

In the Undercover Policing Public Inquiry

First statement of **'Madeleine'**

Dated: 18 February **2021**

Introduction

1. I was born on **Privacy**
2. The Chair granted a restriction order over my real identity on 19 January 2021 and I am known in this Inquiry by the name of 'Madeleine'.
3. I make this statement pursuant to a request made under Rule 9 Inquiries Act dated 13 January 2021.
4. I was asked to file my witness statement by 10 February 2021. I was subsequently granted an extension until 18 February 2021.

5. I was initially provided with a paper copy of my witness pack. Many of the documents were of poor quality and I struggled to read the text, even with the aid of a magnifying glass. The Inquiry agreed to provide me with an electronic version of the documents which was easier to read. On 6 February 2021 I received an electronic bundle; this included one document which had not previously been disclosed. Due to the method of encryption used by the Inquiry I was unable to view the documents. I was provided with an accessible electronic copy of the documents on 12 February 2021.

6. I was invited to provide a statement to the Inquiry because I was deceived into an intimate relationship with an undercover officer who I knew as Vince Miller. The relationship lasted for up to a couple of months and took place in the late summer/early autumn of 1979. I will refer to the officer as Vince Miller throughout this statement as I have not been provided with his real name.

My family background

7. I come from a working class background. My mother came from a mining community and my father grew up in a deprived area of Essex. Both left school aged 14. My paternal grandfather volunteered in the army. He was gassed at the battle of the Somme and eventually discharged due to ill health. My parents' early experiences of poverty and the trauma of war politicised them. They were both committed anti-fascists and my father was a trade unionist. I was (and remain) hugely inspired by them both.

8. My mother's home was owned by the Coal Board and they were evicted after my grandfather left the family following an accident at the mine where he spent 2 days trapped underground. As a result, they became further impoverished. My mother left school to work, initially as a char lady and later in a mill. Days in the mill were long and conditions were poor; she suffered an injury that left one of her fingers permanently deformed. She lied about her age and joined the Women's Royal Army at 16, which is how she later met my father. My grandfather died in his 60s from pneumoconiosis caused by inhaling coal in the pits.

9. My father was at the protest at Cable Street in 1936 joining with others to stop Oswald Mosley and the British Union of Fascists marching into a largely Jewish area to intimidate them. Later, in 1937 my father was one of several thousand British men and women who went to Spain as volunteers in the International Brigades to fight against the fascists in the Spanish Civil War. He was there when Franco enlisted the assistance of the Nazis to carry out the aerial bombing attack that obliterated the Basque country town, Guernica (later depicted by Pablo Picasso in his famous painting). He witnessed the bombing and the terrible injuries and deaths that it caused.

10. When he came back to the UK my father joined the army. He saw the sympathy that many in the ruling class had for Mosley and feared that if Hitler was not defeated, fascism would take root here. My father was not a patriot; he fought for freedom. He was sent to Northern France and was evacuated from the beach at Dunkirk.

11. Later, he was sent to India for 4 years; while there he took part in the Burma campaign. He was present at the Battle of Kohima, one of the most horrific battles in history, before he was invalided out with malaria, dysentery and what would now be diagnosed as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. He would not talk about the war and abhorred violence. I am proud of my father and of what he did to help defeat fascism.

12. After leaving the army my father worked at Briggs Motor Body Company which was later bought out by Fords. He became a shop steward and trade union activist. He helped to set up a welfare fund for sick workers. When he later broke his back in an accident at work, he was unable to work for 2 years. He received no sick pay and the welfare payments became a lifeline for me, my parents and my 3 siblings, one of whom was seriously disabled.

Early political activity

13. My political outlook was shaped by my family's history and my own experience of hardship following my father's accident. I was brought up on class politics. From a young age I understood that capitalism was built on inequality and exploitation. I was also acutely aware of the dangers of fascism. I had a strong sense of injustice and became politically active in my early teens. I was deeply affected by the devastating American assault on Vietnam and the images of obliterated villages and civilians covered in burns which appeared in nightly news bulletins at the time. I attended anti-Vietnam war demonstrations and joined the Young Communist League in 1967 aged around 13.

14. I then joined the International Socialists in about 1968 when I was 14 or 15.

In 1977 this became the Socialist Workers Party (SWP).

15. In the 1970s the far right was ascending. The National Front (NF) vote in local elections grew significantly. Neo-fascists were openly attacking black and Asian communities; "Paki bashing" was common and a number of young black and Asian men were murdered. In response, organisations like the Anti-Nazi League (ANL) and Rock Against Racism (RAR) were set up. RAR was a campaigning group which successfully organised large music events aimed at uniting black and white youth through music and combating racist ideology. Through my involvement with the SWP, I was part of this movement opposing fascism.

16. For a period of time, I was also an active trade unionist. I worked as a bus conductor for around 5 years from 1977 and joined the Transport and General Workers Union. I organised around issues such as pay and conditions. We had some successes, including a change to the policy that you were not entitled to sick pay until you had been employed at London Transport for 5 years. I was also on the regional women's sub-committee.

Political activities in the SWP

17. As stated, I joined what later became the SWP in 1968 aged 15 or 16. After a break for several years from aged 18, I became a member of the Walthamstow branch in around 1973 when I was 21. When the branch split in 1977, I became a member of the Leyton branch. The SWP was a

revolutionary socialist party. My understanding of its political philosophy was that it is only through socialism that we can create a fair and just society, and end exploitation, poverty, war and hunger. We wanted to create the conditions for a society based upon need not profit which would allow for the flourishing of all human potential. We did not believe this could be achieved by parliamentary means, but that revolutionary change could only come from the working class because it is their direct experience of the conditions of capitalist exploitation which is a pre-condition for bringing about such change. A key function of the party at the time was to raise consciousness among the working class as to how capitalism operated by bringing out the broader politics underlying situations of specific conflict. We sought to do this through peaceful, democratic means which included supporting campaigns around specific sites of conflict such as strikes against cuts in public sector funding and services, and for better pay and conditions.

18. My activism within the SWP involved attending branch and public meetings on subjects such as socialism, immigration controls, Chile and fascism, as detailed in the documents in my witness pack. All of these meetings were open to the public. We welcomed debate and had nothing to hide. With other party members, I also sold the Socialist Worker newspaper locally.

19. We leafleted, sold papers at picket lines and went fly posting. By way of example, I joined the picket at Leytonstone High Road fire station during the fire brigade strike of 1977 and helped collect money for the fire fighters. Our

actions were in solidarity with the fire service and also because their demands were important for public safety.

20. I also attended anti-National Front, ANL and other demonstrations. The SWP sometimes helped to organise demonstrations, usually as part of a broad coalition. These demonstrations were generally agreed with the police in advance. At branch meetings where we talked about demonstrations our discussions were usually limited to issues such as who would take on roles as stewards, the practicalities of leafletting and paper sales, how to stay safe in a group and sharing emergency contact details. There was never any instruction to be violent. Violence was generally regarded as counterproductive and likely to alienate the people we were there to support. We wanted to unite not split the movement.

21. I note that in my Core Participant ruling of 6 January 2021 the Chair indicated that he would welcome any evidence that I could give on the part that the SWP and/or Vince Miller played in the Grunwicks dispute and “the battle of Lewisham”. I was not involved in the Grunwicks dispute and I don’t know if Vince Miller had any involvement.

22. I assume the “battle of Lewisham” refers to events in Lewisham on 13 August 1977. Along with other members of my local branch, I did attend the counter demonstration that was organised by All Lewisham Campaign Against Racism and Fascism (ALCARAF) in response to the National Front decision to march through Lewisham on that date. This was a broad coalition event attended by

many in the local community, the Mayor, churches, the Trades Council, tenants' associations and community groups.

23. I don't remember any meetings prior to the event where the branch discussed going. However, I can say that, as with all other demonstrations we attended, we were going to provide support to the local community and there would have been no intention to engage in violence. I don't recall if Vince attended the demonstration in Lewisham or not.

24. In the absence of adequate protection by the police, we also sometimes offered support to local communities who were threatened by fascists. This usually involved being a presence in the area while selling copies of the paper. I also recall us responding to a local racist campaign against a mosque opening on the Lea Bridge Road by organising a protest of support for the mosque.

25. In my late 20s I gradually became less politically active. I worked shifts on the buses so my time was limited. I continued my work in the union, but I became disenchanted with the SWP and a bit demoralised. I gradually drifted away from the party. I had spent my entire youth immersed in political activity and I wanted to explore my passion for art and creativity. I still consider myself to be a socialist and anti-fascist, but I have not been member of a political party since.

26. I stopped working on the buses in 1982 when I had my child. I later went to art school. I became a painter and art educator working in schools and with community groups until I retired.

Intelligence reports disclosed to me

27. I have read the documents provided in my witness pack and provide brief comments below. Unless stated otherwise, in respect of the reports of meetings, I do not recall the event or what was discussed but I accept it is likely I was present as I am listed as an attendee.

28. The first document I have been provided with [UCPI0000017456] is a report of a Walthamstow branch meeting which took place on 1 June 1977. Apparently the meeting included a discussion on revolutionary feminism. This is the kind of topic we would have discussed. There is reference to the Anti-Jubilee picnic that was due to take place on 6 June 1977. I recall this event; it was essentially a social for SWP members and involved a barbeque and music in Epping Forest. It was a lot of fun. As this meeting took place a week before, the picnic probably was discussed. There is also reference to protests at Sainsbury's supermarket over rising prices. I don't remember this specifically, but I can imagine that SWP members probably went with banners and gave out leaflets to people setting out how prices rises wouldn't be necessary if profits to shareholders were cut.

29. [UCPI0000017571] is another report of a Walthamstow branch meeting. This meeting took place on 6 July 1977 and the main focus of the meeting is said to have been a report back from the SWP annual conference. I imagine most

of the report is a fairly accurate reflection of such a meeting. It states that we intended to field 50 to 60 candidates at the next general election. I don't recall this, but we were a political party who engaged in the democratic process, so I have no reason to doubt that it is true. There is a reference to the national conference concluding that the party reiterated "support for the Provisional IRA but remained critical of that organisation's policy of random bombing of working-class people." This is an inaccurate portrayal of the SWP's position. We supported the demands for a unified Ireland and the Irish people's right to self-defence against the RUC and the British army. However, we did not support the bombing of anyone, working class or not. Terrorism rightly earned the hatred of ordinary working people and was bound to fail as a strategy. We understood that bombing campaigns were not a route to socialism; they were a route to repression.

30. [UCPI0000011136] is a report of a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting on 13 July 1977 which discussed the draft of a "British road to socialism" published by the Communist Party. This is the kind of publication we would have discussed.

31. [UCPI0000011129] is a report of a Walthamstow branch meeting which took place on 28 July 1977 where we invited a Chilean refugee to discuss recent events in Chile. The talk was very powerful and I remember this meeting. Following Pinochet's coup in 1973, the democratic government was deposed and a violent military dictatorship was established with the support of imperialist powers. Civilians, particularly those engaged in left wing

movements, were routinely tortured, disappeared and murdered. 4 Chilean refugees had recently started attending our public meetings. One of them was a political journalist and I offered to teach him English. He told me how he had been arrested and tortured in Chile; he had been interrogated while hung up by his feet above a large vat of liquid and beaten and electrocuted. One of refugees spoke to us at this meeting about the success of the coup and the failure to prevent fascism.

32. The report appears deliberately facetious, claiming there was discussion of the “inevitable revolution” in the UK and that it was decided that “arming the workers would have to be the first step”, as well as the need to infiltrate the army. This is nonsense. We were discussing the very specific circumstances in Chile and the speaker’s view that had Allende’s democratic government distributed arms to the workers to allow them to defend the elected government under its direction, it may have been possible to resist the coup. The report makes is all sound very Citizen Smith and appears to be intentionally disparaging. It was a public meeting; there would have been a broad range of opinions and we certainly didn’t reach the conclusions suggested. The final paragraph of the report sums up the attitude of the author and appears to be written for comic affect for his/her audience in Special Branch, rather than to accurately reflect the content of the meeting. With reference to someone crying in response to hearing about the horrific events in Chile (which I recall) it says, “The meeting was finally addressed by Privacy who broke down in tears after summarising the Chilean

conflict... This outburst was rapidly followed by another comrade throwing an epileptic fit, which effectively put a stop to any further business.”

33. [UCPI0000011196] is another report of a Walthamstow branch meeting which took place on 17 August 1977 to hear a guest speaker give a talk on fascism. Given the political climate at the time, this is the kind of topic we would have discussed. The report states that we believed the NF to be in retreat as an organisation at that time and thought that as a result they may resort to intimidation of individual anti-fascists as a tactic. It goes on to say that “several comrades decided that they would arm themselves with catapults and ball bearings for use in the event of personal attacks”. Our meetings were open to the public and it is possible that some people expressed this opinion, but this wouldn’t have been the general view. Aside from anything else, it would be an utterly ineffective response. By way of example, a young woman selling the SWP newspaper outside Barking tube station was seriously attacked by NF thugs who broke her pelvis with a sledgehammer around this time. We were determined to continue selling our papers and not to be intimidated. However, our collective focus was on how to stay safe by remaining in groups and avoiding situations where we might come under attack, not procuring catapults.

34. [UCPI0000010965] is a report of a Walthamstow branch meeting which took place on 7 September 1977. Discussion apparently focussed primarily on the possibility of splitting the Walthamstow branch and establishing a separate Leyton branch. A number of upcoming anti National Front marches were

mentioned. This sounds likely to have been a reasonably accurate account of discussions.

35. [UCPI0000010982] is a report of a Walthamstow branch meeting which took place on 14 September 1977 discussing “socialism and the food crisis”. The author of the report notes that the guest speaker gave a “well balanced and interesting talk on the alleged “hold” that multi-national companies exerted on Third World Countries.” This sounds like the kind of issue we would have discussed.

36. [UCPI0000011193] is a report dated 31 October 1977 detailing members of the newly formed Leyton branch and the time and location of our meetings. I have no reason to doubt its accuracy.

37. [UCPI0000011513] is a report of a joint meeting of Leyton and Walthamstow branches on 27 October 1977 to discuss the life and work of the artist and socialist, William Morris. The report records that the speaker “delivered a well prepared speech, which he illustrated with photographs and slides.” This is the kind of mainstream event we often organised. I wonder if the author of the report was attempting to analyse Morris’ prints for hidden subversive messages?

38. [UCPI0000011550] is an intelligence report about me dated 17 November 1977. It records that I obtained a part time job in a school as an art assistant and that my weekly salary was £25. It notes the date my employment began and a detailed description of my physical appearance. This is a gross invasion

of my privacy and feels very sinister. How did they obtain details of my start date and my salary? What possible justification could they have had for doing so? What relevance does my employment as an art assistant and my salary have to Special Branch and MI5? Why was my physical description recorded and for what purpose? Was it updated every time I had a haircut or changed my glasses? This is outrageous gratuitous recording of my personal data.

39. [UCPI0000011686] is report on a meeting of the Outer East London District Branch that took place on 16 January 1978. It records that around 100 people attended and that there was a discussion on Zionism and whether to stand a candidate at the Ilford North bye-election. With reference to the bye-election the report states that we decided not to put forward a candidate, but that activity was “called for against the National Front, who are expected to put forward a candidate of their own.” The way the report is worded implies that the two groups are seen as equivalent. This concerns me.

40. [UCPI0000011787] is a report of a public meeting on 1 February 1978 where we held a meeting featuring a theatre group. What an absolute waste of taxpayers’ money.

41. [UCPI0000011915] is an intelligence report dated 30 March 1978 detailing information about one of my housemates, including his description, his role in the SWP and his employment in the Privacy. I am mentioned because I lived with him. At the end of the report there is a redacted section which says that I am the subject of REDACTED. This feels very sinister. What was I the

subject of? I have set out the groups that I was active in in this statement. I cannot see what possible justification there can be, more than 40 years after this information was recorded, for it to be withheld from me.

42. [UCPI0000021746] is a report of a meeting organised by the Waltham Forest District branch discussing the subject of immigration controls which took place on 18 May 1978. This is the kind of issue we would have discussed.

43. [UCPI0000011289] is an intelligence report about me dated 11 July 1978. It records the fact of my marriage 2 years earlier and details the address where I lived with my husband. Why was my marriage any business of Special Branch or MI5? What public interest is there in this information being recorded? It is again detailed that I am the subject of something that has been redacted. As stated above, I would like to know what this refers to.

44. [UCPI0000011322] is a report of a Waltham Forest District meeting which took place on 12 June 1978. The report states that there was an "interesting speech on youth work within the SWP." Other topics included the electoral strategy of the party. These were the kind of issues we discussed and it probably is a reasonably accurate account of the meeting. Notably Vince Miller is listed as an attendee. While he does not appear to have a registry file at this time, it is recorded that he is mentioned in the SWP registry file. Who authored this report?

45. [UCPI0000011337] is a report of a Waltham Forest District meeting which took place on 12 July 1978. It records that there was a report back from the national SWP conference and discussion on the internal structure of the local group. The report details the leadership of the branch's various subgroups. It is noted that the Industrial subgroup is led by two members, Pete Weardon and Vince Miller. Vince Miller is now detailed as having his own registry file. I wasn't involved in the industrial group myself, but I recall that Vince was active in this subgroup and I have no reason to doubt that this record is accurate. This leads to some obvious questions. Why on earth was an undercover officer deployed not only to spy on the SWP but also to take a key role in organising the activities that were the subject of surveillance? What influence did Vince Miller have on the political direction of the group? And, as above, who authored this report?

46. [UCPI0000012924] is a report of a Waltham Forest District meeting which took place on 19 October 1978. Of particular note, the report details that a member of the party had organised a "rota of comrades who were to sleep at [an address in], Dagenham, in order to protect a black girl resident there and her Jewish boyfriend from attacks from the NF."

47. At the end of the report there is a short addendum in relation to this item, which states that

"it has been confirmed with Dagenham police station that at 11.15pm on Weds, 18th October 1978, two windows at [redacted] Privacy

Dagenham – the home of [name of woman] aged 24 years, a half caste – were broken with two bricks. One brick carried the letters DAK (understood to mean Dagenham Axe Clan), while the other had a leaflet of an extreme right-wing nature wrapped around it.

It is not possible to identify XXX in Special branch records and there is no trace of the Dagenham Axe Clan (DAK)."

48. I didn't go myself, but I remember people going to stay at this woman's house to try to protect her. It was very common at this time for people of colour to be targeted in this way by the far right. I also remember the name of the group – we assumed the use of the word Klan was based on the Ku Klux Klan. The NF and associated groups were dangerous. Many of them were seasoned street fighters and extremely violent. We wanted to stand in solidarity with people under threat, but we were pretty soft. As I described above, left wing activists like us were also a particular target for the far right and I remember we would never leave meetings alone in case we were attacked. There was a real climate of fear.

49. This report plainly begs the question, why was there no record of the DAK in Special Branch records when the group was so visible and carrying out serious acts of intimidation with a clear political agenda? What was subsequently done to investigate this crime and the group responsible? And more generally, as an aside, why did the woman under attack have to rely on some SWP volunteers instead of having the protection of the police?

50. [UCPI0000021299] is an intelligence report about me dated 31 May 1979. It states that I had “after a variety of jobs, finally gained regular employment as a bus conductor...” The date of the report is odd as I began this employment in around 1977. Again, I am very concerned that details of my employment were recorded and shared with MI5. What was the purpose of this intelligence? Was it because I was active in the Union?

51. [UCPI0000021044] is a report of a Waltham Forest District meeting which took place on 5 July 1979 entitled “Fallow are the murderers – Disband the Special Patrol Group.” I have vague recollections of this meeting. The report states that the guest speaker advocated the disbandment of the Special Patrol Group (SPG) as a small step towards a socialist revolution and that disbandment should be aimed for in light of present public attitude towards the police following the death of Blair Peach. While broadly accurate, this is a typically over simplistic description of discussions.

52. This meeting was held just over 3 months after Blair Peach was killed by members of the SPG at a demonstration against the National Front in Southall. I wasn't at the Southall demonstration, but I attended Blair's funeral along with thousands of others. He was a much-loved teacher who had dedicated his life to helping children in the East End. There was absolute horror at his death.

53. The SPG were an elite core in the police who were deployed in public order situations. They were known to be violent and out of control at the time and I understand that a report compiled by a police commander, John Cass, released in 2010 supported this assessment. The report stated that locker searches of SPG officers at the time found illegal truncheons, knives and a collection of Nazi regalia.

54. I imagine that the speaker was suggesting that we needed to shine a light on this secretive unit so the public became aware that it was overly repressive and anti-democratic. We wanted to raise consciousness. This could ultimately result in its disbandment. We knew that a socialist revolution was not imminent, but it was our long-term goal and we knew it could only be achieved through many small steps. The report says that we made a decision to picket police stations later in the summer. It's possible that we may have planned to hold banners outside police stations, but I don't remember this.

55. [UCPI0000013063] is a report on the Waltham Forest District of the SWP dated 3 January 1979. It is a 7 page report providing detailed information about the different branches in the district and the active members within those branches. It also provides a report on the activities of the various sub groups in the district namely: the ANL, Industrial, Agitprop, Women's Voice, School Kids Against the Nazis, REBEL – SWP Youth Movement, FLAME (described as “SWP coloured section”) and the Right to Work Campaign. Vince Miller is named in the appendix as someone active in the District.

56. Much of the report looks like a reasonable summary of our activities at the time. For example, the review of the ANL subgroup states that the group's activities consist of "slogan painting, 'fly posting', elimination of 'Nazi' graffiti and trying to recruit persons who have expressed sympathy with the policies of the League."

57. Of particular interest is what is said in the report [UCPI0000013063] on the Industrial subgroup. This is the group which, according to document [UCPI0000011337], 6 months earlier, Vince Miller had co-led with Pete Weardon¹. Described as "active and politically aware" the document indicates that the group had thrived under their leadership. Sales of the newspaper in local factories were on the increase, a bulletin was regularly published and public meetings had been organised. The report notes that the "group is also making good progress within the National Plastics and Phonodisc² – two adjacent factories... and are currently achieving a combined 'Socialist Worker' paper sale of 50 copies per week". It further states: "There is little doubt that, in the next few months the Industrial group will prove to be the most effective in increasing the membership of the party."

58. Finally, it is deeply concerning to read a comrade in the District described as 'the militant and aggressive homosexual' at paragraph 3 of the report. This is the first time someone has been referred to in such a derogatory way in the reports, and the first time that reference has been made to anyone's sexuality. It clearly shows the homophobic prejudice that must have been present in the

¹ The copy is difficult to read so the surname may be wrong.

² Again, it is very difficult to read my copy so the name of this company may be wrong.

unit. A description such as this would only be used in circumstances where homophobia was acceptable.

Recollection of events and relationship with Vince Miller

59. Vince Miller's description of our sexual relationship is false.

60. I first met Vince in around 1977 when he turned up at one of our branch meetings in the Rose and Crown pub in Walthamstow. Our meetings were open to anyone to join and took place in a room upstairs at the pub. We were always excited to have new people come along and would go down to the bar for drinks after the meeting finished.

61. Vince started regularly attending meetings and drinking in the pub with us after. At the time I was living in a large shared house in Leytonstone with other people who were also involved in the SWP. When meetings took place on the weekends, a group of us would often go back to our house after the pub closed. Vince started coming back too. He became close friends with one of my best friends, Privacy.

62. I didn't know Vince particularly well at this time, but I considered him to be a comrade. In addition to attending meetings with him and socialising after, I also remember being involved in other political activity with him. I can't recall specific events, but I am sure that I would have sold the paper and gone leafletting, fly posting with him. I note that I have not been provided with any reports about these activities.

63. Vince was jovial and chatty. He said he was an electrician. He was easy to talk to; he wasn't a hard line hack but just seemed like an ordinary working-class guy. Our branch was mostly made up of teachers, social workers and other middle-class professionals; Vince seemed like the kind of person we wanted to reach out to.

64. With the men Vince was quite laddish. He was a big beer drinker. When we socialised after meetings, he was always at the bar with a pint. With the women he had a softer demeanour.

65. He said he was really into west coast Californian music. This didn't mean much to me, and I remember jokingly asking him – "What does that mean, The Eagles?" Like most of the men in the SWP at the time, Vince had long hair and a beard, but his choice of clothing was a bit different to the rest of us. He always wore a parka jacket, a white shirt, jeans and black shoes. No one else wore shirts and I remember thinking that a white shirt was slightly odd attire for an electrician.

66. He had a van which always had a few tools in the back. Vehicles were a rare commodity in our scene and Vince made himself useful by regularly offering lifts to political events and activities. One of our regular activities was fly posting. We'd go out and put up posters about political issues and events, mostly on empty, boarded up shops. To the best of my recollection, Vince was

particularly keen on fly posting and often came out on the evening sessions. He'd drive us around in his van to different locations. We would always end up in the pub afterwards.

67. I'm not sure exactly when Vince and I got together. It is over 40 years ago, and I didn't keep diaries at the time that I can look back at. I have a note referred to at para 99 below from shortly after Vince disappeared dated 9 January. In my Core Participant ruling the Chair says that Vince's deployment ended in September 1979. I think this means that the relationship must have taken place in the late summer/early autumn of 1979. When I remember our time together, I see us in coats, so I think some of the relationship must have taken place in autumn. I was just 25 at the time. Notably, the last document I have been provided in my witness pack is dated 16 July 1979 and must pre-date our relationship.

68. I had always thought Vince was quite attractive, but I'd never had any real interest in him. I'd recently separated from my husband, Privacy, another SWP activist. Our break-up was difficult. I had been very in love with him and initially our relationship had been idyllic. However, once we were married, he became controlling and possessive. After many rocky months, this relationship finally ended in autumn of 1978, leaving me utterly devastated. I hadn't been involved with anyone since, and although my heart was starting to heal, I wasn't looking for romance.

69. I remember the night Vince and I got together. I'd gone to a house party with friends. I think it was in Ilford. Vince arrived late and was sat on a chair. I was dancing with friends and went over to ask him to come and dance with us. He pulled me onto his lap and we spent the rest of the night chatting and flirting. I remember my friend Martin coming over at one point to ask me to dance, and Vince hugging me closer and saying that I was comfortable where I was.

70. I remember there being a discussion at some point about how I would get home. The friends that I had arrived with told me I'd need to leave with them if I wanted a lift. Vince said he would make sure I got home safely so I declined the lift. Towards the end of the night, he suggested we went back to mine. It was the early hours of the morning. I can't remember how we got home, but I know that Vince came to mine and stayed the night. This was the start of our sexual relationship.

71. Vince and I then started spending more time together after SWP meetings. We would sit on a table together in the bar, and he would sometimes come back to mine at the end of the night. I don't remember exactly how long the sexual relationship lasted, but I think it was up to a couple of months.

72. At the beginning he seemed pretty keen on me. He said he'd tried to get to know me in the past, but I had been a bit aloof. I imagine this was because I

was married for much of the time I had known Vince, and then heartbroken after the relationship ended.

73. At that time in my life I was very shy and reserved. I was also quite vulnerable as a result of my marriage ending, and initially I was wary of jumping into a new relationship. I now think Vince probably saw me as easy pickings.

74. As we spent more time together, I began to open up to him, and my feelings grew. Vince was easy going, reliable and warm; he was a welcome contrast to the person my former husband had become. We used to talk a lot, about all sorts of things. We got on really well and I liked him very much. The relationship seemed to hold out promise.

75. As my feelings increased I wanted us to become closer, but Vince was elusive. He told me he was afraid to get too close to anyone. When I probed him about this he told me that he had his heart broken when his former fiancé left him. He said that he had invested a lot in the relationship and had thought they were life partners. He was devastated when she ended the relationship out of the blue. As a result he had closed down emotionally and kept women at arm's length. After the first night we spent together, he would never stay the whole night, saying he had to wake up in own bed. He said that this was because being too close to me made him feel vulnerable and that he had to protect himself. He never invited me to stay at his and I don't think he told me where he lived.

76. I was a hopeless romantic at the time. I thought that the gravity of his heartbreak showed that he was sensitive and capable of deep feelings; I found this attractive. It also appeared that, like me, he was the kind of person who was looking for a long-term commitment. His experience seemed similar to mine with **Privacy** and I could understand his pain. I hoped that I could mend his broken heart and our relationship would develop.

77. He also said that he had a difficult childhood. I can't be entirely certain, but I think he told me that he had grown up in children's home and/or had spent time being fostered. This also made me feel protective of him.

78. I remember popping around to his flat a few times when I was in the area. I think I got the address from the SWP records; the flat was on Forest Road in Walthamstow. There was never anyone in when I visited.

79. My flat mates and **Privacy** and her brother knew we were together, but we didn't parade around as a couple. Vince wanted to keep it low key and not have too many people know about the relationship; he claimed this was due to his broken heart.

80. After a while, he started to withdraw further. He told me he was still too hurt from his previous relationship and couldn't handle the emotion of being involved with someone.

Last time I saw him

81. I think the last time I saw Vince was at an SWP meeting at Privacy's house on Privacy, Leytonstone. Going by the date given in the CP ruling, I believe this must have been around September 1979. Vince was on the other side of the room from me, chatting to a woman called Privacy. He didn't really talk to me all evening and I felt hurt.

82. When Vince left the meeting, I followed him out on to the street. I asked him why he'd been ignoring me. He was defensive and asked me what I wanted from him. He said he'd explained that he was heartbroken and was unable to get too close to me. He said that he was thinking of escaping to West California to find himself. I remember when the conversation ended we hugged in the street for a long time. Sometime shortly after this, Vince disappeared completely.

Vince's participation in crime, criminal or civil proceedings

83. Vince used to drive after consuming a lot of alcohol. Aside from this, with the exception of fly posting, I don't recall him engaging in any criminal activity. In general, I can't remember any of us doing anything criminal – as I set out above we mostly attended meetings, demonstrations and went leafletting etc. I don't have any recollection of him being involved in criminal or civil proceedings or having access to legally privileged material.

Impact at the time

84. When Vince disappeared, I was initially very upset. It hadn't been a casual thing for me. I had hoped it would develop further.

85. After he left, my friend Privacy spoke to me. She told me that he had lengthy conversations with her about his broken heart and ex-fiancé. This supported what he had told me. She was shocked that he had disappeared. She said that she had heard that he gone to America.

86. Over time I got over Vince. Although I had been very keen on him, it was a fairly short relationship and I accepted that he had gone and clearly no longer wanted to be involved with me. His sudden disappearance made me more cautious and for some time I was wary of becoming involved in a new relationship. It also had an impact upon my self-esteem.

87. I'm now 67 years old. I am happy with my life; it has been fulfilling and I have had a wealth of experiences. I have a partner and a child, and I worked in a career that I loved. From this vantage point, the relationship with Vince was a very small part of my life. If it hadn't been for the recent discovery that he was an undercover officer it would have been of very little consequence.

Impact of discovery

88. In around 2018 I read an article about undercover police spying on activist groups and I saw Vince Miller's name. While there were photos of some of the

other undercover officers named, there was no photo of Vince. I spoke to a few people from around that time and asked if they thought it was the same person. We thought that it was possible but as we had nothing more to identify him, we couldn't be sure. I had a lot going on in my life at this time and didn't think about it too much more.

89. In February 2020 a man turned up at my house unexpectedly. My partner answered the door and the man said he needed to speak with me. I remember feeling alarmed when I saw him. I was worried that something might have happened to my child. The man told me that he was from the Undercover Policing Inquiry. He handed me a letter and I think he told me that I had been a victim of undercover policing. When he said that, I felt a sense of relief that it wasn't bad news about my son. I asked if he was referring to Vince Miller and he said that he was.

90. I remember the man told me that many of the women he had visited had been distraught when he explained why he was there. I can well imagine why this would be the case, particularly if you had no prior knowledge that a man you had been in a relationship with was an undercover officer and the relationship had been significant. I think it would be much more appropriate for a woman to disclose information of this nature.

91. When the man left I read the letter properly. It provided information about the Inquiry and asked if I had any evidence to give about Vince Miller's

deployment. Before doing anything else, I thought that I should probably obtain legal advice, but the letter didn't provide any information about how I should go about that. I didn't know what sort of firm I should approach – I didn't think it would be the kind of issue that the average high street firm would have expertise in. In the absence of any other obvious alternatives, I contacted the Inquiry, and I was eventually put in contact with Birnberg Peirce in December 2020.

92. Since instructing Birnberg Peirce, I have been put in contact with a group called Police Spies Out of Lives (PSOOL) which supports women like me who have been deceived into relationships with undercover officers. It was really helpful to speak with PSOOL and I wish I had been told about this organisation when I was first contacted by the Inquiry.

93. I think I'm still processing the impact of the discovery that Vince was an undercover officer. There are different layers to my understanding. I look back to my younger self and wonder how it would have been to discover that Vince was an undercover officer back then. At the time I knew Vince, I was quite naive. I thought I was politically sophisticated, but I was young and inexperienced. I think if I had discovered that Vince was a spy back then, it would have had a profound impact on me. I was idealistic. I saw the best in people and I was very trusting. That trust would have been shattered. It would have impacted on my engagement in political activity. Everything we did was open, our meetings were public, and we welcomed everyone. Discovering a

spy had embedded himself in our movement would have had a chilling effect and would have likely resulted in more secretive activity. I also think it would have impacted on other people becoming involved in political organising. Maybe it has had that effect on present generations.

94. In some ways, it's now so long ago that I almost feel like I'm one step removed. It's like I'm assessing what happened intellectually rather than emotionally. After I received the letter from the Inquiry I initially thought about Vince and the revelation that he was an undercover officer a lot. However, just a few weeks later, the pandemic hit us. There was so much going on, so much fear and change. As a result the revelation about Vince was no longer such a pressing concern.

95. It is taking me a while to work through the dissonance of realising that someone I thought I knew was not who he said he was. It's a disconcerting experience, but as a result of other experiences in my life, I think I have the psychological tools to process it. I'm a robust person and I have quite a lot of protective armour.

96. It's more difficult when I try to address the question of how I feel about the fact that Vince's deception was covering up the truth that he was actually an undercover officer sent to spy on me. I have a good understanding of the nature of the state and how it operates. I'm not surprised that undercover officers would be sent to spy on groups who were organising for social and

political change. We live in a class society and the state will act to protect the ruling class and capitalism. However, while I understand that on an intellectual level, I find it very difficult to think about it in the context of Vince and his intimate relationship with me. My brain struggles to process it.

97. My feelings are much easier to access and articulate when I think about what has happened to other women who were deceived into relationships with undercover officers. The cruelty of the practice makes me incredibly angry. I can see how there have been huge emotional and psychological consequences for many of the women, and some have had their lives destroyed. I'm utterly horrified at the depth of manipulation and deception. What were these officers trained to do? It is effectively psychological torture.

98. I am glad that I can play a part in the Inquiry to shine a light on the early years of this practice. Vince's relationship with me wasn't the act of one rogue officer; it was part of a pattern of behaviour that went on for decades. I don't know if I was a target or if it was just lusty behaviour. However, whether they ordered it or turned a blind eye, his superior officers are at fault. And over the years, as other officers entered into relationships, I am certain that senior officers must have been aware of what was going on and condoned it. There are too many women for this not to be the case. I imagine it was considered that the ends justified the means. Women and their bodies were seen as instruments of surveillance. It is utterly dehumanising and incredibly sexist.

Documents and photographs in my possession

99. At the time of my relationship with Vince I was working as a bus conductor. I was friends with one of my colleagues – [Privacy] – and I discussed my relationship with Vince with him quite often. He used to jokingly refer to Vince as “Vince the Vampire” because he always left my bed before sunrise.

100. When we had spare time at work, we used to sit in the driver’s cab and write limericks and stories in notebooks together. I still have one of my notebooks from the time. There is an entry which my colleague wrote after Vince vanished, inspired by The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole. It makes it clear with the reference to “further tales” that I had previously discussed my relationship with Vince. The description of him as an “ex-lover” who “flees in the night” evidences that it was not a one-night encounter as asserted by Vince. It also demonstrates the significance of the relationship to me as I was still talking about it with [Privacy] several months after it had ended. I exhibit it to this statement as [UCPI0000034310]. It is dated 9 January and says:

Wed 9th Jan

Further tales of Vince [M]'s ex lover. Apparently his flees into the night after an evening of uninhibited lust were originally construed to be a 'psychological hang-up.' Further investigation may reveal him to be an over-sexed vampire, his dash from the bed an attempt to return to his coffin before sunrise. Is Vince in America..... or Transylvania? Is he under contract to Hammer Films Inc? Until further news of his whereabouts, keep your jugulars covered

101. I also exhibit a photo from the Rock Against Racism concert which took place in Victoria Park, Hackney on 30 April 1978 [UCPI0000034311]. Vince is the man furthest left at the back. I am also in the photo, second from the right at the back. Like many of the political activities I took part in with Vince, I have not been provided with a report relating to this event.

Is there anything else that you wish to add that may be of assistance to the work of the Inquiry?

Disclosure

102. My witness pack consists of 21 Special Branch Intelligence Reports dated between 13 June 1976 and 16 July 1979 in which my name is mentioned. I have not been provided with Vince Miller's witness statement; I have just a one paragraph extract.

103. Fifteen of the documents are reports on public SWP meetings where I am listed as an attendee. 3 of the remaining documents are reports containing personal information about me, namely my description and details of my marriage and employment. The other documents consist of a report on one of my housemates at the time in which I am named, and a report on the split of

the Walthamstow branch of the SWP. None of the documents cover the period of my relationship with Vince Miller.

104. I think it is extremely unlikely that I have been provided with all documents relating to my contact with Vince. By way of example, is there not a report relating to the Rock Against Racism concert at Victoria Park on 30 April 1978 that we attended together? More significantly, as I set out above, during the period of our relationship we were both present at branch meetings and socialised together after. I understand that I have been provided with copies of all documents which the Inquiry considers are relevant to its terms of reference in which I am named. If reports of the meetings we attended during our relationship exist, but I have not been provided with them because I am not named for some reason, then the Inquiry's method of determining relevancy of documents is flawed. I find it quite extraordinary that in circumstances where I have been asked to provide a witness statement on the basis of my relationship with an undercover officer, I have not been provided with any documents which cover the period of that relationship.

105. I also want to know if Vince discussed our relationship with his colleagues and/or handlers and whether it was authorised or acknowledged in any way. The documents I have been provided offer no answers to these questions.

106. The documents do not even provide details of who wrote them. The reports begin with the preamble, "The following has been received from a

reliable source.” My solicitor asked the Inquiry to confirm whether Vince Miller was the author of the reports. She was told that the documents “relate to the deployment of HN354.” I am unclear if that means Vince Miller produced them or not.

107. Bizarrely, as I detailed above, 3 of the reports of meetings list Vince Miller as an attendee. He has a Special Branch Registry File, reference 402/78/643. I assume this means that these reports at least were not authored by Vince Miller and the information came from an informant or another UCO.

108. The extent of surveillance against the SWP during this period is truly shocking. I understand that over the period I was active in the SWP, there were at least 17 UCOs who were spying on the organisation. However, as I have not been told that I was subject to surveillance by another UCO, I suspect that the information must have come from an informant. I would like this clarified by the Inquiry.

109. It is clear from the documents that I also have a Special Branch Registry File, reference 402/70/70. I understand that this means a file was first opened on me in 1970, when I was just 16. This predates the first document I have been provided by 6 years and I have no reason to think that the surveillance stopped at the end of Vince Miller’s deployment. I therefore think it likely that I have only been provided with a small number of the documents which are held on me by Special Branch.

110. The SWP also has its own Registry Files. I can only assume that these files also contain a very large amount of documents which have not been provided to me. I also note that the reports of meetings disclosed show that usually over 50% of people attending public SWP branch meetings had their own Registry File, sometimes a significantly higher percentage.

111. Almost all the documents are stamped BOX 500. I am aware that this means that these reports were shared with MI5. I think it is therefore likely that MI5 also holds a file on me and, seemingly, a significant proportion of active SWP members at the time.

112. I am angry that Special Branch and MI5 hold these files. We were ordinary people exercising our democratic rights, expressing reasonable concerns through legitimate means. We wanted to create a better world. I have only ever been involved in legitimate political organisations. No one I knew was engaged in criminal activity and I've never been arrested. Yet, it appears that Special Branch has held a file on me since I was in my mid-teens. Beyond the 21 documents that I've been provided in my witness pack, I have no idea what is held in that file. I want to see it. I want to know why it was opened and why it still exists. I want to know if my loved ones have also been spied upon as a result of their relationship to me and I want the files to be destroyed. This is not just a point of principle. Western democracies are increasingly fragile and I am concerned that the files will leave me at risk if an extreme right wing government were to gain power.

Protection of Vince Miller's real identity

113. While the secret state has held a file on me since 1970, I still don't even know the real name of the undercover officer who deceived me into an intimate relationship. He knew everything about me; it now appears I knew nothing about him. Was any of what he told me about himself true?

114. I understand that the Chair of this Inquiry has said that a woman deceived into an intimate relationship with an undercover officer has a moral right to know his name. Yet, the man I knew as Vince Miller, who infiltrated the most intimate parts of my life, was granted a Restriction Order over his identity in order to protect his right to privacy.

115. I have seen the Chair's rationale for this decision. He said that Vince Miller's "deployment appears to have been unremarkable. He has voluntarily admitted two fleeting sexual encounters with different female activists during his deployment before his marriage."

116. I find it deeply concerning that the Chair considered a deployment involving two deceitful sexual relationships with activists under surveillance to have been "unremarkable." Even on the officer's own case at the time, having two relationships while undercover was plainly 'remarkable'. There was no suggestion this was done out of necessity. But I note that in my Core Participant ruling of 6 January 2021 the Chair states that Vince has in fact admitted to deceiving not two, but four women into sexual relationships during

his 21 month deployment, making it clear that his original voluntary 'admission' was a lie. That alone should raise a doubt in the Chair's mind as to whether his deployment was unremarkable and also whether his evidence in this Inquiry has any credibility. But in any event, Vince Miller's account of the nature of the relationship he had with me is untrue and there is no possible justification for it ever having taken place. I also fail to understand how Vince Miller's marital status at the time was in any way relevant to the decision to grant him anonymity. The Chair is considering the conduct of police officers, not husbands.

117. Like the other officers who deceived women into relationships during their deployments, Vince Miller has lost the right to have his identity protected on privacy grounds. And, like the other women who were deceived into relationships, I should be entitled to know his real name.

My ability to see "Vince Miller" give evidence

118. I understand from the Chair's directions dated 5 February 2021 that for those of us who are unable to attend the evidential hearings at the Amba Hotel in April and May, access to proceedings will be via an audio stream only. Given my age, I am very concerned about catching Covid-19. At best I am likely to have been given one vaccine dose by the time of the hearings and it is currently unclear if this will offer sufficient protection, particularly against new variants. This means that in order to protect my health, my access to the hearings will almost certainly be limited to the audio stream.

119. This is totally unacceptable. I should not be denied the opportunity to view Vince Miller when he gives evidence. As I set out above, I have struggled to get to grips with the reality that he was an undercover officer. It feels very surreal and turns all of my memories upside down. Part of me can't quite believe it. I had hoped that watching him give evidence would help me to accept his real identity. I thought that it would force me to see him as an undercover police officer and help to override the false story that I have had of him for the last 43 years as a former comrade and lover. I would also like the opportunity to see him asked to account for his actions.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed: 'Madeleine'

Date: 18 February 2021