

1st Witness Statement of HN353

Date signed: 12 July 2019

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO UNDERCOVER POLICING

I, HN353 C/o Designated Lawyers, PO Box 73779, London, WC1A 9NL, WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS:

- This witness statement is made in response to a Rule 9 request dated 10 May 2019. It provides my recollection of my deployment as an undercover police officer within the Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).
- I am known in this Public Inquiry by the nominal HN353. There is a Restriction
 Order in force in respect of my real name dated 9 October 2018.

Personal details

2

3

3. My name is HN353 and I was born in the 1940's.

Police career before and after serving with the Special Demonstration Squad

4. I joined the Metropolitan Police Service in the late 60's and Special Branch

5 in the early 1970's. On joining Special Branch, I became a Detective Constable.

Prior to working on the SDS I worked in Special Branch on

undercover policing or work using a cover identity prior to joining the SDS.

Selection for the Special Demonstration Squad

5. Prior to joining the SDS whilst on Special Branch I knew there was a covert group in Special Branch that existed, but I didn't know anything about it, it was a well-kept secret.

HN353 describes how he was recruited to the SDS by an SDS officer HN353 previously worked with

- 6. After that discussion I suppose I would have had a meeting with someone in the middle management of the squad before joining, but I can't remember anything formal. There were no tests or questions that I recall, I was simply asked whether I'd like to join or not. I accepted and started to let my hair and beard grow a bit. I had to wait for

 Whilst I was waiting to move into the back office I details temporary posting.
- 7. I joined the SDS in the late spring of 1974. I wanted to join as it was something different and exciting. It was an opportunity to sink or swim by your own endeavours and that challenge appealed to me. I don't think anything was ever formally said to me about the impact of the work or what the work would entail.

7

I knew that you would be out there, on your own, seeking information. I understood the primary role of the SDS was getting the intelligence on demonstrations and public order. At the time of joining the SDS I was married, but to my knowledge no one went to speak to my partner before I joined.

Training and guidance in the Special Demonstration Squad

- 8. There was no formal training for the role before you were deployed. Whilst working in the back office before your deployment you met the guys who were already deployed and it was from them you got an idea of what the job entailed and what you needed to do to do it successfully. I would have been typing up their reports and learning what they were doing, but I can't really recall any specific examples.
- 9. I have been referred to a document titled 'Home Office Circular Number 97/1969' (tab 3, MPS-0727104, p.2-3) I wasn't made aware of that specific document during my service on the SDS. I do recognise some of the wording in the document however, and suspect I may have covered it sometime during my career. It was probably when details when course was undertaken
- 10. To my recollection we weren't given any advice, guidance or instructions on how far it was acceptable to become involved in the private lives of those you met undercover or how close your relationships could become. Again, to my recollection there was no discussion on sexual relationships whilst deployed or participation in criminal activity whilst undercover. As to what to do if we were

arrested, I recall we were given the phone number of the Chief Inspector Derek Kneale and told to call him should it happen. Beyond this there was no discussion or guidance on what to do if we were brought before a court, either as a witness or defendant or what to do if you obtained information subject to legal privilege. There were no other discussions of ethical or legal limitations, no training on race quality or gender equality and no refresher or repeated guidance, or instruction whilst I was deployed.

Undercover identity

11. I used the cover name of Gary Roberts when I was deployed undercover and I didn't have any other nicknames, I was however provided at one point with a 'party name' by one of the groups I deployed into, which I discuss below. I can't remember who, but someone told me how to choose a cover name. This was done by attending Somerset House and finding a person who was of a similar 11 age The name I chose was that of a deceased child. Beyond the name and birthday, no other aspects of that person's identity were used by me. The other details of my cover identity were kept as vague as possible. My story was that I was brought up by an uncle and that I had previously lived in the North East and had a girlfriend up there.

can't remember if this background was discussed with my managers at the time.

12.I have again been referred to a document called the 'Penetration of Extremist Groups' (tab 2, MPS-0724119, pg3-9) which I've never read before. I was never

aware of the guidance referred to therein about the creation of your cover identity and the practice I followed wasn't the same as that set out in the document. We found our own accommodation and were provided with a vehicle. We weren't given a national insurance number or anything like that. I was not referred to any other written guidance on the creation of my cover identity.

13.I didn't know anyone who could vouch for me as an employee, so my cover [14]
employment was as a self-employed painter and decorator.

Since I was self-employed I had a cover vehicle in which I carried building materials and tools to support my cover.

I chose that job as being an odd-job

handy-man was about the only thing I was any good at should I be required to do anything in my cover role. I didn't do any actual work in that role

- 14. When I moved into the International Marxists Group (IMG) I did become a student and would attend classes at Thames Polytechnic. I studied for a BA in political economy in my cover identity. I attended classes, at first every day, this then dropped to 4 days a week and I sat exams. The course fees were paid by the MPS, I was given the cash and I paid the fees. By the end of my deployment I had got behind on coursework and didn't sit my finals and never obtained the degree.
- 15. My cover accommodation was on the north side of Muswell Hill, the name Rosebury Road rings a bell. I arranged this in light of my initial deployment into the IS in Finsbury Park. I didn't change my accommodation when I moved to

focus on the South East IMG, because I didn't feel there was a need. I arranged the accommodation but I can't now remember how I found it. No one in the accommodation knew I was an undercover officer. It was a large house, the owner and their family lived on the ground floor, the first, second and attic floor were all rented out (the attic was mine). I can't now remember who the people living on those other floors were. Only I lived on the attic floor. I didn't share the house with any other undercover officer and I didn't live anywhere else other than at that cover address when using my cover identity.

16. With regard to my appearance, before joining the SDS I had started growing my beard and hair. Prior to joining I would always have to look rather smart. I adopted a scruffy look: usually an army surplus jacket and jeans. I didn't visit any places or people to prepare for being in my cover identity and I don't think I lived for a time in my new identity before approaching my group. As I've mentioned, I did have a vehicle which I used in my deployment, it stored my building materials, which supported my cover occupation. The vehicle was provided to me before my deployment, and I think was arranged by someone in the back office of the SDS. I was also able to deliver things for the group I deployed into, for example when I became a member of the IMG I would deliver the 'Red Star' paper parcels for their onward distribution around the country. I also took Jonathan Silberman on a speaking tour and transported the slides and equipment he needed.

Deployment

17. My target groups were the International Socialists ('IS') and the IMG. I was definitely regarded as a member of the IMG and probably would have paid

subscriptions. The IS were much less formal and would pretty much accept anyone, I don't think they really had an official membership.

- 18. I was part of the IS from approximately September 1974 and was there for about a year. I started with the IMG in roughly September 1975. From about September 1975 for about 6 months I attended both groups, after that I was asked by Privacy from the IMG, to choose either the IS or IMG, as planned, I chose the IMG. I left the IMG and ended my deployment in around June 1978.
- 19. There's very little of my reporting on the IS included in the documents provided to me by the Inquiry and that which has been provided doesn't really reflect my reporting. I remember in particular attending and reporting on a demonstration in which a demonstrator, Kevin Gately, died; this was in the press at the time, and there doesn't appear to be any reports on that in my witness pack. I didn't however see anything which could've assisted into explaining the circumstances of his death, I was at the back of the crowd. I attended lots of demonstrations, as well as private and public meetings, with the IS and would have reported particularly on the numbers involved in demonstrations both prior to and after. This would have normally been via me handing in manuscript reports at weekly meetings.
- 20. The reporting provided by the Inquiry to me on the IMG is missing the period from December 1977 to June 1978, when I left. I remember in particular reporting on a big anti-racist demonstration in Lewisham and another in Wood

Green which don't appear to feature in any of the reports I've been shown. Regarding the latter, I recall reporting that I had gone out with some members of the IMG who were scouting the route to be taken by the National Front march. The IMG members seemed to know the route, I don't know how (it should be remembered that at that time there was no obligation for processions to report to the police what their route would be). We were scoping for good attack points and sources of ammunition (i.e. rubble). This was all reported back, this would have been in the form of a manuscript report which would have included a sketch plan which I then drove round, in the early hours of the morning, to the home of the SDS back office DS. After the demonstration I would have again reported back, in the normal manner (i.e. a manuscript report handed in at a weekly meeting), what the IMG tactics on the day were, what happened, who was there and the attempts made by the IMG to violently confront the National Front. I recall thinking at the Wood Green demonstration that the police had left too great a gap between officers as they escorted the National Front demonstrators, meaning it was easier for the IMG to violently confront the marchers and violence ensued as a result. This annoved me as whoever had planned the policing of the demonstration appeared not to have paid attention to the information I had provided which could have limited that violence.

21. The reports that I've been provided by the Inquiry in general don't really show the kind of reporting on public order which I would've submitted during my work in the SDS. I don't know why such reports are missing nor why the reports seem to stop at December 1977.

- 22. At the outset of my deployment I'm sure it must have been the Detective Chief Inspector of the SDS, Derek Kneale, who told me the area and group that I was to be deployed into. There seemed to be no set limit in the length of the deployment. I knew I was there to get information about public disorder, and we all knew as police officers this meant obtaining the details of the numbers in groups, details of the group's planned demonstrations, including their routes, tactics and potential dangers like I describe above, but I don't remember being specifically told to obtain that information. We had the option of requesting that Special Branch files be brought up to us should we want to look up information. I understood that I was being deployed into these groups as there was no-one else within those specific group's branches at the time. After about one year in the IS my tasking was shifted to the IMG. The IMG membership was very student and teacher heavy, so I became a student and started attending IMG meetings. There was no other shift in my tasking during the course of my deployment.
- 23. With respect to that change in tasking, I can't remember if it was me who changed or if I influenced it, but having now read some of the reports provided to me by the Inquiry, many of which pre-date my involvement in the IMG, I suspect an SDS undercover officer, possibly HN338 was about to move out of the IMG and so they wanted me to replace him.
- 24. In general, you would always obtain information such as names, dates of birth and membership details. Otherwise I don't think my reporting covered matters we weren't tasked to obtain. I used to attend many meetings and report back

on the politics discussed, though that was probably more helpful to the security service than the police.

25. The SDS premises we used when I was deployed were in South London

these were safe houses. I recall one of them closed

[20]
and we moved to another address in South London We also had premises in West London
I recall I also once had to be smuggled into Scotland Yard, but I don't now remember why.

- 26. I would visit one of the safe houses three times a week, on a Monday, to report on what had happened over the weekend and then on a Wednesday and Friday also. The frequency of attendance then dropped to twice a week later in my deployment. At the meetings we'd hand in our manuscript reports, which I think must have then been typed up by the full time members of the back office. Sometimes we'd be shown photos at those meetings and asked if we recognised anyone.
- 27. I would meet the other undercover officers at these weekly meetings where we would meet and chat, but we didn't really speak much about our deployments it was more friendly banter. Sometimes you would see them at demonstrations but I was the only person in my group so I wouldn't have spoken to them.
- 28. Whilst deployed in the IS I would attend at least one private meeting a week, in addition to public meetings and then demonstrations at the weekend. My cover was as a self-employed painter decorator so during the day I wouldn't be doing very much and would have probably spent time in my cover address and in the IS bookshop. I can't really recall much else of my pattern of life in that group.

- 29. When I moved to the IMG I had to attend a college course five days a week and had to complete my college coursework. Through the IMG I also became involved in student politics so was often in my cover role for 8 hours a day. I would attend a private meeting of the IMG, probably once a week, and then public meetings and demonstrations at the weekend. During the spring and summer there would have been a demonstration at least once a week. I attended conferences with the IMG, but most were on the weekend. Outside of the formal meetings of the SDS I mention above, I would occasionally have met with a member of the management, sometimes just before a big demonstration, sometimes late at night, to pass on the latest information. Consequently, I spent little time at home in my real identity off duty, though most nights I would get home and didn't want to stay in my cover flat if I could avoid it. During the winter and autumn, when the weather was bad, there were fewer demonstrations so I might have the whole weekend at home in my real identity.
- 30. In contrast to work on Special Branch outside of the SDS, you were your own boss and depended on no one, likewise after 1975 we were paid overtime which significantly impacted my pay, probably doubling it. As far as I remember after 1975 overtime rules were changed, certainly for Special Branch, I don't know whether this was a service wide change or nationwide for police officers. As soon as you were in a police vehicle or left your home and assumed your cover identity you would be considered to be on duty. Prior to 1975 you would get some time off in lieu or you may have had some payment, I can't remember. There was no other impact on your take home pay.

- 31.I have been asked regarding a number of documents provided to me about whether I was the author. To explain, usually I would hand in a manuscript report at our SDS meetings which I'd never see again, I don't recall seeing the typed up version. Where I confirm I am the author below I mean that the information referred to in the report probably originated from my original manuscript report.
- 32.1 was tasked to infiltrate the IS in the Finsbury Park branch, this tasking would have been a decision by a manager on the SDS, but I can't definitively now recall who.
- 33. I have been referred to a Special Branch report re International Socialists (tab 4, UCPI0000007917), it's a strong possibility that I was the author of that report but I couldn't definitely confirm I was, it is certainly the right time and at the start of my deployment. Special Branch reports re: International Socialists (tab 26, UCPI0000006946), (tab 110, UCPI0000009421), appear to refer to the right area and the right time, to be me so again I probably was the author. As to the Special Branch reports re: International Socialists (tab 121, UCPI0000012226) I don't remember being there at all, but I could well have been the author. I don't think I was the author of the Special Branch reports re: International Socialists (tab 150, UCPI0000010821) and (tab 172, UCPI0000021538), the former is unlikely to be me as I was probably in the IMG by that time, I doubt I would have been at that meeting. As to the latter, given the date I think I would have left the IS by that time. As set out above, these reports don't represent the entirety of my reporting on the IS. There would have been regular reports on the meetings and demonstrations I was attending for the 18 months or so I was deployed into

the IS, though in the latter 6 months there would have been less as I was hovering between the IS and IMG.

- 34. After nearly a year in the Finsbury Park IS, I remember Derek Kneale, the DCI in the SDS, said that I was to go and infiltrate the IMG. As I mention above, I suspect they wanted to replace a source. The IMG were active in organising demonstrations and public disorder at the time which is why I think there was an interest in their activities.
- 35. As to the documents provided regarding the IMG in South-East London, prior to September 1975 those reports would not have been from me, I suspect most were written by my IMG predecessor in the SDS. I think his name was HN338 but I may be wrong. After September 1975 I think the IMG reports in that area were probably from me, though some of the reports I don't recognise and aren't written in my style of writing, it is possible the wording of my reports could have been changed when typed up. Some of the reports are clearly not me, for example the details of member's bank accounts I doubt I would have had access to nor to subscription fee details; I wonder if that information has come from another non-SDS source. There is also reference in some reports to sub-committees, again I doubt these are mine as I was never a member of any sub-committees. In particular, the Special Branch report (tab 148, UCPI0000010799-1) I doubt is mine as it appears to have originated from an officer at Gatwick airport. Special Branch report (tab 168, UCPI0000008236- is unlikely to be mine as there is reference to information provided by Box 500 which I would have already known (the real identity of Privacy, as I

discuss below, the IMG did use false names. Had it been my report I would've

included that information, which leads me to suspect this isn't mine. Similarly, Special Branch report (tab 156, UCPI0000008231) includes information which I can't say I ever knew, so this is unlikely to be my reporting.

- 36.I was never in a position of responsibility or an office holder for the IMG (for example a treasurer or London organiser).
- 37.I have been referred to a number of reports which relate to the South West London branches of the IMG (tab 7, UCPI0000015063; tab 9, UCPI0000015114; tab 12, UCPI0000015024; tab 13, UCPI0000015032; tab 19, UCPI0000012089; tab 23, UCPI0000006872; tab 41, UCPI0000007215; tab 45, UCPI0000007249; tab 94, UCPI0000009298; and tab 185, UCPI0000017730) and I am sure this wasn't my reporting. The location is obviously not where I was based, some of the phrasing in the reports doesn't appear to be in my style and I don't recognise many of the names of those reported on. I don't know who was reporting on those branches of the IMG.
- 38. As far as I remember the guidance on taking up of any office in the groups we were deployed into was that we weren't to organise things, I took this to mean don't organise demonstrations or counter-demonstrations. I was never an organiser. I think that advice came from one of the SDS managers in the back office before I was deployed, I can't remember who or when, it could have been Derek Kneale.
- 39.I understood the objectives of the IMG was to establish a communist state with power to the workers. I don't think they knew how to achieve that goal.

Confronting the extreme right was an aside to that aim, but a very important one. I think in the back of the members' minds was the thought to achieve their objective by subversive activity (i.e. by entryism or the seizing power outside of the electoral system) and was always in the background to what they were doing. That said there were never any classes about manning the barricade or things of that nature. The theory they followed would have endorsed the use of violence to achieve their aim, but I never saw them actually applying violence to that aim, aside from when they were trying to throw the National Front off the street.

- 40. As I mention above, the reports in which bank details were reported were probably not mine and I suspect came from another non-SDS source (tab 10, UCPI0000014946; tab 31, UCPI0000007003; tab 85, UCPI0000009204 and tab 178, UCPI0000017683). That said Special Branch report (tab 178, UCPI0000017683) could have been me. I was never asked to report on bank details, but had I come across such details I probably would have reported it. I would hoover up everything, it wasn't my job to analyse it, I would just report. I wouldn't have gone out my way to get that kind of information though, but as I say, had I had the opportunity I would have taken it.
- 41.1 don't think I reported on the matters in the special branch reports: tab 5, UCPI0000014957; tab 14, UCPI0000015044; tab 16, UCPI0000012063; tab 18, UCPI0000012086; and tab 42, UCPI000007218 as these are too early for my involvement. I may have been the person who reported the information in the other Special Branch reports regarding student IMG activities (tab 151, UCPI0000010826; tab 184, UCPI0000017727). I wasn't specifically tasked to

report on the student activities of the IMG, but in reporting on the IMG collaterally it would have included student IMG activities as they had a strong presence amongst students and teachers. Of course, this was why my cover was as a student in a polytechnic. I didn't have a position of responsibly within the student wing of the IMG, but through my cover I did become the vice president of the student union for my polytechnic.

- 42.I don't think I reported the information in the Special Branch report tab 40, UCPI0000007195 as it would have been too early for my deployment. I also doubt that I would have provided the information in the Special Branch report at tab 202, UCPI0000017413 as I wouldn't have been able to have obtained that level of detail. The information in the Special Branch report tab 179, UCPI0000017685, could have been provided by me. I wasn't involved in the publication of 'Red Weekly', but I did have the use of a van in my cover name and I was asked by the IMG if I could deliver the parcels of the paper to the mainline stations for onward distribution around the country. I did this once a week, on a Wednesday, for about a year. That was my only involvement in the distribution of the paper.
- 43. I have been referred to the Special Branch report (tab 208, UCPI0000011530),
 I don't think I would have reported that information, the tone of the report sounds
 like an internal memo and I doubt I would have had access to the distribution
 figures referred to therein.
- 44.I have been referred to the Special Branch report (tab 19, UCPI0000012086) I don't think I would have provided that information as it is too early for my deployment.

- 45.I have been referred to several Special Branch reports concerning the IMG Central Education Group (tab 22, UCPI0000015715; tab 25, UCPI0000006903; tab 27, UCPI0000006959; tab 30, UCPI0000007001; tab 36, UCPI0000007112; tab 43, UCPI0000007223; tab 44, UCPI0000007228; tab 46, UCPI0000007267; and tab 54, UCPI0000007367) all of those documents are too early to have been my reports and before reading them for this statement I was never aware of the IMG Central Education Group.
- 46. Again I have been referred to a Special Branch report (tab 29, UCPI0000006977), which I think is too early to be my report. I suspect that the phrasing 'delicate source' probably refers to a non-SDS source.
- 47. I have been referred to a number of Special Branch reports concerning the IMG intention to infiltrate the Labour party ('entryism'). Of those a number are not my reports as they are too early (tab 63, UCPI0000012786; tab 80, UCPI0000007598; and tab 90, UCPI0000008865) I also doubt the Special Branch report at tab 97, UCPI0000009316 is mine as I don't recognise the people referred to within it. I never became a member of the Labour Party, I was never tasked to report on the IMG policy of entryism, but I chose to report on it on my own initiative as I thought it probably came under subversion and was probably one of the important aspects of the work, subversive activity would have been of interest to Special Branch and in particular the security service.
- 48.I was the author of the Special Branch report at tab 143, UCPI0000021343. I wasn't asked to report on membership statistics but I took it for granted that

Special Branch would be interested in that information. Again my job was to obtain as much information as I could and then someone else would analyse it. I would have thought the numbers involved would have been useful to give an idea of trends in whether the organisation was expanding or retreating. I wasn't aware of any policy of entryism by the IMG into trade unions.

- 49.1 wasn't the author the Special Branch report at tab 8, UCPI0000015080.
- 50.I have been referred to several Special Branch reports which refer to 'party names in the IMG (tabs 112, UCPI000009522; 162, UCPI0000021450; 186, UCPI0000017745 and 192, UCPI0000017811), all of which may have been my reports. The IMG did use party names as pseudonyms to disguise their identities and confuse their enemies. I remember I was asked to take a party name, I chose 'Gary Shopland', after having chosen it however I don't think I ever used it again. I can't remember who invited me to take a party name, it was quite early in my deployment, I imagine it was Privacy of the IMG. I'm not really sure what threat the IMG were trying to meet by the use of party names, I think it might have had historical origins.
- 51. As to the Special Branch report at tab 139 UCPI0000010685, I don't remember the meeting referred to therein or the sub-committee and can't see why I would have attended it. It's possible it was me, but I can't be sure. If it wasn't me, I don't know who it would be, I can't recall any of my contemporaries in the SDS being in the IMG, aside from my speculation above as to replacing

 HN338

 The address referenced I believe was the HQ of the IMG, hence why, despite not being in my area, it was possible that I attended there. As to the Special Branch report at tab 142, UCPI0000010744, I doubt that was my

report as I have no recollection of anything going on in Nottingham and I can't think who that could've been. As to the Special Branch reports at tab 144 UCPI0000010777, again I doubt that was my report as I would have only joined the IMG some 8 months previously and I don't think they would have invited me to such a sub-committee, again I don't know who might have been reporting this. As to the Special Branch report at tab 204 UCPl0000011063, again I doubt that was my report in light of the geography referenced, I wonder whether this was in fact a non-SDS source as I note the signature, which I recognise, at the end of the report is that of Roy Creamer who wasn't someone I thought was involved in the SDS. Regarding the Special Branch report at tab 205 UCPI0000010944 again I don't think this was my report based on the location and I doubt by that stage I would have been attending such events as I was already an established member of the IMG by that time but don't know who provided this information. Lastly again the Special Branch report at tab 206 UCPI0000011064 I don't think was me as I don't recall any demonstration in that area and the report references names I don't know, again I don't know who was providing these reports.

52. I have been referred to another set of Special Branch reports, of these those at tabs 21, UCPI0000006851; 48, UCPI0000007335; 51, UCPI0000007344; 103, UCPI0000009460 are my reports based on the dates and locations. The report at tab 147, UCPI0000010798 could be mine but I certainly didn't attend the summer school which is referred to in the report. The Special Branch report at tab 173, UCPI0000017628 seems to be a report from a much later time and isn't related to me. I don't think the Special Branch report at tab 181,

UCPI0000017689 is mine as the phrasing doesn't seem like mine and I doubt I would have been able to obtain that kind of detailed information from another area of the IMG. I don't think the report at tab 183, UCPI0000017726 is mine as I didn't attend the national abortion tribunal and I wouldn't have known those people attending. That said it is possible that this report arose from a number of us being shown some photographs of attendees at the tribunal and being asked whether we recognised anyone. If that's right, I may have contributed to identifying who was attending.

- 53.As to the Special Branch reports at tab 131, UCPI0000015732 and 132, UCPI0000009727 which refer to pre-conference discussions, those may have been my reports, it's certainly the right time and area, but I can't be sure.
- 54. As to the Special Branch report at tab 160, UCPI0000021453 the wording of the report seems strange for me and isn't how I would have phrased it, however I could have been the source of the information referred to therein.
- 55. The Special Branch report at tab 24, UCPl000006893 is too early to be my report as is the report at tab 59, UCPl0000012737. That said I do recognise the names 'Mary' and Privacy they ring a bell but I don't know why and can't say why they would have been of interest.
- 56.I knew Richard Chessum in the IMG and I could have been the author of the Special Branch report at tab 189, UCPI0000017796. I was never tasked to report on an individual person. He was a person involved in the IMG and would

have reported his move for someone else to consider its relevance or not. We would report on such changes of circumstances as it would be updating information for the individual's personal file, if they had one. Special Branch would undertake roughly yearly reviews of personal files to ensure they were up to date, particularly individuals of prominence. Whether he was a person of prominence I can't now recall nor would I have been making that decision.

- 57.1 think I am the author of the Special Branch report at tab 210, UCPI0000011607.
- 58.1 have been referred to a number of Special Branch reports where race and sexual equality campaigning is referenced. Of these, I don't think the reports at tabs 138. UCPI0000010681: 141. UCPI0000010733: 145. UCPI0000010781 were mine, certainly I was a member of the IMG in South East London at that time, but the addresses referred to therein don't mean anything to me and the phrasing doesn't sound like me. The Special Branch report at tab 150, UCPI 0000010821 includes names I don't recognise it is possible that it was my report. The report at tab 159, UCPI 0000021418 could be mine, it's the right area and time and I recognise some of the names referred to therein. The report at tab 168, UCPI0000008236 could be mine, although again I don't recognise the location of the meeting and I can't recollect it at all. The report at tab 169, UCPI0000008235 I don't think is mine as I don't think I was part of a sub-area committee, I think this may be the report of an informant as the phrasing again isn't mine. The report at tab 187, UCPI0000017739 is mine. I was never tasked to report on the issues of race and sexual equality

campaigns referred to in some of those reports. I think they were probably agenda items at the meetings I was attending and I would note them like any other topic. Generally, if the topic was about the overall aim and perspective of the IMG I would report it.

- 59. I've been referred to a Special Branch report at tab 142, UCPl0000010744 I don't remember anything about the anti-fascist sub-committee and don't think this was my report. I never belonged to any sub-committees.
- 60. I have been referred to a Special Branch report at tab 180, UCPl0000017686 concerning the All Lewisham Campaign Against Racialism and Fascism, this may well have been my report though I have no recollection of it. I think I may have been delegated to attend this meeting in my role as the vice president of the student union I was at. The student union knew I was also a member of the IMG. I wasn't tasked to attend this meeting and I don't think I would have been a founding delegate. I imagine I reported on it as I felt, if I was going to a meeting whilst on duty in my cover name, my superiors would expect some report of what happened. I also think the IMG would have been interested in attending such a group as they would probably want to run it. If the IMG were attending, there would probably be some interest in Special Branch as to what happened at the conference, hence why I reported on it.
- 61. I have been referred to a Special Branch report at tab 177, UCPI0000017655 regarding the installation of a phone line at the flat of the organiser of the south London sub-area of the IMG, this could well have been my report. I wouldn't

have been tasked to provide that information, but as I mention above it would have been information relevant to update the individual's file.

- 62.I have been referred to the Special Branch report at tab 193, UCPI0000017814 and IMG members standing in GLC elections, I don't recollect the meeting but imagine it was me who reported on it. Again I wasn't tasked to report on that information, but it formed part of the agenda of an IMG meeting and was potentially subversive so I reported it.
- regarding a request for me to travel abroad as a member of the IMG, I can't remember who would have made that request in the SDS or who in the IMG had asked me to go and I can't really remember anything about the request, to be honest. I suppose I would have been invited out there as a driver. I did certainly assist the IMG in that capacity in a speaking tour of the north of England. I would have called in every day to my superiors in the SDS whilst on that tour, probably from a phone box, which would have been my reporting and would have also written some manuscript reports and given those in on my return from the tour. Whilst the phrasing in the report at tab 209, UCPI0000011531 doesn't look like mine, it does seem to correlate with this speaking tour and the information in it probably was based on information that I provided, but I can't remember. I don't however remember going to Birmingham on that tour, so that information may not have come from me.

- 64. My deployment with the IMG came to an end in June 1978 with the end of the student term. I was pleased when it did as I'd been asked whether I'd want to take another job in the police in around 1978. I never sat my finals but other than that I can't really recall how my deployment ended.
- 65. The IMG sought to influence and be involved with a number of different organisations and bodies so inevitably when I reported on the IMG the topics I touched upon concerned some of those organisations also. As I mention above, if the organisation became a topic on the agenda of the IMG, I would have reported it.
- 66. I joined the student union when I was a student at Thames Polytechnic in my cover identity and became involved in the union's affairs, becoming the vice president. This fitted with my role as a 'good revolutionary' in the IMG and was a necessary part of my cover identity. I was a delegate at national conferences on a couple of occasions. At the local level there weren't that many meetings of the student union. When attending the national conferences and caucus meetings of the IMG at those meetings we would have long discussions with the aim of trying to get a revolutionary candidate elected in the national conference.
- 67.I witnessed the usual punch ups at demonstrations with the IMG, generally I would be at the back, though I recall one occasion where we were charged by the police mounted unit. There was public disorder when the left wing and right wing met in public and the police were generally in between the two groups. As

I mention above, the demonstrations at Lewisham and Wood Green stick in my mind as particularly violent, though I can't recall the year of them. I recall thinking there weren't enough police at Wood Green, there was many a physical confrontation and you had to try and avoid getting hit by the opposing sides. I don't recall any violence to property, it was all between the left and right supporters.

- 68. The role of the SDS was to provide information so that public disorder could be effectively policed. A counter-subversive role wasn't the primary aim of the SDS, but virtually everything we did in Special Branch was copied to the security services who I imagine kept a far more extensive and efficient index on people who might come to their notice for subversive activity. However, I don't know why the security service was copied in and I never had any involvement with them. Our primary purpose, on the SDS, was the policing of disorder and I didn't really think the security service was interested in that I don't think anything I witnessed was actually subversive, the IMG were strong on words, but in hindsight I think they were not really likely to act on them. As I mention below, the security service did give me a commendation for one of my reports, but I don't really know why. Entryism would have been of interest to Special Branch, but even that in the IMG was done in quite a half-hearted way.
- 69.I never engaged in any sexual activity whilst in my undercover identity and I didn't have any personal relationships with anyone, there was no one I'd go for a drink with or watch the football with. Even if we'd had a meeting in a pub. I

never recall going for a drink with someone afterwards and I didn't assume any position of trust with any of the people I was mixing with.

- 70.1 would have wilfully obstructed the highway, for example by stopping and selling a left wing newspaper, and torn down the posters of the opposition when on a demonstration, but otherwise I didn't participate in any criminal activity when deployed and I was never arrested, charged, tried of convicted of any criminal offence whilst serving on the SDS. I never appeared in any criminal proceedings and the fact that I was an undercover officer was never, to my knowledge, disclosed in connection with any such event. I never provoked or encouraged or caused any other person to participate in any criminal activity whilst on the SDS. I don't believe the product of my reporting was ever used in support of or otherwise disclosed in connection with a criminal investigation or prosecution. I didn't provide evidence for use in any prosecution arising from my deployment.
- 71. I wasn't involved in any way in my cover identity in other legal proceedings nor was I involved in any police complaint or disciplinary proceedings.
- 72. I was not aware of receiving or being aware of any legally privileged information whilst I was on the SDS.
- 73. I reported on Piers Corbyn though at that time I don't think he was an elected politician; he may have been a local councillor. I just reported on his attendance at IMG meetings.

- 74.I believe the intelligence I provided on public order was then passed to the police uniform department who would draw up the plans for the police action at demonstrations. When the people responsible listened to that intelligence I think it probably helped a great deal as there was otherwise no firm intelligence on what would happen, when or how.
- 75. My deployment ended in June 1978, the length of time with the IMG coinciding with the student course I was on.

Details ending of deployment in the SDS.

- I was never aware of a rule that an officer should serve no longer than 12 months in the SDS, but I don't think that would have been a good idea; it took you such a long time to become involved with a group and likewise remove yourself gracefully, 12 months wouldn't be long enough.
- 76. After the three-year course, people went their own ways, so I had a good reason to leave the IMG and said I was moving back up north. I think my story was that I was very depressed, and so didn't sit my finals. That withdrawal must have been planned. I had mentioned earlier in the year, to my police managers, an interest in accepting an imminent new posting.

25

77

- 26 78. In my chain of command were the DIs Derek Brice and The HN332 was the Detective Chief DCI was Derek Kneale. I think Superintendent. There was also a permanent DS in the office, but I can't remember who that was. There was also Trevor Butler who was a DI or perhaps a DCI. Angus McIntosh was a DI. Dave Smith was a DI in the office. Ken Pryde was the DCI or possibly the Detective Superintendent. I can't however place HN294 the above or the below in any kind of chronology. remember, but can't recall his rank or role. Matthew Rodger was the Detective Chief Superintendent of B-Squad I think, I can't remember if he was involved in 29 HN340 was I think a DS and was already in the field when I the SDS. was in the back office. I don't think Paul Croyden was in the SDS. Geoffrey Craft was a Detective Chief Superintendent responsible for the SDS, I think he may have followed HN332
- 79.1 cannot think of any other managers who were serving in the SDS during my time in the unit who were not in my chain of command. I don't think there were any administrative staff, but there was a permanent DS and the back office DC who would then go on to be deployed.
- 80. At the regular weekly meetings, I would speak to everyone, the DS, DIs and DCI. The DIs I think attended all the meetings and the DCI would come to at least one or two a week. The managers were always available to talk to at those meetings and by telephone outside of those meetings. At the group meeting you could have a face to face chat if there was something you needed to talk about, I don't think I ever did, but I can imagine if someone had a problem or

there was an issue at home they'd have been there to talk. At the three meetings a week we'd provide our reports, otherwise our reports would be made by telephone. I recall, as I've mentioned above, on one occasion I had to prepare some plans and attend the home of the back office DS late at night. Hand written reports would be given at the meetings and then typed up by someone in the back office. I never had any complaints about my reports, and on one occasion had a commendation, which I mention below.

81. If you didn't tell management about any welfare concerns they wouldn't know and if they asked and you didn't tell them they would be none the wiser. If you told them, I think their assistance was good.

Senior management and oversight bodies

- 82.A Chief Superintendent and Commissioner attended the SDS office once, I think to show an interest (I think it was early on in the Commissioner's appointment). The whole squad were present. There were no visits from outside bodies.
- 83.1 assume the commendation I received was for my report about the national conference in 1976. As I mentioned above, I don't know why the security service commended me and I didn't receive any other commendation for my SDS work.

Deployment of contemporaries

HN298, HN301, HN299/342, HN303, HN13, HN200, HN300 and others were all deployed at the same time as me.

85. As far as I'm aware two named managers did not use a cover name whilst on the SDS

I'm sure HN300 would have used one but I

don't know what it was.

- 86.I didn't have any involvement with the Troops Out Movement during my deployment, I never came across Richard Clark whilst I was deployed in my cover identity. He was a colleague but I wouldn't have said a friend, we were never that close and I never heard much about his conduct whilst deployed.
- 87.I wasn't aware of any of my contemporaries committing a criminal offence, aside from perhaps some involvement in public disorder, like me. None to my knowledge provoked, encouraged or caused a third party to commit an offence. I wouldn't know if any of them engaged in sexual activity whilst deployed. I don't know if any of them got arrested, charged, tried or convicted whilst deployed; it was all on a 'need to know' basis; they didn't tell and I didn't ask. I wouldn't know if they had reported any legally privileged information. I've subsequently learnt through the Inquiry that some may have reported on elected politicians, but I certainly didn't know this at the time.

- 88.I think my contemporaries' reporting benefitted policing. When the information they gave was used properly there was a more realistic tasking of uniformed officers and public disorder was usually avoided as a result or at least contained.
- 89. As to the assistance of the security service, the SDS had people working on Irish matters and I imagine they provided good information to them.

Post deployment

90. After I finished I completed my training course, as I mentioned above; I don't remember any de-brief. Informally we could always go and talk to our former managers and colleagues which was all I ever needed.



92.1 left the police in the rank of Detective Sergeant and I left the MPS on good terms.

Undercover work in the private sector

93.1 was never given any guidance or instruction on working undercover in the private sector and I never worked in that capacity in the private sector.

Any other matters

94. There is nothing further I can add of relevance to the Inquiry.

Request of documents

95.I think I have a photograph of my attending the headquarters of the IMG when I was deployed. This was taken from a police observation post and was no doubt picked up by someone in the back office of the SDS who had written a humorous note on it and passed it to me. I kept it, but I'm afraid I have no idea where in my house it now is. The last time I saw it was probably four or five years ago.

96. My memory has not been refreshed by any other document not in my witness bundle.

Diversity information

97.I am male and would describe myself as White European.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

46		
Signed:	HN353	
Dated: 12	7 2019	