

When Safeguards Become Obstacles

A Brief Public Report on Process, Power and Coincidence

Ian Clayton

Ethical Approach UK

Date: 27 January 2026

Introduction

There are moments in public life when no accusation is required.

When the record itself is sufficient.

When the most effective course is simply to lay out the facts, quietly and in order and allow the reader to observe what follows.

This is one of those moments.

What is set out below is not speculation, not theory and not rhetoric.

It is drawn directly from:

- Parliamentary testimony,
- official policing disclosures,
- and documented operational practice.

Nothing more. Nothing less.

I. The Parliamentary Record

In 2021, during a formal Select Committee hearing, evidence was given concerning the approach to legal and procedural constraints during the Covid response.

The language used was strikingly direct.

The approach described was, verbatim:

“Treat this like a wartime thing. Ignore rules.”

“If lawyers get in your way... we’ll find ways of bulldozing them out of your way.”

“Throw them all down the toilet.”

These were not private remarks.

They were not leaks.

They were statements made on the Parliamentary record.

They describe a conscious decision to treat established safeguards - rules, oversight, legal challenge, not as protections, but as impediments.

In plain constitutional terms, this amounts to the temporary suspension of friction.

The removal of obstacles.

Speed over scrutiny.

II. The Policing Record

Around the same period, policing adopted a national operational framework known as Operation Talla.

Disclosures and force communications show that, in relation to certain categories of Covid and vaccine-related allegations, officers were instructed in substance to:

- reject reports,
- decline to record complaints,
- divert matters away from crime recording processes,
- and create intelligence entries instead of investigations.

Members of the public attempting to report alleged harms or offences were therefore not entering the ordinary criminal justice pathway at all.

No record.

No investigation.

No progression.

Again, this is not interpretation.

It is contained within official documents and confirmed in police disclosures.

III. Two Approaches, One Outcome

It is not necessary to speculate about coordination.

It is sufficient simply to observe outcomes.

On one side:

Legal challenge described as something to be bulldozed out of the way.

On the other:

Public complaints rejected at source and prevented from entering the system.

Different institutions.

Different mechanisms.

Yet a curiously similar effect.

In both cases, friction disappears.

Lawyers do not challenge.

Complaints do not proceed.

Processes that ordinarily test, question, or slow executive action quietly fall away.

And policy implementation proceeds without interruption.

IV. Coincidence

Perhaps this is coincidence.

History allows for coincidence.

But it is an unusual coincidence, when:

- legal safeguards are set aside,
- lawyers are treated as obstacles,
- complaints are filtered out,
- investigations do not begin,

and, at the same time,

- complex national policies encounter remarkably little formal resistance through ordinary legal and criminal channels.

One might reasonably observe that these developments were, at the very least, convenient.

Convenient for speed.

Convenient for administration.

Convenient for the uninterrupted execution of policy.

Whether convenience was intended or incidental is not for this note to assert.

It is simply what the record shows.

V. A Constitutional Observation

Courts exist for a reason.

So do lawyers.

So does the recording of complaints.

They are not decorative.

They are the deliberate friction built into a lawful society.

They are how power is tested.

How error is corrected.

How excess is restrained.

When such safeguards are described as obstacles, or quietly removed in practice, something important changes.

Not necessarily unlawfulness, but certainly balance and balance is the essence of the rule of law.

VI. Conclusion

This report advances no accusation.

It alleges no crime.

It draws no dramatic conclusion.

It simply places side by side:

- the words spoken to Parliament, and
- the operational practices adopted in policing.

The reader may decide what those facts mean.

History, in time, will do the same.

For now, it is enough to preserve the record, calmly, accurately and without embellishment because records endure long after explanations fade.