

From: "[REDACTED]"  
Date: 19 November 2012 12:04:04 GMT  
To: "vc@sussex.ac.uk" <vc@sussex.ac.uk>

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Attack on Mike Weatherley - complaint

Dear Mr Farthing

Please see the email below from [REDACTED] who was one of the people that got caught up in the attack on Mike Weatherley on Wednesday.

We look forward to your response.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 15 November 2012 01:46  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Pls can you forward to sussex uni

To whom it may concern,

I would like to register a formal complaint against your head of security, Roger.

Before yesterdays debate took place we were informed by students that "protesters" were seen with screwdrivers dismantling secured posters about the event and replacing them with offensive posters suggesting Mike is a Nazi.

These armed people were not dispersed or moved on and indeed were allowed to gather in large groups around and in the entrance to the hall of the debate. Nor were their IDs checked or these people who were apparently not students removed from campus. Indeed, there were only a few security on hand which only barely managed to contain the attempts to assault Mike which ultimately forced him to run off and me and his staff to assist security. These thugs have since bragged that they felt free to behave in this manner as there were no police or security.

This minimal security strategy allowed rocks and other "missiles" to be thrown at me, Mike and his staff, with a rock clearly striking mike on his back, a staffer getting a rock thrown at her neck and another

staffer having her arm crushed while trying to help secure mikes safety-all to chants calling to lynch Mike and Execute him.

After mike was evacuated from the secure room the staff, uni students and I were shockingly all told to walk to our vehicles by Roger and that the police wouldn't be needed as their presence would "incite" more criminal behaviour. Everyone was visibly shaken and in no state to drive and we had moments earlier been witness to the riot van driving Mike away being set upon by the mob of anarchists. Roger then insisted "I am not going to call the police I don't have time to organise that now". We instead called 999 several times ourselves and an hour after mike was taken we were finally rescued by two riot vans.

Perhaps the most damning revelation of all came at the police station where an officer indicated they had been actively discouraged from coming back onto campus by Roger who indicated to them that the situation was under control with the suggestion being made that Rogers concern was about attracting bad publicity to Sussex Uni with a police presence, rather than taking into consideration the safety concerns of me, Mikes staff and the university students who had organised the event. I understand it was these communications between Roger and the Sussex Police that led to the protracted decision to send two riot vans to rescue us.

This to me represents gross negligence in formulating a strategy of minimal security presence and steadfastly sticking to it, even when it was patently obvious that peoples LIVES were being threatened.

I want these exchanges between Roger and the police investigated and a report made on the findings.

Not only were we all guests of the university and there at their request, the meeting was forced by the university to be a publicly open one matched with a strategy of minimal policing when there were clearly concerns expressed that criminal activity was being planned and the police and university were given forewarning of this.

This strategy was flawed from the outset and justifications need to be given as to why the meeting was not restricted to students, why security was so poorly planned, and why the police were discouraged by the head of security from attending the scene.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]