



Buro Jansen & Janssen is a research bureau that critically follows police, justice, intelligence services and government in the Netherlands and Europe. A land-rights collective that has been publishing for 30 years on the expansion of repressive legislation, public-private partnerships, powers, government action and other state affairs.

Buro Jansen & Janssen PO Box 10591, 1001EN Amsterdam, 020-6123202, 06-34339533, signal +31684065516, info@burojansen.nl (pgp)

Support Buro Jansen & Janssen. Become a donor, NL43 ASNB 0856 9868 52 or NL56 INGB 0000 6039 04 in the name of Stichting Res Publica, Postbus 11556, 1001 GN Amsterdam.

<https://www.burojansen.nl/aivd/geheime-dienst-probeerde-activist-tegen-politiegeweld-te-ronselen/>

# Secret service tried to recruit activist against police brutality

February 6, 2022

On International Human Rights Day, an activist working for 'Justice for Sammy' was approached by the intelligence service, the AIVD. Sammy Baker was shot dead by police in Amsterdam on August 13, 2020. Two agents of the secret service sat on his couch on the morning of December 10, 2021 and wanted to recruit him as an informant. Then, with the help of agents of the Amsterdam police, they illegally seized the camera footage of the apartment complex where the activist lives.

**The incident illustrates once again that the AIVD is not there to protect the rule of law, but to whitewash police violence.** This is inappropriate in a democratic constitutional state. Police and prosecutors should be transparent about the events surrounding Sammy's death and the steps the government is taking in the context of proper investigation and prosecution of police officers involved. **People who expose, intimidate and spy on police brutality, further abuse trust in the rule of law.**

On **December 10, 2021, International Human Rights Day**, I was awakened by the doorbell at a quarter past ten. I live in an apartment complex and was under the impression that the doorbell had been rung via the central bell system in the hall. When I tried to inquire via the intercom who had rang the doorbell, there was no one on the other end of the line. "It must be one of the neighbors," I thought and without further thought opened my front door.

### **The AIVD sitting on my bench questioning me about a demonstration against police brutality**

There stood a man and a woman. The man was white, had about six-seven or ten inches of brown hair and was wearing a neat jacket -but not a suit or anything. He was in his mid-thirties and about 5,11 feet tall. The woman was slightly older, in her mid-forties and slightly smaller, about 5,6 feet tall. She was also wearing a rather neutral winter coat. Although I did not know these people they seemed to know me. They introduced themselves: "We are from Internal Affairs". They showed a pass at the words Internal Affairs very fleetingly. It might just as well have been their library card, because in that flash I could not make out what was on their cards.

They suggested to come back in ten minutes, since I had just gotten out of bed and was visibly unprepared for their visit. But I referred them to the living room and put on something in the meantime. Afterwards I wondered why I had let them in in the first place. In the past I regularly visited squatter cafes and sympathized with the squatter movement and the housing struggle. I also took part in squatting actions and did some squatting myself. Through the housing struggle I also got involved in climate action and activism in general. So I had heard about approaches, informants and infiltrators.

Now I was taken by surprise. Still only half awake, in my underpants. No idea why I didn't immediately think I could be a potential target of an approach. I was politically active again, but didn't really dwell on it. I even felt like I couldn't just send them away. I even apologized for the mess in the living room to which the woman said, "That's what you get for coming by unannounced." There was a strange sense of familiarity about these comments, as if they were very good friends of mine whose unannounced ringing of the doorbell when they were in the neighborhood would not be remarkable.

Once we were seated, they got right to the point and told me they were from the AIVD. The male agent in particular did the talking. He said that the service was "positively interested in me." Or was it: "positively noticed"? I was clearly taken by surprise, first "home affairs" and then "**AIVD**" (**General Intelligence and Security Service**), when "home affairs" should be enough to become suspicious. After all, it is the ministry responsible for the secret service. "You were involved in that demonstration against police brutality, right?" the officer asked, as if he didn't know. I had signed up for a demonstration in Amsterdam and was a police spokesperson at the event on August 13, 2021. "How did you experience that?", the female officer added.

## Sammy Baker shot dead by Amsterdam police

That date, August 13, 2021 there was a demonstration against police brutality and to commemorate German influencer Sammy Baker who was shot dead by Amsterdam police a year earlier, on August 13, 2020. Sammy had come to Amsterdam for his birthday with his friends. On August 12, 2020, he was reported missing. Sammy had tried weed (cake) with his friends and probably went into a psychosis as a result. Because his friends could not reach him, they decided to inform Sammy's mother, who then came to Amsterdam to help look for him. In the process, the police were also asked for help. Eventually Sammy was found in a confused state in an otherwise completely empty courtyard garden.

At the moment the police found Sammy, he is holding a small pocket knife to his throat. It is clear that at that moment he was only a danger to himself. Sammy's mother had tried to calm him down in her car shortly before, but had been unsuccessful, she was nearby, however but not called to negotiate. Also the psycholance, special transport for confused people, with specialized nurses had arrived. However, the specialized nurses were not asked by the police to assist while Sammy did not respond to orders from officers and to pepper spray. Even a police dog that had been sent to Sammy did not overpower him, but walked past him.

Without waiting for a professional negotiator, specialized nurses or arresting unit, the officers decided to just overpower Sammy and work him to the ground. This turned out to be totally wrong. The psychotic and confused, but non-violent Sammy naturally panicked and maybe swung the pocket knife. Two officers then decided to both shoot twice. Sammy was instantly dead.

The police immediately seem to get defensive after the shooting, talk about a knife and not a pocket knife, about three shots instead of four, that Sammy would be a danger to the environment aka the officers and that Sammy wanted to stab the officers. The knife gets bigger and bigger in the period that follows. The Parool already speaks of a large knife on August 18, 2020 (journalist Sam de Graaff) and on August 21, 2020 even of a butcher knife (crime reporter Paul Vugts). Both journalists do not indicate who has declared about the knife. This is clear in Het Parool of 9 December 2020 when Ruben Koops writes that according to the police it was a large knife, something that the German weekly Bild takes over and writes that the knife was 30 centimeters long. The knife, the shots, the stabbing and the threat that emanated from him prove in the months that follow to be completely different from what the police and the media write.

When, on May 17, 2021, the prosecution decided not to prosecute the officers involved in Sammy's death because of the existence of emergency defense, it becomes clear that a pocket knife was involved and that it was clear that Sammy was primarily a danger to himself and only became a danger to the officers when they tried to overpower him. The fact that the prosecution speaks of emergency defense raises many questions in this regard, because apparently, there was a police negotiator on the way and a psycholance with specialized personnel at the scene. Why were these not deployed?

And if it is true that no damage was found on the vests of the officers, according to the lawyer of the family of Sammy Baker, Richard Korver, can we really still speak of emergency defense? According to Korver, even a vest, the vest of the officer who was allegedly stabbed, was forensically examined twice. So apparently even after a thoughtless and failed overpowerment, Sammy was not a danger to the officers, but only to himself. Sammy was

therefore not shot out of self- defense as the prosecution claims, but by completely thoughtless and unprofessional conduct.

### **"How come you don't want to answer questions? We don't mean anything by it"**

So on August 13, 2021, I was involved in a demonstration in memory of the death of Sammy Baker a year earlier and in general against excessive police brutality. Police brutality that is condoned by the prosecution by saying that it was a case of self-defense, when in fact it was a confused psychotic boy of 23. And then an employee of the AIVD asked me how I had experienced this? "What had I experienced?", shot through my head. The shooting of Sammy? The demonstration against police brutality a year later? Or now a visit from the intelligence service who apparently wanted to intimidate me because I had organized a demonstration.

"How did you experience that?" was the first question the staff of the AIVD asked me and I immediately took this opportunity to inform them that I had no interest in the conversation and that I would not respond to their questions either. By now I was wide awake and it was one hundred percent clear to me what they wanted. **They wanted to recruit me as an informant.** In the back of my mind I already had that feeling at the door, but was not awake enough to refuse them entry. "Oh, why not, how come you don't want to answer questions?", the woman still tried. "We don't mean anything by it," she added. It was clear that she was trying to convince me to continue talking. I was completely done with it and replied, "I'm just telling you that I'm not interested in this conversation so I'm not going to answer any questions either".

I didn't answer anymore and repeated that I had no interest in the conversation. "Okay, then we'll go," the man said and they got up to leave, but not before the woman looked for another small opening, just like a door-to-door salesperson who wants to sell you a subscription: "If you change your mind you can contact the general number of the AIVD." When I called the AIVD, all I had to do was ask about the people who had rang my doorbell and sat on the bench. It all sounded surreal, no name, no direct number, not even a trunk number.

When they left, I was stunned. I wasn't quite sure what to make of all this and needed some time to process it. I just went about my day but after a while I began to wonder very much how on earth they had passed the front door in the hall. I rang the doorbell of the owner's association (VvE) to explain that two uninvited, but mostly unwelcome, people had come to my door and that I would like to see the security camera footage to find out how they got in. When I asked him about this, he told me **that two civil police officers, also a man and a woman, had come by earlier in the day to ask for the camera footage.**

### **AIVD and Amsterdam police try to cover up approach**

The agents turned out to be from the Amsterdam police and not the AIVD. **The male officer has been working for the Amsterdam police for quite some time, according to his LinkedIn page. His own website states that he has his own coaching company.** The woman always positioned herself so that she stayed out of sight and could therefore also be the woman who sat on the bench with me. The plain clothed officers had no search warrant, order to hand over the camera footage or other documents to request camera footage with them. The facility manager had not looked for anything behind it and, in agreement with a neighbor who deals with the footage, had given permission for the footage to be handed over.

The neighbor in charge of the footage told me that there wasn't much I could do about it: "They're going to get the footage anyway if they want it, so I'll just give it to them." The agents had come by around noon, an hour and a half after the AIVD visit. The neighbor did ask the officers if they could somehow provide him with proof that they had taken the images. To this end they sent him a confirmation via e-mail, but that e-mail does not say much.

It is very intimidating to have the AIVD at your front door, especially since they do not introduce themselves as members of the secret service. It is especially disturbing that intelligence agencies are being used to wipe the street clean of the police. Apparently, the government wants to infiltrate action groups against police brutality. So is that the security that the V in AIVD stands for? The security for law enforcement and security services to act with impunity?

**And does the fact that an Amsterdam cop confiscated the footage mean that this intimidation action was carried out by colleagues of the cops who shot Samuel Baker?**

Shouldn't that be investigated?

Thorough and transparent investigation, prosecution and trial in the context of police brutality and the unnecessary death of Sammy are fundamental principles of the rule of law. Apparently, there is no interest in this and even people who report police brutality are intimidated and spied upon. This action by the AIVD has further eradicated my sense of security and trust in the rule of law.