

I also have a copy of your earlier internal email to Jeroen van Der Veer and Malcolm Brinded concerning me and my comments in relation to Sir Mark Moody-Stuart. It provides additional evidence that far from being “*unmoved*”, Shell actually has a standing reaction plan which is activated whenever I contact any outside party regarding Shell. This is a fact which you have subsequently confirmed.

Returning to your email of 14th November 2005, as you may recall, you also commented on the “*activities*” of your “*enquiry agent*”, who used deception, a false identity and faked documents on Shell’s behalf in his uncover spying mission against us during the course of the “SMART” litigation.

At the time of the police investigation into the undercover activities against us, including witness intimidation in the run up to the SMART High Court Trial, Shell management failed to disclose its close association with a leading UK private investigation firm, Hakluyt. Shell subsequently admitted that Hakluyt had engaged in subversion, deception and sabotage against Shell’s perceived NGO enemies including Greenpeace and the Body Shop. On checking with Companies House, we discovered that knighted Shell directors were also directors and major shareholders in Hakluyt, which many Members of Parliament believe to be the commercial arm of the British Secret Service. This connection, like Shell’s connection with the Nazi party in Germany a long time ago, is information unknown to the general public.

We were entitled to expect a fair trial in respect of the SMART litigation. What we got was a travesty of justice with a Judge – Mr Justice Laddie - connected to the son of the Group Chairman of Shell, Sir Mark Moody-Stuart. Sir Hugh Laddie QC failed to disclose that connection even though the Moody-Stuart family name was brought up several times during the trial. The Judge was handed a copy of the bizarre handwritten letter that I received from Lady Judy Moody-Stuart, the Quaker wife of Sir Mark.

Mr Justice Laddie displayed not the slightest interest in the undercover activities, nor in the burglary carried out at the home of our key witness (when documents relating to the trial were tampered with). As you are aware, the Judge has refused to answer the questions that I raised about his inexplicable behaviour during the trial. By coincidence or otherwise, Mr Justice Laddie resigned in controversial circumstances after I wrote to the Lord Chancellor on this matter. His judgement and integrity have subsequently been questioned by the news media.

Sir Hugh now works, as you are aware, for a consultancy firm which has Shell as a client. Last month Sir Hugh had a role in a project in which you acted as joint chairman, he also had a connection with Lord Oxburgh at the time when his lordship was chairman of Shell Transport. It sure is a small world for some.

Although we did not lose the SMART case, despite the many obstacles placed in the path of justice, it was not resolved on fair terms. The compromise settlement was agreed under duress and, in my case, without the benefit of independent legal advice. The independent solicitor had in fact been directly involved in the litigation and had even negotiated with you, Mr Wiseman, in relation to a previous settlement with us. For a variety of reasons it was, from my perspective, a complete stitch-up which cost me and my family our homes as well as my independence. Naturally, I remain aggrieved.

The question which arises is whether it possible for ordinary citizens, small businesses and former Shell employees (such as Dr Huong) to obtain a fair hearing when faced with a gigantic multinational which wields so much power and influence, in our case even over national government (Shell had our legal aid cut off) and with the judiciary?

My only current option is to resort to lawful protest activities under the international human rights laws which Shell purports to support: for some unknown reason that fundamental freedom is being denied to Dr Huong.

Yours sincerely
Alfred Donovan