

In the Undercover Policing Public Inquiry

Second statement of 'Madeleine'

Dated: 16 March 2022

Introduction

1. I make this statement supplementary to my first witness statement of 18 February 2021.

2. In September 2021 the Inquiry gave me permission to submit a supplementary statement after I found a postcard sent to me from the man I knew as 'Vince Miller' following the end of his SDS deployment.

3. To assist the Inquiry, I also provide evidence on two other important issues which have arisen since my first statement:

- (1) The revocation of 'Vince Miller's' restriction order revealing that his real identity is Vincent James Harvey; a senior public servant who went on to perform very high profile roles in the police service after leaving the SDS.
- (2) A significant report authored by Vincent Harvey which was not disclosed to me in my witness pack and which I consequently discovered after I had given evidence. It relates to an event which I believe I was present at during the time of our relationship.

Postcard

4. Following the UCPI hearings in May 2021, I decided to dig out a box which contains letters and cards of emotional significance that I have kept over the years from old boyfriends and other close friends.
5. At the bottom of the box I found a postcard from 'Vince Miller' with a United States Air Mail stamp dated January 1980. I exhibit it to this statement as EXHIBIT3.
6. The postcard was addressed to 'Madeleine', Dave and Co and reads:

"Didn't stay long in New York, not my kind of place. Have bussed and driven hire cars down here for the winter. Lost my address book so can only write to people whose addresses I can remember, and these might not be right. Music and people really better than I expected. All in all a lot better than W'stow.

Having a bit of trouble getting enough money for everything I want to do so traveling and living in an old VW wreck – nothing new. Good luck to everybody, Vince.”

7. The postcard must have arrived about 3 months after Vince disappeared in around October 1979, saying that he was going to America. It is written in his handwriting.
8. I had forgotten about the postcard until I found it in the box, but I now vaguely recall receiving it. I remember being pleasantly surprised that he had written and hoping that the fact he was keeping in touch meant that I would see him again at some point. I would have put it in the box because it meant something to me.
9. I also recall that around Christmas time in 1979 a friend of mine from the SWP went to visit Vince's flat as he hadn't seen him for a while. He'd heard that Vince had stopped being Treasurer for the branch and wanted to check if he was okay.
10. This friend told me that when he called at the flat, two "dodgy looking" men answered the door. He said that they appeared very suspicious and asked him a lot of questions about who he was and why he was there. They told him that Vince had gone to America. He thought it was all very strange.

11. I remember being surprised that anyone had been there as every time that I had gone to the flat, no one had ever answered the door. It was also confusing because Vince had told me that he lived in a bedsit on his own and now it appeared that he had flatmates.
12. It would have been shortly after my friend visited the flat that I received the postcard. I now wonder if the flat was still used by the SDS after Vincent Harvey's deployment ended. Was the postcard sent at this time to divert any suspicions that might have arisen after my friend's strange encounter at Vince's flat?
13. Since becoming a Core Participant in the Inquiry, I have learnt how other women deceived into relationships have had similar experiences. Following the sudden disappearance of their former partners and their subsequent attempts to find them, they too received correspondence from an overseas location where the UCO claimed to have gone. This gave them false hope that they might be reunited. It is a cold and cynical tactic.
14. At Paragraph 237 of his witness statement, Vincent Harvey states that he left 'Vince Miller' and his deployment behind him when he left the field and that he had not talked or thought about his former targets at all from the end of his deployment until his first interview with his risk assessor in 2018. He did not mention the postcard from 'Vince Miller' sent approximately three months after his deployment. This statement was therefore untrue and it further undermines the reliability of his evidence.

15. As explained below, two developments of which I became aware subsequent to my own and Harvey's oral evidence are also significant evidentially.

Vincent James Harvey

16. Following consideration of my first witness statement and the evidence I had given regarding my relationship with Harvey the Chair stated that he was minded to revoke the restriction order over Vincent Harvey's real name.

17. On 9 March 2021, Harvey provided a supplementary impact statement in which he stressed how he had always been "honest and transparent" with the Inquiry and set out various reasons why he believed that the restriction order should not be revoked. Some of the reasons were redacted in the version that I was provided, but I was able to see some of his concerns. In particular [redacted]

publication of his real name prior to his giving evidence risked having a seriously adverse impact on an immediate family member.

18. On 16 March 2021 I was provided with a confidential 'minded to' note from the Chair in which he said that while the restriction order would ultimately be revoked it was "imperative that nothing is done to cause difficulties [redacted] at that

[redacted] time for an immediate family member. I was told that I could be informed of his real name before we both gave evidence while it was still subject to a restriction order which would prevent me from disclosing it until it was revoked; or I could await its revocation.

19. I had sympathy another innocent victim in this whole sorry affair. While I felt the possibility of any negative effects on was negligible, I believed that release of his real name could nonetheless cause anxiety and I wanted to avoid this.

20. Additionally, I was already under a lot of stress from my involvement in the Inquiry and I did not want the extra burden of being privy to information which I could not share with anyone else, even my partner, without facing severe penalties. I therefore decided to wait to learn of his real identity until after the restriction order was revoked. My solicitor communicated my decision to the Inquiry in a letter dated 24 March 2021.

21. In May 2021 I gave oral evidence to the Inquiry. The process of being questioned was extremely stressful and I found publicly recounting deeply personal information in such detail excruciating. My experience of giving oral evidence impacted on the other women deceived into relationships; the fear that they would be subject to similarly intrusive questioning caused some of them such significant distress that they were unsure if they would be able to continue their participation in the Inquiry. It was also insulting and offensive to hear Harvey claim that he could not remember our relationship and to suggest to the Chair that I may have been lying about it in order to discredit the police. After the hearings, I was left reeling and exhausted.

22. On 21 September 2021 the Chair revoked the restriction order and removed redactions over Vincent Harvey's name in his witness statements.

23. Over the coming days and weeks I started to discover who the man who deceived me into a relationship really was. What I learnt shocked and horrified me and cast the evidence which Harvey had given in a different light.

24. From the redacted statement published by the Inquiry during the Phase 2 hearings, I had understood that following his SDS deployment Vincent Harvey had risen to the rank of Detective Chief Inspector in Special Branch and subsequently left the MPS to join another constabulary. His statement had also set out how he had been told that he would only be in "non-public facing roles" following his SDS deployment. Given that nothing in his redacted statement had indicated otherwise, I assumed that this was what had happened. I was also aware that Harvey had claimed in his first impact statement that he had "spent 30 years being careful about security which will all be blown away now if my real name were released."

25. I was extremely disturbed therefore to learn that contrary to these indications he had gone on to perform very senior and high profile roles within the police, and that his real name and image were in the public domain through multiple media appearances.

26. I was chilled to learn that he had been promoted to the rank of Superintendent in the police service, before becoming National Director of the National Criminal

Intelligence Service ('NCIS'), with the equivalent rank of a Commander. The NCIS targets serious organised crime. He had been responsible for investigating all sorts of dangerous criminals using his own name and publicly showing his face. Despite this he had claimed in his first impact statement that he required an anonymity order to protect him from the possibility of "hate mail and abuse" from left wing activists. I am aware that this is a standard concern relied upon by UCOs, and one which has been shown to have very little basis.

27. I was shocked to discover that while he had performed this role, the NCIS had responsibility for the Animal Rights National Index (a forerunner of another undercover policing unit, the National Public Order Intelligence Unit) and the National Domestic Extremism Database. I think it is imperative that he is required to provide evidence relating to this role in later tranches.

28. I felt physically sick when I learnt that he had led Operation Pragada, one of the MPS' highly publicised investigations into allegations of sexual abuse of children in the care of Lambeth Council, (which was examined and strongly criticised by the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse). I saw press articles where he was quoted; it turned my stomach. This was a man who had abused his position to have a sexual relationship with me even though he knew that I would not have agreed to have sex with him if I had known who he really was. And I wasn't the only one who was deceived in this way. I don't think he was a suitable person to lead this operation.

29. When I decided to wait to learn Vince Miller's real name in March 2021, I had not imagined for one second that someone who had risen to such a senior rank in the police (and who carried out a front-facing role and regularly appeared in the press) would have been granted a restriction order over their real name until after they gave evidence on privacy grounds. I had been of the belief that any such concerns would have been outweighed by the public interest in hearing from the former officer in their real identity.

30. It is my view that people rightly expect those running law enforcement institutions to be exemplary and want to know when they do not meet this standard. This is vital for public confidence. With hindsight I feel that Vincent Harvey's oral evidence should have been delayed until the risk of an adverse impact on a family

member had passed and if this was not possible the restriction order should have been revoked prior to the hearings.

31. Had Harvey's real identity been known at the time he gave evidence, this would have allowed for greater public scrutiny. The public learn about what is taking place in the Inquiry via the media and there was relatively little press coverage about 'Vince Miller'. Yesterday's news is today's chip wrapper, and the press are unlikely to re-visit an old story. However, had it been clear at the time that 'Vince Miller' was Vincent Harvey, former National Director of the NCIS and a highly public figure, who had engaged in sexual exploitation as a UCO, I believe there would have been significant press (and public) interest. The timing of the revocation of his restriction order meant that the public were deprived of the full significance of his evidence, and this doesn't seem appropriate to me.

Additional coverage may have even led to new witnesses (possibly including other women he deceived into relationships) coming forward to the Inquiry.

32. I now feel like I was emotionally manipulated by Vincent Harvey in his reliance on privacy concerns arising out of the potential adverse impact on a family member without corresponding honesty (at least in the material given to me) about how he had conducted his career.

33. As I explained above, I didn't believe there was any real risk to the immediate family member, but I weighed up my need to know Harvey's real name before he gave evidence, against the anxiety that this might cause to the family member at that time. On the basis of the information that I had at that time I was prepared to wait.

34. Had I had any idea in March 2021 of his subsequent career trajectory, this would have changed the outcome of the balancing exercise I undertook completely. It is my view that senior public figures, like Harvey, should be held to the highest standards. He should have had the courage to stand up and explain his actions in his real name and be questioned accordingly.

35. His disclosure about his later career also illustrated that some of the grounds he had originally relied on to justify protecting his privacy were demonstrably untrue. For example, his multiple public and press appearances, as not just a senior police officer but one who was involved in the intelligence services with a role in attempting to disrupt serious organised crime, showed that his claim

that he had spent the 30 years following his SDS deployment protecting his security was wrong. This is a matter relevant to the general credibility of his evidence.

36. I also now wonder whether there was any truth to his assertions about fears of his
immediate family members.

37. As explained above, discovering belatedly that Harvey was not only a police officer, but also a senior one engaged in the operations described above, has had a significant further adverse impact on me.

38. Following the end of the May hearings I sailed through summer thinking, "Thank God that's over!". Discovering Harvey's real identity last September took me back to how I felt when the Inquiry first knocked on my door in 2020. I felt unsafe, anxious and paranoid for a time. It cemented my understanding that I had absolutely no idea who he really was.

39. Even though I had seen him give evidence as a police officer, part of me had still found it difficult to dispel the idea that he had some sympathy with our ideals. Once I realised how high up in the police he had gone, I knew this was a delusion. It was clear that he was firmly entrenched and ideologically committed to the 'force.' I have found that hard to deal with.

40. In addition, I had wondered why no other former officers had given any evidence at all to the Inquiry about his relationships, even HN304 who was

otherwise quite candid. I now think it's likely that this was because of his seniority. If his real identity had been known at the time of the Phase 2 hearings, it would have been possible for my legal team to propose questions to the other officers to explore if his role and profile within the force was a reason for their apparent reluctance to remember and give evidence about his behaviour. It concerns me greatly that this opportunity was missed.

41. I worried that Harvey could still hold influence in the MPS and that my family and I might suffer police harassment. The stress I was experiencing manifested physically and, in October, an old back injury flared up which has been painful and debilitating, leaving me unable to fully participate in the Inquiry for a lengthy period.

42. As a woman deceived into a relationship, I have experienced the gravest violation of my privacy. In order for the Inquiry and the public to discover the truth about that violation, I had to stand up and recount details of my most intimate life to the Inquiry and the world. As a result of press coverage following my oral evidence, my son found out for the first time that my first marriage had been abusive. This discovery (on top of learning that I had been deceived into a relationship with a UCO) was very distressing for him and his distress impacted on me.

43. I have exposed myself to these further invasions of my privacy and engaged with openness and sincerity, on the basis that I am working with the Inquiry to discover the truth. The late discovery of the significance of Harvey's true identity

and seniority, which the Inquiry knew but I didn't, has left me feeling as if I was impeded in providing assistance to the best of my ability to the Inquiry. I also feel that the delay in revoking Vincent Harvey's restriction order until after he had given oral evidence, even though he is a senior public servant who has engaged in serious misconduct, has allowed him to hide from proper public scrutiny.

Report UCPI-0000013420

44. In my first witness statement I explained why I thought it was extremely unlikely that the 23 documents I received in my witness pack were the only documents related to my contact with Vincent Harvey held by the Inquiry. In particular, I expressed my deep concern that I had not been provided with any documents which covered the period of the relationship.

45. After submitting my first witness statement, I came across a report from Vincent Harvey [UCPI-0000013420] which I do consider shows that a different approach ought to be taken to assessing relevant documents for disclosure to witnesses, so as to avoid the Inquiry being deprived of important information.

46. [UCPI-0000013420] was disclosed in the Tranche 1 Phase 2 bundle but had not been provided to me in my witness pack. It is a report dated 25 of September 1979. It relates to a special Waltham Forest District meeting that took place in my home towards the end of the period of my relationship with

Harvey. At this time I generally attended most branch and district meetings, and certainly almost all of those that took place in my house.

47. Unfortunately, the report is one of many recording a fairly mundane meeting where nothing memorable took place, making it impossible for me to be absolutely certain I was there. It is extremely likely, however, that I would have been present given that it took place at my home. Notably I am not listed as an attendee.

48. I believe that Harvey purposefully omitted my name. This is important as it is likely to be early evidence of undercover officers who deceived women into relationships writing the affected women out of their reports. If I had been provided this document in my witness pack, I would have been able to evidence of the use of this tactic in my first statement. Harvey could also have been asked questions about this. Notably he has not volunteered this information himself or identified that this relates to a meeting at my address.

49. Much to my concern, the report detailed my full address at the time, potentially risking my anonymity order via the mosaic effect. Had the report been provided to me in my witness pack, I would have been able to ask the Inquiry to redact the address before the document was disclosed in the hearing bundle.

50. There were 65 reports disclosed in the T1P2 hearing bundle which were thought to have been authored by Vincent Harvey. I understand from the Designated Lawyers Opening Statement for T1P2 that there are a further 175

reports attributed to him by the Inquiry that have not been disclosed to non state core participants. It is possible that some of these 175 reports relate to other events that I attended with Harvey which the Inquiry has been unable to identify as relevant because he chose to omit my name from the list of attendees.

51. I am therefore concerned that the Inquiry's approach to disclosure to witnesses means it may be deprived of relevant information about the matters recorded (or omitted) from some of the documents it is considering, particularly in the case of women deceived into relationships. I believe that we should be provided with all reports thought to have been authored by the officer who deceived us into a relationship. This will both assist the Inquiry to meet its terms of reference and enable us to heal from the abuse that we have suffered.

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

Signed:  'Madeleine'

Date: 16 March 2021