



Closing Report – Operation Redrail 2

PROTECTIVE MARKING	Restricted	FOIA EXEMPTION	Partial
SUITABLE FOR PUBLICATION SCHEME	No	DATE CREATED	15th February 2019
IOPC REFERENCE	DPA	CRIS REFERENCE	DPA
TITLE AND VERSION	Closing Report for Op Redrail 2 (Op Winter Key Professional Standards Team Investigation)		
MODE OF INVESTIGATION	Managed		
INVESTIGATION TYPE	Managed		
APPOINTED INVESTIGATOR <small>REG 24 POLICE (COMPLAINTS AND MISCONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012</small>	Detective Inspector Maggie SAMUELS		
CASE OFFICER	Civilian Investigator Christopher LEMON		
IOPC OFFICE AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR	Gareth MORGAN		
HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS This document must be handled in accordance with the protective security marking shown at the bottom of the document and should not be disseminated to outside agencies/partners without the consent of the authorising officer & or Director DPS. This FOIA table must not be detached from this Document			

Introduction

1. On 8th January 2018, the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) became the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC). I have referred to this body as the IOPC within this report.
2. Operation (Op) Redrail 2 has made use of documents and statements from other investigations which are relevant. Where documentation from those other investigations is included in this report the information relevant to Redrail 2 has been highlighted.
3. For the purpose of this report any mention of Lord HENNIKER refers to the Lord HENNIKER who died in 2004.
4. Information was passed to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) in May 2015 by a third party that a retired social worker from Worcestershire Children’s Services named Peter MCKELVIE had concerns about an MPS investigation, Op Clarence. Mr. MCKELVIE felt that the investigation had not been conducted properly due to the interference of prominent individuals.



5. An investigation had already been conducted by Op Fairbank led by a Detective Inspector (DI) ROYAN which reviewed Op Clarence in 2012/13. Op Fairbank was the MPS umbrella inquiry into historical child abuse claims involving politicians and other public figures. It began in 2012 as a scoping exercise to establish if there was any evidence to support formal investigations and as a result a number of criminal investigations commenced. Op Fairbank was later subsumed into Op Winter Key.
6. Op Fairbank began an investigation following Mr. MCKELVIE raising his concerns about a paedophile ring based at Westminster with Tom WATSON MP and Tom WATSON MP then writing to the MPS Commissioner Bernard HOGAN-HOWE. In his closing report¹ DI ROYAN states *'As a result of these comments and a subsequent letter sent by Mr. WATSON to the MPS a review of the investigation (Op Clarence) conducted by the MPS into the activities of Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER was undertaken'*. Mr. MCKELVIE was interviewed by Op Fairbank². DI ROYAN also provided a statement³ concerning his investigation (Thomas WATSON MP enquiry). The investigation was closed with no prosecutions.
7. Following further concerns raised by Mr. MCKELVIE about Op Clarence, Op Winter Key was tasked to investigate and a crime report (CRIS DPA)⁴ was created. Op Winter Key made use of statements taken by Op Fairbank which are directly relevant to Op Redrail 2.
8. Op Clarence was conducted by the paedophile unit (PU) based at New Scotland Yard (NSY) which at that time was part of the Obscene Publications Squad (OPS). This operation was concerned with the activities of men consisting mainly of public school teachers, doctors, clergyman and a leading social worker named Peter RIGHTON. The closing report on Op Clarence dated 18th April 1998 states *'All are or appear to be homosexual and have a sexual preference for males under the age of 16'*. Op Clarence commenced in 1988 and ended in April 1998. This was a natural conclusion to Op Clarence and throughout the ten years it was active it resulted in 12 convictions at court, 4 cautions, seizure of indecent material and valuable intelligence regarding the activities of paedophiles.
9. In particular Mr. MCKELVIE felt there was a lack of police investigation by Op Clarence or as he states *'I have been asked if I have any complaints regarding Op Clarence. I do not have any complaints, however, as previously mentioned in my statement I do have a number of questions regarding the initial investigation and links that I believe were not pursued rigorously enough'*. The links Mr. MCKELVIE were concerned about were between Peter RIGHTON (a convicted paedophile now deceased), Richard ALSTON (a convicted paedophile), Charles NAPIER (a convicted paedophile) and Lord HENNIKER (now deceased) who at the time lived at Thornham Hall, Thornham Magna in Suffolk. Lord HENNIKER has no record of any criminal convictions.
10. Two other investigations into the actions of members of the public by different forces were identified and reviewed by Op Winter Key as they are relevant to Redrail 2. In 2014 Warwickshire and West Mercia police major crime review team's conducted a review into Peter RIGHTON

¹ Appendix 1A – Closing report by DI Royan – Op Fairbank

² Appendix 1B – Interview with Mr. MCKELVIE – Op Fairbank

³ Appendix 1C – Statement from DI Royan – Op Fairbank

⁴ Appendix 1D – CRIS DPA



and his associates and documentation seized from Peter RIGHTON's address⁵ following the execution of a search warrant at his home in 1992. They also produced a linked report titled Op Halfway⁶. According to police reports these reviews were conducted following 'revelations to the media by a former Child Protection Manager of the Worcestershire Children's Services, Peter MCKELVIE'. This review was conducted after Mr. MCKELVIE had contacted Tom WATSON MP raising the issue that, as he termed it, *'known links between paedophiles and Government were not being investigated by police'*.

11. Other Ops which have links to Redrail 2 include Op Millpond which was an investigations by Suffolk Constabulary into allegations of child sexual abuse apparently committed on Lord HENNIKER's Thornham Hall estate in Suffolk in 2015. During this Op, a report on the allegations⁷ and a final review⁸ were produced and have been reviewed by Op Redrail 2. Lord HENNIKER was not named as a suspect in Op Millpond but Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER were. The allegations were made by one person.
12. Ops Fairbank and Millpond and the Warwickshire and West Mercia major crime review team's reports did not result in any prosecutions or any disciplinary actions due to lack of evidence.
13. Due to the nature and number of concerns raised by Mr. MCKELVIE, this investigation has been split into nine separate areas. They are shown as C1 – C9 and begin at para 18. The numbers in brackets indicate where the concern is investigated within this report.

Paul MCKELVIE's statements x 3

14. Mr. MCKELVIE was spoken to by Op Winter Key and he provided two statements on 11 March 2016. One (S1)⁹ consisting of two pages. In S1 MR. MCKELVIE is discussing the investigation conducted by Op Fairbank and raises concerns about the involvement of [WM-F14] [WM-F14] MP with [DPA] Charles NAPIER. Mr. MCKELVIE states 'he ([WM-F14] [WM-F14] MP) should have been interviewed by police during the 1990's over his failure to report [Charles Napier's] ongoing contact with children'.
15. S2¹⁰ consisting of six pages refers in part to Redrail 2 and the relevant part has been highlighted in the appendix. In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE raises several concerns. Firstly that the MPS failed to investigate all or any connections between Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON (who died in 2007), Richard ALSTON and Charles NAPIER. Mr. MCKELVIE believes Lord HENNIKER assisted Charles NAPIER to obtain employment as a teacher overseas when he was prohibited from doing so and continued to sexually abuse children. He had concerns that Lord HENNIKER provided a 'safe refuge' to Peter RIGHTON when he (Peter RIGHTON) was 'being hounded by the press' following his arrest for importing child pornography. Mr. MCKELVIE was also concerned that Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were being protected

⁵ Appendix 1E – Paedophile associations & documentation seized re Peter RIGHTON – West Mercia Police

⁶ Appendix 1F – Op Halfway – West Mercia Police

⁷ Appendix 1G – Thornham Magna Allegations report Op Millpond - Suffolk Police

⁸ Appendix 1H – Final Review Op Millpond - Suffolk Police

⁹ Appendix 1I - MG11 Mr. MCKELVIE's first – S1

¹⁰ Appendix 1J – MG11 Mr. MCKELVIE's second – S2



by their 'links' with the establishment. Mr. MCKELVIE was also concerned that Lord HENNIKER had been running the Islington/Suffolk Project which involved children in care from Islington Social Services spending supervised breaks on Lord HENNIKER's estate. Mr. MCKELVIE stated the project was running '*at the exact same time Islington Social Services were being investigated over the infiltration of every one of it's 12 children's homes by a paedophile network*'. Mr. MCKELVIE has no direct evidence that Lord HENNIKER, Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were involved in child abuse on Lord HENNIKER's estate or at the Islington children's homes but believes the links should have been investigated. Mr. MCKELVIE also stated that when he raised his concerns over the paedophile network in Islington to Detective Superintendent (Det Supt) Mike HAMES who was in charge of the MPS Obscene Publications Squad (OPS) he had agreed with him. However Det Supt HAMES notified Mr. MCKELVIE by phone in mid 1993 that the matter would not be taken any further. Mr. MCKELVIE remembers him saying '*it's been taken over from above*'. Mr. MCKELVIE makes no allegations against Supt HAMES but is concerned that Peter RIGHTON, Richard ALSTON, Charles NAPIER and Lord HENNIKER were being protected because of their connections. Although Mr. MCKELVIE makes no specific allegations against the MPS or other police area he raises questions about Op Clarence he would like answered.

16. Mr. MCKELVIE also provided a third statement S₃¹¹ consisting of two pages on 10 March 2017. In S₃ Mr. MCKELVIE repeats his concerns and gives further details of persons who could provide corroboration and mentions contact with 'Liz DAVIES' who was also raising concerns about child sexual abuse in Islington children homes. Mr. MCKELVIE stated that the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) used to meet in Islington, Peter RIGHTON lived in Islington in the 1970's. Although he had no direct evidence Mr. MCKELVIE believed the paedophile network had been in Islington and states '*The network I believe was there as again joining the dots proved to me there was a paedophile network in Islington. HENNIKER was involved in Islington through the Islington/Suffolk project*'. Mr. MCKELVIE also stated '*I mentioned there was sufficient evidence to charge RIGHTON, NAPIER and ALSTON with child abuse, the evidence was found in the raid on RIGHTON's [property]. The four were very well connected with the establishment. I was concerned they were being protected*'.
17. Mr. MCKELVIE suspects that Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER, Richard ALSTON and Lord HENNIKER were connected for reasons of child abuse. He does not provide direct evidence but believes there to be enough circumstantial evidence that would require police to conduct an investigation.

Background for C₁

18. **C₁**. (Detailed at paras 40-51) Mr. MCKELVIE's first concern focuses on the Islington/Suffolk project. It is known that Lord HENNIKER allowed Islington council to use some of the land on his Thornham Hall estate in Suffolk from 1976. The council decided to use the land for what it called the Islington/Suffolk project. The project allowed Islington council to take children, who were in council care, to Suffolk for short holidays involving supervised outdoor activities. It is known the project became a charitable organisation and ran until 2002. Records show that in early 1995 Islington Social Services were investigated via a conduct of enquiry into the

¹¹ Appendix 1K – MG11 Mr. MCKELVIE's third – S3



management of child care in Islington called the 'White Report', following suspicions that Islington Council had allowed paedophiles to infiltrate their children's homes to carry out child sexual abuse. The 'White Report' is further discussed in para 94.

19. Although the involvement of paedophiles in Islington care homes was exposed by the Evening Standard newspaper in October 1992 (further discussed at para 96), a report by the Islington Gazette, published 28th September 2017 of a meeting between the leader of Islington Council, Richard WATTS and members of the 'Islington Survivors Network and Supporters Group' quoted Councillor WATTS as admitting children in Islington care were subjected to terrible physical and mental abuse from the 1970s to the 1990s.
20. Mr. MCKELVIE believes Lord HENNIKER ran the Islington/Suffolk project for almost 30 years and this would involve access to vulnerable children during the time it was alleged there was a network of paedophiles operating within the Islington care home system. Mr. MCKELVIE suspects Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER, Richard ALSTON and Lord HENNIKER could have been involved in child abuse together. Mr. MCKELVIE states in S2 that *'I have no direct evidence that Lord HENNIKER is/was involved in face-lifting/abusing children. However my concern was that the links between Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON, Richard ALSTON and Lord HENNIKER were never properly investigated as to whether there were more coincidences or something more sinister'*. He also stated *'I was notified of Peter RIGHTON staying with Lord HENNIKER (on Lord HENNIKER's estate at the same time as the Islington/Suffolk project was continuing) by Suffolk Social Services because Peter RIGHTON should not be in the presence of children. Lord HENNIKER had an estate in Suffolk where children from deprived backgrounds from London Borough of Islington would attend'*. In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE also states *'My concern also centered on the fact that Lord HENNIKER ran the scheme for almost 30 years called the Islington/Suffolk Project and at the exact same time Islington Social Services were being investigated over the infiltration of every one of its 12 children's homes by a paedophile network, this is mentioned by Ian White who was director of social services for Oxfordshire in the 'White Report'. I have not been approached by any victims that stayed at Lord HENNIKER's address. I do not have any evidence that Lord HENNIKER abused or facilitated abuse of children at Islington, Lambeth or his home address in Suffolk'* Mr. MCKELVIE also stated that *'the Islington Paedophile network was exposed in 1992 but was found to be running since the 1970's'*.
21. In S3 Mr. MCKELVIE also mentioned contact with a Liz Davies, he states *'I was contacted by Liz DAVIES end of 1992 beginning of 1993. She was asking if any of my investigation(s) were relevant to Islington. I believed so as Paedophile Exchange met in Islington, Peter RIGHTON had been living there in the 70's. The network (paedophile) I believe was there, as again joining the dots, proved to me there was a paedophile network in Islington. Lord HENNIKER was involved in Islington through the Islington/Suffolk project'*.
22. Dr. Liz DAVIES (an academic of child protection at London Metropolitan University) was a social worker for Islington council between 1986 and 1992. She was one of the whistleblowers for the child sexual abuse taking place within the Islington child care system during the 80s and 90s. Islington Council contacted Dr. Liz DAVIES on behalf of Op Winter Key describing her as a co-ordinator of the Islington Survivors Network (ISN). The ISN web site describes itself as *'Survivors and Whistleblowers seeking justice and healing for Islington victims of organised and*



institutional abuse'. It was Op Winter Key's intention to meet with Dr. Liz DAVIES in the hope she could assist with this investigation.

23. Mr. MCKELVIE believes the police should have investigated these connections and their involvement with the Islington/Suffolk project but they did not and that the four men were protected from investigation by their contacts within the UK establishment.

Background C2

24. **C2.** (Detailed at paras 52-63). In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE says he raised concerns over his suspicions regarding a possible paedophile network involving Lord HENNIKER, Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON to a Detective Superintendent (Det Supt) Mike HAMES who at the time was in charge of the MPS obscene publications squad (OPS) and Op Clarence which was run within OPS through a Paedophile Unit (PU). Mr. HAMES retired in 1994. Mr. MCKELVIE states in S2 *'I raised my concerns with Det Supt Mike HAMES and he agreed with me. However he notified me by telephone in mid 1993 that the matter would not be taken any further because 'it's been taken over from above' or words to that effect. He did not expand on that comment and I think that he was deliberately vague with me. He did not specify if senior police officers or politicians were involved'*. This conversation was said to have taken place sometime after a police raid on Peter RIGHTON's address in 1992. Mr. MCKELVIE believed OPS should have been investigating this network under the supervision of Mr. HAMES.
25. In S3 Mr. MCKELVIE also states *'There was a meeting with a Detective Chief Superintendent John MCCAMMONT (head of Criminal Investigation Department (CID) for West Mercia Police) who I believe is dead now (This investigation has confirmed that Mr. MCCAMMONT is still alive), Director of Social Services David TOMBS and Detective Supt HAMES from the MPS Obscene Publications Squad. Mr. HAMES was tasked with carrying on with Op Clarence through his unit. There was another detective present Terry SHUTT (Terry SHUTT was a detective with West Mercia Police). Mr. HAMES accepted this as it was a recommendation of the meeting. This was sometime in 1993. Not long after I had a phone call from HAMES who told me Op Clarence had been taken over from above'*.
26. Mr. MCKELVIE states that he was very angry about HAMES' subsequent failure to carry on with the investigation. In S2 he states *'I was so angry about it that I went to my Director of Social Services, David TOMBS who then liaised with Det Supt McCAMMONT of West Mercia Police who shared Mr. TOMBS anger'*. Mr. MCKELVIE states in S2 *'As a result of the decision not to proceed with this essential investigation, Mr. TOMBS arranged for me to work with the BBC Inside Story documentary team to get the story out by alternative means. This decision was fully supported by the senior officers in West Mercia. This documentary was called The Secret Life of the Paedophile'*. The documentary reported on both Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER.
27. Mr. MCKELVIE also states in S2 *'I am not directly alleging that Mike HAMES pulled any investigation into the connection between Peter RIGHTON, Richard ALSTON, Charles NAPIER and Lord HENNIKER due to corruption. I am however asking the question, were Peter RIGHTON, Richard ALSTON, Charles NAPIER and Lord HENNIKER protected because of their connections'*.



Background C3

28. **C3.** (Detailed at paras 65-70). Mr. MCKELVIE states that when Lord HENNIKER was head of the British Council he used his influence to get Charles NAPIER a teaching post abroad when he (Charles NAPIER) was on "List 99" (this was a register of persons barred from working with children by the Department of Education and Skills). In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE states *'I believe he (Lord HENNIKER) assisted Charles NAPIER obtaining employment overseas. When Charles NAPIER was first placed on the 'List 99' whereby you're not allowed to teach due to child sex offences, he was able to be employed by the British Council overseas. Initially Sweden and secondly Cairo. I know he was employed abroad because in Peter RIGHTON's house we discovered letters from Charles NAPIER to Peter RIGHTON detailing the abuse of children out overseas'*.

Background C4

29. **C4.** (Detailed at paras 71-73). Within the CRIS report (App - 1D) "details of investigation" (dets) section (pages 28 & 29) Mr. MCKELVIE also suggests that Charles NAPIER made use of or was allowed to use the diplomatic bag while working abroad in Cairo to send or receive child pornography and this was also not investigated.

Background C5

30. **C5.** (Detailed at paras 74-76). In S1 Mr. MCKELVIE raises concerns about **WM-F14** MP and his involvement with **Sensitive/Irrelevant** Charles NAPIER and possible criminal activity. Mr. MCKELVIE's concern is that because **WM-F14** MP **Sensitive/Irrelevant** **Sensitive/Irrelevant** he must have known that Charles NAPIER was abusing children. In S1 Mr. MCKELVIE states that when he was informed by DI ROYAN (Op Fairbank) that there was no evidence linking **WM-F14** to child abuse following Op Fairbank's investigation, he states *'I believe the question still stands that even if **WM-F14** was not directly involved in the abuse of children, he should have been interviewed by police during the 1990's over his failure to report **Charles Napier's** ongoing contact with children which he (**WM-F14**) was alleged to have witnessed on more than one occasion'. My full account has been previously recorded by officers from Op Fairbank (investigation conducted by DI ROYAN and discussed in his closing report App 1A). I also believe that if **WM-F14** had knowledge of child abuse that he had a duty to report it to the authorities. I acknowledge that there is no evidence of criminality with regards to **WM-F14**'*.

Background C6

31. **C6.** (Detailed at paras 77-82) Mr. MCKELVIE had concerns that Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were being protected because of their links/connections with prominent people. In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE states *'I suspect but have no direct evidence that Charles NAPIER, Richard ALSTON and Peter RIGHTON's links afforded them a degree of protection'. Those links being: Charles NAPIER's **Sensitive/Irrelevant** (**WM-F14** MP) was **Sensitive/Irrelevant** **Sensitive/Irrelevant** to Margaret THATCHER, Richard ALSTON's **DPA** **Name Redacted** was the High Commissioner to **Sensitive/Irrelevant**; Peter RIGHTON was a government advisor on child care'. Therefore there was no police investigation against them because they were protected by those*



links.' In S3 Mr. MCKELVIE states 'the four (Lord HENNIKER, Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON) were very well connected with the establishment, I was concerned they were being protected. I did not have the evidence to say so but wanted questions asked'.

Background C7

32. **C7.** (Detailed at paras 83-89). Mr. MCKELVIE states there was further evidence that Lord HENNIKER was linked to Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON. Mr MCKELVIE stated that Peter RIGHTON was awaiting trial for the importation of child pornography from Holland in 1992 and he was of interest to the press. Mr. MCKELVIE believed that Lord HENNIKER offered Peter RIGHTON and in consequence Richard ALSTON (Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were then living together) a flat on his estate in Suffolk as a safe refuge to hide from the press.
33. The Islington/Suffolk project was continuing at this time with vulnerable children on the estate. In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE states *'I believe Lord HENNIKER was linked to them because he employed Charles NAPIER as a teacher and offered a safe refuge to Peter RIGHTON when he was on bail awaiting trial in the early 1990's. I am aware that Peter RIGHTON was being hounded by the press at the time. I was notified of Peter RIGHTON staying with Lord HENNIKER by Suffolk Social Services because Peter RIGHTON should not have been in the presence of children'*.

Background C8

34. **C8.** (Detailed at paras 90-93). In S2 Mr. MCKELVIE says *'I have been asked if I have any complaints regarding Operation Clarence. I do not have any complaints, however as previously mentioned in my statement I do have a number of questions regarding the initial investigation and links that I believe were not pursued by police rigorously enough. There may be genuine reasons for that but I have never had the answers. Operation Clarence was a joint investigation between West Mercia and the Metropolitan Police. I do not remember it being called Operation Clarence'*.

Background C9

35. **C9.** (Detailed at paras 94-103). In the IOPC terms of reference (page 20 of this report) they instruct the investigator to *'investigate and obtain evidence if any available regarding allegations that a MPS police officer failed to investigate allegations against an Islington paedophile network that was exposed in the early 1990s as involving prominent persons such as Lord HENNIKER, Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON'*.

Special Requirements (for Public Complaints)

36. A special requirement assessment is only applicable when investigating a public complaint where there is an indication that a person subject to the complaint has committed a criminal offence, or behaved in a manner that would justify the bringing of disciplinary proceedings. This matter does not involve a public complaint and special requirements do not apply. This inquiry has been dealt with as an investigation into a 'conduct matter'.



Subjects of the Investigation

37. Any police officer, staff or relevant contractor whose conduct is under investigation is categorised as a subject of the investigation. A notice of investigation must be served on all subjects, informing them of the allegations against them and the severity of that allegation (Misconduct or Gross Misconduct).
38. Additionally, where the subject's behavior constitutes a criminal offence, the criminal matter will be dealt with before the conduct and the subject will be classified and treated as a suspect. The subject would subsequently be arrested and/or interviewed as appropriate.
39. No subjects have thus far been identified in this investigation.

Details of the Investigation C1

40. **C1 (para 18)**. Documentary evidence and potential witnesses who can remember the Islington/Suffolk project have been hard to come by due to the passage of time. Local newspaper reports give some background information. The Islington Gazette dated Friday January 12 1979¹² reports that land belonging to Thornham (although the paper called it Thornton) Magna Estate in Suffolk (owned by Lord HENNIKER although the paper did not mention him by name) was being used for camping holidays for young people. A leaflet produced in 1988 by the Islington/Suffolk project also assists in providing background information¹³ around what the project can offer, the fact it was being run, '*in essence as a voluntary organisation*', contact details for an address in London with no mention of Lord HENNIKER or his estate in a management capacity.
41. As mentioned in para 20 Mr. MCKELVIE stated the project was run by Lord HENNIKER and this would involve access to vulnerable children. A statement from the widow of Lord HENNIKER (**Name Redacted**)¹⁴ (taken by Op Millpond) states '*John (Lord HENNIKER) became acquainted with a gentleman called John Rea Price. John Rea Price was at the time head of the Islington Social Services and my John offered the use of our land adjacent to the Thornham estate for use by social services. The intention was for children being cared for within Islington social care to come and visit at Thornham Magna for camping and to see the countryside. A camp site was duly created and John obtained a grant to pay for toilets and other facilities on the site. When the camp site was operating we really didn't have contact with the children who used to visit it and stay*'.
42. A statement from Rebecca Elizabeth DOWNE¹⁵ (taken by Op Millpond) who worked on the estate at that time states '*Lord John HENNIKER welcomed many people and groups up to the estate and these all operated from there. For example the Islington Camp site was a separate entity and attended by children in social service care from North London*'.

¹² Appendix 1L - Islington Gazette on 12/01/79

¹³ Appendix 1M – Leaflet from Islington/Suffolk project

¹⁴ Appendix 1N – MG11 of **Name Redacted** from Op Millpond – Suffolk Police

¹⁵ Appendix 1O – MG11 Rebecca Elizabeth Downe from Op Millpond – Suffolk Police



-
43. A statement taken by Op Millpond from Lesley Lady Lord HENNIKER – MAJOR (who was previously married to Lord HENNIKER’s son) on 19th May 2015 states *‘The Islington Campsite was again an entirely separate operation and we had nothing to do with it. It had totally different staff running it’*.
44. Islington council was contacted to see if they had any records which could show if Lord HENNIKER had any direct contact or involvement with the children using his estate or if any concerns had ever been raised.
45. Islington Children’s Services replied informing Winter Key that they had found a letter¹⁶ referring to the Evening Standard article¹⁷ which is discussed in C7. The letter is a briefing for various councilors about the presence of Peter RIGHTON on Lord HENNIKER’s estate near to the Islington/Suffolk project and outlines the general supervision of the children and action taken following the Evening Standard news report. There was no mention of any involvement by Lord HENNIKER or that he had been spoken to. Islington Children’s Services were also able to produce a copy of a file note dated January 1996¹⁸ documenting information from Suffolk Constabulary showed Peter RIGHTON was living some 15 miles from the Lord HENNIKER Estate, other than this there was no other documentation found.
46. On 11 August 2017 Winter Key received an e-mail from Islington Child Safeguarding Services¹⁹ advising that an ex-Suffolk police constable named Richard CARD had e-mailed the leader of Islington council and had made various allegations. Mr. Card mentioned a possible connection between Lord HENNIKER and Peter RIGHTON who had moved onto Lord HENNIKER’s estate. On 4 October 2017 Mr. CARD was visited by Op Winter Key and a statement was obtained²⁰. Mr. CARD could provide no corroboration or evidence which would assist this investigation. It is noted that Mr. CARD has a history of pursuing certain allegations which involved Norfolk Constabulary and its Chief Constable. This includes the involvement of Lord HENNIKER but is not connected to Op Redrail 2.
47. Islington Children’s Services had also suggested Op Winter Key speak to Dr. Liz DAVIES (referred to at para 21-22) who was understood to have a great deal of knowledge surrounding both the child care home abuse scandal and the Islington/Suffolk project.
48. On 12 October 2017 Dr. Liz Davies was spoken to but declined to make a statement. She stated to Op Winter Key she had no real evidence that would assist Redrail 2 but did provide some open source newspaper cuttings and documents she had obtained regarding the Islington/Suffolk project²¹.
49. Dr. Liz Davis also stated she was unaware of any child sexual abuse allegations being made against Lord HENNIKER or the Islington/Suffolk project. She was unable to assist regarding any

¹⁶ Appendix 1P – Letter found by Islington Children’s Services re Islington/Suffolk project

¹⁷ Appendix 1Q - Evening Standard report – Op Fairbank

¹⁸ Appendix 1R - File note from Suffolk Police via Islington Children’s Service

¹⁹ Appendix 1S - E-mail from Islington Council Safeguarding re Mr. Card

²⁰ Appendix 1T - MG11 from Richard Card

²¹ Appendix 1U – Cuttings and documents supplied by Dr. Liz Davies – 1U (A-R)



possible connection between Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON, Richard ALSTON and Charles NAPIER and possible lack of police action.

50. The Islington/Suffolk project ran from 1976 to 2002, some 26 years. This investigation has not been made aware of any allegations concerning the project other than those investigated by Suffolk Police in Op Millpond (see App 1G & 1H).
51. Op Millpond investigated allegations which were made by one individual. The allegations were made against Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER amongst others. There was no mention of Richard ALSTON or Lord HENNIKER. It was alleged that the informant had visited Peter RIGHTON's flat on the estate and had been told by Peter RIGHTON to perform oral sex on Charles NAPIER, when he refused Peter RIGHTON physically assaulted him. He also stated he was anally raped by Peter RIGHTON. He went on to state he had been trafficked by Peter RIGHTON to a series of parties held at two different address and raped by high profile males. Op Millpond found no evidence or corroboration to support the complainant and were able to prove Charles NAPIER was not in the country at the time he was alleged to have committed the offence, nor was Peter RIGHTON living on the estate at this time. On completion of their investigation Suffolk police decided to take no further action due to lack of evidence.

Details of Investigation C2

52. **C2 (para 24).** Mr. HAMES, who was a Det Supt head of the OPS and who retired in 1994, had been interviewed²² by DI ROYAN from Op Fairbank regarding Op Clarence on 22nd January 2013. In reply to DI ROYAN's questions Mr. HAMES stated *'The team were not hindered from senior officers for any political reasons'*. Mr. HAMES also stated *'He was confident that his team would not be subject to pressure from outside the team to subvert the course of any given enquiry'*.
53. On 19 April 2017 Mr. HAMES was interviewed by Op Winter Key where he provided a statement²³. He stated *'A large investigation started with West Mercia Police and we assisted where we could. I did send two of my officers to help out after the raid. I have been asked if we had any control or primacy over this investigation and we did not, it was West Mercia's investigation. There was a great deal of intelligence which came out of this raid and many names we were looking at already. Peter MCKELVIE should have known West Mercia had primacy (over Peter RIGHTON investigation). I can say I never informed Mr. MCKELVIE that the investigation was going nowhere or had been taken over by people from above. Any such decisions would have been made by West Mercia Police'*. Mr. HAMES was also asked if he had heard of Lord HENNIKER. He stated *'I have, I don't recall where the information came from but I was made aware that RIGHTON and ALSTON were living on his estate in Suffolk. Apart from that I have not heard his name mentioned before'*.
54. On 21 April 2017 Mr. McCammont, retired head of CID of West Mercia Police, was contacted by telephone. He did not wish to make a statement nor to be visited by Op Winter Key investigators but agreed to talk on the phone and to reply to questions regarding issues raised by Mr.

²² Appendix 1V – Interview between ex Det Supt HAMES and DI Royan – Op Fairbank

²³ Appendix 1W – MG11 of ex Det Supt HAMES



MCKELVIE. Mr. McCammont requested an e-mail be sent to him detailing the issues and that he would then reply by e-mail. Op Winter Key sent their questions on 21 April 2017²⁴.

55. Mr. McCammont decided to reply by letter²⁵. He stated *'I have never had a meeting with Peter MCKELVIE and the Director of Social Services who at the time was David TOMBS. Indeed I have never had an operational conversation with David TOMBS of any sort'*.
56. Mr. MCCAMONT mentions he viewed seized material from a search of Peter RIGHTON's address shown to him by Mr. MCKELVIE and Mr. SHUTT, a retired DC from West Mercia (this is the material which convinced Mr. MCKELVIE that Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were involved in an international paedophile network). In his letter he states *'I believe I received a phone call from either Peter MCKELVIE or Terry SHUTT telling me that they had seized a suitcase containing a large quantity of documents and correspondence which they believed may be significant intelligence about a potential paedophile ring associate to Peter WRIGHTON [sic Peter RIGHTON]. I attended Evesham police station where I met Peter MCKELVIE and Terry SHUTT. I am sure that this took place in the first few days of WRIGHTON's [sic] arrest. Only we three were present. Together we looked through the documents although I cannot now be sure that I personally looked at every single document. We were each satisfied that there was no evidence relevant to the Evesham charge against WRIGHTON [sic]. We also agreed that there was no evidence of any other criminal offence anywhere else. There was no information about potential or past victims a (sic) child abuse. It seemed to me that the bulk of the documents were the sort of things that people stuff in a suitcase in case they might be needed later but there was also a number of names, addresses and phone numbers belonging to persons who may be associates of WRIGHTON [sic] or persons whom he met at conferences and in the course of his work. I considered it to be unremarkable. Peter and Terry both suggested that the names may be 'intelligence' of WRIGHTON's [sic] criminal associates connected with child sexual abuse or pornography. I could not disagree with them but they were guessing. It was a collection of contacts who may have been paedophiles or only have been professional or social associates. I also concluded that it was not intelligence but information which required development. Both Peter (MCKELVIE) and Terry (SHUTT) were keen to investigate further to develop the intelligence'*.
57. Mr. SHUTT was contacted by Op Winter Key and was interviewed on Thursday 25 January 2018 where he provided a witness statement²⁶. Mr. SHUTT confirmed he was a friend of Mr. MCKELVIE and recalled the investigation into Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER and Richard ALSTON following the raid on Peter RIGHTON's home address. He also recalled a connection between Lord HENNIKER and Peter RIGHTON. Mr. SHUTT states *'During 1992 we received a phone call from Customs who were going to carry out a raid on a premises occupied by Peter RIGHTON (at the time he was a Government advisor on child care)'. He later says 'Our investigations ended and we handed over the correspondence we had, including the diary, to the paedophile desk at New Scotland Yard'. I really thought they could follow this up and there would be prosecutions. However nothing happened or seemed to happen'. He also states he had 'a sense that there had been a block on the investigation'. Mr. SHUTT later states 'I have been asked if I can recall a meeting between Mr. McCammont, Mr. TOMBS, Peter MCKELVIE and possibly myself*

²⁴ Appendix 1X - Email sent to ex Det Ch Supt McCammont

²⁵ Appendix 1Y - Ex Det Ch Supt McCammont's reply by letter

²⁶ Appendix 1Z - MG11 from ex DC Shutt



where the investigation into Peter RIGHTON was discussed and the Met's seeming reluctance to progress the investigation. I don't recall any such conversation. I have been asked if I recall Peter MCKELVIE telling me that he had had a discussion with Supt. Mike HAMES and HAMES told him the investigation was going nowhere, it had been taken over. While I don't recall that conversation, there was always some doubt about what was actually happening to the investigation. It was never satisfactorily explained'.

58. At a meeting of the Evesham Social Services on 22 May 1992 (Warwickshire and West Mercia police report App - 1E on page 21/22) the minutes show Detective Chief Inspector SHORE from West Mercia police informing the meeting that West Mercia police would not be pursuing the investigation into Peter RIGHTON any further and were referring all their information and seized documents to the OPS MPS. The meeting recorded that there was no proof at that stage that Peter RIGHTON was connected to an international network of paedophiles. The minutes state that Mr. MCKELVIE had sifted through all of the evidence and he was of the firm opinion that Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON were involved in the commission of offences against boys.
59. In August 2014 West Mercia Police carried out a review into the investigation into 'paedophile associates of Peter RIGHTON and movement/location of exhibits' (App - 1E). The review states that when Peter RIGHTON was questioned following his arrest for importing child pornography, which he admitted, he also admitted two offences of indecently assaulting young boys (App 1E pages 20,21,22) around 1957 at a specified school where he was employed as a teacher. The report states *'This had already been considered by CPS (Crown Prosecution Service) as we know they had decided to caution RIGHTON for the assaults at [the] school'. In hindsight a caution may seem inappropriate one should bear in mind that the Police investigation into this matter failed to establish any complaints from the victims or school staff and further more the two boys (now men) known to have been sexually assaulted by RIGHTON were known to have continued a sexual liaison with him after leaving the school'*. The decision was made by CPS for West Mercia and it is not known how widely this decision to caution Peter RIGHTON was disseminated or if Mr. MCKELVIE was aware of it.
60. The Warwickshire and West Mercia police report (see App - 1E) states Mr. TOMBS was interviewed and remarked on his failure to convince the Department of Health to undertake an investigation into paedophile connections within their establishment. This led to Mr. TOMBS being asked by Op Winter Key about his comments and why the investigation did not take place.
61. On 28 September 2017 Op Winter Key spoke to Mr. TOMBS and a statement²⁷ was taken from him. Mr. TOMBS states *'I have been asked if Peter (Mr. MCKELVIE) ever raised any concerns about the police and their actions with reference to the Metropolitan Police. I can only recall that Peter mentioned a Metropolitan Police Superintendent called HAMES who he was annoyed with. They had worked well together previously but he had written a book and Peter was annoyed with the content'*. Mr. TOMBS also stated *'I have been asked about a Detective Chief Superintendent MCCAMMONT who was with West Mercia Police. I don't recall that name and my dealings with West Mercia were normally with the Chief Constable David BLACKIE'*. Mr. TOMBS also stated *'I*

²⁷ Appendix 1AA – MG11 by Mr. Tombs



have been asked about a meeting I had with the Department of Health Inspectorate just before I retired in 1994. I recall I had a meeting where I raised my concerns about paedophile connections with the establishment. I felt it was important there should be an investigation with other government departments. I was told 'David you are wasting your time. There are too many of them over there' which I took to be the civil service or parliament'.

62. Mr. TOMBS also states 'I have no reason to raise any issues regarding the decisions or investigations made by the Metropolitan Police'.
63. Mr. TOMBS declined to give the name of this individual at the Department of Health Inspectorate until he had spoken to him to see if he agreed to the release of his details to Op Winter Key. Mr. TOMBS later contacted Op Winter Key and informed them that the person he had the conversation with was Lord LAMING and that he had spoken to Lord LAMING who had informed him he would be happy to discuss the matter with the police.
64. On 23 October 2017 OP Winter Key attended the House of Lords and obtained a statement from Lord LAMING²⁸. Lord LAMING states '*I can say I do not recall the actual meeting. Had I thought anything like this I would not have expressed myself in that way. This is inflammatory comment and not the (way) I would have replied. Had he made that comment I would have immediately seen the serious nature of this and I would have ensured the conversation was properly minuted'.* Although very keen to assist, Lord LAMING was unable to help any further.

Details of Investigation C₃

65. **C₃ (para 28)**. Op Winter Key made contact with the British Council requesting that they check their historical records with regard to Charles NAPIER's employment with them. They replied via email²⁹ and the focus of the enquiry was on Charles NAPIER's employment in Sweden between September 1977 and June 1979 and Egypt between September 1992 and March 1994.
66. On 24 January 2018 Op Winter Key had a telephone conversation with Evelyn Kerrigan LEBLOCK who is deputy head of child protection for the British Council. She agreed to conduct enquiries to see if there was any trace of Charles NAPIER working for them in Sweden and Egypt.
67. The British Council were finally able to confirm by e-mail that as far as they possibly could ascertain, Charles NAPIER had not been employed by them and had not worked for them in Sweden in a teaching capacity which involved teaching under 18s (see App - 1AC).
68. The British Council did confirm that Charles NAPIER was given a teaching role by them and was employed to work in Cairo between Sept 1992 and March 1994. Their records provide no evidence of any involvement or any mention of Lord HENNIKER assisting Charles NAPIER to gain employment abroad as a teacher in Cairo. Lord HENNIKER was not amongst the 'referees' and he was not mentioned in any correspondence concerning Charles NAPIER in any of the documentation they hold.

²⁸ Appendix 1AB - MG11 Lord Laming

²⁹ Appendix 1AC - Email from British Council (4 pages)



69. This reply from the British Council (App - 1AC) raises the possibility that Charles NAPIER may have worked for the Folk University in Gavle, Sweden between 1977-1979. From open source³⁰ it is noted that although he became Director General of the British Council in 1968 Lord HENNIKER resigned in 1972. Charles NAPIER began working in Sweden in September 1977 where he remained until June 1979. This would place his time in Sweden some five years after Lord HENNIKER left the British Council and Operation Winter Key was informed by the British Council that Charles NAPIER did not work for them in Sweden.
70. It is also noted that the British Council's reply (App - 1AC) states that some original documentation was passed over to the police in 1995 as there are hand written notes on some copies stating '*Original handed to Graham PASSINGHAM of International + Organised Crime Branch. Tel No. 071 230 2920. 8/2/95 DMP*'. Although it cannot be confirmed that this is the same PASSINGHAM that worked on the OPS at that time and completed the report on Op Clarence involving Charles NAPIER and Peter RIGHTON it is possible they are one of the same. Graham PASSINGHAM is now deceased.

Details of Investigation C4

71. **C4 (para 29)**. The British Council was asked to clarify if Charles NAPIER had use of the diplomatic bag while he was working with them in Cairo. They replied via e-mail³¹ saying that in Cairo around 1990 the British Council moved towards digital communication but the diplomatic bag was still in use. Looking at their own records the Council acknowledge that Charles NAPIER did have access to the diplomatic bag. However when allegations of indecent assault against a young boy were made against Charles NAPIER his permission to use the bag was withdrawn at the same time he was suspended from his teaching role. He later returned to the UK and was arrested as a result of this allegation.
72. The British Council also confirmed that they have no records to show how and when Charles NAPIER used the diplomatic bag or who he may have been corresponding with. There were no records of addresses the correspondence was sent to or who may have received them. No other records exist and no further information or avenues of enquiry are available.
73. In his record of interview former DC FLANAGAN³², who worked on Op Clarence, stated '*the importation of indecent images of children into the UK by means of use of a diplomatic bag had not been an investigative line of enquiry within 'Op Clarence'*'. As far as DC FLANAGAN was concerned Op Clarence had never been asked to investigate Charles NAPIER's use of the diplomatic bag. This is corroborated by Mr. HAMES in his own interview by DI ROYAN (see App 1V).

³⁰ Appendix 1AD - Open source re Lord HENNIKER

³¹ Appendix 1AE – Reply from British Council (copied from 1AB) two pages

³² Appendix 1AF - General note re meeting ex DC Flannagan Op Clarence - DI Royan Op Fairbank



Details of Investigation C5 (linked to C6)

74. C5 (para 30) DI ROYAN, in his closing report (App - 1B) for the Tom WATSON MP enquiry dated 28 January 2013 and in his statement (App - 1C) dated 13 February 2013, mentions meetings with a victim/witness of Charles NAPIER. This person confirms that to their knowledge WM-F14 MP was never part of Charles NAPIER's paedophile group and that Charles NAPIER tried to keep that part of his life separate from WM-F14 MP. In his statement DI ROYAN states the witness was asked about their knowledge around relatives of Charles NAPIER. The witness stated *'he had met Charles NAPIER's DPA on a couple of occasions and seen what he believed to be his DPA on one occasion. This was a chance meeting that appeared to horrify Charles NAPIER. (The witness explained) he and other boys would often go to Charles NAPIER's house in DPA and that the house had a large open aspect window at the front. It was on one occasion when he turned up unannounced that Charles NAPIER was being visited by WM-F14 Sensitive/Irrelevant Charles NAPIER made great efforts to get (witness) to leave immediately. (The witness) made it clear that Charles NAPIER would not allow the young boys who he had an interest in meeting WM-F14 (The witness) had an awareness that WM-F14 was a politician but was not aware of his name'. (The witness) explained that Charles NAPIER did have a group of male adult friends who (the witness) considered were all of a similar (paedophile) nature to Charles NAPIER, this group did not include his DPA (The witness) was able to list their names which did not include WM-F14*

75. WM-F14 MP was interviewed by Op Fairbank³³. No statement was taken from him as at the time he did not wish to make one. WM-F14 MP stated *'He had received a considerable amount of unwanted media attention since Charles (NAPIER) was arrested. He is concerned that if he provides a statement which is read out in court, then the media will continue to harangue him. He said he will prefer not to sign one at this stage but if it becomes necessary, then he will reconsider'*. Op Fairbank asked questions regarding correspondence between WM-F14 MP and Charles NAPIER and other letters he took in for Charles Napier Sensitive/Irrelevant

Sensitive/Irrelevant

Sensitive/Irrelevant WM-F14 pointed out that he was a teenager during this time and Sensitive/Irrelevant. He stated he *'merely received the letters (from or intended for Charles NAPIER) and took a lot of his (Charles NAPIER's) innuendo at face value and thought nothing of it'*.

76. Mr. FLANNAGAN, a retired DC who was working in PU/OPS on Op Clarence at this time, was interviewed (App - 1AE) by DI ROYAN and stated that WM-F14 was not a line of enquiry of (or) a subject of enquiry at the time there was no tangible evidence of his involvement in offending'.

³³ Appendix 1AG – Notes of interview: WM-F14 MP



Details of Investigation C6 (linked to C5)

77. C6 (para 31). [Sensitive/Irrelevant] [WM-F14] MP was [Sensitive/Irrelevant] to the Prime Minister Margaret THATCHER from [Sensitive/Irrelevant] [Sensitive/Irrelevant] Richard ALSTON's [DPA] [Name Redacted] served as British Ambassador to [DPA] and was High Commissioner to [DPA] Peter RIGHTON was a government advisor on child care before his arrest in 1992.
78. As per C5 which is linked to C6, [WM-F14] MP has been interviewed as a witness (App - 1AF) by Op Fairbank in the previous review of Op Clarence (see para 75). He was unable to provide any corroboration for Mr. COLLINS allegations.
79. Mr. FLANNAGAN, who was working on Op Clarence at this time, was interviewed by DI ROYAN and recalled there was never any evidence against [WM-F14] MP. He states [WM-F14] *was not a line of enquiry of (or) a subject of enquiry, at the time there was no tangible evidence of his involvement in offending* (para 75).
80. Without any evidence, Op Winter Key decided that nothing would be gained by re-interviewing [WM-F14] MP. In S1 (App - 1I) Mr. MCKELVIE stated *I acknowledge there is no evidence of criminality with regards to [WM-F14]*. There is no evidence, line of enquiry or corroboration which may be considered to suggest that [WM-F14] attempted to protect [Sensitive/Irrelevant] Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON or Richard ALSTON.
81. Similarly there has been no evidence or corroborating provided by Mr. MCKELVIE regarding his concern that [Name Redacted] was protecting his [DPA] Richard ALSTON or those connected with him. Mr MCKELVIE states *I suspect but have no direct evidence that NAPIER, ALSTON and RIGHTON links afforded them a degree of protection*. There is no evidence, line of enquiry or corroboration which may be considered to suggest that [Name Redacted] (who is now aged [DPA] years) had tried to influence any decisions concerning possible criminal action toward [Charles Napier] and his associates other than Mr. MCKELVIE's concerns. It was decided not to approach [Name Redacted] without such evidence or corroboration.
82. It is acknowledged that Peter RIGHTON would have had many links and contacts with local government social services and other agencies but this was before his conviction for importation of child pornography. There is no evidence line of enquiry or corroboration which may be considered to suggest anyone attempted to protect him.

Details of Investigation C7

83. C7 (para 32). On 6 May 1993 the Evening Standard (see App 1Q) printed an article exposing Peter RIGHTON as a paedophile and that he was living on Lord HENNIKER's estate. At the time, records from the letting agent (see App 1AK & 1AL) show that Peter RIGHTON was renting a flat on the estate with Richard ALSTON. Documentation confirm that this was at the same time the Islington/Suffolk project was also using the grounds (see App 1P). Lord HENNIKER is quoted by the Evening Standard as stating *he did not know Peter RIGHTON and was not*



responsible for him living on the estate. *'The estate belongs to my son'*. The wife of Lord HENNIKER's son Mrs. Lesley HENNIKER-MAJOR is also quoted as stating *'Mr. Peter RIGHTON is a tenant. He came to us through an estate agent with impeccable references'* (see App 1Q).

84. Statements obtained through Op Millpond provide evidence that Lord HENNIKER had no dealings with renting properties on his estate. Lord HENNIKER's son confirms within his statement³⁴ that he was the person administering the letting and occupation of these premises at that time through a letting agent and not his father. He states *'Sometime in the early 1990s (I think around 1993 or very early in 1994) the Tower flat stable block was rented out by me to Peter RIGHTON and his adult partner Richard ALSTON'*. This is supported by his ex-wife in her statement³⁵. She states *'Regarding the tenants renting flats, this was done by my ex-husband. I do know Peter RIGHTON and another male moved in but I couldn't say when or how long they stayed for'*.

85. Regarding the media disclosure around Peter RIGHTON, Lord Mark HENNIKER (Lord HENNIKER's son) stated *'I was approached at my solicitor's office in Ipswich by a senior female member (whose name I no longer recall) of the permanent teaching staff from Thornham Field Centre Trust and that approach would have been sometime during the early spring of 1994 as I recall. She pointed out serious reservations that the Field Centre staff had over RIGHTON and ALSTON renting from me and thus being present on the estate at all allegedly on the ground of RIGHTON being a long term supporter and well publicised promoter of the legalisation of paedophilia in general'*. He also states *'She and her colleagues at the Field Centre were understandably concerned at the risk RIGHTON potentially posed to child visitors to the estate, and above all to the groups of schoolchildren regularly visiting their Red House Yards area courtesy of the Field Centre itself, and actually wanted me to evict them both. I remember explaining to her that this was extremely difficult and indeed would even be unlawful, given the absence of any serious proof in that regard and the fact that RIGHTON and ALSTON were then part way through a minimum term contractual tenancy with me and hadn't actually done anything wrong'*. He also states *'I thereupon visited both RIGHTON and ALSTON one evening at their home and give them a strict warning over their behavior on the estate'*.

86. On 21 May 1993 a local paper named 'Diss Express' ran a story on Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON being questioned by police regarding allegations against them by young men³⁶. The letting agent was contacted by Richard ALSTON and asked to speak to Hon. Mark HENNIKER-MAJOR (Lord HENNIKER's son) as opposed to Lord HENNIKER himself. There is no mention of any attempt by Richard ALSTON or Peter RIGHTON to contact Lord HENNIKER regarding this matter. The letting agent had left a note for Hon. Mark HENNIKER-MAJOR informing him of this and asked him to contact Richard ALSTON. He included a copy of the article with the request from Richard ALSTON to speak to Hon. Mark HENNIKER-MAJOR. These details were located in a file still held by the letting agent (see App 1A) which also contained the article apparently cut from the Diss Express on 21 May 1993.

³⁴ Appendix 1AH – MG11 Lord Henniker's son the current Lord Henniker - Op Millpond Suffolk Police

³⁵ Appendix 1AI – MG11 Lesley Lady Lord HENNIKER-Major - Op Millpond Suffolk Police

³⁶ Appendix 1AJ– Note from letting agents file re news report on Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON



87. Op Winter Key visited the agency still responsible for representing the HENNIKER estate on Friday 7 April 2017 and spoke to a senior partner there named Christopher PHILPOT. There was nobody remaining with the company that could recall this letting. PHILPOT supplied³⁷ a summary of the letting to Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON.
88. The letting agreement³⁸ for Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON showed that the agreement had been taken out by both of them and had no mention of or comments from Lord HENNIKER. There is nothing to support the view Lord HENNIKER was supporting their application or that it was his idea that they should do so. The timeline (see App 1AK) shows Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON renting the property from November 1992 until November 1994.
89. A written statement was taken from Richard ALSTON³⁹ on 7 May 2005 by Op Millpond. Richard ALSTON confirmed the dates he and Peter RIGHTON were renting Tower flat; this being between November 1992 and November 1994.

Details of Investigation C8

90. **C8 (para 34)**. Op Clarence relates to an MPS investigation into paedophilia. The operation began in 1988 and ended in April 1998. It was concerned with the activities of a group of men consisting mainly of public school teachers (including Richard ALSTON and Charles NAPIER), doctors, clergyman and a then leading social worker (Peter RIGHTON). Op Clarence involved liaison between several police areas and which resulted in several charges and convictions (Apps – 1AN, AO, AP).
91. The PU working within the OPS produced three documents referencing Op Clarence. Two by Graham PASSINGHAM (now deceased) the first being dated 18 April 1998⁴⁰ concerning the investigation into Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER during Op Clarence (see App 1N). The second was a report completed by analyst H. BURTON on 18th April 1998 and was a chronology of Op Clarence⁴¹ (see App 1AO). A third was dated 22 January 1999 and was a summary Op Clarence⁴² completed by DCI MCLACHLAN (see App 1AP).
92. These reports show Op Clarence may be considered to be a successful operation due to the number of convictions, seizure of indecent material and intelligence obtained. The convictions included Peter RIGHTON's following the raid on his address in 1992 led by the HMC&E, Name Redacted Name Redacted as charged by Gloucester Police in **DPA** but was acquitted at Crown Court and Charles NAPIER for indecent assault in 1995. Op Clarence lasted some ten years, with five of these years being subsequent to the date that Mr. MCKELVIE suggested Det Supt HAMES had told him the investigation would not be taken further because it had been allegedly taken over from above.

³⁷ Appendix 1AK – Summary of Letting dates for Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON

³⁸ Appendix 1AL – Part of letting agreement for Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON

³⁹ Appendix 1AM – MG11 from Richard ALSTON from Op Millpond

⁴⁰ Appendix 1AN - Report on Op Clarence – Op Fairbank

⁴¹ Appendix 1AO - Op Clarence chronology – Op Fairbank

⁴² Appendix 1AP - Op Clarence summary – Op Fairbank



93. It is also noted that a review of the material obtained in relation to the investigations that continued into Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER and Richard ALSTON the only mention of Lord HENNIKER is that of Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON renting a flat on his estate. Op Millpond where allegations were made against Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER when it was alleged they were living in a flat on Lord HENNIKER's estate. In the three reports on Op Clarence (see App 1AN, AO and AP) he was not mentioned. In his statement (see App 1W) Mr. HAMES states *'I have been asked if I have heard of Lord HENNIKER. I have, I don't recall where the information came from but I was made aware that RIGHTON and ALSTON were living on his estate in Suffolk. Apart from that I have not heard his name mentioned before'*. No reference was made to Lord HENNIKER in the reports produced by West Mercia Police (see App 1F & 1E), the intelligence searches conducted by Op Winter Key (see App 1AW). No mention of Lord HENNIKER or his estate was made in the 'White Report' (see App 1AQ). The Evening Standard made no allegations against Lord HENNIKER in its report concerning Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON. There is no evidence, line of enquiry or corroboration which may be considered to suggest that Lord HENNIKER was ever suspected of child abuse or involved in such offences with Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER or Richard ALSTON or that he could be a witness to such offences.

Details of Investigation C9

94. **C9 (para 35)**. In October 1992 the Evening Standard newspaper published a story exposing child sexual abuse in Islington care homes. They alleged staff had been abusing children in their care and this was being covered up by the council. The paper was assisted by two whistleblowers who worked for Islington Social Services, one of whom was Dr. Liz Davies.

95. Thirteen reports were commissioned from November 1989 to March 1995 to look into Islington child care (Appendix - 1AQ annex 4). Finally an in depth report was commissioned by Islington Council regarding the management of child care, which was called the White Report⁴³. This was published in May 1995. The White Report highlighted the need for changes within the local authority and collated the previous thirteen reports which had attempted to deal with the authority's practices. The report made ten recommendations none of which involved the MPS although their 'Terms of Reference' (ToR) made no mention of the enquiry looking at the conduct of the police and was focused on the conduct of Islington Council's staff. The ToR did state that *'Whether information indicates the possibility of criminal activity – if it does, the Inquiry must convey the information to the Police without delay'*. It also states that *'the allegations made by the Evening Standard have also been delivered to Scotland Yard'*.

96. The White Report focused on Islington Council and the allegations of child sexual abuse in its care homes. Attached to a report from DI O'MALLEY (see App 1AT) is a request by Islington Council, dated 16th August 1999, following a review of their files on the White Report for the MPS to review the same report and to consider whether there were grounds for a police enquiry⁴⁴. This was sent to a DI SHEPHARD who headed Islington Child Protection Team (CPT) at the time.

⁴³ Appendix 1AQ - White report (partially redacted) – Op Fairbank

⁴⁴ Appendix 1AR - Letter from Islington Council Social Services – Op Fairbank



97. The Chief Social Services Officer (Paul CURRAN) also wrote⁴⁵ to Det Supt AKERS who then held the child protection team (CPT) portfolio for the MPS. This was following a meeting between them and others regarding the possibility of a wider investigation into child abuse within Islington Social Services following publication of the White Report.

98. The request from the Head of Islington Social Services regarding further investigations was assessed by Det Supt Akers who decided that a major enquiry was not justified. Det Supt Akers stated in her reply on 11 November 1999 *'Further to our discussions about the above (Historical allegations of abuse in Islington Children's Homes) and issues raised as a consequence of the WHITE Report, I have given the matter careful, objective consideration. Police records have been searched as far as possible on the information contained in the report and existing files examined. In considering all the above information available at this time I have to conclude that there is insufficient tangible evidence on which to base an holistic enquiry on the scale that would be necessary in the circumstances.'*

Whilst accepting that much of the factual and anecdotal matter contained in the report has not been fully tested, any investigation would, of necessity, involve tactics that have recently failed to produce a satisfactory judicial outcome. (I refer to the Gisburn House enquiry, where methods used to obtain evidence, allied to the historical nature of the complaints, were deemed an abuse of process). There are marked similarities between the nature of the Gisburn House situation and other potential sites of enquiry that, on balance, tend to indicate poor odds of success in the courts, assuming there is sufficient relevant evidence in the first instance.

In light of the foregoing it is my considered view that to 'trawl' for evidence of offences that may have occurred in a historical context would be counter productive. Police will, of course, continue to investigate any allegations volunteered by individuals who are victims of child abuse, whether historical or contemporary in nature. In reaching this decision I have considered the position of Islington Social Services, the wider public interest, and the likely effect on potential victims of abuse. I would like to think that police have adopted a sustainable pragmatic approach to this matter and it is my hope that you are in agreement with this decision. If you have views to the contrary, or would like to discuss the implications further, please let me know and I will be pleased to hear from you.'

99. There also followed two reports on this subject, the first being by DI Shephard⁴⁶ (CPT) who was then reviewing the White report dated 5 April 2001. He identified some new possible suspects who had worked with Islington council. This did not include Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER or Richard ALSTON. He also stated *'The report (White Report) was not officially referred to police at the time of publication (May 1995) but has been made available subsequently. A holistic criminal investigation has, therefore, never taken place'*.

100. The second report,⁴⁷ dated 23 June 2003, is by DI O'MALLEY of the MPS Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD), who was also reviewing the White Report. Again he details possible suspects

⁴⁵ Appendix 1AS – Copy of letter from Chief Islington Social Services to Det Supt Akers

⁴⁶ Appendix 1AS - DI Shephard's report – Op Fairbank

⁴⁷ Appendix 1AT - DI O'Malley's report – Op Fairbank



but makes no mention of Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER or Richard ALSTON.

Within DI O'MALLEY's report there is also a mention of a copy of the WHITE Report being forwarded to OPS in 1995. He states '*The White Report was formulated in 1995 and at the time, a copy was forwarded to the MPS Paedophile Unit. I am not aware what use was made of the Report at that time, but it seems likely from Annex 5 to The White Report, that it was sent to or at least discussed with DCI James REYNOLDS and DI Robert MCLAUGHLIN, both since retired and a DS DRIVER. More recently however, in the summer of and autumn of 1999, there was a discussion between the MPS and the London Borough of Islington (LBI) on whether or not a police investigation into issues raised in the report, should ensue.*

101. The Op Winter Key intelligence unit was tasked to see if there was any known link between Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER and Richard ALSTON and the Islington child sex scandal. They replied via e-mail⁴⁸ and attached a 'restricted' intelligence report⁴⁹ which showed they had identified no trace of these individuals involved in the Islington scandal. The report identifies several suspects but none of the above are mentioned.

Referral to IOPC

102. A Crime report CRIS DPA (Appendix – 1K) was created and an operation name obtained.
103. The investigation was referred to the IOPC for a Mode of Investigation (MOI) decision to be made.
104. Terms of Reference were set by the (then) IPCC and it was determined that the investigation would be managed by the IPCC/IOPC.

Terms of Reference

1. To
 - a) Take initial investigative steps in order to identify and assess further avenues of enquiry.
 - b) Investigate and obtain evidence, if any is available, regarding the allegations that a MPS police officer failed to investigate allegations against an Islington paedophile network that was exposed in the early 1990s involving prominent persons such as Lord HENNIKER Charles NAPIER, Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON.

⁴⁸ Appendix 1AU – E-mail reply from Intel unit

⁴⁹ Appendix 1AV – Copy of Intel report marked 'Restricted'



2. In the event that such evidence is obtained, to identify those involved and whether there is any indication that any individual who was a serving police officer at the time:
 - a. Committed a criminal offence; or
 - b. Behaved in such a manner which would justify the bringing of criminal proceedings.

If so, to: (i) certify the investigations as subject to special requirements; (ii) treat any individual identified as a subject of the investigation accordingly; and (iii) if there is an indication of criminality, and if appropriate, make early contact with the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). On receipt of the final investigation report, the Commissioner shall determine whether the report should be sent to the DPP.

3. To identify whether any subject of the investigation, in the investigator's opinion, has a case to answer for misconduct or gross misconduct, or no case to answer.
4. To consider and report on whether there is organisational learning.

The commissioner previously responsible for oversight of this investigation was Jennifer Izekor. The commissioner approved these terms of reference on 1 August 2016.

The legislation that sets out what information needs to be included in an investigation report has changed. There is no longer a requirement for the investigator to give their opinion on whether any subject of the investigation has a case to answer for misconduct or gross misconduct or no case to answer within the report. Instead, the delegated decision maker will give their opinion on a separate opinion document. The decision maker for this investigation is Sarah-Louise Austin. At the end of the investigation the decision maker will decide whether or not the report should be submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and whether they agree with the appropriate authority's proposals in response to the report. During the investigation they may choose to delegate their role to another member of staff if appropriate.

Analysis of Evidence

105. The Decision Maker is invited to consider the following observations which are accompanied by supporting evidence.
106. Mr. MCKELVIE has stated that he does not have any evidence to support his concerns but that when all the facts are examined he felt there was sufficient cause for those concerns. He feels the police should have investigated but there was no police investigation.

Looking at each concern:

107. **C1.** Having viewed available documentation including statements there is no evidence obtained which may be considered to suggest that Lord HENNIKER had any supervision over the Islington/Suffolk project. As far as this investigation has been able to ascertain there has been only one allegation made of child sexual abuse committed on Lord HENNIKER's estate and this was not directly linked to the Islington/Suffolk project although Peter RIGHTON and Charles NAPIER were named as suspects. Lord HENNIKER and Richard ALSTON were not



named. The allegation was investigated (Op Millpond) and no further action taken due to a lack of evidence.

108. There is no information available which may be considered to corroborate Mr. MCKELVIE's concern that Lord HENNIKER, Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER and Richard ALSTON were abusing vulnerable children who attended the Islington/Suffolk project over a period of 30 years.
109. **C2.** Mr. MCKELVIE's claim that he was told by Det Supt HAMES that the investigation (Op Clarence) into Peter RIGHTON was going nowhere and had been taken over cannot be corroborated. The persons Mr. MCKELVIE has put forward as supporting his concerns, Mr. TOMBS, Mr. McCAMMONT, Mr. SHUTT, have not provided that corroboration. They do not recall Mr. MCKELVIE informing them that he had had that conversation with Det Supt HAMES. Mr. HAMES denies the conversation took place.
110. It has been shown that Op Clarence started in 1988 and finished in 1998. Mr. MCKELVIE believes Op Clarence was stopped in 1993 but it continued for a further 5 years. It was considered by the MPS to be a successful operation with persons being prosecuted and intelligence disseminated to many different police areas.
111. Op Clarence was an MPS operation and officers from the OPS dealing with Op Clarence received a request for assistance from West Mercia Police to assist with their enquiry into Peter RIGHTON. When West Mercia decided not to continue their investigation into Peter RIGHTON they passed all the documentation they had to OPS which assisted Op Clarence, including evidence obtained from the search of Peter RIGHTON's address, who continued their investigation.
112. **C3.** Lord HENNIKER was director general of the British Council from 1968 until 1972. Those remaining records that refer to Charles NAPIER's employment with the British Council that can be located have been checked. There is no reference to Lord HENNIKER assisting Charles NAPIER in obtaining a teaching post overseas. It is noted that Lord HENNIKER left the British Council in 1972 and Charles NAPIER began working in Sweden in 1977. There is a gap of 5 years between the two. Charles NAPIER started teaching in Egypt in 1992 which is twenty years after Lord HENNIKER left the British Council.
113. **C4.** The British Council confirm that Charles NAPIER had use of the diplomatic bag and it is possible he made have utilized this to send or receive indecent pictures of children or other documentation. No records remain to make enquiries of persons or addresses which may have been involved, neither is there any documentary evidence available to show this was ever referred to the police. It is noted that once it was identified that Charles NAPIER was a risk his authority to use the diplomatic bag was removed from him at the same time he was suspended from his teaching role.
114. **C5.** There is no evidence which may be considered to indicate WM-F14 MP knew about or assisted Charles Napier in committing criminal offences involving child sexual abuse. A witness who was interviewed stated the opposite; that Charles NAPIER kept his crimes from WM-F14



-
115. **C6.** There is no evidence which may be considered to indicate Peter RIGHTON, Charles NAPIER or Richard ALSTON were protected by prominent persons. All three have been convicted at one time or another of child sexual offences.
116. **C7.** There is no evidence which may be considered to indicate Lord HENNIKER did provide a flat for Peter RIGHTON, he had no involvement in him renting the property. Lord HENNIKER's son was responsible for the renting. Documentation obtained indicates that Peter RIGHTON and Richard ALSTON rented the property without Lord HENNIKER's assistance.
117. **C8.** This is linked with C2. Op Clarence was considered by the MPS to be a successful operation due to the number of convictions achieved. Op Clarence also provided intelligence/information for other police areas which assisted them in arrests and convictions. Op Clarence lasted from 1988 until 1999. No evidence has been obtained which may be considered to indicate that the operation was closed prematurely.
118. **C9.** There is no evidence found that may be considered to indicate an MPS officer has tried to cover up an investigation into child sexual abuse in Islington connected to the children's care homes. Although the MPS did decline to conduct a full investigation into the allegations presented by Islington Council, the reasons were documented in full and the Council was informed. No evidence has been obtained to indicate that this decision was for an improper or corrupt motive.
119. The WHITE Report did not find the police to be at fault with regard to the allegations of abuse they were investigating.

Organisational Learning

Processes have changed extensively in the intervening years and therefore no organisational learning is suggested.

Report completed by		
Name: C. Lemon	Signature:	Date: 15.02.2019