

Preliminary analysis of, & comments on, police video 'evidence':

The video compilation was created on 17th November 2005 (This information is visible on computer).

-Why were we not given it then? I received it in late April 2006.

The video lasts 6 minutes 47 seconds. I was detained in the police cordon in Canning Street for about 3½ hours.

The video represents the WORST they can prove beyond doubt that I did during the many hours I was being detained against my will.

The video consists of 12 clips that have been edited together:

- 1) A still of me apparently WAVING. This is not illegal.
- 2) Excerpt from a media interview (I gave at least 4 others). In it I clearly state I 'believe in peace' & am 'completely non-violent'. This is audible on the soundtrack. The clip is curtailed after a question from the interviewer. Nothing here that is illegal or disorderly.
- 3) Blowing samba whistle. There was a samba band. Lots of people played different instruments, drums, didgeridoos...
- 4) Interview, in which I use the words 'peace' & 'not violent by nature'. Innocuous I would have thought. Exemplary even.
- 5) Shot of police lines. I'm not even visible in the clip! Interestingly the police shown are bobbies in hats rather than masked riot police in helmets with shields & full riot gear, who actually predominated. I have photos of these & they look frightening & threatening. What is the point of including this clip in so-called evidence against me?
- 6) Shot of me DANCING with my camera phone. Lots of people were dancing. This was meant to be a Carnival. It was non-threatening. Surely not an arrestable offence!
- 7) The police make an announcement via loud-hailer to the effect that the crowd is being detained under Section 14 of the Public Order Act.

I remonstrated at the claim that they were doing so because there was 'a serious risk of disorder & damage to life' (their words). This seemed to me to be a misrepresentation of the truth. We posed no such threat. The procession was allowed to start (from nearby W.Maitland Street) - so it did so with police permission or I would not have followed the

carnival procession. People were proceeding in a peaceful & orderly way, until suddenly cordoned off in Canning Street. At that point there were no valid grounds on which to suspect a threat of 'serious disorder & damage to life.' The claim seemed preposterous. I remonstrated vocally but BRIEFLY about this, no more than a few moments of harmless heckling (of the kind that takes place at every sitting of Parliament).

I used the phrase 'Police State', echoing an Edinburgh bus driver who I'd heard earlier saying 'it looks like a police state out there.'

Such sentiment have also been expressed by a number of reputable journalists.

And perhaps most telling, George Churchill-Coleman, who headed Scotland Yard's anti-terrorist squad as they worked to counter the IRA during their mainland attacks in the late 1980s & early 1990s, said in an interview with the Guardian 28 January 2005):

"I have a horrible feeling that we are sinking into a police state and that's not good for anybody. We live in a democracy & we should police on those standards."

A further point that, to my mind, has some legal relevance is this:

If one section of the Public Order Act (Section 14) is in force (the announcement made), wouldn't it be reasonable to assume that Section 5 of the same Act would be used to issue a warning to someone to stop if they were doing anything arrestable?

I've read of a demonstration some months ago where someone who was shouting was told he would be arrested in 10 minutes unless he stopped (as Section 5 stipulates). Of course, he stopped. Had I been told I was in danger of arrest, obviously I would have stopped.

In fact, why not warn people if the aim is to keep the peace rather than to arrest people?

Instead they eventually arrested me under so-called 'common law', when I was in fact standing peacefully waiting to be let out of the cordon. This smacks of a pick 'n' mix approach to the law.

I had imagined that it is common & considered acceptable for people to vocally remonstrate in such a context. Actually, what I did only lasted for a FEW SECONDS! Most of the time I was completely silent.

8) I say to the police 'let us through', which was reasonable request. I for one had another appointment. I was tired of being detained like that.

I use the phrase 'bloody helicopters burning carbon' to refer to the police helicopters circling overhead. I was expressing legitimate environmental concern. Burning fossil fuels is causing climate change. Helicopters produce lots of Carbon Dioxide. Their use should be severely restricted. That is my opinion. Is it illegal to point this out?

'Bloody' is fairly mild as swear words go. It would not shock a 6 year old. Especially in the context of the following...

9) The person (agent provocateur) who picked a public quarrel with me repeatedly uses the 'F-word'. I did not rise to his bait & swear back. I walked away as I don't like angry confrontation.

Why wasn't he arrested for repeatedly using the F-word, if I'm charged with swearing & the worst I said was 'bloody' on one occasion?

Even he said that the police shouldn't be allowed to 'trap' people (his word).

10)Waving at camera. What's wrong with that. I was showing that I wasn't afraid to be filmed because I wasn't actually doing anything wrong according to any moral code that I'm aware of.

11)A REPEAT of clip 8. This is obviously so 'bad', so 'criminal' they show it TWICE (either that or the video would have been too short!)

They repeat the 'bloody helicopters' - this must be extremely shocking I suppose.

They also include my reference to 'imperialistic wars' - a valid point, which no serious historian would challenge. Bush & Blair, as members of the G8, are guilty of instigating wars of aggression which are essentially imperialistic in nature (more precisely they are resource wars.) I did NOT call for anyone to be bombed or beheaded, which is

apparently acceptable on demonstrations if you are a member of the muslim faith!

I also used the phrase 'walk our streets in peace'. It clearly expresses my innocent intentions. (In fact, on video I repeatedly make reference to peace.) Who can object to that? How ironic then that I was arrested for 'breach of the peace'.

12) After the arrest. Not relevant as evidence of why I was arrested. It merely shows I was fully co-operative. I merely asked under what law I was being arrested. It was not Section 5 of the Public Order Act referred to above.

To sum up:

The video 'evidence' (in inverted commas) lasts for only 6 minutes & 47 seconds out of a total time of approximately 3½ hours that I was penned in before my arrest.

But of that 6 minutes 47 seconds, much is irrelevant.

For instance, clip 12 was taken AFTER my arrest, so by definition does not show any action by me that could have led to my arrest.

Also, each of the clips is preceded by Title frames announcing the subject of the following clip. Again, these do not depict me.

I am not shown in Clip 5 (a view of police lines.) How can this be construed as evidence against me?

Clip 11 repeats part of Clip 8 (the 'bloody helicopters' phrase).

So, my so-called wrongdoing lasts for considerably less than the 6 minutes 47 seconds of the total video, which is itself an almost negligible portion of the 3½ hours I was detained in the cordon.

Out of everything depicted in the video, what precisely is the illegal & arrestable thing I did?
