

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

NOTE FOR FILE

[REDACTED]

Sir Peter HAYMAN

The DPP rang am 31.12.80 about the second article on HAYMAN - "Beast of Berlin (2)" - which appeared in the 2 January 1981 issue of Private Eye. A copy is attached.

2. [REDACTED] I discussed the article with [REDACTED] and then rang the Director back on Federal.

3. He made the following points -

- a. there had been no "flaming row" between himself and the Attorney General. He intended to make this clear should there be press enquiries - otherwise he would make no comment as the case was sub judice. He had consulted the Law Officer's Department.
- b. in his opinion the piece indicated a leak at NSY. When the Yard had been asked (on our behalf) for the diaries, police had been told that they were required by the Attorney. Neither the Attorney, nor his staff, had in fact seen the diaries.

4. In answer to his question, I told the Director [REDACTED] that -

- a. a number of FCO staff had been interviewed. More interviews were to take place. The purpose of our interview programme was to discover:
 - i. the extent of knowledge of HAYMAN's activities, and
 - ii. if there was any evidence of pressure on HAYMAN on the part of a hostile intelligence service
- b. so far the interviews had produced no concrete evidence on either count.
- c. we have had no contact with the Yard over the case.

5. The Director also said that the article's claim that he had attempted a deal with the defence was untrue. Geoffrey Robertson, the defence counsel had asked the Director if he would accept pleas to a lesser charge. The Director had referred the matter to the Attorney and they had decided to go ahead on the original charges.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



31 December 1980

