



UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

REPORT OF THE  
TRIBUNAL OF ENQUIRY

on the events of May 7th 1968 and  
the events leading up to them.

Members of the Tribunal:

Lord Gifford (Chairman)

Mr. Michael Freeman

Mr. Malcolm Gray

Mr. Peter Partington

Dr. John Reissland



## INTRODUCTION

1. The Tribunal met on May 24th to consider written evidence; on May 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, and 31st and June 5th to hold oral hearings; and on June 5th to consider the Chairman's draft report.

2. A total of 73 people, including 38 participants in the demonstration and 22 members of the Chemistry Department, gave evidence to the Tribunal in one form or another. All except five submitted evidence in writing. During the six days of oral hearings 41 people, including 24 demonstrators and 13 chemists, appeared before the Tribunal. Only two witnesses had to be recalled a second time for short supplementary questions.

3. The choice of oral witnesses was dictated in some cases by the prominence of the part which they played; in other cases by the detailed nature of the recollection which they appeared from their written statements to have of the events; and in other cases, and particularly towards the end of the hearings, by the light which they might be able to throw on particular incidents about which the Tribunal was unclear. All those against whom specific allegations of misconduct were made had the opportunity of making oral comments.

4. We were extremely impressed by the readiness shown by all concerned to co-operate with the Tribunal, by coming forward with evidence, submitting thorough and detailed statements, and making themselves available for questioning. We felt that there was a general confidence that the Tribunal would do its work impartially, and a general desire to see the truth established as nearly as possible. This eased our task considerably.

5. Although we did not think that anyone was deliberately intent on misleading the Tribunal, it was clear from the start that there were three important considerations which made it necessary to view the evidence with caution. First, the central happening which we were investigating involved some 150 people who were at times crowded together in scenes of considerable confusion. It is inevitable in such circumstances that memories should be at variance or mistaken or muddled. Happily the quantity of the evidence was so considerable that the Tribunal was able by a process of piecing together and cross-checking to construct an account which it believes to be substantially accurate.

6. Secondly, the witnesses to this happening were almost without exception emotionally involved in what was going on. A glance at a few of the written accounts will immediately show how recollections have been coloured by witnesses' opinions of the rights and wrongs of the



demonstration. Many of the apparent conflicts arising in the written evidence were resolved in the oral hearings, in which many of the accounts were toned down, and in which witnesses from both sides were able to say that the conduct of the opposite faction was not as heinous as some of their colleagues would have us believe.

7. Thirdly, some of the most noteworthy incidents would obviously have been discussed since May 7th among those involved, with the consequence that witnesses may have believed that they were reporting what they saw, when in fact they were reporting what they had heard in subsequent discussion. Because of this we were not prepared to accept that a fact was the more incontrovertibly established merely because it was reported by a greater number of witnesses.

8. We have not attempted to lay down any one standard of proof in arriving at our conclusions. In an affair of this nature, some facts can obviously be established with much greater certainty than others. We hope that we have sufficiently indicated, either by stating a fact without qualification, or by the use of words such as 'we think' or 'we are satisfied', the degree of certainty with which our findings are made.

9. Throughout our sittings the help and support given by Robin Dixon and his team of secretaries and printers was invaluable. The organisation of the whole proceedings, under conditions of considerable pressure, deserves the highest praise.



## THE EVENTS PRECEDING THE DEMONSTRATION

### The Invitation to Dr. Inch

10. The initiative to invite a speaker from Porton Down was taken by the student members of the Chemical Society, as part of a programme of three lectures to be given by chemists working in research establishments other than Universities. The first invitation was sent to Porton Down in Autumn 1967, asking for a speaker on chemical defence mechanisms.

11. In subsequent correspondence the Chemical Society suggested the title ('The Chemical and Biological Properties of Toxic Chemicals'), and Porton Down suggested Dr. Inch as the lecturer. Various chemists in giving evidence confirmed that this title is extremely wide in scope, all chemicals being toxic and all having chemical and biological properties. It is wide enough to cover the use of chemicals for military purposes.

12. Dr. Inch informed us (ref. 57 p.2) that in answer to the Society's request, he had come prepared to talk about the properties of selected classes of chemicals such as organophosphates and atropine-like compounds. He had previously informed the Chemical Society of this subject-matter, which, according to Dr. Tillett, does not necessarily exclude matter of a military significance. In beginning his lecture (before the arrival of the demonstrators), Dr. Inch said that the title was misleading, connoting a vast subject capable of being approached in many different ways.

13. The lecture was advertised in the University Newsletter, and by a number of posters. On the posters (see ref. 35) the words 'visitors are welcome' were prominent; in normal circumstances the object of this would be to attract people from industry and colleges who were notified. But as Professor Bradley confirmed, any student would be entitled to attend.

### Preparations for the Demonstration

14. Certain particular problems confronted us when considering evidence on this part of the story. In the first place, very little written evidence was available; witnesses concentrated almost exclusively on the demonstration itself. We were, however, able to hear very full accounts of the planning from oral witnesses, and we issued a statement inviting further written contributions from anyone who felt that they could help us. Secondly, the fact that only the demonstrators were in a position to tell us about the preparations deprived us of the opportunity to cross-check their evidence by reference to impartial or hostile sources (cf paragraphs 5 and 6 above).



Lastly, the demonstrators were unwilling on principle to reveal the names of any of their colleagues. We accept that this was done not in order to conceal the truth but out of a conviction that it was up to each individual to come forward and testify as to the part which he played.

15. Because of these considerations our account of the planning of the demonstration must be somewhat more vague, and should be approached with more caution, than our account of the demonstration itself. Having said that, however, we should add that we found no reason to disbelieve what was said, and we find the account presented to us entirely credible.

16. The announcement in the Newsletter first came to the notice of witnesses on Thursday May 2nd. The news must have been passed round by word of mouth and the intention must have formed in the minds of a number of people that a protest of some kind was necessary. Mr. Archard on his own initiative began to do some reading about Chemical and Biological Warfare (CBW); he already had material on the subject available at his home.

17. On the Friday the first of several informal discussions as to the form of the demonstration took place. These discussions were renewed each day from the Friday until the following Monday, and before considering the content we will describe what we conceive to have been their general nature.

18. It is absolutely clear that there were never any formal meetings announced in advance for a stipulated time, or organised by a few individuals. What happened rather was that a group of people, having a common aim which they had made known to each other beforehand, came together informally to thrash out in discussion the ways in which that aim might be achieved. The numbers present are difficult to estimate. Mr. Archard mentions a meeting on Friday at which twelve were present. Mr. Rogers and Miss Steel remember a discussion (on Saturday or Sunday in one of the Union offices) in which as many as 30 people were involved. Mr. Houghton was present with eight or more in the Towers on Monday. As the discussions progressed some people would be coming in and others leaving from time to time.

19. We are unable to identify, and we do not think there existed, any one or small number of individuals who could be described as leaders. It seems that there must have been a nucleus of perhaps a dozen who were most frequently involved in the discussions already described, and about 20 or 30 others who participated from time to time. Some of these were obviously more vocal than others. But decisions were reached by the consensus of those present rather than by the dictat of particular dominant personalities.

20. Outside these discussions one can discern a variety of means by which people became aware of and identified with the proposed demonstration. Some



had been talking over the possible ways of demonstrating independently of the others and having heard of the central plan assented to it; in this respect one witness spoke of three loosely defined groups. Others had been talking about a protest from the beginning but for some reason such as being absent over the weekend did not participate in the discussions. A third and very substantial group were only informed of the plan on the Monday or Tuesday, being as it were recruited by those already in the know. It is impossible to reconstruct the process of communication in any further detail; clearly those interested participated in innumerable conversations between Thursday and the Tuesday of the demonstration. Because of this diffuse and complex process of discussion, and because of the reluctance of witnesses to mention names, we find it quite impossible to establish any kind of list of people who were involved in any particular discussion or conversation.

21. The object of the demonstration was to attract public attention, inside and outside the campus, to the issues raised by CBW research and the work of Porton Down. One witness described it as being (or being then) 'a non-issue in this country and elsewhere which should in some way or other be made an issue firstly on this campus, and secondly outside the campus if possible'; and emphasised that no attempt had previously been made to raise the issue inside the University. Quite how the aim of publicity outside the University would be achieved was not discussed at any length; (no journalists were invited from outside the University); but the desire for it certainly influenced the decision as to the form of the protest.

22. It was essentially the fact that Dr. Inch was a scientist working at Porton Down which made people feel that a protest was necessary. Some witnesses said that they would have demonstrated against Dr. Inch whatever the title of his talk; others considered that any work done at Porton Down must have military significance; others still felt that the word 'toxic' in the title might mean that the lecture would have direct relevance to CBW. It would appear that little or no effort was made to discover from the Chemistry Department what in fact Dr. Inch was planning to talk about.

23. In view of the remarks attributed to them in the Press, and of the interpretation which might be put on them, we thought it right to ask Lord Butler and Lord Alport to submit any evidence which they might have to support the contention that outside agencies had been instrumental in bringing about this demonstration. Lord Butler stated frankly (ref. 52) that he had none, and indeed had not intended to refer to Essex. Lord Alport, while apparently mistaking the reasons for our request (ref. 63), has not offered any evidence of this kind.



## The Plans Made

24. The central feature of the plan was the reading of the indictment. The idea was mooted at an early stage, probably on the Friday. On the following days Mr. Archard did further research in the Library, and it was he who drafted both the indictment itself (ref. 4) and the leaflet (ref. 35) which was to be distributed after the demonstration. Mr. Archard told us that other people were shown the draft indictment and assisted with their comments. Mr. Triesman for his own enlightenment read some of the material used by Mr. Archard.

25. The indictment was to be read by certain designated people (see para. 33 below) and further copies were to be circulated to others who were to take over if a reader was in any way prevented from continuing. It was to be read at the beginning, as soon as Dr. Inch began to speak, and not at the end in any time allotted for questions. This was a clear decision, taken to ensure maximum impact for the demonstration, which would suffer if Dr. Inch were to leave having successfully completed his talk. Another factor in this decision was that a technical lecture to chemists would be of no interest to the assembled demonstrators. Finally it was to be read through to the end in spite of any attempts to heckle, restore order, suppress speakers, or resume the scheduled talk.

26. Before the plan to read the indictment was firmly settled, certain alternatives were raised in discussion and discarded. The idea of breaking up the meeting violently, for example, by assembling outside the Lecture Theatre Block and going in en masse, was rejected, and demonstrators were to attend the meeting in the normal way as members of the University entitled to do so. It was firmly decided in fact that there should be no violence in the sense of physical assault or molestation of the lecturer. Anyone who used such violence was to be restrained.

27. Beyond the planning of the indictment reading there appears to have been little discussion of what would be done in the event of the various likely contingencies. It was generally accepted by those who told us of the plans that if the reading was completed Dr. Inch would be asked questions on it and be given the opportunity to reply; and in fact Mr. Triesman made this point before starting the indictment on May 7th. In the event of Dr. Inch leaving - and one witness said that it was implicitly assumed, at least by him, that Dr. Inch would try to leave - then there does not seem to have been a well-formulated plan. Four witnesses said that the point was raised, and it was agreed not to prevent his departure but to follow him wherever he went, shouting slogans, and to renew the reading if the Chemistry Department attempted to restart the meeting elsewhere. Other witnesses, however, said that no plans at all were made for this eventuality. In general it is clear that those involved in the planning were much more concerned with the method



of protest to be used than with following through the possible sequence of events.

28. We asked nearly all the demonstrators who gave oral evidence whether it was envisaged that Dr. Inch would be able to give his lecture as planned at the end of the demonstration. The answer in every case was that the question was simply not discussed at any time. We are satisfied, however, that so far as those involved in the discussions were concerned, the object of the demonstration was not to interrupt or delay the scheduled programme, but to divert it into a different channel: that there should not be an academic talk but a dialogue or confrontation on the ethics of CBW. If this was not consciously willed, it was certainly the most probable outcome.

29. In support of this conclusion we would mention first:

(a) The evidence of some of the demonstrators themselves. Mr. Archard was asked whether it was his intention to prevent Dr. Inch giving his planned lecture, and answered "Yes, as the plan was laid out - certainly. Given the aims of the demonstration this was indeed the case. Dr. Inch was not to deliver his lecture." Mr. Triesman stated that the proceedings might be "resumed in a different form. I don't think that proceedings in a meeting of any kind are so determined that they may not be altered." Mr. Gonzales and Mr. Hatchett agreed that the intention was to divert the discussion into a different area, i.e. the moral implications of germ warfare.

(b) Mr. Triesman's statement before he began reading the indictment is reported by many witnesses as containing words to the effect that Dr. Inch would not be allowed, or would be prevented or stopped from giving his lecture. Mr. Triesman, although using the word 'interrupt' in his written evidence (ref. 42), conceded that he might have used the words attributed to him.

(c) The leaflet (ref. 35) prepared before the demonstration and circulated immediately afterwards, begins "Today ... Dr. Inch ... was invited to speak to the Chemical Society on 'Chemical and Biological Properties of Toxic Chemicals'. He was prevented from doing so by a student demonstration".

(d) The indictment would have taken about 15 minutes to read in full. Dr. Inch would then have been expected to reply to the indictment and answer questions. This would most probably have occupied the scheduled duration of Dr. Inch's lecture.

30. It is fair to say that many of those who were informed of the plans after they were made may genuinely have believed that the lecture would be delayed rather than frustrated. The message to such people seems to have been to the effect that an indictment would be read and questions posed, and that the demonstration would be non-violent. Since what would happen next was not discussed as a central issue, nothing further was communicated.



31. Various points about which we asked questions appeared not to have been considered in the planning discussions. These were the possibility of consulting the Chemistry Department: the likelihood of disciplinary action; and the possibility of the police being called. Our evidence may be incomplete on these points, but from the answers given by those witnesses with whom we raised them they did not come into the discussion. One witness mentioned that the Dean of Students' circular of 4th March 1968 was referred to, but it does not seem to have been a major issue in the planning.

32. One further point which was agreed was that word of the demonstration would be spread around by those involved in the planning, but that those informed in this way should not pass the information on. This was to guard against the possibility that the lecture would be cancelled.

33. On the Monday or Tuesday the indictment was completed and about 20 copies circulated. The names of the five people to read it were chosen, and each was given a passage. Each of the five (Mr. Triesman, Miss Mendleson, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Archard, and Mr. Gonzales) gave evidence to us. Each of them was among those participating in the weekend's discussions, but apart from this there is nothing to suggest that they were more especially involved. Certainly other copies of the indictment had been given to witnesses who had not been present at the discussions.

#### Precautions taken against the Demonstrators

34. Rumours that a demonstration against Dr. Inch's lecture had been planned had reached the administrative and Chemistry Department staff on Monday May 6th. No-one knew how many were intending to take part or how extreme a form it would take. Various plans were made to deal with it.

35. Professor Bradley asked Dr. Tillett to take the chair in place of a graduate student, and asked as many members of the staff as possible to attend. He also gave instructions that demonstrators should not be refused admission to the lecture theatre or otherwise provoked.

36. On the morning of May 7th Dr. Tillett had a discussion with Mr. Wyatt, during which the decision was taken - probably at the suggestion of Dr. Tillett - to change the venue of the lecture from LTB 2 to Wivenhoe House. One reason for this was that it would be easier to extricate the lecturer in the event of trouble. It was moreover a feasible proposition as all the chemists likely to attend could easily be contacted. But Dr. Tillett has very frankly conceded that he hoped also to put the demonstrators off the scent. It is evident that Mr. Wyatt shared this hope, since at 3.00 p.m. he went to LTB 2 and set up the room as if a lecture was to take place. Dr. Tillett asked Dr. Bowden to delay



passing the message around until 3.45 p.m. and himself delayed calling Professor Gordon in the Valley until the same time.

37. Professor Gordon had the impression that there was at one stage a plan also to change the time of the lecture from 4.30 to 4.00. There is no other evidence of this, and we consider that he must have been in error. His secretary (ref. 55) states that the message from Dr. Tillett concerned the change of venue, which she was to keep as quiet as possible.

38. Dr. Bowden was clearly anxious about what might happen. He asked second-year students to come and see him at 3.45 p.m., and when they came told them to congregate again at about 4.15 p.m. to hear where the lecture was to be. We think he was prompted partly by the desire to get the lecture at least begun in peace, and partly by the knowledge that two of his students were likely to leak the news to the demonstrators.

39. Dr. Tillett had decided also that demonstrators should not be prevented from entering, and that it would not be necessary to alert the police. However, independently of Dr. Tillett, Professor MacIntyre had asked Mr. Lilley to inform the police that trouble might occur, so that they could be ready to come quickly if needed. Professor MacIntyre told Mr. Lilley that he himself would not be able to be present at the lecture, and left it to Mr. Lilley's discretion to make arrangements for the police to be called in the event of the situation getting out of control. Mr. Lilley informed the police accordingly.

40. We were somewhat mystified by a statement by Mr. White that he had seen a police car in Square 5 before the demonstration started, at a time which must have been about 4.30 p.m. Nobody else saw this car, although Mr. Marks, the porter on duty, saw and Mr. Goodchild photographed another police car which drove into Square 5 and out again to Wivenhoe House at about 4.50 p.m. From the evidence it is clear that two different cars are involved. The second one came as a result of Mr. Wyatt's call (see paragraph 79 below). As to the first, we can only imagine that police officers, knowing that trouble might occur, looked in to see if anything was happening and then left. At the time of writing this report the police, although invited to make a statement to us, have not done so.



## THE DEMONSTRATION

### Arrival of the Demonstrators

41. The demonstrators were in the valley preparing to go to LTB 2 and did not hear of the changed venue until around 4.15. The leak presumably came from Mr. Carrigan and Miss Plowman (see ref. 34, p.2). They made their way, more or less in a body, up to the House.

42. It was alleged by Mr. Moules (ref. 29) that some demonstrators were seen to pick up stones. Stones were later found when the Committee Room was being cleared. Mr. Archard admits to having on an impulse picked up two stones, which he later thought better of having and placed on the Committee Room floor. No other evidence was forthcoming about these stones. We accept Mr. Archard's account, and are unable to say whether anyone else went through the same motions of collecting and depositing stones. Certainly the use of stones for any purpose was wholly alien to the nature of the demonstration as planned.

43. A large number of demonstrators arrived in the television room to find Mr. Davis and Dr. Bowden standing by the doors into the Committee Room, apparently intent on denying them access. Their impending arrival had already been noticed through the windows of the Committee Room as they were coming over from the Valley.

44. It is clear that the number of the demonstrators far exceeded anything that Dr. Bowden or anyone else had anticipated. His reaction was to try and prevent them from coming in. He asked them if they were members of the Chemical Society, and said that this was a Chemistry Department meeting. Their reply was that they were members of the University and entitled to be present at a University Society lecture. Some offered to join the Chemical Society. During this time Mr. Davis remained silent by the door and the door remained closed.

45. Inside the Committee Room Dr. Tillett had introduced Dr. Inch, who said a few sentences (see paragraph 12 above). There were about 30 students and staff of the Chemistry Department present, and a few seats to spare.

46. At this point some of the demonstrators had found that they could get in by the side door, and Dr. Inch stopped speaking. Dr. Bowden came through the Committee Room and up to the side door. He again asked the visitors whether they were members of the Chemistry Department, and added that the lecture had been cancelled down the Valley. These remarks having no effect, he asked visitors to remember that they were guests of the Chemistry Department.



47. It is alleged by Mr. Houghton that Dr. Tillett said when the demonstrators arrived that this was not the Inch lecture, and that the Inch lecture was off. We are satisfied that he did not say this. We have heard a tape recording of this part of the story (ref. 78), and consider that Mr. Houghton's recollection must stem from Dr. Bowden's statement about the lecture being cancelled.

48. The same tape recording helps to establish that for at least three minutes demonstrators filed in through the side door in almost complete silence. During this time Dr. Greenslade asked Mr. Halberstadt to put out his cigarette. Mr. Halberstadt did not do so and when asked by Dr. Greenslade gave his name.

49. Dr. Tillett was standing at the door with Dr. Bowden. He made one attempt to question a visitor as to whether he was a member of the Chemical Society, but having been brushed aside allowed the crowd to file in. His main concern was that the room should not become too full, and towards the end he attempted to cut off the flow of demonstrators, put his hand across the door and attempted to shut it. There were calls from those inside that there was plenty of room, and in any case Dr. Tillett had divided a party from Maldon Grammar School. So the doors were re-opened. The demonstrators filed round the sides of the room and sat down in the aisle. A number of latecomers were standing in the doorway and back inside the bar by the time the proceedings restarted. Towards the end Mr. Musselwhite, the Wyvern photographer, arrived, and there was a minor altercation between him and Dr. Bowden, the latter arguing that the room was full and the former insisting on coming in. There was an exchange of pushes between them.

50. Estimates as to the number of demonstrators varied. We find that there were 100-120 altogether; 80 to 100 were inside the room, and more were crowded around the doorway.

#### The Demonstration in the Meeting Room

51. Dr. Tillett re-introduced Dr. Inch, but before he could begin Mr. Triesman started to speak. He had earlier that day volunteered to go first, others apparently being reluctant to do so. He introduced the indictment by a statement to the effect that the demonstrators were not allowing Dr. Inch to give his lecture; that after the manner of the War Crimes Tribunal they would read an indictment; and that Dr. Inch would have the opportunity of replying. He read a passage, and was succeeded by Miss Mendleson, who in turn was followed by Mr. Rogers. The indictment was heard in virtual silence, except for a few protests by Chemists, and retaliatory cries by demonstrators. The reading continued for at least 5 minutes.



52. At the front of the room conversations took place among the Chemistry staff and Dr. Inch. Apologies were offered to Dr. Inch by Dr. Tillett and Professor Gordon. Dr. Inch suggested waiting for five minutes to see if he would be allowed to continue. After that time had elapsed he began to collect his papers and suggested going. The Chemistry staff felt that there was no chance of holding the planned lecture, and agreed to this move. No attempt was made to suppress the reading or to resume the planned lecture.

53. The news of Dr. Inch's decision to leave was announced to the meeting by Mr. Houghton, who was up at the front listening to the chemists' conversation and attempting to talk to Dr. Inch. Several witnesses have said that Dr. Tillett made the announcement, but his own evidence that he wanted to slip out with Dr. Inch unobserved seems more probable. At this time Mr. Rogers had just taken over the reading.

54. For some time - one to two minutes - Dr. Inch was unable to get out of the Committee Room. We have already noted that a substantial crowd were standing in and around the side doorway. We have no doubt that the reaction of this crowd to the news of Dr. Inch's departure was to try and prevent it. There were shouts of 'no he doesn't' and 'stop Inch' when the departure was announced. Dr. Inch would in any case have had to push through the crowd in order to get through the door; in fact the crowd bunched together, those behind pushing those in front, and his initial move to depart was frustrated.

55. Dr. Tillett managed at an early stage to squeeze through and sought the help of Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis went to get Mr. Wyatt and the two of them arrived in the doorway. There followed a scene of some confusion, the exact details of which are impossible to establish. Members of the Chemistry Department from inside, and Mr. Davis and Mr. Wyatt from the outside tried to reach Dr. Inch and clear a path for him. The demonstrators obstructed them, more by standing in the way and pushing than by direct manhandling. We do not think that at this stage they were intent on preventing his departure at all costs; he would otherwise have taken much longer to get out. One or two sat down in the doorway, but this tactic did not catch on and probably they got up soon after. Eventually Dr. Inch managed to squeeze out.

56. When the first move of Dr. Inch to leave was made Mr. Archard went straight up to the front, stood behind Dr. Inch, and emptied a tin of mustard powder over his back and shoulders, shouting 'mustard gas' as he did so. Some of the powder went over Dr. Bowden and Dr. Tillett. Mr. Archard was asked for his name, which he gave, and Professor Gordon wrote it down. We accept that Mr. Archard took this action of his own initiative, and not as a result of any plan discussed with others. He had bought two small tins of powder, the second of which he tried to empty over Dr. Inch (though in fact it fell over Mr. Davis



and some policemen) as Dr. Inch was later being escorted from the lobby.

57. An allegation was made by Mr. Wyatt that he warded off an attempted assault by Mr. Halberstadt on Mr. Davis, when the latter was trying to reach Dr. Inch and extricate him from the meeting room. Mr. Wyatt told us that the blow would have landed on Mr. Davis' chin. The incident was not seen by Mr. Davis, and the allegation was denied by Mr. Halberstadt. Although Mr. Wyatt no doubt believed that such an assault was threatened (indeed Mr. Halberstadt recalls that Mr. Wyatt raised his finger as if to reprimand him) we think it more likely that he was mistaken. Both at this time and later on in the lobby, the demonstrators were intent on being obstructive but not aggressive. It would be very easy in the confusion to mistake a push or even an innocent gesture for an attempted blow.

58. After Dr. Inch's departure there was a rush to follow him. Chemists were anxious to protect him, demonstrators to catch him up. The projection screen standing by the door was knocked against the wall. Demonstrators began chanting slogans - 'Close Porton Down' and 'Keep Science Clean' - and continued to do so until Dr. Inch reached the lobby. These slogans had been composed in advance (see paragraph 27 above).

59. In the rush to get out of the door two particular incidents occurred. The first involved Dr. Bowden and Mr. Thomas. There was a conflict of evidence as to whether Dr. Bowden was trying to prevent or obstruct Mr. Thomas from leaving, or vice versa. We think it more probable that Dr. Bowden's predominant concern was to get to Dr. Inch's side. He had accompanied Dr. Inch during the afternoon, and felt a personal responsibility for his safety. Rather than trying to hold back the demonstrators he would have made straight for the door. In doing this, we think that he was obstructed or restrained or in some way impeded by Mr. Thomas.

60. A short struggle ensued, during which Mr. Thomas' glasses came off. It was stated by Mr. Thomas that Dr. Bowden deliberately grabbed the glasses from his face. Dr. Bowden denies this, but says that he may well in the melee have pushed at Mr. Thomas' face. We think that Dr. Bowden's account is the more probable, and that the glasses fell off accidentally. We think that the glasses fell to the floor, as stated by Dr. Bowden and Mr. Joscelyne, and were picked up by Dr. Bowden. At all events Dr. Bowden had the glasses at one time in his hand, and a further allegation is made by Mr. Thomas and Miss Fullerton that he crushed or screwed them up in his palm. To determine the truth of this allegation we must consider the evidence as to the damage done to the glasses in greater detail.

61. The allegation that Dr. Bowden damaged the glasses either accidentally or deliberately at this time is based on the fact that according to Mr. Wyatt



(ref. 75) and Mr. Thomas they were bent at the bridge, so that the lenses were facing towards each other, at the time when Mr. Thomas collected them from Mr. Wyatt in the valley on the following morning. Others saw them in this condition shortly afterwards. The glasses were not seen to be damaged before then, and the cause of the damage is inferred by those making the allegation from the crushing movement described above. Against this Dr. Bowden states positively that he did not damage the glasses, and his evidence is supported by Mr. Wiggins, Mr. Joscelyne, and by eleven others (ref. 73) who state that the glasses 'appeared to be intact and were not bent parallel (with the lenses facing each other)' at the time that Dr. Bowden handed them in at the porters' desk at Wivenhoe House. However, being further questioned some of these witnesses told us that the glasses were slightly bent. We think on the balance of probabilities that the glasses suffered some slight damage and were bent off centre in the course of the struggle with Mr. Thomas. Indeed, in oral evidence Dr. Bowden conceded that this could have been the case. We are satisfied that this did not arise out of any deliberate action on his part. At some stage between their being handed in by Dr. Bowden and being collected by Mr. Thomas the glasses, which are of a kind which bend easily, were further bent. The apparent difference in their condition when handed in and when collected may only involve an angle of some 45 degrees and although we cannot state how the further bending occurred it may have been quite accidental.

62. The second incident at this time involved Mr. Reeve, Mr. Shaw and Dr. Stephens. Mr. Shaw states the struggle began because Mr. Reeve had punched him mildly and was about to kick him. Dr. Stephens said that Mr. Reeve was behaving in a highly excitable way and needed to be restrained. We accept Dr. Stephens' evidence, though we cannot be sure that Mr. Shaw's description of Mr. Reeve's actions is exact in its details. Mr. Shaw caught hold of Mr. Reeve; Mr. Reeve struggled hard against Mr. Shaw, and Dr. Stephens held Mr. Reeve from behind. No blows were exchanged, and after a while Mr. Reeve calmed down. Dr. Stephens released him, and Mr. Carrigan led him away.

#### The Scene in the Lobby

63. As Dr. Inch was being extricated from the Committee Room, a number of the demonstrators exited by the double doors at the back of the room and intercepted Dr. Inch as he was coming through the Bar. Among the first to arrive from the back of the room were Mr. Hatchett, Mr. Bentley, and Mr. Rogers. Among those closely following Dr. Inch were Mr. Davis, Dr. Greenslade, and Dr. Roberts.

64. Mr. Hatchett attempted to stand in Dr. Inch's path, and was pushed aside by one of the party with him. Mr. Rogers was also pushed aside by



Dr. Inch himself. All the above-named people then filed along the short corridor by the kitchen stairs, with Dr. Inch in front and Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bentley following. In the group behind there was a short altercation between Dr. Greenslade and Mr. Halberstadt, Mr. Halberstadt telling Dr. Greenslade to keep out of his way.

65. The intention of Dr. Inch and those who had escorted him out of the Committee Room was obviously to get him out of the building. Mr. Davis aimed to take him down the stairs and out by the porters' desk. This did not happen. Dr. Inch ended up penned in the corner of the lobby by the garden door. We were concerned to discover exactly how this came about.

66. First there was a delay of around 20-30 seconds when Dr. Inch reached the foot of the main staircase leading up to the upper floor. He stopped, perhaps being unsure where to go, and was immediately addressed by Mr. Rogers and Mr. Bentley. A short exchange ensued, mainly between Mr. Rogers and Dr. Inch. Mr. Rogers remembers asking him why he misused science and Dr. Inch asking him for his name.

67. While this was going on the crowd behind pressed forward and around into the lobby. Mr. Davis became separated from Dr. Inch. By the time that Dr. Inch passed into the lobby, with Dr. Roberts now at his side, quite a number of demonstrators were already there, and the way through was not clear. Dr. Inch edged along by the notice board and filing cabinet, seeking a way round by the garden door.

68. Mr. Rogers, Mr. Bentley, and others who directly followed Dr. Inch into the lobby, saw him standing by the wall and not knowing where to proceed further. Behind them more people were coming in. At this point the five who were nearest - Mr. Rogers, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Hatchett, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. White - linked arms and formed a cordon encircling Dr. Inch, and for a time Dr. Roberts, in the corner.

69. We have reconstructed this part of the story as nearly as possible. Although the demonstrators were intent on detaining Dr. Inch as he left and asking him questions, the chance to surround him in this way came quite fortuitously. We are certain that Dr. Inch was not deliberately pushed into the corner, nor was he physically molested in any way. One witness thought that he made attempts to escape from the corner and was pushed back. This was not the case. In his evidence he does not complain of any deliberate molestation; Dr. Roberts did not see any actions of that kind: and we consider that Dr. Inch, seeing that further progress was impossible, resigned himself to the situation and remained where he was.



70. Dr. Inch remained in the corner for 10-15 minutes, with the front cordon standing 3-4 feet away from him. The rest of the room was full of people - we estimate 30-40 - and other demonstrators filled the corridor behind and the centre hallway. His manner was composed; he himself did not feel particularly intimidated, though he states that the situation was such as might have frightened a more nervous individual. Though subjected to verbal attack of various kinds, he was not physically threatened or molested.

71. When the demonstrators first entered the lobby the slogans (see paragraph 58 above) were still being chanted. Quite soon the shouting was quietened, at the instigation of Mr. Archard and others, and the reading of the indictment was completed by Mr. Archard and Mr. Gonzales and perhaps one or two others. This must have taken between five and ten minutes.

72. There followed for around five minutes a period of question and answer between Dr. Inch and the demonstrators. Several people remember his saying 'You've had your say, now let me have mine', and beginning with a quotation from John Wesley about reason and prejudice. His answers were at times interrupted by demonstrators eager to put further questions, and at times greeted by noisy reactions from the crowd (an answer to the effect that CBW agents had been sold to America because Porton Down had to raise funds was particularly recalled in this context). But subject to these interjections, and to the fact that the tone of the questioning was hostile (with some cries of 'murderer' and perhaps other terms of abuse), Dr. Inch was allowed to have his say, and his replies were audible to most of the crowd.

73. During this period efforts made by some of the Chemistry staff to get through to Dr. Inch were thwarted by demonstrators. Dr. Tillett states that he tried to get through alongside the garden door and was blocked: this is confirmed by Mr. Bentley's evidence (ref. 46 page 3) that a member of the staff tried to open the door but someone sat on the handle and said he could not open it. On the other hand Professor Gordon, probably because he showed unusual restraint and composure, was allowed to make his way through the crowd.

74. We considered Dr. Bowden's statement (ref. 36 page 5) that at this stage Mr. Halberstadt and Mr. Gonzales were particularly evident in manhandling and abusing Dr. Inch. In oral evidence Dr. Bowden very fairly conceded that in such incidents one tends to remember individuals for odd reasons, and he could not say with certainty that this singling out of these two was justified. His recollection was that these two were in the inner cordon and that the inner cordon as a whole were behaving in a similarly aggressive way. From other witnesses, however, we have heard, and are satisfied, that there was no 'manhandling' of Dr. Inch; that the front cordon was not more or less ill-behaved than the others; and that these two were not in fact in the front cordon. (Mr. Halberstadt was just behind and Mr. Gonzales further back.)



We think therefore that Dr. Bowden was mistaken in his written statement.

75. Towards the end of the question and answer period Professor Gordon suggested returning to the Committee Room and carrying on the dialogue in greater comfort. He states that the suggestion was met with cries of 'no' and 'you stopped the meeting'; while the evidence of several demonstrators was that the reaction to the idea was favourable. Probably both reactions were expressed; but at all events any action to implement the suggestion was in fact precluded by the arrival of the police soon after.

#### The Calling of the Police

76. We return a little in time to trace the summoning and subsequent arrival of the police. We were faced with a serious conflict of evidence as to when exactly the decision to call them was first taken. Dr. Tillett thought that he followed Dr. Inch from the meeting room to the lobby, saw him penned in, and at that point decided that the police must be called. In particular he was sure that the decision was taken after Dr. Inch left the Committee Room. Mr. Davis and Mr. Wyatt were equally positive that Dr. Tillett made the decision while he and Dr. Inch were still in the Committee Room.

77. We have come to the conclusion that the evidence of Mr. Davis and Mr. Wyatt is right. Dr. Tillett, whom we questioned twice on this point, and who answered most fairly, remembered nothing about his journey from the Committee Room door to the lobby. We think that had he been in the vicinity of Dr. Inch he would have recalled some of the incidents which occurred; and furthermore nobody observed Dr. Tillett among the group following Dr. Inch down the corridor. But more important than this, the theory that the police were called after Dr. Inch had reached the lobby could not be reconciled with the evidence of Miss Steel. Miss Steel was among the first to leave the Committee Room by the back doors, and passed close to Dr. Inch as he went through the Bar. But instead of following him, she ran down the kitchen stairs and out through the kitchen door. She expected to see Dr. Inch emerge from the building, but seeing no-one went straight in again through the main entrance. As she passed the porters' desk she heard Mr. Wyatt on the telephone to the police. She returned up the stairs and along the corridor to see the lobby filling up and hear slogans being still chanted. In other words Dr. Inch had only just reached the lobby when she entered it.

78. Accordingly we reconstruct the calling of the police in this way. While Dr. Inch was still blocked in the Committee Room, Dr. Tillett said to Mr. Davis that the police should be called, and himself went off to the 'phone. The two of them were probably in the Bar near the doorway leading into



the Committee Room. Mr. Wyatt overheard them, and knowing of the arrangements previously made by Mr. Lilley (see paragraph 39 above), went off after Dr. Tillett. He overtook Dr. Tillett somewhere near the porters' desk, and offered to 'phone himself. Meanwhile Dr. Inch had left the meeting room and made his way to the lobby as previously described.

79. Mr. Wyatt's message to the police was to the effect that there had been a demonstration and they were unable to get Dr. Inch out. Mr. Wyatt waited for about 8 minutes for the first police car to arrive. (This was the car which came to the valley first and then back up to Wivenhoe House - see paragraph 40 above.) Three officers were in this car; two went with Mr. Wyatt to the end of the corridor, while the third having spoken to the porter radioed for extra assistance. The first two arrived at the end of the corridor about the time that the reading of the indictment came to an end. They were seen by the crowd in the corridor, who sat down. There was then a delay of a few minutes until more police officers arrived, during which the question and answer with Dr. Inch proceeded. Dr. Bowden had joined the police during this time. Altogether five police cars came, plus a van with dogs.

#### The Police move in

80. About eight policemen, under the direction of one of their number, and accompanied by Dr. Bowden and Mr. Wyatt clambered over the demonstrators sitting in the corridor. Those in the lobby, apart from the two rows facing Dr. Inch, sat down as well. Those who remained standing turned about and linked arms to form a cordon against the police. The police succeeded without undue difficulty in breaking through the cordon and reaching Dr. Inch.

81. We are satisfied that this entry by the police and the others was effected with reasonable care and caution. Although there were statements made to the contrary, some demonstrators in oral evidence conceded that this was the case. No doubt some of those in the corridor were stepped upon more or less painfully; and it may well be that one or two of the policemen were more clumsy than others. But there was absolutely nothing in the nature of deliberate or reckless infliction of harm. For instance we do not think that Dr. Bowden, as alleged by Mr. Taylor (ref. 47 page 2), deliberately planted his heel on Mr. Taylor's ear.

82. It was alleged by Mr. Morris (ref. 59 page 2) that Mr. Ratcliffe argued with and on two occasions assaulted one of the policemen. Mr. Ratcliffe admits arguing but firmly denies the assault. In the absence of evidence from the police we are unable to come to a firm conclusion on this point; though from the evidence of Mr. Taylor (ref. 47 page 3) it would appear that Mr. Ratcliffe



had done, or was thought to have done, something to arouse the attention of the police. Mr. Ratcliffe was among those linking arms as the police came through, and although he may well have pushed or made some gesture at the police, we cannot be satisfied that a blow was struck. Not having evidence from the police, we do not know whether the arrest of Mr. Ratcliffe which they later attempted (see paragraph 88 below) was made because of something Mr. Ratcliffe did in the lobby, or whether (as we were informed by demonstrators) he was chosen at random.

83. After the police had reached Dr. Inch there followed a period of some minutes before they were able to extricate him. Dr. Tillett was able during this time to squeeze out along the corridor, return up the kitchen stairs and assist in opening a passage for Dr. Inch through the door leading to the main hall (M.10 on our plan). The scene was one of considerable confusion. The police surrounding Dr. Inch were themselves surrounded by the crowd of demonstrators. There were arguments between the police and demonstrators. The chanting of policemen's numbers, which had begun sporadically as they came through the corridor, intensified. However, no violence apart from pushing and jostling was reported to have taken place at this stage.

84. After this delay the police, aided by members of the Chemistry Department, made a move to extricate Dr. Inch, and eventually did so through the door mentioned above. This episode was described to us by one witness as being the most frightening of all. In a confined space, there were perhaps a dozen people trying to push a way for Dr. Inch to get out. The demonstrators, whom the arrival of the police had - rightly or wrongly - provoked into a still more obstructive attitude, were trying hard to prevent this happening. In the circumstances the evidence before us is remarkable for the lack of allegations of violence or deliberate fighting. We were satisfied that the activities of both sides were in general limited to pushing and jostling, although so many were pressed together that these activities themselves must have caused some harm - Dr. Greenslade for example received quite a severe kick. It was at this time that the second tin of mustard powder was emptied (see paragraph 56 above). Also a policeman's cap was knocked off.

85. A considerable number of demonstrators alleged that the actions of Dr. Bowden at this time were of an unduly violent nature. It was said that he was furious, was fighting wildly, or hitting out at people. Dr. Bowden agreed that he remonstrated verbally with demonstrators who obstructed or abused him or Dr. Inch, but affirmed that he was in no way violent. We think that Dr. Bowden was angry at what was happening. We have already noted his sense of personal responsibility for Dr. Inch's safety (paragraph 59 above). He had been grabbed by the foot by Mr. Taylor (ref. 47 page 2) when coming down the corridor. In the circumstances it is not improbable that he pushed out, in an attempt to clear a path for Dr. Inch, more vigorously than others.



Even so, we think that accounts of Dr. Bowden fighting or hitting out are somewhat exaggerated.

86. Mr. Davis stated that the flex of the telephone standing in the hall near the door into the lobby had been ripped from its socket. We had no other evidence on this point, and are unable to say when or by whom this was done.

#### Outside Wivenhoe House

87. On emerging from the House Dr. Inch and Dr. Bowden entered one of the police cars. They had to wait for a little time before the driver arrived, and when the car drove off several demonstrators had gathered near it. Mr. Rogers stood in its path but removed himself as it came towards him. He and others thumped the car as it went off and shouted after it.

88. The other police officers remained for a while and were engaged in conversation by various demonstrators, who by then had emerged from the House. The police dogs were at no stage used, although one was taken out on a lead and immediately put back again. We do not think it relevant to describe the general scene in any detail, but will only refer to a few clashes that were reported to us.

89. The first concerned Mr. Ratcliffe, who was standing among a crowd of demonstrators near the Boiler House when he was grasped by one of the policemen. The other demonstrators standing by retaliated by pulling Mr. Ratcliffe away, chanting 'no arrests'. Mr. Ratcliffe ran down the passage by the Boiler House, pursued by policemen and demonstrators. One such demonstrator was Mr. Blair, who was also caught hold of by a policeman, and involved in a brief struggle. Mr. Ratcliffe was caught again, and again escaped. He was surrounded by students, and the police refrained from further attempts to arrest him or anyone else. It is alleged that the policeman when first arresting Mr. Ratcliffe said 'This one will do', as if picking on him at random. We consider it more probable that this attempted arrest was motivated by some offence which Mr. Ratcliffe had committed, or was believed to have committed, inside the lobby (see paragraph 82 above). But in the absence of evidence from the police we cannot come to any firm conclusion.

90. It was emphatically stated by Mr. Lilley, and as emphatically denied by Mr. Harber, that Mr. Harber struck a policeman and knocked off his cap. Mr. Wyatt also stated a policeman was knocked to the ground, and immediately afterwards Mr. Harber was being pursued by police and demonstrators. From their oral evidence it was clear that these incidents involving Mr. Harber occurred - if they occurred - at the same time as the scuffle involving Mr. Ratcliffe; and we are sure that Mr. Wyatt mistakenly believed that



Mr. Harber rather than Mr. Ratcliffe was the object of the police chase. As to Mr. Lilley's allegation, we find by reconstructing the scene that there was a large group of demonstrators standing around by some policemen; the scuffles involving Mr. Ratcliffe, police and demonstrators occurred; the chase of Mr. Ratcliffe followed. Bearing in mind the confusion, and having heard Mr. Harber and Miss Jones who was with him, we believe that Mr. Lilley was also mistaken in his recollection.

91. Finally, we had to consider an allegation of reckless driving made by several witnesses against Mr. Wiggins to the effect that he narrowly missed running over Mr. Holden. We questioned Mr. Wiggins, who stated that he had indeed passed within a foot or two of a group of demonstrators as he moved away from the car park, and that he had revved his car quite high up to 15 m.p.h. in first gear; but had not driven in any way dangerously. We think that to pass so close to a cluster of people at this speed was foolish, and did undoubtedly scare those present. We do not consider that, as stated by one witness, he 'deliberately swerved' towards the group.

92. The police departed amid some jeering and shouting. The demonstrators returned to the valley, and the 500 copies of the leaflet (ref. 35) were circulated around the University.

June 1968

Anthony Grifford

Michael Freeman

Matthew R Gray

P. Partington

John Russell