

8 June 2004

Mr Christopher James
Director
Hakluyt & Company Limited
34 Upper Brook Street
London
W1K 7QS

2 PAGES BY FAX ONLY TO: 0207 491 1844

Dear Mr James

Thank you for your faxed letter received at 10.30 am this morning. It is clear from press reports that you are a highly secretive organisation, so the fact that we have been in direct communication by telephone, email and letter is significant. It suggests that you are concerned.

Even if you are not prepared to confirm that Shell has been a client, they have already admitted that this is the case. Of course we also have the period of several years with common directors and shareholders, one of whom was Chairman of your company, and the other, President of the Hakluyt Foundation. I understand that the Foundation is supposed to fulfil an oversight function equivalent to the role of the Intelligence and Security Committee over the official UK security services, including your former employer, the Secret Intelligence Service.

I note your assurance that none of Hakluyt's "work" has related to me, my family, or our former business. Your assurance would of course have carried far greater weight if you had not included the significant qualification, "so far as I am aware". Since you are a founder of Hakluyt, is it possible that Hakluyt could have been involved in our case without your knowledge? That is the implication of your disclaimer, which bears all the legal hallmarks of a Whitehall Mandarin/lawyer.

It was of course an interesting situation with the Church of England Legal Office. Apparently no one wanted to admit a connection with your fax, which had no intended recipient printed on it. Hence it remained abandoned in the hands of Mr Webster for a number of days until I deduced that it was almost certainly meant for your Hakluyt co-director, Sir Anthony Hammond KCB QC. If he was not the intended recipient it would mean a second Church of England lawyer has a connection with Hakluyt.

Logic and commonsense, as set out in my email to Mr Kendall Freeman dated 20 May 04 (posted on shell2004.com), suggests that Shell would have likely used what was close to being an in-house resource, Hakluyt. But as I pointed out, it could have used another similar spy firm (or even more than one spy firm).

It is also conceivable that Royal Dutch Petroleum issued a brief separately from Shell Transport/Shell UK. I was in correspondence with the President of Royal Dutch Petroleum, Mr Maarten van den Bergh, at about that time. This would explain why Shell UK legal director, Mr Richard Wiseman has no knowledge of the activities of Mr Charles Hoots, the American "spook" from Paris whose energetic and sinister activities were also mentioned in the above email to Kendall Freeman.

What I do know is that Richard Wiseman (and Kendall Freeman) has admitted in writing that the undercover agent who was caught red-handed at our offices, engaged in illegal activity (Mr Christopher Phillips) was working for Shell. He presented fake documents which falsely indicated that he was a "director" of a company, Cofton Consultants, which turned out to be non-existent. Shell also admitted that other agents were involved on our case, but despite the seriousness of the crimes which took place, would not disclose the scope or nature of the brief which had been issued.

Since all of this and other undercover activity had a devastating impact on our preparation for a High Court Trial, it is a serious matter, which is why I have written to Lord Falconer, the Lord Chancellor.

We were already fighting an unequal battle pitted against a malicious multinational giant with an army of lawyers and unlimited shareholder resources. It was therefore ruthless of Shell to make a mismatched contest even more uneven by resorting to underhand "activities" (the term you use in your letter which, incidentally, was precisely the same term used by Shell and Kendall Freeman in relation to their undercover agents).

Shell management pledges "transparency" in its Statement of General Business Principles. In view of your connection with its senior management, perhaps you could ask them to at long last come clean on this matter, as they have with the reserves scandal. It would allow Shell to put these shameful matters to rest so that it could start the battle to restore its reputation. In so doing, if you are innocent of any involvement it would leave Hakluyt and its galaxy of the establishment elite in the clear.

Since it is frustrating to be met with an almost universal wall of silence when justice and fair play are at stake, I am grateful that you have at least responded, even though your carefully constructed assurance, as it stands, is ambiguous and therefore unsatisfactory. In common parlance, it leaves Hakluyt with wiggle room. If Hakluyt had NO association with ANY of these matters, why not say so.

I will publish this correspondence so that interested parties can draw their own conclusions.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Alfred Donovan', written in dark ink.

Alfred Donovan