Dear Mr Wiseman

Thank you for your speedy response. You seem a little tetchy today.

I note the usual blanket denial. You state: "I have nothing to add to the responses previously given to you and your son on the allegations you make. The denials stand." If your denial had been specific rather than all embracing it would have carried more weight. You and your colleagues have made countless denials in the past before reversing course. You settled claims once described as being "bogus" and have made grovelling apologies, once in the form of a letter from a Shell Chairman. So please excuse me if I am not impressed with the latest denial.

Are you denying the written admission made by you in your letter dated 9 July 1998 (following the bout of undercover activity and threats) where you stated: "The activities of Mr Phillips have, of course, been admitted." Do you deny giving us the following assurance in the same letter: "Neither you, your family, nor any potential witness, has any cause for physical fear as a result of your prosecuting this case with
EMAIL APRIL 22, 2004

Dear Mr Wiseman

Thank you for your speedy response. You seem a little tetchy today.

I note the usual blanket denial. You state: "I have nothing to add to the responses previously given to you and your son on the allegations you make. The denials stand." If your denial had been specific rather than all embracing it would have carried more weight. You and your colleagues have made countless denials in the past before reversing course. You settled claims once described as being "bogus" and have made grovelling apologies, once in the form of a letter from a Shell Chairman. So please excuse me if I am not impressed with the latest denial.

Are you denying the written admission made by you in your letter dated 9 July 1998 (following the bout of undercover activity and threats) where you stated: "The activities of Mr Phillips have, of course, been admitted." Do you deny giving us the following assurance in the same letter: "Neither you, your family, nor any potential witness, has any cause for physical fear as a result of your prosecuting this case with all the vigour we have come to expect." If you lost your copy when moving offices (which seems to be a common theme both in the past with our litigation and in the current oil reserves debacle) I will happily supply a copy.

If you deny admitting that Shell's Statement of General Business Principles has no legal standing i.e. not worth the paper it is written on, I can also supply a copy of that letter (dated 5 June 1997). I hope I do not cause you too much embarrassment by quoting your claim of: "a code of behaviour by which we think we should be judged by the public at large and in this respect perhaps define higher standards than some other commercial organisation impose upon themselves."

This was the code of conduct pledging honesty, integrity and transparency in all of Shell's dealings: lofty ideals totally at odds with the record of flagrant lies, cover-up and dishonesty now facing unfortunate Shell shareholders who believed those false promises from senior Shell management.

I also note that you no longer wish to spend any more money using Kendall Freeman to front your response to my campaign for justice. I will therefore continue to write direct to you.
Given our association over the last decade, I had wondered whether despite the acrimony, you would have the good grace to wish me well on my 87th birthday today. I should have known better. It seems the age of chivalry is dead. Or perhaps you never bothered to read the information I sent to you?

Yours sincerely

Alfred Donovan

Chairman, Shell Shareholders Organisation

cc. All Royal Dutch Shell Group main board directors.