

# STATE RESEARCH

**BULLETIN  
No. 16**

---

**OPERATION COUNTRYMAN – POLICE SUPPORT UNITS**

---

---

**THE SCOTTISH CRIMINAL JUSTICE BILL – THE IDEAS OF**

---

---

**JOHN ALDERSON – LABOUR’S TRANSATLANTIC LINKS**

---

**NEWS &  
DEVELOPMENTS**

---

## **A STEADY INCREASE IN DEATHS IN CUSTODY**

---

Detailed figures on the number of deaths in police custody in England and Wales in the 1970s were revealed by the Home Office in December 1979, following pressure from Labour MP Michael Meacher. The figures showed that 245 people died while in custody between January 1970 and June 1979. The publication of the figures led to a major public row, to renewed parliamentary and

press inquiry and to sharp police responses.

Of the 245 deaths, 143 took place in police stations and 102 in hospitals. Someone died in custody in 41 of the 43 police force areas in England and Wales (the two exceptions were Cambridgeshire and Wiltshire). 102 of the deaths were in the Metropolitan Police District (56 in police stations and 46 in hospitals). Other forces with large totals were Merseyside (14 deaths: 2 in police stations, 12 in hospitals), West Midlands (11:6 and 5) and South Wales (11:9 and 2).

The figures reveal an upward trend during the decade, from 7 deaths in 1970 to 48 deaths in 1978. The year by year breakdown is: 7 in 1970, 17 in 1971, 18 in 1972, 20 in 1973, 27 in 1974, 37 in 1975, 24 in 1976, 31 in 1977, 48 in 1978 and 16 in the first six months of 1979.

Inquests were held in 222 of the 245



cases of death. Natural causes were cited in 66 cases, misadventure in 62, accidental death in 39, suicide in 36 and manslaughter in 2. No verdict was given in two cases and open verdicts were returned in 15.

According to medical certificates, among the causes of death in the 23 cases when no inquest was held were cerebral haemorrhage, acute heart failure and cardiac haemorrhage. And among the causes of death recorded when no inquest verdict was reached were five cases of fractured skulls and one hanging.

The pressure on the Home Office continued when Michael Meacher pressed the Home Office to reveal the names of the dead and to clarify the meaning of and distinction between the important categories of 'misadventure' and 'accidental death'.

### **Commons inquiry**

The figures were published as a result of the controversy over one of the cases: the death of Jimmy Kelly in Merseyside police cells in June 1979. Kelly's family have been calling for a public inquiry into his death since claims were made that police were seen to beat Kelly with truncheons and to drag him to a police car from a Liverpool public house. An independent pathologist's report obtained by the family found 32 bruises on Kelly as well as a double fracture of the jaw. This followed the failure of a Home Office pathologist to find any evidence of beatings.

Subsequently, the Merseyside police ordered a third report, which has not been made public, and chief constable Kenneth Oxford called in the Assistant Chief Constable of the West Midlands, David Gerty, to investigate the allegations.

In January, the Director of Public Prosecutions, Sir Thomas Hetherington, announced that he had decided not to prosecute any Merseyside officers, following study of Gerty's report. The reaction of local campaigners and relatives, now with the support of local MP, Sir Harold Wilson, was to call for a public inquiry into the whole case. Several key

witnesses have claimed that they were not interviewed in the Gerty investigation.

The combination of these two well-publicised campaigns, coming on top of the deaths in police custody of Liddle Towers and James McGeown (see Bulletin No 14) and the death of Blair Peach (see Bulletin No 12), led the newly formed House of Commons select committee on home affairs (see In Brief, this issue) to launch an urgent inquiry into deaths in custody. Alex Lyon MP said on January 25: 'We want to know if the system is working properly. There is no intention of a witch-hunt, but the police have been given enormous power in our democracy. The public have to be sure they are not breaking the rules.' The select committee invited the Home Office, the Chief Inspector of Constabulary and the DPP to give evidence on the subject. Police reaction to the issue was dominated by the sharp criticisms which the Police Federation delivered against the motives of the MPs involved. The federation dismissed the figure of 245 deaths as 'not remarkable' and its chairman, Jim Jardine took the opportunity of assuring his members on Merseyside that all critics of the police were either 'mischievous' or 'misguided'.

---

## **MERSEYSIDE POLICE: A COUNCILLOR SPEAKS OUT**

---

A Merseyside county councillor has questioned whether the powers of the Merseyside Police Committee, the police authority for the area, are adequate to supervise police activities. And she has dissented from the view that 'in general, the Police Committee acting as police authority for the Merseyside Force, is capable of fulfilling its duties and obligations as laid down by Parliament'.

Her doubts follow the controversy surrounding the death in custody of Jimmy Kelly and the publication of the report of a Working Party of the Merseyside Police



Committee into the role and responsibilities of the Police Authority.\*

In a letter to **State Research**, Margaret Simey, a Labour county councillor and member of the police committee writes: 'I used to believe that our powers were adequate if only we exercised them: I now seriously doubt it'. The powers referred to are the same for all police authorities.

The working group report came to the conclusion, with only Ms Simey recording dissent, that the committee was capable of fulfilling its duties and obligations. The report consists mainly of an analysis of by the Merseyside County Solicitor and Secretary of the relationship between and the responsibilities of, the Chief Constable, the Police Authority and the county council. The police authority for Merseyside consists of two-thirds county councillors and one third magistrates.

One interesting revelation is, as Ms Simey puts it, that 'all the chat about the Local Authority controlling the purse strings and therefore having control is not true'. The county solicitor records that detailed financial control over the police by the county council is lessened because the following areas are excluded under the Police Act 1964: any sum required for giving effect to regulations, any sum required to satisfy any judgement or order of the Court, any sum directed to be paid out of the police fund by any other statutory authority. He notes that once the police authority has determined the Police establishment, which is 'subject only to the consent of the Home Secretary', the County Council simply pays out the wages and pensions. Pay, allowances and pensions account for somewhere in the order of 73 per cent of the police budget in the current year.

### **Complaints procedure**

The report also contains an interesting extract from a 1977 Ministry note of guidance on complaints, Home Office Circular No 63/1977 Police Discipline And Complaints Procedure, which has, Ms

Simey notes, 'up till now never been brought to our attention.' The circular says: 'It is a principle of long standing and of universal application that the reports of investigations should not be published. Investigation of a complaint against the police follows in many respects the same lines as a criminal investigation and it is equally undesirable that any report of the investigation of a complaint should be published.' This advice appears to be somewhat at odds with the amount of information which the police are often happy to reveal to the Press in the course of, and after, a normal criminal investigation.

The circular goes on: 'To enable the police authority effectively to discharge

● **Conference on London's police:** Events over recent years have raised the level of public concern over the role and activities of the police. The issue of public accountability has been brought into sharp focus by the issues of deaths in police custody, the increasingly aggressive public order role of the police, and revelations of surveillance of political activity. In a new venture for us as a group, State Research is sponsoring a conference, with other organisations, on the topic: What sort of Police does London need?

It will take place at the Mary Ward Centre, Tavistock Place, London WC1, on Saturday March 15th, from 10.30 to 4.30. Trade Unions, community and political groups, and any other interested organisations, are invited to send delegates; the fee is £3. For further details, please write to the London Co-op Political Committee, 116 Notting Hill Gate, London W11 2BR. With State Research and the London Co-op Political Committee, the other sponsors of the Conference are the National Council for Civil Liberties, the Greater London Regional Council of the Labour Party, and the South East Region of the TUC.



their function in relation to complaints, chief officers should continue to make their complaints books available for scrutiny by members of the authority at each ordinary meeting . . . The Secretary of State hopes that chief officers and police authorities will discuss together what can be done to supplement this with other information which may be of assistance to the authority in the discharge of its functions of general oversight of the handling of complaints. *Particularly in cases which have aroused local concern*, it may be helpful to the authority to know something of the background where this can be given without breach of confidence' (our emphasis).

Ms Simey reports that the working party of the police committee 'arose out of a bit of a set to when the Chief Constable [Kenneth Oxford] refused to answer questions as to the complaints procedure in regard to the Kelly case.'

\*The report is obtainable from Merseyside County Council, Metropolitan House, Liverpool.

---

## THE SCOTTISH CRIMINAL JUSTICE BILL

---

After much speculation, the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Bill was finally published by the government shortly before Xmas and introduced into the House of Lords, a measure normally reserved for non-contentious or technical legislation.

The Bill proposes to give the police considerable new powers. It would also create a number of new offences and would make some major changes in Scottish criminal procedure which would adversely affect the rights of suspects or accused persons.

The Bill would create a new concept of 'detention' short of arrest, at present unknown to Scots law except in the supposedly temporary provisions of the Prevention of Terrorism Act. The police would be empowered to detain for up to

six hours at a police station or 'other public place' any person they reasonably suspected of committing an offence for which they could be sent to prison (that is, the vast majority of offences). Access to a friend, relative or solicitor during such detention would be at the discretion of the police, who could deny it 'in the interests of the investigation'. A detainee would be obliged to give his/her name and address and could be searched and fingerprinted but, the Bill states, would not have to answer any other questions and should be told of this by the police.

Normal procedures following an arrest, i.e. a charge and the submission of a report to the procurator fiscal (the independent public prosecutor), would not apply in the case of detention. All that would be required is a record of the place of detention, the reasons for it and the time of arrival and departure (or arrest and charge) of the detainee. (This would be a police record and there is no provision for external scrutiny.) At the end of the six hours (or before) the detainee would either have to be charged or released. Re-detention on the same grounds would only be allowed on the authority of a magistrate. This is hardly much of a safeguard given the tendency of magistrates to accept without question what the police tell them.

### Search Powers

A general power would be given to the police to detain on the streets anyone suspected of committing an offence, to ask them for their name and address and an explanation of the circumstances 'which have given rise to the constable's suspicion', and to detain and obtain the name and address of anyone believed to have information about a suspected offence, for example, a possible witness. New offences of refusing to remain with the police or to give one's name and address (or of giving wrong information) would be created.

The Bill would also give the police power to stop and search anyone believed to be



carrying an offensive weapon and would create new offences of obstructing such a search or of concealing such a weapon. New stop and search powers would also apply to people believed to be in possession of drink or 'controlled containers' (containers made for holding liquid which could cause injury if thrown) at certain 'designated' football matches and to supporters' buses on which drink is believed to be carried. These would all become statutory offences.

In the courts, people accused of serious offences and appearing before a jury could be required to submit to a judicial examination before their trial, at which they could be questioned about their defence. If they refused to say anything or there were inconsistencies with testimony given subsequently in court, this could be drawn to the attention of the jury. An accused could also be excluded from his/her trial on the ground of 'misconduct' and the trial would continue in his/her absence. Among those voting against a similar clause in the Labour government's Criminal Justice Bill in 1979 were the present Solicitor General for Scotland, Nicholas Fairbairn, and the Under Secretary of State, Malcolm Rifkind, whose responsibility the Bill is. In addition, in jury trials it would be possible to make one peremptory challenge of potential jurors instead of the present five.

The Bill had its second reading in the House of Lords in mid-January and is expected to reach the House of Commons sometime in March or April. Although the Bill applies only to Scotland, it would almost certainly, if enacted, make the introduction of similar measures in England and Wales all the easier.

Further information on the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Bill can be obtained from the Scottish Council for Civil Liberties, 146 Holland Street, Glasgow G2 4NG.

---

## OPERATION COUNTRYMAN: FIVE CHARGED

---

Five London detectives have so far been charged as a result of the Operation Countryman inquiry into corruption in the Metropolitan and City of London Police Forces. Countryman is the biggest investigation ever mounted into police malpractices; if all the allegations are well-founded, they point to an organised network of graft going back nearly 20 years. Early attempts by some officers, at least up to the rank of commander, to frustrate and discredit it now appear to have failed. But there are strong doubts still about its ability to prosecute all those thought to be involved. As one chief constable has put it: "They'll get a few tiddlers, but the ones at the top, the ones who have been promoted through the ranks will probably get away."

Countryman was set up in September 1978 by the two commissioners of the forces involved, Sir David McNee of the Metropolitan Police and Peter Marshall of the City, with the approval of the then Home Secretary Merlyn Rees. Mr Leonard Burt, the assistant chief constable of Dorset was chosen to head the inquiry, which, after 18 months, has a team of 80 provincial officers working out of a block of police flats in Godalming, Surrey.

The chief constable of Surrey, Mr Peter Matthews acts as Mr Burt's immediate adviser and the Director of Public Prosecutions has taken the unusual step of seconding a barrister to the team for advice on assembling sufficient prosecution evidence. In normal cases the DPP's rule is that prosecutions should stand a 50 per cent chance of success. With policemen, he claims that the percentage must be higher since juries sometimes are reluctant to convict police officers on the evidence of criminals.

The allegations, made by informers – or 'supergrasses' – in police custody and convicted criminals involve members of the



200-strong Scotland Yard robbery squad and the City of London CID which has about 150 detectives. The most serious allegations are that detectives helped to set up, or took a cut from, armed robberies. In one case, a wage snatch on the Daily Mirror, a security man, Tony Castro, was killed. Detectives, the allegations continue, demanded money for a) not opposing bail applications, b) not providing sufficient evidence for committal for trial, c) lowering the seriousness of charges, d) omitting 'verbals'. Criminals also claim that they have been threatened with a 'fit-up' when they paid.

Some of the guns used in the raids are alleged to have come from the police. Hundreds of thousands of pounds are said to be involved. In one armed robbery, at the headquarters of Williams and Glyn's Bank in the City, it is alleged that £80,000 of the £¼m haul was given to corrupt officers. The going price for arranging bail on serious charges is said to be £10,000.

The implications of the Countryman inquiry go to the heart of the relationship between the police and the public, a relationship which has come under considerable strain and suspicion with the deaths of Liddle Towers, Blair Peach and James Kelly. The fight against organised and armed professional gangs has been used by Scotland Yard as one of its most important success stories. Now, it is alleged, some of the gangs have been promoted and protected by the police. The much publicised clean-up of the CID by the former commissioner Sir Robert Mark may also be discredited. Although Mark disposed of about 450 officers, (150 through the courts and 300 by resignations and dismissals) the Countryman allegations seem to suggest that the network of corruption survived.

---

## THE ROLE OF POLICE SUPPORT UNITS

---

Police in England and Wales have for some time been training a number of

quick-reaction units on a divisional basis within each force. These Police Support Units (PSUs) are being increasingly used in a public order role. Their structure and role places them mid-way between Special Patrol Groups and divisional uniformed police, from which they are drawn and of which they remain a part.

The **Sunday Telegraph** (2.10.77) reported that the Metropolitan police were planning to establish special 'riot squads similar to those used in Northern Ireland' and that the first of these was to be formed in 'T' District (Hounslow/Feltham). Police forces outside London were also considering forming similar squads.

However, in the Home Office **Police Manual of Home Defence** (HMSO 1974), the formation of PSUs is discussed in a civil defence context. Their role is described as dealing with 'the additional duties arising from the onset of war', such as maintaining internal security ('detention or restriction of movement of subversive or potentially subversive people'), guarding key points, maintaining protected areas and control of essential service routes. PSUs are described in the Manual as 'mobile contingency units raised on a force basis and remaining under force control up to and beyond the point of (nuclear) attack...'. The legal basis for their use would rest on Section 14 of the 1964 Police Act, which provides for co-operation between Britain's police forces.

The important distinction between PSUs and SPGs – and one that has often been overlooked by the press in the absence of more detailed knowledge – is that PSU officers remain part of their division as regular officers, but are available for call-up when necessity arises. Thus PSUs are used on an event-by-event basis either within their own force area or within adjoining force areas. They can be deployed at the discretion of the local commander. SPGs differ in that they are permanent operational forces which can therefore be used for month-long commitments to a particular area for 'saturation policing' as well as for specific events. Also their chain of command is



independent of the divisional structure and officers frequently have little or no connection with the divisions to which they are attached.

The machinery envisaged in the **Police Manual of Home Defence** gave to Chief Constables the power to form PSUs at their own discretion. Now it appears that there is a commitment on the part of Chief Constables to raise PSUs on the basis of one to each division, but individual forces have been reluctant to comment. The 30-man PSUs (and it is specified that all the officers should be men) are under the immediate command of an inspector and two sergeants. While the **Police Manual of Home Defence** stated that no specialist training would be given to officers assigned to PSUs, it stated that Chief Constables would have 'opportunities to practise the units in peacetime when suitable policing tasks arise'. Such opportunities have clearly been provided by the public order situations and labour disputes of recent years. However it does appear that much more systematic training is provided for officers assigned to PSUs.

All four Welsh police forces have PSUs which are 'regularly trained in crowd control and have now been trained in the use of protective shields' (**Western Mail**, 26.6.79). There have also been claims that special protective equipment, such as shin guards, groin protectors etc, are issued to officers in PSUs; Devon and Cornwall police force began a pilot training course for their PSUs at their Middlemoor Training College in December 1976. One Inspector, three sergeants and 30 officers from 'J' Division (Exeter) took part, and subsequently in 1977 a modified training programme was carried out in all nine divisions of the force. Chief Constable John Alderson complained in his 1978 Annual Report that 'each unit has to be trained together which places a strain on the manpower of the division from which the unit has been taken.' Despite this, seven PSUs from Devon and Cornwall underwent a week's training in 1978, during which special emphasis was placed on physical fitness. In 1977 PSUs in the

Greater Manchester Police force were trained by the Tactical Aid Group (the local Special Patrol Group) 'in all aspects of crowd control'. In fact the Tactical Aid Group trained not only the Greater Manchester PSUs but also officers from the neighbouring forces, Lancashire, Cheshire, Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire.

When all the 284 divisions in the England and Wales police forces have a PSU, there will be some 8,520 officers trained and equipped specifically for public order duties and crowd control, excluding the officers in Special Patrol Groups and specialist squads such as Scotland Yard's Diplomatic Protection Group and D11. The existence of the PSUs, and the fact that the officers involved are mostly involved in day-to-day policing work, can only serve to strengthen the 'fire-brigade' type of policing typified by the Special Patrol Groups. The kind of police operations seen last year at Nottingham during the newspaper strike, at Southall during the anti-National Front demonstration and at Corby on the day of action against steel closures, are likely to become the norm.

---

## HOW THE ARMY SEES 'SUBVERSIVES'

---

Viewers of BBC1's *War School* on January 9 saw trainee senior army officers at Camberley Staff College acting out plans to deal with internal 'subversion'. Instructor colonels were shown caricaturing four types of internal enemy: trade unionists, Whitehall 'moles', urban guerillas and Scottish nationalists. Students at the college who were interviewed on the programme appeared to accept without question that the army should be involved in internal counter-subversive as well as counter-revolutionary operations. One student said: 'We are really talking about subversion in industry and in the media. I don't consider myself to be right or even left-wing but I am quite clear that a



number of strikes are politically motivated.' (*The Listener*, 10.1.1980).

Students were shown engaged in a mock exercise involving attempts by demonstrators to free jailed political prisoners. The student playing the demonstration leader explained to his colleagues: 'Our aim is to get the army to kill some of our people and in case they don't, we'll do it for them.'

The Commandant of the army's Staff College is Major-General Sir Frank Kitson, author of *Low Intensity Operations* (1971), the book which sets out the case for the army to be involved in internal operations against domestic subversion. In March 1980, Kitson, 53, will take up the post of Deputy Commander, United Kingdom Land Forces.

---

## BIG RISE IN FIREARMS ISSUED TO POLICE

---

The issuing of fire-arms to police in England and Wales increased seven-fold between 1970 and 1978. In the same period, the reported criminal use of fire-arms went up by three times, so that in 1978, police were armed on almost 2000 more occasions than criminals.

Figures given by Home Office junior minister Lord Belstead in a letter to Labour MP Ken Woolmer show that the number of occasions when one or more fire-arms were issued to the police 'in connection with a particular incident involving criminals or other persons known or believed to be armed and dangerous' was 4552 in 1975, 6367 in 1976, 5747 in 1977, 7462 in 1978 and 5614 in the first ten months of 1979. This means, the letter says, that there was an average of about 20 occasions per day in 1978 when fire-arms were issued. The Home Office has not, however, revealed how many weapons were involved.

The figures exclude all occasions when the police provide armed protection. 'It is not easy to produce helpful statistics on this aspect', says Lord Belstead, but he

goes on to state that it would not, in any case, be in the interest of security to provide 'detailed information'. The use of fire-arms for protection duties is 'related strictly to the current assessment of the threat of armed attack on particular persons or premises', says the letter.

The fire-arms were very rarely fired. Excluding the occasions when the police fired guns to destroy wounded or dangerous animals, the yearly firing figures given by Lord Belstead are: 1975: 3 shots (causing 1 injury); 1978: 3 shots (causing 2 deaths); 1979: 3 shots (causing 1 death).

According to figures on the issue of arms to the police given by the Home Office in March 1973, the number of incidents was 1072 in 1970, 1935 in 1971 and 2237 in 1972. In those three years, between 69 and 76 per cent of the gun issue was in the Metropolitan Police District. This breakdown has not been given with the most recent figures.

Comparison of the two sets of figures shows that there has been a 696 per cent increase in gun issue to the police between 1970 and 1978. This is more than double the reported increase in criminal use of firearms in indictable crime, as revealed in the Home Office's annual *Criminal Statistics*. Criminal use rose by 333 per cent between 1969 and 1978. As a result, it appears that the police were armed on 1,790 more occasions than criminals in 1978, even excluding all arming for protection duties.

In London, members of the Metropolitan Police uniformed Diplomatic Protection Group who guard embassies and diplomatic buildings, are armed as a matter of course. Plain-clothes Special Branch Officers guarding royalty, and certain leading politicians are also permanently armed.

---

## CONCERN OVER A COMPUTER PLAN

---

Lothian and Borders Police are to join the growing number of British forces having



their own computer systems. According to a confidential memorandum, the Joint Police Board approved the computer project in principle in May last year and the police operational requirement was then circulated to a number of companies. Four have been short-listed, all of whom have experience of police computers: Honeywell (Thames Valley and Bedfordshire Police), ICL (Tayside), Burroughs (Police National Computer), and Scicon (British Transport Police). The initial purchase price is expected to be around £1m.

The computer system would provide facilities for crime reporting including multi-factor search capabilities, which enable it to identify subjects sharing a number of given characteristics, and would include an index of criminals 'of active interest to the police, their personal details, associates and vehicles used.' The existing communications network, which uses teleprinters, would be replaced by a message switching system operating over visual display units (VDUs) at police offices. Facilities would also be provided for recalling plans for major incidents and contingencies. The computer would be linked directly to the Police National Computer at Hendon which now holds over 30 million records on people and vehicles, and to the proposed Scottish Criminal Records Office computer.

According to the Chief Constable's memorandum, the computer applications 'are directly designed to aid the operational police officer' and to make better use of information currently held on manual systems.

Concern has been expressed about the project, especially about the notion of 'associates' of known criminals but also about the way in which the computer facilities might be developed, for example, to hold criminal intelligence material which is likely to be speculative and unverified. Some assurance, however, has been forthcoming. In reply to a letter from the Scottish Council for Civil Liberties, Chief Constable Orr has said that 'the principles set out in the Report of the Lindop

Committee on Data Protection will be taken into consideration.' And Edinburgh MP, Robin Cook, who has discussed the project with the Chief Constable has been assured that the concept of 'associates of known criminals' will not include anyone who does not have a criminal record. Cook is also satisfied that, on the basis of what he has been told, the scheme is within the guidelines suggested by the Data Protection Committee.

---

## THE IDEAS OF CHIEF CONSTABLE ALDERSON

---

'Policing in Western democracies is in a crisis', writes John Alderson in the first sentence of the introduction to his book **Policing Freedom**. Alderson, Chief Constable of the Devon and Cornwall constabulary, has emerged as a controversial figure in the police force and his book has both provoked widespread debate and earned him a reputation as something of a liberal in police terms.

Alderson's approach to his subject is markedly different from two other often-quoted police men, Metropolitan Commissioner Sir David McNee and Manchester's Chief Constable James Anderton. The latter both tend to identify a 'crisis of law and order' and appear to believe that the solution lies in greater police powers, better technology, fewer rights for suspects and easier convictions in court. Alderson veers away from that path. He has, for instance, attacked the powers proposed for the police in the Scottish Criminal Justice Bill (see elsewhere in this Bulletin). He likened the proposals to the sanctions available to an occupying army (**Time Out**, 11.1.80). His analysis starts by identifying a 'crisis of policing' rather than a crisis of law and order, and from there he argues for a new approach to police methods. He calls his approach communal policing.

### **Pro-active policing**

In a paper presented to the Ditchley



Conference on Preventive Policing in March 1977, Alderson described three main styles of policing: reactive, preventive and pro-active. Reactive policing is a familiar concept, once described by Sir Robert Mark, the former Metropolitan Commissioner as fire-brigade policing. Such a style can, Alderson suggested, lead a police force to 'rely more and more on technological "coppery" and response time evaluation for its self-esteem.' Taken too far, this style is 'more akin to an occupying army than to democratic community-based policing'. Preventive policing on the other hand 'relies for its success on omnipresence and high visibility. It . . . depends heavily on manpower if it is to maintain the so-called "scarecrow" function'.

Alderson favours the third style, pro-active policing. This contains 'all the elements of preventive policing but goes beyond it. Whereas preventive policing tends to put the system on the defensive, pro-active policing sets out to penetrate the community in a multitude of ways. It seeks to reinforce social discipline and mutual trust . . . it strives to activate all possible resources in support of the common good.' He added that the police were probably 'better placed than most other organisations for providing social leadership of this kind'.

Successful pro-active policing, Alderson argues, involves the breaking down of barriers between the police and other agencies – such as social and probation services, an 'open and trusting' relationship with the media and a high level of active police involvement by appropriate officers in education from primary schools to higher education.

Alderson has attempted to put his ideas into practice since becoming the Chief Constable of Devon and Cornwall in 1973. But the origins of his theories probably lie with his experiences with the Metropolitan Police, which he joined in 1966. He was involved mainly with training from 1968, and in 1970 he was appointed Commandant of the Police Staff College, Bramshill.

A good example of the way Alderson's ideas are put into practice can be seen from the approach used in Whipton, a small neighbourhood of Exeter. The central role in this exercise lay with the Crime Prevention Support Unit. Armed with the findings of a research project about the area, the Unit enlisted the help of Youth and Community workers and the Social Services to call a series of public meetings. Within a year, a community association had been formed, with elected officers and the active support of the police. The end result of the operation was two-fold: the police gain close and informative links with the community, while the community benefits to the extent of having an active community association. (A more detailed examination of experiments in this area can be found in **The Exeter Community Policing Consultative Group; a Study of the First Year**, a pamphlet by Ann Blaber, NACRO, 169, Clapham Road, London SW9. Reviewed in Bulletin No 14.)

### **Problems and omissions**

There are scores of problems and omissions in Alderson's theory of pro-active policing. He attempts no discussion of his blandly assumed notion of the common good. He deals almost exclusively with the problems of small communities and 'petty crime'. He offers no course of action for the police in situations such as the Saltley Gates picket during the 1971 miners' strike. He makes no suggestions about how the police should react in the face of mass opposition to widely unpopular government legislation such as the 1971 Industrial Relations Bill or the present immigration laws which discriminate overtly against a significant section of the population.

However, the two major political demonstrations in the Devon and Cornwall area in the past 12 months have passed off without major repercussions. A demonstration in Exeter against a Springbok tour rugby match in October 1979 went off quietly, mainly because the police fully consulted with the



demonstration planners well in advance. On April 24, 1979, – the day after 300 people were arrested on an anti-NF demonstration in Southall – Devon and Cornwall police were faced with a National Front election meeting in a Plymouth school, let under the Representation of the Peoples Acts. Police decided that, under the Acts, the meeting had to be open to the public. The result was that the hall was full of anti-NF protesters and, when a coachload of NF supporters arrived, they were refused admission to the meeting by the police for fear of the consequences. The then NF chairman John Tyndall was eventually taken away from the aborted meeting in a police car. However neither of these two incidents really constitutes a full test of the effectiveness of pro-active policing in handling politically sensitive events.

Alderson's outpourings have provoked some hostility, not least from police colleagues. Sir David McNee, according to **Police** magazine, showed some testiness on the subject when questioned about them on television, suggesting that the ideas were all very well, but Torquay was a long way from Brixton. Mr Alex Lyon, MP for York and a former Home Office minister in the Labour government told Parliament in January that Alderson illustrated the 'irresponsibility of chief officers . . . He believes that he can create communities where police do the work of the social security department without the overall control of the local authorities . . . chief officers are beginning to think they are above the law.' (**Times**, 26.1.80).

Alderson is also completely opposed to any form of democratic accountability for the police. His view is that such accountability would damage police 'neutrality' in a tug-of-war between political parties. He therefore adopts a thoroughly undemocratic position: he claims for the police the advantageous position of social and community leadership but rejects the fundamental principle of democratic accountability. Without this, Alderson is left proposing an extremely dubious political concept:

supposedly benevolent social engineering by an undemocratic, non-accountable police force.

**Policing Freedom**, by John Alderson. Macdonald and Evans, 276 pp, £7.50.

---

## IN BRIEF

---

● **Army appointments:** The Chief Military Adviser to the Governor of Rhodesia is the same man who would be in charge of providing military assistance to the police in Britain in a major national crisis.

Major-General John Acland has been sent to Rhodesia to give military guidance to Lord Soames, the Governor. His normal post is General Officer Commanding, South West District, based on Bulford in Wiltshire, the administrative headquarters of the Eighth Field Force. The Eighth is the grouping of Army units responsible in an emergency for 'Home Defence' – guarding NATO and US installations in Britain, looking after sites of strategic and national importance and providing back-up to the police in maintaining law and order. (The other Field Forces normally based in Britain, the Sixth and Seventh, would be deployed abroad, mainly to Germany. See Bulletin No 2, pp 8-9).

Acland has been in charge of South West District since December 1978. Prior to that, he served with the Scots Guards in Malaya, Cyprus, Egypt, Kenya, Germany, Libya and Northern Ireland (the last three as commander of the Second Battalion).

● **Public order:** The new specialist parliamentary select committee on home affairs has decided to examine the law on public order. Its report, which will cover processions and public meetings, is expected to be completed in the spring. The Home Office is also considering proposals for change in the law on meetings. The select committee, which is one of a number recently established to monitor the work of individual departments, is chaired by the Conservative MP, Sir Graham Page. The



other places on the committee are taken by five Conservative and five Labour MPs. The full membership is: Arthur Davidson (L), George Gardiner (C), John Hunt (C), Robert Kilroy-Silk (L), Jill Knight (C), Alex Lyon (L), Sir Graham Page (C), Jo Richardson (L), William Waldegrave (C), John Wheeler (C), Philip Whitehead (L).

● **Special Branch In Scotland:** According to official statements the number of Special Branch officers in the eight Scottish police forces has increased by nearly 40 per cent in the 18 months to the end of 1979. In a written parliamentary answer to Ernie Ross MP (Labour, Dundee West), the Under Secretary of State at the

Scottish Home and Health Department, Malcolm Rifkind, said that there were 97 officers engaged in Special Branch work. (**Hansard**, 22.11.79) This compares with the figure of 70 officers given to parliament in 1978 (**Hansard**, 13.6.78).

● **Corrections** to the Background Paper of Bulletin No 15 on jury vetting. Page 43, col 2: Terry Chandler asked jurors to stand down in a 1963 trial arising out of demonstrations during a Greek royal visit, not an Official Secrets Act trial as stated. Page 43, col 2: The Stoke Newington Eight trial was in 1972 not 1973. Page 42, col 1: The third Reform Act was passed in 1884, not 1881.

---

## LABOUR'S TRANSATLANTIC LINKS

---

In November 1979, Lane Kirkland succeeded George Meany as President of the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organisations (AFL-CIO). Little change is expected in the policies of America's TUC as a result, for Kirkland, previously AFL-CIO Secretary Treasurer, has for decades been a key figure with Meany in using US trade union money to push the acceptance of US expansionism to the labour movements of the world. AFL-CIO influence has also been used to bolster the right wing in the Labour Party and the trade unions in Britain, as part of a widespread covert campaign for greater arms spending and militant anti-communism. Recently, one of the chosen vehicles for the campaign in this country has been a monthly newsletter, the Labour and Trade Union Press Service (LTUPS), which has been sponsored by Kirkland and prominent Labour right-wingers such as former Labour ministers, Michael Stewart, Roy Mason and David Owen, and trade union leaders Frank

Chapple and Terry Duffy.

The campaign represents a continuation of the dissemination of pro-American, pro-NATO views inside the Labour Party from the links built up in the 1950s and 60s between the CIA-backed organisations such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom and by Labour right-wingers, (see Richard Fletcher, **The CIA and The Labour Movement**, Spokesman Books, 1977).

### Lane Kirkland

Lane Kirkland is a central figure in a complex of organisations which are linked to the LTUPS. Kirkland, 57, is a former naval officer, with no shop floor experience, who joined the AFL in 1948. He worked closely with Meany, and under their command, the AFL-CIO declined steadily in numbers and influence in the USA. About 25 per cent of the US work force were unionised in 1955, when the AFL-CIO was founded; 21 per cent were in AFL-CIO unions. By 1977, only 19 per cent of the work force was unionised, and only 13 per cent were in AFL-CIO unions, an absolute drop from 16 million to 13.6 million workers. 53 per cent of British workers are unionised. (**Comment**, 26.1.80)



This decline – and particularly, the failure to unionise black and women workers – has been a direct result of the AFL-CIO's anti-communist 'business union' policies, which aim to minimise industrial militancy and rely for higher wages on the goodwill of employers and an expanding capitalist economy. The AFL-CIO has been a firm backer of US capital; an indication of how close it is to the US foreign policy establishment is Kirkland's membership of the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberg Group, and the Council on Foreign Relations. (See Bulletin No 10, background paper on NATO.)

The AFL-CIO has been very active in spreading non-communist trade unionism abroad. It runs four overseas training institutes for trade unionists, which try to turn foreign unions away from militancy and the left, and towards collaboration with employers, particularly US multinational companies.

Three of these institutes – the American Institute for Free Labour Development, the African-American Labour Center, and the Asian-American Labour Institute – were formerly run in collaboration with the CIA. These three, and the fourth, the Free Trade Union Institute operating in Spain and Portugal after the Portuguese revolution of 1974, received over \$1.1 million of AFL-CIO money in 1978, nearly \$200,000 more than was spent on organising, according to the AFL-CIO's Annual Report.

### **The CPD**

Given the AFL-CIO's, and Kirkland's, views on foreign policy, it was not surprising to find him, and other prominent US trade unionists, involved in the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), a group of prominent supporters of an interventionist US foreign policy which surfaced in 1976, three days after President Carter's victory. Two of the other Union leaders involved were Sol Chaikin, President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and Albert Shanker, of the American

Federation of Teachers (AFT).

CPD's launching statement in 1976 warned of 'a Soviet drive for dominance based on an unparalleled military build-up'. It suggested that the US should take a tougher stance towards the Soviet Union, spend more on the build-up of military forces, and accelerate the development of new weapons systems. The origins and development of the CPD are described at length in an article by Alan Wolfe and Jerry Sanders, in **Capitalism and the State in US-Latin American Relations**, edited by Richard Fagen, Stanford University Press, USA, 1979.

Wolfe and Sanders trace the origins of the CPD back to the Vietnam war 'hawks', and specifically to Eugene Rostow, Undersecretary of State under President Johnson. Rostow headed the Coalition for Democratic Majority's (CDM) Foreign policy task force. The CDM was formed in 1972 as a response by Democratic Party right wingers to George McGovern's nomination as Democratic Presidential candidate. Many members of CDM followed Rostow into the CPD. Another leading CPD founder was Paul Nitze. Nitze was head of the State Department's Policy Planning Division under President Truman, and was the author of the important document, NSC-68, which laid out the guidelines of politico-military strategy for the Cold War. Nitze was a member of Nixon's SALT negotiating team, but resigned in 1974, accusing Nixon and Kissinger of promoting 'a myth of detente'.

The claim that the Soviet Union was involved in a large arms build-up was based more on a statistical sleight of hand than any new information. In 1976, the CIA – and hence the rest of the West's intelligence agencies, – altered the basis on which they calculated Soviet defence expenditure. It rose abruptly from 6-8 per cent to 11-12 per cent of GNP. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute commented that 'It is the same bundle of goods with higher prices put on them.' (**SIPRI Yearbook**, 1979, and Bulletin No 14)



The re-assessment followed intense lobbying and pressure on the Ford administration in early 1976 – like 1980, an election year – by the group of ‘hawks’ who formed the CPD. Names like Paul Nitze, Foy Kohler, William Van Cleave and Richard Pipes do not mean very much to British readers, but they were key members of both CPD and the re-assessment exercise of 1976. This pitted the hawks – labelled Team B and chaired by Harvard Professor of Russian Studies, Pipes – against analysts from the CIA and the other intelligence agencies – labelled Team A. The hawks won; Wolfe and Sanders argue that this was because ‘Team B had on its side the arguments, as well as the architects, of a ideology which had governed American foreign policy in the generation of its greatest influence in the world’ (Fagen, p 60). The result was that ‘The new National Intelligence Estimate, plus the Pipes report. plus the encouragement given to pessimists or ‘worst case’ theorists on Soviet intentions inside the government, is regarded as a high barrier for the Carter administration to overcome to carry out its own broader objectives for US-Soviet arms control.’ (Murray Marder, *Washington Post*, 2.1.77)

The Pipes report ‘quotes scraps from Soviet military journals, treatises and speeches by Soviet generals and concludes on the basis of these Kremlinological entrails that the Soviets are no longer deterred from starting a nuclear war.’ (Richard Barnet, introduction to Fred M Kaplan, *Dubious Specter: A second look at the “Soviet threat”*, an excellent review of the CPD doctrine. Transnational Institute, Washington and Amsterdam, 1977, p.vi. On the right-wing attack on SALT-II, see Bulletin No 14).

Members of the CPD produced a barrage of writing about the new ‘Soviet threat’, a threat which Richard Barnet put in context in *Foreign Affairs*. Soviet strength has always been less than that of the US: the Soviet ‘build-up’ goes some way towards redressing slightly the overwhelming ‘forward defence’ encirclement of the Soviet Union by hostile

pro-Western states and the Western control over the ‘freedom of the seas’. There is no realistic doubt that the Soviet Union’s overall military might is both less in the important areas and inferior in quality to that of the West. The Soviet Union moreover has hostile or unstable borders with China and the Middle East (Afghanistan) which might reasonably be seen to justify increases in military spending.

The CPD argued something more dramatic: that ‘the Soviet Union thinks it could fight and win a nuclear war’ (to quote the title of Nitze’s article in *Commentary*, July 1977), and that the US should therefore, with its NATO allies, commit itself to maintain Western superiority by agreeing annual real increases in military expenditure of 3 per cent (or 5 per cent for the US), and by going ahead with rapid deployment of new nuclear systems. The notion of ‘winning’ a nuclear war, involves destroying all or very nearly all the enemy nuclear weapons in one first strike. This is a technological impossibility at the moment, but one whose pursuit is profoundly destabilising of the mutual assured destruction upon which stable nuclear deterrence rests. If each side is sure that, no matter what the other attacks with, it cannot win in one go and must itself be substantially destroyed, there is clearly little incentive to start a nuclear confrontation. However, the new Cold War scare of the CPD and its powerful supporters has persuaded NATO governments in December 1979 to introduce a new round of ‘theatre nuclear weapons’ capable of destroying the Soviet Union, to replace considerably less threatening existing tactical nuclear weapons. The CPD has done a great deal to produce the present high level of world tension.

CPD received \$30,000 from the AFL-CIO’s funds in 1978, according to the AFL-CIO’s report. Kirkland is one of CPD’s Vice Presidents.

One of the groups linked to CPD, and sharing similar views, is the Washington based National Strategy Information



Center (NSIC). Eugene Rostow is a leading member; NSIC Director Frank Barnett is a CPD member; and Kirkland, Chaikin and Shanker are members of its Advisory Committee on European Democracy and Security.

### The NSIC

Since its foundation in 1962, NSIC has been a key cold war institution. It has provided money and muscle for the extreme right in Britain. The Institute for the Study of Conflict was created in 1970 out of the CIA-front news agency, Forum World Features (see Bulletin 1). It received financial help from NSIC to publish its 'Annual of Power and Conflict'. Minutes of ISC's Council meeting of January 21, 1972 noted that NSIC was covering the salary of a research assistant, and advertising and printing costs for the Annual. The accounts show that NSIC paid at least £2,720 for this in the year to April 5, 1972, plus £584 for copies of 'Conflict Studies', ISC's journal.

Barnett, in a letter in May 1976 to fellow CPD member Eugene Rostow, described NSIC's intentions to 'crank up an all-out effort to meet the growing and current threat from the USSR' (Fagen, p52).

NSIC has a clear political line: 'The conviction that neither isolationism nor pacifism can provide realistic solutions to the challenge of 20th century totalitarianism.' It exists 'to encourage civil-military partnership, on the grounds that in a democracy informed public opinion is necessary to a viable US defence system capable of protecting the nation's vital interests and assisting other free nations which aspire to independence and self-fulfillment.' In other words, it exists to lobby for an expansionist, interventionist US foreign policy, and for the US to impose its will on the world, if necessary by military might.

NSIC was the principal sponsor of a conference at Brighton in July 1978 on 'NATO and the global threat' (see Bulletin No 7). British organisations co-sponsoring the conference were the Foreign Affairs

Research Institute, The Institute for the Study of Conflict and Aims (formerly Aims of Industry). The Conference called for the creation of an international 'Freedom Blue Cross' organisation to respond to the alleged 'destruction of the CIA' and to finance initiatives designed to enable the west to regain the upper hand, in particular on 'intelligence, information and counter-information': in other words, propaganda.

Further information on the Brighton Conference disclosed by **People's News Service** (17.4.79) led it to the conclusion that the conference had been 'a well-organised attempt strongly to influence NATO military personnel and governments to stand by South Africa and toughen up their attitude to the Soviet Union . . .' The South African Department of Information had financed at least one of the Conference's sponsoring organisations.

### NSIC's 'left' face

But NSIC also had a 'left' face, the Advisory Committee on European Democracy and Security (ACEDAS), called on its notepaper a project of the NSIC. In January 1979, ACEDAS published a book, **Eurocommunism** by Roy Godson and Stephen Haseler. Haseler is Principal Lecturer in Politics at City of London Polytechnic, and a leading member of the Social Democratic Alliance (SDA), a group of right-wingers originally organised within the Labour Party. Haseler has since been expelled from his local Labour Party, and is now drawing up plans to organise right-wing candidates to stand against official Labour Party candidates whom the SDA regards as too left wing. Their initiative has been welcomed by Neville Sandelson, Labour MP for Hayes (**Daily Telegraph**, 31.1.80).

Haseler was also a frequent contributor to **Free Nation**, the journal of the Freedom Association, formerly the NAFF; he was a member of several study groups organised by the Institute for the Study of Conflict.

The main thrust of the Godson-Haseler book, according to an NSIC Press Release



was that the increasing power of Communist Parties in western Europe 'can achieve what the Soviets themselves have failed to accomplish during the past 30 years – detach western Europe from the US – without war.'

Dr Haseler's co-author, Dr Roy Godson, is the Secretary to the National Strategy Information Center's European Advisory Committee, Associate Professor of Government at Georgetown University, Washington DC, and Director of the University's International Labor Program. Georgetown is famous as the 'spook's college', bringing together retired and serving professionals from the US foreign policy establishment with their academic critics. Since his retirement, Nitze's old foe Henry Kissinger has made Georgetown, and specifically the University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, his home. He has also significantly toughened his views on the Soviet Union, bowing to the pressure of the hawks, and opposing the latest SALT agreement. The ubiquitous Lane Kirkland is a member of the Editorial Board of CSIS's prestigious **Washington Quarterly**; Ray Cline, formerly the CIA's Deputy Director of Intelligence is Executive Director of Strategic Studies.

Dr Roy Godson's father, Joseph Godson, is European Co-ordinator for CSIS, and it is to Joe Godson, according to those close to him, to whom the major credit must go for the creation of the Labour and Trade Union Press Service (LTUPS). He, more modestly, told **State Research** that he was just one of the editors.

Joseph Godson is a former US career diplomat, and was Labour attache at the US Embassy in London. Labour attaches in US embassies are appointed only in close consultation with the AFL-CIO, and, where the CIA was and is involved in financing labour activities, they work closely with the Agency.

The Labour and Trade Union Press Service is formally published by the Labour Committee for Transatlantic Understanding, LCTU. LCTU is the Labour section of the British Atlantic

Committee (BAC), the semi-official NATO support and lobbying group. The Press Service was published from BAC's offices until recently, when it moved to the offices of the English Speaking Union, apparently because one of its editors, former Labour MP Alan Lee Williams moved over from his post of Director of the British Atlantic Committee to become Director of the ESU. The LCTU is a galaxy of stars of the Labour Right. Lord Stewart, formerly Labour's foreign Secretary is its President; Roy Mason, former Defence and Northern Ireland Minister, is its Chairman; Terry Duffy, AUEW General Secretary, is Secretary, and Frank Chapple, EETPU General Secretary, is Treasurer. Another former Foreign Secretary, Dr David Owen, is among the Labour MPs who are Vice Chairmen; others are former junior Defence Minister James Wellbeloved, Roy Hattersley, William Rogers and John Cartwright.

Trade Union Vice Chairmen include former Shop Workers' President Lord Allen; Transport Salaried Staffs' President Tom Bradley MP, Tony Christopher, General Secretary of the Inland Revenue Staffs Federation; Pattern Makers' Union leader Gerry Eastwood; ISTC General Secretary Bill Sirs; Hector Smith of the Boilermakers; Sidney Vincent of the National Union of Mineworkers; and Sid Weighell of the National Union of Railwaymen.

Joseph Godson denied to **State Research** that there was any connection between his work for CSIS and the LTUPS; he also denied that there was any connection between the National Strategy Information Centre, the Committee on the Present Danger, and the Press Service; but all three American Vice Chairmen of the LCTU are also members of NSIC's European Advisory Committee and of the CPD. They are Lane Kirkland, Sol Chaikin of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers.

Mr Godson said that it was not possible to make connections between organisations on the basis that the same people were



members of them, and pointed out that Lane Kirkland as a prominent US labour leader, was probably a member of hundreds of committees. He would not accept that the views and analysis of CPD, NSIC and the Press Service were virtually the same.

### LTUPS views

The Press Service first appeared in May 1976, as the CPD was mobilising. Its first issue carried articles by Michael Stewart on the North Atlantic Alliance and the Future of Democracy; interviews with West German Defence Minister George Leber and Roy Mason on the topic of 'Is NATO still necessary?'; an article warning that cuts in defence spending would lead to unemployment; and an attack on opponents of high defence spending, linking all such opposition to Soviet initiatives. To this mixture, later issues of the Press Service have added attacks by the Labour right on the left. The views of left-wingers like Eric Heffer occasionally get an airing, not on the need for greater democracy in the Labour Party, but only when they are critical of conditions in the Soviet Union.

The annual subscription to LTUPS is £10, and Mr Godson said that it also has financial support from 'trade unions and foundations', which he would not specify. He denied that any American money was involved in the Press Service.

The Press Service often carries articles which attract the attention of the national dailies. Pieces by Sir Harold Wilson and Terry Duffy attacking the Labour left have been re-printed. In September 1979, a vitriolic piece by Duffy was widely publicised. He attacked left-wing members of the Labour Party's National Executive Committee for 'wishing to tear the Party apart in their lust for power' and holding views which were 'nothing more than adolescent fantasy'. Such people, Mr Duffy said, 'wished to turn Britain into an Eastern European style peoples' democracy.' (*Tribune* 31.8.79).

An article by Sir John Killick, Britain's former permanent representative to NATO, calling for greater defence expenditure, was also picked up by the press.

Other users of LTUPS material include Robert Taylor, labour correspondent of **The Observer**, who has incorporated material from LTUPS in his articles, and who recently contributed an article on the accession to power of Lane Kirkland which omitted any mention either of the steady decline in AFL-CIO membership or of its overseas operations. Mr Taylor told **State Research** that he was invited to contribute to LTUPS by another of its editors, Peter Stephenson. Stephenson was co-founder with Stephen Haseler of the Social Democratic Alliance – though he has since left it – and was editor of **Socialist Commentary**, the Labour right's now-defunct monthly. Mr Taylor said that he saw his contributions to the Press Service as a continuation of articles on trade unions which he wrote for **Socialist Commentary**.

LTUPS has faithfully followed the concerns of the US hawks; with attacks on Eurocommunism as a fraud, with continuing concern that the left-wing policies of Labour's NEC would weaken NATO and increase unemployment; and an article by General Zeiner Gundersen, Chairman of NATO's military committee, arguing that the Soviet military build-up provided ample justification for NATO's adoption of its new, increased goals for military spending.

Mr Godson said that the articles for inclusion in the press service were chosen by the Editorial Committee, which had been appointed by the Labour Committee for Transatlantic Understanding. The EC has members from seven countries, but Mr Godson insisted that it was a working committee which met regularly, though he would not say how often.

Besides Godson, Williams and Stephenson, other members of the LTUPS Editorial Committee include Horst Niggemeier, an official of the West German Trade Union Federation, the



DGB; Carlo Ripa di Meana, an Italian aristocrat and Member of the European Parliament, (he is also a leading member of the right-wing of the Italian Socialist Party and heads its foreign affairs bureau, and is related by marriage to the Agnelli family, who own Fiat); and Albert Zack, head of the AFL-CIO's publicity Department.

Mr Godson said that LTUPS was financed by 'trade unions and foundations', but would not be more precise; he denied that any American money or money from private companies, was involved. The subscription rate was £10 a year, and about one-fifth of the copies were mailed free, he said. The total number of subscriptions he could not disclose.

The Treasurer of the Labour and Trade Union Press Service is the General

Secretary of the Electrical, Electronic and Plumbing and Telecommunications Union, Frank Chapple. He is doubtless adept at raising money for trade union causes; on September 17, 1976, he attended a lunch designed to raise cash – from McAlpines, the builders – for Truemid, the right-wing trade union organisation (Leveller, July 1978). The Labour Party NEC has now asked all constituency parties 'to consider whether or not the activities of persons associated with Truemid are contrary to the programme, policies and principles of the Labour Party.

Mr Godson said that it was not the special responsibility of Frank Chapple, as Treasurer of the LTUPS to raise money, but that the responsibility rested equally with 'all members'.

---

## BOOKS

---

### REVIEWS & SOURCES

**THE WASHINGTON CONNECTION AND THIRD WORLD FASCISM; Vol. 1 of THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF HUMAN RIGHTS, by Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, Spokesman, 1979, 440 pp, £3.50 pbk.**

In the sixties one book provided the best popular overview of US foreign policy for its opponents, David Horowitz' **From Yalta to Vietnam** (US title: **Leviathan**). The present volume is the first of two, which on the evidence of the first, will be the best single treatment of US policy for the eighties. The focus is on the US-organized system of unpopular, torture-based Third World client regimes which help the transnational corporations to invest and trade in order to bring us our daily bread. To the critique and description of this Pentagon archipelago, Chomsky

and Herman add a thorough examination of how Western media so suppress and distort this picture that people genuinely believe that the US stands for democracy and human rights despite an occasional lapse. This examination of western media coverage, scholarship and official propaganda is particularly apposite as the Carter administration again stokes up popular support for military interventionism. The post-Watergate and post-Vietnam problems of generating the apathy necessary for the continuation of traditional US policy comprise one explanation of the current anti-communism. The general level of western media coverage of the third world makes Soviet propaganda look positively truth-loving by comparison.

One reason why the US is so desperate to avoid the Shah of Iran being put on trial is that it would help expose to the world the Pentagon/CIA archipelago described here by Chomsky and Herman. From South Korea through to the Philippines,



and Indonesia to Malaysia and Thailand (where western aid is feeding the remains of the genocidal Pol Pot-Khieu Sampan Army), to Latin America (where 18 military juntas have been installed by US-trained forces since 1960) and on to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, and Greece, the US has (with the rest of NATO) a complete encirclement of the Soviet Union. This makes last year's fuss about 3,000 Soviet troops in Cuba look ludicrous. Chomsky and Herman begin with a forty-page summary of the conclusions of the whole work. 'The picture (is) . . . a very grim one both at the level of fact and with regard to the capacity of Western ideological institutions to falsify, obscure and reinterpret the facts in the interests of those who dominate the economy and political system. But the system is not all-powerful . . . It is not impossible for substantial groups to gain some real understanding of social and political reality and to organize and act to modify state power . . . The voiceless majorities (of the Pentagon archipelago of Western-backed regimes) can be helped by outsiders in many ways: among them, maximum world-wide exposure of the actual impact of the West on these peoples; strenuous efforts to stem the huge flow of aid and support to the official terrorists; and helping to create an ideological and political environment that will make open intervention difficult when explosions do occur . . . (In the "advanced" capitalist West) it is most probable, unfortunately, that a real crisis would result in a shift toward rightist totalitarianism, a "Brazilianization" of the home country. But . . . educational efforts on the true workings of the machine, and organizational actions . . . may yet yield their benefits, even without the major structural changes required to establish democratic control over the basic social and economic institutions.'

Since the Vietnamese defeat of the US in 1975, American policymakers 'have been able to continue the enlargement and protection of the neo-fascist empire without significant internal impediment.

This can only be changed by a renewal of active involvement of large numbers.' The book is a major contribution to rebuilding resistance again. It is impossible to read it without a sense of outrage at the systematic nature of Western hypocrisy, at the active support for anti-popular regimes by the US and all its allies, and at the refusal to consider the Chomsky and Herman theses, because accommodation to these realities is more comfortable. The book confronts Western mythology with the evidence. NATO's **Atlantic News** last month suggested that the massive escalation of nuclear weaponry in Europe, agreed at the December NATO summit, was in defence of 'Homo Occidentalis' described as 'a man with an open mind, communicative, receptive to new and original undertakings, a man able . . . to take a productive line, a man of principle but a man of freedom, a man without prejudice and with vision, tolerance, restraint and impartiality'. Chomsky and Herman begin with the myth that internal freedom in advanced capitalist nations 'makes for humane and moral international behaviour', showing 'that the commitment to human rights and democracy is mere rhetoric'. They discuss the term 'terrorism', only ever used to refer to the activities of marginal groups and individuals, and never to the **policy** of pro-western states, or to assassination squads such as those run by Latin American states or by the Shah. They then assess the overall balance of terror in the world between 'communist' and 'western' spheres of influence. The 1974 Amnesty International Report on Torture is quoted to the effect that 'no reports on the use of torture in Eastern Europe have been reaching the outside world for the past decade'. Meanwhile, there has been a huge growth in torture under Latin American and other US-backed regimes. Consequently, 'conservative churches throughout the US sphere of influence have been driven into an unprecedented opposition reminiscent of fascist Europe', because the military juntas, like Hitler, 'destroy all forms of institutional



protection for the masses, such as unions, peasant leagues and cooperatives and political groupings.'

Since torture-based military juntas 'are hardly compatible with human rights, democracy and other alleged Western values, the media and intellectuals in the United States and Western Europe have been hard-pressed to rationalize state policy. The primary solution has been massive suppression of the systematic character and extent of the US archipelago of repression. Latin American torture and exile is mentioned in Western media only with brevity and balance. Balance here means first the pretence that the authorities are responding to 'terrorist' atrocities, and giving the explanation of the juntas uncritical prominence. As the exile of Dr Sakharov is reported in detail, the exodus of thousands of intellectuals from the western archipelago under far more vicious persecution is ignored. Secondly, the western media normally present western governments as innocent bystanders, neglecting the calculated and deliberate policy of the United States which has 'brought about a system of clients and who consistently practise torture and murder on a terrifying scale'. These are at least as much US puppets as the nations of Eastern Europe are Soviet puppets. Thirdly, the West requires, for legitimation of its vicious policies, a 'program of "atrocities management"' which can 'concentrate attention on Communist abuses, real and mythical.'

Apart from the repression, deaths and exile from the nations of the American archipelago, corruption and contempt for their own peoples are the primary characteristics of its governments. Feeding, educating and housing the mass of the people are simply not goals for these regimes; it is no accident that the 'gap' between rich and poor widens. In Britain, the track record of organisations like the Institute for the Study of Conflict and the Freedom Association (NAFF) shows how the supporters of the international repressive system also favour right-wing intervention against the labour movement

in their 'civilised' homeland. Robert Moss, for example, moves from lecturing the Chilean and Argentinian military on their contribution to the defence of western values to directing NAFF's support for Grunwick and legal action against the Post Office workers' boycott of South African telecommunications. President Carter's late campaign for human rights and freedoms has been 'weak or non-existent on human rights in US client states . . . (and) thus far has worked out in practice to exacerbate cold war tensions.' Chomsky and Herman are at their best in their denunciation of western-sponsored 'protest' against whomever are the current enemies of the state; while the abuses might be real enough, such 'protest' against Soviet policy is simply support of Western official policy. If protest is really intended to improve the condition of those in whose name it is apparently made, Chomsky and Herman correctly point out, that it 'must consider the plausible consequences for the victims of oppression'. A leading Czech dissident, Dubcek's foreign minister Jiri Hajeok, pointed out how Carter's over-tough approach 'will hinder the struggle for greater political latitude in the East bloc' (*Christian Science Monitor* 6.2.78). 'If the purpose of the "human rights crusade" is to restore US prestige after the battering it has taken in the past decades, then such considerations are irrelevant,' and, indeed, the Carter administration has explicitly declared them irrelevant.

People seriously interested in the welfare of the victims in whose names they purport to speak, must consider consequences for victims of their safe protest. If they are interested in effective activity to right the worst wrongs they 'will try to concentrate protest efforts where they are most likely to ameliorate conditions for the victims of oppression. The emphasis should, in general, be close to home: on violations of human rights that have their roots in the policies of one's own state, or its client states, or domestic economic institutions and, in general, on policies that protest might be able to influence.' The protest of



Medvedev or Grigorenko or Bahro 'who denounce the crimes of the Russian state and its satellites at great personal risk' are worthy of respect: but their denunciations of US policy would be worth little, however accurate. The unbalance of a Solzhenitsyn in exile in the west, and of the NAFF-Institute of the Study of Conflict – radical right is obvious; they serve only the internal legitimation needs of the West. If victims of oppression in Russia or Cambodia can be helped by public protest, then it is justified; otherwise, it is empty rhetoric, or worse. The ultimate vulgarity, perhaps, is those who never criticised the US war against Vietnam on any principled grounds, who 'now feign outrage and indignation over oppressive or murderous acts' (in Cambodia).

The first volume contains this remarkable summary and four long chapters. The first defines the archipelago, and the over-riding importance of a favourable investment climate in determining western support for repression. The primacy of investment considerations allows a distinction between 'benign bloodbaths', basically irrelevant to western interests, like Bangla Desh, Burundi, East Timor and Latin American Indians, and 'constructive bloodbaths', directly contributing to imperial ends, like the Indonesian massacres of 1965-66 which eliminated the largest Communist Party in Asia, and hundreds of thousands of innocents, as America's war against Vietnam moved to its full fury. Other constructive bloodbaths were the destruction of the democratic Thai government in October 1976, and many Latin American cases, beginning with Brazil in 1964. The last chapter considers western treatment of bloodbaths in Indochina, again pointing to the direct involvement in major falsifications by NAFF/ISC luminaries like Sir Robert Thompson.

For example, a nine-page examination of the alleged Communist massacre during the 1968 Tet offensive in Vietnam shows that the 'NLF-DRV "bloodbath" at Hue

was constructed on flimsy evidence indeed'. It is possible 'that massacre victims at Hue may have been killed neither by the DRV nor US firepower but rather by the returning Saigon military and political police . . . large scale retaliatory killing may have taken place in Hue by the Saigon forces *after* its recapture'.

Nonetheless, 'In the hysterical propaganda effusions of Robert Thompson', British advisor both to the US and the Saigon government, 'the number of people executed by the communists escalated to 5,700', having been estimated at the time by the Hue police chief as about 200.

**WHAT DO THE BRITISH WANT FROM PARTICIPATION AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY? by Frank Heller, Peter Abell, Malcolm Wilders, Malcolm Warner. Anglo-German Foundation, 103 pp, £7.95.**

This is published by the Anglo-German Foundation (not to be confused with the pre-war, pro-Hitler Anglo-German Fellowship), a body studying 'industrial society'. The foundation was established by inter-governmental agreement between the FRG and the UK in 1973. Since industrial democracy is now a dead duck under the Thatcher government (avidly supported by the CBI in this resolve), with even the limited experiment of worker directors on the Post Office board now ended, the question in the title hardly seems worth putting.

The study is part of a wider survey of industrial democracy in Europe, supported the Thyssen and Ford Foundations. It looks at 14 companies in metalworking (or engineering as it is more generally known in Britain), banking and insurance and includes a national opinion poll on the subject. The study expresses somewhat naive surprise at the power of boards of directors over company decisions.

The book reads as a quaint piece of history. While the government and employers definitely do not want to know about industrial democracy, the trade union movement is too busy trying to



unshackle itself from Tory anti-union legislation to consider such hypothetical luxuries at present.

**SPY!** by Richard Deacon, with Nigel West. BBC Publications, 190 pp, £5.50.

These 'six great stories of twentieth century espionage', combining 'scrupulous accuracy and readability', were published in conjunction with the BBC TV series, *Spy!* They concern Richard Sorge, the Soviet agent in Tokyo; the Venlo incident in Holland in November 1939, when the very amateur British Secret Service was virtually destroyed by the Nazis; Betty Thorpe (alias Cynthia), the US citizen who spied for Britain on the embassy of Vichy France in Washington; and John Vassall, the Admiralty spy.

More interestingly, there is an account of the Twenty Committee (XX = Double Cross) in World War II Britain, whose task was to interrogate and 'turn' captured enemy agents at Camp 020, the M15 detention centre at Latchmere House, Ham Common, Surrey. The verdict as to whether or not a captured agent should be used as a double agent rested with the so-called 'Hanging Committee', which decided if an enemy agent should die. If the Home Guard captured the agent, it could become public knowledge, and he would be hanged. If M15 got the agent, he could be turned. Thus justice in wartime.

Some research has gone into this lightweight book, but it abounds in acceptance of cold war propaganda. For example, the section on Bogdan Stashinsky, the self-confessed Soviet killer, records casually in an aside that General Gehlen, head of the infant West Germany's Secret Service, 'during the war had been head of German Army Intelligence in Russia'.

Author Richard Deacon is a pseudonym for writer Donald McCormick, former Foreign Manager of *The Sunday Times*.

**HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS, PERSPECTIVES AND TEXTS**, ed. F.E. Dorrick. Saxon House, 223 pp, £8.50. This series of lectures, delivered in the

University of Durham in 1978, forms more than an excellent introduction to the study of human rights. With its copious citation of sources and supporting texts, it presents a most valuable description of the extent to which human rights are universally violated today, and discussion of their foundations in history and political theory. It deserves a very wide audience.

**THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES YEARBOOK, 1979.** Brussels: Editions Delta (distributed by Bowker), 607 pp, £22.50.

It is necessary to command much of the information in this book in order to understand the working of the European Economic Community. There are sections on the European Parliament, Council, Commission, Court of Justice and many other institutions. There are also some details of the governments, press, treaties, customs union, agricultural policy, movement of labour and capital, and much else. There is some historical treatment, hundreds of pages listing sundry office holders (showing a minute proportion of women in senior posts), and in all a valuable introduction to the vast machinery of Brussels. The whole is written in French and English, and sometimes in *Franglais*.

From its origins as a movement whose funding and connections in Washington defied clarification, through the European coal and steel treaty of 1951 to the community of today with its ever-increasing political collaboration, the EEC has retained its common base of anti-communism and perverted internationalism. On this it has built a bureaucratic machine of vast size and expense which looks every bit an embryonic fourth world power. We shall soon need yearbooks by the yard.

**THE BRITISH POLICE**, ed. Simon Holdaway. Edward Arnold, 188 pp, £3.95. This collection of nine essays on different aspects of policing is one of the few sociological studies which looks concretely at police work. However, the essays are



uneven. 'London's Police Tradition in a Changing Society' is a weak attempt to describe the shift from nineteenth to twentieth century policing. 'Police-Black Relations: the Professional Solution' not only has a misleading title, being mainly concerned with 'models' of policing, but comes to the conclusion that the argument 'that blacks are subject to qualitatively discriminatory policing is largely negated by the present data' (p80). The 'data' is based on interviews with police officers.

The essays on arrest, police unionism and the 'Metropolitan Police and the News Media' are on an entirely different plane. Steve Chibnall, in a very interesting essay, traces the different relations between the Metropolitan Commissioners and the press from the 1920s. In the 1930s one senior crime reporter said that 'practically no help whatever was forthcoming to the crime reporter from the Yard, either officially or non-officially'. Police-press relations really started to sour after the scandals of the late fifties, for example, those in Sheffield and West End Central. Mark arrived at Scotland Yard in 1972 determined to cultivate a close relationship with Fleet Street editors. By 1975 Mark could write that 'you almost make a journalist uncomfortable if he disbelieves you'. On the valuable legacy left by Mark to McNee, Chibnall comments that the 'legacy was not so much a well oiled machinery for the repressive control of the news media but rather the painstakingly established conditions of media support and cooperation vital to any further expansion of pre-emptive policing and political control on the 1980s' (p149).

**THE SOLDIERS: AN ANATOMY OF THE BRITISH ARMY**, by Henry Stanhope. Hamish Hamilton, 372pp, £9.95.

This is a unique book – unfortunately. For the last decade Henry Stanhope, as Defence Correspondent of **The Times**, has had privileged access to the normally impenetrable back-stage area of the British Army. Given that very few of the Army's activities, especially the details of how it

disposes of its £3,000m-plus budget, are open to public view, Stanhope's detailed account of the working of one of Britain's most important institutions is obviously of importance.

He examines in considerable detail the organisation and nature of the Army and the society that surrounds it. The book pulls together information that has never been comprehensively collated before, on the recruiting and training of soldiers, the distinctions between the regiments, how officers are made and what happens to the fighters when they are too old to fight. The numerous insights range from the fact that very few troopers in the Household Cavalry can actually ride a horse, to a breakdown of the Army's fighting operations overseas since 1945.

But Stanhope, like all defence correspondents, only usually publishes what the military would like him to publish; if he were to overstep the mark he would suddenly find that all his sources had dried up and he would lose all his stories (and sooner or later his job). So **The Soldiers** and its detailed portrait of today's Army is a military-approved picture, a picture that conceals as much as it reveals. His description of the Royal Corps of Signals, for example, includes no mention of its central role as a spying agency (see Bulletin No 7, p129) and there is only a sketchy outline of the Military Training Teams and Loan Service Personnel, now two of Britain's most important methods of providing military assistance to pro-Western overseas governments.

Stanhope receives the final stamp of military approval, however, for his uncritical and purely factual approach to his controversial and political subject. There is no questioning here of the actual need for a permanent armed body at the disposal of the State, or of the lack of democratic control of the armed forces, or of the constant manoeuvring and manipulation of society by the military establishment to preserve their position and grab a larger and larger slice of Britain's resources.



By focusing on the details of the Army in a way in which no one has been able to before, **The Soldiers** helps divert attention from the broader questions that need discussing about the growing power of the armed forces in British society.

**BURDEN SHARING IN NATO, by Gavin Kennedy. Duckworth, 113 pp, £8.95.**

The burden in question is the cost of NATO, and this book tries to use neoclassical welfare economics to explore possible cost-sharing processes among NATO nations. Such economics is largely mumbo-jumbo, revolving around a handful of tolerably clear concepts whose 'application' to the real world involves many a tendentious assumption. Among these, two are outstanding. First, that the state apparatus as a whole – the processes of law-making, government, 'intelligence', courts and policing, the armed forces and foreign policy – is a 'public good' which exists, or should exist (a useful equivocation), to serve the individuals between whom it gently interposes itself. And second, that the ultimate test of state institutions and policies is individual preferences as expressed ideally in market behaviour, but in cases of 'market failure' by political processes (i.e. voting). Armed forces in this system of persuasive definitions are technically a public good; i.e. it is assumed that all individuals are defended (and thus benefit) equally by military spending, since the benefits cannot be allocated to specific individuals. Since those who will not voluntarily pay for military forces cannot be excluded from the alleged benefits of national security, governments must tax if there are to be armed forces.

The economists, neoclassical and monetarist, who have created this mumbo-jumbo, must at least pretend to have some economic theory about how much governments should spend and tax. This is particularly necessary if they are to defend the price system supposedly operating in the private sector as the basis of either mixed economies or anti-public sector

monetarist ideology of the Institute of Economic Affairs kind. (The IEA is the home of monetarist public sector economics in Britain; its founder Ralph Harris is now Lord Harris thanks to the new honours and it is closely interlocked with the right-wing Freedom Association.) Kennedy doesn't examine the political-ideological role of welfare economics. His book retails a sketchy summary of the sparse literature on burden-sharing, suggests how the various methods in the literature might apply in NATO and compares them with the methods of other international organisations. Kennedy spices this boring gruel with a liberal helping of gratuitous insults – aimed at those who 'are anti-NATO in principle . . . and believe NATO contributes to European tensions rather than lowers it' (p102), at trade unions and OPEC whose 'need for coercion to maintain group solidarity' (p12) is not shared, it seems, by NATO.

Kennedy argues with the Labour Party, however, that 'the burden on Britain of sustaining its major contribution to NATO is inequitable on ability to pay criteria' (because the UK spends a larger proportion of its GNP on armed forces than any West European nation, despite having only four-fifths of NATO average GNP per head). Kennedy's various suggested methods of burden-sharing would all reduce the cost to Britain. But Kennedy, who wrote the book in 1977 as a NATO Research Fellow, tells us that 'the most strenuous and eventually successful pressure was exerted through NATO on the British (Labour) Government to reverse or restrain (its) policy' of cutting Britain's military spending from 5.8 per cent of GNP in 1974 to 4.5 per cent by 1984. The proper way, according to this book, is to keep British expenditure up while pushing other NATO nations to agree a burden-sharing arrangement which would pay part of Britain's cost. (If the British are not going to have any industry, they may as well be mercenaries!) Since such a 'frontal attack on the burden-sharing issue in NATO . . . is extremely unlikely for the present', he is left with no policy proposals for Britain except a



Friedman-like vacuity about 'a determined assault on its chronic economic problems'. Condemning unilateral action, Kennedy tells us that 'the best way to shed some of Britain's defence burden is to negotiate with its allies'. While the Thatcher government is willing to demand reduction in costs of the EEC, its commitment to NATO is so absolute that, all in all, the book might reasonably be thought academic. A fine fruit of the British university system.

**POLICING THE INNER CITY, by Maurice Punch. Macmillan Press, 230 pp, £12.00.**

Amsterdam is a tolerant, cosmopolitan city whose red-light district is world-famous. Punch joined the Amsterdam Police for this district (Warmoesstraat), participating in their uniform patrol work for several periods between 1974 and 1976. He was able to observe the modern inner city policeman fighting not only crime but social tensions and a growing isolation from the population. He discovered that the more alienated policemen felt, the more they tended to over-react and resort to repression.

Punch gives a feeling of police routine, and lards his book with anecdotes about the drunks, prostitutes, mad people, Blacks, other racial minorities, violent husbands and other everyday cases the police deal with. The anecdotes are usually accompanied by sociological analysis and commentary on police responses. Leaving aside the jargon, it is questionable that the inner city is a testing ground for the consequences of social change, as Punch asserts. Nothing is being 'tested': crime and violence are a reality and so are police methods.

Punch's premise is that something called 'effective law-enforcement' can be achieved, in the case of Amsterdam by 'tolerating deviance'. But he still leaves it up to the police to exercise toleration and to decide on permissible degrees of deviancy. As the book jacket says, the book should be interesting to politicians, planners, policemen, academics and

policymakers. At £12 for 230 pages, these are the only people who can afford it anyway. But you are not missing much if you can't.

---

---

## PAMPHLETS

---

---

*What Everyone Should Know about State Repression*, by Victor Serge, New Park Publications, £1. Serge described the Okhrana, the secret police of pre-revolutionary Tsarist Russia, as 'the prototype of the modern political police'. The Okhrana's records were captured intact after the 1917 Revolution, and form the basis of Serge's account of their anatomy and operations, first published in 1926. Serge gives 'simple advice to revolutionaries' on how to avoid detection and paranoia, and everything he says has clear relevance for today. After all, the Bolsheviks made a revolution despite the Okhrana.

*Fire Force Exposed, Anti-Apartheid Movement*, £1.95. 'Fire force' is the Rhodesian regime's term for the use of combined air and ground troops against supporters of the Zimbabwe liberation movements. This booklet shows not only that the Rhodesian security forces deserve their brutal reputation, but that they have become deeply politicised. It is clear that there will be no free Zimbabwe unless they are disbanded.

*In and Against the State*, Discussion notes for Socialists, by the London Edinburgh Weekend Return Group. Distribution: PDC. £1.25. Written by a group of socialists in state employment, this pamphlet explains how the state provides services we need, but does it in a way that oppresses and alienates. The final section, *Against the State: New Forms of Opposition*, is particularly interesting for its questioning of 'traditional forms of struggle' through trade unions, the Labour Party, etc, and its emphasis on everyday human relations.



*The Wealthy*, Counter Information Services, 9 Poland St, London W1. 85p. Any doubts that the poor still have nothing to lose but their chains will be dispelled by this survey of what the wealthy are trying to hang on to. Wealth brings not only comforts but political influence, which is exercised to preserve it. A useful analysis of the connection between wealth and power in British society.

*Identification Evidence*, by Martin Walker and Bernadette Brittain, Justice Against the Identification Laws (JAIL), 271 Upper Street, London N1. £1 + 25p p&p. JAIL's evidence to the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure in 1979. A detailed survey of nine cases which depend solely on identification evidence, together with a history of identification procedure, official documentation and an examination of police investigation procedures and court procedures. JAIL makes excellent recommendations on reforms for identification evidence and argues that the judiciary must change if there is to be a rational framework to protect people against wrongful arrest, conviction or imprisonment.

---

## ARTICLES

---

### *Criminal procedure*

Why Police Evidence "Puzzles" the Royal Commission, Sir Cyril Philips, Police, December 1979. Chairman of the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure critical of police demands for more powers.

Juries and Civil Liberties, Nick Blake, Haldane Society Bulletin, Autumn 1979.

The Coroner's Jury, Anthony Morris, New Law Journal, December 13, 1979.

Election of the Judiciary, David Pannick, NLJ, November 1, 1979. Barrister argues for judges to be elected for five year terms.

### *Intelligence*

US Intelligence in Norway, Counterspy, Vol 4 No 1.

Robert Moss, Andy Weir and Jonathan Bloch, Covert Action, Information Bulletin No 7, (Dec 1979/Jan 1980). Portrait of Robert Moss.

### *Military*

Force Reductions in Europe, Col Jonathan Alford, ADIU Report, December 1979.

### *Police Chiefs*

The Aftermath of Hanging, Robert Mark, Security Gazette, January 1980. Discussion of capital punishment in the light of its latest parliamentary rejection.

The Bail Act has Failed to get the Balance Right, Kenneth Oxford, Security Gazette, December 1979. Merseyside chief constable calls for return to old bail system.

The Village in the City, John Alderson, Police, November 1979, Devon and Cornwall chief constable develops his theories about community policing.

Police or Pilgrims? Tony Judge, Police, December 1979. Editor of the Police Federation magazine analyses the ideas of John Alderson.

Alderson Lays down the Law, Doreen May, Police Review, December 14, 1979. More on Alderson.

The Youngest Chief Constable, Police Review, January 4, 1980. Profile of Ian Oliver, new chief constable of Central Scotland, one of the few Englishmen to land a top Scottish policing job.

No Time for Memories, Brian Hilliard, Police Review, November 30, 1979. Profile of Sir Walter Stansfield, chief constable of Derbyshire.

Quo Vadis? Sir David McNee, Police Journal, January/March 1980. Text of lecture given by the Commissioner in Canada last year, analysing the status and function of British police.



### *Police: International*

The Dutch Police in Evolution, Major Frits Brink and Lt Jelte Bulthuis, *Police Studies*, Vol 2 No 3, Fall 1979. Useful general introduction to the structure of Dutch police.

Does America need a Bramshill? William C. Clancy, *Police Studies*, Vol 2 No 3, Fall 1979. Asks whether the British Police College training system could or should be adopted in America.

### *Police: organisation*

The truth about the SPG, *Police*, November 1979. A member of the controversial squad defends its role and record.

Policing : Then and Now, Douglas Grant, *Police Journal*, January/March 1980. Former policeman describes policing in Glasgow since the 1920s.

Complaints against the Police Complaints Board, Harry Templeton, *Police Review*, January 18, 1980.

Management and the Police, Ian Will, *Management Today*, January 1980. Former police officer proposes reform of police structures.

Police in the New Year's Honours List, *Police Review*, January 4, 1980. Who got what: a full list.

### *Police: powers*

Law and Order: The Way Ahead, G.J. Dear, *Police Journal*, January/March 1980. Assistant chief constable of Nottinghamshire on police powers and the community.

Race, Crime and Arrests, Tom Rees, Philip Stevens and Carole F. Willis, Home Office Research Bulletin No 8. Important official research on race and police powers.

Enemies of Democracy, Paul M. Cook, *Police Review*, December 14, 1979. A police viewpoint on entrism in the Labour Party.

The Bindon Trial, News Release, December 1979/February 1980. Illustrates the complexity of police use of supergrasses.

Anatomy of a Smear, Editorial, *Police*, December 1979. Abusive Police Federation attack on Michael Meacher MP over deaths in custody controversy.

Jim Jardine hits back at the Anti-police Brigade, *Police*, December 1979. Federation leader attacks his critics about deaths in custody.

245 deaths: a Comment, *Police Review*, January 11, 1980. An unsigned call for more information to be made public.

### *Private security*

The Mistake of the Century, John Wheeler, *Security Gazette*, December 1979. Leading private security industry spokesperson attacks liberal and rehabilitative penal measures.

Co-operation, Anthony Davis, *Security Gazette*, January 1980. Analysis of links between the police and private security firms.

### *Surveillance*

The Atomic State and the People who Have to Live in It. Campaign against the Model West Germany No 7, December 1979.

Stamping out Crime in the Post Office, Brian Hilliard, *Police Review*, November 9, 1979. On the Post Office Investigation Division.

### *Terrorism*

The Effects of Terrorism in Society: an analysis with particular reference to the United Kingdom and the European Economic Community. Brian Hayes, *Police Studies*, Vol 2 No 3, Fall 1979. Written by the assistant chief constable of Surrey.



---

## CONTENTS

---

<b>News</b> .....	<b>57</b>
A Steady Increase in Deaths in Custody	
Merseyside Police: A Councillor Speaks Out	
The Scottish Criminal Justice Bill	
Operation Countryman: Five Charged	
The Role of Police Support Units	
How The Army Sees 'Subversives'	
Big Rise in Firearms Issued to Police	
Concern Over a Computer Plan	
The Ideas of John Alderson	
<b>Background Paper</b> .....	<b>68</b>
Labour's Transatlantic Links: Analysis of the origins and promotion of pro-NATO and Cold War ideas in the labour movement.	
<b>Reviews and Sources</b> .....	<b>74</b>

---

**STATE RESEARCH**  
**9 POLAND STREET/LONDON W1**  
**01-734-5831**

---

### **State Research**

An independent group of investigators collecting and publishing information from public sources on developments in state policy, particularly in the fields of the law, policing, internal security, espionage and the military. It also examines the links between the agencies in these fields and business, the Right and paramilitary organisations.

### **State Research Bulletin**

Published bi-monthly in February, April, June, August, October and December. Contributions to the Bulletin are welcomed; they should be sent to the above address. Relevant cuttings from local newspapers are also very welcome.

### **The Review of Security and the State**

Volume 3 of the Review will be published in autumn 1980. This will contain our year's

work in hardback form, i.e. issues 14-19 of State Research Bulletin (October 1979-September 1980), an introductory overview of the year and an index. Hardback (jacketed) £10.00. It can be ordered in advance direct from Julian Friedmann Books, 4 Perrins Lane, Hampstead, London, NW3.

---

## SUBSCRIPTIONS

---

Subscribers receive the bi-monthly Bulletin with an annual index.

### **Rates**

Britain and Europe: £4 pa individuals, £6 pa community, voluntary and trade union groups, £9 institutions and organisations. Elsewhere (by Air Mail): U.S.\$10 pa individuals, U.S.\$16 community and voluntary groups, U.S.\$24 institutions and organisations.

### **Back Issues**

Back issues are available to subscribers only. Bulletins 1-13 (Oct 77-Aug 79), and the indexes (1977-78 and 1978-79) cost 60p each to individuals, £1 each to community, voluntary and trade union groups, £1.50 each to institutions. Elsewhere: U.S.\$2 individuals, U.S.\$3 community groups etc, U.S.\$4 institutions.

Unfortunately we cannot accept foreign cheques worth less than £5 sterling.

**Payment must accompany all subscriptions and orders for back issues. All cheques/postal orders payable to Independent Research Publications. All prices include packaging and postage.**

**Typeset by Red Lion Setters, 22 Brownlow Mews, London WC1N 2LA**

**Printed by Russell Press, Gamble Street, Nottingham.**

**Trade Distribution PDC, 27 Clerkenwell Close, London EC1.**

**Published by Independent Research Publications Ltd, 9 Poland Street, London W1**

**ISSN0141-1667**