

Cover page

Cover page

Date signed: 7 January 2019

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO UNDERCOVER POLICING

I, Barry Moss, c/o Designated Lawyers, PO Box 73779, London, WC1A 9NL, WILL
SAY AS FOLLOWS:

1. This witness statement is made in response to a Rule 9 request dated 4 December 2018. It provides my recollection of my deployment as an undercover police officer within the Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).
2. I am known in this Public Inquiry by the nominal HN218. When I was an undercover police officer, my rank was Detective Constable.

Personal details

- 1** 3. My name is Barry Moss and [REDACTED] I was born in 1945

Police career before and after serving with the Special Demonstration Squad

4. I joined the Metropolitan Police Service in September 1964 and Special Branch in January 1968. On joining Special Branch I was made a Detective Constable. Regarding my work on Special Branch prior to joining the SDS, for the first



month of work on Special Branch I was mentored; there was no formal training. I was part of the team that had responsibility for the area of Barnet and South Hertfordshire and dealt with the Communist Party and other groups in the area. I would attend public meetings of those and other groups, see if I recognised or could identify anyone and then write a report of the meeting. When I attended these meetings I would not say that I was a Special Branch officer, I might have given a false name, if asked, which I would have made up on the spot, but I don't recall whether I did specifically. Attending public meetings of that sort was the 'bread and butter' of Special Branch at that time. As part of my job on Special Branch I also responded to requests from the Security Service. I hadn't done any undercover policing work prior to joining the SDS.

Special Demonstration Squad – Formation

5. The policing of the October 1968 demonstration was the issue that the SDS was set up to address. There was serious disorder at the March 1968 demonstration at the American Embassy, which had caught the MPS unawares and our role as undercover officers was to provide accurate intelligence to the MPS to assist in the policing of the forthcoming October 1968 demonstration. You have to appreciate the ferment that was present at the time, terrorist groups such as Baader-Meinhof and the Red Brigade were active in Europe and there was public disorder on the streets in the UK that the police needed to deal with. We all believed the SDS was short term, the object being the better policing of the October 1968 demonstration. I don't know who directed the set-up of the squad.

- [REDACTED]
6. The difference between the work of the SDS and what was done on Special Branch was that officers on the SDS would go beyond the mere attendance at public meetings, you would join the groups; you never did that on normal Special Branch duties. Special Branch as a whole didn't work undercover, they would just do things without revealing who they were.

Selection for the Special Demonstration Squad

7. I recall being called into a room with Detective Chief Superintendent Arthur Cunningham, along with a dozen or so others, most of us there were newbies. I had joined Special Branch in January 1968 and hadn't gone to many public meetings as part of Special Branch duties. I think that was why we were chosen, as we were less likely to be recognised. At the meeting we were told that we had to go out and get sufficient intelligence on the October 1968 event in order to prevent injury and damage to property. We were then left with DCI Conrad Dixon and DI Phil Saunders.
8. I joined the SDS in Spring 1968, as I mention above, I was simply called to a meeting room, I didn't opt into it and I don't think it occurred to anyone there that we could opt out. Beyond what I said above, I don't recall what we were told about the unit. In those days you did what you were told by people of more senior rank than you.
9. There was no conversation with any SDS managers before or during the work on the SDS about what the work might entail and its possible impact. I was single at the time of joining the SDS so there was no opportunity to speak to my partner about it.

[REDACTED]

Training and guidance in the Special Demonstration Squad

10. As I mentioned, there was no training for the role of an undercover officer before being deployed, there was simply a DCI and DI in the office for help, they were Conrad Dixon, and Phil Saunders.

11. No guidance was given on how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of those we met undercover. There was no guidance given on how far it was acceptable to enter into sexual relationships whilst deployed, the thought of doing so never occurred to me. With respect to participation in criminal activities or the provoking or encouraging of the same, again no guidance was given, but there was an ethos that as a police officer you would not do such things.

12. We were not given any guidance about what to do if we were arrested, it never really occurred to me that I might be arrested whilst in the group I was involved

2 in. I do recall becoming aware that [REDACTED] HN68 [REDACTED] was going to be arrested whilst undercover and I think I knew about this before it happened. There was some discussion in the SDS office about him accepting his arrest, not offering any resistance and pleading guilty at court. This was, I think, common knowledge in the SDS office at the time but I can't remember how I specifically heard about it.

[REDACTED]

13. We were not given any guidance about what to do if we were brought before a court or if we obtained legally privileged information whilst deployed. There was no guidance given on any other ethical or legal limitations whilst deployed.

14. I did not receive any training on race equality from the MPS either prior to or during my deployment undercover on the SDS.

Undercover identity

15. I used the false name Barry Morris or possibly Barry Morse when I was deployed undercover; I plucked that name out of thin air. [REDACTED]

2A

[REDACTED] Neither the false name, nor any aspect of my undercover identity, was based on a deceased child's identity or any other person's identity, alive or dead.

16. My undercover identity didn't have a cover background, aside from having a cover address which I discuss below. I have been referred to a document entitled 'Penetration of Extremist Groups' (Doc1, MPS-0724119, pg3-9), the description therein of the creation of an undercover identity doesn't reflect my recollection of how I created my undercover identity; the document post-dates my deployment. [REDACTED]

2B

[REDACTED]

Cover employment

17. I didn't have any cover employment.

Cover accommodation

18. I was living in a police section house at the time of my work on the SDS, this was a police building in which many police officers would reside. I knew from the meetings I'd been with on Special Branch, prior to joining the SDS, that I may be asked for a name and address at the meetings I attended. I realised therefore that I would need an alternative address to give when asked. I obviously couldn't use the section house's address and I didn't think I'd get away with using an entirely false address without the organisers realising it.

20. [REDACTED] Reasons for choosing [REDACTED] address, which

3. I think was [REDACTED] in west London [REDACTED] I didn't live there, I just used it as an address to write on attendance lists at meetings. I didn't live anywhere other than my address at the section house whilst I worked undercover on the SDS.

Legend building

19. To be clear, we didn't really use the term 'legend' with respect to the creation of our false identities.

20. In Special Branch you were encouraged to dress smartly, you would wear a collar and tie, except if you had to attend a public meeting in the evening in which case you would try and blend in with the milieu of the group you were attending. What you wore at such a meeting would depend on the group you

[REDACTED]

were attending with; you'd probably wear jeans, and generally quite casual clothing. On the SDS it was the same, we might have gone to a meeting a bit unshaven or with slightly longer hair. I would go around unshaven and generally looked a bit unkempt. I would also have worn a leather jacket and had longer hair than usual. I didn't visit any places or people prior to my deployment, nor did I live for a time in my new identity before approaching the group I was deployed into.

21. I used my own car whilst working on the SDS and used my normal real driving licence. I used the vehicle to go to and from meetings and occasionally gave one or two of the group members a lift.

Deployment

22. I joined the Maoist British Vietnam Solidarity Front (BVSF). The same members of that group were also involved in the October 27th Committee for Solidarity with the People of Vietnam. I had thought BVSF were not a part of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign (VSC) as the latter were Trotskyists and so thought I didn't attend any meetings of the VSC. However, having reviewed the documents provided by this Inquiry I accept that I did in fact go to meetings of both the VSC and BVSF. My involvement in the VSC comes as a bit of a surprise to me now; if I hadn't been shown these documents I wouldn't have said I was involved with the VSC at that time. The reporting that has been provided to me by the Inquiry reflects more than I can actually recall providing, but I don't think there are any of any significant quantity which are missing.

[REDACTED]

23. I suppose both the VSC and BVSF had official membership, but I don't recall specifically; I was a member of the BVSF but I can't recall any subscription or membership fees. I have no idea if I was an official member of the VSC. I would say the approximate dates of my involvement in these groups was between Spring 1968 and September 1968.

24. I recall Conrad Dixon tasked us and told us about which groups and fellow 'traveller groups' (by which I mean groups associated with those main groups) were of interest. That said we were told to sweep wide to include any groups sympathetic to involvement at the forthcoming demonstration in October 1968, but as to the specific groups we were told to join, we were largely told to sort ourselves out. I think I suggested the targeting of the BVSF, as they were a group of interest. I had noted they had an advertised meeting on the notice board of a polytechnic college that I attended. I highlighted this to the SDS management, asked them whether I should attend and was told I should. Once we were in the group we were largely left to our own devices.

25. We weren't told how long we would be on the SDS, but the inference was it would be until the demonstration in October 1968, after which we'd be back on normal duties.

26. It was a given that as Special Branch officers you'd know what to look for on joining these groups. In particular, you would be interested in identifying membership of the groups, the strength and size of group and the enthusiasm of the groups (for example, they may talk a good job but only half of the group would turn up at a demonstration and of those who did only a couple might

[REDACTED]

cause any problems to the police at the demonstration). Numbers and attitudes, particularly to violence, were important as were any 'hangers-on' who might attend a group's demonstrations in addition to the group's normal attendees. We would want to know where the group would be at a demonstration and what their banners might say so they could be identified by officers at the demonstration. We used our common sense to sort out from what was said at meetings and demonstrations, what was of importance. Our uniformed colleagues would need to know numbers, tactics and whether the group were likely to stick to the planned route for the demonstration.

27. Once we'd identified an individual at a meeting we would afterwards access Special Branch records to see if they had a record already. You could from that search identify, for example, where the individual lived and who their associates were. This would save you from having to seek the same information yourself and would also give you an overall picture of the person or group and give you a better understanding of, for example, whether the group or person had associates in other groups which may come out in support of them at a demonstration.

28. My tasking didn't really change during the course of my deployment, it's scope was clearly broader than I recollect, as I mentioned above (with respect to my involvement in the VSC).

29. As I mentioned above, I was to an extent self-tasked, so I reported on all the groups I was involved in. Some of the information I recorded was intended to build a picture of a group or individual. Special Branch needed to have an

[REDACTED]

ongoing living record of what these organisations were doing: whether they were increasing in membership or if their ethos was changing. The Security Service too had an interest in these things so as to prevent subversion; there was also a need for record keeping for the purpose of vetting checks. I would have been looking to recall as far as possible, names, descriptions, attitudes, numbers and a little of an individual's views. It was the human side you were interested in, for example the individual's associates, rather than the politics generally, unless there was a subversive element to it.

30. Whilst I was deployed undercover, the SDS was based at Scotland Yard; there 3A was also an office in [REDACTED] West London [REDACTED] The latter was a discreet alternative venue to meet at. I mainly would have attended Scotland Yard, the risks of doing so whilst deployed hadn't really occurred to us in those days.

31. You were on and off duty as required, but I would have probably reported for duty on the SDS by attending Scotland Yard at a normal time of day in the morning, in my real identity, and I may have had some meetings to attend in my assumed identity in the afternoon and evening, I can't really remember specifics. I spent a few hours every week with my targets. There wasn't much happening during the week, most of the activists had jobs. The work undercover was mainly part-time and in the evenings, though I got more involved and attended more events the closer we got to the October 1968 demonstration.

32. Whilst on duty in my assumed identity I was gathering intelligence: I would observe who attended meetings and events and remember what was said. After

[REDACTED]

the first meeting I attended I went to the pub with members of the group. Thereafter over the entire deployment I probably attended 2 or 3 'instructional afternoons'; these were at the houses of some of the group's members where attendees were instructed on topics such as Maoism. There were also probably 2 or 3 banner making sessions which I attended. Then there was attendance at the more formal meetings, these were public and anyone could have attended. I never actually took part in any demonstrations and left the group before the October demonstration.

33. When on duty in my real identity I would attend Scotland yard daily and saw one or the other of the SDS managers, Conrad Dixon and Phil Saunders, every day, but we didn't really have formal meetings. Whilst in Scotland Yard I would have been typing up reports, checking records i.e. research.

34. In normal Special Branch work you were given tasks with specific enquiries; you were handed a file with a task in it and you were required to complete the task in a reasonable timescale. You were also told to attend public meetings. Additionally, you would have to undertake 'reserve duty', where you manned the phones in Special Branch, answered enquiries and undertook searches. In contrast, whilst on the SDS you had a lot more freedom. We had the ultimate objective of 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 (for example they would keep a watch as to which groups they were more interested in). As I recall, you would not have to book on and off duty whilst in the SDS. Your name would be shown on the Special Branch duty book, but you'd be recorded as being on special operations. Likewise, there weren't

[REDACTED]

routine Special Branch enquiries undertaken whilst on the SDS. In my view, the fundamental difference between general Special Branch work and the SDS was that on general Special Branch duties you were task led, whereas on the SDS you sorted out your own tasking under supervision with a view to achieving an objective: for us, the policing of the demonstration in October 1968. A by-product of that work was identifying the membership of these groups which may have been of use to Special Branch further down the line.

35. When on the SDS at this time we didn't receive overtime, but as a CID officer, like all Special Branch officers, you would get an additional flat rate allowance called detective duty allowance. This was all recorded in the CID diary; I can't quite remember what we put in the diary when on SDS duties, we probably would have recorded how long we were engaged in the office, where we went after that (i.e. to a meeting) and how long we were there. There was no impact at all to my take home pay of working undercover on the SDS.

36. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 06/08/1968 (Doc 2, MPS-0722098, pg160-162) and a document titled 'MPS Telegram' 06/08/1968 (Doc 3, MPS-0722098, pg163); I was the author of the former, attended the meeting referred to therein and was a member of the SDS at the time. I would have been to many other meetings before that one, but I can't remember specifics other than to say it would be of the groups I've mentioned already above.

3B 37. The report of 06/08/1968 I think was signed by TN0044 the Chief
3C Inspector. The other signature is that of [REDACTED] who was also a Chief Inspector.

[REDACTED]

38. I have been referred to a document titled 'Special Branch Report' 07/08/1968 (Doc 4, MPS-0722098, pg170-171) which I must have written as it bears my signature. I recorded the names and addresses of members of that group because that was Special Branch practice. I don't know how I obtained those details; at a guess, there may have been an address list circulated during a meeting I attended or it may have been the result of research conducted afterwards from Special Branch files. The report would have been put on a record and copied to the Security Service, I'm not sure what they or Special Branch generally would have done with that information, at my rank at that time I would not have been told.

39. With respect to the reference in the report to following the individuals, I don't know whether I followed them, it is possible that I may have gone with them, (as opposed to following behind them), though had I done so I probably would have used the word 'accompanied'. I have no recollection of whether I attended the address with them or in what circumstances.

40. I have now been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 11/08/1968 (Doc 5, MPS-0722098, pg197-198), I must have attended the meeting referred to in the report. To be clear I didn't attend with DS Fisher and [3D] A/WDC [REDACTED], we would have attended at the same time, but we wouldn't have [3E] acknowledged each other. A/WDC [REDACTED] wasn't in the SDS, she would have attended as a Special Branch officer. It was always possible that I might miss the attendance of a Special Branch officer in writing a report if I hadn't seen them or recognised them at the meeting. There could have been Special

[REDACTED]

Branch and SDS officers present at the same time. The squad chiefs might not have realised that SDS officers were attending the same meeting, the details of attendances might not have been known at the point at which duties were rostered. I don't remember this specific meeting, but DS Fisher and I were not in the same group, therefore, I imagine the fact that DS Fisher and I were at the same meeting was the result of our separate deployments converging at the same event, justifying the attendance of both of us.

41. The two uniformed police officers referred to in the report would have attended the meeting also, and they would have been hovering in the background in case there was any disorder at the meeting itself. They weren't Special Branch Officers, since they were in uniform. I attended the meeting in my undercover identity and was not in uniform. I would say that DS Fisher was also attending in his undercover identity and wouldn't have been in uniform. I'm guessing that
- [3F] A/WDC [REDACTED] wouldn't have attended the meeting in an assumed identity but wouldn't have attended in uniform. There was a need for both uniformed and SDS officers to be present at the meeting as the two were fulfilling different purposes, the SDS was gathering intelligence, the uniformed officers would have answered to a different manager, may not have known what Special Branch were interested in and might have been called away to deal with other matters in any event. On a rare occasion you might as a Special Branch officer highlight to your uniformed colleagues trouble makers. Uniform may well have decided to send their own officers if we had flagged to them the risk of disorder.

[REDACTED]

42. I don't recall attending any other meetings of the Notting Hill Branch of the VSC after this one, but having said that I don't really recall attending any VSC meetings and, had I not seen these documents, I would have said I hadn't attended any VSC meetings. Though having now read some of those documents I do recall some of the names in those documents, but I can't recall any of the circumstances of those meetings.

43. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 10/09/1968 (Doc 6, MPS-0733965) which bears my name and I must have been the author of it. I would have been present at the meeting referred to in the report; I probably would have been invited to the meeting since it was a private meeting, I can't think of how else I would have got in. The SDS officers referred to in the report would have all attended as representatives of their particular groups. Given it was a private meeting, it would have been suspicious if we hadn't 3G attended. DC TN0032 wasn't a member of the SDS and I have no idea how he came to be present at that meeting. In the report I've noted the slogans of the group, this is helpful since the police would have been able from that information to ascertain which group they were dealing with at the demonstration and whether they were likely to be disorderly. The report also confirms the group were going to target the American Embassy. This would have allowed the managers to place their officers where they were needed. Any detail may be useful. This report alone wouldn't change policing, but putting all the reports together gives you a picture so you'd be aware, for example, of whether all the groups were targeting the American Embassy or if there were other targets by other groups.

[REDACTED]

44. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 23/09/1968 (Doc 7, MPS-0733978), I would have attended that meeting as I am recorded as being present. My infiltration of that group probably did end with my attendance at that meeting. My work ended then as I went on to undertake an accelerated promotion course at the police staff college which began on the 6th October 1968.

45. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 19/09/1968 (Doc 8, MPS-0733972) of which I was the author. The manuscript reference 'A' on that document appears to refer to a note on the bottom of the page that records that the future meeting is being covered; this would presumably be a note to say that Special Branch need not send their own officers to the same meeting. It was common practice for such details to be added to the reports after they had been typed, this one was probably added by Conrad Dixon. The significance of reference to the formation of an ad-hoc committee would indicate that the planning of the group was becoming more intense to require the need for such a committee it would also have given an indication of more people becoming involved in the matter. The SDS needed to identify all the groups to be involved in the demonstration so as to gain an understanding of the likely numbers in attendance and whether there were any connections between what may appear disparate groups. A better connected and organised group could cause a bigger problem. I say this with the benefit of hindsight. The significance of the target confirmed what we knew all along and what we believed. It's important for the police to know what the target is going to be and to know where the group would concentrate their efforts.

[REDACTED]

46. I have now been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 23/09/1968 (Doc 9, MPS-0733974) of which I was the author and would have attended the meeting referred to therein. I attended with DC Tyrrell as he was going to replace me on the SDS. He came along to act as my 'best pal'. The final sub paragraph of this report, where they talk in greater detail about the October Demonstration, is important and every bit of information is of value. Since I was there I chose to report on those details as it provides an overall view and you never know what may be relevant in the future. Whilst it would end in October, there might be a Special Branch interest in future matters.

47. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 25/09/1968 (Doc 10, MPS-0733929), my infiltration of that group probably ended with my attendance on that date and, as I mention above, my involvement ended as a result of another professional commitment.

48. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 02/07/1968 (Doc 11: UCPI0000008310 tab 4), as with my recollection of reporting on the VSC I don't remember my involvement in this group but I was the author of the report.

3H The report is signed by [REDACTED], a Chief Inspector and was signed by 3I Superintendent TN0039 on behalf of the Chief Superintendent. I think I was a member of the SDS when I made this report and was the reliable source referred to in it.

49. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 08/07/1968 (Doc 12: UCPI0000014342 tab 5); I don't know if I played any part in obtaining the paper attached to that report or in making the report; I had limited knowledge

[REDACTED]

of that group and don't know if the stated goal of the group is consistent with what I knew of them. I imagine that stated goal would have made the group of interest to Special Branch, but it would have been above my pay grade at the time to know.

50. I have been referred to a document titled 'Special Branch Report' 19/09/1968 (Doc 13, UCPI-0000005782) of which I was the author, but I can't remember how the attached document came to be in my possession. I can only guess that I picked it up from a meeting and may have been asked to write up a separate report on the document itself since it was of particular interest to SDS management. It is hard to read the whole document, but I probably thought everything to do with that group may have been of interest to Special Branch and that the group was likely to be involved in the October demonstration. I wasn't instructed by anyone to have infiltrated that group. I don't remember going to any meetings of that group, and wonder if I picked up the document from the meetings of another group.

51. I have been referred to a document titled 'Routine Meeting Report' 08/09/1968 (Doc 14, UCPI-0000005842) of which I was the author and attended the meeting referred to therein. I assume I was the informant referred to in the report, I didn't use informants on the SDS and we used that phrase commonly at that time to refer to ourselves. My understanding of that group was that they were another umbrella organisation, like the October 27th committee, and that they encompassed groups which I had an interest in. I assume I got access to the meeting by invitation. I reported on the organisation as it was necessary to keep an eye on such left wing groups because of the likelihood of them

[REDACTED]

participating in the October Demonstration. I have no idea what the value of the report would have been to Special Branch, I note it appears the group had appeared in mentions twice and was seemingly growing in importance. I think this was probably the last meeting which I attended of that group as, looking at the date, I would have left the SDS three weeks after it.

52. With respect to the 'common thread' between the groups subject of my reporting when I was undercover on the SDS (aside from the issue of the October demonstration), I think there were common personalities to the groups and, as far as I can recall, there may have been a shared Maoist ideological connection.

53. I did not join any trade union and didn't become involved in any way with trade union affairs whilst deployed undercover in the SDS.

54. I did not witness nor partake in any public disorder whilst serving undercover with the SDS.

55. I did not witness any violence to people or property nor was I involved in any, either as a perpetrator or victim, whilst deployed undercover with the SDS.

56. At that time, I did understand that Special Branch had a role in countering subversive activity, but the extent of my knowledge was limited as I was a new entrant to the Branch. I knew Special Branch was in communication with the Security Service and I knew they had a role in countering subversion. One of our roles in Special Branch was providing reports to the Security Service, but my knowledge back then was limited. I knew we copied reports to the Security

[REDACTED]

Service. They had the lead role in countering subversion which is why our reporting was copied to them.

57. I don't think anything I witnessed whilst undercover on the SDS was really subversive activity. The group I joined wasn't really trying to overthrow the government, they just wanted a big demonstration. With respect to the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation, I wasn't conscious of their views prior to seeing the documents shared with me by the Inquiry and can't recall any more information about them.

58. I didn't personally have any direct contact with the Security Service whilst I was deployed undercover on the SDS.

59. I didn't engage in any sexual activity whilst in my undercover identity.

60. I didn't form any close relationships with individuals during my undercover deployment. The only names I remember from the deployment were [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and I wouldn't call what we had a close relationship. They were the organisers of the BVSF. We would have been on first name terms, but they probably knew the first names of most of the attendees at their meetings. Other than having a drink after the meeting with them and the other attendees or going to their homes as a member of the group (i.e. to make banners or for a meeting), we never met socially or went for a meal or shared birthday cards of anything like that. I can't even remember whose houses I went to. I didn't assume any positions of trust with anyone I mixed with as an undercover officer.



61. I did not participate in any criminal activity nor was I ever arrested, charged, tried or convicted of a criminal offence whilst I was deployed as an undercover officer. I did not ever appear in criminal proceedings as a witness in my undercover identity, nor was the fact that I was an undercover officer ever disclosed in connection with such proceedings.

62. I did not provoke, encourage or cause any other person to participate in any criminal activity whilst deployed undercover on the SDS.

63. To my knowledge the product of my reporting was not used in support of, or otherwise disclosed in connection with, a criminal investigation or prosecution nor did I ever provide evidence in any prosecution arising from my deployment.

64. I was never involved in any way in any other legal proceedings when in my undercover identity nor was I involved in any complaints against the police or disciplinary proceedings.

65. I didn't receive or become aware of any legally privileged information whilst deployed as an undercover police officer.

66. None of the people upon whom I reported whilst deployed undercover were elected politicians.

67. I think the information I reported whilst deployed undercover would have been sent to senior management (a Chief Superintendent on Special Branch's domestic squad (C-squad) and sometimes not even then since the Chief Superintendent would have had a Superintendent under him to assist). I didn't know at the time, but with hindsight I imagine the information I provided would

[REDACTED]

have been consolidated with other reports to allow those senior officers to judge the numbers of police officers required for the policing of the October 1968 demonstration. I would have thought Conrad Dixon would have been reporting to the senior management to give an overall picture of the SDS's activities. C-squad in Special Branch would have in turn consolidated the information the SDS provided to them along with other sources of information and passed it on to officers dealing with public order.

68. I recall reporting two pieces of information which were probably passed on for use in policing: firstly, that protestors may be carrying ball bearings to use on police horses; and secondly that women were being told to flirt with officers on the front line to try and win them over. I don't think my reporting alone would have made a great difference to policing, but I do think that the October demonstration was well policed and any disorder at it was controlled as a result of the intelligence provided by the SDS as whole.

69. As I've mentioned already, my deployment ended in around the end of September 1968, I left at that time as I went on a pre-arranged course at the police college course at Bramshill.

70. With respect to page 4 of the document titled 'Penetration of Extremist Groups' (Doc1, MPS-0724119, pg3-9) I don't recall a rule that officers were to serve only 12 months undercover; that document was created after I left the SDS.

71. I don't recall exactly how I withdrew from my deployment; I think I may have made up a family incident which required me to leave London. I do remember, as I've already mentioned, that before leaving I introduced Mike Tyrell from the

[REDACTED]

SDS into the group to replace me. To that extent my withdrawal was planned and would have been agreed by SDS managers. I was the first of the undercover officers on the SDS to leave; the SDS managers wanted to ensure my groups were covered up until the demonstration. I didn't maintain any contact with the groups once my deployment ended and I didn't make further use of my cover name.

72. Conrad Dixon managed the SDS by force of character and in a 'hands-on' manner. He was larger than life physically, mentally and had real charisma. He didn't sit in an office, he'd come out and go to meetings also. I wouldn't have expected a DCI to go to such meetings, but he did. Equally though he remained in charge, if he as a Chief Inspector told you to do something, you did it. I think Conrad Dixon's objective was to seek as much intelligence to assist the policing of the October demonstration as he could.

73. As already mentioned, the Detective Chief Inspector of the squad was Conrad Dixon, the Detective Inspector was Phil Saunders and there were three sergeants: Dave Fisher, Ray Wilson and Roy Creamer. Conrad Dixon and Phil Saunders were somewhat interchangeable as managers. The management was very fluid and both Conrad and Phil attended the meetings of activists. They were responsible for the strategy and supervision of the SDS, if one of us had strayed they would have put us straight. Above them was Chief Superintendent Arthur Cunningham and his boss in turn was Ferguson Smith, the Commander of Special Branch. There was a DC office manager and there were Sergeants but there was no rigid structure. The Sergeants didn't have a supervisory role they were just more experienced Special Branch officers. The

[REDACTED]

administrative officer was Bill Furnagh, I can't really remember his role, I think he'd have done our expenses and answered the phone, and ensured things like the offices were properly equipped, but I don't know what else he did. He was in the office whenever we went in and was based in Scotland Yard, I don't think he ever came to the field office. We would exchange pleasantries, but that was about it.

74. As touched upon above, I had regular contact with Phil Saunders and Conrad Dixon whilst deployed. This was on an almost daily basis and was face to face in the office at Scotland Yard. Our discussions would be about what you'd been doing, a bit like what I recorded in the reports; in the early days this would've been about which groups I may have got into. I would write up reports, just like the one that have been shown to me by the Inquiry, and there may have been some verbal briefings which were then typed up into reports. The managers were appreciative and supportive of my reporting.

75. There were no apparent arrangements for monitoring our welfare on the SDS at that time, and we didn't really need any. If I'd have had problems, the managers would have been there. I knew they were there if you needed them; in that respect, Phil Saunders was more empathetic; Conrad more ebullient. The operation was unsophisticated and we thought it was only short term.

Senior management and oversight bodies.

76. No senior officers or members of a regulatory or oversight body visited the SDS whilst I was deployed undercover and I didn't receive any form of commendation for my work on the SDS during that period.

Deployment of contemporaries

[5] 77. [HN321] was a member of the SDS but he joined after I left. I think [redacted]
[6] [HN322] was a member of the SDS but again there was no overlap as he
joined after I left. Helen Crampton was on the SDS at the same time as me.
[7] [HN326] was a member of the SDS but joined after me. Dave
Fisher was a member of the SDS and we were contemporaries on the squad
as was Joan Hillier. I don't know if [HN329] was a member of the [8]
[9] SDS. [HN68] was a contemporary of me on the SDS. [HN330] was a [10]
member of the SDS and I think was a contemporary of mine. [HN331] was [11]
a contemporary of mine on the SDS as was [HN334] and Ray Wilson. [12]

78. I can't recall whether Joan Hillier attended meetings on the SDS, I can't really
remember what her role was or whether it was the same as the male SDS
[13] officers. I don't know what role [HN322] played on the SDS. I don't
[14] know what cover name [HN331] used whilst on the SDS. As I mentioned
[15] [HN68] was a member of the SDS throughout the time I was on the
squad. There were two people with the surname Wilson on the SDS, Riby
Wilson and Ray Wilson, both were on the squad whilst I was on it. I don't know
what David Fisher's cover name was or whether he used one. This is also the
[17] case for Helen Crampton. I don't know if [HN332], [HN294] or [18]
Conrad Dixon used a cover name whilst on the SDS.

79. I don't really recall where everyone else was deployed whilst I was working on
[19] the SDS. As I mentioned above, I'm aware that [HN68] was arrested
whilst he was deployed; I think this was for an offence of fly posting or being

[REDACTED]

drunk and disorderly. Beyond what I have stated above I don't know the circumstances of what happened. I am not aware of any of my contemporaries whilst deployed provoking or encouraging a third party to commit a criminal offence.

80. I am not aware of any of my contemporary undercover officers engaging in sexual activity with others whilst undercover.

81. I am not aware of any of any my contemporary undercover officers, beyond 20 [REDACTED] HN68 [REDACTED], being arrested, charged, tried or convicted in their undercover identity.

82. I am not aware of any of any my contemporary undercover officers being involved in incidents of public disorder or violence or other criminal activities.

83. I am not aware of any of any my contemporary undercover officers whilst deployed reporting any legally privileged information.

84. I am not aware of any of any my contemporary undercover officers whilst deployed reporting on the activities of any elected politicians.

85. My contemporaries achieved the successful policing of the October demonstration, I don't know what the value of that information was to the Security Service, we certainly sent them a high volume of information, you would have to ask them.

Post deployment

[REDACTED]

86. There were no arrangements for a period of rest after my deployment and I wasn't debriefed by anyone.

87. I wasn't offered any advice or ongoing support by the MPS after my deployment but it wasn't needed. I imagine had I needed it, help would have been available.

88. After I left the SDS I attended Bramshill police college for a year. This was part of an accelerated promotion scheme. I then returned to Special Branch undertaking routine enquiries on all of the main squads, on rotation, in the Branch. Thereafter I was promoted to Detective Inspector and worked on the Irish Squad. I spent 3 years on ports duty and received a commendation. I left Special Branch and became a DI in normal CID before being promoted to DCI. In February 1980 I returned to the SDS as the DCI for one year; I was then promoted to Superintendent and retained responsibilities for the SDS amongst other matters, whilst a DCI replaced me on the SDS. I ceased to have any responsibility for the SDS in December 1981 when I posted to the squad dealing with international terrorism. In 1984 I was promoted to Chief Superintendent and worked in the uniform branch. In 1990 I was promoted to the rank of Commander responsible for the North East of London. In 1991 I returned to Special Branch as one of the two Commanders in the Branch but wasn't responsible for the SDS. In 1995 I became the Commander of Operations in Special Branch whose remit included the SDS amongst many other matters. In October 1996 responsibility for Special Branch was devolved from the Deputy Assistant Commissioner to Commander level and I became the head of Special Branch as a Commander.

[REDACTED]

89. I retired from the MPS in that role in 1999. After my work undercover on the SDS I didn't really have a say where I was posted and I don't believe my work on the SDS had any influence on my subsequent postings as a police officer.

90. Given my roles in Special Branch, inevitably officers I managed sought, received, used and disseminated intelligence emanating from the SDS.

91. Working undercover on the SDS didn't have any long term effect on my welfare and I didn't need any welfare services or support as a result of my deployment. The culture in 1968 was such that you probably wouldn't have admitted the need for support even if I had needed it.

92. I retired from the MPS and left Special Branch in the rank of Commander. I am now retired.

Undercover work in the private sector

93. I never received any instruction or guidance on working undercover in the private sector or the use of my false identity in the private sector before leaving the MPS and I did not do any undercover work in the private sector after leaving the MPS.

[REDACTED]

Any other matters

94. There is no other evidence, in the context of my undercover deployment, which I can give to the Inquiry, I am aware that the Inquiry will be contacting me in due course with respect to my managerial roles in the SDS.

Request for documents

95. I do not have any documents or other information which are potentially relevant to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

96. Prior to this inquiry I did obtain a copy of my record of service and personnel file but otherwise my memory has not been refreshed by any other documents other than those in the bundle of documents provided to me by the Inquiry.

Diversity

97. I am male and would describe my racial origin as white British.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

21

Signed: [REDACTED]

Dated: 7.1.19