

# A.L.F. ON TRIAL

**THE STAR** BOY, WHAT A SWELL PARTY THAT WAS, BILL

18p..

The Star's night of stars - See Centre Pages

**ANIMAL LIB THUGS CAGED** 38 years for reign of terror

**3 WAY BINGO**

FULL STORY - PAGE 2

CAPITALISM  
UNDER ATTACK  
IN THE 1980'S

"Many different types of activity (public education, boycotts etc) have an important part to play in the struggle for animal liberation, but there is no doubt that there needs to be a massive increase in direct action if animal persecution is ever to be brought to an end. This means that many more animal rights campaigners need to be prepared to risk imprisonment. Going to prison in order to stop the imprisonment of animals may seem a peculiar concept, but then, their prisons are so much worse than ours..."

Ronnie Lee  
Armley Prison  
Leeds  
England  
November 10th 1986



History Is The Gospel According To  
The Authorities... So Here's A Slice Of:

## OUR-STORY

## PROLOGUE

Sheffield, February 5th 1987. Deputy High Court Judge Sir Frederic Lawton has just sentenced ten Animal Liberation Front activists to a total of 38 years in prison. The people convicted have been taken from the courtroom to the cells below, and it's all over bar a few minor quibbles and the judge thanking the Prosecution for being so efficient in their handling of an unusually large amount of evidence and thanking the Defence for not being too objectionable.

The minor quibble amounts to Ronnie Lee's barrister requesting of the judge that his client be able to recover certain documents from the police evidence. The judge relents to allow that certain scrapbooks of press cuttings relating to A.L.F. activity may be returned to Lee, but that a documented history of the A.L.F., diaries and details of subscriptions to the A.L.F. supporters group be destroyed along with all the other evidence. The judge, as he calmly wipes the A.L.F.'s side of the story from the history books as it were, says that Lee won't have any use for them where he is going.

February 6th 1987. The papers are full of it, for this is yet another political show trial cooked up by the Authorities to break the back of the A.L.F. once and for all; and if we hadn't looked any further than the day's headlines then we might well have believed that to be the case.

# ANIMAL BLITZ FANATICS GET 38 YEARS

A MEMBER of a gang of animal rights extremists was jailed for 10 years yesterday.

Ronald Lee, 35, smiled as the judge described him as a fanatic and a dangerous criminal.

He said: "That's all I've got to say. I'll be in a jail for the rest of my life."

**STAR REPORTER**  
Heard, Sheffield, described the 'terror' campaign as 'mad' and 'hooligan'.



The Star's inside story... February 1986  
**VIDEO AD**

*Judge Sir Frederic Lawton said the accused had mounted "a campaign of terror", and the prison sentences should act as a deterrent to other fanatics thinking of carrying out criminal acts in the name of animal liberation.*

(BBC Radio 4 News, 5.2.87.)

Needful to say, in this the Authorities have failed miserably, but not without a vengeance on the people they have sent to prison.

The Authorities have failed because they made, and always will make, the mistake of thinking that by imprisoning those who they single out as the A.L.F.'s 'leader', 'lieutenants', 'agents', and "common foot soldiers", that the movement will collapse; and that the heavy jail sentences will deter others from persisting with or taking up direct action. We know that the Authorities are wrong because they do not, and cannot, understand that we fight back not because of orders from above or from blind subservience to material gain, but because of a love of life and a desire for freedom which comes from within ourselves. Having written it down in black and white the Authorities will still not be able to comprehend it because their power structures and corrupted minds are devoid of that spark inside.

In an interview with *The Observer* on the eve of jumping bail and absconding, Roger Yates, convicted of conspiracy to incite criminal damage and cause criminal damage, attempted to justify the ALF's terror campaign against department stores such as Selfridges and Debenhams.

'It's a threat but it's not terrorism,' he said. 'The campaign is effective because it strikes at the heart of animal exploitation.'

'If people have got no hearts to break then you can always break them through their profits,' continued Yates, who gave no indication of his intention to break his £10,000 bail bond and flee in the closing stages of the trial in Sheffield.

They've Got The Courts, The Cops And

## THE MEDIA

We've Got Each Other And Not Much Time

In a court of law the Prosecution always state their case first, which means that in political trials such as this one, the subsequent newspaper headlines come straight from the prosecuting police barrister's mouth.

Animal front attackers used firebombs and acid on stores, says QC

By Ian Smith, Northern Correspondent  
Animal Liberation Front says: "What that means is... (unreadable) ... department stores and others... (unreadable) ... and had 'strategic' value."

ALF ran 13-month campaign of economic sabotage, court told  
Front 'bombed fur stores'

In this case that mouth belonged to Mr David Bently QC, and his opening remarks were carefully calculated to help destroy the public sympathy which the A.L.F. often attracts.

*"In an orgy of destruction", he said, "several butchers' shops, a fishing tackle shop, a university laboratory and even a travel agent shop selling tickets for a circus were attacked by groups of masked men and women carrying hammers, crossbows and acid."*

(BBC Radio News, 12.1.87.)



And of course, the "orgy of destruction" bit was re-iterated as part of the small print at the end of the trial, which filled out the headlines emanating this time from the Judge's mouth.

Animal activists gaoled  
for 'year of terror'

But before, during and after the trial we heard nothing in the press about the case for the defence, and the reason for that is that the evidence of people who happen to care enough about life to get off their knees to take action to protect life, does not sell papers; and besides, it would contravene editorial policy.



The Star's inside story... February 1986

*'There's only one thing that I'd believe that I read in the British newspapers, and that's the date.'*

(Margaret Devine, sister of Mickey Devine, Irish prisoner who died on hunger strike).

The Seventy-Six Year Old Bloke Who Dodders In With A Walking Stick And A Wig On, Who Everyone Has To Stand Up For...

## ... THE JUDGE

Deputy High Court Judge Sir Frederic Lawton - a one time member of Oswald Moseley's British Union of Fascists - was brought out of retirement especially to handle this case. Throughout the trial he took great delight in doing the Prosecution's job better than the Prosecution did. For example, when evidence was being heard relating to the liberation of animals (i.e. the activities for which the A.L.F. enjoys most public support) the Judge allowed matters to proceed as normal, yet when evidence was being heard relating to criminal damage, the Judge seemed to suffer from bouts of deafness; which meant that this evidence was repeated two or three times in court. This subtle technique was aimed specifically at the jury, and as we know from the outcome of the trial it had some success in driving home to the jury the "subversive - must be stamped out" approach of Judge Lawton's bias, which became personified more and more every time he threw in casual remarks about "terrorists" regarding the people in the dock.

In court the judge is The Man. He commands respect. Such is the structure of Authority and such are Authority's rules that he called the

shots throughout the trial, and in the end it was he who decided it's outcome.

He has addresses at: 2, HARCOURT BUILDINGS, TEMPLE, LONDON, EC4Y 9DB (Tel 01 353 3720), and at MORDRYG, STOPTIDE, ROCK, nr WADEBRIDGE, CORNWALL. (Tel TREBETHERICK 3375).

At The Mercy Of Someone Else's

## RULES

The rules were made up a long long time ago, and they only get changed to keep pace with the ingenuity and creativeness of people fighting back; but because the legal system is so deliberately complicated as to make it over the heads of us all, except for the trained authorities on the subject, the defendants were trapped and had little choice but to put their lives - in fact, *large chunks of their lives* as it turned out for some in this case - in the hands of paid experts: That is, the solicitors who communicate between the defendants and the barristers; and the barristers who communicate between the solicitors and the Judge, and who also get to wear their fair share of wigs.

The system works thus: that before, during and after the trial, the Defence barristers (one for each defendant), the Prosecution barrister and the Judge, all get together behind closed doors to talk shop.

For example before the trial they decide when it would be a good idea to hold the trial, and also they discuss ways of making it "easier" for everyone concerned. The Judge pulled his first fast one as early as December 12th 1986 at the committal proceedings by over-ruling the Defence's objections and setting the trial for January 12th 1987. You see the judge is obliged to talk to the Defence and the Prosecution but he is not obliged to listen to them. What this in fact meant was that the Prosecution were ready to prosecute a full three months earlier than had previously been suggested, and thus by moving the date of the trial forward at such short notice, many of the Defence barristers had already got other work booked for January and February; which meant that the defendants had to find themselves new barristers for the trial and had less than a month to prepare their cases with them.

The method of making it "easier for everyone" is called "plea bargaining", and what happens is this: For example, the Prosecution say to the Defence, "if your client pleads guilty to count one, then we'll drop the charges of count two". Alternatively the Defence barristers might say to the Prosecution "my client will plead guilty to one thing if you drop the other"; Meanwhile the Judge says that those defendants pleading guilty at the start of the trial will have up to a third of their sentence knocked off from what they would receive if they went through the whole rigmarole of the trial only to be found guilty at the end of it. All these machinations make it very difficult for the defendants to have a clear view of what is actually



going on and puts them under considerable pressure to plead guilty. In this case the Authorities were so determined to nail the A.L.F. that from the word go everything was geared to making life for the defendants as difficult as possible; and coupled with the fact that the police had amassed and fabricated "a roomful of evidence", the Defence had very little bargaining power.

## THE CHARGES:

### Conspiracy To Conspire And Other Changes In The Rules

They took part in a nationwide conspiracy to burn, smash and destroy department stores, butcher's shops and research laboratories.

THE OBSERVER.

**Count One:** Conspiracy to commit arson.

**Count Two:** Conspiracy to commit criminal damage.

**Count Three:** Conspiracy to incite others to commit criminal damage.

**Count Four:** Conspiracy to steal a pack of hunting hounds.

"Conspiracy" means people getting together to talk about and/or actually resist Authority... and Authority being what it is does not take kindly to being attacked, because it exposes the heartless, murdering, lying criminals who exercise that authority.

The rules are changed in two ways:

1. By government, who spend their time making up new laws in Parliament to keep us in our places.
2. By Judges setting precedents in court.

And it was with Count Three that the rules were changed by this case, because previous to Ronnie Lee and Roger Yates being found guilty of inciting others to commit criminal damage, the Authorities had never made it stick with anyone else. In his summing-up immediately prior to sentencing Ronnie Lee, Judge Lawton cited A.L.F. Supporter's Group Newsletter No. 15, and specifically the phrase "Go out and burn!", as the damning evidence; that because Lee supposedly wrote that phrase, then he was criminally responsible for the actions of those who had gone out and burned.

The judge told him: "I am satisfied that between the beginning of February 1985 and the middle of March 1986, persons acting under the name of the Animal Liberation Front throughout all parts of the United Kingdom were carrying on a campaign of terror against businesses and activities of which they disapproved.

"I am satisfied that you were responsible for a great deal of that activity. It is clear that you are a fanatic and it may be that some of your ideals are worthwhile ones, but you have no right to use terror to get your own way and persuade the public to accept your points of view."

YORKSHIRE POST

THE OBSERVER.



Lee: 'The General.'



Ringleader Lee ... a fanatic, said judge

THE GUARDIAN



Ronald Lee — fanatic behind campaign

Again, this is where Authority falls down because it cannot conceive of the idea of people taking their lives into their own hands, by taking responsibility for their own actions; and as such it will never extinguish the sparks of resistance in us, as it so desperately tries to do, time and time again. But... BIG BUT, it is both dangerous and worrying for those of us who get singled out and set up, and the fact that they've set the precedent in Sheffield could mean that large sections of the underground press could be liable to prosecution and imprisonment, simply for writing what they normally write. This is yet another example of the ever-increasing police state in which we all live. This is what they tell us only happens in the Soviet Union; but it is happening *here and now*.

You Can't Tell

## THE TRUTH

In A Courtroom

Basically what happens in court is that everybody tells lies...

**THE PROSECUTION TELL LIES.** With the odds stacked in their favour, they have cardboard box after cardboard box full of them for every ounce of hard evidence they produce. It's all piled up down one side of the court-room, and most of it stays there in its boxes as a monument for the jury to see throughout the trial of how meticulous the police have been, and of how evil the defendants must be.

