

GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

- Q.                    <sup>only</sup> There are <sup>only</sup> a few points we want to ask you about on the whole. First of all, going back to the time before May 7th, it seems that you and a number of other people heard about the lecture in the news letter, and we gather that a number of discussions were held in the ensuing days. It seems to have been decided at a fairly early stage that Peter Archard was going to do research. Do you remember being in on any discussions before he started that research, or as he was starting it?
- A.                    I remember a discussion at which we considered the desirability of collecting that research and of using it in a demonstration in some way in order to expand the platform on which the lecture could take place.
- Q.                    Was the idea of drawing up an indictment something that was decided fairly early on?
- A.                    I can't remember. Certainly by the weekend, that is say by Sunday, though I have a feeling that it was slightly earlier. I can't say more than that but it was decided to draw up an indictment.



Q.

It seems that there were a number of discussions, I believe it was Peter Archard who said that, on one of those days, besides some informal conversations, <sup>Some</sup> ~~that~~ sort of specific discussion meetings, <sup>at</sup> which I believe a significant number of people were present, do you remember?

A.

I can remember one on Sunday and one on Monday; the one on Monday being to hurry up and finalise the way in which the indictment was to be presented etc. and on Sunday we were largely discussing the contents, the emphasis of the indictment generally. What kind of information it would contain etc. I certainly recall vaguely discussions before that, indeed when one saw that he was from Porton, Professor MacIntyre was not the only one.

Q.

Do you remember when the broad form of the demonstration, the broad decisions of the demonstration i.e. whether violent or non-violent and what form it should take, were thrashed out?

A.

Either the Sunday or Monday meeting because they are the only ones

I can remember specifically. Certain things were thrashed out including the fact that it was to be non-violent and that its purpose was to draw attention specifically to the question of Germ warfare, to expand the discussion, in other words, not to allow the lecture to continue on that sort of academic level but to bring in the whole question of Germ warfare and since this was very specifically and very permanently the objective of the demonstration, I think everyone was generally anxious that attention should not be diverted from that specific objective. We did discuss the possibility of violence emerging and indeed we were all spontaneously very firm about the fact that there should be



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

non-violent and directed specifically and completely towards the question of Germ warfare.

Q. Provided that you were allowed to continue, and that there was no kind of disruption or people leaving, the object of the demonstration was to divert the proceedings from an academic lecture into a kind of discussion, confrontation, question and answer, about Porton Down?

A. That's right. If you look at the indictment, it does in fact have both in the middle and at the end, if I remember, a series of questions that were to follow on after the indictment and I remember, But only vaguely, that when David Triesman introduced the paper he did say something about "We present this and we want to talk about the ethical and moral <sup>implications</sup> ~~indications~~ of Germ warfare and we ask you to listen to what we have to say and then to discuss or answer questions about it". The indictment does contain a number of questions which arise from the indictment and can only clearly be directed at Dr. Inch. This was the intention to divert the discussion into that area.

Q. Did you have in your mind, before the demonstration, as a result of the discussions that had gone on, any clear idea of what was going to happen in the event of Dr. Inch leaving or being taken out of the lecture?



A. No idea really. One had thought about the possible course of events but we hadn't discussed what would happen if he left. I don't <sup>remember</sup> / us in fact agreeing to any particular policy, but just to see what happened and act accordingly.

Q. Do you remember whether it was discussed whether he should or should not be prevented from leaving the hall?

A. I remember discussing that possibility and the general consensus was that we should not in fact do that because that would be a diversion of the situation, something that would immediately bring the press, who we wanted to involve. We wanted this as a publicist action and anything like that would have immediately diverted all the attention towards some slogan like "Student Violence" or "Students go beserk".

Q. Turning to the press, it seems clear that the object of the demonstration was to bring the matter of Germ warfare to the attention of people both inside and outside the campus. In what way were you hoping to involve the National Press or the outside Press?

A. Largely by virtue of a fairly dramatic form of demonstration, as to the definition of dramatic that is difficult, but we felt that a well-researched ~~take~~ document with impact could in fact reach the National Press as we knew there would be a journalist or two there, or we imagined there would be, who could transmit this on.



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

- The nature of the demonstration would itself would cause attention.
- Q. Were steps taken to alert the Press?
- A. I don't think so. One or two pressmen probably did hear about it , probably through private contacts.
- Q. Do you think that journalists were present in fact?
- A. Yes.
- Q. This is new to us. There was nothing from the Press in detail. Have you any particular reason for believing that?
- A. Well, I suppose not. I was just going by the accuracy of reports. It could have been enterprising students.
- Q. Did you expect the Press to be involved by news of the demonstration that took place or because of the likelihood of a subsequent row?
- A. I don't think we envisaged the likelihood of, if by a row you mean the police called in and a battle or struggle.
- Q. A University row.
- A. A University row. I don't think so. I think it is true to say that I, and everyone I know, was genuinely surprised, not to say horrified, by the stand which the University did take later. The attitude of the people generally on the Friday subsequent ~~were~~ I think testifies to this fact. I think it very surprising that a University should not accept, not only the right to make this demonstration, but indeed the need for it.



- Q. Going back to the two discussions that you remember. You said that at the Sunday evening discussion the contents of the indictment were discussed. By this time certainly Peter Archard must have done quite a lot of his research.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Was the discussion in the nature of a report by him and others? Triesman had also been doing research.
- A. Yes. This was largely it, and in what form it should be presented. Clearly most of the research had been done over the weekend, Saturday and Sunday.
- Q. We didn't hear this from Peter Archard. Do you think he had actually drafted it by the Sunday evening?
- A. I can't remember but it was certainly there by Monday morning.
- Q. About how many people at this Sunday evening discussion.
- A. I would say between fifteen and twenty. That is the only estimate that I can make.
- Q. On the Monday evening, when some of the final details were worked out, how many there?
- A. About the same number I think, but I remember slightly different people. That twenty, or whatever the number was, was not the same as the previous day since more people were then getting to know of the demonstration.
- Q. Did you yourself make a point of going about telling other people of the demonstration?



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

A. Yes.

Q. Would you consider that you yourself played a leading part in the discussions?

A. No. They were just groups of people with a similar intention in mind getting together. The question of leading parts does not arise. It was just a group of people gathered together to talk about what we could do.

Q. Were you aware of other informal discussions going on from time to time at other times.

A. Aware of in the sense that I was told they were going on. That's all. I didn't see or participate in other discussions, but I was told that others were, in fact, taking place.

Q. You made a point of telling other people about the demonstration and presumably there were quite a number of people who knew about the demonstration by word of mouth and sympathised with it and decided to support it, but had not taken any active part in the thrashing out of the issues. Assuming that there were about one hundred demonstrators, do you think this is about right?

A. No I don't. I think there was rather more than that.

Q. Assuming there was a hundred and twenty, how many do you think had come along, as it were, supporters?

A. Do you imply that people would have joined a group of people demonstrating and not agree with.



Q. No, not at all. I will put it in a different way. Some people had taken part in thrashing out the issues as to the plan and kind of demonstration and as to the preparation of the indictment itself. Others were informed at a later stage, Sunday or Monday, about the demonstration which they in good faith decided they should support.

A. Yes.

Q. Could you say if the second lot were the majority or can't you make that distinction.

A. I'm sorry. I may be particularly obtuse but I really don't understand the point.

Q. What proportion of the demonstrators do you feel had come along independently of your plan to demonstrate?

A. That is difficult to say.

Q. Who had seen the news letter and came to the conclusion you had but probably without knowledge of your plan.

A. I just can't say. I myself know probably about twenty people who I met on Tuesday who said "I am going up to demonstrate against Porton Down on the assumption that others will go to" and that assumption was brought up. It is a fairly good assumption to make in this environment.

Q. Would it be fair to say that the fact that Dr. Inch was arriving, and the fact that the demonstration was taking place, was buzzing



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

around those people interested at that weekend?

A. I think that would be true, yes. It even reached Professor MacIntyre and Mr. Evans, so clearly it was buzzing round.

Q. There is a possible distinction between people who knew that there was being some sort of demonstration and those who knew and admitted themselves to the particular form of the reading of the indictment at the meeting. Is it possible for you to estimate what proportion, or how many people, to your knowledge, had agreed to that particular form of demonstration, say reading the indictment at the lecture?

A. I would say that by the time <sup>they</sup> reached the meeting, everybody knew what form it was going to take and by being there and participating, I would suggest they approved the form of the demonstration. I would say probably, well it is very difficult to say unless I break it down into specific times. Who knew by Monday evening, who knew by Tuesday lunchtime.

Q. Who knew by 4.30 on the Tuesday.

A. Everybody.

Q. And what proportion would you say were aware of the plans of what to do should he leave the meeting.

A. Very small because there weren't any.

Q. But it has been mentioned that there was a plan going around the campus.

A. Yes, this was suggested. The word "plan" implies that it had been worked out completely.



- Q. You are saying then that the majority wouldn't have been aware of this discussion?
- A. Probably not.
- Q. There is a rumour that someone had withdrawn from the demonstration because they thought it was too extreme. Do you know anything about this?
- A. Nothing at all.
- Q. Was there any significant body of ~~disent~~ <sup>dissent</sup> at any of the discussions you were at, as to the form decided on.
- A. ~~Disent?~~ <sup>Dissent?</sup> There were other ideas but this idea was agreed on <sup>in</sup> each case by everyone who attended these discussions and there was a general approval of this as a form of demonstration.
- Q. Going up to Wivenhoe House, someone has mentioned seeing a police car in square 5. Did you see a police car?
- A. No.
- Q. Peter Archard has told us about picking up stones on the way. Do you know anything about that?
- A. No.
- Q. Do you have a clear memory, and were you sufficiently close to



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

see clearly, what went on in the doorway as Dr. Inch was trying to leave the meeting?

A. Not really. I was about half way back up the aisle looking in several directions at once. I was sort of looking around and I really only have a very vague memory of what actually happened at the door. That is after the mustard throwing incident. After that I remember very little in fact except the impression of a general <sup>melee</sup>. I was this side of the crowd and I could see a couple <sup>of</sup> members of the chemistry staff pushing behind and around Dr. Inch, and in front pushing their way to the door, in a way that seemed to me vigorous, but that is about all I could possibly say.

Q. The nature of the obstruction which confronted them, whether it was people sitting down, or people linking arms and people pulling them back. Did you really see?

A. No. I came out with the impression that the nature of the obstruction was simply a large and packed group of people at the door, and I don't remember seeing anything like sitting down, linking arms or anything.

Q. When it was known that Dr. Inch was leaving, I gather it was announced by someone, I believe it was Houghton, that there were cries of "No he's not" and "Stop Inch" it seems. Do you remember those cries?



- A. No I don't remember. I'm not saying there weren't, I just can't remember. I didn't shout them.
- Q. I gather you reached the lobby after a lot of people had already got in.
- A. Yes that is right.
- Q. Where were you while the indictment was being completed and the discussion?
- A. I was at the end of the corridor leading into the bit by the garden door. The vestibule. At the end of the corridor, I moved into the room to read my part of the indictment and then just stood at the end of the corridor because just after I had finished reading the constabulary arrived. I like everyone else, sat down and linked arms. It was difficult but tried to link arms.
- Q. Would you have been somewhere near David Triesman.
- A. I can't remember where he was in the vestibule.
- Q. Near the end, near the junction of the corridor with the rooms.
- A. I can't remember.
- Q. I gather the police arrived and you say those in the corridor sat down, you sat down and the police did not move in until some time after that. You must have been almost at the end of people sitting down.
- A. Yes, I was in fact if you like the first one sitting down at the vestibule end by the garden door.



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

- Q. There appears to have been a lot of the time, a cordon of linked arms round Dr. Inch.
- A. I was sitting down.
- Q. Before that. Before you sat down.
- A. I don't think so. I saw no linked arms. No cordon. There was just a group of people. It was very closely packed. They were close enough together to link arms without it being particularly clearly visible.
- Q. You were at no time then in the front line of the people surrounding Dr. Inch?
- A. No.
- Q. Or the front line around the police when the police arrived?
- A. No. I estimated seven or eight and I was sitting down and getting clambered over and I waited until everyone who wanted to, climbed over us too. About that time, the police were firmly settled round Dr. Inch.
- Q. Then the people sitting down got up?
- A. Yes, <sup>by</sup> ~~at~~ the time I had got up Dr. Inch and the cordon had moved off towards the door by the restaurant.
- Q. Did you have a good view of the police proceeding down the corridor to the vestibule?
- A. Excellent. I was under near them.



Q. How did they proceed. With what degree of care and respect for persons.

A. By the time they were proceeding down the corridor, I was really concentrating only on their feet which were the immediate threat, but didn't seem particularly anxious to tread on anybody, they seemed to be proceeding fairly reasonably and cautiously along the arms.

Q. How quickly were they coming.

A. Cautiously and not too quickly. They were just treading very carefully.

Q. An incident has been accounted to us involving Dr. Bowden in the corridor. Someone admits to grabbing hold of his legs because they thought he trod on him. Did you see that at all.

A. No.

Q. How much did you see of the departure of Dr. Inch from the lobby and the way in which he was got out by the police.

A. Very little in fact. What I saw was just a mass of blue uniforms pushing through the door. I assumed that Dr. Inch was somewhere in the middle but I can't say I saw how they got him out because I was just about to leave by the garden door to get round to the front, at the point of which it became clear he was in fact going to get out of the vestibule.

Q. Turning to the incident of the car nearly knocking over Holden.



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

Were you quite close.

A. Yes.

Q. I will ask you a few questions I asked Miss Steel. Was there any provocation of the car in the way that the police car was <sup>provoked</sup> when it went by people banging or shouting?

A. No. There was simply two people who got in the road. The car appeared, I think it was probably going slightly slower than I thought at first since I am informed that it impossible to accelerate up to 60 mph in three feet, but anyway it was going fast, given the circumstances, and these two people were simply crossing the road.

Q. Was there just a driver or a driver and passenger?

A. As I remember, two people in the car.

Q. Did they hoot?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. With regard to the purpose of the demonstration, a distinction has been made between the purpose of the demonstration reading of the indictment being to interrupt Dr. Inch and hold this tribunal. The distinction between that and preventing him giving his lecture, the difference being in the first case that it was at least left open that he might at some time give his lecture that he came to give. Which of those two would you say was most generally agreed should be the purpose of the demonstration.

A. I would say clearly the first. I think this was implied by the questions directed at Dr. Inch which required an answer in the indictment itself, but the point of the indictment was in fact to widen the discussion. To attempt to focus the discussion with Dr. Inch around, not the academic subject which had been the original intention, but the wider question of Germ warfare and its implications and that the indictment was to present, if you like, our side of the story and to then invite him to respond and give his version of the facts.



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

Q. Is it correct to say that you had no objection after that had been done to him giving the lecture he intended to give when he came?

A. No. In a sense that question is irrelevant. The point really was to widen the discussion. What happened after that, when it was over, was really no business of ours.

Q. It has been said that the purpose of the demonstration was that a man was invited to give a talk and was prevented from giving the talk he wished to give.

A. I will give one sentence to try and clear this point up. It was the intention to prevent him giving a talk at the time it was intended and to divert the discussion at that time to a wider discussion. What happened after that was not discussed and was basically no concern of ours.

Q. In the lobby, do you remember Dr. Gordon's suggestion of moving to another room?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember what the reaction was to it?

A. A number of people backed up the suggestion and said "Let's move off" and I believe it was very very soon after that, that the constabulary arrived and the question was simply left in the air. I can definitely remember people saying "Yes, let's go back into the committee room".



- Q. First of all, in the reaction, Dr. Gordon said that he heard people saying no.
- A. I heard people saying no too.
- Q. He also feels that the dialogue continued for a little while after that and that other questions were asked.
- A. Yes. I remember the no's and one or two people who attempted to advocate the suggestion further.
- Q. Would you agree with the estimate of forty people in the lobby?
- A. There seemed a lot more but I suppose that's about right. I really can't say. Do you mean inside the vestibule itself?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Forty is about right. There was a lot of other people around.
- Q. Someone mentioned these three groups and we didn't really follow it up. Three groups of people having discussions about the demonstration. Does that respond to anything you know about the grouping.
- A. Not really. I just knew that a number of people were concerned about this lecture and about the issue generally. I knew that people were discussing it, but it simply wasn't that formal. I had no indication of how many people were discussing it and in what kind of groups. It rings no bells at all.



GONZALES GIVING EVIDENCE

- Q. It is alleged that the telephone near the vestibule was ripped out of its socket. Do you know anything about this?
- A. I wasn't in that area at any time.