Report of an enquiry into allegations of ill-treatment in Northern Ireland

an Amnesty International report

75 pence (US $1.85)

first published March 1972
reprinted July 1974
2nd reprint June 1975

Printed by the Russell Press, Nottingham, England (TU)

Amnesty International Publications
53 Theobald's Road
London WC1X 8SP England

FOREWORD

The Amnesty Commission of Enquiry into allegations of ill-treatment in Northern Ireland deals mainly with cases of persons arrested after 9 August and who, with one exception, were not interrogated in depth. The ill-treatment described in the Amnesty Commission report has therefore not been affected by any government decision based upon the Compton findings and the Parker recommendations.

The Compton Committee reported on the techniques of interrogation in depth used by British authorities in Northern Ireland. These techniques were also considered by the Parker Committee: its report was published on 2 March 1972. The British government has announced that these particular techniques have been stopped and will not be used in future as an aid to interrogation.

In its conclusions the Amnesty Commission finds that persons arrested under the Special Powers Act "had been subjected to brutal treatment by the security forces during arrest and transport. It also concluded that there were cases where suffering had been inflicted on those arrested to obtain from them confessions or information". (page 27)

The present report is divided into three parts. The first part deals with 26 cases which fall outside the terms of reference of the Compton report; the second with four cases covered by the Compton Committee; the third comprises the memorandum submitted by Amnesty International to the Parker Committee.

The Commission met in Belfast between 16 December and 20 December 1971. The latest date of a complaint heard by the Commission related to men arrested on 18 November. Amnesty International continues to receive allegations of ill-treatment from Northern Ireland. While it is encouraging to note that certain techniques of interrogation have been discontinued, the fact remains that brutality of the type confirmed in the present report apparently continues.

The Commission was composed of three professional persons of different nationalities: a Norwegian lawyer, a Swedish journalist and a Dutch doctor. The Secretary of the Commission was a New Zealander, a Researcher employed by Amnesty International.

first published March 1972
reprinted July 1974
2nd reprint June 1975

Printed by the Russell Press, Nottingham, England (TU)

Amnesty International Publications
53 Theobald's Road
London WC1X 8SP England

FOREWORD

The Amnesty Commission of Enquiry into allegations of ill-treatment in Northern Ireland deals mainly with cases of persons arrested after 9 August and who, with one exception, were not interrogated in depth. The ill-treatment described in the Amnesty Commission report has therefore not been affected by any government decision based upon the Compton findings and the Parker recommendations.

The Compton Committee reported on the techniques of interrogation in depth used by British authorities in Northern Ireland. These techniques were also considered by the Parker Committee: its report was published on 2 March 1972. The British government has announced that these particular techniques have been stopped and will not be used in future as an aid to interrogation.

In its conclusions the Amnesty Commission finds that persons arrested under the Special Powers Act "had been subjected to brutal treatment by the security forces during arrest and transport. It also concluded that there were cases where suffering had been inflicted on those arrested to obtain from them confessions or information". (page 27)

The present report is divided into three parts. The first part deals with 26 cases which fall outside the terms of reference of the Compton report; the second with four cases covered by the Compton Committee; the third comprises the memorandum submitted by Amnesty International to the Parker Committee.

The Commission met in Belfast between 16 December and 20 December 1971. The latest date of a complaint heard by the Commission related to men arrested on 18 November. Amnesty International continues to receive allegations of ill-treatment from Northern Ireland. While it is encouraging to note that certain techniques of interrogation have been discontinued, the fact remains that brutality of the type confirmed in the present report apparently continues.

The Commission was composed of three professional persons of different nationalities: a Norwegian lawyer, a Swedish journalist and a Dutch doctor. The Secretary of the Commission was a New Zealander, a Researcher employed by Amnesty International.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT OF AN ENQUIRY INTO ALLEGATIONS OF ILL-TREATMENT MADE AGAINST THE SECURITY FORCES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Introduction

Amnesty International is an independent organisation which works, irrespective of political considerations, for the release of men and women who are in prison because of their beliefs, who have neither used nor advocated violence. It has consultative status with the United Nations and the Council of Europe and works for the implementation of Articles 5, 9, 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In the context of the present Commission of Enquiry, Article 5 of the Declaration is relevant: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment." In addition, Article 3 of the European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, to which the United Kingdom is a party, also provides that "No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment." Article 15 of the Convention stipulates that Article 3 shall continue to apply even in times of war or grave public emergency. It therefore represents an absolute minimum standard of civilised behaviour and treatment from which not even war can justify departure.

After the introduction of internment in Northern Ireland in August 1971, there were allegations that the standards enumerated above had been departed from by the authorities in their treatment of those who had been detained. Soon after these allegations were made public, the U.K. Government set up a Committee of Enquiry, whose Chairman was Sir Edmund Compton. This Committee found that a large number of specific complaints of ill-treatment were justified. Since the publication of the Compton Report on 16 November 1971 a further committee was appointed by the British Government to enquire into interrogation procedures to be used in the future. The Government also asked the Parliamentary Commissioner for Northern Ireland to deal with complaints, but one difficulty encountered by any complaints machinery set up by the authorities is that the complainants themselves have been reluctant to testify before it.

On 30 October 1971, the International Executive Committee of Amnesty International decided to set up an independent, international Commission of Enquiry to investigate allegations of ill-treatment. Its decision was conveyed to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, together with a request that the Commission should be granted the appropriate facilities. In subsequent correspondence, the U.K. authorities refused to grant such facilities to the Commission, and did not accept an invitation to send an observer to sit with the Commission.

The members of the Commission were Mr. Thomas Hammarberg, Chairman of the Swedish section of Amnesty International and a member of the International Executive Committee; Dr. Herman van Geuns, Chairman of the Dutch section of Amnesty International, a member of the International Executive Committee and Medical Director of the TB clinic, Rotterdam; and Mr. Gunnar Lind, a Norwegian lawyer and Assistant Public Prosecutor.

The Commission arrived in Belfast on 16 December 1971 and during the following five days heard evidence given by, and on behalf of, detainees and internees and ex-detainees and ex-internees.

Terms of Reference

The terms of reference were to "examine the allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners and internees detained under the Special Powers Act, as well as the conditions of imprisonment and internment".

As there was no co-operation from the authorities the Commission decided to concentrate its work on investigating allegations of ill-treatment. It was also decided that the Commission should deal mainly with cases outside the terms of reference of the Compton Committee, i.e. cases of men who were arrested after 9 August 1971.

Course of Proceedings

A representative of the Irish section of Amnesty International and a representative of the British section went to Belfast on 9 November 1971 to prepare jointly the ground for the Commission. They reported that various solicitors, acting independently, would be prepared to present their clients' cases to a Commission of the kind proposed by Amnesty.

The procedure adopted by the Commission was as follows:-

1. Cases of complainants were considered individually.

2. The Commission, whenever possible, heard oral evidence from complainants personally.

3. Where a complainant gave oral evidence the following procedure was applied:

   (a) his legal representative, if he wished, made an opening statement

   (b) the complainant gave oral evidence in chief

   (c) the Commission questioned the complainants

   (d) the legal representative had an opportunity to re-examine the complainant.

4. The Commission heard medical evidence wherever available.

5. The Commission heard evidence from such witnesses as were available and they were examined in the same manner as the complainants themselves.

6. In the event of the complainant not being able to appear before the Commission, submissions were made by his legal representative.

7. The only persons present before the Commission while evidence was being given were the complainant concerned, his legal representative and the witness at that time being examined.

8. The proceedings were tape recorded and taken down in shorthand.

Nature of Evidence

1. Documentary evidence in the form of affidavits was produced in all cases presented to the Commission. These contained the statement of the complainant and the medical statement in those cases where medical evidence was available. The statements of the complainants were in most cases given to their solicitor while they were still under detention or internment. The solicitor would then have the statement typed and on a later occasion a Commissioner for Oaths was brought into the institution and the complainant was able to confirm his statement on oath.

The affidavits were presented to the Commission before the hearings started and the Commission thus had an opportunity to learn of the allegations before hearing each case.

2. Oral evidence was taken from Edward Rooney, James Magilton, Anthony Austin, Patrick O'Neill, Gerard Maxwell and Joseph Watson, that is, all the complainants not still detained or interned who were present in Northern Ireland at that time. In those cases where the complainant could not appear before the Commission, his solicitor presented the case, mainly on the basis of the complainant's affidavit. The solicitor was questioned by the Commission about the allegations and any inconsistencies in the complainant's allegations.

3. The Commission also heard oral evidence from doctors who had examined the complainants in the cases of James Magilton, Oliver Grimes, Martin Scullion, John Conlon, Francis Murphy, William Anthony Shannon, Colum Meehan, Michael Patrick Murphy, Thomas Sinclair, Anthony Austin, Seamus Lynch, Liam McKee, Patrick O'Neill, Gerard Maxwell, Joseph Watson, John Patrick Watson, Gabriel Anthony Bradley, Martin Crawford and Michael Nelson. The examination was usually carried out at the request of the complainant's solicitor and performed at the place of detention or internment if the complainant had not been released. The doctors were questioned in particular by the medical member of the Commission about their findings in each individual case and asked whether the findings were consistent with the complainant's allegations.

4. In the cases of Joseph Watson, Patrick O'Neill, Martin Scullion, Oliver Grimes, John Conlon, Francis Murphy, John Patrick Watson, Liam McKee, Patrick McKavanagh and Edward Rooney, two or more complainants had been arrested together, or were together subsequently, which gave us the opportunity of comparing their accounts of the events. In most cases, however, apart from medical evidence, the Commission was unable to obtain corroborating evidence or effectively to check the allegations with other witnesses who could have verified or invalidated them. Similar types of treatment were reported by many of the complainants and this, of course, can be regarded as providing some corroboration.

5. During arrest and detention, it is reasonable to expect that a detainee would be psychologically upset, and that to some extent his normal powers of observation would be impaired. In evaluating the complainant's statement this had to be taken into account. In none of the cases, however, did we find it likely that the complainant had been so psychologically disturbed as to render his statement invalid or substantially to impair its value.

6. As the Commission received no cooperation from the authorities, its sources of information were necessarily one-sided except for cases covered in Section 2 of this report, who had been investigated by the Compton Committee. Evaluation of such information can only be based on a subjective impression of the complainant and his account, viewed in the light of any corroborative or contradictory evidence that might be available. And this is the basis upon which the Commission drew its conclusions.

Case Histories

PATRICK McKAVANAGH

Age: 24 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. McKavanagh and read a medical statement by Conor J. Gilligan, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Mr. Francis Irvine, solicitor.

2. Mr. McKavanagh says that he, his brother William, and Edward Rooney, met a military patrol on Catherine Street at about 2 a.m. on 11 August 1971. They were ordered to halt but William McKavanagh turned to run, was shot and died some minutes later. Mr. Patrick McKavanagh and Mr. Rooney were placed under arrest. An army vehicle arrived at about 6.30 a.m. and they were taken to Hastings Street Barracks. The body of Mr. McKavanagh's brother was taken in the same vehicle.

Mr. McKavanagh was later taken to the Police Office on Townhall Street and charged with theft (he had taken up a rivetting tool, a pair of boots and some socks that were lying on the street during the disturbances - and kept them) and appeared in court on 12 August 1971 and was released on bail. No other charges were preferred against him. He was examined by Mr. Gilligan on 12 August.

3. Mr. McKavanagh alleges the following:

He was struck in his face by a baton or a rifle butt when he entered the army vehicle. His glasses were smashed and a soldier trampled on them deliberately. Both McKavanagh and Rooney were verbally abused and they were also threatened that they would be beaten up and shot. Mr. McKavanagh was further beaten with batons and rifle butts. His watch was damaged.

In the barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against a wall, finger tips against the wall and legs forced back and out. He was hit repeatedly. This went on for about twenty minutes. After this he was forced to do exercises and was hit on the head and elbows.

An empty sand bag was put over his head for about half an hour and he found it hard to breathe. When he was interrogated later he was tapped from behind on the back of the head.

He was first given the diabetic medicine, which he should take three times a day, at about 8 p.m. on 11 August.

4. On examination, Mr. Gilligan found a bruised swelling on the bridge of the nose with the skin broken in centre. There were tender swellings close to the left ear, on the right parietal area, on the right arm and in the neck. There were several extensive areas of swelling and bruisings on the limbs. There was especially extensive bruising on the right thigh and the skin was broken, which could have been caused by an instrument or a weapon with a sharp point. There was evidence that he had been struck repeatedly over different parts of his body by a blunt weapon, used with considerable force.

In Mr. Gilligan's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. McKavanagh's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no major inconsistencies in Mr. McKavanagh's testimony and his account is essentially corroborated by the evidence from Mr. Rooney regarding experiences when the two were together. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by Mr. McKavanagh and Mr. Gilligan, accepts the substance of Mr. McKavanagh's allegations.

EDWARD ROONEY

Age: 27 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Rooney and read a medical statement by Conor J. Gilligan, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Mr. Francis Irvine, solicitor.

2. Mr. Rooney says he was arrested by soldiers at about 2 a.m. on 11 August 1971 in Catherine Street, Belfast. A friend, William McKavanagh, who was with him, was shot when he tried to run from the soldiers. Mr. Rooney and William McKavanagh's brother, Patrick, were kept waiting for about four hours and were then taken in an army vehicle to Hastings Street Barracks.

Mr. Rooney was later taken to the Police Office in Townhall Street and charged with theft (some hours before he was arrested he had taken a pair of boots and some socks that had been thrown out on to the street from a clothing company during the disturbances). He appeared in Court on 12 August and was released on bail. He was examined by Mr. Gilligan on 12 August.

3. Mr. Rooney alleges the following:

He was humiliated after he had been taken into the army vehicle and verbally abused by the soldiers. He was beaten three times with the butt of a pistol so that his glasses and some of his teeth were broken. He was also hit on the cheek-bone. He offered no resistance at that stage or later.

At Hastings Street Barracks he was placed spreadeagled against a wall, leaning against it on his fingertips, and later made to do press-ups. He was hit all the time on the head, shoulders and the back. He was made to squat for about 10 or 15 minutes and to sit with his arms and legs extended straight out. The exercises lasted for about 1½ hours. There was a break during which he was questioned and then the same sort of treatment continued. He was jabbed about five times in the groin with a baton and struck on the back with a baton. When he was unable to carry out the exercises a baton was held between his legs and he was dropped on to it.

4. Mr. Gilligan examined him a few hours after release and found a swelling of soft tissues over the left parietal area, deep laceration on the lower lip, five teeth broken, several other teeth loose, a 2 cm laceration and associated bruising in the face, skin abrasion on left ear, bruisings in the back and on right elbow, left knee joint tender on palpation, and movements restricted by pain.

Mr. Gilligan states in his affidavit that these injuries must have been caused by considerable force. He believed that they could not have been caused merely by a closed fist. Some heavy weapon or instrument would have been necessary to produce the extensive soft tissue bruises.

In Mr. Gilligan's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Rooney's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Rooney's testimony and his account is essentially corroborated by the evidence from Mr. McKavanagh regarding experiences when the two were together. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by Mr. Rooney and Mr. Gilligan, accepts the substance of Mr. Rooney's allegations.

JAMES MAGILTON

Age: 60 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Magilton and expert medical evidence from Mr. J. P. Lane, Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Paschal J. O'Hare, solicitor.

2. Mr. Magilton, a Protestant living in a Catholic area, says he was arrested in his home at 5 a.m. on 13 August 1971 and taken in a Saracen about 400 yards to Falls Road. From there he was taken in a military vehicle to Girdwood Military Barracks. He was released the same day and arrived home at about 1 p.m. He saw his own doctor that day and was referred to the Mater hospital for X-ray and examination. He was admitted to the hospital on 17 August and remained there until 5 September.

3. Mr. Magilton alleges the following:

He was kicked and beaten by soldiers and military policemen after having arrived at the Falls Road. He also received blows on the journey to Girdwood.

After arrival at Girdwood he was made to crawl on all fours into a corridor and his hair was pulled. He was then placed in an enforced posture against the wall with only his finger tips giving him support. He was punched in the stomach and kicked on the shins several times, which caused him to fall. After his release he was barely able to walk and was carried by two men from the place where he had been left by an army vehicle to his home 200 yards away.

4. Mr. Lane says he examined Mr. Magilton for the first time on 17 August after the patient was admitted to the hospital. In Mr. Lane's judgement he had been humiliated and hurt mentally and physically.

Mr. Magilton had bruises on the scalp, back, elbows and arms, both knees on back and front. His legs and ankles had continuous bruising over their whole area on both sides. His right thigh was painful and tender. Movements were markedly restricted and painful and he could not bear weight on the right lower limb. His right thigh was three inches larger in circumference than the left. Both ankles were swollen with pitting oedema. There were also multiple scattered small lacerations, chiefly on the front of both legs.

Mr. Lane believes that as Mr. Magilton suffers from a combination of diabetes and cardiovascular disease, his life was endangered by the treatment he received.

In Mr. Lane's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Magilton's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Magilton's testimony. On examination the medical member of the Commission could still find signs that Mr. Magilton had suffered, particularly in regard to his legs, from the enforced standing. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by Mr. Magilton and Mr. Lane, accepts the substance of Mr. Magilton's allegations.

DERMOT JOHN REYNOLDS

Age: approximately 35 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Reynolds as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment

Camp, was presented to the Commission by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. Reynolds stated that he was arrested by soldiers at the junction of Falls Road and Clonard Street at about 4.30 p.m. on 17 August 1971. He was taken to Girdwood Military Barracks, where he was photographed and handed over to members of the Special Branch of the RUC.

On 19 August he was taken to Crumlin Jail and served with a Detention Order. He was interned on 14 September 1971.

3. Mr. Reynolds alleges the following:

During interrogation at Girdwood, a hood was placed over his head. A number of people kicked him and struck him with their fists. He was then thrown into what he thought was the back of a land rover and driven for about half an hour. He was thrown out on the ground and kicked again. A gun was placed to his head, the trigger was pulled and he heard the gun click. He was kicked again and then taken on foot back to Girdwood.

There he was placed in a room, still hooded, against a wall for a long time. He heard a hissing noise like an air compressor which went on and off. Someone fired what sounded like a rubber bullet gun behind him three or four times. He felt his trousers move with the blast. He does not know for how long he stood there.

4. There is no medical evidence. Mr. Napier says that when he saw Mr. Reynolds for the first time at the end of September or beginning of October he observed no bruising.

5. Conclusion: In the absence of medical or other corroborative evidence the Commission could make no findings in this case.

MARTIN SCULLION

Age: 28 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Scullion as he was still detained. His statement, sworn on 15 November 1971 at Crumlin Jail, was presented to us. We heard expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Scullion says he was arrested by British soldiers and a police constable in his home at about 5 a.m. on 20 September 1971. He was taken to the Police Station in Cookstown and from there to Holywood Military Barracks. After two to three days he was transferred to Crumlin Jail where he was still detained at the time of our investigation. He was examined by Mr. Lane in Crumlin Jail on 23 September 1971. Mr. Duffy visited him in Crumlin Jail on about 25 September 1971 at which time Mr. Scullion's account was related to him.

3. Mr. Scullion alleges the following:

At Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall with his feet as far as possible from the wall and on several occasions his feet were kicked from under him so that he fell to the floor. At intervals he was interrogated and during this was beaten and struck in his stomach which caused him to vomit. At one time he was told by his interrogator that he had been observed leaving Ulster Fireclay Works in Coalisland with twelve sticks of gelignite in the boot of his car at the time when the place was blown up. He

replied by asking how the observer would know that it was twelve sticks and not eleven. This caused the interrogator to strike him severely many times in the stomach and around the head. In the course of the interrogation a syringe was brought in and he was told that he would be given a jab which would put him out for two hours. No injection was given.

4. On examination, Mr. Lane found an area of fading bruising measuring 6 inches by 7 inches on Mr. Scullion's upper abdomen and lower chest wall. In this area of fading yellow bruising there were nine circular areas of bruising which were still purple in colour. Each of these smaller areas was approximately 1 inch in diameter. There was an area of fading bruising 4 inches by 3 inches on the chest wall on the right side and a small bruise ½ an inch in diameter on the right shoulder. His abdominal wall was tender and he complained of pain on deep breathing. In Mr. Lane's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Scullion's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Scullion's statement, which is corroborated by statements from Oliver Grimes, John Conlon and Francis Murphy as to experiences when they all were together. There are no major contradictions in their statements. The Commission, having considered Mr. Scullion's affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Lane, accepts the substance of Mr. Scullion's allegations.

OLIVER GRIMES

Age: 34 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Grimes as he was still interned. His statement sworn on 15 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp was presented to the Commission. We heard expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Grimes says he was arrested by British soldiers and a police constable in his home at about 5 a.m. on 20 September 1971. He was taken to the Police Station in Cookstown and from there to Holywood Military Barracks. After about 2 days he was transferred to and detained in Crumlin Jail, Belfast. Mr. Grimes was examined in Crumlin Jail by Mr. Lane on 23 September 1971.

3. Mr. Grimes alleges the following:

During interrogation in Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall while he was punched on the back of his head and neck and beaten on the stomach. This treatment was repeated several times. He was bleeding from a crack on the side of the eye. On one occasion he was beaten so severely that he fell to the ground and could not stand up. He was then lifted up by the hair and the beating continued. Later his hands were tied behind his back and the beating continued. On another occasion he was prodded in the posterior with an instrument resembling an animal prod.

4. On examination, Mr. Lane found two healing lacerations on Mr. Grimes's forehead, both one inch long and close together. There was a healing laceration ¼ of an inch long outside the right eye with yellow discolouration of the right orbit, and a similar sized laceration in front of the left ear. Over the right lower ribs and upper abdominal wall he found an area of fading bruising 4 inches by 4 inches, and a similar bruising 4 inches by 1½ inches on the left chest wall. Under this area there was a painful and tender swelling. There was diminished air-entry in the right lower chest and Mr. Grimes said he had pain on breathing. There was a circular bruise 1½ inches in diameter on the left shin. There were no signs of the alleged prodding in the buttock, but Mr. Lane stated

that this would not necessarily leave a mark. In Mr. Lane's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Grimes's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Grimes's statement, which is corroborated by statements from Martin Scullion, Francis Murphy and John Conlon as to experiences when they all were together. There are no major contradictions in the statements. The Commission, having considered Mr. Grimes's affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Lane, accepts the substance of Mr. Grimes's allegations.

JOHN CONLON

Age: 35 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Conlon, as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 15 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to us. We heard expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Conlon says he was arrested by British soldiers and a police constable in his home at about 5 a.m. on 20 September. He was taken to the Police Station in Cookstown and from there to Holywood Military Barracks. After about 2 days he was transferred to and detained in Crumlin Jail, Belfast. At the time of our investigation he was interned at Long Kesh Internment Camp. Mr. Conlon was examined in Crumlin Jail by Mr. Lane on 23 September 1971.

3. Mr. Conlon alleges the following:

At Holywood Military Barracks he was taken into a small cubicle where he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall with his feet as far from the wall as possible. On several occasions two of the guards would give signals to each other and then start kicking him on the shins and knocking his feet from under him so that he fell to the floor. At intervals he was taken into another room for questioning and was then severely punched on the ribs and in the stomach and struck around the ears and one side of the head. He was threatened that he would be forced to dig his grave and that he would be shot.

4. On examination, Mr. Lane found an area of bruising on the left side of Mr. Conlon's head (in the left temporal area) measuring 2 inches by 2½ inches. The bruise was of yellow colour, which in Mr. Lane's opinion would indicate that it had occurred some days before his examination. The examination also revealed a similar bruise in a 2½ inches circular area over the right lower rib margin and upper abdominal wall. The abdominal wall was tender to touch and Mr. Conlon complained of pain on breathing and coughing. Mr. Lane found no indication of injuries to other parts of the body. In Mr. Lane's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Conlon's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Conlon's statement, which is corroborated by statements from Martin Scullion, Francis Murphy and Oliver Grimes as to experiences when they all were together. There are no major contradictions in the statements. On the basis of Mr. Conlon's affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Lane, we accept the truth of Mr. Conlon's allegations that he was hit about the head and punched on the ribs with a considerable degree of force. We note, however, that no injuries were found on the shins corresponding to Mr. Conlon's allegation that he was kicked and we make no finding on this.

FRANCIS MURPHY

Age: 39 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Murphy, as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 15 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to us. We heard expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Murphy says he was arrested by British soldiers and a police officer in his home at about 5 a.m. on 20 September. He was transferred to Holywood Military Barracks and after 2 days was taken to Crumlin Jail, Belfast, where he was detained. At the time of our investigation he was interned at Long Kesh Internment Camp. Mr. Murphy was examined in Crumlin Jail by Mr. Lane on 23 September 1971.

3. Mr. Murphy alleges the following:

During interrogation in Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall. On different occasions while standing in this position his feet were kicked from under him so that he fell to the floor. On several occasions he was punched in the stomach and around the head. Once an interrogator struck him very hard in the stomach and as he fell to the floor he was hit by the interrogator's knee in the ribs and partly in the face. At this time he was not able to stand up, and he was lifted by the clothes and was once again punched in the stomach and around the head.

4. On examination, Mr. Lane found that Mr. Murphy had an area of fading bruising triangular in shape, measuring 6 inches by 5 inches by 5 inches over the upper abdomen and lower chest wall. There was a bruise 2 inches by 1 inch on the left side of this chest and his abdominal wall was tender. He also observed a fading bruise measuring 3 inches by 2 inches over the back of his neck and left shoulder and a small area of blue discolouration on the back of his right ear. On the back of his left hand was found a faint fading bruise 3-4 inches in diameter. In Mr. Lane's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Murphy's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no major inconsistencies in Mr. Murphy's statement, which is corroborated by statements from Martin Scullion, Oliver Grimes and John Conlon as to experiences when they all were together. There are no major contradictions in their statements. On the basis of Mr. Murphy's affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Lane, the Commission accepts the substance of Mr. Murphy's allegations.

ANTHONY McCAY

Age: 26 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. McCay, as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to us. We heard no expert medical evidence. The case was presented by James T. Johnston, solicitor.

2. Mr. McCay says he was arrested by British soldiers on his way home after having finished work on 20 September 1971. He was taken to Holywood Army Barracks where he was kept for 2 days and then transferred to Crumlin Jail where he was detained. At the time of our investigation he was interned at Long Kesh Internment Camp.

3. Mr. McCay alleges that:

During transport to Holywood Military Barracks he was made to lie face down on the floor of the army vehicle. At Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall while being interrogated. On one occasion his head was pulled back by the hair and he was punched in the solar plexus and then repeatedly punched until he fell to the floor, when he was kicked. Several times he was punched so severely that he fell to the floor. On one occasion a syringe was produced and he was told that it contained a truth drug. He was threatened with an injection, but was not given one.

4. There is no medical evidence.

5. Conclusion: In the absence of medical or other corroborative evidence the Commission can make no findings in this case.

PATRICK JOSEPH McCALLAN

Age: Not known

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. McCallan, as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission. The case was presented by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. McCallan says he was arrested at his home by British soldiers at about 4 a.m. on 28 September 1971. He was taken to Brown Square Military Post and then to Holywood Military Barracks. After 2 days he was transferred to Crumlin Jail where he was detained.

3. Mr. McCallan alleges the following:

While being interrogated at Holywood Military Barracks, he was beaten by the interrogators on the face and on the body. On one occasion, a bag, described as a sand-bag, was put over his head and tied with string around his neck. A gun was put into his mouth; the interrogators talked about playing "Russian Roulette" and threatened to kill him. When not being interrogated he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall. While in this position blank cartridges were discharged behind him close to his head.

4. There is no medical evidence.

5. Conclusion: In the absence of medical or other corroborative evidence the Commission can make no findings in this case.

WILLIAM ANTHONY SHANNON

Age: 23 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Shannon, as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission. We heard expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast and read a statement from P. P. O'Malley, M.B., F.R.C.P., D.P.M., D.P.H., F.R.C.Psych., Consultant Psychiatrist, Mater Infirmorum Hospital. The case was presented by Paschal O'Hare, solicitor.

2. Mr. Shannon says that he was arrested by British soldiers at about 11.20 p.m. on 9 October 1971. He was taken to Springfield Road Police Barracks, where he was held for one hour, and then to Girdwood Park Military Barracks, Antrim Road. After half an hour he was removed to Holywood Military Barracks, where he remained until the evening of 11 October, when he was taken to Crumlin Jail. After ten minutes he was taken from Crumlin Jail and removed to another place, where he remained until he was returned to Crumlin Jail on 18 October. At this point he received a medical examination. He does not know where he was held for the period between 11 October and 18 October. Mr. Shannon was examined in Crumlin Jail by Mr. Lane on 18 October 1971 and by Mr. O'Malley on 22 October 1971.

3. Mr. Shannon alleges the following:

During interrogation in Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against a wall and his feet were kicked from under him. He was made to count the holes in a section of perforated wall and beaten. A syringe was produced and he was threatened with a truth drug. He was punched on the head, shoulders, back, sides and the back of the neck. On one occasion a shot was fired and passed close to his ear. He was beaten with what he describes as a "sort of plastic hose". At the place where he was taken after leaving Crumlin Jail he was undressed and given overalls to wear. For most of the time his head was covered with a bag. He was made to stand for hours at a time spreadeagled against a wall and at intervals was interrogated. At one stage he was taken into a garden, and made to run without shoes or socks for about half an hour. He was subjected to a noise which he describes as "like steam hissing through a pipe", which varied in volume, sometimes quiet and sometimes roaring. For about four days his diet was restricted to cups of water and dry bread. He had no sleep for about the first three days. He was so disorientated by this treatment that he lost all track of time.

4. On examination Mr. Lane found fading bruises on the front of the left shoulder 3 inches by 1 inch; an oval fading bruise 1 inch long on the inside of the left arm; a fading bruise 3 inches by 3 inches on the back of the left shoulder; a bruise 3 inches by 1 inch over the left shoulder blade; a deeper coloured bruise 1½ inches by 1 inch in the left loin; two small lacerations of the right leg; an oval bruise 1½ inches by 1 inch on the outer side of the left foot; a small laceration on the back of the left foot. There was a flattening of the arches of both feet and the soles of both feet showed an area of dead superficial skin over each heel. The remainder of the feet and toes were very pink, swollen and tender to touch. In Mr. Lane's opinion the condition of Mr. Shannon's feet indicated that they had been subject to severe stress and the appearances were consistent with the prolonged bare-foot standing and forced running which he describes. Mr. Lane reported that Mr. Shannon was coherent, but disorientated as regards time and he thought that there might well be severe mental reaction later. He recommended that a psychiatrist's opinion be obtained.

Mr. O'Malley reported that signs of an Anxiety Tension State were evident on examination and that the development of such a condition was consistent with the history of ill-treatment following detention. When checking the accuracy of the history given, with direct and indirect questions, he found no inconsistencies. In his view, psychiatric treatment was necessary and he prescribed accordingly.

5. Conclusion: Although arrest occurred exactly two months after the period dealt with by the Compton Committee, the treatment he alleges is very reminiscent of that described by the 11 men mentioned in the Compton Report as having been interrogated in depth. The Commission also notes that for 9 days Mr. Shannon's wife and solicitor were unable to discover his whereabouts, in spite of repeated inquiries to the authorities. The Commission, having considered Mr. Shannon's affidavit, the evidence given by Mr. Lane, and Mr. O'Malley's report, accepts the substance of Mr. Shannon's allegations.

COLUM JOSEPH MEEHAN

Age: approximately 40 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Meehan as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. Oliver Hunter. The case was presented by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. Meehan says that he was arrested by British soldiers at about 12.10 a.m. on Saturday 16 October 1971. He was taken to the Henry Taggart Memorial Hall and questioned, then to Springfield Road Police Barracks. From there he was transferred to Holywood Military Barracks. At 8 p.m. on Sunday 17 October 1971 he was taken to Crumlin Jail, where he was served with a Detention Order. Subsequently he was served with an Internment Order and transferred to Long Kesh Internment Camp, where he was at the time of our investigation. Mr. Meehan was examined in Crumlin Jail by Dr. Hunter on 19 October 1971.

3. Mr. Meehan alleges the following:

During interrogation at Holywood Military Barracks he was placed on a chair facing a wall and at first was questioned gently, but later he was verbally abused and struck in the solar plexus with a clenched fist again and again. When he could no longer stand he was ordered to lie flat on the ground with his hands behind his head and his legs elevated, so that his head was off the ground. He was then kicked repeatedly on the chest. He was spreadeagled against a wall and made to stand on the tip of his toes; when he tried to alter his position he was kicked about the legs and manual pressure was applied to his testicles. After some time he was seated on a chair, a gun was produced and he was threatened with it.

4. On examination, Dr. Hunter found extensive bruising on the right chest wall from right axilla over the right lateral and right anterior aspects of his chest. There was also extensive bruising on the anterior abdominal wall and tenderness of the right ribs 8 - 10 at costo chondral junction. In Dr. Hunter's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Meehan's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Meehan's account and having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Dr. Hunter accepts the substance of his allegations.

MICHAEL PATRICK MURPHY

Age: approximately 35 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Murphy as he had returned to the Republic. His statement, sworn on 25 November 1971 at Crumlin Jail, was presented to the Commission. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. Joseph G. Hendron. The case was presented by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. Murphy, who had come to Belfast from Dublin on the afternoon of 16 October, says that he was arrested with Thomas Sinclair by British soldiers at about 11.30 p.m. on 16 October 1971. He was first taken to Vere Foster Military Post, where he remained for about 1 to 1½ hours and then removed to Holywood Military Barracks. He was kept there until about 8.45 p.m. on 17 October 1971, when he was transferred to Crumlin Jail and served with a Detention Order. He was released seven weeks later, in December, and returned to the Republic.

Mr. Murphy was examined at Crumlin Jail by Dr. Hendron on 21 October 1971.

3. Mr. Murphy alleges the following:

During interrogation at Holywood Military Barracks he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall and was hit on the back of the head with a clenched fist. After 20 minutes he was told to sit down and was then beaten on the stomach with a baton. After this, paper was put about the collar of his shirt; he was told that there was paraffin on the paper and that it would be set on fire. He was given tea and says that after drinking this he saw images on the wall. He was again made to stand spreadeagled against the wall on his toes, was beaten around the back of his body with fists and batons and kicked. During further questioning he was beaten so that he collapsed onto the floor and was then kicked in the ribs, legs, and other parts of the body. When he got up he was made to sit on his toes, with his hands outstretched and his back to the wall. When he collapsed he was struck about the hips with a black cane. A gun was produced, put to his head and the trigger pulled nine times; sometimes there was a click and other times a loud bang. After this a green sack was put over his head and there were threats of taking him in front of a firing squad. Several further beatings occurred and on one occasion he was kicked in the genitals.

4. On examination, Dr. Hendron found several bruise marks on the upper abdomen and on the right flank of the abdomen. There was a bruise on the front of the right thigh and one on the inside of the left thigh. There was a small laceration on the right side of the upper gum.

In Dr. Hendron's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Murphy's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Murphy's account, which is essentially corroborated by Thomas Sinclair's statement as to experiences when they were both together, and having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Dr. Hendron accepts the substance of his allegations.

THOMAS SINCLAIR

Age: 32 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Sinclair as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from Conor Gilligan, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast.

2. Mr. Sinclair says that he was arrested, with Michael Murphy, at about 11.30 p.m. on 16 October 1971. He was first taken to Vere Foster Military Post, where he remained for about 1 to 1½ hours, and then to Holywood Military Barracks. It is not clear from Mr. Sinclair's statement how long he remained at Holywood but he was probably transferred to Crumlin Jail on 17 or 18 October. He was seen by Mr. Gilligan in Crumlin Jail about 6 days after receiving the alleged injuries. On 7 November he was transferred to Long Kesh.

3. Mr. Sinclair alleges the following:

When he reached Holywood he was made to sit in a cubicle facing the wall for about an hour. While there he heard about 3 shots being fired and a policeman said "It makes an awful mess when you shoot one of these bastards". He also heard Michael Murphy shouting. During interrogation he was hit about the stomach

and chest and when he denied being in the I.R.A. he was beaten again. He was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall and was beaten in this position. He was kicked about the legs, which caused him to fall several times. He was kicked and beaten while on the floor and trailed by the hair. He thinks that he lost consciousness at one stage. He was interrogated 4 or 5 times and each time received similar treatment. On one occasion he was taken out, stripped to the waist, tied by the thumbs to something above him, with his toes just touching the ground and beaten about the body. He thinks that he again lost consciousness, as a result of this.

4. On examination, Mr. Gilligan found swelling and bruising present over lateral aspect of right and left arms, about mid-humerus level. That on the right measured 5 cm by 5 cm; that on the left 5 cm by 2 cm. Extensive bruises were noted on both sides of rib cage; these tender areas lie in the region of the 10th, 11th and 12th ribs. Bruising was noted in right lumbar area and in left inguinal region, and deep purple discolouration over the entire inner aspects of both thighs, extending three quarters of the way around the circumference of each limb. The upper limit of the changes is in the groin area. Gross discolouration and bruising was noted, extending from dorsum of foot at lower limit, to merge with bruising and discolouration of thighs. Right lower leg revealed similar changes. In Mr. Gilligan's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Sinclair's account of when and how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Sinclair's account and the Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Gilligan, accepts the substance of Mr. Sinclair's allegations.

SEAMUS LYNCH

Age: 26 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Lynch as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission by Paschal O'Hare, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from Conor J. Gilligan, M.B., F.R.C.S.

2. Mr. Lynch says that he was arrested by policemen at about 9.30 p.m. on 17 October 1971. It is not clear from his statement where he was taken in the first instance, but he was eventually handed over to soldiers who transferred him to Girdwood Military Barracks. At about 8 p.m. on Tuesday 19 October he was moved to Crumlin Jail and served with a Detention Order. Mr. Gilligan examined him there on 21 October 1971.

3. Mr. Lynch alleges the following:

During transport to Girdwood he was struck on the head, eyes and face and kicked on the legs. He was cut and scraped by coils of barbed wire on the floor of the lorry. Together with others in the lorry, he was made to sing The Sash, God Save the Queen, Save the British Army and a song about Bernadette Devlin. When it was thought that they were not singing loud enough they were struck, their heads were banged together and their hair pulled. At one point a soldier jumped on his back. From time to time soldiers walked over the men in the lorry. After arrival at Girdwood Barracks he fell to the ground and was kicked. He was trailed by the hair to a hut and spreadeagled against a wall. He was struck on the side of the face; he fell and was trailed into the hut by the hair and by his coat. He was hit on the shoulder which caused him to collapse and was again pulled up by the hair. As he went through a door it was jammed against his shoulder. He was made to stand facing a wall. His head was smacked against the

wall and he fell to the ground. He was lifted and put on a chair. When he could not sit on it he was taken to a doctor who said that he should be put to bed right away and recommended an X-ray. This was done the next day and showed a fractured shoulder blade. During transport to Crumlin Jail, he was struck on the legs 3 or 4 times with a kitbag, kicked on the left arm, and hit on the leg with the butt of a pistol.

4. On examination, Mr. Gilligan found swelling and bruising over the upper outer aspect of the left thigh and a bruise over the crest of the ilium. There was a dark purple bruise circumscribed in the middle of the right calf and visible bruising over the right frontal area. Examination of the shoulder was difficult to carry out because of the pain this caused to Mr. Lynch. Mr. Gilligan subsequently got in touch with the Royal Victoria Hospital and spoke to the doctor who had examined Mr. Lynch. He was told that an X-ray had been done and that it had shown a fracture of the scapula. In Mr. Gilligan's opinion the fracture could have been the result of the treatment alleged by Mr. Lynch.

5. Conclusion: There are no inconsistencies in Mr. Lynch's account. The Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Gilligan, accepts the substance of his allegations.

PATRICK CURRAN

Age: Not known

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Curran as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. Curran says that he was arrested by British soldiers at 9 p.m. on 19 October 1971. He was first taken to Hastings Street Military Barracks, where he was kept until about 7 p.m. on 21 October, when he was removed to Crumlin Jail. He was visited by Mr. Napier and Patricia Drinan, Mr. Napier's apprentice, at approximately 10 a.m. on 22 October. He was served with an Internment Order on 7 November 1971.

3. Mr. Curran alleges the following:

He was made to stand spreadeagled against a wall and during interrogation he was dug in the stomach, shoulders and back, and kicked in the genitals. He was told that his interrogators were going to play "Russian Roulette" with him; a gun was produced, placed against various parts of his body and each time the trigger was pulled. He was also struck repeatedly on the arms. When he fell to the floor he was kicked. He was made to count holes in a section of pegboard; each time he reached 8 he was dug in the arms and questioned. This treatment continued for about an hour, during which his legs were kicked from under him. When he fell, which he did many times, he was pulled around the room by the hair and verbally abused. He was kicked on the thighs. The following day he was made to spend long periods facing the wall and from time to time he was interrogated. Further interrogation took place on the day of his removal to Crumlin Jail.

4. There is no medical evidence, but Mr. Napier and his apprentice, Miss Drinan, saw Mr. Curran at Crumlin Jail on 22 October and Mr. Napier reports that he observed the following: a large bruise in the area of the solar plexus, dark blue in colour and about 5 inches in diameter. The biceps of both arms were considerably swollen and heavily bruised. There were small bruises around the ribs. Mr. Napier considers the injuries he observed consistent with Mr. Curran's allegations.

5. Conclusion: There are no inconsistencies in Mr. Curran's statement. The Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Mr. Napier, accepts the substance of his allegations.

ANTHONY AUSTIN

Age: 28 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Austin and expert medical evidence from Dr. John A. McHugh. The case was presented by James T. Johnston, solicitor.

2. Mr. Austin says that he was arrested by British soldiers at his home on Wednesday 20 October 1971 and taken to Holywood Military Barracks. He was kept there until 6.30 p.m. of the same day, when he was released. He was examined at his home by Dr. McHugh on 21 October 1971.

3. Mr. Austin alleges the following:

Following arrival at Holywood Barracks he was made to sit for about an hour facing a wall. During interrogation he was made to stand with his fingertips on the wall and his feet pushed out backwards so far that he was almost parallel to the floor. While in this position he was struck on the body and his feet were kicked out from under him so that he fell. He was kicked in the stomach, the arms and the buttocks. Questioning continued throughout the day.

4. On examination, Dr. McHugh found several small bruises on the upper arms and larger swollen bruises on the anterior abdominal wall and on both buttocks. In his opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Austin's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: There are no inconsistencies in Mr. Austin's testimony. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by him and Dr. McHugh, accepts the substance of his allegations.

LIAM CHARLES McKEE

Age: Not known

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. McKee as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 14 December 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission by Paschal O'Hare, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from William Rutherford, F.R.C.S., Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, and received an affidavit from Dr. Eamon F. F. Gilleece.

2. Mr. McKee says that he was arrested by British soldiers at 1.30 a.m. on Monday 1 November 1971, in the company of John (Sean) Watson. He was first taken to Andersonstown Police Station and then to Holywood Military Barracks. He remained there until he was transferred to Crumlin Jail, probably at about 8 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November. At Crumlin Jail he was served with a Detention Order. Dr. Gilleece examined Mr. McKee there on 4 November 1971. On the same day he was seen by Mr. Rutherford at the Royal Victoria Hospital.

3. Mr. McKee alleges the following:

At Andersonstown Police Station he was struck and kicked in the stomach

and side. When he fell to the ground he was kicked again. He was handcuffed and put face down with his hands behind his back and his legs wide open. He was beaten on the hands, legs and the back of the head. He was struck across the face with the butt of a rifle. At Holywood he was threatened that if he made a report he would be shot. He was made to run 100 yards at full speed on rough ground. During interrogation he was kicked in the stomach, dug in the back of the head, and kicked between the legs. He saw John Watson being struck on the mouth and kicked. He was made to stand for some time with his hands behind his head and his knees against the wall. Between periods of interrogation he was made to sit facing a wall or standing at a wall in the position described earlier. During subsequent interrogation he was struck so that he fell to the floor; he was then kicked and pulled up by the hair. His head was hit against the wall twice and he was held by two men while another punched him. On one occasion a syringe was produced and he was told it contained a truth drug with which he was to be injected. He was beaten again. A gun was placed in his mouth and the trigger was pulled; he was then struck across the face with the gun. He was punched, threatened that he would be shot, struck on the throat and grabbed around the throat.

4. On examination, Dr. Gilleece found bruising and swelling around the face and both eyes. Discolouration and swelling reached under both eyes. The nose appeared to be broken and this was confirmed by X-ray. There was difficulty in swallowing, neck movements were limited because of pain and there was minor bruising on the front of the neck. There were 3 to 4 bruising marks, each about the size of a ten pence piece, over the muscles in the front of the upper arms and shoulder and also some at the back of the muscles of the upper arms and back of the arms. There was extensive bruising and discolouration of the abdominal muscles covering approximately ¾ of the abdominal area. There was a very extensive bruise about five to six inches long and two to three inches wide approximately on the medial aspect of the right thigh just above the knee. There were numerous small abrasions and bruise marks on the top of the feet and ankles. Mr. Rutherford reports that on examination he found bruises on the upper abdomen, on the left thigh, and a broken nose. In Mr. Rutherford's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. McKee's account of the way in which they had been inflicted.

5. Conclusion: Mr. McKee's account is corroborated by Mr. Watson's testimony regarding incidents when they were both together and there are no major inconsistencies in his account. The Commission, having considered Mr. McKee's and Dr. Gilleece's affidavits and the evidence given by Mr. Rutherford, accepts the substance of Mr. Kee's allegations.

JOHN PATRICK WATSON

Age: 22 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Watson as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Crumlin Jail, was presented to the Commission. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. Damien Beirne. The case was presented by Paschal O'Hare, solicitor.

2. Mr. Watson says, in his affidavit, that he was arrested at 1.30 a.m. on Tuesday 2 November 1971 by the British Army, while driving a stolen car in the company of Liam McKee. The two men were taken to Andersonstown Police Station in a Saracen. After a short while they were taken to Holywood Military Barracks separately in Saracens. Watson was transferred to Crumlin Jail at about 8 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November. On Wednesday 3 November, he was served with a Detention Order. He was examined by Dr. Beirne on 3 November at Crumlin Jail.

3. Mr. Watson alleges the following:

Both he and Liam McKee were beaten by paratroopers in the Saracen on the way to the police station and they were also threatened with a knife. When they arrived at the police station he was made to stand spreadeagled for 15 minutes. A soldier urinated on his left leg and when he moved out of the way he was kicked and jabbed with rifle butts. He received a rabbit punch on the back of the neck which caused him to fall to the ground. He was manhandled again because he fell and then given a couple more rabbit punches. Further manhandling occurred. He was made to kneel on the floor and was kicked in the chest. During transport he was made to lie face down and pressure was applied to various parts of his body. At Holywood he was made to run around the room and jump over chairs which were placed in his way. This continued for 15 to 20 minutes until he could run no more. He was punched in the kidneys and stomach, kicked on the chest and groin and pulled up by the hair. He was spreadeagled against the wall and punched on the side of the face which caused him to fall. He was then kicked. He was grabbed by the throat, which made it difficult for him to breathe,and beaten. Beating continued after he was moved to another room and he was threatened that he would be shot. At one stage he was beaten with a long rubber hose about the stomach, kidneys, legs and ears. He had a paper bag over his head for a short period and he was made to stand on his toes six inches from a wall for long periods. If he fell or moved he was beaten, subjected to various kinds of physical abuse and was threatened that he would be shot. On one occasion a man jumped on his face as he lay on the ground, put both hands about his neck and tried to strangle him. He asked for a medical examination several times but this was not forthcoming. He had no sleep until he reached Crumlin Jail and could not eat because of the injuries to his jaw.

4. On examination, Dr. Beirne found the following: a scar stretching down the right cheek; puncture wound abrasion angle left mandible; multiple bruises on the front of the chest mid-sternal region; similar bruises back of chest, especially up around left and right forearm back, and also one down in the region of his buttock area; multiple abrasions on both legs, particularly round the knee and below the knee area. In Dr. Beirne's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Watson's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Watson's account, and having considered the evidence given by him and by Dr. Beirne accepts the substance of his allegations.

PATRICK O'NEILL

Age: 26 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. O'Neill, and expert medical evidence from J. P. Lane, M.B., F.R.C.S., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by James T. Johnston, solicitor.

2. Mr. O'Neill says he was arrested by British soldiers in his home at 3 a.m. on 2 November 1971. He was first taken to Flax Street Army Billet and from there to Holywood Military Barracks. After some hours he was again taken to Flax Street Army Billet and then at about 7 a.m. the same day to Girdwood Military Barracks. He was released from Girdwood at about 6 p.m. on 3 November and was admitted to Mater Infirmorum Hospital at about 7 p.m. the same day, where he was examined by Mr. Lane.

3. Mr. O'Neill alleges the following:

After being arrested, he was taken away by the soldiers in a Saracen. During transport he was ordered to lie down on the floor of the vehicle while

the soldiers kept their feet on top of him. During interrogation at Holywood Barracks he was stripped completely naked and on one occasion he was hit with batons and kicked on the bare buttocks and the thigh. He was made to lie face down on a bench, feet pointing slightly upwards. In this position he was hit on the ankles with something described as being like a triangular wooden stair-rod. He was beaten approximately ten times. Since he tried to cross his legs, it was mainly the left ankle that was hit. At another time he was put into a box approximately the size of a tea chest with a lid and 3 or 4 holes in each side. There was hardly room for him in the box. Batons were poked through the holes and his head and body were hit. After being taken to Girdwood Military Barracks a padded belt was put around his thighs and he was struck with batons on the belt.

4. On examination, Mr. Lane found tenderness over Mr. O'Neill's left lower ribs, and tenderness and swelling of the right thigh. The upper right thigh was 1½ inches bigger in diameter than the left. Over his right thigh area there was an area of superficial abrasion measuring 7 inches by 3 inches. There was a superficial bruise on the left leg measuring 3 inches by 1 inch and a linear abrasion 3 inches long in the right leg just below the knee. The main injury was found on his left ankle which was markedly swollen. X-ray examination of the heel revealed a fracture of the heel bone which Mr. Lane stressed was not the usual type of fracture of the heel bone which occurs from falling on it from a height but was due to direct violence. Mr. Lane found that Mr. O'Neill needed 14 days in hospital. Against Mr. Lane's advice, Mr. O'Neill was discharged at his own request from the hospital after 9 days. In Mr. Lane's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. O'Neill's story of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: The medical member of the Commission agrees with Mr. Lane's evidence that the fracture of the heel bone could only have been caused by a direct blow. There are no major inconsistencies in his testimony and his account is corroborated by evidence from Mr. Joseph Watson as to the fact that Mr. O'Neill was not able to walk by himself after being released from Girdwood Military Barracks and that he had to be helped into a taxi. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Lane, accepts the substance of Mr. O'Neill's allegations.

PATRICK JOSEPH MULDOON

Age: 21 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Muldoon as he was still interned. His statement, sworn on 27 November 1971 at Long Kesh Internment Camp, was presented to the Commission by James T. Johnston, solicitor. The Commission also had an opportunity to examine Mr. Muldoon's father, Patrick Muldoon, Senior.

2. Mr. Muldoon says that he was arrested with his father at approximately 4 a.m. on Tuesday 2 November 1971 and taken to Girdwood Military Barracks. After some time he was put into a Saracen and driven for about ten minutes, but it is his impression that they did not leave Girdwood. On Wednesday 3 November at approximately 5 p.m. he was transferred to Crumlin Jail where he was served with a Detention Order. He was subsequently served with an Internment Order and transferred to Long Kesh.

3. Mr. Muldoon alleges the following:

He was made to sit for many hours looking at a white perforated wall. During interrogation he was made to stand with his fingertips on a wall and his

legs stretched out behind him, so that all his weight was supported by his fingertips. While in this position he was hit simultaneously on both sides and struck on both ears. He was punched and hit in the stomach a number of times. When he said that he thought he had a stomach ulcer (which was untrue) a baton was squeezed against his stomach. When he fell on his knees he was kicked on both legs. On one occasion he was told that his mother had died from an overdose of sleeping tablets; this was not true.

4. There is no medical evidence in this case, because almost three weeks elapsed before Mr. Muldoon saw Mr. Johnston, who was of the opinion that examination by an independent doctor at that stage would serve no purpose.

5. Conclusion: In the absence of medical evidence the Commission cannot make any findings in this case, but they note that Mr. Muldoon's account of his arrest was corroborated by his father's testimony.

GERARD MAXWELL

Age: 38 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Maxwell and expert medical evidence from Dr. J. P. Donaghy, Consultant Physician, Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by Paschal O'Hare, solicitor.

2. Mr. Maxwell says that he was arrested in the street near his home at about 4 p.m. on Tuesday 2 November 1971 by British soldiers. He was first taken to Musgrave Street Police Station, then removed to Holywood Military Barracks. He was released some hours later on the same day and returned to his home. The next morning, Wednesday 3 November, he went to his own doctor, Dr. Crossin, who examined him. He then went to the solicitor, Mr. O'Hare, who made an appointment for him to see Dr. Donaghy at the Mater Hospital on the following day, Thursday 4 November. After examination Mr. Maxwell was admitted to the hospital and remained there for 15 days.

3. Mr. Maxwell alleges the following:

On the way to Musgrave Street Police Station, he was struck by one soldier "on the left side a couple of times with the butt of his rifle". In the Saracen which transported him from the Police Station to Holywood Barracks he was made to lie face down. During the 20 minute journey to Holywood he was beaten with the butts of rifles; his trousers were removed and he was beaten about the hips with belts. He was abused verbally and threatened that he would be shot.

At Holywood Barracks he was made to sit facing a perforated wall for about 30 - 45 minutes. After further questioning and verbal abuse he was made to sit facing the perforated wall for a period of about 1½ hours. He was again threatened that he would be shot and made to stand against a wall with arms outstretched and knees tight against the wall. A bag was put over his head; he was hit on the back of the neck, ribs and kidneys. When he fell to the ground he was kicked, punched, pulled up and made to stand against the wall again. This treatment continued for about two hours.

4. On examination, Dr. Donaghy reported limitation of movement by virtue of back stiffness and pain in the left ankle. Greatest limitation was seen on rising from full recumbancy to sitting position. There was extensive black to purple discolouration of lumbo-sacral area extending lateralwards, especially right and down both buttock areas to upper posterior thighs especially right, less so to mesial upper left thigh; multiple areas showing bluish to yellowish

discolouration of skin to back extending from scapular throughout dorsal areas; clear line of demarcation along and slightly below waist trouser line; tender swelling left ankle joint and foot; visible and palpable varicose veins; saphenous and tributaries lower limbs around ankle area and both feet; frequent extra systoles with dropped beats at radial arterial pulsation. Dr. Donaghy presented some colour photographs to the Commission shwoing the extent of the injuries received. The photographs were taken on Dr. Donaghy's initiative. In Dr. Donaghy's opinion the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Maxwell's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: After having studied the photographs Dr. Donaghy presented to the Commission, its medical member concluded that the injuries shown on them were consistent with the medical report and with Mr. Maxwell's allegations. The Commission, having considered the evidence given by Mr. Maxwell and Dr. Donaghy, accepts the substance of Mr. Maxwell's allegations.

JOSEPH WATSON

Age: 22 years

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Watson, and medical evidence from Dr. J. A. Allen, M.B., B.CH., Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast. The case was presented by James T. Johnston, solicitor.

2. Mr. Watson says that he was arrested on the morning of Tuesday, 2 November 1971, between 1 a.m. and 1.30 a.m. by British soldiers. He was taken to an army billet at Finiston Primary School, Oldpark Road. From here he was taken to Oldpark Road Police Station and from there to Girdwood Army Barracks. He was released at about 6.30 p.m. on 2 November and driven by a police officer, together with two other released men, to Clifton Park Avenue, where they left the car. He went to his home but later reported to the Mater Infirmorum Hospital where he was examined by Dr. Allen and admitted to the hospital for twenty-four hours observation.

3. Mr. Watson alleges the following:

After he was arrested he was taken inside a sandbag enclosure at Finiston Primary School where he was hit with a rifle and kicked and punched in the stomach. He fell to the ground and was then made to lie on his stomach; a number of soldiers walking past walked on top of him and one of them stood on his head. Others spat on him and sandbags were dropped on him. He alleges that he received this treatment over a period of about two hours. A soldier put a rifle to his head and threatened to shoot him. He was abused verbally. At Girdwood Army Barracks he was made to sit facing a wall for some hours, but received no further ill-treatment.

4. On examination, Dr. Allen found the following: abrasion 2 inches by 3 inches on the right side of forehead; abrasion 2 inches by 1 inch on the right cheek; reddened mark 3 inches long on left side of face parallel to nose; haematoma left eye; swelling and slight abrasion left cheek; laceration on lobe of left ear; small laceration of occipital scalp; right side of face painful to touch; anaesthesia left face below the eye; abrasion 1 inch by 1 inch right lumbar area; faint oval bruise $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch in diameter on the lower left ribs; tender over right lower ribs and right costal margin; limitation of chest expansion. In Dr. Allen's opinion, the injuries he observed were consistent with Mr. Watson's account of how they were inflicted.

5. Conclusion: There were no inconsistencies in Mr. Watson's account and the Commission, having considered the evidence given by him and Dr. Allen, accepts the substance of his allegations.

GABRIEL ANTHONY BRADLEY

Age: 27 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Bradley as he was still in custody. His statement, sworn on 8 December 1971 at the Police Office, Townhall Street, was presented to the Commission by James T. Johnston, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. J. A. Allen, Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast.

2. Mr. Bradley says that he was arrested by British soldiers at approximately 12.30 p.m. on Monday 15 November 1971. He was taken to an army billet in Albert Street and detained there for twenty minutes before being taken to Hastings Street police station where he was kept for twenty minutes. After this he was transferred to Holywood Military Barracks where he remained until about 6 p.m. on the following day, when he was taken to the Police Office in Townhall Street and charged. On Wednesday 17 November he appeared in court and was remanded in custody at Crumlin Jail. There he was examined by Dr. Allen on the evening of Wednesday 17 November 1971.

3. Mr. Bradley alleges the following:

He was made to lie face down in the Saracen on the way to the army billet in Albert Street and was kicked in the ribs and sides by soldiers. At the billet he was made to stand spreadeagled against the wall. He was punched in the stomach, sides and back. His feet were gradually moved backwards until he slipped and fell forward. When he fell he was abused verbally. He fell approximately six times. On five occasions a gun was placed at his head, cocked and discharged; he said he could see the gun flash between his legs. After approximately 4 hours of this treatment he was questioned, at the same time beaten on the stomach, sides and kidneys. He was then made to support himself with only one finger of each hand on the wall and when he fell he was kicked and verbally abused. He suffered from hallucinations after drinking a cup of tea and while sitting or standing (this is not clear) before a white perforated wall. He was allowed to sleep during the night but was awakened by soldiers three times and made to do exercises. On one occasion he was beaten about the head and stomach, causing him to wake up. The following morning he was made to sweep the floor and beaten around the room. He was then made to do press-ups and kicked on the stomach and sides. He was again interrogated while standing in the middle of the floor with legs apart, feet outstretched and finger tips on the top of his head. While in this position he was punched in the stomach and sides. When he fell he was dragged up by his hair. He was also kicked on the floor and punched in the kidneys from behind. On one occasion he was threatened with a gun. The interrogation lasted for several hours.

4. On examination, Dr. Allen found the following: bruising 3 inches by 2 inches in the left lower ribs in the mid-axillary line (he was very tender here); bruising 2 inches by 2 inches in the right lower ribs and again tenderness; the sternal spring test was negative. There was bruising $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 7 inches extending from the xiphisternum to the umbilicus. This had a mottled appearance and was bluish in the right lower corner. On palpation the area was indurated. This type of bruising would be consistent with repeated punches. There was bruising $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches in the left loin with some fullness in this flank, but no bruising of the genitals or of the buttocks. There was a bruise, 5 inches by 4 inches, on the right knee and a bruise 4 inches by 3 inches on the left knee. There was no bruising of the ankles. Dr. Allen considers that the injuries he observed could have been sustained in the way described by Mr. Bradley.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Bradley's statement. The Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Dr. Allen, accepts the substance of his allegations.

MARTIN JOSEPH CRAWFORD

Age: 20 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Crawford as he had been taken to England and there charged with a criminal offence. His statement, sworn on 25 November 1971 at Crumlin Jail, was presented to the Commission by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. George D. O'Neill, Mater Infirmorum Hospital, Belfast.

2. Mr. Crawford says that he was arrested by British soldiers at 1.55 p.m. on Monday 15 November 1971, taken first to Finnis School and later to Girdwood Barracks, where he remained until about 6 p.m. on Wednesday 17 November. He was then taken to Crumlin Jail and served with Detention and Removal Orders. After 15 minutes he was taken back to Girdwood Barracks and kept there until the following day, Thursday 18 November, when he was again taken to Crumlin Jail. Later that evening his mother came to see him. On Friday 19 November Dr. O'Neill examined him at the jail.

3. Mr. Crawford alleges the following:

After his arrival at Girdwood Barracks he was made to sit facing a white wall for 4 to 5 hours, then questioned. He says that if he did not answer questions he was given a kind of rabbit punch, with a half-closed fist, on his chest. During questioning, which went on for an hour, he was kept standing free with his hands by his sides, beside the table at which his interrogators sat. He was threatened with a hyperdermic syringe containing a red liquid, which he was told was a truth drug, but he is satisfied that his arm was just pricked by the needle and that nothing was injected. After this he was made to sit facing the wall until about 4.30 a.m. on 16 November. He was then told to put up a camp bed and was allowed to sleep until 7.30 a.m. On the following day he was again made to sit facing the wall. There was further questioning, during which he was "banged about". This treatment continued for the rest of his time at Girdwood. At one stage a pistol containing live ammunition was put into his mouth; the breach was in firing position.

4. On examination, Dr. O'Neill found five small circular bruises on the lower end of the sternum. There were no other marks on the body and nothing was found to suggest that a needle had been introduced into the skin of either upper limb. Dr. O'Neill says that as some time had elapsed between the alleged infliction of the injuries and the medical examination, the lack of bruising did not necessarily conflict with Mr. Crawford's story. He also says he has no reason to disbelieve Mr. Crawford's account.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Crawford's account. The Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Dr. O'Neill, accepts the substance of his allegations.

MICHAEL AIDAN NELSON

Age: approximately 20 years

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. Nelson as he was still detained. His statement, sworn on 25 November 1971 at Crumlin Jail, was presented to the Commission by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor. We heard expert medical evidence from Dr. Kevin Breslin.

2. Mr. Nelson says that he was arrested by British soldiers at 6 a.m. on

Thursday 18 November 1971. His three sisters were arrested at the same time. He was first taken to Springfield Road Barracks where he was kept for about 4 hours. He was then taken in a Saracen to Holywood Military Barracks, where he remained until about 2.15 p.m. on the following day, Friday 19 November, when he was taken to Crumlin Jail and served with a Detention Order. He was then examined by a doctor. His own doctor, Dr. Breslin, examined him at Crumlin Jail on Saturday 20 November 1971.

3. Mr. Nelson alleges the following:

While being interrogated at Holywood Barracks he was repeatedly struck on the ears. He was also kicked in the genitals and stomach, and his hair was pulled. He was punched in the ribs and stomach and generally knocked about. Much of the time he was spreadeagled against the wall, and in between periods of interrogation he was made to sit looking at a perforated wall. He was threatened that worse would follow, and truth drugs were mentioned.

4. On examination at Crumlin Jail, Dr. Breslin found a traumatic perforation of the right ear drum of very recent origin caused by a blow or a series of blows over this ear. The back of the scalp was bruised and tender. There was bruising of the left lower ribs and tenderness on pressure over the same, and a visible bruise on left scapula. There were bruised areas on the inside of both thighs and a small bruise on the perineum. Dr. Breslin considers these findings consistent with Mr. Nelson's account of the treatment he received during interrogation.

5. Conclusion: There are no major inconsistencies in Mr. Nelson's statement. The Commission, having considered his affidavit and the evidence given by Dr. Breslin, accepts the substance of his allegations.

Summary of Findings

The Commission had no opportunity to examine members of the security forces or any other officials. This of course limited its ability to check the allegations.

Almost all of the complainants the Commission heard alleged that they had been assaulted by British soldiers during arrest and transport to interrogation centres. Mr. Rooney's broken teeth, Mr. Maxwell's very extensive bruisings and Mr. Lynch's fracture of the shoulder bone were all said to be the result of brutality during transport.

The most frequently reported form of ill-treatment was beating and kicking when those arrested stood in an enforced position against the wall. The allegations regarding injuries said to have been caused by this treatment were largely supported by medical evidence. In one case, the medical member of the Commission could still find signs on the legs indicating that the complainant had been made to remain standing in the same position for a considerable time.

The Commission heard evidence about only one case in which the complainant alleged that he received treatment of the kind referred to in the Compton Report as "interrogation in depth". This was Mr. Shannon, who was arrested on 9 October and alleged that he had been hooded, made to stand in an enforced position for hours, put in a room with a hissing noise, given very little food and water and deprived of sleep.

The medical evidence on Mr. Shannon was consistent with his allegation of wall standing for a long time. Besides Mr. Shannon there were 7 complainants

*who said they had been hooded and there was one who alleged that he had been subjected to a hissing noise.

16 complainants alleged that they had been threatened in various ways with guns. 6 said that they were threatened with the use of a truth drug and in 5 cases syringes were said to have been produced, although they were not in fact used. On these points and on the frequent allegations of verbal abuse the Commission could not make any findings because of lack of evidence and of an opportunity to cross-examine members of the security forces.

Some complainants alleged that they had been forced to sit looking at a white perforated wall for long periods, but again the Commission could make no findings.

One complainant said that he was put naked into a relatively small box and assaulted. The same man said that a padded belt was tied round him and he was then beaten, which he said caused pain but little visible injury. In the absence of corroborative evidence the Commission could make no findings as to these particular allegations, but the allegation made by the same complainant that he was beaten about the ankles was supported by an X-ray showing a fractured heel-bone.

Generally those arrested said they were made to sign a paper that they had no complaints about treatment during interrogation. Those who signed the paper implied that they did so because they were frightened, or because they did not understand the contents.

Very few of the complainants said that they had any form of medical examination during the period of interrogation. Most of them had their first medical care either after release or when taken to prison. This resulted in two cases in deprivation of daily used drugs for epilepsy and a cardiac condition respectively.

Conclusion

The Commission had no opportunity to question members of the security forces. This meant that its findings were based on the testimony of complainants, of whom some were cross-examined, and on the evidence given by doctors who had examined complainants. In all cases where medical evidence was available it supported complainants' general allegations that they had been ill-treated, although in some cases specific allegations were not corroborated by medical evidence and the Commission was not able, therefore, to make findings as to the truth of these particular allegations. The Commission bore in mind the possibility that injuries could have been self-inflicted or sustained during arrest, but it felt that, owing to the nature of the injuries, both of these explanations were improbable.

On the basis of the evidence presented to it the Commission concluded that persons arrested under the Special Powers Act had been subject to brutal treatment by the security forces during arrest and transport. It also concluded that there

*Allegations of hooding were made by men arrested on 8 and 11 August 1971, 28 September 1971, 9 and 16 October 1971, and 1 and 2 November 1971.

were cases where suffering had been inflicted on those arrested to obtain from them confessions or information.*

The Commission considered that the instances of substantiated brutality were in distinct contravention of Article 3 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and also of Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

---

* The memorandum submitted by Amnesty International to the Parker Committee on Interrogation Procedures, which is appended to this report, quotes the International Committee of the Red Cross's definition of torture as being "the infliction of suffering on a person to obtain from that person, or from another person, confessions or information".

LIST OF CASES CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION

AUSTIN, Anthony: arrested 20 October 1971
BRADLEY, Gabriel Anthony: arrested 18 November 1971
CONLON, John: arrested 20 September 1971
CRAWFORD, Martin: arrested 18 November 1971
CURRAN, Patrick: arrested 19 October 1971
GRIMES, Oliver: arrested 20 September 1971
* HARVEY, Michael: arrested 9 August 1971
LYNCH, Seamus: arrested 17 October 1971
McCALLAN, Patrick Joseph: arrested 28 September 1971
McCAY, Anthony: arrested 20 September 1971
* McCLEAN, Patrick Joseph: arrested 9 August 1971
McKAVANAGH, Patrick: arrested 11 August 1971
McKEE, Liam: arrested 1 November 1971
MAGILTON, James: arrested 18 August 1971
MAXWELL, Gerard: arrested 2 November 1971
MEEHAN, Colum: arrested 16 October 1971
MULDOON, Patrick Joseph Francis: arrested 2 November 1971
MURPHY, Francis: arrested 20 September 1971
MURPHY, Michael Patrick: arrested 16 October 1971
NELSON, Michael: arrested 18 November 1971
O'NEILL, Patrick: arrested 2 November 1971
REYNOLDS, Dermot John: arrested 17 August 1971
ROONEY, Edward: arrested 17 August 1971
SCULLION, Martin: arrested 20 September 1971
SHANNON, William Anthony: arrested 9 October 1971
* SHIVERS, Patrick: arrested 9 August 1971
SINCLAIR, Thomas: arrested 16 October 1971
* SMITH, Desmond: arrested 9 August 1971
WATSON, John Patrick: arrested 1 November 1971
WATSON, Joseph: arrested 2 November 1971

*Referred to in Section 2

REPORT OF AN ENQUIRY INTO ALLEGATIONS OF ILL-TREATMENT MADE AGAINST THE SECURITY FORCES IN NORTHERN IRELAND BY PERSONS ARRESTED ON 9 AUGUST 1971

I Introduction

Shortly after the introduction of internment in Northern Ireland on 9 August 1971, reports appeared saying that prisoners had been subjected to methods of interrogation designed to break down their resistance by means of sensory deprivation. There were also allegations about assault and other forms of maltreatment.

A Committee of Enquiry under the chairmanship of Sir Edmund Compton was appointed by the British Government to investigate these allegations. Its report was published on 16 November 1971. The Compton Committee found that a number of specific complaints of ill-treatment were justified.

The Compton Committee heard army witnesses, police witnesses, prison officers, regimental medical officers, medical staff officers, civilian doctors and medical specialists. It heard evidence from only one complainant in person and received written evidence from another. In all other cases the evidence of complaints was hearsay and consisted of press reports and statements which were in circulation. The fact that most of the complainants refused to cooperate with the Committee of course limited its ability to reach conclusions.

II Purpose, Proceedings and Nature of Evidence

The Compton Committee investigated allegations by those arrested on 9 August 1971. The Amnesty International Commission of Enquiry heard evidence mainly regarding people arrested after that day, but 4 of the cases it dealt with came within the terms of reference of the Compton Committee and the Amnesty Commission was thus able to compare the evidence of these complainants with the findings of the Compton Committee, before which the complainants had refused to appear.

The course of proceedings was the same as when the Commission investigated complaints by prisoners arrested after 9 August. The Commission received statements from all 4 complainants. Patrick Shivers, Michael Harvey and Desmond Smith appeared in person. Patrick McClean was still interned. Two doctors gave medical evidence regarding one arrestee each. The cases were presented by solicitors.

III Pattern of Complaints

Of the 4 complainants, 2 were reported by the Compton Committee as having suffered interrogation in depth and the other two as having been made to do special exercises at Ballykinler Camp.

IV Allegations, Evidence and Conclusions

A. Interrogation in depth

The Compton Committee reports that 11 men arrested on 9 August were interrogated in depth. These prisoners were moved on 11 August from a Regional Holding Centre to an interrogation centre for a period of intensive questioning. On the same day they were taken by helicopter to Crumlin Jail, served with detention and removal orders and after that taken back to the interrogation

centre.

The treatment in the centre continued, with one exception up to 17 August. The prisoners were then taken to Crumlin Jail and there detained.

The Commission investigated the cases of Patrick Joseph McClean and Patrick Shivers.

PATRICK JOSEPH McCLEAN

1. The Commission could not take oral evidence from Mr. McClean as he was still interned. His statement, sworn at Long Kesh Internment Camp on 15 November 1971, was presented by J. Christopher Napier, solicitor.

2. Mr. McClean says that he was arrested by soldiers at his home on 9 August at about 4.30 a.m. The day after arrest he was kept in a hut all day. On 11 August he was taken by helicopter to an unknown destination. After about an hour he was taken to what seemed to be a chamber. Later he was again transported by helicopter. He was served with a Detention Order that day. On 17 August he was taken by helicopter to the prison in Belfast. He was photographed and medically examined.

3. Mr. McClean alleges the following:

He was hooded in the interrogation centre. For a long time he did not get anything to eat, although he was given water. When he was offered food on 15 or 16 August he could not eat it. He was not allowed to go to the toilet for several days. When hooded he heard a continuous loud noise; he also heard execution orders being announced. He was placed in an enforced posture, spread-eagled, against a wall; fingers were pushed in his stomach, he was kicked between his legs, his head was bumped against the floor, he was slapped on the face, drummed behind the ears with knuckles, handcuffed and hung up by the handcuffs.

4. The Commission has no medical evidence in this case.

5. The Compton Committee did not see Mr. McClean, but he is mentioned in its report as one of those who were interrogated in depth (paragraphs 43 - 105). He was, according to the records, at the wall for 29 hours (paragraph 64). But the Compton Committee was told that Mr. McClean was hardly in the required position at all as he was allowed to lie on the floor (paragraph 65). Mr. McClean refused food and drink on five occasions and bread alone on four further occasions (paragraph 67). The witnesses heard by the Compton Committee also said that there were toilet facilities and that it was Mr. McClean's own fault that he did not use them. Mr. McClean had urinated on the spot on three occasions. The medical officer the Compton Committee heard said that Mr. McClean did not use the toilet because he chose not to do so (paragraphs 84 and 103). Mr. McClean's allegations of physical assault were denied by those who supervised the interrogation in depth. The medical officer's exit certificate on 17 August recorded "bruising right shoulder and both legs", which was not present on examination on 11 August. The medical officer thought that was consistent "with the handling required to move Mr. McClean who on account of his limb resistance had to be carried about the centre" (paragraph 101). The further injuries mentioned in the medical records of the 18 August from Crumlin Jail, "black eye left. Contusions arms and chest", the Committee thought were not due to the treatment in the interrogation centre but must have been suffered during transport (paragraph 101).

6. Conclusion: After comparing the allegations with the Compton Report,

the Commission notes the following:

Wall standing: Those persons supervising the interrogation confirmed that Mr. McClean had been made to stand in the enforced position, but said that after a short time he was not forcibly held up. Mr. McClean, in his affidavit, does not mention how long he was placed in the position. The fact that Mr. McClean does not mention that he was held up after he fell could indicate that he was not forced to stand for a long time.

Hooding: It was confirmed that Mr. McClean was hooded.

Noise: Mr. McClean's allegation about the continuous noise was confirmed.

Diet: It was confirmed that those who were interrogated received a poor bread and water diet. The officials said that McClean refused food when it was offered. Mr. McClean said that he could not eat it. There are other smaller inconsistencies between the two versions.

Toilet possibilities: The witnesses who gave evidence to the Compton Committee said that there were toilet facilities available and that McClean chose not to use them. Mr. McClean says in his affidavit that he was not allowed to do so. The Compton Report does not mention if McClean was fully informed about the toilet possibilities.

Physical assault: McClean's allegations about assault were denied. As the black eye and contusions mentioned in the medical report in Crumlin Jail on 18 August were not mentioned in the exit certificate of 17 August, the Compton Committee draws the conclusion that these injuries were caused during transport. Mr. McClean does not mention specifically that he was ill-treated on the journey. The bruisings on the shoulder and the legs the medical officer said were superficial and consistent with the treatment required when Mr. McClean was carried about the interrogation centre. In his affidavit Mr. McClean mentions not less than 21 types of ill-treatment inflicted on him. Some of them seem to be of a character consistent with the bruisings mentioned. It does not seem totally convincing to the Commission that the bruises on the legs and shoulder could have been caused by just the carrying of Mr. McClean. But as the Commission has not heard the doctors involved, it cannot make any finding on that point.

In the absence of medical or other corroborative evidence, it is not possible for the Commission to reach conclusions on every allegation Mr. McClean made, but as noted above his allegations about hooding, continuous noise and poor diet are confirmed in the Compton Report.

PATRICK SHIVERS

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Shivers and expert medical evidence from Dr. James T. Quinn, Consultant Psychiatrist at Belfast City Hospital. The case was presented by J. D. McSparran, barrister.

2. Mr. Shivers says that he was arrested in his home at 5 a.m. on 9 August. He was taken to Ballykelly and soon afterwards to Magilligan Camp. On 11 August he was transported by helicopter and what he thought was a lorry. He was examined by someone he believed was a doctor and taken into a room. He was later transported once more by helicopter and lorry; interrogated; again transported by helicopter and lorry and taken again to the same room. Some days later, after having been photographed and examined by a doctor, he was transferred to Crumlin Jail where he was detained until 15 October. No charges were preferred against him.

3. Mr. Shivers alleges the following:

During the night of 10 August he was not able to sleep because the lights were left on all night and there was continuous, and he thought deliberate, noise throughout the night. On 11 August he was hooded and handcuffed during transport and, apart from short periods, remained hooded from that time until he was transferred to Crumlin Jail. He was forced to stand against a wall supported by his fingertips, with his legs apart and far back. He was kept in this position for four or perhaps even six hours before he collapsed and fell. He was lifted up again and put in the same position. Later he collapsed again and was put up. This treatment continued and lasted for two or three days. He got no sleep or food during this time. He lost consciousness several times. He had hallucinations and felt that he wanted to die.

During the time he was in the interrogation centre he was assaulted. His head was struck against the wall. He was punched on the ribs and on the knee-caps on one occasion during transport. He had his first drink of water after four or five days. His weight went from 128 lbs to 115 lbs. After he was released he had difficulty in sleeping and he could not work for several weeks.

4. Dr. Quinn examined Mr. Shivers on 28 November. He finds no reason to disbelieve Mr. Shivers's story. He thinks that the kind of treatment he had received involved a serious degree of risk and that this would apply in particular to a person with an unstable personality or with a family history of psychiatric problems. Dr. Quinn finds Mr. Shivers a man of stable personality but underlines that Mr. Shivers's mother has had psychiatric treatment. Dr. Quinn states it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the application of these procedures, known to be potent and dangerous individually, but the consequences of which in combination are not known, to any individual with a positive family history of psychiatric illness is irresponsible in the extreme.

5. The Compton Committee did not see Mr. Shivers, but mentions him in its report in the section which deals with the 11 persons interrogated in depth (paragraph 68). His allegations regarding hooding, the noise machine, wall standing and deprivation of food and sleep were confirmed by the witnesses who appeared before the Compton Committee. The witnesses deny the allegations about assault. The Compton Committee says that it makes no findings on this point. But it says that it must be taken into account that the guards had special training in avoiding violence and that the medical records checked by the Committee do not mention any significant physical damage. There were no signs of injuries in the photographs taken of these men on exit from the interrogation centre (paragraph 97).

6. Conclusion: The Commission finds no inconsistencies in Mr. Shivers's testimony. On the basis of the evidence given by him and Dr. Quinn, the Commission accepts the substance of Mr. Shivers's allegations.

B. Special exercises at Ballykinler

The Compton Committee investigated allegations from five complainants about enforced exercises at Ballykinler Camp. The complainants say that they were forced to carry out a series of exercises which were physically taxing and of long duration.

The Amnesty Commission investigated the cases of Desmond Smith and Michael Harvey.

DESMOND SMITH

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Smith and expert medical evidence from Dr. Gerald Plunkett, Consultant Psychiatrist. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Smith says that he was arrested when only half-dressed at about 4.30 a.m. on 9 August and taken by soldiers to an army centre in Newry. Later he was taken with other men to Ashgrove School and transported from there to Ballykinler Camp by helicopter. A doctor saw him and he was later taken to the Military Wing of Musgrave Park Hospital. After having been in hospital for about a week he was removed to the Maidstone Detention Ship. After some days he was taken to the Royal Victoria Hospital and examined. He was then taken to Musgrave Park Hospital and after some days back to the Maidstone. He was subsequently released.

3. Mr. Smith alleges the following:

He was hit twice on the head when he was arrested. During transport he was thrown onto the floor of an army vehicle and soldiers sat with their feet on him. He was kept in the draught of the turning rotor blades of the helicopter for about half an hour and he was pushed out of the helicopter when he thought they were a considerable distance above the ground. In Ballykinler he was forced to carry out difficult exercises. He was made to lean with his fingertips against the wall, with his legs apart and as far back as possible. He was made to sit with his arms clasped behind his head, leaning backwards without touching the floor, and later to squat with his hands behind his head. After the different exercises he was ordered to hold one leg and hop around on the other, which he found very painful because his circulation was impaired. The whole procedure was repeated over and over again. One of the men in the hut asked for water. A pail of water was brought in, but guard dogs drank out of it and cigarette ends and chewing gum were thrown into it. When the men rejected the water they were beaten. Mr. Smith and the others were at first not given the opportunity to go to the toilet and when he was eventually taken out for that purpose he was not given enough time. Mr. Smith estimates that the enforced exercises continued for about 17 hours, but he apparently blacked out before they finished, and was told later that he had developed a form of convulsions or epileptic fit. After he recovered consciousness he was beaten with a baton and kicked with boots. He fainted several times. He heard later from some of the men who were in the hut at the time that they had seen a broken knife with some blood on it and that they had the impression that the knife had been put into his mouth. Some of his back teeth had been broken. While on the Maidstone he suffered another epileptic attack.

4. Dr. Plunkett examined Mr. Smith on 26 November at St. Lukes Hospital. Mr. Smith had told the doctor that extreme annoyance tended to precipitate a blackout. Any sudden movement of the head caused him to see flashes of bright light and he had a fairly constant pain at the back of his head. He also said he was easily upset and very startled by any sudden noise. His mood fluctuated greatly. He felt very tired some days and his sleep was disturbed. Formerly his sleep had been normal and there were no neurotic traits or behaviour disorders. There was no history of epilepsy. EEG was negative, but epilepsy could not be excluded. Dr. Plunkett had the impression that the attacks, at least in their prolongation, were emotional in nature. The reaction could be seen as an unconscious defence mechanism whereby the person protects himself from overwhelming anxiety. Dr. Plunkett found no reason to disbelieve Mr. Smith's account. He did not think Mr. Smith was the type of person who would exaggerate.

5. The Compton Committee did not meet Mr. Smith, but heard the medical officer involved and members of the security forces (paragraphs 149 - 160 and 311 - 324). One N.C.O. involved said that Smith had to wait outside the helicopter for just a short time. An N.C.O. who went with the helicopter denied that Smith and the others had been pushed from the helicopter before it touched down and said that he himself had been the first to leave it after landing

(paragraph 314). One of the witnesses Compton heard said that anyone in the hut who wanted to relieve himself had been allowed to do so and to take what time he required. Another witness told about one occasion when arrestees had been hastened (paragraph 316).

Compton reports that there was no doubt that Mr. Smith suffered a convulsive fainting attack. The medical officer who was sent for on that occasion had no doubt that Mr. Smith was indeed undergoing a grand mal convulsion (paragraph 318). The medical officer said that as no spoon was available to prevent Mr. Smith from biting his tongue, the handle of a knife was used. The knife was not near the back teeth (paragraph 320).

On the exercises, all the witnesses the Compton Committee heard said that anyone who was not able to vary his position readily was allowed to adopt whatever position was most comfortable. But one of the platoon commanders agreed that some of the arrestees might have regarded the exercises as part of a programme of harassment. The reason mentioned for the position changing was to relieve stiffness (paragraph 154 - 156). The Compton Committee concluded that the evidence heard confirmed that the exercises took place, that they were much as described in the allegations (by the 5 arrestees) and that they were done under some degree of compulsion. The opinion of the Compton Committee was that the exercises must have caused hardship to some at least of those who were made to do them. It did not regard the exercises as "cruel" but thought that the routine was thoughtlessly prolonged after it had served its proper purpose (paragraph 159 - 160). The medical evidence suggested that Mr. Smith should not have been required to perform exercises that imposed an unusual strain on the back (paragraph 159). The military police said that no assault did take place against those who did not obey (paragraph 156).

There is conflicting evidence about how long Mr. Smith was made to wait in the draught from the helicopter and about what happened when Smith was brought out of the helicopter. The witnesses heard by the Compton Committee confirm that the exercises took place and that there was some degree of compulsion. The exercising had definitely been carried on for a longer time than would have been necessary to relieve stiffness. There is conflicting evidence about assault. The military police deny that the prisoners were refused toilet facilities in the beginning but one of the witnesses the Compton Committee heard agrees that one of the prisoners had been hastened, which is consistent with one of Mr. Smith's allegations. The medical officer says that a knife was put into Mr. Smith's mouth, but not in the way alleged. To the Commission Mr. Smith said that he had been to the dentist but had received no treatment. On examination the medical member of the Commission saw that one of the back teeth was broken. The allegation about the dirty water is not mentioned in the Compton Report.

6. Conclusion: It is not possible for the Commission to reach conclusions on every allegation Mr. Smith made, but on the basis of the evidence given by him and by Dr. Plunkett it accepts the substance of his allegations. The Commission notes that he had suffered convulsive fainting attacks and that his health was disturbed after release. As Mr. Smith had not had fainting attacks or similar problems before his arrest, the Commission thinks that these must have been due to the treatment he received while detained.

MICHAEL JOSEPH HARVEY

1. The Commission heard oral evidence from Mr. Harvey. The case was presented by Patrick A. Duffy, solicitor.

2. Mr. Harvey says that he was arrested at about 4.30 a.m. on 9 August at his home. He was taken by soldiers to Armagh and then to Ballykinler, where he arrived at 9.30 a.m. He was released on 10 August at 10 p.m. When in

Ballykinler he was seen by a doctc and photographed.

3. Mr. Harvey alleges the following:

He was forced to do exercises; sitting with arms stretched upwards; sitting on the floor with arms clasped behind the head and head raised; lying on the back with hands clasped behind the head; kneeling on the floor with hands above or behind the head; kneeling with the head down to touch the floor and with hands clasped behind back. This lasted from about 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. and the men involved were then offered a poor meal. After that the exercises continued until about 6 p.m. On one occasion when Harvey whispered to another of the men he was kicked on the base of the spine, forced to a spreadeagled position against the wall and kicked on the ankles. He stood in this position for about 15 to 20 minutes. Later he was struck with a knee on his genitals. He saw another man being brutally assaulted when he refused to kneel. On 10 August he was made to run outside; to run, stop, turn, etc. Later he was made to do the same exercises as the day before, only involving more kneeling. Both knees were badly skinned and one was seeping water and blood.

4. The Commission received no medical evidence.

5. The Compton Committee did not meet Mr. Harvey but investigated his case by hearing members of the security forces involved (paragraphs 149 - 160). The general conclusions of the Compton Committee with regard to the "special exercises" have already been given in connection with the previous case of Desmond Smith and are also relevant to Mr. Harvey's case.

6. Conclusion: It is confirmed by the Compton Report that the enforced exercises took place. Mr. Harvey says that he was made to do them for about eight hours on 9 August. This is consistent with the Compton findings: "Position changing must, according to the evidence we heard, have continued for the greater part of 9 August" (paragraph 157). The witnesses heard by the Compton Committee denied the allegations about assault. The Amnesty Commission had no opportunity to draw any certain conclusions on this point, but notes that Mr. Harvey's account is to some degree corroborated by the evidence given by Mr. Desmond Smith.

V Summary of Findings

A. Interrogation in depth

The allegations about hooding, wall standing, noise, sleep deprivation and the restricted amounts of food and water were confirmed by the Compton Committee. There is conflicting evidence about assault and the Commission makes no findings on this point.

It is the opinion of the Commission that the treatment Mr. Shivers and Mr. McClean received involved a serious risk of creating mental disturbance. Mr. Shivers was obviously harmed by the treatment and after release he found it difficult to sleep and was unable to work for a considerable time.

B. Special exercises at Ballykinler

The allegations about enforced exercises of long duration are confirmed by the Compton Committee. The fact that the exercises went on for hours contradicts the official explanation that the purpose was "to relieve stiffness and prevent cramp". There is conflicting evidence about assault, and the Commission makes no findings on this point, but they note that there were inconsistencies in the evidence given to the Compton Committee about the degree of compulsion used.

The Commission wants to stress that Mr. Smith, during the time in Ballykinler and afterwards, had suffered convulsive fainting attacks which he, according to his own testimony and that of Dr. Plunkett, had never had before. Mr. Smith was obviously harmed by the treatment; since his release he has suffered from headaches, fluctuating moods and disturbed sleep.

VI Conclusion

The Commission had the advantage in 3 of these 4 cases of having before it in the Compton Report the evidence by the security forces in regard to the allegations of violence, and also had the opportunity of questioning the complainants themselves, which the Compton Committee did not have. In these 3 cases, therefore, the Commission were better able to assess in comprehensive manner the principal facts. As a result of its investigation, the Commission concludes that the ill-treatment used in these cases clearly amounted to brutality, and disagree with the Compton Committee when they state: "Where we have concluded that physical ill-treatment took place, we are not making a finding of brutality on the part of those who handled these complainants" (paragraph 105).

The Compton Committee was restricted to investigating allegations of physical brutality. It found that a number of complaints of physical ill-treatment were justified. The officials who gave evidence to the Compton Committee also said that one of the purposes of the hooding and continuous noise was to increase the sense of isolation, so it is obvious that the methods used during interrogation in depth were therefore intended to affect the recipients psychologically. The Commission is of the opinion that the methods used were deliberately designed to disorientate and break down the resistance of the prisoners, in order to induce them to supply information. It is significant that the incidences of physical brutality stopped after the interrogation in depth had been completed.

It is the view of the Commission that the use of wall standing, continuous noise, hooding, bread and water diet and sleep deprivation, in combination, is dangerous both to the immediate mental health of the individual subjected to this treatment and to the long term health of some subjects, especially those with a family history of mental illness.

The fact that some of the prisoners refused food and water, urinated in inappropriate situations, refused to urinate when appropriate facilities were available and kept the hood on when it could have been removed (Compton, paragraph 59) supports our findings that this treatment had serious mental effects. The auditory and visual hallucinations reported are consistent with a state of disorientation caused by sensory deprivation and lack of sleep. It is very likely that the combination of sensory deprivation and deprivation of sleep and food caused such a pathological state of passive obedience, or of extreme anxiety, that little additional maltreatment was needed to make the prisoners stand in the enforced posture for such a long time. The "special exercises" at Ballykinler involved a certain degree of mental stress and the exhaustion which resulted from the exercises added to the state of anxiety already caused by the arrest and general rough treatment.

In the opinion of the Commission, the interrogation in depth especially, but also the "special exercises", constitute violations of Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 3 of the European Convention for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL TO THE PARKER COMMITTEE ON INTERROGATION PROCEDURES

A Committee of three Privy Councillors, under the chairmanship of Lord Parker, was appointed on 16 November 1971 by the British Prime Minister "to consider whether, and if so in what respects, the procedures currently authorised for the interrogation of persons suspected of terrorism and for their custody while subject to interrogation require amendment".

1. Amnesty International begs to present this memorandum to your Committee for the following reasons:

(i) One of the objects of Amnesty International, as laid down in its constitution, is "to secure throughout the world the observance of the provisions of Article 5 ... of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", which provides that "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment".

(ii) In the ten years of its existence Amnesty International has observed with horror that there has been a growing tendency throughout the world for governments to authorize or condone the use of torture or of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment; and such treatment is most commonly inflicted not upon prisoners who have been charged and convicted of an offence, but on suspects in the course of interrogation, in order to obtain information. There are several countries where, within a period of a few years, the use of torture, at the outset sporadic and exceptional, has become an invariable routine part of any interrogation.

(iii) The purpose of your Committee is, so far as we are aware, unique, for although judicial or quasi-judicial tribunals have often been established to consider whether ill-treatment has in fact taken place in the course of interrogation, it has always been stated or implied that such treatment, if it were found to have taken place, was wrong, and that disciplinary or other measures would, if necessary, be taken to prevent its recurrence. For the first time, however, a committee has been established to decide not whether ill-treatment has taken place, but whether it should take place in the future.

(iv) The consequences of your deliberations will extend far beyond the confines of Northern Ireland or even those of the United Kingdom and its dependencies, and in saying this we are particularly mindful of the composition of your Committee and the high respect with which the English judiciary is universally regarded. The approval by your Committee of any of the measures characterized by the Compton Report as physical ill-treatment would be taken throughout the world as a statement by the English judiciary that torture was not only permissible but desirable. Any statement of this kind would in our view be profoundly retrogressive, and would place a mantle of respectability and legality on a practice which has long been outlawed by civilized nations.

2. We may assume that your Commiteee will test any interrogation procedures that may be brought to your attention by asking four questions of them:

(i) Is their use harmful to the suspect, and if so, to what degree?

(ii) Is their use immoral?

(iii) Is their use lawful, having regard both to United Kingdom internal law and to the international conventions to which the United Kingdom is a party? and

(iv) To what extent, if at all, has it been shown that it is helpful to the authorities to use such methods, having regard both to the amount of reliable information obtained and to the wider military and political consequences?

3. It is clear that the procedures associated with "interrogation in depth" described in paragraphs 43 to 105 of the Compton Report must have been painful and frightening to those subjected to them. It is significant that no less than 7 out of the 11 men who made complaints of physical ill-treatment during the period of intensive questioning were found to be suffering from physical injuries by the medical officers who examined them on their departure from the Interrogation Centre or at Crumlin Jail (Compton Report, paragraphs 79, 80-82, 85, 88 and 89). We consider it unreal to suggest that men might be kept at the wall for many hours without being subjected to direct physical violence by their guards. Moreover, the procedures were designed to disorientate and break down the mind of the suspect by sensory deprivation and the infliction of physical injury was ancillary to this purpose. We understand that your Commiteee will be receiving medical evidence relating to the serious physical and psychological injury that may be caused by the use of the methods of interrogation described in the Compton Report, and we do not seek to rehearse such evidence in this memorandum.

4. We have attempted to answer the three remaining questions referred to above. In paragraphs 5(i) - (ii) we have expressed our belief that it is immoral to use such methods; in paragraphs 6(i) - (ix) we have shown that the use of any physical ill-treatment during interrogation is both illegal and contrary to the public policy of the United Kingdom. In paragraphs 7(i) - (xiii) we have considered whether there is evidence that there is even a marginal intelligence gain to be derived from the use of physical ill-treatment. We have reached the conclusion that there probably is not, and that its use is both politically and militarily harmful to the cause it is intended to serve.

5(i) It is said that the physical ill-treatment described in the Compton Report is less severe than the methods of ill-treatment used by other regimes in other countries. But this should not serve to disguise or blind us to the true nature of the procedures described in the Compton Report. There is a danger that even by considering the procedures at length we become anaestetized to the degree to which they constitute an offence against the person. It is a form of torture to force a man to stand at the wall in the posture described for many hours in succession, in some cases for days on end, progressively exhausted and driven literally almost out of his mind by being subjected to continuous noise, and being deprived of food, of sleep, and even of light.

5(ii) But the moral impropriety of these techniques principally derives not from their physical effects at all, but from the fact that they constitute a grave assault on the human mind. It is clear that the purpose and effects of these techniques is to disorientate and break down the mind by sensory deprivation. If we regard the physical ill-treatment as merely a means to achieve the same effect as would be achieved by the forcible injection of an hallucinatory drug or of a drug designed to break down and disorientate the mind, we begin to appreciate the true nature of the moral offence committed. It is because we regard the deliberate destruction of a man's ability to control his own mind with revulsion that we reserve a special place in our catalogue of moral crimes for techniques of thought control and brainwashing. Any interrogation procedure which has the purpose or effect of causing a malfunction or breakdown of a man's mental processes constitutes as grave an assault on the inherent dignity of the human person as more traditional techniques of physical torture.

5(iii) The torture and ill-treatment of prisoners has, in recent years, become a matter of major concern to international organisations such as Amnesty International, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Committee of the Red Cross. They have repeatedly drawn attention to the tendency of some governments to ill-treat and torture prisoners. This question has also been taken up actively by the Churches. The Christian Churches held a Consultation representative of all the Christian Churches in 1970 in Baden, Austria. The Conclusions of this Consultation deal specifically with "torture" and "ill-treatment of prisoners" at pages 55 and 56 of the English version of the Conclusions. These Conclusions, inter alia, declare:

> "There is today a growing concern at the frequency with which some authorities resort to the torture or inhuman treatment of political opponents or prisoners held by them... There exists at the present time, in certain regions of the world, regimes using systematic methods of torture carried out in the most refined way. Torture itself becomes contagious... The expediency of the moment should never silence the voice of the Church Authorities when condemnation of inhuman treatment is called for."
>
> (Report of the Consultation on Christian Concern for Peace sponsored by the World Council of Churches and the Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace jointly, held at Baden, Austria 1970, published by SODEPAX, Geneva)

This Report also draws attention to the United Nations "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners" and requests that "acts of brutality or inhuman treatment of prisoners should always be reported to the highest Church Authorities".

5(iv) The World Conference on Religion and Peace (Kyoto, October 1970) which was a Conference representative of all the world's religions, also drew attention to the torture and ill-treatment of prisoners. In its findings it declared:

> "The torture and ill-treatment of prisoners which is carried out with the authority of some governments constitute not only a crime against humanity, but also a crime against the moral law".
>
> (Findings of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, page 31)

5(v) Morality and law are inextricably joined, and the belief that the use of ill-treatment for the purposes of interrogation is immoral is enshrined in both the municipal law of Northern Ireland and in the international conventions to which the United Kingdom is a party. It is to those that we now turn.

6(i) We list below the main rules of the internal law of Northern Ireland which have bearing upon interrogation procedures. There is no lawful justification for the commission of those acts characterized as ill-treatment in paragraphs 92-96 of the Compton Report, nor, so far as we know, has any legal justification ever been advanced. Prima facie all those persons who committed or who aided or abetted or counselled or procured the commission of those acts are guilty of one or more of the offences specified below and of the torts of assault, battery, and conspiracy.

(a) A person is guilty of an assault if he unlawfully displays force against another in such a way that he intentionally creates in the mind of that person the belief that force is about to be used against him;

(b) a person is guilty of battery if he intentionally uses unlawful force against another;

(c) assault occasioning actual bodily harm is contrary to the provisions of s.47 of the Offences Against the Person Act, 1861. "Actual bodily harm" includes any hurt or injury calculated to interfere with health or comfort, and includes an injury to a person's state of mind : R - v - Miller (1954), 2 Q.B.282; unlawfully and maliciously inflicting grievous bodily harm upon any other person is contrary to the provisions of s.20 of that Act;

(d) the intentional application of force to the person of another without his consent, unless authorized by law, also amounts to the civil wrong of battery, entitling the victim to compensation. Even to touch a person without his consent or some other lawful reason is actionable. "It is also probably a battery to project heat, light, noise or vapours onto another person in such manner as to cause physical injury or personal discomfort" (Salmond on the Law of Torts, 15th ed., p.158). The act of putting another person in reasonable fear or apprehension of an immediate battery by means of an act amounting to a threat to commit a battery amounts to an actionable assault. It is actionable conspiracy when two or more persons combine to commit an assault or battery upon another.

It is right to point out that it is possible that the men who themselves physically enforced the procedures described in the Compton Report in August 1971 might be able to avail themselves of the defence that they were acting in accord with superior orders if they reasonably believed that what they were doing was lawful. There is an obiter dictum of Willes J. in Keighley - v - Bell (1866), 4 F. & F., 763 at 790, that such a defence probably exists in English law, but this has never been decided; and we would suggest that the better view is that superior orders do not provide a defence but in appropriate cases would serve to mitigate punishment. In any event such a defence would not avail the senior officers who gave such orders nor would it be available in any civil proceedings.

6(ii) Any interrogation procedures which depend upon the use or threat of force or the causation of bodily harm by depriving the suspect of food, sleep, or light, or subjecting him to an excess of noise, will therefore be unlawful according to the existing law of Northern Ireland. It is impossible to point to any doctrine of common law in justification of such procedures. Nor does there exist any statute, or order or regulation made under the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland), 1922, which can be invoked as legitimizing interrogation methods of this kind. Indeed it is doubtful whether any order or regulation made under that Act which purported to authorize the use of ill-treatment for the purpose of interrogation would be valid. We do not doubt that the legal power to arrest, detain or intern a citizen carries with it the implied right to exert reasonable force where that is necessary to make the arrest, detention or internment effective. And a prison or detention centre cannot be operated without some restrictive disciplinary measures. But the power to arrest or detain does not carry with it the right to use or threaten to use force, or to inflict bodily harm for any other purpose.

6(iii) Not only are such interrogation procedures prohibited by the internal law of Northern Ireland but the United Kingdom is also a party to a number of international legal instruments which apply to interrogation procedures. The most important of these in the current situation is the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, because it alone has an adjudication mechanism and can investigate and determine whether there has been a violation of the Convention and can in effect review the domestic legislation of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom, which ratified the Convention in 1951, undertook by Article 32(4) to regard as binding upon it any decision of the Committee of Ministers. Article 3 of the Convention provides that

> "No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

6(iv) It is important to note that although Article 15(1) of the Convention provides that in time of war or other public emergency threatening the life of the nation, any contracting power may take measures derogating from its obligations under the Convention, Article 15(2) specifies that no derogation from Article 3 can be made under this provision. Article 3 represents an absolute minimum standard of civilized behaviour and treatment from which not even war can justify departure.

6(v) Whether or not it is right that the procedures characterized by the Compton Report as ill-treatment could fairly be described as a form of torture - and, in the submission of Amnesty International they do amount to a form of torture - it is clear beyond argument that they constitute degrading treatment within the meaning of the Convention. It is significant that the United Kingdom made a proposal for additions to the original draft texts of the Convention which sought to apply Article 3 explicitly to particular types of ill-treatment including "imprisonment with such an excess of light, darkness, noise or silence as to cause mental suffering" (see J.E.S. Fawcett, The Application of the European Convention of Human Rights (Oxford University Press, 1969), pp 34-5).

6(vi) It is difficult to envisage how it would be possible to subject a man to interrogation procedures which were in effect a limited or restricted form of the procedures described in the Compton Report without at the same time degrading him. Procedures whose purpose is to destroy a man's ability to control his own mind must serve to degrade him. To countenance the use of any such restricted or limited forms of ill-treatment would be to countenance serious breaches of the European Convention.

6(vii) The United Kingdom is not only a party to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 5 of which is recited in paragraph 1(i) of this memorandum, but has also signed, although not ratified, the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 10 of which provides that

> "All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person."

6(viii) Article 3 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (1949) provides that

> "In the case of armed conflict not of an international character occurring in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties ... persons taking no active part in the hostilities, including members of armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed hors de combat by ... detention ... shall in all circumstances be treated humanely ...
>
> To this end the following acts are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever with respect to the above-mentioned persons:
>
> (a) violation to life and person, in particular ... cruel treatment and torture ...
>
> ...
>
> (c) Outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment."

It is strongly arguable that this Article applies to the present conflict in Northern Ireland, since it is an "armed conflict not of an international character", and this is apparently the view of Her Majesty's Government, who in s.2(d) of their Note on Interrogation set out in paragraph 46 of the Compton Report, appear to accept that Article 3 applies to "civil disturbances". If that be the case, it is also arguable that, if we are correct in our view that the procedures described in the Compton Report constitute a form of torture,* those who carried them out are guilty of an offence against the Geneva Conventions Act, 1957, punishable with imprisonment for 14 years. This Act made it an offence under the law of the United Kingdom for any person, whatever his nationality, whether inside or outside the United Kingdom, to commit a grave breach of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, 1949. Such breaches include torture or inhuman treatment or wilfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health.

6(ix) Finally, and this will no doubt weigh heavily in your deliberations, although Article 17 of the Geneva Convention does not apply to the present conflict in Northern Ireland, it would apply to all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which might arise between the United Kingdom and any other party to the Convention. This Article provides that

> "No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind."

The Geneva Conventions Act was enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament to enable the Geneva Conventions to be ratified by the United Kingdom, and ratification was effected in 1958. The legislators must have appreciated in 1957, and it must have been appreciated by the United Kingdom when it signed the Convention in August 1949, that in times of war there is a pressing need to obtain information from captured soldiers, information upon which the very survival of the State and the outcome of the war might depend, and yet nevertheless this restriction upon the conduct of any future war was accepted. It would be highly unsatisfactory if the United Kingdom were to tolerate a lower standard of conduct towards its own citizens than it accepts, as a matter of public policy, it should display to citizens of other countries with whom it may be at war.

7(i) The only argument adduced by those in the United Kingdom who advocate the use of physical ill-treatment during interrogation is one of expediency, and runs along the following lines: the authorities are, in effect, engaged in a war against terrorism; terrorism must be defeated; the lives and property of innocent people must be protected and the rule of law must be restored; a continuous supply of tactical information relating to the identity of the enemy and the location of his weapons is vital to achieve these ends, and cannot be obtained without the use of physical ill-treatment; this may be illegal, it may, in the eyes of many, be immoral, it may inflame one's political enemies and alienate many of those who were previously uncommitted, but its military value is established, and that alone serves to justify its use.

* Article 147 of the commentary, published in 1958, on the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War gives the legal definition of torture as:

> "the infliction of suffering on a person to obtain from that person, or from another person, confessions or information."

7(ii) It is Amnesty International's contention that expediency cannot in any event justify the use of physical ill-treatment to obtain information, and we have set this out in paragraphs 5 and 6-above. But we have also considered whether it is, in fact, expedient or necessary to use physical ill-treatment to obtain information. In order to do this we shall consider whether the use of physical ill-treatment in interrogation procedures does in fact produce a greater flow of reliable information than is produced by interrogation procedures which do not involve physical ill-treatment, and secondly, whether the political effects of the use of physical ill-treatment make it more difficult for the authorities to defeat terrorism and to achieve a lasting political settlement.

7(iii) The use of physical ill-treatment during interrogation in Northern Ireland has been explicitly or implicitly defended by reference to the increased flow of intelligence since these methods were introduced. It is said that as a result of these methods the number of wanted men arrested, and the quantities of arms, ammunition and explosives seized, have all been far greater during the three and a half months since 9 August 1971 than they were during the first seven months of this year.

7(iv) These facts do not in themselves demonstrate that there has been any marginal intelligence gain as a result of the use of physical ill-treatment during interrogation. The validity of an argument of the kind advanced can be challenged on the following grounds:

(a) During the period after the re-introduction of internment on the 9 August 1971 a far larger number of people were arrested and interrogated than during the first part of the year. One would expect that the greater the number of people interrogated the more information would be obtained, and it is therefore highly probable that there would have been a dramatic increase in the supply of information after the 9 August 1971 whether or not those interrogated were subjected to physical ill-treatment;

(b) For the reasons set out in paragraphs 7(vii) to 7(xii) below, it is quite possible that if those detained had been skilfully interrogated by methods which do not involve the use of physical ill-treatment, or the threat that it might be used, the amount of reliable information obtained might have been even greater;

(c) Only 14 of those arrested were subjected to interrogation in depth; the total figures of intelligence gained do not reflect upon the value, if any, of the intelligence provided by this small group.

7(v) One may expect that those who were actually responsible for the interrogation in which physical ill-treatment was used would believe that any information obtained by these methods could not have been obtained in any other way. The following considerations may be relevant in determining the weight that should be attached to such evidence. Firstly, it is quite common that when someone has obtained an objective by one method, he will tend to believe that it could not have been obtained by any other; secondly, the men concerned may be unversed in more skilful types of interrogation procedures; thirdly, and most important of all, for reasons which may be clear in the light of paragraph 7(ix) below, once an interrogation involving the use of physical ill-treatment has been started the prospects of obtaining information from the suspect by any other means are, and will appear to the interrogator to be, very slight. If reliable information is eventually obtained by these means the interrogator will therefore tend to believe that it could not have been obtained in any other way.

7(vi) We have searched for any reasoned justification from authorities in other countries in support of the contention that the use of physical ill-treatment during interrogation leads to a marginal intelligence gain. The only material that we have found is a report produced by a M. Wuillaume, a senior French civil servant, made in 1955 at the instance of the French Government to enquire into allegations of torture during interrogation in Algeria. The techniques of interrogation which he found to be prevalent far exceeded in their inhumanity any of those mentioned in the Compton Report. M. Wuillaume in the course of his Report stated, "I myself am in no position to assert that these practices were effective and am compelled to rely on the statements of those who assured me of this and who, it should be noted, were highly thought of by their superiors." Thus he was not prepared to say on the evidence presented to him that information could not have been obtained by other means; and it would appear that in Algeria the use of the most inhuman torture to extract information was automatic, so that, so far as can be gathered, there was little attempt to obtain information by less brutal methods. (It might be noted that M. Wuillaume in his Report dated 2 March 1955 did not unambiguously condemn the use of torture, and from that time until the end of the Algerian War in 1962 the use of torture by the authorities was not only endemic in Algeria but spread to Metropolitan France itself.) An English translation of the Wuillaume Report may be found in Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Torture: Cancer of Democracy (Penguin, 1963).

7(vii) We have searched for, but failed to find (perhaps because of the limited time available to us), any written evidence from those who have been professionally concerned with the conduct of interrogation in times of war or insurgency in recent years on behalf of the United Kingdom, that there is a marginal intelligence gain to be derived from the use of physical ill-treatment; on the contrary, all the evidence that we have seen from such sources indicates that the use of physical ill-treatment decreases the amount of reliable tactical information obtained. At the very least it is problematical whether or not there is even a marginal gain, and even if there were a marginal gain it would be outweighed by the political losses.

7(viii) In the first place, we would draw your Committee's attention to the wider military and political effects of the methods of interrogation used. The use of methods of interrogation which will be characterized as torture by those who have been subjected to them will tend both to imperil the political objectives for which the Government is striving and to strengthen the effectiveness of those to whom the Government is opposed. They are dependent upon the support of the local population; the use of torture gives them a powerful propaganda weapon; their uncommitted but potential supporters identify with the victims of ill-treatment, and become increasingly bitter towards the authorities; the credibility of the Government's claim that it is endeavouring to maintain civilized values is irretrievably weakened when the Government itself stoops to methods which many - including its own supporters at home and abroad - find abhorrent. And the greater the degree of bitterness and hostility that the Government creates by its actions the more difficult it will find it to achieve any political solution whose success depends upon the support and co-operation of all sections of the local population.

7(ix) Secondly, there appear to be two separate reasons why the use of physical ill-treatment as a method of obtaining information is likely to be relatively ineffective. The first is that interrogation procedures using physical ill-treatment suffer from the crucial weakness that the interrogator has to give his intelligence aim away. He has to inform the suspect what information he wishes to know, and the suspect will therefore know what to conceal or where to provide false information. Furthermore, all kinds of physical ill-treatment, including those with which we are concerned in this memorandum, are felt by the suspect to be painful, degrading and humiliating,

and the suspect therefore becomes increasingly hostile and resentful. Whether or not he possesses the information that is sought he is tempted to give false information, either to avoid suffering from further ill-treatment or to mislead the authorities. A large part of the information provided by men subject to physical ill-treatment is therefore likely to be false and the authorities must expend a great deal of time seeking to verify it, if verification be possible. But skilful methods not involving physical ill-treatment can lead a prisoner to provide, utterly unwittingly, the piece of information sought in circumstances in which he may even be unaware that he is being interrogated. The information so obtained is likely to be true, for the interrogator can see that it is given by the suspect voluntarily from his own experience. The second reason is that advanced by Professor Patrick D. Wall, Director of the Cerebral Functions Research Group at University College, London, in a letter to The Times on 24 November 1971. According to Professor Wall, the effect of the methods described by the Compton Report is to disorientate the suspect and lead him to make a fantasy confession which he believes to be true: "The anxious confused hallucinating prisoner searches for any act which will terminate his misery. These are the conditions under which fantasy confessions are made by men completely believing their own false story."

7(x) On the other hand, there is strong testimony to the effectiveness of methods of interrogation which do not involve physical ill-treatment. According to Donald McLachlan, who served in the Naval Intelligence Department during the Second World War,

> This / prisoner of war interrogation / is a great art and there are many methods, but the civilized and intelligent method, in my experience, is the best. If you can convince a prisoner of war that there is no point in his concealing information from you because you know so much already; if you can convince him that you really know all about his U-boat flotilla, or his officers or his torpedoes, or the wavelength of his search apparatus and so on and that you merely want the odd detail, just to make a clearer picture in your mind - then he will succumb; even the best-trained man will succumb eventually. To achieve that, the man who is doing the interrogation has first to be fully briefed by the intelligence staff behind him. They have to tell him all they know about the man's unit or U-boat, and what it is that they want to know. This technique of briefing was gradually evolved with great success by all services and I think it is true to say that it was the only method which worked.
>
> Donald McLachlan, 'Intelligence: the common denominator', The Fourth Dimension of Warfare, ed. Michael Elliott-Bateman, (Manchester University Press, 1970), pp.62-3.

7(xi) This assessment of the effectiveness of "the civilized and intelligent method" was supported by Mr. L. St. Clare Grondona, who was Commandant during the Second World War of the Combined Services Detailed Interrogation Centre, in a letter to The Times on 27 November 1971:

> ... They / German prisoners of war / possessed valuable information of which it was our job to extract as much as possible; but always with proper regard to the Geneva Convention.
>
> So it was that our interrogators (then and thereafter) had to be as wily as they were resourceful. The methods they used were processes of "painless extraction" seasoned with legitimate guile. More often than not a "guest" would be unaware that he had given us useful data. Courtesy was extended to every prisoner so long as his behaviour warranted this - and it usually did. Comfortable quarters were provided, and prisoners' fare was precisely the same as for British personnel.

> It is the simple truth to say that if one of our interrogators had suggested submitting any prisoner to any form of physical duress (which would certainly not have been permitted) he would have been a laughing-stock among his colleagues. Nevertheless, the "intelligence" we obtained (all the items of which were carefully correlated) was of inestimable value.

7(xii) The superiority of methods of interrogation which do not involve physical ill-treatment is also attested to by Sir Robert Thompson, who was concerned with security in Malaya from 1948 to 1960 - by the end of which period he was Secretary for Defence - and in South Vietnam from 1961 to 1965, where he was Head of the British Advisory Mission:

> Well-treated and carefully interrogated, sometimes over a long period, / captured or surrendered enemy personnel / reveal a tremendous amount of information. A situation gradually develops whereby any later individual who is captured or surrenders can then be interrogated on the basis of a mass of information already available to the intelligence organization. This shocks the truth out of him far more effectively than torture.
>
> Sir Robert Thompson, Defeating Communist Insurgency (London, Chatto & Windus, 1966), p.87.

7(xiii) Again, Mr. Cyril Cunningham, who was Senior Psychologist engaged in prisoner of war intelligence on behalf of the British Government, wrote to The Times on the 25 November 1971 in the following terms:

> If the Royal Ulster Constabulary, or indeed the Army, is using the methods reported, they are being singularly stupid and unimaginative. Interrogation by overt verbal examination backed by fear is a blunt, mediaeval and extremely inefficient technique.

8. For these reasons Amnesty International believes that the use of ill-treatment for the purpose of interrogation is immoral, illegal, and inexpedient. But expedient or not, Amnesty believes that its use should never be tolerated. The only proper rule, from which there should be no departure, is that provided by Article 17 of the Geneva Convention: no physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, should be inflicted on prisoners to secure from them information of any kind whatever; prisoners who refuse to answer should not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS FROM AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORT ON TORTURE

A survey of torture allegations in more than 65 countries. Issued in conjunction with Amnesty International's worldwide Campaign for the Abolition of Torture, it includes disturbing accounts of their ordeal by torture victims themselves and examines the medical, psychological and legal aspects of torture.

"Amnesty International has once again made the world aware of an international problem. The report cannot be brushed aside as one-sided or superficial. The accusations are well-documented."
editorial, *Dagbladet*, Oslo

224 pages: paperback £1.50 (US $3.75) plus postage, cloth £3.95 (US $10) plus postage. December 1973.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

A report on the 100,000 or more civilians detained by the Saigon Government. There is also reference to political prisoners held by the Provisional Revolutionary Government.

"The report describes in revolting detail what is done to human beings in the prisons and interrogation centers of South Vietnam: the use of electricity, beating, water; the crippling and death that result. It names the victims and describes cases in convincing detail. It calls the situation, altogether, 'one of the most serious cases of political repression in the world'." Anthony Lewis, *The New York Times*

36 pages illustrated: 35 pence (US $0·90) plus postage. July 1973.

REPORT ON ALLEGATIONS OF TORTURE IN BRAZIL

Brazil is almost a textbook example of a country in which torture has become an institutional instrument of terror and repression. The report, which shows the other face of Brazil's much-vaunted "economic miracle", contains the names of more than a thousand people reported to have been the victims of torture, murder or "disappearance". It gives case histories of torture victims, and describes the places of torture, the techniques used and the police-supported vigilante "death squads" that roam the country.

"This is among the most meticulously documented of all of Amnesty's publications." *The Guardian*
"Un rapport accablant." *Le Monde*

108 pages: £1.20 (US $3) plus postage. First published September 1972. Second edition, re-set with revised preface and commentary, July 1974.

POLITICAL IMPRISONMENT IN SPAIN

Hundreds of men and women are imprisoned in Spain today and several thousand more await trial because of their opposition to the government and its policies. The report traces the history of political imprisonment in Spain since the civil war, describes the legal machinery used by the government to suppress its opponents and shows the brutality and discrimination suffered by political prisoners.

32 pages illustrated: 50 pence (US $1.25) plus postage. Spanish edition without illustrations: 30 pence (75 US cents) plus postage. August 1973.

INDONESIA SPECIAL

At least 55,000 political prisoners have been detained in Indonesia since 1965 without charge or trial and without any civil and legal rights. Supported by a map and photographs, the report relates the background to their ordeal, the conditions in which they are held and the suffering both of the prisoners and their families.

30 pages illustrated: 35 pence (90 US cents) plus postage. Published in English by Amnesty International's Dutch Section, March 1973.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL NEWSLETTER AND ANNUAL REPORT

The *Newsletter* is a useful monthly account of Amnesty International's continuing work in the field of political imprisonment and human rights throughout the world. It also contains developments within the organization itself and a two-page monthly bulletin devoted to the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture.

The *Amnesty International Annual Report*, published each September, is also much more than an internal document. It contains resumés of existing political situations and Amnesty International's work in more than 100 countries where human rights have been violated. It also summarizes AI's own activities and development over the year, including its work promoting human rights through the United Nations and other international bodies.
Both the Newsletter (12 issues per annum of six pages each) and the Annual Report (currently about 88 pages) are offered for the inclusive annual subscription price of £4 (US $10) post free.

All from: Amnesty International Publications, 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP, England.

The introduction of internment in Northern Ireland in August 1971, in an effort to contain sectarian violence, gave rise to serious allegations of brutality by security forces against men taken into custody. The British Government set up first the Compton Committee and then the Parker Committee to investigate the complaints.

In December 1971 Amnesty International sent its own commission of enquiry to Belfast. The commission spent five days hearing evidence given by and on behalf of detainees and internees and ex-detainees and internees. This is the commission's report.

As a result of the report and of the findings of the Compton and Parker Committees the world heard in detail what "interrogation in depth" by the security forces entailed: kicks, beatings, forced standing in one position for many hours and, even more ominously, various forms of sensory deprivation—hooding, boiler suits, "white noise"—which led in some cases to psychological damage.

This report deals with the 30 cases considered by the Amnesty International enquiry and concludes that detainees had been ill-treated by the security forces. The report's final section comprises Amnesty International's memorandum to the Parker Commission. It argues the harmfulness, immorality and illegality of brutal interrogation.