

## SPECIAL BRANCH

Special Report

Noted  
7/1/71

9/10/70	WMS
---------	-----

31st day of January 1970

SUBJECT Anti-

Apartheid

Movement

Reference to Papers

B:400/69/232

1. On 30th January 1970 Mr. J. WADDELL, C.B., Deputy Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, handed to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Special Branch, for appropriate action, two letters addressed privately to the Rt. Hon. L. James CALLAGHAN, M.P., in which questions of police practice and propriety in regard to public meetings were raised by Members of Parliament connected with the Anti-Apartheid Movement.

2. The letters, both dated 26th January 1970, were:-

(1) From Frank JUDD, M.P., (a) questioning the expenditure of police time in reporting speeches by Members of Parliament and others at public meetings of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, particularly those he addressed at Portsmouth on 21st January 1970 and Bournemouth on 23rd January 1970, and (b) asking to what other organisations it was the practice to devote similar attention, and

(2) From Mr. JUDD jointly with Peter JACKSON, M.P. and Frank HOOLEY, M.P., (a) questioning the possibility of information so obtained being communicated by police officers to the Press, particularly in the case of an article, headed "Cricket Raids: the men who stayed silent", published in the "Daily Express" on 22nd January 1970, and (b) claiming to have evidence that officers of Special Branch had passed information concerning other organisations to "The Times".

3. Urgent enquiries, as directed, have been made with a view to answering the issues raised in the letters, as follows:-

(a) Meetings of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (an egalitarian organisation founded in 1960 with the object of influencing public opinion in favour of a general boycott of South African produce) have not ordinarily been of sufficient interest to police to warrant their attendance on grounds other than the preservation of public order.

(b) However, through extension of the boycott campaign to other South African activities abroad, notably sporting events, opportunities have developed for reaching a wider public and among certain elements of the Movement emphasis has shifted from attempts at mere discouragement of public support to attempts at actual disruption of the events themselves.

SECRET

(c) This trend reached practical expression in the formation in October 1969 of the Stop the 'Seventy Tour' Committee (referred to in the "Daily Express" article), an ad-hoc offshoot of the Movement proper, the declared aims of which in respect of the coming visit of a South African cricket team are touched upon in the article mentioned, which was no doubt prompted by the recent incidents of damage and disfigurement at county cricket grounds.

(d) With regard to the employment of police at meetings of the Anti-Apartheid Movement currently, this practice is a precautionary one necessitated by past incidents of disorder or possible disorder involving large-scale police attendance at sporting events, particularly those of the present South African rugby football tour, and is designed to obtain information on future events likely to bear on public order, as well as to detect possible offences by those participating.

(e) With regard to the meetings addressed by Mr. JUDD, it has been established that the earlier, at Portsmouth, was not in fact attended by police or anybody acting on their behalf. The second, at Bournemouth, was attended by an officer of the Dorset and Bournemouth Constabulary whose duties, in addition to those outlined in (d), included ensuring that the speakers were not prevented from delivering their speeches and the identification of likely trouble-makers for that and future occasions.

(f) With regard to police practice generally, public meetings of any organisation appearing to merit attention on any of the grounds set out in (d) and (e) will normally be attended by police in furtherance of their duties under Common Law and the various enactments governing the holding of meetings and the expression of opinions in public.

(g) With regard to the suggestion in the second letter that information obtained in this way might possibly be communicated to the Press, it is, of course, expressly forbidden under the terms of the Official Secrets Acts for police to make unauthorised disclosures of anything learned in the course of their duties and officers are especially mindful of the need for caution in dealing with employees of public information media.

(h) With regard to the specific suggestion that information obtained by police might have been passed to the writer of the "Daily Express" article of 22nd January 1970, it may be stated that the meeting of the Anti-Apartheid Movement to which it principally refers was a private one restricted to credential-holders and was not and could not be attended by police. It is, indeed, stated in the article and has been confirmed by enquiry (v. paragraph (i)) that the information on which it is based was derived from a commercially-produced document copies of which are known to

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

UCPI0000034322/2

have been in existence since November 1969. This ten-page publication, incorrectly described in the article as a transcript, is in fact a report, headed "Confidential" and bearing the caption "Retrospect and Prospect, New Series No.2", on the Annual General Meeting of the Anti-Apartheid Movement held at the National Liberal Club on 26th October 1969, and is presented as an eye-witness account illustrated with notes on the political affiliations and backgrounds of the personalities named. Mr. JACKSON and Mr. JUDD are mentioned in the list of elections to the National Committee. Special Branch cannot comment on the accuracy of the document, although the information it contains would appear to be of a nature reasonably accessible to journalistic methods, whether the writer attended the meeting in person or not. The name of the author is not given.

(i) With regard to the immediate source of the copy reaching the "Daily Express", it has been stated by Alain CASS, joint author of the article, in an interview with Special Branch officers on 27th January 1970 in connection with another matter, that the document was obtained from a private source which he was not prepared to disclose. Whether or not that source was the actual producer of the document and whether or not the latter was obtained as stated and on the date claimed in the article, it is evident that acquisition of a copy need present little difficulty to an experienced journalist. Indeed, a copy held by Special Branch since December 1969 was obtained directly from a well-tried source which is known to distribute such material commercially and another copy, which came into the possession of Sir John LANG, G.C.B., Adviser on Sport, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, earlier this month was referred to Special Branch for enquiry on 27th January 1970 by Home Office (their reference QPE/67 107/1/7).

(j) With regard to the evidence said to implicate Special Branch officers in the passing of information concerning other organisations to "The Times", nothing is known of this matter and no comment can usefully be made without further details.

  
Inspector

  
COMMANDER