

## In the Undercover Policing Inquiry

---

First statement of Julia Poynter

Dated: 11 March 2022

---

### **Introduction**

1. My name is Julia Poynter and I was born in 1956.
2. In November 2021 the Undercover Policing Inquiry accepted my request to provide witness evidence following my discovery that the men I knew as 'Vince Miller' and 'Phil Cooper' were in fact undercover officers (HN354; Vincent James Harvey and HN155; real name unknown)
3. I had anticipated that my statement would be relatively short, setting out my memories of the two former officers, and in particular my recollection of 'Vince Miller's' deceitful sexual relationship with the core participant known in the Inquiry as 'Madeleine'.

4. To my horror, the Inquiry subsequently provided me with 62 intelligence reports in which I am named. I couldn't believe how many reports there were, and I was shocked and angered at the extensive invasion of my privacy that they reveal.
5. In addition to providing evidence about the two undercover officers, I have attempted to address issues raised by the reporting to the best of my recollection. In particular, I have tried to put the reporting in its true context, so that the Inquiry can assess the accuracy of the reports by reference to evidence from someone who was present and involved at the time, can better understand the events which gave rise to the reporting, and can also appreciate the invasiveness of the actions of the police in deploying undercover officers in this way. I have also read 'Vince Miller' and 'Phil Cooper's' witness statements and occasionally provide comments on these.
6. I did not receive a Rule 9 request from the Inquiry, but I attempt to address issues particularly relevant to the Inquiry's terms of reference below.

## **Background**

7. I first became politically active while I was still at school. I joined the Labour Party around the time of the 1974 elections. I liked Michael Foot and the way he spoke about issues and started canvassing for Labour in the October election.

8. I soon grew disillusioned with Labour and towards the end of sixth form I came across the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), which was at that time known as the International Socialists. I was drawn to their version of socialism and how they organised. I became a member in 1975 and remained with the party for 5 years. I was initially active in the Walthamstow branch. I joined the Leytonstone branch when I moved to Leytonstone sometime in 1978. From late 1977 my main focus was anti-racism work through my involvement with the Anti Nazi League (ANL) which was closely affiliated with the SWP at that time.
9. After sixth form I worked for a council social services department in an administrative capacity from 1975 until 1980. I joined the union but wasn't active in trade union organising in my workplace at that time. My political activity was with the SWP and ANL.
10. As I describe in detail below, it was through my involvement in the SWP that I met 'Vince Miller' and 'Phil Cooper' who both infiltrated the Walthamstow branch of the SWP. It is also how I met 'Madeleine'.
11. In 1980 I went to college to study sociology. I went to socialist meetings at the polytechnic for a while, but eventually decided that student politics wasn't for me. The early 1980s was a period of change for me. I continued my involvement with the ANL until 1981, but left the SWP in 1980 and lost contact with most members.

12. Nevertheless, I have retained my interest in politics. I spent many years working in local government where I was an active member of trade unions such as NUPE and NALGO. I was a shop steward with NALGO, and later with UNISON. I was also a convenor with UNISON for 9 years in social services. Much of my trade union work has involved advancing workers' rights by negotiating with management on issues such as restructuring, single status work, sickness leave and representing members in disciplinary and grievance procedures.

#### *Involvement in Inquiry*

13. On 19 November 2019 I attended a conference at Greenwich University on the topic of Undercover Policing and Trade Unions, supported by my union, Unite. My motivation for going was to understand more about how trade union activists organising around health and safety issues had ended up blacklisted, a topic in which I have a standing interest. At the conference I picked up a document which listed all the undercover agents whose details had been published by the UCPI. I saw the name 'Vince Miller', but did not realise that this was the Vince I had known in Walthamstow SWP.

14. If the UCPI had provided more information about 'Vince Miller' at that time, particularly a photograph, it would have enabled me to identify him. I could then have provided this evidence to the Inquiry at a much earlier date, not least regarding his relationship with 'Madeleine'.

15. The conference motivated me to learn more, and we invited one of the women deceived into a relationship to my Unite branch to talk about their experience and the wider issues. I was encouraged to listen to the Inquiry hearings, which I did in May 2021. While listening to one of the hearings, to my surprise, I realised that the witness was describing events and groups in which I had been involved. At first I did not recognise the woman's voice, but after a while I realised that it was 'Madeleine', and that she was describing the 'Vince' from Walthamstow that I had known. I was shocked to learn that Vince had claimed that he only had a one-night stand with 'Madeleine'.

16. Purely by chance, not long after, I bumped into 'Madeleine' Privacy

Privacy

Privacy We hadn't seen each other in over 30 years. Privacy

Privacy She confirmed that the 'Vince' I had known in Waltham was the undercover police officer 'Vince Miller'. She also told me about the man I had known as 'Phil', and who had been a regular visitor at my home, was also now known to have been an undercover officer.

17. 'Madeleine' told me that 'Vince Miller' claimed that they had only had a one-night stand. I know that his claim that his relationship with 'Madeleine' was only for one night is untrue so I offered to give evidence to the inquiry.

18. I also wanted to tell what I know about HN155 / 'Phil Cooper' in case it is helpful.

### **'Vince Miller'**

19. I first met Vince when he started coming to Walthamstow SWP branch meetings in around 1977.

20. We met weekly in the Rose and Crown pub in Walthamstow, with an average of 12 to 15 people attending. Our branch was a close-knit, friendly group and Vince made friends quickly and became a popular person in the branch.

21. Branch members spent a lot of time together, whether carrying out branch work, attending demonstrations, or simply socialising with each other. We would often go for a drink after meetings, and the shared house that 'Madeleine' lived in was a social hub, with people often going back there after the pub.

22. Vince was very sociable and always came to the pub with us. Unlike the rest of us who were often skint and could only afford half-pints, he always had a full one.

23. The only thing I really remember standing out that made him different from us was his taste in music. We used to tease him about that. We were into reggae and ska music and he was into West Coast music. As a result he didn't tend to come with us to music events, other than the ANL Carnival in 1978.

24. He was one of the few members with a vehicle. He used his van to deliver the SWP papers and was always willing to use it to help people too, for example by moving furniture. He was considered trustworthy and had a reputation for reliability. I recall that he served as branch treasurer.

25. At the time I met him, I would describe myself as a mature 21 year old, but I was also very shy and in awe of some of the older people in the branch who knew their political theory. Vince wasn't like that; he wasn't an expert on revolutionary socialism. He didn't mind if I didn't know what Trotsky had said on a particular topic! He was more in to having a laugh and I felt very at ease around him. He came across as kind and considerate. Until the discovery of his true identity, I'd thought he was one of the loveliest people I've ever met.

26. In the autumn of 1979 Vince said he was leaving for America. We held a leaving party for him at the flat I shared with my then boyfriend, Privacy who was active in the Walthamstow branch as well as being involved in anti-nuclear power campaigning. Privacy was a chef and put a lot of effort into making the food for the meal. We liked Vince a lot and were very sad to see him leave.

27. In the gist of his Risk Assessment which I have been provided with (UCPI0000034356), I note the following passage as part of a discussion

where he claims to have 'deliberately distanced himself from potential relationships:

*To illustrate this distinction [H]N354 said that Julia Pointer [sic] (4.8 above) was keen to start a relationship with him and had made this clear. He did not reciprocate for the very reason that this was contrary to SDS directions, morally questionable and could have compromised his deployment.*

28. In his oral evidence which I have been shown Vince repeated the claim that I wanted to have a relationship with him. He said 'I got the impression she wanted to take it further'. It simply isn't true that I wanted to take things further and I question his motivation for making this claim. I liked Vince a lot, but I only ever thought of us as good friends. Vince also said in his oral evidence that he sought advice about whether to have a relationship with me and was told that it wouldn't be a good idea. This, together with what he said to the risk assessors, does show that he knew he should not have been engaging in sexual relationships.

#### **'Madeleine's' relationship with 'Vince Miller'**

29. I met 'Madeleine' within a year or so of joining the SWP in around 1976. We got on well and she became a close friend. We spent time together at meetings, parties, events or socialising in her flat and went on holiday together a couple of times.



30. 'Madeleine' and I confided in each other about our personal lives, including our relationships. I remember 'Madeleine' discussing her relationship with Vince with me. I recall that I knew that it was a sexual relationship and that she liked him a lot. It was clearly not a one-night stand.
31. Given the passage of time, it's difficult to remember much about our conversations, but a couple of details stick in my mind. I recall her telling me how he would leave her flat in the middle of the night and I remember that we both thought it was very odd. I also remember her saying that he had told her that he had been in care as a child and that this had really affected him. I don't remember whether she said he'd been fostered or placed in a children's home, just that he'd been in care. I think I thought that this early childhood experience was somehow connected to him not being able to stay the whole night with 'Madeleine' because this meant he found it difficult to trust people.
32. I spent time with 'Madeleine' and Vince at branch social activities during the few months that they were seeing each other, but I cannot be more specific than that. I knew they were an item, but I don't think it would necessarily have been obvious to lots of other people.
33. I recall 'Madeleine' telling me how disappointed she was when Vince ended the relationship after a few months. I knew she had grown fond of him and she seemed very sad following the break-up. It was clear to me at the time that it had been a significant relationship for her.

34. I also remember seeing 'Madeleine' at the bus depot where we both worked shortly after I learned that Vince had left. I told her that he had gone to America and I recall her being shocked and upset by the news.

### **'Phil Cooper'**

35. I met 'Phil Cooper' through Waltham Forest Anti Nuclear Campaign (WFANC) in around 1980. My boyfriend [Privacy] who I was living with at the time, was active in setting up WFANC with Phil. For a period, I think [Privacy] was the secretary of the group and Phil was the treasurer.

36. While 'Phil Cooper' claims in his witness statement that he thinks it's unlikely that he had any specific personal relationships with anyone in WFNAC, my recollection is that [Privacy] and Phil got on very well and were good friends. WFANC would meet at our house and Phil would attend those meetings.

37. My memory of Phil is that he was a real laugh, very much into drinking and having a good time. I liked him and saw him quite often during the time I was together with [Privacy]. I remember he claimed that he was ex-merchant navy, as was my boyfriend.

38. He used to come to the flat that we lived in to have drinking sessions with [Privacy] and another friend. The flat was small and I remember being annoyed to find them all there when I got home from work after a late shift. I recently ended up back in touch with the other friend and he reminded me that after I

kicked the three of them out, they started going to his flat instead. He told me that Phil would regularly get stoned there, and recounted one occasion where Phil was so inebriated, he fell off his chair and broke it.

39. 'Phil Cooper' never struck me as very organised, so I was surprised to see him say in his statement that he was so high up in the National Right to Work Campaign.

40. I remember going away with Phil and my partner for several days when the Anti-Nuclear Campaign organised a fringe meeting at the Trade Union Conference in Brighton in September 1980. I have been provided with [UCPI0000014546] which is a report of this event. Myself and my partner are listed as being present, as part of Waltham Forest Anti-Nuclear Campaign.

41. I recall this event well. Arthur Scargil was speaking. We wanted to build up support for the anti-nuclear power campaign among trade unionists. Though it was a nationally approved event, only a few people went down to it including me, [Privacy] and 'Phil Cooper'. We spent a few days leafleting delegates at the Conference to encourage them to come to the fringe meeting. We stayed on a campsite for the duration of our time there. I have a photo of 'Phil Cooper' and I together from this weekend and exhibit it to my statement as EXHIBIT1.

42. I also recall going with Phil and others from the branch to an ANL demonstration held to counter the National Front (NF) presence among West

Ham supporters that took place on 8 April 1981. I have also been provided with a report on this event [UCPI0000016599].

43. We had gone there to leaflet a football match to raise the issue that the NF were active in the club. I remember we were concerned for our own safety because West Ham were known to have sympathy for the NF among some of their supporters, but we felt it was important to go. Phil took some of us in the van that he supposedly used for his work.

44. The report describes the actions of uniformed police on the day in a very positive light, stating that the Chief Inspector had prevented clashes by allowing anti NF protestors to reassemble in a single place after the police's earlier actions moving them along had caused us to split up and be "confronted by racists openly admitted to having Nazi tendencies".

45. I remember this day well. However, apart from his implicit acknowledgment that violence would come from the NF rather than us, I do not recognise 'Phil Cooper's' report of the day at all. I recall that we lined up, side by side, to give out the leaflets and we were not separated in the way 'Phil Cooper' describes. The police did not help at all. Rather, it was a good example of quality ANL organising which prevented public disorder; we stuck together throughout to avoid being attacked by the NF. We got some abuse, but a lot of people also came up to us to offer support, so it was worth doing.

46. Once Phil took [Privacy] and I to his flat at Hermon Hill in Wanstead; it was very sparse. I remember being surprised as it was a very nice block of flats and I wondered how on earth he could afford it given he said he worked as a delivery driver for a firm supplying marble. I never saw him work, but he did turn up one day with a large slab of marble, which I still have. I exhibit a photograph of this to my statement as EXHIBIT2.

47. During the period that I knew him, Phil used to talk about having a girlfriend who was a single parent. He would go away quite often to stay with her. I can't provide evidence on what happened later in his deployment because I lost touch with Phil very soon after [Privacy] and I split up in early 1981.

### **Socialist Workers Party**

48. My involvement in the SWP was limited to branch activity, first with the Walthamstow branch and later with Leyton branch; I wasn't active in the wider organisation.

49. We had ardent political beliefs and were critical of existing political and economic structures and took a stance demanding change. We wanted to create a fairer and more just society, one that was not run by big business and for profit. We hoped that there would be a socialist revolution, where power shifted from the minority that hold it to the working-class majority. However, we were realists and knew that this process would take many years. First we had to reach out to like-minded people to try to build a mass movement and raise class consciousness. We hoped that there would be more industrial

action, and perhaps one day a general strike, which could change the balance of power.

50. The reality of our activity was that it was mostly different forms of outreach.

We went out selling the *Socialist Worker* newspaper every Saturday; and we put on lots of public meetings to attract people to listen to our ideas.

51. I would go with other members from my branch to events when London wide or national call outs were made for demonstrations on issues such as anti-racism.

52. We also sometimes visited picket lines where there were local disputes. We wanted to support those fighting for better conditions and pay, and we would also sell our papers. I did not go to the strike at Grunwicks, but I do recall that we supported the firefighters national pay strike of 1977-1978, carrying out collections for them and visiting their picket lines. Like many at the time, the firefighters were suffering badly from the effects of inflation, and they eventually won a 10% pay-rise.

53. We also visited the picket line at the Nevill's Bakery in Leyton to show solidarity with striking workers there. We went to sell papers, talk to strikers and show moral support. Nevill's were a large employer in the area and supporting the strike fitted with the SWP's wider strategy around organising in the industrial area. I have been provided with [UCPI0000011310] which is a report of 18 July 1978 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting held on 21 July 1978,

featuring a talk from a trade union official from the bakery. The report correctly notes that the dispute primarily stemmed from workers' safety concerns and issues around pay. The campaign's aim to set up bakery co-operatives was also recorded.

54. I note that in their witness statements both 'Vince Miller' and 'Phil Cooper' claim that the SWP were subversive, and 'Vince Miller' states that this justifies his spying on our group. That is a misrepresentation; our activities were fully democratic in nature, and we were exercising our rights to be politically active.

55. 'Phil Cooper' makes his claim about subversion with reference to SWP involvement in "industrial action that undermined the ability of businesses to carry out their work." He states his view that picket lines were a public order issue, and asserts that we would "threaten violence towards anyone attempting to go back to work." His comments are ludicrous on several levels.

56. Given our politics, many of us in the SWP didn't want to work for profit making private companies. Instead, we chose to work in the public sector. We were often teachers, social workers and local government workers. We were committed to the public sector and that was why we chose to work in it. We did not want to undermine schools, hospitals and other public services. On the contrary, we worked to improve access and conditions for everyone, whether staff or those in need of those essential services.

57. As mentioned above, we did sometimes support striking workers, mostly in the private sector. We were not running the picket lines though; workers and union representatives were doing that. We would just show up sometimes to offer solidarity, sell our papers, and perhaps bring some biscuits. We also supported workers in their attempts to turn deliveries or other workers away from the picket line. It's rubbish to say we threatened anyone with violence though. When people tried to cross the picket line, we sought to persuade them otherwise by explaining the purpose of the picket and asking them to support the striking workers. We were simply supporting what was already happening. In short, there was nothing subversive about it; it was standard trade union activity.

### **Anti-Nazi League (ANL)**

58. My political activity at that time needs to be seen in the context of the late 1970s. It was a time of high unemployment and considerable right-wing activity, particularly in East London where I lived. The NF were very active, attempting to recruit new members by seducing them with simplistic but attractive arguments. I would see them regularly at Walthamstow Market. This was an era when they were able to attract large support and I recall the Greater London Council in May 1977 elections where they did very well.

59. At that time the NF had a strong presence on the streets and were prepared to be openly violent towards anyone they saw as different. They were recruiting within schools, which worried a lot of us in the Walthamstow branch.



They also began to organise demonstrations in considerable numbers. It was a scary time.

60. We had a general understanding within the branch that we needed to respond to NF rallies with big crowds on the street putting across counter-arguments, showing solidarity with the communities who were under threat, and if possible stopping the NF from marching. Large numbers were also essential for our own protection as the NF frequently carried out attacks against those who opposed them.

61. From late 1977 onwards, much of my activity in the Walthamstow SWP was through my involvement in the Anti-Nazi League, which had formed in November 1977 in response to the rise of the far right. We wanted to build a mass movement which prevented the NF, and others like them, from organising and terrorising black and Asian communities.

62. The passage of time means some of my recollections are less clear than others, but I helped to set up the local branch, perhaps even being secretary, and at one point was probably treasurer. I was active in the ANL until sometime in 1981.

### **'Battle of Lewisham' and opposing the NF**

63. I have been provided with report [MPS-0733367] which is a Special Branch report listing those who attended a counter-demonstration against a NF march

held on 13 August 1977. I recall going to this protest, which is often referred to as the 'Battle of Lewisham'.

64. The day must be put in context. The NF march through New Cross and Deptford was deliberately provocative and sought to intimidate the local community where many black and Asian people lived. There were lots of racist attacks going on in the area and it was also an area known for heavy-handed policing. The march was intended to provoke and stir up racial tension. A counter-protest was called by people in Lewisham and we wanted to go and show solidarity.

65. I attended the Lewisham counter protest with comrades from the Walthamstow Branch, though I do not specifically recall 'Vince' being one of them.

66. There was considerable local support for the counter-protest. I recall locals opening their windows to see what was going on, then coming to join us, outraged that the NF were in their area.

67. I also remember vividly the chaos of the day. The sheer weight of numbers and police tactics meant that I was soon separated from the others I had come with. There were some very scary moments; at one point the police line suddenly disappeared and some of us found ourselves in the middle of the NF march. I ended up coming home by myself.

68. In his witness statement, 'Vince Miller' states that the night before the demonstration, he hid bricks along the route of the march with members of the SWP. This does not ring true to me. It is not something the SWP would have done. We never took weapons to demonstrations; violence was simply not what we were about. We were not street fighters like the NF; I remember being terrified at the thought of physical confrontation with them. Instead, we relied on large numbers to discourage the NF from attacking us.

69. I also recall being at the counter-protest at Ducketts Common organised by local people when the NF tried to march through the Wood Green area in Harringay on 23 April 1977 and the police used horse charges to clear the road for the far right. It is now seen as important event where people came together to stand against racism, which is even celebrated by the local council.

70. I have been provided with report [UCPI0000017403] which relates to a Walthamstow Branch meeting which took place on 11 May 1977 in the Rose and Crown pub. Although Vince had been infiltrating our branch for around 5 months, and I had attended branch meetings throughout this period, this is the earliest report I have been provided in my witness pack. In the list of people who attended the meeting the following is written next to my name: 'Mentioned re anti-fascist demonstration to counter NF March in Harringay 23.4.77.' I am surprised that I have not been provided with earlier reports relating to his infiltration, including the report relating to the Duckett's Common demonstration.

71. More generally, I am surprised to learn that the police put so many resources into a small SWP branch in north east London, and were not sending undercovers into the NF. This at a time when the NF members were out murdering people and clearly a source of serious violence and public disorder - that is where the police attention should have been.

### **Other intelligence reports disclosed to me**

72. I would note that while I have gone through all 62 reports which I have been provided, I cannot recall all of the individual events due to the passage of time. The comments I have made below are based on the details of events which I can remember and also on my knowledge and understanding of my own activities, and those of the individuals and groups described in the reports. Most of the reports are of local Walthamstow or Outer East London District SWP meetings, which I'm listed as attending. A few are lists of people identified as having attended specific demonstrations, again including myself.

73. [UCPI0000017456] is a report of 13 June 1977, detailing a branch meeting of Walthamstow SWP held in the Rose and Crown Public House, Roe Street, E17. It describes a guest speaker from the Newham Teachers SWP branch talking about revolutionary feminism and mentions an unsuccessful attempt by local Women's Action groups to occupy the Sainsburys supermarket in Stratford to protest about rising prices. There is also mention of an upcoming anti-Jubilee picket to be held in Epping Forest on 6 June 1977. I am recorded as having been present.

74. The author shows a concerning and dismissive attitude towards women, where he notes:

*The conversation became rather heavy however, and was only enlivened by comments from an unidentified female who would not listen to any of the proposed socialist alternative to her extreme views on the subject.*

75. [UCPI0000011129] is a report of 2 August 1977, detailing a branch meeting of Walthamstow SWP held on 28 July 1977 at which people who had fled from Chile spoke about events there in light of the Pinochet take over and the abuses they received at the hands of that regime. I remember this meeting vividly. We heard from people who were describing what it was like to live under fascism, including their experience of torture. It was extremely upsetting. The dismissive and disparaging tone of the report and the way it attempts to make light of the meeting and distort what was said about Chile to make it sound as if the focus of the meeting was armed revolution in the UK is horrible.

76. [UCPI0000011226] is a report of 25 August 1977, reporting on a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 10 August. The local full-time District Organiser was present to answer questions from new members. According to the report this was of little interest and the conversation turned to the subject of revolution, during which it was agreed that armed revolution was both imminent and inevitable, and lessons could be learned from other countries.

77. Though I don't recall this meeting, the reporting is laughable, and I do not recognise it as remotely accurate or representative of what we were about. Our objective was to build a mass party by talking to people and getting on with daily organising. This is apparent from the final part of proceedings where a plea for branch members to become involved in the Right to Work Campaign is recorded. Having been deployed for almost a year by this time, 'Vince Miller', who I presume was the author of the report, would have known this was the kind of activity we were involved in, not preparing for armed revolution.

78. [UCPI0000011196] is a report of 26 August 1977 about a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 17 August. The report claims that "several comrades decided that they would arm themselves with catapults and ball bearings for use in the event of personal attacks [by the NF]." I never heard talk of taking catapults or ball bearings to fight the NF and would have been very surprised if I had, so the content of the report is wrong in any case. But I also note that the Inquiry's title to this document suggests that the SWP would use these weapons in pro-active violence against the NF whereas in fact the report states they would be used only in self-defence.

79. [UCPI0000010957] is a report of 9 September 1977 of a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 31 August 1977. It notes that there were speakers discussing how the SWP should exploit its new found 'fame' following the

Battle of Lewisham. It also notes there was to be a special collection following the petrol-bombing of the SWP printshop.

80. I remember the petrol bombing and how shocked I was at the time. It was clear that the far right had been responsible, and we were very fortunate that no one was killed. The printshop was vital to the organisation and targeting it was an effective way to undermine our work. Standing on the street selling the paper was our main activity; it was how we advertised what we believed in and it allowed us to engage people in conversation. The petrol bombing was a severe blow.

81. I am surprised at how 'Vince Miller' characterised this meeting. We wanted to build a mass anti-racist movement, not exploit fame. This is another example of how his reports are coloured and there appears to be an underlying agenda in how he presents the Walthamstow branch.

82. [UCPI0000010965] is a report of 9 September of a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 31 August 1977. It notes an ongoing discussion in the local district regarding whether to split the Walthamstow branch to create a new one based around Leytonstone. There is also mention of several upcoming protests against the NF. I recall the discussion around the formation of a new branch, and the report demonstrates the focus we had on organising rallies and marches to highlight the dangers of the far right.

83. [UCPI0000010982] is a report of 20 September 1978 of a Walthamstow branch meeting held on 14 September 1977 at which the main speaker gave a talk on the food crisis and the socialist answer to it. It seems to be an account of a typical meeting of the time, focusing on current issues of the day.
84. [UCPI0000011686] is a report of 27 January 1978 of a meeting of the Outer East London District of the SWP at the Eagle and Child pub to hear a talk by Tony Cliff on Zionism. There was also a discussion on whether the SWP should stand a candidate in the upcoming Ilford North by-election. I don't recall the meeting clearly, but it was not atypical of the sort of aggregate meetings we had. Electoral politics was an issue that came up at different times and there were mixed views on it. Some saw it as a way for the SWP to reach a wider audience.
85. I note this is the first report in which I am no longer listed as 'mentions re SWP' but am given my own Special Branch Registry File. In the reports I've been provided with, I can see nothing that would justify a personal file being opened on me. It makes me angry, especially when I see the reports set out below where detailed information on my personal life is recorded. I was not even a local organiser in the SWP, let alone a leading light.
86. [UCPI0000011787] is a report of 8 February 1978 on a public meeting held jointly by Waltham Forest SWP District and the Leyton Labour Party Ladies Branch held on 1 February at which a play titled 'Out of Control' was put on by the North West Spanner theatre group. According to the report author, the



meeting and play was “of no particular interest”, though they still listed people who attended, including myself. I have to ask why the undercover even attended, let alone reported back who went?

87. [UCPI0000011831] is a report of 27 February 1978 of a public meeting by Walthamstow SWP on 15 February, at which Tony Cliff spoke on ‘What the SWP stands for’. Tony Cliff was a leading light in the SWP and a member of its Central Committee at the time. He was seen as a significant figure and lots of people came to hear him speak. I think the content of the report reflects what I have said above, that nobody thought a revolution was imminent, and that engagement with people on a large scale was what was needed.

88. [UCPI0000021714] is a report of 13 June 1978, of a public meeting held by Waltham Forest SWP District at Leytonstone Library on 10 May 1978. The topic was on immigration controls. I note it took a month to submit. I vaguely recall this meeting, but it was not unusual. Meetings like this were an opportunity for political education on current issues. Again, it shows how groundless ‘Vince Miller’s’ claims are that Walthamstow SWP merited spying on. Anyone reading these reports can see that it was not merited.

89. [UCPI0000011322] is a report of 18 July 1978 of a Waltham Forest SWP District aggregate meeting held at Leytonstone Library on 12 June. The topics discussed included strategy at elections and youth work in the SWP, as well as the upcoming SWP National Conference. Miller is listed in the report as attending, as ‘mentions re SWP’.

90. [UCPI0000011323] is a report of 24 July 1978 for a meeting of Walthamstow SWP held on 5 July. A guest speaker gave a talk on the SWP's attitude towards terrorism. The report notes that the speaker spoke strongly against kidnapping and assassination, saying it went against SWP theory. I recall that these discussions happened quite often because of the activities of the IRA. While the SWP supported a united Ireland, it did not support terrorism or bombings as a means to achieving that. The support for a united Ireland was as far as it went.

91. [UCPI0000011337] is a report of 31 July 1978, of an aggregate meeting of Waltham Forest SWP District to hear back on the SWP National Conference. It is also announced that the Waltham Forest District was changing how meetings were organised, with Miller listed as one of the people taking on leadership of the Industrial Group. In this role he wasn't simply reporting on what we were doing but would have been influencing our work and the direction of the group. It seems to me obviously inappropriate that he took on a position of such responsibility.

92. [UCPI0000011389] is a report of 15 August 1978 listing the bank details of various SWP members, mostly from Walthamstow, including myself. I recall 'Vince Miller' becoming branch treasurer. At the time I thought it was a good idea because he seemed really organised as well as being likeable and helpful. The role enabled him to visit people to take their bank details and would have required him to handle cash paid in membership subs by those

who did not have bank accounts. It would also have given him full access to the local membership lists.

93. I recognise the people named and they were law abiding people who worked in the public sector. I am really shocked that the police recorded their bank details. I can't see any justification for this further serious invasion of their privacy and of their legitimate expectation of confidentiality; it is an abuse of the police's undercover powers and of the position of treasurer.

94. [UCPI0000012871] is a report of 5 October 1978 listing people who took part in an Anti-Nazi League demonstration held on Brick Lane on 24 September 1978. I am named, as well as 'Madeleine'. I recall being there. We were supposed to go to the ANL Carnival but had heard the NF were marching on Brick Lane. Racist attacks on Brick Lane residents often took place after NF marches and I remember a local, Altab Ali, being murdered in May 1978, which was followed by an NF rampage in the area. Local branches such as ours went there to show solidarity and to counter the NF messages.

95. [UCPI0000012924] is a report of 2 November 1978 of a Waltham Forest SWP District aggregate meeting held on 19 October 1978. Topics mentioned include arranging a rota to stay at the home of a black woman and her Jewish boyfriend in Dagenham who were being attacked by racists and fundraising for two local SWP members arrested for spraying anti-NF slogans on walls. I do not recall the former, but I do remember the latter including that they were acquitted. I remember that we would go out to spray over the NF's racist

graffiti and remove their stickers from tube station escalators. You had to be careful removing stickers as the NF would put razor blades behind them to stop us doing that.

96. [UCPI0000012972] is a report of 16 November 1978 of a public meeting held by the SWP titled 'The Ford Strike and the Fight Against Racism' held on 3 November 1978. The report notes that during leafleting for the event there had been 'friction' with local British Movement (a far right group) members and as a result the SWP had 'demanded a large audience' though the evening ended without the far right showing up.

97. As I have noted previously, the threat from the far right was a real one. The SWP desire for a "large audience" was to have enough numbers present that the NF would be deterred from attacking us. We were regularly confronted by the NF when selling papers in Walthamstow Market. I recall one Rock Against Racism (RAR) gig in London where the far right got in and started doing Nazi salutes on the dance floor before being removed by a group of dockers present. After another RAR gig a group of us were attacked by NF supporters on Upper Street. I was punched in the face after trying to stop one of the NF hitting my Privacy

98. [UCPI0000021227] is a report of 30 April 1979 of an aggregate meeting of Waltham Forest SWP District held on 31 March. The report covers a number of topics including SWP industrial strategy, Women's Voice and internal criticism of the youth strategy. I am singled out at one point:

*[Privacy] then enthused over the success of the 'Orient Against the Nazis' campaign, but his enthusiasm was not shared by those other comrades present who had regularly attended these activities. In particular the secretary of the local ANL, Julia Poynter, was against the campaign since the likely gains to be made by it did not equate with the efforts required.*

I recall the discussion around the Orient Against The Nazi campaign; I felt such a campaign needed to come from the Orient football club's fans.

99. I also note that a particular person is singled out at the end of the police report in the list of who was present. I recall this young woman as a schoolgirl active in a local School Kids Against Nazi group; they were all at secondary school so aged around 15 or 16, or younger. It concerns me that a teenager was being singled out for attention in this way simply for being politically active.

100. [UCPI0000021044] is a report of 16 July 1979 of a meeting held on 5 July by Waltham Forest SWP District under the title 'Police are the Murderers – disband the Special Patrol Group'. This meeting was held in the wake of the murder of Blair Peach by members of the Special Patrol Group (SPG) at a demonstration against the NF in Southall. There was total shock in the SWP following the murder. I had been supposed to go to Southall but didn't manage to make it. I do remember many of our branch including myself going to Blair Peach's funeral.

101. [UCPI0000013462] is a report of 9 October 1979 of a meeting of Walthamstow SWP held at a private residence which I recognise. I don't recall

the meeting, which focused on a talk on Iran after the 1978 revolution there. However, after the branch had split in two we were having difficulty finding a meeting venue so met at the homes of members, 'Vince Miller' would have attended these meetings.

102. [UCPI0000014201] is a report of 26 August 1978 of a Waltham Forest SWP District public meeting of 25 July 1980 where Duncan Hallas spoke out against nuclear power. I have a recollection of this meeting as it was a subject of interest to me. The dangers of civil use of nuclear power were becoming increasingly recognised and people were organising in opposition to its use. We were opposed to the dangers of nuclear war as were many in the wider public.

103. [UCPI0000014208] is a report dated 26 August 1978 of a Waltham Forest SWP District aggregate meeting held on 14 August 1980. The meeting was called to highlight the growth of the NF in Chingford. The report notes that around 20 NF supporters attacked the meeting with rocks but the police presence was supposedly equal to the situation. This is another example of the risk faced by the SWP from the NF when putting on public meetings at the time.

104. [UCPI0000014277] is a report dated 18 September 1980 which says I am a treasurer of the Waltham Forest ANL, sets out my then address and employment as a bus conductor based at the Leyton bus garage, and says I am about to start a sociology course at North London Polytechnic. The

information is correct and would have been known to 'Phil Cooper'. The report makes me really angry. I was the treasurer of a tiny anti-racist group. These details about my life, my employment and my future education plans are so personal and private, the sort of things that are known by and of interest to friends and family. I can't think of any good reason why this sort of information was being recorded and shared by the police and possibly also the security services. I would like to know what purpose it was thought to serve. Why was this of interest to Special Branch?

105. [UCPI0000014554] is a report of 18 September 1980 which details the address, domestic arrangements and employment of my then partner, [Privacy] [Privacy] who I was living with. Again, this information is so personal and it feels deeply invasive that it was observed and recorded by the police. I don't see how this can possibly be justified.

106. This report details an apparent attempt by [Privacy], who was a chef by trade, to get employment with British Rail in order to monitor transport of nuclear waste which was being routed through London at the time. It says that he was turned down because [Privacy] was colour-blind. Again, the extremely intrusive nature of this reporting makes me angry. Reading this report was the first time I had heard this story or learned that [Privacy] was colour-blind. It shows how deeply Phil had deceived [Privacy] into trusting him with intimate details about his life, and how close their 'friendship' was.

107. [UCPI0000016486] is a report of 26 February 1981 listing those who attended a protest held at Deptford Police Station on 17 February. [Privacy] and I are listed as present. I remember going to this protest with four others from the Walthamstow SWP branch. It related to the New Cross Massacre when 13 young black people were killed in a racially motivated arson attack. There was a lot of anger around it at the time, not least due to the police's dismissive attitude and refusal to treat it as a racist attack. I remember people were vocal at the demonstration, but there wasn't any trouble.

108. [UCPI0000017243] is a report of 16 March 1982 of a branch meeting of Leytonstone SWP held on 10 March 1982. Mention is made of a SWP member supposedly planning to disrupt a talk by Norman Tebbit, while the main topic of the night was a speaker on the Russian Revolution. [Privacy] and I are listed as present.

109. [UCPI0000013063] is a report of 3 January 1979 outlining the structure of Waltham Forest SWP District and discussions about internal reports. It makes note of one individual being a 'militant and aggressive homosexual'. I do not recall this meeting or the named individual, but this kind of reporting was completely out of order. It is concerning that someone's sexuality was mentioned in this way or thought to be relevant intelligence and the language used was as unacceptable then as it is now.



110. [UCPI0000017403] is a report dated 23 May 1977, of a meeting of Walthamstow SWP held on 11 May 1977 mentioned at paragraph 70 above. It particularly notes the presence of local students who had been involved in a protest at Pentonville Jail following the imprisonment of an SWP activist for contempt of court. There was a discussion on future activities to counter the NF, but 'Nothing new of particular interest was mentioned.

111. [UCPI0000017415] is a report dated 25 May 1977 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting held on 18 May 1977. The guest speaker due to discuss the situation at the docks had not turned up so another leading member held an impromptu discussion on revolutionary art. I don't recall this meeting specifically, but it was not unusual to hear from the dockers as there were lots of disputes around the docks at the time. They were not treated well as workers.

112. The report singles out a particular young woman as attending, who I recall. She must have been about 15 at the time, as she was still doing her O-Levels. She is also named in report [UCPI0000021722] discussed below. I believe it is highly inappropriate that information about a school child attending political meetings was recorded like this; there seem to have been no limits at all to who or what the police collected and recorded information about.

113. [UCPI0000017565] is a report dated 11 July 1977 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting held on 27 July 1977, which featured a guest speaker from a

local hospital worker on the impact that drug companies were having on the NHS. I do recall this meeting quite well; it was an excellent presentation from a psychologist and her argument was far more sophisticated than it is boiled down to in the report. Again, I do not understand how reporting on this meeting is justified.

114. [UCPI0000011216] is a report dated 24 August 1977 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting held on 3 August 1977. There is a talk on Trotsky and mention of a 'harangue' by an organiser on the branch's lack of work around the Right to Work Campaign. Our branch did not have very many unemployed people so there was not the same interest in that particular issue as other branches; I suspect we were being told we needed to talk to people in dole queues. I do not see how this reporting would have added any intelligence value or otherwise to any state body.

115. [UCPI0000011619] is a report dated 6 December 1977 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting where the main topic is whether our branch should re-merge with the Leytonstone branch to create a new District organisation – the Waltham Forest District. I note someone is recorded for simply attending as a 'potential recruit', indicating it was sufficient to show interest for undercover officers to start reporting on you.

116. [UCPI0000011699] is a report dated 30 January 1978 of a joint branch meeting held by Walthamstow and Leytonstone SWP to further discuss the creation of the Waltham Forest District. [Privacy] is recorded as being

present at the meeting and has his own Special Branch RF number for the first time (after multiple 'mentions re SWP' in previous reports). He was also still at school at the time.

117. [UCPI0000011784] is a report dated 8 February 1978 of a meeting of Walthamstow SWP held on 25 January 1978. Various issues are raised at the meeting including the setting up of a Women's Voice group and the production of an Asian youth bulletin. I am listed as attending, with a Registry File number. There is also a mention of campaigning around the possible closure of a local hospital as well as cuts to funding. This report contains details of very routine branch business and I wonder why it would have been of interest to the State. I recall the Women's Voice, which campaigned on issues such as maternity leave and women's right to abortion as being very popular with local women. I would that say that all of this, not least the campaigning around hospital issues – which was considered a particularly important issue in our branch – was reasonable, democratic activities for us to have participated in.

118. [UCPI0000011821] is a report dated 22 February 1978 on a routine Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 8 February 1978. The only matter recorded in any detail in the report is a "talk on music." I note that the report was not filed until a fortnight after it had happened, presumably because even the SDS recognised that such reporting was utterly pointless.

119. [UCPI0000011893] is a report dated 22 March 1978, a routine Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 8 March 1978. All that is reported

is 'The business of the evening was entirely restricted to Branch matters and little of interest arose.' As often appears to the case, it seems all of us present at this meeting were reported on for nothing more than being SWP members.

120. [UCPI0000011976] is a report dated 20 April 1978 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting of 15 March at which there was a speaker from a commodity broker at the London Commodity Market. Mention is made of the activities of School Kids Against Nazis, Women's Voice and a carnival like march being planned for Mayday. It is noted that the Women's Voice group were trying to ascertain the details around the closure of the Jubilee Hospital in Woodford. Again, the fact that it was over a month before this report was filed is indicative that, unsurprisingly, talks on the London Commodity Market and campaigns around hospital closures, weren't considered to be of significant relevance to Special Branch.

121. [UCPI0000011973] is a report dated 24 April 1978 of a Walthamstow SWP meeting held on 12 April 1978. It is noted that following criticism of how the branch had been functioning, it was decided to elect a new committee at the following week's meeting. The intention to elect 'Vince Miller' as treasurer is noted. This report shows that Vince was aware he was going to be elected the following week but did not take any steps to avoid this. I set out my concerns regarding Vince's role as treasurer elsewhere in this statement.

122. [UCPI0000021721] is a report dated 31 May 1978 of a Waltham Forest SWP District aggregate meeting held on 10 May 1978. It records a guest

speaker discussing the role of Women's Voice, the SWP's women's organisation. It is unclear to me why Women's Voice features so much in 'Vince Miller's' reporting, something I would have liked to have seen put to him when he gave oral evidence, including whether in his or the police's world view fighting for women's issues was a subversive activity? As previously noted, the group focused very much on organising around women's issues. There was a lot of support for Women's Voice within our branch and many of us were involved. I felt it worked really well and reached a wider audience than the SWP often did; its magazine was very good and spoke to the many issues facing women at the time.

123. [UCPI0000021722] is a report dated 31 May 1978 of a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 3 May 1978. The ANL Carnival had just happened and there was a follow up talk by Roger Huddle, a leading member of the branch and co-founder of Rock Against Racism, on how to oppose the NF. There is talk of working to capitalise on the success of the Carnival.

124. There is also a discussion about a recent picket held at Walthamstow High School for Girls protesting against a NF meeting being held there. Twenty people had been arrested, including five school children. It notes that people 'claimed' the NF 'stewards' had assaulted picketers including with knuckle-dusters. A defence committee had been set up to raise funds and support those arrested. The author's use of language is telling. These were very serious events in our eyes, but the violence that we faced from the NF is downplayed and belittled in the report.

125. [UCPI0000016263] is a report listing people who attended an Anti-Nazi League demonstration on Brick Lane on 18 June 1978. I and my then partner are listed as attending.
126. [UCPI0000011339] is a report dated 31 July 1978 of a public meeting held by Waltham Forest SWP District on 29 June 1978. The speaker was Duncan Hallas on the question 'Is the Labour Party Socialist?' I remember this meeting; it was a regular event of the time, open to anyone to come along and debate the points being made, so hardly subversive – otherwise I would say the reporting is accurate. It was part political education, part recruitment, looking to attract people disillusioned with the Labour Party to the SWP.
127. [UCPI0000011426] is a report dated 22 August 1978 providing considerable detail on an individual who had recently transferred to the Walthamstow SWP branch. It covers his past activity in the SWP and information about his family. It also notes he worked alongside me [Privacy] [Privacy] and 'already has reputation there as a militant'. His father is a former MP who is named in the report.
128. I do remember this individual very well and remember visiting his home quite a bit. Though he and, to a greater extent, his partner were local activists (his partner was also active in Women's Voice) they were not more than this. Given that this individual did not regularly attend meetings, I suspect that 'Vince Miller' would not have known him very well. I am puzzled by the

reference to him having a reputation for being a militant in the workplace that I shared with him as this is not how I would have described him.

129. [UCP0000012856] is a personal report on myself dated 26 September 1978. It records that I had left my parents' home and gives my new address. It patronisingly records that I had gone to live with two 'girls' who were not members of the SWP (I was 22 at the time), and notes that I worked with one of them. As he was my friend, 'Vince' would have known about this move. He was always giving myself and others lifts so would have easily known the address, though I don't recall telling him about my then flatmates. He came to the house on more than one occasion, including to a party that we had. Again I find the reporting on these personal details about my private life extremely intrusive and I do not see why it was necessary or justified to report any of this. It was clear that I was no threat to the state or to public order.

130. [UCPI0000021223] is a report dated 1 May 1979 on the activities of Walthamstow SWP in the run up to the General Election. It says that meetings had been effectively suspended in favour of leafleting on behalf of the Anti-Nazi League. I think the NF were standing candidates and Thatcher was also playing on people's fears about immigration in the election campaign, talking about Britain being "swamped by people with a different culture." We were leafleting to get over a general anti-racist message.

131. [UCPI0000021006] is a report dated 28 June 1979 of an aggregate meeting of the Waltham Forest SWP District to discuss industrial rank and file

work within the District. The report notes an intention to re-establish the Right to Work.

132. [UCP0000021063] is a report dated 18 July 1979 on a Walthamstow SWP branch meeting held on 4 July 1979, where a member of the branch and one of the founders of Rock Against Racism gave a talk on 'Afro-American revolutionary music from the days of slavery to the present time'. It strikes me that reporting on this is unnecessary and unjustified and a thorough waste of time and money. I am also concerned at the idea that learning about Afro-American music was considered subversive by the powers that be in Special Branch.

133. [UCPI0000014562] is a report listing people who attended a march and rally organised by Waltham Forest Anti Nuclear Campaign on 6 September 1980. My partner and I and others within Walthamstow SWP are listed as having attended. [UCPI0000014649] is a report dated 29 October 1980 with an attached photograph of me at the march, and which they describe as an excellent likeness. The march would have been a small, low key, local event to draw attention to the cause. I find it very bizarre that it was monitored to this extent.

134. I also notice it uses my full name as given on my birth certificate which would not have been known to most people as I did not use it. I find it very disturbing that I was subject to such detailed profiling and investigation by Special Branch at the time. I was not someone engaged in subversion or who



posed a public order risk, and I have never been arrested or convicted of any offence. I get the feeling that the reason I am being profiled in this way is simply for being active on left-wing issues.

135. [UCPI0000015224] is a report dated 12 December 1980 listing those who attended a counter demonstration organised by Paddington Campaign Against Racism and the Anti-Nazi League in response to a British Movement march being held in Paddington on 23 November 1980. Myself, my partner and others from Walthamstow SWP are listed as having attended. We would have gone to show solidarity with the people of Paddington on the receiving end of the British Movement's racist politics.

136. [UCPI0000016397] is a report dated 10 February 1981 of a Leytonstone SWP branch meeting held on 4 February. The report author writes it 'consisted entirely of a discussion centred on financial, administrative and local organisational topics with nothing of great importance discussed.'

137. [UCPI0000016416] is a report dated 13 February 1981 of a Leytonstone SWP branch meeting held on 11 February 1981. It records a guest speaker talking on monetarism 'which resulted in an hour of questions, comments and contributions from comrades anxious to grasp the fundamental theory of the subject'. This is a further example of people trying to understand the political issues of the time, the sort of debate and discussion any democratic state should be pleased to see its citizens engaging in. I think all

of us would have been surprised to learn it would feature in a Special Branch report.

138. [UCPI0000016417] is a report dated 13 February 1981 of a Waltham Forest SWP District public meeting held on 9 February. The guest speaker is Tony Cliff, a leading light in the SWP, who, according to the report author, said the Labour Party was ineffective and that 'The working class must now actively engage in workplace occupations and step up pickets whenever faced with redundancies or lay-offs and take a decisive and united stand against management at the slightest opportunity.' I am listed as being present, as is my partner.

139. As noted previously, this was a standard debate on the party line and a chance for political education. I feel that 'Phil Cooper', who I presume is the author of the report, is deliberately putting a sinister slant. Cliff was simply saying that the Labour Party was not being effective, so workers should instead organise in the workplace themselves. This is hardly subversive.

140. [UCPI0000016538] is a report dated 27 March 1981 referring to a Waltham Forest SWP District turning out in full to sell papers at Walthamstow High Street to counter the NF leafleting in the area. According to the report author '... due mainly to a uniformed Police presence and West Ham F.C. having a home fixture, there were no untoward incidents.' I am listed as being present. It is the case that we had a weekly paper sale at Walthamstow

Market, and as noted previously, there was a constant threat of attack from NF supporters.

141. [UCPI000016793] is a report dated 4 December 1981 of a Walthamstow and Leyton SWP branch meeting held on 2 December 1981. The report states:

*Members of both branches will be meeting on Sunday 6<sup>th</sup> December at 11am, outside 'A' block, Priory Court Estate, E17 in order to counteract the racist attacks that have been occurring recently in that area. They plan to leaflet the estate, organise its residents into painting out racist slogans on walls, and set up a 'telephone tree' between the Asian residents.*

*Approximately 26-30 members will be participating in the action at Priory Court and this would be followed up by a public meeting organised by the Pakistan Welfare Society at 2pm the same day at Ross Wylde Hall, Church Hill, E17 (see attached leaflet).*

*It was reported that [Privacy] (SWP contact), a Walthamstow fireman, is conducting a personal investigation into recent fires in the Waltham Forest area which he believes were caused by racists. The SWP intend to use this information to stir up further unrest within the Asian community in Walthamstow.*

A copy of the leaflet is attached in the report and lists the speakers as Roy Hattersley (then Shadow Home Secretary), Eric Deakins MP, the Deputy Ambassador of Pakistan Amir Usman and Paul Boateng among others.

142. What was ignored in this report is that in early July petrol had been poured through the door of an Asian household killing Parveen Khan (28) and her children Kamran (11), Aqsa (10) and Imran (2). I recall going on a march where we walked past the family's house. It is not correct that we were stirring up unrest in the Asian community. The community were rightfully angry and we were reaching out and helping to build alliances in the community. It is offensive that the police were spying on us carrying out this work rather than spending resources identifying the murderers, who as far as I am aware have never been caught.

143. I am also offended by how this report smears the work of a firefighter trying identify if other fires were also racist attacks. He was doing what should have been done by the police but was not. The dismissal of this important work and the impact on the community shows the racism within Special Branch and how mis-aligned their work was. If they were genuinely concerned with public order where was the intelligence gathering on the violent and murderous far right that would have prevented this kind of racist attack?

## **Reaction**

144. My first reaction on learning that 'Vince' and 'Phil' were undercover officers was one of upset. Later that became a sense of anger about the betrayal of trust and friendship. In particular, I considered 'Vince' to be a close friend. I trusted him enough to open up to and share things with him over the three years we knew each other; it is hurtful to think it is probably all in a file somewhere. I also feel very angry about his decision to deceive 'Madeleine' into a sexual relationship. What purpose did that serve? While I'm angry about 'Phil Cooper's' lies, the deception by 'Vince Miller' has left a deeper distress.

145. I was amazed to read that 'Vince Miller' went on to become the National Director of the National Criminal Intelligence Service (a rank equivalent to a Commander). Given what I now know now about him, including that he was willing to deceive women into sexual relationships and to lie under oath about his relationship with 'Madeleine', it concerns me greatly that he ended up in such a position of power and authority. I do not understand why such a high-ranking police officer was granted anonymity in the Inquiry when trust in such institutions depends on those leading them being honest and accountable.

146. Overall, if the intrusion into people's personal lives, and the resulting damage to them, were not so serious, I would feel like the undercover police were a bit of a joke. I'm astounded by the sheer volume of reporting, and how trivial much of it was. I cannot see why such intrusive reporting was necessary, especially around my personal life and bank account. I cannot see how any of it would have helped with public order issues or subversion. They

spent years infiltrating a group because of its political ideology rather than any realistic or practical threat of serious violence. What a cushy number they had – sitting in on our meetings and drinking with us – never putting themselves at any risk by targeting groups who posed a genuine threat of violence like the NF. It just seems pathetic.

147. The reports try to imply we were a threat to the state but at the same time our politics and commitment were constantly belittled. The meeting on Chile particularly struck this home to me – the reason people were in tears there was because there were accounts of the torture people had received under Pinochet. It affected all those there deeply, but ‘Vince Miller’s’ omissions of the details and flippant remarks about people’s emotional reaction are very telling.

148. I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed:

Date: 11 March 2022

147. The reports try to imply we were a threat to the state but at the same time our politics and commitment were constantly belittled. The meeting on Chile particularly struck this home to me – the reason people were in tears there was because there were accounts of the torture people had received under Pinochet. It affected all those there deeply, but ‘Vince Miller’s’ omissions of the details and flippant remarks about people’s emotional reaction are very telling.

148. I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed: *Julia Paynter*

Date: 11 March 2022