

Witness: Diane Langford
Statement Number: 1
Exhibits: 5
Date signed: 15 March 2021

In the Undercover Policing Public Inquiry

First Witness Statement of Diane Langford

Dated: 15 March 2021

Introduction

1. I was born on 21 November 1941.
2. I make this statement pursuant to a request made under Rule 9 Inquiries Act, dated 17 January 2021. My solicitor received the request at the close of business on 15 February 2021. It was 6 pages long and consisted of 28 questions.

3. I received the first part of my witness pack containing 45 documents on 18 February 2021, and the second part containing a further 6 documents on 24 February 2021.
4. The original deadline for providing my witness statement was 5 March 2021, allowing me just 2 weeks and 4 days to prepare my statement following receipt of the Rule 9 request. I was subsequently granted an extension until 15 March 2021. This was still less than 4 weeks from receipt of the Rule 9 request and only 19 days after receiving the final tranche of documents.
5. The process of providing my witness evidence has been extremely stressful due to the very short time frames and this has negatively impacted on my ability to provide my best evidence to the Inquiry. Unfortunately, as I set out further below (paragraphs 274 to 292), it is just the latest example of how I have been treated incredibly poorly by the Inquiry since I was first contacted in October last year. The overall impression I have been given is that that Inquiry has little interest in my evidence, despite the fact that I am the only witness who is providing a non state perspective on the deployments of a number of undercover officers. I hope the Inquiry is able to learn lessons from my experience to ensure that other witnesses are not treated in the same way in the future.
6. I am providing a witness statement to the Inquiry because I was spied upon by at least 6 undercover officers HN348/"Sandra", HN45/"Dave Robertson", HN336/"Dick Epps", HN135/Mike Ferguson, HN345/"Peter Fredericks" and

HN346/WDC Jill Mosdell as a result of my involvement in the women's liberation movement and various anti-imperialist struggles.

7. My witness pack consists of 47 Special Branch Intelligence Reports dated between 30 July 1968 and 9 February 1973 relating to 7 UCOs; I am named in almost all of them. I have also been provided with a full witness statement of UCO HN336 and fragmented extracts from the statements of HN348 and HN45. I am disappointed that the Inquiry did not consider it necessary to provide me with the other 2 witness statements in full. I am surely in a better position to determine relevant content than the Inquiry. Fortunately, one of the few benefits of the Inquiry's failure to invite my participation at an earlier stage is that these statements have now been published and I have been able to review them in advance of providing my statement.
8. I was not provided with any of HN345's witness statement. The other 3 officers known to have spied on me are deceased, and I have not been provided with any statements relevant to these officers from managers or other appropriate officers. The only officer who spied on me who I was already aware of is HN45. I have not been provided with photographs of any of the other 6 to assist me in identifying them.
9. The majority of the documents I have been provided consist of reports of events such as meetings, conferences and seminars organised by the British Vietnam Solidarity Front (BVSF), Women's Liberation Front (WLF), Revolutionary Marxist Leninist League (RMLL), Vietnam Solidarity Campaign

(VSC), Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC) or Friends of China. Most of the meetings were private, and some took place in my family home or the homes of other comrades. There are also a number of reports recording personal details about my former partner Manu and myself and a report on the split in the RMLL.

10. The reports frequently include very subjective, deeply personal, and sometimes racist, sexist and homophobic commentary about those who are being surveilled. Yet, the Inquiry warned me when providing this statement that it was not *“seeking... commentary on the contents of the bundle generally”*. What a cheek! What on earth is the bundle but a commentary on the lives that these UCOs infiltrated?
11. My primary reason for engaging with the Inquiry was to help shine a light on the actions of SDS officers infiltrating the women’s liberation movement and I would like to extend my solidarity to all who have been unjustly treated by the abhorrent surveillance practices under investigation, in particular the women who were abused and deceived by UCOs.
12. When I finally received my 6 page Rule 9 request it became clear that the Inquiry’s interest in the women’s liberation movement and obtaining evidence on the actions of SDS officers was very limited. The majority of questions were aimed at dissecting mine and Manu’s broader political views and those of the other groups we were involved in, while others reflected the UCOs’ focus on our personal lives. The distinct impression given is that this is not an

inquiry into undercover policing, but an investigation into the politics and actions of those who were spied upon, which will ultimately seek to justify the SDS operations.

13. It is clear from the documents that a Special Branch Registry File, reference 402/69/250 was opened on me in 1969. Given the extent of my political activity over the years and the relatively small number of documents disclosed in my witness pack, I am certain there are many more documents I have not been provided. The groups and networks I was involved in, also all had their 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.

14. Most if not all the documents I have been provided are stamped BOX 500. I am aware that this means that these reports were shared with MI5. This, in addition to the fact that I know Manu and I were surveilled by the Security Services, means I am certain that MI5 also holds a file on me, though I doubt I will ever see it.

My family background

15. I was born in Christchurch, Aotearoa (New Zealand).

16. While I was growing up I witnessed the effects of colonialism and racism on indigenous people. I also witnessed, and experienced first-hand, the oppression of women, both at home and in low-paid work.

17. In the 1940s and 50s New Zealand had an informal apartheid system. White settlers and Maori lived in separate areas. Maori people were ghettoised into particular areas as a result of land theft and colonisation. Maori children were sent home from school or given corporal punishment for speaking Te Reo in the classroom.
18. My family were working class but I could see from a young age that our living conditions were always better than those of Maori people. There were few indigenous people, particularly women, in positions of dignity, and none in positions of power.
19. Racist attitudes towards Maori people were ubiquitous; white settlers thought that they had civilised New Zealand and the indigenous population were often referred to in racist terms such as "dirty" or "lazy". My parents and grandparents held these views.
20. When I was around 9 or 10, I remember my cousin kicking her ball in a pond in the park. A Maori man kindly rolled up his trousers and waded into the water to retrieve it for her. When my cousin thanked him, my Grandmother scolded her. She told her that we didn't say thank you to black people. I felt personally affronted.
21. Although I couldn't articulate it at the time, from a very young age I knew that there was something deeply wrong with how Maori were treated and how an artificial replica of English suburbia and racist attitudes had been imposed,

invisibilising the indigenous people and normalising 'New Zealand' as a white space. As an adult I have dedicated much of my political activity to anti-colonial and anti-racist work. I have written about my experiences in New Zealand here: <https://dianelangford.wordpress.com/2016/10/15/what-makes-pakeha-tick/>

22. Our family structure was traditionally patriarchal. My father worked long hours as a truck driver and was often away from home. My mother was a "house wife" and unhappy in that role.

23. My father's attitude to women was no more progressive than his attitude to race. He assumed I would marry young and follow a similar trajectory to my mother. He placed little value on women's education and thought that a short hand typing course would be sufficient for me. While my brothers both received a university education, I left school on my 15th birthday. I went to work in a Kodak factory, but chose to continue studying in the evenings via a correspondence course. This inequality of opportunity impacted on me significantly, and campaigning for educational equality for girls later became a key focus of my political activity.

Arrival in London

24. In 1963, I moved to London from Aotearoa (New Zealand) aged 22. I came to support my younger brother, Privacy who had won a scholarship to study piano and composition at the Royal Academy of Music.

25. London in the 1960s was a world away from our parochial life in New Zealand. We didn't have much money, but we were able to rent a flat. Initially it felt quite overwhelming, especially the responsibility for looking after my brother, but it soon became exciting. From the strict segregation in New Zealand we were now living in a thriving multicultural city. The ideas of radical political thinkers were discussed in the Sunday papers and I began regularly visiting my local alternative cinema which showed international films. I was introduced to many new ideas which helped me to contextualise my experiences of race and gender in New Zealand. I began to read widely, including seminal texts by Beauvoir and Sartre, Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva, Marcuse and Lacan.

26. In 1965, Malcolm X was assassinated. I had read *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* serialised in a Sunday newspaper. The same year, I experienced two very significant personal traumas which led me to further reflect on issues of racism and sexism. The first, which I do not wish to share publicly, was compounded by racism. The second, was the death of our flatmate as a result of a backstreet abortion (abortion was illegal in the UK until 1967). These experiences further politicised me and led to my first involvement in activism.

Political Activism – Questions 2 to 4

Q2. Please provide a brief outline of your political activism. Specific questions follow in relation to intelligence reports relating to various groups which refer to you: at the outset of your statement what is sought is an overview of your activism.

27. I began volunteering at the office of the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, an organisation led by Dr David Pitt (later Lord Pitt) and Jocelyn Barrow (later Dame Jocelyn). I worked for them until 1969. Lord Pitt remained a good friend until his death in 1994.

28. In 1967, I joined the print union, NATSOPA, working at various times as an active trade union member at the American Associated Press Picture Library, IPC Magazines, The Daily Mirror, The Press Association and Hansard (House of Lords).

29. I was strongly influenced by the events of 1968. I recall watching films by Jean-Luc Godard, Bertolucci and Antonioni that made links between the Paris Uprising of 1968 and the Cultural Revolution in China. It was an exciting period; it was a time of hope for real, global change, with national liberation movements seeking freedom from colonial rule and burgeoning civil rights movements.

30. Following the October 1968 demonstration against the Vietnam War I joined the BVSF. This was how I met Abhimanyu Manchanda (Manu), who later became my partner. Subsequently, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, I became involved in other organisations opposing Western imperialism and the Vietnam War, including, the RMLL, Friends of China and the Indo China Solidarity Campaign.

31. Around this time, I also became heavily involved in the early women's liberation movement. Ensuring education for women and girls was a key concern of mine, and one of the prime motivations behind my involvement in the women's liberation movement.

32. Unfortunately I did not feel that the feminism of the time focused sufficiently on the need for international solidarity or made connections between women's oppression and anti-racism, any more than most left wing organisations understood the importance of working against patriarchal control of women, male violence and sexism.

33. As a result, in 1970 I co-founded the Women's Liberation Front with colleagues who shared my outlook. The organisation had an international perspective and strong class analysis; we acted in solidarity with national liberation movements across the globe and demanded equality for women in all spheres of life. Together with the teacher Chris Mackinnon, I developed key campaigning demands around education.

34. I also set up a further organisation, the Women's Equal Rights Campaign, which worked primarily with trade unions.

35. I was part of the larger organising committee for the first national Women's Liberation Conference which took place in Ruskin College in 1970. I helped set up the Women's National Co-ordinating Committee which co-ordinated national conferences of women's groups around the country who were fighting

for equality at that time. I attended the first national Women's Liberation Conference in 1970 and many subsequent conferences as a significant organiser.

36. I became involved in the PSC in 1970 and I have continued to work with the PSC since that time.

37. In 1974 I was elected Mother of the Chapel at The Press Association [an archaic term for a shop steward, like Father of the Chapel] and was re-elected annually until I stood down around 1996. During my elected term of office I was active in opposing Section 28, raising awareness of HIV/Aids throughout TU networks and in setting up the Fleet Street Crèche for journalists and print workers. I played a significant role in organising grassroots support for print workers during the Wapping dispute during which I witnessed horrific police violence against protesters.

38. I have never been involved in any criminal activity. All my activism has always been open and through the usual democratic means from lobbying the government to attending demonstrations. I have never been arrested for a criminal offence.

39. While my politics have developed over the past 50 years, my priorities remain the liberation of women from all forms of oppression and exploitation, supporting self-determination and freedom from occupation and apartheid for the Palestinian people, and movements for justice for other dispossessed or

marginalised people. I continue to organise around issues such as anti-racism, the women's liberation movement, the Palestine solidarity campaign, the LGBTQ movement, trade union and worker rights, support for the NHS against privatisation, nursery campaigns, support for the disabled people's movement, in defence of local services etc.

Q3. When providing your overview of the political activism you were involved in, please explain how you came to meet and become involved with Abhimanyu Manchanda. Please include details as to when you married him and had a child together and when your relationship ended.

40. I find the questions as to when Manu and I married and had a child together and when our relationship ended intrusive and borderline prurient, particularly as it is public knowledge that I came out as a lesbian in the process of our intimate relationship ending in the late seventies.

41. My early encounters with Manu are set out in detail in my memoir [UCPI0000034312]. Prior to the October demonstration, I heard Manu being interviewed on the BBC radio discussing the question of where the march should terminate: Hyde Park or Grosvenor Square. Manu was clear, "*The lair of U.S. imperialism is the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square and that's where the protest should be made.*" I didn't know him yet, but I instantly warmed to him and agreed with his logic.

42. After the demonstration, I attended a meeting of the BVSF and met Manu in person. Over the coming months we started working together in the BVSF and other organisations. We got together in around January 1969 and married in January 1970. Our daughter was born in Privacy 1970. Our day to day relationship only ended when Manu died in 1985 as we had joint custody of our child and much in common besides that.

*Q4. Did you use an alias or aliases in relation to any of your political activity?
If so, what was it / what were they and why did you use an alias?*

43. I have never used an alias.

Intelligence Reports and Other Documents

Q5. Please consider the documents which the Inquiry has obtained and included in your witness bundle. You are named in each one of the enclosed reports and/or appendices. Are the details that have been recorded accurate? If not, please identify any inaccurate reports and set out the respects in which the report is inaccurate

44. [MPS-0738693] Please see my answer to Q10 below.

45. [MPS-0730063] Please see my answer to Q11 below.

46. [MPS-0732690] is a report by Mike Ferguson and HN336 of a BVSF meeting which took place at the Union Tavern on 9 March 1969, and is a debrief by 33

people of the march that took place that day. For further comments, please see my answer to Q12.

47. [MPS-0732689] is another report by Ferguson and HN336 on a private meeting of the BVSF, held at the Union Tavern on 16 March 1969, at which 24 people including myself were present. I remember meeting Ms Seedo, an inspiring older activist (probably around my current age) who was a refugee from Belarus. The topics mentioned followed on from the previous report discussed at Q12 on the need to publicise our political message and recruit. We also discussed the forthcoming BVSF Open Conference which would have been an important political event in our calendar.

48. [MPS-0732971] is a private meeting of the BVSF at the Union Tavern on 6 April 1969 in which I am noted as among the 23 attending by undercovers Mike Ferguson and HN336. It notes that we had concerns about the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) Easter March on political grounds. However, as Madame Binh was attending on behalf of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, we naturally wished to show solidarity and ensure that she was given the appropriate welcome. As there was no public order issue, it seems the sole reason for reporting this is because we held political views at odds with the Government of the day, but ones that were not uncommon, as evidenced by the turn out at marches.

49. [MPS-0736439] is an account of a private meeting of the BVSF held on 13 April 1969 at the Union Tavern by Mike Ferguson and HN336. They highlight the CND march and the political differences there, the New Convention on the Left and that the BVSF supported the Revolutionary Socialist Student

Federations call for a general student strike and rally on 1 May. This would have been normal discussion at BVSF meetings at the time, i.e. political engagement in the affairs and issues of the day.

50. [MPS-0736449] is a report on the private weekly meeting of the BVSF held on 4 May 1969 at the Union Tavern at which 17 people attended, along with Mike Ferguson and HN336. It is not, as the UPCI have labelled it, a report simply into the future activities of Abhimanyu Manchanda.

51. I note the brief report focused very much on the theoretical aspects of our work and suggestions for further learning including on the subject of women's liberation. Though standard fare for our meetings and indicative of the value we placed on political education among ourselves, I fail to see what was gained in reporting this back unless educating oneself on women's rights was considered subversive by the undercovers and their managers. It also reports that we would be participating in several future protests on Palestine and Equal Rights for Women. These were simple marches and it would have been clear to the undercovers present that we planned to participate in our usual non-violent manner.

52. [MPS-0736446] is a report of an open conference held by the BVSF over 26 and 27 April 1969 at Fyvie Hall, Regent Street Polytechnic, W1 and Hampstead Town Hall on respective days. It is a lengthy report of proceedings by undercovers Mike Ferguson (author) and HN336. As with so much of the reporting, it focuses in on political disagreements and misconstrues what people are saying in a sensationalist manner. For instance, Ferguson writes of Manu's talk:

“Before coming to power, the proletariat and other revolutionary people should adhere to the principle of making revolution by violence, smashing the old state machine and seizing political power by armed force.”

MANCHANDA did not appear to hold out any immediate prospects of this uncomfortable eventuality taking place in England, but invited members of the B.V.S.F. to view the world situation, especially events in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as part of a massive anti-Imperialist movement inspired by Chairman Mao.”

53. Ferguson says that the quote above comes from page 10 of Appendix B, which was purportedly appended to his report. I have not been provided with Appendix B; my solicitor has been told that the ILT are looking into whether the Inquiry has a copy. I imagine that, if found, Appendix B will provide helpful context. I believe that this will have been one of our theoretical discussions where historical examples of how revolutions developed were discussed. We studied hard: for example, the theory of the state, not as a nebulous entity that most people refer to by calling it ‘they’ as in ‘they are going to increase VAT’ - but the actual theory of the ‘base and superstructure’ of the state and how it functions as the enforcer of patriarchy, imperialism/colonialism and capitalism. We were passionate about our politics. Here, I believe the discussion was focussing on Lenin’s book ‘The State and Revolution’.

54. Given the specific language used in the quote above, and the fact that we did not have our own army, navy and air force or any other means to “*smash the old state machine,*” I am sure that Manu was referring to Leninist theory rather than proposing that we tried to seize political power by armed force here! I find it hard to imagine that Special Branch or MI5 thought we were in a

position to take over the British state, and this is reflected in Ferguson's later comments where he notes that Manu "*did not appear to hold out any immediate prospects of this uncomfortable eventuality taking place in England.*"

55. [UCPI0000005789] is a report of the Second Annual Conference of the London Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation, held at the Union Tavern on 25 June 1969 and attended by approximately 40 people as well as undercover Mike Ferguson. Manu and I are noted as being elected to the Executive Committee. Other than discussion of political differences and elections, Ferguson explicitly notes "*Nothing else of particular interest to Special Branch occurred at this meeting*", implying that the internal politics and roles in the group mentioned previously were of specific interest. This interest also appears to be indicated by the fact that this is the first report disclosed to me where I am detailed as having my own Special Branch Registry File, previously I simply had "mentions" next to my name. The disclosure that I've been provided with evidences that up to that point nothing I had said at meetings had been considered worth noting in the intelligence reports, I therefore believe my file must have been opened as a result of my appointment to the Executive Committee, unless it was simply a result of my attendance at meetings.

56. [UCPI0000005803] is a report of the meeting called by the Vietnam Solidarity Committee on 2 February 1970 at Conway Hall reported on by HN336. I believe that this would have been a closed meeting as the Committee were discussing organisational matters. Around 23 people including myself

attended to discuss what next for Peace movements and Anti-Vietnam War organisations and how they could work together. It notes upcoming future events and protests. Given this meeting would have been in part about setting campaigning objectives, the presence of HN336 at a meeting of this kind indicates that he was actively taking part in our internal democratic and decision making processes.

57. [UCPI0000005804] is a report by HN336 on the Working Committee of the Vietnam Solidarity Committee which took place at 13 Whites Row, London on 10 February 1970, which Manu and I were present at. Again it would have been a closed meeting for those involved in organising, this time for forthcoming VSC activities – namely its Annual Conference and a future broad left meeting. A note is made that research is being done on future speaking arrangements for government and opposition politicians. This would have been to organise small demonstrations and to arrange for questions to be asked at hustings. 10 people are present along with HN336. HN336 would have been there because he was playing an active role in organising the future activities of the VSC as a whole and this indicates that he had a role in steering the group. In a meeting as small as this, he would easily have made his presence and opinions felt even in abstaining on issues. I note that HN336 was not asked about his participation in internal democratic processes in respect of this document or [UCPI0000005803] or more generally. This is an important issue which should have been explored and had I been participating in the Inquiry at the relevant time I would have proposed questions on this topic.

58. [UCP000000580] is a report by HN336 of a private meeting of the VSC April 19th Ad Hoc Committee which took place on 10 March 1970 which Manu and I attended. The name of the committee indicates that a demonstration was to be held on April 19th 1970. Ad Hoc Committees were set up to coordinate the organisation of each demonstration. 14 representatives of the groups participating in the demonstration attended. The report records that we agreed the content of leaflets and press statements at the meeting. The fact that we were agreeing a press statement demonstrates the public nature of the demonstration. Again, HN336 must have been playing an active role in the organising to have been present at a meeting such as this. In this meeting it was decided to gather more evidence of the way some companies were implicated in supporting the war. This shows that we were careful when making plans to picket implicated companies to ensure we properly understood their involvement before undertaking any pickets.

59. [UCPI0000005807] is a report by HN336 of a meeting of the VSC April 19th Ad Hoc Committee at the Roebuck Pub on Tottenham Court Road held on 20 March 1970 which I am noted as being present. The meeting was disrupted as the original venue cancelled at the last minute leading to it moving to the Roebuck. I understand that UCOs sometimes contacted venue managers to encourage them to cancel bookings of political events. This is something I would have suggested that CTI explored with HN336 if I had been a core participant at the time he gave oral evidence.

60. The following three reports concern lectures given by Manu:

[UCPI0000010254] is a report of the BVSF on 25 February 1970 at the Union Tavern, which 15 people attended. [UCPI0000011737] is a report of the RMLL

meeting also held at the Union Tavern on 15 November 1970 and which 12 attended. Finally [UCPI0000011739] is a report on a public meeting celebrating the 26th Anniversary of Socialist Albania at Camden Studios, 29 November 1970. In each, HN45 reports on the broad topic Manu addressed. The background context to these talks was first that both he and Claudia Jones experienced racism at the hands of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB). In particular, he was expelled from the CPGB following an article critical of collaboration between the Soviet Union and the US through the United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo.

61. In the first lecture reported on, Manu explained, among other things, the basis of his theory that the Soviet Union had colluded in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba, the first democratically elected prime minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Sino-Soviet split, the role of the Soviet Union in the liberation movements in Africa and elsewhere are a legitimate topic of study. The second was a theoretical lecture about the political economy of the Soviet Union and the restoration of capitalism. Discussion of these issues posed no threat to the British state or public order, unless political education and discussion per se is perceived as a threat.

62. The Revolutionary Marxist Leninist League was a small group, of only about 12 of us when I was a member. To join you had to be a candidate for six months before becoming a full member. Some of the individuals who attended meetings like this one would have been candidate members and I would anticipate that in attending it was HN45's intention to intimate that he was interested in becoming a full member of the group.

63. [UCPI0000011738] is a report of the farewell party for Nguyen Van Sao & Linh Qui, representatives of Democratic Republic of North Vietnam on 27 November 1970. Around 40 attended the event held at Camden Studios which was organised by Manu. Madam Lin Qui was a close friend and I have photos of her at a private family gathering at the home I then shared with Manu and of other occasions such as her send-off from Victoria Station.
64. [UCPI0000010567] is a report of a meeting of the RMLL held at our home on 20 January 1971, at which 14 of us are present as well as HN45. The report focuses on our discussion of doing more work among trade unions. It also notes that two new branches of the WLF have formed, one in South London and the other in North London. It is of note that this report immediately precedes HN348's 20 month infiltration of the WLF.
65. The inherent racism in HN45's reporting is well illustrated here. The report contains derogatory comments about Manu's capabilities, at one point putting the fact that he was a trained journalist in quote marks, singling it out as a phrase. HN45 would have been well aware that Manu was a journalist and had for several years been managing editor of the *West Indian Gazette and Afro-Asian Caribbean News*.
66. [UCPI0000021998] is a report of a public meeting held at Conway Hall on 29 January 1971 which 250 people attended, and myself, Manu and others are identified as attending. The meeting was hosted by the Communist Party of Britain (ML) and reported back on a 1970 visit China by CPB(ML) members. Though not a member of the CPB(ML), we would have attended given our known interest in China – we were active in the Friends of China organisation.

However, it is not clear to me why my presence at such a large, open meeting would have been of interest and reported back on by HN45.

67. A good proportion of the one page report, which is mostly dismissive of the talk itself as being of little interest to Special Branch, highlights that among those attending were members of the Post Office Workers Union appealing for money to help with a strike then going on. In what is another clear example of racism, HN45 writes:

Permission was given to them to take a collection as people left the hall at the end of the meeting. Most of the Post Office workers were coloured and from time to time gave the clenched fist "Black Power" salute. (Emphasis added.) They may also have been responsible for distribution of a leaflet published by the Black Workers Co-ordinating Committee, c/o [Privacy] [Privacy] which attacks the Industrial Relations Bill and calls on workers to unite in the fight ahead (copies attached).

68. HN45 would have been aware that in anti-racist struggle at the time, people of colour did not use the term 'coloured' and the accepted self-definition was 'Black'. In deliberately choosing to use the former term in the phrase "*Many were "coloured" and gave clenched fist Black Power salute*" he pointedly did not adopt people's chosen way of describing themselves. There is no excuse for continuing to use prejudiced language when the subject's preferred language is at the heart of the perceived prejudice and racism we were opposing.

69. [UCPI0000010569] is a report on the Second Annual Conference of the PSC which took place at the Conway Hall on 6 February 1971 and estimates 60 to

40 people at it. HN35 notes that Manu was active at it, but was unsuccessful in being elected to its Executive Committee. This would have been a natural political activity given the BVSF was, as is noted, affiliated to the PSC.

70. [UCPI0000010570] is a report by HN45 of 16 February 1971 on the WLF. As with other reports, it is clear that HN45 is at pains to insist that the WLF was *"directly controlled by Abhimanyu Manchanda"* as he puts it in this report. This is nonsense. The Aims and Objectives of the WLF were jointly drafted by myself and Chris Mackinnon and decided following a series of meetings with other members of the group. As a group of women, we were fully capable of determining our own politics and running our own group. Manu was politically influential and had an interest in women's liberation issues, yes, but that is considerably different from him controlling our women-led group. This report displays a very sexist mindset.

71. In addition to his sexism, I can only surmise that his emphasis on Manu is designed to justify targeting of the group in light of previous and misconstrued characterising of Manu as advocating violence in pursuit of our aims. I note this is around the time that HN348 apparently begins her targeting of the WLF.

72. [UCPI0000026988] is a report by HN348 of a meeting of the WLF on the topic of 'Smash Fascism', held on 17 February 1971, at the Duke of Clarence pub, Manor Place, SE1. 20 people attend and I am reported as the meeting chair. Representatives from the General Post Office Union are present to talk about their ongoing strike. This is HN348's first report.

73. It is a shame that WDC HN348 fails to note that Women GPO telephone operators were at the time forced to raise their hands to ask their supervisors

for permission to go to the toilet in addition to other humiliating petty rules as described by Ms Spurr. The author misses the important context of this meeting but instead focuses on a detailed description of the two speakers, including the sexist “bleached blonde” descriptor. It is unclear to me why the undercover felt the need to provide a detailed report on the description of two speakers simply seeking to end humiliating and degrading treatment. Instead, seeing fit to prioritise for the files their descriptions without this context, thereby treating them as potential criminals.

74. HN348’s comment that a woman was “*furiously reading from notes ...*” made an “*incoherent speech*” and sarcastic remarks regarding another woman “*outlining the oppression of the female sex throughout the ages,*” clearly reveals the prejudiced attitude of the undercover officer towards those attending a meeting about supporting women in their struggles for equality.

75. [MPS-0739236] is a report by HN45 on Abhimanyu Manchanda, dated 27 February 1971. It notes in snide terms that Manu is receiving a small stipend as General Secretary of the RMLL due to the full time nature of the work. It then provides details of my employment as a typist and names my employer and place of workhand comments that

“Manchanda considers that this is a practical experiment in the field of Women’s Liberation as he remains at home to look after their young baby born in Privacy 1970, while his wife is out working.”

76. This is totally inappropriate reporting on behalf of HN45. I cannot see how reporting on details of my employment and my domestic arrangement with my family is in anyway justified and I find it deeply intrusive. That we arranged for

Manu to do the childcare while I went to work is of no relevance to any aspect of policing. That HN45 considered this important enough to single out is a clear example of his sexist mindset.

77. It is equally disturbing that he saw fit to report on the details of my child, giving the birthdate and I must express my disgust on learning of it.

78. I find it ironic that while we were apparently deemed capable of the violent overthrow of the State, it appears from the reports I've been provided that HN45 showed more interest in our child-care arrangements. He appeared obsessed with our mixed-race relationship as well as what he imagined a 'woman's role' ought to be within a family. The racist connotations behind HN45's commentary on myself and Manu's relationship are conflated in my mind with the horrible incidents we both had to endure as a mixed race couple, once even being attacked by a group of National Front (NF) thugs as we tried to protect our tiny baby who was being rocked in an effort to tip her out of her pram.

79. [UCPI[0000008219]] is a report of the Women's Liberation Demonstration, a 3000 strong march through central London on 6 March 1971. The account from HN334 and another Special Branch officer notes the route, details of speakers and their topics and street performances. Our demands are noted as: equal pay and opportunities for women, complete state child care and nurseries, access to free contraception and abortion and equal educational opportunities. The WLF is given among the groups listed as taking part and my participation is also noted. In particular, the report author (HN334) notes: "*There was no disorder*". It is unclear to me why they would have expected

disorder when the nature of the march and our intention to deliver a petition to Downing Street was publicised widely in advance, including in an article in the Evening Standard which I exhibit to my statement: [UCPI0000034332]. What purpose was there for a UCO attending and reporting on this event?

80. [UCPI0000011741] is a report by HN45 of an extraordinary meeting of the RMLL which took place at a private address on the 13 March 1971. Manu and I are among 17 the people are present. The meeting signalled a significant political crisis within the RMLL. I address this report further in my response to Q16, but I note here comments which are redolent of HN45's racialised reporting, such as referring to Manu's "*characteristic diatribe*" and "*constant stream of anecdotes*." Such comments are also present in his other reports.

81. [UCPI0000011742] reports on a follow up meeting of the RMLL to the one mentioned above, which took place on the 28 March 1971 at the home of Manu and I. HN45 notes 18 people attended, who are all identified in the appendix attached to the report. For all those present HN45 sets out who took which side of the emerging split in our group and who stood aside. He also includes a copy of Manu's five page pre-prepared statement.

82. I discuss in my answer to Q16 my thoughts on HN45's role in the conflict. As I set out there, I do not recall HN45 attending this meeting and I suspect he was fed information by an informer. However, the level of detail he is able to report back is notable and if he wasn't present then someone was readily providing him with information. This gives rise to a twofold fear that there was an informer in the group also reporting on us, and/or that what HN45 was

relying on for intelligence, as much as anything else, was pub gossip with the disaffected, misogynist men in our group.

83. [UCPI0000026995] is a report by HN348 of a public meeting of the WLF at the Laurel Tree pub, NW1 on 7 April 1971, chaired by myself. Approximately 20 people are present. HN348 reports on me opening the meeting with a discussion of the Women's National Co-ordination Committee (WNCC) and in particular a recent demonstration held under its auspices on 6 March. The report focuses on discontent that the WLF had been effectively excluded from the demonstration by the WNCC, and I am quoted as stating at paragraph 4:

"The main reason for this had been that the Committee was mainly composed of representatives from the Women's Liberation Workshop, the main aims and view of which were centred around sexual perversion."

84. I can state categorically that I did not make the above comment that HN348 has attributed to me. It is a gross misrepresentation and I was utterly horrified to read it. The account of this meeting, like others, is obviously couched in terms of the viewpoint of HN348.

85. At this time, as was the case in many left-wing organisations, the primary focus was the prioritisation of women's economic exploitation under capitalist structures, and the growing consciousness that reproductive and sexual autonomy and rights are also crucial was to become a vital part of feminist campaigning. The former perspective was that of our group. Any comment I made then would have reflected this view, and was distorted and

misrepresented by the undercover police officer. I would never have used the phraseology reported.

86. Despite the fact that I raised my concerns about the inherent homophobia in this comment with the Inquiry on 5 November 2020 and asked for my name to be redacted to ensure I was not wrongly associated with this deeply offensive view point, HN348 was not asked any questions about homophobic bias when she subsequently gave oral evidence.

87. [MPS-0739237] is a report authored by HN345, who was undercover as 'Peter Fredericks'. I also address this report in response to Q18 below. The report itself is into the activities of Abhimanyu Manchanda and some of his movements, and is apparently an update of a similar one of 31 January 1969. The author also notes "*The subject is known to me. The photograph is a fair likeness*". In comparison with other reports it does not appear as a 'typical' SDS undercover report though it clearly draws on them – for example, the reference to my family arrangement, my child and my work appears to have been taken from HN45's report at [MPS-0739236].

88. I am disturbed to see that details of my family life and my child are being circulated more widely within Special Branch. What could possibly be the justification for this other than that they considered us on an ideological level as legitimate targets for any form of intrusion. Had the Inquiry disclosed this report to me prior to the Phase 1 hearings, I would have liked to have proposed questions for HN345 when he gave evidence to the Inquiry in November 2020. It is unclear to me how he would have come to otherwise know who Manu was and the level of detail about our family.

89. [UCPI0000026997] is a report by HN348 of a meeting of 27 April 1972 of Friends of China held at my home with Manu, at which 8 people are present. It is wrongly described as a meeting of the Friends of China group, and is actually that of the WLF.

90. In any case, I would question at this point why Friends of China was considered an appropriate target, given that, like others such as the Society for Anglo Chinese Understanding, we were campaigning, among other things, for China's admission to the United Nations, an activity that I would have thought was democratic in nature rather than subversive.

91. [UCPI0000027001] is a report of a meeting of the WLF held at the Laurel Tree pub, Bayham Street on 11 May 1971 which 15 people attended, including Manu and I. It focuses on the differences between the WLF and the WNCC, but notes the WLF would maintain contact with the latter organisation. HN348 notes:

"Nothing of particular interest emerged and it was agreed that the WLF should maintain the link with WNCC even though there were differences between the two organisations about female sexuality."

92. If it was of so little interest, it begs the question of why the police were spending resources on sending an undercover into our midst to report back on it. I also find it incredulous that well thought out political differences (i.e. emphasis on individual liberation rather than structural change, the exclusion of Black women etc.) are misrepresented by their reduction to the phrase *"female sexuality"*. Something that says far more about the attitude and outlook of HN348 than the group.

93. [UCPI0000010918] This is a report by HN45, dated 20 May 1971, in which he provides detail of the RMLL split, following up on the report of 16 March 1971 [UCPI0000011741]. As I set out in my response to Q16, it is my view that HN45 effectively formed an alliance with the misogynist men in the group who took over the RMLL and deliberately stoked tensions, interfering with our democratic processes.

94. HN45 also notes that Manu was responding to the crisis by producing a leaflet advertising political instruction classes to take place at our home each Saturday "*under the auspices of the Women's Liberation Front.*" This is another example of HN45 sexism by treating the concerns of women's liberation dismissively, by seeing it as merely a vessel for Manu rather than as an entity with politics in its own right.

95. [UCPI0000011746] is a report by HN45 of the formation of the Marxist Leninist Workers Association, and the impact on related groups due to the split within the RMLL.

96. [UCPI0000027014] is a report on the North London Branch of the WLF at held at a private residence, which 11 people are present. [UCPI0000027021] is a report of a WLF Committee Meeting of 12 September 1971 at the Cooperative Hall, Seven Sisters Road at which 17 people attend. Both reports are authored by HN348. I address the aspects of the first report relating to criticism of me by other members in my response to Q19. I make a couple of other observations about both reports here.

97. First, when noting the 11 people in attendance in the report of the first meeting, one is described as the "*married sister*" of another attendee. It

appears to me this obsession with marital status is indicative of the hetero-normative attitudes of the undercovers, both male and female.

98. Second, at this meeting HN348 also reports on the fact that a man and woman from the Black Unity and Freedom Party would be attending the Women's National Conference at Skegness. The second report, of a meeting held on the 12 September at the Cooperative Hall, Seven Sisters Road, in which HN348 writes:

"An incident was reported 'between a coloured youth and a white boy at Peckham Fair ... in the ensuing fracas some 30 coloured persons had been arrested and had not been granted bail. The Black Unity and Freedom Party will hold a demonstration. Members were encouraged to notify the press and demand publicity.'"

99. The language is implicitly racist. I would also like to question why it was necessary to include this reporting on people calling for justice and exercising their rights free speech and assembly. Both reports provide clear evidence that the meetings of the WLF were used as a means of gathering information about other individuals and parties, for example the Black Unity and Freedom Party, a legally constituted group set up to campaign against racism.

100. As with HN45, there is a pattern of racist undertones in HN348's reporting. For example, I was appalled to read her refer to internationally respected artist David Medalla in the most racist and disgusting terms: "*dirty appearance, and very poorly clad*" in her report [UCPI0000010919]. I am deeply concerned that the Inquiry didn't explore these examples of racism in reporting with HN348 when she gave oral evidence. If I had been invited to

participate prior to the hearings, I would certainly have proposed questions on this issue, which I understand is one that is central to the Inquiry.

101. Finally, the second report records mine and Manu's expulsion from the WLF following a vote at the meeting. HN348 records that 13 of those present voted for our expulsion and 3 abstained. No one voted against. As I set out at in my response to Q21, given that when the group reformed as the Revolutionary Women's Union some months later, HN348 was elected onto the executive committee of the new organisation, I think it is inconceivable that she did not vote for our expulsion. Had she voted against or abstained, this would have been remembered and she would not have been given a position of power in the newly formed organisation.

102. [UCPI0000010908] is a report on a meeting of the WLF / Revolutionary Women's Union at a private residence at which 11 people were present on the 17 February 1972. As I was not present I am unable to comment on the accuracy of the account. I do note that HN348 in her cover identity as Sandra Davies has been elected Treasurer of the Group according to the minutes of the AGM of the WLF which were attached to this report and I discuss this further in my response to Q21. I note in HN348's statement she down plays this role, saying she does not remember it.

103. [UCPI0000008284] is a report by HN348 on the National Women's Liberation Conference held at Acton Town Hall from 3 to 5 November 1972 which several hundred people attended. I feel this report deserves some detailed consideration as it demonstrates the mindset of HN348. There were aspects of it I found inconsistent and unreliable, including reporting the names

of groups that I do not think existed, such as “*Gay Woman*” (which she described as a close knit libertarian group - how did she know this?) and the “*Men’s Liberation Group*”.

104. A clear example of inaccurate reporting is her account of the expulsion of two people from the women only social event. She states that “*two transvestite men managed to gain entrance, unfortunately their presence was discovered and they were unceremoniously ejected amidst uproar*”. The two involved are in fact known to me: neither were male transvestites; one was a transwoman and the other was her female partner. In any case, providing such misinformation patently serves no intelligence purpose.

105. At one point she writes:

“Lesbian friends in particular made exaggerated and noisy displays of affection openly kissing and hugging each other. These displays were common-place throughout the conference and it was not unusual to see two girls entwined in a corner. That little notice was taken by the majority of women present indicated the prevailing liberal attitude.”

106. This statement can only be described as voyeuristic and homophobic. It did nothing beyond demonstrating her own prejudices and added nothing of value to the Special Branch report. As noted above, HN348’s homophobia and any impact that it had on her reporting is another topic which I believe should have been explored with HN348 when she gave her oral evidence.

107. Later HN348 notes

“One of the more interesting workshops was that on Sexism and Racism.

It was attended by about 40 women of whom 10 were coloured (sic). After much discussion it was broadly accepted that a socialist approach was needed to the problem, although not necessarily a revolutionary one. The three main themes were:

class oppression

colour oppression

sexual oppression

in varying orders of priority according to individual environment

...it was noticeable that the numbers of coloured (sic) women at the conference were significantly more than at previous conferences and their point of view received a level of attention hitherto not given ... they came from outside London and were members of predominantly white groups.” (Emphasis added.)

108. Did HN348 mean of interest to Special Branch or just personally interesting? Why was there such significant focus on the racial identities of the women present and what was the relevance in reporting this? Again, it is very concerning that this wasn't explored with HN348 when she gave oral evidence.

109. Relatedly, it is clear from this report that HN348 was attending numerous women's liberation conferences and was confident in making

comparisons between them. This is also apparent from several subsequent passages (emphasis added):

- a. "of the talk given by Bobby Sykes – *'Throughout her speech there was utter silence and everyone was most attentive – a rare occurrence at these conferences.*"
- b. *"By comparison with previous women's liberation conferences this one was reasonably orderly and a real attempt was made at organising discussions, although the large attendance hindered this somewhat."*

Despite this the Inquiry has published only 3 other reports by HN348 on conferences which predate this.

110. [UCPI0000011764] is a report authored by HN348 on 23 November 1972 into an attempt by Manu and I to resume the activities of the WLF, the name having been abandoned by the previous group.
111. [UCPI0000014701] is a report by HN45 of a Reception for the opening of the Chinese Photographic Exhibition, hosted by Banner Books on 10 December 1972. Approximately 50 people attended including the Chinese Ambassador. Manu and I are identified as attending.
112. [UCPI0000010247] is an SDS report of a private meeting of the BVSF at 101 Gower Street, held on 17 January 1973. It covers a discussion the arrangements of the Indo-China Solidarity Conference the previous night to demonstrate against the forthcoming inauguration of Nixon as the US President. Six people are detailed as attending, along with undercovers Jill Mosdell and HN45. That is quite a noticeable ratio of one undercover to three

people and I wonder how it was justified for what was then was a small group.

I address this report further in my response to Q14.

113. [UCPI: 0000010248] is a report by HN45 and Jill Mosdell of a photographic / film exhibition at the Conway Hall, put on by Anti-Imperialist Co-ordinating Committee on the 3 February 1973 to celebrate the recent truce in Vietnam. The authors make the point of signalling out that half the 120 attending were "Arab and coloured," which fits a pattern in the documents provided by the Inquiry of those undercovers reporting on me where they focusing in on the race of politically engaged people where they are not white British. One thing that I am very much aware of as I read through these documents is that there is a particular comment on the race of people at events which is not mirrored in other characteristics such as age, gender, etc. This causes me to ask the question if there was a particular instruction to Special Branch officers and/or the SDS undercovers to record race, something which would indicate an institutionally racist approach.

114. Another pattern in the reporting is how both HN45 and HN348 have a habit of personally appraising speeches by activists, such as labelling them 'incoherent' or making subjective remarks as 'failed to give any analysis'. Again, it is hard to see what value this adds to the intelligence.

115. [UCPI0000016247] is HN45's report of a meeting of the Indo-China Solidarity Conference meeting held on 6 February 1973 at the Clare Market Building, Houghton Street, W1. Manu and I are mentioned as being in attendance, as are a number of former colleagues of ours from RMLL, etc. Manu is described as "*self-appointed leader of the Maoists*", which is not true,

and which HN45 would have known was false given the splits he witnessed and wrote about previously. The purpose of describing him in this way is either personal prejudice or simply to maintain him as a target for political reasons. Either way, it demonstrates the unreliability of the reporting by HN45.

116. [UCPI0000005791] is a report from DC M. Tyrrell on the National Seminar of the Revolutionary Socialists Students Federation held at Leicester University over 14-17 June 1969. About 100 attended including 40 from London. It is an event I recall as it was the first time I spoke in public, delivering a paper on Women's Liberation, which was the focus of Sunday's meetings. At the time we were using conferences like this to put the issue of Women's Liberation on the wider political agenda. It was somewhat of a baptism of fire, giving a talk to an audience which consisted mostly of men, on issues that are considered normal now, but were controversial then. I remember being heckled significantly and a large number of the men eventually walking out. I still have a copy of the paper and I exhibit it to this statement [UCPI0000034340].

117. Despite this being a detailed report, Tyrrell often chooses to focus in on the divisions between us, and there is reporting for its own sake rather than anything that meets a clear policing objective.

118. [MPS-0736435] a report of a meeting of the BVSF prepared by the undercover Mike Ferguson. It took place on 26 June 1969 at the Union Tavern, one of our regular meeting venues but in a private forum. A split within the BVSF resulted in Manu being elected Chair of London Region BVSF and myself to the Executive Committee.

119. Despite talking about the process of the meeting, Ferguson singularly omits the underlying political difference which caused the split, a disagreement over publicly criticising the Soviet Union in our public work. As noted above, critical appraisal of the Soviet Union was a strong strand of our political discussions, something, which at the height of the Cold War, one would have expected Special Branch in their role of counter-subversion, one of the excuses to spy on us, would have been interested in. It strikes me that the omission of this fact is indicative that they were spying on us simply because we were left wing.

120. [MPS-0736428] is report by Mike Ferguson on a private reception of the BVSF held at Camden Studios on 29 July 1969. Around 100 people attended to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of the Provisional Government of South Vietnam.

121. Ferguson notes:

"The reception was attended by about 100 people, many of whom were coloured,..."(Emphasis added.)

122. As noted previously there is a focus on the race of those attending the events. Given this is a report authored by a different SDS undercover to those I have referred to previously, it demonstrates that this sort of requirement in reporting was an institutional level expectation.

123. [UCPI0000026987] is a report of a public meeting of the WLF held at Camden Studios to celebrate the 150th Anniversary of the Birth of Friedrich Engels. It was an esoteric event by many people's standards, but Engels was

an important figure in our theoretical work and we spent much time studying his writings. It is another joint report by HN45 and Jill Mosdell.

124. A general feature of the reporting, which this report illustrates, is that the undercovers who reported on us failed to acknowledge the importance and amount of theoretical work we did and how it motivated us. Often the UCOs record abstract strong sounding titles and phrases we used when talking about socialist revolution without considering the necessary context. It fundamentally changes the meaning of the discussions and the result is to imply we were a much greater danger or imminent threat than we ever actually were.

125. [UCPI0000026991] is a report by HN45 of a meeting between the WLF and the Women's Liberation Workshop(WLW) on 14 February 1971 at Camden Studios, of approximately 25 people. The WLW withdrew as they thought the meeting was to be private, where the WLF had worked on it being a public debate. I discuss this report further in my response to Q18.

126. [UCPI0000026998] is a report of a joint meeting by the WLF and the BVSF held on 2 May 1971 at the Church Hall on Willoughby Road, NW3 to welcome combined delegation of women from Vietnam, Laos & Cambodia who were visiting the UK. There are approximately 45 in attendance. HN45, the report author, is very focused on confusion as to whether the meeting was public or not leading to one group withdrawing their support.

127. Both reports touch on a point often lost on the authors, namely that we were very much in favour of events being public, something which demonstrates our general ethos. We wanted public debate and discussion, to have political education out there, a point that is obscured in much of the reporting. I also note that I have not been provided with any reports of meetings the WLF held with main stream speakers such as Irma Kurtz, author of an article in the Sunday Times on the women's liberation movement; Paul Ferris, an Observer journalist who campaigned for women's right to contraception and abortion and a gig by Peggy Seeger and her band to raise funds for a Vietnamese women's delegation to the UK. The narrative of our activity is also shaped by what is deliberately left out. We were not a secretive group trying to hide away and plan illegal activity. We were seeking to be out in the realm of public debate. While our ideas may have been considered left wing at the time, many are now mainstream, and what did they have to fear from our political discussions unless they had their own ideological opposition?

The British Vietnam Solidarity Front (BVSF), the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist League (RMLL) and the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation (RSSF).

Q6. Please outline your political activities in connection with the British Vietnam Solidarity Front ('BVSF'), including dates and positions of responsibility held, if any. In particular:

6.1 Were you a member of the BVSF?

6.2 How did you come to join the BVSF?

6.3 What, if any, role did you have in the leadership of the BVSF?

6.4 What were the aims of the BVSF?

6.5 What methods did the BVSF use to advance its aims?

6.6 What steps did you take to advance the cause of the BVSF?

6.7 Did the BVSF vet its members?

6.8 Did the BVSF take other security precautions to keep its plans, tactics or other matters confidential? If so, please explain.

6.9 Was the BVSF concerned about infiltration by the Police or others? If so, please explain why?

128. I was handed a flyer about a meeting of the BVSF taking place at the Union Tavern on the evening of the October demonstration. I attended the meeting and became a member shortly after. I joined in order to protest against the cruel and inhuman war against the Vietnamese people that was being supported by the British State. I wasn't active in the leadership and I don't remember holding any position within the organisation, other than becoming an ordinary committee member to advocate on behalf of the women's groups I was involved in.

129. The aims of the BVSF were to contribute to the ending of the mass killing, maiming, torture, environmental destruction and cultural oppression being caused by a racist, imperialist war waged by the world's largest superpower against a tiny, far-off country that was not threatening anybody outside its own borders.

130. The inhuman ramifications of the war, such as the ongoing effects of Agent Orange are still inflicting untold suffering. Victims have yet to receive compensation from either the US government or the manufacturers, Monsanto, for on-going illnesses and family deaths (<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/vietnam-agent-orange-monsanto-victims-compensation-a8508271.html>)

131. There was nothing out of the ordinary about BVSF in terms of the methods used to conduct its campaign against the war. We held public meetings, showed films about the war and produced leaflets, making the connections between all forms of imperialism and oppression. We tried to educate people about the peaceful nature of Vietnamese culture and the history of suffering caused by Japanese, French and US imperialism and to tell the personal stories behind US aggression and the heroic resistance against it.

132. My role in the organisation to progress its aims was limited to attending meetings, and tasks such as leafletting, administrative activities and cooking for events, and reading out the English text for foreign language films that we showed.

133. All BVSF meetings were open to the public. We publicised details of the meetings in flyers that we handed out at events and by word of mouth. There was no need to send undercover officers to these meetings. The BVSF did not vet its members, nor did we take precautions to keep our plans, tactics

or other matters confidential. On the contrary our strategy was to make the depredations of the war public knowledge.

134. We were not overly concerned about infiltration by the police or others as we didn't have anything to hide. We were also aware that we were being surveilled by various means by various different state bodies as I set out at paragraph 267. In any event, we thought that infiltrators were rather obvious and considered them as something of a joke. This view changed following the extremely sinister incident where 'Dave Robertson' was 'outed' as an undercover officer which I discuss in my response to Q21.

Q7. Did you attend the October 1968 Anti-Vietnam demonstration that ended in Grosvenor Square? Had Grosvenor Square outside the US Embassy always been the destination of the march? If not, how did it become so during the march? Was violence planned and by whom? What violence did you witness?

7.1 Did you attend subsequent VSC demonstrations? Was any violence planned and if so by whom? Did you witness any violence?

135. I attended the 28th October 1968, and I was in the part of the demonstration that ended up in Grosvenor Square. Demonstrators marched from the start point (which I believe was Malet Street) to Trafalgar Square. Upon arrival at Trafalgar Square some demonstrators went to Hyde Park and others, including me, went to Grosvenor Square.

136. In the run up to the demonstration there was a difference of opinion about where the final destination of the march should be. This was covered extensively in the press. As far as I could tell, the BVSF did not waver in its resolution to go to the US Embassy at Grosvenor Square. I was not present at planning meetings for the October 28th demonstration as I joined the BVSF after the demo. However, I was a member of Australians and New Zealanders Against the War and attended their planning meetings where it was decided to march to Grosvenor Square with the BVSF. These were public meetings that anyone could attend.

137. To my knowledge no violence was planned by demonstrators. However, police violence was anticipated and some people padded their clothing to protect themselves.

138. The evening after the demonstration, I attended my first meeting of the BVSF in the Union Tavern and I was told of an incident when a man, considered to be an obvious undercover provocateur, approached Manu and others who were seated at a table in a café before the demonstration. He tried to get them to take some kind of ball bearings or marbles. Manu stood up so everyone could hear and told the man to go back to his bosses and tell them we were not interested in that kind of nonsense.

139. I witnessed countless examples of police brutality on the demonstration and on the way home afterwards. I saw a young Black man being viciously beaten inside the entrance to Bond Street Underground station. I saw women

being hit with batons between the legs. I saw many people with cracked heads and faces streaming with blood. Many people were drenched with red paint, ruining their clothing and matting their hair. I myself had multiple bruises and a cracked rib caused by being trampled by horses and crushed as a result of horses being brought too close to demonstrators. In response to being trampled or nearly trampled, I saw people spontaneously pick up clods of earth churned up by the horses' hooves and throw them at the police to try to push them back.

140. I attended many demonstrations against the Vietnam War, regardless of who organised them. I never heard of violence being planned by anyone. The only talk of violence related to how people could take steps to protect themselves from police violence, for example through stuffing newspapers in clothes as padding in case of being hit etc.

Q8. Your memoir dated in July 2015 shows you posing for a photograph taken by the Sunday Times in 1969 in front of a portrait of Chairman Mao. What did you understand Maoism as advocated by Chairman Mao to be? Did it involve the use of violence to reach its aims?

141. In 1969 I was interviewed by Irma Kurtz for the Sunday Times [UCPI0000034333]. The article was called Boudicca Rides Again. The photographer asked if I had a poster of Chairman Mao I could put on the wall. I had one we used at meetings and agreed to put it up and he asked me to perch on the back of a sofa in front of it. At this time details of the horrific events associated

with Mao's policies had not yet emerged, and having a poster of Mao on the wall was not much different from having a poster of Che Guevara. I was content to be photographed in front of it.

142. My understanding of Maoism was based on books I had read such as Agnes Smedley's *Daughter of Earth*, Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China*, plus my exposure to the work and writing of Rewi Alley while I was in New Zealand. I understood it to be a Marxist analysis with a distinct anti-imperialist, anti-racist and an internationalist and pro women's liberation emphasis.

143. Maoist slogans such as 'Racism is part and parcel of imperialism', 'Women hold up half the Sky' and 'Countries want independence, nations want liberation and people want revolution,' 'It is right to rebel!' resonated internationally at a time of civil rights struggles, the women's liberation movement and national liberation movements against colonialism and imperialism.

144. We were revolutionaries in that we wanted radical change. We sought a true participatory democracy. Our goal was an end to capitalism and patriarchy, as well as the dismantling of the state machine which enforced both. We didn't think this was something that could happen over night; it was a process that we knew would take years. We worked towards the changes we wanted through consciousness raising activities, trade union activity, trying to influence the media etc. It is possible to draw parallels with political movements today, such as Black Live's Matter, whose demands include the defunding of racist police forces, particularly in the United States.

145. We did not call ourselves 'Maoists' but 'Marxist-Leninists.' Some of those identified as Maoists in the West had previously been members of Communist Parties that split as a result of the Sino-Soviet schism. These parties added (ML) to their title to differentiate from Soviet aligned parties.
146. I situated myself in opposition to the super-power role of the Soviet Union, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, crushing the optimism of the Prague Spring. I opposed their policy of 'peaceful co-existence' with American imperialism – which was not at all peaceful.
147. Mao's writings on guerrilla warfare or 'people's war', were followed by national liberation movements in colonial countries who were forced to take up arms to win their freedom. This was the meaning of slogans such as 'Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.'
148. We supported the legitimate right of colonised and oppressed peoples to use armed resistance to liberate themselves as expressed in international law.¹

¹ In 1970, referring to the elaboration of the principle of self-determination in the Declaration Concerning Friendly Relations, the United Nations General Assembly affirmed: *the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial and alien domination recognized as being entitled to restore to themselves that right by any means at their disposal*. In 1973, the General Assembly passed a resolution specifically referring to the South African and Palestinian people and legitimising their liberation struggle: *by all available means, including armed struggle*.

149. It should go without saying that this did not mean that we thought the same tactics were appropriate in the UK context. The comments by UCOs in their reports and the questions I am asked in this statement relating to the issue of violence seem to be based on a ridiculous assumption that because we had acquired the label of Maoists we planned to don Mao suits and arm ourselves with machine guns. In the late 1960s, being a Maoist wasn't so unusual. Simone de Beauvoir and Sartre both identified with Maoism. Many of us were academics; we read a lot of theory. While we supported national liberation movements' right to self defence and self determination, it didn't mean we intended to engage in violence ourselves here. Likewise, Mao also advocated 'surrounding the cities from the countryside' but we didn't try to mobilise rural Britain to capture London! Our movement was primarily about solidarity and developing a strong political analysis of imperialism and the role of the state.

Q9. Please also note the following passages from the witness statement of HN336, a former SDS undercover officer who used the cover name "Dick Epps". In relation to Manchanda he has stated as follows:

Manchanda was one of the principal drivers of the student unrest around LSE. There was a huge amount of student unrest. The protests with students were extremely volatile, very unpredictable, and didn't follow particular political party lines. It was a melting pot of protest groups and again from my point of view, an idea/ way of getting into the scene. It was the students' numbers at Grosvenor Square that had put thousands of people on the streets.

Do you agree that Manchanda used to encourage the student body to demonstrate and that it was this contingent that was responsible for such high numbers at Grosvenor Square?

150. Manu and all of us involved in the movement encouraged as many people as we could to join demonstrations against the war, including students. Students were among the many thousands of people who attended the October Demonstration, including the relatively small group of approximately 6-10,000 of us that went to Grosvenor Square. However, I believe the overwhelming reason that so many people, including students, turned out on the demonstration had little to do with the mobilisation by Manu or anyone else in the universities. The war in Vietnam was one of the first wars to be broadcast on television; ordinary people were horrified at what they saw and wanted to show their support for those on the receiving end of the bombs. This, combined with the huge amount of advance publicity the October Demonstration received in the press, was the reason why so many people came out on the streets. I believe a D Notice was imposed on covering subsequent protest actions in the media as a result of this.

151. I am bewildered as to why I am being asked about this particular statement from Dick Epps. First, as the Inquiry must be aware, the description of "high numbers" at Grosvenor Square is false as the majority of demonstrators went to Hyde Park with Tariq Ali and Robin Blackburn. Second, my understanding is that he joined the SDS in 1969, and therefore

cannot offer any insight into the efforts that went into the mobilising for the October Demonstration from his personal knowledge or even to who went to Grosvenor Square and in what numbers. He appears to be an unreliable narrator who is attempting to magnify his own role by sensationalising aspects of the anti-war movement. Why am I being asked to provide evidence regarding the anti-war movement framed with reference to this UCO's ill informed views?

Q10. In the report dated 30 July 1968 (MPS-0738693) Ernest Tate is recorded as having been a "dove" on the question of violence by comparison with the "hawk" "Albert" Manchanda. This report concerns a meeting chaired by Tariq Ali who you refer to in your memoir.

10.1 Is the description of the differences between Ernest Tate and "Albert" Manchanda accurate?

152. I wasn't present at the Ad Hoc Committee meeting which took place on 30 July 1968 to discuss the October Demonstration, so I do not know what was actually said at the meeting. However, I can share my understanding of the debate that was ongoing at that time between the Maoists, including Manu, and the Trotskyites, such as Tate. It was not about hawks or doves / violence or non violence; there were political differences, including a key disagreement about whether or not to end the October Demonstration in Grosvenor Square or Hyde Park.

10.2 Please explain in your own words the tensions between Ernest Tate, and those who subscribed to his way of thinking, and Manchanda and the Maoists, whom the Inquiry understands he led, during 1968 and 1969. The Inquiry is particularly interested in understanding these tensions in the context of the planning and execution of the 27 October 1968 demonstration.

153. As described in an article in the Sunday Times at the time written by Mary McCarthy, Manu's position was that Grosvenor Square was the headquarters of US imperialism, the prosecutor of the war on the Vietnamese and "*we must march on him there,*" as McCarthy put it. Manu and the Maoists did not plan to storm the American embassy or battle with the police.

[UCPI0000034336].

154. Chief Inspector Conrad Dixon claims in his report of the meeting that Manu was a "*hawk*" over the question of violence. He records that Manu "*stressed time and time again that although he did not seek violence he thought it would be inevitable*".

155. While this sounds like something Manu might have said, Dixon's assessment of him as a "*hawk*" is a blatant misrepresentation of his position. Manu did not seek violence, but he understood that the police are agents of the state who will use violence against people (such as demonstrators) who challenge the state's interests. This is the inevitable violence he described. My understanding is supported by Dixon's later observation in the context of a discussion about attending Grosvenor Square that "*it is noteworthy that there*

was almost universal condemnation of the violence used on 21st of July..." (I am unsure of what occurred on 21 July and I have not been provided with any documents relating to this date).

156. It is a nonsense to interpret the discussion at the meeting to mean that the "violent" protestors wanted to go to Grosvenor Square and the "non violent" protestors wanted go to Hyde Park. While we knew that the police would perhaps be less likely to attack demonstrators at a neutral location such as Hyde Park, this was not a reason not to go to the American Embassy. Not because we were looking for violence, but because we felt so strongly about the war that we were willing to take the risk that we would potentially be manhandled or arrested. In any event, we were also all well aware that if the police wanted to provoke violence and 'teach us a lesson' they would do it regardless of the location.

157. In addition to disagreement about the final destination of the march, there were also political tensions between the 'Trotskyites' and the 'Maoists' due to differing perspectives on the significance of national liberation movements and whether the National Liberation Front (NLF) was a revolutionary movement or not. The 'Maoists' wholeheartedly supported the NLF and wanted the slogan 'Victory to the NLF' to be printed on placards. We saw that those in Vietnam and the working class in Britain had common interests. The NLF was fighting imperialism and therefore challenging the ruling class here. The Trotskyists were of the view that a socialist revolution

could only occur through the actions of the industrial working class and therefore the Vietnamese struggle could not be a revolutionary movement.

Q11. Please look at the report dated 10 September 1968 (MPS-0730063).

11.1 In the first paragraph on p.4 the report states that "The Maoists felt that violence was inevitable - and said so. The more cautious representatives of International Socialism and International Marxist groups paid jip service to the vision of a peaceful demonstration". Is that an accurate assessment of what happened?

158. This is a lengthy report of the VSC protest of 27 October 1968 authored by Conrad Dixon on 10 September 1968. Much of it seems to be quite speculative in nature, reporting back on gossip and such like as given fact. I would struggle to recognise much of what was said based on my experience of the time and feel it has been selective in its reporting to justify viewing the march as a much greater threat than it ever was.

159. As explained above, the Maoist view that violence was inevitable was simply an acknowledgment that the police were likely to be violent towards protestors. There was disagreement about where the march should conclude, but all the groups of various political persuasions that I encountered were committed to non-violent protest. Our collective intention was to raise public awareness about the war not to have a fight with the police. I think that it is possible that there were a tiny minority who attended demonstrations intending to engage in violence. However they were not people I knew or

encountered. There was macho posturing by a tiny minority of activists, and others were the kind of young men who would, at a later time, take pleasure in engaging in football hooliganism. They were extraneous to the political groups who were organising against the war. There were also many rumours about agent provocateurs.

160. Later in the same document, Dixon states that *'the Maoists are active in the British (sic) Vietnam Solidarity Front and openly advocate the use of violence'*. This is unsupported by any evidence and is simply untrue. On any demonstration there are always a few who indulge in macho posturing. However this was strongly disapproved of in our particular group, and 'self discipline' was regarded as an important principle. Judging by the level of surveillance the BVSF was subjected to by SDS officers from this time onwards, it appears likely that Dixon's mischaracterisation was used as a justification for targeting us. Notably, in none of the reports subsequent to this that I have been provided with is there any reference to us organising or seeking to perpetuate violence; we were simply engaging politically in respect of issues we considered to be important.

11.2 Later in the same paragraph, the report states: 'All the indications are that the Maoists and anarchists will disregard any sort of instructions from Police or march leaders — and take an independent line on the day'. Would you have agreed with that assessment on 10 September 1968? If not, why not?

161. I neither agree nor disagree with the assessment; it is an over simplification. While I cannot speak for the anarchists, as far as I am aware, no demonstrators planned to 'completely disregard' instructions from the police. Everyone intended to initially march as a bloc to Trafalgar Square on a route which was agreed in advance with the police, and this is in fact what happened. When the march split at Trafalgar Square, the majority of the demonstration went to Hyde Park and a minority went to Grosvenor Square. Both routes were openly advertised in advance and the police were well aware of them.

162. It is also inaccurate to assert that the Maoists intended to disregard instructions of the 'march leaders'. There was not one single set of 'leaders' for the march. From the time of the earliest discussions about the demonstration, the Maoists had always been clear that they intended to march to Grosvenor Square. The Trotskyites ultimately decided to march to Hyde Park. These different intentions were heavily publicised beforehand in the red tops as well as The Times; I clearly remember the headlines describing the two 'leaders', Manu and Tariq Ali, in racist terms as 'two aliens' along with gruesome cartoons. As planned, on the day, when the march arrived at Trafalgar Square the majority followed one set of 'leaders' to Hyde Park while others followed a different set of 'leaders' to Grosvenor Square.

11.3 On page 5, there is a list tactics which are recorded as having been suggested at branch, but not national level. To what extent were you aware of

any such suggestions? To the extent that you were aware: (a) to what extent did you approve of them; and (b) insofar as you disapproved of them, what did you do about them?

163. With the one exception detailed below, I had no knowledge of discussions about using any of these tactics. Many of them appear farcical (for example, *"carrying missiles to cause damage to property"*), and I struggle to believe that they were seriously suggested by any protestor at a meeting or that the police genuinely believed they were tactics which were likely to be used.

164. The only tactic that I heard discussed which is included on the list is wearing protective clothing (I heard no talk of helmets or batons). Additionally, while I don't know if it was discussed as a tactic in advance of the march, it is the case that we would often link arms on demonstrations. However, this was not to avoid arrest but to avoid being trampled if the crowds surged for any reason (for example, if the police charged); linking arms enabled us to stay on our feet. I thought both of these tactics were sensible.

165. As I mentioned at paragraph 138 above, I heard of an incident where someone offered ball bearings to Manu at the October Demonstration. However, as stated above this person was thought to be an agent provocateur, and the use of marbles or ball bearings was never discussed at any meeting that I attended. It was not a tactic that would have met with my approval. The groups I was involved in placed a lot of emphasis on self

discipline and tactics such as those in the list would have been frowned upon. I remember on demonstrations we would collectively chant "don't be provoked." It was like a mantra, reminding us not to react to police provocation and to avoid violent confrontation.

166. As for the list of suggested "*alternative targets*," again this is confection of Mr Dixon's unsupported by evidence. Throughout, he resorts to woolly language such as "*at one time or another*", "*generally accepted*" etc. that do not amount to anything other than personal supposition. I never heard any of these 'targets' being discussed at any meetings.

167. In my view, Dixon's report consists of puerile, redundant and speculative comments of the kind that could have been made by a person who had simply read the tabloid press. The difference is that Conrad Dixon was being paid with tax payers' money to say it, and his blatant misrepresentations had very serious consequences, laying the foundations for the continued existence of the SDS. I imagine this was no coincidence and it is likely that his unfounded assertions regarding the risks of violence were made with that express intention.

Q12. Please see report dated 11/3/69 (MPS-0732690) about a meeting of the BVSF where recruitment was discussed. Why were the VSC, IS and Young Communists League members 'disillusioned' and why was it thought that the BVSF would be a solution for them?

168. We believed that some members were disillusioned with the politics of these organisations. It was hoped that members of those organisations who shared our express support for the National Liberation Front as a revolutionary force, and who shared our view that anti-war demonstrations should focus on the US Embassy as the symbol of US imperialism, might join the BVSF.

Q13. Please see report dated 7/4/1969 (MPS-0732971) which references you together with [Privacy] Please explain who [Privacy is and why he was attending these meetings with you?

169. [Privacy] is [Privacy] as referred to above. I am unsure why this is of any relevance to the Inquiry.

Q14. How did the rapprochement between the US and Chinese governments in 1972 affect the agenda of the BVSF? Why was it still thought necessary to demonstrate against the inauguration of President Nixon in January 1973? (see report dated 18/1/1973 UCP10000010247 and see report dated 7/2/1973 UCP10000010248 celebrating the truce agreement in Vietnam).

170. Nixon's visit to China heralded a breakthrough in China's efforts to gain its rightful seat at the United Nations. Previously the USA and other western countries had recognised Taiwan (The Republic of China) as the government of China and Taiwan had occupied the UN seat. Thereafter, America adopted a 'two-China policy' that has never been recognised by Peking.

171. This development had no bearing on United States aggression in Indo-China. On the contrary, Nixon began carpet-bombing Vietnam's neutral and defenceless neighbour, Cambodia. That led the BVSF and others to join together in the Indo-China Solidarity Group/Committee to oppose US policy. Once again there was consensus that the US Embassy was a legitimate site of protest.

Q15. Please see the report dated 5/5/1969 (MPS-0736449) which references Manchanda outlining a number of books and essays about on the question of equal rights for women so that members could be informed of the subject before the next discussion.

- Please explain what was the vision he had for equal rights and who you understood he advocated campaigning should be carried out.*
- How did that view fit in with Ed Davoren's suggestion that this background would lead to a fuller meaning of the formation of a "party based on Mao Tse Tun's thought"?*
- How did Manchanda's view of Maoism for the BVSF differ from that of Bateson (see report dated 8/5/1969 (MPS-0736446))?*
- How did Manchanda's view of Maoism for the RMLL differ from Privacy Privacy (see report dated 7/12/1970 UCP10000011739)?*

172. Manu was strongly supportive of women's liberation. He was heavily influenced by both his mother, and his comrade and partner Claudia Jones (who suffered an untimely death on Christmas Eve in 1964). His mother had

been a freedom fighter for Indian independence who refused to fast for her husband as expected according to Hindu tradition. Claudia Jones was both a women's liberation activist and theorist. Angela Davis has acknowledged her as being the first to coin the expression 'the triple exploitation of Black women (the recognition of the interrelationship between oppression resulting from class, sex and race).

173. Manu had an emancipatory approach, believing that women's oppression could never be alleviated under capitalism and that full liberation could only be achieved by dismantling the patriarchal capitalist system.

174. The group's vision, encouraged by Manu, was to create a working class orientated women's liberation movement that would embrace international solidarity with women engaged in freedom struggles, e.g. in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania.

175. Manu's vision for women's liberation was modelled on the work of Claudia Jones' in the trade union and labour movement, and the anti-racist movement. He supported the aims of the broader women's liberation movement for social change and equality: equal education, free 24-hour childcare, equality under the law e.g. divorce and custody rights, free abortion on demand, reproductive rights, equal opportunities at work, to outlaw male violence against women, to demand financial and housing rights to help women to leave prostitution, abolition of the degrading labelling of children as 'illegitimate,' equal pay for equal work and an end to the super-exploitation of women's labour.

176. He saw the study of the age-old root causes of women's oppression as a necessary tool in equipping ourselves to counter patriarchal arguments that asserted male supremacy as 'natural' and a 'given.' We were encouraged to read books and essays to assist us to join the dots between different forms of oppression. Today we call this 'intersectionality.'

177. Manu encouraged us to become part of the women's liberation movement and to attend conferences and meetings. I was initially reluctant as I saw the movement as petty bourgeois. However, as I read more Marxist literature on women's issues I quickly changed my mind. Manu also encouraged us to raise awareness of the issues (for example by speaking in schools) and to become involved with the industrial manifestation of the women's movement, for example by supporting strikes and campaigning within the trade union movement on issues such as equal pay. He saw this as small steps towards the greater revolutionary changes that we wanted. I agreed, and this was the kind of work the WLF subsequently engaged in, independently of Manu. Years later, through my union activity, I helped found the first crèche on Fleet Street. Access to free child care at work had a profound impact for the women who worked in print. I am still of the view, as Manu was, that small changes such as these raise expectations of what is possible and ultimately have the potential to lead to radical change.

178. I have been asked various questions relating to the nuances of opinion on Maoist theory within the BVSF. I do not understand why this is of particular interest to the Inquiry, but I will answer the questions as best I can.

179. I think that the concept of women's liberation was new to Ed Davoren as it was to many men at the time, and he probably didn't think that the emancipation of women was important in and of itself. I imagine he would have been of the view that women's liberation was relevant only to the extent that it was espoused by Mao and this comment reflected the only way he could begin to incorporate the novel notion of women's liberation into his own thinking.

180. The report I've been directed to comment upon briefly details a disagreement between Nick Bateson and Manu regarding the role members would play in deciding future policies of the BVSF. However, my understanding is that more generally Bateson disagreed with Manu's emphasis on an internationalist, anti-imperialism and anti-racist approach. Bateson wanted a greater focus to be placed on the role of industrial (primarily white) working class in Britain. He thought that the British working class were the most advanced in the world and we should focus our attention primarily on change here. Manu believed that we could not see the situation in Britain in isolation and global revolutionary change was necessary. He believed that those fighting colonialism in Asia were fighting the same struggle as the working class in industrial nations; a victory against imperialism in Africa or Asia was a victory against the ruling class here. At the same time, he

also saw that the British working class benefited from imperialism and colonialism and was critical of the racism and xenophobia imbibed by many working class people, which he believed stemmed from a colonial mind set. For him, the struggle of the British working class had to be part of the global movement against imperialism; we could not advance our own interests at the expense of those in the colonised countries.

181. [UCPI0000011739] does not record a disagreement between Manu and [Privacy]. On issues relating to the differences between Russian and Chinese communism and American imperialism, Manu and [Privacy] would have been on the same side, arguing against the man from the C.P.G.B. It appears that [Privacy] wished to carry on the argument and Manu tried to draw the discussion to a close.

Q16. Please see report dated 16/3/1971 (UCP10000011741) where a vote of no confidence in Manchanda's leadership of the RMLL is held.

- How had this division within the group arisen? Had you known in advance that this vote was to happen? If so, how did you prepare for it?*
- Did you try to influence members before the meeting?*
- Did you agree that you working full time to support Manchanda and your daughter was a good example of women's liberation? Were you happy with that arrangement?*

- *How did the loss of the RMLL's weekly salary and assistance with rent and telephone bills affect you and your husband (see report dated 20/5/1971 UCP10000010918)?*

182. This question relates to a report of a meeting of the RMLL authored by HN45. The preamble to the report states that the information within it *"has been received from reliable but delicate source"* and paragraph 11 of the report describes the *"informant's personal view"*. Given the unusual addition of the word *"delicate"* to the preamble and the express reference to *"informant"* I am unclear whether HN45 was present at the meeting himself or if the information was passed to him by an informer. My solicitor asked the Inquiry and received the following response on 9 March 2021, *"Where the report is attributed to an officer, we've made this clear."* It appears that this was a deliberately ambiguous response.

183. The meeting was distressing and I have some clear memories of it. I don't recall HN45 being present. I can't be certain that he wasn't there, but as this was a private meeting at the home address of one of our members, discussing a serious issue relating to the internal dynamics within the group, I think it is unlikely that he would have been invited, particularly as we had concerns that he could be an undercover officer (see paragraph 213). I also note that one of the introductory paragraphs in the report reads *"The object of the meeting, in fact, was to "cut down to size" the organisation's leading personality Abhimanyu Manchanda"*. In referencing the phrase *"cut down to size"* HN45 appears to be quoting someone, and this is the kind of language

that would be used when relaying the meeting to a person who wasn't present, rather than at the meeting itself. Alternatively, if HN45 was present and this is his own language, it is further evidence of racist undertones.

184. The report highlights that divisions had arisen in the group, but the most significant aspect of the conflict is only hinted at in HN45's report. While there were differences of opinion in the group on a number of issues, the divisions in the RMLL at this time stemmed primarily from issues of sexism and specifically an allegation of attempted rape by [Privacy] against [Privacy]. This is one of several examples of women in the group finding the courage to speak out as a result of consciousness raising and their participation in the women's liberation movement. When [Privacy] was challenged about the allegation at the meeting he responded by stating that, "She was too ugly to rape." Manu believed the woman's account and was turned on by [Privacy] and some others as a result. The incident, [Privacy] response and the way it was dealt with by the group is illustrative of the misogyny that was prevalent at the time. Other incidents highlighting the culture of sexism are described in my memoir. Recalling these unpleasant events is extremely disturbing.

185. In advance of the meeting everyone who was attending was required to provide a written statement setting out their views on the issue. I prepared for the meeting by drafting a written statement. I did not try to influence anybody before the meeting. I am unsure why the Inquiry is particularly interested in my role at the meeting. Surely it is HN45's role in our group's democratic

process which should be under scrutiny. If he was present at the meeting, he would have had to prepare a statement setting out his views and shared it with the group. In such a small group, everyone had influence and helped direct the course of events. HN45's report concludes that the *"damage to the RMLL is irreparable"*. What part did he play in the conflict and how did he influence the outcome?

186. Given the level of detail usually contained in the reports, I find it extraordinary that the context of the dispute is not described. HN45's only reference to the alleged attack against [Privacy] is a brief mention of a letter she wrote about the incident. HN45's description of the letter is extremely concerning. He describes it as *"a very personal attack on the private morals of [Privacy] arising from an incident that had taken place some time previously"*. [Privacy] letter was not an attack on [Privacy] *"private morals;"* it was an allegation of attempted rape. What does this description say about HN45's own views about sexual violence against women?

187. I have already set out a number of other concerning sexist comments and assumptions made by HN45 in his reports and how I suspect that these views affected the SDS's assessment of the threat posed by the WLF, and the women's liberation movement generally. HN45's comments regarding our domestic arrangements are another example of the sexism underlying HN45's reporting.

188. HN45 evinces strong personal opinions about Manu, referring to, for example, his *“offensive manner, dogmatic attitude, bullying techniques and general inefficiency.”* He goes on to state that even Manu’s supporters found anecdotes about our child *“insufferable”* and that they *“are not really convinced either of his claim that sending his wife to work whilst he stays home is a practical example of women’s liberation is entirely virtuous.”*

189. Manu did not *“send”* me out to work – this was entirely my choice. This is the kind of gossip that HN45 would only have picked up from discussions in the pub outside of meetings. It appears to me that HN45 was able to connect with some of the sexist men in the group who were opposed to Manu, as I mention above possibly to the extent that one of them became an informer. Either HN45 attended the meeting as an apparent comrade and socialised with these men in the group after, or he was a UCO waiting in the pub to provide solace and a sympathetic ear when our talkative male comrade/s left the uncomfortable meeting where they were confronted by women calling them out. If the latter is correct, it would appear that although HN45 was a police officer, the men’s mutual attachment to the patriarchy overrode other political considerations.

190. The Inquiry’s question regarding whether I thought working full time to support Manchanda and my daughter was a good example of women's liberation appears to be an effort to fill in the gaps in the reports and to validate the biased and vindictive comments by HN45. Of what possible

concern was it to the Special Branch or indeed to the Inquiry whether I was happy with my personal, domestic arrangements?

191. The loss of the RMLL's assistance with living expenses was a hardship. Manu was very sick and regularly admitted to hospital. He was unable to claim sickness benefits as I was working, so we had to survive on my small salary alone. Although, even if he had been entitled to state support, he would have been reluctant to claim it as during a previous spell of unemployment he had been told at the DHSS office to 'get back where you came from.'

Q17. What did your election to the RSSF executive committee mean in terms of the your influence over the action taken by the group (See report dated 26/6/1969 UCP1000005789)?

192. My election to the RSSF executive committee was predicated on my role as secretary of the WLF. It was short-lived and limited as I was only there to present the aims of the WLF. As far as I remember no action was taken as a result of my input.

Q18. As the General Secretary for the WLF, what did you consider to be "the role of women in a socialist revolution" (see report dated 16/2/1971 UCP10000026991)? Was the WLF under the influence of the RMLL as suggested in report dated 15/4/1971 (MPS-0739237)?

193. Socialist revolution is a theoretical concept until it happens. However, it is (and was) my view that women's role within various conceptualisations of it must be one of equality between men and women. In the context of the meeting referenced, attended by representatives of the Women's Liberation Workshop and the WLF, speakers highlighted organisational differences between the two organisations.

194. Both groups reimagined a society beyond the iron rule of patriarchy. I and other members of the WLF focussed more on the symbiotic relationship between patriarchy and racialised capitalism. At the time there was a debate about whether men should be allowed to attend women's liberation movement meetings. The WLF saw women's liberation and socialist revolution as a joint endeavour between men and women as equals. At the same time we also challenged patriarchal attitudes such as that women were handy to have around for the purpose of making tea and typing, also embodied in the 'jokes':
Q: When will you stop beating your wife? A: After the revolution; and
Q: What is women's position in the revolution? A: Prone.

195. Our understanding of the role of women in a socialist revolution encompassed our study of both social revolutions and socialist revolutions through reading Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Sylvia Pankhurst and Emma Goldman, as well as being inspired by women's role in the Paris Commune. We also read contemporary American literature, in particular Kate Millett and Shulamith Firestone. We also read The Scum Manifesto by Valerie Solanas.

196. The paper I presented at the seminar at Leicester University discussed at paragraph 116 and exhibited to this statement is a wide-ranging review of the history and possible trajectory towards women's emancipation and social liberation
197. With reference to [MPS0739237] the Inquiry has asked whether the WLF was under the influence of the RMLL. What the relevant report actually states is that Manu *"is known to have taken more than a passing interest in the Women's Liberation Movement which is believed to be under the influence of the RMLL"* (emphasis added). While both HN345 and the Inquiry seem to conflate the WLF and women's liberation movement it should of course be obvious to anyone that they are distinct.
198. The assertion that the women's liberation movement was under the RMLL is laughingly inaccurate. We were a small organisation of less than 20 people and our reach was limited. The women's liberation movement involved tens of thousands of women and many organisations across the country. I am sure groups such as the Women's Liberation Workshop, The Socialist Woman Group and all the thousands of women up and down the country who belonged to local women's conscious-raising groups and nursery collectives would be astonished to read his assertion.
199. Several female members of the RMLL took the initiative to set up the WLF which had a core of about 10 active members and a wider network of around a couple of hundred working class women who attended public

meetings and other events. Chris McKinnon and I were the Chair and Secretary respectively and played the leadership role in the group. As HN348 notes in her witness statement to the Inquiry, the WLF was women led. Male members of RMLL were expected to give us support in any way they could but did not take on leadership roles. Unfortunately, as illustrated so clearly at the national Women's Liberation Conference that took place in Skegness in October 1972, where former RMLL activist Privacy stormed onto the stage and wrestled the microphone out of a female activist's hand, for many male comrades in the RMLL, and the wider left movement, this dynamic was a bridge too far.

200. As I've set out at above, Manu felt strongly about women's liberation and had "more than a passing interest" in the WLF, encouraging us to establish the organisation. However, this certainly did not mean that the actions of the group were controlled by him beyond the supporting role that I have described above.

201. HN345's report expresses the same incorrect assumptions as HN45 and I have already set out what potential impact I believe this may have had on SDS decisions regarding infiltration of the women's liberation movement. Why did both these male officers make these incorrect assumptions? Was HN345's understanding so limited that he was incapable of distinguishing the difference between the WLF and the women's liberation movement as a whole? Was the inaccurate focus on Manu's influence because both officers

were of the view that women could not take leadership roles?

202. Finally, it is correct to say that the WLF was influenced by the RMLL as all core WLF members were RMLL members. However, if the implication is that this in some way justified the infiltration of the WLF by undercover officers, it is nonsense. As HN45 notes himself in his witness statement the RMLL did not pose a *"threat of subversion or revolution..."* and nor did we engage in violent activity.

Q19. Please see report dated 9/9/1971 (UCP10000027014) of a WLF meeting where a letter you wrote setting out your personal difficulties was read out to the group but where you received criticism for your lack of participation over the previous 6 months. Had your participation in that period been decreased? If so, why? How did you deal with this conflict within your organisation?

203. My participation in the WLF reduced in 1971 because Manu's health suddenly deteriorated and I had to care for him and our child. From this time onwards, he was in and out of hospital for most of the rest of his life. I explained this in the letter that I sent to the group. I was not given the opportunity to deal with the conflict as I was removed from the group soon after this meeting. Not long after this my former comrades re-named the WLF, the Revolutionary Women's Union. It concerns me that the Inquiry seems to have a far greater interest in me providing evidence of the personal dynamics within groups than it does in addressing the work we were undertaking in order to assess the proportionality of the police's spying.

Q20. Please see report dated 17/11/1972 (UCP1000008284) about the National Women's Liberation Conference where you are reported to having called for the "the smashing of the state" and urged women to "stop sitting around talking" and to join together in fighting for socialism and the freedom of all. Were you urging listeners to use violence or actions which disrupted public order? If not, how did you intend listeners to fight for socialism? Why did you consider the movement would not support your resolution?

204. I have described at paragraphs 103 - 108 HN348's inaccurate, homophobic and racist report of the conference and her acute moral panic echoing that of HN45 when he became obsessed with what he saw as an unnatural "role reversal" in my relationship with Manu. HN348's account of my call for "the smashing of the state" reflects further moral panic at the suggestion that institutionalised sexism, enforced by the patriarchal state, should be dismantled.

205. My view at the time was that the state enforced the status quo which treated women as second class citizens; the changes I was seeking were largely summarised in the aims and objectives of the WLF [UCPI0000010570]. When I spoke at the conference I was emphasising the need to push back against the mind-set that the bureaucratic, oppressive patriarchal state was immutable, natural, and set in stone.

206. At the time I was frustrated with the focus on consciousness-raising sessions as an individual form of therapy to ameliorate the hardships women

were being forced to endure. It was my view that women's oppression was and is due to structural patriarchy. Personal work was important, but it wasn't a substitute for collective action. I was asking women to become pro-active in the political struggle for socialism on every level and to confront state-sanctioned patriarchy by addressing the root causes of our oppression. In practical terms, this meant becoming active in Trade Unions or political organisations. By way of example, as noted in [UCPI0000026988] I was involved in supporting the Post Office workers strike at this time. I wasn't advocating violence or public disorder.

207. Even at the time of the conference, as HN348 reports, there was a "general consensus" that socialism seemed to provide the only answer. However, some were understandably wary of the consequences of directly challenging the root cause of our oppression, the malign and punitive patriarchal state. Conferences such as this were an entry point into the women's liberation movement, and the ideas being discussed were new to many of those attending. I had been politically active for years and had developed a clear structural analysis. I think my resolution wasn't accepted because the language I was using was too radical in the circumstances.

Q21. Many of the reports about the BVSF and WLF came from SDS undercover officers who used the cover names "David Robertson" (HN45) and "Sandra" (HN348). Were you aware of these individuals in the group meetings you attended? If so, what is your recollection of them and their

actions? Had you become aware of the presence of an undercover officer at your meetings, what would have been the effect?

Dave Robertson/HN45

208. My first memory of Dave Robertson is at our home on Lisbourne Road. I think this would have been around late 1970 or early 1971. We ran study groups on Marxist-Leninist thought and asked new participants to complete a form which included details about relevant books that they had read. I remember discussing the form with him.

209. Dave came from Scotland and had a strong accent; he said he was a Scottish nationalist. We always chatted to new people to understand their politics and why they were interested in the group. I recall asking him about the revolt on the Clyde. He said that he had never heard of it, which I found odd considering that it was such a significant event in radical Scottish history.

210. Regarding the reading he was asked to do, I exhibit a form filled in by Dave in his own handwriting [UCPI0000034339], listing literature that he claimed to have read. It also detailed his cover address at West End Lane. The note under 'teacher's comments' was made by me after his exposure and was kept amongst my political papers as a fascinating piece of ephemera.

211. While I have some memories of Dave attending meetings, I mostly recall him socialising with us in the pub or at our home at Lisbourne Road. I

quite liked him. He was very ingratiating and bluff. I remember he always used my name when he was talking to me and I can picture him enthusiastically clapping Manu on the shoulder. He'd regularly buy us rounds in the pub and generally tried to be obliging.

212. I remember Dave didn't speak much when he did attend meetings. New comers were often quiet to begin with but would usually join in the discussions after a while. Dave never did; he always stayed on the periphery.

213. We noticed that he drove a number of different cars. When asked about this, Dave explained that he worked for a car rental company. He told someone else he worked at a club called the Tatty Bogle. His lack of involvement at meetings had already raised eyebrows, but the inconsistent comments about his employment led us to seriously suspect that he could be an undercover officer. A comrade went to the Tatty Bogle to ask after Dave; no one there had ever heard of him.

214. We discussed what to do and I remember Manu suggesting we just allow him continue to hang around as we didn't have anything to hide. We couldn't be 100% certain that he was a spy, and in any event he was quite useful – he carried banners, gave us lifts etc. We just treated him as a bit of a joke.

215. I wrote about our experiences with Dave Robertson in a blog post which I published in 2015 [MPS0746274]. In his witness statement HN45

responds to my blog post. He denies that he told us he worked at a care hire company or at Tatty Boggle. He says his cover story was that he worked at a garage and that he didn't have an undercover car or cover license and could not have been seen driving different cars. What possible reason would I have had to make up these details? According to the SDS Annual Reports covering the relevant period the SDS were using 3 hire cars on an almost permanent basis and a fourth occasionally. It therefore seems likely that these were the different cars that I saw. It was not until 1973 that individual officers were given a car each for their own use.

216. HN45 claims that he never socialised with his target groups. As I've detailed above, this is a lie. He also bizarrely alleges that he babysat for our child. This is entirely untrue. We would never have allowed this. When our child was eight months old she started at a day nursery as Manu's health was so bad he needed respite. One of the nursery staff sometimes babysat for us. Other than this, we always took the baby with us wherever we went in a carrycot when she was a pre-toddler.

217. I remember the incident where Dave's cover was properly blown at an Indo-China Solidarity meeting at the London School of Economics on 6 February 1973. The account of this in my 2015 blog post was made using contemporaneous notes.

218. I attended the meeting with an Irish colleague from work, Ethel. She wasn't a political activist, but had expressed interest in the situation in

Cambodia so I invited her along. She didn't know anyone else at the meeting and didn't anticipate meeting anyone she knew. We sat together waiting for the meeting to start.

219. While we were sitting together, we saw Dave. Ethel greeted him by the name "Dave." He immediately pulled her away, forcefully by the wrist. She did not return. I will never forget her confused expression.

220. The next few days at work Ethel wouldn't talk to me. I couldn't understand what had happened but eventually she explained. She said that Dave lived in the same block of flats as her at West End Lane and that it was common knowledge among other tenants in the block that the flat he occupied was a "police flat". He had told her that if she said anything to me about his true identity that something bad would happen to her family in Ireland. She was clearly terrified by his threat and it was very courageous of her to tell me. We remained friends for a few years and then we lost contact.

221. Although I had already been quite convinced that Dave was an undercover officer, this incident completely changed my perception of him and the nature of his role. I had seen the other side of his character - he was no longer the person we had assumed to be a fairly bland, hapless police officer but a far more ruthless figure performing a sinister role. I never saw him again.

222. In his statement, HN45 says the account in my blog regarding the incident with Ethel is completely inaccurate. He says that I wasn't near Ethel when he spoke to her at the meeting. As I brought her to the meeting where she didn't know anyone else, I would not have left her on her own. He claims that when Ethel saw him, she said loudly, "Here are Scotland Yard come to take us away." He goes on to say that he did not grab her by the wrist, and instead gave her a hug and whispered in her ear not to tell anyone who he was (despite the fact that on his own account she already had). He claims that he had only met her once previously so had not known that she was Irish. I note he has chosen not to explain how he knew her.

223. This account does not stand up to any scrutiny. First, as I said above, Ethel only came along to the meeting out of interest; she was not an activist. This fact is supported by the fact that she is named in [UCPI0000016247] and recorded as having "no trace" compared to the majority of the attendees who all have their own Registry File numbers. It's implausible that she would have made the announcement claimed by HN45. Second, she had a strong Irish accent, so even if they had only met once before it would have been clear to him that she was Irish. Third, if they really had only met once before, it would have been very strange behaviour to have hugged her at the meeting as he describes. It isn't what happened and it doesn't even sound credible.

224. Bizarrely, HN45 states with reference to the end of his deployment, *"People came and went in Maoist circles all the time, so I was not concerned that it would appear particularly suspicious."* When his own account is that his

deployment ended after he was outed as “*Scotland Yard*” at a public meeting, how does he conclude that his sudden disappearance immediately after this would not be seen as suspicious? Although his evidence about Ethel's comment is false, it is correct that he knew his cover had been blown, and as explained I subsequently wrote a blog post about this and our previous suspicions about him. My account is also supported by HN348's witness statement where she explains that she “*was withdrawn from the field as a precaution at the same time as HN45 when his cover was compromised.*”

225. I have reason to suspect that HN45 continued undercover activities after this incident. For a period the BVSF co-operated with the International Marxist Group in the Indo China Solidarity Committee. At this time I visited the campaign HQ to attend an organising meeting. This may have been at Endersley Street. While there I spotted the name ‘Dave Robertson’ on a volunteer rota pinned to a notice board. I immediately informed Pat Jordan of IMG who I believe was in charge of the office.

226. I don't recall exactly when this was, but I think it was probably after the LSE meeting. If I am correct then it is not true that he abandoned undercover work immediately; instead it appears he transferred his attentions to the IMG. If this was before the incident at LSE that 100 per cent blew his cover then it indicates that we were already wary enough to warn others about him.

227. I am very concerned at the lack of interest that the Inquiry has shown in the serious incident that took place at the LSE. I can only assume that the

Inquiry read my blog and my description of HN45's concerning misconduct many months ago. The incident is clearly relevant to the Inquiry's terms of reference and specific issues under investigation, including conduct of UCOs and ending of deployments. Further HN45's account was plainly implausible. Yet CTI's opening statement for Phase 1 stated that the Inquiry's view was that *"in all the circumstances it is not proportionate to take further steps to seek to resolve this specific factual issue."* When I was belatedly granted CP status after the Phase 1 hearings had ended, the Chair noted that I had *"evidence to give about the circumstances in which [HN45's] deployment ended."* Why was I asked nothing about this in my Rule 9 request?

228. There was no justification for HN45 to infiltrate any of the groups that I was involved with. I note that his statement supports much of what I have said above about the absence of any threat to public order posed by these organisations. He acknowledges that he doesn't *"remember seeing any Maoists committing public disorder while deployed.... [and] my recollection now is that the Maoists were generally not violent."* He also notes with reference to the RMLL that he is *"not convinced that the group posed a threat of subversion or revolution.... given how low the membership was...."*

229. Finally, HN45 refers to his involvement with Banner books in his statement. I often spent time at the bookshop and was close to Bijur GV who ran it. Banner Books was destroyed in an arson attack in 1975 or 76. My recollection is that a man who was homeless and regularly slept at the bookshop was killed and Bijur was injured. At the time of the fire it was

strongly suspected that a far right organisation was responsible for the attack. I wonder why HN45 has not referred to this serious incident in his witness statement and I haven't seen any reports referencing it .

HN348/Sandra Davies

230. I was not aware of HN348's infiltration of the WLF and women's liberation movement prior to receiving disclosure from the Inquiry late last year. As far as I know none of my comrades were aware of HN348's infiltration either. In the absence of disclosure of a photograph of her, it is near impossible for me to identify who she was and this significantly limits my ability to provide evidence about her actions and the impact that she had on the political movements and individuals she was spying upon.

231. My ability to assist the Inquiry in respect of HN348 has also been seriously hampered by the Inquiry's failure to invite me to provide evidence in advance of the Phase 1 hearings where HN348 gave her oral evidence. I address this further below. As I was only granted CP status after the November hearings had concluded, I have so far been denied the opportunity to propose lines of questions for HN348. I was only informed of the date she was providing evidence 8 days before the hearing took place and was unable to attend. This means that I did not have the opportunity to identify her by attending the hearing and observing her. In anticipation of situations like this, it would seem sensible for audio-visual footage of hearings to be made and retained. In light of my experience, I hope the decision not to make and retain this footage will be reconsidered. As things stand, my solicitor has been

informed that the Inquiry has neither a photograph nor video footage of HN348 and is not prepared to obtain a photograph to allow me to see it subject to a restriction order.

232. Despite the difficulties I face in providing evidence about HN348's deployment, I will do my best to assist the Inquiry. A quick search on the Inquiry's disclosure platform shows that HN348 attended at least 79 meetings during her deployment, 71 of which appear to be related to the women's liberation movement, of which 39 were of the WLF specifically. The reports associated with her date from 17 February 1971 to 23 November, 1972. Therefore, she must have attended 54-55 meetings in the course of 89 weeks. This is plainly a very intensive period involving long meetings and interactions with members of the WLF and Revolutionary Women's Union as well as meetings of the wider women's liberation movement. Extraordinarily, despite this, HN348 claims not to remember what her cover name was and to have very limited memories of her deployment.

233. It appears to me that HN348's cover name must have been "Sandra Davies." This is evidenced by the note at [UCPI0000010908] that Sandra Davies had been elected as Treasurer and HN348's reporting on Executive Committee meetings thereafter, as well as her own acceptance that she doesn't recall any one else by the name of Sandra attending meetings. I also trust that as the Inquiry has access to unredacted versions of all of HN348's reports, a search has been undertaken to confirm that there was no one else

by the name of Sandra attending WLF or WRU meetings. I note this is the case in the unredacted reports of HN348 that I have been provided.

234. HN348 claims in her statement that she would never have had to use her cover surname during her deployment. This is untrue as the WLF kept minutes of every meeting in which attendees' full names were recorded.

235. I have only been provided with 8 of HN348's reports in my witness pack. However, from a quick skim of the Inquiry's disclosure platform I have already identified 2 other events reported on by HN348 where I was present [UCPI0000014310] and [UCPI0000008313]. I therefore think it is likely we came into contact on more occasions than indicated by HN348's reports. Even judging from the 8 reports alone, it appears that she was someone that I knew reasonably well. I note that in oral evidence HN348 said that she did not recall whether she knew me or not, I find this utterly implausible for the reasons I set out further below.

236. The Inquiry has also only provided me with paragraph 64 of HN348's witness statement. When my solicitor queried this, she was told that this was the only paragraph that was considered relevant to me. I find this extremely troubling given that the reports I have been provided with show that HN348 spied on me over a 20 month period and I am named in a significant number of her reports. Further, while I have not been provided with an unredacted version of paragraph 75 I am certain that it relates directly to me because I am named in the associated report [UCPI0000008284] and it forms the basis

of Question 20 in my Rule 9 request. The Inquiry has not responded to my solicitor's question about this.

237. According to the documents provided to me by the Inquiry, the first meeting that HN348 infiltrated was a meeting of the WLF that I chaired, held at the Duke of Clarence Pub, Manor Place, SE1 on 17 February 1971. This was a relatively small meeting of 20 people according to HN348's report [UCPI0000026988].

238. It's useful to remember that in the period under review, there was no social media, no email or mobile phones. Although this was characterised as a 'public meeting' the reality is that no-one ever simply walked in off the street. People attended who'd been handed a leaflet at a previous meeting or a demonstration, or had been added to our mailing list, or had been brought along by a friend. I note in HN348's evidence she claims that prior to this meeting she attended a large public meeting in North London where she thinks that she was handed a leaflet by the WLF and invited to attend our meetings. The Inquiry has not published a report relating to this conference. As HN348 did not join the SDS until January 1971 according to her oral evidence, this conference must have taken place in January or February of that year. I don't recall a large women's liberation movement conference taking place at this time and I have found no record of one in my archives. I also note that HN348 attended the WLF meeting with a Special Branch Detective Sergeant and the latter is the author of the report [UCPI0000026988]. The format of the report is also different to other SDS

reports. I am not convinced that HN348's account of how she first became involved is reliable. On the other hand, if it is correct, it raises questions about missing reports.

239. In her statement HN348 claims that she was not asked to target the WLF in particular, but was directed to attend our meetings after being approached and invited. This doesn't appear credible to me, and I note that she conceded this point to a degree in her oral evidence. In my view this must be right. HN45 had highlighted the opening of two new WLF branches in his report of [UCPI0000010567] and also produced a report on the WLF just the day before HN348 is first noted as attending a WLF meeting [UCPI000010570]. I also note that the WLF had its own Registry File from 1969 and the November 1970 Annual report [MPS-0728972] mentions the Women's Liberation Front as having been penetrated by the SDS at that time. The organisation was clearly an SDS target and it is obvious that HN348 was recruited to target it.

240. As an aside, I recall that at around this time, [Privacy] the founder of [Privacy] was known to have gone voluntarily to a police station to report that she had seen Chinese revolutionary iconography on the walls of women from the women's liberation movement when she had attended meetings in their homes [Privacy] had grown up in Hong Kong where it was a crime to display pictures of Mao or other symbols of the People's Republic of China. I recall that I was working at IPC magazines when a friend from the wider

movement came to meet me near my workplace to warn me about Privacy
This timing coincides with HN348's deployment. Apparently, Privacy was
told that it was not illegal to have pictures of Mao on your wall and she went
away disappointed. I wonder now if her intervention did influence events after
all.

241. According to HN348's reports, the week after attending her very first
WLF meeting, she attended a WLF study group meeting at a private home on
25 February 1971 [UCPI0000026989]. Again, this chronology does not seem
credible to me. A new person would never be invited along to a small private
meeting where they might be exposed to unpleasant exchanges or rows that
quickly. There was awareness that washing dirty linen in public was not a
good recruitment strategy. Therefore, by this time, she had ingratiated herself
sufficiently to be trusted to witness internal disagreements.

242. HN348's reports show that she regularly attended meetings of the WLF
in members' homes from February onwards. I haven't been provided with
most of these reports and I assume this is because I was not recorded as
being in attendance. As I have already identified that I have not been
provided with reports of two events which I definitely was present at, I query
the accuracy of her attendance records. WLF study meetings were small,
generally around 10 people, and I can say with certainty that she would have
been considered a central member of the group, as well as a friend.

243. By April 71 she was writing detailed reports on my WLF activity [UCPI0000026995], and on 4 May 1971 she was sitting in my home attending a meeting focussed on the WLF [UCPI0000026997]. As there were only eight people present in addition to HN348, and two of those were myself and Manu, this was an intimate meeting. Only those we knew well would have attended; I am certain there would have been personal discussions before and after the meeting.

244. It feels incredibly violating to know that HN348 entered my family home to spy on me. HN348 claims that she was "*advised not to get involved in activists' private lives*" and never socialised or accepted hospitality from those she was surveilling. This is utter nonsense. Meetings were generally held in people's private homes, we always socialised and snacks and tea were provided. Manu and I were known for providing tasty food and always had a large pot of dahl and rice on the stove for people who were coming straight from work. I believe she has made these kind of comments to try to differentiate early deployments like hers from what came later. In fact, it's clear that her deployment and those of her contemporaries (such as HN45) were paving the way for what came later. They were in and out of activists' homes all the time and the close connections that they had established are illustrated by the very personal narratives on our lives concocted in their reports.

245. In September 1971 HN348 was at Chris Mackinnon's home address [UCPI0000027014] noting the beginning of the fall out in the WLF,

concentrating on the conflict involving me. By 16/09/71 [UCPI0000027021] HN348 was at a meeting (with 17 people present, 14 of whom she was now able to identify). The report of the meeting includes HN348's own note that "After an hour of this onslaught DL was called to answer the charges made against her and her husband." Of the 17 people in attendance, 13 voted to suspend Manu and I and 3 abstained – it is my view that HN348 must have participated in this process as I explain below.

246. When the WLF formally split on 3 February 1972, HN348's reports of the meeting note that Manu and I were "*formally expelled from the organisation*" and that "Sandra Davies" was elected as Treasurer of the WRU [UCPI0000010908/4]. HN348 thereafter reports on Executive Committee meetings as a member of the Executive Committee.

247. It is worth making a few observations about the treasurer position that HN348 took on. It was a hands' on role. It would have involved obtaining the small fees intermittently paid by members, collections at meetings and demonstrations, and taking a role in organising fund raising events such as jumble sales. The proceeds would be used for hiring halls and producing leaflets and posters and the treasurer would have had to play an active role in these tasks too.

248. The fact that she joined the executive committee after the split indicates to me that she must have played an active role in the process. When I was verbally attacked then expelled from the WLF HN348 would not

have had the option of remaining silent. After all, she had to be accepted by the side she chose. I find it highly doubtful that she would have been asked to take on the role of treasurer of the newly formed group if she had been a silent observer.

249. The extent to which HN348 had developed a relationship with those of us in the WLF is also indicated, for example, by her attendance at the talk organised by the Society for Anglo-Chinese with guest speaker Dr Joshua Horne (incorrectly named as Hall [UCPI0000014310] on 9th December, 1971, at Holborn Library. The Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding was an organisation made up of academics, business people, and those interested in the history and culture of China. The event attracted around 300 people

250. I remember going along with a number of women from the WLF and some others. We attended as a group of friends and I can assume that as she was there HN348 attended with us.

251. More generally, why was HN348 reporting on this event at all? The Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding had no involvement in demonstrations; of what interest was it to the SDS? In her report HN348 states that, *"Dr Hall (sic) spoke ... on the various aspects of Chinese life and the application of Chairman Mao thought. He was extremely pro-China and gave glowing reports of their progress in every field. He gave such stress to the overall activities of the people which he felt were of more importance than*

actual written laws and rules." What does this mumbo jumbo mean and how can it have helped the security services in their work?

252. I have set out at paragraph 177 some of the types of legitimate activities that the WLF engaged in. This is supported by HN348 in her witness statement where she states that *"the activities of the groups I infiltrated were involved in were hosting meetings, leafleting and demonstrations. There were all within the bounds of the law."* Later she says, *"I was not even aware of the WLF being involved in criminal activity apart from putting up posters (if that would be considered criminal) and there is no record in the reports of any WLF member committing any acts of public disorder or being arrested at any demonstrations."* She claims to have been *"genuinely interested when [topics related to women's issues] were discussed in the bigger meetings, but not the extremist activities."* Yet she provides no details of what these *"extremist activities"* were and this contradicts her earlier assertions. The only other supposed justifications given for the infiltration of the women's movement was alleged links to the "Angry Brigade" and "Ireland". What on earth is she talking about? These allegations have no basis and notably she provided no evidence to substantiate them. I knew no one connected with the Angry Brigade and had a dim view of them. I also knew no one active in the women's liberation movement who was connected with groups in Ireland at this time; the only exception being that I recall women's groups from around the country organising demonstrations calling for the release of MP, feminist and civil rights leader Bernadette Devlin.

253. In her statement, HN348 acknowledges that her deployment didn't *"really yield any good intelligence"* but goes on to justify by claiming it *"eliminated the WLF from public order concerns."* While it is true that the WLF should have been eliminated from public order concerns, this is not in fact what happened. HN348 spent over 18 months attending small study groups in private homes, organising events such as jumble sales and attending large public meetings of women legitimately campaigning for equality and the only reason that her deployment ended was due to HN45's cover being blown. Had it not been for the incident at LSE who knows how much longer she would have continued her unjustifiable surveillance?

254. I also note her acknowledgement that she was affected by structural sexism (such as initially being paid less than her male colleagues) and her statement is littered with comments that implied she is and was interested in women's issues. I assume it is an attempt to soften her image and distract attention from the embarrassing fact that she was paid to spy on and undermine the very movements who were largely responsible for the Equal Pay Act 1970 and which generally helped to advance her status in society as a woman.

255. The Inquiry has asked what the effect would have been if we had discovered that HN348 was infiltrating our meetings at the time. I think women would have been utterly disgusted and baffled, and it would have had a ripple effect through the movement. It would also likely have further politicised many women in the movement to know that the state was going to

such lengths to undermine their struggle. I also imagine many would have had sympathy for her; it is another expression of the patriarchal system that a woman would be tasked by men (and it is clear from the reports that it was men who were in senior positions at this time) with spying on the women's movement. I imagine it may well have impacted negatively on her on a personal level as well as in the wider sense that her work was a means to enforce patriarchal power and to preserve the status quo of male privilege.

256. As detailed elsewhere in this statement, I can already identify a number of important issues that weren't explored with HN348 when she gave oral evidence and I think it is essential that she is now recalled. Most crucially, I think her assertions in both her written and oral evidence that she does not remember me are utterly incredible and need to be properly explored by the Inquiry in order to get to the truth of her deployment.

257. First, one of the few things that HN348 has admitted being able to recall is a presentation by HN45 at the beginning of her deployment. In her oral evidence she noted that the presentation was about "*the relevant politics that were involved in the WLF*" and "*it was mainly to do with the Maoist movement.*" Considering the extent to which the Inquiry has concentrated on Manu (and to a lesser degree me) when considering Maoist activity at the time, it is inconceivable that HN348 was not focused directly on us at the earliest point of her deployment. I understand that there were also some other Maoist groups reported on at the time because these groups appear to be referenced in the Annual Reports. However, I do not know if they were related

to me as details about these organisations have been redacted, and my request to be provided with the names of these groups to assist in preparing my witness evidence was refused.

258. Second, as illustrated by the chronology of HN348's deployment above, it is inconceivable that myself and Manu, the two individuals who appear to have been the main target of her deployments, the focus of her reports, and who were the subjects of a dramatic "coup" within the organisations she was infiltrating, have been "forgotten".

259. I am concerned about what underlies HN348's purported amnesia. Is the rationale for the forgetfulness the fact that she interfered in the democratic process of her target organisation to such an extent that the targets of her infiltration were expelled from the organisation that they had founded?

260. While some limited questions were put to HN348 in oral evidence regarding her interference in the democratic processes of our group (namely, voting to suspend three members from the RWU and involvement in the name change to include the word "revolutionary"), the level of interference (effectively the "political decapitation" of her targets) was not. This is a very serious issue, particularly given the parallels with the split in the RMLL around the same time and HN45's role there. It should have been properly explored in oral evidence with HN348.

261. Further, if HN348 is recalled I feel certain this will enable me to identify her. Given the number of times we were in meetings together, I am sure that I

will recognise her if I see her. I will then be able to assist the Inquiry further by proposing lines of questioning relevant to her deployment on the basis of my knowledge from the time. When HN348 gave evidence, there weren't any non state witnesses who were able to do this, and the Inquiry therefore lacked this critical perspective.

HN336, HN135, HN335 and HN346

262. While I have only been asked for my comments regarding HN348 and HN45, I was spied upon by a further 4 undercover officers during the Tranche 1 period: HN135, HN336, HN335 and HN346.

263. I am named in 9 of HN135 reports. He spied on me at private BVSF meetings and one RSSF meeting over a period of about 17 weeks in 1969. I was not aware of him being a UCO at the time and, as he has been granted a Restriction Order over his cover name, I am unable to identify him and provide any evidence as to his actions. It is worth mentioning here that, while the RSSF included the word revolution in their title, they were a normal student organisation, running campaigns such as calling for the Royal Academy of Music to include jazz and Stockhausen in the curriculum.

264. I am also named in 9 of HN336's reports. He spied on me at various BVSF and VSC meetings over a period of approximately a year from March 1969 to March 1970. Many of these meetings were private and some had as little as 10 people attending. I was not aware of him being a UCO at the time

and while I have been provided with his cover name, I have not been provided with a photograph and I am unable to identify him from his cover name alone. I understand that he gave oral evidence at the Phase 1 hearings. Had the Inquiry informed me of the date when he was giving evidence, I would have attended and I think it is likely that I may then have been able to identify him and assist the Inquiry with evidence of his actions during his deployment. As noted above, given that the Inquiry made contact with me immediately prior to the start of the Phase 1 hearings, it is shocking that I wasn't informed of the dates when officers who spied up on were giving evidence.

265. I am also named in one of HN335's reports. He spied on me while I was attending the RSSF national conference in June 1969. He is deceased and apparently his cover name is not known. No photograph has been provided. I was not aware of him being a UCO at the time and in the absence of any information about him I am unable to identify him.

266. Finally, I am named in 3 of HN346's reports. Over a very short period, she spied on me with HN45 at a private meeting of the BVSF which took place on 17 January 1973 a photographic and film exhibition at the Conway Hall on 3 February 1973, put on by the Anti-Imperialist Coordinating Committee and an Indo-China Solidarity Conference that took place on 6 February 1973. As I discuss at paragraph 112 the final meeting included just 6 people, excluding the UCOs. Again, I have not been provided with her cover name or a photograph of her so I have been unable to identify her.

267. My perception of the impact that discovery of these officers would have had at the time is different to my thoughts regarding HN348 and her infiltration of the women's liberation movement. We knew that the BVSF and VSC were targets, and we recognised the men in corduroy jumpers who sat awkwardly in meetings as Special Branch. More specifically, Manu and I knew that we were under surveillance by the Security Services. We regularly had a large white van with protruding aerials outside our address at 58 Lisbourne Road, the occupants of which would accept a cup tea if we banged on the rear door. We were frequently followed on foot by two men. Sometimes when they followed us on to the bus, and they would pay up when we cheekily asked the conductor to collect our fares from them. At the time I wouldn't have understood that they all played different roles and reported to different bosses. It puzzles me why the SDS were tasked with spying on us when we already had the Security Services monitoring us so closely.

Recollection of Events

Q22. Please provide a factual account of events at the demonstration of 27 October 1968 in particular from the point of view of the freedom to mount a demonstration and with regards to policing and any public disorder that you might have witnessed.

268. I have nothing further to add on this issue.

Impact

Q23. If not already covered in your answers to the above questions, please explain when you were first aware that the BVSF, RMLL and WLF had been the subject of undercover policing and the impact that had on you. Please also explain the impact that sight of the reports in your witness pack recording your political activities has had.

269. I have discussed the discovery that HN45 was a UCO above. My discovery of the infiltration by the other officers has only come about over the past few months as the Inquiry has drip fed me reports since it first made contact with me in October last year. Initially I was provided with reports of HN45 and HN348. My immediate reaction to reading the reports in my witness pack detailing the abusive and predatory behaviour of these officers was one of disgust and a sense of violation. I felt besmirched and soiled, as if I needed to pick up the file with a pair of tongs. I didn't want to have the bundle in my home. I also experienced guilt for unknowingly enabling HN348 to spy on the wider women's liberation movement by using me and the Women's Liberation Front as a means of gaining access.

270. The reports were perturbing and disorientating, particularly in relation to HN348. I already knew about HN45. I felt gaslighted and experienced cognitive dissonance when I realised that a woman, pretending to be an ally, violated my family space by lying to us and spying on women working to improve all women's lives.

271. As I've explained above, I was shocked and repelled by the racist, homophobic and misogynist language used by UCOs in the reports. I was sickened when I read of the language that HN348 had attributed to me in [UCPI0000026995] and I immediately wrote to the Inquiry outlining my distress and outrage and challenging the Inquiry's 'normalisation' and perpetuation of the language of the UCOs.

272. I experienced fear, anger and confusion when I realised the extent to which all the officers who spied on me that are still alive are being protected by the Inquiry Chair, who has permitted them to remain anonymous, while my name and those of many of the other subjects of the operations have been published. I find it incredible that these officers who were purportedly carrying out a public service are too ashamed to stand by what they did and to provide their real names. I note that when applying for anonymity HN348 said she would be "*embarrassed*" about people finding out that she was an undercover officer and worried that her "*reputation would be tainted.*" That may be so, but it is not a reasonable basis for the Chair to protect her from public scrutiny. Other officers claim fear of potential reprisals. This is a joke; we are all now elderly and the groups that we were part of wound up decades ago. Meanwhile the institution which carried out these abuses is still active, albeit that the SDS itself has disbanded. Those of us who were spied upon are surely at more risk from the police, who can be both vindictive and punitive as I have witnessed in their response to political protests and as is illustrated by much of the contents of the SDS reports.

Other

Q24. Please set out any other factual evidence that you can provide about the conduct of "Rick Gibson" and "Gary Roberts" to assist the Inquiry get to the truth?

273. I do not recognise the names of these UCOs and I have not been provided with any reports relating to them. If the Inquiry is able to provide me with photographs of them and information about their deployments I may be able to assist.

Q25. Is there anything else that you wish to add that may be of assistance to the work of the Inquiry?

274. I would like to take the opportunity to describe the tremendous difficulties that I have faced to date as a new civilian witness in the Inquiry. As I have described above, my ability to effectively participate in the Inquiry has been severely hampered. The problems I have encountered were entirely avoidable and if my experience is indicative of the way in which the Inquiry usually contacts and communicates with civilians identified within the documents it is very concerning. I hope that the account below will assist the Inquiry to reconsider its approach to new civilian witnesses.

275. My first contact from the Inquiry was in a one page letter dated 13 October 2020. I had little knowledge of the Inquiry at this time.

276. The letter said that the first phase of evidential hearings was due to begin the following month and that the Inquiry had identified a 'small number' of documents which mentioned me, within the evidence of an officer I had known by the name of David Robertson. I was told that evidence relating to this officer was due to be heard in November and that the Inquiry would disclose the documents to me, subject to a restriction order, in advance of the November hearings if I wanted. The letter said that the Inquiry did not intend to issue me with a formal request for evidence and I was not told why I was being offered sight of the documents.

277. I was very surprised by the letter and curious as to the contents of the documents. On 28 October 2020, following my request for copies, I received a parcel containing a folder with 29 documents from the Inquiry. Due to concerns about potential Covid-19 contamination, I did not open the parcel for 4 days. By this time, the November hearings had already commenced.

278. When I opened the parcel, I was very shocked to see a Penal Notice stating that if I disclosed the documents or their contents to anyone or published them, I could be imprisoned, fined or have my assets seized. The letter accompanying the documents did not inform me that I could be entitled to publicly funded legal advice or provide any information about how I might

access such advice. As a result, I was too scared to contact anyone regarding the documents I had received.

279. The letter informed me that the documents would be published in due course and that if I wanted I could request restrictions of particular information on privacy grounds prior to publication. I was again told that the Inquiry did not intend to issue me with a formal request for witness evidence, but I was invited to comment on the documents if I wished.

280. On 5 November 2020 I contacted the Inquiry to request the redaction of my name where HN 348 recorded a homophobic comment which she falsely attributed to me. As previously stated, I was appalled that such offensive language was attributed to me.

281. On 18 November 2020 I was contacted by the Undercover Research Group who supported me to obtain legal advice; on 8 December I instructed Birnberg Pierce to act for me. My core participant application was delayed because when the Inquiry provided the bundle of documents to my solicitor my name was redacted in error. As soon as this was rectified my solicitor made an application for core participant status on 18 December 2020 which was granted by the Chair on 23 December 2020.

282. I am 79 years old, visually impaired and only recently completed cancer treatment; I tire easily. The Inquiry was aware of this as I set it all out in my CP application. In an email dated 19 December 2020, my solicitor also

wrote to the Inquiry saying. *"I am also very conscious of Ms Langford's age and other difficult personal circumstances and want to reduce any pressure on her as much as possible. Both Ms Langford, Lydia Dagostino and Birnbergs have progressed matters as quickly as possible. It would be extremely unfair for Ms Langford to be subject to additional stress of very tight deadlines through no fault of her own."*

283. Despite this, it wasn't until nearly 2 months after my Core Participant application was granted that I finally received my Rule 9 request on 15 February 2021. It was 6 pages long and consisted of 28 questions. On 17 February, I was told to submit my statement by 5 March 2021. The proposed deadline allowed me just 2 weeks and 2 days to produce my statement. At this point I had not even received a full copy of the witness pack.

284. On 18 February 2021, I received an incomplete copy of my witness pack, consisting of 45 documents. I received a further 6 documents on 25 February 2021.

285. Since I was first contacted by the Inquiry in October last year, I have been shocked at the extreme disregard shown to me by the Inquiry. I find it inexplicable that I was first contacted by the Inquiry just a couple of weeks before the officers who spied on me were due to give evidence and that I was not invited to be a witness. This is all the more difficult to understand given the fact the Chair thought my role in matters to which the Inquiry relates was so significant that he later granted me CP status, on the basis of an application

which was based almost entirely on information which was already in the documents in the Inquiry's possession. Further, I was subsequently provided with a lengthy Rule 9 request which asked me to provide detailed evidence on a wide range of issues.

286. The Inquiry must have been aware that I featured in the documents long before I was first contacted. Why was I not contacted sooner? It appears that there is no real interest in obtaining the perspective of those who were spied upon. As a result of the Inquiry's decision not to invite me to provide evidence at an earlier stage, I missed the opportunity to input into questions asked of HN348 AND HN336 and to see them give oral evidence. This is problematic for the reasons I set out above. HN45 was also scheduled to give evidence at the November hearings, and the only reason he did not was due to ill health.

287. I note that the surveillance I was subjected to was the first known infiltration of an organisation campaigning for equality for women. Until my core participant application was granted, there were no non state core participants who were active in the women's liberation movement generally or the WLF specifically participating in the Inquiry. It is a real concern to me that the Inquiry did not think it was important to obtain evidence from the non state perspective and properly explore why and for what purpose SDS officers infiltrated and reported upon the WLF. This lack of interest is also apparent in the Rule 9 questions I have been asked.

288. I also do not understand why I was not given any information about my right to legal advice in the letters from the Inquiry. It was only luck that I was contacted by the Undercover Research Group and was able to instruct solicitors as a result. This surely should be part of the basic information provided to anyone in my situation.

289. The initial letters from the Inquiry wrongly stated that I had been spied upon by one officer, HN45. In fact, I was reported on by 7 officers that I know of so far. The documents initially provided to me evidenced that I was spied upon by at least 3 undercover officers between October 1970 and February 1973. Why did the Inquiry not tell me this?

290. Finally, I am appalled that after its initial failure to invite me to participate in the Inquiry, steps were not taken to reduce any further delay following the granting of my core participant application. Considering that the Inquiry was aware through my solicitor of the reasons why it would take time for me to provide my evidence and requesting that reasonable steps were taken to limit any stress caused to me through the process, why was I asked to provide my evidence within just over 2 weeks when the Inquiry had spent nearly 2 months preparing the Rule 9 request? It is utterly disrespectful.

291. My witness pack consists of 51 documents, many of them lengthy. Reading this volume of documents in such a short time frame is a huge burden. It brings up many old memories and I have at times found the experience quite distressing; the process is both physically and mentally

exhausting. Even with the extension until 15 March 2021, I have had less than 4 weeks to produce my statement. This is a short period of time to digest all the material and provide instructions and it inhibits my ability to provide my best evidence to the Inquiry.

292. I hope the Inquiry learns from my experience and treats future witnesses and core participants with more care and respect. This will not just be of benefit to those individuals, but also to the Inquiry as important new evidence is obtained.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "D. M. L. H. S.", written in black ink.

Date: 15 March 2021