

## Re: Message to the LSE Encampment

---

From LSE Liberated Zone Security [REDACTED]  
To Executiveoffice [REDACTED]  
CC LSE Liberated [REDACTED] >, Executiveoffice< [REDACTED] >  
Date Monday, 3 June 2024 at 11:17

---

Good Morning,

Thank you for your email. We are responding as the Security Liaison Team. As previously stated, we request that security and operational concerns are kept within a separate channel of communication to any negotiation discussions.

We find it particularly disingenuous within your school-wide email that you state: "We were unsure of the status of the person from LFB who came." The Senior Fire Safety Officer concerned came in a London Fire Brigade vehicle and explicitly showed his ID to Richard Mulcahy and Allan Blair and gave his name and rank before he was allowed to enter the building. Following his visit we were informed that he has updated the allocation of vehicles, personnel and pumps that would be sent in case of a fire as the building had not been registered as a high rise with the appropriate allocation. We remind you that this officer was called in because Richard and Allan refused to allow members of the Fire Brigades Union into the building.

In regards to the fire consultant report which you circulated last week the encampment has endeavoured to address these concerns to make the space as safe as possible. Included below are the specific concerns raised in the fire report and the ways the concerns have been addressed:

### Risks:

- There is an unacceptable level of fire loading in the base of the atrium due to the number of tents and other combustible items in the area - **to address this the encampment has reduced overcrowding and created larger space between tents. We also are only allowing fire-retardant tents within the encampment.**
- There are numerous potential sources of ignition due to the introduction of untested electrical equipment and extension leads - **the level of electrical loading has been reduced and electrical usage is spread out across the encampment, as was recommended by the LFB's Senior Fire Safety Officer when he attended. The encampment is no longer using extension cables and have signs encouraging all Occupiers to unplug electrical items when not in use. Due to the Occupation now encompassing the Portugal Street window, the plugs on this side are now in use and thus reduce the overcrowding of plugs within the original (smaller) encampment area.**
- Possible increased risks of smoking and vaping - **the encampment has a 'Code of Conduct' which all Occupiers are expected to adhere to. There is a zero tolerance policy for smoking and any occupier found smoking or vaping in the building will be asked to leave immediately.**

- Exit routes are obstructed and reduced in width due to the furniture forming a barricade - **both fire exits have been cleared and the encampment has created clear fire escape corridors which are marked by both signs and tape on the floor. Occupiers are reminded to keep these exits clear at all times.**

#### **Other significant factors:**

- In the event of a fire, even though persons escaping from the upper floors will be in a place of relative safety once inside the fire escape staircases, due to the open atrium design, it is foreseeable that persons may be affected by smoke and the products of combustion when they try to access the fire escape stairs - **we reiterate that the atrium design is a pre-existing factor and the Occupation bares no responsibility for the University's design. As the report indicates, the atrium staircase is not a fire evacuation route and therefore does not bare fire exit signs or arrows, thus anyone on upper floors should use the fire escape staircases as was established in the original building fire evacuation plans.**
- Reducing the level of occupation may slightly reduce the probability of an incident, but it does not reduce the risk to other persons if an incident occurs - **we would emphasise that reducing the area of the occupation would increase all of the risk factors listed above, tents would be closer together, there would be more electrical overloading on the plug sockets and there would be less space for the fire safety routes.**

#### **Likely level of enforcement action:**

- Due to the risk to persons being injured it is likely that any visit by the fire service would result in a prohibition notice being issued - **The LFB Senior Fire Safety Officer visited on Wednesday at our request and did not issue a prohibition notice and in fact have taken steps to increase the building's safety in the event of a fire.**
- It was discussed during the inspection that the London Fire Brigade should be informed of the current situation with the increased risk - **The encampment informed the LFB of the fire safety risk, which was not done by Management or the LSE Security team following the circulation of the report. In line with this, both of the two nearest fire stations (Soho and Lambeth) have been informed of our occupation and the fire allocation has been increased inline.**

#### **Immediate Action:**

- Ensure a fire watch is maintained covering 24-hour surveillance. All staff conducting a fire watch must be trained in the use of fire extinguishers, fire procedures and the evacuation plan - **there is a 24-hr security watch within the Marshall Building. We therefore request confirmation from you that all those on the night watch have been trained in fire procedures and the use of fire extinguishers.**

We take the fire safety and general security of the encampment very seriously. As such we have taken on board the findings of your privately consulted fire report and have sought to address these to the best of our ability. As to your assertion that reducing the size of the encampment is necessary to increase fire safety, we again reiterate that this is contrary to the findings of the report you commissioned and of the feedback of the Senior Fire Safety

Officer from the LFB. Reducing the encampment boundaries would directly increase the risks to ourselves and others in the building.

**As the recommendations of your report clearly state, "it is likely that any visit by the fire service would result in a prohibition notice being issued." We would like to stress that the fire service visited, and a prohibition notice was not issued. The verdict of the London Fire Brigade far outweighs that of an independent surveyor acting on your behalf, therefore, we reject the visit of another private surveyor and request that you contact the London Fire Brigade for any further inspection.**

Finally, given the emphasis on the safety of the encampment in your previous email, we find it alarming that the University knew about the rally organised in collaboration with the Israel Embassy and groups such as 'Enough is Enough', which gathered in Lincoln's Inn yesterday. Yet did not feel it necessary to inform us. We found out about the location of the March at 1am on Sunday morning due to a message from a concerned member of the public who informed us of the march and its starting location. As soon as we received this message we informed all people within the occupation and took all measures we could to protect each others' safety, such as encouraging occupiers to stay inside and far away from the windows and we also encouraged nobody to be outside the occupation with visible pro-Palestine markers such as a Keffiyeh. Although the University placed barriers in front of the Lincoln's Inn field entrance to the Marshall Building yesterday morning, these were inadequate to protect us in the event of an escalation. There was a large open gap between the barriers meaning it was easy to get close to the building. We find it wholly disingenuous that the university knew of this planned march but did not feel it necessary to inform us in order for us to take precautions to minimise confrontation and increase our safety. This shows a particular disregard for the safety of the Palestinian and Muslim students within the encampment.

In this respect we are additionally concerned that you have not responded to our email dated 22 May in which we outlined a number of safety and security concerns that had been raised by students. There have been further instances of harassment reported by students in the encampment, including an incident on 26 May when a student from outside the encampment provoked and filmed the encampment, and attacked two students when they asked him to stop recording.

Yours sincerely,

The Security Liaison Team