

## Re: Message to LSE Encampment Security Team

From LSE Liberated Zone Security [REDACTED]

To Executiveoffice [REDACTED]

CC LSE Liberated Zone [REDACTED]

Date Wednesday, 5 June 2024 at 00:42

Dear Eric Neumayer, Emma McCoy, Joanne Hay,

Thank you for your email. As mentioned to Eric today, the encampment has decided to first receive your second fire inspection report before security liaisons meet with you, given that the position of the encampment has been communicated to you in full in our last email (Monday 3 June, 11:17). We note that on Tuesday morning two unidentified fire safety inspectors were brought to the camp to conduct an inspection. Despite being told by SMC that “representatives from your encampment may accompany the independent surveyor to ask questions, offer explanation, and make suggestions,” we were not allowed to speak to them and they did not engage with us.

Our email (3 June) extensively detailed the ways in which the encampment has addressed and complied with the fire safety concerns raised in your first inspection report. We’d like to reiterate that we are deeply concerned about potential fire hazards and risks ourselves, which is why we sought an independent fire report last week - which SMC has actively blocked in a number of ways:

1) On Monday 27 May, after we were first notified about the School’s fire safety concerns, we requested via email the floor and building plans of the Marshall Building from Allan Blair. The floor and building plans are required for us to seek out our own assessment and clear fire safety advice in line with BS 0999 which Allan also notified us of. We immediately sought fire safety advice from contacts including the Fire Brigades Union. **Our email request for the plans was ignored. We find it troubling that Allan and SMC have refused to share the floor and building plans with us which are imperative for our own safety. This has hindered and delayed the encampment from carrying out a fire inspection.**

2) On Tuesday 28 May, SMC was informed that we would carry out our own fire safety inspection before taking any action regarding the conditions SMC was trying to set on the encampment. It is obvious that a private fire surveyor acting on behalf of SMC would issue a report with findings in line with the wishes of SMC; thus the point of carrying out our own fire inspection was to ensure balance and a fair assessment from our point of view. SMC was aware that our fire safety inspectors were coming the following day. On Wednesday 29 May, they arrived at LSE for an independent site visit - 3 members of the Fire Brigades Union - to carry out an inspection. However, **Richard Mulcahy and Allan Blair refused to allow our fire safety advisors entry into the building, denying us the ability to conduct our own fire risk and safety inspection. We were surprised and shocked at why you would deny students the right to a fire safety inspection, and the School an additional fire safety report, if this is your concern.**

3) There is a clear dispute between the information that we have received from the London Fire Brigade following their senior fire safety officer Chris Andrews’ entry on Wednesday 29 May (when Richard and Allan were both present), and the information you claim to have received from them separately. The reason why we called the

London Fire Brigade to arrive and carry out a check on Wednesday 29 May is because you denied entry to Fire Brigades Union members to carry out a fire safety inspection in the building for the encampment, as stated in the previous point. **We'd like to remind you that as you know, the London Fire Brigade's checks resulted in no concerns, as Allan Blair and Richard Mulch were informed of in person at the site by Chris Andrews.** This invalidates the findings of your own first fire safety report which states "it is likely that any visit by the fire service would result in a prohibition notice being issued." No prohibition notice was issued when the London Fire Brigade visited. We are concerned that you may be sharing selective information or a particular interpretation of Chris Andrews' checks on Wednesday 29 May. We have since asked that, again, in line with your first fire safety report, rather than issuing a second private report, you call on the London Fire Brigade to return and carry out a check, which you state they have refused to do.

4) You took the decision to close the Marshall building on Thursday 30 May based on your interpretation of the findings of your first fire inspection report (denying us the ability to conduct our own report; and contrary to the London Fire Brigade's verdict regarding fire safety in the building) - without checking whether the report's recommendations had been met by the encampment. **We strongly believe that if SMC had not hindered our ability to carry out an independent fire safety inspection on Wednesday 29 May, like the London Fire Brigade's verdict, the findings would have stated no reason to close the Marshall building. We therefore believe that for this reason you intentionally denied us the ability to carry out a fire safety assessment, and you sought to immediately close the building to prevent us from carrying out an independent assessment.** Your closure of the Marshall building is not in the interests of the wider School community nor the encampment.

We find that the only appropriate course of action is for us to carry out our **own independent fire safety check**, as we planned over a week ago on Tuesday 28 May, and ask that in the interests of the School community and the occupiers, you do not deny entry for our fire safety advisors this time. We are shocked and disappointed to see your disingenuous portrayal of the events above in your School-wide email (4 May). While we seek further advice, we continue to take full measures to improve the safety of the encampment in line with the first report.

We will be able to meet with you once we have received your second fire inspection report as well as appropriate legal advice from our side.

Finally, we would like to remind you that you have not responded to a single concern regarding student safety that we have repeatedly sent to you via email. Our email dated 22 May outlined a number of safety and security concerns that had been raised by students including Islamophobia and discrimination against Muslim students, surveillance of students and harassment. Our email on 3 June outlined our concern that LSE had knowledge of a rally organised by several groups in collaboration with the Israeli Embassy at Lincoln's Inn field on 1 June and did not inform the encampment to protect students' safety despite the considerable risk posed. We seek an urgent response to these emails. We also request urgent clarification on why a student in the encampment facing medical/health issues was denied entry into the building this evening (at 11.05pm on Tuesday 4 June). We have previously been given assurances that the 11pm curfew does not apply in the case of a medical emergency.

All the best,  
Security Liaison Team