

HATCHETT GIVING EVIDENCE

Q. You have heard this very complete account from Bentley about the progress of Dr. Inch from the bar to the lobby?

A. Yes but I didn't remember it exactly as he did.

Q. One thing in your evidence seems to conflict with that and that is that you definitely remember that you got in front of Dr. Inch and obstructed his path. Where were you then?

A. Almost directly in front of the bar.

Q. You were pushed out of the way and then went ahead again, again in front of Dr. Inch. Where would that be?

A. This went over some period of time. I had to get through the next door. M16 to the bar is it.

Q. M16 to the bar and then the corridor to the stairs leading into the hallway?

HATCHETT GIVING EVIDENCE

A. I went ahead into the area of M10 which I believe is the hall outside the dining hall. Dr. Inch was then with one of the porters I believe, trying to get through that door into M11. Several students were also trying to get through the door. I was at that time in M10. Dr. Inch then went through the door into M11 with several people and I ~~went~~ ^{went} straight through ~~behind~~ him. He was then standing by the doorway to M14.

Q. What you have in mind is what Mr. Bentley said but obviously because it all happened in such a short time it is not necessarily accurate?

A. I am speaking for myself.

Q. Do you remember the questioning by Colin Rogers at the foot of the stairs?

A. No. I don't recollect that.

Q. Going back to the bar again, Having been pushed aside by a member of the staff. Could this man be described as ^{wearing} glasses, well fed?

A. I don't remember.

Q. As you followed Dr. Inch up the corridor had some other demonstrators or people got in front of you by then?

A. Yes, Three, four or five. I don't remember. There were other people standing around but it was difficult to distinguish.

Q. You had to make your way with a lot of other people up the corridor?

A. Several other people. There was-a large number following behind but there wasn't many people ahead.

Q. So what you did really was to go slowly up the corridor and straight round into the doorway of M10-M11?

A. Yes, I was following, actually following Dr. Inch at this point until he had gone through that doorway.

Q. Do you remember any gap in Dr. Inch's progress? Any particular wait? Would he have gone straight from the bar to the lobby?

A. No, he didn't go straight there because I think there were either people talking to him or trying to prevent him. I don't know what was going on ahead. I remember I was actually following Mr. Halberstadt and someone in that small corridor tried to grab hold of him.

Q. Of Halberstadt?

A. Yes. Someone grabbed hold of Halberstadt and he turned round to say take your hands off me or something like that and this slowed down my progress.

Q. So by the time you came through into M11, Dr. Inch had already got there?

A. Yes. I followed him almost immediately in fact. There was a bit of a squash getting through that narrow door.

Q. And so your progress between the bar and that doorway might have taken what sort of estimate?

HATCHETT GIVING EVIDENCE

A. Possibly twenty to thirty seconds. It is hard to say.

Q. At what point did this second attempt by you to stand in front of Dr. Inch occur?

A. Dr. Inch was standing beside, or against the wall against M14. There were people trying to get to him who I assumed to be either administrative staff or chemistry staff and there were several students around. I think several of the students cut the chemistry staff off and allowed Dr. Inch to stand without anyone trying to grab hold of him.

Q. Was it at that time that you formed the cordon?

A. In a sense yes. There was just people standing around to prevent people pushing against us and Dr. Inch.

Q. You say you saw him standing by the wall. I believe there is a notice board in the middle of the wall there?

A. I don't remember it.

Q. When you say he was standing by the wall, was he in the corner or not in the corner by then?

A. As more people came in from the bar, I think he moved into the corner and we moved with him.

Q. Was he in fact pushed or guided into the corner by the demonstrators?

A. He was pushed in a sense because there was a crush because of the people coming through that door and filling that area. As more people came in, there just wasn't room. The cordon, in fact, kept a fair distance away from him in order that he didn't get squashed in the corner.

Q. Would it be fair to say that Dr. Inch got into the corner, not so much because he was deliberately pushed there by anyone, but because it was the only thing to do.

A. Yes it was the ~~only~~ thing to do in the circumstances.

Q. And you stopped him from being completely crushed or manhandled?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the ~~gentle~~man that Bentley described?

A. I seem to remember that there was one of the porters, or someone, around ~~at~~ this time, but I don't remember distinctly. I think someone was trying to get through to me to guide him off somewhere but it didn't seem a very sensible idea to try and take him through a confused mass of people.

Q. This man who struck ^{you}/_{you}, Bentley didn't strike you particularly? Do you have a clear recollection of this?

A. No one came up and struck me over the head or anything.

Q. No, strike your memory.

A. No.

Q. We have heard that there were a number of ~~discussions~~ between the Friday and Monday as to the form that this demonstration should take. Were you involved in those discussions?

HATCHETT GIVING EVIDENCE

A. I was involved in several discussions. Discussions were going on almost continuously almost, in the coffee bar and places, as to what should be done and form the demonstration should take. I was in contact all the time with people who were going to be at the demonstration and there was a lot of talk as to what should be done. I took part in no formal discussions behind locked doors. I don't think there were any. It was generally informal discussions.

Q. No, there is not anything to give the impression of formal meetings or discussions, but we have heard for instance ~~that~~ ^{of} one discussion involving twenty or more people and went on for quite some considerable time. I think two hours was mentioned and I think that was on the Sunday evening. Were you present at something of that nature?

A. No I wasn't present at a meeting like that.

Q. But you remember issues such as violence or non-violence, reading an indictment and reading it at the beginning rather than at the end?

A. Yes.

Q. I gather that the idea of the indictment or a significant interruption at the beginning of the meeting was talked about quite early on, round about the Friday. Were you talking about the demonstration as early as that ?

A. I was talking about it as soon as I saw it in a news letter. I believe it was Thursday that the news letter came out, I don't know. The day the news letter came out I noticed it in the coffee bar and I started to talk about it with people.

Q. Did you know early on that Peter Archard was doing research for the indictment?

A. Yes.

Q. In the discussions at which you were present, was any reference made to the ^{Dean of} Students' circular about heckling at meetings?

A. Yes.

Q. Perhaps you could tell me in your own words what you conceived as a result of the discussions, the generally agreed plan to be.

A. I think that from the beginning people thought that the lecture should not take place at all and that some sort of violent action might be taken to prevent it happening. This was dismissed by the sense that people wanted to have a non-violent demonstration, and get beyond the typical riot that the press make demonstrations out to be and try some rational discussion with Dr. Inch as to his work and this is where the idea of the indictment came up to start a dialogue with Dr. Inch in which we could discuss what his work entailed. I think Peter Archard offered to write this indictment and do the research for it. Most of us knew in rough terms what was going on at Porton Down but our knowledge of bacteriological/chemical warfare was rather small. A large number

HATCHETT GIVING EVIDENCE

of people went about looking into the work. I know several other people that did research also apart from Peter Archard. Other people were informing themselves of the work that was going on.

Q. Was it thought likely that you would be able to get through the reading of the indictment and onto a dialogue without some action being taken by the organisers?

A. I wasn't sure what the reaction of the chemistry staff would be to the reading of this indictment. I didn't see the indictment before the demonstration and I didn't realise it was as long as it was. I hadn't envisaged it going on for some time before he would get the chance to reply.

Q. Do you remember any discussion about what would happen if he tried to leave or be ushered out?

A. Not really. I think people generally wanted ~~him~~ him to hear the whole of the indictment and to have a discussion. I don't remember any discussion that I took part in discussing what measures to take.

■■■

Q The idea which seems to have been discussed shortly on one occasion to follow him about the campus wherever he went?

A I didn't hear about that.

Q Did you gather that the idea was to carry on with the indictment and with an attempt to get the dialogue going despite attempts which might be made by the Chairman of the meeting to restore order as he saw it?

A No, not prior to the demonstration. At the demonstration when one saw how hostile the Chemistry staff seemed to be to the demonstration I think as they escalated the feeling of the meeting people wanted Dr. Inch to stay to hear it all. There had not been any plan of any kind to make sure that he stayed.

Q Would it be fair to say that the general hope was that after the indictment was completed a dialogue between Dr. Inch and the demonstrators would be established, Dr. Inch would speak about the ethics of his ~~work~~ work or the work at Porton Down and that the meeting would take that form and not the form foreseen by the Chemistry Department?

A Yes, that is true.

Q Following from that you didn't, I don't believe this was in fact discussed, but speaking personally, you didn't envisage that whatever lecture Dr. Inch was planning to give would take place?

A I wanted him to establish his moral position on his work and if this was convincing enough then his lecture could have ^{possibly} gone on. I didn't think ~~of~~ in terms of the lecture, afterwards I was more concerned with establishing his moral position and explaining our moral position to him.

Q Was your mind affected in any way by the title of the talk?

A It seemed a scientific jargon as far as I was concerned, nothing more.

Q It was the connection with Porton Down?

A The Chemical and physical properties of toxic chemicals. This might be on the skin or on the brain. It didn't say what it would be on in fact. It could have been a really obscene lecture, I don't know what it ~~was~~ going to be.

Q Were you under the impression that the lecture would have something fairly direct itself or the proposed lecture itself would have something ^{directly} to do with Chemical warfare?

A I know that the work at Porton Down is on what they call chemical defence which is the same as chemical offence and that his work would necessarily be to do with this and so that any discussion that he would have on toxic chemicals would necessarily involve something on chemical defence, of what toxic chemicals could do to people or what they could produce at Porton Down to protect people from toxic chemicals.

Q So in so far as you ~~were~~ ^{were} altering the nature of the proceedings did you feel that it would be a radical alteration in topic or not, or ~~xxxxxx~~ can't you give a view as to that?

A What the indictment was talking about and what the moral position was necessarily concerned about was the toxic effect of chemicals on people, and his work is of the same nature.

Q Do you mean that a similar demonstration might have been planned if Enoch Powell had come to talk about Greek Literature and you wished him to defend his views on the race question? Was it as radical a departure that was planned as that?

A If he came to speak on Greek Literature and we asked him to speak on whether or not the Greek Government is democratic then these two would have important links in a sense. It is difficult to say.

Q There were important links?

A Very important links. His work and what he represents was what we were talking about. We were talking about toxic chemicals and their reflection on people.

Q The fact that his work might have been unconnected with chemical offence and germ warfare. Presumably it must have been connected?

A Yes, because it comes from Porton Down and he works ~~for~~ ^{for} the Ministry of Defence.

Q Would it have made any difference if you had made investigations and found for example that part of the work of Porton Down is unrelated to chemical defence?

A As far as I am concerned, it is whether one believes the classified evidence that comes out of Porton Down or whether one accepts the fact that nearly all the work at Porton Down takes the form of some work on toxic chemicals whether these are for microbiological use or whether they are for chemical warfare or whatever. His side of the work is on defence work.

Q Paul Houghton has commented on this question quite effectively. He says I was demonstrating against CBW in connection with this of Porton Down: "Inch could have claimed he intended to speak on polymer aspects of dildo-technology. I would still be demonstrating against Porton Down and the scientist who worked there." You would share that view?

A In a sense, yes, because he comes from Porton Down, he works for the Ministry of Defence, I believe that he is doing work into ~~the~~ chemical and bacteriological warfare whether he is doing a very narrow specialised field of research, I believe that his work will have an influence on the total amount of work done at Porton Down and he is a representative of that establishment.

Q Is there a belief that 100% of the work at Porton Down is military orientated?

A 100% of the work at Porton Down, I believe, can be military orientated. Maybe they say that this is not ^{for} military use but the research that goes on, if something is found then it can be used. People who are doing research don't know what they are going to find and when they find something out it may involve some radical change in CBW knowledge.

Q Would you demonstrate against any research which could be used for a military purpose?

A This would be saying would I demonstrate against any scientific work because any scientific research might lead to something which could be used in some military way. From what I know of Porton Down nearly all the research ~~that~~ is done in order to find new weapons or new defences against weapons. It is specifically orientated towards defence, it is a Ministry of Defence establishment.