

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

R10 questioning template

NAME OR NOMINAL OF WITNESS TO BE QUESTIONED: HN34 Geoffrey Craft				COUNSEL TO INQUIRY RESPONSE
DATE WITNESS SCHEDULED TO GIVE ORAL EVIDENCE: 18 th of May				
CORE PARTICIPANT OR WITNESS WISHING TO QUESTION: Richard Chessum, "Mary", Lindsey German.				
TOPIC	ISSUE/LINE OF QUESTIONING PROPOSED	RELEVANCE & JUSTIFICATION	DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO ISSUE OR LINE OF QUESTIONING	<i>Y / RLR / N</i>
1	<p><u>Manager understanding of legal limits of Police Operations generally:</u> As per Cat H Generic rule 10s. In summary, the basis on which he considered the infiltrations to be lawful.</p>	Justification		
2	<p><u>Invasion of Rights:</u> As per Cat H Generic rule 10s. In summary, the extent to which he considered the rights of targets, both direct and indirect.</p>	Justification		

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Does HN34 consider any lack of consideration to be consistent with his comment at W/S Para 66: <i>“The concern from the SDS was to provide the quality of intelligence which would enable the policing of public order activities to preserve our right to free speech and to demonstrate our views, within the rule of law, based upon parliamentary democracy”</i>:</p>			
3	<p><u>Training in respect of the concept of subversion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the manager’s understanding of the term? • What training/guidance had they received on the definition of the term? And who trained them? • Did their understanding of the term change over time? • Extent to which they were aware that their definition meant that they were reporting on people who had never broken the law and were not engaged in any unlawful behaviour. • How they squared the fact of that inevitability/normality with their duties as a police officer. 	Justification	UCPI0000030051	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Did Craft give any consideration to the fact that work on subversion had “little or no relevance to SB’s proper charter” (Words of DAC Gilbert/Commander Rodger July 1974: UCPI0000030051)</p> <p>What training did they give UCOs on the concept of subversion?</p> <p>What assurances did managers seek to ensure that their officers understood the concept?</p>			
4	<p><u>Emphasis on supervision:</u></p> <p>Bearing in mind that HN34 has stated:</p> <p>Para 22: <i>“Supervision had to be very close”</i></p> <p>Para 82: <i>“improving still further the degree of supervision which is so necessary in this delicate field of operations”</i>.</p> <p>Para 89: <i>“[As CS of S Squad] “I knew exactly what the officers were up to”</i>.</p> <p>Para 113: <i>“I do not think any officers were more carefully monitored than this lot”</i></p> <p>What form did the supervision take?</p>	Extent of manager control of/responsibility for actions of UCOs.		

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>How confident is HN34 that, as DI and DCI, his UCOs were well monitored?</p> <p>Did supervision include, for example, reading a UCO's reports?</p> <p>Did supervision include, monitoring or consideration of a UCO's relationships with targets?</p>			
5	<p><u>Recruitment of Richard Clark (HN297)</u></p> <p>Who was responsible for the recruitment of Rick Clark?</p> <p>Bearing in mind: Para 23: <i>"looking for people who had a good reputation within the Branch in terms of the enquiries they did and the way they conducted themselves"</i>.</p> <p>Para: 24: <i>"advantage of a comparatively small Branch. Everyone had a reputation very quickly"</i>.</p> <p>What was HN34's understanding of Clark's reputation?</p>	<p>Pertinent to terms of reference.</p>	<p>MPS-0748061/44 MPS-0748061/47 MPS-0748061/61</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Where did HN34's understanding of Clark's reputation come from?</p> <p>To what extent was he aware of Clark's wider reputation in Special Branch?</p> <p>For example (closed officers): (MPS-0748061/44 "<i>a bit of a lad [reputation for womanising]</i>", MPS-0748061//47 "<i>a carnivore</i>", MPS-074806/61 "<i>Rick had a certain reputation and it gradually came out he had a sexual relationship which led to his being compromised, and that was, to my way of thinking, generally well known among the existing SDS officers</i>"</p> <p>If he was not aware of that reputation is HN34 able to indicate why he would not have been, particularly bearing in mind his emphasis on supervision?</p>			
6	<p><u>Targeting of TOM:</u></p> <p>Who was responsible for targeting TOM? (bearing in mind the lack of clarity at para 27: "<i>tasking came from C Squad</i>" and para 40:</p>	Pertinent to terms of reference.	MPS-0747688	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>“generally all communication with SyS was through C Squad”</i></p> <p>At the time of Clark’s deployment there had been a recent TOM infiltration: “Mike Scott” (HN298) in 1974 concluded that TOM <i>“had no subversive objectives and... did not employ or approve the use of violence to achieve its objectives”</i>. (HN298 statement paragraph 167). With that in mind: What was the purpose of a further infiltration into TOM?</p> <p>There are no records (either SDS reports or open source) of disorder at any TOM demonstration. How does is that fact consistent with HN34: Para 28: <i>“We did not target individual people, our concern always was public order and the intelligence needed to control the dangerous parts of public order”</i>.</p> <p>HN34 W/S Para 70: <i>“TOM... infiltrations used for public order and identifying Sinn Fein members...”</i>: <i>“TOM was quite big because of their numbers on demonstrations, so we needed to know what was happening... they</i></p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>very much contributed to public order; we could find out how large demonstrations were going to be... this would affect the number of police required at a demonstration. The background is these were revolutionary people with intention to do away with Parliamentary democracy, starting with mob rule”</i></p> <p>Challenges:</p> <p>1: None of the reports of Rick Clark or HN298 suggest any public order considerations (of any kind). Is HN34 able to give any examples of any?</p> <p>2: to what extent were TOM members (a) revolutionary people? (b) with an intention to do away with Parliamentary democracy? (c) promoting “mob rule”?</p> <p>Is HN34 able to comment on the above in relation to Richard Chessum or “Mary”?</p> <p>Is HN34’s suggestion on the “background” accurate?</p> <p>Is HN34’s suggestion on the “background” indicative of an attempt to find any reason to retrospectively justify this deployment?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>(Please note: HN297 reports are primarily MPS refs i.e. sourced from the MPS. The excuse that MPS files in relation to public order issues, have been destroyed, if it is offered, does not apply).</p>			
7	<p><u>Tasking of Richard Clark:</u> Who was responsible for tasking Richard Clark? (note: para 27: “<i>The CI would then task the officer</i>”).</p> <p>Richard Clark did not “<i>float around</i>” (as at para 29). He wrote to TOM prior to his deployment (whilst in back office, presumably), which HN34 must have known about? and deployed directly into Goldsmiths College, which HN34 must have authorised? (RC Transcript Day 10T1P2 page 36)</p> <p>Bearing in mind Craft’s “<i>day to day involvement in the deployments of SDS officers</i>” (para 32) he must have been aware of both aspects of the targeting?</p> <p>Why was Rick Clark specifically deployed into TOM?</p>	<p>Pertinent to terms of reference.</p>	<p>(RC Transcript Day 10T1P2 page 36)</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	Why was Rick Clark specifically deployed into Goldsmiths?			
8	<p><u>Deployment into educational institutions:</u> Richard Clark was deployed into Goldsmiths college. HN353 “Gary Roberts” was also deployed into an educational institution, Thames Polytechnic (by December 1974 see UCPI0000015044 and MPS-0740413/6)</p> <p>As both of these officers were deployed during HN34’s tenure: what was HN34’s involvement in this targeting? Did he make the decision to target educational institutions? If so, why? What considerations were given to the legality of this?</p>	Pertinent to terms of reference.	UCPI0000015044 MPS-0740413/6	
9	<p><u>Positions of responsibility:</u></p> <p>Generally: Para 114: “<i>Whether an officer was permitted to assume a position of responsibility within their target group really depended on the nature of the group, the quality of intelligence</i></p>	Pertinent to terms of reference.		

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>we would get and whether that position of responsibility was justified”</i></p> <p>Break that down:</p> <p>Explicit that permission needed to be sought from senior management by the UCO?</p> <p>Consideration then had to be given to a number of factors?</p> <p>The decision was made by management?</p> <p>Para 114: “<i>There was always [our emphasis] discussion about assuming a position of responsibility in a particular case”</i></p> <p>“<i>The Chief Inspector and [our emphasis] Detective inspector of the SDS would have given this guidance to officers”.</i></p> <p>Presumably the decision would have been taken in consultation with both senior officers because it was such an important decision?</p> <p>A discussion between the two senior officers and the UCO?</p> <p>To discuss the purpose of taking the position?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>This would have been the case for each officer and each position of responsibility?</p> <p>Would HN34 have considered this aspect of deployments an important part of his supervision and monitoring of UCOs?</p> <p>Presumably, because HN34 considered the role of Inspector and Chief Inspector to be interchangeable (para 22) and there was no material difference between the work he did in the two roles (para 17), he would have considered this monitoring as an important aspect of both management roles?</p> <p>In terms of the decision making process, HN34 says (at para 114): <i>“The ACC’s consolidated instructions were always in the back of our mind. UCOs could not initiate serious crime.” “disadvantage or risk that the UCO suddenly found they would have to be involved in serious crime”</i></p> <p>Were any other factors considered?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Was any consideration given to, for example, the impact on an organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) of a UCO taking a role that another could have done better? (b) A UCO not having the best interests of the organisation at heart? (c) The potential of an organisation being de-stabilised, for example by discord generated by an officer? (d) The democratic implications of an undercover officer impacting negatively on a lawful organisation? 			
10	<p><u>Rick Clark's positions of responsibility:</u></p> <p>As at para 97: <i>"I am told Rick Clark [took senior roles]. I did not know that he was prominent in establishing the SE London branch of TOM, nor did I know anything about his positions of responsibility. I would be very surprised if he did play such a senior role in the group"</i>.</p> <p>Rick Clark's deployment must have been memorable?</p>	<p>Relevant to terms of reference.</p>	<p>MPS-0728678 MPS-0728205 MPS-0728938 UCPI0000012136 UCPI0000012135 MPS-0728710 MPS- 0728718 MPS-0728721 MPS-0728730 MPS-0728731 MPS-0728734 MPS-0728735</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>The compromise of his identity became part of SDS folklore? Is it really right that HN34 cannot remember the roles that Clark took in the TOM?</p> <p><i>“I think Rick Gibson was in TOM but only because he started there and then moved to the SWP” (para 70)</i></p> <p>Is HN34 being deliberately vague about Clark’s deployment into TOM?</p> <p>Bearing in mind that <i>“As Inspector and Chief Inspector I would attend the twice weekly meetings every time”</i> (para 48): he must have known about both the role in establishing the SE London branch and the subsequent positions of responsibility?</p> <p>When HN34 says that <i>“he would be very surprised [if Clark took such roles]”</i> is he suggesting that it is not true that he did?</p> <p><u>Establishing the SE London Branch:</u></p>		<p>MPS-0728667 MPS-0728669 MPS-0728675 MPS-0728697 MPS-0728755 MPS-0728761 MPS-0728736 MPS-0728762 MPS-0728772 MPS-0729779 MPS-0728785</p>	
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>The SE London branch of TOM was established on 17th of February 1975. This was just one month into Clark's deployment. Presumably, the monitoring and supervision of a UCO would be particularly intense in the early stage of their deployment?</p> <p>The report detailing the formation of the SE London branch of TOM and Rick Clark's role in that is at MPS-0728678. Can HN34 confirm that it is his signature on the report? Can he confirm that he must have known about Clark's role in establishing it?</p> <p>Can he confirm from the face of the document that there were only four people involved in establishing that branch? They were Richard Chessum? Richard Chessum's girlfriend? [a redacted male name] and a woman known to the Inquiry as "Mary"?</p> <p>Is HN34 sure that he does not remember it?</p> <p>That document was sent to Box 500 i.e. the Security Service?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>The report is dated the 17th of February 1975 and is signed by Clark and HN34?</p> <p>On the same date HN34 signed four further documents: MPS-0728205, MPS-0728938, UCPI0000012136 and UCPI0000012135. Individual personal reports on Richard Chessum, his girlfriend, "Mary" and someone known to the Inquiry as "Mary's flat mate".</p> <p>All four were sent to Box 500.</p> <p>The establishment of the branch must have been significant enough for HN34 to send five separate reports in relation to it to MI5 on the same day that he heard about it. Is he sure that he can't remember it?</p> <p><u>Other positions of responsibility:</u> Elected as branch secretary (MPS-0728710). 18th March 1975 (signed off by Kneale)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Elected as delegate to London Co-ordinating committee (MPS- 0728718) 2nd of April 1975. (Kneale)</p> <p>Elected as delegate to the All London meeting (MPS-0728721) 7th April 1975. (Kneale)</p> <p>21st April 1975: election as branch's delegate to the National Co-ordinating Committee of TOM. (MPS-0728730). (Kneale)</p> <p>Four separate elections in the space of a month: Bearing in mind (a) the close "supervision" (b) the need for both senior officers to discuss positions of responsibility (c) HN34's attendance at every twice weekly meeting. How is it that he says that he did not know?</p> <p>Is he sure about that?</p> <p>(NOTE: although these reports are signed off by DCI Kneale, DI Craft was signing off Clark's reports that indicated he had obtained this positions see for example: MPS-0728731, MPS-0728734, MPS-0728735: May 1975.</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>16th of June 1975: further election as delegate to London Co-ordinating Committee (MPS-0728667). (signed by Craft)</p> <p>23rd June 1975: further election as delegate to National Co-ordinating Committee, (MPS-0728669) (signed by Kneale)</p> <p>HN34 must have been aware of his repeated standing for election? What was the purpose of it? Surely this is evidence of a clear campaign to gain a place in the National Office of the TOM?</p> <p>27th of June 1975 (MPS-0728675): RC at private meeting organised by Gerry Lawless, (Head of TOM). Only 10 people in attendance. People deemed key to supporting Lawless's position. (Signed off by Kneale)</p> <p>7th of July 1975 (MPS-0728697) Branch meeting. "unprecedented turnout", additional attendees from Worker's Fight. Clark elected as a delegate again. (Signed off by Craft).</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>19th of September 1975 (MPS-0728755) Clark was at the London-Co-ordinating Committee as the branch delegate. He stood for a National position (on the Organising Committee for London) and was elected. He had passed completely beyond branch politics. (Kneale)</p> <p>13th of October 1975: (MPS-0728761) RC resigned his position as branch secretary because he no longer needed it. (Kneale)</p> <p>Quickly became the London Organiser (20th of October 1975) (MPS0728736 signed by Kneale).</p> <p>Then nominated by Lawless for a position on the National Secretariat (MPS – 0728762) (sent to Box 500) (17th of November 1975). He was one of only 7 people in charge of the whole movement. (signed off by Kneale)</p> <p>In just 9 months Rick Clark moved from establishing a branch to becoming one of the</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>seven people in charge of the National movement. HN34 must be able to remember that?</p> <p>Organiser of the National Rally (MPS-0728772 Kneale).</p> <p>And then got himself a position on the Press Committee (MPS-0729779) (again signed off by Craft). (11th of February 1976).</p> <p>March 1976: took Lawless's position as Convenor of the Secretariat and was thus in charge of the whole movement (MPS0728785) (again signed off by Craft and sent to Box 500).</p> <p>HN34 must be able to remember this? What was the purpose of this? Rick Clark clearly ended up in a position where he would had to have been taking decisions on behalf of the movement?</p> <p>The alternative was that he took no such role and therefore left the organisation without effective leadership?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

11	<p><u>De-stabilising the TOM:</u></p> <p>There are a number of examples of incidents where Clark's approach could be said to be de-stabilising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21st April 1975: "severely criticised another section of the movement". Ensured election as branch's delegate to the National Co-ordinating Committee of TOM. (MPS-0728730). (Kneale) • 13th of October 1975: (MPS-0728761) reported that he had made a "scathing attack" on RCG and WF members. (Kneale) • Clark "insisted on the removal of TOM Press Officer from the Secretariat" (MPS-0728774) (January 1976) Signed off by Craft. Sent to Box 500. • As Convenor, delayed a long-planned Trade union delegation to Ireland (UCPI0000012332 and 12328). (Craft). 	Impact of deployments.	<p>MPS-0728730 MPS-0728761 MPS-0728774 UCPI0000012332 and 12328 UCPI000009684 UCPI000009733 UCPI000009790 UCPI0000016711 MPS-0745772 UCPI0000016769, UCPI0000016816 UCPI0000011895</p>	
----	--	------------------------	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Severely criticised another member [redacted] (UCPI000009684) and prepared documents for circulation to the press. (Craft).• Censured Sean Matgamna (a very prominent member of TOM) (UCPI000009733 Craft)• At least one prominent organisation withdrew its support for TOM (UCPI000009790) because the “atmosphere was increasingly reformist” (4 months into Clark’s leadership).• Serious dissent with IMG (UCPI000009790) over postponement of delegation to NI.• By the time Lawless returned two members of the Secretariat had resigned (UCPI9790) All Craft.			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Firstly, HN34 must have known about these, because he signed them off?</p> <p>Does he recognise the negative impact that this could have on an organisation?</p> <p>These are repeated examples of a UCO sowing discord? From a position of leadership? They are repeatedly signed off by management? HN34 must accept that that amounts to managerial encouragement?</p> <p>Was this the purpose of the deployment?</p> <p>If not, why did HN34 not try to stop Clark's activity?</p> <p>Is HN34 aware of another UCO deployment, HN96, who also took very high positions in the TOM? HN96 also joined TOM National Steering Committee (UCPI0000016711, UCPI0000016769, UCPI0000016816) in</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>November and December 1981. He moved into TOM two years into his deployment (see MPS-0745772/38).</p> <p>Does HN34 recall this officer?</p> <p>HN96's movement into the TOM and taking positions of high responsibility co-incide with HN34's appointment as Chief Superintendent of "S" Squad.</p> <p>Is that a co-incidence?</p> <p>TOM was widely viewed as having "too many splits in the movement... too busy fighting amongst themselves to do any good work on the troops out issue"? (UCPI0000011895)</p> <p>Does HN34 accept that the activity of Rick Clark appears to have contributed to that?</p> <p>Is HN34 aware that the Troops Out Movement argued that the withdrawal of the British military from Northern Ireland was an essential precursor to peace?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Is HN34 aware that during the 1990's 'peace process', successive British, Irish and US governments, and all the main Westminster political parties, accepted that a 'de-militarisation' process in Northern Ireland was an essential step towards peace?</p> <p>Is HN34 aware that but for that de-militarisation there would never have been a Good Friday agreement?</p> <p>Is HN34</p>			
12	<p><u>Other positions of responsibility taken by UCOs during HN34's tenure:</u></p> <p>There are a number of such officers. HN353 "Gary Roberts" is pertinent to Richard Chessum (see transcript of evidence page 107 to 108):</p> <p>HN353: deployed into Thames Polytechnic. Was that a decision that HN34 played a part in?</p> <p>His course fees were paid for by the MPSB: is that a decision HN34 had a part in?</p>	Pertinent to terms of reference.	MPS-0740413	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>He became the Vice President of the Student's Union. Was that a decision that HN34 had a part in?</p> <p>He was a delegate at National Union of Students conferences and attended the International Marxist Group caucuses at those conferences (HN353 statement paragraph 66) involved in the selection of "revolutionary" candidates. REFS (HN353 statement paragraphs 36 and 66).</p> <p>This was a prominent role in a London branch of the National Union of Students.</p> <p>What was the rationale for putting a UCO into a national union?</p>			
13.	<p><u>Personal reporting:</u></p> <p>The four reports that HN34 sent to MI5 on the day that SE London TOM was established:</p> <p>MPS-0728205: An individual personal report on Richard Chessum, detailing his home address, background, physical description and the fact that he once wrote an article for "Black Dwarf" and so came to attention of SB.</p>	<p>Relevant to Terms of Reference.</p>	<p>MPS-0728205 MPS-0728938 UCPI0000012136 UCPI0000012135 MPS-0731417 UCPI000006936</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>MPS-0728938: An individual personal report on Richard Chessum's girlfriend, again with personal details, including a physical description, her employment as a student nurse.</p> <p>UCPI0000012136: an individual personal report on "Mary", with personal details, teacher training studies, physical description, background. It also included her age (27) and by implication, the fact that she was single?</p> <p>UCPI0000012135: an individual personal report on someone known to this Inquiry as "Mary's flat mate", includes physical description and the fact that she frequently suffered asthma attacks. It also included her age (24) and by implication, the fact that she was single?</p> <p>Why were these personal details reported? Why were they sent to MI5?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Why would jobs such as “student nurse” and “teacher training student” be of interest to SDS? And MI5?</p> <p>Why would a health condition be reported?</p> <p>Later reporting: Report on Richard Chessum’s job as a clerk at London Electricity Board (MPS-0731417). This report deals with nothing other than employment? Copies were sent to “C” Squad and MI5? Why?</p> <p>Of these four individuals: only one (RC’s girlfriend) had a SB file, prior to Clark’s reporting. They accrued “mentions” for activity such as watching a play? (UCPI000006936)</p>			
14	<p><u>Personal relationships:</u></p> <p>Bearing in mind the small group that established the branch, what sort of</p>	<p>Relevant to terms of reference.</p>	<p>MPS-0728678 UCPI0000012136 UCPI0000012135 MPS-0728721 MPS-0728728</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>relationships does HN34 think Clark established with Richard Chessum?</p> <p>and “Mary”?</p> <p>Bearing in mind that “Mary’s flat mate” was not in attendance at the meeting that established the SE London TOM branch, how was it that her details came to be reported on the same day?</p> <p>“Mary” was reported as being in attendance at the meeting?</p> <p>Her detailed home address was also reported at the same time?</p> <p>At the same time the detail of her flat-mate was provided as living at the same address?</p> <p>And that included a detailed physical description? Indicating that he had seen her?</p> <p>But she hadn’t been at the meeting?</p> <p>Does that not suggest that Rick Clark had visited “Mary’s” home address?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>As a very senior detective is that not something that would have occurred to you?</p> <p>Did the fact that both women were young and single not raise a concern?</p> <p>Did you ask Rick Clark how he came by that information?</p> <p>Did HN34 ask Rick Clark how he came by more intimate personal information such as the frequency of “Mary’s flat-mate’s” asthma attacks?</p> <p>What was HN34’s attitude to UCOs entering the home addresses of activists, under false pretences?</p> <p>On what basis would HN34 say that that was lawful?</p> <p>What was HN34’s attitude to UCOs entering the home addresses of young women, under false pretences?</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Clark was deployed into a College. Isn't it inevitable that he would have contact with young, single, females in a college?</p> <p>On that basis what enquiries were made into Clark's sexual reputation?</p> <p>Clark was involved in establishing a branch with a small number of others. Isn't it inevitable that creating a new branch with others would result in close personal relationships?</p> <p>Bearing in mind that two of the four individuals initially reported were, and were known to be, young, single females: what enquiries were made into Clark's sexual reputation?</p> <p>There is a combination of "red flags":</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1: Deployment into a college with young, single women.2: immediate interaction with young, single women.3: a strong indication that Clark had visited the home address of the young single women.			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Isn't it clear, to anyone (let alone a senior detective) that there was a very significant risk of Clark entering into sexual relationships under false pretences?</p> <p>In the light Clark's reputation isn't it absolutely inevitable?</p> <p>Did HN34 recognise that inevitability?</p> <p>Did he recognise a risk?</p> <p>Did he recognise a possibility?</p> <p>Was HN34 really not aware that Rick Clark had sexual relationships with both "Mary" and her flatmate?</p> <p>There are numerous examples of Clark entering Richard Chessum's home address, for example: MPS-0728721, MPS-0728728.</p> <p>Clark's reporting details an extensive interaction with Richard Chessum over a period of almost two years.</p> <p>Must have been clear that personal relationships were formed?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Must have been clear that those personal relationships enabled Clark to build a legend, establish credibility and move up the hierarchy of the TOM?</p> <p>Clark's rise in TOM was meteoric. Those relationships facilitated that rise. HN34 must have realised that?</p> <p>The formation of friendships was clearly a very effective tactic? It paid big dividends?</p> <p>HN304 "Graham Coates" was clear that Rick Clark's sexual relationships were discussed in the presence of management.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the tactical advantage in such relationships, is HN34 still maintaining that he was not aware of the fact that Rick Clark was having sexual relationships with his targets?</p>			
15	<p><u>Big Flame:</u> Was a specific target of yours?</p>	Relevant to terms of reference.	MPS-0728980 UCPI0000010775	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>An organisation you referred to as “sinister”? (MPS-0728980/4)</p> <p>But HN34’s account barely deals with Big Flame at all?</p> <p>Is HN34 being intentionally vague?</p> <p>At W/S para 77 and para 80: HN34 says:</p> <p>Para 77: <i>“Infiltration [of Big Flame] came out of our infiltration of the SWP”</i></p> <p>And at para 77: <i>“the deployment was successful in terms of how it assisted the policing of public order”.</i></p> <p>Firstly: who was deployed into Big Flame?</p> <p>Secondly: How did that deployment assist the policing of public order?</p> <p>There was no successful deployment into Big Flame?</p> <p>Why does HN34 attempt to give a different impression in his statement?</p> <p>Why does HN34 suggest that the attempted deployment into Big Flame came from infiltration of the SWP?</p>		<p>MPS-0728754</p> <p>UCPI000009283</p> <p>UCPI0000021388</p>	
--	--	---	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Is that an attempt to distract from the reality?</p> <p>The tactics used by Rick Clark to infiltrate Big Flame were particularly extreme?</p> <p>He used Richard Chessum to get an introduction to Big Flame in the summer of 1975 (MPS-0728754) and attended his home (UCPI000009283) under false pretences to increase that access.</p> <p>Does HN34 approve of those two tactics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) The creation and exploitation of a false friendship?(b) Entering someone's home under false pretences? <p>Does he have any moral qualms about the first?</p> <p>Does he have any legal qualms about either?</p> <p>The following year:</p> <p>On 25 July 1976 (UCPI0000010775) Rick Clark held a meeting with 5 Big Flame members to plot opposition/"resistance" to the leadership of TOM?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>This was not just reported by Clark? It was facilitated by him? Even to the extent that he held it in his police cover flat? HN34 must have been aware of the content? He must have been aware that was a direct police attempt to decapitate and undermine a campaigning organisation? That is not a decision that can be taken without serious consideration and consultation with high level management surely? HN34 signed this off? and it was sent to MI5? The Security Service and the MPSB Chief Superintendents and above were aware that an SDS officer was conspiring to de-stabilise a peace campaign?</p> <p>That is an extreme tactic?</p> <p>The leadership that Clark was plotting against was Gerry Lawless? Clark had formed a close relationship with Lawless which enabled him to rise up the TOM hierarchy and replace him as Convenor during</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Lawless's paternity leave (from reports above that Craft signed off)? And now Clark was plotting, with managerial authority to oust him?</p> <p>Does HN34 have any qualms about the extreme duplicity of that activity?</p> <p>On the 2nd September 1976 (UCPI0000021388) Clark went even further? Another meeting: Big Flame and other "influential members" of TOM including Clark? First question: Clark is self-describing as "influential" and HN34 is signing that off: This is clear recognition by the SDS that an officer is "influencing" a movement, isn't it?</p> <p>The "major aim" of the nine attendees (including Clark) was "the defeat of the present leadership [of TOM] and the replacement of them by independent members"?</p> <p>Rick Clark was named as the second of five proposed new leaders?</p> <p>This is plotting a coup isn't it?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>A coup in what was fundamentally a democratic, peace campaign? This is signed off by HN34? And his Chief Superintendent? And sent to MI5?</p> <p>HN34 must remember this?</p> <p>How is this consistent with HN34's assertion: Para 66: <i>"The concern from the SDS was to provide the quality of intelligence which would enable the policing of public order activities to preserve our right to free speech and to demonstrate our views, within the rule of law, based upon parliamentary democracy"</i>:</p> <p>Isn't this a direct assault on the right to free speech and views?</p> <p>Did HN34 have any qualms about that?</p> <p>Isn't this an example of using the most extreme tactics to infiltrate Big Flame?</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>If the police are prepared to so blatantly undermine the democracy that they are supposed to be serving, wouldn't they be prepared to do anything?</p> <p>Is that the reason that HN34 has been so vague about the activities of Clark?</p> <p>HN34's first statement to the Inquiry was signed on the 7th of December 2020. Was he aware that at that time, the Inquiry viewed Rick Clark's deployment as uneventful?</p> <p>Did he hope that Clark's activities and his own complicity in them would not be uncovered?</p>			
16	<p><u>Identity compromise:</u> HN34 had a very close involvement with the creation of UCO identities: Para 30 "<i>I was very much involved in the invention, development and assessment of cover identities... We felt very secure on birth... knew it was a pretty secure method. I very much oversaw this</i>".</p>	<p>Pertinent to terms of reference.</p>	<p>MPS-0728980 MPS-0728981 Transcript of Richard Chessum's evidence. MPS-0731077, MPS-0731078, MPS-0731075</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Equally, he must have been aware that his superiors and the Home Office considered the continued secrecy of the SDS to be of paramount importance?</p> <p>Aware that it would be politically “embarrassing” if the activities of the SDS became public? (MPS-0728981 paragraph 10, authored by Craft’s successor, Pryde)</p> <p>See for example the cover letter (from Assistant Commissioner Wilson) to the 1976 SDS Annual report that Craft authored (MPS-0728980/13): <i>“Security surrounding the activities of the Squad is maintained at a very high level, and the Chief Superintendent and Superintendent responsible ensure the closest supervision of each of the officers operationally involved. Needless to say, the Commissioner and I also exercise a keen interest in their activities”</i>.</p> <p>HN34 was conscious that cover identities were key to that security?</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Craft's own words in that report: "<i>Security of the operation has always rested upon close supervision of officers as individuals and as a group, backed up by 'safe' premises... and the provision of the strongest possible cover backgrounds compatible with the modern computer age</i>". (MPS-0728980/5)</p> <p>Any compromise of a UCO identity would be very serious indeed? It could cause "embarrassment" to the Commissioner? And to the Home Office? It could have ramifications that could prove fatal to the existence of the Squad?</p> <p>Rick Clark's identity was compromised? The fact and circumstances of that compromise became a part of SDS folklore? (note: including mention in the "Tradecraft Manual").</p> <p>And yet HN34 makes no reference to the actual compromise in his December 2020 statement?</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>The reference at para 33: <i>“when things went wrong, I was there to be on hand to discuss where we went. Welfare was always our responsibility as the most senior officers in the SDS. On one occasion Rick Clark thought that he had been rumbled and was called to a meeting in a pub; Derek and I both went and kept observation. This is the only time I remember having to do that.”</i></p> <p>Is deliberately vague?</p> <p>Rick Clark didn't “think” he had been rumbled? He knew that he had been rumbled and so did HN34 and Kneale?</p> <p>HN34 was present when Clark was confronted with his “own” death certificate? (Transcript Day 10 T1P2 page 112).</p> <p>Clark was in a pub with members of Big Flame? He went to buy a round of drinks?</p> <p>And when he returned his birth certificate and death certificate were spread out on the table in front of him?</p> <p>He became emotional and went as white as a sheet?</p> <p>And then he left?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>There was no violence, or anger, or retribution from the Big Flame members?</p> <p>This was the biggest risk to the security of the SDS until “True Spies”?</p> <p>Why does HN34 not deal with it in his statement?</p> <p>It led to immediate exfiltration (which HN34 must have been involved in? see statement para 34 “<i>very much involved in exfiltration</i>”, “<i>It [exfiltration generally] was a serious matter</i>”. (para 34).</p> <p>Clark’s cover flat was stripped overnight? (RC transcript page 112) (particularly as he had held a coup plot meeting there, see above).</p> <p>This must have been the biggest and most important incident in HN34’s SDS career? Why was he deliberately vague about it in his statement?</p> <p>There must have been an internal inquiry about this?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Clark must have been asked how it was that he came to be “rumbled”? And his account must have been vigorously examined?</p> <p>The implications were potentially catastrophic for the existence of the SDS?</p> <p>The compromise also put the security of every previous and current SDS officer at risk?</p> <p>It put the “secure” method of creating cover identities at risk?</p> <p>This was such a big incident that a decade later, in 1986, a Special Branch Commander’s memorandum was drafted for the attention of “All officers”, alerting them to the fact that Richard Chessum was talking to a freelance investigative journalist about Rick Clark and Big Flame? (see MPS-0731077, MPS-0731078, MPS-0731075)</p> <p>You and Clark must have known the importance of finding out the reason for the compromise?</p> <p>So, what enquiries were made?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Several officers (see Closed officer transcript page 46) were told by Clark that the reason for the compromise was because he had told different stories in relation to his background to two female Big Flame members that he was having sexual relationships with (closed officer gist para 26).</p> <p>Bearing in mind that HN34 was aware that: <i>“people did talk all the time and it was much more open [than SB]”</i> Para 26. What enquiries were made with other officers?</p> <p>Is HN34 really saying that he did not know?</p> <p>Bearing in mind that HN34 was closely involved in the “serious matter” of exfiltration, was he involved in the decision to send a note to one of the women that Clark had had a sexual relationship with?</p> <p>It was a note explaining why he had left? (Richard Chessum transcript pages 106, 107 and 112)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>This was an exfiltration tactic used by many officers after that? Particularly to people that UCOs had had close relationships with? To explain departures and reduce the risk that UCOs would be sought out after their exfiltration? Can HN34 see that that would be an effective tactic to use in the exfiltration process?</p> <p>Did Rick Clark come up with that idea on his own? Or did he have help from senior management in his exfiltration?</p> <p>Is it just a co-incidence that Clark was the first to use what became a tried and tested exfiltration tactic?</p>			
17	<p><u>Clear decline in public order work:</u> The purpose of SDS had originally been to counter public disorder at the October 1968 anti-vietnam war demonstration? But the risk of disorder at demonstrations dwindled considerably after that? In the 1975 SDS Annual Report (MPS-0730099) there is a section called "Product and</p>	Justification	<p>MPS-0730099 MPS-0730658 MPS-0730745 MPS-0728980</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Distribution". It deals with the demonstrations over 1975? And the risk to public disorder?</p> <p>The only reference to a public order risk in that section is a risk from the far -right? Hard-line fascists in the "Legion [sic] of St. George"? the rest deals with how campaigns against unemployment and abortion rights attracted attention? But posed no threat, in the SDS view because of "sectarian differences"?</p> <p>The "Review" [of the year] section: No disorder at the Abortion rights demo (para 21)? No disorder at TOM demo (para 25).</p> <p>The only disorder referred to was in relation to NF demonstrations? NF marchers in minority areas, alleging "muggings" by the black population? SDS describe an attempt by the IS/SWP to block the march as "pathetic"? "no serious public order"? (para 23)</p> <p>(para 24): What is described as an attempt by the left to disrupt a NF function? But actually details an attack by he NF on a meeting of a campaign against racism?</p> <p>That's the sum of the 1975 disorder worthy of mention in the SDS Annual Report?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Although it was your job to “<i>point up the value of the SDS in terms of public order and seek continuation for another year</i>” (W/S para 68): that was the total?</p> <p>You were conscious of this report because you contributed to it?</p> <p>(W/S para 41): “<i>In terms of other SDS paperwork that was produced, the main thing was the annual report. This was detailed and produced in the office by all of us</i>”.</p> <p>This lack of disorder led to questions being raised about whether there actually any point in the SDS?</p> <p>Commander Rodger commissioned a “<i>complete review of the [SDS]... its activities and objectives</i>”? (MPS-0730658)</p> <p>His concern was that “<i>over the past seven years [disorder at demonstrations] has dwindled considerably</i>”? Now HN34 has heard that “dwindled considerably” were Commander Rodger’s words, would he agree with that assessment?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Commander Rodger had been in position as Commander of MPSB since the autumn of 1971? Would HN34 agree that Rodger was likely to have had a greater insight into the dwindling public order situation than an Inspector who had been at the SDS since the end of 1974?</p> <p>This review request must have been considered to be very important? The continued existence of the SDS depended on it?</p> <p>To what extent was HN34 involved in the response to the review? Did he contribute to it? He is listed as being one of three in the working party set up to respond to it (MPS-0730745)? As part of the three man response team, he must have read it?</p> <p>Firstly, it accepted the decline? (<i>Certainly the degree of violence associated with public demonstrations has declined since... 1968</i>".</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>But it rationalised the continuance of the SDS by saying</p> <p>(1) that the number of demonstrations had increased? <i>(However, if anything, the popularity of street demonstrations has increased, so that public issues like abortion, trespass, unemployment, civil liberties etc. have brought very large numbers onto the streets with the ever-present potential for public disorder”)</i></p> <p>But you knew that there wasn't any disorder at these demonstrations?</p> <p>This is not an argument for policing disorder is it?</p> <p>It's an argument for policing the right to protest?</p> <p>(2) The response stated that the SDS had responded to the decline in public disorder by reducing the number of operational SDS officers? From 26 down to 12?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>That is designed to make it look like the SDS were responding appropriately to the lack of disorder by a corresponding reduction in the number of infiltrations?</p> <p>That just wasn't true?</p> <p>The number of operational officers had stayed at between 10 and 12 since either the outset or at least 1969? (NOTE: every Annual report since 1969 details no more than 12 operational officers).</p> <p>That is an outright lie? You must have been a party to that lie? You must have read it? Did you check it?</p> <p>You were also aware that, in fact, the lengths of deployments and the amount of reports generated had increased dramatically since 1968?</p> <p>Despite the decline in disorder the extent of the intrusion into private lives had actually increased?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Why was that not referred to in the response?</p> <p>It's not just a "gloss or a slant" (see W/S para 68) is it?</p> <p>It is blatant dishonesty?</p> <p>And it can only have been designed to continue the existence of the SDS by deception?</p> <p>The third rationale for the continued existence of the SDS was "<i>Suffice it to say that the contribution made by the SDS to the national interests of the Security Service is a very considerable one; a point which is fully acknowledged</i>".</p> <p>When you were asked in your witness statement about the SDS assistance to MI5, you replied that you didn't know? (para 151) All you could suggest was that you "<i>would have thought the far-left intelligence provided them with a huge base of information for their vetting activity</i>"?</p> <p>All three of these rationales are deeply suspect?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

18	<p><u>Communication with Sys:</u> HN34: Para 40: <i>“did not have much communication with SyS whilst I was on the SDS”</i>. Para: 157: <i>“I cannot remember having any contact or dealing with SyS”</i>.</p> <p>He was shown three documents by the inquiry that demonstrate that he did have such contact: UCPI0000027451: 18th of January 1976: This must have been a very memorable occasion?</p> <p>Specific requests for enquiry work were sent by MI5 to SDS? Perhaps that was not unusual? Kneale and Craft went to meet MI5? MI5 raised a very specific and memorable concern? They notified HN34 and Kneale that although the SDS was supposed to be a secret, there was actually widespread knowledge of its existence amongst Special Branches around the country?</p>	UCPI0000027451 UCPI0000030058 MPS-0730700		

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>That disclosure had important implications? The SDS “security” was not what it was supposed to be? That must have been extremely concerning? He must remember that meeting?</p> <p>UCPI0000030058: 19th of September 1977: This was a meeting specifically to introduce his successor Ken Pryde to MI5? Why specifically introduce Pryde if there “was not much communication”? Went for drinks and sandwiches with MI5? Doesn’t remember that? Told MI5 that SDS was putting most of their effort into the SWP?</p> <p>(NOTE: Doc J: Memorandum 15th of March 1976 was the third document shown to Craft: We can’t find this on OPUS... can ILT direct us?)</p> <p>Is it right that SDS contact with MI5 was increasing? And that increased contact happened to co-incide with the decline in public order?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>The material that you were providing MI5 with, was very much to do with the SWP?</p> <p>And as you said, you didn't know how the SDS assisted SyS other than with vetting?</p> <p>There is another document: MPS-0730700 that deals with your interaction with MI5. 3 months before the drinks and sandwiches with Ken Pryde:</p> <p>It's a letter from MI5 to you directly, it's addressed "Dear Geoff"?</p> <p>How was it that you were on first name terms with MI5 if you barely communicated with them?</p> <p>They specifically say "Geoff", rather than "Geoffrey", so it's very familiar?</p> <p>Does HN34 have any explanation for that?</p> <p>The letter thanks HN34 for the "<i>flow of information you are sending us on the activities of the SWP</i>"?</p> <p>This was in June 1977, clearly providing significant quantities of intelligence to them?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>As you said at para 159 of W/S: <i>The SDS provided SyS with a great deal of information on individuals that were of concern for their responsibility in vetting.</i></p> <p>This is the sort of material that they were thanking you for?</p>			
19	<p><u>Trotskyists, SWP:</u></p> <p>W/S: Para 23: <i>“quite often [new officers] would be moved into something like the SWP initially because it was easy... and then they would move onto other areas having gained a reputation”.</i></p> <p>SWP a very open organisation? Easy access to their meetings? To their views, aims and proposed activities through their various publications? Like <i>“The Socialist Worker”</i>? Does it surprise HN34 to know that the Metropolitan Police were subscribers to <i>the Socialist Worker</i>? That when a UCO took subscription lists from SWP Head office, that</p>	Pertinent to LG.	UCPI0000015521 MPS-0728980	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>list had the Met itself down for 5 copies a week? UCPI0000015521</p> <p>SDS used them as a stepping stone? i.e. join easily, build a legend? And use that legend to move on elsewhere? Into an organisation that was not as open?</p> <p>At the same time, sending lists of members and financial information to MI5? Would HN34 agree that the vast majority of reports on the SWP dealt with matters such as that?</p> <p>1976: Annual report: <i>“Trotskyist groups have all followed similar lines of protest against unemployment and cuts in public expenditure but their sectarianism continues to limit joint activity and thus renders the task of police less difficult than it might otherwise be”</i> (para 4) MPS-0728980/3</p> <p>Fair to summarise as: protesting about poverty and living standards? That these are economic issues?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>And the only concern in relation to public disorder is in relation to what you describe as “confrontation” with the National Front?</p> <p>You describe SWP opposition to the National Front as “almost paranoid”?</p>			
20	<p><u>The National Front:</u></p> <p>In the 1975 SDS Annual Report (MPS-0730099) there is reference to the first SDS infiltration of the National Front?</p> <p>This was not an SDS deployment though? It was a UCO deployed into the WRP, who the WRP in turn asked to infiltrate the NF?</p> <p>Fair to say that infiltration of Far-right organisations was being led by the WRP rather than the SDS?</p> <p>The 1975 Annual report also raised concerns about the public order threat from far-right groups? (Para 22: <i>Most of the public order problems were concerned with the activities of the National Front</i>) And detailed some of the provocative marches they organised through minority areas? As well as giving as example of an attack by the Far-right on a Campaign</p>	Public order justification.	<p>MPS-0730099 MPS-0728980 MPS-0747578 UCPI0000010947 UCPI0000011244 MPS-0747791 MPS-0728985/9 MPS-0730904/14 UCPI0000010957</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>meeting organised against racists? (see examples in the “Decline in public disorder” section above). That report was quite vocal about the “discovery” of the hard-line fascists “the Legion [sic] of St. George”? and their potential threat to public order? That report attributed value to the NF infiltration? The information was unobtainable from any other source? Particularly valuable, as it was the only threat to public order identified in 1975?</p> <p>By the 1976 SDS Annual Report (signed by you) the position had changed? (MPS-0728980) You are saying that the information lauded as valuable was actually not valuable? (see AR para 9). And the SDS already had “excellent sources” in the NF?</p> <p>What changed? Why did your assessment of value change?</p> <p>Your Detective Inspector Angus McIntosh (who joined the SDs in the spring of 1976) believes that the decision not to infiltrate the far-right was nothing to do with “sources” but was a</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>“high level policy decision” (MPS-0747578 para 92).</p> <p>You were more senior to him? Were you aware of the existence of the “policy decision”? Would you have been high enough as DCI to be told of one? What was it?</p> <p>Were you aware of high level SB contact with prominent fascists? In 1968 SB Chief Superintendent had sent two senior SDS officers to meet Lady Birdwood at her home address, to discuss the October demonstration? Do you know who she is? In the mid 1970s she was associated with the NF? She was a well-known racist and antisemite, who later gained a number of convictions for inciting racial hatred?</p> <p>You were well aware of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Significant violence and public disorder from NF, their members and associates?(b) Against people from ethnic minorities? and(c) Against leftists?			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>You were well aware that there was a widely held perception that the police either did not take it seriously or did very little about it?</p> <p>UCPI0000010947: September 1977: signed off by Craft: Attachment to the report was a leaflet detailing concern about NF activity in Brick Lane. Listed the racist attacks in the area: arson attack on the home of an Indian restaurant, the family that lived upstairs were hospitalised along with three firemen. A middle aged Indian man attacked. An attack on an Indian family home with hammers and bars. Two Indian youths arrested for taking down NF stickers, threatened with deportation and told if they didn't like it here, they should go back where they came from. Fascist slogans daubed on the Canning Town mosque. Police refusal to engage in investigations.</p> <p>August 1977: Column 88 threat to burn down house of SWP Central Committee member signed off by Craft UCPI0000011244. Who were Column 88?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>What does the 88 stand for? It refers to the 8th letter of the alphabet? 88 = HH? Which stands for <i>Heil Hitler</i>? Do you appreciate that there was a lot of fear in local communities?</p> <p>September 1977 UCPI0000010957: The Far-Right petrol bombed the SWP Centre? Report signed off by Craft.</p> <p>Did you ever listen to the views of your own officers? HN21 was one of your UCOs? Deployed into the SWP? <i>“You would be selling the papers and then suddenly from out of the blue some National Front or National Party people would turn up and try and have a go at you... Physically... I had a fight with someone who was trying to attack me... they were quite big and you know some of us were puny creatures. So, it wasn't in our interests to confront them physically... From the SWP side, it was mostly shouting.</i></p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>From the Far Right thing, it was mostly physical violence”.</i></p> <p>He would have had actual experience of the situation on the street? Whereas you would not? HN21 himself was involved in fighting the NF? You wouldn't have disciplined him for that? Because he was defending himself?</p> <p>In the first 4 months of 1978 there were 33 racist attacks in Brick Lane, including hammer attacks, stabbings, punctured lungs? Are you aware of the extent of the violence and disorder? In May of 1978 Altab Ali was murdered in a racist attack? Aware of that?</p> <p>In 1978 SDS Annual report (MPS-0747791) it was accepted that National Front members were responsible for “<i>several brutal attacks on members of ethnic minorities</i>” and that the brutality heightened opposition to them.</p> <p>Do you still maintain, as you did in the 1976 report, that the opposition to the National Front was “almost paranoid”?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Do you accept that when you said that you were speaking on behalf of the SDS?</p> <p>Do you accept that that comment is indicative of a police approach to not take the concerns of local communities seriously?</p> <p>You were informing the Home Office, in effect, that National Front violence was not what the communities, the SWP and others were making it out to be?</p> <p>Do you accept now that that was wrong?</p> <p>Were you aware of strong local community objections to National Front processions in their areas?</p> <p>The communities of Lewisham and Southall, including their councils, strongly objected to those NF demonstrations?</p> <p>They weren't listened to?</p> <p>In the 1981 and 1982 SDS Annual Reports (MPS-0728985/9 MPS-0730904/14) there was no significant disorder between the left and the right. The SDS put that down to the</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Commissioner having banned NF marches in minority areas as “deliberately provocative of disorder and violence”.</p> <p>Does HN34 accept that if the police had listened to the communities of Lewisham in 1977 and Southall in 1979 the disorder at those NF demonstrations would not have happened?</p>			
21	<p><u>Trade Unions:</u></p> <p>What did HN34 understand the purpose of trade unions to be?</p> <p>Para 148: “<i>Information about trade unions was of interest to the Security Service</i>”. What was Craft’s understanding of why?</p> <p>Did HN34 see it as part of his responsibility to obtain intelligence on individuals or organisations who used or threatened the use of strikes, sit-ins and other forms of aggressive action to further industrial disputes?</p>	<p>Pertinent to terms of reference.</p>	<p>UCPI0000012061</p>	

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>Did HN34 see it as part of his responsibility to obtain intelligence on individuals or organisations who showed or encouraged an unwillingness to seek or accept compromise solutions through negotiations, conciliation or arbitration?</p> <p>An example: West London SWP report (23/01/75 so International Socialists) on a shop stewards committee that wrote to factories in the area to support each other when on strike and to organise a rank and file conference – signed by Craft (UCPI0000012061).</p> <p>Why was this sent to Box 500?</p> <p>Isn't this just an example of trade unionism?</p> <p>Factories showing solidarity with one another?</p> <p>Craft's deployment of two officers into educational institutions: they therefore became members of the NUS immediately?</p> <p>One of them took a senior union role. HN34</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>seems to have no concerns about targeting unions directly?</p>			
22	<p><u>Blacklisting:</u></p> <p><i>Para 70: "In theory "pro Irish" deployments assisted the Security Service as it was their responsibility to ensure that people who might be a problem were not employed in sensitive organisations":</i></p> <p>Would HN34 put TOM members into this category?</p> <p>Members of the TOM would not be employed in "sensitive organisations"?</p> <p>To be clear, if you believed that there could only be peace in Northern Ireland if British troops were withdrawn, and you joined an organisation to express those views and lobby for that withdrawal you would not be employed in "sensitive organisations"?</p> <p>If that individual had a special branch file reference, would that increase their unemployability?</p>	<p>Pertinent to terms of reference.</p>		<p>UCPI0000006936</p> <p>UCPI0000006997</p> <p>UCPI0000012136</p> <p>MPS-0728701</p> <p>UCPI0000012737</p> <p>MPS-0735755</p> <p>UCPI0000034699</p> <p>MPS-0730906</p> <p>UCPI0000031845</p>

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>If you wrote an article for “Black Dwarf” and received a SB “mention” and then set up a branch of TOM with a UCO and received a mention for every meeting of that branch, you would get a file? Even though you hadn’t done anything remotely unlawful?</p> <p>To be clear, it was quite easy to stack up “mentions”?</p> <p>“Mary” had no trace on SB files when she met Rick Clark (UCPI0000012136)?</p> <p>She got a “mention” for being at the meeting to set up the SE London branch that Rick Clark had instigated?</p> <p>Then she received a mention for watching a play about fascism? (UCPI0000006936) That was sent to MI5? Why was “Mary’s attendance at a play of interest to you? And why was it of interest to MI5?</p> <p>(NOTE: he can’t use the “file updating” excuse because she didn’t have a file).</p> <p>Then another “mention” for going to one of Clark’s TOM meetings (MPS-0728701)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>And another for going on an anti-National Front demonstration? (UCPI000006997)</p> <p>By June 1975 she had a file (UCPI0000012737) and her holiday plans were being reported? Why was her holiday of interest to you and MI5?</p> <p>Every one of those reports went to MI5?</p> <p>In your witness statement you were asked what use SDS reports were to MI5?</p> <p>The only concrete answer you could give was: <i>I would have thought the far-left intelligence provided them with a huge base of information for their vetting activity</i> Para 151. That was it? Reports such as theatre attendance and going to meetings of a branch set up by a UCO were part of that “huge base of information for vetting activity”?</p> <p>He said further at Para 159: <i>“The SDS provided SyS with a great deal of information on individuals that were of concern for their responsibility in vetting”</i>. Richard Chessum and “Mary” became “individuals of concern for</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	<p>vetting” because of the number of mentions they had?</p> <p>What were the “sensitive organisations” HN34 referred to?</p> <p>At the time that HN34 was deploying Clark into Goldsmiths college, MI5 sent a document to MPSB (MPS-0735755) with “Guidelines” for MPSB to follow in respect of “enquiries at Government Departments and others”. This dealt with what HN34 has described as “sensitive organisations”.</p> <p>Do the following fit the bill as “sensitive organisations” as far as HN34 is concerned: Government departments? Can he give some examples of the scope of that? Certain public corporations? Bank of England? Post Office? British Council? BBC? BA? Do any others spring to mind?</p> <p>And List X firms? i.e. private corporations engaged in government security contracts?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>Security contracts can include all sectors of industry? Communications? Vehicle manufacturing? Construction (for example of Government buildings)?</p> <p>Can HN34 give us an idea of any list X firms at the time that he was in charge of the SDS?</p> <p>Would it surprise HN34 to know that List X firms included many household names? (REFERENCE: From 1973: https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1973-07-04/debates/15a91c0d-9fa1-4a18-a4b3-86deffd6034e/GovernmentContracts). BA, BP, EMI, Rolls-Royce, Dunlop, ICI?</p> <p>If a company was supplied with a list of individuals to not employ on government contracts, what was to stop that company from using that list on its other, non-government contracts?</p> <p>At para 163: "<i>Industrial squad a small part of C squad.... Liaised with trade unions at the top level about industrial unrest, which was</i></p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>affecting public order. As far as the police was concerned this was not connected at all to "blacklisting". I believe that was a commercial thing run by an organisation called the Economic League".</i></p> <p>Is HN34 sure that C squad liaison with trade union officials and employers was nothing to do with blacklisting?</p> <p>The document from MI5 to MPSB (MPS-0735755) was a rebuke: MI5 notifying MPSB that they knew that SB were passing on details of employees to employers and asking them to stop.</p> <p>It was well known in SB that there was intelligence sharing with employers and Trade union officials wasn't it?</p> <p>The Home Office knew that went on? (UCPI0000034699) A letter from a senior civil servant to the Home Secretary (pre-dating the MI5 document by about 6 months):</p> <p>Questions about that document:</p> <p><i>"We know ourselves that some employers plead to be given warning if known agitators</i></p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p><i>seek or obtain employment with them. The official response has always been refusal, sometimes with a hint that there are unofficial bodies which might help”.</i></p> <p>“Unofficial bodies”: would that be a reference to the Economic League that HN34 referred to? What was his understanding of what the Economic League was?</p> <p>Document continued:</p> <p><i>But when a Special Branch officer is himself seeking help from an employer, or from a trade union official, it is asking a good deal to expect him to insist invariably that he is engaged in one way traffic”</i></p> <p>This is official acceptance that SB officers provide employee information to employers and TU officials isn't it?</p> <p>Of course Special Branch received a lot of employee details from SDS intelligence didn't it?</p> <p>The civil servant who wrote the letter to the Home Secretary was Sir James Waddell. Does HN34 know that name?</p>			
---	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

<p>He was the civil servant that the SDS sent Annual reports to for funding and authorisation? The first Annual report that HN34 contributed to (MPS-0730906/19) was sent to him?</p> <p>Another example of the passing on of employee information to employers and employees was the account given by a senior officer from another Special Branch on the “True Spies” programme? (UCPI0000031845/18)</p> <p>Aware of that?</p> <p>Did you watch “True Spies”?</p> <p>Another officer has described the accounts given to that programme as “<i>an earth shattering breach of the need to know principle</i>”. How would you describe it?</p> <p>The example in “True Spies” was employee information being sent to a private company to prevent strikes i.e. not to employ individuals likely to be involved in striking for improved pay and conditions.</p> <p>These were the kind of individuals that you were reporting on weren't they?</p>			
--	--	--	--

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

	The intelligence that the SDS was gathering on employment and trade union involvement was being used for blacklisting?			
--	--	--	--	--