³ UCPI0000011759 and witness statement para.72. The report of this conference obtained by the Inquiry has not been published due to its extremely poor document quality.

- 62.13.6. On 17 November 1972 HN348 submitted a report on the National Women's Liberation Conference held two weeks earlier in Acton⁶⁹⁴. This conference was organised by "Gay Woman" which HN348 notes as a "*loose knit libertarian group*". The conference was well attended and HN348 notes that "*those present were predominately 'middle class' and there was a very broad cross-section of the leftist political community. The majority were involved in either political or reformist groups and all appeared to be socialist to a greater or lesser degree.*"⁶⁹⁵ She goes on to report "*Lesbian friends in particular made exaggerated and noisy displays of affection openly kissing and hugging each other. These displays were common-place throughout the conference and it was not unusual to see two girls entwined in a corner. That little notice was taken by the majority of women present indicated the prevailing liberal attitude.*"⁶⁹⁶
- 62.13.7. The Inquiry will wish to explore why some of the matters mentioned were considered relevant to report.
- 62.14. HN348 was withdrawn "*as a precaution*"⁶⁹⁷ at the same time as HN45 and Jill Mosdell, when HN45 was recognised at a meeting by a member of the public. It therefore does not appear that HN348 was withdrawn due to a concerns about the justification for reporting on the activities of the RWU. It also appears that HN348 may have continued to submit a small number of reports in response to specific requests after she was withdrawn⁶⁹⁸.
- 62.15. HN348 notes "*[i]n hindsight, I was quite exposed at meetings being a young woman alone and with no backup or support, and with no one to supervise me.*"⁶⁹⁹ The Inquiry will explore what, if any, consideration was given to the welfare of those deployed as UCOs.
- 62.16. HN348 acknowledges "*I do not think my work really yielded any good intelligence, but I eliminated the WLF from public order concern*"⁷⁰⁰.
- 62.17. Notably, HN348 also comments that she had a genuine interest in the social issues which were being discussed by the WLF/RWU, and which, by modern standards, are uncontroversial⁷⁰¹. She draws a

⁶⁹⁴ UCPI0000008284

⁶⁹⁵ Paragraph 17

⁶⁹⁶ Paragraph 7

⁶⁹⁷ Witness statement para.107

⁶⁹⁸ UCPI0000011771 and UCPI0000014358.

⁶⁹⁹ Witness statement, para.16

⁷⁰⁰ Witness statement, para.34

⁷⁰¹ Witness statement, para,11

parallel to her experience as a women in the police service at that time where she was paid “90% of what the men were paid” despite having the same powers. She recalls receiving a pay rise when the Equal Pay Act (which specifically affected police pay⁷⁰²) became law⁷⁰³.

- 62.18. Looking back on her deployment, HN348 comments “*I question whether police officers should be undercover at all. It seems to me that perhaps undercover work should be dealt with by the Security Service, simply with links to senior police officers.*”⁷⁰⁴”

HN345 “Peter Fredericks” – Operation Omega - Action Bangla Desh – Black Power - Black Defence Committee – Young Haganah – A few months in 1971, including September 1971

63. Publication of HN345 “Peter Fredericks’s” real name is restricted⁷⁰⁵. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry and is due to give oral evidence. The Inquiry has been able to obtain very few documents from HN345’s deployment. The Hearing Bundle contains 5 documents, grouped in 4 electronic files⁷⁰⁶. The first three documents (2 files) pre-date HN345’s service in the SDS but illustrate, for comparative purposes, non-SDS Special Branch reporting. The last two files contain two reports, each of which concerns the Black Defence Committee. HN345’s deployment was short. His services were not retained beyond his probationary period. However, he is a rare example of an SDS officer with previous experience of undercover policing: a feature which permits a comparison to be made. Moreover, his tasking by the SDS to infiltrate Operation Omega and Black Power is unusual when compared to those of his contemporaries. We will be paying particular attention to why HN345 was tasked to infiltrate these groups and whether his deployment was justified. The infiltration of black protest groups is, of course, an important theme that the Inquiry will be examining throughout its work.

64. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the documents and witness statement.

⁷⁰² Equal Pay Act 1970, s8

⁷⁰³ Witness statement, para.48

⁷⁰⁴ Witness statement, para.133

⁷⁰⁵ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

- 64.1. HN345 states that he operated as a conventional undercover officer targeted against street criminals before joining either Special Branch or the SDS. In the course of his conventional deployment he passed on intelligence about both the Stop the Tour campaign and Black Power. He was then invited first to join Special Branch.
- 64.2. According to his statement, whilst in Special Branch, HN345 was already gathering intelligence on Operation Omega, a group (or collection of groups) that was delivering aid to Bangladesh (then East Pakistan) during the turmoil there that led to the country seceding from West Pakistan. He continued this work in the SDS, which he was invited to join, and also reported on the Black Power movement. The choice of target was not his but that of managers.
- 64.3. It is clear that the Inquiry has been unable to recover all of HN345's SDS reporting. The two reports that have been obtained relate to two relatively small meetings of the Black Defence Committee⁷⁰⁷.
- 64.4. HN345 may have reported on Young Haganah, a group that he states had nothing to do with the Israeli Haganah but was a left wing organisation supportive of Operation Omega's aims. HN345 states that he determined that the group was not a threat to public order⁷⁰⁸.
- 64.5. HN345 found the SDS work boring and the meetings that he covered routine compared to the "*more visceral*" street work that he had previously undertaken⁷⁰⁹. He considers that his tasking did not, with the benefit of hindsight, make the best use of resources⁷¹⁰. However, he also recalls that there was some public disorder associated with protests about events in Bangladesh⁷¹¹. As to why Black Power was of interest to the SDS he states: "*A rationale for targeting the Black Power movement was its subversive activities and the attendant risk of public disorder*".
- 64.6. HN345 observes that the SDS reported most things, whereas he had previously been used to reporting on what was out of the ordinary⁷¹². The breadth of information reported by the SDS does appear to be a striking feature of its mode of operation.

⁷⁰⁷ UCPI0000026455 & UCPI0000026456

⁷⁰⁸ Witness statement Opus p.22, para.57

⁷⁰⁹ Witness statement, para.15

⁷¹⁰ Witness statement, para.123

⁷¹¹ Witness statement, para.18 – although compare with the SDS 1971 Annual Report which states that demonstrations in relation to events in Pakistan and Bangladesh were "*spectacular in their orderliness and co-operation with police*": MPS-0728971, p.5, para.12.

⁷¹² Witness statement, para.16

- 64.7. HN345 participated in flyposting and witnessed a theft from a chip shop but he did not witness any serious criminal offending amongst those that he infiltrated whilst in the SDS.

Phase 1 Managers

HN325 – Conrad Dixon – Head of the SDS from 30 July 1968 to July 1969

65. HN325 Conrad Dixon is deceased. There is no restriction on the publication of his real name and his cover name, if he had one, is unknown. His Central Record of Service indicates that he joined the police in December 1947 and he was transferred to Special Branch on 29 May 1950⁷¹³. The SDS under his command was founded on 30 July 1968. He remained in his post until July 1969 when his second in command, Detective Inspector Saunders, took over.
66. Documents linked to CI Dixon show that he had been involved in the policing of the VSC demonstrations of March 1968 and thereafter set up the SDS as a primarily intelligence gathering unit to assist the police response to VSC demonstrations planned for October 1968. Policing of the October Demonstrations was deemed to be highly effective with little of the violence and damage seen at the March demonstration and the SDS were credited with its success. Thereafter funding was extended for the ongoing operation of the SDS. Throughout his time in the SDS CI Dixon appears to have carried out undercover duties as well as managerial duties, a practice which was followed by managers who served with him but ceased thereafter. In her witness statement HN328 Joan Hillier who served under CI Dixon describes the SDS under his leadership as follows: *"I think Conrad Dixon managed the SDS very well, he knew he was asking a difficult job of people and he let them get on with it. He was always there and available for discussion and was very approachable, the whole squad was very informal...there wasn't really a chain of command, there was just the Chief Inspector, Conrad Dixon. After October 1968 however the squad did change and it became a bit more professional with more of a structure in the command"*.⁷¹⁴
67. An analysis of the documents associated with CI Dixon give rise to the following observations and questions:

⁷¹³ MPS-0722818

⁷¹⁴ HN328 witness statement paras.21-22

- 67.1. Prior to the formation of the SDS CI Dixon appears to have been part of a unit that was involved in the policing of the March 1968 VSC demonstrations and dealt with its aftermath. He was the author of a comprehensive report about events of that day dated 2 April 1968⁷¹⁵. At the request of the Director of Public Prosecution he provided a report containing figures for the prosecution outcomes of those charged and the status of those with cases pending following the March demonstrations⁷¹⁶. He signed off a report by a junior officer reporting his attendance at a film 'The Demonstration' which attaches his shorthand notes of a speech made by a student, David Clark, during the course of it.
- 67.2. Once the SDS had been set up it appears that much of the intelligence regarding the October 1968 was funnelled through CI Dixon as head of the unit⁷¹⁷.
- 67.3. Throughout his period of service at the SDS he attended activist meetings either with other members of the SDS or alone:
- 67.3.1. A report dated 30 July 1968 with detailed reporting of a meeting of supporters of the Ad Hoc Committee for the 27 October Demonstration is signed by CI Dixon. Abhimanyu Manchanda and Tariq Ali were attendance and addressed the meeting⁷¹⁸.
- 67.3.2. On 11 September 1968 with HN332 he attended a meeting of the North West London Ad Hoc Committee of the VSC. Ernest Tate addressed the meeting⁷¹⁹.
- 67.3.3. On 17 September 1968 CI Dixon is shown on a Routine Meeting report as in attendance at a meeting of the VSC October 27 Ad Hoc Committee at which the targets of the demonstration to be held on 27 October 1968 were discussed⁷²⁰. Of the 250 people in attendance 8 of them were SDS officer, 4 of whom occupied managerial roles (CI Dixon, HN332; HN3093 Roy Creamer; DI Saunders) and four of whom were field officers (HN318 Raymond Wilson HN327 David Fisher; HN329 "John Graham"; HN218 Barry Moss)⁷²¹.
- 67.3.4. He attended a number of other meetings of the North West London Ad Hoc Committee of the VSC in the run up to the

⁷¹⁵ MPS-0722106

⁷¹⁶ MPS-0730912

⁷¹⁷ MPS-0730912

⁷¹⁸ MPS-0738693

⁷¹⁹ MPS-0738815

⁷²⁰ MPS-0738583

⁷²¹ See summary in respect of HN329.

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

October Demonstrations, often with either HN332 or HN329⁷²². He continued to attend VSC meetings after the October Demonstration⁷²³ and was a regular attender of the Camden branch of the VSC, in particular, which he attended alone⁷²⁴.

- 67.4. In his witness statement HN329, who served under CI Dixon, recalled that CI Dixon grew a beard to assist his undercover attendance at activist meetings⁷²⁵. HN336 goes further. He recalls a period during his deployment when he infiltrated the Camden branch of the VSC, previously frequented by CI Dixon *“Conrad Dixon had been involved at the very start with them as an undercover. They used to talk about him from time to time long after he had moved on. He used to dress as a yachtsman and he became a figure of fun”*⁷²⁶.
- 67.5. Prior to the October Demonstration the intelligence obtained through his own and others attendance at activist meetings and other events was collated, filtered and processed by him into weekly reports⁷²⁷. Following the demonstration CI Dixon drafted a report on the future direction of the VSC⁷²⁸.
- 67.6. From the outset there is an indication that the SDS and the Security Service worked closely together.
- 67.6.1. A Security Service note for file dated 2 August 1968 indicates that the Security Service were informed about the formation of the SDS during a meeting between the Heads of Special Branch, CI Dixon and the Security Services regarding the policing of the October Demonstration. The purpose of the squad was said to be to co-ordinate intelligence for the operation. It was agreed at that meeting that one of CI Dixon’s squad should be attached to the Security Service so as to be able to see the information in the hands of the Security Service and plan such use as could be made of it⁷²⁹.
- 67.6.2. A further note dated 29 August 1968 summarises the SDS and its relevance to the Security Service as follows: *“Special Branch have set up a special squad under Dickson [sic],*

⁷²² MPS-0733973; MPS-0733952; MPS-0738435

⁷²³ See for example MPS-0730768, a meeting attended by 5 officers, 4 of whom were SDS officers

⁷²⁴ UCPI0000007757; UCPI0000007758 UCPI0000007760; UCPI0000007762; UCPI0000007761; UCPI0000007693; UCPI0000007695; UCPI0000007764; UCPI0000007700

⁷²⁵ HN329 witness statement, para.104

⁷²⁶ HN336 witness statement, para.63

⁷²⁷ MPS-0730061; MPS-0730065; MPS-0730066; MPS-0730063; MPS-0730064; MPS-0730095; MPS-0730096; MPS-0730084; MPS-0730091; MPS-0730092

⁷²⁸ MPS-0730094

⁷²⁹ UCPI0000030045

*bearded and unwashed males and scruffy females, who are participating in demonstrations where they make contact with students, and then hope to turn them and use them as short-term informers...any information which they pick up this way which they think might be of interest to us will be passed on*⁷³⁰.

- 67.6.3. A Police Memo dated 29 November 1968 indicates that at an early stage the SDS was partly funded by the Security Services who provided £3000 at 2 monthly intervals to maintain SDS premises⁷³¹. The Inquiry will explore the nature of the relationship between the Security Services and the SDS as it developed over time.
- 67.7. Following the October Demonstrations it appears that CI Dixon applied for funding for the continued operation of the SDS. In a minute sheet dated 8 November 1968 Chief Superintendent Cunningham considers CI Dixon's request for further funding to enable the SDS to continue its operations: *"As you are aware the information obtained by Chief Inspector Dixon's men during the months preceding the "Autumn Offensive" demonstration was invaluable. We were able to provide 'A' Department with accurate and comprehensive assessments of the covert plans made by the numerous organisations taking part prior to the demonstration, and on the day officers of this special squad were able to relay rapidly to C.O details of diversionary tactics employed by the demonstrators...I am convinced that with discretion there are handsome dividends to be earned in this field and that the operation so successfully begun should be continued – a further demonstration is planned for March 1969"*. The minute sheets (covering a period between 1968 and 1974) repeatedly approve the re-financing of the SDS on the basis of the efficacy of its methods and the benefits to both standard policing and the Security Service⁷³². The documents appear to show that the primary concern regarding the continued operation of the SDS was financial. The Inquiry will be exploring what scrutiny was given to the methods employed by the SDS by those who repeatedly approved its continuation.
- 67.8. Following the approval for the continuation of the operation of the SDS, CI Dixon sets out his vision for the Squad in a document entitled *Penetration of Extremist Groups* dated 26 November 1968⁷³³.

⁷³⁰ UCPI0000030046

⁷³¹ MPS-0724118

⁷³² MPS-0730219

⁷³³ MPS-0724119

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 67.8.1. The preamble lays down this marker “[This document] *does not pretend to explore all the problems posed when Police officers are utilised for the close infiltration of extremist organisation but attempts to lay down basic principles for that type of operation*”. CI’s Dixon’s intention was that the primary object of the SDS would be to provide information in relation to public order problems “*the secondary by-product is that our knowledge of extremist organisations, and individuals active in them, is considerably enhanced*”. The Inquiry will be considering how these objectives were adhered to over the life of the SDS.
- 67.8.2. CI Dixon recommends that the SDS be composed of, not less than twelve officer and no more than twenty to maximise coverage but ensure personal guidance and daily detailed supervision could be maintained. CI Dixon advised that supervision of field officers should be undertaken by Detective Inspectors who should be retained at a ratio of one to every three field officers with the supervising officers having particular responsibilities for their own three person teams. The Inquiry will be looking with care at the management structure of the SDS and level of supervision provided to SDS field officers over the life of the SDS.
- 67.8.3. CI Dixon’s idea was that the Detective Inspectors could also be employed on “*certain delicate assignments in groups where great experience is required and on general enquiry and assessment duties and as liaison officers with the parallel organisation in the Security Service*”. The demarcation of roles within the SDS will be a matter explored by the Inquiry.
- 67.8.4. CI Dixon recommended that the length of SDS deployment should be for no longer than twelve months “*unless there are special circumstances why [the officer] should be retained for a longer period*”. This time limitation was in recognition of the “*nervous strains involved in this work*”. Within a year of CI Dixon leaving the SDS this general policy was abandoned. A Security Service note on agent-handling dated 22 September 1969, shortly after CI Dixon’s departure, describes the Special Branch use of both civilian informants and SDS police agents in this way: “*these tactics, improvised of necessity at short notice to deal with riot conditions, paid off handsomely in containing demonstrations when used in conjunction with intelligence derived from other MPSB and Security Services sources*”.

*However, with one or two notable exceptions, these MPSB informants have not been capable of deep and long term penetration of the revolutionary organisations. Admittedly, it is not easy to achieve such penetration because [of the nature, characteristics and structure of the groups]*⁷³⁴. The Inquiry will be exploring the reasons for the increasing length of SDS deployments.

- 67.8.5. CI Dixon evidently envisaged an evidential policing role for the SDS, not merely an intelligence gathering one: *“When we are in a position to obtain evidence about a serious offence arrangements have to be made so that it is obtained by an “uncommitted” officer, and thus avoid compromising an undercover man. An “uncommitted” officer is an essential part of the unit; women officers fill the role extremely well and can be taken to public or private gatherings where the evidence is obtainable with little risk of denunciation”*. HN323 Helen Crampton occupied this role during the CI Dixon’s period in the SDS⁷³⁵. The Inquiry will be exploring the extent to which an evidential as opposed to an intelligence role was pursued in the SDS over the years that followed.
- 67.8.6. CI Dixon stipulated that on joining the Squad, each officer should supply an autobiography covering his new identity and, after inconsistencies have been eradicated, he will obtain the necessary papers to confirm that identity. The Inquiry will be considering the guidance given to undercover officers about the choice and development of their cover identities.
- 67.8.7. CI Dixon warned that officers should take care not to get into a position of responsibility within the target group and they must not take office, chair meetings, draft leaflets, speak in public or initiate activity. This injunction too appears to have been abandoned. The Inquiry will be considering what guidance was offered to officers regarding their positions of authority within their target groups over the life of the SDS.
- 67.8.8. CI Dixon’s documents finishes as follows: *“The Squad should be autonomous, independently-financed and flexible. The personnel should be free of extraneous duties, and given full scope for initiative...success in this field depends on the unfettered enthusiasm of a small closely-knit group working in*

⁷³⁴ UCPI0000030903

⁷³⁵ See summary in respect of HN323

harmony for a common object, and possessing that high morale engendered in elite groups by the knowledge of their special and exclusive function". The Inquiry will be considering the culture of the SDS and the extent of the regulation by oversight bodies.

HN1251/HN371 – Philip Saunders – Detective Inspector and second in command in the SDS from July 1968. Head of the SDS between November 1969 and August 1971.

68. HN1251/HN371 Philip Saunders is deceased. There is no restriction on the publication of his real name and his cover name, if he had one, is unknown. He joined the SDS at its inception as Detective Inspector of the unit and second in command to HN325 Chief Inspector Dixon. He became head of the unit in November 1969 and was promoted to Chief Inspector in early 1970. In August 1971 he was succeeded by HN332 and went on to become a Chief Superintendent of Special Branch. Documents linked to him appear to show that he occasionally attended activist meetings of groups targeted by the SDS but that his primary role was managerial. Under his management the SDS broadened its coverage of left wing groups and pro-Irish groups. The duration of undercover deployments also increased.
69. An analysis of the documents linked to DI Saunders gives rise to the following observations and questions:
- 69.1. In a report dated 16 August 1968, in view of the an application made by the VSC to hold public meeting in Trafalgar Square on 26 October 1968, DI Saunders set out the state of knowledge regarding the VSC's intention to hold a demonstration in October 1968 – "the Autumn Offensive". This discursive document draws on intelligence gathered by SDS officers' attendance at VSC meetings⁷³⁶.
- 69.2. On 17 September 1968 DI Saunders is shown on a Routine Meeting report as in attendance at a meeting of the VSC October 27 Ad Hoc Committee at which the targets of the demonstration to be held on 27 October 1968 were discussed⁷³⁷. Of the 250 people in attendance 8 of them were SDS officer, 4 of whom occupied managerial roles (HN325 CI Conrad Dixon; HN332; HN3093 Roy Creamer; DI Saunders) and

⁷³⁶ MPS-0730062

⁷³⁷ MPS-0738583

- four of whom were field officers (HN318 Raymond Wilson; HN327 David Fisher; HN329 “John Graham”; HN218 Barry Moss)⁷³⁸.
- 69.3. DI Saunders also attended a meeting of the October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, held on 3 October 1968⁷³⁹. This was a group, headed by Manchanda, which had split from the VSC and was more militant in nature. During the course of the meeting Manchanda *“denounced the VSC Committee ...for its failure to include Grosvenor Square in its itinerary for the demonstration”*. Another leading figure in the Solidarity for Vietnam group, Adolfo Olaechea reportedly stated that *“the demonstrators had no wish to clash with police but if they chose to defend the American Embassy, the symbol of imperialism throughout the world, it was probable that there would be trouble”*. Of the 60 people in attendance 3 were SDS officers: DI Saunders, HN327 David Fisher and HN318 Raymond Wilson.
- 69.4. A police telegram dated 27 October 1968 from DI Saunders to Chief Superintendent Special Branch indicates that he took an active policing role on the 27 October 1968, the day of the demonstration: he reports that he has been with a group anarchists who have broken away from the main march and engaged in *“hooliganism”* in vicinity of Grosvenor Square, confronting police. It is unclear whether DI Saunders was present in an overt or covert policing capacity.⁷⁴⁰
- 69.5. Despite the entry at Annexe A of The Penetration of Extremist Groups document which indicates that he was due to leave the SDS after the May 1969 demonstration⁷⁴¹, by late November 1969 DI Saunders, still a Detective Inspector, had taken charge of the SDS⁷⁴² (whose continued operation had been approved) and there is no further reference to him attending meetings of target groups. His name appears instead on letters requesting funds to support the continued operation of the SDS⁷⁴³.
- 69.6. His name also appears on a number of police telegrams communicating intelligence obtained from SDS field officers regarding forthcoming demonstrations/pickets/possible disorder to Commander Special Branch⁷⁴⁴.

⁷³⁸ See summary in respect of HN329

⁷³⁹ MPS-0733939

⁷⁴⁰ MPS-0733954

⁷⁴¹ MPS-0724119

⁷⁴² See MPS-0730219 p11

⁷⁴³ MPS-0724107; MPS-0724099; MPS-0724098; MPS-0724136; MPS-0724134

⁷⁴⁴ MPS-0736078; MPS-0733221; MPS-0746715

- 69.7. DI Saunders drafted the SDS Annual Reports for 1969 and 1970⁷⁴⁵. In the 1969 report he sets out the SDS operational position as follows:

Following the October 27th Vietnam Demonstration it was decided that the Squad should continue to operate but within a broader spectrum of the political extremist left-wing. The difficulties were foreseeable and proved by events. The Vietnam issue which briefly united the extremist factions appear, temporarily at least, to have lost its appeal and to date no alternative unifying cause has been found. None of the potentially troublesome groups has been able to rally significant support for the various issues they have raised and a feeling of frustration and even lethargy is evident amongst them. It is know that the absence of serious public disorder is in part due to the increased efficiency of police, both in obtaining advanced information of potentially disorderly demonstrations and in handling them on the day.

Be that as it may, the task of anticipating which of the factions might well be successful in fermenting disorder, in sufficient time to penetrate them, has been the preoccupation of the Squad.”

In due course the Inquiry will consider the extent to which the SDS Annual Reports accurately reflected the operational successes and intelligence reach of the SDS.

- 69.8. In the 1970 report dated 18 November 1970 DCI Saunders appears to signal the operational need to move away from the recommendation set out in “Penetration of Extremist Groups” of deployments of 12 months maximum period: *“the surveillance of established organisations, once penetration has been achieved, depends mainly on the skill of the officer but those groups which mushroom in response to topical matters often present but brief opportunities for infiltration which can only be seized if a suitably “qualified” officer is available – this, of course is a problem in recruitment and administration. It is accepted that the longer an officer serves in this field the greater is his product but it is a fact that only one of the original officers on the Squad remains – due to the progress of the others in their careers and the influence of their domestic duties”*. The Inquiry will be exploring how and why the length of SDS undercover deployments began to increase in this period.

⁷⁴⁵ MPS-0728973 – 1969 Annual Report; MPS-0728972 – 1970 Annual Report

- 69.9. Whilst it appears that the SDS field officer routinely signed off their own intelligence reports during this time (which were then countersigned by the head of the SDS and the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch)⁷⁴⁶ there are some examples of reports signed off by SDS management, rather than the undercover officer responsible for the content of the report. The reporting of HN68, for example, who was deployed in to Irish campaign groups (ICRSC, NICRA and Sinn Fein) was routinely signed off by SDS management although it is usually clear that the intelligence contained in the reports emanated from HN68 because his cover name “Sean Lynch” appears on the face of the documents as an attendee of the event reported on⁷⁴⁷. The reason for this is unclear but may reflect the nature of the officer’s deployment.
- 69.10. On 21 February 1971 DCI Saunders intervened to direct the course of local police action in respect of HN68, who, together with two men, was stopped by uniformed police in his undercover role when engaged in an unauthorised collection for the Republican Prisoners Dependants Fund⁷⁴⁸. The document evidences local police were directed to mark a HORT2 relating to HN68’s cover vehicle as in order and to recommend a caution for the street collecting offences in order to keep Special Branch “*in the background*”⁷⁴⁹.
- 69.11. DCI Saunders recommended the award of the Commissioner’s Commendation to HN135 at the time of his re-deployment in July 1971 for his role in enabling the police to “*anticipate and frustrate the machinations of demonstrators bent on provoking civil disorder*”⁷⁵⁰.

HN332 - Detective Inspector in the SDS from July 1968 to mid-1969. Head of the SDS between August 1971 mid-1972.

70. HN332 is unable to provide a witness statement due to ill health. There is a restriction on publication of his real name⁷⁵¹. His cover name, if he had one, is unknown. He occupied a management role in the SDS at its inception as a Detective Inspector. He is attributed the duty ‘Poster Workshop’ in Annexe A of Penetration of Extremist Groups. It would appear that he left the SDS sometime in mid-1969 returning to become head of the SDS in August 1971,

⁷⁴⁶ See for example MPS-0732551

⁷⁴⁷ See for example UCPI0000016063

⁷⁴⁸ MPS-0735864

⁷⁴⁹ See also summary in respect of HN68

⁷⁵⁰ MPS-0724135. See also summary in respect of HN135

⁷⁵¹ https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf

succeeding DCI Saunders. Documents linked to him show that, as with other managers of this era, he regularly attended the meetings of SDS target groups together with field officers and, as a Detective Inspector, undertook various other duties outwith his management role. In 1971 the SDS began reporting on women's liberation groups and from this time there was an increasing emphasis on anti-racist campaign groups.

71. An analysis of the documents which can be linked to him raises the following observations:

71.1. There is some evidence in the documents related to HN332 at a very early stage that his SDS work was not entirely related to undercover policing: on 4 September 1968 he reports information obtained from a "*source of unknown reliability*" about the support to be given to the October Demonstration by the International Socialists and the Young Liberals;⁷⁵² on 5 September 1968 at the behest of the Chief Superintendent of Special Branch he attended on Lady Jane Birdwood ("*well known to Special Branch for her anti-communist views and activities*") together with Detective Inspector Riby Wilson, another member of SDS management, to reassure her that the police were aware of the October Demonstrations and taking them seriously⁷⁵³; on 13 September he dealt with a report from the "Wanstead Crime Collator" of the recent thefts of copper steralising drums and street electric light time-switches. The information had been passed to the SDS because it was suspected that these thefts had a connection to the forthcoming October Demonstrations⁷⁵⁴.

71.2. He, like other managers of this era did however undertake an undercover role in the earlier part of his deployment

71.2.1. A report dated 16 September 1968 indicates that HN322 undertook a patrol of proposed site of meeting of Kilburn VSC together with HN334, an undercover officer and author of the report⁷⁵⁵.

71.2.2. On 17 September 1968 HN322 is shown on a Routine Meeting report as in attendance at a meeting of the VSC October 27 Ad Hoc Committee at which the targets of the demonstration to be held on 27 October 1968 were discussed⁷⁵⁶. Of the 250 people in attendance 8 of them were SDS officer, 4 of whom occupied

⁷⁵² MPS-0738581

⁷⁵³ MPS-0738582

⁷⁵⁴ MPS-0738579

⁷⁵⁵ MPS-0738580

⁷⁵⁶ MPS-0738583

managerial roles (HN325 CI Conrad Dixon; HN332; HN3093 Roy Creamer; DI Saunders) and four of whom were field officers (HN318 Raymond Wilson; HN327 David Fisher; HN329 “John Graham”; HN218 Barry Moss)⁷⁵⁷.

- 71.2.3. He attended a number of other VSC meetings, often with HN325 Chief Inspector Dixon and HN329 in advance of the October Demonstration⁷⁵⁸ and after the demonstration there are a number of reports indicating that he attended meetings of the Camden branch of the VSC alone⁷⁵⁹.
- 71.3. As observed above in the summary concerning DI Saunders, as Chief Inspector of the SDS, HN332 signed reports containing the intelligence gathered by HN68 during his infiltration of Irish campaign groups⁷⁶⁰. He also signed a number of reports into the London Irish Solidarity Campaign⁷⁶¹. It is not known whether he attended meetings of this group or he signed these reports on behalf of another member of the SDS.
- 71.4. In a document drafted in early 1972 he recommends that HN45 take over and run Banner Books, a Maoist bookshop in Camden, for a period of a couple of weeks in order to (1) build up his profile in Maoist circles; (2) introduce him to the inner workings of Banner Books; (3) allow him access to records and mailing lists of persons of interest to Special Branch; and (4) enable him to provide a plan of the book shop and have access to keys of the premises⁷⁶². This gives an indication of what senior managers considered to be information of use to Special Branch. The Inquiry will explore the increasing tendency of SDS officers to achieve positions of responsibility within their target groups.
- 71.5. In the 1971 Annual Report, signed by HN332, he writes “*The high proportion of single officers has helped to reduce the inherent social problems encountered by this type of work*”. The Inquiry will be exploring to what extent the marital status of undercover officers was of importance to the SDS and why.
- 71.6. A handwritten note dated 27 January 1975 from HN332 indicates that he has commissioned a documented history of the Squad “*before members of the original ‘Hairies’ memories fade*”. He adds “*in future*”

⁷⁵⁷ See summary in respect of HN329

⁷⁵⁸ MPS-0733973; MPS-0722099; MPS-0722099; MPS-0733952; MPS-0738435

⁷⁵⁹ UCPI0000007752; UCPI0000007766; UCPI000005800

⁷⁶⁰ See for example UCPI0000008136; MPS-0738310; MPS-0728445

⁷⁶¹ See MPS-0738299; MPS-0738301; MPS-0738302

⁷⁶² MPS-0730515 – this document is signed by HN332 but appears under the documents linked to HN294 in error. See also summary in respect of HN45.

years it may help future SB historians". The note indicates that "only one copy will be made – for obvious reasons". The Inquiry have not been able to locate any such document.

HN294 - Detective Sergeant and then Detective Inspector in the SDS from 1969. Head of the SDS mid-1972 to 1974

72. HN294 is deceased. There is a restriction on the publication of his real name⁷⁶³ and his cover name, if he used one, is unknown. He appears to have joined the SDS in 1969. References to him in the documents show that he was a Detective Sergeant in the early days of his deployment⁷⁶⁴ but by June 1970 had been promoted to Detective Inspector⁷⁶⁵ and in March 1972 he was signing documents as the Acting Chief Inspector of the SDS⁷⁶⁶.
73. An analysis of the documents linked to him give rise the following observations:
- 73.1. A very small number of documents have been seen by the Inquiry relating to HN294's period in the SDS as a Detective Sergeant. Examples are a minute sheet dated September 1969 praising his report on the subject of the International Socialists involvement in Northern Irish Affairs⁷⁶⁷ another is a report dated 9 December 1969 relating to the prospective travel of Abhimanyu Manchanda⁷⁶⁸. It is not known if the existence of these reports indicate that HN294 was deployed undercover before taking on his managerial role.
- 73.2. HN294 sent a number of police telegrams disseminating intelligence derived from SDS field officers to dated Special Branch⁷⁶⁹.
- 73.3. A Security Service Note for File indicates that HN294 informed the Security Service of SDS presence at the forthcoming Progressive Intellectuals Study Group on 3-5 December 1971⁷⁷⁰. In Penetration of Extremist Groups⁷⁷¹ CI Dixon had envisaged an SDS DI acting as a liaison officer with the parallel organisation in the Security Service. The

⁷⁶³ <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/20171205-anonymity-ruling-SD-Dec-2017.pdf>

⁷⁶⁴ MPS-0736122

⁷⁶⁵ MPS-0739227

⁷⁶⁶ MPS-0730581

⁷⁶⁷ MPS-0736122

⁷⁶⁸ MPS-0739232

⁷⁶⁹ MPS-0739327; MPS-0732633

⁷⁷⁰ UCPI0000014390

⁷⁷¹ MPS-0724119

Inquiry will be exploring the relationship between SDS management and the Security Service throughout the life of the SDS.

- 73.4. From 1 March 1972 onwards HN294 took on the responsibility of drafting letters requesting funds to support the continued operation of the SDS⁷⁷².
- 73.5. During HN294's tenure in the SDS the custom of senior management signing reports containing intelligence gathered by certain field officers appears to have continued. HN294's signature appears on intelligence reports concerning the Irish Solidarity Campaign, a group reported on by HN340 whose name appears as an attendee⁷⁷³, the Anti-Internment League, a group reported on by HN344 whose name also appears on the reports⁷⁷⁴ and the Northern Minority Defence Force, also reported on by HN344⁷⁷⁵ and the Irish Civil Rights Association, reported on by HN68 whose name appears on the reports⁷⁷⁶. This practice of signing a report as though the author of it, in HN294's case, on occasion leads to him signing as both a Detective Inspector and then as a Chief Inspector to whom the report was submitted⁷⁷⁷. The Inquiry will consider whether the content of intelligence reports was subject to any regulation by managers and if so, why and how this took place.
- 73.6. After the arrest of HN298, together with core participants Jonathan Rosenhead and Ernest Rodker and others, outside the Star & Garter hotel on 12 May 1972, HN294 sought advice about the course to take from the Commander Operations Special Branch:

"...[HN298] was left with a difficult decision: whether on learning of the extremists plan, to withdraw and inform me so that counter-measures could be taken, which would almost certainly have exposed him at the very least as a police informant, or to go along with them in the hope that he would learn more of what seems to be a new combination of extremists. He chose to do the latter....the decision on which I should be obliged for your guidance is whether [HN298] should continue his attempt to learn more of them. To do this he will probably have to apply, as they are doing, for legal aid and attend meetings with all those arrested to discuss tactics etc. Whilst I am reasonably confident that [HN298] could, with assistance, carry this off, there is, of course

⁷⁷² MPS-0730581; MPS-0724172; MPS-0724165; MPS-0724154; MPS-0724155

⁷⁷³ See for example UCPI0000007946

⁷⁷⁴ See for example UCPI0000007945

⁷⁷⁵ See for example MPS-0734410

⁷⁷⁶ See for example MPS-0737801

⁷⁷⁷ See for example MPS-0734408; MPS-0734409; MPS-0728828

the potential of embarrassment to police if his true identity should ever be disclosed.

Alternatively, he could disappear from the political scene.

Both are technically possible but if the latter decision is reached we would lose intelligence coverage or what in the past has been a troublesome area of the public order field”⁷⁷⁸

The decision having been taken to allow HN298 to continue in his undercover role and be prosecuted under his cover name, HN294’s assessment of the eventual outcome of the criminal proceedings in respect of HN298 was as follows: *“The case should prove beneficial to us in that [HN298] has proved himself to the extremists and may well become privy to subsequent mischief; at the same time, his being bound over is a ready made excuse for avoiding further arrest”⁷⁷⁹*. The Inquiry will be considering the SDS handling of this episode including the decision to knowingly permit HN298 to be present at meetings in which tactics for the criminal proceedings were discussed between the defendants. We will be hearing more evidence about this incident in Tranche 1 Phase 2.

- 73.7. HN294 was in favour of HN344 taking a trip to Londonderry at the invitation of the Northern Minorities Defence Force. In considering this request Commander Roger writes as follows: *“I have questioned [HN294] closely on this matter and he is convinced that [HN344] is held in high esteem by [privacy redaction] and could handle this new situation quite easily. He points out the advantages and benefits that would accrue from such a trip in that our officer’s stock would be even higher within NMDF thereafter...Are we therefore justified in allowing one of our own officers to enter such an area which is outside our jurisdiction for a start, quite apart from the danger to which he will be expose? Is this a function for the Metropolitan Police officer?”* Commander Roger concludes that a dangerous journey out of the jurisdiction could not be justified. The Inquiry will be considering the regulation of SDS activities by both SDS managers and external oversight bodies⁷⁸⁰.

⁷⁷⁸ MPS-0526782 p7-8

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid p3

⁷⁸⁰ MPS-0724171

- 73.8. HN294 signed off the 1972 and 1973 Annual Reports⁷⁸¹. The 1973 Annual Reports contains the observation that “*of the twelve ‘field’ officers, five left the Squad during the year...which reduced the average length of service on the SDS by current officers to two years*”.

⁷⁸¹ MPS-0728970; MPS-0728975