

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY - TRANCHE 1

CLOSING STATEMENT BY DAVE MORRIS (CORE PARTICIPANT)

[10.2.2023]

A. Who I am

I have been involved since 1974 in a range of groups and campaigns trying to encourage people to support one another and to make the world a better place. Such groups include ones promoting libertarian socialist and anarchist politics, workplace solidarity, environmental campaigning (including London Greenpeace), opposition to corporate power and exploitation (including being one of the two defendants in the 'McLibel' case), and involvement in community groups promoting local mutual aid and self-organisation speaking up for their needs as local residents. I am currently Secretary of the Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, and Chair of the National Federation of Parks and Green Spaces.

The essence of my personal motivation and political beliefs has remained constant throughout the last 50 years or so – the desire to tackle injustice, to seek improvements in society in the public interest, and to encourage and empower people to have as much control over their lives as possible.

B. Other Statements I rely on

I welcome and am guided by the General Statement of 90 CPs, from Sept 24th 2020 [See Appendix 1, below.]

See my previous Opening Statements for more detail, especially about my own experiences. [See Appendices 2-4]. I have incorporated or referenced a few of their key points.

I welcome the Closing Statement of Kirsten Heaven on behalf of all the co-operating CPs, and our other lawyers' Closing Statements. They of course include a wealth of detail of the range of undercover operations, the tactics employed, the unlawful and unacceptable tactics employed, and the impacts on so many groups and individuals.

In this Statement I will outline:

- How the Undercover Policing operations became a major scandal, now recognised at every level
- What kind of activities, campaigns and movements I have been involved in and why
- How I was targeted
- What everyone has learned so far
- What remains to be uncovered, learned and achieved
- Some important recommendations by Core Participants.

C. How did the Undercover Policing operations become a major scandal, as now recognised at every level?

Research, exposure and publicity

Credit is due to all the victims and campaigners who have spoken out, and to all Core Participants (CPs) who've worked together for many years, supported each other and exposed the truth. This includes our coordinated campaigning - through, for example, the Campaign Opposing Police Surveillance, Police Spies Out of Lives, the Blacklist Support Group, The Monitoring Group of family justice and anti-racism campaigners, the Network for Police Monitoring, and the Undercover Research Group. We thank the UNITE Union and the 200 trades union branches who have affiliated to the campaign, and the Lush company, who have also actively backed the campaigning.

Everyone involved with this Inquiry must give special credit to the women shockingly targeted by Undercover Police Officers (UCOs) for sexual relationships. They were the first to investigate and eventually uncover and expose the extent of deception and depths of abuse the undercover units were prepared to employ. I strongly recommend everyone to read the book written and published last year by a group of such women: 'Deep Deception' – it is vital and damning evidence for the Inquiry.

These efforts should not be underestimated. The long and often opaque Inquiry has been exhausting and frustrating for CPs, and many have fallen along the way (eg due to age, illness, or not being properly engaged and listened to, finding the history too personal or unsavoury to engage with, or just being fed up with the time it is all taking and so have moved on). They have fallen away without yet getting the truth and justice they deserve. Justice delayed is justice denied, including for the millions of members and supporters of targeted organisations, campaigns and movements who are also entitled to know the full truth, and to be confident that such secret political policing will never be tolerated again.

The lawyers acting on our behalf have eloquently and persuasively summed up the evidence obtained and the legal implications.

I'd like to thank the investigative journalists who have published in-depth articles and books.

And finally I'd like to credit the Met Police whistleblower, Peter Francis (a former Undercover Officer) who helped expose the reality of what his secret unit was really up to, including the infiltration of the Stephen Lawrence family justice campaign. Any UCOs or members of M15 who wish to turn whistleblower and tell the full truth are welcome to contact me or any of the CPs' lawyers in confidence anytime – it will be much appreciated.

There have been a number of legal and official milestones which have formally recognised the depth and scale of the undercover policing scandal, slammed the SDS, and called for action.

These milestones include:

- The Ellison Review in 2013 into the 'seriously flawed' police investigation into the murder of Stephen Lawrence. The Review made a range of devastating findings against the Met, and the shocking role of the SDS in targeting the Lawrence family campaign.

- Theresa May's statement to Parliament on 6th March 2014, saying she was 'profoundly shocked' by some of the Ellison Review revelations about the Met and the SDS, and that therefore she was initiating this Public Inquiry and calling for a 'change in culture' in the police.
- The Metropolitan Police's 2015 apology and payment of compensation to 7 women targeted for fraudulent sexual relationships by SDS officers
- The Investigative Powers Tribunal's powerful legal judgment in favour of Kate Wilson and against the Metropolitan Police spying operations, ruling that the undercover policing units did not meet a pressing social need and were not necessary in a democratic society.

The conclusion last month of this Inquiry's legal team is therefore to be welcomed. Their view is that the Metropolitan Police and Government had failed in the 1970s, despite many opportunities to do so, to consider the legality and justification of the SDS activities, and that if they had done so they would have been likely to conclude it should have been closed down.

The rights and laws breached by the SDS are not just ordinary lawful rights - they are specially protected rights enshrined in law and international Human Rights Charters (eg privacy, need for warrants to enter homes, right to trade union activity, rights of assembly and freedom of speech). This is precisely because Governments and other powerful interests will otherwise constantly seek to extend and abuse their powers against the public. The police therefore have a responsibility to resist Government pressure to attack such fundamental rights, ie a responsibility to defend those rights, and to not undermine them and those who exercise them.

D. What kind of activities, campaigns and movements have I been involved in and why?

The various groups I have been involved in over the decades have been open and democratically or collectively-run, and engaged in the kind of public activities which the public are invited to join in or to replicate for themselves, and which are essential if humanity is to progress and survive.

Such groups, as we all should, question and challenge those institutions which wield power over people's lives, and control the world's resources and decision-making. These include Governments, transnational corporations, military organisations, and financial institutions. Such powerful institutions are generally tightly controlled by a small self-serving elite, continually obsessed with power and profit, and are ruthless and unaccountable. In fact, as I outlined in more detail in my April 2021 statement [Appendix 3, paras 34-38], they are subversive of society and people's real needs – they are the real subversives that need to be investigated. Indeed they are also the inevitable cause of most of what the SDS would define as 'public disorder' in response to unfairness and injustice.

Unsurprisingly such powerful institutions have made a shocking mess of the world for centuries - causing mass hardship and poverty; disempowerment, discrimination and oppression; exploitation of workers and resources; horrific wars; and large scale environmental destruction. They have brought humanity to the brink of nuclear annihilation, and have been systematically exploiting and destroying the natural environment upon which human society depends for our survival – as a result our species now faces a catastrophic and possibly terminal future.

Many of the groups I have been involved with have come to the conclusion that the evidence of history demonstrates that such powerful institutions can't be successfully reformed and turned into benevolent, useful public bodies. However history also demonstrates that grassroots movements for change, if large enough and determined enough, can shift the balance of power and win concessions and victories for the public along the way.

The groups I have been involved in have tried their best to support efforts to build 'single issue' and other campaigns and movements to improve things in the here and now. Some of those groups logically also call for the hierarchical and authoritarian institutions which are causing the shocking problems humanity unfortunately has to face, to be transformed or replaced in the long term by a genuinely democratic way of running society. One in which people all over the world collectively manage their own neighbourhoods, workplaces and lives, and ensure that all the resources are shared fairly and all decision-making is for the public good.

In fact most of the groups, organisations and movements targeted by undercover units over decades share some or most of the aforementioned and wholly legitimate characteristics and beliefs (basically challenging the oppressive and unfair status quo in order to improve things for all), which is why they were targeted.

E. How was I targeted?

I was targeted from the mid-1970s for at least 30 years, and probably much longer – for my political, social and environmental activism.

As we have heard, in the 1970s Anarchy Magazine - a theoretical periodical produced by collective meetings openly advertised - was infiltrated by 'Graham Coates', who fraudulently 'befriended' and latched on to me in particular. [See Appendix 3, paras 24-30].

I was also involved, as a post office worker active in my Union, in the London Workers Group. It held fortnightly openly-advertised meetings to discuss key issues facing workers, and to encourage workplace solidarity and opposition to exploitation by employers. The group was infiltrated and the spy volunteered to become the treasurer of the group. [See Appendix 4, paras 11-12].

In the next Tranche of evidence in the Inquiry we will hear about how - at the end of the 1970s and start of the 1980s - the SDS targeted the large UK-wide grassroots movement (of which it was noted I was part) challenging Government policy promoting the growth of nuclear power plants and the transport and dumping of dangerous radioactive waste. [See Appendix 4, paras 13-14]. Not long afterwards an accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in Ukraine caused an estimated 9-16,000 deaths across Europe, including in the UK.

I later got involved with London Greenpeace, a small but influential environmental group, who had been very active in the anti-nuclear movement. In Tranche 2 we will hear how 3 undercover police infiltrated the group over a 10 year period. One of them, Bob Lambert, helped write the group's 'What's Wrong With McDonald's?' factsheet which became the subject of the longest and one of the most controversial trials in English legal history (in which myself and my colleague Helen Steel defended ourselves). Bob Lambert had a number of sexual relationships with women activists to boost his information-gathering, and even fathered a child before abandoning him and his mother. He also, it was later alleged in Parliament, acted as an agent-

provocateur to get others arrested and jailed. What was the SDS's reaction to all these disgusting misdeeds? He was promoted to the head of the Unit. [It should be noted that after myself and Helen tracked him down and confronted him over 20 years later, he was interviewed on Channel 4 TV and had to no option but to apologise for his 'behaviour'].

We will also hear in Tranche 2 how the next police spy to infiltrate London Greenpeace, John Dines, engineered a long fraudulent relationship with Helen Steel while she was preparing for the legal battle with McDonald's. His sudden disappearance faking a mental breakdown caused her intense stress for over 20 years. During the SDS's infiltration of the group, McDonald's also sent in infiltrators. During the McLibel trial we were able to expose collaboration between the police and McDonald's. In 1999 we sued the Met Police – they were forced to issue an apology and to write to all officers in London to tell them not to pass on information to third parties.

I look forward to Tranche 2 and the rest of the Inquiry, but for now I will mainly focus on what fundamental things we've learned so far.

F. What have we all learned?

- i. The Undercover policing units were a secret, wholly unjustifiable and illegal operation from the beginning and throughout their existence.
- ii. They were a colossal waste of time and public resources. The evidence of UCO 'Graham Coates' who targeted me, is significant. For 3 years he targeted first the International Socialists and then anarchist groups. In his Statement he concluded: *'The anarchists I reported on posed a minimal challenge to public order.'* *'I do not think either IS [the International Socialists] or the anarchist movement was subversive in terms of their actions.'* *'I do not believe any info I provided... was particularly significant. I do not think it would have made any difference to public order if I had not worked for the SDS'. ...*
- iii. The SDS were funded, backed, praised and covered up at the highest level of Government and Police throughout their existence.
- iv. They targeted at least 1,000 groups - almost exclusively left-wing and campaigning groups and movements which were challenging the policies and practices of the Government, capitalism and the Police. These movements were (and still are) representing the hopes and wishes of millions of people.
- v. The SDS deliberately targeted mainly those in those movements who were (generally voluntarily and in their own time) the most committed, most determined, most clear sighted on how to reach the agreed goals of such movements. These principled, dedicated and generally selfless people were then insultingly and wrongly categorised as so-called 'extremists' and 'subversives' and somehow less than human for actively caring about and supporting people's real needs, questioning and challenging the powerful, and actively seeking a better society for all.

- vi. Unacceptable, disgusting, and illegal tactics were systematically employed on an industrial scale for decades eg the adoption and abuse of the identities of deceased children, the entry into people's homes without warrants, the invasion of people's private lives, the abuse of women as sexual targets (one victim describing what happened to her as 'being raped by the State'), mass surveillance and 'hoovering up' of private info to be passed on to 'customers' for their use and abuse (including illegal blacklisting of active trades unionists and activists on a mass scale)..
- vii. The phone hacking scandal rightly caused public outrage and calls for action (including prosecutions, jailings and the closure of the News of the World). But the SDS behaviour was 1,000 times worse than phone-hacking a few messages – this was LIFE-hacking often for years.
- viii. The Police never considered the welfare (as well as the Human and Legal Rights) of those members of the public they targeted. Surely any normal human being would do so? Surely as public servants and in a position of power they had a duty of care whilst invading and influencing people's lives? After 8 years of the Inquiry, many thousands of people in groups targeted (whether those groups have already been revealed or so far are still concealed) remain in the dark about who spied on them, what information was collected and what was done with it. They are understandably angry, as well as being confused and suspicious about which individuals from their past may have been police spies, and events from their life which may have been secretly invaded and manipulated by State agents cynically masquerading as their friends and colleagues. This delay is unacceptable, and we need the full truth.
- ix. In contrast the Public Inquiry, at the behest of the police, is strongly applying privacy and Human Rights concerns to protect the identity and welfare of UCOs. This sudden police conversion to such rights not previously of any concern of their secret units during their operations is surely staggering hypocrisy. It would be seen as ironic if it wasn't so serious. Many might think that those who secretly invaded and abused people's lives should have vacated their own privacy rights. Furthermore in most core participants' opinion, the 'privacy' strategy of the police during this Inquiry is the key cause of its massive logistical problems, costs and delays.
- x. The public might expect that the Inquiry's determination to invoke Human Rights laws to protect the privacy of former undercover spies despite their abuses of the law, might be applied a hundred times more strongly when protecting the rights of those victims who were seeking a better society and who were thereby secretly targeted, lied to, abused, manipulated, and reported on to the secret services and other 'customers'.
- xi. It is pretty clear that from the beginning and throughout the life of the SDS they were dominated by the needs and obsessions of the shadowy Security Services (MI5 etc) – almost all UCO reports seem to have been sent to 'Box 500', ie the Security Services.

- xii. Fascist organisations were not targeted by the SDS despite the recognition that they were likely to be violent, their predilection for crime and their promotion of hate speech – not to mention their organising to impose by force a fascist state on society. These were exactly the sorts of things the SDS were claiming they were supposed to exist for.
- xiii. Why did the SDS do what they did and how did they get away with it? Because they COULD. It seems the old adage is true - power corrupts, and absolute (secret) power corrupts absolutely.
- xiv. To the Met Police's current scandal over its pervasive and toxic sexism (as recognised by its current Chief Commissioner), can be added previous Inquiries' findings against them of institutional racism, and institutional corruption. The SDS has demonstrated that such entrenched problems in policing 'culture' go back a long way. We believe that the undercover policing practices, sanctioned at the highest levels, also demonstrate a clear anti-democratic bias and culture.
- xv. Not only did the SDS turn their eyes away from fascist movements and their violence and subversion, they and the Security Services also ignored the systematic and daily mass capitalist violence against the public, its often illegitimacy/illegality and its subversion of society. This includes daily industrial scale breaches of health and safety and workers' rights' at work; landlords' illegalities and intimidation of tenants; the subversion of society and even of The State by the practices of particular industries and their propaganda forced on the public (for example fossil fuels, tobacco, junk food corporations, construction companies, tax havens and tax avoidance, and so on). Why weren't the SDS and SYS targeting employers and landlords' organisations, corporations and financial institutions? In fact, by targeting the left, trades union activists and progressive campaigns, they were in effect actively protecting capitalist wrongdoing.
- xvi. The campaigning causes SDS targeted are generally on the right side of history, and in many cases successfully so. Countering apartheid, racism, sexism, for women's equality, for trade union rights and adequate pay, against blacklisting, to protect the environment, for animal welfare, for equal rights for lesbians and gay men, to hold the police accountable etc – all those are now enshrined in law and/or mainstream opinion. Those campaigns, and those who were pushing hardest for them, should have been enthusiastically supported by all public bodies (including the police), not targeted and undermined.

It should be recognised that history vindicates progressive campaigns and movements, despite them being attacked and undermined at the time as 'extremist' and 'subversive'. For example movements against slavery, for trade union rights (trades unionists were once forcibly deported to Australia), for working class people to be allowed to vote (the Chartists in the 19th Century), for votes for women (Suffragettes in the 20th Century), and 20th century movements opposing imperialism and colonisation of all the now-independent countries (eg throughout Africa, Asia and South America).

G. What do we have still to learn?

We look forward to seeing and hearing the evidence relevant to Tranche 2 and the other Tranches – the documents and hearings. This will be accompanied by the evidence provided by those we know were targeted - CPs and others.

We are still calling for substantial disclosure – the UCO cover names, their photos, the names of all 1000 groups reported on, the files held on these groups and their members targeted. This is crucial so that the people (CPs, members of targeted groups, the wider public etc) can get the info they are entitled to, the 'closure' they need, the full understanding of the extent and impact of the scandalous operations, and an opportunity to respond.

H. Recommendations for action

In conclusion, the Inquiry is called upon to support the recommendations of the People's Inquiry organised by non-State CPs in July 2018 in Conway Hall, London – as reaffirmed in the Joint Statement by 90 Core Participants in November 2020. [See the end of Appendix 1 below]

In summary, what is needed is:

- Full disclosure of the names of all the spies, all the organisations they targeted or reported on, and the files on individuals and groups which were compiled by these units and related bodies.
- A finding of institutional sexism, racism, and an anti-working class, anti-democratic agenda in the police - and a requirement to address it effectively
- A recommendation that undercover or secret political policing of progressive protest and campaigning groups (including by Special Branch and the Security Services) ceases and all such existing specialist units are disbanded.

Many are also calling for an apology from the Government, and appropriate compensation to those most affected by the targeting operations.

* * * * *

APPENDIX 1

Undercover Policing - A General Statement

September 24th 2020

Supported by the undersigned 90 Core Participants in the Undercover Policing Inquiry

1. In 1968, following huge demonstrations in London's Grosvenor Square (and around the world) against the widely-condemned Vietnam War, British police set up a Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) to monitor and undermine such street protests. Since that time, over 1,000 groups campaigning in the UK for a better society and better world have been systematically spied upon, infiltrated or otherwise targeted by secret and unaccountable political police units.
2. This targeting has included over 140 highly paid police spies living long term as 'activists' engaging in the everyday activities of groups and campaigns for equality and justice, for environmental protection, for community and trade union empowerment, and for international solidarity; for rights for women, black and ethnic minorities, workers, LGBTQ people, and for animals; and also targeting those campaigning against war, racism, sexism, corporate power, legal repression, and police oppression and brutality. Such groups and movements have comprised many millions of people throughout the UK who want to make the world better, fairer and more sustainable for everyone. Thanks to their efforts, many of the ideas spread by such groups have now become mainstream opinion and some campaigns and rights sought eventually resulted in legal and other formal recognition by society.
3. Yet it appears that almost any group that stood up to make a positive difference in questioning or challenging the establishment has been or could have potentially been considered a legitimate target by the UK's secret political policing units. Any claims that the UK police are a non-political institution are therefore clearly incorrect.
4. These secret policing activities went far beyond investigating what was said in meetings. Individuals within or associated with those campaign groups - most of which had an open membership and active involvement based on trust and co-operation - were subjected to intrusions into their personal lives. Thousands of fake 'friendships' were developed, exploited and abused by secret police who continuously lied for their own political ends. Many people, especially women, were deceived into intimate and abusive relationships. Children have been fathered then abandoned, and the identities of deceased children stolen to provide 'cover' names. Police spies took part in and actively influenced groups and activities, and there have been very many arrests and victims of miscarriages of justice as a result. Family campaigns, people seeking justice for loved ones killed by police, were deliberately undermined by these units.
5. To bug a phone is recognised as a controversial breach of someone's human rights and so police have to apply for a warrant. We're generally opposed to that and note the public

outrage over the phone hacking scandal a few years ago. However, to hack people's LIVES is infinitely worse and should be totally unacceptable to everyone.

6. Much of the State response to public anger over these tactics has been to present the spying and the abuses that came with it as an aberration, a mistake, or the fault of rogue officers. We disagree. Based on the evidence, this spying was established and conducted with the full sanction of the State and supported by its apparatus and taxpayer funding. As stated by one of the women deceived into a relationship with a police spy, it was not just a single undercover policeman in her bed but also all those who put the officer in the field and supported them there.
7. No decision about all this was taken in isolation. The Government, senior managers and the handlers may have tried to turn a blind eye to the abuses, or deemed them politically 'necessary', but the reality is they were complicit in all of it. They readily accepted the 'intelligence' provided, they funded, tasked and oversaw the spycops units, and they set the agenda and ethos according to which these units operated.
8. This had nothing to do with responding to genuine public concern over any real and imminent serious violent threats to public safety and lives. The groups represented in this Inquiry were not terrorist organisations, but were groups pushing for positive social change in an overwhelmingly public and open way. By targeting these groups the police were demonstrating unacceptable and ongoing institutional discrimination, racism, sexism and anti-democratic action, including industrial-scale breaches of laws and charters that protect basic human rights and the right to protest.
9. Over 100 of the Inquiry's Core Participants summed up the problem here in a previous Collective Statement on 17th October 2017: *'For us, this Inquiry is about political policing to undermine groups and organisations campaigning for a better society and world.'*
10. This police bias was clearly sanctioned at the highest level. We know of no effort to show 'balance' by police infiltration or secret targeting of powerful establishment bodies to investigate their crimes and threats to social peace and society. Such organisations not targeted include greedy and unethical financial corporations, tax-avoiding hedge funds, military elites and their development of weapons of mass destruction, and power-mad establishment political parties. This is despite their continuous and widespread promotion of systematic institutional violence (such as wars, poverty, exploitation of workers, colonialism and environmental destruction) and discrimination on the grounds of race, sex and class, reinforced by Public Relations and manipulation of society for these institutions' own power and profit.
11. Following the exposure of this undercover policing scandal in 2010, it took five years of investigation, publicity and campaigning by victims and survivors of police infiltration, reinforced by police whistleblowers, for the Government to decide to act. Even then it took the shocking revelations that the family and surviving victim and close friend of murdered black teenager Stephen Lawrence had themselves been targeted by undercover policing.
12. In July 2015 following widespread public outrage, the then Home Secretary Theresa May tasked the current Undercover Policing Public Inquiry with getting to the truth about this

scandal and who authorised it, and recommending action to prevent future police wrongdoing.

13. Since then we have had to suffer five more years of police delays and obstruction. These tactics have resulted in a refusal to release most of the names of the 1,000 organisations spied and reported on, refusal to release the names and photos of most of the police spies, and refusal to release most of the relevant documentation generated by political policing units. Throughout these five years we and other core participants, despite an imbalance in resources and almost zero access to the documentation held by the police for decades, have worked hard to get the information and justice that we and the wider public are entitled to. We have worked hard and remain determined to bring the whole murky secret political policing operation and its unethical, unacceptable practices into the public spotlight where it belongs.
14. This is supposed to be a public inquiry, but it seems more like a police damage-limitation exercise or cover up. The hearings are not yet publicly-accessible and nor will they be live-streamed, which is the only way to ensure that the millions of members and supporters of the targeted groups and movements have the opportunity to follow the proceedings as they happen.
15. We call for the Inquiry to recommend that police units targeting campaigners seeking a better society should never have been set up, and should be disbanded in their entirety. We call for full transparency, and release of all the names of the groups targeted, all the names of the police spies, and the full political files police have amassed on such campaign groups. Only in a spirit of openness and transparency can the grievous police crimes of the past be acknowledged, those responsible at all levels be held accountable, and the many victims start to move forward with the answers they have consistently called for - and are entitled to.
16. When the SDS was formed they aimed to undermine the movements they were spying on. But despite the disgusting police tactics employed, movements for positive change to benefit the public good are still here and growing, and have had many successes on the way. Such movements are needed more than ever in order to address the cumulative and deepening crises into which humanity is being plunged by the current system and its policies. A better world is possible and its up to all of us, whoever we are, to ensure support for - and not the undermining of - such movements for positive change.

We endorse the 13 Recommendations discussed and agreed at the Peoples Public Inquiry into Secret Political Policing, Conway Hall, London July 2018:

1. Full disclosure of all names – both cover and real – of officers from the disgraced political police units, accompanied by contemporaneous photographs
2. Release of the names of all groups suspected to have been spied upon
3. Release of all the police's personal files on activists
4. Extension of the inquiry to all countries where the British spycops are known to have operated

5. The appointment of a diverse panel with experience relevant to victims to assist the chair in making decisions and judgements
6. Inclusion of children and young people who had contact with spycops as Core Participants in the Inquiry
7. Urgent and immediate review of convictions where spycops had involvement in the cases and who misled courts – 50 wrongful convictions have already been overturned and this is likely to be a fraction of the true total.
8. The Inquiry must extend its scope to understand political policing and its impact on democracy. This must include a thorough investigation into racist, sexist, anti-working class, anti-democratic behaviour on behalf of the spycops and those that instructed them to operate in this manner. Such political policing and political policing units must be abolished.
9. An urgent review into all undercover police activities to investigate whether the bad practice exposed by this inquiry has been extended to other areas of undercover operations
10. Make available the necessary resources of the judge to be able to do their job in the available time
11. Equalising of resources, the police are spending millions on stonewalling the inquiry, victims have almost nothing.
12. Increase the severity of penalties for [police] non-compliance with the inquiry
13. Investigation into collusion between police and corporate spies

Statement above supported [as of 12th November 2020] by the following 90 Non-State Core Participants in the Undercover Policing Inquiry:

Dave Morris; Dr Donal O'Driscoll; The Hon. Zoe Young BSc MSc MFA; Martyn Lowe; 'Lindsey'; Danny Chivers; Paul Gravett; Juliet McBride; Matt Salusbury; 'VSP'; 'Jessica'; Robert Banbury; Ceri Gibbons; 'Sara'; Asa Winstanley; Atif Choudhury; 'MCD'; 'Jane'; Kate Wilson; Claire Hildreth; Cllr Shane Collins; Lois Austin; Jason Kirkpatrick; Grainne Gannon; Ben Leamy (aka 'Mark Morgan'); Chris Dutton; Emily Apple; Olaf Bayer; Guy Taylor; Debbie Vincent; Alice Cutler; Albert Beale; Donna McLean; Nicola Bengel on behalf of Rhythms of Resistance; Nicola Bengel; 'Naomi'; Kirsty Wright; Trevor Houghton; Simon Taylor; Brian Healy; Robin Lane; Michael Zeitlin; Michael Zeitlin on behalf of Advisory Service for Squatters; 'Monica'; Professor Jonathan Rosenhead; Hunt Saboteurs Association; Merrick Cork; Sarah Shoraka; Leila Deen; Tom Fowler; Dr Harry Halpin; Kristina Goodwin-Jones; Professor Simon Lewis; Paul Morozzo; Ben Stewart; Professor Paul Chatterton; Spencer Cooke; 'Lisa'; Frank Bennett; Nagakusala Dharmacharin (aka William Frugal); John Jordan; Mel Evans; Indra Donfrancesco; Reverend Dr Michael Carroll; Dan Glass; David Kaplowitz; 'AN'; Terence Evans; Patrick Gillett; Blacklist Support Group; Gabrielle Bosley; Alice Jelinek; 'Jenny'; Jane Laporte; London Animal Action; London Greenpeace; Martin Shaw; Ken Livingstone; Frank Smith; Tomas Remiarz; Claire Fauset; Gerrah Selby; Robbin Gillett; Dave Nellist; Dave Smith; Carolyn Wilson; Norman Blair; Piers Corbyn; Jim Paton; Megan Donfrancesco Reddy; Ippy Gray;

APPENDIX 2

November 8th 2020.

UCPI Opening Statement – updated version with added notes/references *[Original text of the paragraphs unchanged]*

by Dave Morris, McLibel Support Campaign

1. I have been involved since 1974 in a range of groups and campaigns trying to encourage people to support one another and to make the world a better place. Such groups include ones promoting libertarian socialist politics **[Note 1 below]**, workplace solidarity **[Note 2]**, claimants rights, environmental campaigning (including London Greenpeace), opposition to corporate power and exploitation (including being one of the two defendants in the 'McLibel' case), the anti-poll tax movement, and groups promoting community mutual aid and self-organisation to encourage people to speak up for their needs as local residents and the needs of their own local neighbourhoods. I am currently Secretary of the Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, and Chair of the National Federation of Parks and Green Spaces.

London Greenpeace and the McLibel campaign, and the subversion of civil rights

2. Both London Greenpeace and the McLibel Support Campaign were infiltrated by Undercover Officers (UCOs), one of whom - Bob Lambert - contributed significantly to the anti-McDonald's leaflet and campaign which McDonald's sued over. In addition there was infiltration from 1989-1991 by at least 7 spies hired by the McDonald's Corporation, one of whom had a 6 month sexual relationship with someone in the group.[See Judgment of Justice Bell, 1997]. Please see the detailed Opening Statement of my McLibel co-defendant Helen Steel, which I support and do not need to repeat here.
3. In summary, the McLibel case ran from 1990-2005, encompassing the longest trial in English legal history **[Note 3]**. We were denied Legal Aid and Jury trial. However, as a result of our efforts as Litigants In Person, the High Court and then Court of Appeal ruled that McDonald's 'exploited children' with their advertising, produced 'misleading' advertising, that McDonald's regular customers faced an increased risk of heart disease, that McDonald's were 'culpably responsible' for

cruelty to animals, were 'antipathetic' to unionisation and it was fair comment to say McDonald's workers suffered poor pay and conditions.

4. It emerged during the McLibel trial that police officers (including Special Branch) had passed private and in some cases false information about us (and other protestors), including home addresses, to McDonald's. Sid Nicholson, McDonald's Head of Security and a former Met Chief Superintendent, had stated from the witness box that McDonald's security department were 'all ex-policemen' and if he ever wanted to know information about protestors he would go to his contacts in the police (day 249 of the trial, transcripts p38). No doubt the Inquiry will want to get to the bottom of the full level of this collusion. Helen and I sued the Metropolitan Police for passing on personal information about us to McDonald's. In July 2000 we received £10,000 compensation, and a Consent Order in which the police committed 'to bring this settlement to the attention of the 3 Area Commanders of the Metropolitan Police Force and ask them to remind their officers of their responsibility not to disclose information on the Police National Computer to a third party.'
5. In 2005, the European Court of Human Rights ruled in our favour [Steel & Morris vs UK] that there had been violations of the Convention's Article 6 (right to a fair hearing) and Article 10 (freedom of expression). Despite the damning rulings against McDonald's, it seems that no police investigation (undercover or otherwise) or legal action was ever taken against them as a result. It is shocking that the police were instead targeting those exposing the truth about powerful, greedy and unethical corporations. **[Note 4]**

The background / context [Note 5]

6. In 1968, following huge demonstrations in London's Grosvenor Square (and around the world) against the widely-condemned Vietnam War, British police set up a Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) to monitor and undermine such street protests. **[Note 6]**. Since that time, over 1,000 groups campaigning in the UK for a better society and better world have been systematically spied upon, infiltrated or otherwise targeted by secret and unaccountable political police units.
7. This targeting has included over 140 highly paid police spies living long term as 'activists' engaging in the everyday activities of groups and campaigns for equality and justice, for environmental protection, for community and trade union empowerment, and for international solidarity; for rights for women, black and ethnic minorities, workers, LGBTQ people, and for animals; and also targeting those campaigning against war, racism, sexism, corporate power, legal repression, and police oppression and brutality. Such groups and movements

have comprised many millions of people throughout the UK who want to make the world better, fairer and more sustainable for everyone. Thanks to their efforts, many of the ideas spread by such groups have now become mainstream opinion and some campaigns and rights sought eventually resulted in legal and other formal recognition by society.

8. Yet it appears that almost any group that stood up to make a positive difference in questioning or challenging the establishment has been or could have potentially been considered a legitimate target by the UK's secret political policing units. Any claims that the UK police are a non-political institution are therefore clearly incorrect. **[Note 7]**
9. These secret policing activities went far beyond investigating what was said in meetings. Individuals within or associated with those campaign groups - most of which had an open membership and active involvement based on trust and co-operation - were subjected to intrusions into their personal lives. Thousands of fake 'friendships' were developed, exploited and abused by secret police who continuously lied for their own political ends. Many people, especially women, were deceived into intimate and abusive relationships. Children have been fathered then abandoned, and the identities of deceased children stolen to provide 'cover' names. Police spies took part in and actively influenced groups and activities, and there have been very many arrests and victims of miscarriages of justice as a result. Family campaigns, people seeking justice for loved ones killed by police, were deliberately undermined by these units.
10. To bug a phone is recognised as a controversial breach of someone's human rights and so police have to apply for a warrant. We're generally opposed to that and note the public outrage over the phone hacking scandal a few years ago. However, to hack people's LIVES is infinitely worse and should be totally unacceptable to everyone.
11. Much of the State response to public anger over these tactics has been to present the spying and the abuses that came with it as an aberration, a mistake, or the fault of rogue officers. We disagree. Based on the evidence, this spying was established and conducted with the full sanction of the State and supported by its apparatus and taxpayer funding. As stated by one of the women deceived into a relationship with a police spy, it was not just a single undercover policeman in her bed but also all those who put the officer in the field and supported them there.
12. No decision about all this was taken in isolation. The Government, senior managers and the handlers may have tried to turn a blind eye to the abuses, or deemed them politically 'necessary', but the reality is they were complicit in all of

it. They readily accepted the 'intelligence' provided, they funded, tasked and oversaw the spycops units, and they set the agenda and ethos according to which these units operated.

13. This had nothing to do with responding to genuine public concern over any real and imminent serious violent threats to public safety and lives. The groups represented in this Inquiry were not terrorist organisations, but were groups pushing for positive social change in an overwhelmingly public and open way. By targeting these groups the police were demonstrating unacceptable and ongoing institutional discrimination, racism, sexism and anti-democratic action, including industrial-scale breaches of laws and charters that protect basic human rights and the right to protest. **[Note 8]**
14. Over 100 of the Inquiry's Core Participants summed up the problem here in a previous Collective Statement on 17th October 2017: *'For us, this Inquiry is about political policing to undermine groups and organisations campaigning for a better society and world.'*
15. This police bias was clearly sanctioned at the highest level. We know of no effort to show 'balance' by police infiltration or secret targeting of powerful establishment bodies to investigate their crimes and threats to social peace and society. Such organisations not targeted include greedy and unethical financial corporations, tax-avoiding hedge funds, military elites and their development of weapons of mass destruction, and power-mad establishment political parties. This is despite their continuous and widespread promotion of systematic institutional violence (such as wars, poverty, exploitation of workers, colonialism and environmental destruction) and discrimination on the grounds of race, sex and class, reinforced by Public Relations and manipulation of society for these institutions' own power and profit. **[Note 9]**
16. Following the exposure of this undercover policing scandal in 2010, it took five years of investigation, publicity and campaigning by victims and survivors of police infiltration, reinforced by police whistleblowers, for the Government to decide to act. Even then it took the shocking revelations that the family and surviving victim and close friend of murdered black teenager Stephen Lawrence had themselves been targeted by undercover policing.
17. In July 2015 following widespread public outrage, the then Home Secretary Theresa May tasked the current Undercover Policing Public Inquiry with getting to the truth about this scandal and who authorised it, and recommending action to prevent future police wrong-doing.
18. Since then we have had to suffer five more years of police delays and obstruction. These tactics have resulted in a refusal to release most of the names

of the 1,000 organisations spied and reported on, refusal to release the names and photos of most of the police spies, and refusal to release most of the relevant documentation generated by political policing units. Throughout these five years we and other core participants, despite an imbalance in resources and almost zero access to the documentation held by the police for decades, have worked hard to get the information and justice that we and the wider public are entitled to. We have worked hard and remain determined to bring the whole murky secret political policing operation and its unethical, unacceptable practices into the public spotlight where it belongs.

19. This is supposed to be a public inquiry, but it seems more like a police damage-limitation exercise or cover up. The hearings are not yet publicly-accessible and nor will they be live-streamed, which is the only way to ensure that the millions of members and supporters of the targeted groups and movements have the opportunity to follow the proceedings as they happen.
20. We call for the Inquiry to recommend that police units targeting campaigners seeking a better society should never have been set up, and should be disbanded in their entirety. **[Note 10]**. We call for full transparency, and release of all the names of the groups targeted, all the names of the police spies, and the full political files police have amassed on such campaign groups. Only in a spirit of openness and transparency can the grievous police crimes of the past be acknowledged, those responsible at all levels be held accountable, and the many victims start to move forward with the answers they have consistently called for - and are entitled to.
21. When the SDS was formed they aimed to undermine the movements they were spying on. But despite the disgusting police tactics employed, movements for positive change to benefit the public good are still here and growing, and have had many successes on the way. Such movements are needed more than ever in order to address the cumulative and deepening crises into which humanity is being plunged by the current system and its policies. A better world is possible and its up to all of us, whoever we are, to ensure support for - and not the undermining of - such movements for positive change.

What is needed

22. In conclusion, I support the recommendations taken from the People's Inquiry organised by NSCPs in July 2018 in Conway Hall, London. **[Note 11]**. **[Note 12]**. These include (in summary):

- Full disclosure of the names of the spies, the organisations they targeted and the files compiled by political policing units

- A finding of institutional sexism, racism, and an anti-working class, anti-democratic agenda in the police - and a requirement to address it effectively
- A recommendation that undercover political policing of protest and campaigning groups ceases and all such existing units are disbanded.

* * * * *

Dave Morris's added notes/references

[Note 1] Libertarian socialism is synonymous with 'anarchism'. Eg Google 'OED anarchism' for an accurate definition: *'Being the abolition of all government and the organisation of society on a voluntary, cooperative basis without the recourse to force or compulsion'*. This fairly accurately describes my guiding ethical framework.

[Note 2] I was at one time a Branch Secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers. I was later found to have been illegally added to the Consulting Association blacklist (green section).

[Note 3] See the McLibel documentary (2005).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V58kK4r26yk> This 90 min documentary was broadcast by the BBC. It was chosen for the British Film Institute's prestigious series, "Ten Documentaries which Changed the World". A particularly relevant 10min extract is recommended to be viewed: From 4min 30sec to 14min 30sec: 4.30 on.. The 'What's Wrong With McDonald's' factsheet, subject of the libel action, co-written by UCO Bob Lambert. 6min on.. McDonald's own infiltrators unmasked + a notebook extract. One of them interviewed as a whistleblower. 8.30. McDonald's spy Michelle Hooker (with leaflets) next to UCO John Dines on London Greenpeace protest at McDonald's HQ (East Finchley) in 1989. *[The footage was obtained from McDonald's by disclosure, and shown during the McLibel proceedings. McDonald's UK Vice President, a former policeman in apartheid South Africa and later the Met's Police Chief Superintendent in Brixton, was in charge of the spying operation – he testified that a Special Branch officer was given 'a perch' next to himself at the HQ to jointly observe that very protest in the film].* 9.45.. Dave Morris and son Charlie on bikes outside home. During the case, UCO Matt Rayner had an abusive sexual relationship with a woman living next door. 10.10.. Helen Steel receives writ whilst in van whilst with her 'partner' UCO John Dines. 12.18. Denied jury trial. 13.45. Denied legal aid, and offered pro bono legal advice by barrister Keir Starmer. How much of that privileged advice was UCO John Dines privy to whilst living with Ms Steel?

[Note 4] The 1997 'McLibel' trial Judgment of Bell J set out in detail the continuous, industrial scale of criminality by the McDonald's Corporation throughout the UK (and world) in the 1990s, especially in relation to employment laws and its suppliers' animal welfare laws. Yet the SDS targeted the campaigners who exposed these truths and not the organisation responsible for that criminality. The McDonald's Corporation could accurately be described as being 'subversive' of societal norms regarding employment, advertising, nutrition and animal welfare.

[Note 5] Paragraphs 6-22 above are supported [as of November 8th 2020] by the following 90 Non-State Core Participants:

Dave Morris; Dr Donal O'Driscoll; The Hon. Zoe Young BSc MSc MFA; Martyn Lowe; 'Lindsey'; Danny Chivers; Paul Gravett; Juliet McBride; Matt Salusbury; 'VSP'; 'Jessica'; Robert Banbury; Ceri Gibbons; 'Sara'; Asa Winstanley; Atif Choudhury; 'MCD'; 'Jane'; Kate Wilson; Claire Hildreth; Cllr Shane Collins; Lois Austin; Jason Kirkpatrick; Grainne Gannon; Ben Leamy (aka 'Mark Morgan'); Chris Dutton; Emily Apple; Olaf Bayer; Guy Taylor; Debbie Vincent; Alice Cutler; Albert Beale; Donna McLean; Nicola Benghe on behalf of Rhythms of Resistance; Nicola Benghe; 'Naomi'; Kirsty Wright; Trevor Houghton; Simon Taylor; Brian Healy; Robin Lane; Michael Zeitlin; Michael Zeitlin on behalf of Advisory Service for Squatters; 'Monica'; Professor Jonathan Rosenhead; Hunt Saboteurs Association; Merrick Cork; Sarah Shoraka; Leila Deen; Tom Fowler; Dr Harry Halpin; Kristina Goodwin-Jones; Professor Simon Lewis; Paul Morozzo; Ben Stewart; Professor Paul Chatterton; Spencer Cooke; 'Lisa'; Frank Bennett; Nagakusala Dharmacharin (aka William Frugal); John Jordan; Mel Evans; Indra Donfrancesco; Reverend Dr Michael Carroll; Dan Glass; David Kaplowitz; 'AN'; Terence Evans; Patrick Gillett; Blacklist Support Group; Gabrielle Bosley; Alice Jelinek; 'Jenny'; Jane Laporte; London Animal Action; London Greenpeace; Martin Shaw; Ken Livingstone; Frank Smith; Tomas Remiarz; Claire Fauset; Gerrah Selby; Robbin Gillett; Dave Nellist; Dave Smith; Carolyn Wilson; Norman Blair; Piers Corbyn; Jim Paton; Megan Donfrancesco Reddy

[Note 6] 1968-72 has been called a 'different era' by a couple of the State CPs' in their Opening Statements. If anything, the crises the world's Governments preside over now, including a deepening climate catastrophe threatening our whole civilisation, are more extreme and therefore call for stronger and more effective civil movements to change things.

[Note 7] In paras 24.4 and 24.5 of the Opening Statement by the Counsel to the Inquiry, he describes how, at the very beginning of the formation of the SDS in 1968, SDS UCO HN330 fulfilled the needs of Special Branch and MI5 for details about certain Labour Party members, protestors against apartheid South Africa and racist Rhodesia, and full details of the signatories to petitions on those issues. This is blatant subversion of everyone's civil rights, and pretty much sets the scene for the next 50 years of these units.

[Note 8] Both society and the law both recognise that political activity (often along with religious activity) is entitled to extra protection. For example, in my own case, the European Court of Human Rights stated, in their Steel and Morris v UK (15.2.2005) Judgment, p4, Re: Article 10 of the Convention: *"The central issue which fell to be determined was whether the interference with the applicants' freedom of expression had been "necessary in a democratic society". The Government had contended that, as the applicants were not journalists, they should not attract the high level of protection afforded to the press under Article 10. However, in a democratic society even small and informal campaign groups, such as London Greenpeace, had to be able to carry on their activities effectively. There existed a strong public interest in enabling such groups and individuals outside the mainstream to contribute to the public debate by disseminating information and ideas on matters of general public interest such as health and the environment."*

[Note 9] A lot of random words have been retrospectively conjured up by some State CP lawyers to try to justify the controversial secret political policing operations. Almost none of the target groups can be said to actively promote 'violence' (with the exception of fascist groups, who seem to hardly feature in the targeting). However It has been said that some people 'associated' with some targeted groups 'may' have been, sometimes, not opposed to occasional 'violence' or 'criminality' or 'disorder', have been 'extremist', or 'subversive', or even 'totalitarian'!

In my view, most religions and Governments are, or potentially are, 'extremist' and 'totalitarian' unless restrained by a strong and assertive civil society. All governments support mass state violence (eg wars and weapons of mass destruction) and police violence to impose their laws and ensure the maintenance of the capitalist status quo and its attendant injustices and oppressions. ['Communist' Governments have mostly been just as bad and often worse. Interestingly in the 1970s I was arrested by Met Police on a protest outside the Bulgarian tourist office for supporting persecuted dissidents in that 'Communist' country].

MI5 seems to have dominated the SDS and NPOIU objectives by seeking information about, and the undermining of, groups and movements which are deemed to support 'subversion of the State'. But instead they should look elsewhere – for the last 30 years mass subversion of the State, supported by successive Governments, has been systematically and continuously carried out by unaccountable multinational corporations seeking deregulation of laws protecting society from unrestrained profiteering, and taking over formerly nationalised industries and sectors so that a tiny few can profit from what were once State-run public services. Adding insult to injury is this the deliberate widespread use of 'tax havens' and other so-called 'loopholes' to annually avoid billions of pounds of taxes due to the State which could have been used for our struggling public services. Millions of people have suffered as a result. But has there been any UCO targeting of this serious, industrial-scale daily subversion of the State? I guess never.

Those opposing this decades-long public scandal, as many if not most of the target groups have done, cannot credibly be characterised as 'subversive of the State'. In any case, I would suggest that the consensus in society is in large part that the State and police should be protecting society, and not employing undercover political units with the aim of subverting civil society and the many progressive political and social movements who seek to protect and improve our society for all.

What is 'extremism'? The most extreme challenge we all face, and probably have ever faced, is the climate catastrophe being caused by Governments and corporations promoting unbridled resource extraction and consumerism based on fossil fuel extraction. In 1968, the American Petroleum Institute had commissioned US Stanford Institute scientists to look at the consequences of burning fossil fuels. Those scientists said that continuing to burn fossil fuels would lead to increases in temperature at the earth's surface, and that significant temperature increase could lead to melting ice caps, rising seas, and potentially serious environmental damage worldwide. They said *"there seems to be no doubt that the potential damage to our*

environment could be severe.” That was 50 years ago, at the same time as the SDS was being set up. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/apr/13/climate-change-oil-industry-environment-warning-1968>

Earlier this year the Government recognised that concerted mass direct action protests about this issue weren't to be labelled 'extremist'. As I stated in my witness statement for T1P1, served in March 2020:

“ I note the recent uproar [January 2020] over police 'counter-terrorism' documents including details about a range of left wing and progressive campaigning groups. The groups targeted included Extinction Rebellion following their civil disobedience efforts to blockade a number of London streets and sites for days at a time to bring attention to the climate crisis, challenge government policy and propose alternatives. In particular I welcome the following official response of the Government (Security Minister Brandon Lewis MP) to questions about these controversial police documents raised in parliament (as reported 22 Jan 2020). He stated *'I want to reiterate that Extinction Rebellion is in no way considered an extremist group under the 2015 definition of extremism and the Home Secretary has been clear on this point.'* ”

[Note 10] It is revealing to note that the women who had been married to UCOs say in their Opening Statement [para 20b] that they were '*horrified*' that the MPS - possibly through UCO Bob Lambert - had given the (wrong) impression to them that their husbands' targets were '*violent criminals, and not the protestors, campaigners or political groups who were in fact being infiltrated*', who '*posed no threats to the UCOs or their families*'.

Former UCO Peter Francis, also states, in para 43 of his Opening Statement: '*I now think that no undercover police officers should be targeting political campaigners*', it being '*wholly unjustified*'.

[Note 11] The 90 supporters of paragraphs 6-22 of my Opening Statement have endorsed the full Recommendations discussed and agreed at the Peoples Public Inquiry into Secret Political Policing, Conway Hall, London July 2018:

1. Full disclosure of all names – both cover and real – of officers from the disgraced political police units, accompanied by contemporaneous photographs
2. Release of the names of all groups suspected to have been spied upon
3. Release of all the police's personal files on activists
4. Extension of the inquiry to all countries where the British spycops are known to have operated
5. The appointment of a diverse panel with experience relevant to victims to assist the chair in making decisions and judgements
6. Inclusion of children and young people who had contact with spycops as Core Participants in the Inquiry

7. Urgent and immediate review of convictions where spycops had involvement in the cases and who misled courts – 50 wrongful convictions have already been overturned and this is likely to be a fraction of the true total.

8. The Inquiry must extend its scope to understand political policing and its impact on democracy. This must include a thorough investigation into racist, sexist, anti-working class, anti-democratic behaviour on behalf of the spycops and those that instructed them to operate in this manner. Such political policing and political policing units must be abolished.

9. An urgent review into all undercover police activities to investigate whether the bad practice exposed by this inquiry has been extended to other areas of undercover operations

10. Make available the necessary resources of the judge to be able to do their job in the available time

11. Equalising of resources, the police are spending millions on stonewalling the inquiry, victims have almost nothing.

12. Increase the severity of penalties for [police] non-compliance with the inquiry

13. Investigation into collusion between police and corporate spies

[Note 12] Regarding the Covert Human Intelligence Sources (Criminal Conduct) Bill currently being rushed through Parliament: The British Government must clearly be very concerned - as indeed are the public - about the revelations coming out of this Inquiry and is therefore moving at a spectacular pace to try to sideline, undermine and - I'm sorry to say - sabotage it. Instead of - as they clearly should be - respecting and considering the Inquiry's content, progress and recommendations, the Government is showing its contempt of due process and the contributions being made in good faith by those contributing (even by those whose contributions we may not agree with). In the light of that, the matters we are discussing can clearly no longer be dismissed as merely 'historical'. This gives even more reason for any independent public Inquiry to not be intimidated or discouraged from making the necessary recommendations to address the concerns which have been raised, which clearly will be more important than ever in future.

APPENDIX 3

DAVE MORRIS – SECOND OPENING STATEMENT 14.4.2021

[Additional paragraph added orally during presentation, 23.4.2021]

INTRODUCTION

1. I make this second Core Participant opening statement following the recent disclosure to me of a substantial volume of material showing the targeting of myself personally by UCO 'Graham Coates' ie his witness statement and related material that the police have had for years (and which I have just recently been able to read). I hope to respond briefly to some of the strategic issues raised, and explain a bit about being an activist.
2. I welcome the Opening Statement given by Kirsten Heaven on behalf of the non-state Core Participants. I don't intend to repeat its points here, except for its conclusion – which I agree with:

“ The sheer scale of the spying operation, the volume of people and groups spied upon, the apparent lack of accountability, the exaggeration of risk, and the obvious imbalance in targeting by the SDS between the left and the right all suggests, in the submission of the NPSCPs, that undercover policing during this Tranche was from its inception unjustified and illegitimate. It was an unlawful enterprise conducted for political purposes and motivated by the desire to preserve the power of the establishment rather than protect the wider public interest.”

3. I also reaffirm my previous Witness Statement from March 2020, and my Opening Statement of November last year (paragraphs 6-22 of which were formally endorsed by 90 of the non-State CPs).

ABOUT MYSELF

4. As outlined in more detail during my previous statements, I have been involved since 1974 in a range of groups and campaigns trying to encourage people to support one another and to make the world a better place. Such groups include ones promoting libertarian socialist / anarchist politics, workplace solidarity, environmental campaigning (including London Greenpeace), opposition to corporate power and exploitation (including being one of the two defendants in the 'McLibel' case), and community groups promoting local mutual aid and self-organisation speaking up for their needs as local residents. I am currently Secretary of the Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, and Chair of the National Federation of Parks and Green Spaces.
5. The essence of my personal motivation and political beliefs has remained constant throughout the last 50 years or so – the desire to tackle injustice, to seek improvements

in society in the public interest, and to encourage and empower people to have as much control over their lives as possible.

6. I left school in 1972 at the age of 18 and then did 2 years of full time voluntary work placements with refugees and people with disabilities.
7. I then began my job as an Islington postal worker in 1974, and moved into that borough.
8. I first became aware of the anarchist groups through an October 1974 BBC 'Open Door' programme supportive of the movement. Why was I attracted to anarchist ideas back in the 1970s? Anarchism is defined as: '*A political theory advocating the abolition of hierarchical government and the organisation of society on a voluntary cooperative basis without recourse to force or compulsion.*' [OED / Lexico online]. Anarchist ideas are about seeking a society based on freedom and sharing, rather than power and greed etc, and an inclusive and collective way of working without hierarchical structures. These are traditional ideas which – along with authoritarian ideas too - can be found within the hearts of the majority of people, within the majority of all social and community groups, and in movements for a better society. There is also a need to take personal responsibility for what's around us – to care about others and to try to improve society regarding for example: people's rights to housing, public services, a decent income for all, good working conditions, and human rights; some real control over lives at work, in neighbourhoods, in people's private lives; and to protect the natural environment.
9. In early 1975, I believe, I started attending the Freedom newspaper collective meetings in Whitechapel. A few weeks later I got involved instead in the Anarchy magazine collective as the nearest group to me – meeting in someone's Islington's home. Also the group was good at discussing important everyday issues of housing, poverty, exploitation, feminism, parenting, industrial disputes, etc. It was a friendly, sociable group based on meetings advertised in the paper and open to all supporters.
10. I always tried to understand and appreciate a wide range of points of view within the anarchist movement, and indeed all related campaigning activities.
11. I was active in the Union of Postal Workers (UPW) up to 1980, encouraging a spirit of mutual support and solidarity in the workplace and discussing and taking up issues of concern to all members relating to terms and conditions of employment, wages and rights. I was elected from my branch to attend a UPW annual delegates conference of 3,000 delegates, and a National Rank and File Trade Union Movement conference of 1100 delegates. Eventually I was elected as the local UPW branch secretary. My branch of course took part in a number of local, London and national postal disputes. I did my job diligently and personally got on well with most managers I came in contact with. [Appendix 1: See my Post Office reference]
12. I never hid my views, nor did I try to force them on anyone else.
13. Anarchy magazine gave a platform for a range of views, some of which I disagreed with or was uncomfortable with but were legitimate subjects of information to impart and

debate to be had: eg an anti-abortion article (I was concerned by a failure to put women's right to choose at the heart of the subject), anti-fascist news and strategy (concerned by it being too dismissive of mass community-based educational work needed), and about guerrilla groups abroad (concerned this was too militaristic and a substitute for grassroots movements for change).

14. I was opposed to the Soviet Union's system and empire, and keen to support dissidents, For example I took part in a pro-dissident picket outside the Bulgarian tourist office in 1977 (but was unfortunately arrested for 'obstruction' by the police despite no 'obstruction' occurring). I also visited Poland 3 times in the 1980s to support Solidarnosc union activists and young anarchists resisting Soviet-style rule. I was pleased to be able help establish direct links between those interned in Poland and Northern Ireland, and tried to help establish direct links between miners in eastern Poland and Yorkshire.
15. My increasing focus on the importance of grassroots movements (not just ideological groups or newspapers) and my increasing concern for the growing threats to the environment (especially the nuclear power industry) led me to drift towards getting involved in those movements towards the end of the 70s.
16. And since then being involved in community and environmental groups and movements has been my main focus.

Relations

17. With other people: Personally I try to get on with pretty much everyone. I value genuine friendships and honesty, especially within activist and community groups. I don't like violence between people, and I've never hit another person in my life as far as I can recall, even when I have been physically attacked. However I believe, as do most people and the law of the land, that people have the right to defend themselves (effectively but proportionately) when attacked or put under threat.
18. With Government: Groups and movements I am currently part of expect Government support and action for their cause. Hence I am happy to work constructively alongside both local and national Government who have access to the resources and decision-making powers communities need to work for them. On the local level I have been chair of my local Friends of Lordship Recreation Ground for the last 20 years - in which we have been successfully working in partnership with Haringey Council parks service to jointly manage Tottenham's largest public park. It has been recognised as an exemplary project with a national profile. At the national level over the last 3 years I have been on the sector/Government liaison body, coordinating its Community Empowerment workstream. [See Appendix 2: Letter to the NFPGS from Rishi Sunak MP when Minister for Parks.]

THE CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE OF 'GRAHAM COATES'

19. I have read the statement and related disclosure.
20. Looking back on the surveillance and infiltration of groups I was involved with in the 1970s (and then later in the 1980s and onwards), and how I was personally targeted, I feel disgust at this cynical and blatant breach of trust. Not just for me but also for the other victims I knew and know – such as the family with young children whose home was where the Anarchy Collective held meetings. Of course I am outraged not just by the tactics used but also by the very existence and purpose of the whole spying operation. This Stasi-like behaviour is totally unacceptable.
21. All my activity which was being monitored was traditional and legitimate political and campaigning activity, albeit much of it at the radical and libertarian end of the left/right spectrum viz: producing magazines, exercising hard-fought for rights to freedom of speech and assembly, attending or helping organise protests and social events (eg demonstrations, public meetings, picnics, attending union meetings and supporting industrial disputes, defence campaigns for people arrested) etc. These rights, explicitly enshrined in international conventions and laws, are supposed to be afforded specific and highest possible protection.
22. Secret political policing is not supposed to happen in this country, only in totalitarian regimes who hate any idea of human rights or effective opposition.
23. I and others I know who were targeted were friendly and trusting people – and not some sort of scary thugs from Planet Zog as implied by a few apologists for this 50 year operation. We were aiming to spread ideas which seek to protect and improve society for virtually everyone's benefit.
24. Graham Coates concludes: Para 110. *'The anarchists I reported on posed a minimal challenge to public order'...*and *'did not even really discuss activities that would be a public order threat'*. Para 113. *'I do not think either the IS or the anarchist movement was subversive in terms of their actions'*. Para 127 *'I do not believe any info I provided.. was particularly significant. I do not think it would have made any difference to public order if I had not worked for the SDS'*.
25. A key question therefore is: was the infiltration, and the resulting breach of trust and human rights (especially of protected human rights, for example to participate in political activity, to assembly, and to exercise freedom of speech) justifiable at all, let alone proven to be justified in the individual circumstances of each operation?
26. The spying operation against myself and others during the 1970s has not, on the face of it, been shown to have had any reasonable basis at all.

27. In fact the opposite is true. The right to take part in political, religious and trades union activity has additional legal protection at highest level. In my own experience, I have battled over those rights as they are fundamental to people's ability to challenge injustice and oppression. Here are just three, very different, examples:

- being a litigant in person during the 'McLibel' trial throughout the 1990s, the longest case in English legal history. The campaign successfully used mass defiance to defeat McDonald's attempts to censor their critics – as a result it is thought that no corporation has taken a similar case to court since. Helen Steel and I also eventually secured a historic legal victory at the European Court of Human Rights in 2005. [Details in my first Opening Statement]
- in 2007 challenging the stop and search military-style police road blocks in Kent aiming to undermine and isolate a week long 'camp for climate action' at the site of Kingsnorth Power Station. I took part in a mass defiance effort which ensured the suspension and change of that police operation at the site. I was one of three people who took a successful legal case against the police afterwards which resulted in a declaration that mass stop and search against protestors was illegal.
- as a community activist in Haringey asserting the right to be able to distribute campaign leaflets to the public on the street. Enforcement officers had to recognise that political campaigners were exempt from bans on handing out commercial flyers in High Streets.

28. Of course countless thousands of others throughout the UK and throughout history have asserted their political and human rights, and will continue to do so.

Note on the strength of the evidence base in the documents disclosed

29. Graham Coates states, in para 38 of his witness statement, that: *'I have considered the reports in the witness bundle. I do not specifically recall the content of **any** [my emphasis] of these reports, however I accept that I must have provided information for **a number** [my emphasis] of them'*.

30. [Note: this para slightly revised orally, 23.4.2021] It is important to note that information in the relevant reports is not necessarily accurate. For example, a key report about me personally after a year of being targetted [UCPI 0000021741, 23.5.1978] states: *'Morris was brought up in Hackney and Stoke Newington [Note: It was actually Ealing and Finchley], and gained GCE 'A' level passes in English [actually Physics] and Mathematics at a local school [actually it wasn't local, it was Ealing and Finchley]'*. Some reports also seem to have been created up to a month after the event they purport to describe, [...and may, at least in part...] have been written by someone else who may or may not have seen some UCO notes, and who may or may not have edited, embellished or created content in any way they sought fit.

30b. [Note: this para added orally, 23.4.2021] Document UCPI 0000011648 dated 6 Jan 78, is said to be based on *'information received from a reliable source'* about a meeting a month earlier on the 8th December 1977. But Graham Coates is not listed as being present (unlike in the previous and following meetings reports disclosed to me), so who provided the information is unclear. It claims I stated at a meeting that the Anarchy Magazine collective should be involved in *'fire raising activities on Government buildings'* in support of the long and bitter national

firefighters strike, a suggestion it is said no-one else agreed with. [In fact I recall the group produced 'support the firefighters strike' stickers and joined local picket lines! I dispute the accuracy of the report given, although I recognise that people might say all kinds of things in private in the heat of the moment, or exaggerate, or probe an idea to see what others think, or make a joke, or whatever.

THE WIDER CONTEXT – THE REAL SOURCES OF VIOLENCE AND SUBVERSION

31. In the relevant period there seemed to be an almost pathological obsession with the left, by those in charge of the spying operations. They seemed to cover the whole left spectrum. That included the reformist left, radical left, single-issue left, left parties, libertarian/anarchist left, left MPs, and left-leaning trades union activities. What unites all those left tendencies, whatever their tactical differences? The fact they are all motivated by seeking to protect and improve society and to encourage people to organise and speak up for their needs.

32. Such secret political policing is only supposed to take place under totalitarian regimes who despise human rights and any effective questioning and opposition to those in power.

33. In the mid-1970s someone decided I should be targeted by the SDS/SyS. As demonstrated elsewhere it seems clear that that extreme right wing and pro-nazi groups were virtually ignored.

34. But if the SDS/SyS had been genuinely worried about serious and large-scale criminality and subversion in the 1970s, and had carried out proper risk assessments on the key existing and emerging threats to our society they would have been more likely to have targeted the following organisations active around the same period:

- **fossil fuels companies** (who 50 years ago were secretly suppressing the research findings of their industry's causing of global climate heating. This now threatens the lives of millions of people and the collapse of the eco-systems on which our species depends)

- **the tobacco companies** and their subversive advertising (encouraging people to smoke, leading to widespread disease and death)

- **the development of tax havens** (subverting the State and society by hiving off ££billions of tax revenue which could have gone to public services);

- **car companies** (and the rampant pollution, danger and deaths caused by cars, and the related industrial-scale criminality of breaching of laws on speeding, parking, pollution etc), all backed by subversive pro-car advertising. Traffic pollution contributes to thousands of premature deaths a year and has been at illegal levels in urban areas for many years.

- **the military in Northern Ireland** and the Bloody Sunday massacre of demonstrators calling for equal rights for all, followed by mass internment without trial of thousands of people (showing what the British Government is prepared to do to its citizens). This led to another 25 years of bitter war and hundreds of deaths, only resolved by political negotiations and solutions.

- **The police themselves**, with the institutional racism and racist use of 'sus laws' in the 1970s (believed to be the key cause of the 1981 uprisings and serious public disorder in Brixton and across the country).

- **the major construction companies** bitterly opposed a 1971 national strike to improve wages and conditions on building sites. Trade union pickets who became known as the Shrewsbury 24 were framed and some jailed. After nearly 50 years of campaigning the Court of Appeal last month declared a miscarriage of justice. During the appeal it was revealed that a secret 'anti-

communist' unit within the Foreign Office, backed by the Prime Minister Edward Heath, had been involved. Meanwhile the illegal industry-wide blacklist to deny jobs to construction site union activists and others continued until recently. Why didn't the SDS or MI5 target these construction companies instead of union activists? Trades unionists continued to campaign against shocking safety conditions on building sites, and can report that the high rate of 240 recorded deaths a year in the early 1970s was down to 50 a year in the early 1990s.
<https://www.theguardian.com/law/2021/mar/23/shrewsbury-24-court-of-appeal-overturns-1970s-picketing-convictions>
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Deaths-of-UK-construction-employees-in-the-25-years-prior-to-the-CDM-Regulations-were_fig1_245407835

The targeting of London Greenpeace from the late 1970s onwards

35. London Greenpeace begins to feature in the disclosed material from around 1978 onwards as far as I can tell. I first came across the group in the late 70s through their work to expose the truth about the ***dangers of nuclear power stations***. I later got involved in the group in 1982. The group is a NSCP and is due to be scheduled to appear in later hearings covering the 1980s-2000s, so are not contributing a response at this stage to the disclosure so far.

36. Throughout the 1970s London Greenpeace campaigned against ***militarism, and nuclear weapons*** – which only exist to enable Governments to threaten to murder millions of innocent people. From 1981 the group supported what became a massive movement to oppose the siting of US cruise missiles on British soil from 1981, with tens of thousands involved in regular blockades of military sites including at Greenham Common. London Greenpeace proposed and helped coordinate a day of action against the profits from the arms trade in the City of London in 1983. In 1982 the group had supported opposition to both sides in the Falklands War, which notoriously included the deaths of hundreds of soldiers from the sinking of an Argentine ship, the Belgrano, outside an exclusion zone.

37. In the late 1970s the group began to focus more on the dangers of ***nuclear energy production*** - for which the group was targeted by UCOs [See disclosed files]. The group was also named in a Secret Anti-Terrorism Report to the Government in 1980, obtained under the 30 years rule. It states: *'Anti-nuclear power groups have been active since 1977 in arranging demonstrations in various parts of the country. In the past 2 years there has been a marked increase in the number of small anarchist dominated or influenced groups in the UK, the most prominent being London Greenpeace; the latter plays a major coordinating role in anti-nuclear affairs and is responsible for many of the international links.'* ... *'The bulk of the anti-nuclear power lobby (including most of the anarchist groups) in the UK is opposed to the use of violence and there is no evidence of any current terrorist threat from that quarter.'* [See attached Appendix: Secret Anti-Terrorism Intelligence Report extract, 1980].

But it was the industry itself that should have been investigated, with the 1979 Three Mile Island power plant meltdown in the USA a warning of the threat posed to the public. In 1986 the Chernobyl nuclear meltdown caused an estimated 9-16,000 deaths from air pollution throughout Europe over the following 20 years.

38. I was later involved in the London Greenpeace anti-McDonald's campaign. **The McDonald's Corporation** opened their first UK burger store in 1974. The campaign and subsequent McLibel trial successfully exposed the corporation's subversion of society

(McDonaldisation of society), of the parent/child relationship (via advertising to children), daily industrial-scale breaches of laws protecting workers rights and animal welfare, and the fast food industry's seeking to replace healthy eating habits with the current unhealthy junk food culture. These resulted in serious rulings against the company at the end of the legal case. Yet why didn't SDS or the security services want to investigate and infiltrate this company? There will be more on this matter at a later stage of the proceedings. This will particularly focus on the 3 UCOs who infiltrated the group during this period, and the shocking and disgusting tactics they employed.

SOME BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

39. The spying operation against myself and others during the 1970s has not, on the face of it, been shown to have had any reasonable basis at all. In fact just the opposite – it was unacceptable and unlawful.

40. It was a gross breach of peoples' trust and human rights, which maybe could have raised an arguable case if targeting active gangs of mass killers, but has no shred of legitimacy when it was actually being used to protect those who control society's wealth and power from the real needs of the public.

APPENDIX 4

Undercover policing Inquiry

DAVE MORRIS THIRD OPENING STATEMENT FOR T1P3 – 25th April 2022

ORAL VERSION FOR PRESENTATION 11th MAY - FINAL

[Submitted 9th May, amended 10th May]]

Introduction

1. I speak as a core participant in this Inquiry, and one who was targeted by police spies from the mid-1970s onwards both personally and as a member of targeted political and campaigning groups.
2. I have already contributed to the Inquiry a Witness Statement, and two detailed Opening Statements for previous hearings.

I have slightly amended and expanded on my written statement submitted in April, and a little bit on the updated oral version sent to the Inquiry 2 days ago.

On Monday you, as the Chair of the Inquiry, indicated you had welcomed Tariq Ali, when he gave evidence in 2020, in helping explain Trotskyist ideas to you. In the light of police misconceptions about anarchists in various disclosed documents, including Annual Reports, I will try to explain the predominant motivations, aims and activities of anarchists and the anarchist movement as I see it.

Standing up for the public interest against the rich and powerful

3. As already outlined in my previous statements, I have been involved since 1974 in a range of groups and campaigns trying to encourage the public to support one another and empower themselves where they live and work, to challenge injustice, oppression and damage to the environment, and to make the world a better place for everyone. The various groups I have been involved in over the decades have been open and collectively-run, and engaged in the kind of public activities which the public

are invited to join in or to replicate for themselves, and which are essential if humanity is to progress and survive.

4. Such groups, as we all should, question and challenge those institutions which wield power over people's lives, and control the world's resources and decision-making. These include Governments, transnational corporations, military organisations, and financial institutions. Such powerful institutions are generally tightly controlled by a small self-serving elite, continually obsessed with power and profit, and are ruthless and unaccountable. In fact, as I outlined in more detail in my April 2021 statement, they are subversive of society and people's real needs – they are the real subversives that need to be investigated. Indeed they are also the inevitable cause of most of what the SDS would define as 'public disorder' in response to injustice.

5. Unsurprisingly such institutions have made a shocking mess of the world for centuries - causing mass hardship and poverty; disempowerment, discrimination and oppression; exploitation of workers and resources; horrific wars; and large scale environmental destruction. They have brought humanity to the brink of nuclear annihilation, and have been systematically exploiting and destroying the natural environment upon which human society depends for our survival – as a result our species now faces a catastrophic and possibly terminal future.

6. Many of the groups I have been involved with believe that the evidence of history demonstrates that such aforementioned institutions can't be successfully reformed and turned into benevolent, useful public bodies. However history also demonstrates that grassroots movements for change, if large enough and determined enough, **can** shift the balance of power and win concessions and victories for the public along the way.

7. The groups I have been involved in have tried their best to support efforts to build 'single issue' and other campaigns and movements to improve things in the here and now. Some of those groups logically also call for the hierarchical and authoritarian institutions which are causing the shocking problems humanity unfortunately has to face, to be replaced in the long term by a genuinely democratic way of running society. One in which people all over the world collectively manage their own neighbourhoods, workplaces and lives, and ensure that all the resources are shared fairly and all decision-making is for the public good. This is libertarian socialism, or anarchism.

On Monday you requested suggestions for key relevant reading materials, hence I recommend the following books: 'On Anarchism' by Noam Chomsky (Penguin, 2014), 'Anarchism: a very short introduction' by Colin Ward (OUP, 2004), and 'Demanding the Impossible – a history of anarchism' by Peter Marshall (Harper Perennial, 2008). If you enjoy science fiction I also recommend 'The Dispossessed' by Ursula Le Guin.

8. I am proud of the many groups and campaigns I have been involved in and believe that such efforts should be supported, not undermined.

Similar to points made by other Non State Core Participants in this week's opening statements, as an active anarchist in the Tranche 1 period I do not recognise the ignorant, derogatory and misleading SDS and Special Branch Annual Reports' official characterisations about the ideals and activities of anarchists during that period.

The evidence of UCO 'Graham Coates', as the only UCO spying on anarchists we have relevant evidence from at this stage, amply demonstrates the reality. For 2 years he personally targeted me and the groups I was involved in (especially the Anarchy magazine collective). As he concluded: *'The anarchists I reported on posed a minimal challenge to public order.'* *'I do not think either IS [the International Socialists] or the anarchist movement was subversive in terms of their actions.'* *'I do not believe any info I provided... was particularly significant. I do not think it would have made any difference to public order if I had not worked for the SDS.'*

Anarchist groups, just like pretty much all of the left wing and campaign groups targeted, were full of well-meaning and idealistic people with a sense of justice, engaged in spreading progressive ideas for a better society. They were

- helping run newspapers, bookshops and other co-operative projects;
- taking part in open or public meetings and social and cultural events;
- encouraging people to think and speak up for themselves and support each other and their needs where they live and work;
- and encouraging people to empower themselves to be in control of their lives rather than just be loyal 'subjects', passive 'consumers' (of corporate products, media and advertising) and forced to obey those with power over them (eg landlords, employers, politicians and police).

They were participating in a range of essential protests on the issues of the time, and constructively supporting movements against injustice and inequality, and for positive change.

Yet the biased and self-serving official Annual Reports – extracts of which were quoted so eruditely by the Counsel To the Inquiry in his opening statement on Monday – deliberately fail to acknowledge and outline these basic facts. If they had of done, they would have had to have admitted that their infiltration operations were indeed totally unacceptable.

SDS targeting in the 1970s, and further important evidence awaited

9. In the Tranche 1 period the main groups I was involved in included the London Workers Group (supporting workers challenging exploitation at work), the Union of Postal Workers and 'Rank and File Post Office Worker' magazine (fellow postal workers supporting each other), Anarchy Magazine (spreading anti-authoritarian ideas and news), the Persons Unknown Support Group (a campaign in defence of activists

arrested, found at trial to be not guilty), and the Torness Alliance (opposition to the development of nuclear energy).

10. I have already referred to Anarchy magazine.

11. The London Workers Group was infiltrated by 'Tony Williams', who was a spy from 1978-1982. His statement has so far been withheld from me as for some reason he has been allocated to Tranche 2. It is therefore impossible to comment or ask questions of his managers about the extent of this unlawful and disgusting infiltration of what was an open group, and about the other groups he targeted. However, we know from two of the disclosed documents that he became firstly the Treasurer of the London Workers Group and then the Secretary, giving him full access to personal information on the group's supporters, no doubt to be passed on to M15 for blacklisting purposes. Interestingly, another document from M15 dated 30th July 1982 states that when 'Tony Williams' was due to be withdrawn from the SDS in 1982 the M15 F6 manager had met with HN68, who considered it was no 'great loss' as 'Tony Williams's work had not been 'particularly productive'.

12. .. I have given the Inquiry a photo I took of Tony Williams in 1980.

13. Regarding the Torness Alliance, this was a UK wide campaign to oppose the building of a new nuclear power station in Scotland. The main objections were firstly the threat of catastrophic nuclear accidents (as had almost happened in 1979 at Three Mile Island in the US, and in 1986 actually happened at Chernobyl in Ukraine resulting subsequently in an estimated 9-16,000 deaths from air pollution throughout Europe). And secondly the lack of safe disposal of nuclear waste which would be dangerously radioactive for thousands of years. 10,000 people protested at Torness in 1979, and there were some follow-up protests in the year afterwards. I was involved in this campaign. London Greenpeace were heavily involved in this movement, and I later got involved with that group around 1982. London Greenpeace was infiltrated by the SDS for many years, as we will come to in Tranche 2.

14. According to their witness statements for T1P3 a number of SDS UCOs were infiltrating the anti-nuclear movement, and at least 4 SDS managers visited the Torness site. However, we are unfortunately expecting most of the evidence and documentation relevant to this movement and London Greenpeace to not be disclosed until Tranche 2.

15. The 1979 Special Branch Annual Report is disclosed in full, and contains a huge wealth of evidence about or relevant to the SDS and its spying operation. It includes 3 explicit references to myself in the monthly sections, and many other references to groups and events I was involved with – with a month by month chronology and very helpful Index cross referencing the names of over 200 targeted groups and over 100 targeted individuals in that year alone. The other SB Annual Reports disclosed are massively cut, thin and vague in comparison. The full reports for all the relevant years (including for the forthcoming Tranches) should be disclosed as soon as possible. This

will help identify many of the list of the 1,000 groups targeted, for which we have been waiting for years.

16. Due to the many delays during the Inquiry and the further delays expected, all the Witness Statements already taken from UCOs should be disclosed as soon as possible. This is essential so that core participants can begin to prepare their responses, including seeking out others from groups and events affected by the spying operation over the life of the SDS (and later the NPIOU), rather than having to wait for years until the last minute when it is generally too late to trace victims and prepare evidence effectively.

A key Question for Managers

17. Why did the Police never consider the welfare (as well as the Human and Legal Rights) of those members of the public they targeted – the victims? Surely they had a duty of care whilst invading and influencing people's lives? Surely any normal human being would do so anyway, duty of care or not? After 7 years of the Inquiry, many thousands of people in groups targeted (whether those groups have already been revealed or so far are still concealed) remain in the dark about who spied on them, what information was collected and what was done with it. They are understandably angry, as well as being confused and suspicious about which individuals from their past may have been police spies, and events from their life which may have been secretly invaded and manipulated by State agents cynically masquerading as their friends and colleagues. This delay is unacceptable, and we need the truth.

18. In contrast the UCPI, at the behest of the police, is strongly applying privacy and Human Rights concerns to protect the identity and welfare of UCOs. This sudden police conversion to such rights not previously of any concern of their secret units during their operations is surely staggering hypocrisy. It would be seen as ironic if it wasn't so serious. Many might think that those who secretly invaded and abused people's lives should have vacated their own privacy rights. Furthermore in most core participants' opinion, the current privacy strategy of the police and Inquiry is the key cause of the massive problems, costs and delays in the Inquiry.

19. The public would expect that such privacy protection criteria be applied a hundred times more strongly when evaluating the unlawfulness of the SDS and the rights of those victims who were seeking a better society who were thereby secretly targeted, lied to, abused, manipulated, and reported on to the police and secret services.

Conclusion

20. I have read and support the impressive detailed Opening Statements made on behalf of the Category H core participants, and on behalf of the Cooperating Group of core participants – and indeed for the other Non State CPs. These statements clearly demonstrate beyond doubt that the entire secret SDS operation was unacceptable and unlawful, as well as being worthless. It demonstrates that the police were institutionally anti-democratic, as well as being institutionally sexist, racist and anti-working-class.

21. The infiltration of left wing and progressive groups and campaigns and the invasions of their members' lives, should never have been allowed to happen. Managers, and those higher up the chain – all the way to Police Chiefs and Government Ministers – must apologise and be held responsible and accountable.

Dave Morris