

---

## COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY'S OPENING STATEMENT FOR TRANCHE 1

### PHASE 2

---

#### Contents

- [Tranche 1 Phase 2](#)
- [Appendix 1 – Groups reported on by the SDS as set out in the Annual Reports 1975 to 1984](#)
- [Appendix 2 – Phase 2 officers](#)

### TRANCHE 1 PHASE 2

#### The Inquiry's November 2020 Hearings

1. At the hearings held by the Inquiry in November 2020 we received oral and written evidence about events leading up to the formation of the undercover police unit that will be the focus of a good deal of this inquiry's work. The unit was known by a variety of names during its 40 year history. I shall refer to it throughout as the Special Demonstration Squad, or SDS. The evidence was to the effect that the SDS was set up to gather intelligence about the Vietnam Solidarity Committee (which I shall call the VSC) and, in particular, its 1968 "Autumn Offensive". The desire for more intelligence about the VSC appears to have stemmed from concerns, both within the police and within the Government, that there would be a repeat of the serious and violent public disorder that had occurred outside the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square at the demonstration organised by the VSC in March 1968.
2. The evidence about the SDS's first months of operation demonstrated that it was focused on those planning demonstrations against the Vietnam War: principally the VSC, but also Maoists who had founded a separate organisation, the British Vietnam Solidarity Front (which I shall refer to as the BVSF). Many of the early SDS undercover officers were deployed for only a few weeks or months<sup>1</sup>. They were all Special Branch officers with experience of how Special Branch had hitherto gathered and recorded intelligence. This had included attending activist meetings in plain clothes and giving a false name if asked. As

---

<sup>1</sup> The evidence indicated that 6 of the early SDS UCOs served only in 1968: HN218, HN323, HN327, HN334, HN318 and HN330. A seventh, HN322, does not appear to have deployed properly at all.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

SDS undercover officers they appear to have reported the same type of information in the same format. The difference was that the information which they reported was obtained by assuming, for an extended period, a false identity and playing the role of an activist. Doing so resulted in their obtaining much more access to private meetings of political activists. It also meant that some undercover police officers began to participate in the social lives of political activists. Regular reports were provided by the SDS about the activities of the VSC and the BVSF during the autumn of 1968.

3. In the event, the massive VSC organised demonstration, held on 27 October 1968, passed off peacefully, following a route from the Embankment to Hyde Park. Tariq Ali, one of the principal organisers of the demonstration, gave evidence that the VSC's leadership had no wish to see a repeat of the violence that had occurred in March 1968. The route which the VSC chose, avoiding the American Embassy, and the group's public pronouncements were intended to avoid violent clashes. There were violent scenes again outside the American Embassy which was the destination of a planned breakaway organised by the BVSF.
4. We received evidence about how and why the SDS continued to exist after the 27 October 1968 demonstration. In particular we admitted into evidence correspondence between the Metropolitan Police Service (which I shall call the MPS) and the Home Office about the continued need for and funding of the SDS. We noted concerns on the part of the Home Office that it might be embarrassed if the SDS did not observe tight security. The sensitivity committed to paper at that stage was about the use of public money to pay for cover accommodation.
5. Documents demonstrated that the Security Service was aware of the existence of the SDS from the start and already had an established working relationship with Special Branch before the SDS was formed. It appears to have been supportive of the unit and to have valued its intelligence reporting, much of which appears to have been copied to it using the address Box 500. The SDS's value to the Security Service was relied upon by the MPS to the Home Office as a reason to continue the existence of its undercover operations. The documents suggest that the MPS, Security Service and the Home Office proceeded on the basis that SDS intelligence assisted the Security Service in the discharge of its responsibility to counter subversion. We considered carefully the definitions of subversion applicable at the time, definitions which it is important to keep in mind during Phase 2.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

6. We saw how the SDS continued to operate after October 1968 with UCOs deployed into a growing list of left wing organisations, for periods of time longer than the majority of the SDS's initial operations. Groups were no longer being infiltrated on the basis of concerns about a particular imminent threat to public order. They were infiltrated on the basis that having undercover officers established within left wing activist groups was necessary in order to provide timely intelligence if trouble were to brew suddenly. A by-product of this approach, it was said, was the ongoing provision of intelligence useful to the Security Service, particularly in relation to the organisation and members of groups considered to be subversive.
7. A noticeable feature of the evidence admitted in Phase 1 was how little criminality was reported amongst the groups that were being infiltrated, how often groups reported on had subversive aims but lacked the means to realise those aims, and the limited extent of serious public disorder after 1968. Former undercover officers nevertheless often felt that the SDS had provided timely and accurate intelligence which permitted appropriate police resources to be allocated for the purposes of public order policing. At opposite ends of the spectrum there was, on the one hand, some reporting connected with Irish related terrorism about the funding of terrorism. On the other there was considerable reporting on causes considered today to be mainstream: anti-racism and women's rights.
8. Another striking feature of the SDS reporting in Phase 1 was the extensive, detailed and highly personal reporting on individuals. Some such reports were drafted in terms indicative of attitudes that are relevant to the issues of race and sex discrimination that we are investigating. The Phase 1 SDS deployments, particularly after October 1968, often appear to have involved the UCO being given a significant degree of latitude in relation to which events to attend and what information to report. In some cases that latitude extended to which groups to infiltrate. In terms of what was reported, SDS undercover officers seem typically to have cast their nets wide. Their understanding seems to have been that it all helped to build the intelligence picture, or that it was for others to decide what was relevant, or that it might be useful at some point. The written evidence that we have obtained for Phase 2 is consistent with these themes and we will be exploring the detail further in oral evidence.
9. In total the deployments of 25 former SDS undercover officers were covered in Phase 1, together with evidence relating to 4 early managers.

### The Tranche 1 Phase 2 Hearings

10. We now embark upon Phase 2 of the Inquiry's hearings. The Inquiry's method, in relation to the SDS, remains to investigate on an officer-by-officer basis. In this phase we will be receiving evidence which results from our investigation of a further 29 former SDS undercover police officers. In keeping with our investigative approach we will be calling witnesses and admitting written evidence about the deployments of these SDS undercover police officers in a broadly chronological order.
11. Seven of the former UCOs are the subject of restriction orders which cover both their real and cover names. The amount of evidence that the Inquiry can publish emanating from, or relating to, these officers is limited by the need to protect their identities. However, the Inquiry has obtained documents relating to all 7 deployments and witness statements from each of the former undercover officers which form part of the closed evidence that you, Sir, will take into account. A single composite gist containing the evidence relating to all seven which can be made public is being published on the Inquiry's website today<sup>2</sup>.
12. All but one of the remaining 22 former UCOs in Phase 2 are the subject of orders which restrict the publication of their real names but not their cover names. I will refer to them as "open officers". The exception is HN297, Richard Clark, who is not the subject of any restriction order<sup>3</sup>. The earliest deployment in this group is that of the officer known by the Herne nominal HN45 who used the cover name "David Robertson". Our investigations suggest that he deployed between 1970 and 1973. The latest deployment is that of HN155, who used the cover name "Phil Cooper". We understand that this officer deployed in 1979 and remained undercover until either late 1983 or early 1984.
13. All of the Phase 2 officers infiltrated political groups and all of their principal targets were left wing organisations. One officer, HN303 who used the cover name "Peter Collins", was instructed by his target group and not the SDS to infiltrate right wing groups: he appears to have done so, presumably in order to maintain his cover.

---

<sup>2</sup> UCPI0000034307

<sup>3</sup> HN354 "Vince Miller's" real name restriction order is going to be revoked and his real name will therefore be used in Phase 3. However, to protect the privacy of a third party in the short term, his real name remains restricted at present.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

14. A wide range of groups was reported on but the evidence will show that the group most commonly targeted by the SDS, during the 1970s, was that known until 1977 as the International Socialists and thereafter as the Socialist Workers Party.
15. The average length of the Phase 2 undercover officers' deployments is markedly longer than that of the very earliest SDS deployments. Deployments of between 3 and 5 years are the norm, although there are exceptions and there is a significant amount of variation between individual deployments. For example, shorter deployment could result if an undercover officer asked to be withdrawn, as the officer who used the cover name "Jeff Slater" HN351 states occurred; or if the officer's cover identity was compromised to some degree, as happened in the case of HN297 Richard Clark the officer who used the cover name "Rick Gibson".
16. We are investigating a large number of issues in relation to the SDS but three deserve particular mention, at the outset. In Phase 2, we will receive the first evidence of sexual contact and sexual relationships occurring between SDS undercover police officers, in their undercover identities, and women whom they met whilst using those undercover identities. Secondly, we will investigate the first instances in which the SDS instructed its undercover officers to use aspects of the identity of a deceased child upon which to found their undercover identities. Finally, we will hear evidence that will require the Chairman to consider whether to refer cases to a panel set up to consider potential miscarriages of justice arising from undercover policing. I will return to all three of these important topics later this morning.
17. Of the 22 open officers in Phase 2, 4 are deceased<sup>4</sup>. We are due to hear oral evidence from 8 former undercover officers<sup>5</sup>. 7 more have provided witness statements but will not be called to give oral evidence for a variety of reasons. In the remaining 3 cases we have not been able to obtain a witness statement from the former officer but we have recovered documents relating to his deployment<sup>6</sup>. In one of these cases, that of HN296 who used the cover name "Geoff Wallace", the Inquiry anticipates being able to obtain a witness statement at some point in the future.

---

<sup>4</sup> HN297 "Rick Gibson", HN300 "Jim Pickford", HN13 "Desmond or Barry Loader" and HN356 "William or Bill Biggs".

<sup>5</sup> HN45 "David Robertson", HN347 "Alex Sloan", HN298 "Michael Scott", HN200 "Roger Harris", HN304 "Graham Coates", HN354 "Vince Miller", HN126 "Paul Gray" and HN96 "Michael James".

<sup>6</sup> HN344 "Ian Cameron", HN303 "Peter Collins" and HN296 "Geoff Wallace".

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

18. The procedure for admitting the evidence of those former UCOs who give oral evidence will be to publish their witness statements and the documents relating to their deployment on the Inquiry's website at the start of the session in which the officer will give his oral evidence.
19. The evidence of the former UCOs who have provided witness statements but who will not be called to give oral evidence will be summarised by junior counsel to the Inquiry, in a live streamed session. The witness statement and documents relating to the deployment will be uploaded onto the Inquiry's website at the same time.
20. The documents relating to the deployments of those former undercover officers from whom there is no witness statement will be published on the Inquiry's website at a point appropriate to his place in the chronology.
21. We are not investigating the Security Service but an important aspect of our investigation of the SDS concerns its relationship with the Security Service. We have been greatly assisted to date by the Security Service in our search for potentially relevant documents. We have been further assisted by the provision of a corporate witness statement which provides important contextual evidence. It also explains the Security Service's perspective on documents which evidence the relationship between it and the SDS during the Tranche 1 era. The witness statement, made by a Security Service witness whom we are calling "Witness Z", together with a significant number of associated documents, will be published on the Inquiry's website today.
22. We will have the benefit of more evidence from activists who were reported upon by the SDS in Phase 2 than we had in Phase 1. Nine witnesses in this category will be giving oral evidence. Three more have provided witness statements. Two of these will be read into evidence and the third posted on the Inquiry's website.
23. In addition to the former undercover police officers and those who were the subject of SDS reporting, the evidence of six more witnesses completes the programme for Phase 2. The Inquiry has been provided with helpful statements from the relatives of two of the deceased former undercover officers: HN300 who used the cover name "Jim Pickford" and HN13 who used the cover name "Barry or Desmond Loader". We will be hearing from two of the risk assessors appointed by the Metropolitan Police Service because there is a

dispute of fact about what was said in their presence by the officer who used the cover name “Phil Cooper” HN155. The dispute concerns whether or not he said that he had engaged in sexual activity with another person in his undercover identity. Finally, we have two witness statements which address the question whether or not HN298’s conviction in his undercover identity was ever recorded in the criminal record of the living person whose name HN298 used as a cover name. These will be posted on the website when HN298 gives evidence.

24. I shall return to say more about the witnesses and the evidence that they will give later.
25. The default position for a witness who gives evidence in Phase 2 is that he or she will do so remotely over a virtual audio-visual link which enables the Chairman, Counsel to the Inquiry, other relevant lawyers and the witness to see and hear one another. The audio-visual feed will usually be streamed live at the Inquiry’s hearing venue, the Amba Hotel, Marble Arch. In the cases of two witnesses, for specific reasons accepted by the Chairman, only the audio feed will be streamed live at the hearing venue<sup>7</sup>. In all cases, people who wish to follow the evidence other than at our hearing venue will be able to do so online. The audio feed of all of the sessions at which witnesses give oral evidence to the Inquiry will be streamed online with a 10 minute delay. The Inquiry’s near real time transcript will also be streamed online subject to the same 10 minute delay. A finalised version of the transcript will be published on the Inquiry’s website at the end of each day. Some non-police witnesses have exercised the option to have both the audio and visual feeds of their oral evidence streamed with a 10 minute delay.
26. Core participants will begin making their opening statements for Phase 2 this afternoon and will continue through to the end of the week. They will all be streamed live on the Inquiry’s YouTube channel. We will be pausing at 10am tomorrow for a minute’s silence to remember Stephen Lawrence on the anniversary of his death 28 years ago. We will also pause at 10am on Friday for a minute’s silence to remember Blair Peach who died on 24 April 1979. The evidential sessions will begin next Monday and last until Thursday 13 May. A timetable for the witnesses and other evidence being received will be published on the Inquiry’s website, together with an Operational Note.

---

<sup>7</sup> “Madeleine” and HN126 “Paul Gray”



### Issues

27. We remain guided, but not straightjacketed, by the Lists of Issues published on the Inquiry's website. Two of the Inquiry's published issues lists are, in very large part, relevant to the Phase 2 investigation. First, the Module 1 Special Demonstration Squad Issues List, which is directed at the SDS's undercover officers. Second, the Module 2(a) Special Demonstration Squad Issues List, which concerns unit level management of the SDS.
28. The Module 1 SDS Issues List itemises 158 issues grouped under the following 21 headings:
- 28.1.1. The establishment of the SDS
  - 28.1.2. Size, organisation and composition of the SDS
  - 28.1.3. Recruitment, selection and training
  - 28.1.4. Legend building
  - 28.1.5. Targeting and initial authorisation
  - 28.1.6. Relationships
  - 28.1.7. Participation in or encouragement of crime
  - 28.1.8. Criminal proceedings
  - 28.1.9. Infringement of legal professional privilege
  - 28.1.10. Reporting generally
  - 28.1.11. Reporting on justice campaigns
  - 28.1.12. Reporting on The Stephen Lawrence Campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE
  - 28.1.13. Reporting on Elected politicians, political organisations and political activists
  - 28.1.14. Reporting on trade unions and trade union members
  - 28.1.15. Reporting on social and environmental activists
  - 28.1.16. The prevention and detection of crime
  - 28.1.17. Management, supervision and oversight
  - 28.1.18. Withdrawal from deployment
  - 28.1.19. Management of post-deployment conduct
  - 28.1.20. Debriefing
  - 28.1.21. The welfare of undercover officers and their families
- 28.2. The M2a SDS Issues List specifies 219 issues grouped under the following 30 subheadings<sup>8</sup>:
- 28.2.1. The establishment of the SDS

---

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module\\_2a\\_issues\\_list-san.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf)



## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 28.2.2. The function of the SDS
- 28.2.3. Size, organisation and composition of the SDS
- 28.2.4. Management and supervisory structure and function
- 28.2.5. Selection and recruitment
- 28.2.6. Training and guidance
- 28.2.7. Legend building
- 28.2.8. Targeting and authorisation
- 28.2.9. Role of supervisors and managers – generally
- 28.2.10. Reporting on justice campaigns
- 28.2.11. Reporting on the Stephen Lawrence campaign and Duwayne Brooks OBE
- 28.2.12. Reporting on elected politicians, political organisations and political activists
- 28.2.13. Reporting on trade unions and trade union members
- 28.2.14. Reporting on social and environmental activists
- 28.2.15. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards relationships between undercover officers and their targets or those upon whom they reported
- 28.2.16. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards participation in, or encouragement of, crime by undercover officers
- 28.2.17. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in criminal proceedings
- 28.2.18. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards undercover officers' involvement in civil proceedings
- 28.2.19. Management knowledge of and attitudes towards infringement of legal professional privilege by undercover officers
- 28.2.20. SDS record keeping
- 28.2.21. Whistleblowing
- 28.2.22. Withdrawal from deployment
- 28.2.23. Debriefing
- 28.2.24. Management of post-deployment conduct
- 28.2.25. The welfare of undercover officers and their families
- 28.2.26. The prevention and detection of crime
- 28.2.27. Interaction between SDS managers and those responsible for overseeing its operation
- 28.2.28. Dissemination of intelligence
- 28.2.29. Interaction with the Security Service
- 28.2.30. Disbandment of the SDS

### Political and Geopolitical Context

29. I turn now to say a little about the political and geopolitical context in which the events that we will be hearing about in Phase 2 occurred. The long-running Vietnam War came to an end in 1975 and the remainder of that conflict did not provoke any further public disorder in this country on the scale seen in Grosvenor Square in March 1968. However, the Cold War continued throughout the period we are now considering and formed an important part of the context in which events with which the Inquiry is concerned occurred. At its core was the rivalry between two systems: communist and capitalist. The latter often referred to as the Free World by its supporters and imperialist by its detractors. There was concern within Government that foreign powers, especially the Soviet Union, were seeking to foment division and unrest. In fact one SDS undercover officer, HN106, who used the cover name “Barry Tompkins”, did report being approached by the Soviet foreign intelligence service, the KGB<sup>9</sup>. But such contact was an isolated occurrence for the SDS. More relevant, for our purposes, is the apparent interest in any form of left wing political activity considered subversive. The evidence heard in Phase 1 and that in Phase 2 indicates that this interest emanated both from the Security Service and Special Branch. Counter-subversion was a part of the Security Service’s remit to defend the Realm. A part of Special Branch’s remit was to assist the Security Service in its counter-subversion work.
30. Relations between the West and the People’s Republic of China changed significantly during the period in which the Phase 2 UCOs were deployed. At the start of the period China was Maoist. Relations with the West were poor. Relations gradually improved. President Nixon’s visit to China in 1972 was an important step in that process. Diplomatic relations between the United States of America and China were restored at the start of 1979. Mao died in 1976 and China entered a post-Maoist era. Two Phase 2 SDS officers, HN45 “David Robertson” and HN13 “Desmond or Barry Loader” specifically infiltrated Maoist groups. The former in 1970 and the latter in 1975. Why these groups were targeted and whether their infiltration was justified remain the subject of investigation. We shall be hearing oral evidence from Diane Langford, a prominent member of Maoist groups at the time whose activities, personal and political, were reported on by a number of undercover officers.

---

<sup>9</sup> HN106 Witness statement, para.123

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

31. The Prime Ministers during the Phase 2 era were:
  - 31.1. Edward Heath (1970-1974);
  - 31.2. Harold Wilson (1974-1976);
  - 31.3. James Callaghan (1976-1979); and
  - 31.4. Margaret Thatcher (1979-1990).
  
32. The Home Secretaries during the Phase 2 era were:
  - 32.1. Reginald Maudling (1970-1972)
  - 32.2. Robert Carr (1972-1974)
  - 32.3. Roy Jenkins (1974-1976)
  - 32.4. Merlyn Rees (1976-1979)
  - 32.5. William Whitelaw (1979-1983)
  - 32.6. Leon Brittan (1983-1985)
  
33. The Troubles in Northern Ireland, which had flared in 1969, continued throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s. The early-to-mid 1970s were particularly violent, especially after the killings on Bloody Sunday on 30 January 1972. Special Branch retained lead responsibility for countering Irish related terrorism on the mainland throughout the Phase 2 deployments. A consistent theme in the Phase 2 evidence is Special Branch's interest in groups campaigning about the situation in Northern Ireland. Two of the deployments that we are considering in Phase 2 were targeted specifically at Irish related groups. HN347 who used the cover name "Alex Sloan" targeted the non-sectarian but, as it described itself, anti-imperialist Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front (the INLSF) in 1971<sup>10</sup>. Both HN347 and Dr Norman Temple, who was a member of the INLSF, will be giving oral evidence. HN344 who used the cover name "Ian Cameron" was transferred into the SDS having secured an entrée into the Northern Minorities Defence Force in 1972. The NMDF is recorded as believing that civil war was imminent in Northern Ireland and as seeking to provide military training to volunteers prepared to fight in the anticipated conflict. Many left wing groups of the era campaigned in support of a united Ireland, amongst other causes. Very many of the Phase 2 UCOs reported on this activity in the context of their infiltration of the groups concerned.
  
34. Racism was an important political issue for the left wing throughout the period of the Phase 2 deployments. Reporting on the anti-racist activities of both single issue groups and left wing groups generally is very common amongst the

---

<sup>10</sup> MPS-0739470

documents we have recovered. The issues of the day were both domestic and international and the evidence that we will be receiving in Phase 2 needs to be considered in conjunction with the related evidence already taken in Phase 1.

35. There was considerable protest against the system of apartheid in South Africa that was in place throughout the Phase 1 and 2 eras. This included, for example, the work of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (or AAM as I shall call it) and specific campaigns such as the Stop the Seventy Tour (or STST).
36. There was also protest against the Government of Rhodesia which had unilaterally declared independence from the United Kingdom in 1965 and persisted, almost unrecognised internationally, with a system of white minority rule until it was forced to capitulate after a long guerrilla war. The country was granted international recognition as Zimbabwe, in 1980, following elections won by Robert Mugabe's ZANU party.
37. At the start of the Phase 2 era, Portugal remained a right wing dictatorship which exercised colonial power over a number of African countries. Of specific relevance for our purposes these included Angola and Mozambique. The dictatorship fell in the 1974 Carnation Revolution and with it Portuguese colonial rule. The SDS reported, for example, on the activities in England of the Dambusters Mobilising Committee, a campaign against the Caborra Bassa dam project in Mozambique. The project was a collaboration between Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia. There are other occasional mentions in SDS reporting of events both in Portugal and its southern African colonies.
38. At home, the 1970s witnessed a marked rise in far right political parties, especially the National Front and the British Movement. There was considerable tension between these groups and groups on the left which resolutely opposed them. These tensions spilled over into violence. Sometimes violence was on a small scale, for example in relation to the sale of party newspapers but, occasionally, violence occurred on a larger scale, particularly when there were demonstrations and counter demonstrations. There is a significant amount of SDS reporting about the struggle between the far right and anti-racist, anti-fascist groups. In terms of public order policing, perhaps the biggest single race-related disturbance reported upon in the Phase 2 period by SDS officers was that which occurred when the National Front marched from New Cross to Lewisham on 13 August 1977, an occasion known colloquially as the Battle of Lewisham. Amongst other things, we will be

examining the role played by the SDS in policing before, during and after that event.

39. We have obtained two news reports about the Battle of Lewisham which give a flavour of the events that took place. We are grateful to the BBC and Associated Press respectively for them.

DISPLAY DOC043 BBC Report

DISPLAY DOC042 Associated Press Report

40. On 23 April 1979 the National Front held a meeting at Southall Town Hall in the run up to the 1979 general election. It was met with staunch opposition from counter-demonstrators. In the course of the public disorder that ensued that evening Blair Peach, an anti-racist, anti-fascist, member of the SWP and Anti-Nazi League (which I shall refer to as the ANL) received a blow to the head that was to prove fatal. The lethal blow was almost certainly struck by a member of the MPS's Special Patrol Group<sup>11</sup>. The aftermath of Blair Peach's death and the justice campaign that was established after his death were reported on by members of the SDS. We will be exploring the extent to which it did so and hearing oral evidence from Celia Stubbs, Blair's partner, who was also reported on.
41. HN106, who used the cover name "Barry Tompkins" infiltrated and reported on the East London Workers Against Racism (or ELWAR). The group was connected to the Revolutionary Communist Party. It had, as the name suggests, revolutionary aims. ELWAR's members are recorded as visiting victims of racist attacks and organising vigilante patrols in areas with a history of racist attacks. By this route HN106 may have come into contact and reported on the identities of the victims of racist attacks. He states that he: *"would go as a group of three or four people to offer support to families that were experiencing difficulties as a result of their race and we would offer assistance and invite them to become involved with WAR"*<sup>12</sup>. He certainly reported on ELWAR's activities in this regard<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/apr/27/blair-peach-killed-police-met-report> and <https://www.met.police.uk/foi-ai/af/accessing-information/met/investigation-into-the-death-of-blair-peach/>

<sup>12</sup> Witness statement para.92

<sup>13</sup> UCPI0000018095

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

DISPLAY UCPI0000018095

Paragraphs 2 & 3

42. Through ELWAR, HN106 also reported on a march in support of the Newham 8 campaign<sup>14</sup>. A public meeting of the Newham 8 Defence Campaign held on 28 October 1982 was the subject of another report although HN106 has no recollection of it<sup>15</sup>. There appear to be at least some similarities between HN106's deployment and that of HN81 (who used the cover name "David Hagan"). In the 1990s "David Hagan" reported on the Stephen Lawrence Campaign. He did so having infiltrated another group which campaigned against racism, the Movement for Justice.
43. Racial tensions between the police and people in the London Borough of Lambeth, combined with serious social and economic problems, boiled over in April 1981 when the Brixton riots occurred. The scale and ferocity of the violence that ensued was considerable. The documents that we will be putting into evidence do not suggest that there was significant SDS intelligence either before or during the riots but there is some evidence of reporting in their aftermath. For example, HN356 (cover name "Bill Biggs") had been infiltrating the Socialist Workers Party (or SWP) in south east London, particularly in Greenwich and Plumstead, for some time by the time of the riots. However, he appeared in Brixton in the months following the riots apparently in connection with a newly formed branch of the SWP<sup>16</sup>.
44. Many of the civilian witnesses in Phase 2 were very active anti-racists. Both Lord Peter Hain and Christabel Gurney OBE held particularly prominent leadership roles. All have evidence to give relevant to the infiltration of anti-racist groups.
45. Campaigning for sexual equality continued throughout the Phase 2 era. Many of the groups infiltrated by the SDS supported this cause. Towards the end of the Phase 1 hearings we heard evidence from HN348 (whose cover name was "Sandra"). She infiltrated the Women's Liberation Front, reporting on members of that group, including Diane Langford. Our oral evidence in Phase 2 will begin with hearing from Diane Langford. Towards the end of our oral hearings we will

---

<sup>14</sup> UCPI0000019525

<sup>15</sup> UCPI0000015892 and witness statement 103d. There are other SDS reports on racial justice campaigns the New Cross Massacre Action Committee and Winston Rose Action Campaign which are in HN106's folder in the bundle and possibly attributable to HN106. See our summary for HN106 at para. 7.29

<sup>16</sup> UCPI00000015441 & UCPI00000016622

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

also hear from “Madeleine” whose activism within the Women’s Voice subgroup of the SWP was reported on by HN354 “Vince Miller” in the late 1970s.

46. The 1970s, particularly after the oil crisis of 1973, and the early 1980s were a period of economic malaise and industrial unrest. There was high inflation and mass unemployment. A number of the groups infiltrated by the SDS involved themselves in the industrial unrest and championed associated causes. For example the support of both the Workers Revolutionary Party and the International Socialists for Shrewsbury 2 and Shrewsbury 24 campaigns was reported on by SDS officers. There were also protests against unemployment, such as Right to Work marches which the Phase 2 evidence indicates were infiltrated by SDS officers. We will be exploring why such reporting was made and whether it was justified.
47. Trade unions and strike action organised by them were prominent in the 1970s and early 1980s. References to trade unions and trade union membership is common amongst the Phase 2 documents but appears to arise in the context of SDS deployments into left wing political groups and not as a result of any specific targeting of trade unions. It includes some references to core participant unions UCATT and the NUM. One officer, HN299/342 cover name “David Hughes”, has stated that he joined a trade union, the Transport and General Workers Union (which I shall refer to as the TGWU). However, we have found no evidence that trade unions were the specific target of an SDS deployment. There will be some evidence to the effect that the groups infiltrated by the SDS were themselves seeking to infiltrate and influence the direction of trade unions. We will be examining why trade unions and trade union membership featured in SDS reporting.
48. One particularly protracted industrial dispute of the time is mentioned repeatedly in SDS reporting and involved significant public disorder: that at the Grunwick Film Processing Laboratories. The dispute, about union recognition, involved a two year strike. We are grateful to the Associated Press for the following contemporary report.

DISPLAY DOC041

49. Returning to the international stage, other events occasionally feature in the evidence that we will be adducing. For example the death of Franco in 1975 which led to the end of fascist dictatorship in Spain and a transition to



democracy; the Arab-Israeli conflict which persisted throughout the Phase 2 period; and the coming to power in Cambodia of Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge.

### **Phase 2 Management Chain**

50. I move now to our present understanding of relevant aspects of the organisation of Special Branch during the Phase 2 era and the management chain above the officers whose evidence we will be hearing. All, of course, subject to the evidence and especially to the more detailed examination of management that we are planning to undertake in Phase 3 of Tranche 1 and Tranche 6 of the Inquiry's work.

#### *Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis*

51. In 1972 Sir Robert Mark succeeded Sir John Waldron as Commissioner of the Police of the Metropolis. Sir David McNee was the next Commissioner from 1977 until mid-1982 when Sir Kenneth Newman was appointed. He served until 1984. We will be receiving evidence that senior officers, including Commissioners, visited the SDS personally on a number of occasions during the Phase 2 era and we will be exploring what senior officers knew about the operation of the unit.

#### *Deputy Commissioners*

52. The sequence of Deputy Commissioners was Sir Robert Mark (1968-1972), John Hill (1972), Sir Jim Starritt (1972-1975), Sir Colin Woods (1975-1977) and Patrick Kavanagh (1977-1983).

#### *Assistant Commissioners (Crime)*

53. At the rank of Assistant Commissioner (Crime) Peter Brodie was succeeded in 1972 by Colin Woods until 1975. John S Wilson held the post of Assistant Commissioner (Crime) from 1975 until he was succeeded by Gilbert Kelland in 1977. Gilbert Kelland remained in post until 1984.

#### *Deputy Assistant Commissioner*

54. At the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissioner and occupying the post Head of Special Branch, was Ferguson Smith between 1970 and 1972; followed by Victor Gilbert between 1972 and 1977; Robert Bryan occupied the post between 1977 and 1981 and was followed by Colin Hewett.

### *Commander*

55. Documents held by the Inquiry indicate that Matthew Rodger held the rank of Commander between 1970 and 1974. From February 1973 Rollo Watts was signing documents in the capacity of Acting Commander<sup>17</sup>. He held the rank of Commander Special Branch from at least 1976 to 1977. He was followed by John Wilson, HN332 and David Bicknell.

### *Chief Superintendent*

56. At the rank of Chief Superintendent, significant documents are signed by Arthur Cunningham in the period 1968 to 1972. During 1971 it appears that Rollo Watts signed documents as Acting Chief Superintendent<sup>18</sup>. HN332, who is more significant for his role as head of the SDS at lower ranks, also occupies this rank in 1972. Documents indicate that Riby Wilson occupied the role of Chief Superintendent from January 1975 and thereafter John Wilson took over until 1978 when he became Commander Special Branch. Derek Kneale was Chief Superintendent in 1979 and was succeeded by Geoffrey Craft in 1981 who continued in the role until 1983. Both of the latter two officers had previously been the Chief Inspector in charge of the SDS and are early examples of former SDS managers rising through ranks in which they continue to have the SDS in their chain of command<sup>19</sup>.

### *Superintendent*

57. David Bicknell was Superintendent between 1974 and 1976 and Derek Kneale from 1976. On the evidence obtained by the Inquiry it is likely that Ken Pryde occupied the role of Superintendent from at least early 1978<sup>20</sup>. He continued in this role into late 1979<sup>21</sup>. Mike Waller was Superintendent between approximately 1981 and 1983<sup>22</sup>.

### *Chief Inspector*

---

<sup>17</sup> For example MPS-0730219 contains a series of minute sheets

<sup>18</sup> For example MPS-0738137 contains a series of minute sheets

<sup>19</sup> Riby Wilson had also had some involvement with the SDS, initially as an administrator and later countersigning some SDS intelligence reports between February and December 1969 for the unit's Chief Inspector.

<sup>20</sup> MPS-0728981 signs Annual Review for 1977; MPS-0726721 p.38 signs appraisal

<sup>21</sup> UCPI0000030893

<sup>22</sup> MPS-0747446 paragraph 53 (witness statement of Craft)

58. Phil Saunders occupied the post of Chief Inspector of the SDS from July 1969 until August 1971. During the first part of this period, until March 1970, Saunders appears to have been an Acting Chief Inspector. During this period he may have shared the role with Detective Inspector Riby Wilson. Thereafter Saunders is recorded as a Chief Inspector. Before taking command of the SDS, Saunders had served in the SDS, from the unit's formation, as a detective inspector.
59. Chief Inspector Saunders was himself succeeded by HN332 in August 1971<sup>23</sup>. HN332 commanded the SDS, briefly, until early 1972. Like Saunders, he too had served as a detective inspector in the SDS from the unit's inception. It appears that HN332 was an SDS detective inspector until at least July 1969<sup>24</sup>.
60. The SDS' next leader was HN294, between 1972 and 1974. He commenced his service in the SDS, when holding the rank of Detective Sergeant, in December 1969<sup>25</sup>. He served as a Detective Inspector from March 1970<sup>26</sup> and is recorded as being Acting Chief Inspector from mid-1972<sup>27</sup> onwards, until his promotion to Chief Inspector by 1974<sup>28</sup>.
61. HN294 was succeeded by Derek Kneale who commanded the SDS between 1974 and early 1976. He served briefly as a Detective Inspector in the SDS before promotion to Chief Inspector.
62. After a period as Acting Chief Inspector, Geoffrey Craft was promoted to Chief Inspector in November 1976<sup>29</sup> and remained in the role until 1977. He was succeeded by Ken Pryde who was himself succeeded by Michael Ferguson in early 1978. Barry Moss took over in the role in February 1980 and remained in the role for one year before being promoted to Superintendent. He retained responsibilities for the SDS whilst a replacement DCI was recruited, ceasing his involvement in the SDS in December 1981. He was succeeded by Trevor Butler in mid-1981. To the recollection of Geoffrey Craft, David Short occupied the role of Chief Inspector between 1981 and 1983<sup>30</sup>. Both Michael Ferguson and Barry Moss were former SDS undercover officers. It is a feature of the

---

<sup>23</sup> See MPS-0730219, p18

<sup>24</sup> UCPI0000005800

<sup>25</sup> MPS-0739232

<sup>26</sup> MPS-0729093

<sup>27</sup> MPS-0728970

<sup>28</sup> MPS-0728975

<sup>29</sup> MPS-0747446 paragraph 21 (Craft's witness statement)

<sup>30</sup> MPS-0747446 paragraph 53

SDS that a number of its former undercover officers became managers in the unit and we will be examining throughout our investigation of the SDS whether this had an impact on how the SDS was run.

### *Detective Inspector*

63. HN294 occupied the role of Detective Inspector between March 1970<sup>31</sup> and mid-1972 when he is recorded as being Acting Chief Inspector<sup>32</sup>.
64. Derek Brice was the Detective Inspector between 1973 and 1974 and was succeeded by Geoffrey Craft who became Acting Chief Inspector before being officially promoted to that role in November 1976<sup>33</sup>. Angus McIntosh was the Detective Inspector between 1976 and 1979. Les Willingale appears to have served as a Detective Inspector in 1977. Trevor Butler was the Detective Inspector between 1979 and 1981 when he was succeeded by HN68.

### *Administrators*

65. During the time period with which Phase 2 of the evidence is concerned SDS office administrative functions were carried out by Detective Sergeant David Smith between October 1970 and October 1974<sup>34</sup>, then Detective Sergeant Richard Walker between 1974 and 1978. Detective Sergeant Richard Scully performed administrative duties from 1978 to 1980. Detective Sergeant Paul Croyden performed these duties from 1979 to 1981. Detective Sergeant Christopher Skey also undertook these duties from the late 1970's to early 1980s.
66. Organisationally, the SDS became a part of the newly created S Squad in July 1974. Paragraph 1 of the SDS Annual Report for 1974 explained the development in the following terms<sup>35</sup>.

*"Since July 1974, the SDS has been a part of the newly created S Squad which was formed to co-ordinate the various technical and support functions performed by Special Branch, and as such, now has the added benefit of a Chief Superintendent and Superintendent, thus improving still further the degree of supervision which is so necessary in this delicate field of*

---

<sup>31</sup> MPS-0729093

<sup>32</sup> MPS-0728970

<sup>33</sup> MPS-0747446 paragraph 21 (Craft's witness statement)

<sup>34</sup> MPS-0747443 paragraph 9 (Smith's witness statement)

<sup>35</sup> MPS-0730906 p.8/19, para.1

*operations. A further advantage of being part of “S Squad” is that there can be greater co-operation between the SDS and other sections of the Squad, leading to greater efficiency against common targets.”*

### **Documents: Preliminary Observations**

67. Before I turn to introduce some specific documents that will form part of the evidence in Phase 2, I should make some preliminary observations on documents generally. Shortly before the start of the Tranche 1 Phase 1 hearings we posted a disclosure note on the Inquiry’s website setting out for the whole of Tranche 1 how the documents in the hearing bundle had been obtained, selected and redacted<sup>36</sup>. On 25 March we published an addendum on the website to bring these matters up to date. Amongst other things, the addendum set out how we have obtained material from the Security Service and outlined the contents of the Phase 2 Hearing Bundle<sup>37</sup>. The vast majority of the documents that we will be putting into evidence in Phase 2 have come either from the Metropolitan Police Service or the Security Service. In many instances, copy quality is a serious problem. I am afraid that some of the documents that we will be working with are very difficult to read. In some places text is illegible.
68. It has sometimes been necessary to put into the Hearing Bundle documents which post-date the Phase 2 era. For example, so that they can be put to witnesses who we are calling in Phase 2 and avoid having to recall them at a later date. Save for one exceptional case, such documents have been redacted to the state in which they will be used not just in Phase 2 but also later in the Inquiry. It is important that people bear in mind that some of the persons mentioned in these documents will not have their say about them until much later in the Inquiry. The truth or fairness of their contents may be disputed. Future witnesses may have important context to add. The Inquiry will be considering these documents, at this stage, on that basis.

### **Annual Reports**

69. We are today uploading to the Inquiry’s website the SDS’s annual reports for the years 1975 to 1984 inclusive and associated correspondence. Earlier annual reports were admitted into evidence in Phase 1 and are already on the

---

<sup>36</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20201022\\_T1\\_Disclosure\\_Note.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20201022_T1_Disclosure_Note.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210325-T1\\_disclosure\\_note-addendum.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210325-T1_disclosure_note-addendum.pdf)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

website. The pattern in the period 1975 to 1984 is similar to that of previous years. A report was produced by the SDS itself and signed either by the Chief Inspector or by one of the unit's detective inspectors. It was passed up the chain of command and clearly informs the contents of a letter from a senior officer in the Metropolitan Police to the Home Office advocating the continuing need for the unit and seeking continued funding for the SDS for another year. Approval was then forthcoming in a written response.

70. The annual reports contain a great deal of information about the SDS. We will be examining their accuracy and significance in oral evidence, in this phase and in Phase 3, when we will be hearing from former SDS managers. The later reports overlap with both deployments of UCOs and the tenure of managers who will be considered in Tranche 2. I consciously leave until then consideration of such material, for example the references to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the animal rights movement.
71. The reports record information about the size of the SDS. Between 1975 and 1984 the overall size of the unit fluctuates between 15 and 18 persons. The number of undercover officers fluctuates between 9 and 12, most usually it is 12. Staffing of the back office is usually 5 or 6, although in 1977 it fell to 4.

Year	Total Number of Officers	Operational	Back Office
1975	17	12 5 Sergeants 7 Constables	5 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 1 Constable
1976	17	12 4 Sergeants 8 Constables	5 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 1 Constable
1977	15	11 2 Sergeants 9 Constables	4 1 Inspector 3 Sergeants
1978	16	11	5

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

		4 Sergeants 7 Constables	1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 1 Constable (awaiting deployment)
1979	16	11 4 Sergeants 7 Constables	5 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 3 Sergeants (1 awaiting deployment)
1980	18	12 8 Sergeants 4 Constables	6 1 A/Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 2 Constables (1 awaiting deployment)
1981	15	9 6 Sergeants 3 Constables	6 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 2 Constables (awaiting deployment)
1982	18	12 8 Sergeants 4 Constables	6 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 2 Sergeants 2 Constables (awaiting deployment)
1983	18	12 6 Sergeants 6 Constables	6 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector



## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

			2 Sergeants 2 Constables (awaiting deployment)
1984	17	12 7 Sergeants 5 Constables	5 1 Chief Inspector 1 Inspector 3 Sergeants (1 awaiting deployment)

72. A common feature of the annual reports is a statement about the purpose of the unit. They differentiate between what is stated to be the primary role of the SDS which relates to the policing of public order and a secondary aim relating to subversion. For example, paragraph 2 of the 1975 report states:

*“Since 1968, the SDS has concentrated on gathering intelligence about the activities of those extremists whose political views are to the left of the Communist Party of Great Britain, generally described as the “ultra-left”, and the anarchist and libertarian movements. The primary aim has been to give warning of impending demonstrations and to obtain information, not available from any other source, regarding the number of persons taking part and the degree of planned or likely public disorder. This information enables “A” Department to assess the required police coverage to ensure adequate control. In pursuance of this aim, valuable information is also obtained regarding subversive organisations which is passed to other Special Branch Squads and to the Security Service”.*

73. One explanation given from time to time in the documents to justify the SDS’s role is an assertion that some left wing groups did not co-operate with the police when organising demonstrations. For example, paragraph 7 of the 1975 report states:

*“Such schisms [amongst left wing groups] and smaller groupings are of course to the advantages of the police, whose manpower would be severely stretched should the “ultra-left” sink their differences and unite for joint demonstrations. This advantage, however is to some extent outweighed by the need for greater SDS coverage of the smaller groups, who, unlike the larger, more established organisations rarely inform police of their intention to demonstrate, and lacking a committee structure or headquarters, cannot be*

*contacted in the normal way. Such information which is obtained by the SDS is passed, with the necessary safeguards, by Commander 'Operations' to Commander 'A' Department".*

74. The Assistant Commissioner (Crime)'s covering letter to the Home Office in 1977 developed the point. I quote<sup>38</sup>.

*"Non co-operation with the police is a current feature of ultra-left revolutionary philosophy and the primary, and almost unique, value of the Special Demonstration Squad lies in its ability not only to provide warning of forthcoming events but also to forecast the size of the support and the degree of threat to public order. This intelligence is of immense value to our uniformed colleagues who are able to assess the strength of police coverage required, as well as to deploy that strength operationally in the most suitable way, i.e. both overt and in reserve. Needless to say, this brings a side benefit in ensuring the most economic use of manpower. The fact that many of the individuals and organisations of concern to the Squad fall into the subversive category produces a by-product of information which is of direct interest to the Security Service and which is acknowledged by them as being of considerable assistance".*

75. Another reason given within the annual reports to continue SDS operations, is the risk of sudden future public disorder even during times when public disorder was on the wane. In other words, infiltrate just in case. Paragraph 31 of the 1975 report reads:

*"Whilst, for a variety of reasons there has, over the past few years, been a decline in the disorders associated with political demonstrations, violence generally has increased within our society and the potential for attacks on public order are ever present. The situation could change rapidly and it is the responsibility of the SDS to watch such trends carefully and be strategically placed to take efficient action".*

76. In the same vein, paragraph 18 of the 1979 Annual Report succinctly states:

*"A constant supply of intelligence about the intentions of the extremists remains an essential ingredient of police preparations in preventing disorder and is the primary object of the Special Demonstration Squad"<sup>39</sup>.*

---

<sup>38</sup> MPS-0730719/1 para. 4

<sup>39</sup> MPS-0728963/12

77. A third reason is the argument that maintaining public order is important, sensitive and only the SDS could obtain the intelligence that they did. It is articulated at paragraph 33 of the 1975 report. I quote:

*"The Commissioner has stated that 'the maintenance of order during political demonstrations has always been the most sensitive problem of the Metropolitan Police'. The SDS was formed in 1968 to assist in providing a solution to this very problem and the officers currently serving, closely supervised and constantly aware of the need for security, will continue to provide valuable intelligence on public order, which only they can obtain".*

78. The reports always give an indication of the groups that the SDS has targeted. A list of those groups, divided by report, is set out in Appendix 1 to the written version of this opening statement. With the exception of a little reporting on the far right which resulted from HN303 being tasked to do so by the Workers' Revolutionary Party, all of the groups are either left wing or tended to draw support mainly from the left. A large number of different groups were infiltrated falling into the following categories: Trotskyist, Maoist (or Marxist-Leninist), Irish related, Anarchist, Alternative Society, Anti-Racist and Anti-Fascist, Revolutionary Socialist and latterly Anti-Nuclear. Animal Liberation groups also appear as a category in their own right on the lists towards the end of the period. There are sometimes other groups, such as the National Abortion Campaign and, in 1984 (and therefore Tranche 2), Miners' Support Groups.

79. HN303's infiltration of the far right is summarised in the 1975 Annual Report which reads.

*"For the first time an officer has penetrated the National Front, at the instigation of a leading member of the Workers Revolutionary Party with whom he is particularly friendly, and is obliged to lead a 'treble' life. By attending National Front meetings in the East End of London he has discovered a small group of hard line fascists, dissatisfied with the National Front leadership, calling themselves the Legion of St. George, whose intent is to move even further to the right. Although few in number, such a group could well pose future public order problems."*<sup>40</sup>

80. The apparent explanation as to why the SDS did not infiltrate the far right until later in its history, with the exception of HN303's unexpected diversion into the far right at the behest of the WRP, can be found in the 1976 Annual Report. Special Branch already had excellent sources in the far right. The SDS

---

<sup>40</sup> MPS-073099/2 para. 4

however, made it clear to its superiors that it stood ready to infiltrate the far right if it were to become necessary. Paragraph 9 of the 1976 report reads.

*“For some months in 1975 an officer from the Squad penetrated the National Front at the behest of his ‘parent’ Trotskyist organisation. The information gained added nothing of real value to that obtainable from already excellent Special Branch sources and since the officer’s withdrawal early in 1976 it has not been considered necessary to replace him. If the Metropolitan Police is to keep the peace between the extremes of the political spectrum it is clearly essential that accurate information be readily available from both ends. Should existing sources on the far right show any sign of weakening, the SDS will give immediate consideration to renewed coverage there”.*

81. The justification given for infiltrating anarchist groups is a concern that they will spawn further serious violent offending of the type committed by the Angry Brigade in the early 1970s. In this vein, paragraph 6 of the 1976 Annual Report states:

*“Little has changed on the anarchist front in the last year. Those professing the creed are a continuing nuisance on demonstrations and from the circles in which they move come rumours of the formation of ‘Angry Brigade’ type cells bent upon violence. Several individuals known to hold such views have appeared in political campaigns recently and SDS coverage of anarchist groups continues in the hope that advance warning may be obtained of any intention to carry political protest into the realms of violence”.*

82. References to SDS intelligence leading to arrests are uncommon generally in our work but one such reference appears, in connection with the anarchist scene at paragraph 2(iii)(c) of the 1978 Annual Report which reads:

*“During the past year SDS coverage of the Anarchist scene has been continued. In June, two people, known by forenames only and wanted by police for conspiracy to cause explosions, were identified, and although their appearance had been changed radically, located and as a result of the information provided they were arrested”.*

83. The 1982 report contains evidence of a raid on the Freedom Collective of Anarchists based on SDS intelligence but which did not result in arrests. Police are recorded as having found pamphlets dealing with the manufacture of explosive devices, home-made guns, assassination techniques and booby-

traps which were seized<sup>41</sup>. It also recorded the results of SDS intelligence gathering in the aftermath of the Brixton riots<sup>42</sup>.

*“SDS information has indicated that no links exist between the highly politicised Brixton anarchists and the local young black community”.*

84. A review of the unit's activities during the year is always included in an annual report. The contents record salient events and issues. Typically the major demonstrations and public order issues of the year are covered, sometimes with specific reference to the SDS's contribution to public order policing. For example, against a background of recent confrontations between the left and right, paragraph 29 of the 1976 Annual Report includes the following passage.

*“Similar confrontations were planned in Blackburn and Walsall on 11 and 25 September, respectively, and it was a matter of some satisfaction within the SDS that the Squad was able to provide the Police Forces concerned with accurate assessments of likely ultra-left involvement...”*

85. Based on the 1977 Annual Review, the Assistant Commissioner (Crime) wrote to the Home Office in early 1978 about both the industrial dispute at Grunwick's and the “Battle of Lewisham”.

*“1977 saw the escalation and eruption of street violence in London in the Grunwick's industrial dispute and the confrontations between extreme right and extreme left-wing political parties which reached its zenith in the Lewisham street battle in August. Throughout these confrontations the intelligence supplied by the Special Demonstration Squad of the numbers and intent of the numerous revolutionary parties enabled the Uniform Branch to effectively and economically police some of the most violent public disorder in recent times”.*

86. How accurate an assessment the above passage was, in relation to the SDS's contribution, will be examined. HN354, cover name “Vince Miller”, has stated that valuable intelligence which he provided shortly before the “Battle of Lewisham” was not acted upon.

87. An example of the SDS providing public order intelligence to a regional police force is given in the 1982 Annual Report, at paragraph 27. It relates to the picket organised by the SWP outside the Conservative Party's autumn conference held in Brighton. Sussex Police are stated: *“to have placed on*

---

<sup>41</sup> MPS-0730904 para. 19

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. para. 20

*record their appreciation of the assistance rendered by the SDS in connection with the event”.*

88. The Assistant Commissioner, G J Kelland, asserted to R J Andrew, the Deputy Under Secretary of State at the Home Office, by letter dated 7 March 1980, that the SDS had been invaluable to the policing of extremist activity during the 1979 General Election campaign. The terms in which he did so make clear that the SDS had provided intelligence relating to events following the death of Blair Peach. The Friends of Blair Peach Committee is not mentioned by name. The description used is: *“the subsequent campaign against Police”*. Paragraph 3 of the letter reads as follows<sup>43</sup>:

*“The focal point of much of the extremist activity in 1979 was the General Election held in May with the extreme Left contriving to take advantage of the National Front’s election campaign to provoke hostile confrontation whenever possible. The culmination of the virulent anti-fascist demonstrations was the death of the Anti-Nazi League supporter Blair Peach and the subsequent campaign against the Police. During this period the Special Demonstration Squad was able to provide useful information which was invaluable, enabling uniformed officers to be effectively deployed.”*

89. There can be little doubt that tensions between left and right were running high during the 1979 General Election campaign and with it the need for intelligence to inform public order policing. However, we note the defensive language used to describe the Blair Peach justice campaign and the fact that reporting on it was communicated to the Home Office as having been a part of an invaluable service. We shall need to examine the motives for reporting on the campaign.
90. In this regard, paragraph 9 of the 1979 Annual Report, upon which AC Kelland’s letter was presumably based, is also worded defensively when referring to the Blair Peach campaign. It explains the SDS’s action as being directed at public order policing.

*“The General Election held in May was the focal point of intensive activity by several extremist parties. The Socialist Workers Party eschewed contesting any constituency in favour of a policy of confronting the National Front during the latter party’s election campaign. The SWP contrived to make use of all public meetings arranged by the NF to arouse anti-fascist feeling; the death of Blair Peach, an active supporter of the Anti-Nazi League, which was a consequence of a violent anti-fascist demonstration in Southall, provided the extreme left wing with an opportunity to mount a sustained campaign to*

---

<sup>43</sup> MPS-0728963/2



*discredit and criticise the Police. Information supplied by SDS staff was of great value in enabling uniformed officers to deal effectively with the public order problems which arose both during the period before the election and on subsequent demonstrations held in connection with the death of Peach”.*

91. On security, the authors of the annual reports are clearly conscious of the risk of criticism should what the SDS was doing become known. In the following passage, at paragraph 10 of the 1975 report, the author refers both to the risk of embarrassing the Commissioner and the need to protect undercover police officers. It reads:

*“Over the past eight years since the inception of the SDS, security has been of paramount importance, not only to prevent embarrassment to the Commissioner should any leakage of our activities occur, but also to protect the field officers themselves. This is achieved primarily through supervision, and it is probably true that no other unit of police officers is so regularly or so strongly supervised. In addition to normal supervisory visits, the field officers have been seen by Commander ‘Operations’, DAC and the ACC”.*

92. Paragraph 14 of the 1976 Annual Report addresses what is described as the political sensitivity of the SDS operation in the following terms.

*“The political sensitivity of the SDS operation is fully recognised by all officers concerned and, to protect the ultimate defence line, great care is taken to ensure that penetration of an organisation can be fully justified on the basis of the Commissioner’s responsibility for the preservation of public order in the Metropolis”.*

93. Whether the SDS maintained what the author styled “the ultimate defence line” is, of course, an important issue for the Inquiry.

94. The group “Big Flame” discovered that SDS UCO DC Richard Clark, about whom I shall have more to say later, was not who he said he was. Consequently, DC Clark had to be withdrawn from his deployment. The event is referred to in the 1976 report and appears to have contributed to considerable police suspicion about the group: even though it was not thought to have been involved in any illegal activities in London<sup>44</sup>.

*“The sinister Big Flame organisation, which originated in the North West but soon spread to London, was the subject of close scrutiny until September*

---

<sup>44</sup> 1976 Annual Report, para.7



*when, for security reasons, it was decided to withdraw...Whereas the ultra-left as a whole claims to be security conscious, no organisation has shown practical ingenuity in the field of investigation to compare with that of Big Flame...".*

95. Paragraph 8 of the 1982 Annual Report suggests that maintaining security had become more difficult over time and that precautions had been developed to address this issue.

*"The difficulties in maintaining a high degree of security have increased in direct proportion to the length of time the Squad has been in existence, now 14 years. To combat this problem, security precautions are continually reviewed. Each new operational officer is carefully selected, thoroughly schooled in a 'cover story' [REDACTED] provided with appropriate documentation to substantiate his 'new' existence. Improvements over the years have catered for most, if not all, loopholes or anomalies save the human error..."*

96. Amongst the documents associated with the annual reports are minute sheets which show the reports passing up the chain of command within the MPS. As well as being evidence of the knowledge of the senior officers concerned about the SDS and its activities, the documents record high praise and support for the SDS. For example, on 26 February 1979, DAC Bryan wrote to the Assistant Commissioner (Crime) that:

*"The SB Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) Annual Report is submitted for your consideration. The work of the unit scarcely needs extolling and its members have yet again made most valuable contributions in the public order field. Election year will no doubt increase the demands upon them but I have every confidence in their ability to respond".*

97. Amongst the documents which we have grouped with the 1983 Annual Report in the hearing bundle is what appears to be an illuminating programme and briefing pack prepared for a visit to the SDS by Sir Kenneth Newman, then Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. It is clear from the programme that the plan was for the Commissioner to spend 2 hours with the unit, over a buffet lunch, at what is described as an "in-field location".

DISPLAY MPS-0730903/30

98. The briefing pack includes a brief profile of each member of the SDS at the time. Detective Sergeant Roger Pearce's has not had to be redacted, so we can look at that one.

DISPLAY MPS-0730903/40

99. The profiles include the officer's target, in DS Pearce's case, it was the anarchist field. These documents add to the evidence that the most senior officers within the SDS were aware not only of the unit's existence but to some extent the details of what it was doing.
100. The Phase 2 documents also indicate that the Home Office was receiving at least a little more information about what the SDS was doing than is recorded in the relatively brief annual letters seeking the continued authorisation and funding of the unit's existence. The 1984 letter from the Home Office authorising the continued existence of the SDS concluded with a request to know more about the current focus of the Squad's work and how it was being carried out.

*"Without in any way making that authority provisional, I think it would be helpful for us in due course to know more about which groups and activities are the current focus of the Squad's work and how that is carried out. Both on resource grounds, and in view of the sensitivity of such undercover work, it would be desirable to have this indication of how the squad's task and role has adapted to current circumstances since the days of the Vietnam war demonstrations when it was set up. A brief account of this in a report or by way of discussion between Colin Hewett and Roy Harrington here would be very helpful."*

101. The Home Office's 1985 annual authorisation letter to the Assistant Commissioner confirms that a discussion of the kind requested had taken place the year before. The same sort of discussion was again being sought<sup>45</sup>.

*"Because of the inevitable political sensitivity of this sort of operation, we should like to keep in touch – in general terms – with their current areas of interest and it would be helpful to us if those concerned here could have the same sort of informed discussion with Peter Phelan as took place last year. Roy Harrington will be getting in touch with him".*

---

<sup>45</sup> MPS-0730902

102. A minute dated 7 June 1984, from Deputy Assistant Commissioner C V Hewett to the Assistant Commissioner (Crime), records the 1984 meeting. It took place on 5 June 1984. Roy Harrington, from F4 Division Home Office, had met with Commander Phelan. It is significant for two reasons. First, it records the Home Office's concern that the SDS might have been: *"something which had been allowed to drift on after having been set up for a specific purpose in 1968"*. Second, the minute records that Harrington was shown and permitted to make notes on the 1983 SDS Annual Report. This is significant because we have not found evidence that the annual reports were sent to the Home Office. The terms of the note suggest that security concerns might have been the reason why.

DISPLAY MPS-0737347/9 & THEN MPS-0737347/10

Read bottom of first page and top of second page

### SDS Policy File Documents

103. I turn now to the SDS Policy File. Nineteen further documents from that file are being uploaded onto our website today to supplement those from the Phase 1 era published in November last year. The new documents are dated between 17 April 1974 and 13 November 1981. Most concern financial or personnel related issues. However, three documents deserve specific mention here. The first two are linked and shed light on how the SDS sought to justify its continued existence to the Home Office in the light of a decline in public disorder. In a memorandum dated 24 February 1976 Commander Rodger tasked then Chief Superintendent Rollo Watts to set up a study group to consider three questions<sup>46</sup>. The purpose of the study group's work was expressly to assist preparation of that year's case for continuation of the SDS to the Home Office.

DISPLAY MPS-0730658

Read paragraphs 1-4

104. The members of the study group were well versed in the work of the SDS. Three of them especially so: HN332 had been the Chief Inspector of the unit, Kneale was the then current Chief Inspector and Craft his deputy, soon to

---

<sup>46</sup> MPS-0730658/1

succeed him. The group's unanimous findings are set out in a memorandum dated 15 March 1976<sup>47</sup>.

DISPLAY MPS-0730745

Read whole page

105. The third document dates from just over 2 years later: 1 May 1978<sup>48</sup>. It is significant because it is a rare survival of a document expressly recording in any detail the relationship between the SDS and A Department of the MPS, the primary consumer of the SDS's public order intelligence. Moreover, it relates to a large and significant anti-racist event: the Rock Against Racism rally and concert. It is a memorandum from the then newly appointed Detective Chief Inspector of the SDS, Michael Ferguson (HN135) to the Detective Chief Superintendent S Branch and is a defence of criticism apparently made by A Department's Deputy Assistant Commissioner about the accuracy of SDS intelligence. There was no disorder at the event. A Department's criticism was, apparently, that the SDS's intelligence about the level of attendance at Rock Against Racism had been inaccurate. The content of the document provokes thought about whether intelligence that disorder was not expected was of use to the police. If so, could it have been obtained by other means? If the memorandum is accurate the SDS had reported both that "*no disorder was planned or envisaged*" at the ANL event and that those attending it did not intend to oppose a National Front march planned for the following day. That intelligence is stated to have come from "*Constant contact with our sources.*".

### Home Office Documents

106. Five further documents obtained from the Home Office are being uploaded onto the website today. The first is a latecomer from the Phase 1 era recording an informal review, conducted on 13 November 1967, at the instance of the then Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, to consider whether there was any duplication in the work of the Security Service and of Special Branch of the Metropolitan Police<sup>49</sup>. It is principally of interest because paragraph 3 explains the respective interests of the two organisations in relation to subversive activities. It may assist in understanding why information was reported and stored. Implicit in the passage is the view that a subversive threat could be long-term

---

<sup>47</sup> MPS-0730745/1

<sup>48</sup> MPS-0726913/3

<sup>49</sup> UCPI0000034284

which may explain why the SDS reported on the membership of some organisations over the course of many years. Whether they were justified in so doing is one of the issues which the Inquiry must consider. The relevant passage reads:

*“Both bodies were often interested in the same target but the Security Service sought to assess the long-term as well as the short term threat and were therefore particularly interested in the policy and membership of subversive organisations; the immediate police interest was in discovering what action, such as a demonstration, was being planned. The interests of the two bodies led them to complement rather than duplicate one another’s activities...”*

107. The second document is Home Office Circular No.97/1969 entitled “*Informants who take part in crime*”. It featured in the Phase 1 bundle and is repeated here not least because of its relevance to the question of whether miscarriages of justice may have occurred as a result of the activities of one or more Phase 2 SDS undercover police officers. I shall return to that topic later.
108. The third document is dated 29 May 1974 and is a letter from the then Director General of the Security Service to Chief Constables in England and Wales, including the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. Following concerns raised in Parliament it sought to remind Chief Constables of the guidance given in the Terms of Reference for a Special Branch issued on the authority of the Association of Chief Police Officers in June 1970. We considered those terms of reference in Phase 1<sup>50</sup>. In particular, the letter emphasised the distinction between subversion and militancy. The former being of interest to the Security Service, the latter off limits.

DISPLAY UCPI0000004545

Read paragraph 7 and note para.8

109. The final two documents are both dated December 1984 and so fall shortly after the deployment of the last officer whose evidence we will be considering in Phase 2. The first is entitled Home Office Guidelines on the Work of a Special Branch<sup>51</sup>. Much of the content is in line with similar older documents that we have published. Of note is the fact that it contains the first substantial guidance that we have obtained on the subject of data protection. We assume that it was

---

<sup>50</sup> UCPI0000004459

<sup>51</sup> UCPI0000004538

the result of the enactment of the first Data Protection Act in 1984. We will be considering, in due course, in Tranche 2 whether this new legal regime made any difference in practice to what was recorded by the SDS and retained. For the moment we note that the document permits a comparison between practice prior to 1984 and that which from then on ought to have been complied with.

DISPLAY UCPI0000004538

Read paras.16-19

110. The final document is an updated version of the Home Office Guidelines on the Work of a Special Branch issued to Chief Officers<sup>52</sup>. Of particular significance is the guidance in the section entitled "*Assistance to the Security Service*" which is highly germane to our investigation as to whether aspects of the SDS's intelligence gathering were justified. Were the lines drawn by the guidance drawn in the right place? If so, were they crossed by the SDS?
111. We also note the emphatic statement at paragraph 4 of the guidance about the importance of training. Thus far in our hearings we have had no evidence that the SDS provided any formal training to its UCOs but relied upon general police and Special Branch training combined with the SDS's informal arrangements.

DISPLAY UCPI0000004584

Read paras. 4-8

### **Security Service Corporate Witness Statement and Documents**

112. Returning to the corporate witness statement and documents provided by the Security Service, it is divided into two parts. The first part addresses questions about the role and remit of the Security Service throughout the period covered by the Inquiry's terms of reference. It also covers the role of Metropolitan Police Special Branch, particularly vis-à-vis the Security Service, for the same period. The second part of the statement deals in more detail with the Tranche 1 era. It is focused upon the Security Service's relationship with Metropolitan Police Special Branch and the SDS in particular during this period. The Inquiry will be requesting further, tranche specific, evidence from the Security Service as our investigation proceeds. Individual Metropolitan Police Service witnesses

---

<sup>52</sup> UCPI0000004584

will be providing us with their own evidence about the liaison relationship, during the Tranche 1 era, in this phase and Phase 3.

113. Time does not permit me this morning to deal at any length with the Security Service's evidence which can be read online. However, I will make a few observations before I move on.

114. At the start of the Phase 2 era, the official definition of subversion was that contained in the Maxwell Fyfe Directive to which I referred last November. It is so important to our work that I shall repeat it<sup>53</sup>.

*"The Security Service is part of the Defence Forces of the country. Its task is the Defence of the Realm as a whole, from external and internal dangers arising from attempts at espionage and sabotage, or from actions of persons and organisations, whether directed from within or without the country which may be judged to be subversive of the security of the State".*

115. The Director of F Branch (with which branch the SDS had direct contact) defined subversion in 1972 as:

*"...activities threatening the safety or well-being of the State and intended to undermine or overthrow Parliamentary democracy by political, industrial or violent means".*

116. Director F's above definition was formally adopted by Lord Harris of Greenwich in a debate in the House of Lords on 26 February 1975. It has since been known as the Harris definition. We note in particular that the Harris definition has two limbs. First, do the activities threaten the safety or well-being of the State and, second, are they intended to undermine or overthrow Parliamentary democracy by political, industrial or violent means? What amounts to an activity which threatens the safety or well-being of the State is not defined. However, the threshold for meeting this test is important in the context of this inquiry because so many of the groups infiltrated are described by SDS undercover officers as having had subversive aims but lacking the means to realise those aims.

117. The inclusion of political and industrial means in the second limb of the test may explain the interest in groups at both ends of the political spectrum and the interest that those on the far left took in industrial disputes and the trade union movement.

---

<sup>53</sup> Z's witness statement para.10 UCPI0000034308/3



118. What is clear is that the threat must be to the system of Parliamentary democracy and not just to the government of the day. Witness Z explains that in 1978 the then Deputy Director General of the Security Service clarified that subversion did not equate to *activity which threatens Government policies or may threaten its very existence*. Witness Z also refers to essentially the same point being made publicly by Sir Leon Brittan MP, then the Home Secretary, in 1985. He was quoted as saying<sup>54</sup>:

*“There is a clear distinction between subversion and opposition to the policies of the government of the day or peaceful campaigning to bring about changes in those policies or to influence public opinion generally”.*

119. Witness Z further explains that the Security Service’s counter subversion role was as: *“the provider of objective factual information about the security status of individuals and groups...”*<sup>55</sup>.

120. These are all important parameters against which we can test the SDS’s reporting, especially that which was provided to the Security Service.

121. Witness Z’s evidence is that:

121.1. Within the context of its investigations into subversion, the Security Service was most interested in subversive groups that sought to influence non-subversive organisations, through obtaining membership of those organisations (for example Trade Unions), in order to achieve the subversive goal of undermining parliamentary democracy<sup>56</sup>.

121.2. What he describes as “Ultra-left groups”, consisting of Trotskyist, Maoist and Anarchists, were considered a threat but didn’t take high priority until the mid-1970s<sup>57</sup>.

122. As to what the Security Service did with the SDS’s reporting, Witness Z states that:

*“It appears that, on at least one occasion, the Security Service considered disseminating SDS intelligence to liaison partners. However, we have found*

---

<sup>54</sup> Z’s witness statement paras.17 & 18

<sup>55</sup> Z’s witness statement para.16

<sup>56</sup> Z’s witness statement para.51

<sup>57</sup> Ibid para.52

*no evidence to suggest that any SDS intelligence was, in fact, shared outside the Security Service”.*<sup>58</sup>

123. Witness Z confirms that the Security Service did provide the SDS with what is described as: *“occasional and limited assistance with the development of SDS undercover officers’ cover identities”*<sup>59</sup>. Witness Z adds that: *“There is also limited evidence to suggest that the Security Service was occasionally able to help protect the safety of an SDS officer at risk of being compromised”*<sup>60</sup>.

124. On the question of targeting Witness Z accepts that the Security Service made requests of the SDS for certain intelligence and that Security Service briefings may have influenced SDS decisions. However, Witness Z emphasises that the decisions were ultimately for the SDS. Paragraph 108 of Witness Z’s statement reads:

*“Whilst the meetings with the SDS discussed the targeting of SDS agents, it is important to note that the decisions on deployment of SDS agents were taken by the SDS alone. Further, for various reasons, including lack of relevance to the MPSB’s remit and availability of resources, the SDS did not provide intelligence in relation to all Security Service requests. The SDS were responsible for their agents and, while the Security Service’s briefings may have influenced SDS decisions, the Security Service had no control over the placement or targeting of the SDS agents.”*

125. As to the de-briefing of SDS undercover police officers by the Security Service, Witness Z observes that only three formal requests for debriefs in the relevant period were acceded to by the SDS: in 1982 and 1983<sup>61</sup>. However, Witness Z accepts that there were other meetings, albeit that Witness Z’s understanding is that these were contrary to SDS policy.

126. Turning to the utility of SDS reporting to the Security Service, as perceived at the time, Witness Z states that: *“The development in the relationship is evidence that the Security Service found, on the whole, SDS reporting to be useful, enabling them to gain intelligence into subversive organisations which may not have otherwise been readily available”.*

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid para.85

<sup>59</sup> Ibid para.100

<sup>60</sup> Ibid para.103

<sup>61</sup> Z’s witness statement paras. 111-118

127. Witness Z's view now of the utility of the SDS's reporting is essentially the same. Of note is Witness Z's view that it helped to assess the subversive threat that each group, or individual, posed. Paragraph 123 of Witness Z's statement reads:

*"I have been asked how useful the SDS reporting is considered to have been now, and for what purpose was the reporting useful. It appears from the review of documents that the SDS reporting was useful to assist the Security Service in building the wider intelligence pictures in respect of subversive individuals and organisations. It is clear from a review of the Security Service's intelligence requirements, summarised above, that the purpose of the reporting for the Security Service was to obtain detailed information about the functioning of these groups and the individuals within them, which in turn would help towards the Security Service's assessment, when combined with other intelligence, of the subversive threat that each group, or individual, posed. The SDS reporting did not provide comprehensive coverage of these organisations, in part as a consequence of their law and order remit. It is clear to me that the SDS reporting was one element of intelligence that the Security Service relied upon to fulfil its functions to protect the United Kingdom from subversion".*

128. The documents that accompany Witness Z's statement evidence what appears to be a fluctuating level of contact between Security Service and SDS managers over the Tranche 1 period. We shall be examining that in more detail in Phase 3 when we will hear evidence from some of the SDS's managers. We will also be raising with individual officers who give oral evidence any material directly relevant to them. With both of those points in mind I shall make only two observations on the documents at this stage.

129. First, in January 1973 the then Commissioner's concerns about the potential of the SDS to cause "embarrassment" are recorded in a Security Service file note. The note records a meeting between the Security Service's F4 and DAC Vic Gilbert. It states: *"Special Branch penetrate these groups by the Hairy Squad ie Special Branch officers who are given a false identity and back-ground. Gilbert said the Commissioner was concerned about possible embarrassment arising out of this operation and he, Gilbert, felt that the Hairy Squad survived almost day to day"*<sup>62</sup>.

---

<sup>62</sup> UCPI0000031258/2

130. At a meeting between SDS managers and the Security Service's F6, on 8 April 1980, what appear to have been perceived as the advantages of the SDS's operation over the Security Service's own were recorded. The material part reads: *"This discussion also highlighted the advantages they have over ourselves when Butler told me that they meet their sources two or three times a week. Their sources are fully briefed and all options are discussed at these meetings"*<sup>63</sup>.

### Witnesses

131. The activists who were reported on and who have agreed to give oral evidence in Phase 2, in the order that they will be called, are as follows. Some I have already referred to.

- 131.1. Diane Langford, who was reported on by HN348 "Sandra", HN45 "David Robertson" and other SDS officers when active with the BVSF and Women's Liberation Front.
- 131.2. Dr Norman Temple, whose activities in the INLSF were reported on by HN347 "Alex Sloan".
- 131.3. Piers Corbyn, whose political activities, particularly those in connection with the International Marxist Group (which I shall call the IMG) and the Anti-Apartheid Movement, were reported on by various SDS undercover officers. These include his standing for elected office in the Greater London Council.
- 131.4. Lord Peter Hain who features in many of the SDS's reports, including, amongst others, those relating to his leadership of the successful anti-apartheid Stop the Seventy Tour campaign.
- 131.5. Professor Jonathan Rosenhead, an anti-apartheid campaigner who was arrested at an anti-apartheid protest and convicted in 1972 with HN298 cover name "Michael Scott".
- 131.6. Christabel Gurney OBE, a prominent member of the Anti-Apartheid Movement who was also arrested and convicted at the same anti-apartheid protest with HN298.
- 131.7. Richard Chessum, who was a member of the IMG and the Troops Out Movement (TOM). He was reported on extensively by Richard Clark (HN297) and can give evidence about Clark's actions.
- 131.8. Celia Stubbs who was at the time a member of the SWP and the partner of Blair Peach. She was reported on. So too, as I have already

---

<sup>63</sup> UCPI0000028814/1

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

mentioned, were events relating to Blair after his death, including attendance at his funeral and his justice campaign.

- 131.9. “Madeleine” being the pseudonym for a woman who was in the 1970s a member of the SWP, including its sub-group Women’s Voice. SDS undercover officer HN354, who used the cover name “Vince Miller”, had sex with “Madeleine” in his undercover identity. The nature and extent of the relationship between HN354 and “Madeleine” will be a matter for evidence. In order to respect “Madeleine’s” privacy, her image will not be screened at our hearing venue following an application for special measures.
132. The three witnesses who were reported on but who will not be giving oral evidence are:
  - 132.1. Ernest Rodker, whose son Oli will read his witness statement. Ernest Rodker was reported on by several SDS undercover officers. Of particular interest to the Inquiry in Phase 2, he was an anti-apartheid campaigner who was also arrested and convicted with HN298 in 1972.
  - 132.2. “Mary” being the pseudonym that we are using for a woman whose evidence is that the SDS undercover officer HN297 Richard Clark, who used the cover name “Rick Gibson” had some sexual contact with her whilst in his undercover identity. “Mary” was at the time a student, member of the Goldsmith’s College Socialist Society and a supporter of the IMG. She was also the subject of Richard Clark’s SDS reporting. “Mary’s” witness statement will be read.
  - 132.3. Dave Morris a libertarian and community activist has provided a voluntary witness statement for the purposes of Tranche 1 Phase 2. It will be posted on the Inquiry’s website.
133. Pursuant to the Chairman’s statement on photographs, where we have photographs of undercover officers, as they appeared when undercover, which cannot be made public because of the risk that doing so would undermine a restriction order, they are shown privately to the relevant civilian witnesses. This has occurred in relation to three officers in Phase 2. The officers concerned are HN80 “Colin Clark”, HN96 “Michael James” and HN106 “Barry Tompkins”.
134. The former undercover police officers who will give oral evidence, in the order that they are scheduled to do so, are:
  - 134.1. HN45, cover name “David Robertson”, who infiltrated Maoist groups.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 134.2. HN347, cover name "Alex Sloan", who infiltrated the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front.
- 134.3. HN298, cover name "Michael Scott", who reported on numerous groups and who was arrested on 12 May 1972 and convicted together with, amongst others, as I have noted earlier, Christabel Gurney, Professor Rosenhead and Ernest Rodker. HN298 used the name of a living person as his cover name.
- 134.4. HN200, cover name "Roger Harris", who infiltrated the International Socialists, joining their Twickenham branch. He later followed those members who broke away to form the Workers' League. HN200 will be the first SDS former undercover officer to give oral evidence who has stated to the Inquiry that he was instructed to use a deceased child's identity when constructing his cover identity.
- 134.5. HN304, cover name "Graham Coates", who infiltrated the International Socialists, anarchist groups and then the Socialist Workers' Party. He has important evidence to give on a number of issues including what was said in the SDS office about sexual relationships.
- 134.6. HN354, cover name "Vince Miller", who infiltrated the International Socialists which became the Socialist Workers Party during his deployment. He has stated that he had sex with four different women in his undercover identity whilst in the SDS. As I have already mentioned, one of those women was "Madeleine".
- 134.7. HN126, cover name "Paul Gray", who infiltrated the Socialist Workers Party in Northwest London and the West Hampstead Anti-Nazi League. He also reported on a significant number of young people, especially from the group School Kids and the Nazis (SKAN). His image will not be screened at the hearing venue following an application for special measures.
- 134.8. HN96, cover name "Michael James", who infiltrated the Hackney branch of the SWP and then the Hackney Branch of the Troops Out Movement.
135. The officers whose evidence will be summarised because they have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement but will not be giving oral evidence are:
  - 135.1. HN299/342, cover name "David Hughes", who reported on numerous groups.
  - 135.2. HN301, cover name "Bob Stubbs", who infiltrated the International Socialists.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 135.3. HN353, cover name "Gary Roberts", who infiltrated the Finsbury Park branch of the International Socialists and then the IMG in Southeast London.
  - 135.4. HN351, cover name "Jeff Slater", who infiltrated the International Socialists.
  - 135.5. HN80, cover name "Colin Clark", who infiltrated the SWP.
  - 135.6. HN106, cover name "Barry Tompkins", who infiltrated various groups, in particular the Revolutionary Communist Group (which changed name a number of times) and East London Workers Against Racism.
  - 135.7. HN155, cover name "Phil Cooper", who infiltrated the SWP in East London and at its main office.
136. I pause to mention a document dated 15 May 1974 from HN299/342 "David Hughes" reporting. It relates to what is referred to as a Marxist study group, although from the context in which it is found it is clear that it was a Marxist-Leninist group<sup>64</sup>. It is an isolated example but in terms of subversive aims it is the most disturbing document that we have found.

DISPLAY UCPI0000008823

Read paragraph 3

137. "David Hughes" states that these sorts of views were present to varying degrees but that the majority of people he encountered during his deployment were not that extreme<sup>65</sup>.
138. Our approach to the remaining officers, from whom we have not been able to obtain a witness statement, has been to identify the necessary documents that we believe are, or may be, attributable to the officer. Attribution of intelligence reports in Phase 2 has not been straightforward because the source officer, or officers, is usually not recorded on the face of the report. It has to be deduced. The batches of documents that we publish in relation to this final category of officers must be considered in this light. The former UCOs concerned are:
- 138.1. HN344, cover name "Ian Cameron", who infiltrated the Northern Minorities Defence Force.
  - 138.2. HN303, cover name "Peter Collins", who infiltrated the Workers Revolutionary Party.

---

<sup>64</sup> A series of meetings of the same study group were reported on. The others are all described as Marxist-Leninist.

<sup>65</sup> Witness statement para 141



- 138.3. HN297, Richard Clark, cover name “Rick Gibson”, who infiltrated the Troops Out Movement and Big Flame.
  - 138.4. HN300, cover name “Jim Pickford”, who infiltrated anarchist groups.
  - 138.5. HN13, cover name “Desmond or Barry Loader”, who infiltrated Maoist groups.
  - 138.6. HN296, cover name “Geoff Wallace”, who infiltrated the International Socialists.
  - 138.7. HN356, cover name “Bill Biggs”, who infiltrated the International Socialists which became the SWP during his deployment. He joined the Plumstead and later the Brixton Branches.
139. I am not going to introduce the evidence of these witnesses, or the evidence of the other SDS officers in Phase 2 individually. However, as we did in Phase 1, we are appending to the written version of this opening statement a lengthy appendix which summarises the evidence obtained to date relating to each former UCO in the phase. We hope that these will assist those following the Inquiry. They can be found in Appendix 2.

### **Miscarriages of Justice**

140. I now turn to some of the main themes that we will be exploring in the oral hearings: first, miscarriages of justice. That actions of undercover police officers have the potential to give rise to miscarriages of justice is well known, particularly if they act as agent provocateurs, if necessary disclosures are not made to prosecutors, or if a court is misled. The fact that Mark Kennedy’s undercover deployment as a member of the National Public Order Intelligence Unit was not properly disclosed led to a number of convictions being overturned and a large number of prosecutions being abandoned.
141. The Inquiry’s terms of reference require it to review the extent of the duty to make disclosure of an undercover operation during a criminal prosecution and the scope for miscarriage of justice in the absence of proper disclosure. They also reflect a concern that we may discover further potential miscarriages of justice as we investigate. The material parts of the terms of reference read as follows.

*“The inquiry’s investigations will include a review of the extent of the duty to make, during a criminal prosecution, disclosure of an undercover police operation and the scope for miscarriage of justice in the absence*

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

*of proper disclosure. The inquiry will refer to a panel, consisting of senior members of the Crown Prosecution Service and the police, the facts of any case in respect of which it concludes that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred as a result of an undercover police operation or its non disclosure. The panel will consider whether further action is required, including but not limited to, referral of the case to the Criminal Cases Review Commission.”*

142. It is clear from the terms of reference that the Inquiry is not required to decide whether there has been a miscarriage of justice. Rather, it must refer any case in which it concludes that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred as a result of an undercover police operation or its non-disclosure. It is not the Inquiry's function to determine criminal liability. S.2 Inquiries Act 2005 expressly provides that an inquiry panel is not to rule on, and has no power to determine, any person's civil or criminal liability. However that provision also states that an inquiry panel is not to be inhibited in the discharge of its functions by any likelihood of liability being inferred from facts it determines or recommendations that it makes. A miscarriages of justice panel, as required by the terms of reference, has been established.
143. The Inquiry will not wait until it has completed its work to make references to the panel in appropriate cases. If evidence is admitted which meets the threshold test for referral to the panel then a referral should be made. I know Sir that you will be considering immediately after the current hearings whether a referral should be made.
144. The principle that there is an obligation on the Prosecution to disclose the use of a participating informant to enable the Court to be sufficiently informed to ensure a fair trial, now comprehensively set out in Patel and others [2001] EWCA Crim 2505, was an established principle governing the disclosure obligations on the Prosecuting authorities in the Phase 2 era. In R v Marks and Beyfus [1890] 25 Q.B.D.495 the court held that the Prosecuting authority is entitled to withhold the names of those from which information has been obtained unless, at trial, the judge considers that the disclosure of the name of an informant or the nature of the information is “*necessary or desirable in order to shew the prisoner's innocence*”. Contemporaneous reference to the same broad principle can be found in R v Birtles [1969] 1 W.L.R. 1047 in which the Court reiterated that “*within certain limits ... informers should be protected*” but that the “*the court of trial should not be misled*”. The court gave as an example of such an occasion the facts giving rise to R v Macro, The Times, February 11

1969, a case in which the fact of a participating informant was not disclosed. The principles to be derived from *Macro* were later distilled for the wider consumption of police and prosecuting parties in the Home Office Circular 97/1969 'Informants who take part in crime'.

145. The relevant issues from the Module 1 SDS List of Issues are to be found under the heading "Conduct whilst deployed – criminal proceedings". They are as follows.
- 145.1. What happened when undercover officers were arrested and/or charged or summonsed?
  - 145.2. What was the response of managers?
  - 145.3. What happened when undercover officers appeared in court as a defendant?
  - 145.4. Were prosecutors and/or the court made aware that the defendant was an undercover officer?
  - 145.5. What happened when undercover officers appeared in court other than as a defendant?
  - 145.6. Were the parties to the proceedings and the court made aware that the individual appearing was an undercover officer?
  - 145.7. Did undercover officers provide or give evidence in criminal cases involving others?
  - 145.8. If so, what arrangements were made to ensure the prosecuting authorities and the court were informed about the status of the undercover officer?
  - 145.9. Did any other circumstance arise in which the participation of an undercover officer in events which gave rise to a criminal case involving others should have been communicated to the prosecuting authorities and/or court?
  - 145.10. If so, was it?
  - 145.11. In any given case, does the participation of an undercover officer in proceedings before a court or in connection with proceedings before a court require referral to the panel considering miscarriages of justice?
146. The associated Module 2(a) managerial issues are as follows<sup>66</sup>:
- 146.1. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer being arrested, charged or summonsed in his or her cover identity?

---

<sup>66</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module\\_2a\\_issues\\_list-san.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 146.2. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?
- 146.3. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?
- 146.4. Were undercover officers authorised to maintain their cover identities upon arrest, charge, or in response to a summons?
- 146.5. If so, who authorised this?
- 146.6. What happened when undercover officers were arrested and/or charged or summonsed?
- 146.7. Did undercover officers maintain their cover identities upon arrest, charge, or in response to a summons?
- 146.8. Were managers aware of this conduct?
- 146.9. If so, what was their response?
- 146.10. If not, should they have been aware?
- 146.11. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning an undercover officer appearing in court as a defendant or defence witness in his/her cover identity?
- 146.12. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?
- 146.13. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?
- 146.14. Were undercover officers authorised to maintain their cover identities if they appeared in court as a defendant or defence witness?
- 146.15. What happened when undercover officers appeared in court as a defendant or defence witness?
- 146.16. Were managers aware of this conduct?
- 146.17. If so, what was their response?
- 146.18. If not, should they have been?
- 146.19. Did undercover officers ever appear in court other than as a defendant or defence witness?
- 146.20. If so, in what circumstances did this occur?
- 146.21. Were managers aware of this conduct?
- 146.22. If so, what was their response?
- 146.23. What arrangements were made to ensure that prosecuting authorities and/or courts were informed about the status of an undercover officer appearing in court in any capacity in his/her undercover identity?
- 146.24. Were arresting/investigating police officers, prosecutors, the courts and/or other parties to the proceedings made aware when an undercover officer was (a) arrested, (b) charged, (c) responded to a summons, (d) appeared as a defendant, (e) appeared as a defence witness and/or (f) appeared in a criminal court in any other capacity in

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

his/her cover identity, that the person concerned was an undercover officer?

146.25. If so, who made them aware and by what means?

146.26. If not, why not?

146.27. Did any other circumstance arise in which the participation of an undercover officer, in events which gave rise to a criminal case involving others, should have been communicated to the prosecuting authorities and/or court?

146.28. If so, was it?

146.29. In any given case, does the participation of an undercover officer in proceedings before a court or in connection with proceedings before a court require referral to the panel considering miscarriages of justice?

147. To date the only relevant written guidance that we have received in evidence concerns the Home Office circular 97/1969. The guidance was addressed to Chief Constables and directed at informants who take part in crime. The guidance sets out broad principles, endorsed by the then Home Secretary. Of particular interest are paragraphs 3 & 4.

[DISPLAY MPS-0727104].

148. In Phase 1 the evidence was to the effect that many officers stated that they understood the need not to act as an agent provocateur but few could recall seeing the circular. None could recall any formal training within the SDS but all had naturally had basic police training and training by Special Branch. None could recall any direct involvement with the SDS by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. We shall continue to explore the understanding which undercover police officers had in relation to matters germane to miscarriages of justice. Not just their own actions when deployed but also their training, instructions, supervision and oversight.

149. We will be receiving evidence from 3 civilian witnesses: Christabel Gurney, Professor Rosenhead and Ernest Rodker; and from one former SDS undercover police officer, HN298, about the incident which occurred on 12 May 1972. All four, together with others, were arrested whilst protesting against apartheid outside the Star & Garter Hotel in Richmond. All four were subsequently prosecuted and convicted. All of the witnesses save for Ernest Rodker will give oral evidence. We will be exploring with the witnesses who give oral evidence the circumstances to establish what happened and, in particular, whether or not there may have been a miscarriage of justice.

150. The Inquiry has also established that one of the deceased former SDS officers, HN13, was twice arrested and subject to criminal proceedings together with others in his undercover identity. The relevant evidence will be posted during the course of the hearings. You Sir will need to consider whether any of the resulting convictions merit a referral to the miscarriage of justice panel.

### Deceased Children's Identities

151. In her opening statement on behalf of the relatives of deceased individuals, Ms Williams QC eloquently explained the hurt, distress and revulsion felt by the relatives about the practice of using deceased children's identities when constructing undercover legends. She drew attention to the condemnation of the practice both by the Home Office Select Committee, the Home Secretary and the Metropolitan Police Service's apologies<sup>67</sup>. She explained the investigations to date, which I shall not repeat, and emphasised the desire of the relatives for answers to all of the questions to which use of the practice has given rise.
152. The Inquiry Legal Team has, as far as possible, established whether or not former SDS undercover officers used a real person's identity. In cases where a deceased child's identity was used and the officer's cover name is not restricted we have sought to establish whether there are surviving close relatives who can be traced and contacted. In relation to the Phase 2 era we have contacted relatives in eight cases. In none of those cases have the relatives wished to apply for core participant status or to participate as witnesses in the Inquiry.
153. The relevant issues from the Module 1 SDS Issues List are to found under the heading "Legend Building"<sup>68</sup>. They are:
- 153.1. When and why did the practice of using deceased children's identities begin?
  - 153.2. Who devised and/or authorised the practice?
  - 153.3. What use did undercover officers make of the identities of deceased children?
  - 153.4. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on the surviving family of a deceased child of the use for police purposes of their identity?

<sup>67</sup> As did counsel for the Commissioner.

<sup>68</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180705\\_list\\_of\\_issues\\_module\\_one\\_SDS\\_final.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180705_list_of_issues_module_one_SDS_final.pdf) See issues 19-24

- 153.5. When and why did the practice cease?
- 153.6. What else did undercover officers do to build their legends prior to deployment?
- 154. The relevant associated managerial issues from the Module 2(a) SDS Issues List are<sup>69</sup>:
  - 154.1. What involvement did managers have in legend building activity by prospective undercover officers, including any involvement in authorising legend building activity?
  - 154.2. When and why did the practice of using deceased children's identities begin?
  - 154.3. Who devised and/or authorised the practice?
  - 154.4. What, if any, thought was given by managers to the impact on the surviving family of a deceased child of the use for police purposes of their identity?
  - 154.5. When and why did the practice cease?
- 155. None of the former undercover officers whose evidence was received in Phase 1 stated that they had been instructed to use a deceased child's identity to construct their cover identity. Chief Inspector Dixon wrote the study paper entitled "Penetration of Extremist Groups" which covered the construction of a cover legend but did not advocate using a deceased child's identity. The study paper does not appear to have been circulated amongst SDS undercover officers though and the evidence was to the effect that there appears to have been little guidance given to early officers about how to construct their undercover identities. The steps taken to produce a cover identity by early SDS UCOs appeared, on the evidence, to have been basic.
- 156. Some of the early SDS undercover officers, who did not use a real person's identity were either compromised or withdrawn from their deployments because of the risk of compromise. We will be hearing oral evidence from HN45 who was recognised by a neighbour at an activist meeting and from HN347 who was withdrawn after being accused of being an undercover police officer. The reasons for that suspicion will need to be explored.
- 157. At some point during the early to mid-1970s the SDS began to instruct its UCOs to use deceased children's identities. No written instruction or guidance to record the introduction of the practice survives, if such ever existed. The

---

<sup>69</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module\\_2a\\_issues\\_list-san.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf)



written evidence that we have obtained from HN347, HN299/342, HN298 and HN301 suggests that the SDS was not instructing its officers to use deceased children's identities in 1971, the year in which they all joined the SDS. However, the evidence relating to HN353 cover name "Gary Roberts", HN351 cover name "Jeff Slater", HN297 cover name "Rick Gibson" and HN200 cover "Roger Harris" who all joined the SDS in 1974 is that they each used deceased children's identities to some extent<sup>70</sup>. HN301 cover name "Bob Stubbs" and HN344 cover name "Ian Cameron", who joined the SDS in 1971 and 1972 respectively, each told their risk assessors, at the anonymity stage, that they were not instructed to use a deceased child's identity.

158. Three cases deserve specific mention. First, HN298 who used the cover name "Michael Scott" states that he obtained that name by visiting the registry of births and deaths then at Somerset House in 1971. However, his recollection is that he was not guided or instructed to do so. Unlike later officers, who were instructed to use a deceased child's identity, he did not ascertain whether the person whose identity he used was dead or alive. The Inquiry has established that the real Michael Scott was not dead and was not a child in 1971. We have been able to trace and contact him. He did not wish to give evidence and we are respecting that wish. The facts give rise to a concern that the criminal conviction that HN298 received in his cover identity might have been entered onto the real Michael Scott's records. Our investigations have confirmed that the "Star and Garter" conviction is not recorded against Michael Scott on the Police National Computer. However, we have not been able to establish whether or not there ever was a record of the conviction. The witness statements of Karen Progl, (Senior Manager and Data Protection Officer at the ACRO Criminal Records Office) and Detective Constable Katie McAleer (who is attached to the Inquiry Review and Support Command of the MPS) which go to this issue will be published on the day that HN298 gives oral evidence.
159. The second case is that of HN297 Detective Constable Richard Clark aka "Rick Gibson". Although he is deceased it appears that he used a deceased child's identity because one of the groups that he infiltrated – Big Flame – discovered that fact. Mr Chessum will be giving evidence about Richard Clark's deployment, including the discovery that he was not who he said he was. Thus, we will hear that one of the first SDS undercover officers to use a

deceased child's identity found that it was not robust enough fully to protect his cover story.

160. The third case is that of HN80 who used the cover name "Colin Clark". He has stated that he refused to use a deceased child's identity. He states that "*It distressed me to consider using the details from a dead child's birth certificate and I knew that it would necessarily cause distress to that child's family if it was discovered...*"<sup>71</sup>.
161. Most of the Phase 2 officers describe in their statements using only some information about the deceased child whose identity they used. Typically the name, or part of the name, together with the date and/or place of birth. Few describe visiting the area where the deceased child lived although there are two exceptions. First, HN304 who describes making a detour of his own volition to the place where the deceased child in question had been born<sup>72</sup>. Second, HN96 who used the cover name "Michael James" goes further. He describes being instructed to visit Blackpool, the birthplace of the deceased child, Robert Michael James, whose middle and last names he had adopted. Moreover, he states that he was assisted by the local Special Branch to establish that Robert James's family no longer lived at his former address. Thus we have an example of inquiries being made about the deceased's child's family. We will be exploring in more detail the issues surrounding the use of deceased children's identities with the Phase 2 witnesses who give oral evidence.
162. We have included the SDS's Tradecraft Manual in the Phase 2 Hearing Bundle because of the content relating to the use of deceased children's identities. That is to say, Section 3 and Appendix E. However, readers should be aware that as far as we have been able to ascertain this document appears to date from the 1990s, long after the deployments of the officers who will be giving evidence in Phase 2.

### Sexual Relationships

163. Ms Kaufmann QC and Ms Williams QC in their respective opening statements made crystal clear the devastating and life-altering impact that deceitful sexual relationships conducted by undercover police officers have had and the burning need for answers felt by the core participants in Category H. The Metropolitan

---

<sup>71</sup> Witness statement paragraph 21

<sup>72</sup> Witness statement paragraph 31

Police Service has long since issued an unreserved apology which, amongst other things has accepted that sexual relationships between undercover police officers and members of the public should not happen. There can be no doubt that deceitful sexual relationships were one of the principal issues of public concern which led to this public inquiry being established. We shall be pursuing our search for the truth on this issue throughout the Inquiry. The importance of the present phase to the process is that the evidence that we are going to hear and read concerns the first known sexual contact between SDS undercover officers and members of the public.

164. The relevant issues are to be found under the heading “Conduct whilst deployed – relationships” in the Module 1 SDS Issues List. They are as follows.
- 164.1. What relationships with individuals did undercover officers form whilst deployed?
  - 164.2. With whom did they form such relationships?
  - 164.3. For what purpose did they form such relationships?
  - 164.4. What form did the relationships take?
  - 164.5. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom relationships were formed of the deception implicit in them?
  - 164.6. To the extent which a relationship involved sexual intimacy, how and why did it occur? how long did it last? what occurred during it? what impact did it have on both parties to the relationship? how and why did it end?
  - 164.7. Did undercover officers know about intimate sexual relationships conducted by other officers?
  - 164.8. Were managers aware of such relationships, and if so, what were their attitudes to those relationships?
  - 164.9. If not, should they have been?
  - 164.10. Were such relationships authorised and/or tolerated by managers?
  - 164.11. If not, what, if anything, was done to ensure that they did not occur?
  - 164.12. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom such relationships occurred about the consequences of them for them?
  - 164.13. To what extent, if at all, was the occurrence of such relationships prompted by conscious or unconscious sexist attitudes on the part of undercover officers and their managers?

165. The associated managerial issues from the Module 2(a) Issues List are<sup>73</sup>:

---

<sup>73</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module\\_2a\\_issues\\_list-san.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/20190930-module_2a_issues_list-san.pdf)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 165.1. What, if any, policy, instruction, procedure or guidance existed concerning relationships between undercover officers and targets/those upon whom they reported?
  - 165.2. How, when and by whom was that policy, instruction, procedure or guidance communicated to undercover officers?
  - 165.3. Who authored any written policy, instruction, procedure or guidance?
  - 165.4. Were the families of undercover officers informed of any such policy prior to recruitment and/or deployment?
  - 165.5. Were such relationships authorised and/or encouraged by managers?
  - 165.6. Who gave that authorisation and/or encouragement?
  - 165.7. Were managers aware of relationships between undercover officers in their cover identities and those upon whom they were reporting, or with whom they came into contact as a result of their undercover deployment?
  - 165.8. If so, what were their attitudes to those relationships?
  - 165.9. If not, should they have been?
  - 165.10. Were such relationships tolerated and/or condoned by managers?
  - 165.11. If not, what, if anything, was done to ensure that they did not occur?
  - 165.12. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom relationships were formed of the deception implicit in them?
  - 165.13. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on those with whom such relationships occurred about the consequences of them for them?
  - 165.14. What, if any, thought was given to the impact on the families of undercover officers who formed relationships with their targets/those upon whom they reported?
  - 165.15. To what extent, if at all, was the occurrence of such relationships prompted by conscious or unconscious sexist attitudes on the part of undercover officers and their managers?
166. There was no evidence of sexual contact between SDS undercover officers and members of the public in Phase 1. However, there was evidence of some social contact of the kind which may be a precursor to more intimate contact: HN336 cover name "Dick Epps" gave evidence that he had a drink with a female activist. There was also evidence of a blurring of the lines between undercover work for policing purposes (whether or not it was justified) and social contact with a woman befriended by an SDS officer for other purposes: HN345 "Peter Fredericks" gave evidence that after he had left the police he returned to the home of a female activist.

167. The evidence in Phase 2 is going to be altogether different. We move into a period when there is evidence that at least 5 former SDS officers had sexual contact with as many as 12 different women. The evidence that I briefly introduce below is obviously subject to the oral evidence that we are about to hear and we do not rule out taking further evidence about these officers if more witnesses come forward.
168. Richard Clark, cover name "Rick Gibson" (HN297) is deceased. He deployed into the Troops Out Movement and Big Flame between 1974 and 1976. He is described by HN304 as having a reputation for being something of a "*ladies man*"<sup>74</sup>. "Mary's" written evidence is that Clark was a frequent visitor to her flat and they had half-hearted sexual encounters which she did not initiate and fizzled out. She has stated: "*Had I known he was a police officer there is absolutely no way I would have had any sexual contact with him at all*"<sup>75</sup>. Her flatmate confided in her that she too had become sexually intimate with him<sup>76</sup>. Richard Chessum has provided a witness statement which explains that he knew "Rick Gibson" well and he had sexual relations with at least four women in his undercover identity. "Mary" was one of those women. All were activists. We will be exploring, insofar as possible, Clark's motive for forming these relationships. A hallmark of his deployment is how thoroughly he appears to have infiltrated his target group and how active and influential he was within it. "Mary's" impression is that DC Clark was seeking to use sexual activity with her to bolster his cover.
169. HN300, who is now deceased, used the cover name "Jim Pickford" to infiltrate anarchist groups between 1974 and 1976. There will be evidence that he was known as a philanderer who chased after women<sup>77</sup>. His second wife, to whom he was married at the start of his deployment and family members made a statement during the course of the anonymity process which indicates that "Jim Pickford" met a woman in his undercover identity whom he went on to marry. HN300 and his third wife had a child together. The marriage did not last and ended in divorce. There is corroborative evidence in the closed officer gist that HN300 told a fellow UCO that he had fallen in love with a woman associated with his group and wanted to tell her everything<sup>78</sup>.

---

<sup>74</sup> HN304 Witness statement paragraph 146

<sup>75</sup> R9 Witness statement 6(v).

<sup>76</sup> "Mary" 2018 witness statement para. 9

<sup>77</sup> HN304 Witness statement paragraph 146c

<sup>78</sup> Closed Officer Gist paragraph 21

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

170. HN354, who used the cover name "Vince Miller", infiltrated the SWP between 1976 and 1979. He has stated that he had 4 "one night stands" whilst in his undercover identity at a time when he was single. On his account two of the women with whom he slept were activists and two were "friends of friends"<sup>79</sup>. He states that he did not tell his managers. As I have already mentioned one of the activists with whom he slept was "Madeleine". Her account of the relationship is different. She states that there was a sexual relationship, initiated by "Vince Miller", which lasted up to a couple of months and which occurred soon after the breakup of her marriage. It was not a casual thing for her and she was very upset when "Vince Miller" disappeared. We shall be hearing oral evidence from them both. We are grateful to "Madeleine" for providing the Inquiry with photographs of "Vince Miller" during his undercover deployment. We can look at one of these now.

DISPLAY UCPI00000034331

171. Two of the fully anonymous officers, HN302 who served in the 1970s and HN21 who served in the late 1970s and early 1980s, have stated that they had sexual contact with women whilst in their cover identities. The material parts of their witness statements have been included in the Closed Officer Gist.

DISPLAY UCPI00000034307/4

Read para.20

172. Both HN302 and HN21 are going to give oral evidence in closed hearings. This is necessary in order to avoid undermining the restriction orders made in respect of their real and cover names. It is also necessary to enable them to be questioned freely without the questions having to be tailored and the answers stifled in order to avoid undermining the restriction orders. We will be reviewing after they have given evidence what can safely be put into the public domain.

173. HN106, who used the cover name "Barry Tompkins" denies that he had any sexual relationships in his cover identity. However, there is a Security Service document which suggests that his managers thought that he had probably "*bedded*" a woman and they had warned him off<sup>80</sup>. There is also evidence that

---

<sup>79</sup> Witness statement paragraphs 165-169

<sup>80</sup> HN106 Witness statement paragraph 130

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

another woman was referred to by some activists as “*Barry’s girlfriend*”<sup>81</sup>.

HN106 states that he had a close friendship with the second woman but denies having sex with either of them. HN106 is unable to give evidence because he is both abroad and in ill health.

174. HN155, who used the cover name “Phil Cooper”, denies in his witness statement having any sexual encounters or relationships whilst in his undercover identity<sup>82</sup>. However, the risk assessors understood him to have admitted to having “*a number of liaisons*”<sup>83</sup>. HN155 denies making this admission. That dispute of fact will need to be decided.
175. I should make clear that we are seeking to establish the facts. On the question of sexual contact we are not drawing bright lines between one night stands and lengthy relationships such that we are investigating one but not the other. Nor are we investigating only sexual contact with activists. We ask former undercover officers whether they engaged in any sexual activity in their cover identities. As will be apparent from the cases to which I have just referred, we have elicited evidence of a wide variety of intimate relationships and sexual contact. However, the Chairman necessarily has to make fact sensitive judgments, on a case by case basis, about how far we should pursue investigations. The terms of reference do not require exhaustive investigation of every instance of sexual contact. Even in those instances which the Inquiry would wish to investigate further we sometimes cannot do so. We are not always able to trace witnesses. Some civilian witnesses whom we do contact may not reply to the Inquiry. Whether and, if so, the extent to which deceived women participate in the Inquiry is voluntary. The need to protect a former undercover police officer from harm may, in some cases, such as HN302’s, outweigh the need to trace and contact a deceived woman.
176. We have found no evidence of any written instruction for SDS officers relating to sexual activity in their undercover identities during the Phase 2 era. Nothing to state that they must not engage in sexual activity in their undercover identities with members of the public. Nothing to state that they should. There will be some evidence that SDS officers were advised against it orally. There is also evidence, such as the reference to HN106 being “warned off”, which suggest at least some management opposition to sexual relationships. However, we will also be hearing evidence that there was comment and joking

---

<sup>81</sup> HN106 Witness statement paragraph 134

<sup>82</sup> HN155 Witness statement paragraph 20

<sup>83</sup> Lockie Witness statement paragraph 7 & Reid witness statement paragraph 9



amongst SDS undercover officers about sexual relationships that, it is stated, would have been made in the presence of managers<sup>84</sup>. Moreover, the officer to whom HN300 spoke about falling in love with the woman who became his third wife states that he agreed to act as a conduit between HN300 and his managers.

177. In Phase 1, 5 of the SDS officers who served in the earliest years of the SDS were female<sup>85</sup>. In Phase 2 all of the officers and their managers are male. We will be exploring whether the complete absence of female officers from the SDS after 1973 until 1983, when HN33/98 joined the SDS, affected the culture within the SDS. In particular, we will be examining whether it affected the attitude within the unit to male officers, in their undercover identities, having sexual contact with women who did not know who the men really were.
178. The overwhelming majority of SDS undercover officers were married or in a relationship when they joined the SDS. Of those who have made witness statements 12 were married. 2 others had partners. Only one states that he was single. The reasons for this phenomenon will need to be examined. There is clear evidence of marital status being noted at the time of recruitment. We see this in the case of two officers who went on to have sexual relationships with women in their undercover identities. If marital status was thought to be a deterrent to the formation of sexual relationships by UCOs in their undercover identities, it did not always prove to be so.

[DISPLAY MPS-0724152/3]

Read paragraphs 2 & 3

179. In our quest to get to the truth, there will plainly be a great deal to explore in oral evidence on the issue of sexual relationships. I must not pre-empt that evidence or the findings of fact that you will make Sir. But, it can safely be said that from the mid-1970s onwards, sexual contact between SDS officers in their undercover identities and members of the public was not uncommon.

### Analysis of Undercover Officers' Witness Statements

---

<sup>84</sup> HN304 Witness statement paragraph 146

<sup>85</sup> HN323 Helen Crampton, HN334 "Margaret White", HN328 Joan Hillier, HN346 Jill Mosdell and HN348 "Sandra"

180. The requests for witness statements that the Inquiry issues to former SDS undercover officers, pursuant to rule 9 Inquiry Rules 2006, are organised under common headings. This facilitates the gathering and analysis of evidence across themes. We have obtained witness statements from 15 former undercover officers in Phase 2 who are not fully anonymous. All will be uploaded onto the Inquiry's website during the course of the hearings for followers of the Inquiry to read. We have analysed them and make the following observations about general themes and broad patterns in the evidence.
- 180.1. All of the undercover officers were recruited from within Special Branch.
  - 180.2. All but one (HN200) held the rank of detective constable when recruited into the SDS. Four more were promoted to detective sergeant during their service with the SDS.
  - 180.3. All who gave specific answers served in B (Irish) or C ("Extreme Left") Squads of Special Branch at some point in their Special Branch careers. That is to say branches likely to have had a particular interest in SDS intelligence.
  - 180.4. Two state that they had done undercover work prior to joining the SDS over and above the usual Special Branch activity of attending activist meetings in plain clothes: HN299/342 and HN155.
  - 180.5. Recruits were mostly approached by current or former members of the SDS. A minority asked to join. There is no evidence that the role of SDS undercover officer was advertised or that there was any formal recruitment and selection process beyond an interview.
  - 180.6. The SDS provided no formal training of any kind. However, the majority recall spending months in the SDS's back office before deploying. Those who do not recall doing so are confined to the early part of the Phase 2 period. When taken together with the Phase 1 evidence, in which we heard that some of the earliest officers had no, or only brief stints in the SDS back office, we see a clear trend emerging. The practice of spending some months in the back office before deploying becomes cemented. HN200 and HN126 recall the longest periods: both recall spending 6 months in the back office.
  - 180.7. A few officers recall being given specific guidance about what to do in the event of an arrest. Most officers did not recall being given any specific advice about involvement in private lives, sexual relationships, criminal activity or legal professional privilege.
  - 180.8. The majority of officers could not recall being shown Home Office Circular 97/1967 entitled "*Informants who take part in crime*".

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 180.9. A trend appears to the effect that the later officers commonly recall being told to expect a deployment of approximately 4 years' duration. Starting with HN304 (who joined in 1976) 5 of the officers have this or a similar recollection.
- 180.10. All 15 officers had cover employment (sometimes fictional<sup>86</sup>) and a cover address. None shared their accommodation with activists. Only HN96 and HN106, who shared accommodation with one another, recall sharing with another officer.
- 180.11. A trend emerges towards the end of the Phase 2 period to the effect that more officers recall living in their cover identity for a period before approaching their targets (HN304, HN106, HN96 and, insofar as he can remember, HN155).
- 180.12. All of the officers who joined from a point in 1971 onwards recall having a car. Only HN45 (1970-1973) and HN347 (1971) do not.
- 180.13. On the question of targeting, the majority write in their statements of being steered by senior SDS managers or collaborating with them in the making of decisions. Two, HN298 and HN299/342 refer to it being their decision and write respectively of self-tasking and being left to his own devices. Both of those officers reported on and appear to have mixed with a significant number of different groups.
- 180.14. There is a broad trend over time which has earlier officers recalling weekly meetings in the SDS safe house (HN45, HN347 & HN298), then thrice weekly meetings for a period and then recollections of twice weekly meetings, unless the officer was too busy appears to have been the position.
- 180.15. Only HN298 recalls being arrested and being advised, with others, by a solicitor. Most officers state that they did not offend in their undercover identities. Those who did so refer to minor offences: flyposting, graffiti and obstruction.
- 180.16. Most of the officers state that they at least witnessed some violence during their deployments.
- 180.17. Only one officer states that he joined a trade union: HN299/342 who states that he joined the TGWU.
- 180.18. Former SDS UCOs in the Phase 2 era typically believe that their work contributed to the effective and efficient policing of public order. Most also refer to their work assisting the Security Service.
- 180.19. Only one officer, HN106, states that he had direct contact with the Security Service during his deployment.

---

<sup>86</sup> HN298 Witness statement para. 27

- 180.20. Many of the officers assumed positions of responsibility. HN298 became the Membership Secretary of the Putney Branch of the Young Liberals, HN353 became the Vice President of a student union (which was not his target) and HN106 formed a new group with 2 others. However, by far the most common examples of the assumption of responsibilities occurs in deployments into the International Socialists or SWP as it became. Positions such as treasurer, paper sales organiser, or member of a committee with responsibility for a particular activity, such as the Right to Work Campaign are typical. None states that he became a branch secretary and there is some evidence that this post was actively avoided. The assumption of positions of responsibility occurs mostly at branch level but sometimes at higher levels<sup>87</sup>. Richard Clark (HN297) was particularly active in the Troops Out Movement. He did not avoid the role of secretary and worked his way up from branch secretary (having been involved in the setting up of the branch) to London Organiser and then National Organiser.
- 180.21. On the question of subversion, many officers describe their targets as having subversive aims but not the means with which to realise those aims. Some targeted groups that were in no way subversive.
- 180.22. Recollections that senior police officers visited the SDS are common. Many recall visits by the Commissioner of the day.
- 180.23. There was no formal welfare support provided by the SDS for its officers. However, many officers describe their managers as having been supportive. There was no formal post-deployment support.
- 180.24. Most officers recall that overtime payments increased their income, in some cases dramatically.
- 180.25. None states that he used his SDS undercover legend in the private sector after having left the SDS.

### Future Hearings

181. Turning to the future conduct of the Inquiry after the Phase 2 hearings, the outstanding elements of Tranche 1 of our investigation will include:
- 181.1. First, closed hearings at which some of the fully anonymous Phase 2 former SDS UCOs will give oral evidence.
- 181.2. Second, the Tranche 1 Phase 3 open hearings. These are being held principally so that the Inquiry can receive evidence from former SDS

---

<sup>87</sup> For example HN80 "Colin Clark" was treasurer of a branch, a district and Right to Work campaign. HN155 "Phil Cooper" became national treasurer of the 1982 Right to Work campaign.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

managers and administrators. In particular, those whose postings to the SDS fell wholly within the Tranche 1 era. The managers will be preceded by further evidence from a new core participant, Lindsey German. It had been our intention to hold the Phase 3 hearings in October 2021 but in order to permit time to obtain evidence from Lindsey German it will need to be put back. A further advantage of putting the date back is that it should enable a less pressured preparatory phase than has been the case in Phases 1 & 2. We anticipate being able to set a new date for Phase 3 by July.

- 181.3. Third, closed hearings at which former SDS managers can give oral evidence. The purpose of any such hearings will be to hear evidence that cannot be given at a public hearing.
182. The Inquiry will be taking steps to obtain witness statements for Tranche 6 witnesses from the Tranche 1 era. In other words from senior police officers in the chain of command above the SDS itself and relevant witnesses from other parts of Her Majesty's Government to ascertain their state of awareness of the SDS's undercover operations.
183. I explained in November that the work of the Inquiry has been seriously affected by the global pandemic. That was before the second wave. Serious disruption has continued to affect the Inquiry and those upon whom we rely to advance our work. The impact on our timetable is now more serious than we anticipated last November. We no longer expect that the Tranche 2 hearings will be ready for hearing in 2022. Detailed re-planning work for Tranche 2 and later tranches is currently ongoing.
184. I would like to end by thanking everyone involved in the preparations for the present hearings. Publicly investigating the actions of undercover police officers involved in the private lives of members of the public is no easy task. We are very conscious that we have in the course of our work had to ask many people to work to tight deadlines. We are grateful for their considerable efforts.

Counsel to the Inquiry

19 April 2021

## APPENDIX 1 – GROUPS REPORTED ON BY THE SDS AS SET OUT IN ANNUAL REPORTS 1975 TO 1984

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

Chief Inspector Derek Kneale's report dated 19 March 1976 (1975 Annual Report)

Pro-Irish Organisations:

Troops Out Movement

Big Flame Irish Commission

Bloody Sunday Commemoration Ad-Hoc Committee

Trotskyist Groups:

International Socialists

International Marxist Group

Workers Revolutionary Party

Workers Revolutionary Party Young Socialists

Revolutionary Communist Group

League for Socialist Action

International - Communist League (an amalgamation of Workers Fight and Workers Power)

Maoists:

Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist)

The East London Marxist-Leninist Association

Extreme right-wing:

National Front

Legion of St George

Through involvement in anarchist, alternative society and racist groups, information was also obtained about:

West London Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Anarchist Workers Association (formerly the Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Campaign for the Repeal of the Immigration Act 1971

Claimants' Union

Stop All Racist Tours

### Chief Inspector G T M Craft's undated report (1976 Annual Report)

#### Pro-Irish:

Troops Out Movement

Peace Through Freedom Committee (ad hoc group against 'Peace People')

Trade Union Committee Against the Prevention of Terrorism Act (combination of Trotskyists and Sinn Fein)

#### Trotskyist:

Workers League

International Marxist Group

International Socialists (now Socialist Workers Party)

International Communist League

Right to Work Campaign (IS and IMG)

#### Maoists:

Communist Unity Association (M-L)

#### Anarchist:

Anarchist Workers Association

Freedom Collective

East London Libertarians

Federation of London Anarchist Groups

#### Revolutionary Socialist:

Big Flame

#### Anti-Fascist (infiltrated or controlled by revolutionaries):

Croydon Collective

Battersea and Tooting Campaign Against Racism



## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Battersea and Wandsworth Anti Racist Committee

All Lambeth Anti Racist Movement

Greenwich Anti Fascist Committee

Hackney Committee Against Racism and Fascism

West London Anti Racist Forum

### Superintendent K Pryde's report dated 13 March 1978 (1977 Annual Report)

Pro Irish:

Trades Union Committee Against Prevention of Terrorism Act

Trotskyist:

Socialist Workers Party

Womens Voice

International Marxist Group

Workers League

Socialist Unity

Right to Work Campaign

National Organisation of International Socialist Students

Rank and File Movement

South Africa Solidarity Campaign

Maoist:

Communist Party of England (M-L)

Progressive Cultural Association

Community Unity Association (M-L)

Communist Federation of Britain (M-L)

} now Revolutionary  
Communist League of  
Britain

East London Peoples Front

Outer East London Anti-Fascist Anti-Racist Committee

Indian Workers Movement

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

West Indian Defence Committee

Indian Defence Committee

Ford Workers Committee

Irish Support and Friendship Committee

Anarchist:

Freedom Collective

Anarchy Collective

Anarchist Workers Association now Libertarian Communist Group & Anarchist Communist Association

Black Aid

Campaign Against Repression in West Germany

Zero Collective

London Workers Group

Federation of London Anarchist Groups

East London Libertarians

Other Groups:

National Abortion Campaign

Anti-Fascist (infiltrated or controlled by revolutionaries):

Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Haringey Campaign Against Racism

All Lewisham Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Hackney Committee Against Racism and Fascism

Southwark Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Anti Nazi League

Detective Chief Inspector M Ferguson's report dated 31 January 1979 (1978 Annual Report)

Trotskyist:

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Socialist Workers Party

International Marxist Group

Womens Voice

Socialist Unity

Right to Work Campaign

National Organisation of International Socialist Students

Rank and File Movements

Maoist:

Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) \*\*

Progressive Cultural Association \*\*

East London Peoples Front \*\*

Indian Workers Movement \*\*

West Indian Defence Committee \*\*

Indian Defence Committee \*\*

Ford Workers Committee \*\*

Irish Support and Friendship Committee \*\*

London Students Movement \*\*

Pro-Irish:

British Withdrawal from Northern Ireland Campaign \*\*

Troops Out Movement \*\*

Trades Union Committee against Prevention of Terrorism Act \*\*

Anarchist:

Freedom Collective

Anarchy Collective

East London Libertarians

Persons Unknown (PUNK)

Zero Collective (now defunct)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

London Workers Group

Federation of London Anarchists Group

Syndicalist Workers Federation

Rising Free Collective

Graffiti Collective

Anarcho-Utopian Mystics

Monday Club (London School of Economics Anarchist Group)

Reading University Anarchists

Anti-Fascist:

Anti-Nazi League

School Kids Against the Nazis

*“Those marked \*\* are not currently penetrated, due to change of personnel, but where necessary they will be targets for future operations”*

Detective Inspector T Butler's undated report (1979 Annual Report)

Trotskyist:

Socialist Workers Party

Womens Voice

Socialist Unity

Right to Work Campaign

Spartacist League

Revolutionary Communist Tendency

Flame

Anarchist:

Freedom Collective

Anarchy Collective

Persons Unknown

Autonomous Group (formerly LSE Monday Club)

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Revolutionary Prisoners Group

London Workers Group

Syndicalist Workers Federation

Direct Action Movement

Rising Free Collective

London Weekly Collective

Anti-Fascist:

Anti-Nazi League

Schoolkids Against the Nazis

Stop All Racist Tours

Anti-Nuclear

Acting Chief Inspector T Butler's undated report (1980 Annual Report)

Trotskyist:

Socialist Workers Party

Womens Voice

Right to Work Campaign

Spartacist League

Revolutionary Marxist Tendency

East London Workers Against Racism

Marxist-Leninist:

British-Kampuchea Support Campaign

Pro-Irish:

Troops Out Movement

Anarchist:

Freedom Collective

London Workers Group

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Rising Free Collective

Krondstat Kids (formerly Autonomous Group)

London Squatters Union

North London Anarchist Group

### Anti-Fascist:

Anti-Nazi League

Bexley Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Paddington Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

### Anti-Nuclear:

Anti-Nuclear Campaign

London Region Anti-Nuclear Alliance

Friends of the Earth

Scottish Campaign to Resist the Atomic Menace

Torness Alliance

### Chief Inspector T Butler's undated report (1981 Annual Report)

#### Trotskyist:

Socialist Workers Party

Womens Voice

Right to Work Campaign

Engineers Charter Group

Spartacist League

Revolutionary Communist Party

East London Workers Against Racism

#### Pro-Irish:

Troops Out Movement

London H Block/Armagh Committee

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Armagh Womens Group

Smash the Prevention of Terrorism Act Campaign

### Anarchist:

Freedom Collective

London Workers Group

Xtra

A Distribution

Autonomy Centre

121 Brixton Anarchist Bookshop

Rising Free Collective

Krondstat Kids (formerly Autonomous Group)

London Squatters Union

International Communist Current

### Anti-Fascist:

Anti-Nazi League

Campaign Against Racist Laws

Wandsworth Against Fascism

Bexley Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Paddington Campaign Against Racism and Fascism

Campaign for Police Accountability in Camden

### Anti-Nuclear:

World Disarmament Campaign

Anti-Nuclear Campaign

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

London Peace Action

London Region Anti-Nuclear Alliance

Hackney Anti-Nuclear Group



## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Friends of the Earth

Scottish Campaign to Resist the Atomic Menace

Torness Alliance

### Chief Inspector N D Short's undated report (1982 Annual Report)

#### Trotskyist:

Socialist Workers Party

Right to Work Campaign

Socialist Workers Student Organisation

Revolutionary Communist Party

Spartacist League

Red Action

Revolutionary Communist Group

Fight Racism Fight Imperialism

#### Marxist-Leninist:

Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (M-L)

Peoples Democratic Front

Communist Youth Union of Britain

Albanian Society

Progressive Cultural Association

London Student Movement

#### Pro-Irish:

Troops Out Movement

Irish Freedom Movement

Armagh Co-ordinating Group

North (and South) Irish Solidarity Committee

Irish in Britain Representation Group

### Anarchist:

- Freedom Collective
- Xtra
- 121 Brixton Anarchist Bookshop
- Brixton Squatters Aid
- Direct Action Movement
- Belfast Anarchist Collective
- Black Flag

### Anti-Fascist:

- Anti Nazi League
- Workers Against Racism

### Anti-Nuclear:

- Anti-Nuclear Campaign
- Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
- Peace Camp Movement
- European Nuclear Disarmament

### Chief Inspector N D Short's undated report (1983 Annual Report)

### Trotskyist:

- Socialist Workers Party
- Right to Work Campaign
- Socialist Workers Student Organisation
- Revolutionary Communist Party
- Workers Against Racism
- Irish Freedom Movement
- Spartacist League
- Red Action

### Marxist:

- Revolutionary Communist Group
- Fight Racism Fight imperialism
- Irish Solidarity Campaign
- Stoke Newington and Hackney Defence Campaign
- Revolutionary Communist Party of Great Britain
- Peoples Democratic Front
- Communist Youth of Britain
- Albanian Society
- Progressive Cultural Association

### Pro-Irish:

- Troops Out Movement

### Anarchist:

- Freedom Collective
- Xtra
- 121 Brixton Anarchist Bookshop
- Brixton Squatters Aid
- Direct Action Movement
- Belfast Anarchist Collective
- Black Flag

### Anti-Nuclear:

- Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
- Anti-Nuclear Campaign
- Greenham Common Women Support Groups
- Lambeth Women for Peace
- European Nuclear Disarmament
- London Greenpeace

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

### Animal Liberation:

- Animal Aid
- Animal Liberation Front (Supporters Group)
- British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection
- Co-ordinating Animal Welfare
- South London Animal Movement
- South London Animal Group
- South East Animal Liberation League
- Hunt Saboteurs Association

### Others:

- Roach Family Support Committee
- 3<sup>rd</sup> May Defence Committee
- City Branch of Anti-Apartheid Movement
- National Campaign Against the Police Bill
- London Campaign Against the Police Bill
- Hackney Campaign Against the Police Bill

### Detective Chief Inspector A R Wait's undated report (1984 Annual Report)

### Trotskyist:

- Socialist Workers Party
- Socialist Workers Student Society
- Revolutionary Communist Party
- Workers Against Racism \*
- Irish Freedom Movement
- Red Action

### Marxist:

- Revolutionary Communist Group \*

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Fight Racism Fight Imperialism \*

Irish Solidarity Movement \*

### Anarchist:

Anarchist Exchange

Freedom Collective

Xtra

121 Brixton Anarchist Bookshop \*

Direct Action Movement

'Stop the City'

London Greenpeace

Black Flag \*

London Workers Group

London Autonomists

Class War

### Anti-Nuclear:

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

Anti-Nuclear Campaign

Greenham Common Women Support Groups

Lambeth Women for Peace

European Nuclear Disarmament

### Animal Liberation:

Animal Aid

Animal Liberation Front (Supporters Group)

Badgers (Haringey Animal Rights Group)

British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection

Campaign Against Farm Animal Abuse

Co-ordinating Animal Welfare

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

East London Animal Rights

Islington Animal Rights

Fur Action Group

London Animal Rights Movement

Putney Anti-Vivisection Campaign

South London Animal Movement

South London Animal Group

South East Animal Liberation League

Hunt Saboteurs Association

West London Animal Rights Group

Others:

City of London Anti-Apartheid Group \*

East London Campaign against Racist Attacks & Police Harassment

Hackney Police Monitoring Group

Miners' Support Groups

*"Those marked \* have been covered but are not currently infiltrated either due to circumstances beyond our control or through changes in personnel"*

## APPENDIX 2 – PHASE 2 OFFICERS

HN45 – “David Robertson”  
HN347 – Alex Sloan  
HN344 – “Ian Cameron”  
HN299/342 – “David Hughes”  
HN298 – “Mike Scott”  
HN301 – “Bob Stubbs”  
HN303 – “Peter Collins”  
HN353 – “Gary Roberts”  
HN351 – “Jeff Slater”  
HN297 – Richard Clark “Rick Gibson”  
HN200 – “Roger Harris”  
HN300 – “Jim Pickford”  
HN13 – “Barry Loader”  
HN296 – “Geoff Wallace”  
HN304 – “Graham Coates”  
HN354 – “Vince Miller”  
HN80 – “Colin Clark”  
HN356 – “Bill Biggs”  
HN126 – “Paul Gray”  
HN106 – “Barry Tompkins”  
HN96 – “Michael James”  
HN155 – “Phil Cooper”

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

1. HN45 “David Robertson” has provided a witness statement. Publication of his real name has been restricted<sup>88</sup>. He is due to give oral evidence. The reports in the bundle connected to HN45 relate to events that took place between 25 November 1970 and 6 February 1973. The reports concern the activities of Maoist activists. Many involve reporting on the prominent Maoist activist, Abhimanyu Manchanda. HN45 returned to the SDS in what he describes as an administrative role between 1982 and 1985<sup>89</sup>. We will be dealing with this subsequent service in Tranche 2.
2. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the reports and HN45’s witness statement.

---

<sup>88</sup> See <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/20171114-SDS-anonymity-Minded-to-2.pdf> and [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515\\_ruling\\_SDS\\_anonymity.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf)

<sup>89</sup> Witness statement, para.109



## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 2.1. This is an early example of a longer SDS deployment which spanned more than 2 years. It can be contrasted with some of the very short SDS deployments that took place in 1968. The deployment significantly exceeded the 12 month maximum period advocated by DCI Dixon in 1968. We will be exploring how and why the length of SDS undercover deployments began to increase in this period.
- 2.2. Unlike many SDS officers, HN45 was single when he joined the SDS<sup>90</sup>. We will be exploring the extent to which the marital status of potential recruits mattered to the SDS and why.
- 2.3. HN45 states that he was specifically tasked to infiltrate Maoist groups, many of which were very small<sup>91</sup>. In particular, he states that his task was to find out what the Maoists groups were “*all about*”, their plans, members etc.<sup>92</sup> He specifically denies any remit to disrupt or distract the groups<sup>93</sup>. His written evidence is that his role was confined to gathering and reporting information. There is no contrary evidence in the documents.
- 2.4. HN45 recalls discussing with SDS undercover officers what they were doing and the methods they were using before he was deployed<sup>94</sup>. He describes regularly attending the SDS cover accommodation to write up his reports and to attend meetings that he recalls being held weekly, on Wednesdays<sup>95</sup>. As to what occurred in the cover accommodation, HN45 describes exchanging good ideas. He states: “*I would have discussed my deployment with the other UCOs at the SDS flat*” and “*We would have had general conversations about what we were up to during our deployments*”. He recalls his managers being present during these conversations<sup>96</sup>. The Inquiry will be exploring the role of the cover accommodation in the operation of the SDS, including the sharing of ideas and practice, throughout our investigation.
- 2.5. HN45 does not recall working much longer hours than he normally worked in Special Branch. He states that the hours were a bit more unpredictable and variable but: “*I don’t think that my working life was that different to [those] in the rest of Special Branch*”<sup>97</sup>. This is consistent with the impression, which we shall be testing, that many of

---

<sup>90</sup> Witness statement, para.8

<sup>91</sup> Witness statement, para.28

<sup>92</sup> Witness statement, para.32

<sup>93</sup> Witness statement, para.34

<sup>94</sup> Witness statement, para.12

<sup>95</sup> Witness statement, paras.39 & 44

<sup>96</sup> Witness statement, paras.40-41

<sup>97</sup> Witness statement, para.45

early SDS undercover officers were, in using the undercover tactic, simply extending what they had already been doing in Special Branch. Their deployments may be contrasted with those that came later who became much more involved in the lives of those with whom they were mixing. However, HN45 still became involved with the Maoists that he was targeting to the extent that he states that he babysat on one occasion for Abhimanyu Manchanda and Diane Langford<sup>98</sup>.

- 2.6. In all but a few instances, there is no evidence to suggest that any SDS undercover officer, other than "David Robertson" was present at any of the events reported on. The exceptions are the reports dated 18 January 1973, 7 February 1973 and 9 February 1973 which bear the names of both HN45 and WPC Jill Mosdell. The 18 January 1973 report concerns a very small meeting: the Chair (Manchanda) and five other persons. We will explore which undercover police officers were present at the meeting and, if there were two, how and why this occurred at such a small meeting? HN45 explains how Jill Mosdell came to be present at paragraph 56 of his witness statement and states that his own presence at a meeting of so few people was: "... *not indicative of any special position of trust that I had obtained it is simply that some of these meetings were not well attended and they were happy to have any attendees that they could*".
- 2.7. The report dated 22 January 1971 is relevant to a number of issues<sup>99</sup>. If it is accurate, it concerns a meeting of 14 persons held at Abhimanyu Manchanda's home. The object of the meeting was to plan the RMLL's activities for 1971, including those of three connected organisations: the Women's Liberation Front (WLF), the British Vietnam Solidarity Front (BVSF) and Friends of China. The report asserts that the RMLL was now going to concentrate its activities in the field of political agitation within industry. To that end three persons were directed to obtain employment at the Ford factory in Dagenham (para.4). The WLF is reported as having formed two new branches, including one deliberately situated in North London close to the factory run by Metal Box Co. which employed a large number of women (para.5). Other WLF members, all of whom were also members of the trade union SOGAT "*intended to try and organise women members of that union*" (para.6). Another RMLL activist, who is recorded as being Indian, is reported as now being able to devote more time to the RMLL,

---

<sup>98</sup> Witness statement, para.76

<sup>99</sup> UCPI0000010567

especially in the industrial field. This individual is recorded as stating that he had many contacts in various factories in London, particularly the Metal Box Co. "*which employed large numbers of Asians*" (para.7). They were all advised by Manchanda, if the report is accurate, not to draw the attention of the employers at the outset (para.8). Towards the end of the report is a brief paragraph recording conversation on the topic of "*involvement with coloured people*". This single report therefore records information in relation to political activity connected with industrial relations, racial equality and women's rights. These are matters which are reported on frequently in the reporting on the RMLL and connected groups. There was a specific SDS deployment into the WLF (see HN348). Reports on these issues are not confined to the reporting on Maoist groups and we shall be following such reporting throughout our investigation of the SDS and examining why it occurred. This report is also an example of the race of a person who is referred to in a report being recorded. This is another common feature of SDS reporting which we shall be following. There are other examples in HN45's reporting, notably the report dated 7 February 1973: "*The meeting ... was attended by about 120 persons of whom at least half were Arabs and Coloureds*" (para.2)<sup>100</sup>.

- 2.8. A report dated 3 February 1971 concerns a large meeting of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)<sup>101</sup>. It is an example of a practice that we have sometimes seen in SDS reports of the writer stating that all or a part of a meeting's proceedings were not of interest to Special Branch. In this case the reports of a delegation to China are recorded only very briefly and it is said of general questions from the floor that "*again nothing of particular interest occurred*". We shall be exploring what officers understood to be of interest to Special Branch and how they came to that understanding. What was recorded in more detail was presumably believed to be of interest to Special Branch. In this case that included, amongst other things, a collection by members of the Post Office Workers Union to help in the then current strike and that: "*Most of the Post Office workers were coloured and from time-to-time gave the clenched fist "Black Power" salute*". Thus, this is a further example of reporting relating to industrial relations and those campaigning for racial equality.

<sup>100</sup> UCPI0000010248 – see HN45 witness statement, para.59 for his explanation: "*This would simply have been a statement of fact and I tried to pass on as much information as possible*".

<sup>101</sup> UCPI0000021998

- 2.9. There is reference in the report dated 11 February 1971 to a core participant, Dr Norman Temple. The report concerns the second annual conference of the Palestine Solidarity Committee. Dr Temple is recorded as having proposed a resolution expressing solidarity with the people of Ireland. He is also recorded as having stood unsuccessfully for a seat on the Executive Committee of the VSC<sup>102</sup>. Why was the SDS recording such details of an individual's political activities? Was it justified?<sup>103</sup>
- 2.10. HN45 documents a split in the RMLL in March 1971 which arose, according to the reports, from a rejection of Manchanda's leadership<sup>104</sup>. He also then reports on the formation of a new group, by those disenchanted by Manchanda's leadership, called the Marxist Leninist Workers Association (MLWA). A series of reports on this group then follows, portraying it as a powerless and ineffective force<sup>105</sup>. Reporting on the internal politics of activist groups, including the dissolution of some groups and the formation of others, is something which the Inquiry Legal Team has frequently come across when considering SDS reporting. Why were such events reported on? Was there any justification for so doing?
- 2.11. A report dated 18 November 1971 appears to be a clear example of an SDS officer providing specific advance intelligence of a public demonstration<sup>106</sup>. In this case what is being reported is an attempt to organise support for a picket to be held outside Tottenham Magistrates' Court and to fill the court's public gallery with supporters of the accused: three members of the London Alliance in Defence of Workers Rights. The time and date of the event are included in the report. So too are the groups whose members are expected to attend: the London Alliance, Schools Action Union and Black Unity Freedom Party.
- 2.12. A memorandum dated 7 February 1972, from SDS manager HN332 to Special Branch's Commander Operations records that HN45 had been invited to run Banner Books, a Maoist bookshop<sup>107</sup>. HN332 wished HN45 to assume this responsibility but only temporarily and gives four reasons: (a) to enhance HN45's legend; (b) to understand how the

---

<sup>102</sup> UCPI0000010569

<sup>103</sup> There is further reporting on Dr Temple in Tranche 1 Phase 1. Therefore Dr Temple will be invited to give evidence in Phase 2 when he will have the opportunity to give any evidence that he has to give arising from this February 1971 report.

<sup>104</sup> UCPI0000011741, UCPI0000011742 and UCPI0000010918

<sup>105</sup> UCPI0000011746, UCPI0000014360 and UCPI0000014363

<sup>106</sup> UCPI0000010935

<sup>107</sup> MPS-0730516

bookshop operated; (c) to obtain access to the bookshop's records and mailing list; and (d) to obtain a plan of and keys to the building<sup>108</sup>.

HN45's evidence is that he "...continued to attend the bookshop but was not otherwise involved in the running of it"<sup>109</sup>. HN332's document appears to evidence examples of the sort of intelligence that the SDS was interested in and the reference to keys seems to afford some corroboration to HN326's account that he was asked to take an impression of the keys to the IMG's offices.

- 2.13. HN45's reports are not all strictly factual. Many contain an element of assessment or analysis. The clearest example is his report on the BVSF dated 5 May 1972 which comprises solely of an assessment of the then current position of the BVSF. This is an early example of an SDS undercover officer who, having built up an extensive knowledge of a group, provides his assessment of that group. Why were such assessments made and what were they used for?
- 2.14. All of the reports obtained in relation to "David Robertson's" deployment use the Special Report form. There are none submitted on the Meeting Report / Poster Parade form. It is not clear why this is the case. Special Report forms do not specifically record whether meetings were private or public. Consequently, in some cases it is not clear from the content of HN45's reports whether an event was public or private. However, three of the reports concern RMLL meetings that took place in a private home between January and March 1971<sup>110</sup>.
- 2.15. As to the level of threat of subversion posed by the Maoists, HN45 states: "*With the benefit of hindsight, I'm not convinced that the group posed a threat of subversion or revolution ...given how low the membership was ..*"<sup>111</sup> In a similar vein, he asserts: "*The activity that I witnessed was subversive in the sense that the whole purpose of the Maoists was to subvert the political system but they could not actually achieve this as they did not have the means to do so and were largely pretty ineffective*"<sup>112</sup>.
- 2.16. In relation to violence and public order, HN45 states: "*I don't remember seeing any Maoists committing public disorder while deployed but I may just have forgotten over the years*" and "*..my recollection now is that the Maoists were generally not violent*"<sup>113</sup>.

---

<sup>108</sup> MPS-0730516

<sup>109</sup> Witness statement, para.61

<sup>110</sup> UCPI0000010567, UCPI0000011741 and UCPI0000011742

<sup>111</sup> Witness statement, para.54

<sup>112</sup> Witness statement, para.72

<sup>113</sup> Witness statement, paras.68-69

- 2.17. HN45 makes two points in connection with the overall level of threat of subversion, violence or public disorder posed by the Maoists he infiltrated which we will need to explore: first, the level of understanding at the time; and, second, the utility of proving a negative. He states: *“Although in hindsight the Maoist groups may not actually have posed a particular threat, this may not have been understood at the time and it was also important for the police to have negative intelligence so as not to waste police resources”*<sup>114</sup>. We note that in relation to the Maoist groups, justification will also need to be considered against the background of what is asserted to be changing behaviour. For example, the 1973 Annual Report states that the Maoist groups were undergoing a period of introspection as a result of the détente between China and the United States of America<sup>115</sup> whereas in 1968, before China’s relations with the West shifted, they are portrayed as having been amongst the more militant activists.
- 2.18. As is usual, HN45’s reporting includes reports on individuals. In his witness statement, he explains: *“...one of the main reasons we deployed was to gather intelligence about who was involved in these protest groups”*<sup>116</sup>. The examples in the bundle include details of the personal finances, domestic arrangements and employment of individual activists<sup>117</sup>. The report dated 10 March 1972 is notable because the employment particulars reported are stated to have been provided in response to a request from the Security Service<sup>118</sup>.
- 2.19. HN45 worked in Special Branch both before and after his service in the SDS. This included working in C Squad prior to joining the SDS. He states that will have read SDS reports during the course of his ordinary Special Branch duties but made no specific requests of the SDS for particular information<sup>119</sup>. We will be exploring the extent to which the SDS’ targeting was the product of external requests and how its “product” was used and disseminated by Special Branch throughout our investigation.
- 2.20. HN45 states that he was present at the first Grosvenor Square riot, before he served in the SDS, and describes the police as having been *“completely overwhelmed”* on that occasion<sup>120</sup>. His evidence

---

<sup>114</sup> Witness statement, para.81

<sup>115</sup> MPS-0728975, para.15

<sup>116</sup> Witness statement, para.65

<sup>117</sup> MPS-0739236 and MPS-0739238

<sup>118</sup> MPS-0739241

<sup>119</sup> Witness statement, paras. 6 & 112

<sup>120</sup> Witness statement, para.82



- corroborates other evidence to the effect that the authorities were not adequately prepared for events on that day.
- 2.21. HN45 appears to have been managed, within the SDS, primarily by Saunders and HN294. Some of his reports are signed by HN332.
  - 2.22. There is unfortunately an error in the way that the documents have been scanned. The activist documents that accompany the report dated 16 March 1971 are out of order and include a document dated 28 March 1971 that should have been included in the scan of the report dated 31 March 1971<sup>121</sup>.
  - 2.23. We note the Undercover Research Group's online article about HN45 and, in particular, the allegation that an activist called Ethel was threatened by HN45, an allegation also referred to in the statement of Diane Langford<sup>122</sup>. This is not an allegation that is accepted by HN45<sup>123</sup>. He refers to a meeting with Ethel, an acquaintance from his time as a uniformed officer, at the London School of Economics. He claims that Ethel announced his status as a police officer in a loud voice although not many people heard. HN45 states that he made his excuses and left<sup>124</sup>.
  - 2.24. This incident ultimately led to his withdrawal from the field: on the following day he spoke to the head of Special Branch, Vic Gilbert and the Deputy Commissioner, Roland Watts, about this episode. They told him that if confronted about his role as an undercover officer he should say that he *"was acting completely 'off his own bat' and that [his] superior officers were unaware of what [he] was doing"*<sup>125</sup>.

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

3. HN347 "Alex Sloan" has provided the Inquiry with a witness statement. Publication of his real name has been restricted<sup>126</sup>. He is due to give oral evidence. 23 intelligence reports connected with his reporting have been obtained. They are dated between 13 January and 27 August 1971 and refer

<sup>121</sup> See UCPI0000011741 and UCPI0000011742 respectively.

<sup>122</sup> Witness statement of Diane Langford paras 218-220

<sup>123</sup> <https://undercoverresearch.net/2018/05/25/dave-robertson-a-1970s-spycop-among-north-london-maoists/> / See paragraphs 85 & 88 of HN45's witness statement for his account.

<sup>124</sup> Witness statement para 85

<sup>125</sup> Witness statement para 86

<sup>126</sup> <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180327-Final-ruling-following-21-March-hearing.pdf>



to events which occurred between 10 January 1971 and 27 June 1971<sup>127</sup>.

They all concern the activities of the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front (INLSF), a revolutionary socialist group which is reported to have had Marxist-Leninist connections, during this period. HN347's deployment was therefore relatively short and targeted at a specific single group. 16 of the reports refer to core participant Norman Temple making this an early example of a deployment in respect of which there is a core participant who had significant personal contact with a SDS undercover police officer.

4. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the reporting and the witness statements of HN347 and Norman Temple.
  - 4.1. HN347 states that when he joined, there were 364 people serving in Special Branch which, if accurate, gives an indication of the size of Special Branch relative to the SDS<sup>128</sup>.
  - 4.2. Unlike many of the Phase 1 former UCOs, HN347 does think that he created his identity as set out in the document "Penetration of Extremist Groups"<sup>129</sup>. He states that he did not use a deceased child's identity to create his legend and this evidence is consistent with that of his contemporaries<sup>130</sup>.
  - 4.3. In contrast with some SDS officers, HN347 states that he had no scope to influence his own tasking (e.g. compare with HN336). Why was this?
  - 4.4. HN347 describes attending weekly meetings at HN45's cover accommodation which he describes as akin to a safe house<sup>131</sup>. It is not clear whether this is the same safe house that his contemporaries recall.
  - 4.5. HN347 recalls life undercover as differing enormously from his ordinary duties because he did not go home between Thursdays and Mondays<sup>132</sup>. However, he also states that he was not allowed to take overtime<sup>133</sup>. We will wish to explore how deeply involved "Alex Sloan" became with the members of INLSF. For his part, Dr Temple states: "I

---

<sup>127</sup> HN347's recollection is that his deployment was confined to 1971 (witness statement: para.28) and therefore the risk assessment which supported his application for anonymity is at odds with both the reporting that has been obtained and the witness' recollection.

<sup>128</sup> Witness statement, para.9

<sup>129</sup> Witness statement, para.23

<sup>130</sup> Witness statement, para.18

<sup>131</sup> Witness statement, para.36

<sup>132</sup> Witness statement, para.44

<sup>133</sup> Witness statement, para.45

*did speak to him, but only in limited terms*". He also describes "Alex Sloan" as quiet and never part of the inner circle<sup>134</sup>.

- 4.6. The pattern revealed by the intelligence reports shows "Alex Sloan" regularly attending weekly meetings of the INLSF held first at the Marquis of Clanricarde public house (between 10 January 1971 and 7 March 1971) and then, slightly less regularly, at 83A Golders Green Road, the home of an INLSF member being used as the group's headquarters<sup>135</sup>.
- 4.7. The meetings are either recorded as being private, or appear to have been so, a matter to be clarified in evidence. The meetings were small: attendance is recorded as varying between 9 and 26 persons, typically in the early 20s.
- 4.8. All of the reports are Special Reports in HN347's name. All but two are countersigned by DCI Saunders, the others are countersigned by HN294<sup>136</sup>. Dr Temple's impression is that the reports: *"...appear accurate in terms of their content"*<sup>137</sup>.
- 4.9. As well as regular meetings the INLSF ran political education classes but there are no reports arising from "Alex Sloan's" attendance at such classes.
- 4.10. In his witness statement, HN347 describes selling the INLSF newspaper as well as attending meetings and demonstrations<sup>138</sup>.
- 4.11. There is reporting about forthcoming events either organised by, or to be attended by, INLSF, for example pickets, demonstrations, a rally and a march. However, there is little evidence in the reports to suggest that these events gave rise to any public disorder. Whether the INLSF posed any threat to public order will be explored.
- 4.12. There is no evidence in the reports that the INLSF was involved in actual violence. Some contact with the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) is recorded as having occurred but this was the source of considerable controversy within the INLSF. It was denounced as nationalistic and a betrayal of revolutionary socialism<sup>139</sup>.
- 4.13. The reports do not suggest that the INLSF set out to commit criminal acts to further its political aims.

---

<sup>134</sup> Witness statement, para.17

<sup>135</sup> MPS-0739863

<sup>136</sup> See also witness statement, para.34 which is consistent with the documents.

<sup>137</sup> Witness statement, para.14

<sup>138</sup> Witness statement, paras.43 & 70

<sup>139</sup> UCPI-0000007822

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 4.14. The INLSF appears to have had revolutionary aspirations but the reports do not suggest that it was a potent revolutionary force<sup>140</sup>.
- 4.15. HN347's reporting does include details of the inner workings of the INLSF which, if accurate, suggests that the group was in practice controlled by an inner circle of Marxist-Leninists<sup>141</sup>. Dr Temple's witness statement also describes an inner group<sup>142</sup>.
- 4.16. There is evidence that the INLSF sought to avoid the attention of Special Branch but, if accurate, it is not clear why it did so<sup>143</sup>.
- 4.17. HN347 reported upon a serious internal dispute within the INLSF which led to the expulsions. This event attracted specific interest and comment from senior MPS management<sup>144</sup>.
- 4.18. There is reporting that touches upon the justice campaign arising from the death of Stephen McCarthy<sup>145</sup>. Why was this activity reported on?
- 4.19. There is also reporting on INLSF activity supporting the campaign for racial equality and protesting against the police<sup>146</sup>. Why was this activity reported on?
- 4.20. One report includes content which appears to record legal advice and contemplated legal action against a senior police officer. There does not appear in this era to have been any restriction on the recording of legal advice received by activists which gives rise to questions about respect for the doctrine of legal professional privilege<sup>147</sup>.
- 4.21. The report dated 11 May 1971 is an example of SDS reporting touching upon trade union membership. It records details of both an individual's INLSF activism and the fact that his studies at the London School of Economics were funded by a trade union scholarship<sup>148</sup>. The reasons for the SDS' interest in trade union connections is a matter which we are investigating.
- 4.22. The last of HN347's reports in the Hearing Bundle lists persons on the mailing list for the Irish Liberation Press, the INLSF's newspaper. It is striking that most of those named are recorded as persons who could not be identified or of whom there was no trace. We shall be exploring whether and to what extent that means that submission of this list meant that persons who had hitherto not come to the attention of

---

<sup>140</sup> MPS-0739487

<sup>141</sup> MPS-0739321

<sup>142</sup> Witness statement, para.9

<sup>143</sup> MPS-0739490 at para.4

<sup>144</sup> MPS-0739470 & UCPI-0000007822

<sup>145</sup> MPS-0739317 & MPS-0739483

<sup>146</sup> MPS-0739479. See also MPS-0739317 and MPS-0739475

<sup>147</sup> MPS-0739487

<sup>148</sup> MPS-0739863

Special Branch or the Security Service come to be named in a report filed by both organisations solely because they subscribed to this publication. Was such recording justified? HN347 states that although he was not specifically tasked to obtain membership or mailing lists, doing so was: *“obviously part of my remit”*<sup>149</sup>.

- 4.23. Of the many reports which refer to Norman Temple, notable examples appear to us to include those which include the police version of his role in the events which led to the internal split within the INLSF, his position as Treasurer of the group, his membership of the Communist Workers’ League (said to be the inner caucus of the INLSF), his contributions to group meetings on issues as diverse as reading from The Thoughts of Chairman Mao, what to do if arrested and his experiences selling copies of the Irish Liberation Press in Ireland<sup>150</sup>. Was such reporting of an individual’s activism within the INLSF justified?
- 4.24. Dr Temple describes there being *“...a lot of talking (often from Davoren) about how we should overthrow the state and change things”* and states: *“References were often made within meetings of the need to use violence as a means by which to achieve revolutionary change, but I always took this to be just talk”*<sup>151</sup>.
- 4.25. For question, in light of all of the above, is why the INLSF was targeted by the SDS? Was the infiltration of this group justified? HN347 states: *“It soon became obvious that the INLSF weren’t a group that were going to carry out bombings or any other serious criminal activity”*<sup>152</sup>. He further states that the group was not violent or subversive: *“The INLSF did not endorse, encourage, instigate, facilitate, or participate in violence during my deployment”* and *“The INLSF did nothing to subvert Parliamentary Democracy in the United Kingdom. It was a political, rather than a terrorist, group”*<sup>153</sup>. He does not recall witnessing any public disorder, violence or subversive activity<sup>154</sup>. Did events in Northern Ireland at the time justify infiltrating the INLSF? Dr Temple states that *“Ireland was definitely a hot political topic”* and *“I can understand why the police would be interested in the INLSF”*<sup>155</sup>. If so,

<sup>149</sup> Witness statement, para.65

<sup>150</sup> MPS-0739470, UCPI0000007822, MPS-0739474, MPS-0739319, MPS-0739321, MPS-0739483 and MPS-0739490

<sup>151</sup> Witness statement, para.11

<sup>152</sup> Witness statement, para.31

<sup>153</sup> Witness statement, paras.48 & 49

<sup>154</sup> Witness statement, paras.66-69

<sup>155</sup> Witness statement, para.21

should infiltration have continued once it had been confirmed that the INLSF was not involved in public disorder, violence or subversion?

- 4.26. HN347 was withdrawn after he was accused of being a police officer by members of his group, whom he describes as being very nervous about undercover police officers<sup>156</sup>. Dr Temple's recollection, as set out at para.19 of his witness statement, is that "Alex Sloan" did not simply slip away. Rather, he tried to disrupt the group by stating that he had been spied upon from both of the camps that then existed within the INLSF. We will be affording HN347 the opportunity either to confirm this account or to give his own version of events.

*HN344 "Ian Cameron" - Anti-Internment League – 9 March 1972 to 13 Jun 1972; Northern Minorities Defence Force 10 February - 1972 to 18 May 1972<sup>157</sup>*

5. HN344 adopted the cover name "Ian Cameron". Publication of his real name has been restricted<sup>158</sup>. He lives outside the United Kingdom and has not provided the Inquiry with a witness statement.
6. 22 intelligence reports have been attributed to him dating between 2 October 1970 and 15 June 1972 and referring to events which occurred between 24 September 1970 and 13 June 1972. Those dated before 6 March 1972 appear to pre-date HN344's service with the SDS, although he is recorded as being involved in unspecified "Special Operations"<sup>159</sup>. All but one of the reports concern the activities of Irish political groups. At the start of 1972, the focus of his reporting narrowed to the Anti-Internment League ('AIL') and the Northern Minorities Defence Force ('NMDF'). Prior to that, he reported on a handful of other Irish political groups. In a Minute Sheet dating from early 1972, Commander Rodger requests HN344's transfer to the Special Operations Squad<sup>160</sup>.
7. The following observations arise from HN344's reporting:

<sup>156</sup> Witness statement, paras.77 & 80

<sup>157</sup> Dates confined to the period of HN344's SDS service excluding his prior "Special Operations" work. Dates refer to the date of the event reported on save where this cannot be ascertained from the report.

<sup>158</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction\\_order-HN344.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction_order-HN344.pdf)

<sup>159</sup> MPS-740746 (reference to "Special Operations") and UCPI0000008649 (first SDS report)

<sup>160</sup> "We cannot possibly have too many sources in the Irish field at the present time and consequently I am in the course of making arrangements for DC HN344 to be transferred to the Special Operations Squad...in the very near future." MPS-0734406/2 and MPS-0734406/3

- 7.1. Prior to his transfer to the SDS, HN344 reported on criminal proceedings arising from activities of protestors at demonstrations<sup>161</sup>.
- 7.2. HN344's infiltration of NMDF came about following an invitation to a private meeting from the Chairman of that group whilst attending a film screening on 8 February 1972<sup>162</sup>. The NMDF successfully applied for affiliation with the AIL<sup>163</sup> and HN344 went on to attend delegate meetings of the latter group<sup>164</sup>. On 29 March 1972, HN344 attended a meeting of the NMDF Officers' Committee. His attendance at this meeting indicates that he had been appointed as one of the "Headquarters Staff" for the organisation<sup>165</sup>. He does not appear to have been a member of the Officers' Committee itself, although the command structure of the organisation notes that he is in command of the North West Section and that he is the AIL delegate<sup>166</sup>. His primary group therefore appears to have been NMDF and his infiltration of AIL comes via his attendance as delegate.
- 7.3. Commander Rodger described the leadership of the NMDF as "*extremely militant*"<sup>167</sup>. The Officers' Committee expressed the view in March 1972 that civil war in Northern Ireland was "*very imminent*" and in response, they planned to send a unit of men to assist Active Service Units in Northern Ireland<sup>168</sup>. In preparation for this, there was discussion of members training by joining rifle clubs<sup>169</sup>. On 6 April 1972, the Officers' Committee noted that the imminent threat of Civil War appeared to have been averted for a few months, but that in the meantime, they should begin a training programme for volunteers "*to include instruction on radio theory, fieldcraft, weapon handling (theory) and general discipline*"<sup>170</sup>. There was discussion at the same meeting of obtaining land for the purposes of weapons training and at a later meeting, Government leaflets and books on the subject of arms and explosives were sought.<sup>171</sup> The Second-in-Command of the North West London Section was described as having served with the Royal Engineers thereby gaining "*a good working knowledge of explosives*

---

<sup>161</sup> MPS-0732322 and MPS-07399671

<sup>162</sup> MPS-0734406

<sup>163</sup> UCPI0000008649 – HN344's first report as a member of the SDS, dated 6 March 1972

<sup>164</sup> UCPI0000007945, MPS-0728841 and UCPI0000007970

<sup>165</sup> MPS-0734410/1

<sup>166</sup> MPS-0734410/10

<sup>167</sup> MPS-0734406/2

<sup>168</sup> MPS-0734410

<sup>169</sup> MPS-0734406/5

<sup>170</sup> MPS-0734410/8

<sup>171</sup> MPS-0734410/12



*and radio operating*<sup>172</sup>. However, HN344 does not report on the use of actual violence by NMDF at any point.

- 7.4. On 24 April 1972, there was discussion of NMDF countering a rally in London by Vanguard. Violence was noted as a possibility, but the stewards would ensure that there would be “*no fatal casualties*”<sup>173</sup>.
- 7.5. On 18 May 1972, there was a disagreement between the majority of NMDF participants and one member who had close ties to the Provisional Irish Republican Army (‘PIRA’). In the course of this dispute, he stated that the NMDF would not be welcome in Belfast in the future<sup>174</sup>. On 27 May 1972, Commander Rodger wrote to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner stating that HN344 had been invited to Londonderry with the NMDF<sup>175</sup>. He expressed the view that it would be too dangerous for HN344 to attend, given the risk that resentment from either faction of the IRA could end in disastrous consequences. There is no further NMDF reporting from HN344 after this date.
- 7.6. HN344 provided intelligence about forthcoming AIL demonstrations with potential public order implications, for example the “March 26” protest where organisers and stewards reportedly planned to relinquish control in the hope that “*participants will then rampage down Whitehall and the surrounding area, smashing windows, etc.*”<sup>176</sup>. He also reported on plans for spontaneous demonstrations which “*could be of a violent nature*”<sup>177</sup> and on a counter demonstration by the AIL in Bristol against a march of the Gloucester Regiment at which hostility from onlookers led to “*scuffles*” and eggs being thrown at the AIL protesters. This is the only report referring to any actual violence involving the AIL<sup>178</sup>.
- 7.7. HN344 reported on an executive meeting of the AIL<sup>179</sup>.
- 7.8. There was some support for the PIRA amongst AIL members. When voting on a mandate for the organisation, an original draft expressed support for “*both wings of the IRA,*” but this was removed and a motion passed in support of “*Solidarity with all forces fighting British Imperialism*”<sup>180</sup>.

---

<sup>172</sup> MPS-0734410/4

<sup>173</sup> MPS-0734411/1

<sup>174</sup> MPS-0734415/2

<sup>175</sup> MPS-0724171

<sup>176</sup> UCPI0000008651

<sup>177</sup> UCPI0000007970

<sup>178</sup> MPS-0728828/3

<sup>179</sup> UCPI00000007950

<sup>180</sup> MPS-0728841

*HN299/342 – “David Hughes” –Various groups including International Marxist Group, Anti-Internment League, Irish Solidarity Campaign, Red Circle, Spartacus League, Fight On, Troops Out Movement, Marxist-Leninist study groups– 11 November 1971 to 11 March 1976.*

8. HN299/342 who adopted the cover name “David Hughes” (referred to as HN299 in this summary) has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry. He is not being called to give oral evidence in Phase 2 of Tranche 1. His real name is the subject of a restriction order<sup>181</sup>.
9. The evidence gathered indicates that HN299 was recruited to the SDS in 1971 and served until 11 March 1976. His case is one of the earliest examples of a deployment that lasted for approximately 5 years. Of the SDS undercover officers who commenced service before 1971 only HN68 served for as long. It marks the start of a pattern of longer deployments. HN298 and HN301 also commenced their deployments in 1971 and worked undercover until 1976. The bundle contains 30 reports which have been linked to HN299. They are the reports deemed necessary by the Inquiry Legal Team. HN299 was sent a larger witness pack for memory refreshing purposes but, like many former SDS undercover officers (‘UCOs’), recalls that he would have submitted reports on every meeting and most demonstrations that he attended. He therefore believes that many of his reports were missing from his witness pack<sup>182</sup>.
10. The following observations and comments arise from a consideration of his witness statement and the reports associated with his deployment:
  - 10.1. When he joined the SDS, HN299 recalls that he was not tasked at any group, but was instructed only to attend meetings. Before doing so he spent 6-8 weeks building his cover in his cover flat<sup>183</sup>. He is an early example of an SDS UCO legend building in this way. At the beginning of his deployment he found information on left-wing meetings in the ‘Agit Prop’ section of Time Out, and could choose which ones to attend without consulting SDS management<sup>184</sup>. Despite the lack of formal tasking, however, HN299 claims that the International Marxist Group (‘IMG’) is the group most likely to have regarded him as a member<sup>185</sup>.

<sup>181</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction\\_order-HN299\\_342](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction_order-HN299_342)

<sup>182</sup> HN299 Witness statement para 73

<sup>183</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 58

<sup>184</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 65

<sup>185</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 68



Nine of the reports in the bundle relate to the IMG and reporting on this group spans almost the entire period of his deployment, from 11 November 1971 to 11 March 1976.

- 10.2. His additional reporting is quite diffuse, with reports on a meeting of the International Solidarity Campaign ('ISC') held on 10 February 1972<sup>186</sup>, on the inaugural meetings of the Finsbury Park branch of the Anti-Internment League ('AIL') held on 5 April 1972<sup>187</sup> and of Tottenham Red Circle held on 7 April 1972<sup>188</sup>, and on members of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign ('PSC') and People's Democracy/North London Claimant's Union dated 7 February 1973<sup>189</sup> and 18 September 1973<sup>190</sup> respectively. There are also two reports on 'Fight On' meetings held on 24 November 1973<sup>191</sup> and 1 December 1973<sup>192</sup>, and in the latter part of his deployment, on a Troops Out Movement ('TOM') meeting held on 31 January 1975<sup>193</sup>, and on attendees at a TOM demonstration held on 5 July 1975<sup>194</sup>. There is one report on a member of the newly-established International Communist League dated 12 January 1976<sup>195</sup>. He also reported on Marxist discussion groups held in private addresses over the period 15 May 1974 to 21 October 1975. The variety of groups upon which HN299 reported is consistent with the impression that he was allowed to self-task given in his witness statement: "*I was just told to attend meetings*" "*...I had to find out whatever information I could about whichever groups I came into contact with*"<sup>196</sup>. He states that when attending the SDS safe house, 2 to 3 times per week, he was sometimes asked to attend specific meetings or demonstrations but: "*Other than that, I was never really told what to do whilst undercover, or how to do it. To a large extent I was left to my own devices*"<sup>197</sup>.
- 10.3. HN299 served in Special Branch before his posting to the SDS. He states that in 1968, around three years before he joined the SDS and when he happened to wear a beard, he was tasked by a senior Special Branch officer to attend Vietnam Solidarity Campaign ("VSC") meetings

---

<sup>186</sup>UCPI0000008275

<sup>187</sup>UCPI0000007952

<sup>188</sup>UCPI0000008952

<sup>189</sup>UCPI0000014725

<sup>190</sup>UCPI0000008158

<sup>191</sup>UCPI0000016221

<sup>192</sup>UCPI0000016222

<sup>193</sup>MPS-0728690

<sup>194</sup>UCPI0000012767

<sup>195</sup>UCPI0000009510

<sup>196</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 64

<sup>197</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraphs 81 & 82

undercover to report on plans for demonstrations in London and an Aldermaston march. He describes attending several VSC meetings in London and the VSC march at Aldermaston, where he “*wore casual clothes*” and thinks he used a fake name<sup>198</sup>.

- 10.4. He states that his previous experience of Special Branch reporting meant that when he joined the SDS he knew the kind of information that would interest Special Branch.
- 10.5. There are three pre-SDS reports from early 1968. There are no uniformed police at any of the meetings recorded. The first is on a public meeting of the VSC held on the 8<sup>th</sup> February in Toynbee Hall in East London, with 110 attendees including Ernest Tate, which refers to discussion of future activities and of preparations for the March 17<sup>th</sup> demonstration such as the distribution of leaflets and posters<sup>199</sup>. HN299 appears to have attended this meeting alone. The second relates to a private VSC meeting, mentioned in the meeting of the 8<sup>th</sup> February, and held on 15 February in a “*small room*” in the Earl of Russell Public House. It is recorded that the 35 attendees discussed VSC policy at the forthcoming 17 March demonstration<sup>200</sup>. HN299, who again appears to be the only officer present, reports that some members intended to break US Embassy windows and were prepared for a “*punch-up*” with the police, and that others planned to sit down in the roadway outside the Embassy. He concludes that overall the intentions expressed at the meeting suggested there would be a “*fair amount*” of violence at the demonstration, a prediction which was borne out by events. The final pre-SDS report is on a public meeting held on the 4 April at Toynbee Hall<sup>201</sup>, which HN299 attended with Joan Hillier (HN328), and at which, if the report is accurate, the speaker John Palmer deemed the 17 March demonstration a “*great success*” in that it showed strong support for a National Liberation Front victory in Vietnam. HN299 reports that while Palmer acknowledged disapproval in certain sections of the press and public at the violent actions of demonstrators, he argued that the police were also violent and that it was his belief that no major changes could take place in the UK by entirely pacifist means. The second speaker, Tariq Ali, is reported to have stated that even in the event of peace in Vietnam, the VSC would have to continue fighting until world socialism had been achieved.

---

<sup>198</sup>HN299 Witness statement paragraphs 10, 11, 12

<sup>199</sup>MPS-0739885

<sup>200</sup>MPS-0739886

<sup>201</sup>MPS-0732692

HN299's witness statement suggests that his VSC reports were very well received by senior officers and may have contributed to the genesis of the SDS<sup>202</sup>. We note that the format of these reports is the same as those later used by the SDS.

- 10.6. HN299's reports show that the different groups often had aims, activities and members in common: in a document dated 15 February 1972 on an ISC meeting held in the IMG centre on Pentonville Road he reports that the ISC would be appealing for funds to pay the fines of those arrested at an AIL demonstration on the 5 February 1972<sup>203</sup>; a report on the inaugural meeting of the Tottenham Red Circle dated 13 April 1972<sup>204</sup> refers to the ISC conference to be held in Oxford on 29 and 30 April 1972 and the IMG/Spartacus League fusion conference to be held on 27 to 29 May 1972; at the aforementioned Fusion conference Gery Lawless is reported to have introduced two speakers from Sinn Fein, and to have won a unanimous vote for his resolution that the conference send a message of solidarity from the IMG to the republican hunger strikers<sup>205</sup>; a report on 'Fight On' dated 30 November 1973<sup>206</sup> describes a young woman attendee who is 'known to be a member of Claimant's Union'. It is not clear whether HN299's course through these groups was guided by individuals with whom he was mixing, who were common to more than one group, or otherwise.
- 10.7. His reporting on the IMG spans almost the entire period of his deployment, from 1 November 1971 to 11 March 1976. The 9 IMG reports in his bundle are on both private and public meetings, with attendance varying between 14 and 600 people. All reports were sent onto the Security Service. 7 of the reports relate to large-scale and well-attended IMG meetings, conferences and rallies, or to future plans, and evidence matters of interest to the Inquiry:
  - 10.7.1. One report is on a series of meetings (2 private and one open) held between the 21 and 22 January 1972 at the LSE, under the auspices of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Students' Union, the IMG/Spartacus League, the International Socialists and "*various anarchists*" to discuss policy and tactics of the students' demonstration against the proposed Government control of Students Unions'

<sup>202</sup>HN299 Witness statement paragraph 15

<sup>203</sup>UCPI0000008275

<sup>204</sup>UCPI0000008952

<sup>205</sup>UCPI00000015694

<sup>206</sup>UCPI0000016221

finances<sup>207</sup>. Piers Corbyn is reported to be one of three “*leading personalities*” advocating a strong militant approach to the students’ protest march. At the second of these meetings held on 21 January HN299 reports a vague request for “*three volunteers to take part in a special task during the demonstration which would involve breaking the law*”, for which three unidentified people volunteered and were told they would be given instructions in private at some later date. In his witness statement HN299 is unable to shed further light on this matter, stating that if he knew any more about the nature of the task he would have included it in the report<sup>208</sup>. In his penultimate paragraph, HN299 reports that at no meetings were there calls made for physical violence at the upcoming demonstration.

- 10.7.2. There is a 21-page report on a fusion conference of the IMG and Spartacus League held on the 27 to 29 May 1972, with between 300 to 500 attendees at the various sessions, which were themselves a mix of open and closed<sup>209</sup>. On page 6 HN299 denigrates a speech on ‘*The Oppression of Women and Work of the British Section*’, reporting that it “*reiterated the now standard clichés of women’s liberation*” such as “*oppressed women in society, the struggle for equal rights, the establishment of the woman as an accepted member of society and the fight against sexist male chauvinism*”. He comments that the speech, made by a Comrade Surgitt, contained little that was constructive and confined itself almost entirely to an attack upon men at the conference, which apparently elicited “*squeals of delight*” from female members of the audience. He describes the female members as “*completely dominating*” the session as if to emphasise their “*liberation*”, using “*obscenities to punctuate their prose and running onto the stage as often as possible for ‘maximum effect’*”. Was this dismissive attitude typical of the SDS? To what extent did attitudes like this influence its undercover policing of women’s movements? On page 7 he reports that fraternal greetings presented on behalf of the Ceylon Solidarity Campaign (‘CSC’) by Barbara

<sup>207</sup>UCPI0000007940

<sup>208</sup>HN299 Witness statement paragraph 127

<sup>209</sup>UCPI0000015694

Ross are a regular occurrence at IMG conference and that it provides confirmation that she still cohabits with another individual. Why is this information reported?

- 10.7.3. In a document dated 17 September 1975<sup>210</sup> HN299 relays “*strong rumours*” concerning a “*substantial number of members of the IMG*” being instructed to join the Labour Party in anticipation of a split within it, which would enable the IMG to join forces with its more left-wing members.<sup>211</sup> HN299 states that the IMG employed ‘entryism’ and sought to infiltrate the Labour Party<sup>212</sup> and that he was aware during his deployment of IMG efforts to infiltrate the Labour Party as a vehicle to achieve national prominence<sup>213</sup>. He asserts that the infiltration of the Labour Party and Trade Unions by ‘extreme political groups’ was of concern to both Special Branch and the Security Service.
- 10.7.4. There are additional reports on larger IMG gatherings which feature core participants to the Inquiry: in a document dated 22 November 1974 HN299 reports on an IMG rally held in the Conway Hall on 8 November to celebrate the 57<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Russian Revolution, with 600 attendees and an introduction from Tariq Ali;<sup>214</sup> a report dated 10 February 1976 is on the IMG starting to rally support for a student week of action starting on 23 February 1976, with an all-day rally planned for 28 February, to be addressed, it was hoped, by Tariq Ali and Upali Cooray<sup>215</sup>; a report on the aggregate meeting for the London membership of the IMG held on the 6 and 7 February 1976, with attendance varying from 40 to a maximum of 120 persons, concerns the thesis prepared by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International on the future direction of the IMG and attaches a document containing proposals on improving the organisational structure of the IMG<sup>216</sup>. Piers Corbyn is recorded as an attendee; the final report in his pack, dated 11 March 1976, lists some of those present at an IMG rally

---

<sup>210</sup>UCPI0000007598

<sup>211</sup>UCPI0000007598

<sup>212</sup> HN299 witness statement paragraph 119

<sup>213</sup>HN299 Witness statement paragraph 163

<sup>214</sup>UCPI0000015058

<sup>215</sup>UCPI0000009616

<sup>216</sup>UCPI0000008229

at the St Pancras Assembly Rooms in WC1 on the evening of 5 March 1976, and includes Piers Corbyn<sup>217</sup>.

- 10.8. There are, however, 2 IMG reports on smaller gatherings:
  - 10.8.1. One report on a party held by the Wandsworth branch of the IMG<sup>218</sup>, with 75 attendees and admission at 75p a ticket. HN299 records that Councillor Martin Linton is present. Why was it necessary to record the presence of a democratically elected individual at a social event?
  - 10.8.2. One report dated 11 November 1971, on a private meeting of 13 IMG and Spartacus League members held in someone's bedroom<sup>219</sup>. The meeting involved a discussion of Marxist economic theory. Why was it necessary to report on this close-knit meeting? Why does HN299 state that 4 of the 13 are females?
- 10.9. Six of the other reports relate to groups campaigning on Irish matters:
  - 10.9.1. One report on a meeting of the ISC held on 10 February 1972<sup>220</sup> which, if accurate, relays the group's plans to carry out collections for the IRA around building sites, and for this to be done, as far as possible, by ISC members who are also members of IMG, as *"in the past, when Irish members and organisations made collections not all the money reached its intended destination."* We observe that intelligence about fundraising for a terrorist organisation may be a legitimate aim to be taken into account when considering whether undercover policing was justified.
  - 10.9.2. One very brief report on the inaugural meeting of the Finsbury Park branch of the AIL held on 5 April 1972<sup>221</sup>
  - 10.9.3. One report on an occupation of a section of Eton's playing fields by AIL members from Slough and various London branches on 10 December 1972 to protest against the British Army's perceived occupation of public places in the Anderstown area of Belfast<sup>222</sup>. HN299's personal disdain for the protestors is evident; he describes their arguments as *"always pathetic"* and reports that *"although most of them (i.e. the 'young Etonians' who came to observe the protest)*

---

<sup>217</sup>UCPI0000012237

<sup>218</sup>UCPI0000015032

<sup>219</sup>MPS-0732356

<sup>220</sup>UCPI0000008275

<sup>221</sup>UCPI000007952

<sup>222</sup>MPS-0728891



*were diminutive in stature they showed a certain amount of courage on being surrounded by a crowd of half-inebriated Irish labourers*". He states in evidence that the SDS office made no comment on whether the tone of such reports was appropriate or permitted<sup>223</sup>.

10.9.4. One report dated 18 September 1973 on the defection of an anarchist member of the People's Democracy to the North London Claimant's Union because of the group's "*unconditional*" support for the Provisionals' bombing campaign in Northern Ireland<sup>224</sup>. In his witness statement he comments that while support for indiscriminate violence in Northern Ireland by the PIRA was not "*particularly common*" in the groups he infiltrated, he did come across individuals who held those views. He states that while many more supported the type of targeted lethal violence against big businessmen, politicians and "*other capitalists*" espoused by the subject of the report, more than half of those he met in his deployment who supported Irish Republicanism were opposed to the use of lethal violence<sup>225</sup>.

10.9.5. Towards the end of his deployment, he produces two short reports on TOM. One on a meeting held on 31 January 1975 at the LSE where speakers included Bernadette Devlin and Eamon McCann<sup>226</sup>, and another listing some of the attendees, of which Piers Corbyn is one, at a TOM demonstration in Kilburn against the Prevention of Terrorism Act 1974<sup>227</sup>.

10.10. There are two reports on Fight On: one a public meeting held on 24 November 1973 at which a number of films were shown, interspersed with the singing of revolutionary songs<sup>228</sup>; one a free film show held on 1 December 1973 which included a film showing left-wing demonstrators breaking up a large fascist open-air meeting in Milan<sup>229</sup>. HN299 reports that according to the speaker Grimaldi, the left-wing protestors succeeded in routing the 10,000 police officers present by separating into groups of 500 separate from the main body of the

<sup>223</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 133

<sup>224</sup> UCPI0000008158

<sup>225</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraphs 165 and 166

<sup>226</sup> MPS-0728690

<sup>227</sup> UCPI00000012767

<sup>228</sup> UCPI00000016221

<sup>229</sup> UCPI00000016222

demonstration and then attacking the weaker flanks of the police contingent. In the report HN299 opines that the intention of showing these films immediately prior to political demonstrations is “*clearly to whip up a militant aggressive mood in demonstrators*”. He states in evidence that he believed it was important to impart to Special Branch that demonstrations arranged by Fight On were more likely to turn violent<sup>230</sup>. If the reports are accurate then Fight On was advocating violent revolution: Grimaldi is recorded as urging local people to “*take over by force the running of their local communities*” and another speaker urged a similar course with a view “*eventually to take over the State itself*”<sup>231</sup>.

- 10.11. There are 6 reports on Marxist discussion groups held at private addresses between 15 April 1974 and 12 October 1975, with attendees ranging in number from 9 to 14.
- 10.12. Regarding a class held on 30 April 1974<sup>232</sup>, HN299 records an attendee's belief that come the socialist revolution in England, two million people who presented a permanent threat to its continuance, namely senior police officers (including those in Special Branch), members of the Security Service, senior army officers, all big businessmen and all members of the Conservative Party, would have to be liquidated. HN299 notes in his statement that while some members of the Marxist class shared this belief, the majority of the activists he met through his deployment did not hold such extreme views<sup>233</sup>.
- 10.13. In report on a class held on 28 May 1974<sup>234</sup> at which participants read from ‘The Communist Manifesto’, HN299 reports a “*long emotional discussion about the presence of Special Branch spies in various left-wing organisations*” and that any identified should at least get a “*good hiding*”. In his statement he says that such comments were “*quite common*” in the groups he infiltrated, but that he does not recall that they made him feel particularly threatened. He believes that all of his colleagues experienced similar incidents, and as he remembers, the report prompted no extra measures from SDS management to protect his welfare. Does this suggest that SDS management also considered

<sup>230</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 139

<sup>231</sup> UCPI0000016221 paragraphs 7 and 8

<sup>232</sup> UCPI0000008823

<sup>233</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 141

<sup>234</sup> UCPI0000014712



- such people to be basically harmless? And does it undermine the rationale for infiltrating such groups?
- 10.14. In a report dated 21 October 1975<sup>235</sup>, HN299 reports on a Marxist study session introduced by core participant Richard Chessum and attended by 'Mary'.
- 10.15. Another report dated 21 August 1974<sup>236</sup> reveals that Box 500 requested further information on some of the participants in the study group. Of one attendee, HN299 records that his income derives from the proceeds of crime, but provides no further detail. He also relays information on the four year-old daughter of an attendee who he describes as "*half caste*" and as living with her mother and another individual and her "*half-caste son*". Why did the SDS report about children and their ethnicity?
- 10.16. The following features stand out from the remaining reports:
- 10.16.1. Two of the six attendees at the inaugural meeting of Tottenham Red Circle held on 7 April 1972 are recorded as being 17 and 19 years old<sup>237</sup>.
- 10.16.2. A report dated 7 February 1973<sup>238</sup> records antipathy from a member of the PSC towards two of her fellow members, and describes one young member as being of "*strong Arab appearance*", "*light brown 'tanned' complexion*" and "*speaks English with a very noticeable Arab accent*". Why were such minor divisions reported? Why was the young man described in this way?
- 10.17. HN299 states that at meetings at the SDS safe house undercover officers would sometimes speak to managers about activist meetings they had been to in front of other officers<sup>239</sup>. He also recalls very occasionally asking for and being provided with a Special Branch file about a person he had come across whilst deployed<sup>240</sup>. Like a number of UCOs in this era he states that he wrote up reports at his real home<sup>241</sup>.
- 10.18. Unlike most of his SDS colleagues, HN299 joined a trade union whilst undercover, the TGWU, to bolster his cover. He states that he attended some meetings but probably did not report them because

---

<sup>235</sup>UCPI0000008223

<sup>236</sup>UCPI0000008854

<sup>237</sup>UCPI0000008952

<sup>238</sup>UCPI0000014725

<sup>239</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 93

<sup>240</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 83

<sup>241</sup> HN299 Witness statement paragraph 103

*“those meetings would be covered by an ordinary Special Branch officer”.* He further states that the reason for Special Branch's interest in the trade union was because of concerns about entryism by extreme political groups<sup>242</sup>.

- 10.19. He recalls the then Commissioner, Sir Robert Mark, visiting the SDS and saying something to the effect that: *“You realise that you could cause me tremendous problems under certain circumstances”*<sup>243</sup>. This evidence calls to mind the concerns that the Home Office expressed in the early years of the SDS to senior MPS managers about the potential consequences of the unit's continued existence becoming public knowledge.

*HN298 “Mike Scott” – Putney branch of Young Liberals early 1972 to mid-1974, Commitment and the Croydon Libertarians – early 1972 to mid-1973, Irish Solidarity Campaign – mid 1972 to September 1972, Anti-Internment League – September 1972 to late 1973, Workers Revolutionary Party – spring 1975 to April 1976.*

11. During the course of his deployment HN298 used the cover name “Michael Peter Scott” or “Mike Scott”. A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>244</sup>. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry and will be called to give oral evidence. He joined the SDS in 1971. His cover name was a name he had identified at Somerset House although it belonged to a living individual. At the beginning of his deployment he reported on the Spartacus League and the International Socialists although did not infiltrate either group. He infiltrated the Young Liberals, the youth wing of the Liberal Party, there reporting regularly on Peter Hain. His infiltration of this group led to his peripheral reporting on a number of other groups and his infiltration of others. He infiltrated the anarchist/libertarian groups Commitment and the Croydon Libertarians. He also infiltrated the Irish Solidarity Campaign and later the Anti-Internment League and reported peripherally on the Troops Out Movement. He ended his deployment by infiltrating the Workers Revolutionary Party and withdrew from the field in April 1976. During the course of his deployment he was arrested for obstructing the highway and, with the knowledge and approval of senior management, prosecuted and convicted in his cover name.

<sup>242</sup> Witness statement paragraphs 174-176

<sup>243</sup> Witness statement paragraph 226

<sup>244</sup> <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/publications/anonymity-special-demonstration-squad-44/>

12. A consideration of his witness statement and documents associated with his deployment gives rise to the following observations and comments:
- 12.1. HN298 believes he joined the SDS in the latter part of 1971. Prior to joining the squad he had not undertaken any undercover work although as part of his work on Special Branch he had attended public meetings in plain clothes in order to report on events<sup>245</sup>. The existence of the undercover unit the SDS or "*hairies*" was common knowledge and he was aware that they were deployed into groups involved in demonstrations in order to assist in policing and crowd control<sup>246</sup>.
  - 12.2. He had actively sought to be deployed into the SDS and believes he may have spoken to HN294, then the Detective Inspector in charge of the unit. He may have had an interview. Neither he nor his family were advised of what the work would entail or its impact<sup>247</sup>.
  - 12.3. He began to grow his hair and beard as soon as he understood he was to join the SDS. He did not undergo any training and his recollection is that he was deployed straight out into the field rather than, as others a little later in the period, spending some time in the back office prior to active deployment<sup>248</sup>.
  - 12.4. He was aware from standard police training that an officer should not act as an agent provocateur but has no memory of seeing the Home Office Circular entitled 'Informants who take part in crime'<sup>249</sup>. He was given no advice or guidance on how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of others whilst undercover; sexual relationship whilst undercover; participation in criminal activity or inciting or encouraging others to participate in criminal activity whilst undercover; what to do when arrested; reporting on matters subject to legal professional privilege; or any ethical or legal limitations on behaviour whilst undercover<sup>250</sup>.
  - 12.5. HN298 used the cover name Michael Peter Scott. He chose this name from the register of births at Somerset House. The name and date of birth are those of a living individual. He states that he had not been instructed to attend Somerset House for this purpose but it had made sense to him to obtain a cover name and date of birth in that way. He was not influenced by any book or film<sup>251</sup>.

---

<sup>245</sup> Witness statement para 6-7

<sup>246</sup> Witness statement para 8

<sup>247</sup> Witness statement para 10-12

<sup>248</sup> Witness statement para 13

<sup>249</sup> MPS-0727104

<sup>250</sup> Witness statement para 14-15

<sup>251</sup> Witness statement para 17-21

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 12.6. HN298 nominally had cover employment as a tank erector/estimator but this was simply a fiction and he had no employer or any work in this field<sup>252</sup>.
- 12.7. HN298 states that he was never tasked to infiltrate any particular groups but attended any meetings with groups that he came across that he thought would be of interests to Special Branch where intelligence relevant to public order could be obtained. His movement between groups happened organically beginning with the Young Liberals and anti-apartheid groups and then libertarian groups such as Commitment and the Croydon Libertarians and then some exposure to Irish groups before finally infiltrating the Workers Revolutionary Party. Because of the fluid way that he moved from group to group it is difficult for him to provide specific dates for his involvement with particular groups<sup>253</sup>.
- 12.8. He produced his reports by typing them up on a type writer at his home address as close to the event as he could. He would sign these by hand and then print his real name on them. He would submit these reports to his management at weekly meetings at the SDS safe house. He was unaware of what happened to his reports after this but assumes that they would have been considered and disseminated. The reports he has been shown by the Inquiry are not in the same form as the reports he typed up and contain additional information although he accepts that if his name appears on the bottom it is likely that he was the source of some of the information contained in the reports. The reports often contain references to Special Branch files which he would not have had access to<sup>254</sup>.
- 12.9. HN298 states that he would visit the SDS safe house once a week for a the weekly meeting with all the other undercover officers at which he would hand in reports and speak to managers and shared a meal with other undercover officers<sup>255</sup>.
- 12.10. He recalls a visit to the SDS safe house from "Bushy Bignell", a Superintendent, on two occasions during his time in the unit. The Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Vic Gilbert also visited on one occasion<sup>256</sup>.

---

<sup>252</sup> Witness statement para 29-30

<sup>253</sup> Witness statement para 39-40, 53-54

<sup>254</sup> Witness statement para 42-45, 48

<sup>255</sup> Witness statement para 55, 57

<sup>256</sup> Witness statement para 232-234

- 12.11. The additional hours as overtime he worked in the SDS increased his take home pay<sup>257</sup>.
- 12.12. HN298 states that he witnesses some public disorder whilst he was actively deployed with the SDS and attended some “*raucous demonstrations*”. He can recall a demonstration in Whitehall which may have taken place after a Troops Out Movement (‘TOM’) meeting during which people were trying to hit the police with sticks and other items although those responsible were not from the group he was with<sup>258</sup>.
- 12.13. HN298 understood that Special Branch had a role in countering subversive activity but he did not witness any such activity whilst undercover<sup>259</sup>.
- 12.14. There are a small number of reports with his name appended to them concerning activities of the South West London Spartacus League<sup>260</sup>. He cannot recall these meetings or preparing the reports but assumes that he attended them because they were a revolutionary group that held demonstrations and so would have been of interest to Special Branch from a public order perspective<sup>261</sup>. He identifies this reporting as dating from a time when he was serving in the SDS by the fact that one of the reports describes a meeting in a private house<sup>262</sup>, something that he could not have done as a plain clothes Special Branch officer<sup>263</sup>.
- 12.15. The Routine Meeting report on a meeting of the Spartacus League is perhaps typical of HN298’s reporting in that whilst nominally a meeting on the Spartacus League, in fact the report focuses on a speech made to the meeting by Brian Grogan of the IMG who spoke of the work done by the IMG to cultivate shop stewards in large factories with the aim of setting up further branches of IMG<sup>264</sup>. HN298 reported that he was able to engage Brian Grogan in conversation and heard more of his plans for ‘Revolutionary training camps’ to educate others in revolutionary thinking, such education to involve “*public speaking, theoretical teaching and instruction in the erection of barricades*”. His

---

<sup>257</sup> Witness statement para 61

<sup>258</sup> Witness statement para 202-203

<sup>259</sup> Witness statement para 204-205

<sup>260</sup> See MPS-0732350; MPS-0732352; MPS-0732353

<sup>261</sup> Witness statement para 62-65

<sup>262</sup> MPS-0732352

<sup>263</sup> Witness statement para 63

<sup>264</sup> MPS-0732350

conversation with Brian Grogan ended with an invitation to attend a meeting at his house<sup>265</sup>.

- 12.16. HN298 also accepts that he was the author of a small number of reports regarding the International Socialists ('IS') which range in dates between September 1971 to December 1971. He believes that IS were a revolutionary group that held demonstrations and so would have been of interest to Special Branch for reasons of public order<sup>266</sup>. HN298's small number of IS reports focus on the Enfield branch; one reports the registered details of cars used by those seen attending the event<sup>267</sup>, the other provides the identity and address of a member of the Enfield branch of IS<sup>268</sup>.
- 12.17. HN298 reported on and infiltrated the Young Liberals, the Youth wing of the Liberal Party between early 1972 and mid-1974 and he accepts he is the source of the information on the Young Liberals shown to him in that time frame. He does not recognise the information contained in reports on the Young Liberals from 1975 and does not believe that he was the source for those reports<sup>269</sup>.
- 12.18. The Inquiry will explore the justification for reporting on the youth wing of a mainstream political party operating within legitimate bounds. HN298 states that the Young Liberals were of interest to Special Branch due to their membership which included those who organised demonstrations or were involved in public disorder. Peter Hain, a core participant, was one such individual. HN298 explains that he reported specifically on the Putney branch of Young Liberals because Peter Hain was a member of that branch. He also states, however, that he was not tasked to report on Peter Hain but that his reporting contained references to Peter Hain because Peter Hain was the leader of the Young Liberals and therefore any reporting on the Young Liberals would have necessitated reporting on Peter Hain<sup>270</sup>. HN298

---

<sup>265</sup> The report of 2 August 1971 indicates that when HN298 attended Brian Grogan's house for the meeting he found that the venue had been changed (MPS-0732352)

<sup>266</sup> Witness statement para 67-69

<sup>267</sup> MPS-0731829

<sup>268</sup> MPS-0731839

<sup>269</sup> Witness statement para 71-73. See UCPI0000007365 dated 16 June 1975

<sup>270</sup> Witness statement para 82. References to Peter Hain can be found in the following reports: UCPI0000008551; UCPI0000008554; UCPI0000008240; UCPI0000008242; UCPI0000008241; UCPI0000008244; UCPI0000008558; UCPI0000008248; UCPI0000008560; UCPI0000008254; UCPI0000008255; UCPI0000008566; UCPI0000008257; UCPI0000008258; UCPI0000008260; UCPI0000008259; UCPI0000008267



acknowledges that the Young Liberals were not subversive nor did they approve the use of violent means to achieve their objectives<sup>271</sup>.

- 12.19. Examples of the concerns held by the Young Liberals are as follows: the report dated 12 January 1972 regarding a meeting of the Putney branch of Young Liberals at the parental home of Peter Hain<sup>272</sup> notes discussion on the legalisation of cannabis, a sit in at the local council chambers in protest at the exclusion of the public, campaigning for a free mini bus service in an area with poor transport links and some form of protest against the unpleasant smell emanating from a glucose factory in Battersea<sup>273</sup>. In a further report dated 16 January 1972, also of a meeting held at Peter Hain's parents' home, the Young Liberals are reported to have heard a talk on homelessness and passed a motion that their branch of the Young Liberals were concerned about the exclusion of the German Democratic Republic from a forthcoming environmental conference to be held in Stockholm to which the Federal Republic of Germany had been invited<sup>274</sup>. It would appear that the Young Liberals were also concerned about Irish politics and the report dated 1 February 1972 sets out the broad thrust of a report compiled by Peter Hain and another about the strategy to be employed in mounting a campaign focused on British involvement in Ireland. The strategy however, does not appear to have included any illegitimate means; it included demonstrations, meetings, leaflet drops and protests and pressure on Irish based trades unions through British based trades unions to rid their ranks of sectarianism<sup>275</sup>. In another report Peter Hain is reported to have sought to put a resolution to the Easter conference of the Young Liberals calling on the conference to "*recognise*" the need for legislation to limit its population growth<sup>276</sup>.
- 12.20. Some of the reporting on Peter Hain does not appear to have been simply incidental to his role in a number of activist or political groups of

---

<sup>271</sup> Witness statement paras 75-76. At the Young Liberal conference (UCPI0000008255) the YL members rejected a motion put forward which advocated the destruction "*by all legitimate means available*" of the societal structure which was "*based upon the ownership of wealth by the few and the consequent enslavement of the many by those who labour alone that wealth is produced*".

<sup>272</sup> In common with many SDS officers HN298 frequently reported on meetings which took place inside a private residence

<sup>273</sup> UCPI0000008551

<sup>274</sup> UCPI0000008554

<sup>275</sup> UCPI0000008242

<sup>276</sup> UCPI0000008244. Other reports focus on the Young Liberals concern to address traffic pollution and congestion in Putney and water pollution in Wandsworth (UCPI0000008254); legal and social equality for same-sex attracted individuals (to be manifested by a requirement that Young Liberals dance with those of the same sex during the dancing to follow the annual conference) (UCPI0000008255); support for continued sanctions against "Rhodesian" (UCPI0000008255);



the era: HN298 reported on the colour, make and registration number and registered keeper of the car driven by Peter Hain<sup>277</sup>, and the identity of his private secretary<sup>278</sup>.

- 12.21. In the course of his report on the Young Liberal Movement's annual conference HN298 reports that Peter Hain told the conference that that the telephones at the Young Liberals headquarters and those of prominent Young Liberals were being tapped and mail tampered with. Peter Hain declined to give further detail but stated that it was another example on the attacks on civil liberties that had become frequent<sup>279</sup>. From HN298's report it is evident that the conference was addressed by David Steel, MP, the president of the Young Liberals<sup>280</sup>. HN298 appears to have provided a separate report dealing with the results of the elections to the main organisational roles within the Young Liberals which were held at the conference at which Peter Hain was voted in as Chairman<sup>281</sup>. Similarly a separate report was made of the election results after the 1973 Young Liberals annual conference<sup>282</sup> and the 1974 conference<sup>283</sup>. Why were the SDS providing detailed reporting on legitimate, established political groups and their aims and objectives and personnel?
- 12.22. In a report dated 13 August 1974 HN298 provides details of a Young Liberal Movement Council meeting held in Birmingham at which the demonstration at which Kevin Gately, a student at Warwick University, lost his life. HN298 reports that the Council passed resolutions condemning the "*vicious and unnecessary attack on the left-wing demonstrators by the police and the blatant bias shown by the police in favour of the march organised by the National Front*". The Council agreed that the Chairman should write to the Home Secretary calling for a public inquiry into the circumstances of Kevin Gately's death and police conduct on the day<sup>284</sup>.
- 12.23. During this time spent in the Putney branch of Young Liberals he was elected membership secretary. He cannot recall the meeting at which this happened but assumes that he volunteered for the role because it would give him access to information. It was not an organisational role

---

<sup>277</sup> UCPI0000008558

<sup>278</sup> UCPI0000008248

<sup>279</sup> UCPI0000008255

<sup>280</sup> *ibid*

<sup>281</sup> UCPI0000008257

<sup>282</sup> UCPI0000008267

<sup>283</sup> UCPI0000008268

<sup>284</sup> UCPI0000008269

and he does not believe he discussed the post with his managers prior to taking it up<sup>285</sup>.

- 12.24. HN298's reporting on Peter Hain contains a report on the Palestine Solidarity Campaign whose forthcoming rally, to be addressed by Peter Hain, was reported by HN298 in a report dated 9 May 1972<sup>286</sup>
- 12.25. HN298 also reported on the West Cross Action Group, a group headed by Peter Hain with the aim of halting plans to build the West Cross motorway<sup>287</sup>. In furtherance of this aim HN298 reported that Peter Hain suggested direct action in the form of painting the road at the point where the motorway would cross the existing road; there was a plan to broadcast a pirate radio programme; the areas surrounding the motorway were to be leafleted; and a demonstration organised at the Earls Court motor show<sup>288</sup>. He also reported on a demonstration which utilised a transit van equipped with a loud speaker system which took place at the site of the new motorway on 24 June 1972<sup>289</sup>.
- 12.26. There are a number of other reports attributable to HN298 which contain information which appears to have been garnered by chance: a report of 6 December 1972 provides information about the Stop the Squash demonstration at the Landsdown Club, a demonstration involving a member of the Young Liberals<sup>290</sup>; a report dated 11 January 1973 contains the information that Eammon McCann, then a prominent Irish journalist and campaigner will be returning to England to encourage support for and Bloody Sunday commemorative demonstrations to be held in Derry and London on 28 January 1973; a report dated 8 March 1973 provides information about a forthcoming meeting on Northern Ireland organised by the London Group of the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)<sup>291</sup>; a report dated 18 March 1974 provides information on the Irish Forum, formerly known as the Anti-Internment League Forum. Piers Corbyn, a core participant, is listed among the attendees<sup>292</sup>; a report dated 3 November 1972 contains a lengthy and detailed summary of the life and current circumstances of a former student at Trinity College Dublin who has a "*fanatical*" enthusiasm for the English Communist Movement, the

<sup>285</sup> Witness statement para 79; UCPI0000008240

<sup>286</sup> UCPI0000008566

<sup>287</sup> UCPI0000008258; UCPI0000008260; UCPI0000008259

<sup>288</sup> UCPI0000008260

<sup>289</sup> UCPI0000008259

<sup>290</sup> MPS-0737673

<sup>291</sup> MPS-0737448

<sup>292</sup> UCPI0000015710

English student movement and the Internationalists and who had evidently become an individual of concern<sup>293</sup>.

- 12.27. On 12 May 1972 HN298 was part of a group arrested outside the Star & Garter hotel in Richmond which had been protesting the participation by the British and Irish Lions in a South African rugby tour<sup>294</sup>. He had come to participate in the tour after attending the house of Ernest Rodker, a core participant in this Inquiry. The demonstration was organised by Ernest Rodker and Jonathan Rosenhead, also a core participant in the Inquiry. Christabel Gurney, who will give evidence to the Inquiry, was also arrested. HN298 denies playing any part in the organisation of the demonstration beyond being part of the meeting. The demonstration started immediately after the meeting and so he did not have an opportunity to inform the SDS about it in advance, neither did he have specific authorisation to attend the demonstration from his managers, although he explains that this was not the sort of event for which he would have required specific authorisation<sup>295</sup>.
- 12.28. HN298 states that he played no particular role during the course of the demonstration beyond being present, and denies provoking, encouraging or causing any other person to participate in the demonstration. He did not regard any of those participating as criminals they simply wanted to protest the involvement of the rugby team in the South African tour<sup>296</sup>.
- 12.29. He recalls that the police dealt with the protest quickly. All those demonstrating were arrested together. He felt he had no choice but to allow himself to be arrested with the others. The police were pleasant and offered those arrested tea at the police station<sup>297</sup>.
- 12.30. He received legal advice from Ben Birnberg, a solicitor who was well known for representing left wing groups. He recalls the group were asked whether they were manhandled by the police and one of the participants may have said that they had been hit in the eye. Ben Birnberg's advice was to plead not guilty. HN298 accepted this advice because "*he did not want to make any waves*"<sup>298</sup>.

---

<sup>293</sup> UCPI0000014385

<sup>294</sup> See MPS report on the incident MPS-0737087 which details an allegation of minor injury at the hands of the police by Ernest Rodker and damage caused by police to Jonathan Rosenhead's vehicle which had been used during the course of the demonstration. HN298 is listed as one of those arrested, in his cover name and his cover address.

<sup>295</sup> Witness statement para 83-88

<sup>296</sup> Witness statement para 89-90

<sup>297</sup> Witness statement para 91-92

<sup>298</sup> Witness statement para 93

- 12.31. HN298 states that he would have informed his managers about the circumstances of his arrest as soon as possible after he left the police station. HN298's report of the incident is dated 14 May 1972<sup>299</sup>. It appears from paperwork in the possession of the Inquiry that senior management knew and were planning next steps shortly afterwards<sup>300</sup>. On 16 May HN294, the head of the SDS, sought advice from the Commander Rodger (then Commander 'Operations') as to whether HN298 should be withdrawn from the field as a result of his arrest or *"continue his attempt to learn more of them. In order to do this he will probably have to apply, as they are doing, for legal aid and attend meetings with all those arrested to discuss tactics etc"*. HN294 warns that there is the *"potential of embarrassment to police if his true identity should be disclosed"* but that if he were withdrawn Special Branch would *"loose intelligence coverage of what in the past has been a troublesome area of the public order field"*<sup>301</sup>. It was evidently the view of senior management, embodied by Commander Rodger, that the group was of significant interest: *"this group of anarchist-orientated extremists under the control of Ernest Rodker. This man has been a thorn in the flesh for several years now..."* HN298's arrest was, it seems, unfortunate but, *"rather than have DC [HN298] withdraw from this field in which he has now clearly ensconced himself, we should take advantage of the situation to keep abreast of their intention...it is anticipated that Rodker will convene a meeting in the very near future to discuss what their tactics should be"*. This view was endorsed by the Deputy Assistant Commissioner who observed that whilst the charges remained as they were *"we should not run into difficulties"* but should more serious charges be preferred the position may have to be re-considered<sup>302</sup>. The Inquiry will look with care at the course taken by senior management and the potential consequence of their decisions to the subsequent court proceedings.
- 12.32. HN298 attended the Magistrates Court in his cover identity charged with obstructing a highway. DC Dave Smith from the SDS back officer also attended the hearing although HN298 was not aware of it at the time<sup>303</sup>. He did not inform anyone of his undercover status but does not know whether DC Smith informed the Magistrate. HN298 was not

<sup>299</sup> MPS-0526782 p9-12

<sup>300</sup> Witness statement para 95. See Special Branch memorandum MPS-0526782 p1

<sup>301</sup> MPS-0526782 p7-8

<sup>302</sup> MPS-0526782 p2

<sup>303</sup> See DC Smiths report MPS-0526782 p12-15

concerned about his arrest but understands that his managers may have been concerned about it reflecting badly on them<sup>304</sup>. DC Smith's report confirms that all the defendants entered not guilty pleas and the case was adjourned.

- 12.33. HN298 explains that the two reports which concern events after arrest but before trial contain information HN298 provided to his senior officers which he believed was relevant<sup>305</sup>. These are accounts of the anticipated meetings, anticipated by HN294, arranged by Ernest Rodker for the benefit of the defendants to discuss tactics<sup>306</sup>. Both reports contain material subject to legal professional privilege. As indicated above, HN298 states that he was given no guidance as to his conduct should he come into possession of information which was subject to legal professional privilege. Indeed it appears that senior management encouraged his participation in the criminal proceedings in the full knowledge that he would attend meetings to discuss trial tactics but there seems little appreciation by senior management either that these meetings may be subject to legal professional privilege or that his participation in criminal proceedings as a police officer in a covert identity raised any legal or ethical considerations.
- 12.34. HN298 believes he entered a not guilty plea in his cover name. At the trial he believes the arresting officers gave evidence. He does not recall whether he gave evidence but he does not think that he did. His managers were aware that he was attending court and participating in a trial in his cover name. HN298 viewed this as a simply a matter of being arrested for breaking the law, going to court and being fined. To his knowledge the presence of an undercover officer was not revealed to the police officers involving in the arrest or prosecution, the prosecutor, any court staff or magistrate<sup>307</sup>.
- 12.35. A Special Branch report regarding the court proceedings on 14 June 1972 at which HN298 was found guilty indicates that whilst all 14 of the defendants entered not guilty pleas, a number of defendants, including Ernest Rodker and Jonathan Rosenhead were adjourned to 28 June 1972<sup>308</sup>. This report confirms that at the proceedings on the 14 June

---

<sup>304</sup> Witness statement paras 96-97

<sup>305</sup> Witness statement para 98

<sup>306</sup> MPS-0737108; UCPI0000008258

<sup>307</sup> Witness statement paras 99-101

<sup>308</sup> MPS-0526782 p4-5. HN294's note at p3 states that the seven defendants elected Crown Court trial which necessitated the adjournment to 28 June 1972. The Schedule of Prisoners Charged (MPS-0737126) appears to show that Ernest Rodker and Jonathan Rosenhead were convicted and/or sentenced on 12 July 1972

HN298 and Christabel Gurney, amongst others, were found guilty of obstructing a highway and fined £2 and also of obstructing police for which they were conditionally discharged.

- 12.36. A note to Commander Roger from HN294 sets out the SDS assessment of the situation following HN298's arrest thus: *"the case should prove beneficial to us in that DC [HN298] has proved himself to the extremists and may well become privy to subsequent mischief; at the same time, his being bound over is a ready made excuse for avoiding further arrest"*<sup>309</sup>. A manuscript note indicates that this note was put in front of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner.
- 12.37. HN298 is not aware of whether any efforts were made to ensure that the conviction he received in his cover name was not attributed to the real Michael Scott<sup>310</sup>. Investigations set in train by the Inquiry have revealed that there is no record of this conviction on the Police National Computer in the name of Michael Scott but it is not possible to say if a record ever existed.
- 12.38. HN298 explains that to his knowledge, the product of his reporting was not used in support of or in connection with, a criminal investigation or prosecution and he did not provoke, encourage or cause another person to participate in any criminal activity whilst he was in the SDS<sup>311</sup>.
- 12.39. HN298 undertook some flyposting which in his undercover identity<sup>312</sup>.
- 12.40. He accepts that his reporting contains references to Ernest Rodker<sup>313</sup>, a core participant, but explains that this was because he was a vocal member of HN298's targeted group rather than as a result of any specific tasking<sup>314</sup>. The report dated 12 March 1973 notes that Ernest Rodker is moving house and provides his new address and confirms that he is active in the Wandsworth Community Workshop and in the production of Pavement and also in other local action groups such as the Battersea Re-development Action Group, a group which was campaigning against the redevelopment of Battersea Park<sup>315</sup>.
- 12.41. Jonathan Rosenhead is another core participant whose name appears in HN298's reporting<sup>316</sup>. HN298 explains that this was not as a result of

---

<sup>309</sup> MPS-0526782 p3

<sup>310</sup> Witness statement para 102

<sup>311</sup> Witness statement para 212-214

<sup>312</sup> Witness statement para 210

<sup>313</sup> MPS-0526782 p9-11; MPS-0737109; MPS-0737108; MPS-0741133

<sup>314</sup> Witness statement para 103

<sup>315</sup> MPS-0741133

<sup>316</sup> MPS-0737108; MPS-0737109; UCPI0000008152



specific tasking but due to his vocal involvement in the groups HN298 was reporting on<sup>317</sup>.

- 12.42. HN298 infiltrated 'Commitment' and attended meetings in the Croydon/Thornton Heath area. He was tasked to infiltrate this group and believes he may have been led to the group through some connection with the Young Liberals<sup>318</sup>.
- 12.43. HN298 states that Commitment were primarily a libertarian group although some members considered themselves anarchist. Their objectives were hard to define. In his view their objectives were not subversive although they supported action against the State. In reality their action was limited to inconveniencing or irritating large companies. He does not think they either employed or approved of violence for this end<sup>319</sup>.
- 12.44. Examples of HN298's reporting on Croydon Commitment include: reference to a plan to create disruption or "*create chaos*" at the annual general meeting of the Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation to protest mining incursion into the Snowdonia National Park, a plan Peter Hain was involved with; a plan for a number of people to travel to Snowdonia to sabotage mining equipment<sup>320</sup>.
- 12.45. HN298 accepts that he also reported on the Croydon Libertarians which in reality were the same group as Commitment led by the same individual who was also a member of the Young Liberals<sup>321</sup>. Commitment had a national network however whereas the Croydon Libertarians were a local group. Their aims and objectives were the same as Commitment. They did not use violent means. They were involved in and initiated demonstrations. He reported on the Croydon Libertarians because he thought they that they might be participating in activities of interest to Special Branch<sup>322</sup>. His reports do not appear to bear out that assessment: the report dated 25 August 1972 is a report of a joint meeting of South London Commitment and Croydon Libertarians which seven people attended. A suggestion that local schools should be leafletted was not progressed because of the costs involved; another member apologised for failing to attend a 'bike-in' which he attributed to his bike suffering mechanical failure; the report of

---

<sup>317</sup> Witness statement para 104

<sup>318</sup> Witness statement para 108. It would appear from the report UCPI0000008255 that Commitment were in fact an anarchist faction under the general Young Liberal Movement umbrella.

<sup>319</sup> Witness statement paras 105-107

<sup>320</sup> UCPI0000008560

<sup>321</sup> The report dated UCPI0000008780 was a joint meeting of these groups.

<sup>322</sup> Witness statement paras 111-113



12 April 1973 details a failed demonstration to highlight the need for a road to be pedestrianised. An attempt was made to block the road by suspending a metal chain across it. This remained in place for 5 minutes only with minimal disruption to traffic and no police involvement.<sup>323</sup> The final report in the possession of the Inquiry related to the Croydon Libertarians is dated 12 April 1973<sup>324</sup>.

- 12.46. HN298 does not recall attending any meetings or reporting on the London Federation of Anarchists although accepts that there is a report on this group which bears his name<sup>325</sup>.
- 12.47. HN298 infiltrated the Irish Solidarity Campaign ('ISC'). He cannot specifically recall their aims and objectives but surmises that they supported the republican movement in Northern Ireland. He is not aware of the group having any overtly subversive aims and whilst they would support others using violence in the republican cause he does not believe that they would have used violence themselves. He was not specifically tasked to infiltrate the group but did so because he thought that he was likely to obtain information of importance given their support of the Irish republican movement<sup>326</sup>.
- 12.48. In a report dated 10 May 1972 of a meeting of the South London branch of the ISC HN298 reported a member describing the building of a solidarity movement with the struggle in Ireland as being not only in the Irish interests but in the interests of the class struggle in Britain and advocating capitalising on any strike action or "*worker-capitalist conflict*" in Britain. Those at the meeting agreed to make contact with ASLEF shop stewards, "*the most militant of the rail stewards south of the Thames*"<sup>327</sup>.
- 12.49. HN298 also reported on the Central London branch of the Anti-Internment League ('AIL') after its merger with the ISC<sup>328</sup>. He cannot specifically recall its aims and objectives but assumes that their merger with the ISC indicated common goals. Whilst he is unable to say whether the group's intentions were subversive or violent it would appear, at the very least, that the group supported violence by others. This information, he explains, would have been valuable to B-Squad

---

<sup>323</sup> UCPI0000008152

<sup>324</sup> UCPI0000008152

<sup>325</sup> Witness statement para 117; UCPI0000008159

<sup>326</sup> Witness statement paras 118-122

<sup>327</sup> UCPI0000008509

<sup>328</sup> AIL reports can be found at MPS-0728836; UCPI0000007991; MPS-0728845

(who dealt with Irish related matters) and to Special Branch in general<sup>329</sup>.

- 12.50. In the report dated 26 September 1972 which recorded events of the first official branch meeting of the Central London AIL since its amalgamation with the ISC, Bob Purdie described the AIL as “*a body comprising a cross section of liberal opinion united in their abhorrence of internment*” and the ISC as “*more political and consistent in its approach, calling from the beginning for self-determination and unconditional support for those involved in the struggle ... unconditional support however, did not infer uncritical support*”<sup>330</sup> During the same meeting HN298 reported that an individual present told the meeting that Peoples Democracy were forming “*a force*” which was understood to be an armed unit quite distinct from many involvement with either wings of the IRA’.
- 12.51. HN298 reported on the AIL national conference held on 7-8 October 1972 together with two other SDS officers, HN338 “Bob Chippendale” and HN301 “Bob Stubbs”<sup>331</sup>. The revolutionary aspirations of AIL are reported on: an AIL representative told the conference that the AIL must conduct a full educational programme amongst the Trade Unions and working class to build a mass revolutionary vanguard which would be the only way “*to help the working class of Ireland in their bloody struggle against British Imperialism*”. Also referred to are sectarian affiliations of various groups represented at the conference: a representative of Sinn Fein spoke of the need to support the Provisional IRA and defended its bombing campaigns; an International Socialist delegate declared unconditional support for the activities of the IRA in their struggle for freedom. The report comments on the future political direction of the AIL in that it concludes that the main point to arise from the conference was the emergence of the IMG as the new leaders of the AIL.
- 12.52. HN298 states that although in a single report he is mentioned in connection with the first publication of the AIL publication ‘Free Ireland’ his role was simply as the point of contact for the donation of books and magazines for internees in Northern Ireland. He cannot recall whether he volunteered or was assigned to the role but it would have been a good way to obtain further information about the AIL. It was neither a

---

<sup>329</sup> Witness statement paras 126-130

<sup>330</sup> UCPI0000007991

<sup>331</sup> MPS-0728845

position of responsibility nor an organisation role and in fact he does not remember being sent any donations<sup>332</sup>.

- 12.53. HN298 does not believe he infiltrated the Anti-Apartheid League ('AAM') and that any information on this group that he may have provided came from more general sources and through his connection to Peter Hain and his family who were active in South African campaigning groups<sup>333</sup>. He cannot recall ever attending the AAM AGM and thinks it more likely that the report dated 16 October 1974<sup>334</sup> is attributable to Jill Mosdell (HN346) who infiltrated this group<sup>335</sup>. It should be noted that the report of this date contains information about the forthcoming AGM and attaches appendices and it is not a report dealing with the AGM itself. HN298 states that there was nothing clandestine or revolutionary about the AAM and it was not subversive or violent so far as he was aware<sup>336</sup>.
- 12.54. HN298 accepts that he may have attended meetings of the TOM and reported on these but did not infiltrate this group. The aim of TOM was to get British troops out of Ireland and they also supported a united Ireland. It was neither subversive nor violent as far as HN298 was aware<sup>337</sup>. The report dated 22 November 1973 provides information about an individual who is a member of the Central London branch of the AIL and a member of North London TOM and who spoke at the first ever public meeting held by the West London TOM (the founding branch of the movement)<sup>338</sup>. Another report notes that Gery Lawless (a principle member of the IMG amongst a number of other groups) is to make TOM the principal vehicle for his future political work<sup>339</sup>. These are further examples, among many, of the blurred lines between certain groups with shared interests and bears out HN298's account of his organic movement between groups.
- 12.55. He was informed by a third party during a TOM meeting that Gery Lawless had accused him of him being a spy. Later that evening HN298 saw Gery Lawless in a phone box. He confronted him over this accusation and punched him in the face. He broke his little finger as a result. This was discussed with his managers. He appreciated that he

---

<sup>332</sup> Witness statement para 132

<sup>333</sup> See UCPI0000008568 for an example of AAM-linked reporting

<sup>334</sup> MPS-0732378

<sup>335</sup> It should be noted that HN346's deployment appears to have come to an end in February 1973

<sup>336</sup> Witness statement paras 137-140

<sup>337</sup> Witness statement paras 165-167

<sup>338</sup> UCPI0000008104

<sup>339</sup> UCPI0000016345

may have been exposed subsequently but took the decision that he should return to this particular group on a further occasion to demonstrate the fact that he was not a spy. His managers agreed but were present in the area during the meeting to assist him if necessary. Gery Lawless was not present at that next meeting and HN298 took the decision not to attend another one<sup>340</sup>.

- 12.56. HN298 infiltrated the Workers Revolutionary Party between 1975 and 1976. He was not aware that HN303 also infiltrated the WRP and was not conscious of replacing him or overlapping with him. Once again his association with this group arose spontaneously rather than by design<sup>341</sup>.
- 12.57. HN298 attended meetings of the Little Ilford branch of the WRP which held meetings at a private house and also attended some larger WRP meetings in London. He does not believe he is the source of other reports<sup>342</sup>. The report dated 22 February 1975 relates to the first of a series of lectures held under the auspices of the WRP at a school in West Ham, proximate to Little Ilford. It may be that this is an early example of HN298's reporting on the WRP<sup>343</sup>. A further example of a report which may be attributable to the very early part of HN298's WRP deployment is the report which concerns the East London sub-district secretary who is a milkman who delivers milk to East Ham police station<sup>344</sup>.
- 12.58. The WRP supported a workers revolution by a system of educational programmes teaching revolutionary doctrines which could then be spread throughout workplaces. Whilst all revolutions may ultimately involve violence HN298 did not hear violence discussed or witness any violence within the WRP<sup>345</sup>.
- 12.59. He was not aware of a WRP policy of 'entryism' into Trade Unions states that common sense would suggest that they practiced entryism<sup>346</sup>.

---

<sup>340</sup> Witness statement paras 165-171

<sup>341</sup> Witness statement para 173

<sup>342</sup> Witness statement paras 174-178. This includes reporting regarding Stoke Newington and Hackney branches of the WRP (UCPI0000012070; UCPI0000009259), the North London Sub District Committee of the WRP (UCPI0000012087) and the Islington branch of the WRP (UCPI0000012107). HN303 reported extensively on the activities of the WRP Central Committee and there it may be that any report dealing with the Central Committee dating from a period when both HN298 and HN303 were actively deployed are more likely to be attributable to HN303. See for example UCPI0000007017; UCPI0000007023; UCPI0000007245; UCPI0000022002

<sup>343</sup> UCPI0000012162

<sup>344</sup> UCPI0000006944

<sup>345</sup> Witness statement para 179

<sup>346</sup> Witness statement para 181

- 12.60. HN298's reporting on the Little Ilford branch of the WRP contains a number of reports on individuals. For example: the report dated 26 April 1975 reports the marriage of two WRP members in a Catholic church and the anticipated "*conscience money*" the couple will have to pay to the WRP to appease the Party's displeasure at a church wedding<sup>347</sup>; a report dated 12 June 1975 concerns a recent recruit to the Little Ilford branch who is employed as an electrician at a government department<sup>348</sup>.
- 12.61. The report of 5 September 1975 concerning a meeting the East Ham sub-district of the WRP contains the information that the son of a millionaire who was a large share-holder of an insurance group appeared to be interested in the Party<sup>349</sup>. Also reported is the information that on 1 September 1975 a group of Iranians had gone to the Clapham headquarters of the party and had donated £50 without being solicited to do so.
- 12.62. HN298 does not believe he was ever specifically tasked by the Security Services and does not recognise the contents of the 'Box 500' reports<sup>350</sup>.
- 12.63. HN298 states that he did not report on the youth branch of the WRP, the Young Socialists, although he may have obtained information about them in passing and passed it on<sup>351</sup>. Of the reports which would not have required infiltration of the group one is a report on the National Organiser of the Young Socialists and full time employee of the Party who was pregnant<sup>352</sup>, another is a report of a 16 year old member of the Dagenham Young Socialists who is described as a school girl who has attended numerous meetings and demonstrations organised by the WRP<sup>353</sup>.
- 12.64. HN298 states that he was not responsible for any reporting suggesting infiltration of the Labour Young Party Young Socialists and does not know whether the WRP had a policy of entryism into the Labour Party<sup>354</sup>. The report dated 18 July 1975 however, is a report on the Little Ilford branch of the WRP during which the campaign to oust the

---

<sup>347</sup> UCPI0000007111

<sup>348</sup> UCPI0000007322

<sup>349</sup> UCPI0000007533

<sup>350</sup> Witness statement para 182; UCPI0000007000; UCPI0000007646; UCPI0000009259. There is a further Box 500 report at UCPI0000006993

<sup>351</sup> Witness statement paras 183-185

<sup>352</sup> UCPI0000012161

<sup>353</sup> UCPI0000009417

<sup>354</sup> Witness statement para 185. It is likely that HN303 is the source of this reporting. See UCPI0000007176

local MP, covertly recruit a member of the local Labour Party and build up a cell within the local party were discussed<sup>355</sup>.

- 12.65. He states that he was not responsible for any reporting on the WRP Shrewsbury Two Action Committee held at the Adelphi Hotel in Liverpool<sup>356</sup> and was not on any action committee<sup>357</sup>. HN298 has not commented on whether he may be responsible for the report dated 24 March 1975 which provides information about the intention of the WRP to organise a march from Hull to Liverpool in support of the Shrewsbury Two. This march was linked to the WRP intention to set up action committees throughout the country. The march was planned to pass through Yorkshire mining area in order to provoke a response by Arthur Scargill who would then be denounced as a “*Stalinist betrayer of the working class*”<sup>358</sup>.
- 12.66. HN298 has not commented on whether he was responsible for the report regarding the WRP’s reluctance to support the Free George Davis Campaign due to adverse publicity after a previous Free George Davis event, and the Campaign’s refusal give the WRP a guarantee that they would not engage in criminal acts<sup>359</sup>.
- 12.67. HN298 states that he is not responsible for any reporting on a police raid on White Meadows, the WRP education centre which took place on 27 September 1975<sup>360</sup>.
- 12.68. HN298 attended the WRP education centre in Derbyshire for a course. He deduces from documents he has been sent by the Inquiry that this course took place between 8 -15 February 1976<sup>361</sup>. He was given permission to go by his managers. A memorandum dated 25 September 1975 from Chief Inspector Kneale, then head of the SDS, to the Chief Superintendent ‘S’ Squad, at this stage HN332, seeks permission for HN298’s visit to White Meadows on the basis that “*as well as gaining useful security information, such a visit will undoubtedly do much to consolidate HN298’s standing in the WRP – an organisation notorious for its security consciousness*”<sup>362</sup>. Further memoranda make it clear that in September 1975 this visit received the approval of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner<sup>363</sup>. HN298 was then

---

<sup>355</sup> UCPI0000012640

<sup>356</sup> UCPI0000012752; UCPI000012781

<sup>357</sup> Witness statement para 186

<sup>358</sup> UCPI0000006961

<sup>359</sup> UCPI0000009410

<sup>360</sup> Witness statement para 187; MPS-0741130; UCPI0000009257

<sup>361</sup> See MPS-0741115

<sup>362</sup> MPS-0741114

<sup>363</sup> MPS-0741115 p1



invited to go White Meadows at short notice and simultaneously permission for his attendance was withdrawn by Commander Watts following concerns raised regarding the recent police raid on the premises. The withdrawal of permission was not able to be conveyed to HN298 in time and he attended the training course. It is clear from Commander Watts note that strict secrecy was to be maintained about HN298's visit<sup>364</sup>.

- 12.69. On his return he explains that he wrote a 30 page report on this visit which included a discussion on the class topics, teachers, attendees, security, accommodation and facilities. He does not believe he has been provided with this report by the Inquiry. He is aware, entirely co-incidentally, that his report was given a higher security classification than he had expected. HN298 does not think that the report which appears to be dated 4 February 1976 is his report and he does not believe that it is a summary of his report either<sup>365</sup>. He believes that the report must refer to a weekend school at White Meadows which had taken place over the weekend of 31 January to 1 February referenced in a report dated 29 January 1976<sup>366</sup>. The following may be of note: the report dated 4 February 1976 is said to have been received from a reliable source and the 22 paragraphs are set out in quotation marks; between paragraphs 5 and 6 and between paragraphs 21 and 22 there appears a dotted line, which may indicate a passage that has been omitted. It may be that the report represents extracts only of HN298's report (a suggestion he rejects) and an erroneous date has been applied to it.
- 12.70. The White Meadows report begins by setting out the purchase price of the property (£24,000), the renovation costs (£37,000) and the new insurance evaluation (£135,000) and the current capacity – the property could accommodate 60 students at any one time. It goes on to describe the introduction given to students on their arrival at the Centre and the security measures in place generally. Each student in attendance was required to be searched and *“items which could be construed as offensive weapons, cameras, tape recorders and any name, addresses or telephone numbers”* were removed from them for safe keeping. Students were informed that the premises were likely to be bugged by the police and not to refer to anyone by their surname. The internal telephone was also bugged and any use of the telephone

---

<sup>364</sup> MSP-0741115 p2

<sup>365</sup> MPS-0741113

<sup>366</sup> Witness statement paras 190-196; UCPI0000009578



required permission. Students were not permitted to leave the grounds of the property without permission. Students were required to comply with a rigorous programme of cleaning each day. Students were also required to undertake security patrols of the building at night and there was a strict procedure for how late night visitors to the site should be processed. The lectures were on topics such as dialectical and historical materialism, capital and philosophy interspersed with readings from Marx, Engel and Lenin. The educational day came to an end at 11pm.

- 12.71. Management comments about HN298's report are dated from 6 March 1976<sup>367</sup>. It is referred to as his '*swan song*'. It should be noted that HN298 was shortly to be withdrawn from the field. The comments also make reference to the "*security mania which permeates the WRP*". It appeared to allay their anxieties as to the WRP's immediate intentions however, "*for the time at least, the organisation is concerned more with the political education of a hard core nucleus than with immediate revolution*". This is echoed by Acting Commander Watts: "*It is valuable for us to learn that, despite all the speculation, the courses at "White Meadows" do not include incitement to public disorder.*" It appears the report was not retained on the SDS file but placed in 'Room 1834'. The Security Service were provided with a copy however as Commander Rodger's note on 11 March 1976 makes clear<sup>368</sup>. The covering letter of the report sent to the Security Service is dated 11 March 1976<sup>369</sup>. This also refers to the report as the "*swan song*" of the source who is "*withdrawing from this area of extremist activity*". The report attached is dated 4 February 1976. The management notes clearly imply that HN298 was the author of the attached report. HN298 notes the reference to his "*swan song*" in the Management documents commenting on the report and concedes that this implies that he is the author of the report but he suggests that if this is the suggestion, this is an error<sup>370</sup>.
- 12.72. The report was evidently of some value to the Security Services: the text of the report was copied into a Security Service report and receives positive commentary whilst also, it seems, raising further areas of inquiry<sup>371</sup>.

---

<sup>367</sup> MPS-0741115 p3

<sup>368</sup> MPS-0741115 p4

<sup>369</sup> UCPI0000012240

<sup>370</sup> Witness statement para 197

<sup>371</sup> UCPI0000033495. See p3 for SyS comment

- 12.73. HN298 does not believe that any of the reporting on the All Trades Union Alliance is attributable to him<sup>372</sup>. The All Trades Union Alliance was the industrial arm of the WRP and therefore closely allied. The report dated 20 March 1975, however, deals with the meeting of the East Ham All Trades Union Alliance, geographically close to HN298's branch of the WRP<sup>373</sup>.
- 12.74. HN298 agrees that it is likely that his active deployment with the SDS came to an end in April 1976<sup>374</sup>. He enjoyed the role and would have been happy to continue in it but he was told it was time for him to withdraw<sup>375</sup>.
- 12.75. Whilst he acknowledges the fact that the period of his deployment overlapped with that of HN297 (Richard Clark) HN298 states that he did not have any direct involvement with the South East London branch of TOM which was infiltrated by HN297 and had not opportunity to observe him undercover and so cannot comment on his conduct<sup>376</sup>.

*HN301 - "Bob Stubbs" –International Socialists initially Hammersmith and Fulham branch, later Wandsworth and Battersea branch, still later Paddington branch; late 1971 - May 1976; the South London branch of the Anti-Internment League - early 1972 to mid-1973; peripheral reporting on the Fulham and Hammersmith branch of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association and the Troops Out Movement, West London branch.*

13. During the course of his deployment HN301 used the cover name "Bob Stubbs". There is a restriction order in place prohibiting publication of his real name<sup>377</sup>. He has provided a witness statement but will not be giving oral evidence.
14. HN301 joined the SDS in 1971 and infiltrated a number of branches of the International Socialists ('IS'), beginning in the Hammersmith and Fulham branch, then the Wandsworth and Battersea branch and finally the Paddington branch. He also reported on the South London branch of the Anti-Internment

---

<sup>372</sup> Witness statement para 200 and reports UCPI0000006906; UCPI0000007017; UCPI0000007036

<sup>373</sup> UCPI0000008947.

<sup>374</sup> Witness statement para 199

<sup>375</sup> Witness statement para 220

<sup>376</sup> Witness statement para 238

<sup>377</sup> <https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180327-Final-ruling-following-21-March-hearing.pdf>

League ('AIL') and, peripherally, on the Fulham and Hammersmith branch of the Northern Irish Civil Rights Association ('NICRA') and the West London branch of the Troops Out Movement ('TOM'). HN301 was deployed for a period of approximately five years leaving in May 1976 and it would appear from the large chronological gaps in the reporting in possession of the Inquiry that the Inquiry has not been able to locate the entirety of his reporting. The following points of interest arise from consideration of his witness statement and reports associated with his deployment:

- 14.1. HN301 joined the SDS further to an invitation by HN332<sup>378</sup>. He is of the opinion that he was chosen in part due to his dark complexion which may have assisted him to infiltrate groups focusing on Middle-Eastern politics at a time when Palestinian hijackings were of significant concern<sup>379</sup>.
- 14.2. There was no formal training given to SDS officers at this time but he spent two to three months in the SDS back-office reading intelligence files on various protest groups and attending meetings with the field officers in the SDS safe-house where he was given general guidance and given the opportunity to ask questions<sup>380</sup>.
- 14.3. His cover name was not based on the identity of a deceased child<sup>381</sup>.
- 14.4. At first his cover-employment was as a laboratory technician at Guys and St Thomas' Hospital and later a handyman for a VW garage<sup>382</sup>. He rented cover accommodation but used it to park his cover vehicle, a vehicle purchased for his use by the SDS management, outside and stayed only rarely<sup>383</sup>.
- 14.5. His cover employment as a hospital technician was intended to bring him into contact with a member of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, also a laboratory worker, with a view to infiltrating this group. He failed in his attempts and his focus switched to the International Socialists<sup>384</sup>.
- 14.6. HN301 became a member of the Hammersmith & Fulham branch of IS by attending their publicised meetings. The Inquiry have been unable to find any reporting on the Hammersmith and Fulham branch of IS

---

<sup>378</sup> Witness statement para 8

<sup>379</sup> Witness statement para 9

<sup>380</sup> Witness statement para 11

<sup>381</sup> Witness statement para 16

<sup>382</sup> Witness statement para 18-19

<sup>383</sup> Witness statement para 22

<sup>384</sup> Witness statement para 27-28

- associated with this part of HN301's deployment. HN301 recalls that he was the treasurer of this branch early in his deployment<sup>385</sup>.
- 14.7. HN301 states that he used his membership of IS to report on meetings of other politically aligned groups in particular the Anti-Internment League ('AIL') and the Troops Out Movement ('TOM'). He cannot recall being directly tasked to attend AIL or TOM meetings but would have sought the views of his senior management prior to attending them<sup>386</sup>. Whilst he was initially tasked to infiltrate the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, thereafter his ongoing deployment targets were the result of a more collaborative process with senior management<sup>387</sup>.
- 14.8. He was not given any instructions about the sort of information he should gather but learnt by watching others. He was given a significantly "*free rein*" to direct his own tasking<sup>388</sup>.
- 14.9. He understood that the function of the SDS was to gather information about groups and individuals which posed a threat of public disorder and violence but states that the SDS "*gradually morphed into more of a general intelligence-gathering unit*"<sup>389</sup>.
- 14.10. HN303 states that in the course of his deployment he would visit the SDS safe house two to three times per week. By the end of his deployment the arrangement had become more formal and all field officers were expected to attend at the SDS premises on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday to meet with managers from the SDS office. Here they handed over their weekly diaries and reports and discussed matters with management. It also performed a welfare function because it was an opportunity to socialise with one another<sup>390</sup>.
- 14.11. Like a number of other SDS undercover officers in this era, he recalls writing up his reports at his own home<sup>391</sup>.
- 14.12. During the course of his deployment HN301 witnessed public disorder and violence during demonstrations involving IS and the National Front. He specifically recalls a demonstration at Red Lion Square during which he was punched by a police officer<sup>392</sup>.

---

<sup>385</sup> Witness statement para 72

<sup>386</sup> Witness statement para 29

<sup>387</sup> Witness statement para 32

<sup>388</sup> Witness statement para 34

<sup>389</sup> Witness statement para 35

<sup>390</sup> Witness statement para 38-39

<sup>391</sup> Witness statement para 41

<sup>392</sup> Witness statement para 84

- 14.13. HN301 states that he was on friendly terms with activists and would on occasion have a drink with others following a meeting but he did not form any close relationships<sup>393</sup>.
- 14.14. Whilst not directly tasked to attend meetings of the AIL HN301 states that the activities of the AIL were related to the Troubles and so were of automatic interest. He cannot recall the AIL posing any particular threat of public disorder but suspects that some members approved of the use of violence as a political tool and of the activities of the Provisional IRA<sup>394</sup>.
- 14.15. Due to the passage of time, HN301 is unable to comment as to whether all the reporting attributed to him which does not bear his name, has been correctly attributed to him<sup>395</sup>.
- 14.16. HN301 does not recall reporting on the Northern Irish Civil Rights Association ('NICRA') but accepts that he must have done because there are reports in his name regarding the activities of this group<sup>396</sup>. He cannot recall attending or reporting on the inaugural meeting of the International Sub-Committee of the Belfast Ten Defence Committee although accepts that must have done so because his name appears in the list of attendees<sup>397</sup>.
- 14.17. He attended meetings and reported on the West London branch of TOM, where the group was first formed<sup>398</sup>. He cannot recall any violence, criminality or public disorder being deployed by members of TOM as a tactic and presumes that the SDS interest in TOM was as a result of their connection to Irish extremism<sup>399</sup>.
- 14.18. HN301 believes that the International Socialists were principally of interest to the SDS because of the possibility of public disorder and violence, particularly during anti-fascist counter protests<sup>400</sup>.
- 14.19. The earliest report in the possession of the Inquiry which can be linked with HN301 is a report on a meeting of Hammersmith and Fulham branch of AIL dated 11 May 1972. The names and addresses of the key figures at the meeting are noted in the report. The report concerns the decision to set up a new publication entitled 'Irish Struggle' and the election of an editorial board<sup>401</sup>.

---

<sup>393</sup> Witness statement para 91

<sup>394</sup> Witness statement para 45-46

<sup>395</sup> Witness statement para 30-31 see also para 79

<sup>396</sup> Witness statement para 53-55 see also reports MPS-0737808

<sup>397</sup> Witness statement para 56

<sup>398</sup> See for example UCPI0000009938, UCPI0000009942

<sup>399</sup> Witness statement para 59-60

<sup>400</sup> Witness statement para 65

<sup>401</sup> MPS-0728847

- 14.20. In a report on a meeting of West London branch of AIL dated 13 July 1972 HN301 reports that a member of the Irish Solidarity Campaign rebuked the AIL for its attitude towards the IRA and “*urged stronger support for the military struggle in Ulster*”<sup>402</sup>. However he also notes that most people present were unsure of the approach to take and felt that no decision should be taken until the situation became clearer.
- 14.21. A report dated 18 July 1973 concerning a meeting of the Fulham and Hammersmith NICRA notes that a recent march organised by NICRA was a failure due to poor attendance. A member observed that civil rights organisations were in decline as people turned to more militant organisations such as AIL or the ISC but that the Fulham and Hammersmith branch of NICRA would continue<sup>403</sup>. The justification for reporting on predominantly civil rights organisations will be a matter the Inquiry will be considering.
- 14.22. HN301 reported on the AIL delegate conference on held on 16 July 1972<sup>404</sup>. 90 people were in attendance. Delegates attended from each branch and from Clann na h'Eireann and Sinn Fein. During the course of the meeting one of the delegates expressed support of both the Official and Provisional IRA and urged the AIL to do likewise. HN301 reports that in order to try to achieve their aim of getting British troops out of Ireland and undermine support for military action the AIL were planning to start an anti-war movement in the UK. The AIL would hope to recruit others to this cause by the picketing of military establishments and Army Recruitment Offices and the organisation of mass demonstrations.
- 14.23. On 7-8 October 1972 HN301 attended and later reported on the AIL National Conference<sup>405</sup>. The report was co-authored by HN298 and HN338. It is both factual and discursive in tone. The revolutionary aspirations of AIL are reported on: an AIL representative told the conference that the AIL must conduct a full educational programme amongst the Trade Unions and working class to build a mass revolutionary vanguard which would be the only way “*to help the working class of Ireland in their bloody struggle against British Imperialism*”. Also referred to are sectarian affiliations of various groups represented at the conference: a representative of Sinn Fein spoke of the need to support the Provisional IRA and defended its

---

<sup>402</sup> MPS-0728913

<sup>403</sup> MPS-0737808

<sup>404</sup> MPS-072916

<sup>405</sup> Witness statement para 51 and MPS-0728845



bombing campaigns; an International Socialist delegate declared unconditional support for the activities of the IRA in their struggle for freedom. The report comments on the future political direction of the AIL in that it concludes that the main point to arise from the conference was the emergence of the IMG as the new leaders of the AIL.

- 14.24. HN301 reported on forthcoming demonstrations and pickets<sup>406</sup> and provided detailed descriptions of politically active individuals<sup>407</sup>.
- 14.25. In a report on a delegate meeting of the AIL dated 23 November 1972 HN301 reported the detailed knowledge Gery Lawless had of the route to be taken by Irish Prime Minister, Jack Lynch, on his journey from Heathrow to London to meet the Edward Heath which Lawless claimed to have obtained from a press officer at the Irish Embassy<sup>408</sup>.
- 14.26. HN301 and HN338 produced a joint report on the conference supported by the IMG, IS and the Socialist Labour League entitled 'Police oppression and victimisation', a conference which had come about in response to police raids on the homes of Irish individuals living in Coventry. The report notes that, despite conciliatory noises, there was little likelihood of a close working relationships between these left wing revolutionary groups.
- 14.27. In March 1973 HN301 produced a report on the IS national conference<sup>409</sup>. The lengthy report combines a narrative of events with discursive commentary. This was an event attended by 1,200 people on more popular days amid tight security. The conference was told that IS was "*the primary revolutionary organisation*". It was recruiting at a "*staggering*" rate and now had 130 branches across the country and "*into the heart of industry*" although at present black workers were "*a large, untapped resource*" which IS should address. The report of the political committee recommended that IS form factory branches and challenge the communist leadership of industrial action from the shop floor. HN301 reported on the wide circulation of the Socialist Worker—28,000 copies per week. Tony Cliff is recorded as emphasising the "*...need for work inside the field of black workers where so much potential lay*" and "*...fighting the fight of the black worker*" and that "*The same was true in the case of women*". The appendices provide details of some of those in attendance and those elected to the National Committee.

---

<sup>406</sup> MPS-0728927; UCPI0000008056

<sup>407</sup> UCPI0000007153

<sup>408</sup> MPS-0728874

<sup>409</sup> UCPI0000007905 and referenced at witness statement para 66



- 14.28. HN301 reported on TOM in its infancy as a group of left wing activists and others with few political leanings united by the common goal of expelling British troops from Ireland. In his report dated 12 November 1973<sup>410</sup> he predicts that the movement will split along political lines as the overall political leanings of the movement are discussed.
- 14.29. In April 1974 HN301 reported on the possible formation of an IS Lawyers Group to give legal advice to members in the event of arrest by the police and to assist trade unionists “*who clash with the law on pickets, marches and demonstrations*”<sup>411</sup>. There are a number of examples of the reporting of legal assistance given to activists in the period covered by tranche 1.
- 14.30. In November 1974 HN301, now a member of Wandsworth and Battersea branch of IS, reported on a suggestion in a branch meeting that prisons provided fertile ground for the dissemination of revolutionary politics<sup>412</sup>.
- 14.31. In a report dated 13 March 1975 the intention of the IS to stand a candidate in the Walsall by-election is reported<sup>413</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for reporting of legitimate political aspirations of left wing groups.
- 14.32. On 6 September 1975 members of the South West London District of IS with which HN301 was associated, were in the vanguard of IS members who attempted to prevent a march by the National Front in Bethnal Green<sup>414</sup>. The authorship of this report is unclear and HN301 has not commented on it in his witness statement when commenting on attendance at protests involving the National Front<sup>415</sup>. HN301 states that he did not attend any counter-National Front march in Coventry and does not believe that any associated reporting can be connected to him<sup>416</sup>.
- 14.33. It is unclear when HN301 moved into the Paddington branch of IS. The earliest reporting in the possession of the Inquiry is dated 28 October 1975, although this does not contain HN301’s name or cover name<sup>417</sup>. In January 1976, however, HN301 became branch treasurer of Paddington branch of IS<sup>418</sup>. He cannot recall why he became treasurer

---

<sup>410</sup> UCPI0000009938

<sup>411</sup> UCPI0000007915

<sup>412</sup> UCPI0000015010

<sup>413</sup> UCPI0000006921

<sup>414</sup> UCPI0000007566

<sup>415</sup> See witness statement para84

<sup>416</sup> UCPI0000012203; UCPI0000012230

<sup>417</sup> UCPI0000009250

<sup>418</sup> UCPI0000009537

but assumes he simply applied for the role when it became vacant. The sole duty he remembers was to collect subscription fees. He remembers being told at the beginning of his deployment that the SDS encouraged field officers to take on a positions in activist groups which would give them access to membership information<sup>419</sup>. This is a pattern seen in a number of SDS undercover deployments during this period.

- 14.34. A category of report which HN301 states that he created but which have not been recovered are his reports about what occurred at small-scale events such as pickets. He adds that reports about large scale demonstrations were not written up by the SDS<sup>420</sup>.
- 14.35. HN301 recalls a Commissioner, Sir Robert Mark, visiting the SDS flat in Northwest London on one occasion evidencing both a knowledge of and interest in the SDS at the highest level of the MPS<sup>421</sup>.
- 14.36. There are references to core participants Piers Corbyn and Tariq Ali amongst HN301's documents<sup>422</sup>.
- 14.37. Some of the meetings which HN301 appears to have attended were very small and/or took place in private homes<sup>423</sup>.
- 14.38. His deployment came to an end in May 1976 after approximately 5 years which appeared to the optimal length: *"five years would allow time for officers to become comfortable in their role and get to know activists but it was not such a long period that they would then find it hard to transition back to their normal lives"*<sup>424</sup>.

*HN303 – "Peter Collins" – early 1974 to 1977 - North London branch of the Workers Revolutionary Party and later tasked by the WRP to infiltrate the National Front.*

15. HN303 who used the cover name "Peter Collins" has a restriction order prohibiting publication of his real name<sup>425</sup>. He has not been able to provide a witness statement to the Inquiry due to ill health. He was actively deployed in the SDS from early 1974 and appears to have been still in the field in November 1977. During the course of his deployment he infiltrated the

<sup>419</sup> Witness statement para 72-73

<sup>420</sup> Witness statement para 108

<sup>421</sup> Witness statement para 112

<sup>422</sup> MPS-0739282 and UCPI0000015700

<sup>423</sup> UCPI0000008047, MPS-737808, MPS-0728867, UCPI0000015010 & UCPI0000009250

<sup>424</sup> Witness statement para 78 and para 97 and also UCPI0000012374

<sup>425</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

Workers Revolutionary Party ('WRP'), initially in North London. The WRP, a Trotskyist organisation, sought the establishment of a socialist state. From some point in 1975 he was tasked by the WRP to infiltrate the National Front and report back to senior figures within the WRP. A small number of reports on the National Front activities have been located beginning in March 1975. HN303's re-tasking coincided with HN298's infiltration of the WRP which lasted until April 1976. The extent to which HN303 continued to report on the WRP following his re-focus on the National Front is unclear and the attribution of reporting on the activities of the WRP after early 1975 is difficult. There is no evidence that HN303 used the identity of a deceased child. He told the risk assessors that he used a name that he was given by his superiors.

16. The following observations and comments arise on consideration of the documents associated with his deployment:
  - 16.1. HN303's reporting makes it clear that the WRP was a sizable organisation with a wide reach: In June 1974 the weekly circulation numbers of the WRP publication, Workers Press, in North London indicated a circulation of over 7000<sup>426</sup>; numbers in attendance at the WRP Special Delegates conference over the weekend of 13 – 14 May 1974 indicated that the total membership of the WRP countrywide was between 3500-4000 and a Young Socialist "*field of influence*" was approximately 7,000<sup>427</sup>. The WRP was also well funded; in August 1975 the WRP financial report indicated a turnover in the Party of £155,000 and a balance of income over expenditure of £66,000. The turnover of Workers Press was £156,000<sup>428</sup>.
  - 16.2. The revolutionary aspirations of the WRP are referenced in HN303's reporting. In a report dated 1 August 1975 regarding the WRP delegates conference held over the weekend of 11-12 July 1975 it is reported that the Political Committee had decided that, just as Lenin calculated the optimal time for a call to bring down the government prior to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the material conditions were right for a successful call to bring down the government and the delegates were assembled to consider a draft resolution entitled 'Down with the Labour Government'. Vanessa Redgrave told the conference that "*the ruling class know that civil war is on the agenda...the time for class compromise is over; the struggle can only be resolved by force*". Another Central Committee member described the Workers Press and

---

<sup>426</sup> UCPI0000022274

<sup>427</sup> UCPI0000009950

<sup>428</sup> UCPI0000022002

the Education Centre as “*weapons of the revolutionary*”<sup>429</sup>. However, there is also evidence, found in the WRP’s reported dealings with the Free George Davis Campaign, that it actively sought to avoid being associated with criminal acts<sup>430</sup>.

- 16.3. The extreme security consciousness of the WRP is a topic repeatedly referenced in HN303’s reporting. In a report dated 7 May 1974 HN303 reported on the measures to be taken by the WRP to combat police spies and informants and also “*spies and agent provocateurs*” who may attempt to steer the Party away from revolutionary building of the Party and in to popular-front actions which may expose the WRP to “*police persecution and ridicule in the capitalist press*”<sup>431</sup>
- 16.4. HN303 regularly reported on individual members of the WRP<sup>432</sup>. This included references to their trade union affiliations<sup>433</sup>, being a journalist<sup>434</sup>, or positions of authority within their workplaces<sup>435</sup>.
- 16.5. HN303 reported on forthcoming rallies and protests organised or supported by the WRP<sup>436</sup>.
- 16.6. HN303’s report on the WRP Special Delegates conference in Mansion House<sup>437</sup> describes Gery Healy’s speech on Party building. Recruitment had been a success during the deepening economic crisis in which he advocated “*exploiting every grievance, whether real or imagined, to the maximum benefit of the WRP*” and urged those who had recently undertaken Marxist theory classes run by the WRP to develop their influence within work places, unions and local branches areas in preparation for the revolution.
- 16.7. HN303 attended and reported on the first Party conference of the WRP which took place between 15 and 17 December 1974<sup>438</sup>. In his report he discusses the internal state of the WRP during a period of internal division and in particular expulsion of WRP members. HN303 quotes from a speech by Mike Banda, who in 1978 would succeed Gery Healy as general secretary of the WRP, setting out the WRP’s attitude

---

<sup>429</sup> UCPI0000022002

<sup>430</sup> UCPI0000009410

<sup>431</sup> UCPI0000009964, see also UCPI0000009950, UCPI0000012168 and UCPI0000022002 for references to tight security

<sup>432</sup> UCPI0000015049; UCPI0000012070; UCPI0000012161; UCPI0000007023; UCPI0000007177

<sup>433</sup> See UCPI00000012070

<sup>434</sup> UCPI0000007023

<sup>435</sup> UCPI0000007017 regarding a WRP member who is a shop steward at his work place and a member of the Central Committee of the WRP

<sup>436</sup> See for example UCPI0000009962 a report on a forthcoming WRP organised rally at Speaker Corner in support of the miners

<sup>437</sup> UCPI0000009950

<sup>438</sup> UCPI0000012168

towards the trade unions: *“the Party cannot and will not bend its theory and practice to the capriciousness of Trade Unionists. If they are not prepared to subordinate themselves to the needs of the Party, then the Party will not tolerate them within its ranks”*. HN303’s reporting on the WRP regularly referred to the WRP’s associations with or attitudes towards trades unions. Other examples, which touch upon core participants UCATT and the NUM, include a report dated 11 March 1975 detailing events at a meeting of the builders section of the WRP at Conway Hall. At that meeting reference was made to the events leading up to the arrest and conviction of the Shrewsbury 2 and the betrayals workers had experienced from “Stalinists” including the UCATT general secretary who had *“played down events which should have been fought against”*<sup>439</sup>. A report dated 24 March 1975 gives information about a march from Hull to Liverpool organised by the WRP<sup>440</sup>, the route having been chosen to put Arthur Scargill, then president of the Yorkshire National Union of Mineworkers, under pressure to support the march whilst being denounced by the WRP as a *“Stalinist betrayer of the working class”*. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for SDS reporting on industrial relations between left wing groups and legitimate trade unions.

- 16.8. It is unclear at which point in 1975 HN303 began his reporting on the National Front as a result of instructions by the WRP to infiltrate this group but it would appear that his infiltration of the National Front continued until early 1976<sup>441</sup>. It is equally unclear whether he continued to report on the WRP during this time. At some point in 1975 HN298 began reporting on the WRP<sup>442</sup>. The Inquiry have been unable to identify which of these officers was responsible for collating the information contained in a number of reports on the WRP in the period 1975-1976, although it would appear that HN303 had largely reported on North London WRP activities and matters concerning the Central Committee whilst in his witness statement HN298 states that he reported on the Little Ilford branch of the WRP and also attended some larger WRP events in London<sup>443</sup>. A number of reports from 1975 onwards focus on WRP meetings in East Ham<sup>444</sup>. It may be more likely

---

<sup>439</sup> UCPI0000006909

<sup>440</sup> UCPI0000006961

<sup>441</sup> See SDS Annual Report for 1976 (MPS-0728980) at para 9

<sup>442</sup> See HN298’s witness statement at para173

<sup>443</sup> Witness statement of HN298 para 176-177

<sup>444</sup> The first of these in the possession of the Inquiry is UCPI0000012162, dated 22 February 1975

that the origin of the information contained in these reports is accurately attributed to HN298 rather than HN303.

- 16.9. The Inquiry is in possession of a small number of SDS intelligence reports which focus on the National Front and also on a splinter group of the National Front, the Legion of St George<sup>445</sup>. The first of these is dated 14 March 1975. The 1976 SDS Annual Report<sup>446</sup> indicates that the information obtained from HN303's infiltration of the National Front added little of value to that already available from Special Branch sources.
- 16.10. A number of the SDS reports regarding the WRP are responses to requests for information from the Security Services<sup>447</sup>. The report dated 26 March 1975, for example, is a response to a request from the Security Services from the previous year to clarify the meaning of 'sleeping' WRP members. The report, which is likely to be attributable to HN303, describes the practice employed by North London WRP members in which they disguise their WRP affiliation in order to avoid "*communist opposition*" and gain positions of responsibility in trade unions in order to further the WRP objectives. HN303 comments that the practice is not widespread due to internal industrial schisms but is still undertaken where members are "*in isolated or Stalinist dominated employment*". Another report dated 26 March 1975 provides a corrective to a Security Service letter erroneously referring to an individual as part of the Central Committee of the WRP.
- 16.11. Entryism is a subject regularly returned to in SDS reporting, including that of HN303's. A report dated 14 May 1975 provides information that the WRP was considering infiltrating the Labour Party Young Socialist with a view to the eventual subversion of all branches of the LPYS as they had already achieved in Tonbridge<sup>448</sup>. In a report dated 1 August 1975 regarding the WRP delegates' conference it is noted that Gery Healy called for constituency members of the Labour party to be won over to the WRP in order to create factions within the party and suggested that WRP members may have to join the Labour party in order to create these factions. He stated however, that the Labour party could not be revolutionised from within because it was a reformist organisation and would remain so until it was brought down<sup>449</sup>

---

<sup>445</sup> UCPI0000006931; UCPI0000012751; UCPI0000009480; UCPI0000009553

<sup>446</sup> See above

<sup>447</sup> See UCPI0000006993; UCPI0000007000; UCPI0000009259

<sup>448</sup> UCPI0000007176

<sup>449</sup> UCPI0000022002



- 16.12. A report dated 30 May 1975 provides information about the prospective visit by Vanessa Redgrave and a group of WRP members to South Vietnam, approved by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam<sup>450</sup>.
- 16.13. There a number of reports which reference the Shrewsbury Two in conjunction with the WRP who appear to have viewed the arrests and surrounding events as illustrating points of principle in respect of industrial organising. There are two reports which detail the meeting of the Shrewsbury Two Action Committee organised by the WRP at the Adelphi Hotel in Liverpool on 29 July 1975 attended by 800 people, including coachloads of individuals from London<sup>451</sup>. In his speech Gery Healy stated that *"the single task of the Workers Revolutionary Party was to train a Marxist leadership in the trade union movement and that such a leadership would not be beaten"*. Attribution of either of these reports to a specific author is difficult. In his witness statement HN298 denies authorship or attendance at an event in Liverpool<sup>452</sup>.
- 16.14. In the summer of 1975 the WRP came into possession of White Meadows Villa in Parwich, Derbyshire, purchased by Corin Redgrave for their use. It became the WRP Education Centre. Shortly after its opening it was subject to a police raid. The WRP reaction to this raid was reported by the SDS<sup>453</sup>. A report dated 4 February 1976<sup>454</sup>, apparently compiled after the writer attended an educational event at the Centre, details the extensive security arrangements in place at the Centre and the purported discovery of listening devices at the Centre following the police raid. In correspondence between senior management figures Commander Watts notes *'It is valuable for us to learn that, despite all the speculation, the courses at "White Meadows" do not include incitement to public disorder'*<sup>455</sup>. There is some doubt over whether the contents of this report should be attributed to HN303 or HN298, the only other SDS field officer reporting on the WRP. HN298 states that he attended an educational course at the Centre between 8 and 14 February 1976 and compiled a 30 page report of his observations and experiences and this report of an earlier date cannot be connected to him<sup>456</sup>. It is clear however, that the report was

<sup>450</sup> UCPI0000007245

<sup>451</sup> UCPI0000012752; UCPI0000012781

<sup>452</sup> Witness statement of HN298 para 186

<sup>453</sup> UCPI0000009265

<sup>454</sup> UCPI0000012240

<sup>455</sup> MPS-0741115

<sup>456</sup> Witness statement of HN298 paras 190-197



forwarded to the Security Services on 11 March 1976 and referred to as the “*swan song*” of the author – HN298 was withdrawn from the field in March 1976 whereas HN303 remained actively deployed in the SDS until 1977, furthermore managerial correspondence regarding HN298’s visit to the Centre and his subsequent report indicates that it was mainly concerned with WRP security procedures; finally, correspondence dated 9 March 1976 indicates that the report written by HN298 would be forwarded to the Security Service<sup>457</sup>. The fact that the 4 February 1976 report is duplicated in a Security Service document with Security Service comments on it indicate that it was of particular interest to them<sup>458</sup>.

- 16.15. There is little reporting in the hands of the Inquiry that can be linked with HN303 after April 1976 and the latter period of his deployment is unclear. In November 1977, however, HN303, together with HN13, was chosen as an SDS representative to discuss the police handling of serious public disorder events such as the Battle of Lewisham and the Grunwick dispute from their standpoint of undercover police officers in the field infiltrating “*the extreme left-wing*”<sup>459</sup>. This may suggest that HN303 was present at one or both of these events. The Inquiry has not been able to find any reporting associated with HN303 regarding these events. The SDS value to the effective policing of public demonstration and protests will be a matter explored by the Inquiry.

*HN353 – “Gary Roberts” – Finsbury Park branch of the International Socialists and then South East London International Marxist Group - spring 1974 to June 1978*

17. HN353 adopted the cover name ‘Gary Roberts’. There is a restriction order prohibiting publication of his real name<sup>460</sup>. His cover name is that of a deceased child. He provided a witness statement to the Inquiry but will not be called to give oral evidence. HN353’s was first deployed into the International Socialists (‘IS’) but spent the bulk of his four year deployment reporting on the activities of the South East London International Marxist Group (‘IMG’). The period of time he spent reporting on IS is unclear from the documents. His

---

<sup>457</sup> See MPS-0741115

<sup>458</sup> UCPI0000033495 at page 3

<sup>459</sup> MPS-0732885; MPS-0732886

<sup>460</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

reporting contains references to core participants 'Mary', Richard Chessum, Tariq Ali, UCATT, NUM and Piers Corbyn.

18. A consideration of his witness statement and documents associated with his deployment gives rise to the following observations:
  - 18.1. HN353 was recruited to the SDS by an SDS officer who he had previously worked with. He had previously known of the bare existence of a covert group within Special Branch but no more than that. He can recall no formal meetings or any testing before his recruitment<sup>461</sup>.
  - 18.2. HN353 recalls that he joined the SDS in spring 1974. The challenge of the role appealed to him. He cannot recall being told anything formally about the impact of the work or what it would entail. He understood that the primary role of the SDS was obtaining intelligence on demonstrations so that public disorder could be effectively policed. The SDS did not have a primary role in counter-subversion but most Special Branch material was copied to the Security Services who tracked subversive activity<sup>462</sup>.
  - 18.3. He received no formal training for this role in the SDS prior to his active deployment. He states that he got an idea of what the job entailed during his time in the SDS back office when he would type up the reports of officers in the field<sup>463</sup>. He understood that the purpose of his deployment was to obtain the details of the numbers in groups<sup>464</sup> and details of planned demonstrations, and did so<sup>465</sup>, but he cannot recall being specifically told to obtain such information<sup>466</sup>. He would report names, dates of birth and membership details<sup>467</sup>. He also reported back on the politics discussed at meeting but thinks that this may have

---

<sup>461</sup> Witness statement para 5-6

<sup>462</sup> Witness statement para 7, 68

<sup>463</sup> Witness statement para 8

<sup>464</sup> See for example UCPI0000008229; HN353 reports that the total London membership of IMG is estimated to be 225; UCPI0000011024 total membership 750 in July 1977

<sup>465</sup> See UCPI000007515 IMG participation in an anti-National Front demonstration and pickets to be organised by the Chile Solidarity Campaign outside the Chilean Embassy; UCPI0000009460 a picket to protest cuts to the NHS; UCPI0000021538 picket of a National Front election meeting in Brixton.

<sup>466</sup> Witness statement para 22

<sup>467</sup> Examples of such reporting include UCPI0000015044 re IMG member's personal details (HN353 disowns this report on the basis that he believes he began his infiltration of SE London branches of IMG in September 1975. However, this report concerns an individual who is a member of IMG and who is active in student politics at Thames Polytechnic, details that indicate that HN353 may be responsible for this report); UCPI0000007368 (this report is similarly disowned on the basis of date but contains personal details of a member of SE London branch of IMG); UCPI000007576 a reference to a IMG member concerned with "gay" work

been more of use to the Security Services than to the police<sup>468</sup>. In respect of the information he reported he states “*I would Hoover up everything, it wasn’t my job to analyse it, I would just report it*”<sup>469</sup>.

- 18.4. HN353 attended and reported on meetings held in private residences<sup>470</sup>, often attended by small numbers of people<sup>471</sup>.
- 18.5. HN353 cannot recall any advice, guidance or instruction on the acceptable limit of intrusion into the private lives of those he came across in the course of his active deployment nor on sexual activity or participation in criminal activity. He can recall however being given the phone number of Chief Inspector Derek Kneale, then head of the SDS for use if he was arrested in his undercover role. There was no guidance about how any subsequent court proceedings should be navigated nor was he given any guidance about obtaining information which may be subject to legal professional privilege<sup>472</sup>. Insofar as taking up office within their target groups, the UCOs were advised never to take any organisational role, he took this to mean that they should not organise demonstrations<sup>473</sup>
- 18.6. His cover name, Gary Roberts, was the name of a deceased child. It was chosen by HN353 at Somerset House on the basis that HN353 had a similar date of birth. The name and date of birth were the only features of the child’s identity that he used. He created a vague back story for his cover identity and a cover occupation as a self-employed painter and decorator<sup>474</sup>.
- 18.7. In order to undertake his SDS deployment he grew his hair and beard and wore army surplus jacket and jeans. He was provided with a cover vehicle in which he transported tools for his cover-employment and also, for a period of about a year during his infiltration of the IMG, to deliver bundles of ‘Red Weekly’, the IMG publication, to main line stations<sup>475</sup>.

---

<sup>468</sup> Witness statement para 24. See for example UCPI0000009727 and UCPI0000015732 which are reports on the pre-conference discussions of the IMG and set focus on some of the internal politics of IMG

<sup>469</sup> Witness statement para 40

<sup>470</sup> UCPI0000007318; UCPI0000012705; UCPI0000007664

<sup>471</sup> UCPI0000012806 – a report of a meeting of the SE London members of the IMG at which only 4 people were present. HN353 disowns this report by virtue of the date. UCPI0000009301; UCPI0000009852 – a report of the business meeting of the South Easter London area of the IMG at which 3 people were present

<sup>472</sup> Witness statement para 10

<sup>473</sup> Witness statement para 38

<sup>474</sup> Witness statement para 11, 13,

<sup>475</sup> Witness statement para 16, 42

- 18.8. In the early days of his deployment HN353 states that he would attend the SDS safe house three times per week to report back on his activities. This dropped to twice a week later in his deployment. At the meetings they would hand in their manuscript reports which would be typed up in the back office. Occasionally at these meetings the SDS field officers would be shown photographs and asked if we recognised the individuals pictured. He met other UCO's at the weekly meeting but they did not discuss their deployments to any great extent. Occasionally he would see a fellow SDS officer at demonstrations but he would not have spoken to them<sup>476</sup>.
- 18.9. On one occasion HN353 recalls a Chief Superintendent and the Commissioner visiting the SDS safe house and got the impression that it was in order to show an interest in the work of the SDS early in the Commissioner's appointment. The whole squad was present during this visit<sup>477</sup>.
- 18.10. After 1975 he began to receive overtime payments and due to the hours he spent in his undercover identity this doubled his take home pay<sup>478</sup>.
- 18.11. HN353 believes he was told the area and group in to which he was to be deployed by DCI Derek Kneale<sup>479</sup>. He infiltrated the Finsbury Park branch of the International Socialists ('IS') in September 1974<sup>480</sup>. He states that the reporting on IS provided to him by the Inquiry does not reflect the entirety of his reporting of this period. He attended many demonstrations and public and private meetings in the course of this part of his deployment and provided reports in relation to them. In particular he recalls reporting on the demonstration at which a demonstrator, Kevin Gately died, although the report did not contain any information which would have assisted in understanding the circumstances of his death<sup>481</sup>.
- 18.12. The earliest report relating to IS in the possession of the Inquiry which can be connected to HN353 is dated 18 June 1974 and is signed off in HN353's real name<sup>482</sup>. This may indicate that HN353's active deployment began a little earlier than September 1974.

---

<sup>476</sup> Witness statement para 26-27

<sup>477</sup> Witness statement para 82

<sup>478</sup> Witness statement para 30

<sup>479</sup> Witness statement para 22

<sup>480</sup> Witness statement para 18,32

<sup>481</sup> Witness statement para 19. It should be noted that the demonstration at which Kevin Gately lost his life took place in June 1974 which may indicate that HN353 infiltrated IS a little earlier than he recalls

<sup>482</sup> UCPI0000007917

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 18.13. There are a small number of additional IS reports which HN353, by virtue of their date and broad geographical area, accepts may contain information supplied by him<sup>483</sup>.
- 18.14. He recalls that he infiltrated IS for approximately a year before moving to the IMG<sup>484</sup>. It should be noted that from 21 November 1974<sup>485</sup> there are number of SDS reports which concern IMG members connected to Thames Polytechnic or IMG meetings in South East London, both features of HN353's reporting. HN353 denies that IMG related reports prior to the autumn of 1975 contain information obtained from him. He suggests that this is likely to be the reporting of HN338, an SDS officer also deployed in to the IMG. However, the Inquiry believe that HN338 was withdrawn from the field in December 1973, and so could not be responsible for this reporting. In addition HN338 reported on the IMG in the Notting Hill and West London area.
- 18.15. The report dated 31 December 1974, which HN353 rejects as being attributable to him by virtue of the date, provides information about an IMG meeting which took place in the Queen's Arms on Burrage Road, SE18, the site of a large number of meetings of the South East branch of the IMG which HN353 confirms were attended by him<sup>486</sup>. The report notes that the IMG were considering their internal structure and a cell structure was favoured; the position of student members remained unclear but that students in South East London could continue to attend meetings on a geographical basis<sup>487</sup>.
- 18.16. HN353 cannot recall who or what influenced this change of tasking but believes that it may have been because another SDS officer, HN338 who was deployed in to the IMG, had been withdrawn<sup>488</sup>.
- 18.17. HN353's movement from IS and the IMG apparently enabled him to provide information about the political tensions that existed between IS and the IMG. A report dated 11 June 1975 sets out the friction caused by the cancellation of a speaking tour by the Irish Republican Socialist Party<sup>489</sup>.

---

<sup>483</sup> Witness statement para 33:UCPI0000006946; UCPI0000009421;

<sup>484</sup> Witness statement para 23

<sup>485</sup> UCPI0000015044;UCPI0000007160; UCPI0000007318; UCPI0000007368; UCPI0000012743; UCPI0000012786

<sup>486</sup> UCPI0000015046

<sup>487</sup> Further reports on IMG internal structure see for example UCPI0000007160; UCPI0000021343; UCPI0000009350

<sup>488</sup> Witness statement para 23. As noted above, the Inquiry believe that HN338 was withdrawn from the field in December 1973, nearly two years prior to the time when HN353 believes he infiltrated the IMG

<sup>489</sup> UCPI0000007335

- 18.18. After he infiltrated the IMG he became a student on a degree course at Thames Polytechnic in his cover identity, attending classes and taking exams. The course was paid for by the MPS. He never completed the degree<sup>490</sup>.
- 18.19. Like other IMG members HN353 was required to adopt a 'party name', the purpose of which was to "*disguise their identities and confuse their enemies*". HN353's party name was 'Gary Shopland' but he cannot remember ever using it<sup>491</sup>.
- 18.20. HN353 understood that the IMG's objectives were to establish a communist state and place power in the hands of the workers but he did not think that they knew how to achieve that goal. Whilst they may have hoped to achieve their objective by subversive activity (entryism, or by seizing power outside the electoral system) and whilst their political theory may have endorsed the use of violence to achieve their aim, he never saw any evidence of violence used for this purpose<sup>492</sup>.
- 18.21. He witnessed public disorder between the left wing and right wing at demonstrations attended by the IMG<sup>493</sup>.
- 18.22. HN353 states that he did not witness anything subversive in the IMG and says that they "*were strong on words, but in hindsight I think they were not really likely to act on them*"<sup>494</sup>.
- 18.23. In a report regarding a discussion on 'The Nature of the Soviet Union' held jointly by the North East Lewisham branch of the Communist Party and the South East London IMG, the IMG were said to view the USSR as having "*great bearing on the progress of European revolution*" and that the IMG were seeking "*world-wide revolution*" and regarded the USSR as a "*deformed worker's state*"<sup>495</sup>.
- 18.24. The report dated 4 July 1975 regarding an aggregate meeting of the South East London members of the IMG notes that a policy of IMG agitation within the Labour Party had been agreed on but that the method of such agitation had yet to be established<sup>496</sup>. A further report dated 17 September 1975 concerns the rumour that 'a substantial number' of people have been instructed to join the Labour Party in anticipation of a split in the Labour Party when the IMG members can

---

<sup>490</sup> Witness statement para 14,22

<sup>491</sup> Witness statement para 50

<sup>492</sup> Witness statement para 39

<sup>493</sup> Witness statement para 67

<sup>494</sup> Witness statement para 68

<sup>495</sup> UCPI0000007449 – HN353 does not comment on this report in his statement but it may be that he disowns this report on the basis of the date.

<sup>496</sup> UCPI0000012786 – another report disowned by HN353 on the basis of the date



join forces with the left-wing of the Labour Party<sup>497</sup>. This is further referenced in the report of the aggregate meeting of London membership of the IMG on 20 October 1975 which confirmed that 60 ‘comrades had been allocated to work in the Labour Party’<sup>498</sup>. A foiled attempt to join the Labour Party by a South East London IMG member is also reported<sup>499</sup>. A successful attempt to join the Labour Party in Barnet is also reported<sup>500</sup>.

- 18.25. In the report on the pre-conference aggregate meeting of the London membership of the IMG, it is noted that the position of the Majority Tendency of the IMG was that the IMG should build tendencies in the Labour Party and the trade unions where the IMG could intervene in its national campaigns. This was not a position supported by other groups within IMG some of whom supported building campaigns through mass action on a local rather than a national basis<sup>501</sup>.
- 18.26. HN353 also appears to have reported on the march and meeting organised by the South-East London Labour Party Young Socialists held on 8 November 1975<sup>502</sup>. The march was supported by South East London IMG and South East London branches of IS among others. In the report of the aggregate meeting of South London IMG dated 25 March 1977 information was provided about the IMG standing candidates in the 1977 GLC elections, such candidates to include Piers Corbyn who was to stand as candidate for Lambeth Central. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for SDS reporting on legitimate political expression.
- 18.27. In a detailed report dated 4 February 1976 on the subject of the internal structure of the IMG the logical conclusion of IMG activities is described as “*the destruction of capitalism and the seizure of state power*”<sup>503</sup>.
- 18.28. A number of reports which the Inquiry has associated with HN353’s name highlight other IMG areas of interest for example abortion campaigning, anti EEC campaigning, health work<sup>504</sup> and Ireland<sup>505</sup>.

---

<sup>497</sup> UCPI0000007598

<sup>498</sup> UCPI0000008865

<sup>499</sup> UCPI0000009316

<sup>500</sup> UCPI0000008229 para 6. See also UCPI0000012390, UCPI0000010791; UCPI0000017651; UCPI0000017291; UCPI0000017292 for reporting on IMG entryism of the Labour Party

<sup>501</sup> UCPI0000008230

<sup>502</sup> UCPI0000008224

<sup>503</sup> UCPI0000009602 para 6

<sup>504</sup> See UCPI0000012383

<sup>505</sup> UCPI0000007160. HN353 denies any connection with this report on the basis of the date. It is a meeting of SE London IMG which references student members at Thames Polytechnic. See also UCPI0000007318



- 18.29. In a report dated 24 November 1975, at a time when HN353 accepts he had infiltrated the South East London IMG, the telephone number of an IMG member is reported<sup>506</sup>.
- 18.30. He was not specifically tasked to report on student IMG activities but in reporting on the IMG and being a student he would have reported on them collaterally because the IMG had a strong presence amongst students and teachers<sup>507</sup>. Whilst he was a student at Thames Polytechnic he became involved in student politics through the IMG and became vice-president of the Student Union<sup>508</sup>. As the Vice President of the Students Union he was a delegate at IMG national conferences on a few occasions<sup>509</sup>.
- 18.31. HN353 disputes attribution of the report which provides details of a London student aggregate meeting of the IMG held on 3 January 1974 on the basis of that he does not believe that he was deployed into the IMG at this time<sup>510</sup>. The report notes that the student IMG members present agreed that support should be encouraged for a forthcoming Troops Out Movement demonstration and that a coachload of students would be sent to support a demonstration in Leeds to protest the imprisonment of a student in Leeds. A report dated 28 January 1975 indicates that in fact the decision to send a coachload of IMG supporters was overruled by the IMG and only a small number of Thames Polytechnic students and three members of a local further education college attended the Leeds demonstration from London<sup>511</sup>. The conjunction of the IMG and Thames Polytechnic may indicate that HN353 is likely to have provided this information.
- 18.32. HN353 states that the reporting sent to him by the Inquiry relating to the IMG appears to omit a period from December 1977 to June 1978. He recalls that during this period he reported on a big anti-racist demonstration in Lewisham and another in Wood Green which have not been sent to him<sup>512</sup>. HN353 believes that the documents supplied to him by the Inquiry are generally missing his reporting on public order events<sup>513</sup>. There were big anti-racist demonstrations in both Wood

---

<sup>506</sup> UCPI0000009359

<sup>507</sup> Witness statement para 41

<sup>508</sup> Witness statement para 29

<sup>509</sup> Witness statement para 66

<sup>510</sup> UCPI0000012063

<sup>511</sup> UCPI0000012085

<sup>512</sup> Witness statement para 20

<sup>513</sup> Witness statement para 21

Green (23 April 1977) and Lewisham (13 August 1977) around this time to which he may be referring.

- 18.33. HN353 can recall going with IMG members to scout out the route to be taken by the National Front during the National Front demonstration in Wood Green which the IMG had discovered. They were “*scoping for good attack points and sources of ammunition (i.e. rubble)*”. This information was fed back to the SDS prior to the demonstration in order that it could inform the policing of the event. During his attendance at the counter-demonstration he can recall thinking that the police had left too great a gap between officers as they escorted the National Front demonstrators which enabled the IMG to violently confront the marchers resulting in violence<sup>514</sup>.
- 18.34. HN353 does not believe that he was responsible for any of the information contained in reports relating to the IMG which pre-date September 1975 and believes these are attributable to HN338<sup>515</sup>. He denies any reporting of bank details or subscription fee details<sup>516</sup> however, the bank details of a number of individuals connected with the South East London IMG are reported<sup>517</sup>.
- 18.35. The report dated 12 June 1975 provides information on a demonstration undertaken by the South East London branch of the National Abortion Campaign<sup>518</sup>. HN353 accepts that he provided this information. The demonstration was addressed by a John Fraser MP. A report dated 20 June 1975 regarding the South East London branch of IMG and their involvement in the National Abortion Campaign’s demonstrations is disowned by HN353 on the basis of the date<sup>519</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering the utility to policing of the reporting on social justice campaigns, in particular those supported by democratically elected politicians.
- 18.36. He recalls the name ‘Mary’ (a core participant) but states that he has no idea why this individual would have been of any interest to Special Branch. This name appears in a number of reports which he claims are

---

<sup>514</sup> Witness statement para 20

<sup>515</sup> Witness statement para 35. As noted above, HN338’s deployment is believed to have come to an end in December 1973 and in any event he infiltrated the IMG in the Notting Hill and West London area rather than IMG branches in South East London.

<sup>516</sup> Witness statement para 35

<sup>517</sup> UCPI0000009204; UCPI0000009522; UCPI0000017683

<sup>518</sup> UCPI0000007344

<sup>519</sup> UCPI0000012705. See also UCPI0000012738 for a report detailing individuals present at this rally. See also UCPI0000017726 for details of attendance at a National Abortion Campaign tribunal on 29 January 1977 although HN353 does not believe that this is his reporting although he may have been a contributor (Witness statement para 52)

too early to be attributable to him<sup>520</sup> although it should also be noted that her name appears in a report listing attendees at a National Abortion Campaign rally, a campaign he accepts he has reported on, which he does not comment on in his statement<sup>521</sup>. It also appears in a report dated 26 September 1975 which contains details of the IMG member who she had married<sup>522</sup>.

- 18.37. HN353 also recalls Richard Chessum, another core participant, and accepts that he may have provided the information in a report that names him. He states that he was not tasked to report on him but Richard Chessum was a member of the IMG and so he would have reported personal details about Chessum for others to assess. Such information may be updating information for an individual's personal file, if they had one; Special Branch would review personal files each year to ensure that the details were up to date<sup>523</sup>. The information relating to Richard Chessum contained in a report dated 21 October 1975 relates to his introduction of a talk on 'Predictions of the Founders of Marxism on the Development of World Revolution'<sup>524</sup>, a talk also attended by 'Mary'. He is also referenced in a report relating to a meeting of South East London IMG at which he was criticised for leadership of the South East London branch of TOM which was introspective and "*totally lacking in perspectives for building it into a mass movement*"<sup>525</sup>. A report dated 16 March 1977 reports Richard Chessum's address<sup>526</sup>.
- 18.38. HN353 reports the growing support from the South East London IMG for TOM. In a meeting on 18 December 1975 the group (although the report indicates that only three were present) decided in favour of greater involvement in the South East London TOM<sup>527</sup>. The growing tensions within TOM between the IMG contingent and the 'Lawless clique' reported on extensively by HN297 are touched on in HN353's reporting also.<sup>528</sup>

---

<sup>520</sup> Her name features in a small number of reports connected to South East London branch of IMG: UCPI0000007160 – by virtue of the date HN353 disowns this report. See also UCPI0000012737 a report concerning 'Mary's forthcoming holiday with a companion; UCPI0000012786 reference to 'Mary' as a former student at Goldsmiths College

<sup>521</sup> UCPI0000012738

<sup>522</sup> UCPI0000007640

<sup>523</sup> Witness statement para 55 and 56

<sup>524</sup> UCPI0000008223

<sup>525</sup> UCPI0000009479

<sup>526</sup> UCPI0000017796

<sup>527</sup> UCPI0000009401

<sup>528</sup> UCPI0000009852

- 18.39. HN353 occasionally reports on the presence of Piers Corbyn, another core participant, at IMG events<sup>529</sup>.
- 18.40. Tariq Ali, also a core participant and leading figure in the IMG, is peripherally reported on<sup>530</sup>.
- 18.41. HN353 states that he may have been responsible for reporting on the London IMG anti-racist ad-hoc sub-committee<sup>531</sup>.
- 18.42. He was not specifically tasked to report on race or sexual equality campaigns but would have reported on any topic which touched on the aim and perspectives on IMG<sup>532</sup>.
- 18.43. He may have attended and reported on the founding delegate conference of the All Lewisham Campaign Against Racism and Fascism in his capacity as vice president of the student union<sup>533</sup>. The group contained representatives from the IMG, the Anglican Church Council, the Labour Party, the Communist Party and black and Asian groups.
- 18.44. HN353 may have been responsible for some peripheral reporting on the Greenwich Trades' Council. At the meeting of 4 December 1975 the Greenwich Trades' Council voted to send a send an affiliate to the local Troops Out Movement<sup>534</sup>.
- 18.45. He received a commendation for his report on the 1976 IMG National Conference<sup>535</sup>. Contrary to HN353's recollection, this appears to have been a Deputy Assistant Commissioner's commendation rather than a Security Services commendation but the telephone message dated 3 November 1976 from Box 500 would indicate that this report was considered of value to the Security Services<sup>536</sup>. This lengthy detailed report largely focuses on the debates between different ideological groups within the IMG. At appendix D to the report the details are given of membership and finances and trade union affiliations; in May 1976 there were 647 members of the IMG of which the largest groups were white collar works (257) and students (171). Of the total membership 312 had trade union affiliations. The list of trade union

---

<sup>529</sup> Witness statement para 73; UCPI0000008229; UCPI0000012232; UCPI0000021355; UCPI0000017379; UCPI0000021343

<sup>530</sup> UCPI0000010676 in which a speech he gave to a joint IMG, International Communist League meeting was referred to; also referred to in outline of internal structure of IMG and addressing the 1977 National Conference at UCPI0000021343 and the 1978 National Conference UCPI0000011360

<sup>531</sup> Witness statement para 51; UCPI0000010685

<sup>532</sup> Witness statement para 58. See UCPI0000010733; UCPI0000010821; UCPI0000021515; UCPI0000017739 for examples of reporting on anti-racist campaigning

<sup>533</sup> Witness statement para 60; UCPI0000017686

<sup>534</sup> UCPI0000009380

<sup>535</sup> Witness statement para 68, 83; UCPI0000021343

<sup>536</sup> MPS-0730725

membership contains reference to UCATT and the NUM. He also reported on the 1978 National Conference<sup>537</sup>.

- 18.46. He participated in an IMG speaking tour in the North of England as a driver<sup>538</sup>. In a memorandum dated 2 November 1977 Chief Inspector Ken Pryde, then the head of the SDS, sought permission for HN353 to attend the speaking tour in the North of England between 7 – 11 November 1977<sup>539</sup>.
- 18.47. HN353 was deployed at the same time as HN297 but did not consider him a friend. He did not encounter him whilst he was undercover and “never heard much about his conduct whilst deployed”<sup>540</sup>
- 18.48. His deployment with IMG came to an end in June of 1978 at the end of the educational year<sup>541</sup>.

*HN351 – “Jeff Slater” - Tottenham branch of the Workers Revolutionary Party early 1974 to April 1975*

19. HN351 who used the cover name “Jeff Slater” or “Geoff Slater” has a restriction order prohibiting the publication of his real name<sup>542</sup>. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry. He will not be giving live evidence.
20. HN351 joined the SDS in early 1974 and was actively deployed from May 1974. It would appear from a small number of documents which record his cover name, that he joined the Tottenham branch of the International Socialists (‘IS’)<sup>543</sup>. His cover name was that of a deceased child. HN351 does not recognise any of the reporting which has been attributed to him on the basis of this association between his cover name and the Tottenham branch reports and, whilst he confirms that he was a member of IS, he has not specified the geographical area of meetings he attended and reported on. His period of active deployment was short; in the spring of 1975 he was withdrawn from the field at his own request having found himself unsuited to the role. The following points of interest arise from a consideration of his witness statement and the reports associated with his deployment.

---

<sup>537</sup> UCPI0000011360

<sup>538</sup> Witness statement para 63

<sup>539</sup> MPS-0730694

<sup>540</sup> Witness statement para 86

<sup>541</sup> Witness statement para 64

<sup>542</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

<sup>543</sup> UCPI0000012014; UCPI0000012021

- 20.1. HN351 can recall no formal training for his role in the SDS and states that an officer would be expected to draw on the experience and training they had already received in Special Branch<sup>544</sup>.
- 20.2. HN351 believes that his cover name was based on the identity of a deceased child and he believes that he must have visited the government birth certificate archives to obtain the name. He cannot recall being instructed to use the identity of a deceased child but believes that this was the prevailing convention at the time. He used only the name and date of birth of the deceased birth. He cannot now recall the date of birth he utilised<sup>545</sup>.
- 20.3. He had cover employment at a car dealership and a cover address which he occasionally visited but did not stay overnight<sup>546</sup>.
- 20.4. As part of his deployment HN351 became a formal member of IS. He cannot recall how he infiltrated IS but believes he attended a number of anti-fascist demonstrations and thereafter attended IS meetings<sup>547</sup>. He was not tasked to infiltrate any particular group but simply went along to demonstrations and waited to see which groups he came into contact with. He would then have discussed which of these to focus on with senior management<sup>548</sup>.
- 20.5. HN351 does not recognise any of the reporting that he has been shown and does not believe that he was the author of any of the reports, with the possible exception of two which appear to bear his real name. He supplied information to the SDS management by word of mouth or notes but never saw any report generated from this information<sup>549</sup>.
- 20.6. HN351 states that he was simply told to *"pick up any useful snippets of information and feed it back [he] was not given more guidance about what information the SDS was interested in...that said [SDS UCO's] had a general understanding of which areas Special Branch was interested in and would not stray beyond that"*<sup>550</sup>.
- 20.7. HN351 recalls meeting with other SDS UCO's in the presence of senior management figures at least once per week at the SDS offices. Whilst there they would discuss any problems encountered by SDS officers or

---

<sup>544</sup> Witness statement para 12-13

<sup>545</sup> Witness statement para 15

<sup>546</sup> Witness statement para 18-19

<sup>547</sup> Witness statement para 24-25

<sup>548</sup> Witness statement para 28

<sup>549</sup> Witness statement para 26

<sup>550</sup> Witness statement para 29, 31



anything amusing that had happened. There was no set agenda for these meetings<sup>551</sup>.

- 20.8. He states that his working pattern was unpredictable and involved working anti-social hours. He describes his time in the SDS as *“more intensive, more anxious and more debilitating than it had been in the rest of Special Branch”*.<sup>552</sup>
- 20.9. In the view of HN351, IS were of interest to Special Branch because they *“wanted to bring the state down and affect the very fabric of the way we do things. Some members were violent and they knew people who were even worse. IS objectives were achieving socialist revolution in this country and worldwide and they would use any means available to achieve this, including violence”*. He states that part of the reason he was deployed was to provide information to inform the adequate policing of protests<sup>553</sup>.
- 20.10. HN351 witnessed serious public disorder and violence whilst actively deployed but is unable to recall the specific occasions he witnessed but states that it would have been at demonstrations. He witnessed police officers receive beatings by activist and members of the public being beaten when they intervened. He saw damage to cars, street furniture and buildings by activists and violence between counter-protest groups. He states that was not involved in any public disorder himself<sup>554</sup>.
- 20.11. He was not aware of his contemporaries, who included HN297, engaging in any sexual activity or any criminal activity<sup>555</sup>.
- 20.12. The first report which can be connected with HN351 is dated 8 August 1974 and is signed off in HN351's real name<sup>556</sup>. It is a report of a meeting held by Socialist Worker at Conway Hall to protest Greece, Turkey and Britain's alleged imperialist policies in respect of Cyprus. 90 people were in attendance. During the course of the meeting a member of the audience called for mass mobilisation against the National Front's intended marches on 24 August 1974 in Leicester and 7 September 1974 in London. Following the meeting the report writer notes that there was a suggestion that some IS supporters were considering taking pepper, marbles and flour to the National Front marches. HN351 addresses this report in his witness statement. He states that he is confused as to the presence of his name on the report

<sup>551</sup> Witness statement paras 33-34

<sup>552</sup> Witness statement para 37

<sup>553</sup> Witness statement para 41

<sup>554</sup> Witness statement para 55

<sup>555</sup> Witness statement para 84

<sup>556</sup> UCPI0000007918



and can only speculate that it was written up by him at a time when he was typing up reports in the back office<sup>557</sup>. This may be an example of the reporting of forthcoming demonstrations in order to facilitate adequate policing. There are further examples of such reporting; a report dated 21 January 1975 relaying events at a branch meeting of Tottenham IS, provides details of a forthcoming march to take place to protest the imprisonment of the Shrewsbury Two<sup>558</sup>.

- 20.13. A number of reports appear in HN351's pack for which attribution is unclear. This includes a report regarding an individual who is employed by the Socialist Worker Circulation Department<sup>559</sup>; a report submitting four leaflets issued by the IS dealing encouraging members to dispense copies of Socialist Worker in lorry depots and transport cafes to capitalise on the recent Lorry Driver's dispute<sup>560</sup>; information gleaned after an Executive Committee meeting of the IS in which a number of additional branches were officially recognised by IS which are listed as white collar branches, geographical branches and factory branches<sup>561</sup>; a report detailing the discussion at the IS Executive Committee meeting as to whether to appoint a full time Woman's Organiser<sup>562</sup>. A further report of unknown origin details a social evening held by IS in Camden Town Hall to celebrate the success of the Socialist Worker fighting fund. 400 people were in attendance and were entertained by a revolutionary film about the overthrow of Salvador Allende, by folk singing and an account of the Shrewsbury flying picket phenomenon of 1973. A flyer requesting the release of the Shrewsbury Two is appended to the report<sup>563</sup>.
- 20.14. The first report in possession of the Inquiry relating to Tottenham IS is dated 18 November 1974 and details the events of a meeting at which a member of Croydon IS gave a talk with the title "Can Labour Deliver the Goods"<sup>564</sup>. The report gives a flavour of the revolutionary aspirations of IS. The talk focused on Labour's lack of socialist credentials and made reference to the imprisonment of the Shrewsbury Two and Labours "*betrayal of the working class*". The speaker told the meeting that he "*envied the young members of IS because he thought*

---

<sup>557</sup> Witness statement para 40

<sup>558</sup> UCPI0000012054

<sup>559</sup> UCPI000001533

<sup>560</sup> UCPI0000015064

<sup>561</sup> UCPI0000014958

<sup>562</sup> UCPI0000014964

<sup>563</sup> UCPI0000015015

<sup>564</sup> UCPI0000015059

*a revolutionary situation was now in the offing and in the words of Marx 'the world was theirs for the taking'".*

- 20.15. The relationship between IS and industrial political organising is highlighted in some of the reports; in a report dated 22 November 1974 members were exhorted to organise sales of Socialist Worker outside local factories and tube stations and at their respective places of work; encouraged to spend more time building contacts at work, at meetings and at street sales and to follow up those introductions immediately. There was also a call for more intervention by IS members in industrial disputes in local factories<sup>565</sup>. In his witness statement HN351 states that he was not tasked to report on trade unions but would have mentioned them if he was concerned that IS were seeking to use the trade union to further IS's aims which he viewed as subversive<sup>566</sup>.
- 20.16. HN351 may have been responsible for the information contained in the report dated 4 December 1974 regarding an aggregate meeting of the North London district IS held in the wake of the Birmingham bombings on 21 November 1974<sup>567</sup>. Speakers at the meeting indicated that whilst the IS had unconditional support of the IRA and that socialists were not opposed to violence provided it was controlled, the bombings carried out by the Provisional IRA had alienated the British working class and done incalculable harm to the progress of socialism. In his witness statement, whilst having no recollection of the contents of the report, HN351 states that he was instructed to report on any matter relating to the IRA and Irish Troubles more generally which were of relevance to Special Branch at the time<sup>568</sup>.
- 20.17. There are a number of reports which provide personal details of North London affiliated IS members, for example employment details<sup>569</sup>, trade union affiliation (NUJ)<sup>570</sup> and a more detailed commentary on individuals noting their personal appearance, personal associations and pregnancy<sup>571</sup>.
- 20.18. A report dated in January 1975 appears to indicate that "Geoff Slater" had been appointed 'SW [Socialist Worker] Organiser' for the Tottenham branch of IS<sup>572</sup>. In his witness statement HN351 states that

---

<sup>565</sup> UCPI0000015056

<sup>566</sup> Witness statement para 52

<sup>567</sup> UCPI0000014961

<sup>568</sup> Witness statement para 50

<sup>569</sup> UCPI0000015005; UCPI0000006919

<sup>570</sup> UCPI0000006949

<sup>571</sup> UCPI0000006971

<sup>572</sup> UCPI0000012014

he has no recollection of occupying this role or of taking any position of responsibility within IS<sup>573</sup>.

- 20.19. In a report dated 7 January 1975 HN351 appears to have reported the names of active members of Tottenham branch of IS active in the fields of fund raising, anti-racist work and industrial contact visiting<sup>574</sup>.
- 20.20. The baby sitting rota of the North London District of IS was shared in a report dated 8 January 1975. This list shows “Geoff Slater” as a sitter<sup>575</sup>. In another report (signed off by HN351 in his real name) it is reported that members of IS resident in Tottenham had held a birthday party attended by individuals who were either students or members of IS<sup>576</sup>. The names of attendees are listed. As with the report dated the previous August, HN351, expresses his confusion as to presence of his name on the report and suggests that he may have written up the report for another<sup>577</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for such reporting on the personal lives of activists and its utility.
- 20.21. HN351 left active deployment in the spring of 1975 at his request after finding the work “*debilitating and exhausting, both mentally and physically*” and assessing himself unsuited to the role<sup>578</sup>. Following his withdrawal from the field he worked for a period in the SDS back office undertaking general clerical duties<sup>579</sup>.

HN297 Richard Clark ‘Rick Gibson’ - South East London Branch of the Troops Out Movement – January 1975 – September 1976; TOM London Organiser – December 1975; Convenor of the Secretariat TOM - March - 1976; Big Flame – September 1975 – September 1976

21. HN297 is deceased. His real name is Richard Clark. During his undercover deployment he adopted the cover name ‘Rick Gibson’. The restriction order prohibiting publication of his real name was lifted, following the provision of a statement by ‘Mary’ in January 2018<sup>580</sup>. In her statement<sup>581</sup>, ‘Mary’ (a core

---

<sup>573</sup> Witness statement para 45

<sup>574</sup> UCPI0000012019

<sup>575</sup> UCPI0000012021

<sup>576</sup> UCPI0000006850

<sup>577</sup> Witness statement para 40 and 43

<sup>578</sup> Witness statement para 68

<sup>579</sup> Witness statement para 71

<sup>580</sup> Final Ruling 20 February 2018 – restriction order to be lifted if no evidence was forthcoming by 8 March 2018 to controvert the statement of ‘Mary’. Explanatory note 22 March 2018 confirms that no such evidence was forthcoming and the real name had been communicated to Mary

<sup>581</sup> UCPI0000034306 Statement to the UCPI from Mary dated 25 January 2018; UCPI0000034181 First Witness Statement of ‘Mary’ dated 26 March 2020

participant) describes that she had a sexual relationship with ‘Rick Gibson’ in 1975. She was unaware that he was a police officer and thought he was a fellow activist. ‘Mary’ is supported in her account by another core participant, Richard Chessum, who was befriended and spied upon by ‘Rick Gibson’. Richard Chessum states that to his recollection ‘Rick Gibson’ was involved in four sexual encounters during his deployment<sup>582</sup>. The evidence obtained to date indicates that Richard Clark was part of the SDS between July 1974 and November 1976, actively deployed between early 1975 and October 1976. Richard Chessum explains in his statement that ‘Rick Gibson’ wrote to the National Committee of the Troops Out Movement (TOM) following the Birmingham pub bombings in November 1974, indicating a desire to join a group in south east London. Richard Chessum suggests that the letter was the catalyst to forming a branch in that area<sup>583</sup>. From the documents obtained by the Inquiry and included in the hearing bundle, it is evident that ‘Rick Gibson’ quickly rose in the ranks of TOM, first becoming Secretary to the South East London branch, then London Organiser and finally Convenor of the Secretariat. At the latter stages of his deployment he became involved with Big Flame. In late September 1976 he was confronted by members of Big Flame with official copies of birth and death certificates in his cover name. As a result, he was withdrawn from the field by October 1976.

22. The following observations and questions regarding the deployment of HN297 arise from a consideration of the documents relating to HN297, contained in the hearing bundle and the witness statements of Richard Chessum and ‘Mary’:

- 22.1. HN297 joined Special Branch in October 1970 in the rank of Constable<sup>584</sup>. In January 1974 he was described, in his yearly appraisal, as showing “*remarkable abilities during a period of difficult surveillance work*”, with “*enthusiastic and intelligent use of available intelligence to full advantage*”. A Detective Chief Superintendent signed off the review on 15 February 1974, confirming that HN297 had transferred to another squad where his talents would be displayed to advantage<sup>585</sup>.

---

<sup>582</sup> UCPI0000034182 Witness statement of Richard Chessum dated 4 April 2020 at page 48

<sup>583</sup> UCPI0000034182 pages 19-23

<sup>584</sup> MPS-0742190

<sup>585</sup> MPS-0741094

- 22.2. In a memorandum authored by Chief Superintendent Bicknell, he was recorded as a member of the SDS from July 1974 and in the field from early 1975<sup>586</sup>.
- 22.3. HN297 passed the qualifying exam for promotion to Detective Sergeant prior to joining the SDS, on 8 January 1972. He was promoted to the rank on 17 November 1975<sup>587</sup>.
- 22.3.1. There are two reports in the hearing bundle prior to his deployment date in 1975. The first, dated 25 November 1974 concerns a sit-in by a left wing faction of students at Goldsmiths College (Lewisham), protesting against current student grants<sup>588</sup>. The second, dated 26 November 1974 reports on the establishment of a 'Race Relations Working Party' concerned with aspects of police work in connection with immigrants, by Lewisham Council for Community Relations, including the Assistant Community Relations Officer to Asquith Gibbes for the London Borough of Lewisham<sup>589</sup>. It is unclear whether these reports were as a result of intelligence provided by HN297. Was the first report part of a scoping duty for making contact in the south east London area?
- 22.4. A report, dated 10 December 1974, enclosed a copy of a press statement issued by the London Co-ordinating Committee of TOM, concerning recent bombings in Birmingham on 21 November 1974<sup>590</sup>.
- 22.5. In his witness statement, Richard Chessum recalls that a letter was received at the TOM National Office from 'Rick Gibson' almost immediately following the bombing<sup>591</sup>. He understood the content of that letter to suggest that 'Rick Gibson' wanted to join a group in south east London, as he had enrolled on an evening course at Goldsmiths College in Lewisham. Richard Chessum was contacted by the National Office, he believes as a result of his earlier activities with the Anti-Internment League, and asked to meet with Gibson<sup>592</sup>. At that time Richard Chessum was a student at the college and involved with the Socialist Society<sup>593</sup>. Richard Chessum states that 'Rick Gibson' was

---

<sup>586</sup> MPS-0732910 dated 24 September 1976; MPS-0741092 HN297's personal record records that he was an SDS field officer from July 1974

<sup>587</sup> MPS-0742190

<sup>588</sup> UCPI0000015053

<sup>589</sup> UCPI0000015060

<sup>590</sup> UCPI0000014979

<sup>591</sup> UCPI0000034182 - Witness statement of Richard Chessum dated 4 April 2020 at page 20/76

<sup>592</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 19

<sup>593</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 20

the catalyst to the establishment of the South East London Branch of TOM<sup>594</sup>.

- 22.6. A meeting took place on 30 January 1975<sup>595</sup> of the Socialist Society of Goldsmiths College, on the subject 'Why a Troops Out Movement'. The meeting was attended by representatives from IMG, Workers Fight, Big Flame, Goldsmith IS and Lewisham IS. The report records the 'most important item to be discussed was proposed by Richard Chesham, who suggested that a South East London branch of TOM be formed'. An informal meeting was arranged for the following week. It is of note that in this report Richard Chessum's surname is spelt 'Chesham' and he is recorded as 'no trace'<sup>596</sup>.
- 22.7. Richard Chessum recalls that he first met 'Rick Gibson' at the Student Union bar. He thinks this was in December 1974 or January 1975 and certainly before the meeting on 6 February 1975<sup>597</sup>.
- 22.8. A report dated 17 February 1975 and bearing the name 'R Clark' recorded the informal meeting that took place on 6 February 1975. The meeting commenced with Richard Chessum and one other being present, later joined by three members of Lewisham IMG. One attendee was 'Mary'. An inaugural meeting was planned on 12 March 1975 at Deptford town hall. It is of note that Richard Chessum's surname was correctly spelt in this report and a link had been made to his former association with IMG. The report was disseminated to Special Branch B and C squads, room 890 and the Security Service<sup>598</sup>.
- 22.9. A further meeting took place on 17 February 1975<sup>599</sup> and leaflets were created advertising the forthcoming inaugural meeting, signed by 'Bill Knight' which is said to be Richard Chessum<sup>600</sup>.

---

<sup>594</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 23

<sup>595</sup> It is likely that the date in the report of 1974 was an error and the meeting was 30 January 1975. It was the first meeting at which a SE London branch of TOM was raised. Confirmed in report UCPI0000012135 which refers to 30 January 1975 meeting

<sup>596</sup> UCPI0000012122 dated 11 February 1975

<sup>597</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 20

<sup>598</sup> MPS-0728678

<sup>599</sup> MPS-0728698

<sup>600</sup> MPS-0728699 Report dated 5 March 1975 authored by Richard Clark, attaching leaflet. Minute sheet records that the public meeting on 12 March 1975 is not for SB coverage



- 22.10. Following the meeting on 6 February 1975, it appears that detailed research took place on Richard Chessum, his partner<sup>601</sup>, 'Mary' and 'Mary's' flat-mate<sup>602</sup>.
- 22.10.1. The report on Richard Chessum<sup>603</sup>, bearing the name of 'R Clark', gave a detailed history, recording the first and last date on which he had come to Special Branch's attention<sup>604</sup>. It detailed his address, employment, previous ill health and description<sup>605</sup>.
- 22.10.2. The report on 'Mary'<sup>606</sup> similarly goes into detail concerning her place of birth, education, address, description. She is recorded as actively involved with the IMG, attending education classes. It is of note that she has no Special Branch record. For question is why she was the subject of such a detailed report? Had an intention been formed at this stage to befriend both her and Richard Chessum?
- 22.11. In her statements, Mary describes the following:
- 22.11.1. 'Mary' was completing a teacher training course at Goldsmiths College between 1972 and 1975. She was politically active in the student movement and a member of the Socialist Society. 'Mary' recalls in her statement that she first met 'Rick Gibson' in either December 1974 or January 1975, when he approached her whilst she was distributing political literature. He showed an interest in the political campaign, albeit he seemed to have no history of political involvement<sup>607</sup>.
- 22.11.2. There is a report in the hearing bundle unconnected to HN297's other reporting that may have a connection to

---

<sup>601</sup> MPS-0728938 dated 17 February 1975 concerning a female co-habiting with Richard Chessum who was a member of Lewisham IMG and employed as a nurse. Further report MPS-0728206 dated 25 March 1975 confirming that the individual had given up her job as was unemployed. (Duplicated at MPS-0728937)

<sup>602</sup> UCPI0000012135 report states she chaired the first meeting and is an inactive member of Lewisham IS.

<sup>603</sup> MPS-0728205

<sup>604</sup> The first date being 1969 and last 1973. Detail on fly-posting and intervention in a police incident, dealt with by Richard Chessum at pages 60-61 of his witness statement

<sup>605</sup> Reports providing personal information on Richard Chessum continued to July 1976: MPS-0731414 dated 26 August 1975 will not be attending Warwick University mainly due to lack of a grant but also an issue with his grading. Seeking employment as full-time officer within TOM. Supporter of Gery Lawless; MPS-0731417 2 December 1975 employed as clerk London Electricity Board; UCPI0000010708 dated 23 July 1976 Richard Chessum had married

<sup>606</sup> UCPI0000012136

<sup>607</sup> UCPI0000034306 (25 January 2018 statement) paras. 1-3



'Mary', as a group she mentions in her statement<sup>608</sup> It is dated 3 May 1975 and concerns a forthcoming public meeting of South East London Branch National Abortion Campaign<sup>609</sup>.

- 22.11.3. 'Mary' recalls him as "*easy to befriend, he was a harmless sort of person and he was not predatory*". She goes on to state "*he was very mild, very bland and also very boring*"<sup>610</sup>.
- 22.11.4. 'Mary' hosted some IMG meetings at her flat, although she was not a member. She had a flat mate who was active in TOM and recalls that 'Rick Gibson' also befriended her. In fact her flatmate related to her that she, too, became sexually intimate with him<sup>611</sup>. He quickly became a frequent visitor to the flat to co-ordinate TOM publicity and planning<sup>612</sup>. He was friendly and she assumed he was in contact with her for political reasons<sup>613</sup>;
- 22.11.5. During that time 'Mary' and 'Rick Gibson' became sexually intimate. 'Mary' did not initiate or make the first move but assumed their sexual encounters were a manifestation of a mutual attraction. Their relationship proved to be half hearted and fizzled out. She describes that she was not concerned as she was not interested and had a long term partner<sup>614</sup>. In her statement, 'Mary' goes on to describe that 'Rick Gibson' soon became more involved in TOM and moved up in the organisation away from student scene. They lost contact and never heard from him again<sup>615</sup>.
- 22.11.6. 'Mary' states that if she knew he was a police officer there is "*absolutely no way she would have had any sexual contact with him at all*". Her opinion is that he used sex as a way of consolidating his history and to cement his reputation. Using it to get closer to us as a group of activists<sup>616</sup>. She

---

<sup>608</sup> Witness statement 26 March 2020 page 5

<sup>609</sup> UCPI0000007248

<sup>610</sup> UCPI0000034181 (26 March 2020 statement) page 12

<sup>611</sup> UCPI0000034306 (25 January 2018 statement) para.9

<sup>612</sup> UCPI0000034306 (25 January 2018 statement) para.6 It should be noted that the attribution of this report is unclear and it may be a product of HN353's reporting on activist groups in south east London.

<sup>613</sup> UCPI0000034181 (26 March 2020 statement) page 12

<sup>614</sup> UCPI0000034181 (26 March 2020 statement) page 13

<sup>615</sup> UCPI0000034306 (25 January 2018 statement) para. 7

<sup>616</sup> UCPI0000034181 (26 March 2020 statement) page 13

concludes that his sexual advances and use of sex was a way of ingratiating his way into the group as a whole<sup>617</sup>.

- 22.11.7. Mary is recorded in the list of attendees in a number of other reports<sup>618</sup>. For example, a report dated 19 March 1975 concerning a performance by the May Day Theatre Group at Goldsmiths College<sup>619</sup>. Why was an undercover officer reporting on such an event?
- 22.12. Richard Chessum asserts that 'Rick Gibson' had sexual relationships with at least four females, one of them being 'Mary'. He states that one female was an activist from Goldsmiths College, another a female member of Big Flame<sup>620</sup> and a fourth female was a woman in an open relationship. There is no reference to any sexual encounter in the reports and management memoranda included in the hearing bundle.
- 22.13. The inaugural meeting of the South East London branch of TOM took place on 12 March 1975, reported on 25 March 1975. The meeting was chaired by Richard Chessum and attended by fourteen people, one of whom was 'Mary'. Gery Lawless was the speaker<sup>621</sup>.
- 22.14. HN297 took a central role in the group from the outset. At the first meeting of the newly formed branch of TOM, held on 18 March 1975 and chaired by Richard Chessum, 'Rick Gibson' was elected as secretary. In that role, 'Rick Gibson' was to attend the Liaison Committee Conference as a delegate with Richard Chessum<sup>622</sup>.
- 22.15. There follows a series of 38 reports concerning the regular meetings of the South East London branch of TOM. These date between 10 April 1975 and 5 August 1976<sup>623</sup>. The meetings are attended by between four and fifteen individuals. A number take place at Richard Chessum's home address<sup>624</sup>. Both Richard Chessum and 'Rick Gibson', amongst

<sup>617</sup> UCPI0000034181 (26 March 2020 statement) page 23

<sup>618</sup> Reporting on 'Mary' continued to January 1976. UCPI0000012737 dated 27 June 1975 'Mary' is recorded as going on holiday to South Africa, along with her flat mate. UCPI0000009562 January 1976 'Mary' had taken work as a carpenter's mate in Norfolk, whilst retaining her flat for weekend visits. 'Mary' states she moved to Cardiff, not Norfolk, witness statement 26 March 2020 page 11

<sup>619</sup> UCPI0000006936

<sup>620</sup> UCPI0000034182 Witness statement Richard Chessum Page 48/76

<sup>621</sup> MPS-0728701

<sup>622</sup> MPS-0728710 dated 7 April 1975, authored by R Clark

<sup>623</sup> MPS-0728718; MPS-0728720; MPS-0728721; MPS-0728728; MPS-0728730; MPS-0728731; MPS-0728735; MPS-0728686; MPS-0728679; MPS-0728667; MPS-0728669; MPS-0728697; MPS-0728704; MPS-0728725; MPS-0728748 (Mary attended) ]; MPS0728752: MPS-0728753; UCPI000007665; MPS-0728761; MPS-0728729; MPS-0728732; MPS-0728740; MPS-0728743; MPS-0728766; MPS-0728771; MPS-0728773; UCPI0000009529; MPS-0728776; UCPI0000009629; MPS-0728781; MPS-0728783; UCPI0000012299; UCPI0000012332; UCPI0000009733; UCPI0000009754; UCPI0000009766; UCPI0000010704; UCPI0000010761

<sup>624</sup> Examples include MPS-0728721

others, act as Chair. 'Mary' is recorded as present at one meeting<sup>625</sup>. The reports, as set out below, demonstrate that 'Rick Gibson' regularly volunteered himself for a variety of roles and was active within the branch, leafletting, fly-posting, lobbying MPs, attending central committee meetings, trade council meetings and Labour Party meetings or acting as a steward. It is clear that, as a consequence of his actions, he quickly rose in the ranks.

- 22.16. Richard Chessum describes how they set out to seek support and build an active branch<sup>626</sup>. During that time their relationship grew close; he thought they shared views about problems of sectarianism within TOM and had an interest in combating that. HN297 was a frequent visitor to his home<sup>627</sup>. In hindsight, Richard Chessum states that 'Rick Gibson' strategically befriended him. He describes him as a very committed and reliable member of the branch and willing to take on the role of Secretary<sup>628</sup>. His contributions, albeit with a poor grasp of political issues, were short and non-controversial. Richard Chessum believes that a wide dispensation was given to Gibson, as he was not connected to any political group, had access to a car and was willing to be active<sup>629</sup>. He initially aligned himself with activists who were independent left and non-sectarian and later with Gery Lawless who was a leading national organiser<sup>630</sup>.
- 22.17. In contrast to Richard Chessum's assertion that HN297 was non-controversial, there are a number of reports that record him as challenging members and taking them to task<sup>631</sup>. It is for question why his role was portrayed in this way in intelligence reports?
- 22.18. At a meeting reported on 10 April 1975 it was agreed that 'Rick Gibson' and Richard Chessum would attend the London Co-ordinating Committee of TOM on 5 April 1975<sup>632</sup>. From then on 'Rick Gibson' was regularly elected to attend such committee meetings, often with Richard Chessum, and report back to branch<sup>633</sup>. Richard Chessum comments, in his witness statement, that the committee provided a strategy and

---

<sup>625</sup> MPS-0728748

<sup>626</sup> MPS-0728710 Richard Chessum witness statement page 20/76

<sup>627</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 23/76

<sup>628</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 24/76

<sup>629</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 28/76

<sup>630</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 21/76

<sup>631</sup> Examples MPS-0728730 -'Rick Gibson' interjecting during the meeting to severely criticise the RCG; MPS-0728774

<sup>632</sup> MPS-0728718

<sup>633</sup> MPS-0728667 13 January 1976 (MPS-0728773); MPS-0728665 at private address; MPS-0728759; MPS-0728755; UCPI0000009733

- leadership for London TOM. As a result, 'Rick Gibson' would be able to understand all aspects of activities of London wide TOM and have a say over campaign and strategic plans<sup>634</sup>.
- 22.19. The reports include discussion on the Labour Movement conference<sup>635</sup>, TOM rally<sup>636</sup>; TOM support for vigils outside Northern Ireland Office and Home Office and picket outside Old Bailey<sup>637</sup>.
- 22.20. At the same time as being delegate to London wide meetings, 'Rick Gibson' became involved in attending Trade Council meetings. It is reported on 10 April 1975 that he and Richard Chessum attended a meeting of Greenwich Trades Council to raise the question of sponsorship of the TOM Labour Movement Conference to be held on 24 May 1975<sup>638</sup>. In April 'Rick Gibson' and Richard Chessum volunteered to attend the Lewisham Trades Council meeting<sup>639</sup>. Later, in September 1975 they both took part, along with Gery Lawless, in a TOM picket of delegates attending the Greater London Association of Trades Council meeting<sup>640</sup>.
- 22.21. It was reported on 14 April 1975 that 'Rick Gibson' and Richard Chessum would attend the All London TOM meeting<sup>641</sup>.
- 22.22. A report, dated 14 April 1975 records a decision that Richard Chessum, 'Rick Gibson' and a third individual would fly-post local areas. 'Rick Gibson' also agreed to act as a steward at a meeting at University London Union<sup>642</sup>.
- 22.23. In a report, dated 21 April 1975 'Rick Gibson' was recorded as updating the group on replies received from five local MPs and ongoing correspondence with Guy Barnett MP regarding his possible support for TOM<sup>643</sup>. Richard Chessum remarks in his witness statement that 'Rick Gibson' was given the task of writing to Guy Barnett MP. He believes that Gibson never signed his letters and so there was no response from the MP<sup>644</sup>.
- 22.24. By late April 1975 it is reported that at a regular branch meeting, 'Rick Gibson' had been elected to attend the National Co-ordinating

---

<sup>634</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 36/76

<sup>635</sup> MPS-0728665

<sup>636</sup> MPS-0728759

<sup>637</sup> MPS-0728755

<sup>638</sup> MPS-0728715

<sup>639</sup> MPS-0728728 Report attaches copy of TOM constitution and delegate conference

<sup>640</sup> MPS-0728751

<sup>641</sup> MPS-0728721

<sup>642</sup> MPS-0728720. Richard Chessum did not take part as unwell: witness statement page 41/76

<sup>643</sup> MPS-0728728

<sup>644</sup> Richard Chessum witness statement page 31/76

Committee meeting. During the branch meeting he also volunteered to leaflet delegates at the Labour Party Conference, set up meeting with the student union and prepare a leaflet detailing the aims of TOM<sup>645</sup>. He was subsequently elected at a branch meeting to act as delegate to the forthcoming National Co-ordinating Committee meeting to be held on 28 June 1975<sup>646</sup>.

- 22.25. In advance of the first public meeting of the South East London branch of TOM and the TOM Labour Movement Conference, 'Rick Gibson' involved himself in the publicity campaign. A report, dated 28 May 1975 details the efforts of Richard Chessum and 'Rick Gibson' to contact members of local Trade Union Movement and obtain signatures from a wide variety of people including Greenwich Labour Party, NALGO, Lewisham AUEW<sup>647</sup>. Those efforts appeared to pay off as the first public meeting of the branch, held on 21 May 1975 was reported as an 'unqualified success'. 'Rick Gibson' chaired the meeting, which was attended by approximately 45 people<sup>648</sup>.
- 22.26. In a report dated 4 June 1975 it was concluded that the south east London District Committee of the International Socialists had decided to affiliate to the south east London branch of TOM, thereby regarding it as a viable proposition<sup>649</sup>.
- 22.27. Members of South East London Branch TOM, including 'Rick Gibson' and Richard Chessum, were recorded in a report dated 23 June 1975 as attending a Labour Party meeting where the views of the candidate were sought on Ireland and withdrawal of troops<sup>650</sup>.
- 22.28. Following his election to attend the National Co-ordinating Committee meeting, a report dated 4 July 1975 records 'Rick Gibson's' attendance at a meeting held by those in support of Gery Lawless to discuss tactics. Following an analysis of the voting of London delegates, it was agreed that two delegates from London branches rather than one would favour the Lawless group. The report concluded that an uneasy alliance had been agreed between Lawless and the 'independents', including Big Flame, within TOM in an effort to end the sectarian outbursts<sup>651</sup>.

---

<sup>645</sup> MPS-0728730

<sup>646</sup> MPS-0728669

<sup>647</sup> MPS-0728739

<sup>648</sup> MPS-0728681

<sup>649</sup> UCPI000007275

<sup>650</sup> MPS-0728668

<sup>651</sup> MPS-0728675

- 22.29. At a public meeting of South East London Branch of TOM, reported on 7 July 1975, 'Rick Gibson' acting as chair fed back on the TOM Labour Movement Delegate conference held on 24 May 1975. He said assistance of the local Labour Movement was necessary during the forthcoming 'Week of Action' if the local branch were to implement a lobby of every Labour Member of Parliament in the area<sup>652</sup>.
- 22.30. A further meeting, reported on 11 July 1975, took place to discuss the implementation of the 'Week of Action'. 'Rick Gibson' agreed to contact members of Greenwich Constituency Labour Party in an attempt to lobby Guy Barnett MP. The report was widely disseminated including to A8, B Squad and the Security Service<sup>653</sup>.
- 22.31. 'Rick Gibson' and Richard Chessum, along with other branch members, took part in a number of activities planned as part of the 'Week of Action' including: a picket outside of Lewisham Town Hall lobbying councillors sympathetic to TOM position<sup>654</sup>; picket outside of Roland Moyle MP's surgery<sup>655</sup>; open air rally opposite the home of Roland Moyle MP<sup>656</sup>; leafleted Deptford and Woolwich Markets<sup>657</sup>.
- 22.32. By September 1975, HN297 had been invited to take part in a week-long visit to Northern Ireland to meet comrades active in the liberation struggle. His involvement was discussed by his superiors, including Chief Inspector Kneale, Chief Superintendent HN332, Commanders Watts and Rodger. It is of note that the prominent role played by HN297 in TOM was known and endorsed within the SDS. He was described in a memorandum authored by Kneale as "*a leading member of the South East London Branch of TOM*", adding that the fact members of the group had urged him to go was "*indicative of his standing*". It was recorded that HN297 was a responsible, mature officer and that such a visit would enhance his cover within the Irish field<sup>658</sup>. The proposition, supported by HN332, was viewed as a "*useful stepping stone*" into Irish fields with visits to Bogside, Creggan and Markets potentially useful to other organisations. From a welfare perspective, HN332 commented that "*as important as other considerations*" was that HN297 had discussed it with his wife and wanted to go. Ultimately the request was refused. It was felt the

---

<sup>652</sup> MPS-0728676

<sup>653</sup> MPS-0728697

<sup>654</sup> MPS-0728716

<sup>655</sup> MPS-0728722

<sup>656</sup> MPS-0728723

<sup>657</sup> MPS-0728719

<sup>658</sup> MPS-0732954



situation in Northern Ireland was so serious that to allow an officer to visit and mix with Provisional IRA elements would involve unacceptable personal risk, not justified for groups such as TOM<sup>659</sup>.

- 22.33. It appears that the visit, by others, went ahead; a report of a meeting chaired by Rick Gibson on 23 September 1975 referred to an individual reporting on a recent visit to Belfast, where the individual met several prominent members of Provisional IRA and members of Irish Republican Socialist Party<sup>660</sup>.
- 22.34. By mid-October 1975 'Rick Gibson' resigned from his role as Branch Secretary, following a "*scathing attack on the sectarianism that existed in the branch*"<sup>661</sup>. Richard Chessum, in his witness statement, recalls that he was present and it was not a scathing attack but a few words likely to be a tactical argument to ingratiate himself with the leaders of TOM. Richard Chessum suggests that 'Rick Gibson' resigned to free up time for the role of London co-ordinator<sup>662</sup>. Richard Chessum replaced Gibson as secretary<sup>663</sup>.
- 22.35. At a meeting of the Organising Committee of TOM, reported on 28 October 1975, it was agreed that Rick Gibson should stand for the post of London Organiser<sup>664</sup>. At the subsequent 'All London meeting' of TOM, held on 7 November 1975 and reported on 17 November 1975, it is recorded that, on the suggestion of Gery Lawless, Rick Gibson was selected to stand for post of London Organiser. The intention was to set up the Secretariat to replace the TOM organising committee. It was to consist of seven members including a Convenor (Gery Lawless), speaker's organiser and press officer<sup>665</sup>. It was reported on 19 November 1975 that the South East London branch agreed to support his nomination<sup>666</sup>.
- 22.36. Richard Chessum suggests that as London organiser 'Rick Gibson' would have access to membership lists, ability to resolve problems within or between branches, the ear of the national leadership and potentially access to national lists of members. He would have been a go to person and seen as a person to trust<sup>667</sup>.

---

<sup>659</sup> MPS-0732953

<sup>660</sup> UCPI0000007665

<sup>661</sup> MPS-0728732

<sup>662</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 32/76

<sup>663</sup> MPS-0728740

<sup>664</sup> MPS-0728736

<sup>665</sup> MPS-0728762

<sup>666</sup> MPS-0728743

<sup>667</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 38/76



- 22.37. By December 1975 it was reported there was decreasing membership and apathy amongst the few people who regularly attended South East London branch meetings. Richard Chessum would contact all those who previously attended or shown interest. If a meeting was successful, then the branch would hold a series of local events. As part of this, fortnightly educational meetings would be reintroduced, 'Rick Gibson' to lead the first<sup>668</sup>. He subsequently gave a lecture on 'The Rights of Nations to Self-Determination'<sup>669</sup>. Later, in a report dated 11 June 1976, it is recorded that the educational lectures had continued and Richard Chessum gave a talk on the Communist Party of Great Britain's position on Ireland<sup>670</sup>. It is of note that HN297 persisted in his efforts to keep the branch running, despite his involvement at a London wide level. Why was this?
- 22.38. A report, dated 30 December 1975<sup>671</sup> of a meeting of the London Co-ordinating committee of TOM records that 'Rick Gibson', along with Gery Lawless, joined a rally sub-committee for the Bloody Sunday demonstration<sup>672</sup>. 'Rick Gibson' then attended a meeting of the Bloody Sunday Commemoration Committee, involved in planning the forthcoming march<sup>673</sup>. Richard Chessum comments that by being elected as delegate to this committee, 'Rick Gibson' had access to delegate information, details of commemoration march, speakers and plans for the day<sup>674</sup>.
- 22.39. The TOM movement was planning its own rally, to take place at the Hammersmith Palais after the Bloody Sunday demonstration. A meeting was held on 9 January 1976 by the London Co-ordinating Committee to discuss the rally. Gery Lawless chaired proceedings and Rick Gibson attended as part of the rally committee. During the meeting Rick Gibson insisted on the removal of an individual from the secretariat for persistently being absent from meetings<sup>675</sup>. At a later Secretariat meeting, held on 16 January 1976 discussion centred on the cancellation of the booking by Hammersmith Palais. The general

---

<sup>668</sup> MPS-0728766

<sup>669</sup> MPS-0728781

<sup>670</sup> UCPI0000009766

<sup>671</sup> There is an earlier report dated 13 November 1975 concerning bitter division in TOM organising committee following proposal by Ad-Hoc Committee for Bloody Sunday demonstration that a pre-rally mobilisation be arranged. Lawless walked out when proposal by passed. Decision that any interim event should be arranged by TOM organising committee: UCPI0000009306

<sup>672</sup> MPS-0728772

<sup>673</sup> UCPI0000009517

<sup>674</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 34/76

<sup>675</sup> MPS-0728774

feeling was that the police were responsible. 'Rick Gibson' was now London organiser, secretariat<sup>676</sup>. Richard Chessum suggests that it may be of no coincidence the TOM had many venues cancelled and many rallies and large meetings stopped as a result of visits from Special Branch<sup>677</sup>. He questions whether HN297's role went further than spying on people but also to derail campaigns<sup>678</sup>.

- 22.40. At the next meeting of the London Co-ordinating Committee, reported on 11 February 1976 'Rick Gibson' was elected as a member of the TOM Press committee. The first function of the committee was to prepare comprehensive statement on the general harassment of TOM by the state. Gery Lawless provided a report on the Bloody Sunday and rally, expressing concern that the National Party's attack may have damaged the image of TOM<sup>679</sup>.
- 22.41. Rick Gibson's role at the heart of TOM developed further when he was chosen to fill the role of Convenor of the Secretariat, in March 1976, whilst Gery Lawless temporarily stood down. At the same meeting, reported 25 March 1976, there was discussion regarding the possibility of securing Peter Hain as speaker at a forthcoming rally<sup>680</sup>. In his witness statement, Richard Chessum equates this role to being national organiser, with access to names, addresses and personal information of all members TOM. He questions such deep infiltration of an open, independent and democratic organisation<sup>681</sup>.
- 22.42. Once in the role of Convenor, HN297 was instrumental in the TOM Labour Movement Delegation to Ireland being postponed to September 1976<sup>682</sup>. HN297 also became involved in a fringe meeting set up by TOM at Labour Party Young Socialists conference in Blackpool, for which he wrote a report<sup>683</sup>. The influence of this role is seen in a report dated 23 August 1976, at a meeting of the Labour Delegation to Ireland Sub-Committee the issue of an unsigned letter to Trade Unionists in Ireland accusing the delegation of being the inspiration of the Provisional IRA was raised. At the suggestion of 'Rick Gibson' nothing

---

<sup>676</sup> MPS-0728777

<sup>677</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 30/76

<sup>678</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 75/76

<sup>679</sup> MPS-0728779

<sup>680</sup> MPS-0728785

<sup>681</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 39/76

<sup>682</sup> UCPI0000012332; UCPI0000012328 dated 6 April 1976 delegation postponed on basis of Convenors report (attached)

<sup>683</sup> UCPI0000009684 dated 12 May 1976; Richard Chessum was surprised at sophistication of the report, suggesting HN297 had help to write it witness statement page 40/76

was to be said to TOM delegates at the Central Co-ordinating Committee until the position had been clarified<sup>684</sup>.

- 22.43. It is evident from two meetings of the Central Co-ordinating Committee of TOM, reported on 16 June 1976 and 6 September 1976 that internal disputes continued. At the meeting reported on 16 June 1976, the Communist Federation of Britain (M-L) withdrew its members on the basis that TOM had an increasingly reformist atmosphere and had not been built into a mass movement. There was also an internal debate over the TOM Labour Movement Delegation to Ireland<sup>685</sup>. During the meeting reported on 6 September 1976, Rick Gibson (chair) read out a letter from East London branch criticising Gery Lawless, following which "*anarchy reigned for over an hour*" amongst attendees. Both meetings were attended by Gery Lawless and Richard Chessum<sup>686</sup>.
- 22.44. The final report on the weekly branch meetings is dated 5 August 1976. There were only four people present, 'Rick Gibson' acted as chair. It was recorded that Richard Chessum had secured a place at Warwick University, as a result of his impending departure the branch would need a new secretary and treasurer<sup>687</sup>.
- 22.45. There are other reports in the hearing bundle concerning activities of TOM, such as social and fund raising events<sup>688</sup>.
- 22.46. Richard Chessum states, in his witness statement, that in general conversation he mentioned to 'Rick Gibson' he attended Big Flame discussion groups<sup>689</sup>. Gibson asked if he could go along, which he did once permission had been granted from members. Richard Chessum's recollection is that after attending a couple such discussion groups Gibson asked to join the organisation, by summer 1976<sup>690</sup>.

---

<sup>684</sup> UCPI0000010824

<sup>685</sup> UCPI0000009790

<sup>686</sup> UCPI0000010875

<sup>687</sup> UCPI0000010761; MPS-0731422 report dated 3 September: 1976 Richard Chessum and another would be leaving London on 10 September 1976 to begin study for a MA at Warwick University

<sup>688</sup> MPS-0728734 dated 3 May 1975: film showing of 'Ireland Behind the Wire' at Goldsmiths Student Union. Leaflet attached to report, likely prepared by Rick Gibson who volunteered to do it at weekly meeting; MPS-0728741 dated 6 November 1975: forthcoming TOM public meeting to be held at time of Communist Party of Great Britain congress; UCPI0000012314 dated 5 April 1976 social on behalf of TOM at Thames Polytechnic including Richard Chessum and Rick Gibson; UCPI0000009824 dated 23 June 1976 TOM evening of culture at Conway Hall to raise funds for TOM Labour Movement delegation to Ireland. Richard Chessum present

<sup>689</sup> An example of such a meeting: UCPI0000009748 dated 9 June 1976 meeting of South London Group Big Flame, 121 Railton Road, series of educational meetings for sympathisers and close contacts.

<sup>690</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 44/76

- 22.47. The reports indicate that HN297 was attending Big Flame meetings and groups by September 1975<sup>691</sup>.
- 22.48. The first series of reports relate to the London Group of Big Flame Ireland Commission. A report dated 23 September 1975, concerned a meeting held on 20 August 1975 at a private address and chaired by 'Rick', a member of south east London TOM. Richard Chessum attended<sup>692</sup>. A second meeting of the Commission is reported on 24 September 1975, again held at a private address and attended by six people. There was an informal discussion introduced by Richard Chessum regarding the virtual takeover of South East London TOM by Workers Fight and RCG. Consideration was given to forming a breakaway branch in Woolwich. Rick Gibson gave a talk on the current situation in Northern Ireland<sup>693</sup>. There follows a report, dated 17 June 1976 on the National Ireland Commission of Big Flame conference. 'Rick Gibson' gave a pessimistic report of the general demoralisation within branches of TOM. He felt that if the Ireland delegation failed it would lead to the breakup of the movement<sup>694</sup>.
- 22.49. There is a detailed report, dated 18 February 1976 concerning a national day school held by Big Flame in Liverpool on 7 February 1976, with the aim of addressing confusion in the organisation as to its true identity<sup>695</sup>. It is of interest to note that Richard Chessum suggests the Big Flame members became suspicious of 'Rick Gibson' partly as he indicated he was going to move to Liverpool and get involved there. Liverpool was its biggest branch and had built relationships with people in nationalist communities in North of Ireland page<sup>696</sup>. Suspicions were also based on his lack of politics and political nous<sup>697</sup>.
- 22.50. The following reports concern meetings of Big Flame, at which 'Rick Gibson' plays an active role<sup>698</sup>.

---

<sup>691</sup> An example: UCPI0000007630 dated 23 September 1975 open meeting held by Big Flame on 'Portugal the Building of Popular Power'. Richard Chessum present

<sup>692</sup> UCPI0000027166

<sup>693</sup> MPS-0728754

<sup>694</sup> UCPI0000009822

<sup>695</sup> UCPI0000012174

<sup>696</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 45/76

<sup>697</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum Page 46

<sup>698</sup> Other reports included in the hearing bundle: UCPI0000009775 dated 9 June 1976 London groups of Big Flame to be co-ordinated by administrative committee; UCPI0000010803 dated 12 August 1976 national mobilisation for anti-fascist demonstration urged by Big Flame; UCPI000001082 dated 4 August 1976 meeting of Big Flame and Croydon Collective to discuss tactics to wrest control from IS at forthcoming formation of Croydon Anti-Fascist Committee

- 22.50.1. In a report, dated 1 April 1976 'Rick Gibson' chaired a recruitment drive at a meeting of Big Flame<sup>699</sup>.
- 22.50.2. He then chaired a public meeting, attended by Richard Chessum, reported on 6 May 1976 at which a film was played on Portugal 'On the side of the people'<sup>700</sup>.
- 22.50.3. A report, dated 21 June 1976 records that 'Rick Gibson' attended the first in a series of All-London Big Flame meetings at Conway Hall<sup>701</sup>.
- 22.50.4. By 25 July 1976 'Rick Gibson' held a meeting at his cover address, 62 Peckham Road. The meeting was recorded as designed to re-vamp the London Ireland Commission, in attempt by Big Flame to offer resistance to the leadership (Lawless clique) within TOM<sup>702</sup>.
- 22.50.5. On 2 September 1976, in a report dated 27 September 1976, a gathering was reported as being held at a private address of Big Flame members of TOM where the aim of defeating the present leadership at the next National Delegate Conference and replacing with independent members was discussed. It was felt without such a change, TOM would cease to exist. The new leadership would include 'Rick Gibson'<sup>703</sup>.
- 22.51. At about the same time, the Security Service expressed an interest in using an SDS agent to assist with its interest in the forthcoming Big Flame National Conference in October 1976. A note records that the Security Service had previously found Special Branch unwilling to admit that they are able to provide information in certain fields of interest, even when they provided detailed reports on them. The note goes on to suggest that, in a similar format to the working relationship between F6 (Security Service) and the SDS, desk officers could make requests for information of the SDS. They could also offer feedback on SDS reports<sup>704</sup>.
- 22.52. Whilst HN297 was clearly continuing his trajectory toward the controlling forces of TOM and Big Flame, suspicion had fallen on him by leaders of Big Flame. Richard Chessum states that he returned to

---

<sup>699</sup> UCPI0000012311

<sup>700</sup> UCPI0000012396

<sup>701</sup> UCPI000009818

<sup>702</sup> UCPI0000010775

<sup>703</sup> UCPI0000021388

<sup>704</sup> UCPI0000030059 dated 27 September 1977

London in autumn 1976<sup>705</sup> and during a meeting with Alan Hayling (Big Flame) was told that they had exposed 'Rick Gibson' as living under a false name. Richard Chessum was shown a file prepared by Big Flame, which included a letter from 'Rick' to a female member of the group explaining his reasons for leaving. Richard Chessum conducted his own enquiries, visiting an office in Woolwich where he had previously met Gibson and thought to be his place of work. An occupier of the premises below provided a contact number, informing him that it had been empty for a month. On calling the number, Richard Chessum was told that 'Rick Gibson' no longer worked there. He was asked to leave his name, address and telephone number. It was at this time he informed 'Mary' that 'Rick Gibson' had been a police officer<sup>706</sup>.

- 22.53. In a memorandum, dated 24 September 1976 Chief Superintendent Bicknell recorded that the cover identity of Detective Sergeant Clark had come under scrutiny by London members of Big Flame. Whilst it was not thought that his true identity was known, in an unprecedented move and "*disturbing situation*" he had been confronted with official copies of birth and death certificates in his cover name. Commander Watts endorsed that he should be withdrawn as soon as possible under suitable cover. There is a further remark in the memorandum that "*the enquirers appear to be confused by other purported facts*". It is unclear what this refers to<sup>707</sup>.
- 22.54. By mid-October 1976 withdrawal had been accomplished without incident<sup>708</sup>. In an interview with Commander Watts, HN297 had been reminded of the personal responsibility incumbent upon him to ensure the continuing security of SDS. He would be available for other duties from 22 November 1976. HN80 was posted to S Squad, as replacement, with effect from December 1976<sup>709</sup>.
- 22.55. HN297 was promoted to rank of Detective Inspector on 6 May 1986. He received a Police Long Service and Good Conduct Medal in 1989.

---

<sup>705</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 52/76

<sup>706</sup> Witness statement Richard Chessum page 53/76

<sup>707</sup> MPS-0732910

<sup>708</sup> In June 1986 it is confirmed that a freelance researcher, engaged in obtaining material on Special Branch on behalf of the Observer, has received information from Richard Chessum (working for Labour Committee on Ireland) regarding Rick Gibson: MPS-0731078; MPS-0731075. Richard Chessum comments that it was only confirmed HN297 was a police officer in 1986 when notified of investigations of Nick Davies and Ian Hollingsworth of the Guardian: witness statement page 54

<sup>709</sup> MPS-0732916



He retired in 1998 after 31 years of service. His conduct was certified as exemplary<sup>710</sup>.

- 22.56. There are three reports in the hearing bundle for HN297, not relating to TOM or Big Flame. The first is a report, dated 24 February 1975 authored by Richard Clark, concerning a forthcoming picket outside South Africa House by the Anti-Apartheid Movement<sup>711</sup>. The other two reports dated 2 May 1975 and 14 May 1975 concern the newly formed South London sub-committee of the Free Desmond Trotter Campaign at a private address and South London headquarters of Caribbean People's Solidarity Campaign. The second report concludes that a demonstration held by the group had little or no impact on passers-by and shoppers<sup>712</sup>.

HN200 "Roger Harris" – Twickenham branch of the International Socialists which *became the Workers League, peripheral reporting on the Troops Out Movement – April 1974 to October 1977.*

23. During the course of his SDS deployment HN200 used the name "Roger Harris", the identity of a deceased child. There is a restriction order preventing reporting of his real name<sup>713</sup>. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry and will give oral evidence. HN200 was tasked to infiltrate the Twickenham branch of the International Socialists. The branch was suspended in early 1976 and the members formed a branch of Workers League which HN200 also reported on. HN200 states that his reporting, as recovered by the Inquiry and provided to him in his witness pack, is incomplete.
24. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN200's reports and witness statement:
- 24.1. Prior to his SDS deployment HN200 attended and reported on meetings held by the International Socialists. These were largely public meetings but on occasion he reported on private meetings<sup>714</sup>. In his witness statement he explains that although he may have been able to gain access to private meetings as a non-uniformed Special Branch officer, "*that was not possible on a consistent basis*". The main

---

<sup>710</sup> MPS-0742190

<sup>711</sup> MPS-0732371

<sup>712</sup> UCPI0000007138; UCPI000007194

<sup>713</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108\\_Ruling\\_13\\_final.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108_Ruling_13_final.pdf)

<sup>714</sup> Witness statement paragraphs 75-76 and in particular MPS-0739315 (entry attempted to private meeting but unsuccessful notwithstanding the involvement of 9 officers).



advantages of the SDS were that UCOs were able to gain regular entry to private meetings and obtain full names of attendees and details of what was discussed.

- 24.2. He states that he was fortunate to be tasked to infiltrate the International Socialists because *“they were not too extreme...I recognised many IS members as holding reasonable views, and it can be forgotten that some policemen held those views as well”*<sup>715</sup>. He describes them as having subversive objectives, being disruptive but not generally violent.
- 24.3. He spent 6 months in the back office and, whilst he had no formal training for his role in the SDS, he met with other SDS officers twice weekly and listened to their discussions as well as speaking to HN343 who he was to replace in the field about the structure of the International Socialists and the key figures in the organisation<sup>716</sup>.
- 24.4. He was informed that the *“normal way”* to choose a cover name was to find a name from the Register of deaths at Somerset House. He believes that he queried the necessity to do this but was told that it was the usual process. He had a driving licence and a birth certificate in his cover identity<sup>717</sup>.
- 24.5. The advantage of infiltrating the International Socialists was that the organisation gave him access to other left wing groups because IS *“used to tag on to anything they could”*<sup>718</sup>.
- 24.6. When the Twickenham branch of the International Socialists was suspended, many members moved in to the Workers League. He cannot recall reporting on Workers League but accepts that he must have moved with them and continued to report on the same individuals<sup>719</sup>.
- 24.7. In his view, three years was the optimal time for an SDS deployment: *“I feel that the first year you find your feet, the middle year is the most effective, and in the third year there is a danger you could become careless or overconfident”*<sup>720</sup>.
- 24.8. He was tasked by the DCI Derek Kneale but states that he would have made suggestions about which events he should attend and would seek agreement from senior officers. He was aware of the other areas

---

<sup>715</sup> Witness statement paragraphs 16, 50

<sup>716</sup> Witness statement paragraph 17

<sup>717</sup> Witness statement paragraphs 22, 25

<sup>718</sup> Witness statement paragraph 36

<sup>719</sup> Witness statement paragraph 64

<sup>720</sup> Witness statement paragraph 40

- into which SDS officers were deployed from discussions at the SDS twice weekly meetings<sup>721</sup>.
- 24.9. Twice a week the SDS field officers would meet senior managers at the safe house. This meeting was in order to hand in reports, have a general discussion and in order for the senior officers to speak to any field officer if they needed to. The field officers did not discuss what was going on within their groups but would discuss demonstrations<sup>722</sup>.
- 24.10. HN200 states that public disorder was not a regular event in the 1970s although he did see damage to shop windows and cars during the course of demonstrations<sup>723</sup>.
- 24.11. HN200 explains that in his view the work of the SDS enabled policing of demonstrations to be scaled more appropriately and more cost-effectively<sup>724</sup>. He gives a specific example of receiving helpful real time intelligence during a riot, later in his police career, which he believes came in part from the SDS<sup>725</sup>. We will be exploring the contribution made by the SDS to public order policing.
- 24.12. HN200 served in the SDS at the same time as HN297 (Richard Clark) and they were friends throughout his time in Special Branch. He cannot recall any of his fellow officers engaging in sexual relationships in their undercover roles and states that he cannot comment on the conduct of HN297.
- 24.13. HN200 was appointed contacts secretary of the Twickenham branch of the International Socialists which gave him access to the details of IS members in the area<sup>726</sup>.
- 24.14. There are two reports which relate to the industrial actions of the International Socialists in the Middlesex International Socialist district, the area that HN200 reported on. These reports deal with the involvement of the International Socialists in co-ordinating strike action in factories in the Middlesex area<sup>727</sup>. HN200 denies authorship of these reports on the basis that Special Branch had an industrial section and so he was unlikely to have reported on these matters.
- 24.15. HN200 reported on a meeting held by the West Middlesex District of the International Socialists at which International Socialists' members

---

<sup>721</sup> Witness statement paragraph 43

<sup>722</sup> Witness statement paragraph 46

<sup>723</sup> Witness statement paragraph 84

<sup>724</sup> Witness statement paragraph 101

<sup>725</sup> Witness statement paras. 101 & 102

<sup>726</sup> Witness statement paragraph 62 and UCPI0000007328 (a report also of note as an example of meeting that was hosted at a private address).

<sup>727</sup> UCPI0000012061; UCPI0000012060

were urged to vote 'no' in the forthcoming referendum on membership of the EEC since the EEC was a vehicle of capitalism<sup>728</sup>. The Inquiry will be exploring whether the SDS was encouraged to report on the lawful political expression of left wing groups.

- 24.16. HN200 reported on the assistance to be given to strike action by the National Union of Railwaymen by Twickenham branch of the International Socialists<sup>729</sup>.
- 24.17. In January 1976 HN200 attended a conference of former International Socialist members who formed a new organisation, Worker's League. He reported on the names and trade union affiliations of supports of Workers League<sup>730</sup>. We will be exploring the reason for reporting on trade union affiliations.
- 24.18. By late April 1976 the Workers League had a total membership of 143, 63 of whom were members resident in London. In a report dated 22 May 1976 on the national aggregate meeting of the Workers League it was a "*unanimous feeling among members of dissatisfaction with the national Committee which had failed to give the organisation any clear political direction*"<sup>731</sup>. The Inquiry will be exploring why small groups without clear goals were the focus of SDS reporting.
- 24.19. A number of the reports on the activities of the Workers League focus on the League's interest in, or campaigning on, race issues<sup>732</sup>. HN200 explains that it was his practice simply to report anything which was brought up in a meeting<sup>733</sup>.
- 24.20. There are examples of how groups other than that being targeted by the undercover officer come to be mentioned in reports: e.g. The Labour Party and South Asian Socialists Forum<sup>734</sup>.
- 24.21. HN200 recalls two Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis visiting the SDS: Sir Robert Mark and Sir David McNee<sup>735</sup>. This account corroborates other evidence that the work of the SDS was known to the MPS' most senior managers.

---

<sup>728</sup> UCPI0000012141 see also UCPI000007328 at which IS's anti-Common Market Campaign was discussed.

<sup>729</sup> UCPI0000012710

<sup>730</sup> UCPI0000009608

<sup>731</sup> UCPI000009735

<sup>732</sup> UCPI0000009788, UCPI0000017719, UCPI0000010713

<sup>733</sup> Witness statement para 73

<sup>734</sup> UCPI0000012385 (Workers League discuss whether to work within or outside the Labour Party) & UCPI0000009788 (report on joint Workers League / South Asia Socialists Forum meeting)

<sup>735</sup> Witness statement, para.113

*HN300 “Jim Pickford” – left wing groups in Wandsworth Battersea area and then, from March 1975. Anarchist Workers’ Association - October 1974 to December 1976*

25. HN300 is deceased. He was deployed between October 1974 and December 1976 into far-left groups, most notably the Anarchist Workers’ Association (AWA) and several leftist groups around the Battersea/Wandsworth area. He adopted the cover name “Jim Pickford”. A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>736</sup>.
26. HN300 joined the MPS in 1969, moving to Special Branch in 1973<sup>737</sup>. Prior to joining the SDS, HN300 was part of the surveillance section, ‘C’ Squad<sup>738</sup>. He was recruited to the SDS in the summer of 1974, and seems to have replaced HN351 in the back office<sup>739</sup>. Reporting held by the Inquiry suggests that he began his field deployment around October of that year.
27. Early reporting from HN300’s deployment suggests that this officer began by targeting a number of leftist publications, writing articles for and generally becoming involved with the papers ‘Freedom’, ‘Lower Down’, ‘Up Against the Law’ and ‘Pavement’<sup>740</sup>. Likewise, the reporting shows early involvement with a number of left-leaning groups around the Battersea and Wandsworth area. These include the Battersea Park Action Group (‘BPAG’), the Battersea Redevelopment Action Group (‘BRAG’), and the Battersea and Wandsworth Trades Council Anti-Fascist Committee. HN300 produced reports on these Battersea/Wandsworth groups throughout his deployment.
28. In March 1975, HN300 joined the Kingston Branch of the Anarchist Workers Association (‘AWA’)<sup>741</sup>. By July of that year, HN300 helped to set up a new

<sup>736</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20181009\\_HN300-Real-only-RO.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/20181009_HN300-Real-only-RO.pdf)

<sup>737</sup> MPS-0726711

<sup>738</sup> MPS-0724152

<sup>739</sup> MPS-0724152

<sup>740</sup> UCPI0000007125 – Jim Pickford listed as ‘Mentions re AWA, ‘Lower Down’, ‘Pavement’ and ‘Freedom’. UCPI0000007076 p.15 of the 1975 Anarchist Workers Association Internal Bulletin also provides support for the suggestion that HN300 gained entry via such groups. The report submitted by the Kingston AWA notes that “*After the contacts meeting, two comrades from Wandsworth area came along to a Kingston group meeting and subsequently became candidate members. JP works for a small building firm... JP & [Privacy] who used to ‘fold Freedom’ informed us that it was going fortnightly due to increased postage costs. They have also been working with tow [sic] community papers: Pavement and Lower Down. The group discussed an article JP was going to write on Anarchism for Lower Down.*” It is inferable from the initials and the details mentioned that ‘JP’ is a reference to HN300.

<sup>741</sup> UCPI0000006950

Branch of the Association in Wandsworth. In the related reporting, HN300 is named as one of the three individuals responsible for running the new branch<sup>742</sup>. He was soon after elected Branch Treasurer<sup>743</sup>. The Wandsworth Branch of the AWA later renamed itself to the South London Branch following the collapse of the Kingston Branch<sup>744</sup>. During this time, HN300 had access to the larger AWA structure, attending a National Conference<sup>745</sup> and Delegate Conferences<sup>746</sup>.

29. HN300 became involved in a number of parallel anarchist organisations thanks to his role in the AWA. In March 1976 he began attending meetings of the Confederation of British Anarchists<sup>747</sup>, and in April 1976 joined the Federation of London Anarchist Groups ('FLAG') on behalf of the AWA<sup>748</sup>. Of note, near the end of his deployment, HN300 produced two reports from meetings of FLAG which mention the presence of Core Participant in the Inquiry, Dave Morris<sup>749</sup>.
30. His final meeting report shows he resigned abruptly from the AWA on 16 December 1976, citing disagreement over a 'minority tendency' that had arisen in the broader Association. <sup>750</sup>
31. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN300's reports and associated documents:
  - 31.1 As HN300 is deceased, the use of a deceased child's identity cannot be confirmed, however it was common practice during the time period of his deployment.
  - 31.2 Much of HN300's reporting shows an interest in Ernest Rodker, who is a Core Participant in this Inquiry. Reports providing personal details on Rodker span the length of HN300's deployment, and include information on his address<sup>751</sup>, employment<sup>752</sup>, vehicle details<sup>753</sup>,

---

<sup>742</sup> UCPI0000012805

<sup>743</sup> UCPI0000012685

<sup>744</sup> UCPI0000009252, UCPI0000012356

<sup>745</sup> UCPI0000012220

<sup>746</sup> UCPI0000007093, UCPI0000009252

<sup>747</sup> UCPI0000012318

<sup>748</sup> UCPI0000012356

<sup>749</sup> UCPI0000021496, UCPI0000017641

<sup>750</sup> UCPI0000017642

<sup>751</sup> UCPI0000015076

<sup>752</sup> UCPI0000006877

<sup>753</sup> UCPI0000015076, UCPI0000009726

health<sup>754</sup>, legal proceedings<sup>755</sup>, and the birth of his son<sup>756</sup>. It is likewise notable that HN300 begins reporting on a number of groups of which Rodker is a member from the very beginning of his deployment. These include BPAG, BRAG, and, most prominently the publication 'Pavement'. The immediate and extensive reporting on Ernest Rodker by this officer may suggest deliberate targeting towards this individual from the outset of HN300's deployment.

- 31.3 Certain reports attributed to HN300 indicate an awareness amongst group members of the potential for infiltration by undercover officers. In a report on the Freedom Collective from December 1974, one attendee was reported to say that *"while working recently opposite Notting Hill police station, he had seen some persons come out of the building who had looked like hippies. [Privacy] also added that there were a lot of police like this at the Windsor pop festival. The general feeling of the meeting was that more care should be taken when new persons attended"*<sup>757</sup>. Similar sentiments can be seen in a report of a meeting of Up Against the Law, which states that *"[s]ecurity was then discussed and it was agreed by all present that members should be made aware of the dangers when dealing with 'outsiders'. It was feared that plain clothes police officers might attempt to enter their shop premises in order to gain evidence"*<sup>758</sup>. Likewise, a report on the Kingston AWA suggests an awareness that Special Branch may be interested in their activities: *"[Privacy] suggested that for this reason individual members copies of the Internal Bulletin should be sent to a central address. This prompted [Privacy] to ask if it was thought likely that Special Branch were in a position to breach the security of the Association. In answer to this [Privacy] said that because of the revolutionary nature of the AWA this was probable. All persons present were, therefore, told to be constantly on the alert for possible breaches of security"*<sup>759</sup>. Despite this, none of the groups infiltrated by HN300 seem to otherwise have been particularly security-conscious or presented any barriers to membership.

- 31.4 A report from 14 May 1975 describes the financial commitments required by the AWA for membership. It notes that HN300 was to be made a full member of the AWA *"on the understanding that they paid*

---

<sup>754</sup> UCPI0000010719

<sup>755</sup> UCPI0000012115

<sup>756</sup> UCPI0000012246

<sup>757</sup> UCPI0000015023

<sup>758</sup> UCPI0000006942

<sup>759</sup> UCPI0000007190



*£2 to the Association's treasurer at the National Conference as an indication that they intended to pay 1% of their declared income over the year"*<sup>760</sup>. It is unclear if these costs were ever incurred by the officer, or how such expenses would have been covered by the SDS.

31.5 HN300's reporting reveals him to have been highly involved in AWA activity, particularly at branch-level. He is noted to have chaired meetings<sup>761</sup>, organised public events including arranging for speakers<sup>762</sup>, and written articles for the AWA newspaper<sup>763</sup>. HN300 was also clearly instrumental in establishing a new branch of the AWA in Wandsworth<sup>764</sup>. Notably, the following year, the AWA National Conference was hosted in Wandsworth. During the conference, HN300 is reported to have been nominated for the post of National Secretary, but ultimately not selected<sup>765</sup>. HN300 was Treasurer of the Wandsworth Branch until the end of his deployment,<sup>766</sup> and acted as a delegate for the group at meetings of FLAG. Despite this, HN300's overall reporting paints the group as fairly small, impecunious<sup>767</sup>, and subject to occasionally variable levels of commitment from its members<sup>768</sup>. One report from July 1975 notes that, early in its existence, the Wandsworth AWA had only two full members, one of which being HN300<sup>769</sup>. Indeed, most reports on AWA branch meetings suggest a fairly small membership, with seemingly no more than about six to eight regular members at any time. At the time of HN300's resignation from the group, this had dwindled to about four<sup>770</sup>. This discrepancy suggests the possibility that the Wandsworth Branch of the AWA, if not the larger organisation as a whole, was being kept alive largely by the actions of a UCO. The question therefore arises as to whether this group would have existed or managed to survive the years of HN300's deployment without his personal involvement.

31.6 HN300 reported on BPAG, an offshoot of the BRAG whose objective was to fight against the proposal to build a Disneyland Park on the Battersea Fun Fair site<sup>771</sup>. BPAG conducted public meetings, leafleting

---

<sup>760</sup> UCPI0000007200

<sup>761</sup> e.g. UCPI0000009516, UCPI0000007200

<sup>762</sup> UCPI0000009369

<sup>763</sup> UCPI0000007190

<sup>764</sup> UCPI0000012805

<sup>765</sup> UCPI0000012220, p.2

<sup>766</sup> UCPI0000012685

<sup>767</sup> UCPI0000009737

<sup>768</sup> UCPI0000021345

<sup>769</sup> UCPI0000012685

<sup>770</sup> e.g. UCPI0000021345, UCPI0000017642

<sup>771</sup> UCPI0000012093



and rallies, and sought to lobby MPs, councillors and local tenants associations for their cause<sup>772</sup>. It is unclear what utility this reporting would have had to Special Branch.

- 31.7 There is occasional comment in the reporting on the AWA of members indicating a willingness for violence in service of their cause. One member of the Kingston AWA is described as *“an active anarchist, who has said that he believes that the time will come when the throwing of a few bombs will become a necessity and come that time he would be willing to use his house for their manufacture”*<sup>773</sup>. Another member of the AWA is noted to have joined the Marylebone Rifle and Pistol Club, because *“[i]n his opinion he thinks that the time will soon come when most revolutionaries should be familiar with firearms”*<sup>774</sup>. At a meeting of the Wandsworth AWA, some members were noted to believe that *“violence on a large scale would be needed to bring about the ‘revolution’”*<sup>775</sup>. Despite these assertions, there is little in the reporting that suggests any criminality or violence by the members on a day-to-day basis. One of the few AWA reports by HN300 that note any tangible threat of criminality is a report that some AWA members may disrupt a Royal Navy recruitment drive with stink bombs and smoke pellets<sup>776</sup>.
- 31.8 There is evidence that HN300 engaged in a sexual relationship while in his cover identity. In a statement provided to the Inquiry, HN300’s second wife (to whom he was married during his deployment) and family state that while HN300 was working undercover, he began a relationship with another woman. The strain this put on his marriage led to a divorce shortly after his deployment ended<sup>777</sup>. HN300 is said to have later married the woman he met while deployed. HN300’s family note that this woman would sometimes call HN300 ‘Jimmy’, his cover name<sup>778</sup>. There is also evidence from one officer, who recalls being visited by HN300 during his deployment. They state: *“He tearfully told me that he had fallen in love with a lady who was associated with his group... He was beside himself because he wanted to tell her everything including his undercover role which he realised could seriously impact the entire SDS operation. ”* With HN300’s agreement,

<sup>772</sup> UCPI0000012093, UCPI0000012154, UCPI0000007596

<sup>773</sup> UCPI0000007032

<sup>774</sup> UCPI0000010807

<sup>775</sup> UCPI0000012627

<sup>776</sup> UCPI0000007604

<sup>777</sup> MPS-0726711, MPS-0747525 p.4

<sup>778</sup> MPS-0747525 p.4

this officer then contacted the SDS office and acted as a conduit between this officer and their managers<sup>779</sup>.

- 31.9 The statement provided to the Inquiry by HN300's second wife and family also details the significant impact that this UCO's deployment had on their family life, especially as a family with young children. The statement notes that HN300's second wife was left "*extremely isolated*", bringing up their children "*effectively as a single parent*"<sup>780</sup>. They state that no support was given to the family by Special Branch<sup>781</sup>. The impact of undercover deployments on the families of UCOs is an issue to be explored by the Inquiry.

### *HN13 "Barry Loader – Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) 1975 to late 1978*

32. HN13 is deceased. There is a restriction order in place over his real name<sup>782</sup>. HN13 used the cover name 'Desmond Barry Loader' while deployed. In a statement given to the Inquiry, HN13's widow confirms that her husband took the surname from a deceased child<sup>783</sup>. HN13 joined the MPS in the late 1960s, transferring to Special Branch in the early 1970s<sup>784</sup>. It seems that HN13 joined the SDS around December 1974<sup>785</sup>, and likely spent some time working in the back office<sup>786</sup>.
33. It is believed that HN13 was deployed between 1975 and 1978 into the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist) (CPE (M-L)), specifically in the East London Branch. His affiliation with this group also provided entry to several associated and front organisations, including the Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist), the East London Peoples Front (ELPF), the Progressive Cultural Association, and the Outer East London Anti-Fascist Anti-Racist Committee.
34. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the reporting:

---

<sup>779</sup> UCPI0000034307, para. 21

<sup>780</sup> MPS-0747525, p.4

<sup>781</sup> Ibid.

<sup>782</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction\\_order-HN13.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/20200114-restriction_order-HN13.pdf)

<sup>783</sup> MPS-0740967

<sup>784</sup> MPS-0724142

<sup>785</sup> MPS-0724141

<sup>786</sup> MPS-0724142

- 34.1. The first reporting held by the Inquiry believed to be attributable to HN13 dates from February 1975. There is little reporting that has been identified for this officer from 1975. What is identifiable suggests interest in a range of 'leftist' groups, including the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain<sup>787</sup>, the Free Desmond Trotter Campaign<sup>788</sup>, and the West London Campaign against Racism and Fascism<sup>789</sup>. It is unclear to what extent HN13 may have been embedded directly within these groups, or whether these are examples of peripheral reporting resulting from the officer's connection to another group.
- 34.2. Reporting between 1976 and early 1977 indicates that HN13 attended multiple meetings of the Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist) (CUA (M-L)). These included ideological study sessions, as well as a series of party-building talks designed to explore the possible fusion of existing communist groups<sup>790</sup>. Penetration of this group would have likely provided an overview of various active communist groups.
- 34.3. HN13's reporting from 1977 onward focuses largely on the CPE (M-L), in particular the East London Branch. It is also apparent from the reporting that HN13 was an active member of the Progressive Cultural Association, considered to be a front-group for the CPE (M-L) which was created to promote cultural activities with a Marxist-Leninist theme. The PCA's activities included a popular music study group, the organisation of concerts, film showings, and the production of anti-fascist theatre<sup>791</sup>. One report conveys the disappointment of the CPE (M-L) Central Committee with the activities of the PCA, which, it appears, was seen as ineffective and lacking 'political direction'<sup>792</sup>. The question arises of what, if any, benefit to policing was gained from a UCO's involvement in such a group.
- 34.4. Several reports mention union activity or provide updates on industrial action, however these appear to be the result of reporting on topics of interest to HN13's primary target group (CPE (M-L)), rather than the product of deliberate targeting of union activity<sup>793</sup>.

---

<sup>787</sup> UCPI0000012145

<sup>788</sup> UCPI0000007024

<sup>789</sup> UCPI0000007632

<sup>790</sup> e.g. UCPI0000009751, UCPI0000010884, UCPI0000021552, UCPI0000017668

<sup>791</sup> e.g. UCPI0000017425, UCPI0000017546, UCPI0000011057, UCPI0000011117

<sup>792</sup> UCPI0000017546

<sup>793</sup> e.g. UCPI0000017813, UCPI0000011047, UCPI0000011724

- 34.5. A number of the groups reported on by HN13 sought specifically to target and disrupt the National Front<sup>794</sup>. While this included peaceful measures such as the organisation of demonstrations, pickets, and leafletting, HN13 also reports a willingness of members to use violence against these far-right groups and the police. In one report discussing an Anti-National Front demonstration that had taken place, HN13 notes one member of the PCA to have stated that *“[n]ext time [...] the CPE (M-L) would seize the role of leaders. There would be no eggs, tomatoes and flour – these would be replaced by stones, bottles and cans. The mounted police, a major hazard at such events, would be immobilised by designated pairs of members pulling the horses heads down by the reins”*<sup>795</sup>. Likewise in a separate report on the ELPF, HN13 describes a forthcoming Anti-Fascist demonstration as being organised to march near *“usual selling positions for the National Front”*, and notes that *“there is no doubt that ELPF will attack the NF if they identify them”*<sup>796</sup>.
- 34.6. HN13 attended the Anti-National Front demonstration in Lewisham on 13 August 1977, which escalated into physical confrontations between demonstrators, counter-demonstrators and the police. HN13 was injured during the event, receiving ‘a blow to the head’<sup>797</sup>. A report on a meeting of the CPE (M-L) in the aftermath of the Lewisham demonstration states that the Party were reviewing tactics in place to “attack” the National Front<sup>798</sup>. HN13 also notes in the same report that *“it is generally agreed amongst members that, with the advent of the police shield, more sophisticated ‘weaponry’ is required in the riot situation.”* Internal Special Branch documents show that HN13 met with DAC ‘A’ Ops along with HN303, DCI Pryde and DI Willingale following the Lewisham demonstration to convey his experience and provide recommendations for future policing in similar circumstances<sup>799</sup>. This meeting ultimately resulted in a note authored by DI Willingale aimed to assist with methods of policing future demonstrations<sup>800</sup>.

---

<sup>794</sup> For example, the cross-party Outer East London Anti-Fascist Anti-Racist Committee, which was formed with the aim of preventing ‘the National Front and other Fascist organisations’ from organising (UCPI0000017812), or the East London Peoples Front (ELPF) (UCPI0000010947).

<sup>795</sup> UCPI0000017425

<sup>796</sup> UCPI0000010947

<sup>797</sup> MPS-0722618, p.15

<sup>798</sup> UCPI0000011180

<sup>799</sup> MPS-0732885

<sup>800</sup> MPS-0732886

- 34.7. HN13 was arrested twice while in his cover identity. On the first occasion, he was arrested in late 1977<sup>801</sup> for insulting or threatening behaviour following a clash with the National Front while marching with the ELPF outside of Barking Police Station. Chief Inspector Craft of the SDS recorded that HN13 was *“somewhat battered by police prior to his arrest”*<sup>802</sup>. Seven other individuals from HN13’s group were also arrested. It is recorded in SDS Minute Sheets that Superintendent Pryde maintained contact with a court official during the proceedings, and informed them that one of the defendants (name not given) was a police informant that they would be ‘anxious to safeguard from any prison sentence’<sup>803</sup>. Ultimately, the charges against HN13 were dismissed. Of note, of the other seven individuals charged, two others had their cases dismissed, one failed to appear, and three were found guilty and fined<sup>804</sup>. This conviction was the subject of a report to the CPS drafted as part of Operation Shay<sup>805</sup>.
- 34.8. HN13’s first arrest was complicated by the fact that HN13 noticed one of the arresting officer to be a previous colleague of his. This required HN13’s supervisors to investigate whether the UCO may have been recognised as a police officer. Discussion in Special Branch Minute Sheets held by the Inquiry and reviewed by Operation Herne reveal that HN13’s superiors took a cautious approach to exploring the issue, choosing to bring the arresting officer only ‘partially in the picture’. A clear attempt was made by HN13’s superiors to avoid revealing the full nature of the operation<sup>806</sup>. This illustrates the level of secrecy at which the SDS operated, even with regards to other members of the police.
- 34.9. HN13 was arrested a second time on 15 April 1978 during a clash between the right and left in Brixton. He was again charged with threatening behaviour under s.5 of the Public Order Act 1936, along with three others<sup>807</sup>. At the hearing, an application was made to hear all the defendants’ cases together, however the Magistrates decided to hear HN13’s case alone. This was stated to be due to the fact that HN13 had been involved in a separate incident to the other defendants, who had infiltrated a National Front meeting while HN13 stayed

<sup>801</sup> Reports conflict as to whether the arrest took place on 17 September 1977 (MPS-0526784) or 8 October 1977 (UCPI0000011984)

<sup>802</sup> MPS-0722618 p.14/31

<sup>803</sup> MPS-0526784, p.10

<sup>804</sup> UCPI0000011984

<sup>805</sup> MPS-0722618

<sup>806</sup> MPS-0722618 p.15

<sup>807</sup> UCPI0000011356

outside<sup>808</sup>. Again, Minute Sheets reveal that Superintendent Pryde established contact with a court official during the proceedings, and told them that one of the defendants was “*a valuable informant in the public order field whom we would wish to safeguard from a prison sentence should the occasion arise*”<sup>809</sup>. Unlike the previous arrest, however, it is noted that HN13’s cover name was specifically given to the official<sup>810</sup>. All the defendants in this case were found guilty, with HN13 being fined and given a one-year bind-over of £100<sup>811</sup>. It is noted in the Minute Sheet that this sentence was considered “*very useful*” as it would allow HN13 to keep a low profile for the remainder of his deployment<sup>812</sup>.

- 34.10. HN13 was married with children at the time of his recruitment to the SDS<sup>813</sup>. There is no evidence to suggest that this officer engaged in any sexual relationships in his cover identity.
- 34.11. A note made of a meeting with Commander Buchanan in 2013 suggests that HN13 had difficulty reintegrating with the police following his deployment<sup>814</sup>. The Inquiry seeks to explore what, if any, welfare provisions were available to officers during and following their deployments.

*HN296 - “Geoff Wallace” - Hammersmith branch and the Inner West London district of the International Socialists (which became the Socialist Workers Party during the course of his deployment) - summer 1975 to autumn 1978<sup>815</sup>. He also reported on the Trade Union Committee Against Prevention of Terrorism Act and may have reported on the Anti-Nazi League.*

- 35. HN296 has a restriction order prohibiting publication of his real name. HN296 does not reside in the United Kingdom and global pandemic has prevented him from providing a witness statement to the Inquiry at present. A witness statement is expected when circumstances allow. HN296’s cover name was that of a deceased child. He held a driver’s licence using the name and date of birth of this deceased child during the course of his deployment<sup>816</sup>. HN296 has

---

<sup>808</sup> UCPI0000011356

<sup>809</sup> MPS-0526784, p.7

<sup>810</sup> Ibid.

<sup>811</sup> UCPI0000011356

<sup>812</sup> MPS-0526784, p.4

<sup>813</sup> MPS-0724142

<sup>814</sup> MPS-0738057

<sup>815</sup> The Inquiry has seen but not published documentation to suggest that HN296’s deployment came to an end in October 1978

<sup>816</sup> This information is taken from the account HN296 gave to the MPS Risk Assessor



not yet viewed all the reporting the Inquiry have associated with his deployment and so has not confirmed attribution of it to him. HN296 joined the SDS in the summer of 1975<sup>817</sup> and by December 1975 it would appear that he was actively deployed into the Hammersmith branch of the International Socialists ('IS')<sup>818</sup>, later the Socialist Workers Party ('SWP'). His membership card indicates that he became a member of IS on 29 January 1976<sup>819</sup>. HN296's reporting covers pickets, demonstrations and race-related campaigning. He became treasurer of his branch of IS but declined to stand as branch secretary. He also occupied as role as Socialist Worker (the IS publication) organiser and 'Flame' organiser. His deployment came to an end in October of 1978.

36. A review of reporting the Inquiry has associated with deployment gives rise the following observations:

36.1. The first report in the possession of the Inquiry involving Hammersmith branch of IS which is likely to be attributed to HN296 is dated 29 January 1976<sup>820</sup> and refers to students' at Chiswick Comprehensive School's intention to organise a Right to Work Campaign meeting for school leavers. The Right to Work Campaign was a campaign instigated by the Rank and File Co-ordinating Committee of IS but supported by other left wing groups. A number of the reports on IS meetings at branch or district level refer to the activities of the Right to Work Campaign<sup>821</sup>. This reporting includes details of the numbers expected to attend forthcoming events. He also reported the complaints about police conduct made by one of the solicitors employed by the Socialist Worker to represent those arrested in the course of Right to Work Campaign activities<sup>822</sup>.

36.2. HN296's reporting contains many references to pickets and protests, some forthcoming, some containing a list of those involved. In particular he reports on a number of campaigns to protest the closure of local hospitals<sup>823</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering the justification for reporting on uneventful and apparently legitimate protest. He also appears to have reported on a meeting of the campaign group Save Acton Hospital Campaign. This group appears to have had wider

---

<sup>817</sup> MPS-0730673

<sup>818</sup> UCPI0000009396

<sup>819</sup> UCPI00000017920

<sup>820</sup> UCPI0000009576

<sup>821</sup> UCPI0000009396; UCPI00000012265; UCPI0000009685. It is unclear whether the information contained in the reports of IS District meetings was obtained through HN296's attendance at meetings or HN301 who by October 1975 may have moved to the Paddington branch of IS.

<sup>822</sup> UCPI00000012323

<sup>823</sup> UCPI000000012227; UCPI00000011189



- political objectives; those in attendance were urged to oust Labour Party from power and to join the Right to Work campaign<sup>824</sup>.
- 36.3. HN296 may be the source of reporting on the Trade Union Committee Against Prevention of Terrorism Act. This was a group formed in Hammersmith and consisting of individuals from IS, the Troops Out Movement, the Camden, Hackney and Hammersmith Trades Councils and various trades unions, to provide a solicitor for anyone arrested under the Prevention of Terrorism Act - an Act conferring emergency powers on police forces where terrorism (which in practice at this time meant Irish terrorism) was suspected<sup>825</sup>. The report on the conference held by this organisation on 10 April 1976 notes that the underlying political goal of the committee would be self-determination for the Irish people as a whole whilst actively campaigning for repeal of the Prevention of Terrorism Act by manning pickets outside police stations holding those detained under the Act, raising money for campaign groups and recruiting others to the cause<sup>826</sup>. This report also notes that the conference was addressed by, amongst others, a member of UCATT<sup>827</sup>. At a meeting of the Hammersmith and Kensington branch of IS, now renamed the Socialist Worker's Party ('SWP') in January 1977 HN296 reported the anticipated break-up of the Troops Out Movement and a consequential larger role to be played by the Trades Union Committee Against the Prevention of Terrorism Act<sup>828</sup>.
- 36.4. HN296 provided some reporting on individuals<sup>829</sup> including reporting on a member of the Hammersmith hospital branch of IS and his girlfriend<sup>830</sup> and reporting the personal details of the solicitor representing those arrested on the Right to Work march<sup>831</sup>.
- 36.5. HN296 attended and reported on meetings attended by small numbers of people in private houses<sup>832</sup>.
- 36.6. "Geoff Wallace" is recorded as providing activists with transport – a role adopted by a number of SDS officers<sup>833</sup>.

---

<sup>824</sup> UCPI0000012378. Forthcoming pickets by this campaign group are also referenced in report dated 14 May 1976 - UCPI0000009695

<sup>825</sup> UCPI0000012269

<sup>826</sup> UCPI0000012373

<sup>827</sup> Ibid para 6

<sup>828</sup> UCPI0000017698

<sup>829</sup> UCPI0000021512; UCPI0000017789; UCPI0000011860

<sup>830</sup> UCPI0000012280

<sup>831</sup> UCPI0000009718

<sup>832</sup> UCPI0000009695, 7 individuals in attendance; UCPI0000011830, 6 individuals in attendance

<sup>833</sup> UCPI0000017917

- 36.7. HN296 held a series of positions of authority within his target group. The report of a branch meeting of Hammersmith IS indicates that as of 6 May 1976 he was branch treasurer although at this meeting he declined to stand for branch secretary, despite pressure to do so from other IS members<sup>834</sup>. By July 1976 it would appear HN296 had become Socialist Worker organiser<sup>835</sup>. In January 1977 HN296 was elected 'Flame' organiser<sup>836</sup>. In April 1978 HN296 agreed, with two others, to form a three person committee to manage the logistical arrangements for an ANL carnival<sup>837</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering to what extent SDS officers were encouraged to take on or seek out positions of authority within their target groups, how much authority was deemed acceptable and how such decisions were made.
- 36.8. One of the reports attributed to HN296, dated May 1976 (at which time he occupied the role of branch treasurer), provides the bank details of Hammersmith IS who had opened a bank account in the name of Inner West London Film Club '*as a security precaution*'<sup>838</sup>.
- 36.9. A report regarding the meeting of the Inner West London District of IS on 11 May 1976 summarises the main areas of interest for this district of IS at this time which they wished to be discussed at a forthcoming IS conference. These included: the woman's perspective; the establishment of a new weekly newspaper for student; building rank and file in workplaces; race work; the 'gay' issue<sup>839</sup>.
- 36.10. In a report on 5 August 1976 HN296 reported on a discussion during a meeting of the Hammersmith and Kensington branch of IS about IS standing a candidate in the Wallsall by-election<sup>840</sup>. In March 1978 he reported on the SWP's intention to stand a candidate in the forthcoming general election in Hammersmith North<sup>841</sup>. The Inquiry will be considering the SDS reporting on the legitimate democratic activities of left wing groups.
- 36.11. Many of HN296's reports contain references to race-related demonstrations or pickets:

---

<sup>834</sup> UCPI0000009695

<sup>835</sup> UCPI00000017921 see also UCPI00000017922, a note written by HN296 in his role as Socialist Worker organiser. See also UCPI00000017917 in which HN296 features in Special Branch reporting on the SWP in his role as Socialist Worker organiser

<sup>836</sup> UCPI00000017698

<sup>837</sup> UCPI00000011981

<sup>838</sup> UCPI0000009725

<sup>839</sup> UCPI0000009734

<sup>840</sup> UCPI00000010782

<sup>841</sup> UCPI00000011876

- 36.11.1. In a report dated 20 September 1976 he details a meeting of the Hammersmith and Kensington branch of IS at which members were encouraged to join pickets outside the Magistrates Court at which those arrested in the Notting Hill Riots on 30 August 1976 would be appearing<sup>842</sup>. It was proposed that IS should join the defence committee set up by Black Liberation Front and Grass Roots and contribute to its funds.
- 36.11.2. A report dated 9 March 1977 detailing a public meeting supported by the Hammersmith and Kensington branch of the SWP and organised by the Southern African Solidarity Campaign under the title 'Victory to the Freedom Fighters'<sup>843</sup>.
- 36.11.3. A report dated 21 June 1977 on a public meeting held by the West Middlesex district SWP entitled 'Smash Racism' refers to the ethnic makeup of the attendees (*'A total of 25 persons attended including 4 Asians'*)<sup>844</sup>.
- 36.12. SDS field officers were a regular conduit of pamphlets, agendas, bulletins published by their target groups. HN296 may have supplied Special Branch with the issue number 1 of the SWP Bulletin dated February 1977<sup>845</sup>. The attached report highlights that Tariq Ali, a core participant, features in its pages.
- 36.13. A number of reports which may be attributable to HN296 concern protests or confrontations between the SWP and the National Front:
  - 36.13.1. HN296 may have been in attendance and be the source for the information contained in a report on a march on 28 February 1976 in Coventry<sup>846</sup>. The march was organised by the Coventry and Chrysler Right to Work Committee, supported by IS, to protest a demonstration organised by the National Front on that day under the slogans 'A Right to Work for Whites Only' and 'Stop Immigration' and attended by a number of London branches of IS. According to the report, after a peaceful march, the IS contingent of the marchers, and in particular the London based members, made their way to the location of the National Front election

---

<sup>842</sup> UCPI0000021361

<sup>843</sup> UCPI0000017790

<sup>844</sup> UCPI0000017485

<sup>845</sup> UCPI0000017375

<sup>846</sup> UCPI0000012230

offices and attacked members of the National Front with stones and bricks. The National Front members retaliated. At least one person was taken to hospital. When order was restored by the police, the IS contingent marched to the shopping precinct and chased away members of the National Party who were having a rally there before returning to their coaches. We note that, if the report is accurate, this was an occasion on which the violence was started by left wing activists from the infiltrated group.

36.13.2. HN296 may have been one of the SDS deployed officers who attended a counter-protest march against the National Front in Birmingham on 24 February 1977. London branches of the SWP and the IMG sent coachloads of their members to join the march. The SWP contingent from NW London and West Middlesex districts appears to have been involved in an encounter with the National Front in a service station en route to Birmingham, but were unsuccessful at joining the counter protest in Birmingham<sup>847</sup>. DS Richard Walker (HN368), representing the SDS management, was also dispatched to Birmingham by DI Geoffrey Craft (HN34) to “*look after our interests*”<sup>848</sup>.

36.13.3. A report dated 21 July 1977 refers to the intention of the Hammersmith and Kensington SWP to send two mini-vans of people to an anti-fascist demonstration in Lewisham on 23 July 1977 ‘*in order that the National Front could take a real “hammering”*’<sup>849</sup>.

36.14. In a report dated 26 May 1977 regarding a meeting of Hammersmith and Kensington SWP, HN296 notes that a member of SWP announced that he was mobilising local trades union branches to support an anti-Jubilee demonstration to take place during the visit of HRH Princess Anne to Kensington Town Hall on 31 May<sup>850</sup>. Of the 1,500 demonstrators expected, 1,000 were likely to be trades unionists who were “*violently opposed*” to Jubilee celebrations.

36.15. The report of 26 May 1977 also refers to SWP support for the industrial action at Grunwick factory, which had begun in the previous year and would last until 1978 and involved often violent clashes between

---

<sup>847</sup> UCPI0000017776

<sup>848</sup> MPS-0730703

<sup>849</sup> UCPI0000011055

<sup>850</sup> UCPI0000017437

supporters of the strikers and the Metropolitan Police Service. At the meeting members were urged to assist in manning picket lines at Grunwick factory. A number of other reports reference support for the Grunwick strikes<sup>851</sup>. In the report dated 21 July 1977 a plan to assist the Grunwick picket lines was reported and the intention to hold a mass picket on 23 August 1977, rather than 22 July 1977 as had been reported in the press. It was hoped that the erroneous reporting in the press would cause inconvenience to the police. The utility of SDS reporting to public order policing is a theme throughout the life of the SDS.

- 36.16. HN296 may have been involved in supplying information for the report on the London District National Delegates conference on the SWP held on 15 October 1977 to which London branches sent delegates. Tony Cliff addressed the conference on why he thought that workplaces were open to "*development by the party*" due to a combination of economic factors; the failure of the trades unions and the decline of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Lindsay German, the Central London Organiser, and a core participant, is recorded as addressing the conference on the need to provide formal education on SWP politics to new SWP recruits<sup>852</sup>. A further speaker, Sean Doherty, is recorded as urging the party to build away from the image of "Nazi-bashing, red thugs". We will be exploring the extent of violent animosity between the SWP and the extreme right wing and whether it justified the infiltration of the former<sup>853</sup>.
- 36.17. HN296 may have been responsible for reporting on an SWP 'day school' on Ireland held by the SWP attended by 60 people including Tony Cliff<sup>854</sup>. During the course of the day there was a call to give unconditional support to the Provisional IRA. Tony Cliff expressed the view that the IRA had alienated the British working class by bomb attacks in London and Birmingham and said he hoped that there would be no further attacks on the mainland. He clarified, however, that this view did not indicate his lack of support for PIRA but a criticism of their approach. The report contains a reference to Bernadette McAliskey (nee Devlin) and her attempt to start a mass workers movement in Northern Ireland.

---

<sup>851</sup> UCPI0000017437; UCPI0000017485; UCPI0000011055

<sup>852</sup> UCPI0000011563

<sup>853</sup> UCPI0000011563 at para.6

<sup>854</sup> UCPI0000011803

- 36.18. In a report dated 23 February 1978 HN296 provides information about a meeting of the newly configured Hammersmith and Kensington district of IS<sup>855</sup>. The Fulham and Hammersmith branches would be disbanded and new branches, Hammersmith and Shepherd's Bush, would be formed. The focus of the Shepherd's Bush branch would be to concentrate on recruitment of young black people in the area.
- 36.19. There is some reporting on the Anti-Nazi League, a group formed after the events of the "Battle of Lewisham" in August 1977, with a close connection to the SWP, which may be attributable to HN296: a report listing the names of those attending an Anti-Nazi League meeting in W3 on 26 January 1978<sup>856</sup>; and a discursive report on the relationship between the ANL and the SWP and the increasingly important role played by Peter Hain, a core participant, in the ANL<sup>857</sup>.

*HN304 "Graham Coates" – International Socialists, Hackney Branch - approx. July 1976 – May 1977; Anarchist groups including Zero Collective and Anarchy Collective – January 1977 – April 1979; Socialist Workers Party, Croydon branch*

37. Graham Coates has provided a witness statement. He is due to give oral evidence. His real name is the subject of a restriction order<sup>858</sup>. He used a deceased child's identity. On the evidence obtained to date it appears that he joined the SDS in late 1975. He was deployed in approximately May 1976 and withdrawn in April or May 1979. These documents indicate that he operated in North London, reporting on meetings of Hackney Branch International Socialists, Anarchist groups including Zero Collective, Anarchy Collective and Persons Unknown.
38. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of the witness statement and documents associated with HN304.
- 38.1. In his witness statement HN304 recalls that he joined Special Branch in the mid-1970s working on B, C and E Squad<sup>859</sup>. In approximately late 1975<sup>860</sup> he was asked by Detective Inspector Creamer to attend an

---

<sup>855</sup> UCPI0000011829

<sup>856</sup> UCPI0000011794

<sup>857</sup> UCPI0000011887

<sup>858</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108\\_Ruling\\_13\\_final.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108_Ruling_13_final.pdf)

<sup>859</sup> Witness statement (MPS-0742282) para.5

<sup>860</sup> MPS-0730665. This document is not in witness pack but referenced in witness statement at para.12



activist meeting and report back<sup>861</sup>. Soon after he was invited to join the SDS. HN304 recalls “*an element of pride at having been asked*”<sup>862</sup>. He was told that he would be in the SDS for four years<sup>863</sup>. There was a general discussion with SDS managers about impact of the work on his family life<sup>864</sup>. HN304 remarks that, prior to entering the field, there was insufficient emphasis placed on the stresses and strains of working a long undercover deployment<sup>865</sup>.

- 38.2. He describes work in Special Branch as being completely different to that of the SDS; as a Special Branch officer he worked regular hours, was office based and always smartly dressed<sup>866</sup>. The overtime he worked in his SDS role resulted in a significant increase in income<sup>867</sup>.
- 38.3. HN304 states there was no formal training, “*just loose and unwritten guidelines*”<sup>868</sup>. He recalls spending about five months in the back office reading reports and familiarising himself with cover names<sup>869</sup>. During this time he attended occasional SDS meetings and became acquainted with field officers. HN304 later found out that the established undercover officers would give their views on new recruits following such meetings<sup>870</sup>. He did not have sight of a Tradecraft manual<sup>871</sup> or the Home Officer circular entitled ‘Informants who take part in crime’<sup>872</sup>. He thinks that he was shown ‘Penetration of Extremists Groups’ but did not follow it<sup>873</sup>.
- 38.4. HN304 observes the following about the culture of the SDS during the time of his deployment: “*I recognised at the time that job satisfaction was paramount to the managers. They desperately did not want people unhappy and misplaced and so were, generally speaking, prepared to listen and accede to requests if they fitted with the general SDS scheme. This attitude for freedom encompassed the whole of UCO life to the point that it sometimes seemed the managers did not want to instruct the UCOs at all. I do not think managers were weak,*

---

<sup>861</sup> Witness statement para.10

<sup>862</sup> Witness statement para.11

<sup>863</sup> Witness statement para.52

<sup>864</sup> Witness statement para.13

<sup>865</sup> Witness statement para.154d

<sup>866</sup> Witness statement para.66

<sup>867</sup> Witness statement para.67

<sup>868</sup> Witness statement para.14

<sup>869</sup> Witness statement para.14

<sup>870</sup> Witness statement para.15

<sup>871</sup> Witness statement para.16

<sup>872</sup> Witness statement para.17

<sup>873</sup> Witness statement para.24



*but it seemed as though they were deliberately blind in some areas, such as sexual activity whilst undercover*<sup>874</sup>.

- 38.5. With regard to relationships and sexual activity, he describes that the advice, if any, was to “*be very careful*” if you were going to get involved in people’s private lives, especially if you were going to engage in a sexual relationship<sup>875</sup>.
- 38.6. The culture amongst SDS field officers is described by HN304 as one where there would be “*informal banter*” at the SDS safe house, concerning women the undercover officers had seen and met at meetings<sup>876</sup>.
- 38.7. “*Jokey remarks*” were made, in the presence of supervisors, regarding sexual encounters, which HN304 took at face value and believed to be based on truth<sup>877</sup>. He gives examples of three officers who were the subject of such remarks: Rick Clark (HN297), HN300 and another undercover officer who he cannot recall.
- 38.8. HN304 states that Rick Clark had a reputation for being a ladies man and was subjected to jokes regarding a sexual encounter<sup>878</sup>.
- 38.9. He recalls that HN300 had a reputation for chasing after women and was widely known as a philanderer<sup>879</sup>.
- 38.10. HN304 does not recall anyone challenging the behaviour of the officers when jokes were made and it never prompted a question about where to draw the line or resulted in disciplinary action<sup>880</sup>.
- 38.11. He states that his managers: “*must have known it was almost bound to happen with certain individuals who had a predilection for chasing women (before during and after their time with the SDS. Indeed single men were generally not admitted to the SDS and I understood this was partly about avoiding relationships*”<sup>881</sup>.
- 38.12. With hindsight he thinks that there should have been much stricter guidance in terms of the potential damage of such relationships to individuals and families, and that intimate relationships by UCOs should have been discouraged<sup>882</sup>.

---

<sup>874</sup> Witness statement para.57

<sup>875</sup> Witness statement para.18

<sup>876</sup> Witness statement para.146b

<sup>877</sup> Witness statement para.146

<sup>878</sup> Witness statement para.146a

<sup>879</sup> Witness statement para.146c

<sup>880</sup> Witness statement para.147

<sup>881</sup> Witness statement para.147

<sup>882</sup> Witness statement para.149

- 38.13. He recalls the following SDS managers during his time: Derek Kneale, Les Willingale, Angus McIntosh, Ken Pryde, Mike Ferguson and Geoff Craft. His main contact was with Willingale and Craft<sup>883</sup>.
- 38.14. With regard to being arrested whilst undercover, he recalls if arrested during a demonstration they were just to go along with it. Managers would sort it out afterwards<sup>884</sup>.
- 38.15. HN304 was told to go to Somerset house and chose a cover name which was that of a deceased child. He was advised that the *“person should not have died very old”* because an older child would have *“much more history that could be checked”*<sup>885</sup>. He also once made a detour, of his own volition, to where the deceased child was born to familiarise himself with the area.<sup>886</sup>
- 38.16. To further develop his cover identity, HN304 grew his hair long and had a perm. He wore thick heavy-framed glasses and habitually smoked a pipe<sup>887</sup>. His main cover employment was as a self-employed window cleaner<sup>888</sup>. He obtained a blue Mini as a cover vehicle and used it to carry various tools of his trade as a window cleaner<sup>889</sup>. He had a driving licence in his cover name but no other identity documents<sup>890</sup>. He arranged his own cover accommodation, first a flat in Stoke Newington, then an address off Blackstock Road in Finsbury Park<sup>891</sup>.
- 38.17. Once ready to be deployed, HN304’s understanding was that the primary task was to gather information and that *“no scrap of information was ever rejected as irrelevant”*<sup>892</sup>. In his witness statement he describes that undercover officers were expected to *“take information in through the skin”*<sup>893</sup>.
- 38.18. HN304 recalls that he was tasked to infiltrate the Hackney branch of the International Socialists. He spent time at community venues in Dalston. Having struck up conversation, he was invited to sell newspapers. It was after that he was invited to join a meeting<sup>894</sup>.

---

<sup>883</sup> Witness statement para.136

<sup>884</sup> Witness statement para.17

<sup>885</sup> Witness statement, paragraph 22

<sup>886</sup> Witness statement paras.21-22, 31

<sup>887</sup> Witness statement para.30

<sup>888</sup> Witness statement para.27

<sup>889</sup> Witness statement para.33

<sup>890</sup> Witness statement para.25

<sup>891</sup> Witness statement para.28

<sup>892</sup> Witness statement para.51

<sup>893</sup> Witness statement para.14

<sup>894</sup> Witness statement para.68

- 38.19. The earliest report in the hearing bundle regarding International Socialists<sup>895</sup> is dated 9 June 1976. It concerns a meeting held on 27 May 1976 by Tower Hamlets branch of International Socialists<sup>896</sup>. The second report, dated 10 June 1976 concerns a meeting of North East London Workers' Action Support Group<sup>897</sup>. HN304 has no recollection of the meeting or names but recalls the meeting place at Centreprise bookshop in Dalston<sup>898</sup>.
- 38.20. There then follows seven reports concerning the Hackney branch of IS dating between 13 July 1976 and 9 November 1976<sup>899</sup>. Three of the reports relate to regular meetings taking place at Centreprise in Dalston and were attended by between 15 and 24 individuals<sup>900</sup>. HN304 states that meetings were by invitation only<sup>901</sup>.
- 38.21. The first report includes reference to a "*negress*" in the audience talking about West Indian Defence Committee in Brixton, who were engaged with knives and coshes ready to meet physical racialism with physical attacks<sup>902</sup>. Was any action taken by the SDS as a result of this report? Would such a report be disseminated more widely within Special Branch? Of the meeting reported on 9 November 1976, it is recorded that "*nothing of interest was discussed*"<sup>903</sup>.
- 38.22. A report, dated 24 August 1976,<sup>904</sup> concerns an educational meeting at which Graham Coates (HN304) gave a talk on the history of the Labour Party. Five people attended. Graham Coates is in the list of attendees as 'unable to identify'. HN304 believes that as a recent member of IS he was asked to give a talk as a way of establishing his knowledge<sup>905</sup>. He suggests that this report is attributed to Vince Miller (HN354), whom he did not know. He states that he was not engaged in a co-ordinated

---

<sup>895</sup> There are two earlier reports regarding Dave Morris UCPI0000021741 dated 25/06/76 and FLAG UCPI0000021715 dated 31/05/76, neither dealt with in witness statement.

<sup>896</sup> UCPI0000009749, not dealt with in witness statement

<sup>897</sup> UCPI0000009764

<sup>898</sup> Witness statement para.39a

<sup>899</sup> UCPI0000010659 dated 13 July 1976; UCPI0000021409 30 September 1976 concerning crippling mortgage repayments of members on a jointly owned premises (WS para. 77 WS); UCPI0000021431 dated 4 October 1976; UCPI0000021427 dated 4 October 1976 rumours within Hackney branch Tariq Ali has approached IS with a view to joining that organisation; UCPI0000021537 dated 3 November 1976; UCPI0000021577 dated 9 November 1976

<sup>900</sup> UCPI0000010659 dated 13 July 1976; UCPI0000021537 dated 3 November 1976; UCPI0000021577 dated 9 November 1976

<sup>901</sup> Witness statement para.69

<sup>902</sup> UCPI0000010659

<sup>903</sup> UCPI0000021577

<sup>904</sup> UCPI0000010831

<sup>905</sup> Witness statement para.74

dual deployment<sup>906</sup>. Was this HN354's report or HN304? If the former, why were two undercover officers present at an educational meeting of only five people?

- 38.23. HN304 attended meetings of Finsbury Park International Socialists<sup>907</sup>. Within the hearing bundle there are five reports relating to this branch<sup>908</sup>. A report, dated 23 August 1976<sup>909</sup> concerns a weekly meeting at which a central member of Women's Voice gave a speech. It is recorded that "*in addition to being attractive*" she was both eloquent and forceful. What was the purpose of recording such detail?
- 38.24. HN304 does not recall attending meetings of the Islington, Tottenham, Haringey<sup>910</sup> or Seven Sister branches of IS/SWP<sup>911</sup>. He does accept that he may have provided information on individual members of these groups<sup>912</sup>. An example of a report on the Islington branch, dated 24 February 1977 concerns the recently formed Islington 18 Defence Campaign which co-ordinated the defence for eighteen local black youths arrested on charges of robbery and theft<sup>913</sup>.
- 38.25. There are eleven reports<sup>914</sup> in the hearing bundle for HN304 relating to public or aggregate meetings of North and Inner East London International Socialists. HN304 has not considered these in his witness statement. He does, however, comment that public meetings would mainly be covered by Special Branch rather than undercover

<sup>906</sup> Witness statement para.75; HN354 was deployed into Walthamstow SWP sometime in late 1976 (WS MPS-0744903 para.60/61). He does not accept this report as his (WS para.67)

<sup>907</sup> Witness statement para. 72

<sup>908</sup> UCPI0000010823 dated 23 August 1976; UCPI0000010898 dated 10 September 1976 secretary of Finsbury park branch who is also member of National Union of Journalists; UCPI0000017643 dated 4 January 1977, Islington branch IS public meeting supported by Finsbury Park IS; UCPI0000010956 dated 8 September 1977; UCPI0000011139 dated 25 October 1977 (the final 2 post-date the latest time frame HN304 accepts he was in IS/SWP

<sup>909</sup> UCPI0000010823.

<sup>910</sup> Witness statement para.73

<sup>911</sup> Witness statement para.39c; UCPI0000017463 Report on weekly business meeting dated 16 June 1977

<sup>912</sup> There are three reports concerning individual members of these groups although not in witness pack: UCPI0000021468; UCPI0000017653; UCPI0000021548

<sup>913</sup> UCPI0000017759, this has not been considered by HN304 in WS

<sup>914</sup> In addition to those referenced below at 59 and 60: UCPI0000010712 dated 26 July 1976 public meeting Hackney branch 'Black Workers in Struggle – Jamaica - Africa - Britain'; UCPI0000010756 dated 2 August 1976 meeting of North London group on 'The fight against racialism'; UCPI0000021474 dated 14 October 1976 providing a contact address given to Hackney and Tower Hamlets IS to assist with election campaign; UCPI0000021532 dated 2 November 1976 concerning planned demonstration by North London IS and teachers against government cuts during Prime Minister's visit to a school; UCPI0000021620 dated 19 November 1976 on a public meeting of Hackney branch IS; UCPI0000017615 dated 10 December 1976 inaugural district aggregate meeting of the newly formed North London District of IS; UCPI0000017637 dated 31 December 1976 aggregate meeting of North West London District IS, proposed change of name to SWP, Roger Cox account of his election campaign in local council election in Harlesden; UCPI0000017701 dated 30 January 1977

officers<sup>915</sup>. The reports date between 26 July 1976 and 30 January 1977. Of note are the following:

- 38.25.1. Report, dated 4 August 1976 of an aggregate meeting of Inner East London District IS attended by Celia Stubbs, a core participant. The report describes an “*evening taken up with boring speeches*” where little of interest to Special Branch was discussed<sup>916</sup>;
- 38.25.2. Report, dated 4 August 1976<sup>917</sup> of a public meeting of the Hackney Community Relations Council attended by 250 people, including Celia Stubbs, concerning a picket organised by Hackney Branch of IS against the National Front. Violence erupted during the meeting, following a contribution from National Front member. A hoax bomb call brought the meeting to a close;
- 38.25.3. Report, dated 18 October 1976<sup>918</sup> of North London District Southern Area aggregate meeting. The meeting was addressed by Tony Cliff who was recorded as saying that IS was the leading political force left of the Labour party, with a candidate standing in the Walsall North parliamentary by-election.
- 38.26. After a year, in early 1977, HN304 switched his focus to the Anarchist Movement in North London. The transition was at his own initiative rather than the managers, mainly as he found reporting on IS dull<sup>919</sup>. He states that managers were prepared to listen and accede to requests if it fitted the general SDS scheme<sup>920</sup>. There was a period of crossover and HN304 accepts that he could have reported on SWP meetings until May 1977<sup>921</sup>.
- 38.27. An example of a report during this period, dated 8 March 1977 concerns a picket organised by North London District of SWP in conjunction with North London Women’s Voice to take place outside of Michael O’Halloran’s surgery following his vote in favour of a bill to amend the Abortion Act<sup>922</sup>. There are a number of reports in the hearing

---

<sup>915</sup> Witness statement para.71

<sup>916</sup> UCPI0000010779

<sup>917</sup> UCPI0000010769

<sup>918</sup> UCPI0000021493

<sup>919</sup> Witness statement para.56

<sup>920</sup> Witness statement para.57

<sup>921</sup> Witness statement para.40b

<sup>922</sup> UCPI0000017787; other reports UCPI0000017643 dated 4 January 1977 Islington branch IS public meeting supported by Finsbury Park IS; UCPI0000017786 dated 8 March 1977 North London District meeting; UCPI0000017375 11 May 1977 SWP bulletin

bundle for HN304 concerning IS/SWP that post-date May 1977, the latest date he accepts reporting on these groups. They include:

- 38.27.1. Report, dated 13 June 1977 regarding North London SWP's 'abortive campaign' with Islington 18 Defence Committee<sup>923</sup>;
- 38.27.2. Report, dated 16 June 1977 providing personal details of the Women's Voice group organiser<sup>924</sup>;
- 38.27.3. Report, dated 22 June 1977 concerning a public meeting of North London District SWP on Law and Order. There was discussion on the Bell prison riots, during which John Deason stated that the police service had shown itself to be a tool of the ruling classes<sup>925</sup>;
- 38.27.4. Report, dated 29 June 1977 concerning the personal relationships of, and affair between two SWP activists<sup>926</sup>;
- 38.27.5. Report, dated 8 September 1977 providing additional information on the National Conference Debate on the Rank and File Movement including lessons to be learned from the Grunwick's demonstration<sup>927</sup>;
- 38.27.6. Report, dated 25 October 1977 providing detail on a member of Finsbury Park branch SWP<sup>928</sup>;
- 38.27.7. Report, dated 21 November 1977 enclosing a leaflet produced by the SWP declaring support for fireman's strike and opposition to use of troops in industrial dispute<sup>929</sup>.
- 38.28. There are a number of reports during the period between 3 September 1976 and 14 July 1977 that HN304 does not recall<sup>930</sup>. These reports relate to a variety of groups including: Trico Strike Committee<sup>931</sup>; Islington Committee of Community Relations<sup>932</sup>; International Communist League<sup>933</sup>.
- 38.29. The first report, in the hearing bundle, relating to the Anarchist Movement that HN304 accepts was likely to have been provided by him, is dated 4 January 1977. He believes that he overlapped with

<sup>923</sup> UCPI0000017457, not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>924</sup> UCPI0000017465, HN304 disowns this report WS at para.83

<sup>925</sup> UCPI0000017496, not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>926</sup> UCPI0000017523, HN304 disowns this report as had moved to anarchists WS at para.80

<sup>927</sup> UCPI0000010956, not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>928</sup> UCPI0000011139, not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>929</sup> UCPI0000011559, not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>930</sup> Witness statement para.43

<sup>931</sup> UCPI0000010868 3 September 1976

<sup>932</sup> UCPI0000021556 3 November 1976

<sup>933</sup> UCPI0000017382 18 May 1977



- HN300 for a period, although does not recall HN300 helping him integrate with anarchist groups<sup>934</sup>.
- 38.30. There are two reports dated 4 January 1977 concerning the Federation of London Anarchist Groups (FLAG)<sup>935</sup>. The second report concerns a day school held by FLAG and addressed by Dave Morris. The social that followed the meeting is described as consisting “*of a few scruffily dressed people sitting around listening to music, smoking and drinking*”<sup>936</sup>.
- 38.31. HN304 recalls that, within the Anarchist Movement, the groupings were so nebulous that he used his initiative as to who to approach and what to do. He set himself milestones to make connections, in addition to relieving the “*monotony of undercover work*”<sup>937</sup>. He names Dave Morris as being a key person in the movement in the East End<sup>938</sup> and it was with him he formed the closest relationship of his deployment<sup>939</sup>. Dave Morris was present at the first meeting HN304 recalls attending in January 1977.
- 38.32. There are a number of reports in the hearing bundle that focus on Dave Morris. The first is dated 25 May 1976 and provided his personal/contact details<sup>940</sup>. Other reports concern his connection with various individuals<sup>941</sup> and in June 1978<sup>942</sup> a report, confirming he was Secretary of FLAG, provided a detailed physical description following his change in appearance, prompted by police raids on fellow anarchists. In September 1977 it was reported that Dave Morris had expressed a willingness to “*his close friends*” to use violence in pursuit of his anarchist aims<sup>943</sup>.
- 38.33. HN304 states that he was first aware of Zero Collective, situated in the Docklands area. There are five reports in the hearing bundle dating between 24 February 1977 and 28 September 1978. The first report in February 1977 concerns the formation of the group<sup>944</sup>. Other reports

<sup>934</sup> Witness statement para.56

<sup>935</sup> UCPI0000017639; UCPI0000017641

<sup>936</sup> Hearing bundle contains 3 further reports on FLAG (not considered by HN304). UCPI0000010974 dated 20 September 1977, ‘nothing new or important emerged’; UCPI0000021740 dated 9 June 1978; UCPI0000013134 dated 15 February 1979 reporting FLAG was defunct as Dave Morris did not have time to run it.

<sup>937</sup> Witness statement para.58

<sup>938</sup> Witness statement para.37

<sup>939</sup> Witness statement para.117

<sup>940</sup> UCPI0000021741, this is the first report in the witness pack. Not considered by HN304 in WS

<sup>941</sup> UCPI0000011266 dated 7 May 1976 (not considered by HN304 in WS)

<sup>942</sup> UCPI0000021776

<sup>943</sup> UCPI0000011003 dated 22 September 1977 (not considered by HN304 in WS)

<sup>944</sup> UCPI0000017760 (considered by HN304 in WS para. 95)



- deal with the group's aim of publishing a magazine, 'Zero'<sup>945</sup>. By 31 May 1978 it is suggested that the group was in dire financial trouble<sup>946</sup>.
- 38.34. HN304 states that the group was not really a threat to anyone, something he suggests his managers would have already heard from HN300<sup>947</sup>.
- 38.35. During the same period of time, there are ten reports dealing with the East London Libertarians. HN304 does not recall infiltrating this group but accepts he may have provided the reports which are dated between 24 February 1977 and 5 May 1977 and appear of little interest to the SDS. HN304 remarks that anarchist groups were really quite chaotic, which he states is described "*in a nutshell*" in a report dated 24 February 1977<sup>948</sup>. One example of his reporting on this group is that dated 8 February 1977 which concerned a regular meeting of the East London Libertarians and enclosed a leaflet. HN304 comments that it was easy to obtain newsletters on anarchist groups and such documents were useful as they set down in writing what the group had in their minds<sup>949</sup>.
- 38.36. The largest bulk of reporting, contained in the hearing bundle, relates to the Anarchy Collective. HN304's recollection is that the group met at a private address<sup>950</sup>. He took care not to attend every meeting as he did not want them to assume that he would always attend and as a result he was never regarded as fully committed to the group. He describes the meetings as "*theoretical: they seemed to just love talking about things, critiquing and discussing them*". They would socialise outside of meetings; HN304 recalls that on occasion he would entertain at his cover address<sup>951</sup>.
- 38.37. There are 23 reports dated between 16 September 1977 and 14 May 1979<sup>952</sup>. Most of the reports concern weekly meetings, usually held at

<sup>945</sup> UCPI0000017793 dated 11 March 1977; UCPI0000017300 dated 14 April 1977 (not considered by HN304 in WS)

<sup>946</sup> UCPI0000021713 (not considered by N304 in WS)

<sup>947</sup> Witness statement para.87. Final report dated 28 September 1978 UCPI0000012857 individual member of Zero Collective address

<sup>948</sup> Witness statement para.94. UCPI0000017761, para.3. Other reports on ELL UCPI0000017762; UCPI0000017804; UCPI0000017816; UCPI0000017296; UCPI0000017304; UCPI0000017349; UCPI0000017351; UCPI0000017352

<sup>949</sup> UCPI0000017723; Witness statement para.93

<sup>950</sup> Witness statement para.89

<sup>951</sup> Witness statement para.28 & 90

<sup>952</sup> UCPI0000010596; UCPI0000010598; UCPI0000011005; UCPI0000011076; UCPI0000011094; UCPI0000011505; UCPI0000011564; UCPI0000011568; UCPI0000008336; UCPI0000011648; UCPI0000011654; UCPI0000008355; UCPI0000021750; UCPI0000021769; UCPI0000021796; UCPI0000021807; UCPI0000012859; UCPI0000012915; UCPI0000010626; UCPI0000013023; UCPI0000010651

a private address and attended by five to eleven individuals, including Dave Morris. The meetings focused on production of the group's magazine, finding suitable premises and a long running dispute with Zero Collective. The following reports are of note:

- 38.37.1. Report dated 9 December 1977<sup>953</sup> is the first report listing 'Graham Coates' in the list of attendees. He is then included in the list of attendees in reports dated 31 May 1978<sup>954</sup>; 3 July 1978<sup>955</sup>; 19 October 1978<sup>956</sup> and 6 December 1978<sup>957</sup>.
- 38.37.2. By 28 September 1978 Graham Coates is listed as a "*main member*" of the group, which also includes Dave Morris<sup>958</sup>. It should be noted that by October 1978 there are only five individuals attending the meetings, one of which is HN304.
- 38.37.3. In a report dated 6 January 1978<sup>959</sup> Dave Morris is recorded as questioning why the Collective is not engaged in "*fire-raising activities on Government buildings*", a suggestion not supported by other members.
- 38.37.4. A Report, dated 31 May 1978 concerned a bitter dispute between the Anarchy Collective and Zero Collective over the use of the proposed joint Anarchist Centre<sup>960</sup>.
- 38.37.5. The final report concerning the Anarchy Collective is dated 14 May 1979 and provides an overview of the Collective for the preceding five to six months, which is described as having been reduced to "*printing articles which have an overly anarchist flavour and an unmistakably anti-establishment policy, in an attempt to convince its readers that it is still the grand-father of the Movement*". Dave Morris is considered to retain control of the Collective, along with two others. HN304 does not think that he provided this report as he had left the field by May 1979<sup>961</sup>.

- 38.38. It is of note that HN304 is considered a main member of this small group that, in his assessment, could only have been considered to pose a public order threat due to the leaders of the group having

---

<sup>953</sup> UCPI0000008336

<sup>954</sup> UCPI0000008355

<sup>955</sup> UCPI0000021807

<sup>956</sup> UCPI0000012915

<sup>957</sup> UCPI0000013023

<sup>958</sup> UCPI0000012859

<sup>959</sup> UCPI0000011648

<sup>960</sup> UCPI0000021714. This report has not been considered by HN304 in his WS

<sup>961</sup> Witness statement para. 42d; UCPI0000010632

previously been involved with Angry Brigade<sup>962</sup>. Why did his infiltration continue for such a long time? What was the justification for attending meetings in a private home when there was no suggestion of public disorder?

- 38.39. There are a number of other anarchist groups that HN304 may have reported on but not infiltrated. Dave Morris is involved in all of these groups and some, such as Persons Unknown and Black Aid, were introduced during weekly meetings of the Zero and Anarchy Collective<sup>963</sup>.
- 38.40. HN304 recalls that he was peripherally involved with Persons Unknown (PUNK)<sup>964</sup>. The first report, dated 16 June 1978 concerns the formation of the group in support of Iris Mills, Ronan Bennett and Dafydd Ladd, all arrested for conspiracy to cause explosions. Dave Morris is described as an instigator of the group<sup>965</sup>. There follows a series of nine reports dated between 19 June 1978 and 30 March 1979<sup>966</sup>. The reports concern private meetings discussing fund raising activities, prison conditions, benefit concert and details of individuals connected to the group. Dave Morris is present at the majority of the meetings.
  - 38.40.1. A report, dated 27 June 1978 concerns a private meeting during which the group decided to create a “*riotous situation*” at court during the next remand hearing<sup>967</sup>.
  - 38.40.2. At a later meeting, reported on 21 November 1978 there is discussion concerning Special Branch being infiltrated by well-educated anarchists. The report concludes that information of little importance was disclosed<sup>968</sup>.
  - 38.40.3. A report, dated 12 March 1979 concerns a private meeting of eighteen people, during which an individual discussed her forthcoming drugs trial and the suggestion by her barrister that she should not make a fuss over her property being searched by anti-terrorism police. The group sought to persuade her to use this fact for publicity<sup>969</sup>.

---

<sup>962</sup> Witness statement para.88

<sup>963</sup> For example UCPI0000011568 a meeting during which Black Aid was introduced

<sup>964</sup> Witness statement para.91

<sup>965</sup> UCPI0000021771

<sup>966</sup> UCPI0000021764; UCPI0000011292; UCPI000001301130; UCPI000001309324; UCPI000001323412; UCPI0000013056; UCPI0000013226; UCPI0000013269

<sup>967</sup> UCPI0000021806

<sup>968</sup> UCPI0000013056

<sup>969</sup> UCPI0000013226

- 38.41. There are four reports included in the hearing bundle concerning the group, Black Aid<sup>970</sup>. The reports are dated between 24 May 1978<sup>971</sup> and 13 July 1978<sup>972</sup> and mainly concern private meetings of activists and Black Aid supporters. In the first report, dated 24 May 1978<sup>973</sup> it was agreed that supporters should attack a school in a working class area to point out the “*uselessness of academic education*”, and publicly beat teachers.
- 38.42. Another report, dated 25 May 1978<sup>974</sup> concerns a decision taken at a private meeting to advertise a future meeting with a guest speaker from the Paedophile Information Exchange. The purpose was to lure National Front members who would be attacked<sup>975</sup>. There are a number of other reports regarding meetings and activities of anarchist groups, some of which HN304 does not accept was his reporting and some not considered by him. These include:
- 38.42.1. A report, dated 18 March 1977 regarding a leading figure in the Freedom Collective<sup>976</sup>;
- 38.42.2. Two reports dated 2 September 1977 and 29 October 1977, concerning the formation of a network of working anarchists who met at the Rising Free bookshop. Dave Morris was involved in the creation of the group<sup>977</sup>;
- 38.42.3. A report, dated 26 September 1977 concerning a private meeting of anarchists on the subject “*how should we react to racialism and anti-fascist demonstration*”. The event was attended by 23 people, some of whom were advocating violence. Dave Morris present<sup>978</sup>;
- 38.42.4. A report, dated 10 January 1978 concerning the formation of British Anti-Nuclear Group (BANG). It was known by the author of the report that one of its members was also a member of the Anarchy Collective. HN304 does not accept that he provided the information for this report and suggests it must have been another undercover officer<sup>979</sup>;

---

<sup>970</sup> Not considered by HN304 in his witness statement

<sup>971</sup> UCPI0000021710

<sup>972</sup> UCPI0000011297

<sup>973</sup> UCPI0000021710

<sup>974</sup> UCPI0000021709

<sup>975</sup> UCPI0000021703 Report dated 26 May 1978 confirms meeting went ahead however, National Front did not show

<sup>976</sup> UCPI0000017806; This report has not been considered by HN304 in his WS

<sup>977</sup> UCPI0000010936; UCPI0000011082 These reports have not been considered by HN304

<sup>978</sup> UCPI0000010997; This has not been considered by HN304 in WS

<sup>979</sup> UCPI0000024598; HN304 disowns this report in witness statement at para.44

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

- 38.42.5. Two reports dated 30 May 1978 and 19 April 1979 concerning the yearly Anarchists May Day Picnic, both involved Dave Morris<sup>980</sup>;
- 38.42.6. A report, dated 27 April 1979 concerning a meeting held under the auspices of the 'People's Commission' at Conway Hall. Dave Morris, acting as spokesperson for Persons Unknown, explained that the purpose of the commission was to examine how police enforced laws and to hold a demonstration against the police. Attendees included a number of individuals connected to Persons Unknown and Piers Corbyn<sup>981</sup>.
- 38.43. In his witness statement, HN304 recalls that shortly before the end of his deployment he was tasked to infiltrate Croydon SWP<sup>982</sup>. There are no reports in the hearing bundle for HN304 concerned with Croydon SWP.
- 38.44. As has often been seen in SDS reporting, there are a number of reports concerning individuals. The following are some examples, with HN304's response:
- 38.44.1. A report on a schoolboy. HN304 states that no consideration was given to reporting on children<sup>983</sup>;
- 38.44.2. A report on the sexual orientation of a group member. HN304 states there was no specific instruction or encouragement to report on homosexuality, it was normal practice to report any information that could be obtained<sup>984</sup>;
- 38.44.3. A report of the child of an anarchist being a "*mongol*". HN304 suggests that this was reported simply because it was known information<sup>985</sup>;
- 38.44.4. A report on an individual living in "*conditions of utmost squalor*" with three young children whose parenthood was unknown, was given to "*paint a picture*"<sup>986</sup>.

<sup>980</sup> UCPI0000021706; UCPI0000021197. First has not been considered by HN304. He is unsure whether he provided the information for the second (para.42b)

<sup>981</sup> UCPI0000021215. HN304 does not accept this report WS para.42c

<sup>982</sup> Witness statement para.47 HN304 suggests that an appraisal by DCS Kneale on 20 April 1979 refers to him moving to another area of work rather than out of the SDS (MPS-0726721)

<sup>983</sup> UCPI0000021558 dated 5 November 1976, Witness statement para.79

<sup>984</sup> UCPI0000017323 dated 22 April 1977, witness statement para. 82

<sup>985</sup> UCPI0000011086 dated 14 October 1977, witness statement para.98

<sup>986</sup> UCPI0000011525 dated 7 November 1977, witness statement para.99. Other examples: UCPI0000010971; UCPI0000010988; UCPI0000011680; UCPI0000011706

- 38.45. HN304 suggests that “*any piece of information was fair game*”, as it might become relevant at a later stage<sup>987</sup>. He would often make notes after a meeting at his cover address and then provide handwritten reports to his managers at the next SDS meeting<sup>988</sup>. The primary purpose of such meetings was to submit Special Branch diaries, expense claims and hand in reports<sup>989</sup>. Officers would sometimes been asked to help identify activists from photographs<sup>990</sup>. HN304 recalls that undercover officers would share anecdotes mocking plans of various groups<sup>991</sup>. Reports were typed up in the office by others; he was not shown the final report.
- 38.46. HN304 was withdrawn from the field sometime after 20 April 1979. He recalls that he was not happy, nor performing well<sup>992</sup>. When stopped by police whilst driving his car, he mistakenly gave his real name. The licence he produced was in his cover name. Detective Inspector Ferguson was informed and terminated his posting the following day<sup>993</sup>. HN304 disclosed this information for the first time in his witness statement.
- 38.47. HN304 states that “*undercover work got me down*”<sup>994</sup>. Toward the end of his deployment, when Superintendent Kneale described a dip in his work, he was experiencing marriage difficulties, partly due to irregular hours and stress of working undercover<sup>995</sup>. His deployment had a huge impact on his family<sup>996</sup>. He describes his SDS service as having had both short and long term effects on his welfare<sup>997</sup>.
- 38.48. Whilst he is of the view that regular SDS meetings were effective in monitoring welfare<sup>998</sup>, he suggests that without proper oversight, such work was potentially too destructive of undercover officers and their families<sup>999</sup>. He received no advice or ongoing support by the Metropolitan Police Service following his withdrawal<sup>1000</sup>.

---

<sup>987</sup> Witness statement para. 51

<sup>988</sup> Witness statement para.46

<sup>989</sup> Witness statement para.60

<sup>990</sup> Witness statement para.54

<sup>991</sup> Witness statement para.61

<sup>992</sup> Witness statement para.128

<sup>993</sup> Witness statement para.129

<sup>994</sup> Witness statement para. 8

<sup>995</sup> Witness statement para.7

<sup>996</sup> Witness statement para.154

<sup>997</sup> Witness statement para.154

<sup>998</sup> Witness statement para.138

<sup>999</sup> Witness statement para.154c

<sup>1000</sup> Witness statement para.152



- 38.49. HN304 does not believe any of the information provided whilst deployed was particularly significant nor would it have made any difference to public order<sup>1001</sup>. He suggests that the groups he infiltrated were not subversive in their actions<sup>1002</sup>. He singles out one significant public order disturbance during his deployment; demonstrations at Grunwick's film processing factory in North London<sup>1003</sup>. There are no reports concerning these demonstrations in his bundle.
- 38.50. HN304 considers the importance of the work of undercover officers was the ability to attend private meetings and present intelligence giving colour to how an individual or group was thinking, their plans or direct reports on the individuals themselves<sup>1004</sup>. He also thinks that the work of the SDS helped to make sure police resources were not being wasted on small demonstrations, and that larger demonstrations were properly policed<sup>1005</sup>.

*HN354 "Vince Miller"— Socialist Workers' Party, Walthamstow branch, Outer East London District of deployment - late 1976/early 1977 to autumn 1979*

39. HN354 used the cover name "Vince Miller" which is the name of a deceased child. A Restriction Order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>1006</sup> although this will be published at a time to be determined following the T1P2 hearing<sup>1007</sup>. He has provided a witness statement and will give oral evidence. He infiltrated the Socialist Workers Party, Walthamstow branch, between late 1976/early 1977 until autumn 1979. He became treasurer of his branch before becoming treasurer and a member of the Social Committee of the Outer East London District. He attended the demonstration that became known as the Battle of Lewisham with his target group. During the course of his deployment and under his cover identity he became sexually involved with four separate individuals, two of whom were activists that he encountered as a result of his employment. One of these, "Madeleine", is a core-participant and will give oral evidence to the Inquiry

<sup>1001</sup> Witness statement para.127

<sup>1002</sup> Witness statement para. 113/114

<sup>1003</sup> Witness statement para.107/109

<sup>1004</sup> Witness statement para.104

<sup>1005</sup> Witness statement para.150

<sup>1006</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

<sup>1007</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210330-ruling-HN354\\_real\\_name.pdf?v=1](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210330-ruling-HN354_real_name.pdf?v=1)



40. Consideration of his witness statements and associated documents gives rise the following observations and comments:
- 40.1. HN354 deployed into the Walthamstow Branch of the Socialist Workers' Party (SWP) in the late 1970s, and was known by the cover name "Vincent (Vince) Miller" which was the identity of a deceased child. He was instructed by the SDS 'office' to go to St Catherine's House to find a deceased child's identity to use<sup>1008</sup>. He did not visit the area where the child's family were from<sup>1009</sup>, and made up his legend as he went along<sup>1010</sup>. He recalls, by way of example, telling someone that both of his parents were dead<sup>1011</sup>.
- 40.2. He describes spending time in the back office of the SDS prior to deploying undercover during which time handwritten reports would come in from the deployed undercover officers, be read by Les Willingale, and then sent to a typing pool before he checked that they had been correctly typed up<sup>1012</sup>. His signature appears on SDS reporting during this period<sup>1013</sup>. He received no formal training, but appears to have "*learnt on the job*" whilst in the office. Of significance in relation to HN354's conduct whilst deployed, he says he cannot recall any guidance regarding how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of those he met whilst undercover, nor any discussion or guidance concerning sexual relationships<sup>1014</sup>.
- 40.3. HN354 recalls being tasked by the then-DCI of the SDS, Geoffrey Craft, to go to an area of London which had not had any SDS cover for some time. He was asked to observe, and then become involved in "*an active subversive group that were of interest to Special Branch*"<sup>1015</sup>. In common with other officers who infiltrated the SWP at around this time, he was not, he says, tasked specifically to infiltrate the SWP<sup>1016</sup>. He says he understood one of Special Branch's primary functions to be to counter subversion, and that he witnessed subversive activity whilst undercover: the SWP's aim, according to HN354, was to create a socialist state other than by legitimate democratic means<sup>1017</sup>. He was

---

<sup>1008</sup> Witness statement para 34

<sup>1009</sup> Witness statement para 38

<sup>1010</sup> Witness statement para 39

<sup>1011</sup> Witness statement para 40

<sup>1012</sup> Witness statement para 58

<sup>1013</sup> UCPI0000010718

<sup>1014</sup> Witness statement paras 23-24

<sup>1015</sup> Witness statement para 68

<sup>1016</sup> Witness statement para 69

<sup>1017</sup> Witness statement para 161-162

told that his deployment would last for about 4 years<sup>1018</sup>, although in fact he was withdrawn before 3 years had passed.

- 40.4. HN354 describes his understanding of the role of an SDS undercover officer as being to “gather both information and intelligence regarding potential public order problems and activities defined as subversive by the Security Service”. He draws a distinction between intelligence, which he defines as “any material that is of operational value to the police for example how many people were to attend a demonstration” - and information: “facts provided or learned about something or someone”<sup>1019</sup>. He says he would report “the intelligence and information that I thought was of use”<sup>1020</sup>.
- 40.5. At the start of his deployment HN354 states that he began to buy the ‘Socialist Worker’ newspaper in Walthamstow, and after buying it a few times was invited to a branch meeting at the Rose and Crown pub<sup>1021</sup>; he identified the earliest report based on his intelligence as one from February 1977 which concerns a meeting at that pub on 26 January 1977<sup>1022</sup>. He would sell the Socialist Worker most Saturdays, attend demonstrations and pickets, and protest against National Front meetings<sup>1023</sup>. He also describes attending birthday parties, music venues, and fundraising socials<sup>1024</sup>. On occasion, he chaired Walthamstow branch meetings<sup>1025</sup>.
- 40.6. He reported on a march in which a Member of Parliament participated and states that: “The instructions on reporting on MPs was to putting [sic] “MP” next to their name and undertake no inquiries on that person”<sup>1026</sup>.
- 40.7. In common with other SDS officers infiltrating the SWP in this era, HN354 acted as treasurer for his group. By the summer of 1977 he had been elected as District Treasurer and was on the Social Committee of the Outer East London District of the SWP<sup>1027</sup>. He appears to have remained in a Branch Treasurer role throughout his deployment<sup>1028</sup>. He expresses the view that becoming treasurer “was

<sup>1018</sup> Witness statement para 71

<sup>1019</sup> Witness statement para 70

<sup>1020</sup> Witness statement para 74

<sup>1021</sup> Witness statement para 62

<sup>1022</sup> Witness statement paras 66 & 95

<sup>1023</sup> Witness statement para 88

<sup>1024</sup> Witness statement para 89

<sup>1025</sup> For example, UCPI0000013040

<sup>1026</sup> UCPI0000017753 and WS para 96

<sup>1027</sup> UCPI0000011144, UCPI0000011141 (election to Social Committee July 1977)

<sup>1028</sup> Witness statement para 134; UCPI0000017902 (re-election as Branch Treasurer 26 April 1978), UCPI0000017909 (re-election as Branch Treasurer 11 October 1978), UCPI0000013419

*fantastic for information and intelligence gathering*<sup>1029</sup>, giving him access to lists of and details about members. In relation to a report dated 7 December 1977<sup>1030</sup> providing a list of SWP members, HN354 says he would have been tasked to supply this information to the Security Service<sup>1031</sup>. A report dated 22 March 1979<sup>1032</sup> records HN354 resigning from his role as District Treasurer amidst a *“period of disorder and ineffectiveness”*. HN354 says he doesn’t remember much about these events<sup>1033</sup>.

- 40.8. HN354 submitted some reports concerning children – for example a report dated 13 March 1978<sup>1034</sup> on a school-aged child - *“because the SWP had two youth movements that generated considerable support. It was important that SB and the Security Service knew of the impact of the group[s]”*<sup>1035</sup>. He also may have submitted a report which refers to an individual as *“an aggressive homosexual”*<sup>1036</sup>.
- 40.9. HN354 recalls *“frequent violence”* between the National Front and the SWP<sup>1037</sup>. SWP members would agree, he says, with the sentiment recorded in a report of an SWP meeting dated 22 July 1977<sup>1038</sup> that National Front force should be met with greater force, but *“it would only be a few who would actually engage in violence”*. Asked about a report of an SWP meeting at which the use of violent struggle to achieve political ends was denounced, HN354 offered his view that *“the SWP at this point thought that the mechanism by which they would obtain power would be by a general strike...the idea was that the SWP would not have to rely on street violence to gain power. Having said this, street violence was seen as permissible against the fascists”*<sup>1039</sup>. He makes mention of public disorder *“most Sundays”* at a *“heavily policed”* Brick Lane market, where the National Front and the SWP would gather to sell their respective newspapers and *“where violence could break out at any moment”*<sup>1040</sup>.

---

(relinquishing his role as Branch Treasurer, September 1979, in anticipation of *“taking a prolonged holiday in the United States”* – the reason he gave for leaving at the time of his withdrawal).

<sup>1029</sup> Witness statement para 119

<sup>1030</sup> UCPI0000011626

<sup>1031</sup> Witness statement para 127

<sup>1032</sup> UCPI0000013240

<sup>1033</sup> Witness statement para 144

<sup>1034</sup> UCPI0000011874

<sup>1035</sup> Witness statement para 132

<sup>1036</sup> UCPI0000013063 WS para 142

<sup>1037</sup> Witness statement para 101

<sup>1038</sup> UCPI0000011059

<sup>1039</sup> Witness statement para 136

<sup>1040</sup> Witness statement para 156-157

- 40.10. HN354 was involved in the events known as ‘The Battle of Lewisham’ in August 1977, turning up the night before to plan the counter demonstration with the SWP. HN354 recalls some SWP members placing bricks “*at strategic locations to use the next day*” and telephoning the SDS office around 2am to report the locations of the bricks. On the day of the demonstration HN354 describes arriving mid-afternoon when the National Front march was already underway; he recalls the SWP counter-demonstration turning violent: “*it was absolute chaos*”<sup>1041</sup>. He describes his surprise that the police did not re-route the National Front march which enabled some SWP members to throw the stashed bricks at the police. He denies taking part in any violence or encouraging anyone else to do so, rather he considers that his previous policing experience allowed him to remain calm and to pull his group away from the violence<sup>1042</sup>. He says he snuck away mid-evening when he was able to do so, calling the office to inform them that he was safe. He was aware that he was not the only undercover officer present at those events<sup>1043</sup>.
- 40.11. The events of the ‘Battle of Lewisham’ are of interest to the Inquiry in the context of the stated aims of the SDS – viz. to provide pre-emptive intelligence to assist with the policing of public disorder. Whatever pre-emptive intelligence or information HN354 was able to report appears in the end to have provided limited direct or practical assistance to those tasked with policing the event<sup>1044</sup>.
- 40.12. Although HN354 says he was never tasked to record any events that involved Trade Unions nor became involved in trade union affairs he recalls reporting on trade disputes which were supported by the SWP, including the dispute at the Ford plant in Dagenham, and the Grunwick’s Dispute on one occasion in 1977<sup>1045</sup>; he recalls discussing what happened on the latter occasion in the SDS safe house. He says he has no recollection of being part of an ‘industrial group’ despite a report dated 31 July 1978 indicating that he was<sup>1046</sup>.
- 40.12.1. As to the written reporting provided to him, HN354 commented that<sup>1047</sup>:

<sup>1041</sup> Witness statement para 107

<sup>1042</sup> Witness statement para 110

<sup>1043</sup> Witness statement para 109

<sup>1044</sup> MPS-0733369. Other SDS reporting is asserted in documents in the bundle to have been of use, as was the role of SDS officers in debriefing after the event.

<sup>1045</sup> Witness statement para 98-99 & 155

<sup>1046</sup> Witness statement para 137 and UCPI0000011337

<sup>1047</sup> Witness statement paras 63-64

- 40.12.2. A number of those sent to him by the Inquiry are not attributable to him<sup>1048</sup>;
- 40.12.3. He submitted a lot more reports than those provided to him by the Inquiry;
- 40.12.4. On occasion he would draft composite reports at SDS meetings with HN80 and HN126;
- 40.12.5. After big demonstrations he would be shown a big album of photographs and be asked to identify who each person was – the albums would be brought to the SDS safe house meetings.

41. One significant feature of HN354's deployment as an undercover officer are the relationships he conducted in his undercover relationship. The Inquiry has received a witness statement from "Madeleine", one of those with whom HN354 had a relationship. What follows will also consider "Madeleine's" evidence on this topic.

41.1. When he first provided a witness statement to the Inquiry – signed 18 November 2019 – HN354 provided evidence that he was in a long term relationship at the start of his deployment which ended about 12 months after he joined the SDS. Thereafter, he said, he "*engaged in sexual activity whilst in my undercover identity on four occasions. All four were one night stands. All sexual activity was between two consenting adults.*"<sup>1049</sup> Two of the encounters were stated to have been with activists and the other two were not. The reference to four 'one night stands' was consistent with a risk assessment prepared in the course of HN354's application to the Inquiry for anonymity in November 2017, although different from his own statement at the time dated 29 November 2017 which referred to "two very brief sexual encounters with activists...in each case we had sex on one occasion", and from his response to a letter from the Inquiry in 2018 which asked about intimate and sexual relationships, in response to which HN354 referred to two one night stands<sup>1050</sup>. Both HN354's 29 November 2017 statement and his solicitors' letter dated 22 February 2018 appear to have omitted reference to the non-activists to whom he referred both

<sup>1048</sup> Of the reports in HN354's tab of the hearing bundle, this applies to: UCPI011019, UCPI011563, & UCPI0000011803 [all of which are considered to be of uncertain attribution by UCPI]; and UCPI0000011695, UCPI0000011787, & UCPI0000021133 [which UCPI considers remain likely to be attributable to HN354]

<sup>1049</sup> Witness statement para 165

<sup>1050</sup> Gist of HN354's accounts of sexual relationships

before when interviewed by the risk assessor and since in his substantive witness statement.

- 41.2. In his witness statement submitted in November 2019 HN354 described the first of his four ‘one night stands’ as having been with “Madeleine”, a core participant in this Inquiry, and someone upon whom he had reported as can be seen from copies of his reporting obtained by the Inquiry<sup>1051</sup>. He described attending a social event at her flat after which, having had a drink and not being able to drive home, he decided to sleep on a chair. He told the Inquiry that Madeleine “*unexpectedly asked me to come into her bedroom. It only happened on one occasion*”<sup>1052</sup>.
- 41.3. Madeleine submitted a detailed witness statement to the Inquiry dated 18 February 2021. In 1977 she became a member of the Leyton branch of the SWP, having formerly been a member of the Walthamstow branch<sup>1053</sup>. She says HN354’s description of their sexual relationship is “*false*”. She describes meeting ‘Vince Miller’ in the Rose and Crown pub in Walthamstow around 1977, that he started regularly attending meetings<sup>1054</sup> and drinking in the pub with them, often going back to her shared house with a group at weekends after the pub closed<sup>1055</sup>. She recalls him becoming close friends with one of her best friends, and him being involved in political activities with them, such as newspaper selling and fly posting. He had a van, which Madeleine recalls HN354 using to give lifts to others to political events and activities, in particular to drive people around for fly posting<sup>1056</sup>. She says he used to drive after consuming a lot of alcohol, but aside from that and fly posting, wasn’t aware of him engaging in any criminal activity<sup>1057</sup>.
- 41.4. Madeleine is “*not sure exactly when Vince and I got together*” now, after 40 years, but thinks their relationship took place in the late

---

<sup>1051</sup> See, by way of example, UCPI0000017571, UCPI0000011136, UCPI0000011129, UCPI0000011196, UCPI0000011550 & UCPI0000011787 – all before any relationship appears to have begun

<sup>1052</sup> Witness statement para 166

<sup>1053</sup> Madeleine WS para 17; a series of reports from HN354 in September/October 1977 record the formation and membership of the new Leyton/Leytonstone branch, splitting from the Walthamstow branch, and name Madeleine as an attendee/member (see UCPI0000010965, UCPI0000010982 & UCPI0000011193).

<sup>1054</sup> UCPI0000011322 is an example of a report by HN354 which records them both present at an SWP meeting

<sup>1055</sup> Madeleine WS paras 59-61; see also report dated 30 March 1978 at UCPI0000011915, which tends to indicate that HN354 was familiar with the occupants of the house by that time.

<sup>1056</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 66

<sup>1057</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 83



summer/early autumn of 1979<sup>1058</sup>. She had been “utterly devastated” in the autumn of 1978 following the break-up of her marriage<sup>1059</sup>. She recalls going to a house party with friends, at which ‘Vince’ arrived late. She asked him to come and dance with her and her friends, whereupon he pulled her on to his lap and “we spent the rest of the night chatting and flirting”<sup>1060</sup>. She declined a lift home with her friends because ‘Vince’ said he would make sure she got home safely: “towards the end of the night, he suggested we went back to mine.... Vince came to mine and stayed the night. This was the start of our sexual relationship”<sup>1061</sup>.

- 41.5. Madeleine recalls spending more time together with HN354 after SWP meetings following that first encounter. She describes HN354 sometimes coming back to hers at the end of the night. She estimates the sexual relationship between them lasted “up to a couple of months”<sup>1062</sup>. They used to talk a lot, and got on really well. She says she “liked him very much. The relationship seemed to hold out promise”<sup>1063</sup>. As her feelings increased towards him, she recalls ‘Vince’ being “elusive”. He told her that he had had his heart broken previously. After the first night they spent together “he would never stay the whole night, saying he had to wake up in his own bed”<sup>1064</sup>. He wanted to keep the relationship “low key and not have too many people know”<sup>1065</sup>.
- 41.6. In support of her recollection, Madeleine has provided an extract from a notebook of hers in which a work colleague wrote an entry referring to “Vince” her “ex-lover” who used to “flee into the night”<sup>1066</sup>. She has also provided three photographs of HN354 – including one in which she is also depicted at the ‘Rock Against Racism’ event in east London on 30 April 1978<sup>1067</sup>.
- 41.7. Madeleine describes herself at the time as “very shy and reserved. I was also quite vulnerable as a result of my marriage ending.... I now think Vince probably saw me as easy pickings”<sup>1068</sup>. She noticed similarities in their past experiences and felt protective towards him

<sup>1058</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 67

<sup>1059</sup> HN354 reported on her 1976 marriage in a report dated 11 July 1978 (UCPI0000011289)

<sup>1060</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 68-69

<sup>1061</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 70

<sup>1062</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 71

<sup>1063</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 74

<sup>1064</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 75

<sup>1065</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 79

<sup>1066</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 99-100 and UCPI0000034310; the notebook entry is headed “Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> Jan” – 9 January fell on a Wednesday in 1980.

<sup>1067</sup> UCPI0000034311

<sup>1068</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 73



because of what he told her about his childhood<sup>1069</sup>. Madeline recalls last seeing HN354 at an SWP meeting at someone's house in Leytonstone, at which he didn't really talk to her and she felt hurt<sup>1070</sup>. She confronted him after the meeting, following him into the street. She recalls them hugging for a long time, and shortly afterwards, he disappeared completely<sup>1071</sup>.

41.8. She describes the relationship as *"fairly short...I accepted that he had gone and clearly no longer wanted to be involved with me"*, but also observes that his sudden disappearance made her more cautious and wary for a time of becoming involved in a new relationship<sup>1072</sup>. The relationship was *"a very small part of [her] life"*<sup>1073</sup>, until her involvement with the Inquiry began in February 2020. She is *"still processing the impact of the discovery that Vince was an undercover officer"*<sup>1074</sup>. She reflects that had she found out at the time that Vince was an undercover officer *"it would have had a profound impact on me"*<sup>1075</sup>; now, she feels *"like I'm one step removed"*, and describes herself as a *"robust person"* with *"the psychological tools to process it"*<sup>1076</sup>. She notes, however, that the thought that other women were also deceived into relationships with undercover officers *"makes me incredibly angry... I'm utterly horrified at the depth of manipulation and deception...It is effectively psychological torture...utterly dehumanising and incredibly sexist"*<sup>1077</sup>.

41.9. Having seen Madeleine's witness statement HN354 maintains that they had sex only once, and thereafter whilst they remained on friendly terms he *"only ever saw her in and around SWP-related meetings and events"*<sup>1078</sup>. However, he says that with hindsight he accepts that sleeping with Madeleine *"risked hurting her feelings and was inappropriate and wrong"*<sup>1079</sup>. He denies that his managers knew anything about this or any other sexual encounter he had whilst undercover, and denies that they were planned<sup>1080</sup>.

---

<sup>1069</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 76-77

<sup>1070</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 81

<sup>1071</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 82

<sup>1072</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 86

<sup>1073</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 87

<sup>1074</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 93

<sup>1075</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 93

<sup>1076</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 95

<sup>1077</sup> Madeleine Witness statement para 97-98

<sup>1078</sup> Witness statement para 243

<sup>1079</sup> Witness statement para 248

<sup>1080</sup> Witness statement para 250

- 41.10. As to the other three sexual relationships, HN354 describes them in similar terms. One he says occurred just before his departure from the field and he has named the woman in question. The other two women he describes as “*not in the SWP but friends of friends*” (presumably, ‘friends’ who knew him as Vince Miller, his undercover persona). On each occasion he says he had been drinking alcohol at a social event or party beforehand<sup>1081</sup>.
- 41.11. Asked whether sexual activity was permitted whilst in an undercover identity, HN354 said “*I find this very difficult to answer*”, and made reference to a possible concern over security. He says he never told his managers “*because I didn’t attribute it much importance*”<sup>1082</sup>.
- 41.12. HN354 describes the SDS management as “*very tolerant and supportive of me*”<sup>1083</sup>, and describes meeting fellow undercover officers at twice-weekly meetings and sometimes at the pub. He says he was “*at times...quite stressed*” due to the “*pressure of the job*”, and these meetings were an opportunity “*to talk to one another and release some stress*”<sup>1084</sup>. He says that he heard that Rick Clark (HN297) – another officer who had sexual relationships with women in his undercover identity and whose deployment ended whilst HN354 was preparing for his in the back office - had been confronted by his group, but denies knowing about sexual relationships: “*there was a meeting but I do not know the rest of the story*”<sup>1085</sup>. HN354 says he didn’t know if any of his contemporaries engaged in sexual activity whilst undercover. The extent to which this type of conduct was discussed and/or more widely known about amongst SDS undercover officers and their managers is an issue the Inquiry will explore, in T1P2 with the undercover officers deployed alongside HN354, and in later hearing/tranches with their managers.

*HN80 ‘Colin Clark’– Socialist Workers Party – Seven Sisters/Haringey branch, Lea Valley District, Right to Work Campaign and Anti-Nazi League– 15 March 1977-March 1982*

---

<sup>1081</sup> Witness statement para 167

<sup>1082</sup> Witness statement para 168-9

<sup>1083</sup> Witness statement para 80

<sup>1084</sup> Witness statement para 81

<sup>1085</sup> Witness statement para 190

42. Publication of the real name of HN80 ‘Colin Clark’ is restricted<sup>1086</sup>. He has provided the Inquiry with a signed witness statement, but has been excused from giving oral evidence<sup>1087</sup>. HN80 infiltrated the Socialist Workers Party, primarily in North London from March 1977 onwards. He began within the Seven Sisters branch, (which appears to have merged with or become the Haringey branch) of the SWP, and moved on to become involved with the Lea Valley district of that organisation and the Right to Work Campaign. HN80 held the position of treasurer within all these levels of the SWP. To a lesser extent, HN80 also submitted reporting on the Anti-Nazi League. His deployment came to a conclusion on March 1982, by which time HN155 had firmly established himself within many parts of the SWP which HN80 had covered before him.
43. The following observations and questions arise from consideration of HN80’s documents and witness statement.
- 43.1. HN80 was first informed about by the SDS by Rick Clark (HN297) who encouraged him to be put forward as a UCO<sup>1088</sup>. This marks a continued trend of recruitment to the SDS by word of mouth amongst Special Branch officers.
- 43.2. HN80 states that he was aware of the practice of using the identities of deceased children, but he refused to use it himself as it distressed him. Instead he recalls obtaining a death certificate for a ‘Paul Clark’, but used the forename ‘Colin’ instead<sup>1089</sup>. This would represent a unique arrangement for an SDS officer at this time.
- 43.3. HN80 notes that his pay increased considerably as a result of “*thousands of hours*” worth of overtime payments during his deployment<sup>1090</sup>. This appears to be a common trend amongst officers at this time and the Inquiry will explore what effect, if any, this had.
- 43.4. As is common to many of the officers who have provided statements, HN80 does not believe that the reporting in his witness pack reflects what he in fact submitted throughout his deployment. He considers that many of his reports would have been telephoned in and would have related to public order issues<sup>1091</sup>.

<sup>1086</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

<sup>1087</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210330-ruling-hn80\\_oral\\_evidence.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210330-ruling-hn80_oral_evidence.pdf)

<sup>1088</sup> Witness statement, para 7.

<sup>1089</sup> Ibid, para 21.

<sup>1090</sup> Ibid, para 48.

<sup>1091</sup> Ibid, para 32.

- 43.5. This officer recalls locating himself in the north London area<sup>1092</sup> as his managers suggested it was “*a good place to be based in order to make contact with the more important individuals on the extreme left-wing*”<sup>1093</sup>. He denies that he was deliberately targeted at the SWP specifically, but rather claims he was tasked with obtaining information on groups of this general nature. Interaction with SWP paper sellers provided an opportunity to be recruited. Other officers have also mentioned similar inexplicit targeting direction from managers<sup>1094</sup>, but it appears that this approach was less common than deliberate direction towards a group.
- 43.6. HN80 recalls that he was only involved within the Seven Sisters and Haringey branches of the SWP, although it appears he also became involved in the Tottenham branch in some capacity<sup>1095</sup>. The Inquiry has obtained early reporting from some other local branches<sup>1096</sup> which HN80 does not recall, and may be attributable to other officers reporting on the SWP at this time, such as HN304. The first reports in which HN80 is named in his cover identity date from October 1977 and concern meetings held in September of that year<sup>1097</sup>.
- 43.7. In a series of reports submitted early in his deployment, HN80 provides details of members of the Seven Sisters Branch of the SWP including physical descriptions (including race), children, occupations, vehicles, union affiliations (see below) and living arrangements<sup>1098</sup>. In April and August 1980, HN80 may have submitted reports which relayed private sexual and medical information on members of the SWP<sup>1099</sup>. He notes that he would not have regarded the health of individuals as significant, but it remains unclear why this was reported, even if not submitted by him. Similarly, in the course of a SWP branch meeting he also reported the details of a talk entitled ‘pornography in a socialist society’, the policing value of which remains for question<sup>1100</sup>. HN80 notes, in

<sup>1092</sup> See UCPI0000013670, within which HN80’s cover address, phone number and occupation are recorded.

<sup>1093</sup> Witness statement, para 25.

<sup>1094</sup> For example, HN298 (witness statement, para 39).

<sup>1095</sup> Witness statement, para 57.

<sup>1096</sup> Finsbury Park (UCPI0000017453) and Tottenham (UPI0000017515).

<sup>1097</sup> UCPI0000011116 and UCPI0000016307.

<sup>1098</sup> UCPI0000017518, UCPI0000017540, UPI0000017575, UCPI0000011166, UCPI0000011210, UCPI0000010940, UCPI0000010970, UCPI0000011602.

<sup>1099</sup> UCPI0000013873 and UCPI0000014174— HN80 does not believe he submitted these reports. However, in respect of the latter report, HN80 regularly reported on this branch of the SWP at this time and accepts meeting the person concerned.

<sup>1100</sup> UCPI0000014155.

relation to similar reporting, that “[t]he attendance lists were of greater relevance to SB.”<sup>1101</sup>

- 43.8. HN80 was also able to submit regular copies of the ‘weekly information sheets’ which were prepared by the SWP Central Committee, confidentially, for various party office holders<sup>1102</sup>. The frequency of such reporting increased throughout his deployment, perhaps a reflection of his rise within the organisation. HN80 comments that these documents were handed out to members at meetings and were obtained because they “*provided useful information about future events*”<sup>1103</sup>.
- 43.9. Another report submitted in July 1977 reported on a public meeting held by the SWP on the tactics to be used at a demonstration at the Grunwick’s factory, which, by this time, was a major industrial dispute<sup>1104</sup>. HN80 notes that this information was of interest to Special Branch as the dispute “*has significant public order implications and so it and the groups involved were a focus for reporting.*”<sup>1105</sup> Similarly, HN80 also provided reporting concerning the build-up to and aftermath of the events of 13<sup>th</sup> August 1977 in Lewisham<sup>1106</sup>. For consideration: to what extent did public order concerns justify the considerable volume of reporting containing personal information which this approach required?
- 43.10. At around this time the SWP established the Anti-Nazi League, which is reflected within HN80’s reporting at branch and district level. He notes that he was not involved with the organisation to any great extent<sup>1107</sup>. He certainly attended an Anti-Nazi League carnival in April 1978 and submitted a report with the names of 229 people (including his own cover name and the names of three core participants)<sup>1108</sup>. He concludes that such reporting, which may have been compiled from several lists submitted separately, was justifiable and proportionate as “*the ANL was known to use violence and seek out confrontation. It was important to know where its support came from and was likely to come from in future.*”<sup>1109</sup> The Inquiry will need to consider the extent to which

<sup>1101</sup> Witness statement, para 74.

<sup>1102</sup> For example, UCPI0000013556 or UCPI0000013321.

<sup>1103</sup> Witness statement, para 66.

<sup>1104</sup> UCPI0000011039.

<sup>1105</sup> Witness statement, para 75.

<sup>1106</sup> UCPI0000011188, UCPI0000011244 and UCPI000001222.

<sup>1107</sup> Witness statement, para 104.

<sup>1108</sup> UCPI0000021653. See also UCPI0000012985.

<sup>1109</sup> Witness statement, para 105.

this view was justified. Even if so, did it necessitate the level and detail of this reporting?

- 43.11. HN80 also attended an Anti-Nazi League conference in Birmingham in November 1978 and subsequently provided an 8-page report<sup>1110</sup>. He suspects that he would have discussed his attendance with his managers in advance<sup>1111</sup>. This represents one of several occasions where HN80 reported on events outside the London area.
- 43.12. The Inquiry has been unable to obtain any reporting submitted by HN80 between November 1978 and spring/summer of the following year. HN80 is unable to explain this apparent anomaly<sup>1112</sup>.
- 43.13. The Inquiry has obtained a report which suggests that HN80 attended a demonstration protesting against police involvement in the death of Blair Peach, along with his branch of the SWP, in October 1979<sup>1113</sup>. It does not appear that HN80 had any more substantial involvement in this campaign or the core participant Celia Stubbs than this.
- 43.14. During his deployment HN80 attended the SWP National Delegate Conference on four consecutive years<sup>1114</sup>. He recalls providing detailed reports on them, some of which have been obtained by the Inquiry. Such an example was submitted in June 1978 when HN80 provided a lengthy and detailed report on the conference, for which he received a police commendation. In addition to the events of the conference, the report also provides considerable detail on the SWP's organisation, membership (including statistical information), finances and links to trade unions and educational establishments. HN80 is listed in his cover name as a steward with a responsibility for security<sup>1115</sup>. In consideration of why such reporting occurred, it is notable that a detailed brief was submitted in advance of the following year's conference by MI5<sup>1116</sup>.
- 43.15. In August 1980 HN80 attended and submitted a report concerning a conference organised "*for branch secretaries and leading cadres within the London area, to formulate Party perspectives and activities during the next three months.*"<sup>1117</sup> Mere access to this meeting suggests that HN80 was held in some esteem by the SWP by this time. The report

---

<sup>1110</sup> UCPI000013018.

<sup>1111</sup> Witness statement, para 62.

<sup>1112</sup> Ibid, para 67.

<sup>1113</sup> UCPI0000013653.

<sup>1114</sup> Ibid, paras 64 and 111.

<sup>1115</sup> UCPI0000013228, p166. He is similarly listed in the report for 1981 along with HN155 (UCPI0000016752, p12).

<sup>1116</sup> UCPI0000029198.

<sup>1117</sup> MPS-0729029.



provides considerable detail on organisational and practical aims of the SWP and the minute sheet records praise from Derek Kneale (HN819) in this regard. The report is copied up to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner – perhaps indicating that this was the sort of material those managing the SDS wished to be shared higher up the chain. As with much of the SDS reporting on this SWP, this was also copied to MI5.

- 43.16. More evidence of the regard in which HN80 was held can be found in the fact that he was trusted to lecture on “*political standards and recruitment*” on behalf of the SWP around the country<sup>1118</sup>. Were HN80’s managers aware of this? Was such a significant level of involvement encouraged or just HN80 showing himself to be committed “*to the minimum extent necessary*” as he suggests<sup>1119</sup>?
- 43.17. HN80 obtained several notable positions of responsibility during his deployment. By March 1980 he had been appointed treasurer of the Tottenham branch of the SWP<sup>1120</sup>, and already sat on the Lea Valley District Committee, as he recalls, by virtue of becoming treasurer at that level too<sup>1121</sup>. He comments that he did not push himself forward for these roles, but rather, was probably encouraged to do so and expected to take on some responsibility within the group. Similarly, a telephone transcript from around this time records him as bookkeeper for the Right to Work Campaign with the responsibility for setting up a bank account<sup>1122</sup>. He is documented as National Treasurer of the campaign by July 1980<sup>1123</sup>. Was this a legitimate role for an undercover policeman?
- 43.18. Around a week before the 1980 Right to Work march was due to commence, HN80 submitted a report which detailed the logistical plans for the march and likely numbers at each stage of the route. Along with his analysis was also provided copies of documentation relating to the hire of a hall and a chartered train. HN80 questions whether he, in fact, obtained these documents<sup>1124</sup>, but it seems clear that they were deemed to be of interest to the SDS. Some months following the march, he submitted a 12-page report containing the names and details

<sup>1118</sup> Witness statement, para 32(n).

<sup>1119</sup> Ibid, para 47.

<sup>1120</sup> UCPI0000013958.

<sup>1121</sup> Witness statement, para 55.

<sup>1122</sup> UCPI000002714.

<sup>1123</sup> Although the report of this meeting (MPS-0729027) was not submitted until September.

<sup>1124</sup> Witness statement, para 92.



of those who had attended<sup>1125</sup>, and another listing details of the school children recruited as a result of a picket of schools in Port Talbot on route<sup>1126</sup>. HN80 notes, in a similar context “*youth was not determinative of innocence of any potential public disorder*”<sup>1127</sup>. The justification for such reporting remains for question.

- 43.19. HN80 recalls that he attended the whole of the march (along with HN155) and drove one of the support vehicles. He remembers that there was some violence at the picket of the Conservative Party Conference at its conclusion, in the course of which he was “*not able to stay on the sidelines*”, assaulted, and struck out in self-defence<sup>1128</sup>. It seems clear that HN80’s managers were well aware of this incident, given that he received a commendation for his actions. What level of involvement and risk did those managing HN80 consider was acceptable?
- 43.20. HN80 recalls that he did not attend the 1981 march, but continued to submit reports on its organisation<sup>1129</sup>.
- 43.21. From 1981 onwards HN80’s reporting changed in focus from district/branch level to providing intelligence on the SWP national office and Central Committee. This is broadly consistent with HN80’s recollection that he had increasing access to the SWP headquarters on an ad hoc basis as his deployment progressed, although he notes this was not a deliberate tasking<sup>1130</sup>. He even received an offer to join the Committee which he refused as it was “*wholly inconsistent with [his] responsibilities as a deployed UCO: [he] did not want to run the risk of being a party to any illegality.*”<sup>1131</sup> He believes that he therefore told those who had invited him that he was too busy to give up any more time. Despite refusing this offer, HN80 had managed to obtain more access to the SWP hierarchy than any SDS UCO before him. He notes that his managers “*were a little surprised on occasions by the activists that I was able to have contact with and gain information on, even if only fleetingly.*”<sup>1132</sup> When placed within the context of other SDS deployments at this time limited to branch and district levels of the SWP, this begs the question; was this an aberration or represent an

<sup>1125</sup> UCPI0000016562, submitted 6 months afterwards.

<sup>1126</sup> UCPI0000016563. See also UCPI0000015625.

<sup>1127</sup> Witness statement, para 73.

<sup>1128</sup> Ibid, para 96.

<sup>1129</sup> Ibid, para 100 (see UCPI0000015624). This is consistent with the fact that HN155 had taken over his role by this time.

<sup>1130</sup> Witness statement, para 60.

<sup>1131</sup> Ibid, para 59.

<sup>1132</sup> Ibid, para 37.

ambition achieved? The extension of HN80's deployment to allow him to be replaced by HN155 certainly suggests that it was considered worthwhile by SDS management and those above<sup>1133</sup>.

- 43.22. Some indication of this perceived utility may be found in the type of intelligence provided. Access to the upper echelons of the SWP allowed HN80 to provide considerable intelligence on the SWP's membership and organisation nationally. This included details of the installation and operation of the SWP computer<sup>1134</sup>, an extensive international distribution list for 'Socialist Worker'<sup>1135</sup> and details of SWP membership records<sup>1136</sup> - possibly documented with photographs<sup>1137</sup>. HN80 also reported personal details, including relationship information, of members of the Central Committee<sup>1138</sup>, and may have provided a copy of a personal address book<sup>1139</sup>. In respect of this latter document, HN80 notes that he differentiated between personal and organisation documents; something he acknowledges is a "*fine distinction*"<sup>1140</sup>. This access, or perhaps his previous role as treasurer also allowed HN80 to provide financial intelligence on the SWP more generally<sup>1141</sup>. This included details of financial difficulties<sup>1142</sup>. Did this level of reporting still relate to the SDS' public order remit, or does this mark a shift towards reporting on the running of groups considered to be subversive? Notably, the officer does not consider that those he reported on met this criteria<sup>1143</sup>.
- 43.23. The involvement and interest of MI5 may be instructive. In late 1981 several MI5 'notes for file' record requests made of SDS managers (and corresponding intelligence) arising from an SDS officer who had access to the SWP headquarters<sup>1144</sup>. This is likely to be HN80 or possibly his successor HN155<sup>1145</sup>. HN80 also appears to have been one of the earliest SDS officers debriefed by MI5, possibly only preceded by HN354 (another SWP deployment). In a letter sent to the

---

<sup>1133</sup> Ibid, para 35.

<sup>1134</sup> UCPI0000015430 and UCPI0000016693 – HN80 doubts he would have known enough on the "*computing aspects*" of the first report (witness statement, para 60).

<sup>1135</sup> UCPI0000015521.

<sup>1136</sup> UCPI0000016619.

<sup>1137</sup> UCPI0000027529 and UCPI0000027532.

<sup>1138</sup> UCPI0000015637

<sup>1139</sup> UCPI0000017230.

<sup>1140</sup> UCPI0000017230. Notably HN155 does not recall submitting this report either.

<sup>1141</sup> UCPI0000014555, UCPI0000016369, UCPI0000016594

<sup>1142</sup> UCPI0000015617.

<sup>1143</sup> Witness statement, para 122.

<sup>1144</sup> UCPI0000027529, UCPI0000028837, UCPI0000027532, UCPI0000027533.

<sup>1145</sup> UCPI0000028840.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MI5 thanked him for the “very fruitful discussion” and noted that it had filled a number of gaps in their knowledge<sup>1146</sup>. In a later file note, MI5 again noted the value of this encounter and stated “*we would welcome the opportunity to do this on a regular basis*”<sup>1147</sup>. Of all the deployments considered up to this point in time, this, perhaps, represents the closest example of close cooperation between the SDS and MI5.

- 43.24. HN80 recalls that he also had peripheral contact with those on the left-wing of politics who supported the cause of Republicanism in Northern Ireland<sup>1148</sup>. He considers that there is reporting missing from his pack in this regard, although the Inquiry has obtained some evidence to suggest that he took part in demonstrations and meetings on this topic<sup>1149</sup>.
- 43.25. Another theme in HN80’s reporting was the inclusion of details of relevance to trade unions:
  - 43.25.1. HN80 often reported union affiliation along with other personal details<sup>1150</sup>.
  - 43.25.2. He attended the founding conference for the ‘Defend our Unions Campaign’ (an off-shoot of Right to Work), which was established by the SWP to try and improve support within the trade union movement<sup>1151</sup>.
  - 43.25.3. In September 1980 HN80 reported on members of this campaign who had lobbied delegates at the annual TUC conference in Brighton<sup>1152</sup>.
  - 43.25.4. In February 1981 he reported on the SWP Industrial Department’s response to strike action called by the National Union of Mineworkers (a core participant). This included raising money and the possibility of supporting ‘effective pickets’<sup>1153</sup>.
  - 43.25.5. He reported on the production and distribution of SWP literature in support of strikes<sup>1154</sup>.

---

<sup>1146</sup> UCPI0000017518.

<sup>1147</sup> UCPI0000028783.

<sup>1148</sup> Witness statement, paras 31 and 106.

<sup>1149</sup> See witness statement para 33. See UCPI0000013324 (also attended by core participant Piers Corbyn), UCPI0000016195 and UCPI0000016539.

<sup>1150</sup> UCPI0000017182.

<sup>1151</sup> UCPI0000014260.

<sup>1152</sup> UCPI0000014547.

<sup>1153</sup> UCPI0000016446.

<sup>1154</sup> UCPI0000016681.

- 43.25.6. In July 1980 HN80 submitted a report containing the details of a meeting at which a play concerning trade union 'worker/management participation schemes' was performed<sup>1155</sup>. It remains unclear what intelligence value was gained from such reporting.
- 43.25.7. HN80 noted on his SWP registration form that he was a member of 'AUEW' (Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers), which he claims he only added to bolster his credentials<sup>1156</sup>. The officer states he never joined a trade union during his deployment<sup>1157</sup>.
- 43.26. Through SWP sporting events HN80 met and befriended John Deason who was a member of the Central Committee at the time<sup>1158</sup>. The officer notes that they became close, and he even drove HN80 to the airport as part of his exfiltration strategy<sup>1159</sup>. Unsurprisingly, Mr Deason appears regularly within HN80's reporting. This is not limited to his role within the management of the SWP, but also includes personal events such as the purchase of a new car<sup>1160</sup>. Of note is that HN155 continued to report on this person once HN80 had withdrawn.
- 43.27. HN80 recalls an incident when he was recognised in his real identity by people selling the SWP newspaper who found out his real home address. His managers acted on the risk of his exposure and to the SDS more generally, but HN80 notes that his request to move outside the 20-mile limit was refused by the MPS hierarchy<sup>1161</sup>. HN80 also notes that he was approached on three or four occasions after he was withdrawn by those who had known him in his cover identity<sup>1162</sup>. HN80 considers the management of the SDS to have been excellent during his deployment, but also notes that "*the MPS as an organisation ignored sensible representations about the risks*"<sup>1163</sup>. The extent to which the MPS considered and acted on any risks to UCOs will be for consideration by the Inquiry.
- 43.28. HN80 was able to provide a copy of a passport in his cover name<sup>1164</sup>. This is the first cover identity document to be published by the Inquiry.

---

<sup>1155</sup> UCPI0000014068.

<sup>1156</sup> UCPI0000028713, witness statement, para 56.

<sup>1157</sup> Witness statement, para 112.

<sup>1158</sup> Ibid, para 51

<sup>1159</sup> Ibid, paras 126 and 141.

<sup>1160</sup> UCPI0000015160.

<sup>1161</sup> Witness statement, para 46.

<sup>1162</sup> Ibid, para 143.

<sup>1163</sup> Ibid, para 159.

<sup>1164</sup> UCPI0000033625.

*HN356 “Bill Biggs” – Socialist Workers Party, south east London and latterly Brixton  
- 3 February 1978 to 14 December 1981 - peripheral reporting on Anti-Nazi League  
- 15 September 1978 to 26 February 1981 and Greenwich and Bexley Campaign  
Against Racism and Fascism - 29 March 1978 to 6 February 1981*

44. HN356 is deceased. A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>1165</sup>. He used the cover name “Bill Biggs”. The evidence obtained by the Inquiry indicates that he was part of the SDS by October 1977 and, along with HN126, ready to replace HN200 and another Detective Sergeant in the field<sup>1166</sup>. Once deployed, HN356 infiltrated the Socialist Workers Party, focusing on the south east London branches of Plumstead and Greenwich. He quickly rose to prominence within those groups, being elected as Paper Sales organiser and Treasurer of the Plumstead branch and, later, Treasurer of the Brixton branch. His reporting extended to groups affiliated with the SWP, such as the Anti-Nazi League and Right To Work Campaign. There are five reports attributed to HN356 concerning anti-racist campaigning. He was withdrawn from the field by March 1982<sup>1167</sup>. HN356 was married throughout his time in the SDS<sup>1168</sup>.
45. The following observations and questions arise from a consideration of the documents relating to HN356 contained in the hearing bundle.
- 45.1. HN356’s possible involvement with the SDS is first observed in a series of four reports concerning the Battle of Lewisham in August 1977. On 11 August 1977 Detective Inspector Willingale (SDS) and Chief Superintendent Dickinson, signed a report concerning a planned counter demonstration by left wing groups against a National Front march taking place on 13 August 1977. This report was shared with Deputy Assistant Commander of Special Branch and Commander of A8<sup>1169</sup>. On the day of the march, HN356 provided information by telephone at 14:55 that SWP ‘heavies’ were to be moved to Church Street in Deptford, ready to attack the National Front marchers. Detective

---

<sup>1165</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515\\_ruling\\_SDS\\_anonymity.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180515_ruling_SDS_anonymity.pdf)

<sup>1166</sup> MPS-0730697

<sup>1167</sup> UCPI0000027519

<sup>1168</sup> MPS-0726700

<sup>1169</sup> MPS-0733365

Inspector Willingale recorded the information, which was passed directly to A8 Ops room<sup>1170</sup>.

- 45.2. At the conclusion of the march a 56 page report was produced detailing events of that day. This was followed by a report, dated 23 August 1977 and compiled following debrief with eighteen Special Branch officers who had been on duty during the march. The two reports describe a series of violent clashes with police by determined counter demonstrators, leading to 212 arrests and a substantial number of injuries to both police and demonstrators. A feature of the way in which both reports are written, which may be revealing of a mindset, is a focus on the actions of 1000 “*coloured*” youths, of no obvious political attachment, who are assumed by the author to be “*enjoying the chance to indulge themselves*” by throwing missiles and assaulting the police. A list of those identified as taking part in the march and counter demonstration is provided. Consideration for future policing of such events includes the suggestion that there is perhaps a case for “*meeting violence with violence*”<sup>1171</sup> and the establishment of an intelligence arm to uniform branch. It is suggested that uniformed police were able to prevent really serious disorder as a result of intelligence gleaned<sup>1172</sup>.
- 45.3. Some five months after the Battle of Lewisham the first report attributed to HN356 was produced. This report, dated 3 February 1978 relates to a public meeting of the South East London District of the SWP held on 24 January 1978<sup>1173</sup>.
- 45.4. There are then regular reports concerning informal and business meetings of the Plumstead branch of SWP. These reports date between February and December 1978<sup>1174</sup>. One of the meetings is chaired by William Biggs<sup>1175</sup>. Membership of the Plumstead branch stood at seven in March 1979<sup>1176</sup>. It is of note that attendance at these meetings was low, between five and ten people. The tone of some of the reporting is dismissive: “*After a meaningless tirade on the*

---

<sup>1170</sup> MPS-0733366

<sup>1171</sup> MPS-0733369 paragraph 19

<sup>1172</sup> MPS-0733367; MPS-0733369

<sup>1173</sup> UCPI0000011713

<sup>1174</sup> UCPI0000011814 21 February 1978; UCPI0000011900 30 March 1978; UCPI0000013021 6 December 1978; UCPI0000013029 15 December 1978

<sup>1175</sup> UCPI0000013021 dated 6 December 1978

<sup>1176</sup> UCPI0000013229



*exploitation of women, "gays" etc., and a brief discussion, the meeting was finally brought to a close"*<sup>1177</sup>.

- 45.5. Within two months of the first report and by late April 1978 'William Biggs' was appointed as Treasurer of the Plumstead branch of SWP<sup>1178</sup>. In December 1978 he became Branch Organiser for the SWP newspaper 'Socialist Worker'<sup>1179</sup>. Once he was in this role, he resigned his duties as Treasurer<sup>1180</sup>. For question is why an SDS officer was playing a central role in small groups and what, if any, influence that had on the group activities?
- 45.6. In September 1979 there was an amalgamation of the Plumstead and Greenwich branches of SWP<sup>1181</sup>. This was short lived as by November 1979, at a meeting held in a private address and attended by five people, the Plumstead branch re-formed. The report records that the return of ex-members meant that the branch was strong enough to function alone. There was to be an increased effort in paper sales following criticism from the District that the branch was lax in this regard<sup>1182</sup>. It should be noted that HN356 had been paper-sales organiser since December 1978.
- 45.7. At a meeting of the Greenwich branch on 12 December 1979 'William Biggs', member of Plumstead branch, was the guest speaker giving a short speech on the political climate in South Africa. It is not known whether, in his earlier life, HN356 visited or resided in South Africa however, it is reported that he was able to speak of his "*personal experiences regarding workings of apartheid*" which prompted a lengthy discussion<sup>1183</sup>. Later, on 25 June 1980 he chaired a meeting of the Greenwich branch on the subject of racism and fascism during which an address was given by the secretary of Greenwich Branch of the Indian Workers' Association on the oppression of Asians in Woolwich and Greenwich<sup>1184</sup>. For question is whether SDS officers, infiltrating the SWP, were tasked to use that position as a stepping stone to involvement with and infiltration of anti-racist groups.
- 45.8. HN356's reporting on the Plumstead branch of the SWP continued into March 1981; a report, dated 3 March 1981 concerns a forthcoming

<sup>1177</sup> UCPI0000011814, end of para.6

<sup>1178</sup> UCPI0000011996 dated 26 April 1978

<sup>1179</sup> UCPI0000013021

<sup>1180</sup> UCPI0000013029 dated 15 December 1978

<sup>1181</sup> UCPI0000013398 dated 19 September 1979

<sup>1182</sup> UCPI0000013614 dated 21 November 1979

<sup>1183</sup> UCPI0000013688 dated 2 January 1980

<sup>1184</sup> UCPI0000014053 dated 3 July 1980



meeting between the Plumstead branch and Indian Workers Association at a Sikh temple<sup>1185</sup>.

- 45.9. By June 1981, HN356 had turned his attention to the Brixton area. We note that this follows soon after the serious public disorder that occurred in Brixton earlier in 1981. Once again, he achieved a prominent role within the group. A report, dated 30 June 1981 refers to the inaugural meeting of the Brixton branch of SWP, attended by nine people and at which William Biggs was elected as Branch Treasurer<sup>1186</sup>. There is a further report regarding a meeting of the Brixton branch of the SWP, dated 13 October 1981. The purpose of the meeting, attended by thirteen people, was to discuss the 'Brixton Defence Campaign'. Members agreed to organise pickets outside courts in support of those arrested during the Brixton riots<sup>1187</sup>. As is detailed below, this is not the only reporting attributed to HN356 that concerns the activities of anti-racist campaigners.
- 45.10. In addition to reporting on specific SWP branch meetings, there are five reports concerning aggregate meetings of the South East London District of the SWP and other District business, dated 26 October 1978<sup>1188</sup>, 12 March 1979<sup>1189</sup>, 30 August 1979<sup>1190</sup>, 27 November 1979<sup>1191</sup> and 24 April 1980<sup>1192</sup>. These reports provide an assessment of the District including details of finances, meeting places, membership of each of the six branches (National Association of Teachers of Further and Higher Education, Greenwich, Lewisham, Deptford, Plumstead and Bromley), union representation, paper sales, future policy (meetings are to become small and intimate, with greater liaison between branches once a full time organiser had been appointed) and SWP affiliated groups such as the Anti-Nazi League, Bexley CARAF and Women's Voice. HN356's cover name appears in the list of names affiliated with the district.
- 45.11. There are many examples of reports about public meetings, forthcoming activities including pickets and marches amongst HN356's reporting, as is the norm in SDS reporting. These include:

---

<sup>1185</sup> UCPI0000016493

<sup>1186</sup> UCPI0000015441

<sup>1187</sup> UCPI0000016622

<sup>1188</sup> UCPI0000012955

<sup>1189</sup> UCPI0000013229

<sup>1190</sup> UCPI0000013306

<sup>1191</sup> UCPI0000013625

<sup>1192</sup> UCPI0000013911

- 45.11.1. A report, dated 11 June 1980 on a public SWP meeting on the subject of the Thin Blue Line during which it was discussed that the 'Community Relations' scheme was a way for police to infiltrate youths, gaining information and intelligence<sup>1193</sup>;
- 45.11.2. A report, dated 18 June 1980 concerning a SWP Party Council meeting covering industrial and political situation, unemployment and right to work campaign, party building and finance. A member of the Central Committee, Tony Cliff, suggested that selling of the Socialist Worker newspaper was the single most important factor in successfully building a revolutionary party. HN356's involvement in SWP activities included being Branch Organiser for paper sales<sup>1194</sup>;
- 45.11.3. A report, dated 10 September 1980 concerning harassment of SWP paper sellers by members of the National Front and British Movement supporters<sup>1195</sup>;
- 45.11.4. A report, dated 5 December 1980 concerning a forthcoming, peaceful, picket by members of South East London District of SWP in support of Irish hunger strikers. The Press, but not the police, were to be notified of the picket<sup>1196</sup>;
- 45.11.5. A report, dated 17 February 1981 enclosing a leaflet outlining future events planned by South East London RTW campaign including a picket of Eltham Police Station on the second anniversary of death of Blair Peach<sup>1197</sup>;
- 45.11.6. A report, dated 21 July 1981 concerning a public meeting of the SWP entitled 'From Riot to Revolution'. The meeting, described as a recruitment drive for the SWP and RTW was seen as a failure as only SWP members and contacts were present. It was thought that the title of the meeting failed to attract outsiders and should have been 'anti-police'<sup>1198</sup>.
- 45.11.7. Some of the reporting attributed to HN356 includes reference to trade unions. One example is a report, dated 4 June 1980 regarding a 'Day of Action' march organised by Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley Trades Councils, Royal

---

<sup>1193</sup> UCPI0000014028

<sup>1194</sup> UCPI0000014044

<sup>1195</sup> UCPI0000014261

<sup>1196</sup> UCPI0000015202

<sup>1197</sup> UCPI0000016434

<sup>1198</sup> UCPI0000015479

Arsenal Co-operative Society Political Purposes Committee and AUEW Erith District Committee. Within the list of attendees is a Member of Parliament, Guy Barnett<sup>1199</sup>. Another example is a report dated 26 March 1981 concerning a forthcoming public meeting of Bromley TUC and Co-operative party on the subject of public transport cuts. The meeting was to be addressed by a Labour Party Shadow spokesman<sup>1200</sup>. This intelligence evidences an interest on the part of the SWP in trade union activity. The Inquiry will be exploring how and why the SDS reported on trade union related matters and whether it was justified. Also of interest is why reference to the political activities of democratically elected Members of Parliament were recorded and filed? To what use, if any, was such reporting put?

- 45.12. A report, dated 30 August 1978 contains personal information on an active shop-steward within the builders union, UCATT. Though this individual is also said to boast of contacts with the Provisional IRA<sup>1201</sup>.
- 45.13. HN356's reporting includes reports of individuals, as is typical of SDS reporting. One example is that of a report on a member of the Plumstead branch who worked as a hospital porter and was secretary of Hospital Branch of National Union of Public Employees<sup>1202</sup>. Another example is a report, dated 24 June 1981 providing a photograph and description of a "gay" member of Brixton SWP<sup>1203</sup>.
- 45.14. Whilst the bulk of his reporting appears to have focused on the SWP, there are reports which have a different focus: HN356 reports on the Anti-Nazi League, a group affiliated to the SWP, and Anti-Racist Campaigns. This reporting was as early as March 1978 and continued throughout his deployment until February 1981.
- 45.15. There are four reports concerning the Anti-Nazi League, dated 15 September 1978, 18 December 1978, 17 October 1979 and 26 February 1981. The first report records the inaugural meeting of the Bexley branch of the Anti-Nazi League, attended by about 40 people. Speaking at this event was the Assistant General Secretary of the National Union of Public Employees who discussed anti-racist activities

---

<sup>1199</sup> UCPI0000013983

<sup>1200</sup> UCPI0000016545

<sup>1201</sup> UCPI0000011422

<sup>1202</sup> UCPI0000011911

<sup>1203</sup> UCPI0000015431

within trade unions<sup>1204</sup>. The next report, a business meeting of the Bexley branch, records Bill Biggs as one of the ten people in attendance<sup>1205</sup>. A report, dated 17 October 1979 concerns a peaceful picket organised in aid of the Blair Peach memorial<sup>1206</sup>. The final report relates to a picket outside Deptford police station demonstrating against perceived racial discrimination within the police force following the New Cross house fire of 18 January 1981. The picket was as a result of feeling that there was reluctance on the part of the police to investigate a possible arson attack that led to the deaths of 13 black youngsters<sup>1207</sup>.

- 45.16. There are five reports relating to Anti-Racist Campaigns. The first, dated 29 March 1978, records the inaugural meeting of the Greenwich Campaign Against Racism and Fascism, attended by about 120 people<sup>1208</sup>. Later, on 23 July 1978, names of individuals are reported who took part in a demonstration earlier that month, protesting against racist attacks in Lewisham<sup>1209</sup>. There are two reports, dated 13 and 24 October 1980 concerning counter demonstrations organised by the Bexley Campaign Against Racism and Fascism against the British Movement<sup>1210</sup>.
- 45.17. On 6 February 1981, a report is prepared enclosing a leaflet issued by New Cross Action Committee, calling for a 'Black People's Day of Action'<sup>1211</sup>.
- 45.18. Toward the end of HN356's deployment, there is an example of the Security Service making a detailed request for information. In a minute sheet, dated 24 November 1981 a request is made of the SDS for information on SWP South London Groups, including members of Women's Voice. A specific request is made for details of an individual's future within the party, identity of her successor and location of District headquarters<sup>1212</sup>. The document also records the Security Service's interest in: "*future policy direction, particularly as regards blacks*". We will be investigating whether and to what extent the Security Service's requirements influenced the activities and reporting of the SDS.

---

<sup>1204</sup> UCPI0000011472

<sup>1205</sup> UCPI0000013045

<sup>1206</sup> UCPI0000013500

<sup>1207</sup> UCPI0000016486

<sup>1208</sup> UCPI0000011917

<sup>1209</sup> UCPI0000011330

<sup>1210</sup> UCPI0000014573; UCPI0000014624

<sup>1211</sup> UCPI0000016379

<sup>1212</sup> UCPI0000028839

- 45.19. Shortly after this request, a report dated 14 December 1981 details recent nominations by Central Committee of the SWP to serve on the South London District Committee. This is the final report in HN356's hearing bundle<sup>1213</sup>.
- 45.20. Although some of HN356's reporting seems likely to have been of some use to the policing of public order<sup>1214</sup>, other reports, taken in isolation at least, appear to us to be of questionable policing value<sup>1215</sup>.
- 45.21. The Inquiry has been able to obtain three annual appraisals of HN356 during his deployment, 1978, 1979 and 1980. The first is signed off by Detective Inspector McIntosh and Superintendent Pryde. He is assessed as showing initiative and ability, thereby achieving 'useful results'<sup>1216</sup>. The following year in July 1979, McIntosh remains as his assessing Detective Inspector. The position of Superintendent has been occupied by Kneale. HN356 is said to be highly regarded by his colleagues and is to remain in his post for another year<sup>1217</sup>. In his appraisal dated September 1980, Superintendent Raymond Wilson states that HN356's "good results" justify his retention for at least another 12 months. Detective Inspector McIntosh has been replaced by Butler. Throughout his deployment, HN356 studied for the promotion examination<sup>1218</sup>. The content of these reports also provide positive evidence that there were no welfare problems: he gave the impression of thoroughly enjoying his work.

*HN126 "Paul Gray" - Socialist Workers' Party and Anti-Nazi League in Cricklewood, Kilburn, West Hampstead, Paddington (North West London District of the SWP) - spring 1978-spring/summer 1982*

46. HN126 used the cover name "Paul Gray". A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>1219</sup>. He has provided a witness statement to the Inquiry and will give oral evidence. HN126 was deployed in to the Socialist Workers' Party (SWP) in north-west London. He involved himself in the Anti-Nazi League (ANL) as well as the SWP, and reported on other related groups from time to time.

<sup>1213</sup> UCPI0000016824

<sup>1214</sup> For example, UCPI0000014573, UCPI0000015202 & UCPI0000014261

<sup>1215</sup> For example, UCPI0000013500, UCPI00000013983, UCPI0000016493 & UCPI0000016545

<sup>1216</sup> MPS-0743908

<sup>1217</sup> MPS-0743907

<sup>1218</sup> MPS-0743906

<sup>1219</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/20191029-sds\\_anonymity-ruling\\_16\\_san.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/20191029-sds_anonymity-ruling_16_san.pdf)

47. A consideration of this witness statement and documents associated with his area of deployment gives rise to following:
- 47.1. In common with other SDS officers, HN126 was already a Special Branch officer when he was approached to join the SDS. He describes an approach by somebody he knew, followed by a mostly informal recruitment exercise culminating in an interview<sup>1220</sup>. He was married at the time, but his partner was not consulted as part of the process<sup>1221</sup>.
  - 47.2. He describes preparing for his deployment from the SDS office, during which time he attended twice-weekly meetings also attended by deployed officers. He recalls chatting with the officers deployed into similar areas that he was expecting to deploy into, either at those meetings, or afterwards over a drink in the pub. They gave him advice on what he should be doing when he went into the field. He describes the 'office staff' telling him anything else he needed to know<sup>1222</sup>. He was not aware of any tradecraft manual, nor the Home Office circular 97/1969 regarding informants participating in crime<sup>1223</sup>. He was not provided with any advice about sexual relationships whilst undercover<sup>1224</sup>. Most of his 'training' for deployment, and any guidance he did receive, appears to have been informally delivered by officers already in the field.
  - 47.3. HN126 describes his managers in the SDS – HN68 and Mike Ferguson (HN135), both formerly undercover officers in the SDS – as *"absolutely brilliant, very experienced. They would always be there if you needed them"*<sup>1225</sup>.
  - 47.4. 'Paul Gray' was the name of a deceased child. HN126 says he was shown how to create his cover identity by another officer, HN356, who was about to commence his deployment at the time HN126 joined the unit. He describes using the individual's name and date of birth but says he did not adopt any other aspect of their identity<sup>1226</sup>. There is some lack of clarity around the extent to which HN126 used this individual's identity. The Inquiry identified only one deceased child named 'Paul Gray' based on official records of births and deaths whose date of birth was consistent with use during the period of HN126's

<sup>1220</sup> Witness statement paras 11, 16-17

<sup>1221</sup> Witness statement para 19

<sup>1222</sup> Witness statement para 20-25

<sup>1223</sup> Witness statement para 27-28

<sup>1224</sup> Witness statement para 29

<sup>1225</sup> Witness statement para 124

<sup>1226</sup> Witness statement para 35-36



deployment, but having seen the birth and death certificates of that individual HN126 expressed doubt that they referred to the correct individual, and there is some evidence to support the use of a different date of birth by HN126 than that of this 'Paul Gray'<sup>1227</sup>.

- 47.5. HN126 presented himself as a van driver<sup>1228</sup>, and at the outset rented what he describes as "*a grotty flat*" in the Queen's Park area<sup>1229</sup>. Later in his deployment he moved to a different flat in the Paddington area following a suspected compromise<sup>1230</sup>. He describes using his van to give lifts to members of the groups with which he was involved. He states that he got to know where everyone lived from driving and giving these lifts<sup>1231</sup>.
- 47.6. His SDS undercover deployment commenced in the spring of 1978 - when he recalls he was targeted towards the North West London region of the SWP - and concluded in the spring of 1982. He describes the SWP as "*a leading group in the public order field*" at the time<sup>1232</sup>, and recalls regularly witnessing public disorder and violence when he attended demonstrations, protests, marches and pickets, although not playing any direct part in that disorder<sup>1233</sup>. He gives as examples counter-demonstrations against the National Front, and 'Rock Against Racism' events. He explains the relative absence of mention of incidents of public disorder and violence in his reporting as the result of SDS intelligence being "*pre-emptive. Our job was to report in advance on likely numbers at public events so the right numbers of uniformed officers could be deployed to police them*"<sup>1234</sup>.
- 47.7. Other than being tasked to infiltrate the SWP, HN126 says that what he did and what he reported on was "*generally left to my discretion*"<sup>1235</sup>, although he also describes as his primary objective the gathering of intelligence on demonstrations and the individuals who were involved in them in order to assist in policing public disorder<sup>1236</sup>. He describes spending time socialising with those upon whom he was reporting – "*it was a social scene as much as a political one*"<sup>1237</sup>. A number of

---

<sup>1227</sup> Witness statement para 37

<sup>1228</sup> Witness statement para 44

<sup>1229</sup> Witness statement para 49

<sup>1230</sup> Witness statement para 50, 53-55

<sup>1231</sup> Witness statement para 47

<sup>1232</sup> Witness statement para 111

<sup>1233</sup> Witness statement para 193, 216, 242

<sup>1234</sup> Witness statement para 245

<sup>1235</sup> Witness statement para 112

<sup>1236</sup> Witness statement para 245, 307

<sup>1237</sup> Witness statement para 258



meetings which he is recorded as having attended took place in private homes.

- 47.8. He initially associated himself with SWP branches in Cricklewood and Kilburn, and in July 1978, within a few months of his deployment commencing, he became the 'Socialist Worker' organiser for Cricklewood<sup>1238</sup>, in which role he used his van to collect and distribute copies of the 'Socialist Worker'. As to why he took up the role, HN126 expresses the view that "[y]ou had to be willing to do things to help out if you were going to be accepted"<sup>1239</sup>. He denies having a decision-making role or being in a position to influence the actions of the group<sup>1240</sup>.
- 47.9. At a meeting on 11 January 1979 he was elected to the North West London District Committee of the SWP, nominated as the 'Socialist Worker' newspaper organiser for the entire district<sup>1241</sup>. He was re-elected to the position twice, in October 1979 and May 1980<sup>1242</sup>. As Socialist Worker organiser for the District he describes dropping off newspapers to "almost all" SWP branches in the North West London District<sup>1243</sup>, and reports record directly or by implication his involvement with the following branches, in addition to those of which he was a member: Finchley and Barnet, Park Royal, Brent, and Wembley. Other branches within the District appear to have included Harlesden and Acton. His role appears to have allowed him to report personal details about individuals who were not members of the SWP, but who received copies of the newspaper.
- 47.10. Around the end of 1981 HN126 moved from the Kilburn and Cricklewood Branch of the SWP to the Paddington Branch. A report dated 3 November 1981<sup>1244</sup> records him still in attendance at a branch meeting of the Kilburn and Cricklewood SWP, however he is recorded as attending a meeting of the Paddington Branch of the SWP by 20 January 1982<sup>1245</sup>, now apparently part of a new West and North West London District<sup>1246</sup>.

---

<sup>1238</sup> UCPI0000011354

<sup>1239</sup> WS para 142

<sup>1240</sup> Witness statement para 143

<sup>1241</sup> UCPI0000013111 & UCPI0000013123

<sup>1242</sup> UCPI0000013536; UCPI0000013949

<sup>1243</sup> Witness statement para 165

<sup>1244</sup> UCPI0000016676

<sup>1245</sup> UCPI0000017108

<sup>1246</sup> UCPI0000017942

- 47.11. He recalls joining the Anti-Nazi League (ANL) because that was what was expected as a member of the SWP<sup>1247</sup>. He identifies as his a report very early on in his deployment concerning a meeting in Cricklewood on 23 March 1978 at which a North-West London ‘district’ of the ANL was formed<sup>1248</sup>, and attended its inaugural meeting on 19 April 1978<sup>1249</sup>. He appears thereafter to have been affiliated to the West Hampstead and Hampstead branch(es) of the ANL<sup>1250</sup>. He is occasionally recorded in reporting in attendance at meetings of other ANL branches, such as the Kilburn and Queens Park branch<sup>1251</sup>. By November 1978 he had been elected to the Central Committee of the newly formed ‘Camden Against Racism’, apparently as a delegate of the West Hampstead and Hampstead ANL, and in March 1979 was elected as a committee member of the “Hampstead and West Hampstead Camden Against Racism/ANL Group”<sup>1252</sup>
- 47.12. The time period covered by HN126’s deployment means that the Inquiry has relied primarily on reporting recovered from the dedicated SDS file kept by MI5 [see T1P2 addendum disclosure note<sup>1253</sup>] to locate the intelligence submitted by the officer. Within that file reporting was not attributed to individual officers, just to the SDS by means of an ‘SDS’ stamp on the face of the reports. The Inquiry therefore relied upon its own analysis of evidence about HN126’s deployment to attribute reporting that it considered was or was likely to have been submitted by him at the time of seeking a witness statement from the officer, relying primarily on the geographical locations and individuals mentioned. When presented with that reporting, HN126 denied having been responsible for some of the intelligence. In a small number of cases the Inquiry accepted that attribution of a report to HN126 was likely to have been inaccurate, and sought to re-attribute it to another officer (such reports are not included in the hearing bundle for HN126); in others there remains a live issue as to whether reporting disowned by HN126 is in fact based on intelligence gathered by him.
- 47.13. Although he disowned some of the reports sent to him, HN126 describes providing much more intelligence than is recorded in the

<sup>1247</sup> Witness statement para 194

<sup>1248</sup> UCPI0000011970

<sup>1249</sup> UCPI0000021728

<sup>1250</sup> UCPI0000011380

<sup>1251</sup> UCPI0000011301

<sup>1252</sup> UCPI0000013260

<sup>1253</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210325-T1\\_disclosure\\_note-addendum.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/20210325-T1_disclosure_note-addendum.pdf)

written reports, and says that he provided much of his reporting by telephone<sup>1254</sup>.

- 47.14. With relative frequency HN126 commented on photographs of individuals that were then attached to his reports; a number of the reports recovered still show the photographs that were attached<sup>1255</sup>. HN126 describes 'up-to-date' reports being prepared by the SDS office, relying on a number of sources not limited to the reporting of SDS officers<sup>1256</sup>. He identified a number of reports sent to him as falling into this category, and therefore not always based solely (or in some cases, he says, at all) on his reporting, including many of those with photographs attached<sup>1257</sup>. He does not recall receiving reporting from other sources to consider.
- 47.15. A number of reports submitted by HN126 concerning branch meetings of the SWP include words to the effect "*nothing of special interest emerged*". He nonetheless noted down the attendees at each meeting. He says he understood Special Branch was interested in knowing who attended meetings, and tracking individuals' involvement with the group. He describes reporting "*everything that I learnt about the group, even if it was just the occurrence of a social event*"<sup>1258</sup>. The extent to which this meant HN126 reported information about individuals who never involved themselves in criminal activity or public disorder is of interest in the context of his deployment, and what he identifies as the primary purpose of the SDS: to assist with the policing of public disorder.
- 47.16. HN126 reported on the personal circumstances of individuals within the groups he infiltrated, including their personal relationships. He has, however, denied that a series of reports which included information on relationships<sup>1259</sup>, intimate sexual practices<sup>1260</sup>, sexual orientation<sup>1261</sup>, and the mental health<sup>1262</sup> of individual SWP members in north-west London during the period of his deployment are based on his reporting.
- 47.17. HN126's reporting also focussed on the activities of school-aged children within the groups he infiltrated, including the children of the adults upon whom he was reporting. This extended to a series of

---

<sup>1254</sup> Witness statement para 90

<sup>1255</sup> Witness statement para 209

<sup>1256</sup> Witness statement para 82

<sup>1257</sup> Witness statement para 153, 154

<sup>1258</sup> Witness statement para 150

<sup>1259</sup> UCPI0000018103; UCPI0000018208

<sup>1260</sup> UCPI0000015536

<sup>1261</sup> UCPI0000015145

<sup>1262</sup> UCPI0000013871; UCPI0000013873

reports about the activities of ‘Schoolkids Against the Nazis’ whose members he describes as “*just as violent as any other anti-fascist group*” and the reporting as justified from a public order policing perspective<sup>1263</sup>. Based on the reports themselves, a number of the children upon whom HN126 reported appear not to have come to the attention of Special Branch prior to being reported upon by HN126 himself.

- 47.18. HN126 reported regularly on individuals’ membership of Trade Unions and their roles as shop stewards. He says that as far as he was aware the SDS was not monitoring the activities of Trade Unions, and the information would “*just be added to that person’s file*”<sup>1264</sup>.
- 47.19. At the end of his deployment HN126 appears to have submitted a series of reports on individual members of the SWP, some of whom are reported as not having been active within the group for months or years. He says he was “*probably asked to prepare these reports to bring the files of various individuals up to date before I left the unit*”<sup>1265</sup>.
- 47.20. HN126 had recently deployed into the SWP at the time of the death of Blair Peach. He recalls attending a picket in support of Blair Peach following his death, but does not recall coming into contact with any of his friends of family<sup>1266</sup>. A handful of reports attributed to HN126 by the Inquiry suggest that he attended meetings at which the death of Blair Peach was spoken about, including one addressed by a friend of Mr Peach. Several reports concerning meetings of the SWP record discussion of planned events in connection with the funeral, and the inquest into Blair Peach’s death. HN126 appears to have submitted lists of those in attendance at pickets of police stations in Harlesden and Kilburn on the eve of the inquest<sup>1267</sup>. He also identified individuals from photographs taken at the funeral.
- 47.21. HN126 came into contact with individuals involved with the Troops Out Movement (TOM) through attendance at TOM social events and “*a few meetings*”. He attributes this to the fact that there were a lot of Irish people in the branch of the SWP to which he belonged, rather than joining TOM<sup>1268</sup>.

---

<sup>1263</sup> Witness para 207

<sup>1264</sup> Witness statement para 237

<sup>1265</sup> Witness statement 160

<sup>1266</sup> Witness statement para 211

<sup>1267</sup> UCPI0000013497 & UCPI0000013498

<sup>1268</sup> Witness statement para 219

*HN106 “Barry Tompkins” – Spartacist League, Revolutionary Marxist Tendency/Revolutionary Communist Tendency/Revolutionary Communist Group/Revolutionary Communist Party, East London Workers Against Racism – 1979 to 1983*

42. HN106, who used the cover name “Barry Tompkins”, has provided a witness statement. A restriction order prohibits publication of his real name<sup>1269</sup>. The Inquiry would have liked HN106 to give oral evidence but he is unable to do so for health reasons.
43. HN106 joined the police in the early 1970s. For six months before joining the SDS, whilst in Special Branch, HN106 carried out plain clothes surveillance work but did not have an undercover identity or engage with any individuals<sup>1270</sup>. HN106’s vague memory is that he was told there were vacancies within the SDS and so approached Mike Ferguson, who he knew to be the head of the SDS, to express his interest in joining<sup>1271</sup>. HN106 states that he wanted to become an undercover officer as he thought the work would be challenging and different to regular police work, which he had not particularly enjoyed. Discussions with Mike Ferguson followed, including with HN106’s wife about the potential strain that this work could place on family life, but HN106 does not recall any formal interview process<sup>1272</sup>. HN106 believes that there was a general preference within the SDS to recruit married officers. HN106 assumes this was mainly because an undercover officer’s spouse was able to offer substantial support and probably also because it would reduce the likelihood of an undercover officer “going rogue”<sup>1273</sup>.
44. The evidence indicates that HN106 joined the SDS during 1978, but that he was not deployed until 1979. HN106 does not believe there was any formal training given when he joined the SDS<sup>1274</sup>. He read intelligence reports and activist literature to familiarise himself with the various groups’ activities. He thinks he must also have been given instructions about how to go about infiltrating groups. HN106 does not recall being shown any Tradecraft manual but did read a lot whilst he was in the back office<sup>1275</sup>. HN106 does not recall

---

<sup>1269</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

<sup>1270</sup> Witness statement, para 6.

<sup>1271</sup> Witness statement, para 8.

<sup>1272</sup> Witness statement, paras 8-9.

<sup>1273</sup> Witness statement, para 10.

<sup>1274</sup> Witness statement, para 11.

<sup>1275</sup> Witness statement, para 13.

receiving any advice about how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of those officers met undercover or whether they could enter sexual relationships. HN106 states he would be surprised if no advice at all was provided about these topics but he simply cannot remember it. HN106 states that it would have been obvious to him that it would not be a good idea to become sexually involved with targets<sup>1276</sup>. HN106 describes having a reasonable level of influence over his own tasking, which he describes as inevitable given he could not be constantly tasked while in the field and would therefore have to deploy his own common sense and judgement<sup>1277</sup>.

45. HN106 used the name and date of birth of a deceased child called Lionel Barry Tompkins to construct his cover identity<sup>1278</sup>. HN106's cover employment was as a delivery driver for a garden centre in Greater London<sup>1279</sup>. He had the use of a cover vehicle which he occasionally used to transport activist contacts<sup>1280</sup>. HN106 states that he had a number of cover flats during his deployment, and that towards the latter part of his deployment he shared a flat in Stoke Newington with another undercover officer, HN96<sup>1281</sup>.
46. For the purposes of producing his witness statement, HN106 was provided with material including approximately 380 intelligence reports that the Inquiry believed may be attributable to him. HN106 does not recall when he first submitted intelligence reports<sup>1282</sup>. Nor can HN106 recall providing most of the information contained in the intelligence reports attributed to him, although he is able to dispute attribution in relation to certain groups<sup>1283</sup>. He is not able to say confidently that he is responsible for the reporting in the remaining reports and cannot recall any of the reasons for providing certain information, assuming he was the source<sup>1284</sup>.
47. HN106 believes that the bulk of his reporting would have been passed back to the SDS in writing. HN106 states that he would hand-write his reports either at his family home or during the twice-weekly SDS meetings and hand them in during the meeting<sup>1285</sup>. Information that was particularly urgent would have

---

<sup>1276</sup> Witness statement, para 16.

<sup>1277</sup> Witness statement, para 44.

<sup>1278</sup> Witness statement, paras 20-22.

<sup>1279</sup> Witness statement, para 23.

<sup>1280</sup> Witness statement, para 30.

<sup>1281</sup> Witness statement, para 25.

<sup>1282</sup> Witness statement, para 39.

<sup>1283</sup> For example, the Campaign Against Racist Laws: see witness statement, para 58.

<sup>1284</sup> Witness statement, para 62.

<sup>1285</sup> Witness statement, para 155.



been given over the telephone<sup>1286</sup>. HN106 states that by and large he passed on as much information as he could recall during his deployment and he understood it was up to SDS managers to decide whether this information should be formally recorded and disseminated<sup>1287</sup>. HN106 states that he had routine contact with all managers within the SDS. He states he kept in touch with them by telephone and that he would call in every day or two to let the office know he was ok<sup>1288</sup>. He would also meet them face-to-face at the twice-weekly SDS meetings, of which an undercover officer would be expected to attend at least one. HN106 states that *“most people would provide a brief oral update about their deployment”* and that deployments were discussed in general terms<sup>1289</sup>. He may sometimes have arranged separate meetings if there was something of importance to discuss away from other undercover officers (such as his meeting with a KGB agent, as to which see below)<sup>1290</sup>.

48. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN106's witness statement and the documents relating to HN106 contained in the hearing bundle.

48.1. HN106 suspects he would have started reporting in May 1979 as he was deployed in the field from April 1979<sup>1291</sup>. The earliest report contained in the hearing bundle relating to HN106 is dated 30 May 1979<sup>1292</sup> and relates to a leaflet issued by the Friends of Blair Peach Committee concerning the alleged circumstances which led to the death of Blair Peach on 23 April 1979 during an anti-National Front demonstration. There is other intelligence reporting concerning Blair Peach in the hearing bundle relating to HN106: reports in relation to a demonstration in connection with the death of Blair Peach in May 1980<sup>1293</sup> and an attempt in July 1980<sup>1294</sup> by the Friends of Blair Peach Committee to form a national co-ordinating body with other such committees concerned with cases of state brutality by the police and prison authorities. HN106 states that to the best of his recollection he had no involvement with the Friends of Blair Peach Committee,

<sup>1286</sup> Witness statement, para 156.

<sup>1287</sup> Witness statement, para 45.

<sup>1288</sup> Witness statement, para 153.

<sup>1289</sup> Witness statement, para 49.

<sup>1290</sup> Witness statement, para 154.

<sup>1291</sup> Witness statement, para 39.

<sup>1292</sup> UCPI0000021297.

<sup>1293</sup> UCPI0000013961 and UCPI0000014149.

<sup>1294</sup> UCPI0000014149.



although it is possible he came into possession of the leaflet<sup>1295</sup>.

HN106 states, with reference to an intelligence report dated 13 July 1979 which lists attendees at Blair Peach's funeral<sup>1296</sup>, that he certainly does not recall attending Blair Peach's funeral and cannot see how he would have been trusted to be invited to the funeral within such a short time or able to name such a large number of attendees<sup>1297</sup>.

- 48.2. HN106 states that he was not directed to infiltrate a particular group but was told to focus on the far left-wing. He states that the major left-wing groups, such as the Socialist Workers' Party, were already pretty well covered by the SDS so he was told to look into whether any other groups should be targeted<sup>1298</sup>.
- 48.3. HN106 states that he came across the Spartacist League, which he describes as a revolutionary Trotskyist group that originated in America, because they were active in East London where HN106 was based. HN106 recalls speaking with some Spartacist League members who expressed pride at throwing bricks at police officers during the Miners' Strike pickets, which made him think they might be of interest to the SDS. HN106 is sure that he would have then discussed this with Mike Ferguson and presumes this was then approved. HN106 states that there may also have been interest in the Spartacist League because they were supportive of the Provisional IRA's campaigns<sup>1299</sup>.
- 48.4. HN106 presumes he became involved with the Spartacist League by buying their newspaper and attending their meetings. He thinks the members were initially cautious around him but he was gradually accepted by them as a left-wing activist. In order to gain legitimacy, HN106 describes attending some general left-wing and Labour Party events and making sure he had a good grounding in Marxist/Trotskyist literature<sup>1300</sup>. We note, in particular, the use of a mainstream political party, the Labour Party, on HN106's evidence, as a stepping stone to build up his cover identity.
- 48.5. HN106 states that he was involved with the Spartacist League throughout his deployment and describes the Spartacist League as the principal group that he was involved with<sup>1301</sup>.

---

<sup>1295</sup> Witness statement, para 57.

<sup>1296</sup> UCPI0000021047.

<sup>1297</sup> Witness statement, para 57.

<sup>1298</sup> Witness statement, para 31.

<sup>1299</sup> Witness statement, para 31.

<sup>1300</sup> Witness statement, paras 32 & 53.

<sup>1301</sup> Witness statement, para 59.

- 48.6. The Spartacist League was the main focus of the intelligence reports attributed to HN106 until around mid-1980. HN106 states that he would not have been considered a member but would have been thought of as a relatively trusted supporter, especially as he attended their office on a couple of occasions<sup>1302</sup>.
- 48.7. HN106 states that over the course of his deployment he did not really witness the Spartacist League posing a significant challenge to public disorder and that they seemed to be more intellectual than active. There were occasions when they gave the impression of wanting to split off from peaceful demonstrations to “*cause trouble*” elsewhere but this never really amounted to much. However, he believes their support for the provisional IRA may have been of greater concern and HN106 suspects that the Spartacist League would have been capable of providing low-level support to the Provisional IRA<sup>1303</sup>.
- 48.8. An intelligence report dated 28 May 1980 indicates that the Spartacist League fused with the Leninist Faction after the latter’s expulsion from the Workers Socialist League<sup>1304</sup>.
- 48.9. HN106 states that he reported the mere fact that an individual had attended a Spartacist League meeting because people present at meetings were likely to have been involved in the Spartacist League’s activities<sup>1305</sup>.
- 48.10. Photographs are included with some Spartacist League intelligence reports attributed to HN106<sup>1306</sup>. HN106 states that he did not take these photographs and assumes they were taken by surveillance officers and passed to the SDS office, perhaps for the purpose of identifying the individuals<sup>1307</sup>. There is evidence that the Security Service passed photographs of individuals associated with groups to the SDS for the purposes of SDS officers identifying the individuals<sup>1308</sup>.
- 48.11. HN106 produced some reporting on the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency (RMT) from mid-1980 onwards. HN106 believes it was “*effectively a sister organisation*” to the Spartacist League which was formed in around mid-1980 following a merger between the Revolutionary Labour League and former members of the

<sup>1302</sup> Witness statement, para 33.

<sup>1303</sup> Witness statement, para 61.

<sup>1304</sup> UCPI0000013999.

<sup>1305</sup> Witness statement, para 64.

<sup>1306</sup> For example, UCPI0000013727.

<sup>1307</sup> Witness statement, para 66.

<sup>1308</sup> UCPI0000028794.

Revolutionary Communist Tendency (RCT)<sup>1309</sup>. This is consistent with HN106's reporting from July 1980<sup>1310</sup>. Revolutionary Labour League individuals were attending Spartacist League meetings in early to mid-1980<sup>1311</sup> so HN106 presumes this is how he became involved with the RMT<sup>1312</sup>. HN106 also notes that there appears to have been cross-over between the membership of the RCT and the Spartacist League<sup>1313</sup>.

- 48.12. The large majority of HN106's reporting from 1980 onwards concerned the RCT and, from the end of 1980, Workers Against Racism (described in the reporting as a 'front' for the RCT – see below). The RCT appears to have changed its name to the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG) and then to the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP). HN106 does not recall these name changes and cannot comment on their significance<sup>1314</sup>.
- 48.13. Unusually, HN106 also describes, after he had been deployed for some time, forming a new activist group with two individuals he had met through either the Spartacist League or the RMT<sup>1315</sup>. He states that this arose from expressing dissatisfaction with the groups they were already involved in but they did not seek other members.
- 48.14. The intelligence reports attributed to HN106 do not describe any significant instances of public disorder instigated by the RCT or RCP. Instead the reports focus on the membership of these groups and public meetings and conferences at which the RCT or RCP promoted their political ideology<sup>1316</sup>. HN106 imagines that since it was a new group, it may have been deemed useful for him to investigate whether they had the potential or desire to cause public disorder and civil unrest but he does not recall them being distinct from the Spartacist League<sup>1317</sup>.
- 48.15. An intelligence report dated 29 October 1980<sup>1318</sup> concerns a social event being organised by the 'Smash the Prevention of Terrorism Act Campaign' in aid of Thameside Trades Council, which had been recently disaffiliated for supporting the Irish Liberation Movement. The

<sup>1309</sup> Witness statement, para 68; see also UCPI0000014258.

<sup>1310</sup> See UCPI0000014134 and in particular UCPI0000014148.

<sup>1311</sup> See for example UCPI0000013805.

<sup>1312</sup> Witness statement, para 69.

<sup>1313</sup> Witness statement, para 70.

<sup>1314</sup> Witness statement, para 80.

<sup>1315</sup> Witness statement, para 36.

<sup>1316</sup> See for example UCPI0000015575.

<sup>1317</sup> Witness statement, para 73.

<sup>1318</sup> UCPI0000014621. See also UCPI0000015238.

report describes this campaign also as a ‘front organisation’ of the RCT.

- 48.16. An intelligence report dated 3 March 1981<sup>1319</sup> concerns a RCT ‘educational’ in relation to Ireland, held on 12 February 1981 and attended by twelve people. The conclusion of the discussion concerned what the giving of unconditional support to the Irish Republican Army entailed and one individual raised the point of whether such support should extend to planting bombs or gun-running (see paragraph 5 of the report). HN106 presumes that reporting on the RCT may have been deemed necessary in part because of their support of the Provisional IRA but he cannot actually recall this<sup>1320</sup>.
- 48.17. An intelligence report dated 3 April 1981<sup>1321</sup> purports to summarise events at a national conference held on 22 February 1981 by the RCT for supporters and readers of its newspaper, ‘The Next Step’. The summary of the first speech indicates that the speaker stated, amongst other things, that, *“Every opportunity must be seized to ferment the fundamental conflict between the state, capitalists and workers. The last thing that revolutionaries should do now was to unite with the Labour Party and Trades Union bosses against the Tories, as this would only result in another Labour Party Government. A clear revolutionary alternative to Labourism must be projected. None had ever been put forward, and for this reason out and out opposition to the Labour Party was essential to building a new party.”* Could such an aim properly be considered to be a threat to public order or subversive?
- 48.18. HN106 describes what he believes to have been an attempt by a KGB officer from the Russian security services to recruit HN106 to work as a courier to deliver information on behalf of the KGB. HN106 states that he attended a follow up meeting in a pub in Hackney where he was told he would need to go to Russia for training. HN106 states that he said he would need to think about this and then discussed it with his SDS managers but because it was felt that his cover identity would not stand up to scrutiny in Russia he did not go. HN106 states he must have told the KGB officer that he was not interested and does not believe he had any further contact with him although he describes later reading in the newspaper that this individual had been expelled from the country for trying to recruit sailors in Plymouth<sup>1322</sup>. HN106 believes this KGB

---

<sup>1319</sup> UCPI0000016491.

<sup>1320</sup> Witness statement, para 79.

<sup>1321</sup> See UCPI0000016584.

<sup>1322</sup> Witness statement, paras 123-126.

officer to be a Russian individual recorded in HN106's intelligence reports as having attended two RCP meetings in 1982<sup>1323</sup>. The Inquiry has obtained contemporaneous documents from the Security Service regarding HN106's involvement with this individual<sup>1324</sup>. They are consistent with HN106's account insofar as the extent of contact is concerned and the suggestion that HN106 might act as a courier. There is no reference in those documents to HN106 being asked to travel to Russia for training. What is recorded is that Metropolitan Police Special Branch were "*totally against allowing an SDS source to become involved*" with such a situation<sup>1325</sup>.

- 48.19. HN106 also believes that he came into contact with another individual who may have been working for a foreign security service. HN106 states that he and two others, who had set up their own small group as referred to above, passed little bits of information to this individual in return for money estimated to be in the hundreds in total<sup>1326</sup>. This individual also appears to HN106 to have given quite a bit of money to the RCP in return for information<sup>1327</sup>. HN106 states that the SDS office was aware of his connection with this individual, who he thinks he may have been involved with for a number of months, and knew that he was funding HN106's group in exchange for information. HN106 does not know why this is not recorded in any of the intelligence reports he has seen<sup>1328</sup>.
- 48.20. HN106 also infiltrated Workers Against Racism (WAR). HN106 presumes that since he was based in East London, he was involved with East London Workers Against Racism (ELWAR), as the reporting attributed to HN106 indicates<sup>1329</sup>. HN106 recalls that he would visit the houses of people that WAR wished to recruit, as part of a group of three or four people, to offer support to families that were experiencing difficulties as a result of their race. One report in the bundle records a visit by a delegation of 17, comprising ELWAR members, contacts from the RCP's Sheffield branch, and a 'Time Out' journalist, to Priory Court Estate in Walthamstow to garner physical support from residents for a family living in U Block, who were being racially harassed by youths on

<sup>1323</sup> UCPI0000018248.

<sup>1324</sup> See UCPI0000028780, UCPI0000018322, UCPI0000028784, UCPI0000028795.

<sup>1325</sup> UCPI0000028784.

<sup>1326</sup> Witness statement, para 127.

<sup>1327</sup> Witness statement, para 127; UCPI0000014258.

<sup>1328</sup> Witness statement, para 128.

<sup>1329</sup> Witness statement, para 92. See for example MPS-0731462.

the estate<sup>1330</sup>. HN106 describes ELWAR members taking smaller groups to the homes of the victims of racist attacks who ELWAR had either helped, or were in the process of helping, and lists the names and addresses of three such families. HN106 justifies reporting these details on the grounds that *“if I came into possession of information that people were being attacked and racially abused, I would have thought this should be passed on to the police”*<sup>1331</sup>. We note that a report on a planning meeting for a forthcoming GLC election also contains details of a family whom ELWAR members were said to be guarding in their house<sup>1332</sup>.

- 48.21. HN106 recalls that WAR was trying to establish itself as a group that fought against racist injustices primarily in relation to housing and employment. The Inquiry is particularly concerned to investigate on what basis the infiltration of a group with these objectives could be justified.
- 48.22. In the reporting attributed to HN106, WAR is described as a *“front organisation”* for the RCT<sup>1333</sup>, the RCT is referred to as its *“parent organisation”*<sup>1334</sup> and, in November 1981, WAR is described as a satellite of the RCP<sup>1335</sup>.
- 48.23. HN106 believes WAR was established by RCP members with the ultimate aim of recruiting people to the RCP (or an associated group). HN106 states that it was felt that WAR would be a more appealing banner as many more people considered themselves to be anti-racists than communists and therefore WAR could attract broader membership that in time could be recruited into the RCP<sup>1336</sup>.
- 48.24. As part of his deployment, HN106 was involved with campaigning on behalf of WAR for the Greater London Council elections on 7 May 1981<sup>1337</sup>.
- 48.25. HN106 recalls that after he had been involved with WAR for some time, an article was published in the Daily Mail which suggested that WAR was a militant organisation and HN106 was asked to report upon whether this was accurate. HN106 thinks the concern was that communist groups would try to ferment (sic) disorder among ethnic

---

<sup>1330</sup> UCPI0000018095.

<sup>1331</sup> Witness Statement, para 108

<sup>1332</sup> UCPI0000016552.

<sup>1333</sup> See for example MPS-0731461 and UCPI0000019008.

<sup>1334</sup> UCPI0000016385.

<sup>1335</sup> UCPI0000016706.

<sup>1336</sup> Witness statement, para 93.

<sup>1337</sup> Witness statement, para 97.



minority groups and that this could lead to public disorder, which the communist groups could use as propaganda. This was around the time of the Brixton riots so was of particular concern, according to HN106<sup>1338</sup>. In fact, during his deployment, HN106 formed the view that WAR did not represent much of a threat. HN106 states that the largely white RCP membership struggled easily to win the trust of ethnic minority communities and as it struggled to recruit ethnic minority individuals WAR did not have that much credibility as an organisation<sup>1339</sup>.

- 48.26. We note that when HN106 infiltrated WAR at the end of 1980, racial tension and distrust of the police amongst ethnic minorities was particularly acute, and the reports reflect this backdrop. A report dated 16 April 1981 records the RCT accelerating plans to form a South London branch of Workers Against Racism “*as a result of violent disturbances in Brixton over the weekend of 11-12 April 1981*”<sup>1340</sup>. The issue of police racism appears in a number of reports. An intelligence report dated 30 April 1981 concerns an ELWAR public election meeting at which speakers apparently criticised the police for their “*attitude to young blacks*”, for their repressive role in society, “*especially against the black population*”, of an attempted cover-up of the fact that their “*continuous harassment of black people had totally destroyed their confidence in police*” and if the report is accurate, included a debate on how actually to fight the police<sup>1341</sup>. Of this report HN106 states “*I do not recall that reporting the view of WAR’s members in relation to the police was of especial interest or importance. I suspect that this is a topic that would have arisen quite frequently given the tensions between the police and the black community at the time. If I was present during discussions such as this, I would have passed information of this nature on, particularly since it might have helped in understanding the causes of the riots*”<sup>1342</sup>. The bundle also contains an intelligence report dated 31 March 1982 concerning a public meeting held by the RCP under the banner of ‘South London Workers Against Racism’ to discuss racism in the police<sup>1343</sup>. HN106 notes that this meeting took place about a year after the Brixton riots so there would

<sup>1338</sup> Witness statement, para 94.

<sup>1339</sup> Witness statement, para 95.

<sup>1340</sup> UCPI0000016611.

<sup>1341</sup> UCPI0000015302.

<sup>1342</sup> Witness statement, para 98.

<sup>1343</sup> UCPI0000017977.



have been interest in events like this<sup>1344</sup>. Paragraph 11 of the report states however that, *“Although the whole theme of the meeting was anti-police and emphasised the importance of fighting against racism, there was no actual suggestion that people present should incite a riot.”* In relation to the RCP, the same paragraph states that, *“Whilst it is unlikely that the RCP deceives itself into over-estimating its influence amongst blacks, as with most extremist organisations, it would welcome the propagation of civil unrest which it could turn into political propaganda.”*

- 48.27. HN106 also records a WAR meeting on 19 April 1983 relating to its involvement in the case of a 13 year old ‘West-Indian’ boy who claimed to have been beaten up and stabbed by the police and whose case had been turned down by a law firm<sup>1345</sup>. Of this HN106 states that he cannot recall the meeting, but that if he provided the information, he would have considered it of interest to Special Branch. He asserts that the reference in the report to whether the case could have the *“agitative potential of the Colin Roach incident”* would render information on the allegation, and its perceived credibility, useful<sup>1346</sup>. He is unable to recall how he learnt about the law firm refusing to represent the family, but thinks it must have been passed on to WAR by a member who worked at the firm in question. A report on a meeting of the Hackney Legal Defence Committee, set up to monitor black defendants’ court cases arising primarily from the riots in the area from April to July 1981, records that an individual plans to appeal a conviction<sup>1347</sup>. Why? There are also reports on a public meeting of the Newham 8 Defence Campaign held on 28 October 1982<sup>1348</sup> (of which HN106 has no recollection<sup>1349</sup>) and a report dated 11 November 1981 summarising the contents of a document entitled ‘Evidence to the Greater London Council Police Committee – October 1981 – Racist Violence and Police Harassment, published by Workers Against Racism (WAR)’ which cites several cases of families in the Brixton area who have suffered *“brutal treatment at the hands of police”* and of *“racist’ attacks where the police have taken no action or obtained no result”*<sup>1350</sup>.

<sup>1344</sup> Witness statement, para 83.

<sup>1345</sup> UCPI0000019008.

<sup>1346</sup> Witness statement, para 102

<sup>1347</sup> UCPI0000015647.

<sup>1348</sup> UCPI0000015892.

<sup>1349</sup> Witness statement, para 103 d.

<sup>1350</sup> UCPI0000016706.

- 48.28. An intelligence report attributed to HN106, dated 2 February 1983, concerns a private meeting of the Organising Committee of the Roach Family Support Committee on 26 January 1983<sup>1351</sup>. HN106 states that he does not believe he attended this meeting as he has no memory of being involved with this committee and that he must have got the information from the East London RCP member recorded as having attended. HN106 notes that this report contains details of pickets and demonstrations that the Committee has arranged, which would obviously have been of interest to the SDS<sup>1352</sup>. There are further reports attributed to HN106 which mention Colin Roach as a result of East London RCP or ELWAR support or through the production of a leaflet<sup>1353</sup>.
- 48.29. HN106's hearing bundle contains further intelligence reporting on race-related social justice groups. One is a short report, dated 24 February 1982, relating that an individual is involved with the New Cross Massacre Action Committee and 'an intimate' of a leading personality in that organisation<sup>1354</sup>. HN106 says he cannot recall any involvement with this committee<sup>1355</sup>. The second is a report on a public meeting of the Winston Rose Action Campaign held on 10 August 1981. The mood at the meeting is described as angry, with some of the audience alleged to have shown quiet sympathy for the "*black separatists*" who advocated revenge attacks on the police<sup>1356</sup>. HN106 has no recollection of the meeting and states that the events and attendees are unfamiliar<sup>1357</sup>, but we note that it takes place in East London, and that Fran Eden of ELWAR is reported to have spoken, calling for the destruction of the police. Further, the report ends thus: "*Despite the angry atmosphere it seemed apparent that most present would prefer to keep the campaign within legal bounds. A small number of black separatists, however, would be prepared to use any methods available, and ELWAR would no doubt offer support*"<sup>1358</sup>. The report's ELWAR slant suggests that HN106 is the author. This is also one of three reports in the bundle which record the number of black attendees at meetings<sup>1359</sup>.

<sup>1351</sup> UCPI0000016951.

<sup>1352</sup> Witness statement, para 109.

<sup>1353</sup> UCPI0000016959, UCPI0000018697, MPS-0746727, UCPI0000018833.

<sup>1354</sup> UCPI0000017186.

<sup>1355</sup> Witness statement, para 104 b.

<sup>1356</sup> UCPI0000015540.

<sup>1357</sup> Witness statement, para 103.

<sup>1358</sup> UCPI0000015540.

<sup>1359</sup> See UCPI0000016959 and UCPI0000016366.

- 48.30. Some of the reporting on the RCP indicates an apparent desire to support a revolution in Ireland and to support the Irish Republican Army.<sup>1360</sup> There is limited reporting on the Irish Freedom Movement (also linked to the RCP<sup>1361</sup>).
- 48.31. The bundle contains reports on meetings addressed by MPs, and at which core participants Peter Hain and Tariq Ali are recorded as present<sup>1362</sup>.
- 48.32. The final intelligence report in the hearing bundle which the Inquiry believed may have been attributable to HN106 is dated 27 September 1983 and concerns the involvement of ELWAR members at a march in support of the Newham 8 Defence Campaign<sup>1363</sup>. The report details a member of the Revolutionary Communist Group accusing ELWAR “*comrades*” of being racists, agents of the Police and of the South African security services and a subsequent melee in which the ELWAR banner was dragged to one side. Paragraph 5 of the report states that this incident “*illustrates how ELWAR (i.e. the RCP), in addition to its predictable attitude against lawful authority, has a perverse knack of antagonising those left-wing elements with which it might be expected, by any reasonable standards to express a degree of solidarity.*”
- 48.33. However, it is not clear that that report from September 1983 is properly attributable to HN106. The evidence available to the Inquiry, in particular from the Security Service, indicates that HN106 ceased operational duties in June 1983 and after a period of leave was debriefed by the Security Service in July 1983<sup>1364</sup>. The write up of the debrief<sup>1365</sup> of HN106 has been obtained by the Inquiry (and is not dated until 17 October 1983). Of note in that debrief is that HN106 is recorded as saying he was a member of the Transport and General Workers Union through a branch office and that the RCP wanted him to be active at branch level and aspire to membership of a Trades Council: see paragraph 11. HN106 is recorded as saying that he avoided this without apparent loss of credibility and allowed his membership to lapse. This aspect of the debrief is inconsistent with HN106’s witness statement in which he says he did not join a trade

<sup>1360</sup> See MPS-0731471.

<sup>1361</sup> See UCPI0000018243 and UCPI0000019211.

<sup>1362</sup> See UCPI0000016568 and UCPI0000016579.

<sup>1363</sup> UCPI0000019525.

<sup>1364</sup> See UCPI0000029214, UCPI0000029219 and UCPI0000027539.

<sup>1365</sup> UCPI0000034280.

- union while deployed and does not recall becoming involved in trade union affairs<sup>1366</sup>.
- 48.34. HN106 understands that a deployment of four years was deemed to be around the optimum<sup>1367</sup>. HN106 does not recall how he withdrew from his deployment and states he must have just said something had come up and that he was leaving, although this was planned and discussed with managers<sup>1368</sup>.
- 48.35. The intelligence reports attributed to HN106 contain a significant number of examples of him reporting personal information about individuals, including addresses, telephone numbers, occupations and employer details and car descriptions together with registration numbers. On occasion, and from the outset of HN106's deployment, the reports contain more specific personal information, such as details regarding the partner and family of the subject of the report, the identity of a cohabitee<sup>1369</sup> and details of sexual relationships<sup>1370</sup>.
- 48.36. HN106's explanation for reporting this personal information in relation to members of the Spartacist League is that he was meant to be finding out about the membership and supporters of the Spartacist League and so it would seem logical to report any information that would help to identify members and regular attendees. When reporting on these individuals, HN106 would not have been aware of the fact that some of these individuals were 'no trace' on Special Branch files<sup>1371</sup>. Where intelligence reports about individuals contain significant amounts of personal information, HN106 is not convinced that all this information would have come from him and suspects that some it has been obtained through research by the SDS office<sup>1372</sup>. Any information provided by HN106 would have been intended to give as full a picture as possible about background, to enable identification, and he would try to pass on as much as possible<sup>1373</sup>.
- 48.37. Some of the intelligence reports attributed to HN106 contain particularly personal information being reported and disseminated. By way of example, an intelligence report dated 2 September 1980<sup>1374</sup> not only records the fact that the subject of the report was "*presently indulging in*

<sup>1366</sup> Witness statement, para 114.

<sup>1367</sup> Witness statement, para 147.

<sup>1368</sup> Witness statement, para 148.

<sup>1369</sup> See, for example, UCPI0000013345, dated 7 September 1979.

<sup>1370</sup> See UCPI0000017955 and UCPI0000018817.

<sup>1371</sup> Witness statement, para 63.

<sup>1372</sup> Witness statement, para 74.

<sup>1373</sup> Witness statement, paras 74 and 111.

<sup>1374</sup> UCPI0000014258.

*a sexual relationship*” with a named individual but also contains the comment that, “*Judging by the depressing regularity with which [redacted] suffers from attacks of cystitis, neither is permitting [redacted]’s tenuous position in the United Kingdom to interfere with more immediate needs.*” HN106 states that he would be very surprised if he provided this information<sup>1375</sup>. An intelligence report dated 30 September 1980<sup>1376</sup> details how a RMT member had been suspended from that organisation for misappropriating party funds. Paragraph 3 of that report sets out in some detail the reasons for a strong suspicion that the money had been spent on a prostitute, including that the subject of the report had a physical deformity and had often shown signs of being obsessed with the thought of women. HN106 considers that it would have been appropriate to report this as the reasons for the suspension of a relatively prominent left-wing activist from the RMT<sup>1377</sup>. Also, an intelligence report dated 8 April 1983 records that an individual “*recently had an abortion at a South London ‘day abortion’ clinic. Whilst the identity of the putative father is not certain it is known that [redacted] previously had a relationship with [redacted].*” Again, HN106 states that he would be surprised if he reported this information<sup>1378</sup>. Why was such highly sensitive personal information to be written up in formal intelligence reports? Could it have served a legitimate purpose? How could it have met any such purpose? Was it necessary to record and store it?

- 48.38. HN106 states that he did not take up any formal roles within the groups that he infiltrated<sup>1379</sup>.
- 48.39. HN106 believes that it would have been difficult to gain the sort of information he reported without covert means and that information about private events could not have been obtained without the use of undercover officers. HN106 also states that it was necessary gradually to gain the trust of activists in order to obtain intelligence about the group’s planned activities and real intentions, which could only be done by adopting the undercover persona of a committed left-wing activist<sup>1380</sup>.
- 48.40. HN106’s recollection is that most of the protests he attended were fairly calm and peaceful. There may have been some pushing and shoving

<sup>1375</sup> Witness statement, para 745.

<sup>1376</sup> UCPI0000014543.

<sup>1377</sup> Witness statement, para 77.

<sup>1378</sup> Witness statement, para 88.

<sup>1379</sup> Witness statement, para 139.

<sup>1380</sup> Witness statement, paras 112-113.

but HN106 does not think it went much beyond that and he cannot recall any specific incidents of public disorder. He remembers one occasion when Spartacist League members went to a protest near Portobello Road with the intention of breaking away from the main protest and causing “trouble” elsewhere but this did not actually happen<sup>1381</sup>.

- 48.41. HN106 does not think he witnessed subversion during his deployment. He states that the ultimate aim of left-wing communist groups was to achieve communist government in the UK but they did not have the necessary degree of influence to achieve this and therefore HN106 does not think of them as being actively or effectively subversive<sup>1382</sup>.
- 48.42. HN106 believes that he sometimes participated in low-level criminality while deployed. He recalls one incident when he accompanied Spartacist League activists to spray graffiti on Bow Bridge in London. HN106 acted as the lookout to avoid active participation in the graffiti. HN106 describes an incident when he transported about seven activists under a mattress in the back of his van which he thinks may have been connected to criminality but he does not know of any particular crime<sup>1383</sup>.
- 48.43. HN106 states that he never engaged in any sexual relationships whilst in his undercover identity<sup>1384</sup>. He describes how he was interviewed as part of Operation Herne regarding a possible relationship with an activist. HN106 understands this was as a result of a Security Service file note which referred to HN106 as a possible candidate to approach a potential informant and stated that HN106 had “*probably bedded her and been warned off by [his] bosses*”<sup>1385</sup>. A copy of this file note has been obtained by the Inquiry<sup>1386</sup>. HN106 states he has no clear memory of who this person is and certainly did not have a sexual relationship with this person. HN106 states that the only reason why he remembers her is because she had a party trick that she would lactate on demand and demonstrated this on a couple of occasions to other activists<sup>1387</sup>.
- 48.44. HN106 states that the only reason he can think of for the Security Service file note relates to the ex-wife or ex-partner of an activist, who

<sup>1381</sup> Witness statement, para 115.

<sup>1382</sup> Witness statement, para 119.

<sup>1383</sup> Witness statement, para 140.

<sup>1384</sup> Witness statement, para 129.

<sup>1385</sup> Witness statement, paras 130-131.

<sup>1386</sup> UCPI0000027446.

<sup>1387</sup> Witness statement, para 131.



was not an activist herself, but with whom HN106 developed a quite close relationship. HN106 describes bumping into her a few months after she had split up with her partner and going on to develop a friendship which involved meeting up for drinks and HN106 sometimes staying the night at her house if he was unable to drive home after drinking. He states he would sleep in one of the children's rooms and they would share with her. HN106 describes how although it was an entirely platonic relationship, some activists started to refer to her as "*Barry's girlfriend*". HN106 states that he did not correct them as it was actually helpful for his cover for people to think he had a girlfriend. HN106 also describes how Trevor Butler, a manager in the SDS, asked to speak to HN106 because reference had been made in an intercepted telephone call to potentially storing items from Ireland at "*Barry's girlfriend's place*". HN106 thinks Trevor Butler said something to him along the lines of "*You're not going to get us into trouble are you?*" and HN106 said "*No, it's nothing like that*". HN106 states he did not feel the need to say much more as there was not anything untoward to explain. HN106 states his relationship with this woman was never anything more than friends but he was sad when he had to disappear from her life<sup>1388</sup>. The attitude of SDS management to undercover officers having sexual relationships in their undercover identities is obviously a critical issue for the Inquiry to explore.

- 48.45. HN106 states that he never had any concerns that his or his family's welfare was being neglected. He describes how when his wife was pregnant with their second child, he was given a pager so that he could be contacted if she went into labour while he was undercover. HN106 made up a story about how his undercover employer had given him a pager. HN106 was contacted via the pager and was able to be present in time for his child's birth<sup>1389</sup>.
- 48.46. HN106 describes how about 5 years after he left the SDS, he was contacted by Tony Waite, who he believes was the Inspector in charge of the SDS at the time. He asked HN106 about the accuracy of his reporting in relation to a particular individual, which HN106 confirmed. HN106 believes this was in connection with consideration being given to deporting the individual but does not know what happened and was not contacted again<sup>1390</sup>.

---

<sup>1388</sup> Witness statement, paras 132-136.

<sup>1389</sup> Witness statement, para 158.

<sup>1390</sup> Witness statement, para 143.



- 48.47. For a period in the 1990's, after having retired from the police, HN106 worked as a private investigator. He describes one occasion when he was asked to carry out due diligence for a company considering investing in a business proposition and, in order to do so, went to meet with the owner of the business. HN106 used a false name (not his SDS cover name) and pretended to be a potential investor in order to ask him questions about his business plan. HN106 states that this was in no way comparable to his SDS work but he imagines he was more comfortable doing this because of his time in the SDS<sup>1391</sup>.
49. In light of the contents of HN106's witness statement and as a result of the Inquiry being provided with further documents relevant to him, a request for HN106 to provide a further witness statement was prepared. Due to HN106's deteriorating health, this request was not sent to HN106.
- HN96 "Michael James" – Socialist Workers Party and Troops Out Movement – End of 1978/early 1979 to 3 April 1983*
50. HN96, who used the cover name "Michael James", has provided a witness statement. He is due to give oral evidence. His real name is the subject of a restriction order<sup>1392</sup>.
51. The evidence indicates that HN96 joined the SDS around the end of 1978. He did not do any undercover policing work or work using a cover identity before joining the SDS. Fairly soon after joining Special Branch, HN96 describes how he became aware that there was an undercover unit. He was interested and so went along to the office to introduce himself, where he spoke with Chief Superintendent Craft who said he would look into HN96 joining the SDS. Some time (at least a couple of months) later, HN96 received a telephone call from Chief Inspector Pryde who told him he was going to be selected for the SDS<sup>1393</sup>.
52. When HN96 joined the SDS, he was told that he would replace HN296<sup>1394</sup>, who used the cover name "Geoff Wallace" and who was deployed between 1975 and 1978. HN96 states that although he was not going to infiltrate the same

---

<sup>1391</sup> Witness statement, para 172.

<sup>1392</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108\\_Ruling\\_13\\_final.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/20181108_Ruling_13_final.pdf)

<sup>1393</sup> Witness statement, paras 10-15.

<sup>1394</sup> Witness statement, para 24.

groups, HN296 gave advice to HN96 on how to conduct himself when he went undercover<sup>1395</sup>.

53. HN96 states that there was no formal training for being an undercover officer<sup>1396</sup> and no tradecraft manual or binder containing guidance about how to behave whilst deployed<sup>1397</sup>. HN96 states that most of the guidance he received came from HN296 and he felt he was expected to use his common sense and sound judgement to decide how to behave in any given situation<sup>1398</sup>. For example, HN96 states that he does not think anyone ever sat him down and said he should not have sexual relationships, but common sense dictated that was definitely not allowed<sup>1399</sup>.
54. HN96 used the name, location of birth and possibly date of birth of a deceased child called Robert Michael James to construct his cover identity<sup>1400</sup>.
55. The following observations and questions arise from an analysis of HN96's witness statement and the documents associated with HN96.
  - 55.1. HN96 was told by the SDS office that they wanted him to go to East London and become involved with the Socialist Workers Party (SWP)<sup>1401</sup>. As a result, he found accommodation in Hackney. HN96 subsequently moved into a flat in the Hackney area which he shared with HN106 for around three years<sup>1402</sup>. HN106 and HN96 were friends and HN106 was the only other undercover officer with whom HN96 discussed his deployment<sup>1403</sup>. HN96 subsequently moved to a bedsit in the Stoke Newington area which he was in for around 6 months before his deployment ended.
  - 55.2. HN96's cover employment was in the painter and decorator business<sup>1404</sup>.
  - 55.3. HN96 believes that he started submitting intelligence reports around the end of 1978<sup>1405</sup>. The first intelligence report attributed to the HN96

---

<sup>1395</sup> See witness statement, paras 25 to 31.

<sup>1396</sup> Witness statement, para 23.

<sup>1397</sup> Witness statement, para 29.

<sup>1398</sup> Witness statement, para 29.

<sup>1399</sup> Witness statement, para 32.

<sup>1400</sup> Witness statement, paras 42 to 48.

<sup>1401</sup> Witness statement, para 57.

<sup>1402</sup> Witness statement, para 62.

<sup>1403</sup> Witness statement, para 113.

<sup>1404</sup> Witness statement, para 55.

<sup>1405</sup> Witness statement, para 82.

- by the Inquiry is dated 8 February 1979 and concerns the geographical make-up of the Hackney District of the SWP<sup>1406</sup>.
- 55.4. The first group that HN96 was targeted to infiltrate was the SWP in East London, which he did for the first two years of his deployment<sup>1407</sup>. At that time, the Hackney area was a melting pot of various political groups, so lots of members of the SWP would associate with people who were involved in other groups. Although HN96 was only targeted towards the SWP in his first two years, during that time he had peripheral interactions with a number of groups including Red Action and the Revolutionary Communist Party. However, HN96 only attended SWP meetings<sup>1408</sup>.
- 55.5. HN96 states that he was initially tasked to the East London SWP as there was a requirement within Special Branch to have good intelligence on that group. HN96 states that they were potentially the most disruptive group, from a public order perspective, that were currently active. HN96 understood there to be several officers in the SDS at the time who were involved with various branches of the SWP, dispersed throughout the London area<sup>1409</sup>.
- 55.6. HN96 believes he was well known in East London SWP. He regularly attended meetings and, although careful not to come across as political, was always willing to help out. As he had a vehicle, HN96 would give members of the SWP lifts to demonstrations. He sold the SWP paper and went along to the pub after meetings and to social events to help maintain his cover. HN96 states that he formed friendships with members of the SWP but would not describe them as close friendships<sup>1410</sup>. HN96's recollection is that he would not submit an intelligence report on a purely social event unless something of interest unexpectedly arose<sup>1411</sup>.
- 55.7. HN96's deployment focused on the Hackney District of the SWP, which in early 1979 comprised the geographical branches of Clapton, Hackney and Stoke Newington<sup>1412</sup>.
- 55.8. For the purposes of producing his witness statement, HN96 was provided with material including approximately 700 intelligence reports. HN96 does not think that there are any significant groups, individuals or

---

<sup>1406</sup> UCPI0000013113.

<sup>1407</sup> Witness statement, para 72.

<sup>1408</sup> Witness statement, para 74.

<sup>1409</sup> Witness statement, para 106.

<sup>1410</sup> Witness statement, para 131.

<sup>1411</sup> Witness statement, para 168.

<sup>1412</sup> UCPI0000013113.

periods in respect of which there are reports missing<sup>1413</sup>. However, HN96 does believe that a large number of reports have been incorrectly attributed to him, such as reports of Revolutionary Communist Party meetings<sup>1414</sup>. HN96 states that the intelligence he provided took a number of forms. At the time HN96 was in the SDS, providing public order intelligence was still one of the SDS's main roles<sup>1415</sup>. HN96 would always submit a written report when he came to learn information about an upcoming demonstration, and sometimes would also inform a member of the SDS office when he saw them at the SDS safe house<sup>1416</sup>. HN96 would remember what he could about a meeting and then make notes as soon as he reached a safe place (normally his real home)<sup>1417</sup>. He would then write up those notes into a draft report which he would hand in at the next meeting that he attended at a SDS safe house<sup>1418</sup>. Other reporting was more general. HN96 would report any information he came to learn about individuals who were in the groups, or their future plans. HN96 understood that the purpose of this reporting was part of a broader remit that Special Branch had for monitoring subversion. A lot of information sharing took place between Special Branch and the Security Service, who had the lead in relation to this sort of intelligence<sup>1419</sup>.

- 55.9. HN96 states that he did not apply a filter to what was reported, because it was not really for him to decide what was important and what was not<sup>1420</sup>. The intelligence reports attributed to HN96 contain a number of examples of him reporting personal information about individual members of the SWP. By way of example, in an intelligence report dated 22 May 1979, HN96 reported that a member of the Clapton branch of the SWP was a divorced woman with a daughter aged about 6 years<sup>1421</sup>. In an intelligence report dated 22 August 1979, HN96 reported that a member of the Clapton branch of the SWP lived with his parents in a specified place and was a pupil at Hackney Downs Comprehensive School<sup>1422</sup>. In an intelligence report dated 1 April 1980, HN96 reported that a member of the SWP had just been

---

<sup>1413</sup> Witness statement, para 78.

<sup>1414</sup> Witness statement, paras 79-80.

<sup>1415</sup> Witness statement, para 90.

<sup>1416</sup> Witness statement, para 92.

<sup>1417</sup> Witness statement, para 86.

<sup>1418</sup> Witness statement, para 87.

<sup>1419</sup> Witness statement, para 98.

<sup>1420</sup> Witness statement, para 99.

<sup>1421</sup> UCPI0000021293

<sup>1422</sup> UCPI0000013300.

discharged from hospital, where she had been receiving treatment for a nervous breakdown, which it was thought was the result of worry about recent surgical operations and the ending of a longstanding friendship<sup>1423</sup>. An intelligence report dated 28 January 1981 contains details of “*private sexual behaviour*”<sup>1424</sup>. An intelligence report dated 30 January 1981 records that an individual who recently joined the Stoke Newington branch of the SWP continued to be employed as a fireman at an identified fire station where he was the representative of the core participant Fire Brigade Union<sup>1425</sup>. In an intelligence report dated 4 June 1981, HN96 reported on the marriage of two members of the SWP<sup>1426</sup>. In an intelligence report dated 1 June 1982, HN96 reported that a member of an East London branch of the SWP was a member of the National Union of Journalists who had been involved in a campaign to prevent the closure of the ‘Camden Journal’ newspaper<sup>1427</sup>.

- 55.10. On 5 September 1979, HN96 was elected to a position on the Hackney District Committee of the SWP<sup>1428</sup>. HN96 states that he would have been seen as fairly active within the SWP in that area and that there were not a lot of people in the SWP who were willing to actually do things beyond attend meetings and demonstrations. HN96 describes being at a meeting and someone putting him forward to sit on the committee<sup>1429</sup>, which is consistent with what is recorded in the intelligence report dated 19 September 1979<sup>1430</sup>. HN96 states he was reluctant to undertake this role as the advice he had received was not to become too prominent. However, he was also mindful that being on such a committee might provide him with the opportunity to learn more information about the activities the SWP were planning to participate in, so he agreed to do it<sup>1431</sup>.
- 55.11. HN96 has a limited recollection about what this committee did, but believes it was not really a decision-making body and essentially assisted with implementing the decisions of the SWP head office at a local level<sup>1432</sup>. HN96 does not think that being on this committee gave

---

<sup>1423</sup> UCPI0000013873.

<sup>1424</sup> UCPI0000016206.

<sup>1425</sup> UCPI0000016207.

<sup>1426</sup> UCPI0000015379.

<sup>1427</sup> UCPI0000018229.

<sup>1428</sup> UCPI0000013376; witness statement, para 148.

<sup>1429</sup> Witness statement, para 149.

<sup>1430</sup> UCPI0000013376.

<sup>1431</sup> Witness statement, para 151.

<sup>1432</sup> Witness statement, paras 152-153.

him influence over the committee as a whole or the SWP generally: HN96 states that he did not seek to influence the direction it went in<sup>1433</sup>. An intelligence report dated 26 February 1980 records that HN96 was the 'District Book Organiser' in his capacity as a member of the district committee<sup>1434</sup>. HN96 does not recall what this role entailed but assumes it was something to do with distributing SWP books or literature<sup>1435</sup>.

- 55.12. On occasion, HN96 chaired SWP meetings<sup>1436</sup>. For example, he chaired a meeting of the Clapton Branch of the SWP on 3 October 1979<sup>1437</sup>. HN96 states that chairing meetings did not give him an opportunity to influence the actions of the Clapton branch of the SWP or the SWP more generally<sup>1438</sup>.
- 55.13. On occasion, HN96 reported on the relationship between the SWP and elements of trade unions. In an intelligence report dated 2 August 1979, HN96 reported that various trade union branches had been approached by the SWP to seek support for a day of protest against government financial cuts to the local authority<sup>1439</sup>. In an intelligence report dated 8 February 1980, HN96 reported that the SWP had despatched "*a number of comrades from London*" to report back on the steel workers' strike and had been instructed to fly the Socialist banner at meetings organised by the unions<sup>1440</sup>. This was consistent with the SWP's policy of "active involvement in industrial disputes"<sup>1441</sup>.
- 55.14. HN96 had a loose association with the Irish Sub-Committee of the SWP. HN96 knew an individual who he believed was quite active within it. HN96 showed some interest in Irish matters within the SWP and would talk about those matters with that individual. HN96 did not attend any meetings of the Irish Sub-Committee<sup>1442</sup>.
- 55.15. The focus of HN96's deployment shifted from 1981 onwards towards the Troops Out Movement (see below). However, HN96 continued to provide some reporting on the activities of the SWP. For example, an intelligence report dated 6 May 1982<sup>1443</sup> attaches a leaflet distributed

<sup>1433</sup> Witness statement, para 153.

<sup>1434</sup> UCPI0000013803.

<sup>1435</sup> Witness statement, para 160.

<sup>1436</sup> Witness statement, paras 155-157.

<sup>1437</sup> UCPI0000013468.

<sup>1438</sup> Witness statement, para 157.

<sup>1439</sup> UCPI0000021118.

<sup>1440</sup> UCPI0000013754.

<sup>1441</sup> UCPI0000013787.

<sup>1442</sup> Witness statement, para 132.

<sup>1443</sup> UCPI0000018047.



by the SWP which refers to the visit of President Reagan to Britain on 7-9 June 1982 and calls for support for the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament national demonstration on 6 June 1982 and for a picket of the American embassy on 7 June 1982. The letter on the reverse of the leaflet, attributed to Ernie Roberts MP, calls for a “*mass peaceful protest*”. However, it is reported that the word ‘peaceful’ was inserted only at the request of Ernie Roberts MP and that he probably did so because he realised that the SWP were in a militant mood and would endeavour to ensure that “*a riotous atmosphere*” prevails at the picket of the US Embassy. It should be noted that the list of ‘sponsors’ for this demonstration, set out on the attached leaflets includes the core participants Tariq Ali, Lord Hain and Ken Livingstone.

- 55.16. A number of earlier intelligence reports from 1979 and 1980 relate to events at which Lord Hain was a speaker<sup>1444</sup>. On one of these occasions, at a debate held by the Labour Co-ordinating Committee on 17 March 1980 which was chaired by Lord Hain, Tariq Ali was also a speaker<sup>1445</sup>. Tariq Ali is also mentioned in another report, as the author of a book in which a series of cartoons produced by the SWP member who was the subject of the report would be included<sup>1446</sup>. Lord Hain is also referred to, in his capacity as the National Treasurer of the Anti-Nazi League, in a detailed intelligence report, dated 31 March 1981, produced following the Anti-Nazi League 1981 National Conference<sup>1447</sup>.
- 55.17. An intelligence report dated 16 February 1983 records that an SWP member recently acted as a steward on a Roach Family Support Committee demonstration in the Hackney area<sup>1448</sup>.
- 55.18. HN96 states that whilst the SWP was a Trotskyist organisation, its full-time members were realistic about the fact that as an organisation it did not have sufficient power to replace parliamentary democracy with another system of government. The SWP sought to influence people’s views and bring about change through protest. HN96 states that at the time he was in the SWP, Special Branch were not concerned that it presented a threat to UK democracy<sup>1449</sup>. However, HN96 states that the SWP did have the capacity to cause serious public order issues and that there were elements within the SWP that looked to cause trouble and engage in violence at events. Most were entirely peaceful.

<sup>1444</sup> UCPI0000021231, UCPI0000013868, UCPI0000014080

<sup>1445</sup> UCPI0000013868.

<sup>1446</sup> UCPI0000013736.

<sup>1447</sup> UCPI0000016579.

<sup>1448</sup> UCPI0000018700.

<sup>1449</sup> Witness statement, para 174.



However, some of the younger members in particular liked to get involved in criminal damage and public disorder at events<sup>1450</sup>. Save for some elements being involved in public disorder, the SWP was not, to HN96's knowledge, involved in criminality<sup>1451</sup>.

- 55.19. HN96 also provided some reporting on the activities of Red Action, a group whose main aim, according to HN96, was to get into violent confrontations with the National Front<sup>1452</sup>. HN96 did not join Red Action and did not attend any meetings or form any friendships with members of Red Action but would find out what they were up to from members of the SWP that he knew<sup>1453</sup>. An intelligence report dated 22 January 1982<sup>1454</sup> summarises the reasons for the establishment of Red Action by former East London SWP members who had recently resigned and who wanted to consider a more 'confrontationist' attitude to anti-racist work. HN96 states that Red Action did not have the power to present a serious threat to democracy but did engage in violence in order to achieve their aims and consequently presented a threat to public order and cause issues for police at demonstrations.
- 55.20. HN96 recalls that he started reporting on the Hackney TOM towards the end of 1980, around two years into his deployment<sup>1455</sup>. That recollection is consistent with the intelligence reporting attributed to HN96. After being invited to social events by TOM members, HN96 was invited to their meetings. Having reported that development to the SDS office, HN96 was told he should seek to infiltrate the Hackney branch of the TOM. There was no SDS coverage of the TOM at that time and Irish matters were of particular interest to Special Branch due to events in Ireland at the time<sup>1456</sup>. Through his involvement with the TOM, HN96 met members of the Irish Socialist Party and the Revolutionary Communist Party, but HN96 does not think he ever attended any meetings of either of those groups<sup>1457</sup>. He started attending fewer SWP meetings and more TOM meetings although members of both groups all went to the same pubs so he basically carried on as before<sup>1458</sup>.

---

<sup>1450</sup> Witness statement, para 175.

<sup>1451</sup> Witness statement, para 176.

<sup>1452</sup> Witness statement, para 177.

<sup>1453</sup> Witness statement, para 178.

<sup>1454</sup> UCPI0000017111.

<sup>1455</sup> Witness statement, para 184.

<sup>1456</sup> Witness statement, para 75.

<sup>1457</sup> Witness statement, para 76.

<sup>1458</sup> Witness statement, paras 189-190.

- 55.21. There was cross over in membership between TOM and the Revolutionary Communist Tendency (RCT). They would sometimes hold joint events and go to the same demonstrations<sup>1459</sup>. HN96 reported on such a public meeting, jointly organised by the TOM and RCT, in an intelligence report dated 9 December 1980<sup>1460</sup>, in connection with the 'H' Block hunger strike in Ireland and at which a speech was given by Ernie Roberts MP. HN96 states that this was a meeting he attended so he would have reported what was said at it, irrespective of the fact the speaker was a member of parliament<sup>1461</sup>.
- 55.22. HN96 states that he was involved in a sit-in in a Central London building during his time in the TOM, which was a protest in support of the IRA hunger strikes, which HN96 thinks took place at the headquarters of a national trade union body<sup>1462</sup>. This description is consistent with the contents of an intelligence report dated 5 June 1981<sup>1463</sup>, regarding an occupation of the TUC's headquarters in London on 28 May 1981. An intelligence report dated 16 September 1981 following a meeting of the East London TOM sets out in considerable detail the plans for a visit to London by the relatives of the hunger strikers<sup>1464</sup>.
- 55.23. During HN96's infiltration of TOM, a vacancy arose to join the National Steering Committee in the post of Membership and Affiliation Secretary<sup>1465</sup>. HN96 was put forward for the post at a meeting of Hackney TOM and accepted<sup>1466</sup>. He did not have the opportunity to discuss it with his SDS managers beforehand but he remembers them being pleased<sup>1467</sup>. In fact, this role required very little of HN96 and he states that he just dealt with any applications for membership<sup>1468</sup>. An intelligence report dated 30 September 1982 sets out a list of those persons who "*this year*" had subscribed to TOM and become individual members of the organisation<sup>1469</sup>.

---

<sup>1459</sup> Witness statement, para 193.

<sup>1460</sup> UCPI0000015210.

<sup>1461</sup> Witness statement, para 194.

<sup>1462</sup> Witness statement, para 273.

<sup>1463</sup> UCPI0000015367.

<sup>1464</sup> UCPI0000015583.

<sup>1465</sup> Witness statement, para 199; see UCPI0000018080 which records that HN96 held this position in May 1982.

<sup>1466</sup> Witness statement, para 201.

<sup>1467</sup> Witness statement, para 203.

<sup>1468</sup> Witness statement, para 204.

<sup>1469</sup> UCPI0000018658.

- 55.24. HN96 attended meetings of the TOM National Steering Committee, which on occasion he chaired<sup>1470</sup>. HN96 believes he fulfilled this role for around a year and a half, until he left the TOM<sup>1471</sup>. The intelligence reports attributed to HN96 contain numerous examples of reports from November 1981 onwards which relate to, and attach minutes of, TOM National Steering Committee meetings<sup>1472</sup>. A number of intelligence reports from November 1981 onwards, and attached minutes, contain passing references to core participant Ken Livingstone<sup>1473</sup>.
- 55.25. HN96 performed other roles for TOM, including acting as treasurer for various demonstration committees. By way of example, HN96 was the treasurer for an organising committee (referred to as the May 8<sup>th</sup> Organising Committee) for a demonstration in March 1982<sup>1474</sup> and was also the treasurer for a demonstration committee for a planned 'Hunger Strikers' demonstration in London on 7 May 1983<sup>1475</sup>. HN96 states he did lots of roles like that and stepped in to help whenever he was asked as being on the organising committees for such demonstrations enabled him to get detailed and accurate public order intelligence on them<sup>1476</sup>.
- 55.26. There is an intelligence report dated 30 June 1982 which indicates that HN96 was a member of the TOM Delegation Committee to Northern Ireland<sup>1477</sup>, although HN96 has no recollection of performing any such role<sup>1478</sup>. On 8 April 1982, HN96 had reported that Provisional Sinn Fein had been sending its representatives to meetings of the May 8<sup>th</sup> Organising Committee, although they would not be seen publicly to mobilise for the demonstration as it was aimed at members of trade unions and the Labour Party who might not give their support if they knew any extreme Irish organisations were involved<sup>1479</sup>.
- 55.27. An intelligence report dated 22 September 1982 records that the South London TOM were to hold a public meeting to protest about the appointment of Sir Kenneth Newman as Commissioner of the

---

<sup>1470</sup> Witness statement, para 212; see intelligence report UCPI0000018365, dated 25 June 1982.

<sup>1471</sup> Witness statement, paras 205-206.

<sup>1472</sup> See for example the intelligence report UCPI0000016816, dated 11 December 1981, the minutes attached to which record "Mike J" as present at the meeting.

<sup>1473</sup> UCPI0000016711, UCPI0000016742, UCPI0000016769, UCPI0000017231, UCPI0000017973, UCPI0000018026, UCPI0000015926, UCPI0000018713 and UCPI0000018804.

<sup>1474</sup> UCPI0000017973.

<sup>1475</sup> UCPI0000016842.

<sup>1476</sup> Witness statement, para 210.

<sup>1477</sup> UCPI0000018381.

<sup>1478</sup> Witness statement, paras 214-215.

<sup>1479</sup> UCPI0000018009.

- Metropolitan Police and that the speakers were to include the core participant Jonathan Rosenhead<sup>1480</sup>.
- 55.28. HN96 states that in none of his roles did he seek to exert control over or influence the direction of the groups that he infiltrated and that he went along with what the majority decided<sup>1481</sup>.
- 55.29. Towards the end of his deployment, on 14 February 1983, HN96 provided a detailed report on TOM, including its membership, affiliated groups, finances, organisation, main personalities and activities<sup>1482</sup>. That report states that the Acton branch of the core participant Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT) was one of the organisations affiliated to the TOM at that time. On 16 February 1983, an intelligence report was submitted which sets out TOM's bank account details<sup>1483</sup>.
- 55.30. HN96 states that the main reason the TOM was of interest to the Special Branch was not because it was subversive, but because there were concerns about whether it would create public order policing issues when it held demonstrations<sup>1484</sup>. In HN96's time, TOM rarely attracted enough support to cause any really serious issues for public order policing, but HN96 states that it was a group that was involved in a lot of street activities that the police needed to know about<sup>1485</sup>. To HN96's knowledge, the TOM was not involved in criminality, but there was always a concern that it might be used to provide support to Irish Republican terrorist groups<sup>1486</sup>. HN96 recalls that during his deployment he reported a new address for a member of TOM who was involved in the Republican movement. A few days after HN96 submitted that intelligence report, HN96 states that the flat was raided by the anti-terrorist branch of the Metropolitan Police Service<sup>1487</sup>.
- 55.31. HN96 provided some limited reporting on the Irish Republican Socialist Party but states his association with that group was only in connection with events jointly organised with the TOM. A meeting of the May 8<sup>th</sup> Organising Committee which HN96 attended on 25 March 1982 took place at the home of a member of the Irish Republican Socialist Party<sup>1488</sup>. HN96 states that he did not separately infiltrate the Irish

---

<sup>1480</sup> UCPI0000018643.

<sup>1481</sup> Witness statement, para 222.

<sup>1482</sup> UCPI0000018713.

<sup>1483</sup> UCPI0000018707.

<sup>1484</sup> Witness statement, para 226.

<sup>1485</sup> Witness statement, para 227.

<sup>1486</sup> Witness statement, para 228.

<sup>1487</sup> Witness statement, para 100.

<sup>1488</sup> UCPI0000017973.

Republican Socialist Party or form any close relationships with its members<sup>1489</sup>. In his limited association with them, HN96 did not form a view as to whether it was subversive, presented a challenge to public order or was involved in criminality<sup>1490</sup>.

- 55.32. HN96 states that only the SWP and the TOM would have regarded him as a member<sup>1491</sup>.
- 55.33. The hearing bundle contains intelligence reports attributed to HN96 which bear on events in connection with the death of Blair Peach, including events organised by the SWP to protest at his death<sup>1492</sup>. An intelligence report dated 30 May 1979 was submitted with a leaflet issued by the Friends of Blair Peach Committee, which sought to highlight the circumstances which led to the death of Blair Peach<sup>1493</sup>. HN96 states that this report could be his as anyone could have submitted the leaflet, but he did not report on the Friends of Blair Peach Committee<sup>1494</sup>. HN96 also states that he did not attend the funeral of Blair Peach<sup>1495</sup>.
- 55.34. HN96 states that he travelled outside London a couple of times for events but did not do so frequently<sup>1496</sup>. For example, it appears likely that HN96 attended the TOM National Delegate Conference in Manchester on 11 September 1982, a detailed report on which was provided on 30 September 1982<sup>1497</sup>.
- 55.35. HN96 describes how during his time in the SDS, Metropolitan Police Service Commanders, Deputy Assistant Commissioners and a Commissioner visited the SDS safe house<sup>1498</sup>. HN96 thinks it was useful for them to know a bit about the kinds of things that the unit was doing. The extent to which senior Metropolitan Police Service management was aware of the activities of the SDS undercover officers is an important topic which the Inquiry will investigate.
- 55.36. Before HN96's deployment ended, he was told he would be going straight back into "*ordinary Special Branch*", rather than to a covert surveillance, as he had understood would happen<sup>1499</sup>. HN96 states

<sup>1489</sup> Witness statement, para 235.

<sup>1490</sup> Witness statement, para 236.

<sup>1491</sup> Witness statement, para 77.

<sup>1492</sup> UCPI0000021297, UCPI0000013468, UCPI0000013505, UCPI0000013891, UCPI0000013935, UCPI0000013961, UCPI0000014149, MPS-0730184, UCPI0000016579.

<sup>1493</sup> UCPI0000021297.

<sup>1494</sup> Witness statement, para 240.

<sup>1495</sup> Witness statement, para 241.

<sup>1496</sup> Witness statement, para 218.

<sup>1497</sup> UCPI0000015779.

<sup>1498</sup> Witness statement, para 320.

<sup>1499</sup> Witness statement, paras 339-340.

that the practice in the SDS at the time was to find undercover officers postings that were out of the public eye so he was unhappy about this decision. HN96 states that it felt as though concerns for his security “totally went away” once he left the SDS<sup>1500</sup>.

55.37. The two latest intelligence reports attributed to HN96 are dated in April 1983 and concern a forthcoming TOM demonstration on 7 May 1983<sup>1501</sup>, at which Ken Livingstone and a representative from the core participant National Union of Mineworkers were due to speak, and addresses linked to Red Action<sup>1502</sup>.

55.38. HN96 believes his deployment came to an end in the spring or early summer of 1983<sup>1503</sup>.

56. With hindsight, HN96 believes that the undercover officers could have been directed a bit more towards particular things that Special Branch was interested in finding out about. HN96 does not feel that really happened in his case and he was largely left to his own devices<sup>1504</sup>.

*HN155 ‘Phil Cooper’ – Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign, Socialist Workers Party (Right to Work Campaign) – Late 1979/early 1980- January 1984*

57. Publication of the real name of HN155 ‘Phil Cooper’ is restricted<sup>1505</sup>. He has provided a witness statement, but is not due to give oral evidence due to his current state of health<sup>1506</sup>. The reporting obtained by the Inquiry illustrates that his initial involvement was with the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign, before moving on to the SWP, and more specifically the Right to Work Campaign, becoming national treasurer. The officer recalls that he joined the SDS slightly before October 1979 and spent a considerable time in the back office<sup>1507</sup>. The first report which can confidently be attributed to him dates from April 1980<sup>1508</sup>, although the content - his election to a committee in February 1980 - would suggest that the officer had been deployed for a period prior to

---

<sup>1500</sup> Witness statement, para 341.

<sup>1501</sup> UCPI0000018804.

<sup>1502</sup> UCPI0000019023.

<sup>1503</sup> Witness statement para 299.

<sup>1504</sup> Witness statement, para 311.

<sup>1505</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730\\_SDS\\_anonymity\\_ruling\\_11.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/20180730_SDS_anonymity_ruling_11.pdf)

<sup>1506</sup> [https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/20210223\\_Ruling\\_HN155\\_Oral\\_Evidence.pdf](https://www.ucpi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/20210223_Ruling_HN155_Oral_Evidence.pdf)

<sup>1507</sup> Witness Statement, paras 12 & 17.

<sup>1508</sup> UCPI0000013893.



this date. This is also consistent with the officer's recollection<sup>1509</sup>. His deployment appears to have extended until January 1984, ending in some suggestion of compromise.

58. The following observations and questions arise from consideration of HN155's documents and witness statement. HN155 had undertaken undercover police work before he was deployed with the SDS. This involved the use of a cover identity, aspects of which, he utilised within his SDS deployment. He adopted the cover background of someone who had grown up in Liverpool and had been in the Merchant Navy. In advance of his deployment he recalls visiting Liverpool to build his legend<sup>1510</sup>.

58.2. Although he has no recollection of doing so, the officer accepts that he is likely to have assumed a deceased child's identity as it was the usual process at the time<sup>1511</sup>. This is consistent with other officers who were deployed at this time. The Inquiry Legal Team has not been able confidently to identify a deceased child. Consequently, it has not been possible to ascertain whether the connection between Liverpool and HN155's backstory is limited to a connection with the Merchant Navy or whether it was also connected to the identity of a deceased child.

58.3. HN155 adopted at least two notable positions of responsibility within the groups he reported on. The first, treasurer of the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign, was at the very start of his deployment and the second, the same role but within the SWP's Right to Work Campaign, came later in January 1982<sup>1512</sup>. The officer states that he did not consider such roles to be 'off limits', but was never in a position to influence the actions of a group<sup>1513</sup> - perhaps indicating the limits which he understood applied in this regard. It is notable that the latter position was held by HN80 shortly beforehand, and it seems clear that HN155 was seen as a successor by SDS management<sup>1514</sup>. More generally, this represents a developing trend within SDS deployments at this time of adoption of the role of treasurer within groups reported on.

58.4. It remains unclear precisely how HN155 moved between the groups he reported on. He recalls that he began by reporting on the SWP, and from this, then began covering the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear

<sup>1509</sup> Witness statement, para 44.

<sup>1510</sup> Ibid, paras 9 and 35.

<sup>1511</sup> Witness statement, para 25.

<sup>1512</sup> UCPI0000017060.

<sup>1513</sup> Witness statement, para 57.

<sup>1514</sup> UCPI0000028840.



Campaign<sup>1515</sup>. This recollection is not supported by the documents obtained by the Inquiry. The first example of an SWP report which bears this officer's cover name is from October 1980<sup>1516</sup>, by which time he is known to have become treasurer and represented the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign at a regional conference<sup>1517</sup>. In this regard it does appear that HN155 reported on people who had links with *both* the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign and that district of the SWP<sup>1518</sup>, although unusually for SDS officers of this time, it does not appear that he reported extensively on any branches or districts of the SWP.

- 58.5. It seems likely that, through the Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign, HN155 also became involved in the campaign opposing the construction of a nuclear power plant at Torness, Scotland, although he doubts that the reports on this subject within his witness pack are necessarily his<sup>1519</sup>. It seems likely that he attended a protest at the site in the course of his deployment<sup>1520</sup>.
- 58.6. HN155 began reporting on the Right to Work Campaign some months after the start of his deployment<sup>1521</sup>. He explains that the campaign: *"[W]as of interest to the SDS because it involved large numbers of people on marches lasting a number of days. Hundreds or thousands of local activists would join the march along the way, which included Marxists and anarchists. There were planned demonstrations in major towns along the route as the march passed through and it was important to provide intelligence to allow local constabularies to assess the risk of public disorder and ensure an appropriate police presence."*<sup>1522</sup>
- 58.7. A comprehensive report which records the events of the 1980 march from Port Talbot in detail, culminating in a demonstration outside the Conservative Party Conference in Brighton, is likely to be attributable to

---

<sup>1515</sup> Witness statement, para 64.

<sup>1516</sup> UCPI0000014591, which records a meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> September 1980.

<sup>1517</sup> UCPI0000014213.

<sup>1518</sup> See UCPI0000014554. This is the district of the SWP which was reported on by HN354, whose withdrawal appears to have coincided with the start of HN155's deployment. The Inquiry has also obtained evidence of reporting from HN155 which mentions the core participant 'Madeleine' (UCPI0000016599).

<sup>1519</sup> Witness statement, para 58-59. This may be explained by officers who are due to be considered as part of Tranche 2.

<sup>1520</sup> Ibid, para 58.

<sup>1521</sup> UCPI0000014591.

<sup>1522</sup> Witness statement, para 74.

him and HN80 who also remained involved<sup>1523</sup>. Both received commendations for their work. HN155 does not recall attending or reporting on a fundraising event in Wales in February 1981<sup>1524</sup>, but notes, by way of potential explanation, that the intelligence which was submitted on those unconnected to the SWP was justified as “*there were no clear lines between any of the groups, and it may be that those individuals joined and became influential members of the SWP*”<sup>1525</sup>.

The Inquiry will need to explore how widely this view was held, and whether it extended to those managing and supervising the SDS.

- 58.8. From 1982 onwards, it seems likely that HN155 was the only SDS officer involved in the Right to Work Campaign<sup>1526</sup>. He became National Treasurer in January 1982, with associated control over the bank account<sup>1527</sup>. A result of this role HN155 was able to submit detailed reports on the arrangements in the run-up to the intended 1982 march<sup>1528</sup>, which was latterly modified to become a picket of the Conservative Party Conference attended by 400-500 people<sup>1529</sup>. He was also able to obtain private documents<sup>1530</sup> and correspondence with the organisers (one of whom was a serving member of parliament, see below)<sup>1531</sup>, and the personal bank account details of those concerned<sup>1532</sup>.
- 58.9. Within this role HN155 also gained access to the SWP headquarters, as HN80 had done before him<sup>1533</sup>. As a result, HN155 was able to provide a detailed floorplan of the office which showed that he had a desk within it<sup>1534</sup>. This also allowed HN155 to provide information on the state of SWP membership records, in response to a request, to MI5, along with an offer to pass on any old cards if he was given access to them made on his behalf by SDS managers<sup>1535</sup>. Similarly, he was able to respond to a requests from MI5 for the technical details of

<sup>1523</sup> UCPI0000014610. It seems clear that both officers attended the march (HN80's witness statement, para 97).

<sup>1524</sup> UCPI0000016485, and neither does HN80 (witness statement, para 99).

<sup>1525</sup> Witness statement, para 80.

<sup>1526</sup> HN80's witness statement, para 100.

<sup>1527</sup> UCPI0000018091 and see UCPI0000015888 for a cheque signed by 'P Cooper' on p10.

<sup>1528</sup> For example, UCPI0000017152.

<sup>1529</sup> UCPI0000015888.

<sup>1530</sup> UCPI0000017230, although this is not recalled by HN155 (witness statement, para 88).

<sup>1531</sup> UCPI0000017125, see also UCPI0000017202.

<sup>1532</sup> UCPI0000016846.

<sup>1533</sup> UCPI0000027519, see witness statement, para 93. HN155 apparently obtained this access based on HN80's 'personal recommendation' (UCPI0000029193).

<sup>1534</sup> UCPI0000018482.

<sup>1535</sup> UCPI0000027448.

the SWP computer, and passed on membership details contained therein<sup>1536</sup>.

- 58.10. Perhaps as a result of his access to these headquarters, HN155 was also able to provide intelligence on the personal lives and circumstances of members of the SWP central committee and those close to them<sup>1537</sup>. The Inquiry will explore what justification, if any, existed for reporting all this information.
- 58.11. HN155 attended the SWP national delegate conference annually between 1981 and 1983, and provided detailed reports on each occasion<sup>1538</sup>. He attended alongside HN80 in 1981 when both are listed as part of the conference administrative staff (as HN155 is in subsequent years). In respect of the 1983 report it was noted by MI5 that *"the SDS office [was] still groaning under the weight of HN155's report"* and it was subsequently considered to be of significant value to the Special Branch and MI5 alike<sup>1539</sup>. He also attended the annual SWP rally in Skegness in 1982 and 1983 (reporting back an 18-page list of attendees). HN155 recalls that he collected the entrance money<sup>1540</sup>.
- 58.12. HN155 may have submitted reporting on the National Union of School Students, and school aged children more generally<sup>1541</sup>. He notes that the fact that this involved reporting on children *"was not considered at the time, but probably would not have involved myself"*. Similarly, the Inquiry has obtained reporting enclosing lists of SWP members with trade union affiliations which HN155 considers was a *"useful piece of a larger intelligence picture regarding the presence of left-wing activists in trade unions at that time."*<sup>1542</sup> Such justifications for reporting of this nature will need to be considered by the Inquiry with officers and their managers and supervisors alike.
- 58.13. Towards the end of his deployment HN155 appears to have submitted a report on a former member of the central committee who had *"obtained false employment references which he hopes will hide his*

<sup>1536</sup> UCPI0000016862, UCPI0000028809, UCPI0000016946, UCPI0000018690, UCPI0000029230, UCPI0000020522.

<sup>1537</sup> UCPI0000016986, UCPI0000019117 and UCPI0000019408.

<sup>1538</sup> Witness statement, para 82. See UCPI0000016752 (1981), UCPI0000015994 (1982) and MPS-0735900 (1983).

<sup>1539</sup> UCPI0000028728, MPS-0730009 and MPS-0735901.

<sup>1540</sup> UCPI0000018180 and UCPI0000019387. See witness statement, para 89.

<sup>1541</sup> See UCPI0000016563 and UCPI0000015625, although note that the officer does not recall submitting this reporting (witness statement, para 81).

<sup>1542</sup> UCPI0000019377 and witness statement, para 106.

*political activities from prospective employers*"<sup>1543</sup>. This report is of some interest, as it suggests that this information could have been of relevance to those receiving this intelligence. It is unclear precisely what use was made of details such as this, but its mere reporting is of some significance.

- 58.14. In late 1981 several MI5 'notes for file' record requests made of SDS managers (and corresponding SDS intelligence in response) arising from SDS officer(s) who had access to the SWP headquarters<sup>1544</sup>. This is very likely to have been directed towards HN155 or HN80, and represents a clear trend at this time of MI5 requests made of SDS officers.
- 58.15. Similarly, by autumn 1982 HN155 was able to answer a detailed request for information on SWP structure and branches from MI5<sup>1545</sup>. The 9-page report he provided<sup>1546</sup>, provides a significant level of detail on the organisation, and demonstrates the advanced state of his infiltration by this point.
- 58.16. In a meeting with MI5 in July 1982, HN68 (by then an SDS manager) is recorded as expressing "*serious doubts about the performance of HN155*"<sup>1547</sup>. This is said to relate to the officer's failure to pay child maintenance and an incident when he left his cover vehicle outside his home address. HN155 does not recall this incident, and notes that he finds some of the comments within this file note "*objectionable*"<sup>1548</sup>. Within a subsequent note<sup>1549</sup>, it is recorded that HN68 "*is still very worried by the case because Cooper's position within the Right to Work Movement gives him regular access to Ernie Roberts MP and meetings at the House of Commons*". In contrast, the officer does not recall any contact with Mr Roberts, and considers any involvement would have been limited<sup>1550</sup>. This aspect of HN155's deployment is of significant interest to the Inquiry. At the very least, this demonstrates that those within the management of the SDS at the time were aware of the significance of UCO's reporting on MPs and had concerns about it - it is unclear whether these concerns relate to the possible lack of justification for, or potential exposure of, this practice.

---

<sup>1543</sup> UCPI0000020466.

<sup>1544</sup> UCPI0000027529, UCPI0000028837, UCPI0000027532, UCPI0000027533.

<sup>1545</sup> UCPI0000028782.

<sup>1546</sup> UCPI0000015751.

<sup>1547</sup> UCPI0000027446.

<sup>1548</sup> Witness statement, para 131.

<sup>1549</sup> UCPI0000027515.

<sup>1550</sup> Witness statement, para 126.

- 58.17. There remains a significant dispute of fact regarding whether HN155 told risk assessors that he engaged in sexual activity whilst he was deployed. Within a risk assessment prepared in late 2017, the author recorded that HN155 accepted doing so and some of the general circumstances which led to this taking place<sup>1551</sup>. Both the author, David Reid, and the second risk assessor, Brian Lockie, were left with the impression that HN155 was describing his own experiences whilst deployed<sup>1552</sup>. In contrast, HN155 suggests that both have misinterpreted his comments and that he *“was not as clear as [he] should have been about the dividing line between the specific, factual details of [his] particular deployment and more hypothetical comments about such deployments more generally.”*<sup>1553</sup> HN155 denies engaging in a sexual relationship within the context of his deployment and the Inquiry has not identified any other evidence to directly contradict this assertion.
- 58.18. During the course of his deployment HN155 was involved in a car accident. Documents obtained by the Inquiry suggest he reported this to the police under his cover identity<sup>1554</sup>. HN155 suggests that he would have done so as the car was registered in his cover identity and does not recall if any consideration was given to the lawfulness of this course of action.
- 58.19. It appears that HN155’s deployment came to an end at around the time of a telephone call between two members of the SWP<sup>1555</sup>. A transcript of this call suggests that his cover was blown with the group and that there had previously been suspicions regarding HN155. The officer disputes that this call (which was passed to his managers) led to his withdrawal, and claims that it was in fact his exit strategy which caused the conversation to take place. He also recalls some concern from senior managers regarding his possible compromise having an effect on future intelligence and their careers: *“...I felt that some of the senior officers were more concerned about losing intelligence and repercussions for their career rather than concern for my safety or welfare”*<sup>1556</sup>. He notes that they were *“prone to panic when issues*

<sup>1551</sup> MPS-0746710.

<sup>1552</sup> Witness statements: Reid (para 15), Lockie (para 6).

<sup>1553</sup> Witness statement, para 115(9).

<sup>1554</sup> Witness statement, para 38.

<sup>1555</sup> UCPI0000028712.

<sup>1556</sup> Witness statement, para 144.

*[such as this] occurred'*, in contrast to his immediate managers Mike Ferguson and HN68<sup>1557</sup>.

- 58.20. HN155 explains that he went through a divorce during his time in the SDS (perhaps linked to the doubts about his performance above), and suggests that his deployment was a “*significant contributory factor*” in this regard<sup>1558</sup>. It also appears that the impact of HN155’s deployment on him did not end with this withdrawal - he notes that “*[t]he effects are quite deep-rooted, and have probably made me more of an insular and secretive person.*”<sup>1559</sup>
- 58.21. The Inquiry has obtained a report written by Bob Lambert (HN10) several years after HN155 had left the MPS, concerning Mike Chitty (HN11)<sup>1560</sup>. HN155 is said to have assisted Chitty and played ‘the SDS card’ in 1985 to extract himself from a dismissal from the police, resulting from an assault. It is suggested that HN155 had “*convinced his psychiatrist...that he was suffering from ‘Stockholm Syndrome’, rather than, say, merely calculated, selfish and devious behaviour.*” Lambert also alleges that HN155 wrote to a Special Branch Commander threatening to expose the SDS, actions which Lambert describes as “*the lowest point in the twenty five year history of the SDS*”. Both the letter and threats to expose the SDS are denied by HN155, who notes that he never met Bob Lambert and that Lambert’s report is therefore not based on any personal knowledge of him<sup>1561</sup>. This is unlikely to be a dispute of fact which it is necessary to resolve, but the impact of deployments on UCOs, and welfare more generally, are aspects of undercover policing of interest to the Inquiry. It is clear that such issues begin to become of significance at around this time.

<sup>1557</sup> Witness statement, paras 132, 135 and 140.

<sup>1558</sup> Ibid, para 16.

<sup>1559</sup> Ibid, para 155.

<sup>1560</sup> MPS-0726956. This report will be of further significance within Tranche 2.

<sup>1561</sup> Witness statement, para 157.