

Chairman: Dr. Greenslade. Referring to your written evidence, it is number 14, I gather that although you heard the rumour and had a word with Professor Bradley you were not directly concerned with any of the arrangements made for the lecture or for the change of venue?

Greenslade: No.

Partington: ~~Reissland~~ You were not involved in it in any way at all?

Greenslade: No.

Chairman: So you went to the lecture. About how many Chemists were present at the beginning?

Greenslade: Around 13. It is a bit difficult to specify, I think about 13.

Chairman: There has been some ~~tale~~ of many of the chemists being told of the venue at the last moment. Were you aware of any last minute arrangements which got the chemists to the meeting in question?

Greenslade: I think it is true that the second year chemists were told quite late in the afternoon but I am not sure exactly when but probably after 3 o'clock anyway. I myself did not hear of it until after 3 o'clock.

Chairman: And when you were told at 3 o'clock you were told <sup>just</sup> that it was in Wivenhoe House or were you told which room it was going to be in?

Greenslade: That is fairly obvious, that is the room usually used.

Chairman: You sat with Mr. Adams, towards the back of the room?

Greenslade: The last row, I should think, or the last but one at least, but I think it was the last row.

Reissland: Could we go back to the stage before the meeting. Some people have told us about this rumour, how you came to hear about this planned demonstration. You are slightly ~~more~~ stronger and more detailed about this rumour. You say you heard there was going to be a violent demonstration and also this detail that an original collaborator had withdrawn from planning as he thought the measures too extreme. From what ~~of~~ sort of source was this?

Greenslade: Professor Bradley actually stated the source, I did not want to state it. It was Mr. Evans in fact and the reason it came through me is that I have a lot of liaison with Mr. Evans through schools.

Reissland: And this description was his words?

Greenslade: I am pretty sure that is what he said.

Chairman: Notably the word violence?

Greenslade: I think that might be too strong, I cannot remember exactly but ~~definitely~~ <sup>certainly</sup> a nasty demonstration if not violent.

Freeman: I put this to another witness that some form of the demonstration now that is generally considered quite legitimate and other forms clearly are not. Was there anything in what you heard which would suggest that this was likely to be an illegitimate form of demonstration and could you specify?

Greenslade: I think what Mr. Evans said in paraphrase was that there was going to be a demonstration and it was going to be so nasty that one of the collaborators had withdrawn. That is the extent to which I had information.

Partington: Did he say who the collaborator was?

Greenslade: No, he did not name his source of the rumour.

Chairman: What was the first you heard of the demonstration itself in the room?

greenslade: When ~~xx~~ you say the first that I heard.

Chairman: The first realisation.

Greenslade: One could look out of the window and see a vast troop of people coming across to the House, the green to the huts, wierdly dressed people.

Chairman: After that, what was the next thing you know of it?

Greenslade: A number of these came into the back of the <sup>room</sup> ~~building~~ and filled up the standing space at the back of the room. I suppose there was room for two or three rows of people standing, fairly close standing, and this soon filled up and one

Greenslade: or two people, half a dozen, or perhaps more sidled round to the window space and sat in the side aisle on the right hand side.

Chairman: Yours is the first evidence we have heard of anyone coming through the back door, the double door. Can you be sure of that?

Greenslade: Oh, yes. I think definitely that the first lot of people came in the back. I am pretty sure of that, and then when that was blocked up it is that more came to the side.

Chairman: You are sure that it could not have been that a commotion was going on behind the back door which you might have heard and thought that the main body came through the side?

Greenslade: When you say the main body came through the side I should think at least as many came through the side afterwards as came through the back.

Chairman: People definitely came through the back?

Greenslade: People definitely came through the back door.

Chairman: I am trying to get the order of this. ~~Yes~~ Do you remember at any time Dr. Bowden going out of the meeting room? before the demonstrators really came in?

Greenslade: I know he went out but I could not say when. I think in fact he went out, in fact he went out the side door after the back rows had been filled up but I am not sure, I would not like to say exactly.

Chairman: Obviously peoples' recollections get confused. We have heard for instance from Mr. Davis that he was stationed by the back door and did not let anyone through. Lets take it as you remember.

Greenslade: It is a long time ago now.

Chairman: As far as you remember they came through the back door? Was the back door then closed?

Greenslade: It was blocked, by people standing.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral Evidence page 120 28th May

Dr. Greenslade giving evidence

Q Did you hear any conversation going on at all behind you at the back door, between particularly Dr. Bowden and people trying to get in?

A I seem to remember Mr. Davis saying something but I do not recollect Dr. Bowden being outside the back door. I don't recollect that.

Q After as you think people came through the back door was there any gap before they started emerging through the side?

A There was a momentary pause. That was about all.

Q As they came through either door, particularly the side door, what steps did you notice being taken by any members of the Chemistry Department to prevent entry?

A I think it is clearly I was here before the official opening. Mrs. Trueman recollects it very clearly that in fact I think Dr. Bowden did say this is a Chemistry department meeting. In fact ~~this was~~ the original lecture had been cancelled and this was a new one, and he was saying this in an agitated manner, I think it was on the spur of the moment. <sup>Eventually</sup> Somebody did point that all University lectures are open and he said remember you are guests of the Chemistry department.

Q Do you recollect him saying this and where was he when he was saying this?

A In the doorway.

Q Inside the doorway?

A Yes.

Q Perhaps we ought to get your view on this as someone not directly involved.  
Do you think that non-members of the Chemistry Society <sup>the would-be</sup> ~~would-be~~ hecklers~~x~~ do have a right to come to Chemistry Society lectures?

A Quite clearly there should be no restriction on people coming to a lecture which is essentially academic and is of a faculty society. As far as heckling goes I do not think that <sup>at</sup> an academic lecture people should heckle during the course of the lecture.

Q Now we are getting outside our terms of reference, I just want to get your view on the access, prima facie non-members do have a right to come in?

A I think we all probably agree on that.

Q There is just one question about what Dr. Bowden said. One of our pieces of

evidence alleged that Dr. Tillett had said that when the demonstrators came in the room that this was<sup>not</sup> the Dr. Inch meeting. Dr. Tillett denied that. I think a number of things, a number of people not knowing Drs. Tillett and Bowden had attributed things that were said by one to the other. Dr. Tillett denied ever having said this. What you have told us Dr. Bowden said is something like this remark that has been attributed to Dr. Tillett. Did Dr. Bowden actually say that this was not the Inch meeting?

A This is what he actually, the exact words I am not sure, but I am sure of ~~that~~ the statement that ~~he~~<sup>he</sup> did try and indicate that this was being cancelled and this was a new meeting.

2 ~~The~~<sup>A</sup> witness, we have not seen him yet but he has put it in writing, remembers this exchange, says that he himself made a rejoinder to the effect that<sup>if</sup> it is not the Dr. Inch meeting why did you introduce Dr. Inch. (Reference 21, Houghton, page 2 at the bottom.) Dr. Tillett then said that this was not the Inch meeting and that the Inch<sup>meeting</sup> was off and this was a meeting of the Chemistry department staff. I asked him firmly why he had then introduced the speaker as Dr. Inch just before the new arrivals entered. Does that interchange strike any chord in your memory?

A No, I do not recollect anybody asking this question in fact. They may have done but there was quite a commotion outside the door so it is conceivable that it may have been drowned. I thought it was Dr. Bowden who actually stood at the door to try and stop people coming in.

Q Dr. Tillett has <sup>denied</sup> ~~said~~ quite firmly having said the remarks attributed to him.

A It is possible that this person has confused the two.

Q There is a difference between saying that this is a Chemistry Department meeting and this is not the Inch meeting or the Inch meeting has been cancelled. Can you remember?

A Well, I don't think there was, I see what you are getting at, but the way, of course I can see what he was getting at maybe that is why I remember it differently but I am sure what he was trying to say was that in fact they cancelled the open meeting and are now holding a departmental meeting to restrict people coming in. I don't think it was <sup>any</sup> ~~the~~ intention to claim that it was other than Dr. Inch giving the lecture.

Q Can you explain exactly what you mean by departmental meeting? This was not clear earlier on in someone else's explanation.

A To some extent this is my opinion but it seems to me that on the spur of the moment people were surprised ~~in~~ by the extent to which there were demonstrators there. They suspected sort of a handful and they were faced with, I would say, about 60 to 80. This surprised them and therefore on the spur of the moment they had to think something up to keep people out and in many universities, and after all most of the chemistry staff have been at other universities, of course a departmental meeting is closed and I think therefore when a member of staff said this is a departmental meeting there was the implication that it was closed to outsiders. But this I think is purely retrospect. One can say here that the University has the rule that all lectures are open to everyone, therefore there is no such thing in a sense ~~as~~ as a lecture departmental meeting in that sense.

Q It is true that departments, and I understand from the previous witness from the Chemistry department, certainly the government department, has weekly seminars which are really confined to staff and graduate students.

Q I don't want us to pursue this too much. I don't think it part of our job to find out what the legal position is.

Q I was concerned with what was meant to the demonstrators.

A. If I can quickly answer that one. Our departmental research colloquia are open to anyone in fact but normally of course it is only research students and graduate students and staff and some third year undergraduate students who come to these but by and large they are open, we do not close them.

Q Two more points on the entry. One slightly different version has been put to us, Dr. Bowden may be able to clear it up, that he was admitting people six at a time in little groups and trying to cut off the flow at frequent intervals. Is that the impression you got?

A I cannot remember. This was at the front and I was at the back and by this time there was a crowd round the side wall.

Q May I just pick you up on this estimate of 60 to 80. We have had ~~all sorts of~~ varying estimates going up as high as 150 and as low as 50 I think. Are you fairly confident in saying 60 to 80?

A The way I worked this out was ~~this~~ this. I know that that room fitting in the padded chairs which were used at that time, padded arm chairs, and even pushing those up, there are only about 30 to 40 such chairs. If you put these in there is very little space left and even with people standing at the back, ~~then~~ near the windows, then I would think you could not get more than another 40 perhaps 60 at the outside although there were some people outside, so it seems to me that there was certainly not more than about 80. In fact when it came to the eventual stage when there were people in the corridor I would have thought that the corridor might hold 20 and the vestibule, the two vestibules might hold 40 people so again I would have thought that the number of demonstrators was not more than 80 as an outside estimate.

Q We have heard two accounts of an incident in which you were involved, during this time with Halberstadt.

A Yes.

Q I will refer you to, ~~Adams~~ one is Adams, they are both exactly the same in fact, although one is interluded with certain expressions of opinion. ~~But~~ Adams is Number 10.

A I have read that.

Q Is that fairly accurate?

A. Let me see. With Halberstadt?

Q The incident I am thinking of is halfway down page 10, Halberstadt and the smoking.

A Oh, yes. Dr. Inch is making an entrance.

Q There is a fuller account of that incident. Can you tell <sup>me</sup> what ~~me~~ you remember ~~about~~ <sup>of</sup> your talking <sup>to</sup> Halberstadt about smoking?

A Dr. Lewis was sitting on my right, asked Halberstadt to put his cigarette out and the reason being that there were no windows open and smoke was drifting down and creating a nuisance. Halberstadt ignored this or said something rather rude I think, I cannot remember exactly, and so I asked him as a member of the academic staff of the Chemistry Department to put his cigarette out and again he refused to do this, so I asked him for his name and that was it.

Q Were you aware of other people smoking? We have heard that they were.

A I think there may have been other people smoking. This was just in the neighbourhood I was in.

Q It is not a very important incident but I will just put to you the version given by someone else which basically was that you were rather brisk and that Halberstadt was rather polite.

A I am not right to judge that.

Q It is not an incident of vast importance. Now we get on to Triesman getting up and speaking. Now I would refer you to the Adams conversation. Do you accept the accuracy of that? Page 10, conversation with Dr. Greenslade.

A I am not sure of his last claim, that I shall recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that he is sent down. I must admit that I had forgotten it and I am not sure that I ever said it. I <sup>was</sup> certainly very angry that somebody should stand up and announce that a war tribunal was going to take place and they were going to read the indictment and interrupt the speaker. I am not sure that I have the power or that much weight with the Vice-Chancellor, that I would have said it.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence

page 125 28 May 1968

Chairman: You might have expressed your anger and perhaps your view that he should be sent down in some circumstances?

Greenslade: I think it is quite likely that I expressed the view that he was a boulder or some words to that effect.

Chairman: Just going back to the entry again. The general picture we've got is of a reasonably orderly entry, people coming in the side door and filing round the sides and back and down the aisles punctuated by some shouts of there being plenty of more room.

Greenslade: I don't think one should say orderly because that implies a sort of school childrenlike procession (public school children that is). I think that undoubtedly people pushed <sup>past</sup> ~~passed~~ Dr. Bowden and they pushed ~~passed~~ the door open. I think there is no doubt about that. There is no doubt that there is some shouting at the back and incitement for people to push in. Calls that there was plenty of room which was blatantly untrue of course. I think there is no doubt of that. I don't think at this stage anybody had taken any really serious steps but they had shown a sort of impoliteness in their manner. Their manner was certainly arrogant.

Chairman: I am <sup>pondering</sup> ~~qualifying~~ a phrase <sup>in</sup> ~~on~~ which you say that they pushed <sup>past</sup> ~~passed~~ Dr. Bowden. Having pushed <sup>past</sup> ~~passed~~ him they moved round the corner of the room. <sup>in</sup> They weren't really shoving when they got into the room?

Greenslade: No.

Chairman: I want to ask you about Triesman's opening words, you mention the reading of the indictment and the War Crimes Tribunal. You may very well not remember this but do you remember whether words such as 'preventing the lecture' were used or whether words such as 'interrupting the lecture' were used?

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence

page 126

28 May 1968

Greenslade:

I distinctly remember Mr. Triesman saying - we are going to stop you before you start.

Chairman:

At that what made you feel that the visitor ought to leave?

Greenslade:

Well I thought it was quite clear that ~~We~~ wouldn't hear a lecture on Chemistry, there was no doubt that it had been broken up - the meeting at that stage or that there was no likelihood of it starting.

Partington:

Why did you consider there was no likelihood of it starting? Did you consider that they might finish reading this indictment and then ~~the~~ lecture would continue?

Greenslade:

Well, they had already stated that they were going to conduct a War Crimes Tribunal and <sup>from</sup> their whole manner it seemed to me that a lengthy demonstration was in the offing at least, and conceivably we could have held the lecture ~~that~~ evening but I should have thought that at the disturbed state of affairs nobody wanted to hear a lecture at that stage.

Freeman:

Why did you assume that the Chairman would be unable to restore order?

Greenslade:

My own personal view is that right from the start the Chemistry Department did underplay it. I would have taken much more stringent precautions myself and I felt at that stage, knowing or having heard this rumour and so forth, I felt that there was no doubt that there was every intention to stop this lecture taking place and to substitute this so-called War Crimes Tribunal. There seemed no doubt to me at ~~this~~ stage.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence

page 127

28 May 1968

Giving evidence Dr. Greenslade

I want to ask you what you saw of Dr. Inch's departure from the room, you may not have been able to see very much, but one impression we got certainly is that a combination of a large number of demonstrators in the doorway and no doubt others moving up from the side constituted a physical obstruction through which Dr. Inch only got through with great difficulty. What I want to ask you is whether you saw any acts of restraint or assault other than this physical obstruction?

Well there is this act of assault which this person, who said he was Archard . . .

Apart from that?

I don't think I could specify but there was no doubt to my mind that there was an attempt to restrain Dr. Inch from leaving the room in the sense that people pushed forward and that he would be stopped from leaving. I mean I think I heard cries of - no he doesn't - of words to that effect.

Were you in a position to get a clear view of the steps taken by Dr. Inch and other members of staff?

I had moved to the front of the room by that time and I was a little way behind Dr. Inch and I remember Mr. Davis coming to the side door and trying to ease Dr. Inch through and I followed this procession through and then there seemed to be a mad rush, literally, once he had got to the bottom of the stairs.

I am still concerned with his getting out of the room, because we have heard slightly contradictory accounts of this particular manoeuvre. How long after he made to leave was he able to get out? Was it  $\frac{1}{2}$  minute or 3 minutes?

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence

page 128

28 May 1968

Evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

A Well it was a slow progress I don't think he had to hold back while a gap was broken. There was a lot of jostling and he took probably a few minutes to get to the bottom of the stairs.

Q Do you remember anything said at that stage about calling the police?

A No.

Q. We have 2 contradictory accounts of this, one that Dr. Tillett while still in the room told Mr. Davis to call the police. Another that he didn't do it until much later when he saw Dr. Inch pinned in the vestibule. Were you there near Dr. Tillett and do you remember him being there most of the time trying to assist Dr. Inch leaving?

A Well he certainly seemed to be present trying to assist Dr. Inch leaving but then I lost track of him and I don't know what happened then until a much later stage when we were standing in the vestibule.

Q You lost track of him before or after Dr. Inch got out?

A Just after he got out of the room I lost sight of Dr. Tillett.

Q Do you then have a specific memory of Dr. Tillett being at Dr. Inch's side as it were all the time as Dr. Inch was trying to get out?

A I think he was at Dr. Inch's side certainly until Dr. Inch was into the end of the bar.

Q During the rush you mention Halberstadt, saying - keep your hands off me. Was he then behind a lot of the others who had already rushed out?

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence page 129

28 May 1968

evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

A Well there was quite a rush forward at this stage. I'm not quite sure where he would be. There were still a fair number of people behind us at this stage.

Q. The reason I ask this is that an allegation has been made by Mr. Wyatt that Halberstadt attempted to strike Davis in the doorway. I am wondering whether you can confirm or deny or don't know whether Halberstadt was in the doorway or whether he was back behind the crowd?

A I didn't see that.

Q Did you notice any linking of arms at the doorway to prevent Inch going?

A At the sort of stage in the vestibule?

Q No, not at that stage. I am still talking of getting out of the room.

A I don't think at that stage there was linking of arms.

Q Now we go along to the vestibule. During the reading of the indictment and the questioning of Dr. Inch, you were present? You had gone off and come back?

A Yes I went off and I came back and I was present while this indictment was continued to be read.

Q Whereabouts were you at that time?

A I was about three rows away from Dr. Inch.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

Oral evidence page 130 28 May 1968  
evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

Q The impression we have got of all this, before the police moved in, was that first of all you know Dr. Inch was hemmed in the corner, were you able to see whether or not he was molested or not in any way apart from being hemmed in by a close cordon of demonstrators?

A No I couldn't see.

Q The impression we have got is to start with quite a lot of shouting of slogans which then subsided when the indictment was continued. The indictment then being read in comparative silence. Dr. Inch then offering to have his say, a number of questions being directed at him, him answering and his answers being from time to time being interrupted by further questioning coming forward.

A I think at that stage that I should say that when you say further questions coming forward there was intimidation in the sense of a sort of heckling in almost a threatening manner.

Q For instance were you able to hear his answers?

A Yes, I could hear his answers.

Q There were two kinds of interruption we have heard. First of all what have been termed cries of derision to some of his answers and secondly almost a stampede of further questions hurled at him while he was answering. Does that seem to you about accurate?

A That is about accurate but of course cries of derision cover a wide range of things and if you have got a man penned in a corner it is a bit different to cries of derision at a politician on a platform. He certainly didn't look a very happy man to me.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

oral evidence

page 131

28 May 1968

evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

Q Can I take you up on that? This is a very difficult one for you to remember because quite obviously you thought it, perhaps quite justifiably, an intimidating situation but do you have a clear memory of him looking intimidated? There has been some doubt on this point.

A I would definitely say that he looked intimidated.

Q Did the way he gave his answer lend or confirm this impression?

A He started off by quoting John Wesley but of course having hardly heard him speak it was difficult to say whether he was nervous but he seemed to be a little nervous to me even at that stage. And certainly later on he seemed very nervous at answering questions.

Q Just a little further into your comment that the heckling was almost in a threatening manner. Was there any physical action or anything they said that at all suggested that his physical safety was in question? Did anyone threaten him in the ordinary sense?

A I don't recollect that, no.

Q Did you see him express any desire to leave at that stage?

A Well I didn't but I would have been surprised if he had. You don't try and leave if there are about 40 to 50 people standing close around you, do you?

Q Coming on the question of the police. Again the impression we have got is that the police arrived some minutes before they actually stepped in. That when they arrived there was a general sit-down in the corridor although not in the vestibule. It seems to have been about the time that Professor Gordon made a suggestion that they should move to the meeting room that the police actually stepped in. Do you remember that?

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

oral evidence

page 132

28 May 1968

evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

A I have a feeling-that this suggestion occurred before the police stepped in.

Q Do you remember what reception that suggestion got?

A Yes, I think there was definitely a hostile reception - people ignored it.

Q And then the police clambered over the sitting demonstrators and managed to reach Dr. Inch. About how many policemen do you remember came through?

A Half a dozen, perhaps 8.

Q. Now you talk about the scrimmage being fairly rough. Of course there was such a mass of people it is difficult to get any clear picture. Given the numbers of people in the room and given the fact that police had to clamber over the demonstrators and given that there was a certain amount of shouting, was the scrimmage rougher than you would expect?

A Well there was no doubt that the demonstrators were trying to restrain the police from getting to Dr. Inch and escorting him out.

Q Restraining them by standing in front of them or restraining them by grabbing hold of them?

A Well I think initially there was this linking arms business and then there was this demonstration intimidation tactic of calling the policeman's number. Eventually the police got round Dr. Inch and there might well have been arms coming out to try and pull them back at that stage. In fact there was certainly one incident near the doorway which I didn't really see but it looked to me as if somebody did try and get their arm round a policeman's neck. A hat was knocked off.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

oral evidence

page 133

28 May 1968

evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

- Q Now the impression I have got so far is that after the police had got through to Dr. Inch the demonstrators formed a linked-arm ~~ed~~ cordon around the police who themselves were surrounding Dr. Inch, which for some|time prevented the police from getting Dr. Inch out.
- A I think the linked-arms cordon was used at three stages. I tried to get nearer to Dr. Inch at one stage and certainly there was a linked-arms cordon in front of me before the police had arrived. Secondly when the police did arrive and tried to get through, the linking spread and there was a lot of linked-arm cordoning going on and certainly when the police got through even more linked arms to try and prevent them getting out. There is no doubt in my mind that that was the practice throughout.
- Q Apart from the incident which you didn't see very clearly you didn't notice any significant deviations from this particular tactic?
- A Well the police had to try and push through and there was a certain amount of boot flying in fact I got an inch cut on my leg but this may have been a policeman's boot it may have been anybody's but this was just because the police were trying to get through to Dr. Inch through a linked-arm cordon.
- Q Were you close to the police and Dr. Inch when they did in fact get him out?
- A Well I was in the vestibule the whole of the time.
- Q Again, primarily in extricating him was it a question of police pushing a way out and demonstrators obstructing?
- A Oh Yes.
- Q Obstructing them by their physical presence or by their linked arms or was there any kind of pushing or grabbing that you saw?

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY MAY 1968

oral evidence page 134 28 May 1968  
evidence given by Dr. Greenslade

A Apart from this one incident I am not sure whether there was or not but when they finally got out of the room I suppose there were a few rows of people between me and the police and at that stage it was a bit difficult to see.

Q When the police were in the vestibule did you notice a helmet knocked off?

A Well they were capped police and there was a cap knocked off.

Q You didn't actually witness the knocking?

A Well I saw it go off but I didn't see who did it.

Q You can't take a view as to whether it was a deliberate move by someone or whether it was something which happened accidentally in the rush?

A I don't think I'd like to, no.

\* \* \*