



University College London

**Investigation into the UCLU Friends of Israel Society
event on 27th October 2016 (“the Event”)**

Professor Geraint Rees,
Dean of the UCL Faculty of Life Sciences

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

1. On the evening of 27th October 2016, the UCLU Friends of Israel Society conducted an event featuring an external speaker, Hen Mazzig (the “Event”). The Event was held to enable the external speaker and participants to discuss his experiences as an ex-commander in the Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories (COGAT) unit in the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) interfacing between the Israeli Government and Palestinian Authority. The event was intended to take place at 19:00 in a seminar room (Room G6 LT) in the Archaeology Department at UCL.
2. The Event was disrupted by a protest organised by a number of pro-Palestinian individuals and groups including some external to UCL. In consideration of the potential for disruption, UCL Security Services (“UCL Security”) changed the venue to a new room in 26 Bedford Way. However, protestors entered the building where the event was to take place and so it was considered necessary to change the venue for a second time to the Haldane Room and delay the start of the meeting. Protestors made their way to this new venue and conducted a protest in the North Cloisters and in the Quad outside the Haldane room.
3. A number of protestors continued to make sustained efforts to disrupt the Event verbally and physically. During the Event, a number of protestors forced entry to the Haldane Room through the windows opening onto the Quad. Police were called during the course of the Event both by UCL Security and by individuals attending the Event who believed the safety of the students present and the external speaker may be compromised. The police received at least one allegation of assault. Loudspeakers, loud shouting, chanting (including chants that could be interpreted as anti-Semitic) and banging on the windows of the venue continued to disrupt attempts to conduct the Event.
4. After some delay, the speaker delivered a short talk with discussion. Following the Event, the speaker was safely escorted off the premises by UCL Security. A number of protestors continued to loudly express their opinions as attendees left. Police powers to disperse protestors were not used and once the protestors had left, police and UCL Security departed the venue.
5. On 28th October, the day following the Event, UCL and UCLU issued a joint statement. The circumstances surrounding the Event received wide social media and media coverage.
6. In response to the incident UCL President and Provost, Professor Michael Arthur requested that I undertake an investigation into the incident. I have undertaken a detailed investigation and prepared this report for Professor Arthur to consider when determining whether any further action should be taken.

PURPOSE AND FOCUS OF THE INVESTIGATION

7. The purpose of the investigation is twofold. The first purpose is to establish the facts and obtain an accurate record of what occurred prior to, during and immediately following the Event and to understand the reasons why.
8. The second purpose of the Investigation is to make recommendations as to how, in future, UCL should
 - consider requests to hold potentially contentious events on campus

- plan for and administer such events
 - respond to large protests and to major public order incidents on or in the vicinity of campus all with a view to establishing and maintaining the right balance between freedom of speech and the right to protest whilst minimizing the prospect of public disorder on or around campus.
9. Where my investigation finds evidence of misconduct, behaviour contrary to UCL policies governing events held on campus, the academic regulations, and student and staff safety-related policies I will refer that evidence to the relevant officers within UCL for action.

PROCESS FOLLOWED BY THE INVESTIGATION

10. Evidence was collected from:-
- UCL's own records including (but not restricted to) emails, forms, advertisements, attendance lists, UCL Security logs and CCTV footage;
 - Publicly available sources including postings on social media, statements released to the press and press coverage of the lead up to the Event and of the Event itself and the associated public disorder;
 - Individuals whom the investigation team identified as having, or being likely to have relevant information (for example members of UCL staff) and
 - Individuals who responded to a Call for Evidence which was issued on 24th November 2016 with a deadline to respond of 9th December 2016.
11. Evidence collected from individuals was in the form of written statements and/or transcripts or recordings of face to face interviews. It was recognized that the investigation team was not able to compel all potential witnesses to come forward and provide evidence but it was hoped that those with relevant information and knowledge would volunteer to do so.
12. Except in the circumstances described in the sub-paragraphs a) to d) below, the evidence obtained is being held securely and confidentially following publication of the investigation findings for a period of not less than six (6) months thereafter. It is our intention that only the chair of the investigation (Professor Geraint Rees), the assistant to the inquiry (Dr. Edel Mahony) and legal counsel to the inquiry will have access to this secure evidence store during that time. UCL did not and does not, however, guarantee that evidence provided will be kept confidential in all circumstances. In particular the investigation team:-
- is required to and will pass prima facie evidence of misconduct by a registered student of UCL to the Registrar of UCL for action in accordance with the Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure in Respect of Students; and
 - is required to and will pass prima facie evidence of misconduct by any of UCL's staff (or staff of any third-party supplier) to that person's line manager and/or HR department for action;
 - may pass prima facie evidence of criminal activity to the Metropolitan Police for further investigation; and
 - may be required, by law, to disclose evidence and other information it holds to a court and/or to third parties.

13. The findings of the investigation are being published in this written report which will be made available to the public.
14. The investigation would like to record its thanks to all the individuals who contributed evidence to the investigation and thus assisted its work. In response to the call for written evidence, a total of nineteen formal submissions were received from individuals both inside and outside UCL; nine submissions were from attendees and eight from individuals taking part in the protest. Four individuals were subsequently interviewed in line with the process to clarify specific points. In addition, twenty-five videos and seventeen still images were submitted and the investigation identified a further 113 pages of social media evidence plus relevant CCTV footage from UCL.

LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL CONSIDERATIONS

15. The Education Act (No 2) 1986 (the “Act”) imposes a positive and proactive legal duty on universities (Section 43) to promote and protect freedom of speech on campus, and states that the only constraints on the duty to secure freedom of speech are those imposed by the law. It is therefore for the law, not for institutions, to set limitations. Section 43 states that “persons concerned in the government of any establishment... shall take such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured for members, students and employees of the establishment and for visiting speakers”.
16. Section 43 of the Act also imposes specific obligations, including a duty on university governing bodies to issue and keep updated a code of practice setting out the procedures to be followed by members, students and employees of the establishment in connection with meetings on the university’s premises, and on the conduct required of members, students and employees in connection with those meetings. UCL’s Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech sets out arrangements for the management of meetings and other functions held on UCL premises, in line with its obligations under the Act.
17. These statutory provisions are relevant to the approach taken by UCLU and UCL staff in approving and managing the event and indicate that there is an obligation to consider if it is appropriate to initiate any disciplinary processes following the disruption of the event by protestors or any actions taken by attendees.
18. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9); freedom of expression (Article 10); and freedom of assembly and association (Article 11) are safeguarded by the European Convention on Human Rights and incorporated into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998. It is unlawful for public authorities to act in a manner incompatible with these rights. The rights are qualified and can be limited by actions necessary and proportionate that pursue a legitimate aim such as the prevention of disorder. This is relevant to the actions of individuals present on 27th October 2016 to protest about the event in that they had a right to freedom of assembly but that right was only protected to the extent the protest was peaceful.
19. UCL has a long tradition of seeking to safeguard freedom of speech. UCL is committed to upholding academic freedom of enquiry in its teaching and research and to ensuring that free and open discussion can take place in an atmosphere of tolerance. The key aim of UCL policies is the creation of an environment on and off campus that permits freedom of speech and expression within a framework of respect for the rights of others. These are

included in codes of practice, policies and procedures that students agree to comply with on commencement of their studies.

20. The UCL Code of Conduct for Students is also relevant and provides the following useful definition of good conduct:

“Good conduct means

- *In general realising that you are an ambassador for UCL and behaving accordingly. This applies anywhere and at any time but is particularly important in the local community around UCL, whilst on fieldwork, whilst on other study away from UCL, on the sports field and whilst engaged in any other UCL-related activity.*
- *Recognising the diversity of the UCL community and not discriminating against others on the basis of their age, ethnic origin, race, nationality, membership of a national minority, culture, language, religious faith or affiliation or lack thereof, political affiliation or opinions or lack thereof, sex, gender, gender identity, sexuality, sexual orientation, marital status, caring or parental responsibilities, illness, ability or disability, mental health status, medical condition, physical appearance, genetic features, parentage, descent, full or part-time student status, socio-economic background, employment status, trade union affiliation, spent or irrelevant criminal convictions or any other irrelevant distinction.*
- *Acting responsibly, being honest, being considerate, respectful and courteous towards others. Behaving in a respectful manner towards others so that they do not feel that they are being harassed or bullied and abiding by the law.”*

21. If there is evidence of misconduct by students, then UCL may take action against those individuals under the Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure. The Code provides the following long but useful definition of what behaviour would constitute misconduct, sections 1, 2, 6 and 7 being particularly relevant in the context of this investigation:

“Misconduct which may be the subject of disciplinary procedures under this Code is defined as improper interference with the proper functioning or activities of UCL, or of those who work or study in UCL, or action which otherwise damages UCL and/or its staff or students, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. *disruption or improper interference, whether on UCL premises or elsewhere, with the academic, administrative, sporting, social, cultural or other activities of UCL*
2. *obstruction or improper interference on UCL premises or whilst engaged in any UCL activity with the functions, duties or activities of any student, member of staff or other employee of UCL or any authorised visitor of UCL;*
3. *violent, indecent, disorderly, threatening or offensive behaviour or language on UCL premises or whilst engaged in any UCL activity;*
4. *fraud, deceit, deception or dishonesty in relation to UCL or its staff or students;*
5. *action likely to cause injury to, or impair the safety of, either themselves or others on UCL premises or whilst engaged in any UCL activity;*
6. *sexual, racial or other kind of harassment of any student, member of staff or other employee of UCL or any authorised visitor to UCL;*
7. *breach of the provisions of UCL’s Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech or of any other code or UCL rule or regulation which provides for breaches to constitute misconduct under this code;*
8. *damage to or defacement, caused intentionally or recklessly, or misappropriation of UCL property or the property of other members of UCL and/or the UCL community or*

- any other property which the Student enters, or misappropriation of such property whilst engaged in UCL activities;*
9. *misuse or unauthorised use of UCL premises or items of property, including computer misuse;*
 10. *distributing or publishing a poster, notice, sign or any publication which is offensive, intimidating, threatening, indecent or illegal, including the broadcasting and electronic distribution of such material;*
 11. *conduct which constitutes a criminal offence where that conduct – took place on UCL premises or*
 - i. *affected or concerned other members of the UCL community or*
 - ii. *damages the good name of UCL or*
 - iii. *itself constitutes misconduct within the terms of this Code or*
 - iv. *is an offence of dishonesty, where the Student holds an office of responsibility in UCL, or*
 12. *involves a student registered on a programme leading to membership of a professional body and where that conduct may fall short of the professional codes of conduct such as to render the Student unfit to practise, or*
 - i. *resulted in the acquisition of a criminal conviction for an offence not involving members of UCL or its premises, which may affect the safety of a member of UCL or the premises of UCL or which could bring UCL into disrepute;*
 13. *failure to declare a criminal conviction to UCL, subject to the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act;*
 14. *behaviour which brings UCL into disrepute;*
 15. *failure to disclose name and other relevant details to an officer or employee of UCL in circumstances where it is reasonable to require that such information be given;*
 16. *failure to comply with a previously imposed penalty under this Code.*

Details of the relevant policies referred to here are included at appendix 1.

ORGANISATION AND APPROVAL OF THE EVENT PRIOR TO 27th OCTOBER 2016

22. On 11th October 2016 (11 working days prior to the Event) UCLU received a room booking request from the UCLU Friends of Israel Society to hold an event featuring an external speaker, Hen Mazzig, on 27th October 2016. The Event organisers requested a room from 19:00-21:00 in Darwin B40 Lecture Theatre, or 104 Elvin Hall Bedford Way and (as part of the mandatory completion of the form) stated that security was not required, that the function would not attract media interest and that in the past, the speaker and topic have not generated any controversy. Kings College London (“KCL”) Israel Society was named as a co-host on the booking form.
23. The Acting Activities Skills Manager, Societies at UCLU (Johnny Glover) responded to the room booking request on 20th October 2016 (six working days prior to the event) by email informing the UCLU Friends of Israel Society that their speaker request required further checks and they would be informed of the outcome the following day.
24. UCL Security became aware the Event was being advertised on the internet on 21st October 2016 (five working days prior to the Event) and informed UCLU. As a consequence, UCLU judged that the room booking request was in breach of the UCLU External Speaker Information Procedure on grounds of failure to disclose full information on the speaker (where original request indicated that there had been no controversy, that the event would

not create media interest and would not require security, and on grounds of advertising prior to approval) and rejected the request on 21st October by email and phone.

25. The President of the UCLU Friends of Israel Society (Liora Cadranel) appealed this decision in line with the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech (and UCLU External Speaker Information and Procedures) and the matter was passed to UCLU Senior Management for consideration.
26. In the absence of the UCLU Operations Manager (Lynne Adams), the appeal was considered by the UCLU Activities & Events Officer (Nick Edmonds) who rejected it on the grounds that no new information was provided in the appeal that would constitute a reason to overturn to original decision. The UCLU Friends of Israel Society President was informed of this decision on 24th October 2016 (three working days prior to the event).
27. The UCLU Friends of Israel Society President sought advice from the UK Lawyers for Israel who advised a direct appeal to the UCL Provost, Michael Arthur and Vice Provost (Operations), Rex Knight in line with the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech. The appeal was received on 26th October 2016 (one working day prior to the event).
28. The UCL Vice Provost (Operations) considered the request for the event to go ahead, and agreed it could proceed after risk assessment. In doing so key considerations included the obligation on UCL to take such steps such as are practicable to secure freedom of expression; that the previous protest involving this speaker at KCL in 2014 was a silent and non-violent protest; and that although the UCLU Friends of Israel Society was in breach of the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech for booking speakers there was an appreciation of the distress and concern that might be triggered by cancelling an event.
29. UCLU therefore confirmed the Event was proceeding on the following working day to UCL Security and to the UCLU Friends of Israel Society President, and provided the proposed location. A chronology of relevant correspondence and timeline is attached as Appendix 3.
30. The event was ticketed by UCLU Friends of Israel Society through Eventbrite with all ticketing and any screening of potential attendees handled by UCLU Friends of Israel Society. The event attendees included student and non-student attendees external to UCL. Around 50 attendees were expected.

ORGANISATION OF THE PROTEST PRIOR TO 27th OCTOBER 2016

31. Prior to approval of the event, UCLU Friends of Israel Society and KCL Israel Society had already advertised the event on social media (and EventBrite) contrary to UCLU policy and guidance on external speakers and events (UCLU, <http://uclu.org/how-to-guides/how-to-organise-event-with-external-speaker>, paragraph 1). The investigation notes that the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/staff/resources/documents/Freedom_of_Speech_Code_of_Practice_Rev_Sep_2010.pdf, paragraph 14) states that advertising should not be made without appropriate authorisation from UCL, but the investigation notes that this paragraph appears to suggest this is only the case if it is anticipated at the time of notification that difficulties might arise at the meeting (see para 21 & 22 above).
32. On the evening prior to the event, a message was widely circulated on social media sites claiming that UCL had overruled a decision by UCLU to prevent Hen Mazzig from speaking at

the UCLU Friends of Israel Society event. The message did not reflect the fact that due process had been followed in appealing the original decision. It has not been possible to conclusively determine the origin or authorship of this message. The message was widely circulated among student and student society websites and the investigation has identified the message on KCL Action Palestine (Facebook site), Kingston University PalSoc (Facebook site), London School of Economics (LSE) Students' Union Palestine Society (Facebook site) and a posting on 4Chan. The message contains a call to disrupt the event and prevent the speaker from giving his talk.

The message posted online (various lightly edited versions exist) reads:

*Today, UCL overruled a decision by UCLU to prevent *Hen Mazzig* from coming in to give a talk as part of a Friends of Israel event. _Hen_ served as lieutenant in the Israel Occupation Forces (IOF) for 5 years. That means he's complicit in the colonisation of Palestinian territory, protection of illegal Israeli settlements, and the murder and displacement of hundreds of innocent families.*

UCLU represents us, the students of UCL. Here's the thing. When UCLU didn't approve the speaker, Friends of Israel society broke union policy and advertised the event anyways. Unfortunately, FOI doesn't think our opinions as students, or the opinions of the people we elected to run the union, matter.

As students we aren't here to make a scene, or cause any unnecessary drama. We're just shocked and outraged that someone with the blood of innocent people on their hands can be given a platform at UCL to speak to students.

What's even more outrageous? This was a decision taken by the university _ignoring_ the Union's capacity as our representatives _completely_

We're gonna be gathering in the quad from 12.30pm onwards. We're not about to sit back and let this happen. It's sick, wrong, and a grotesque violation of every mechanism in place to make sure we don't get _evil_ people given a platform at our university.

We'll see you there.

The official protest will take place at 6pm in Archaeology G6 LT, but do come to UCL Main Quad at 12:30 to be filled in on the plan.

Please share this BC with anyone you know in london. Thank you.

Responses to this message on public websites indicate a high degree of interest by potential protestors external to UCL in attending the protest and the timelines indicate that this decision was premeditated. Video evidence shows [REDACTED] talking to an individual in 26 Bedford Way G03 stating that 'that's why people are angry; university officials overturned the ruling' (video evidence IMG_2666.MOV at 0:48).

33. The investigation heard that the UCLU Friends of Palestine Society held a committee meeting the evening prior to the event to discuss whether to officially organize a protest. The result of this committee meeting was that the group decided not to officially organize a protest, but that individuals from the UCLU Friends of Palestine Society could attend on an individual basis.
34. The evidence collected thus does not identify one particular individual responsible for organizing the protest, but does suggest a distributed attempt by a large number of individuals and some student societies external to UCL to encourage a protest with the planned intention of preventing the event going ahead.

WHAT TOOK PLACE ON THE DAY OF 27th OCTOBER 2016 PRIOR TO THE EVENT

35. At approximately 12:30 on October 27th around 20 protesters gathered in UCL Front Quad (presumably in response to the message identified in paragraph 32) and were addressed by individuals including [REDACTED] who encouraged them to attend a protest outside the venue of the meeting in the Archaeology Department at 6pm. [REDACTED] talked to [REDACTED] who was in the Quad on other business and as part of the exchange stated "The talk is not going to happen".
36. UCL Security recorded that they were advised of potential protests and subsequently identified concerns about the proposed venue (Archaeology G6 LT) and the ability to retain free access/egress in the event of protest given scaffolding on site. Agreement on a change in venue (to G03 in 26 Bedford Way) was sought and given via UCLU at 11.44 and the UCLU Friends of Israel Society President was informed.
37. UCL Security deployed what they judged to be a proportionate team of security officers at 26 Bedford Way one hour before the event (18:00) in order to cover access to the location. When the security officers arrived, they identified that the group intending to protest was already within the building.
38. [REDACTED] stated to the investigation that individuals associated with the UCLU Friends of Palestine Society had attempted to book a room within 26 Bedford Way in order to facilitate the protesters gaining access to the building. The room booking diary for 26 Bedford Way names [REDACTED] as having booked the public cluster room 316 for a "meeting" between 18:00 and 20:00 on Thursday 27th October 2016.
39. A lecture was already taking place in Bedford Way G03 Lecture Theatre between 18:00 – 19:00 and UCL Security stationed officers outside the doors, which were locked. At around 18:30, Neil Moscrop, the UCL Security Contract Manager and Razwan Hussain, CIS Operations Manager spoke to [REDACTED] who expressed that [REDACTED] intended to prevent the event taking place, and stated that if the speaker did not attend 26 Bedford Way then they would follow the UCLU Friends of Israel Society elsewhere.
40. On the basis of this information, UCL Security attempted to revert the event to Archaeology G6 Lecture Theatre but this was not possible and so Neil Moscrop arranged an alternative location at the Haldane Room. The guest speaker was met in the Bedford Way carpark and escorted by security officers to the Haldane Room without incident.
41. UCL Security successfully managed to prevent the ongoing G03 lecture being disrupted. Once students and staff had exited the room at 19:00, both supporters of the UCLU Friends of Israel Society Event and protesters occupied G03. Evidence from multiple sources (including video evidence) shows that there was a hostile and tense atmosphere, with verbal hostility and flag waving from both groups. There was some pushing and shoving on entry to the room but no physical violence or damage to property.
42. The evidence shows that both protestors and counter-protesters in the G03 lecture theatre were verbally hostile and occasionally verbally abusive towards each other.
43. As the protest and counter-protest in G03 continued, UCL Security evaluated the risk of physical violence breaking out as high and therefore called the Police and stepped in to

separate a small number of individuals. This calmed the situation; many people left apparently informed of the new venue. At around 19:30 UCL Security asked everyone within 26 Bedford Way to leave and ultimately the lecture theatre was emptied and secured.

WHAT TOOK PLACE ON THE MAIN CAMPUS ON THE EVENING OF 27th OCTOBER 2016

44. Security officers and management were deployed to the Haldane Room on the main campus while attendees made their way to the new venue. Protestors followed.
45. Protestors became aware of this venue change very rapidly, within about a minute of attendees and potential attendees being emailed by the organisers. The evidence uncovered by the investigation does not reveal how this occurred. Only a relatively small number of people, including UCL Security, Event organisers (UCLU Friends of Israel Society), attendees and some UCLU officers would be aware of planned venue changes in advance; although once the venue change had occurred, protestors could also follow groups of attendees.
46. UCL Security with the UCLU Friends of Israel Society began escorting small groups of attendees from the 26 Bedford Way location to the Haldane Room. While initially the Haldane Room was quiet, subsequently unsuccessful attempts were made by protestors to prevent attendees from gaining entry to the Haldane Room by placing themselves in front of UCL Security.
47. The Haldane Room has three large windows looking onto the UCL main Quad and two doors. Both doors were locked from the inside with a security officer present in the room and security officers outside both doors. No access card restrictions were placed on spaces around the Haldane Room (which would have been possible albeit restricting access to a large public space) and soon protestors arrived. Video and eye witness evidence shows that protestors created a verbally intimidating atmosphere by shouting, chanting and banging on the window and (one) of the doors, augmented by amplified loudspeakers. This was audible within the room and prevented normal conversation.
48. Outside the Haldane Room, intermittent verbal altercations and some pushing and shoving continued throughout the evening. Verbally hostile behaviour was not confined to protestors but a small minority of attendees engaged in aggressive and physically intimidatory behaviour. Evidence shows that an individual the investigation has identified as [REDACTED] engaged in pushing and shoving of security officers and made comments to protestors that Islam was a violent religion.
49. Between intermittent verbal altercations and pushing and shoving, many of the protestors engaged in peaceful singing and dancing, some of it accompanied by amplified music in the Cloisters. The protest also drew attention from UCL students, some of whom joined the protest while others watched at a distance. Many individuals filmed portions of the protest, lecture and other parts of the evening on their mobile phones.
50. At around 19:45 a small group of protestors opened an unlocked window in the Haldane Room and three climbed into the Haldane room, landing on top of an attendee as they did so. UCL Security did not immediately eject them. At this point two attendees ([REDACTED] [REDACTED]) called the police who advised they would attend in 30-40 minutes.

51. UCL Security later confirmed to this investigation that the windows were undamaged following the incursion indicating that they were unlocked at the time of entry and had not been checked prior to usage of the room to ensure that they were locked.
52. The protestors who had entered the room intended to disrupt the meeting. Two of the three protestors have been identified as UCL undergraduates [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (see Appendix 5). The protesters were not violent and initially lay on the floor to disrupt the meeting. One attendee was recorded (video evidence Video 9.mp4) being verbally hostile to the protestors and stamping her foot in the vicinity of one protestor as he lay on the floor, but there was no violence recorded or reported by either attendees or protestors once the room had been occupied. After a few minutes UCL Security escorted the protestors out of the room.
53. By 20:00 there was now a large gathering of hostile and abusive protestors around the Haldane Room both in the Cloisters and the Quad. Although many were filming the event and/or chanting, a minority continued to make sustained efforts to disrupt the event. By now there was a significant UCL Security deployment enhanced and supported over time with increasing numbers of police who had requested backup after being called to an allegation of assault from within the venue (presumably the call described in 50 above).
54. At around 20:15 representations were made by police to use their powers to disperse protestors from the area around the venue. This was considered but declined by UCL Security as at that time no serious violence or property damage was evident.
55. The noisy demonstration and banging on the windows continued intermittently. This was clearly audible within the room and included the use of amplified loudhailers (e.g. video evidence IMG_1665.MOV, IMG_1681.MOV, IMG_1682.MOV and others) but the meeting was opened and Hen Mazzig spoke for about 15 minutes. UCL Security within the room confirmed that it was very difficult for attendees to hear him clearly due to the volume of shouting, chanting and banging on the windows including amplified music. Some questions and discussion followed Hen Mazzig's presentation.
56. Chanting was a prominent feature of the protest. While the majority of the chants represented legitimate and legal protest, the investigation notes the use of the chant 'From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free' which was sung several times during the protest (e.g. video evidence IMG_1660.MOV, IMG_1662.MOV). By highlighting the geographic extent of the State of Israel from its eastern (river) to western (sea) boundaries as coextensive with a free Palestine, this chant appears to be calling for the destruction of the state of Israel. This goes beyond calls for a 'free Palestine' which can also refer to geographically adjacent states of Israel and Palestine, and if calling for destruction of the state of Israel could be considered anti-Semitic.
57. The use of loudspeakers was also a feature of the protest (e.g. video 11.mp4 outside the Haldane room). UCL Security made requests throughout the evening to specific protestors not to plug in or use loudspeakers when inappropriate but testimony from security officers suggests that this was largely ignored.
58. The event concluded around 21:25

WHAT HAPPENED AFTER THE EVENT ON 27th OCTOBER 2016

59. After the Event finished, the speaker was escorted to his vehicle (dressed in a security high visibility jacket to make him appear like a member of UCL Security staff) leaving from the front door while the protestors were concentrated around the back. The speaker was not followed.
60. UCL Security and the Metropolitan Police liaised with attendees to ensure a safe exit from the venue. The protestors organised themselves into two rings with open ends inside the cloisters and outside both entrances to the Haldane Room. Attendees were required to traverse these groups of protestors who repeatedly shouted 'Shame!' at them while they left the premises. Acts of intimidation were recorded with phones in particular being used by both attendees and protestors in a way that invaded people's personal space and exacerbated tension.
61. Later that evening and in the following days a number of individuals, student groups and others posted their experiences of the incident on social media. This included a large number of videos and some edited and/or annotated video presentations. A non-exhaustive 113 page list of publicly available social media postings was considered by the investigation in evidence.
62. Allegations of assault by attendees and at least one protestor were widely publicised in social and other media. The investigation has established that a complaint of assault from within the Haldane room to the police was withdrawn; a further complaint of assault by being crushed against a wall could not be substantiated. At the time of writing, the Camden UCL police liaison officer has confirmed to the investigation that there has been no police action taken and there are no ongoing police inquiries in relation to the event.
63. Allegations were also circulated in social media that pro-Israel individuals from outside UCL had attended the protest in an attempt to disrupt and/or inflame the protestors. The investigation was not able to verify these allegations through the evidence collected.

BROADER CONTEXT OF THE EVENT

64. The terms of reference of this investigation are focused on establishing the facts associated with the Event hosted by the UCLU Friends of Israel Society on October 27th 2016, and so it is important to note that the investigation cannot deal with the broader context of anti-Semitic, anti-Zionist and anti-Israeli incidents in the UK, nor with the broader context of freedom of expression in contemporary society.
65. Some contextual factors are relevant, however. The investigation notes similarities with an incident at KCL earlier in 2016, when a talk given by Admiral Ami Ayalon was disrupted by pro-Palestinian protestors (the majority of students were not from Kings) and the event cancelled. An investigation concluded that a number of individuals intentionally disrupted the rights of others to exert freedom of speech within the law.¹

¹ <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/newsevents/news/newsrecords/2016/01%20January/Statement-regarding-the-Security-of-Israel-event-.aspx>

66. The event also notes that the most recent data suggests that in the first six months of 2016 the Community Security Trust¹² recorded an eleven percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the UK, of which the greatest number overall and the largest percentage increase was in Greater London.
67. The context in which the event and associated protest took place is therefore one where there is evidence for increasing religious and racial intolerance in Greater London in particular. There is also some precedent for situations where students and others disrupt and attempt to prevent events taking place at other universities in London.

STATEMENTS ISSUED AFTER THE INCIDENT

68. UCL issued a statement on 28th October 2016³ indicating their support for freedom of expression for all sides involved in debating controversial issues, their commitment to investigating the circumstances surrounding the protest and their concern for the safety of UCL students

“UCL and UCLU do not condone acts of intimidation or violence under any circumstances and, as a university with a longstanding radical history, we fiercely support the right to exercise free speech within the law.

The freedom to debate and challenge views is fundamental to the nature of a university. We also acknowledge the right to peaceful protest and we put the safety of our staff and student community at the heart of everything we do.

On 27 October, we did all we could to ensure that the UCLU Friends of Israel Society event could go ahead at UCL, working with our Security team and the Metropolitan police.

It was widely advertised and open to the public, and as a result a small but noisy group of protesters attended and occupied the rooms where the event was originally meant to take place. UCL Security found an alternative location and ensured the event went ahead safely. We regret protesters took measures to try to prevent the event from happening but stress that the protest was non-violent.

We are aware that the Metropolitan police attended following accusations of assault and support them fully in their investigations. As this was a public event, it is unclear how many UCL students were present but we are instigating an enquiry and we will take appropriate disciplinary action where there is clear evidence that students may have breached our disciplinary regulations.

Both UCL and UCLU have a code of practice governing the participation of external speakers at events held at UCL. It is clearly stated in UCL’s code of practice that the premises will not be denied to any individual on any ground connected with their beliefs. “

69. UCL subsequently updated their initial statement on 30th October 2016 to include further information about the investigation and to make clear UCL’s opposition to any violent protest.

² https://cst.org.uk/data/file/4/f/Incidents_Report_-_Jan-June_2016.1470133952.pdf

³ <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/news-articles/1016/281016-UCL-statement-UCLU-event-protest>

Initial investigations into the event are underway. We have received allegations of violence and intimidation which, if confirmed, we condemn in the strongest possible terms. These allegations will be the focus of our continuing investigation and we will be working with the police if necessary to pursue evidence.

We re-iterate our position that we are a university that supports both the right to free speech and of protest. The latter must however be conducted in a respectful and peaceful manner. As part of our investigation we will be reviewing our procedures to ensure this is adhered to.

70. UCLU also issued a statement on 28th October 2016⁴

Last night (27/10/2016) an event was hosted on campus by UCLU Friends of Israel society with Hen Mazzig, which was met with demonstrations by students. Extra security presence was put in place and police were called due to the controversial nature of the event.

The demonstrations were organised independently, rather than by any society as reported by Pi Media (This has been rectified on the Pi Media website as of 28/10). Two sets of protests had taken place, in support as well as in opposition the event.

At no point did UCLU ‘no-platform’ Hen Mazzig. The initial problems with the event were due entirely to procedural errors on behalf of the organising society. Once these mistakes were rectified and the requisite information given, the event was given the green light to go ahead. As a result of the speaker approval procedure, which is in place for all societies and stands so that we can organise events safely, being correctly completed, extra security and safety provisions were allocated for the event by UCLU.

The protests which took place were peaceful on both sides. The protests and events were covered on live social media by both groups involved and a large body of video coverage evidences the peaceful nature of the protests. The presence of the Metropolitan Police force as well as UCL Security at the event was to facilitate peaceful proceeding of events and largely they did a great job of keeping the situation under control and treating both sides fairly, we are however concerned at reports of inappropriate behaviour by security and police officers towards students, which are subject to investigation.

UCLU is committed to securing all members’ freedom of speech within the university, and this extends to the right to express and protest peacefully and within the law.

Any reports of individuals involved with yesterday’s events in any capacity acting contrary to our code of conduct and values will be investigated appropriately by UCLU, and we encourage students affected to report this to us.

71. The UCLU Friends of Palestine Society issued a statement on 28th October 2016⁵

Last night, a large and diverse group of students staged a protest against Hen Mazzig, a reservist lieutenant in the Israeli army. UCLU Friends of Palestine would like to make clear that the protest was not organised on behalf of the society, or affiliated to the society in any way.

Hen Mazzig was a ‘humanitarian affairs’ officer in CoGAT, Coordinator of Government Affairs in the Territory, the Israeli state body responsible for the day to day management of the military occupation, including demolition of Palestinian homes, forced displacement, restrictions of movement, and is headquartered in illegal settlements. These are grave violations of

⁴ <http://uclu.org/articles/uclu-statement-regarding-yesterdays-protests>

⁵ <https://www.facebook.com/UCLUFOP/posts/2125241587700537>

international law, and it is reasonable for students to protest an event at which these crimes are whitewashed and defended.

We support the protest which took place for these reasons. We also believe that all groups reserve the right to free expression as long as they abide by the UCL code of practice on freedom of speech and remain within the law. This allowed the event as well as the protest to take place.

Both authorities; the UCL security and police, confirmed that the protest ended safely, and there are hours of footage live from the protest suggesting that it was peaceful. We do condemn all forms of abuse and violence and encourage the relevant authorities to investigate any instances of it if reported by individuals.

ANALYSIS

72. This was a serious incident that represents a failure of the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech to adequately protect freedom of expression on campus. While the event took place, it did so in a highly disruptive and intimidatory atmosphere and in an abbreviated form. This failure of the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech is very rare – several hundred events are routinely organised and occur every term, including high risk and high profile events – but affords an important opportunity to identify and remedy the key factors that led to this failure.
73. The evidence suggests that the majority of protestors and attendees were non-violent and the majority of UCL students acted in accordance with UCL’s Code of Conduct for Students. However, the evidence also shows that a smaller group of protestors intentionally disrupted the rights of others to exercise freedom of speech within the law and their behaviour caused stress and anxiety to students and staff at UCL.
74. The investigation notes that a significant proportion of the media and social media commentary following the Event, and some of the evidence submitted, has focused particularly on whether physical violence took place at the Event or not. The investigation has found evidence that there was pushing and shoving (by individuals some of whom are not identified) and allegations of assault were made to the police. The investigation understands from the local police liaison officer that these allegations have either been withdrawn or are not currently being pursued as a line of inquiry. The investigation found no evidence that any of these actions were planned or pre-meditated. There was also no property damage.
75. However, it should be noted that a lack of serious physical violence does not indicate that an event was peaceful. The evidence from social media posts as well as other information obtained by the investigation suggests that some individuals at UCL and from at least four other institutions – Kingston University, KCL, LSE and the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) - planned to prevent the event taking place; created a hostile, aggressive and intimidatory atmosphere; and conducted their protest noisily and aggressively such that many students, staff and other attendees felt intimidated by their behaviour. The impact of this behaviour was amplified by the actions of individuals who banged on the external windows of the Haldane Room and by the use of loudspeakers and amplification on campus.
76. The evidence shows that individuals, both before and during the Event, planned to disrupt the Event and prevent the legitimate exercise of free speech.
 1. Video evidence (described in Appendix 5) identifies two UCL students, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], as having been among the protestors who

entered the Haldane Room through the windows. In doing so they intentionally disrupted and interfered with an event organised by a UCLU student society on UCL premises; and acted in a manner which deviates from the UCL Code of Conduct for Students. I have therefore concluded that the actions of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in relation to this incident should be considered under UCL's Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure.

2. Testimony and video evidence (described in Appendix 5) identifies UCL student [REDACTED] as having made a number of statements prior to and during the Event to UCL staff and in public that indicated his planned intention to prevent the Event taking place. This constitutes a deliberate attempt to prevent freedom of expression and intentional disruption and interference with an event organised by a UCLU student society on UCL premises. However, other evidence indicates that [REDACTED] appeared to assist with the safe management of the protest by interacting with UCL Security staff. I have therefore concluded that the actions of [REDACTED] in relation to this incident should be considered under UCL's Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure.
3. Outside the Haldane Room, video evidence (described in Appendix 5) and written testimony indicates that UCL student [REDACTED] engaged in physically aggressive behaviour towards attendees that included attempting to block entry to the Haldane Room, and pushing a female attendee necessitating police intervention. However, video evidence also indicates that [REDACTED] (para 77, below and accompanying video evidence) played a role in this incident. I have nevertheless concluded that [REDACTED] actions in relation to this incident should be considered under UCL's Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure.
4. Outside the Haldane Room, evidence (described in Appendix 5) shows that UCL student [REDACTED] engaged in physically aggressive and insulting behaviour towards attendees. I have therefore concluded that his actions in relation to this incident should be considered under UCL's Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure.

77. The evidence also shows that a small number of non-UCL attendees also behaved in a verbally and physically aggressive manner that protestors found intimidating.

1. Outside the Haldane Room, video evidence (described in Appendix 5) and written testimony demonstrates that an individual that the investigation identifies as [REDACTED], engaged in physically aggressive behaviour and made comments which could be interpreted as Islamophobic (video evidence external to UCL [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] is not a member of UCL staff or student but I have concluded that his actions in relation to this incident were unacceptable on campus.

78. This is not an exhaustive list of individuals who behaved in a manner likely to intimidate staff and students (whether attendees or protestors or bystanders) but reflect those individuals that the investigation has been able to positively identify. It is worth re-iterating that the evidence shows the majority of protestors (and attendees) did not behave in such a fashion.

79. Despite the intention of some individuals to disrupt the event, we need to understand the other contributing factors which led to the incident occurring, notwithstanding that UCL and UCLU have policies and procedures in place designed to protect freedom of expression on

campus, in particular the factors that created a situation where attendees and protestors came together and aligned in a situation that led to the adverse outcomes described here.

80. These contributing factors failed the protestors as much as the attendees, for they allowed a situation to take place that inflamed passions and tensions by the too-close proximity of those legitimately wanting to protest a speaker whose opinions they did not agree with and those legitimately wanting to hear that speaker.
81. Remedies to prevent a similar situation arising in future, whether with this UCLU Society or any other where freedom of expression might be an issue, must therefore not only focus on individuals who can be identified whose behaviour transgressed UCL codes of conduct, but perhaps more importantly on fixing these latent factors that aligned on the night of October 27th 2016. This will protect both the right to protest and the right to free speech on campus.
82. The investigation has identified four key factors that aligned in this incident:
 - I. An initial failure to accurately assess and report risk and need for Security by the UCLU Friends of Israel Society on their speaker request form. This was an error and did not follow the training provided to UCLU Friends of Israel Society and other student societies. Failure to accurately assess risk and the need for security subsequently put time pressure on events and reduced the ability for UCLU, UCL and the UCLU Friends of Israel Society to prepare adequately and mitigate the risk.
 - II. Time pressure for appeal of the initial decision not to permit the event. The UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech does not provide any guidance on the timing of the appeal process when an event is not permitted, nor on the grounds by which an appeal can be considered. Thus, an appeal is possible immediately before an event is due to take place on any grounds. This put significant and unhelpful pressure on the Vice Provost (Operations) who has responsibility for considering these issues. The evidence shows that his decision to allow the event to proceed was made in good faith and fully mindful of the legal requirement for UCL to protect freedom of speech. The investigation identifies the lack of timelines and clear grounds for appeal rather than the particular decision as a key factor that must be addressed to prevent any recurrence.
 - III. Wide circulation on social media of an inflammatory message that UCL had overturned a UCLU decision to 'no platform' Hen Mazzig. This did not take account of the fact that the correct procedure for appealing a decision had been followed. The investigation has not been able to identify the source of this message, but evidence suggests that it had the effect of stirring up strong feelings among the protestors based on incomplete information and attracting a range of non-UCL students and individuals. This was not a failure of UCLU or UCL policy, but the division of responsibilities between UCL and UCLU in the speaker approval process meant that this message could be propagated. In addition, the time pressure associated with factors (I) and (II) above meant that UCL and UCLU did not have time to become aware of and consider issuing a joint response in response to this the incomplete and potentially misleading narrative presented in the message.
 - IV. Time pressure for change(s) of venue with limited time for on-site risk assessment. Protestors gained access to the 26 Bedford Way venue and UCL Security appropriately decided to change venue. However, a perimeter was not secured around the ultimate venue and the windows were not secured prior to use of the venue. This allowed further

attempts to disrupt the event by entry to the Haldane Room. It also ultimately proved impossible to separate protestors and attendees which increased tension, created a physically and verbally intimidating atmosphere, and led in some cases to abusive language and gestures and inappropriate pushing and shoving highlighted above.

83. Following the event, both UCL and UCLU issued statements that the protest was 'non-violent' (UCL) and the 'protests which took place were peaceful on both sides' (UCLU) although UCL's subsequent updates do highlight 'allegations of violence and intimidation' and condemn any such actions. The evidence collected by this investigation does not support either statement, except in the technical sense that there were no serious incidents of violence or property damage and allegations of assault were not ultimately pursued. Rather, both protestors and attendees consistently report a minority of individuals participating in verbally aggressive and physically intimidating actions intended to disrupt the event, a minority of attendees and protestors engaging in hostile dialogue that increased tension between protestors and attendees; and a sustained attempt to prevent free speech on campus within the law that went beyond a legitimate vigorous protest.
84. The UCLU public statement following the incident highlighted reports of 'inappropriate behaviour by Security and police officers towards students, which are subject to investigation'. One witness statement stated that a UCL Security officer had pushed a female student but it was not possible to further identify the individual or identify video evidence. A second statement indicated that a UCL Security officer knocked three protestors while attempting to unplug amplified speakers and subsequently apologised.
85. UCL Security, and the Metropolitan Police Service, had a difficult job on the evening of October 27th. The investigation would like to record that numerous individuals, both attendees and protestors, expressed their appreciation of the efforts of UCL Security to keep the situation as calm and safe as possible. While the incident was serious in nature and in its effects on attendees, the actions of UCL Security Officers on site ensured that there was no further escalation and are commended. UCL staff clearly acted in the best interests of all those involved and responded to all of the issues that arose in a professional and timely manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS

86. As a result of the enquiries made in this investigation I make four recommendations that identify where the clear boundaries for behaviour already established by UCL and UCLU codes of practice on freedom of speech and lawful protest have been crossed; that set out to strengthen the existing processes and practices to prevent future incidents of this kind; and will ensure that UCL can continue to be a place where students and staff can both freely express controversial opinions within the law and freely express their opposition to such opinions within the law.
87. **Recommendation 1.** The following UCL students should be referred to the relevant officers for consideration of disciplinary action

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

The following individual cannot be considered for disciplinary action by UCL as he is not a member of UCL and was a visitor on campus at the time of the recorded incident. UCL does not have a visitor code of conduct.

1. [REDACTED]

The investigation recommends that UCL develops a Code of Conduct for visitors (student and non-student) on campus that sets out expected standards of behaviour, and an appropriate process for dealing with situations where those standards of behaviour are not adhered to.

88. **Recommendation 2.** The following actions are recommended to strengthen UCL/UCLU event management in order both to encourage and protect free speech and safe legal protest

- a) UCLU Friends of Israel Society officers should be asked to repeat UCLU induction training for student societies to ensure they are thoroughly familiar with the need to accurately report and assess risk in the event management process. UCLU should reassure themselves that all current student society presidents have already received this induction training.
- b) UCL should redraft its Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech (last updated in 2010) to consider (a) simplifying the appeals process with fewer steps (b) include absolute requirements for the timeline in working days of each step, providing sufficient time for an appeals process (c) identification of grounds on which an appeal can be considered (specifically, only on the grounds of new information)
- c) In redrafting the Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech, the investigation commends best practice in the sector (e.g. at University of Leeds and University of Manchester^{6, 7}) to include (a) an overview of the context and law and balancing academic freedom and speech with health, safety and security of staff and students (b) consideration of the mental health and well-being of attendees and/or protestors as well as attention to their physical safety (c) clear articulation of roles and responsibilities with 'responsible' and 'designated' officers (d) a section explicitly considering and promoting the effective and responsible organisation of protests and demonstrations which are part of UCL's obligation to protect freedom of speech.
- d) In redrafting the Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech, the investigation recommends integration of this Code with UCL's duties under the Prevent Policy and updating of the corresponding website.
- e) UCLU should consider updating its External Speaker Information and Procedures to reflect any changes made to UCL's Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech
- f) UCL and UCLU should ensure that the policies described in the UCL Code of Practice of Freedom of Speech and the UCLU guidance for External Speakers and Events are consistent and mutually reinforcing (see paragraph 29)

⁶ https://www.leeds.ac.uk/secretariat/documents/freedom_of_expression_protocol.pdf

⁷ <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=11846>

89. **Recommendation 3.** UCL/UCLU together with UCL Security should review and consider revising the operational protocol and training for high risk events. This should explicitly consider
- a) Prohibiting the use of loudspeakers or other forms of amplification in the vicinity of high risk campus events, and revising student and staff codes of conduct to make clear this context-sensitive prohibition.
 - b) Preparing a list of suitable rooms and lecture theatres where an appropriate separation can be maintained between any protestors and attendees at high risk events, including use of temporary restrictions on card access to UCL premises around the venue, and consideration of potential routes of ingress/egress to the venue.
90. **Recommendation 4.** UCL should take steps to pro-actively promote racial and religious tolerance in university culture and life and consider the following actions:
- a) Convening a UCL Interfaith forum, for staff and students, to seek to increase trust, tolerance and respect between different groups through promoting inter and intra-religious understanding, and with a specific request for the group to have input (as one of many relevant groups) into redrafting the UCL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech
 - b) Appoint a UCL Senior Management Team Interfaith Champion, in line with existing Race, Gender, Disability and LGBTQ+ Champions, and with a specific request to consider how best to prevent anti-Semitic and Islamophobic incidents on campus.
 - c) Communicate with University of London authorities plus senior management representatives at institutions whose students were associated with the Event, to make them aware of the outcome of this investigation; and invite them to consider actions to promote freedom of speech and religious and racial tolerance across Greater London Higher Education Institutions.

Professor Geraint Rees

Dean of the UCL Faculty of Life Sciences

January 2017

APPENDIX 1 – KEY DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN THIS REPORT

NAME	SOURCE	DATED	URL
Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech	UCL	2010	http://bit.ly/2hN3CFS
External Speaker Information and Procedures	UCLU	2014	http://bit.ly/2iKqcxI
Code of Conduct for Students	UCL		http://bit.ly/2iKp5xu
Student Disciplinary Code and Procedure	UCL	2015	http://bit.ly/2iykJd5

APPENDIX 2

Organisations Referred to in this Report

Community Security Trust – a British charity established in 1994 to ensure the safety and security of the Jewish community in the UK

KCL Israel Society – a society affiliated to KCL

Kingston University

LSE – the London School of Economics

SOAS – School of Oriental and African Studies

UCL – University College London

UCLU – University College London Students Union

UCLU Friends of Israel Society - a society affiliated to UCLU

UCLU Friends of Palestine Society – a society affiliated to UCLU

APPENDIX 3 – EVENT TIMELINE

This event timeline has been collated using evidence gathered from UCL Security, UCL and UCLU on 14th December 2016.

Date & Time	Source	Instance
11 October 2016		
-	UCLU	External Speaker Request received from UCLU Friends of Israel Society by UCLU Clubs & Societies Admin.
14 October 2016		
11:48	UCLU	Admin informed UCLU Friends of Israel Society President that the speakers request had been received and logged
20 October 2016	UCLU	
18:38		UCLU Friends of Israel Society President and Treasurer informed that external speaker request had been approved for event on 22/11/16 but that further checks needed to be done for Hen Mazzig and that they would be informed of the outcome the following day
Friday 21 October 2016		
09:20	UCL Security	UCL Security made aware of event that could involve a controversial speaker via a third party
09:45	UCL Security	Research confirms social media promoting UCLU UCLU Friends of Israel Society event at 19.00 27/10 with Hen Mazzig as a speaker. Location not confirmed but ticketed via Eventbrite.
09:55	UCL Security	Enquiry made of UCLU as UCL Security has no information provided as would have been expected for a sanctioned event with a potential controversial speaker.
10:07	UCL Security	Event confirmed as not approved and potential breach of procedures being investigated by UCLU.
10:30	UCLU	After further investigation, UCLU Activities and Skills Manager (Societies) discovered that the request was in breach of UCLU external speaker regulations as they failed to disclose full information and that they had advertised the speaker prior to approval (approx. from 15/10/16).
10:54	UCL Security	Confirmation UCLU had decided to reject the request for the event to involve the speaker proposed on the following grounds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They failed to disclose full speaker details on their request form i.e. stated that the speaker had not generated any controversy in the past, that the event would not create

		<p>media interest, nor would it require UCL Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The failed to follow external speaker request regulations by advertising the speaker prior to approval.
11:00	UCLU	UCLU Activities and Skills Manager (Societies) phoned the UCLU Friends of Israel Society President and explained why the request was rejected (purely on failing to adhere to regulations and procedures, nothing to do with the speaker himself) and spoke at length with her about her options and offered assistance to help with following procedures correctly and helping organise future events, including rearranging this one.
11:30	UCLU	UCL Activities and Skills Manager (Societies) confirmed rejection, reasons why and further options via email.
14:31	UCLU	UCLU Friends of Israel Society President emailed an appeal against the decision
16:46	UCLU	UCL Activities and Skills Manager (Societies) informed the UCLU Friends of Israel Society President that the Skills Manager had no authority to overturn the decision and that it had been passed to senior management and a decision would be made by Monday 24/10/16
Monday 24 October 2016		
11:25	UCL Security	Update received from UCLU that Society had appealed that outcome but had not been successful in overturning the decision.
11:31	UCLU	Due to the absence of the Operations Manager the appeal was considered by the UCLU Activities & Events Officer who rejected it. And as a result, the event could not go ahead. UCLU offered assistance to help with following procedures correctly and helping organise future events, including rearranging this one.
Weds 26 October 2016		
08:30	UCLU	UCL Activities and Skills Manager (Societies) was made aware that UCLU Friends of Israel Society had approached the Chair, UK Lawyers for Israel over the matter on evening of 25/10/16 and that he had advised them to contact the Provost and Vice Provost (Operations) of UCL.
-	UCL Vice- Provost (Operations)	UCL Senior Management considered the request for the event to go ahead, and agreed it could proceed after risk assessment. Key considerations:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The obligation on UCL to take such steps as are practicable to secure freedom of speech. • There was no evidence that the speaker was likely to say anything that would constitute a breach of the law. • Although there had been a protest at an event at King's in 2014 attended by this speaker, the protest was a silent, peaceful one (video footage is available online. In discussion with the Head of UCL Security it was determined that the event should be manageable. • Although the Society had clearly breached the rules for such bookings we were also mindful of the distress and concern that would be likely to be triggered by cancelling an event that had already been advertised, particularly in the context of a Boycott Divestment and Sanctions vote passed by UCLU in the previous academic year.
14:53	UCL Security	Further Enquiry made of UCLU as Estates Security had learnt from Vice Provost Operations office that event may in fact be proceeding as planned. Confirmation and location sought.
16:27	UCL Security	Confirmation via UCLU that event was proceeding and proposed location provided.
Thurs 27 October 2016		
07:39	UCL Security	Estates Security advised of potential protest from group with Palestinian interests.
09:09	UCL Security	Estates Security raise concerns of proposed venue and ability to retain free access/egress in the event of protest, agreement on change of location sought via UCLU.
11:44	UCL Security	Confirmation received via UCLU that agreement on change of location to 26 Bedford Way building reached.
18:00	UCL Security	Security Management and proportionate team of Security Officers deployed in Bedford Way an hour before event to cover access to the lecture theatre to be used. Group intending to protest already within building. Assessment identified group included protestors external to UCL.
18:30	UCL Security	Negotiations held with protest group 'organiser'. Intention of occupation of venue declared, agreement that once event disrupted protest would not follow UCLU Friends of Israel Society and guests.
19:00	UCL Security	Vocal protest and crowd management becoming very difficult around agreed venue, clear escalation

		of risk of violence resulted in police support being requested by Security Management to assist keeping the peace. Occupation discovered at previous venue.
19:15	UCL Security	Fresh venue identified on main Campus. UCLU Friends of Israel Society advised, speaker escorted to location independently. UCL Security Management and additional Security Officers deployed to new location.
20:00	UCL Security	Large gathering of hostile and abusive protestors who had followed making sustained efforts made to disrupt event. Event able to proceed with significant UCL Security deployment enhanced and supported over time with increasing numbers of Police who requested back up having originally been called to an allegation of assault from within the venue.
20:15	UCL Security	Representations made by police to use powers to disperse protestors from area around venue considered but declined by UCL Security Management as no serious violence or property damage evident.
21:25	UCL Security	Event concluded, protestors continue to harangue those departing the venue.
Friday 28 October 2016		
-	UCLU	[...] one of the organisers of the event emailed UCLU the following day and stated: <i>One thing I would commend is the presence of a UCLU officer there to gain a first hand account of the incident as well as the UCL Security guards present. If you had a contact email for the security guards we would like to say a thank you to them.</i>

APPENDIX 4 - RESPONSE TO PUBLIC CALL FOR EVIDENCE & INTERVIEWEES

A call for evidence was initiated via the investigation website and by email on 24th November 2016 with a requirement to submit evidence by 9th December 2016. Responses were received from the following nineteen individuals

[REDACTED]

Nine of these responses who identify themselves as attendees, eight from individuals who identify themselves as protesters, and two from individuals not present at the event who did not provide factual information about the event itself. 25 videos and sixteen still images were submitted along with the written statements.

In addition, the following individuals were interviewed in order to resolve specific questions around the Event

[REDACTED]

APPENDIX 5 – IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC INDIVIDUALS

This appendix has been removed from the published version of the report.

(rest of page intentionally blank)