

Cover Sheet

[REDACTED]

1

First Witness Statement of [REDACTED] HN348 [REDACTED] as Supplemented

Date signed: [REDACTED] 14.10.2019 [REDACTED]

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO UNDERCOVER POLICING

1

I, [REDACTED] HN348 [REDACTED] c/o Designated Lawyers, PO Box 73779, London, WC1A 9NL, WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS:

On 8 April 2019 I made a statement of 138 paragraphs which read as follows;

1. This witness statement is made in response to a Rule 9 request dated 25 February 2019. It provides my full recollection of my deployment as an undercover police officer ("UCO") within the Special Demonstration Squad ("SDS") of the Metropolitan Police Service ("MPS") from 1971 to 1973.
2. I have been shown the documents attached to the Rule 9 request but I have not otherwise refreshed my memory by looking at any other documents. Given the time that has passed, my recollection of my deployment is limited.
3. I am known in this Public Inquiry by my cover name of "Sandra". There is a Restriction Order in force in respect of my real name dated 20 February 2018. My nominal number is HN348.

11/11/2016

4.

3

11/11/2016

I had various temporary jobs until

6.

HN348 describes joining the MPS, her initial posting and where she lived.

7.

In the early 1970s

[REDACTED]

7

interview and then was posted [REDACTED]

a Special Branch Squad, with details given. [REDACTED]

I was attached to another DC who had been there for a while, and we were based in New Scotland Yard, I think on the seventh floor. I had not done any undercover policing or work using a cover identity prior to joining the SDS.

Selection for the SDS

8. I was invited to join the SDS not long after I joined Special Branch. I was approached by Peter Imbert (later Sir Peter Imbert). He was one of the senior officers in the SDS. I went out for lunch with him and he outlined the role and explained the origins of the SDS. I did not know the SDS existed before Peter Imbert spoke to me. He said it was born out of the demonstration outside Grosvenor Square. The police were not prepared for the outcome of that demonstration. That's when the decision came to collate and disseminate information about public order. I was cautioned that the extent of my involvement would be as an observer. He mentioned 'agent provocateur' and made clear that my role was just to observe and report back. He said that 'one bad apple' in the police service could affect the whole service. I did not see Peter Imbert after this initial meeting.

8

9. I do not recall exactly when I joined the SDS, [REDACTED]

HN348 speculates on date of joining based on personal circumstances around that time.

[REDACTED]

I have been asked to consider the managerial documents dated 28 October 1971 ([REDACTED] MPS-0728971, p.10) and I accept I must have joined the SDS before 28 October 1971 based on this document. I have also considered the Special Report dated 11 October 1971 (Doc 2, Tab 7 [REDACTED] UCPI0000010930), which is a report of a meeting on 6 October 1971 with my name at the bottom. Whilst I cannot recall the precise date, I accept that I must have joined the SDS and been deployed undercover by 6 October 1971 based on this document.

10. I do not recall very much of the undercover work at all, and certainly nothing in particular prior to the meeting on 6 October 1971.

[REDACTED]

provides details of private life at the time

[REDACTED]

I had so much going on in my private life that maybe that explains why I cannot recall much of my undercover work from this period.

11. I really do not know why I joined the SDS. It might have been they were looking for a woman. I do not recall if Peter Imbert specifically mentioned the women's

[REDACTED]

meetings and needing a woman, but I assume this may have been mentioned as this would explain my interest in joining the SDS. I think that's why I was approached as, at the time, the women's movement was really growing. 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. This was before the Equal Pay Act 1970 had come into force. There were certain jobs even then where you had to leave when you got married. I did not understand the logic of that: it seemed unfair. Even in the police service, women had the same powers as men but I was only paid 90% of what the men were paid. I was interested in women's issues, such as contraception and nurseries. I was genuinely interested when those topics were discussed in the bigger meetings, but not the extremist activities.

12. I might have also been interested in joining the SDS for my career development. My career was important to me at that stage and I might have thought the SDS was a good stepping stone. I had not taken the sergeant's exams but I was preparing for them. I thought I would perhaps be transferred back into uniform afterwards. After my ¹⁰ child was born, I was prepared to go back to the MPS, but I decided in the end that I wanted to be a stay at home mum.

¹¹

13.

provides details of private life at the time

- [REDACTED]
14. I have been asked whether any of the senior officers discussed with me what the work would entail and the impact of my undercover work on my family, but I cannot recall it ever being discussed in those terms. I understood what my role was, but the impact on my family was not discussed by the senior officers. It was not something that concerned me at the time but, in hindsight, I think it should have been discussed. It was all rather casual.
15. At the time, I felt quite detached from the activists and that I was not in any particular danger, especially at the public meetings which were open to anyone. But it was always in the back of my mind that someone would point a finger at me and accuse me of being a UCO, which would have been embarrassing at the least.
16. In 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. Some of the meetings finished quite late at night and I was concerned about travelling home alone. Travelling on the tube late at night was always problematic. There were 12 all sorts of weird and wonderful people at that time of night. So I always told husband where I was going and what time to expect me back and, sometimes, he would meet me somewhere down the line or at the tube station. This was a backup that I arranged for myself; it was for my own protection. I might have told my senior officers about this, but I cannot recall.

Training and guidance in the SDS

17. I cannot recall any formal training prior to being deployed with the SDS, although

13

HN45 did give a presentation to me and the other UCOs about Maoist politics because he understood it to an extent or had done some work on it, but I am not sure I would call that formal training. That was so we had a better understanding of these extremist ideologies. But I think that was at one of the SDS meetings after I was already in the field. I do recall having discussions with the senior officers, but I cannot recall any particular advice before I was in the field. Once in the field, we supported each other as UCOs when we had our meetings, but we did not really share what we were doing specifically with each other.

18. I have been asked if I was made aware of the Home Office Circular No.

97/1969 "*Informants who take part in crime*" (Doc 3, MPS-0727104) during my service with the SDS. I cannot recall being shown this circular, but I would say that I was made aware of the principles. Peter Imbert certainly referred to the term *agent provocateur*. This was explained as meaning not to be involved in any illegal activities. Being arrested, going to court and issues of legal privilege were never discussed explicitly. I think the assumption was that we were protected, but personally I would never have been involved in any criminal activities. I did not even get involved in sticking up a poster because it could have been a criminal activity. If I had any intelligence regarding criminal activity or planning of criminal activity, I would have reported back to the senior officer and said that I would not be involved any further. I do not recall it ever being mentioned that there might be any court case or proceedings, so misleading a

[REDACTED]

court was not mentioned as far as I recall. I suppose if I had been a witness to any criminal activities then it might have gone to court, but I was never confronted with that situation and so it was never fully discussed.

19. Reading it now, I imagine the Home Office circular (Doc 3) would have been directed towards UCOs dealing with trafficking of weapons, etc., as opposed to political activity. The activists were not breaking any laws by meeting and demonstrating unless they took a further step and broke the law. The activities the groups I infiltrated were involved in were hosting meetings, leafleting and demonstrations. They were all within the bounds of the law. The political ideology they were promoting did not spill over into what they were doing. They were just very vocal. Of course, the MPS were concerned about whether it would spill over. The Irish situation was very bad at the time and there were links between Ireland and some of the groups we were infiltrating.
20. I was discouraged from forming any close relationships from the outset. It was pretty much a rule not to get involved in the activists' private lives. I was told that I was there to observe people, who we regarded as being on the fringes of society. There was definitely a feeling amongst the UCOs that it was 'them and us'. As far as I was concerned, we were not to get involved in any depth in the lives of the activists. We were there as police officers upholding the law; it almost went without saying, but it probably was said. If I had met up one-on-one with an activist, I think the senior officers would have told me it was not part of my remit. Within myself, I was not prepared to do that because I did not think it was my role as an UCO. I knew we were not allowed to enter sexual

[REDACTED]

relationships – that is one thing I can feel quite certain about, although it was never discussed explicitly.

21. I have been asked to what extent my training was repeated or refreshed during my deployment. I suppose ¹⁴ [REDACTED] HN45 [REDACTED] talk about Maoist activities could be considered reinforcement, as it happened after I was already in the field. I assume we would have discussed topical issues from the news within our SDS meetings but I cannot recall specifically. That would have been a form of training but not really a refresher as we did not have particular training to begin with. We were not encouraged to become more politically aware, but that was not an issue for me as the meetings I attended were almost a form of brainwashing with Maoist propaganda. The group leaders wanted to educate their members so it was not a problem that I did not know very much.

22. I have been asked whether I received any training on race equality and confirm that I did not.

Undercover identity

Cover name

23. I adopted the cover name of Sandra when I was deployed by the SDS and this was the name I would use when undercover. I do not remember whether I had a cover surname or, if I did, what it was. I presume that I would have done but, as I explain below, I did not have a cover background beyond the limited details set out and do not recall living for any length of time in my cover identity before approaching the group. I cannot remember any specific occasion whilst

[REDACTED]

undercover when I was or would have been asked what my surname was.

I have been provided, as part of the witness pack, the Women's Liberation Front ("WLF") Minutes of Decision from the AGM held on 6 February 1972 attached to the Special Report dated 21 February 1972 (Doc 4, Tab 24) which refers to "Sandra Davies" being appointed as Treasurer. I am asked whether Davies could have been my cover surname. I do not recall being appointed Treasurer at the AGM and nor do I recall undertaking any subsequent activity related to this role. However, nor do I recall any other Sandra within the group during my deployment. I still do not have any recollection of using that or any surname while I was deployed but accept I may have done. This relates to events nearly 50 years ago.

24. As far as I recall, I had no other names or nicknames, and my cover name was not another person's identity. I am confident that I did not use a deceased child's identity as the first time I was aware of that practice was when I heard about it as part of this Inquiry. As to how my cover name would have been chosen, I believe I would have been given advice on how to do this by senior officers.

Cover employment

25. I had cover employment as a student at Goldsmiths University, but I never actually enrolled there. I was directed to say that I studied there but there was nothing official and I never contacted or attended the university. I did not apply

[REDACTED]

for any loans or grants or receive any income as a student. Thankfully I was never questioned about this by the activists: they were quite wrapped up in themselves and their own philosophy so they did not ask many questions of me.

Cover accommodation

26. I have seen the managerial documents dated 28 October 1971 (Doc 5, MPS-0728971, p.10) showing the rent for my cover address. I recall it being a shared house in Paddington in which I had a room, although I cannot recall why it was chosen. I cannot recall who arranged it, or whether any explanation was provided to the landlord. I assume it was rented in my cover name, but I cannot specifically recall. This was my cover address for the whole time that I was in the SDS. I would try to visit it as often as I could, but it was a pretty anonymous sort of place and I did not get to know the other housemates at all. There were no other UCOs at that address and I did not live with any of the activists at any point.

Legend building

15

27.

HN348 gives personal details

- [REDACTED]
28. I did not particularly change my appearance for my undercover role. I did not change my hair and did not particularly change my clothes either. "Washed and worn" is the sort of outfit I would have had. But I deliberately did not wear any makeup at all when undercover and I would have taken off my wedding ring and my engagement ring as my cover identity was that I was single.
29. I recall certain officers were very scruffy and dirty but Jill Mosdell was very smart and particular about her clothing. She was very smart compared to UCOs infiltrating the anarchist groups, although she probably wore less expensive clothes when she was undercover.
30. I had a private vehicle but not one from the SDS and I did not use my private vehicle in my cover identity. I did not have a driving licence in my cover identity. Being in London, I did not need a car for work as the public transport system was so good.
31. Aside from the matters referred to above, I had no cover background. I did not visit any places or people in order to prepare myself for my undercover role and I do not recall living for any length of time in my cover identity before approaching any activists. I have considered the document titled "*Penetration of Extremist Groups*" dated 28 November 1968 (Doc 6, MPS-0724119) and I cannot recall being shown the document during my deployment. In particular, I cannot recall supplying a detailed cover autobiography, I do not recall any process of inconsistencies in my cover background being eradicated as referred to in this document, and I did not have any identity documents in my

[REDACTED]

cover name. Despite this lack of preparation, I was fortunate that I never asked questions that put me in difficulties.

Deployment

Infiltration of groups

32. I was tasked to make contact with the women's liberation movement. I was not initially asked to target the WLF in particular, but I was directed to attend after I was approached and invited to their meetings. The WLF may have regarded me as being a member but I do not remember becoming a proper member of the WLF. I have seen that, according to the constitution attached to the Special Report dated 21 February 1972 (Doc 4), if a person agreed with the WLF's aims then they could become a member by paying £1 per annum, but I do not ever recall paying that subscription. I must just have been an informal member. The constitution makes the WLF sound very important but it was really just a disorganised group with a couple of very vocal members.
33. I have seen the Special Reports dated from 6 October 1971 to 30 May 1973. I do not recall the contents of these reports or writing them myself. However, I accept that I must have written the reports with my name at the bottom. I was reporting on the WLF and these reports are consistent with that tasking, so I assume that they must have been written by me. Also, I do not recall typing any reports, so they must have been typed up by someone else. I cannot recognise the way some of the reports read as there are a number of words that I do not think I would have used. I think they may have been tidied up by the person who typed them; my spelling was terrible so this would have taken some time. I

[REDACTED]

am not aware of any significant reports missing from those I have been provided.

Tasking

34. I think that the SDS was looking for links from smaller groups to really large organisations, such as the Irish movement. The MPS did not really know very much about the smaller groups and wanted to know more to see if they were of significance to state security or any real threat to our democracy. It was not until the SDS got involved that we knew if it was worthwhile to infiltrate a group. I do not think my work really yielded any good intelligence, but I eliminated the WLF from public order concerns.
35. I was expected to report back what I saw as much as I could so the powers that be could make a decision about their relevance and their links with any other groups. I was aware of this at the time, but I never found any links. I simply reported the location of any meetings, the numbers at that meeting, the start and finish times, and what was discussed. I reported any future plans and the likely numbers if there was a demonstration. For example, I reported that "*a rally would commence at 1pm in Trafalgar Square and four RWU members would attend*" in the Special Report dated 28 September 1972 (Doc 7, Tab 56

UCPI0000011758

36. I knew that the SDS was trying to prepare themselves in the event of a large demonstration. Many of the demonstrations at the time would encompass broad issues and smaller groups would unite under that umbrella. If I reported

[REDACTED]

that my group was planning to attend a demonstration and gave an indication of the numbers, and other groups reported back similarly, a picture could be formed of how many would be there in total, which would help with police preparation.

37. My first specific tasking was to attend a public meeting in a town hall in North London. It was under the umbrella of the women's liberation movement and there were hundreds of people there including lots of left-wing groups, such as the Socialist Worker's Party. All the groups had their own particular focus but were getting in on the women's liberation movement. I cannot recall who tasked me but I assume it must have been my senior officers, [REDACTED] 15B [REDACTED] HN294 [REDACTED] and Phil Saunders, although it was mainly Phil Saunders who communicated with me and the other UCOs. I have not seen a report of that meeting. I cannot recall if that public meeting was before or after [REDACTED] 16 [REDACTED] a particular event in personal life [REDACTED] but presumably my cover identity was already established at that point. I think it must have been at that public meeting that I was approached by the WLF. The WLF was part of the women's liberation movement but they also wanted to promote their own Maoist philosophy.

38. I was tasked to attend a WLF meeting. As far as I recall, I was just instructed to attend a meeting: to look, listen and feedback any plans including demonstrations or potential disorder. I cannot recall the date of the first WLF meeting I attended. The earliest report of a WLF meeting that I have seen is the Special Report dated [REDACTED] UCPI0000010930 [REDACTED] 11 October 1971 (Doc 2) which gives details of a meeting on 6 October 1971. However, I have also seen the Special Report dated 6 October 1971 (Doc 8, [REDACTED] UCPI0000010922 [REDACTED]) attaching a letter from [REDACTED] Privacy [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Privacy

, then the WLF's acting secretary, dated 27 September 1971 and referring to an upcoming WLF meeting on 29 September 1971. It is possible that I attended a meeting on 27 or 29 September 1971, but I cannot recall.

39. After the first WLF meeting, I went back to my senior officers and discussed what the WLF were saying and the literature they were distributing. As far as I recall, they thought it was worth looking into as there was so much going on in the women's liberation movement at that time. As far as I recall, I was not provided with any specific information from other sources about the WLF or the women's liberation movement in general, and I was not party to any intelligence from the Security Service. I became aware that that the WLF and other groups were using the women's movement to promote their own philosophy, but I don't know if I was informed of this by a senior officer at the outset or whether I picked it up myself. I did not suggest my own tasking and I did not question my tasking or suggest infiltrating any other group. I did not challenge the value of what I was doing at the time; I trusted my senior officers as they had more information.
40. I was not specifically instructed to report back everything and part of my role would have been to filter out certain things from very long meetings. A lot of the meetings reflected the dogma of Maoism and repeated their philosophy. I left out a lot of the dogma from my reports and focused on what they were going to do. I would also pick up leaflets and report on the Chinese revolutionary films that were shown. The ultimate responsibility was with the senior officers as to

[REDACTED]

whether or not this information was of any relevance. I don't think there were many occasions when I put my own interpretation on it.

17

41. I have seen the Special Report dated 22 January 1971 written by [REDACTED] HN45 [REDACTED] (Doc 9, UCPI0000011740). I note that, at paragraph 3, [REDACTED] 17 HN45 [REDACTED] states the meeting was to plan activities for the WLF, British Vietnam Solidarity Front and Friends of China. This makes it look like a much bigger movement, but there were only fourteen people present at that meeting and very often these groups had an overlap of the same people. I note also that, at paragraph 5, he refers to the start of a new branch of the WLF in North London being run by [REDACTED] Privacy [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Privacy [REDACTED] 17 I was not aware that intelligence from [REDACTED] HN45 [REDACTED] prompted my recruitment to join this group, although this possibly could have happened.

42. I have also seen the Memorandum dated 18 November 1971 written by [REDACTED] HN332 [REDACTED] (Doc 10, MPS-0728971). I note that, at paragraph 9, 17B [REDACTED] HN332 [REDACTED] refers to the arrival of a second woman officer having "*proved invaluable in the comparatively recent field of 'Women's Liberation'*". Again, I was not aware that I was specifically recruited for this purpose, but it is possible. Women's liberation was viewed as a worrying trend at the time; there was a very different view towards the women's movement then as compared to today.

[REDACTED]

Premises

43. The SDS operated from three premises whilst I was deployed: the back office and two safe houses. I do not recall going to the back office at all, although I think it was near Scotland Yard. One of the safe houses I cannot recall at all. The other safe house was [REDACTED] 17C somewhere in central London, [REDACTED] 17C but I cannot recall exactly. [REDACTED] 17C. I went to these safe houses for SDS meetings with my senior officers and other UCOs on a fairly regular basis.

Pattern of life whilst undercover

44. During my deployment, I did not carry out any duties in my real identity apart from when I was at SDS meetings in the safe house. If I was not attending activist meetings, then I would sometimes be at my cover address. When I went home to my private address, I would have been officially off-duty. However, if I had been contacted by a senior officer, I would have been available. Being constantly available was the unwritten rule. I think it is possible I was contacted like that, to clarify or discuss something, but I cannot recall the circumstances. I think it would have had to have been something quite significant.
45. The SDS meetings took place during office hours and took up quite a chunk of the middle of the day. I would sometimes go out afterwards for lunch with [REDACTED] 18 one or two colleagues as they were good friends of mine.

[REDACTED]

46. The activist meetings were in the afternoon or evening, and sometimes at the weekend, such as the WLF AGM on Sunday 6 February 1972 (Doc 11, UCPI0000010905) and Sunday 7 May 1972 (Doc 12, UCPI0000010914). There were also some conferences that lasted all day. I note that many of my reports record meetings starting between 7pm and 7.30pm and finishing between 10pm and midnight on a weekday evening.

47. My SDS work was not as structured as my other Special Branch work, although I did very little other Special Branch work with which to compare. [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

Pay and overtime

48. I had no extra money for being on the SDS except expenses, although I did not have a lot of expenses other than travel expenses, as I always used public transport to attend meetings. When I joined Special Branch, I became a DC and received a detective allowance, so there was an increase in my basic salary as compared to when I was in uniform. I think I also received a pay increase when the Equal Pay Act kicked in. I do not think I had a lot more pay in the SDS than in my other Special Branch roles and I do not recall whether the SDS paid me overtime. I cannot recall if I made any claims for overtime or even what time would have been considered overtime.

Women's Liberation Front

20

49. Based on the Special Report dated 22 January 1971 written by [redacted] HN45 [redacted] (Doc UCPI0000011740

9), it seems the North London branch was only formed after January 1971 and was initially led by [redacted] Privacy and [redacted] Privacy. I note that the WLF changed its name to the Revolutionary Women's Union ("RWU") at the meeting

on 17 February 1972, based on the Special Report dated 21 February

[redacted] UCPI0000010908 1972 (Doc 4). Having seen the Special Report dated 22 March 1972 (Doc 13,

[redacted] UCPI0000010917), I also note that [redacted] Privacy and

[redacted] Privacy left the RWU at a meeting on 20 March 1972.

50. The WLF meetings were by invitation only, and mainly held in the evenings at

[redacted] Privacy or [redacted] Privacy house in North London. I cannot recall how frequent they were, but not as much as weekly. I recall the meetings being mainly women, and the men who were occasionally present were usually related to female members of the WLF, such as [redacted] Privacy or [redacted] Privacy. They may have just been there because the meeting was in their house.

51. The meetings were led from the front by [redacted] Privacy and focussed on Maoist teachings. I recall one meeting in particular when we watched a propaganda film relating to Chairman Mao. There were sections of it showing surgical operations done without anaesthetic, but using acupuncture to alleviate the pain. It was pretty horrific. It promoted the Maoist philosophy, which was typical of the meetings. There was often discussion singing the praises of Chairman Mao and being very critical of our democracy. The group was trying to educate

[REDACTED]

people and there was various literature that we were invited to read. I did not say much at these meetings. This did not arouse suspicion as many of them were very vocal and glad to have a passive ear sitting there listening to them.

52. The WLF were active at demonstrations but I cannot recall if I went on any of them. I think they took place at the weekends. Many were broadly to do with the women's liberation movement, but were attended by all sorts of different groups. I do not think the WLF would have had many more than 10 women at any demonstration.

53. The WLF produced their own literature. I think it was printed at a bookshop that had a printing press, although I never visited it myself. It may have been "Banner Books" which is mentioned in the Special Report dated 4 January 1972 (Doc 14, [UCPI0000010931]). The WLF produced advertisements for meetings and demonstrations, as well as documentation generally about the women's movement and their political philosophy. I was not involved in distributing any literature, although I may have been asked to do so.

54. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to know that [Privacy] [Privacy] was going to help with artwork for the WLF magazine, as stated in the Special Report dated 6 October 1971 (Doc 15, [UCPI0000010919]). I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this information is included. As stated above, I considered one of the main aims of the SDS to gather intelligence to draw links between different groups and individuals. The report records a new link between [Privacy] and [Privacy] and [Privacy]. The report says that he was very opposed to the

[REDACTED]

government in the Philippines and had been exiled from there. I assume I thought this link might be meaningful to my senior officers, although I do not recall this report in particular.

55. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 11 October 1971 (Doc UCPI0000010930 2) about a meeting on 6 October 1971. As set out above, this may have been the first WLF meeting that I attended, but it would not have been my first encounter with the WLF as that was at the public meeting when I was invited. My recollection is that there were usually between around a dozen and 20 people at a WLF meeting, although I note that there were 10 people at this meeting and other reports show smaller numbers, such as the Special Report dated 7 September 1972 (Doc 16, UCPI0000011756) about a meeting on 4 September 1972 when there were only five people present.

56. I have been asked if I am recorded as Treasurer in the Minutes of Decision from the WLF AGM was held on 6 February 1972, attached to the Special Report UCPI0000010908 dated 21 February 1972 (Doc 4). I note that the Special Report dated 9 UCPI0000010905 February 1972 (Doc 11) is a report of the AGM itself and lists Privacy as Acting Secretary and Treasurer. That report also lists the election of officers on the agenda and states that Privacy was elected Secretary. It does not list anyone as being elected as Treasurer. I cannot recall if I was elected Treasurer at the AGM on 6 February 1972. I have no idea why the Minutes mention what I assume to be my cover name. I do not recall dealing with any accounts or any money or taking any of the committee roles. I cannot remember being or becoming the treasurer. It may be that on occasion I stood in for someone, but

[REDACTED]

that is speculation as I really cannot recall. I certainly did not have a key role or any decision-making role within the WLF.

57. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to know the sums of contributions being made by members present at the meeting held on 25 November 1971, as stated in the Special Report dated 1 December 1971 (Doc 17, UCPI0000010923). I have found this document very difficult to read as it is of poor quality. It is not clear to me what the contributions related to except that they may have been to cover running costs for a Centre in Leamington Spa. It may have been for the Nurseries Campaign, which is mentioned a few lines above. The availability of free nurseries in the community and attached to places of work was a key issue for the women's liberation movement at that time. I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this information is included. As far as I recall, my reports covered as much as was necessary so my senior officers and others could understand the tone of the meeting and the types of things they were discussing. The activists were talking about nurseries at the larger meetings as well, so it was a prominent issue and relevant to the right for women to work as the nurseries would support that right.

58. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to know that some of the group would be making homemade sweets and cakes for the Children's Christmas Party on 18 December 1971, as stated in the Special Report dated 13 December 1971 (Doc 18, UCPI0000010932). I note that paragraph 5 of that report states that the Children's Christmas Party was being run by the

[REDACTED]

Black Unity and Freedom Party ("BUFP"), who had asked the WLF members for contributions. I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this information is included. But as stated above, I think some of the main things the senior officers were interested in were the links between groups. With this in mind, the information might have been included to support the link between the BUFP and the WLF.

59. This report also refers to an Irish woman coming from Dublin at a time of troubles in Northern Ireland and being arrested for her links to the Angry Brigade. I knew very little about the Angry Brigade, even at the time, except that alarm bells rang if they were mentioned as they were very active and had links with the IRA. The report states that this information had come from [Privacy] via [Privacy]. I do not recall the connection between [Privacy] [Privacy] or [Privacy] and the Angry Brigade. I assume it was mentioned in the hope that somebody would have been able to make a connection somewhere along the line. This is another example of how the reporting could attempt to draw links between these people. In the 1970s, direct action in Ireland was affecting so many people's lives.
60. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to know that one of the members had been accused of having an affair with the husband of another member, as stated in the Special Report dated 4 January 1972 (Doc 14). The report refers to this accusation being made by [Privacy] "of Banner Books" and prompted [Privacy] to end her employment at that bookshop. I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this

[REDACTED]

information is included. But I recall that this bookshop was quite significant: there was another Maoist group involved with them and they had a printing press there. I do not recall if they were printing "*Women's Liberation*" at Banner Books, but they may have been. This information once again shows the links between organisations, in this case the breakdown in the relationship between the WLF and Banner Books. It also gives a flavour of the meetings and the level of things that were discussed. The accusation of an affair would also have been a potentially major event in the history of the WLF. The Maoist philosophy is quite purist and they would frown upon things such as affairs. In Maoist China, they even had a lot of strict rules about their style of dress and how they presented themselves because the clothes they wore depended on their status.

61. I have been asked about reports recording meetings in the homes of private individuals. The WLF meetings I attended were often in the homes of [Privacy] [Privacy] or [Privacy]. I was just invited to the meetings, I told my senior officers, and there was no suggestion that I should not attend because the meetings were held in people's homes.
62. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 9 February 1972 which [UCPI0000010905] relates to the WLF's AGM held on 6 February 1972 (Doc 11). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this AGM. I cannot recall whether the aims and constitution were adopted by the group, but I assume they were as this is recorded at paragraph 7 of the report.
63. I have been asked whether the WLF was a "*revolutionary socialist group*" as recorded in the Special Report dated 18 April 1972 (Doc 19, UCPI0000008304)

[REDACTED]

which details the Haringey Women's Liberation Workshop meeting on 13 April 1972. I have found this document very difficult to read as it is of poor quality. However, I note that [Privacy] was asked to outline the aims and activities of the RWU (as it then was) and pointed out that the group was socialist and had revolutionary aims. I agree that the WLF/RWU was revolutionary in terms of their Maoist ideology, which was opposed to democratic values. The way they talked suggested they would have liked to have overthrown Parliamentary democracy, but "overthrow" is a huge word and this was a small group, so it was not something that they could have done in reality. I was not even aware of the WLF being involved in any criminal activity apart from putting up posters (if that would be considered criminal) and there is no record in the reports of any WLF member committing any act of public

disorder or being arrested at any demonstrations. I note that the Special Report dated 16 February 1972 (Doc 20, [UCPI0000010912]) states that [Privacy] [Privacy] was in prison, but I cannot recall why. I note that he could not have been a WLF member as men had been barred from holding membership at the meeting on 30 December 1971, as recorded in the Special Report dated 4 [UCPI0000010931] January 1972 (Doc 14).

64. I have been asked what difference the expulsion of Diane Langford and Mr Manchanda had on the WLF's aims and methods, as recorded in the Special Report dated 11 February 1972 (Doc 21, Tab 21 [UCPI0000010908 Pg 4-6] I do not recall why they were expelled or the impact it had. I note that neither Diane Langford nor Mr Manchanda are recorded at attending WLF meetings in any of the reports I have been shown. The only reference to them appears to be in the

Special Report dated 22 January 1971 written by [REDACTED] HN45 [REDACTED] (Doc 9), which was prior to my deployment.

65. I have been asked whether the change in the group's name from WLF to RWU, as recorded in the Special Report dated 21 February 1972 (Doc 4) also changed the nature of the group's activities or aims. I do not specifically recall writing this report and I cannot recall if change of name also changed the group's aims. UCPI0000010908
66. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to be informed of the provisional date for a fund-raising jumble sale, as recorded in the Special Report dated 22 February 1972 (Doc 22, Tab 25 UCPI0000010907). I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this information is included. However, an event like a jumble sale might reveal links between different people and different groups that attended, all under the auspices of a fundraising sale. It was something the WLF was doing, as opposed to ideology and rhetoric, which I would not have recorded. This report would put a flag in the diary on that date so someone could be directed to attend. I cannot recall the sale itself, but it might have been something I attended.
67. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 22 March 1972 (Doc 13) about a meeting on 20 March 1972 in which [REDACTED] Privacy and [REDACTED] Privacy are referred to as a "self-confessed faction within the RWU" and make a statement "on behalf of the Marxist-Leninist Workers' Association members of the RWU". I recall that Marxist-Leninists were very UCPI0000010917

[REDACTED]

much opposed to Trotskyists. They both had their own agendas, even under the umbrella of women's movement, and there were arguments between them at public meetings. My recollection is that the WLF also had a lot of internal disagreement between members at that time. The report suggests that these women left the organisation on 20 March 1972 and not just the meeting. I note that there was ongoing hostility between [Privacy] and [Privacy] in the months preceding this meeting, as recorded in a number of the reports.

68. I have been asked why I thought Special Branch needed to know that members of the Angry Brigade were present at the Women's Liberation Conference on 25 and 26 March 1972, as recorded in the Special Report dated 6 April 1972 (Doc 23, UCPI0000008274). As above, I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why this information is included. But I know that the Angry Brigade was an extremist faction and its members had been convicted for offences including the use of explosives. The report refers to the 'Stoke Newington 8' who had been charged with "*very serious offences*" but I cannot recall what these offences were. The report also states that the women were "*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*". I cannot specifically recall why this comment is included, but I imagine it was due to their association and support for the Angry Brigade and the 'Stoke Newington 8'. The reputation of the Angry Brigade was common knowledge at the time, and the group was linked to the women's liberation movement. The fact the report says these women are "*self-confessed*" also suggests they made comments supporting my conclusions.

69. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 20 April 1972 (Doc 24, UCPI0000008273) which lists various events. I cannot recall being specifically tasked to attend any of these events, but I assume that if there is no report in my name relating to the event, then I did not go. Some of the events are Marxist-Leninist or Trotskyist events. My recollection is that the Marxists hated the Trotskyists and the Trotskyists hated the Marxists, but everyone hated the Maoists.
70. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 8 May 1972 (Doc 25, UCPI0000010913) about the meeting on 4 May 1972. I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting so I do not know which organisation activities Privacy was referring to when she warned people not to discuss them over the phone in case her phone *"may be tapped"*. I do not specifically recall why the report includes that the Anti-Internment League were thinking of a demonstration, but this would fit with the overall purpose of the SDS. The Anti-Internment League was linked to the Irish issue and anything to do with Ireland was very sensitive at that time.
71. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 15 May 1972 (Doc 26, UCPI0000011753) which highlights a difference between the aims of different members in the RWU. But there were a lot of differences. I cannot recall them all now, but some are clear from the other reports. The essence is that Privacy Privacy and Privacy were unable to work with each other on many levels and the meetings were confrontational prior to the split in the group.

72. I have been asked to consider the Special Reports dated 5 September 1972 (Doc 27, UCPI0000008276), 7 September 1972 (Doc 16), and 28 September 1972 (Doc 28, UCPI0000008280). I do not specifically recall writing these reports or how I came to be selected to attend the conference on Women's Liberation and Abortion and Contraception. I note that the report dated 7 September 1972 states that, although only three people would attend the conference, there were only five people at that meeting anyhow. I cannot specifically recall going to the conference but I have seen a report of the conference in my name, although I have found this document very difficult to read as it is of poor quality.
73. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 20 September 1972 (Doc 29, UCPI0000008278). I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain why the information about the film is included.
74. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 5 October 1972 (Doc 30, UCPI0000011759). I do not specifically recall writing this report and so I cannot fully explain which event Privacy attended, but I think it may have commemorated the October Revolution.
75. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 17 November 1972 (Doc 31, UCPI0000008284). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending the National Women's Liberation Conference in November 1972, and so I cannot fully explain why the conference withdrew the resolution proposed by Diane Manchanda. I note that her terminology is quite strong (e.g.

[REDACTED]

“smashing the state”), which shows the type of language used by some people at that time.

76. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 17 November 1972 (Doc 32, UCPI0000008349). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting and so I cannot fully explain why the information is included. I note the report states that [Privacy] and [Privacy] supported the Angry Brigade and the ‘Stoke Newington 8’ so the report may state they are *“extremely militant”* just by association with those groups. The report states they were *“advocating direct action”*, which suggests they made comments to that effect.
77. I have been asked to consider the Special Reports dated 2 February 1973 (Doc 33, [UCPI0000014736]), 24 May 1973 (Doc 34, [UCPI0000011771]), and 30 May 1973 (Doc 35, [UCPI0000014358]). Although I do not specifically recall writing these reports [REDACTED] 21A I suspect these are responses to queries made after the end of my deployment. If I wrote them, I think I must have been asked based on my experience in the [22] SDS and not because of [REDACTED] a subsequent role [REDACTED]. I accept these reports refer to people I did know whilst undercover.

Women’s Liberation Workshop

78. I have been asked to consider the Special Reports dated 12 December 1972 (Doc 36, [UCPI0000008287]) and 18 January 1973 (Doc 37, [UCPI0000014704])

[REDACTED]

). I do not specifically recall writing these reports and neither report has my name on it. I cannot say if I reported on this group but, as far as I recall, I was reporting on the WLF/RWU throughout my deployment.

London Region Women's National Co-ordinating Committee

79. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 3 January 1973 (Doc 38, UCPI0000008313). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting. From reading the report now, I think it was a public meeting which anyone could attend and so I would not have needed to be trusted or elected in order to go. I do not think I attended any public meetings on behalf of a particular group. I would not have been representing the WLF but would attend public meetings as an individual, even though I was also going to WLF meetings by this time.

Anglo-Chinese Understanding

80. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 13 December 1971 (Doc 39, UCPI0000014310). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting. From reading the report now, it also appears to be a public event as there were 300 people there and other members of WLF attended.

Artists' Liberation Front

81. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 25 April 1972 (Doc 40, UCPI0000010926). I do not specifically recall writing this report, and I have no

[REDACTED]

idea what the aims of the Artists' Liberation Front were or what they were doing. But I think Special Branch may have been interested in the link between this group and the WLF. It is just another link building up a picture of intelligence.

Holloway Anti-Internment League

82. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 1 August 1972 (Doc 41, MPS-0728922). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting, and I cannot see my signature on this document. I accept that I was in the SDS at this time, but I do not recall being tasked to attend this meeting. The report may be based on information that I have heard, but I was not directly involved with any of the Irish issues.

National Union of Students

83. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 22 January 1972 (Doc 42, UCPI0000008277). I do not specifically recall writing this report or attending this meeting. I do not recall being tasked to attend this meeting specifically. I think the National Union of Students was just another banner the WLF was trying to get under to attract membership to their way of thinking. Certainly idealist young students would be a target for them to encourage into their view of the movement with its Maoist ideology. For example, I note the report highlights a conflict between the general focus on education and the WLF's focus on their socialist ideology. As far as I recall, I was not particularly trusted or part of the leadership team within the WLF.

[REDACTED]

Privacy

84. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 6 October 1971 (Doc UCPI0000010922

8). I do not recall obtaining this handwriting sample. Reading it now, I assume the letter was something she has given out to everyone attending the meeting to advertise the upcoming meeting on 29 September 1971. I would have submitted any handouts with my report. I was not specifically tasked to submit these handouts but there was lots of paper floating around and I would take it back to my senior officers to see if it was of any relevance.

Privacy

85. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 12 April 1972 (Doc 43,

UCPI0000010916

). I do not specifically recall writing this report but I think Special Branch may have been interested in Privacy because he was linked to Privacy and their activities. I do not recall why he was in prison, but the fact he had a criminal record suggests he would have been of interest to senior officers. This information builds a picture of Privacy Privacy as associating with convicted criminals.

Privacy

86. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 26 April 1972 (Doc 44,

UCPI0000010927

). I do not specifically recall writing this report but the report may have been written to show the link between Privacy and the WLF.

[REDACTED]

The Miss World competition had been a focus of women's liberation movement so the fact she had previously been involved in a demonstration at that event was likely to be of interest to my senior officers.

Privacy

87. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 3 May 1972 (Doc 45, UCPI0000010934). I do not specifically recall writing this report, but I think Special Branch may have been interested in the link between Privacy and Privacy in the production of the 'Class War' magazine. I also note that both men were members of the Artists' Liberation Front referred to in the UCPI0000010926 Special Report dated 25 April 1972 (Doc 40) and Privacy was later involved in protest march with the Schools Action Union, as recorded in the Special Report dated 12 May 1972 (Doc 46, UCPI0000010928).

Privacy

88. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 1 August 1972 (Doc 47, UCPI0000011754). I do not specifically recall writing this report, but I think Special Branch may have been interested in this information to build up a picture of this woman, especially as she was a member of the group I was infiltrating and was associated with Privacy.

Privacy

89. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 12 October 1972 (Doc 48, UCPI0000014699). I do not specifically recall writing this report, but I think

[REDACTED]

Special Branch may have been interested in this information to build up a picture of his character. The fact that he was sacked also meant that he may have been more involved in activism in the following months.

Privacy

90. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 12 May 1972 (Doc 49, UCPI0000010928). I do not specifically recall writing this report, but I think Special Branch may have been interested in this information as she was an active member of the WLF and it helped to build up a picture of her. Maoism was the undercurrent of the WLF and so it was important that she supported Chairman Mao and really believed in his philosophy. This was not the same across the women's movement: lots of people were looking for greater equality, mostly left-wing but not necessarily Maoist. I note that this reference is in the context of a protest march involving teaching staff and children in which people were arrested.
91. I have been asked to consider the Special Report dated 12 October 1972 (Doc 50, UCPI0000011761). I do not specifically recall writing this report and do not recall Privacy being involved in any militant activity in factories or at all.

Trade Unions

92. I did not join a trade union or become involved in trade union affairs in any way whilst serving with the SDS.

[REDACTED]

Public order and violence

93. I did not witness or participate in any public disorder whilst serving with the SDS. I do not even recall going on any marches or demonstrations. I did not witness nor was I involved in any violence.

Subversion

94. I was not aware of Special Branch having a role in countering subversive activity aside from gaining intelligence and disseminating information. The WLF was involved in influencing people's thinking, but I do not know if this could be considered subversion. The WLF was much more talk than action. I was tasked to observe them because Special Branch did not know much about them and wanted to find out what was really happening.
95. The Maoist regime was subversive to the extent that it undermined our democratic system. But people are free to complain and I think it depends on the extent to which we do that and the actions we take. ²³ [REDACTED]

Sets out circumstances in which family member died and impact of that

- [REDACTED] That reminds me that sometimes there needs to be change, but it should be through democratic means. A lot of good has come out of the women's movement, but the WLF was based on a philosophy that undermines our democratic society.
96. I was not aware that my reports were copied to the Security Service, but I assumed there were links at a higher level between Special Branch and the

[REDACTED]

Security Service. I did not have any direct contact with the Security Service to my knowledge.

Sexual relationships

97. I never engaged in any sexual activity in my undercover identity whilst serving in the SDS.

Other relationships

98. I had no real close relationships with any activist during my deployment. I did not meet anyone outside the meetings and did not form any particular relationships with any of them. [REDACTED] Privacy was the main mover in the group but I did not even get to know her very well. I did not have any significant one-to-one conversations with her. I still could not put a face to any of the names in the reports. The only person's appearance that I vaguely remember is [REDACTED] Privacy [REDACTED] Privacy but we did not have a close relationship. I just recall that she had long auburn hair in a plait over her shoulder, and wore a sheepskin coat and Maoist badges on the outside.
99. I do not recall assuming any positions of trust with any of the activists, and do not recall being Treasurer of the WLF. As far as I was concerned, they were trying to educate me and convert me to their way of thinking.

Criminal justice

100. I did not participate or provoke, encourage or cause any other person to participate in any criminal activity whilst I was deployed as a UCO. I was never arrested, charged, tried or convicted of a criminal offence whilst deployed as a UCO. Neither did I appear in any criminal proceedings as a witness in my undercover identity.

101. As far as I am aware, the fact that I was an UCO was never disclosed in connection with any criminal investigation or prosecution and, to my knowledge, my reporting was not used in any criminal investigation. As far as I am aware, the product of my reports was never used in support of, or disclosed in connection with, any criminal investigation or prosecution, and I never provided evidence for use in any such prosecution.

Other legal or disciplinary proceedings and legal professional privilege

102. I was never involved in other legal proceedings or any complaint against or disciplinary proceedings involving a police officer in my undercover identity. I never received or became aware of any legally privileged information whilst deployed as a UCO.

Elected politicians

103. I had no involvement in or awareness of targeting elected politicians whilst I was deployed as a UCO.

Use of reporting

104. I did not know what happened to my reports after I gave them to my senior officers. I thought they might have aided the policing of meetings and the level of staffing they needed for any possible demonstration or direct action.

Exfiltration

105. I think my SDS deployment ended around January 1973. I think this is the correct date as [24] [redacted] provides details of private life at the time [redacted]

[redacted] At that point, I recall having long finished [25] with the SDS and being posted for at least 6 months [a subsequent role.]

106. If I did leave the SDS in January 1973, I would have been undercover with the SDS for just over a year since October 1971. Initially, I thought it was a shorter period of time than that but, based on the documents I have been shown, I accept that I could have been deployed until January 1973. The Special Report dated 5 February 1973 (Doc 51, [UCPI0000014707]) is a report of a meeting on 31 January 1973. I cannot recall if I was still attending meetings at that time, but it is possible.

107. I was withdrawn from the field as a precaution at the same time as [redacted] [26] [HN45] when his cover was compromised. Jill Mosdell was withdrawn at the same time and for the same reason. [HN45] was recognised at a meeting by

[REDACTED]

a member of the public.

[REDACTED]

31

108.

[REDACTED]

109. I cannot recall who told me that I would be withdrawn and I cannot recall if it was

31A

[HN45] or a senior officer that told me what had happened to [HN45] I cannot even recall if it was by telephone or in person. I do not remember being given a lengthy explanation; the events spoke for themselves. There was no formal SDS debrief. I simply did not make any further contact with the WLF. I was of little significance to them and I was probably hardly missed.

110. I have been asked to consider a document titled "*Penetration of Extremist Groups*" dated 28 November 1968 (Doc 6) but I cannot recall being aware of any rule not to serve longer than 12 months.

Managers and administrative staff

111. When I was deployed with the SDS, there were two senior officers as well as the UCOs. I recall the senior officers as being Phil Saunders and [31C] [HN294]. I do not recall anyone else managing the SDS.

112. Of course, they would have had senior officers to report to, but I don't know who they were. All the UCOs reported back to them. Their oversight was mainly at the regular SDS meetings. They might have called me on occasion, but I did not call them. I did not have a mobile phone and there was no phone at my cover address. I have seen the name [31D] [HN332] in the reports, and it rings a bell. I note that he signed many of the earlier reports in my name, but I do not recall my chain of command changing.

113. I have been asked to consider document titled "*Penetration of Extremist Groups*" dated 28 November 1968 (Doc 6). My chain of command was similar to the one set out in that document, but I do not recall there being any other Detective Inspectors. The only other person I recall was Peter Imbert, who was a higher rank than both Phil and [31E] [HN294] and I cannot recall any administrative staff, if there were any.

Management and supervision: general arrangements

114. My deployment was mainly supervised by Phil Saunders. He was my direct manager, and was a higher rank than [31F] [HN294]. We had regular SDS meetings at the safe house every weekday or at least four times per week. The

[REDACTED]

two senior officers would be there, along with the other UCOs. These were an opportunity for people to express concerns and submit written reports and expenses claims. I would give a one-to-one verbal report to one of the senior officers. As far as I recall, I would have handwritten my reports in the safe house and given them to the senior officers, although I might have made some notes just after an activist meeting so that I could remember the details. I cannot recall if I ever contacted the senior officers by telephone. There was no means of contacting me at my cover address as there was no telephone there.

115. I have read some of a book written by a UCO who was deployed around 20 years after me and it did not relate to my experience. There was no alcohol involved in the SDS meetings. I do not drink in any case, and only drank a little at the time. We got together to support each other and have a discussion with a senior officer.
116. As far as my welfare was concerned, my senior managers probably would have known if I was attending a meeting and where it was going to be, so they would have known where I was supposed to be. I suppose the safe house was also a safeguard for our welfare and, the minute there was a suggestion we might be exposed, we were withdrawn. In hindsight, I would not have joined the SDS as I was putting myself too much at risk and there were more worthwhile things I could have been doing.

[REDACTED]

Senior management and oversight bodies

117. I do not recall any Superintendents or above visiting the SDS during my deployment.

118. I do not recall any outside body with any form of regulatory or oversight responsibility visiting the SDS during my deployment.

119. I did not receive any form of commendation for my work as an SDS officer.

Deployment of contemporaries

[32] [32A]

120. There are only six other UCOs that I can recall: Jill Mosdell, [HN342] [REDACTED] [32] [REDACTED] [HN45] [REDACTED] [HN340] [REDACTED] [32] [REDACTED] [HN68] [REDACTED]. That was the core of the UCO group whilst I was deployed. I vaguely recall the name [32] [REDACTED] [HN332] [REDACTED] but no one else.

[32B]

121. As far as I recall, [HN294] [REDACTED] did not use a cover name whilst serving in the SDS as he was not operational.

122. As far as I am aware, none of my contemporary UCOs committed a criminal offence, or provoked, encouraged or caused a third party to commit a criminal offence, whilst deployed undercover.

123. As far as I am aware, none of my contemporary UCOs engaged in sexual activity whilst in their cover identity.

124. As far as I am aware, none of my contemporary UCOs were arrested, charged, tried or convicted in their undercover identity, or were involved in incidents of public disorder, violence or other criminal activity whilst deployed.

125. As far as I am aware, none of my contemporary UCOs reported any legally privileged information or reported on the activities of any elected politicians whilst deployed.

126. I would not expect to be aware of any of the above as I was not present with the other UCOs in the field and was not given the details of their work at any meetings. But I would be very shocked if they had engaged in any of the above activity based on the UCOs I knew.

127. I cannot comment on anything my contemporaries may have achieved for the benefit of policing or to assist the Security Service as I operated separately from them. We did not really share any specifics of our undercover work and I was not given access to that kind of information. It was kept between them and their senior officers.

Post deployment

Period immediately post deployment

128. I do not recall there being a period of rest after my SDS deployment. As set out above, I was not debriefed. Nor was I offered advice or ongoing support from the SDS or MPS following my withdrawal.

[REDACTED]

Post SDS police career

33

129. After I left the SDS, I moved to [REDACTED]

subsequent role within Special Branch

I think I was posted there because

they just wanted me out of the way. I had no say in it but I did not object to it at

34

all. [REDACTED] The subsequent role [REDACTED] was nothing to do with my SDS undercover work at all.

130. I was not offered counselling or welfare support following my work as a UCO, but at the time I did not think about it. I have been more affected by the inquiry than by my work in the SDS. As a very young uniformed officer I had dealt with some awful things, but the general view was that you were not supposed to show weaknesses. For example, I recall policing a demonstration [REDACTED] 34A [REDACTED] location [REDACTED] I recall being sat on a police bus operating the radio and the other officers walking outside. There must have been a sort of an incident for them to have left the bus. We got trapped in a narrow street and detached from the rest of the other police vehicles. The crowds were throwing rocks from skips at the side of the road. They started rocking the bus and trying to set fire to it. I had to pull injured officers off the street and back onto the bus. Eventually we got some support and managed to get away from there. When I got back to the station I was covered in blood. I was really quite frightened but there was no counselling. The men used to say: "you joined a man's job so get on with it".

Leaving the police

35

131.

HN348 provides details of private life at time of leaving police in the mid 1970s

36

132.

HN348 provides details of private life after leaving the police

Undercover work in the private sector

133. I do not recall being given any guidance from the MPS about working undercover in the private sector. I did not do any private undercover work and I was not in a position to do so once I had ^{36A} a child anyhow. If the opportunity had arisen, I would not have done so as I had begun to think about the relevance of the work I had done. I would have preferred to be involved with something a little more meaningful. My happiest times was as a uniformed policewoman when we mainly dealt with women and young people. As far as job satisfaction is concerned, I felt most fulfilled working with women who were victims of or had committed a crime. It was far more fulfilling than SDS undercover work and is the type of work that I have found most satisfying throughout my life. I question whether police officers should be undercover at

[REDACTED]

all. It seems to me that perhaps undercover work should all be dealt with by the Security Service, simply with links to senior police officers.

Any other matters

134. There is no other evidence which I am able to give which is of relevance to the work of the Undercover Policing Inquiry.

Request for documents

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

136. I have not been shown any document which is not in my witness bundle.

Diversity information

137. My gender is female.

138. My racial origin is White British.

Information to supplement my first statement

139. Since making my statement I have been supplied with some additional intelligence reports in a supplementary witness pack, which it is suggested, may assist in my recollection as to when I was first deployed as an undercover officer

38

in the SDS. At paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 above I explained I cannot recall exactly when I joined the SDS. My central records confirms that I joined the Special Branch **in the early 1970s** and that I joined the SDS not long after and certainly before September 1971. Furthermore, at paragraph 9 above I accepted that I must have joined the SDS and been deployed undercover by 6 October 1971 because this was the earliest report supplied in my original Witness Pack bearing my name.

140. I have considered the additional intelligence reports and, whilst I do not have any particular recollection of attending the earlier meetings, I accept that as my name is on the reports I must have attended the meetings. I accept that it is likely therefore, that I joined the SDS and was deployed earlier than 6 October 1971.

141. Paragraph 17 sets out the extent of my recollection regarding training and guidance in the SDS. The further intelligence reports do not assist me in expanding upon this and I cannot add anything further.

142. I have considered the intelligence report with reference number UCPI0000025259. I do not believe I was using the name which appears at the bottom of the page at the date this report was prepared. In light of this, I cannot say with confidence that I was the author of this report.

[REDACTED]

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

39

Signed: [REDACTED] HN348

Date: [REDACTED] 14.10.2019