

14 June 2004

Mr Alistair Corbett  
Clerk to the Intelligence  
and Security Committee  
70 Whitehall  
London  
SW1A 2AS

Dear Corbett

Thank you for your letter dated 9 June 2004. I note the change in tone and that this time the name of the supposedly private spy firm which has been the subject of our correspondence is for some reason not mentioned in your letter.

Although you say that you do not enter into correspondence this is of course exactly what has happened. Thank you for advising me of the secretive way in which the Committee works. Can I just respectfully remind you that all of the members of the Committee and your good self ultimately work for the public at large and hopefully in the public interest?

You have provided information now which perhaps should have been supplied in your first letter. I recently received a communication from an authority investigating the Shell oil reserves scandal. They made it plain that I should not disclose their identity, so I have not done so. No such request was included in your letter.

I have been careful to repeat the basic formulation stated in your first letter i.e. that "the contents of your email have been noted and will be brought to the attention of the other Committee members. (The underlining is mine). I reasonably took this to be a genuine indication of interest. Since developments took place subsequent to the original correspondence (and since I was then unaware of the way the Committee deals with such matters), I decided to advise the Committee accordingly. I am sorry that you were disappointed by the way I accurately recounted what you had stated in your letter.

I am also disturbed at your accusation that I instigated the correspondence with the Committee. This is not a "fact" as you state. I had never heard of the Committee or (with all due respect to her) its Chairman Rt. Hon Ann Taylor MP. I sent emails to hundreds of MP's. One of them happened to be Ann Taylor MP. There is no indication on the relevant House of Commons email facility that she is the Chairman of the ISC. My email was sent to her as an MP. She could have replied on her House of Commons letter heading (or by email) as did many other of her parliamentary colleagues. Instead I received a letter from you on her behalf in her capacity as Chairman of the Committee. It was a pleasant surprise. How could I end up being convicted by you of instigating contact with the ISC when I did not even know that the ISC existed?

Thank you for directing me towards the Investigatory Powers Tribunal. I am a little puzzled, as you have indicated that this is the body established to investigate complaints about "any of the Intelligence and Security Agencies". However I have not made any complaints about any such agency unless you are trying to tell me that Hakluyt falls within that definition i.e. that it is a front for a Secret Intelligence Agency (MI6?) as many MP's apparently believe?

I would draw your attention to the most recent self-explanatory correspondence between myself and a founder of Hakluyt, another secretive organisation which claims that it does not discuss what it does, or does not do. It is published on the website [shell2004.com](http://shell2004.com) where your correspondence with me is also published. I believe in freedom of information unless any other basis of discussion/correspondence is requested.

The whole crux of this matter is that I expected a fair trial under British law not one which involved the use of underhand tactics, including sinister undercover agents. This is not speculation or loose talk; it is a matter of fact admitted by Shell.

It is now obvious some unethical major companies, such as Shell, use such tactics against financially weaker opponents, utilising private spy firms like Hakluyt, which Shell has admitting hiring. Indeed the two organisations have been intimately linked, with common directors and shareholders. The normal practice is to bring in undercover agents from overseas who carry out their "activities", then return to their own home base countries. You can work out for yourself why that policy (admitted by Hakluyt) is adopted.



Unfortunately I am met with a wall of silence whenever I attempt to find out precisely who was involved in intimidating our key witnesses, frightening my family, and ruining our lives. This was why I was encouraged by your initial response. An official body had at long last expressed some degree of interest. Now I am once again faced with the usual intrigue and secrecy.

Some 60 years ago I was involved in fighting the Japanese in Burma. My comrades and I (there are not many left) were fighting for freedom from tyranny and oppression. Today the evil oppressors seem to be certain unethical multinationals, none of whom are constrained under any particular national legal jurisdiction and have more power (and resources) than many individual Countries. They are capable of exercising that power ruthlessly, sometimes in conjunction with corrupt governments as in Nigeria, or in collusion with friendly intelligence agencies or their offspring.

You may have read over the weekend the various news reports about Shell's horrific record in Nigeria. No doubt this will not prevent senior current discredited managers/directors of Shell Transport receiving titles as per their unscrupulous predecessors, Sir Mark Moody Stuart and Sir Philip Watts, the recently disgraced and sacked Group Chairman. Both are directly implicated in Shell's past activities in Nigeria. (Bloomberg report 10 June 04: Shell itself 'Feeds' Nigeria "violence" - paragraph headed: "A Step to the Top").

I hope my comments have at least cleared up any misunderstandings.

Yours sincerely

Alfred Donovan