



METROPOLITAN POLICE

LA

Special Report

SPECIAL BRANCH

1

19/10/70

2

7th day of March 1970

SUBJECT Stop the Seventy Four

with D.C. DOCKER, I was present today at Hampstead Town Hall, Haverstock Hill, N.W.3, where a conference was held under the auspices of the "Stop The Seventy Four" organisation.

Reference to Papers

346/70/9

The organiser was Privacy, the chairman was Mike CHAFF and the speakers were John REX, Professor of Sociology at Durham University; Mike BRIBBLEY, Lecturer in Philosophy at Newcastle University and a member of the M.C.C.; Jeff CRAWFORD, secretary of the West Indian Standing Conference and Peter HAIN.

The conference was divided into two sessions, open during the morning and closed during the afternoon. About 250 to 300 people were present at the morning session.

The conference was due to begin at 10.15a.m. and on my arrival at that time a member of the M.C.C. named Privacy was addressing those present among whom were a number of press reporters. Privacy claimed that he was merely doing to the conference what those present wanted to do to the cricket tour this summer. By his peaceful, non-violent action he was preventing the conference from taking place. Some of those present wanted to use force to throw him out but others disagreed with this. Eventually Privacy was pulled from the table on which he was standing and left quietly at about 10.30a.m.

Privacy opened the conference by stating that the morning session would be open to the public while the afternoon one would be strictly closed. All attending in the afternoon would have to be delegates representing an organisation and only those with proper delegates credentials would be admitted.

He then read extracts from South African newspapers commenting on the effects of the demonstrations on the Springbok rugby tour which had just taken place and the likely effect of similar demonstrations on the forthcoming cricket tour.

REX said that nobody had the guts to say that he or she stood for white supremacy although this was the feeling of those who wanted the tour to take place. Instead reasons were given for the tour such as allowing the white South Africans to come to this country to see how multi-racial sport should be played. There was no chance of this having any effect on the policies of the South African Government as apartheid there was becoming stronger



with the passage of time, not weaker. He then gave a history of apartheid and the campaigns against it.

He pointed out that the demonstrations against the rugby tour had made the South African players think about apartheid, probably for the first time in their lives. This was not just another left-wing student movement. It was equivalent to the campaign against slavery. After sport with South Africa had been attacked another target would be trade.

BRIDLEY said that he shared the M.C.C.'s desire to play cricket but he felt that the feelings of non-whites in this country should have been considered before inviting the South Africans to make the tour. The tour could lead to race riots and a worsening of race relations in this country. The tour was not worth this trouble and the M.C.C. should call it off. Anyone with any knowledge of racial harm which might be done in this country should still, even at this late hour, write to his M.P. or the Prime Minister or perhaps even to Sir Alec Douglas-Home, who was probably the only person likely to be able to influence the M.C.C.

He went on to say that the question of using violence should be carefully looked at, as the sympathetic members of the public could easily be alienated by the use of violence. Violence could only be justified if there were no other course open. He said that the organisation itself depended on legality and he cited **Privacy**'s stand at the beginning of the meeting as an example of what might happen if other people took non-legal action against their meetings.

CRAWFORD said that he had often been asked why the West Indians in this country had taken no part in the demonstrations against the rugby tour. He had replied that rugby was not really a thing that West Indians felt strongly about, but cricket was their way of life and they would support demonstrations to stop South African cricket here. He said that it was no good waiting for a show of good faith from the South Africans as the M.C.C. wanted to do. The real reason that the M.C.C. was going ahead with the tour was that many M.C.C. members had financial interests in South Africa. West Indians had not yet made up their minds how far they would be prepared to go in demonstrations. Black people had a fear of being picked on by the police but they were going to prepare themselves, as far as possible, for attacks from the police. Tensions would rise and there would be a backlash but it would be better to suffer this backlash now rather than wait until it got worse in the future.

MAIN said that the spectacle of barbed wire being put up around cricket pitches was very appropriate. Apartheid sport would be played in concentration camp conditions. He reviewed what had been achieved against the rugby tour and said that many lessons had been learnt. Among these was that the police were not impartial. Although the demonstrators did not stop the rugby tour the fact that it went on for the full programme meant that they got more publicity and support than they might have got had it finished early. It had provided an excellent springboard for the cricket demonstrations. There were also many other sports which could be worked on after the cricket tour had been tackled. He said that they had had some success in that half of the tour had been stopped already.

He did not believe that the M.C.C. was susceptible to moral pressure. Only non-violent direct action would have any effect on their policies. He concluded by saying that during the afternoon session, some thought would be given to co-ordinating the activities of various groups.

MIKE CRAFT then opened the discussion period. He asked that only general policy be discussed, leaving details to be decided during the afternoon.

Among the points raised was a suggestion that action should be taken at the very start of the cricket season rather than waiting for the tour to start. In this way clubs would be made aware of their individual responsibilities. Another suggestion was that, to neutralise pro-police public opinion which came about when fighting with police took place, those concerned should take every opportunity to complain against police action at demonstrations.

There followed a considerable amount of discussion as to whether demonstrations should be violent or non-violent. No conclusion was reached although the general feeling seemed to be that there was room in the movement for all shades of opinion rather than to split over the issue. This could be achieved by having a mass non-violent demonstration but with small ad hoc groups having their own special targets.

GRAFT then closed the morning session at 1.10p.m. He reminded those present that the afternoon session would be open to credentials holders only and asked them to arrive a few minutes before 2p.m. so that credentials could be checked in time for the session to begin at 2p.m. He also asked that some people should remain in the hall during the lunch period to avoid the hall being taken over by any opposing elements.

In view of the warnings about admission to the afternoon session being only by credentials, I deemed it inadvisable to try to enter. D.C. LOCKER kept observation in the vicinity during the lunch break and there was no disorder or attempt to take over the hall.

[REDACTED]

Among those present in the audience were

[REDACTED] Privacy of Sutton Communist Party and [REDACTED] Privacy of the W.C.P.

Special Branch references to the persons mentioned in this report are contained in the Appendix.

3 [REDACTED]

(P. PHELAN.)
Sergeant.

Submitted.

4 [REDACTED]

Chief Inspector.

5

CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT

[REDACTED]