

## The Security Apparatus and the British Left, 1950s-2000s (Part II)

Bonino, Stefano

DOI:

[10.1080/08850607.2018.1466583](https://doi.org/10.1080/08850607.2018.1466583)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Bonino, S 2018, 'The Security Apparatus and the British Left, 1950s-2000s (Part II)', *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 507-543.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08850607.2018.1466583>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Checked for eligibility: 28/02/2017

"This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* on 10th September 2018, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/08850607.2018.1466583>

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## The Security Apparatus and the British Left, 1950s–2000s (Part II)

### *Abstract*

*This paper continues Part I's exploration of the mutable and polymorphous political nature of the 'enemies' that the British security apparatus faced between the 1950s and the 2000s, and the ways in which their real and perceived threats expressed themselves and were countered by the State. Part II presented here explores some of the several left-wing and/or radical protest groups that the security apparatus monitored in order to neutralize real and perceived political and criminal threats to the State and society, with a particular focus on the pacifist, anti-war and anti-apartheid movements, groups involved in industrial disputes and the environmental and animal rights movement.*

**Keywords:** security; intelligence; police; political violence; subversion; protest.

### **The Public Discontent of the Pacifist, Anti-War and Anti-Apartheid Movements**

Between the late 1950s and the early 1960s, the discontent of the British political left found its expression in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), a nonviolent organization formed in 1958 that aimed to pressure the UK government to abandon nuclear weapons. CND had a middle-class outlook and often sought to work within established political parameters, particularly by maintaining connections with the Labour Party, but eventually ended up being used as “a platform and a stalking-horse by almost all the dissident groups.”<sup>1</sup> The organization was largely peaceful and enjoyed support from leading clergy members and cultural figures such as Bertrand Russell.<sup>2</sup> CND's flirtatious relationship with the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) and the Soviet organization World Council of Peace made it suspect to some anti-nuclear-weapons activists but “did not dent the organization as much as its ineffectual marches and rallies and its increasingly hidebound administration, which was strangling itself with bureaucracy even as early as the mid-1960s.”<sup>3</sup> Fringe militants, usually anarchists, brought violence to one of CND's annual ‘Aldermaston marches’ in 1963, leading Special Branch to keep a watching brief on these marches,

but it allegedly devoted “little time to covering the activities of the organisation or its individual members.”<sup>4</sup> A more markedly violent organization and an offshoot of CND was the Committee of 100. It was formed in 1960 by Bertrand Russell and former CND members and attracted the attention of Special Branch.<sup>5</sup> The Committee of 100 made full use of tactics of civil disobedience. Over 1000 people were arrested in Trafalgar Square and more than 350 at Holy Loch in 1961.<sup>6</sup> Several people were also arrested at a violent demonstration instigated during the visit to the United Kingdom by King Paul and Queen Frederica of the Hellenes in 1963.<sup>7</sup>

American military intervention in South East Asia and the support offered by the British government led by Prime Minister Harold Wilson during the Vietnam War (1955–1975) further united the British political left in opposing racism, imperialism and capitalism and forging “alliances between students and radicals on issues such as sexual and racial equality.”<sup>8</sup> The appeal of Trotskyism, Maoism and revolutionary figures such as Che Guevara, Fidel Castro and Ho Chi Minh emerged out of disillusionment with Sovietism and the Communist Party and expressed itself through the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign (VSC), a revolutionary organization launched in June 1966 under the leadership of Ken Coates and Pat Condell.<sup>9</sup> In 1965, the moderate British Campaign for Peace in Vietnam emerged as a front for the Communist Party, while in 1967 Maoist organizations, such as the Friends of China, started their activities and became involved in the VSC too. The VSC acted as an umbrella organization for various left-wing groups,<sup>10</sup> such as the violence-oriented Maoists and the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation, and the more disciplined International Socialist Group (ISG), the International Marxist Group (IMG) and the Communist Party.<sup>11</sup> On 22 October 1967, 10,000 peaceful marchers led by Tariq Ali of the IMG, Vanessa Redgrave of the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) and the ISG conducted the first protest against the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square in London.<sup>12</sup>

Special Branch started showing increasing preoccupation with “agitation by various extreme left-wing organisations, pacifist and student bodies, against American aggression in Vietnam and the British Government’s association with U.S. policy” that were directing protests against the American Embassy in Downing Street, the House of Commons and Dow Chemicals (an American company that produced napalm).<sup>13</sup> On 17 March 1968, the VSC and the Vietnam Ad Hoc Committee organized a second rally. On that occasion, 80,000–100,000 activists, CND

supporters, trade unionists, pacifists, students and politicians “gathered in Trafalgar Square to hear Ali and Redgrave proclaim the revolution”<sup>14</sup> and to support the North Vietnam’s National Liberation Front (NLF).<sup>15</sup> The protest resulted in violent clashes between police and protesters:<sup>16</sup> eighty-six people were injured and almost three hundred protesters were arrested.<sup>17</sup> On the following day, the Special Operations Squad (SOS)<sup>18</sup> was created within the Metropolitan Police Special Branch (MPSB) under the leadership of Conrad Dixon, a legendary police officer who promised to gather key information on subversives with “twenty men, half a million pounds and a free hand.”<sup>19</sup> Over the next seven months, a small number of MPSB officers infiltrated the anti-war movement, provided “intelligence about those organising the public disorder”<sup>20</sup> and kept the Home Office well informed.

Youth CND, with support from the Communist Party and the Young Communist League, organized the third anti-Vietnam-War protest, called ‘Dissociation Day’, on 24 March 1968.<sup>21</sup> Over a thousand people gathered at the Oval Underground Station and started their march, chanting anti-American songs and displaying anti-war posters.<sup>22</sup> 288 police officers and 114 reserves policed the event.<sup>23</sup> Protesters increased to 3000 at their meeting point in Trafalgar Square, where a number of speakers made the case for opposing the Vietnam War. Protesters later marched along Whitehall to hand in around 1000 petitions at No. 10 Downing Street. 4000 demonstrators gathered in Whitehall, including a dozen members of ‘Kilburn Anarchists’ and some communists and Trotskyists shouting “Ho Chi Minh” and “NLF” (National Liberation Front of South Vietnam). The event was relatively peaceful,<sup>24</sup> save for six arrests, minor scuffles, some coins and a glass receptacle containing red dye being thrown at police officers, a smoke bomb going off in Whitehall, and the amusing problems caused by a demonstrator who “was sitting in the roadway, and being allowed to do so realised he was failing to attract sufficient attention, so he stood on his head.”<sup>25</sup> In July of the same year, an anti-American demonstration was led by communists and infiltrated by VSC members: disorder and arrests ensued.<sup>26</sup>

On 10 September 1968, Conrad Dixon described the British protest environment as follows:

The climate of opinion among extreme left-wing elements in this country in relation to public political protest has undergone a radical

change over the last few years. The emphasis has shifted, first from orderly, peaceful, co-operative meetings and processions to passive resistance and 'sit-downs' and now to active confrontation with the authorities to attempt to force social change and alterations of government policy. Indeed, the more vociferous spokesmen of the left are calling for the complete overthrow of parliamentary democracy and the substitution of various brands of 'socialism' and 'workers' control.' They claim that this can only be achieved by 'action on the streets,' and although few of them will admit publicly, or in the press, that they desire a state of anarchy, it is nevertheless tacitly accepted that such a condition is a necessary preamble to engineering a breakdown of our present system of government and achieving a revolutionary change in the society in which we live.<sup>27</sup>

Study papers from that era located the anti-Vietnam-War protest movement within a larger struggle leading to worldwide revolution and regarded the upcoming demonstration "as a skirmish before the larger battle."<sup>28</sup> The VSC, with support from students, organized the 'Autumn Offensive'<sup>29</sup> in London to run between 20 and 27 October 1968. Special Branch expected large-scale organized violence,<sup>30</sup> particularly from the Trotskyist and anarchist contingents.<sup>31</sup> While the Young Liberals were firmly on the side of nonviolence,<sup>32</sup> the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation, numbering 278 members at that time, regarded throwing missiles at buildings as permissible and argued that police could be attacked if they tried to break up the march.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, Maoists and anarchists were not motivated by mere political considerations<sup>34</sup> but were instead willing to disregard instructions from police or march leaders.<sup>35</sup> The Federation of Anarchists planned to join the original, peaceful march starting from the Embankment at 2 pm, while an ad hoc committee led by Maoists decided to hold their speeches in Trafalgar Square and to later march to the American Embassy.<sup>36</sup> In the weeks leading up to the demonstration, CND decided not to support the protest. Special Branch's files commented that "the pacifist element, which has hitherto provided a large percentage of the demonstrators at any street action in London, will be absent, and [...] the unruly faction will not be able to shelter behind the screen of peaceful marchers."<sup>37</sup>

The VCS sought support from the Amalgamated Union of Engineering and

Foundry Workers (AEF) and attempted to link the upcoming demonstration with the 1968 Chicago disturbances and the civil rights movement in Northern Ireland, but neither plan achieved the intended results.<sup>38</sup> At the same time, the Anti-Imperialist Solidarity Movement, formed with the aim of defeating “police brutality by organised and disciplined resistance,” suggested demonstrators to use gas helmets, swimming goggles and smog masks to protect them from police action and advised them to “build a solid phalanx of irresistible weight and power by linking arms [... so that] the strongest police cordon can be broken, and the most violent police charge will fail to break through.”<sup>39</sup> Maoists formed a front organization called October 27 Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam. They devised deceptive tactics for the upcoming demonstration that included traveling into London in the guise of football fans; using poles from placards and banners as weapons; waging a psychological war against the police; and acting in small secret cells of five people.<sup>40</sup>

During the planning stages, some activists further proposed to deposit paper bags with house bricks along the route on the night before the demonstration<sup>41</sup> and suggested a number of targets,<sup>42</sup> including the Bank of England, the Ministry of Defence, the House of Commons, New Scotland Yard, the Home Office, foreign embassies and other political, financial or commercial buildings. Meanwhile, Special Branch’s search of the *Black Dwarf*, an IMG-supported newspaper, found that “a drawing of a Molotov Cocktail and instructions [... had been] drawn on a wall.”<sup>43</sup> Yet police remained cautious about the real capacity of demonstrators to attack the proposed targets and utilize firearms and explosives<sup>44</sup> and expressed concern at the alarming, inaccurate and speculative news given by the *Evening News* and *The Times* in this respect.<sup>45</sup> Government grew more and more worried about the demonstration planned for 27 October, and a letter from the Secretary of State for Defence Denis Healey to the Home Secretary James Callaghan discussed the possibility that troops could be called to assist with riot control procedures – a course of action that was eventually dismissed by both the Secretary of State and the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis John Waldron.<sup>46</sup>

The Home Secretary decided against taking exceptional action to restrict the demonstration, but urged the police to ensure that law-breaking actions be sanctioned.<sup>47</sup> The Secretary of State further decided that foreigners with a record of violence should be prevented from entering the United Kingdom.<sup>48</sup> 7000 police officers, 150 mounted officers (who made good use of police horses as a tool of

crowd control), an unspecified number of special constables and a special mobile group were all deployed without specific defensive or offensive gear.<sup>49</sup> The march was mainly peaceful but violence erupted when about 1000 Maoists and anarchists broke off to rush towards Grosvenor Square, where they threw bottles, banners and other missiles at the police. The clashes lasted for about half an hour, after which these people rejoined the original group in Hyde Park.<sup>50</sup>

Other political groups that caught the attention of Special Branch during this period were the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) and its offshoot, the Stop the Seventy Tour (STST) Committee. From at least the late 1960s, when the movement was very active in protesting against apartheid in South Africa, Special Branch compiled numerous reports with information received from secret and reliable sources (there was also an informer close to the STST Committee leadership),<sup>51</sup> uniformed police officers and its own officers, including SDS officers,<sup>52</sup> who were attending meetings and rallies and monitoring the activities of both the AAM and the STST.<sup>53</sup> Communists held positions in the AAM's committee through the CPGB and the South African Communist Party (SACP),<sup>54</sup> while the Trotskyist and violence-prone Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) and Socialist Workers Party (SWP) operated via a front organization called City of London Anti-Apartheid Group (CLAAG).<sup>55</sup> Peter Hain, the chairman of the STST and later a prominent Labour politician, was particularly active in the anti-apartheid movement. The AAM was committed to informing the public about the British government's ties with the South African apartheid government, "to mobilise the active support of all militant anti-apartheid forces inside and outside the Labour and Trade Union movement [which was lukewarm towards the AAM], to direct this campaign with the forthcoming General Election in mind and to secure due recognition for the South African freedom struggle."<sup>56</sup> Police reports were submitted to A.8 Department (public order preservation) and to the Home Office<sup>57</sup> to inform ministers and civil servants of the evolution of the movement and its public activities.

The anti-apartheid movement undertook direct action against British supply of capital and equipment to South Africa and Rhodesia, and sought to disrupt the British tour of the South African cricket and rugby union teams in 1969–1970. Special Branch gathered intelligence on the planning of the demonstrations,<sup>58</sup> revealing that protestors believed that "the continuation of sporting ties between British [sic] and South Africa bolsters the morale of the apartheid regimes and their supporters"<sup>59</sup> and

wanted to “focus attention on South Africa’s anti-apartheid policy by denying white South Africa any sporting outlets beyond their own country.”<sup>60</sup> To avoid burdening police with serious public order maintenance duties, endangering diplomatic relationships with other African countries and disrupting trade relations with South Africa as a consequence of the likely public disorder that the tour would have caused, Home Secretary James Callaghan requested of the Cricket Council that the South African team tour be canceled.<sup>61</sup>

But the planned demonstrations against the rugby tour went ahead. STST’s goal was to “harass the Springbok’s Rugby Tour that was due to start at Oxford on November 5,” avoiding linking the AAM with the protestors “because of the possibility of its leaders being charged with conspiracy to commit a public disorder.”<sup>62</sup> Anti-apartheid demonstrators carried out actions at Heathrow Airport,<sup>63</sup> at the hotel hosting the team,<sup>64</sup> on training grounds<sup>65</sup> and at matches,<sup>66</sup> where they planned to disperse tear gas<sup>67</sup> and utilize seat cushions as missiles<sup>68</sup> (it is unclear whether they ever undertook these actions). In December 1969, an anti-apartheid protestor hijacked the bus carrying the Springbok squad that was due to play England at Twickenham Stadium. A group of players overpowered the man and the bus eventually crashed without causing any loss of life.<sup>69</sup>

Related student protests did not escape Special Branch’s surveillance.<sup>70</sup> The National Union of Students (NUS) was supporting the STST committee and the anti-apartheid movement.<sup>71</sup> The NUS also opposed the political stances of Enoch Powell, a controversial British right-wing scholar and politician, and often had confrontations with the far-right National Front.<sup>72</sup> But while a more markedly militant fringe was ready to commit serious offences in pursuance of their cause – for example, it planned to abduct the South African Ambassador during 1970<sup>73</sup> – protests were often peaceful. In the early-to-mid-1980s, the movement held demonstrations to protest at or against the South African Embassy;<sup>74</sup> South African Prime Minister Pieter Willem Botha;<sup>75</sup> meetings of South African officials;<sup>76</sup> the existence of the independent South African State of Bophuthatswana;<sup>77</sup> the South African Airways Office;<sup>78</sup> supermarkets selling South African food;<sup>79</sup> rugby matches;<sup>80</sup> the Blue Star Port Lines, a company that maintained shipping services to Namibia;<sup>81</sup> the Foreign Office;<sup>82</sup> and the British government’s plan “to use South Africa as a staging post for the construction of an airport in the Falklands.”<sup>83</sup>

The AAM was later disbanded in 1994 and replaced with Action for Southern

Africa (ACTSA), a group primarily concerned “with providing information and education on issues in Southern Africa” and therefore “of little interest to [...Special] Branch.”<sup>84</sup> But much before that time, Special Branch spent considerable effort monitoring two of the most symbolic disputes of the 1970s and the 1980s, during periods of heated industrial unrest and at a time of intense confrontations between trade unions and the State. It is also an era when, historian Clive Bloom argues, the police acted as ‘foot soldiers’ on behalf of a tight-knit group of right-wing activists with a vigilante image (e.g. the National Association for Freedom and Civil Assistance) in order to defeat socialism; the security services waged a black propaganda war with the miners that “spread paranoia among those who were being watched and create[d] circumstances under which [this] paranoia destroyed its victims without them having to intervene;”<sup>85</sup> and the military-style tactics employed by the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) in Northern Ireland informed mainland policing dealing with strikers and rioters.<sup>86</sup> Yet these largely peaceful strikes incorporated some fringe elements dedicated to achieving their political goals via violent means.

The next section focuses on the Grunwick (1976–1978) and the Wapping (1984–1985) disputes that saw Special Branch and the government working together in monitoring the activities of violent and nonviolent groups that were protesting in the name of labor rights.

### **Industrial Unrest, Labor Rights and Public Disorder: the Grunwick and Wapping Disputes**

The Grunwick dispute was one of the most iconic British disputes in the second half of the twentieth century and centered on labor conditions and workers’ rights at the Grunwick Film Processing Laboratories in Willesden (London), in particular issues related to low wages; compulsory overtime; unfair dismissal; and lack of trade union recognition. The company’s largely Asian female workforce<sup>87</sup> and trade unionists started organizing strikes and pickets in August 1976.<sup>88</sup> Within a few weeks, protest had already escalated: 137 striking workers were dismissed and pickets became the new normal at Grunwick.<sup>89</sup> In early November 1976, the Union of Post Office Workers (UPW) ‘blacked’ (that is, refused to handle) Grunwick mail until a legal threat forced them to abandon this course of action.<sup>90</sup>

The dispute further intensified and attracted national attention in June 1977,

when police and company employees started facing public disorder, abuse, threatening behavior and violence from hard-core militants that the moderate white-collar union the Association of Professional, Executive, Clerical and Computer Staff (APEX) and the Grunwick Strike Committee could neither control nor restrain.<sup>91</sup> The SWP was particularly active in infiltrating the dispute in pursuance of its own agenda and did not refrain from engaging in public disorder and violent confrontation with the police. While APEX kept a distance from the SWP and treated it as “a proscribed organisation,”<sup>92</sup> the SWP managed both to influence the Brent Trades Council, which was playing a prominent role in support of the strikers, and to mainstream militant activities.<sup>93</sup> The SWP effectively introduced violence within the dispute and “in anticipation of an eventual victory by the striking workers, pose[d] as their champions.”<sup>94</sup> The picket lines were joined by several other groups, including the IMG, the WRP, the Revolutionary Workers Party (Trotskyist), the Indian Workers Movement/Caribbean Workers Organisation and many others.<sup>95</sup>

But the SWP and its Trotskyist allies soon became disenchanted with the dispute. The Grunwick Film Processing Laboratories were not going to crumble anytime soon, the various groups were uncoordinated, the police were successful in containing the situation and daily pickets were placing a financial strain on activists.<sup>96</sup> The SWP therefore took a more marginal and strategic direction by “providing mere presence, prepared, as always, to leap into any breach that can be exploited.”<sup>97</sup> In this context, the CPGB started manifesting a more evident interest in the dispute, attempting to have a dominant influence<sup>98</sup> and becoming “committed to mobilising maximum support from within the trade union movement for the strikers.”<sup>99</sup> The dispute moved beyond the disagreements between the company management and APEX, which the CPGB considered to be “too right wing.”<sup>100</sup> Instead, the trade union movement adopted the wider goal of imposing mandatory trade union membership on private companies.<sup>101</sup>

The National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) and notable figures such as Arthur Scargill,<sup>102</sup> the powerful leader of the Yorkshire branch of the NUM (later to become the leader of the NUM between 1982 and 2002) who had his own recording category<sup>103</sup> (‘unaffiliated subversive’)<sup>104</sup> in the Personal File (PF) system held by the Security Service, started becoming involved in the picketing, attracting larger numbers of protesters which caused problems of public disorder. APEX and the Trade Union Congress (TUC) later planned a ‘National Day of Action’, a large

demonstration to be held outside the premises of the company on 11 July 1977. The demonstration was welcomed by the CPGB<sup>105</sup> and was supported by Arthur Scargill<sup>106</sup> and other notable trade unionists, such as Hugh Scanlon, the president of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (AUEW).<sup>107</sup> This demonstration became yet another occasion for the SWP to place violence at the heart of the dispute.<sup>108</sup>

Government was well briefed about the developments and Prime Minister James Callaghan was personally informed about the event and the consequences that the involvement of the NUM and Arthur Scargill might have had for public order.<sup>109</sup> The NUM later became the target of large-scale surveillance via police infiltrators, Security Service's intelligence and GCHQ's auditing with the National Security Agency (NSA) in the United States. This surveillance was so extensive that the phone-tapping and bugging systems of the Tinkerbell Squad ended up breaking down.<sup>110</sup> The political environment and the long-term threat that the dispute posed to government raised grave prime ministerial concerns. Callaghan encouraged more proactive policing methods and controversially stated that "the Government was not dealing with respectable unionism but rent a mob."<sup>111</sup> Police braced themselves for major public disorder. The 'National Day of Action' was expected to become the most violent demonstration on British soil, resulting in "some 2,000 potentially violent Trotskyists and the like augmenting an indeterminate but massive number of trade unionists, Communist Party members and other less extreme demonstrators."<sup>112</sup> The proceedings ended up as two separate events that attracted around 15,000 demonstrators: APEX and the TUC led a peaceful march, while the Grunwick Strike Committee, with support from miners, engineers and builders, led a picket outside the premises of the company.<sup>113</sup> Militant Trotskyists, far-left youngsters and a number of miners engaged in violent confrontation with the police<sup>114</sup> but failed to live up to the much gloomier expectations of the authorities. The dispute continued with further pickets, arrests, confrontations and various events, such as the publication of the Scarman Report,<sup>115</sup> until mid-1978, when the strike finally ended. The MPSB thoroughly monitored the activities of these groups, while the Metropolitan Police Service Special Patrol Group (MPS SPG) was present during pickets<sup>116</sup> and the SDS played a pivotal role in providing up-to-date information on what uniform branch was to expect. Two former MPSB senior officers, Ray Wilson and the late Ian Adams, recount that "On most days an early-morning telephone call was made from the senior

officer of the SDS to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of 'A' Department, responsible for public order, giving him the latest available intelligence on the extremists' plans for the day."<sup>117</sup>

During the two years of dispute, police arrested 500 people,<sup>118</sup> amid accusations from APEX that officers had assaulted protesters, unlawfully disrupted strikes and conducted indiscriminate arrests.<sup>119</sup> This highly symbolic dispute opened a debate on whether employers had a right not to recognize trade unions and whether the law could be utilized to achieve such recognition.<sup>120</sup> Set within a decade of turbulent industrial unrest and battles for labor rights, the Grunwick dispute represents "a test case of ideological binary oppositions: 'individual freedom' versus 'solidarity'; 'over-mighty unions' versus 'over-mighty bosses'; 'voluntarism' in industrial relations versus 'the rule of law'; 'us' versus 'them.'"<sup>121</sup>

Almost a decade later, another industrial dispute would become a new battleground for trade unionism and workers' rights, in an era when Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was keen both to target what she perceived to be a culture of moral degeneration within the political left and to "curb union power (and its apparently communistic corporatism)."<sup>122</sup> In early 1986, the collapse in the negotiations between newspaper workers and their employer, News International, over Rupert Murdoch's plan to move the printing and distribution of newspapers from Fleet Street to a new warehouse in Wapping (London), "where journalists would input copy directly on screen and the jobs of several thousand printers would be rendered redundant,"<sup>123</sup> opened a new wave of industrial unrest. Murdoch's decision angered the print unions and resulted in a strike by 6000 newspaper workers. These workers were quickly dismissed.<sup>124</sup> Pickets and demonstrations were soon organized to "disrupt the movement of newspapers from the plant [... and] to prevent vehicles using Virginia Street to access The Highway."<sup>125</sup> Residents of Wapping led demonstrations in support of the print workers and police prevented local protesters from returning home while extending "abusive behavior and arbitrary arrest"<sup>126</sup> to journalists, photographers, TV cameramen and first-aid workers.

A small contingent of SWP members,<sup>127</sup> other Trotskyists, communists and anarchists joined the dispute, which led to violent confrontations with the police and 1200 arrests in just over one year.<sup>128</sup> The Special Demonstration Squad (SDS)<sup>129</sup> and informants<sup>130</sup> helped the MPSB monitor all aspects of the dispute, which soon became a drain on police resources "on a par with that in Warrington [Messenger Industrial

Dispute] in 1983.”<sup>131</sup> Senior police officers sought to differentiate between the print workers, whose cooperation could “be elicited in attempting to preserve order”<sup>132</sup> and “extremist elements unconnected with the unions [who instigate] violence on the picket lines.”<sup>133</sup> However, secret police reports equally noted the “emergence of a substantial group of militant print workers [... who might devise] their own methods of protest and perhaps join forces with the now [note: in mid-May 1986] established extremist elements.”

Industrial action was carried out continuously for over one year. Disclosed police files offer insights into a large demonstration that was organized by the South East Region Trades Union Council (SERTUC) together with the Labour Party ‘Joint May Day Committee’ on 1 May 1986.<sup>134</sup> The demonstration attracted about 3000 people: 1500 trade unionists (mostly print workers), 1000 members of various left-wing groups and 500 Turks. The event included the presence of “paper sellers for Class War, Socialist Worker, New Worker and Militant”<sup>135</sup> and banners representing the small faction of hard left-wing movements alongside the larger contingent of soft left-wing groups and trade unions.<sup>136</sup> The demonstration resulted in violence, with missiles being thrown at police, who made dozens of arrests.<sup>137</sup> Two days later, this rally was followed by a ‘May Day’ national demonstration.<sup>138</sup> The demonstration started peacefully but by the evening it descended into violence and disorder<sup>139</sup> to a level “that had not previously been witnessed in connection with this dispute.”<sup>140</sup> Smoke bombs, thunderflashes, wood, bricks and other missiles were thrown at police officers<sup>141</sup> by what the MPSB described as “not the middle-aged printworkers normally seen on a Saturday evening, but [...] younger, hooligan types which included both Trotskyists and anarchists [...] taking advantage of the situation to attack the police.”<sup>142</sup> The night ended with eighty-one arrests and with 175 police officers and forty-eight demonstrators injured.<sup>143</sup> The violence eventually “provided something of a watershed for many printworkers and [was] reflected in the diminishing numbers [...] attending demonstrations outside the News International plant”<sup>144</sup> in the following three weeks.

Pickets and demonstrations nonetheless continued to take place, sometimes without incident,<sup>145</sup> sometimes with protestors intending but failing to commit violent actions,<sup>146</sup> and sometimes with violence and disorder,<sup>147</sup> whenever Trotskyists and anarchists were successful in exploiting the emotions of the day and the frustration of the strikers<sup>148</sup> to bring chaos into the dispute.<sup>149</sup> Police faced accusations of

employing paramilitary tactics that had originally been devised for, and utilized in, the Battle of Orgreave during the 1984–1985 miners’ strike, thus essentially “moving from uniformed citizens keeping the peace to activists in militarised operations.”<sup>150</sup> The Wapping dispute ended in early 1987, “less than two years after the collapse of the miners’ strike [..., and] the print unions ended up as neutered as the National Union of Mineworkers.”<sup>151</sup> But, for the next two decades, the State continued to face a series of mutable threats that required the security apparatus to spend considerable time gathering intelligence on a plethora of politically active groups.

### **Security Responses against the Mutable Threats Posed by Various Left-Wing Groups Between the 1980s and the 2000s**

From as early as the 1960s and until the early 1980s, the Security Service classified CND as a ‘subversive’ organization, had a spy called Harry Newton in its office<sup>152</sup> and kept the group under surveillance, believing that it acted as an entryist platform under the influence of Trotskyists and communists, particularly the CPGB, which had a majority eight seats out of fifteen of CND’s national executive by the mid-1970s.<sup>153</sup> In the mid-to-late 1970s, the government even mobilized the army due to fears of potential terrorist action around nuclear sites in Scotland.<sup>154</sup> CND benefitted from the role played by the more confrontational Greenham Common as a coordinating force behind the organization and as speakers during rallies. In 1981, Joan Ruddock took up the CND chair and, at a time of particular good fortune, the organization counted 16,500 national members and a total membership of 200,000 people.<sup>155</sup> But security concerns over foreign influences were unfounded. The Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (KGB) did not play any major role in CND and “the [Security] Service found no evidence that funding to the British peace movement went beyond occasional payment of fares and expenses to individuals.”<sup>156</sup> It was, however, the State Security Service of the German Democratic Republic that received information from a member of CND’s national committee.<sup>157</sup> Joan Ruddock and Jeremy Corbyn had PFs opened by both the Security Service<sup>158</sup> and the SDS<sup>159</sup> for, respectively, having meetings with a Soviet journalist who was a KGB officer (Ruddock was unaware)<sup>160</sup> and his involvement in the organization. Several activists within CND also had PFs opened by the Security Service that were later passed on to ministers.<sup>161</sup>

Although CND was removed from the ‘subversive’ list, the security apparatus

continued to collect intelligence on the group amid persisting fears of Trotskyist and communist penetration and the unpredictable nature of the large demonstrations that the group continued to plan. Notably, in 1983 the Ministry of Defence set up a unit called Defence Secretariat 19 to monitor CND.<sup>162</sup> Between 1980 and 1983, CND organized several activities, such as rallies and camps in Westminster, at Trafalgar Square and in Hyde Park; a blockade of the Royal Ordnance Factory; a picket of the Russian Embassy; a march along Embankment; protests against the visit of the then Secretary of Defense of the United States Caspar Weinberger; a die-in at the Bank of England; a ‘Stop the City Demonstration’; and eighteen peace camps.<sup>163</sup> During the same period, CND was seeking to move away from being a merely anti-American organization to encompass anti-Soviet sentiments too. It was in this spirit that the group organized a ‘Human Chain’ demonstration on 16 July 1983 to link the Soviet embassy in Kensington Palace Gardens with the United States embassy in Grosvenor Square.<sup>164</sup> Special Branch considered this event to pose a low risk to public order.<sup>165</sup> And so it did. Approximately 7000 people took part in the demonstration, leaders presented anti-nuclear petitions to the embassies’ staff and, save for a single arrest for ‘insulting behavior,’ the demonstration was entirely peaceful.<sup>166</sup>

It was a national demonstration planned to take place three months later, on 22 October, that made police and government<sup>167</sup> more concerned about the risks of public disorder and the actions of fringe militant elements within CND. Special Branch expected a level of support similar to that witnessed during the previous two national demonstrations (50,000–70,000), nonviolent direct action (in particular, a spontaneous sit-down protest in the Whitehall area), clashes between CND and anti-CND groups – notably, the Coalition for Peace Through Security (CPS) and Women for Defence – and attempts by some punk anarchists who had been “involved in the recent ‘Stop the City’ event [...to] ‘take over’ the CND demonstration, using black flags as an identifying feature.”<sup>168</sup> But while police underestimated the numerical support for what was the largest ever CND march – a record 200,000 demonstrators were in attendance, – they overestimated their threat to public order. The great majority of demonstrators acted in a peaceful manner and the five-and-a-half-hour-long march<sup>169</sup> resulted in neither incidents nor attempts at nonviolent direct action, and the punk anarchist contingent had little success in attempting to stop the march.<sup>170</sup> The political left was represented, among other groups, by 25 branches of the CPGB, several trade union members and a Trotskyist presence in the SWP, numbering 600–

700 supporters. In their overall assessment of the event, police noted the support of ordinary people for CND and the “relatively low turn-out of extremists [... who were] vociferous [... but] had little or no effect on the day’s proceedings.”<sup>171</sup> The strategy of entryism that some extremist political groups advanced by using CND “in the wider context of left-wing politics rather than the narrow confines of the ‘peace movement’”<sup>172</sup> was given a deadly blow on that very day.

The London School of Economics’ Student CND later organized a peaceful demonstration called ‘Books not Bombs’ on 4 March 1984. It was a quiet demonstration that attracted a mere 250 people and did not pose any public order issue.<sup>173</sup> Government and police were more concerned about gathering reliable intelligence on a series of demonstrations taking place in June that year and culminating in a ‘Day of Action’ on 9 June to coincide with the Economic Summit at Lancaster House in London, when President Ronald Reagan was due to attend.<sup>174</sup> Expecting no serious public disorder, aside from potential attempts from the Class War Collective of Anarchists to create confusion and inspire acts of criminal damage,<sup>175</sup> the Home Office F4 Division (counter-terrorism) could not prohibit this unwelcome demonstration and planned to give police the necessary support to maintain public order and security, “while conceding to the marchers a route sufficiently close to their objective to win their consent and co-operation.”<sup>176</sup>

Meanwhile, by the early 1990s the SWP had lost members and financial support.<sup>177</sup> Unlike communists, the SWP had no associations with foreign powers<sup>178</sup> and, unlike Militant Tendency (MT), with which it maintained an antagonistic relationship,<sup>179</sup> did not engage in entryist tactics. While attendance of six or more meetings of the Party was considered proof of membership and anyone attending these meetings was recorded as “member: Trotskyist organisation,” “many individuals attended these meetings to protest against specific issues such as the NHS cuts or the poll tax, subjects of legitimate dissent.”<sup>180</sup> The Security Service’s management retained an interest in the SWP following its support of various industrial disputes in the early 1990s and maintained a telephone tap on the Party’s headquarters. Many intercepts, however, were never transcribed. A large number of English-speaking telephone intercept transcribers had been directed from F Branch to T Branch (Irish terrorism) to work against the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) by the time the Security Service took over responsibility for Northern Ireland-related terrorism in 1992,<sup>181</sup> and the Security Service devoted almost half of its resources to it by 1994.<sup>182</sup>

The number of agents who assigned to the SWP was greatly reduced and the last telephone tap against an individual member of the group – its founder Tony Cliff – was terminated.

But a decline in membership and faltering finances did not deter the SWP from engaging in political activism. The group remained highly invested in the global justice and anti-war movements and acted as the “organisational engine of the [Respect Party] project”<sup>183</sup> that was launched by Salma Yaqoob and George Monbiot in 2004. The SWP effectively dominated the global justice movement in the United Kingdom in the late 1990s and early 2000s, achieving positions of leadership in Globalise Resistance (GR), an umbrella group that was formed “as a means to federate different forces of the left in order to get involved in the emerging [alter-globalization] movement in Britain which was originally dominated by anarchist groups such as Reclaim the Streets.”<sup>184</sup> Special Branch, via the SDS, kept an eye on the SWP’s activities and infiltrated an undercover officer into the main committee of GR.<sup>185</sup>

This was a period when Special Branch was particularly active in monitoring and disrupting the activities of environmental and animal rights protestors – a loose aggregate of people who fall under the umbrella of the international Radical Environmentalist and Animal Rights (REAR) movement. The REAR movement includes various groups that condone radical, often illegal, actions that expose or stop environmental destruction and animal abuse but that differ in tactics and strategic direction. The REAR movement was originally born out of a willingness to use aggressive tactics and to undertake direct action against animal abuse. In the United Kingdom, the movement was active throughout the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s with support from “a general [ideological] consensus of the left and of intellectuals”<sup>186</sup> and was popularized through the activities of groups such as the Hunt Retribution Squad, the Band of Mercy and the Animal Liberation Front (ALF),<sup>187</sup> which emerged in 1976 from the more moderate Hunt Saboteurs Association (HAS) and was penetrated by the SDS.<sup>188</sup> The ALF boomed and reached over 1500 members by the mid-1980s, having gained a foothold in the United States in 1979 and having given rise to even more radical and openly violent groups, such as the Animal Rights Militia (ARM).<sup>189</sup> Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the British ALF engaged in violence, committed criminal damage and intimidated a wide range of targets,<sup>190</sup> including prominent politicians (e.g. Margaret Thatcher and William Whitelaw), academics (e.g. Colin

Blakemore) and the general public (e.g. an attempt to contaminate bottles of the popular soft drink Lucozade in 1991). Between 1990 and 1992 the Animal Rights National Index (ARNI) recorded 3073 crimes. The first eight months of 1994 recorded 585 incidents, many involving criminal damage and including twenty-nine incendiary attacks, which resulted in a total of £5.4 million in damage.<sup>191</sup>

Protest by animal rights activists towards both organizations that carried out vivisection and the pharmaceutical companies and businesses that provided, respectively, contract work and resources increased a decade later, at the beginning of 2004. Although many activists were peaceful, a militant fringe used a wide array of tactics, such as threats, intimidation and harassment, and engaged in serious criminality, including “contamination threats, blackmail and the use of improvised explosive devices.”<sup>192</sup> They utilized crime as a strategic tool to pursue an ideological cause and were dealt with by counter-terrorism police as ‘domestic extremists.’<sup>193</sup> These extremists switched their tactics from “attacks on premises where animals were farmed for fur or bred for experimental purposes or where experiments were carried out, increasingly to the homes and families of employees of organizations engaged in research using animals.”<sup>194</sup> In the first six months of 2004, a vast array of intimidating tactics included “arson, criminal damage to homes or vehicles, threatening animal rights graffiti”<sup>195</sup> and so on, while in the second half of the same year, there was a strategic change to targeting employees of supply companies. After the chief executive officers (CEOs) of (mostly Japanese) scientific and pharmaceutical companies in the United Kingdom exerted pressure and threatened to move their business to other countries, government responded by empowering the police and creating offences<sup>196</sup> to target animal rights extremism via specific provisions set out in the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005.

Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC), a group formed in 1999 with the purpose of stopping the activities of Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS), a company testing the effects of drugs on animals, was a particularly effective and hard-to-defeat animal rights organization. The group carried out a blend of lawful demonstrations and illegal acts of intimidation<sup>197</sup> that resulted in about 100 companies terminating contracts with HLS in 2004.<sup>198</sup> By 2006, HLS had moved its headquarters to the United States, having been delisted on the UK and US stock exchanges.<sup>199</sup> Later on, the animal rights movement targeted banks and financial companies that were investing in the biotechnology industry. Police employed a set of preventative,

intelligence and enforcement strategies to deal with animal rights activists and extremists. Against the conventional notion that organized crime is an illegal activity that merely involves a financial element of profit-making, the police sought to prevent and pursue the activities of SHAC, SPEAK – the Voice for the Rights of Animals and other groups through typically anti-organized-crime-oriented activities of investigative policing. In this sense, police were careful not to charge for offences under the Terrorism Act 2000, in order to ensure that the legislation was preserved for more serious cases.

Incidents of animal rights extremism drastically reduced over a five-year period (2006–2010).<sup>200</sup> In the case of SHAC, an investigative strategy that pursued cases of conspiracy to blackmail and removed the group’s leadership resulted in a decline in offending and harm to the company.<sup>201</sup> Nonetheless, policing activity “could not prevent HLS and other companies that supplied services and products to HLS losing income,”<sup>202</sup> and it endangered human rights (particularly the rights to assembly and to free protest) and gave rise to prosecution cases lost in court, litigations against the police and misconduct procedures that were brought against police officers.<sup>203</sup> In so doing, the police “pushed the campaign organisations’ leaders to adopt new tactics and become innovative in the use of technology and social media to achieve their objectives and avoid detection.”<sup>204</sup>

The radical animal rights movement, with its focus on the rights of sentient beings, helped shape the ideological contours of the closely linked radical environmentalist movement, which focused on the wider rights of the whole ecosystem. It worked via grassroots, leaderless organizations that conducted direct action and resistance in pursuance of their common goal to uphold ideas of biocentrism and the equality of human and non-human species.<sup>205</sup> This movement “includes groups like Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front (ELF), but also green anarchists, ecofeminists, Pagans and Wiccans, and anti-globalization and anti-capitalist protestors.”<sup>206</sup> While the activities of some of these groups are dubbed ‘ecoterrorism,’ the term is often an inaccurate representation of radical individuals who may well conduct illegal activities (e.g. animal liberations, vandalism and cyber-attacks) but who do not engage in terrorism per se. The latter is the preserve of a tiny minority of environmental extremists who do not refrain from bombings, arson and other criminal tactics to instill fear and bring about political change. In this sense, “the label ecoterrorism should not be used for the whole REAR movement, but only for

some of its actions, individuals and groups,”<sup>207</sup> insofar as the movement runs along a ‘protest, crime, terrorism’ continuum.<sup>208</sup>

A decisive security shift towards environmental activism, which would later be fully penetrated by the NPOIU, occurred at a time – the 1990s – when chief constables across England and Wales were frustrated at the successes of the anti-road movement, originally pioneered by Earth First! in 1980 and re-popularized by Reclaim the Streets (RTS) a decade later. The anti-road movement stopped work at sites across the country and often drew from the ranks of the more explicitly violent animal liberation groups. Radical green activists accumulated sophisticated tactics learnt by the anti-road movement and, mirroring the achievements of cruise missiles activists, became a natural focus of police attention.<sup>209</sup>

In 1991–1992, protest campaigns by Alarm UK, a national umbrella organization for local anti-road action groups and affiliated groups, included “a mixture of innovative publicity stunts, demonstrations, mass letter-writing and the circulation of alternative sustainable transport plans and counter-information to the media.”<sup>210</sup> These campaigns took a new dimension in the summer of 1992, when environmental and anti-road activists attempted to stop the building of the M3 at Twyford Down. Local action groups, young activists of the Donga Tribe and members of Earth First! obstructed the machinery and engaged in mass trespass of the Twyford Down construction site, eventually leading to “physical confrontations with security guards, and large-scale arrests from the police.”<sup>211</sup> The battle did not succeed but “substantially managed to increase the costs of construction and strengthened the alliance between local groups working with Alarm UK and radical environmental groups”<sup>212</sup> operating underground to undertake economic sabotage via direct action in protection of the environment (e.g. Earth Liberation Front).<sup>213</sup>

Environmental and anti-road groups were subjected to crafty police tactics that undermined their operational capacities. Here, conspiracy theories abound. A former member of RTS believes that the police ‘allowed’ short-term violence to take place in order to stop the longer-term threat of a large movement on the streets that was developing a surprisingly vast and mostly nonviolent activist reach and that was willing to break the law with illegal protests. The real contours of Operation Yellowstone remain shrouded in secrecy; however, some activists claim that it may have effectively ended RTS. This police operation took place during the ‘May Day Guerrilla Gardening’ in London. The former RTS member mentioned above contends

that police deliberately flooded the square, corralling people at Whitehall and leaving a McDonald's at Whitehall (a key target that had been attacked twice before during similar protests), the Churchill monument and the Cenotaph entirely unprotected. Police argue that, on this occasion, the absence of riot officers served to avoid inciting violent public disorder, while activists and members of Indymedia (a network affiliated with the global justice movement) believe that it was a calculated plan to allow violence to take place and later discredit the peaceful image of the group.<sup>214</sup>

Travelers were also thoroughly monitored by the secret wing of the police. Policing activities in this sphere can be traced back to the early 1970s, when "New Traveller culture grew out of the music festival scene."<sup>215</sup> The group known as New Age Travellers "originated in the free festivals and lifestyle experiments of the 1960s [...] in meetings at Stonehenge, at Windsor and the Phun City Festival on the Isle of Wight."<sup>216</sup> It emerged from the alternative-lifestyle communities of the 1960s. A decade later, these communities turned to squatting and ecological causes peppered with "anarchist ideas of social justice,"<sup>217</sup> which found an ideological ally in the anti-nuclear movement.<sup>218</sup> In 1973, police clamped down on the disorganization, deviance and drug culture of the travelers who were gathering at the Windsor 'People's Free Festival' and sought to disrupt the low-level criminality of the group. Similarly, police used a heavy hand in dealing with the first Stonehenge Festival in 1974.<sup>219</sup> By the 1980s, "the older hippy elements had morphed into something different [... and the movement] was not merely into drugs but was becoming radicalised."<sup>220</sup> Protests under the common political banner of social justice, and in support of Greenham Common, started becoming a normal occurrence to the point that "By 1983, the mixture of festival and protest at Stonehenge attracted 30,000 people and finally, with the miners' strike in full flow, class-war demonstrations held to 'stop the city' and with the memory of Toxteth, Brixton and Moss Side, the celebrations were getting more ugly and confrontational."<sup>221</sup>

In 1984, travelers infiltrated and brought violence into peaceful animal rights protests, leading police to break up two festivals at Boscombe Down Airfield and Nostell Priory.<sup>222</sup> The following year, police took stronger action against the Stonehenge festival. Six different territorial police forces, plus military police, set up roadblocks to stop 140 vehicles and 450 people traveling to Stonehenge. More than a thousand police officers in riot gear patrolled what became an 'exclusion zone' and entered into violent confrontations with the travelers, in what is now known as the

Battle of Beanfield, leading to legal actions for false imprisonment.<sup>223</sup> Police historically dealt with the travelers via pre-emptive strategies and paramilitary methods<sup>224</sup> of public order policing: the Battle of Beanfield is one such example. However, by the mid-1990s police had started pursuing a more pragmatic approach.<sup>225</sup> The Castlemorton Festival of 1992, which brought together 25,000 travelers and resulted in 100 arrests, was a key occasion for the Southern Central Intelligence Unit (operating from Devizes in Wiltshire and covering the south of the country), the Northern New Age Traveller Co-ordination Unit (operating from Penrith in Cumbria and covering the north of the country), some individual police constabularies and the Ministry of Defence to monitor ravers<sup>226</sup> and travelers.<sup>227</sup> About 8000 travelers in attendance, having access to about 2000 vehicles<sup>228</sup> and acting as catalysts for drug dealers,<sup>229</sup> were targeted by blanket countrywide injunctions against public events,<sup>230</sup> legislation, intelligence, harassment, benefit cuts and alleged fabrication of news<sup>231</sup> that placed enormous pressure on free parties and a largely lawless movement.<sup>232</sup> The festival resulted in the exacerbation in the relationship between traveler culture and the State. Two years later, the police were granted further powers via the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to better deal with the raves, squatting and trespass that occurred during events organized by anti-road protesters, gypsies and travelers. The Southern and Northern intelligence units held a database with information on travelers, while police officers took photographs and videos of people, vehicles and sites that were allegedly used for “gathering purposes, rather than to inform proactive policing.”<sup>233</sup>

Proactive policing in this sphere remained confined to an imminent and serious breach of public order that necessitated the covert collection of information for prevention.<sup>234</sup> Prosecutions for trespass and arrests for returning to a rave after being required to leave under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 were rare, save for specific instances (protests against the building of the Newbury bypass that led to 356 arrests: 258 people were prosecuted and fifty-nine people were cautioned for aggravated trespass).<sup>235</sup> Although the law endowed police with a wide range of powers, the reality is that “formal action by way of a police caution or prosecution was relatively infrequent [...] because the directions, or even the threat of their use, were commonly found to resolve situations without the need for arrests.”<sup>236</sup> A few years later, in 1999, the NPOIU was established and continued its operations until 2011. The unit placed officers within Earth First!, Camp for Climate Action, The

Common Place, Dissent!, Cardiff Anarchist Network and many more direct action groups, thoroughly monitoring the REAR and the anarchist-communist movements, in an attempt to know, prevent and disrupt the activities of elusive and ever mutating ‘enemies’ that since the new millennium have extolled a plurality of political causes<sup>237</sup> and that the British State has countered, and continues to counter, in defense of the realm.

## **Conclusion**

Overall, the paper (Part I and Part II) has sought to present a non-exhaustive history of the political terrain in which the security apparatus operated during and after the Cold War and the various left-wing and/or radical political groups that were deemed to pose a threat of public disorder, political violence and subversion. The real contours of state covert action against a whole range of politically active groups will never fully emerge. Yet the tensions between, on the one hand, the security of the public and the well-being of the State and, on the other hand, civil liberties and human rights will continue to shape a dichotomous relationship between radical political activism and state surveillance. Within the limited context of Western undercover and intelligence activities resides a larger political world, where the State identifies historically contingent domestic ‘enemies’, often residing on the left of the political spectrum, which pose real and perceived threats to national security and/or public order. The paper contributes to scholarly understandings of both the evolving nature of these ‘enemies’ and the intelligence activities that the secret wing of the British State put in place to monitor, anticipate and disrupt political and criminal threats. Whether they be foreign spies, British traitors, communists, Trotskyists, anarchists, environmental and animal rights campaigners or extremists of other types, individuals and groups considered to engage in subversion, espionage, political violence and/or public disorder did not escape the crafty tactics that the Security Service and Special Branch adopted to defend the status quo and protect society from harm. The ongoing Undercover Policing Inquiry is set to conclude in mid-2018 but its consequences are destined to continue shaping future debates on the role of the State and its actors within the political life of the country – and these are debates that touch on the intrinsically connected and mutually shaping relationship between security activity vis-à-vis militant and/or dissident political action in conceptualizing the historically

contingent, acceptable and unacceptable social contours of the United Kingdom.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 10 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487404-10th-sep-1968-sb-report-on-vietnam-solidarity.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>2</sup> Clive Bloom, *Violent London: 2000 Years of Riots, Rebels and Revolts* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

<sup>3</sup> Clive Bloom, *Thatcher's Secret War: Subversion, Coercion, Secrecy and Government, 1974–90* (Stroud: The History Press, 2015), p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> Ray Wilson and Ian Adams, *Special Branch – A History: 1883–2006* (London: Biteback Publishing, 2015), p. 248.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*.

<sup>7</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*.

<sup>8</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*, p. 424.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> The nineteen members of the VSC's Liaison Committee responsible for activity coordination at the time were the following: four members of the Communist Party; four members of the ISG; three members of the IMG; one member of the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation; one member of the Socialist Medical Association; and six members of unknown affiliation. The VSC had branches in Hampstead; Kilburn; Fulham; Lambeth; Walthamstow; Hornsey; Highgate and Holloway; Notting Hill Gate; and Earls Court. The latter two branches were 'disowned' by the VSC in September 1968 after falling to Maoist control. See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 August 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487406-30th-august-1968-sb-report-on-vietnam-solidarity.html> (accessed 24 July 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 23 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487403-23rd-sep-1968-weekly-report-on-preparations-for.html> (accessed 24 July 2016).

<sup>11</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Letter Dated 14 August 1968* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487409-1968-letter-from-sb-requesting-info-on-extremists.html> (accessed 24 July 2016).

<sup>12</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*.

<sup>13</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 24 March 1968: Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487410-1968-sb-report-on-youth-cnd.html> (accessed 23 July 2016).

<sup>14</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*, p. 422.

<sup>15</sup> The night before the protest, supporters of the NLF disrupted shows at twenty London theatres. See Bloom, *Violent London*.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*.

<sup>18</sup> This is the original name of the Special Demonstration Squad (SDS) when it was founded in 1968.

<sup>19</sup> The Times, "Conrad Dixon Obituary," *The Times* (28 April 1999).

<sup>20</sup> Mick Creedon, *Operation Herne: Report 1 – Use of Covert Identities* (London: Metropolitan Police, 2013), p. 5.

<sup>21</sup> The following groups and organizations displayed banners during the protest: National Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; Southampton Area Peace Action Committee; Highgate Youth YCL (Young Communist League); AEU (Amalgamated Engineering Union) New Malden; Sutton YCL; Surrey YCL; Reigate and Redhill Committee for Peace in Vietnam; Merton Committee for Peace in Vietnam; Kingston and Surbiton CND (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament); Kensington YCL; Dorking YCND (Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament); Hants and Dorset Communist Party; Southampton CND; Hants, and Dorset YCL; Lambeth CND; Camberwell Arts Students Committee for Peace in Vietnam; London District Committee of the CP (Communist Party); West Lewisham YCL;

---

Harrow YCL; District Committee of the London YCL; Wales YCL; Hampstead YCL; Bath CND; Havering YCL; Highgate YCND; Hornchurch Young Liberals; Sydenham CND; Kent Council for Peace in Vietnam; Peace Pledge Union; Greenwich YCL; 'Stop it' Campaign; Stepney YCL; Gillingham Anarchists; South Essex District YCL; and Hadioner Hertzner Zionist Youth Movement. See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 24 March 1968: Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*.

<sup>22</sup> Protesters displayed the following posters: "Britain must Dissociate from U.S. war in Vietnam"; "Harlow for Peace and Freedom"; "Ban Napalm"; "Stop Destroying Vietnam"; "Youth demands an end to war in Vietnam"; "Call Wilson to end war in Vietnam"; "Call Johnson to stop the bombing"; "World Festival of Youth July 28<sup>th</sup> to August 6<sup>th</sup> Biggest International Vietnam Protest"; "Britain condemns America"; "U.S. get out of Vietnam"; "Youth demands end of Vietnam war"; "Youth demands that Britain leads for Peace"; "Support U Thant; Not Johnson"; "Free Saigon Buddhists"; "If we kill our brother – with whom shall we live?"; "End the dictatorship in Vietnam"; "Does Britain have to support U.S.A.?" "Peace in Vietnam"; "Youth United for Peace in Vietnam"; "Wilson – condemn bombing of civilians"; "End the American war in Vietnam"; "Stop the U.S. brutal war in Vietnam." See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 24 March 1968: Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*.

<sup>23</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament: Sunday, 24 March, 1968* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487411-1968-police-report-of-youth-cnd-demo.html> (accessed 24 July 2016).

<sup>24</sup> See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 24 March 1968: Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*.

<sup>25</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament: Sunday, 24 March, 1968*, p. 1.

<sup>26</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 10 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Official slogans included the following: "Defeat US aggression in Vietnam"; "Solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution"; "End the Labour Government's complicity in the war"; "Victory for the National Liberation Front." See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 August 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

<sup>30</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 20 August 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

<sup>31</sup> Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968: Minutes of Meeting held on 18 October 1968 between the Home Secretary, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and Newspaper Proprietors* (London: Home Office, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2642278-1968-10-18-Minutes-of-Meeting-Between-Home-Sec.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>32</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 16 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494420-16th-oct-1968-weekly-report-on-preparations-for.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>33</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 August 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

<sup>34</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 22 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494419-22nd-oct-1968-assessment-on-upcoming-demo-of.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>35</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 23 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

<sup>36</sup> Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968*.

<sup>37</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 9 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive'* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2494421-9th-oct-1968-reports-cnd-not-backing-27th-oct-demo.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 10 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*

- <sup>40</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 23 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*
- <sup>41</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 16 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*
- <sup>42</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 10 September 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*; Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 9 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*; Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 16 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*; Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 22 October 1968: Vietnam Solidarity Campaign 'Autumn Offensive.'*
- <sup>43</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Letter Dated 5 September 1968* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2487405-5th-sep-1968-sb-press-report.html> (accessed 24 July 2016).
- <sup>44</sup> Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968.*
- <sup>45</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Letter Dated 5 September 1968*; Clive Borrell and Brian Cashinella, "Callaghan Faces Plot Questions," *The Times* (6 September 1968).
- <sup>46</sup> Ministry of Defence, *Demonstrations: Letter Dated 14 October 1968* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1968). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2642277-1968-10-14-Letter-From-Denis-Healey-to-James.html> (accessed 25 July 2016).
- <sup>47</sup> Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968.*
- <sup>48</sup> Immigration and Nationality Department, *Aliens: Immigration – Demonstration on 27 October* (London: Immigration and Nationality Department, 1968). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2642275-1968-10-11-Foreign-Demonstrators.html> (accessed 24 July 2016); Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968.*
- <sup>49</sup> Home Office, *Demonstrations on 26 and 27 October 1968.*
- <sup>50</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch.*
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>52</sup> Peter Taylor, "True Spies, Episode 1: Subversive my Ass!" *BBC Two* (27 October 2002). Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DW2jcRSPulc0> (accessed 20 July 2016).
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid.; Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 31 January 1970: Anti-Apartheid Movement* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1970). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599800-1970-01-31-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>54</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 8 November 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2630825-1983-11-08-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>55</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 12 November 1969: Anti-Apartheid Movement* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2623883-1969-11-12-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 9 June 1993: Anti-Apartheid Movement March 20 June 1993* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1993), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599824-1984-06-09-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 21 June 1993* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1993), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599825-1984-06-21-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 29 May 1984* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599820-1984-05-29-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>56</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 12 November 1969: Anti-Apartheid Movement*, p. 4.
- <sup>57</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch.*
- <sup>58</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 23 March 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599817-1984-03-23-aam-sb-house-of-commons.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>59</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 12 November 1969: Anti-Apartheid Movement*, p. 2.
- <sup>60</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*, p. 301.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>62</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 15 December 1969: Apartheid Movement* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969), p. 2, available at

---

<http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599798-1969-12-15-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Anti-Apartheid Movement, *Stop the Springboks*, available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490729-mepo2-11477-0002a.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>63</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telegram Dated 29 October 1969* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490741-mepo2-11477-0011.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>64</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 10 March 1970* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1970). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490773-mepo31-30-0007.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>65</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telegram Dated 31 October 1969* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490738-mepo2-11477-0009.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>66</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 5 November 1969: South African Rugby Tour* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490728-mepo2-11477-0002.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telegram Dated 5 November 1969* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490743-mepo2-11477-0003.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>67</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 21 November 1969* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490725-mepo2-11477-0001a.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>68</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Letter Dated 31 March 1970* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1970). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490749-mepo31-30-0001d.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>69</sup> Wim van der Berg, *The Extraordinary Book of South African Rugby* (London: Penguin Books, 2012); Rhodri Davies, *Undefeated: The Story of the 1974 Lions* (Tal-y-bont: Y Lolfa, 2014).

<sup>70</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telegram Dated 5 November 1969* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1969). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490727-mepo2-11477-0001peterhain.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>71</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 15 December 1969: Apartheid Movement*.

<sup>72</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 13 May 1970* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1970), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599802-1970-05-13-aam-sb-routine-meeting-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 2 June 1984* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599822-1984-06-02-aam-sb-tel-msg-nf-demo.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>73</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Memorandum Dated 1 May 1970* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1970). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490775-mepo31-30-0007b.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>74</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 11 January 1981* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1981).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2490727-mepo2-11477-0001peterhain.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>75</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 31 May 1984* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599821-1984-05-31-aam-sb-assessment.html> (accessed 8 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 29 May 1984*.

<sup>76</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 17 June 1982* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1982).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599808-1982-06-17-aam-sb-tel-msg.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>77</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 7 December 1984* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599832-1984-12-07-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

<sup>78</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 11 March 1985: Anti-Apartheid Movement* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1985).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599833-1985-03-11-aam-sb-report-on-supermarket-pickets.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).

- 
- <sup>79</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>80</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 1 October 1984: Anti-Apartheid Demonstration Twickenham 29 September 1984* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599830-1984-10-01-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>81</sup> Anti-Apartheid Movement, *Newspaper Clipping*, 3 November 1982. Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599813-1982-11-03-aam-news-paper-clipping.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>82</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 11 October 1984: Anti-Apartheid Movement* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599831-1984-11-10-aam-sb-report.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>83</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 8 November 1983*.
- <sup>84</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 17 July 1995: Action for Southern Africa (ACTSA)* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1995). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2599834-1985-07-17-aam-sb-aam-now-defunct.html> (accessed 8 August 2016).
- <sup>85</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher's Secret War*, p. 132.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>87</sup> This was part of a wider Asian and Afro-Caribbean experience of self-organization that took place in England during industrial disputes in the 1970s. See Anne Dunlop, "An United Front? Anti-Racist Political Mobilisation in Scotland," *Scottish Affairs* 3(Spring) (1993), pp. 89–101.
- <sup>88</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*.
- <sup>89</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*.
- <sup>90</sup> Leeds University, *Grunwick 1976–1978: Chronology of Events*. Available at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/strikingwomen/grunwick/chronology> (accessed 6 August 2016).
- <sup>91</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Metropolitan Police Report Dated 15 June 1977: Trade Dispute – Arrests and Disorder Grunwick Processing Ltd* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693928-1977-06-15-MPS-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Metropolitan Police Report Dated 16 June 1977: Trade Dispute – Disorder/Arrests – Grunwick Processing Ltd*. (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693929-1977-06-16-MPS-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- <sup>92</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 16 June 1977: Grunwick Processing Laboratories Ltd* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693930-1977-06-16-Special-Branch-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016), p. 3.
- <sup>93</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>94</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>95</sup> Jack McGowan, "'Dispute', 'Battle', 'Siege', 'Farce' – Grunwick 30 Years On," *Contemporary British History* 22(3) (2008), pp. 383–406.
- <sup>96</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 28 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693941-1977-06-28-MPS-Report-1-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- <sup>97</sup> Ibid. Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693942-1977-06-28-MPS-Report-2-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- <sup>98</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute. Assessment of 11 July Demonstration* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693933-1977-06-20-Special-Branch-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- <sup>99</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 28 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute*.
- <sup>100</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 6 July 1977: Grunwick 11 July* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693962-1977-07-06-Special-Branch-Report-1-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- <sup>101</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute. Assessment of 11 July Demonstration*.

---

<sup>102</sup> The NUM and Arthur Scargill would later mount, and be defeated in, the 1984–1985 miners’ strike that resulted in a key symbolic and political victory for the government of Margaret Thatcher and the weakening of trade unionism.

<sup>103</sup> Annie Machon, *Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers: MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair* (Sussex: The Book Guild, 2005).

<sup>104</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*.

<sup>105</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Letter Dated 1 July 1977* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693953-1977-07-01-SB-Letter-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).

<sup>106</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute. Assessment of 11 July Demonstration*.

<sup>107</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 4 July 1977: Grunwick Processing Laboratories Ltd* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693959-1977-07-05-Special-Branch-Report-1-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).

<sup>108</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 8 July 1977: Grunwick Day of Action 11.7.77* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693967-1977-07-08-Special-Branch-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).

<sup>109</sup> Her Majesty’s Government, *Grunwick Dispute* (London: Her Majesty’s Government, 1977).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2712462-PREM-16-1491-20.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).

<sup>110</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*.

<sup>111</sup> Her Majesty’s Government, *Note of a Meeting at Chequers on 26 June 1977: The Grunwick Dispute* (London: Her Majesty’s Government, 1977).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2746963-PREM-16-1491-46.html> (accessed 5 August 2016).

<sup>112</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 30 June 1977: Grunwick Dispute. Assessment of 11 July Demonstration*.

<sup>113</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 11 July 1977: Grunwick Day of Action* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693970-1977-07-11-Special-Branch-Report-Grunwick.html> (accessed 6 August 2016).

<sup>114</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Metropolitan Police Report Dated 15 July 1977: Demonstration & March on Monday, 11 July, 1977* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2693969-1977-07-11-MPS-Report-2-Grunwick.html>

(accessed 5 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 1977: Grunwick Day of Action*.

<sup>115</sup> The Scarman Report criticized the mass pickets but recommended Grunwick’s management to both reinstate the 137 sacked strikers and recognize trade unionism. Grunwick’s management rejected these recommendations.

<sup>116</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Metropolitan Police Report Dated 15 June 1977: Trade Dispute – Arrests and Disorder Grunwick Processing Ltd* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1977).

<sup>117</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*, p. 307. The SDS’s presence at a Grunwick demonstration and its infiltration of the SWP is also recounted in the 2002 BBC documentary *True Spies*. See Taylor, “True Spies, Episode 1.”

<sup>118</sup> Wilson and Adams, *Special Branch*.

<sup>119</sup> Lindsay Mackie, “Police ‘Provoked’ Grunwick Pickets,” *The Guardian* (14 July 1977).

<sup>120</sup> Keith Ewing and Brian Napier, “The Wapping Dispute and Labour Law,” *Cambridge Law Journal* 45(2) (1986), pp. 285–304.

<sup>121</sup> McGowan, “‘Dispute’, ‘Battle’, ‘Siege’, ‘Farce’ – Grunwick 30 Years On,” p. 384.

<sup>122</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*, p. 14.

<sup>123</sup> Independent, “Wapping: Twenty Years, Twenty Voices,” *Independent* (22 January 2006).

Available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/media/wapping-twenty-years-twenty-voices-523987.html> (accessed 13 August 2016).

<sup>124</sup> Paul Lewis and Rob Evans, *Undercover: The True Story of Britain’s Secret Police* (London: Faber and Faber, 2013).

<sup>125</sup> Nic Oatridge, “Wapping ’86: The Strike that Broke Britain’s Newspaper Unions,” *ColdType* (2002), p. 10.

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>127</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 14 March 1986: News International Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510432-wapping-1986-03-14-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 27 March 1986: News International Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510431-wapping-1986-03-27-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>128</sup> Lewis and Evans, *Undercover*. BBC News, “1986: Printers and Police Clash in Wapping,” *BBC News* (15 February 1986). Available at [http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/february/15/newsid\\_3455000/3455083.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/february/15/newsid_3455000/3455083.stm) (accessed 13 August 2016).

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Messages Dated 3 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511844-wapping-1986-05-03-messages.html#document/p1/a265874> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>131</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Memo Dated 15 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511833-wapping-1986-05-misc.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>132</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: News International Print Dispute Overview – Wednesday 21 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2553971-wapping-1986-05-21-overview.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>133</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 12 May 1986: News International Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515149-wapping-1986-05-12-special-branch-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>134</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Assessment Dated 22 April 1986: South East Region TUC* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510428-wapping-1986-04-22-sb-assessment.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Assessment Dated 28 April 1986: South East Region TUC* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510426-wapping-1986-04-28-sb-assessment.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Memo Dated 17 April 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510429-wapping-1986-04-17-memo-to-sb-commander.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 1 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510424-wapping-1986-05-01-telephone-message.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>135</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 2 May 1986: South East Region TUC* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510423-wapping-1986-05-02-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>136</sup> The following organizations and groups displayed banners during the demonstration: Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers; Long Live May Day; Fleet Street AUEW; Daily & Sunday Telegraph AUEW; SOGAT – London Central Branch; NATSOPA; News of the World – SOGAT Publishing Chapel; SOGAT 82 – Deptford Depot; WH Smith – Peckham Chapel; WH Smith – King’s Cross; SOGAT Times Publishing Branch; SOGAT Clerical Chapel; Daily Mirror Warehouse Chapel; NGA; COHSE; NUPE; NALGO; ASTMS; GCHQ; Morning Star; Communist Party; Trades Council of Brent, Hammersmith and Greenwich; Socialist Workers Party; Workers Revolutionary Party; Revolutionary Communist Party; Fire Brigade Union; Turkish Communist Party; Turkish Communist Party (Marxist–Leninist); Union of Turkish Workers; Association of Turkish Women in London; and Turkish Community Centre. See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 2 May 1986: South East Region TUC*.

<sup>137</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Messages Dated 2 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511845-wapping-1986-05-02-messages.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>138</sup> The following banners and posters were displayed during the demonstration: Southwark Trades Council; SOGAT London Machine Group; Brixton Young Socialists; Clerical Gate Taker 86; “6000 Sacked Printworkers”; Observer Night Machine Chapter SOGAT ’82; SOGAT Clerical Chapel; Govan

---

and Glasgow Morning Star; SOGAT '82 Machine Chapel; AUEW Fleet Street Branch; Camden Labour Councillors; Morning Star; NGA Liverpool Branch; NUJ Freelance Branch; Support Print Workers – Expel EETPU; Brixton Young Socialists; South Wales Branch Women’s Support Group; Port of London Dockers; Oxford Anarchists Society; New Worker Supports the Printers; Camden Tenants Association; Socialist Workers Party; SWP National Committee; ASTMS; WH Smith – King’s Cross Branch – SOGAT '82; John Menzies Deptford – SOGAT '82; Sun Publishing Chapel; Times Night Publishing Chapel – SOGAT '82; NGA London Branch; NGA Guardian Chapel; London Standard Chapel; Johnsons Wholesale SOGAT '82 Chapel; SUN NATSOPA; Express Night Machine Chapel – SOGAT '82; Daily Mirror Warehouse Chapel. See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 6 May 1986: News International Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511840-wapping-1986-05-06-demonstration-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>139</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Messages Dated 3 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511843-wapping-1986-05-03-messages-phone.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>140</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 6 May 1986: News International Dispute*.

<sup>141</sup> Police were also on the receiving end of chants such as “I’d rather be a cow-pat than a cop” and “the Mets are the biggest scabs of all.” Other chants heard during the march were “TUC get off your knees, call a general strike” and “I’d rather be a picket than a scab.” See Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 6 May 1986: News International Dispute*.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>144</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Memo Dated 23 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2630301-wapping-1986-05-23-special-branch-memo.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>145</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 9 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515154-wapping-1986-05-09-telephone-messages.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Telephone Message Dated 10 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515152-wapping-1986-05-10-telephone-messages.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 12 May 1986: News International Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515148-wapping-1986-05-12-special-branch-memo.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 14 May 1986: News International Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515138-wapping-1986-05-14-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 16 May 1986: News International Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515131-wapping-1986-05-16-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 20 May 1986: News International* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2553974-wapping-1986-05-20-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 21 May 1986: News International* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2553972-wapping-1986-05-21-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>146</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: News International Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515153-wapping-1986-05-10-threat-assessment.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>147</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Memo Dated 15 May 1986*.

<sup>148</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: News International – Print Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2515129-wapping-1986-05-17-daily-overview.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>149</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Daily Overview – Friday 9 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2511831-wapping-1986-05-09-daily-overview.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 19 May 1986: News International Dispute* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2553980-wapping-1986-05-19-sb-report.html> (accessed 12 August 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: News International Dispute*

---

*Daily Overview – Tuesday 27 May 1986* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1986), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2630300-wapping-1986-05-27-threat-assessment.html> (accessed 12 August 2016).

<sup>150</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher's Secret War*, p. 273.

<sup>151</sup> David Smith, *Something Will Turn Up: Britain's Economy, Past, Present and Future* (London: Profile Books, 2015).

<sup>152</sup> Channel 4, "MI5's Official Secrets," *Channel Four* (10 March 1985). Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qRuAzSDhZXk> (accessed 25 July 2016).

<sup>153</sup> Christopher Andrew, *The Defence of the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5* (London: Allen Lane, 2009).

<sup>154</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher's Secret War*.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>156</sup> Andrew, *The Defence of the Realm*, p. 676.

<sup>157</sup> Hansard, *British Stasi Agents* (London: House of Commons, 1999), available at [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199900/cmhansrd/vo991221/halltext/91221h04.htm#91221h04\\_head0](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199900/cmhansrd/vo991221/halltext/91221h04.htm#91221h04_head0) (accessed 25 July 2016); Stefan Berger and Norman Laporte (eds), *The Other Germany: Perceptions and Influences in British–East German Relations, 1945–1990* (Augsburg: Wissner-Verlag, 2005).

<sup>158</sup> Machon, *Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers*.

<sup>159</sup> Rob Evans and Rowena Mason, "Police Continued Spying on Labour Activists after Their Election as MPs," *The Guardian* (25 May 2015). Available at <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/mar/25/police-spied-on-labour-mps-whistleblower> (accessed 20 June 2016).

<sup>160</sup> Andrew, *The Defence of the Realm*.

<sup>161</sup> Machon, *Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers*.

<sup>162</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher's Secret War*.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>164</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Telephone Messages Dated 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2650296-Cnd-Surveillance-July-1983Upright.html> (accessed 28 July 2016); Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 25 July 1983: CND 'Human Chain' Demonstration, 16.7.1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2434909-cnd-surveillance-july-1983.html> (accessed 28 July 2016).

<sup>165</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: CND 'Human Chain' Demonstration from the US Embassy to the USSR Embassy due to be Held on Saturday 16 July 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2434907-cnd-surveillance-july-1983b.html> (accessed 28 July 2016).

<sup>166</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 25 July 1983: CND 'Human Chain' Demonstration, 16.7.1983*.

<sup>167</sup> Home Office, *Demonstration about Nuclear Defence Policy* (London: Home Office, 1983), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2330568-cnd-surveillance1.html> (accessed 28 July 2016); Home Office: F4 Division, *Demonstration about Nuclear Defence Policy: London, 22 October* (London: Home Office, 1983), available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2650356-1983-10-22-Home-Office-Correspondence-Relating.html> (accessed 28 July 2016).

<sup>168</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Threat Assessment: National CND Demonstration in Central London on 22 October 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2434912-cnd-surveillance-oct-1983.html> (accessed 28 July 2016).

<sup>169</sup> The following placards and slogans were used during the demonstration: "War will mutually destruct"; "CND No arms race"; "Refuse Cruise now"; "Once upon a time there was peace"; "Quakers say 'No' to war"; "Welfare not warfare"; "Schools not suicide"; "Hospitals not bombs"; "Christ is our peace"; "Hospitals not holocausts"; "Study war no more"; "Teachers for peace"; "Nuclear war is never having to say 'Sorry'"; "Gi' us a job, not the bomb"; "Bollocks to the bomb"; "Be realistic, demand the impossible"; "Give kids a chance"; "Fight against the end of the world"; "American women support Greenham women"; "No crime, no Trident, together we can stop the bomb"; "Ban the bomb"; "The only good missile is a pasty." See Home Office: F4 Division, *Demonstration about Nuclear Defence Policy: London, 22 October – Appendix 'A'* (London: Home Office, 1983). Available at

---

<http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2650356-1983-10-22-Home-Office-Correspondence-Relating.html> (accessed 28 July 2016).

<sup>170</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 24 October 1983* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1983). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2650344-Report-of-CND-Demo-1983-10-22.html#document/p13/a268615> (accessed 29 July 2016).

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>173</sup> Metropolitan Police, *Special Branch Report Dated 7 March 1984: Student CND Demonstration* (London: Metropolitan Police, 1984).

Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2434911-cnd-surveillance-march-1984.html> (accessed 30 July 2016).

<sup>174</sup> Home Office: F4 Division, *CND Demonstration During the Economic Summit – 9 June* (London: Home Office, 1984). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2650559-1984-06-09-HO-Correspondence-Relating-to-Demo.html> (accessed 29 July 2016).

<sup>175</sup> Home Office: F4 Division, *Protests Directed at the Summit – Saturday 9 June* (London: Home Office, 1984). Available at <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2330250-cnd-surveillance.html> (accessed 30 July 2016).

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>177</sup> Machon, *Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers*.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>179</sup> Bloom, *Violent London*.

<sup>180</sup> Machon, *Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers*, p. 39.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>182</sup> Steve Hewitt, *Snitch! A History of the Modern Intelligence Informer* (London: Continuum, 2010).

<sup>183</sup> Timothy Peace, *European Social Movements and Muslim Activism: Another World but with Whom?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 77.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11. Reclaim the Streets (RTS) is an anti-neoliberal and anti-capitalist group that was founded by former members of Earth First! in 1991 and that instigated major protests, such as the ‘Global Street Party’ in 1998, the ‘Global Carnival Against Capitalism’ in 1999, and a ‘May Day Guerrilla Gardening’ event in 2000, “which famously resulted in the defacing of a statue of Winston Churchill in Parliament Square.” See Peace, *European Social Movements and Muslim Activism*, p. 21.

<sup>185</sup> Lewis and Evans, *Undercover*.

<sup>186</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*, p. 159.

<sup>187</sup> John Donovan and Richard Timothy Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism: Victimization, Investigation and Detection of a Campaign of Criminal Intimidation,” *European Journal of Criminology* 10(1) (2013), pp. 113–132.

<sup>188</sup> Lewis and Evans, *Undercover*.

<sup>189</sup> Sivan Hirsch-Hoefler and Cas Mudde, “‘Ecoterrorism’: Terrorist Threat of Political Ploy?” *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 37(7) (2014), pp. 586–603.

<sup>190</sup> Robert Lambert, “Researching Counterterrorism: A Personal Perspective From a Former Undercover Police Officer,” *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 7(1) (2014), pp. 165–181.

<sup>191</sup> Emma Wilkins, “Class Warriors Accused of Infiltrating Animal Lobby,” *The Times* (4 February 1995).

<sup>192</sup> Gordon Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK,” *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 15(1) (2013), pp. 30–44 (p. 31). See also Gordon Mills, *Assessing the Challenge of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK and the Changing Impact on Community Safety and Human Rights in the Period 2004–2010* (London: London Metropolitan University, Unpublished Professional Doctorate Thesis, 2012).

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>194</sup> Donovan and Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism,” p. 114.

<sup>195</sup> Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK,” p. 34.

<sup>196</sup> For example, Section 145 created the offence of interfering with “contractual relationships so as to harm animal research organisations”; Section 146 created the offence of “threatening someone that they will be the victim of a crime or tortuous act causing loss or damage, because they are linked to an ARO [animal research organisation]”; and Section 42 created the offence of harassing an individual near their home. See Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK.”

<sup>197</sup> Donovan and Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism.”

<sup>198</sup> Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK.”

- 
- <sup>199</sup> Donovan and Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism.”
- <sup>200</sup> Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK.”
- <sup>201</sup> Donovan and Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism.”
- <sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- <sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>204</sup> Mills, “The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in the UK,” p. 41.
- <sup>205</sup> Hirsch-Hoefler and Mudde, “‘Ecoterrorism.’”
- <sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 591.
- <sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 598.
- <sup>208</sup> Donovan and Coupe, “Animal Rights Extremism.”
- <sup>209</sup> Christopher Elliott and Duncan Campbell, “Police Chiefs Want Anti-Terror Squad to Spy on Green Activists,” *The Guardian* (27 March 1996).
- <sup>210</sup> Wallace McNeish, “The Vitality of Local Protest: Alarm UK and the British Anti-Roads Protest Movement” in Benjamin Seel, Matthew Paterson and Brian Doherty, eds, *Direct Action in British Environmentalism* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 183–198.
- <sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 192.
- <sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 198.
- <sup>213</sup> Hirsch-Hoefler and Mudde, “‘Ecoterrorism.’”
- <sup>214</sup> Matthew Kalman, “Mayday McDonald’s Police Entrapment?” *White Wash* (23 June 2000). Available at <http://white-wash.tripod.com/report.html> (accessed 22 July 2016).
- <sup>215</sup> Zoë James, *New Travellers, New Policing? Exploring the Policing of New Traveller Communities under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994* (Guildford: University of Surrey, Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2004), p. 124.
- <sup>216</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*, p. 157.
- <sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.
- <sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>219</sup> James, *New Travellers, New Policing?*
- <sup>220</sup> Bloom, *Thatcher’s Secret War*, p. 158.
- <sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.
- <sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>224</sup> James, *New Travellers, New Policing?*
- <sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>226</sup> Ravers were monitored long before the 1992 festival. Newspaper records show that, for example, Kent Police were logging around 300–400 parties per month in the summer of 1989 and were losing control of the movement of traffic and people. See Ian Burrell, “Trance Encounter: Can it Really Be 25 Years Since Acid House Was Born?” *The Independent* (29 June 2012). Available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/music/features/trance-encounter-can-it-really-be-25-years-since-acid-house-was-born-7893365.html> (accessed 22 June 2016).
- <sup>227</sup> Michael Prestage, “Police Keeps Tabs on the Travellers,” *The Independent* (15 May 1993), available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/police-keep-tabs-on-the-travellers-2323342.html> (accessed 22 June 2016); Neil Spencer, “Beat Against Bullies,” *The Observer* (1 May 1994); Duncan Campbell, “Police Watch on Travellers to Go Before European Court,” *The Guardian* (1 March 1994).
- <sup>228</sup> Jim Carey, “A Criminal Culture?” in *Towards 2012: The Journal of Millennial Mutations – Part III: Culture and Language* (Leeds: The Unlimited Dream Company / Slab-O-Concrete Publications, 1996).
- <sup>229</sup> Ian Burrell, “Trance Encounter.”
- <sup>230</sup> Duncan Campbell, “Police Track Travellers by Computer,” *The Guardian* (25 March 1994).
- <sup>231</sup> Jim Carey, “A Criminal Culture?”
- <sup>232</sup> Tim Guest, “The Fight for the Right to Party,” *The Guardian* (12 July 2009). Available at <http://www.theguardian.com/music/2009/jul/12/90s-spiral-tribe-free-parties> (accessed 22 June 2016).
- <sup>233</sup> James, *New Travellers, New Policing?*, p. 260.
- <sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>235</sup> Tom Bucke and Zoë James, *Trespass and Protest: Policing Under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994* (London: Home Office, 1998).
- <sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xii.
- <sup>237</sup> Clive Bloom, *Riot City: Protest and Rebellion in the Capital* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).