



**VETERANS
DEMANDING
PROPER
RECOGNITION
FOR ALL
HM ARMED FORCES**

Commissioned by	National Defence Medal Campaign
Title	Veterans Recognition Report
Document Version	Issue V1.1
Date of Issue	21 st June 2009
Edited by	Jarrold Cotter

Patron:
Arnold
Schwartzman
OBE, RDI

www.nationaldefencemedal.webs.com
n-d-m@hotmail.co.uk

(+44) 0 1428 722249
(+44) 0 7767 365446
(+44) 0 1722 500048

NDM©2009

Contents:

Contents:.....	2
Foreword.....	4
1. Introduction	4
2. The Sovereign	5
3. Do our Service personnel deserve official recognition?	6
3.1 Military Covenant.....	6
3.2 Exposing the Arguments	7
3.3 Models of Success	8
3.4 Administration.....	9
3.5 Tradition and Morale	10
3.6 Political Pressure.....	11
3.7 Long Service Anomaly	13
3.8 What Is The Policy?	13
3.9 Badges	14
3.10 Time to Change.....	15
4. National Service.....	17
75% Support Honour.....	18
5. The HD Committee	18
6. MoD Issued HM Armed Forces Veteran’s Badge – HMAFVB	19
6.1 The Proliferation of Unofficial Badges.....	19
6.2 What is a Medal?.....	20
6.3 What are the facts?	22
7. Armed Forces Recognition For The Fallen.....	24
8. Previous Defence Medal.....	25
9. Case Studies	26
9.1 Post-Armistice Korea – 1953 to 1957 (by R. Farrar).....	26
Imagine the situation.....	26
Old Order	28
Why doesn’t Great Britain follow suit?	29
Risk and Rigour.....	29
Post Script.....	32
Dedication	32
Comparison.....	32
9.2 Cyprus – 1954 – 1959 (by Maj S Pollock).....	35
Synopsis.....	35
No Arm, No Medal.....	35
Stonewalled.....	36
9.3 Irish Republicanism	36
Northern Ireland	36
The War Outside Of NI	37
Britain’s Formal 'Declaration Of War' Against The IRA.....	38
Targets	38
Conclusion	39
9.4 Active Service Post World War Two	40
Berlin Airlift	40
British Army of the Rhine (BAOR).....	40
Rest of the World	41
9.5 The Cold War	41
9.6 South Atlantic	43
9.7 British Nuclear Testing	44
9.8 Global War on Terror.....	45
9.9 Normal Service Life	45
9.10 Chemical Warfare Testing.....	46
10. A View From A Recognised Expert In The Field – Extract from an article in <i>Medal News</i> by Ashley Tinson.	46
10.1 Qualification Periods For Campaign Medals.....	46
10.2 Post 1945	47

10.3 The Cyprus Travesty	47
10.4 Qualification Settles Down	47
10.5 The Answer; Defence Service Medal.....	48
11. A Proposal	48
12. What is a Veteran?	49
13. Conclusion	49
14. NDM Society Committee	51
15. Reference Documentation	52
Appendix A	53
Appendix B	58

Foreword

In passing comment on the way that medals are, or are not, awarded, it would behove anyone wishing to state any point of view, pro or con, to read once again the words that Sir Winston Churchill had to say on the subject of medals and awards:

“The object of giving medals, stars and ribbons is to give pride and pleasure to those who have deserved them. At the same time a distinction is something which everybody does not possess. If all have it, it is of less value. There must, therefore, be heart-burnings and disappointments on the borderline. A medal glitters, but it also casts a shadow. The task of drawing up regulations for such awards is one which does not admit of a perfect solution. It is not possible to satisfy everybody without running the risk of satisfying nobody. All that is possible is to give the greatest satisfaction to the greatest number and to hurt the feelings of the fewest.”

Winston Churchill (Prime Minister) – March 22nd, 1944

This quote is also used in the introduction within the Joint Service Publication (JSP 761) which is the authoritative guide for Honours and Awards in the Armed Services. It should act as a reminder to those who administer our honours system of what they are meant to be about. The quote has been hijacked by some to argue that no change is required, but that is a misrepresentation. The last sentence is the key to understanding the entire quote. In the context of the Armed Services, by virtue of the fact that anybody who wears their country’s uniform to do his or her duty, they have already set themselves apart from the rest of the population and have in a sense already distinguished themselves from the pack. This paper will detail how ‘the greatest number’ have somehow been treated as if they were the few.

The National Defence Medal concept would serve to unite the broader community, as well as uniting the veterans themselves, awakening and giving meaning to the inherent pride that so many of us have but presently feel unable to demonstrate.

As the Armed Forces are constantly updated and re-equipped to deal with such contingencies as they are likely to face, the infrastructure that supports them must of necessity also be brought into line with the perceived needs of those who man the weaponry needed to maintain the Nation’s integrity. In failing to address the obvious needs of instituting a medal that would be applicable to all ranks and all arms, as a recognition of service, the people within whose remit this lies can be said to have failed most signally in their tasking.

1. Introduction

“There’s nothing more important to troops than a medal - they are incredibly emotive and they mean the world to soldiers.”

Patrick Mercer, MP for Newark, and former infantry commander – *Daily Telegraph* March 19th, 2008

In organizing a concerted assault on any entrenched position, some effort must be made to fully rationalize the effort and lay out the logic behind the intended action. In this instance, the entrenched position is being held by a group of empowered but reactionary people who have, without any such remit, set themselves up as the defenders of the status quo where medals and honours for the British Armed Forces are concerned. You will in due course see for yourselves that their actual function, per se, is to oversee the equitable distribution of such honours, medals and awards as the Sovereign may approve. They are also required to advise the Sovereign as to whether or not any proposed medal, award or honour, is appropriate. They are not required to prevent the issuance of any new awards, medals or honours, nor to prevent discourse on their merit or otherwise, merely to advise. From the gist of the responses from certain bureaucrats to enquiries from veterans and others that you will read in this paper, it would seem that these bureaucrats seem to think they have the right to ignore any suggestions for change that come from sources outside the corridors of their own ‘exalted’ group.

As things stand, those responsible for the maintenance of the honours system are normally themselves well placed in the queue for decorations. It is therefore a little ironic that these same people see no justice or merit in adding a

National Defence Medal (NDM) to the present list of honours. Surely, there can be absolutely no realistic dispute that anyone devoting life and limb in the Sovereign's service, ought to be worthy of recognition for that act of profound loyalty and patriotism. As regards the powers that be who work in government, their civilian decorations are often perceived by the general public as having been being awarded because of appointments or positions held by them; or just simply for doing their jobs. By contrast, those that have served often receive no recognition. For them, an NDM would be an appropriate and worthy recognition of their willingness to make sacrifice for the common good and the wellbeing of the realm.

A motto, such as, '*one for all*' would serve to remind all involved, supporters or otherwise, that the medal that veterans seek is a simple and broad based indication of service for our Sovereign and country, nothing more and nothing less. Eligibility criteria must be uniform across the whole spectrum of those for whom it is intended and it must be all encompassing in scope. National Service is another area that has been grievously neglected in respect of medal allocation and that also needs to be brought into the manifesto.

Much is made of the fact that our Armed Forces need constant upgrading and modification, in weaponry, tactics and organisation. If that be a truism for the organism itself, then most assuredly it also applies to the ancillary aspects that are part and parcel of the whole. Honours, medals and awards are an important and highly effective way of encouraging high morale and *esprit de corps*, things that are currently under great pressure, given the types of service presently being experienced by members of today's Armed Forces. It is vitally important that the archaic honours and awards system be altered to suit the needs of today's (and yesterday's) sailors, marines, soldiers and airmen.

There is no doubt whatsoever that a great number of sorely vexed ex-servicemen and women would 'front up' for commemorative parades, were they given a proper medal to distinguish them from the crowds around them. This is evidenced in Australia and New Zealand, where ANZAC Day parades have become a whole of community effort year after year and April 25th is now a public holiday and one of the most important national occasions. So there can be no doubt that proper recognition of veterans is the best way to bring patriotism to the fore. Jingoism is not needed, just a quiet and affectionate appreciation of what the veterans represent.

There now follows some of the arguments put forth and the wholly unsatisfactory answers thus far given, denying utterly the heartfelt pleas of those who have taken up this challenge for the gaining of that which should be the due of all veterans, a National Defence Medal. The wide range of people from all walks of life thus willing to stand up and be recognized in this struggle for natural justice is remarkable in itself. Please read on.

2. The Sovereign

All readers should be aware that the Sovereign is the fount of all honours in the United Kingdom and while the honours system operates through government it is not at the disposal of the government of the day which cannot, by its own decision, alter, or abolish it. For the last century the Sovereign has called on his or her Private Secretary, in consultation with civil servants, to give advice about the honours system. Prior to the establishment of the HD Committee, the Sovereign would have been asked to give permission for the setting up of a special enquiry each time a question of policy was raised. The non-ministerial nature of the HD Committee does not exclude influence by government ministers. Far from it. Private secretaries, permanent secretaries and the Cabinet Secretary, who sits on the Committee, will be alert to the views of ministers and those views would almost certainly be taken into account by the Committee when deciding upon issues raised and before any recommendations are made to the Sovereign.

Many thousands of former servicemen have never been properly honoured in the form of a medal, despite having served in HM Forces for many years. For this dedication to the Crown, they must be given an opportunity to put the case to the Sovereign. We know the Queen has already listened to a similar case and seen fit to endorse them.

Having written directly to the Sovereign on the subject, we take encouragement from the fact that Her Majesty has not dismissed our plea out of hand. Given the constitutional constraints under which she has to function, this is not at all discouraging to those of us that seek to place the issue of a National Defence Medal before the Nation.

3. Do our Service personnel deserve official recognition?

In a recent debate several Members of Parliament talked about medals and raised many arguments and principles which were very relevant to a National Defence Medal. Using this debate and supplementing it with other contributions, an incredibly strong case emerges with plenty of new evidence to support the case for an NDM.

As you read through this paper, it is important to appreciate the difference between service and campaign medals. There are some who mistakenly group these two very different kinds of medals together. To fully understand the concepts and issues set forth in this paper, the reader should be very clear on the difference between the two types of medals.

The Armed Forces have recognised service since 1830 – normally, with a reckonable service qualification period and a requirement, depending on whether the medal is awarded for exemplary conduct, long service, efficient service or proven capacity. There are also commemorative medals such as the Queen’s Golden Jubilee Medal, which required service on a particular day and possibly also a number of years reckonable service. These types of official medals are typically referred to as Service Medals. They require no time spent in any particular campaign or operational theatre.

All other military medals we will group together as Campaign Medals. These medals are instituted based on recommendations of the military chiefs taking into account the risks and rigours of a particular conflict, war or campaign. The qualification days for these awards has controversially varied during the post World War Two period.

Almost everyone we speak to is startled to learn that in Great Britain there is no official recognition for military service in the form of a National Defence Medal. We do not wish to criticise individuals, but concur with some of the sentiments expressed by **David Taylor MP** when he addressed the Minister for Veterans on the subject of new medals:

“...the nation recognises the heroism of troops in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, which is certainly true. Can he come up with any rationale as to why the decision on this issue is taken not by the Minister, but by bureaucrats in the Ministry of Defence, just 200 yards away, who do not even seem to recognise what is happening?”

We will explore some of the reasons for this later in this paper.

3.1 Military Covenant

Under the Military Covenant, British soldiers must always get fair treatment, be valued and respected as individuals, and be sustained and rewarded by terms of service that match the personal sacrifices that they make. The proposed National Defence Medal would support the terms of the Covenant in helping to demonstrate personal endeavour is valued by their Country.

On September 21st, 2007, the Chief of the General Staff, General Sir Richard Dannatt, said:

“The Covenant says that we do what we do in the Nation’s name, that’s the way a democracy works – and so soldiers do not ask why; but they do ask for respect and honour for doing what they have been sent to do – which they do with courage and professionalism.”

General Dannatt went on to quote from the then Minister for the Armed Forces, Mr Bob Ainsworth MP, who said:

“There is not an appreciation or even an understanding among wide sections of the community of exactly what we ask our Armed Forces to do, and we’re asking an awful lot of them.”

Awarding an NDM would help to explain to the wider community the many different kinds of duties that those young men and women have undertaken on our behalf.

Having spoken to many in the service community and their families and listening to their stories which are often very moving, to a man and to a woman, they have no objection to and, indeed, find it hard to understand why some type of official recognition has not already been given.

There are many examples of what other countries have done inside and outside the Commonwealth. Anyone who has met veterans from Australia, Canada, New Zealand or the USA, to name just a few, will know that they are very proud to have their service properly recognised with a suitable medal. The principle of awarding the medal is more important than the details of how it would be awarded.

Then there is the Military Covenant. The Minister of Defence knows how much veterans have heard about that, trusting that an NDM will result from the Covenant. Civilians, sitting in the comfort and security of their homes are open-minded enough to listen to their service men, women and veterans, and there is a groundswell of support in favour of this award. There may be some senior officers inside the Ministry of Defence who themselves, by virtue of not being subjected to the indignity of unencumbered chests, do not quite understand what it means to be overlooked, forgotten or made to feel worthless and therefore lack any empathy. Veterans have received letters written to them, or officials by those in the Ministry of Defence, which give the distinct impression that any suggestion that an NDM be instituted is regarded as a nuisance and utterly out of the question. Perhaps the issuance of the medal would be too much of a burden on the military budget. Surely, however, those officers should cease to be so narrow-minded and understand that all veterans need to have an official medal to recognise their past service.

This type of award should be seen as part of the Military Covenant. Failure to honour our servicemen and women and their families in this way is actually a failure in the civilian side of the bargain. Politicians have a responsibility to do all that they can to meet that part of the bargain and this type of award is a relatively simple way of doing that.

Now is not the time to be concerned about what to call the medal. In this paper, we suggest that it be called the National Defence Medal, or NDM for short. However, such details can be resolved once the basic principles concerning the issuance of the medal have been established.

3.2 Exposing the Arguments

Some have put forward reasons why such an NDM should not be awarded, and it is important to expose them to a little critical thinking. There is much support in the service community for the recognition for those who have served a reasonable engagement. Dividing officers from other ranks would be an error since it would leave a lot of Armed Forces personnel feeling that the measure was half-hearted. As a result, the award should be for all. Our service personnel should not be used and abused then treated like disposable assets.

Another argument put forward is that the medal would be divisive. However, all medals are divisive. Certainly, gallantry medals are. People often have opinions on whether recipients should or should not have received them. Clearly, good conduct medals or even awards such as the OBE or MBE are divisive because people have opinions on whether others should receive them. We note that the Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff, General Sir Timothy Granville-Chapman, has a KCB and a CBE, as does the Chief of the General Staff, Sir Richard Dannatt. Those awards were undoubtedly well deserved, but in the nature of things, some might think otherwise.

Therefore, divisiveness should not and cannot be a valid reason for denying awarding medals to such individuals. We do not think that they would have refused to accept those medals on the grounds that they were divisive in relation to those people who did not get similar awards. We are not talking here about Sir Richard Dannatt's Military Cross which of course is well deserved – credit to him for the sacrifice that he made to earn it. However, we are talking about service rather than gallantry or campaign awards. Some of the ladies and gentlemen who will decide the fate of the NDM will no doubt hold some kind of award themselves, and to many members of the public those awards could be regarded as controversial.

The institution of an NDM would be far less divisive than other types of medals, because to earn it recipients would need to have served a prescribed finite term in the forces which would be transparent and therefore not open to dispute.

Another argument, which comes from traditionalists, is that Britain does not award such medals and that there is no tradition or precedent for it in the British Armed Forces. However this is not strictly true and we will explore this later. Perhaps this argument is a significant reason why Commonwealth countries like Australia, Canada and New Zealand opted out of the British Imperial Honours System, giving them the freedom to honour all of their service personnel without the archaic constraints currently in force in the UK.

Another objection put forward by a few is that rather than making an award we should be concentrating on providing for proper medical treatment, rehabilitation, equipment and resettlement for those injured in the line of duty. Instituting an NDM should not supersede or replace all of those vital issues, but should be added to them. This is a very important point.

The MoD (Mr R T Coney, Defence Services Secretary) points out that there are no plans to move toward introducing medals purely as a record of service. An NDM would be an official recognition of service, not a record of service, which is something quite different. There is no suggestion of it being issued with a clasp or clasps recording postings, length of service etc, which is accepted might not be practical or desirable. Even if, perhaps, Mr Coney has not considered these points, it is important that the reader does.

3.3 Models of Success

If it is appropriate for the Queen to approve medals similar to an NDM for Australians and New Zealanders, then surely institution of a similar medal for UK Armed Forces personnel would also be desirable and very fitting. The Queen approved the Australian Defence Medal on the recommendation of Her Australian Minister. So why is she not given the opportunity to approve one for her own British subjects?

The Australian Defence Medal (ADM) was established to recognise Australian Defence Force, regular and reserve personnel, who have demonstrated their commitment and contribution to the nation by serving for an initial enlistment period or 4 years service whichever is the lesser. Her Majesty the Queen approved the Regulations and Letters Patent for the medal on March 20th, 2006. The New Zealanders, also now free of restrictions imposed on them as a Sovereign nation by the Imperial Honours System, have been incredibly innovative about how they ensure all their troops would be recognised for their service by creating the New Zealand General Service Medal for warlike and non-warlike operations and the New Zealand Operational Service Medal. American patriotism, well known to all, has always ensured its troops are well honoured – perhaps overly so in the opinion of some. However, what, by contrast, we are suggesting here is a single award, not an avalanche. France's Medal of National Defence has employed three echelons: a bronze medal for 6 months of service, silver for 5 years service and gold for 10 years service. There are many more just as credible examples around the world and we have listed some below, but our model would focus on those that the Queen has already endorsed.

Without wishing to labour the point, outside of the Commonwealth, there are more examples:

USA - National Defence Medal (after 90 days)
FRANCE – Medal of National Defence (after 6 months), 3 Classes
NORWAY - National Service Defence Medal (after 1 year)
FINLAND - Maanpuolustusmitali National Defence Medal, 3 Classes
PORTUGAL - National Defence Medal, 3 Classes
RUSSIA - Discharge Defence Medal (issued automatically upon discharge of service)
CZECH REPUBLIC - National Service Medal

We could list more from around the world, all have variations on the theme but they are all united in recognising the importance and respect of their Armed Forces. We would be happy to supply further examples if required. It seems to be the norm rather than the exception for countries to honour their service personnel with a medal, and where countries don't give an NDM they do award other medals for career service as well as long service. UK veterans can easily and frequently do see how others are treated, then compare and draw conclusions about their own treatment.

In relation to British, Australian, Canadian and New Zealand armed forces, it is interesting to observe that when serving in Korea post 1954 alongside each other on the same front, one would expect that they would receive similar awards since they were exposed to equal risk and rigour. However, strange as this may seem, such is not

the case because whilst Australia, Canada and New Zealand have subsequently awarded medals to their people with the approval of the Queen, Britain has not and refuses to honour its own veterans. This state of affairs is indeed a strange anomaly. We do not say Britain should follow blindly everything our allies do, but in this case they have got it right, and when they do the powers that be should have the grace to admit that there is a need to correct this injustice.

Now consider the response by Mr R T Coney of the MoD to a request to adopt a similar modern approach for British forces who served alongside their Commonwealth allies in Korea:

“Australia, Canada and New Zealand withdrew from the Imperial Honours System many years ago and have since introduced a number of medals for which there are no British equivalents. The decision to institute these awards, and any approval which The Queen may have given, would have been on the advice of that Country’s Ministers. These awards are the sole responsibility of the countries concerned and the British Government is under no obligation to follow suit.”

This should not be a matter of obligation but, rather, a matter of intense desire as the Military Covenant suggests. If we accept the premise that the UK has one of the finest armed forces in the world, one would expect the country to also set the standards for the rest of the world in appreciating them.

In the awards structure for US forces, it is politicians who make decisions. Such a structure is something that politicians in the UK could emulate – not on a party-political basis, but across the board, across all parties and opinion.

Ministers in the above Commonwealth countries have demonstrated the confidence to challenge an out of date system and create a modern system of their own fit for today’s forces. It shows great hubris to dismiss our allies and friends with the suggestion that the British system is superior. This no longer holds up to scrutiny.

3.4 Administration

Another argument that has been put forward is that the award would somehow be difficult to administer. That is a famous argument because we often hear it from the MoD. However, in the First World War, we had 965,703 people killed and 2,272,999 wounded in four years, as well as all the survivors and every single one received some type of medal. A similar situation occurred after the Second World War. There would be far fewer administrative difficulties these days.

We cannot be distracted by the cost of something such as this, because objecting on the grounds of cost is simply nonsense. Anybody who says that this award would distract from good medical care for the wounded and pastoral care for the close relatives of those killed during service should not be taken seriously. Furthermore, many veterans have indicated a strong willingness to contribute towards any cost, suggesting proceeds could be channelled towards the very medical care and support so desperately needed for our serving personnel past and present. Obviously, this is not the case for every individual but a framework to benefit all parties is something that is surely achievable and could prove very popular.

The esteem in which families hold medals which have been awarded in the Monarch’s name is incredible and therefore how can talk of cost or administrative difficulties be regarded as a serious contra-argument? In the larger scheme of the defence budget we suggest that the cost of producing them is negligible. There is a moral obligation despite what some previous ministers and senior civil servants have said, and a way should and could be found to move ahead with this project.

Again, some people will undoubtedly complain that the issuance of a National Defence Medal is not the ‘British’ way and do not approve of the fact our Commonwealth friends and the Americans, all great nations, have decided that this type of medal *is* very necessary and have managed to overcome any administrative difficulties in awarding the medals. Surely, this is a lesson the British can emulate.

3.5 Tradition and Morale

It is important and right that such endeavours and sacrifices are recognised by the awarding medals to individuals or their families, because surely it would significantly boost the morale of the armed forces in general – forces that have been under such stress in recent times in relation to the Military Covenant and other factors? Indeed, more than 12,500 non-commissioned officers and experienced officers have left the services since Britain invaded Iraq six years ago. Is it not the case that the morale of the forces would be boosted by the decision to award such a medal? That would be a clear indication of one simple thing – that we care about those individuals and that we do not take for granted what they do on our behalf.

Also, service personnel who were invalided out of the Armed Forces or forced to leave due to rules of the day, i.e. when women became pregnant and therefore were unable to achieve long service milestones or participate in campaigns, could still qualify if we correctly set the qualification criteria. Research demonstrates that medals are rightly handed on as family heirlooms and they establish proud family traditions, and it is sad to think that so many service personnel have been robbed of this and their service may fade unnoticed into history.

A lot of opposition will come to this campaign from what is viewed as the 'heel-dragging community'. They will say, "Why on earth should we do this? This is so American. We have never done anything like this before. Why should we emulate the Yanks?" This is not a credible argument. Let us then focus on the merits of the case and when something is right stand up, and say so.

All of the members of parliament and the public will see and hear, if they keep their eyes and ears open, exactly the point already referred to. The bronze plaques and medals that honoured those who served in past wars and campaigns are fantastic treasures. If one visits the homes in any constituency, now, or in the future, those plaques and medals keep the names of the dead alive. Such medals and memorabilia are displayed with huge pride by those who fondly remember with pride their family members that earned them. But not very many from the Cold War era, which was without a doubt one of the most dangerous periods in world history, when from 1945–1991 as East and West squared up to each other in a build up of massive military force either side of an 'Iron Curtain', ready to engage in all out war at any time. The fact that global annihilation didn't actually occur owes much to the men and women who stepped forward to take up arms and get ready to defend this country, its values and its freedom. Their constant training and preparedness for total war speaks volumes of their willingness and commitment to fight if called upon. We will touch on this subject again later.

People argue that the institution of an NDM would be unprecedented and that we are stepping into new territory. However, we would just say that decorations have sprung up out of nowhere, and quite rightly so. We are confident that nobody today can have failed to hear of Queen Victoria. She established the Victoria Cross, which is internationally renowned, and so it should be. What about the Conspicuous Gallantry Cross and other decorations that have come into play over the past 10 or 20 years. Such honourable, highly thought of and valued decorations may not have been around for long, but so what? We must surely take a step forward and release our minds from the foolish nonsense and narrow-mindedness of the past. We must understand that as well as the NDM, the wounded should also receive the honours that they deserve.

One campaigner talked about his father:

"...He served twice in the Middle East, firstly just after the Second World War then again during the Suez crisis. He served 7 years in the regulars and then later 9 more years in the Territorials – 16 years service without any form of gratitude. He finally received a GSM for the Canal Zone just 2 months before he died. Our family hold this medal most dearly, but for many years there was nothing to reinforce the family military tradition, and he had nothing to pass on to his children. I realise how important some medal or tangible recognition is for families and loved ones and for the individuals who are bravely operating in all kinds of operational locations, some of whom have lost their lives."

Our Parliament needs to keep up the pressure on Defence Ministers and MoD. One need only look at some of the obituaries to see the bizarre way in which we give people recognition. A lady who was a real heroine in World War Two died recently. She was parachuted into France as a Special Operations Executive officer and in the end commanded something like 3,000 resistance fighters and was instrumental in much of the success of the D-Day

landings. When she returned to the UK she was put forward for the Military Cross, but the Ministry of Defence said she could not have it, because she was a woman. They could not find a suitable medal for her, so they decided to offer her a civilian MBE, which she rejected. Subsequently, after the war, she was offered a military MBE, which she accepted. Thirty years later, in recognition of the service of that lady, who had been honoured by France and other countries, the Queen awarded her the CBE, and said to her, as reported in the papers “We should have done this a long time ago.”

We are talking about giving such people the recognition that they deserve, today. Bureaucrats got it wrong for a real heroine who put her life on the line as a 22-year-old girl, being parachuted into France and leading a very effective force. They got it wrong because they said the system could not cope with a woman.

Then there are cases such as the young soldier who was killed during a live firing exercise during pre-operational deployment training. He did not receive the medal for the eventual deployment, or any other medal to mark his service, or death whilst on duty.

Traditions do change and often for the better. For example, not too long ago it was not official policy to hold a two minutes silence on the actual anniversary of Armistice Day. Not until the mid-1990s did public opinion force a rethink. So to not only observe the two minutes silence at 11am on November 11th, but to actually hold a gathering to commemorate the 90th anniversary of the Armistice being declared was a complete reversal of previous thinking. This reversal was right, but why does it take so long to do the right thing?

We should like a medal – a medal of honour that people can wear proudly on parade, a medal which can supplement the veteran’s badge worn on the lapel as they go about their daily business. A medal to show that they have made a sacrifice for this country and that we owe them a debt of gratitude. It is important, and most service personnel would, we think, take the view that the awards are not just for them, but for their families as well. They can be passed down through families as a way of remembering the service that was given. It is an example to many especially today that our freedom is worth preserving and we can show and use the NDM as a vehicle to raise awareness throughout the Nation.

3.6 Political Pressure

We do not need to be reminded that it is not ministers or other politicians who currently create such official awards (not badges). We have heard this from Prime Minister’s and Secretary’s of State for Defence. It will be argued that the service chiefs and the military decide such things. We understand why and respect those reasons. We are using this paper to say to the service chiefs and politicians that veterans are not lobbying them for political reasons to award such a medal. We believe that such young and not so young, men and women need recognition. If the service chiefs do not listen to our voice or the voices of politicians or the public, then please listen to the veterans themselves and their families. Mark well what our Sovereign has done for the armed forces of her Australian and other Commonwealth countries. No one who listens to tributes to their fathers, mothers, sons or daughters and hears about their efforts and preparedness to do what the Nation commanded, could be in any doubt that such people deserve recognition. The medal should be awarded to those brave and willing people, for they are indeed, an example to the whole nation.

Reticence about putting pressure on politicians at the Ministry of Defence is just not good enough. The men and women we are talking about are prepared to go to war on the command of politicians, and many currently are, with many more supporting those operations either directly or indirectly. It is believed nearly 50 percent of the House of Commons have expressed the view that recognition is overdue. We’ve heard mention of the mood of the country, and the mood of the country not only says, but demands that proper recognition should be forthcoming.

We implore all Ministers to make, for goodness’ sake, a political decision, and instruct the Ministry of Defence to get on with it. Do not let this be another Arctic convoy saga, which took 50 years, until 55 percent of the people who could have received the award were dead. Let the people and their families have what we believe the nation says they deserve: recognition today. Let them have recognition, and let us give it to them with pride. Do not count the cost. We did not count the cost before we conscripted or signed them up, and an 80p badge does not do them proper justice.

So let us examine our consciences and say that yes, there is a moral obligation on the State to give those men, women and their families the recognition that they deserve. It will be a good thing for the Armed Forces generally. Surely, no one would begrudge any servicemen or women that recognition, would they?

It is about supporting people from this country who go forward in our name possibly to lay down their lives or be wounded whether in action, or during military training, be it basic, trade, or pre or post operational deployments/exercises, for bombs, bullets, & explosives still kill, maim, and injure for they do not know it was only an exercise, a case of negligent discharge, or the difference between enemy action and friendly fire. And we should not only treat the visible physical wounds and injuries, we must not forget the unseen psychological injuries that can, and do, still inflict terrible consequences long after the physical wounds have healed, they still, as Prime Minister Churchill observed; “cast long shadows”. It is important that Parliament should show support for them.

It is a matter of the respect and debt that we owe to them. The only sure way we can show that respect and honour is by recognition. The best recognition that the House can offer is a medal, and it should be given through the Minister and the Ministry of Defence, and its hierarchy. What should not happen has already been discussed. We should not be seen to be dragging people along to an eventual cave-in, because that becomes an apology. We ought to be leading from the front and saying, “*Now is the right time – the time is here*”. As we have said, we must do that for the families too. We must also recognise the mood of the country. Please do not allow this to happen later. Let us do it now.

It could be inappropriate to excuse Ministers, given that the two most recent conflicts – in Iraq and Afghanistan – have been fought on their instructions, and with the mandate, of Parliament. Ministers cannot, therefore, hide behind people at the Ministry of Defence, even if they were minded to do so. Action should be taken through, and under pressure from the democratic institution which governs where our brave forces serve.

Examine the case of the Queen’s Golden Jubilee Medal (QGJM):

Jeremy Bagwell Purefoy, MVO, Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, St James Palace on Behalf of the Queen, wrote in a letter dated 21/12/2006:

*“The criteria for the award of the 2002 Golden Jubilee Medal were drawn up by the **Government**. As a Constitutional Monarch, Her Majesty is obliged to accept. The Royal Household cannot seek to influence what is essentially a political matter.”*

Mr R T Coney, Defence Services Secretary – Honours (D/DS Sec/1102/10) wrote in a letter dated 04/01/2008:

*“I understand that the introduction of the Queen’s Golden Jubilee Medal (QGJM) was organised by a cross **Government** committee representing a number of Government Departments, the Prime Minister’s office and Buckingham Palace, which was organised and coordinated by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. The MoD and the Home Office were both involved.”*

Mr Twigg MP wrote in a letter to Robert Key MP (D/US of S/DT MC06590/2006):

*“The **Home Secretary** announced on 15/02/2001 a Golden Jubilee Medal was **instituted** for the uniformed members of the Armed Forces including Volunteer Reserves.”*

The point being it was **Government** (NOT the Chief of Defence Staff or wholly the MoD) that instituted the **QGJM**. This is reasonable as it was **not a Campaign medal**. The Queen cannot institute a medal even if she wanted to because of constitutional constraints.

Proof then if any were needed that Politicians **DO** have the power to institute a medal if it is not a campaign medal. The NDM, not being a campaign medal, does not break any protocols if politicians seize the initiative. The QGJM was awarded only one year after the announcement, which proves fairly swift results once a decision is made.

3.7 Long Service Anomaly

We have been told that the military do not like to award new medals or honours. If *The Sunday Times* is anything to go by, the MoD is considering a good conduct badge (we hardly think that more badges are needed!). However, an award for good conduct could be divisive, which shows up the MoD's argument.

The Government states that, with the exception of long service awards, it has never been Government policy to consider service in the Armed Forces the sole justification for the institution of a medal. Is it really a matter of Government policy, as stated by the Minister or is it a matter for senior military officials to decide, which is it?

On the 22nd March 1944, as illustrated in the quote on page 4 of this paper; Prime Minister Winston Churchill observed with a chilling insight that, "A medal glitters, but it also casts a shadow", so let's get it right, the idea that the proposed medal would divide people in the Armed Forces does not hold a great deal of water as it can treat all equally. As we struggle to avoid the shadow that Churchill talked about, we might like to give some thought to the disparity in the award of various long service and good conduct medals, which was mentioned briefly earlier. There is the Volunteer Reserve Medal, which has a qualifying period of 10 years for efficient service, in contrast to the 15 years for the Long Service and Good Conduct Medal for other ranks. Officers of all the regular forces, however, are left out. Also long service in itself is still not enough as 'Good Conduct' is a prerequisite and relatively minor indiscretions have robbed many from even this award, the divisiveness of which has already been mentioned.

Service personnel who join at 16 can have up to 1½ years additional service which doesn't count towards medal qualification. Junior level entrants play a key role in our national defence with roles defending key installations. This is time spent in uniform being paid and trained as a member of HM Armed Forces, this service should count. This does not imply a change to pension rules.

The MoD, however states

"There is no unequal treatment on any grounds despite the 5 year qualification difference."

At risk of stating the blindingly obvious, equality means exactly that, this policy is absurd, never mind the fact it completely ignores commissioned officers who as well as other ranks also swore the same oath of allegiance to crown and country. It is difficult for us to understand the twisted logic of some criteria.

3.8 What Is The Policy?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence pays tribute to the men and women in our Armed Forces, who do such an amazing job, and recognises they are clearly the best armed forces in the world. The underlying issue is the fundamental recognition of the service of our Armed Forces personnel, on which we are all absolutely united. He recognises their commitment to professionalism is second to none, and it is important that we properly recognise this contribution. One way of doing so is through medals. We hope he would congratulate also the *NDM CAMPAIGN* on raising regularly the issue of the bravery and sacrifice of our Armed Forces personnel. It is important that the public do so, and it is important for the families, too. As Derek Twigg MP stated on February 28th, 2008:

"As a Minister of the Crown, I am very wary of expressing opinions about individual medals and honours for the very reason that this country has a system that relies on a process that is independent of politicians." [Official Report, 10 January 2008; Vol. 470, c. 581.]

He goes on to say;

"....medals are a hugely emotive issue, they can also be divisive. There are a number of ongoing campaigns for new medals to be minted for one reason or another, and it is impossible to satisfy everyone. British campaign medals are awarded as a result of particularly difficult circumstances considered over and above the usual conditions of service life."

What exactly does the Minister mean by the term *the “usual conditions of service life”*? Perhaps being deployed to the Falkland Islands on an isolated mountain site for 6 months, or mine clearance post June 1982, or being bombed whilst in barracks at Rheindahlen? The truth is conditions vary all the time all over the world and consequently usual conditions of service life is not a good analogy. Perhaps he compares a desk job at Whitehall to an Infantry or Armoured unit on exercise for weeks on end during the peak of the Cold War. Which as those of us who served during the Cold War will remember was conducted wearing Nuclear, Biological and Chemical suits with respirators, and all the joys that that brought, even when performing the most basic of bodily functions, eating and drinking etc, let alone having to fight and survive, and all, with a life expectancy measured in minutes.

The minister continues:

“Medals are not awarded as a record of service, as is the case in some countries. The British military medal system is held in the highest regard around the world, and in many ways it is the special nature of British medals that gives them such great esteem. Other countries choose to issue more medals, to record an individual’s service as well as to reflect the risks and rigours of a particular campaign. Decisions on new UK medals are not taken lightly, and careful consideration is given to ensure that we do not do anything to undermine the system.”

It is not clear which countries he refers to, but it appears he confuses Record of service with Recognition of service. There is an inference in this statement that the British system is the best and other countries do not apply a proper calculation of risk and rigour, or value service. Personnel from Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the USA have all contacted us to state, in no uncertain terms, this is not the case and they take great offence at its suggestion. Furthermore the countries that deliberately opted out of the Imperial Honours System would be particularly aggrieved. They go on to point out that their systems take great care and sensitivity deciding on appropriate awards, all with the blessing of our Queen. They also point out that the UK would do well to look at their awards systems instead of our own archaic system. Indeed referring to a report ‘**A Matter of Honour: Reforming the Honours System**’ (House of Commons public administration select committee fifth report) which delves into how the UK can better honour its citizens, it uses examples to highlight better models particularly from Australia which it mentions 15 times and Canada 8 times. It also goes on to say several times “*We recommend the commission examines the Australian system and considers whether it is appropriate to adopt the same methodology*”. The report thankfully had an element of independence to it.

*“The British armed forces are involved in a wide range of operations, which means that there is a greater opportunity for some individuals to be awarded British, United Nations, European Union and NATO awards. However, joining the armed forces still does not guarantee the award of a medal, and there are no plans to institute one **simply** for being a serviceman or woman.”*

Using other awards available to some as an argument is missing the point and also not taking the case on its own merits. As we have taken great pains to point out, confusing campaign medals with service medals is wrong. NATO, EU and UN medals are not ‘British’ and you will find our Commonwealth allies often issue National medals instead which are most definitely held in much higher esteem, as is our own Operational Service Medal when compared with the NATO ISAF medal. To those with respect who have never served in uniform, a reminder may be needed that service in HM Forces is never ‘simple’.

3.9 Badges

The introduction of the Armed Forces Veteran’s Badge a few years ago was considered by some an appropriate way for veterans to demonstrate that they had served their country as members of the Armed Forces and the lapel badge was considered to be more discreet and adaptable for daily wear than a medal. Over 580,000 badges have been issued so far.

This demonstrates a desire for recognition no matter what form that takes, but what about the 4.5 MILLION veterans who have not taken up the offer of a veteran’s badge, and the many who have applied simply because it

is all that's on offer. Indeed there was no debate in parliament whether a medal was the better course of action. In any case it has a completely different purpose as it is not an 'Official' award, it does not resolve the problem.

To the Government's credit they have gone a considerable way to acknowledge the need for such recognition, but have failed to act correctly. Ashley R Tinson, Honorary Medals Consultant for the Royal British Legion, said:

"The badge was devised as the Government's answer to the demand for a medal to show who had served. By doing it this way they got round the need to involve the Queen, thereby fast tracking the procedure."

Whilst this recognises the need, it fails to deliver what would be most valued and esteemed. It would now be appropriate for the Government to provide proper official recognition of those **ready** to fight so bravely in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan, even if they were not required to go there.

Mr Paul Rowen MP demonstrated the confusion many have when talking on this subject he said:

"In recent years, as has been said, the Government have gone a considerable way to recognise the need for such medals, with the award of the veteran's badge."

If MPs are confused when speaking in parliament, it is little wonder that the general public cannot understand why their Armed Forces do not have a medal. We will go into much more detail about the veteran's badge later, because it has been used as an argument against an official medal. Mr Rowan did, however, grasp the concept despite the confusion, because he went on to say:

"... The past few years have been unprecedented for our military in the number of conflicts in which they have fought on all levels. Many have said that they have been stretched to breaking point. Recognition is long overdue and I hope that he will agree move forward and give them the awards that they deserve."

We echo what Patrick Mercer MP said when he suggested that soldiers attitudes are in stark contrast to what they were only a couple of decades ago. He said:

"...It seems that military fashion has changed. Twenty years ago, I think that people were not keen to wear medals, but that was a different Army. I believe that the vast majority of the soldiers, the sailors, airmen and marines would be very much in favour of an award."

This is further evidenced with the increased applications by World War Two veterans for missed awards.

3.10 Time to Change

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence has made it clear that the Government's mind is not closed to proposals for new medals or other forms of recognition, but decisions are not to be taken lightly or rushed into. It is right and proper that the military chiefs of staff make initial detailed recommendations on proposed forms of recognition for new campaign medals. They can truly judge the risk and rigour of any campaign and make proper judgments on what is appropriate. But when it comes to service medals it is now time for the public, politicians and the veteran community to push the boundaries and look to the successful formulas that have been implemented around the world.

We have established it is not within the gift of the MoD to introduce new medals automatically. Proposals for any new medals are submitted to the cross-Government Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals, led by the Cabinet Secretary, for its consideration, before ultimately being submitted to the Queen. The route through the established process should not be short circuited if we agree the principle of 'Official' recognition is the right and proper target.

The MoD is currently minded not to support the proposed medal. But they have also clearly stated that they are also not closed to it completely and if a compelling case is submitted with sufficient evidence then there is room for discussion. Hence the commissioning of this paper.

We understand that there are other means of recognition and commemoration. We support continued efforts to establish and/or better improve the British public's awareness of the important work done on their behalf by the Armed Forces, and whether there are ways in which the public can better express their support and gratitude.

The Government frequently tells us that they do not underestimate the enormous contribution that is made by members of our Armed Forces and their families, and the need for proper recognition of them. They must take the advice of senior military personnel, but they should not rely solely on their opinions and ignore those without such sway. Is it true that the chiefs of staff are keeping the matter under review? If so what form does this review take? We must not sit back and wait for such a moment if the present time is obviously right for action.

When Andrew MacKinlay MP asked whether the Veterans Minister would agree to meet him and others to discuss a medal for Bomber Command, he was happy to do that, stating:

“He does not refuse Hon. Members a meeting on any issue that concerns them.”

Unfortunately the same courtesy was not extended to NDM campaigners who have repeatedly been turned down, because the Minister was too busy and would be for the foreseeable future. However, whilst on the subject of Bomber Command, the Canadian Senate recently passed unanimously a motion requesting their government to formally approach the British Government and ask for a special campaign medal.

Despite what the government has said in its statements not all medals are issued for campaigns; the Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal (QGJM) for instance. The QGJM was issued for effectively 5 years of usual service as long as you were in service in 2002. But many who served even in operational zones which have been described as normal conditions, such as the Falkland Island post June 1982, were denied this award also. Veterans who may have served well in excess of the 5 year period and were just as keen to celebrate the magnificent milestone were once again excluded, as they were in the cases of the Queen's Coronation Medal and Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal. There is also an admission that Government policy plays a part, but in some letters they say it is purely a military decision (CDS). Once again we re-state that the campaign medals are purely down to the Military, but SERVICE medals can be a matter of Government policy as the QGJM has proved.

The QGJM is an interesting case because it was also divisive restricting it to only approximately 300,000 military and emergency service personnel. Perhaps this is why a commemorative QGJM was struck with the 'approval' of Buckingham Palace through HM Lord Chamberlain and bearing the Royal Crown on its reverse, making it unique. Does this mean that it could be worn as an official award? Apparently not and it further confuses the processes and rules about official awards.

Generally the rules for wearing medals only recognise those authorised by the Queen, so where does that leave this medal? The HD committee or MoD cannot authorise, only advise, and the very existence of this anomaly destroys any credibility as regards the argument that 'tradition' cannot be broken. This is a massive step outside of the parameters that we are told actually guide the standards (supposedly) applied to medals. What we have in point of fact is a shambles that has come about by default and it is likely to become an embarrassment if it is not urgently addressed by a reform of the procedures that see medals recognised, approved and issued. By virtue of the campaign that we have entered into, we have the right to produce such evidence as proves the point(s) we are endeavouring to make and this is one point that cannot fail to make an impact!

Government officials go on to say they understand that people who have been in the Armed Forces who have not received any campaign medals may feel that the system is unfair. However, they would not have been able to choose their particular assignments and as a result, should not be criticised for not participating in operations for which medals were subsequently awarded. Accordingly, there is no stigma attached to not having any campaign medals. We fully understand this, which is why we are not asking for a campaign medal, even though all members of the Armed Forces support each other operationally to a greater or lesser extent.

Many veterans who have been in the Armed Forces and have not received any medals, campaign or otherwise, do feel the system is unfair. A good example is that of a retired RAF Wing Commander. After 25 years of service to Queen and Country, he had no visible award to show it. Had there been a National Defence Medal in place and a Long Service medal for ALL ranks, he would have had at least 2 medals. That would have been reasonable for 25 years service. It is not a question of stigma, but lack of appreciation by the government.

Chiefs of Staff have considered and rejected the introduction of a Wounded in Action Medal, partly on the basis that it would become divisive and undermine the system of British military honours, decorations and medals, decisions on new medals for UK Armed Forces are not taken lightly. Those who are injured on duty pay a high price, but the hardships of operational duty is shared by many. It appears decisions are not taken at all. The government has no problem in committing our troops to war and yet refuses to recognise their sacrifice. It is quite obvious from the number of requests and complaints about the current system that it is unfair, outdated and needs to be upgraded to the 21st Century. Indeed the injured do deserve the greatest support which is achieved by providing them with the finest medical and any other care they require. However, many media reports indicate that is not the case. Recent media campaigns suggest massive support for an award, as do the letter pages in the MOD *Soldier* magazine. Again we see the UK lagging behind. On August 28th, 2008 the "Sacrifice Medal" was introduced with the approval of the Queen for those Canadians killed/or wounded in action. Why should Her Majesty's UK subjects be denied a similar medal? The Sacrifice Medal differs from the Elizabeth II Cross as it is a posthumous award not an award to the next of kin.

If you are familiar with the incredible story of Harry Patch, 'The last fighting Tommy' from the First World War, you will know he immediately evokes respect and admiration. But have you also noticed that he wears his unofficial commemorative medals with pride, both his 'National Service Medal' and the 'Hors de Combat' to recognise the wounds he sustained in the line of duty. No such recognition has been forthcoming from any British Government or the MoD.

It is hollow and disrespectful the way many veterans are treated. Many frustrated veterans, like Harry, have resorted to buying 'Bling' medals in their attempt to show they too served, which is unfortunate and regrettable. The time has surely come to review the entire medals programme and make realistic decisions to reflect the sacrifice of those who serve Queen and country. Honours and awards are supposed to reflect the appreciation of a grateful nation, but this is clearly not the case. Long overdue changes to the current outdated system are required NOW, in order to honour our veterans past, present and future without further delay.

4. National Service

The proposal for the issuance of a National Defence Medal (NDM) evolved from an initial call from National Servicemen for a National Service Medal (NSM). The UK Government has never been in favour of a National Service Medal as it would have been seen as unfair and divisive to Regular Service Personnel. Eventually the Royal British Legion sponsored a National Service Medal commemorative award. However, this is an unofficial medal. Some argue that it actually undermined the campaign for official recognition. The argument has now moved on for an all inclusive award – the NDM. Indeed, the largest official body representing National Servicemen has recently come out in support of the NDM, thus changing from their previous position calling for the NSM. Alan Tizzard (Chair & National Secretary) said:

"The National Service Veterans Alliance, support the Campaign for a UK National Defence Medal (NDM) for all service personnel Conscripted and Volunteer."

The smaller though no less significant National Service Veterans Association also now supports the NDM.

The Australian Defence Medal is once again held up as the model for consideration. The Government of Australia withdrew from the Imperial Honours System in the mid-1970s. As a result they are wholly responsible for any new medals that they wish to introduce. However Her Majesty the Queen, as Queen of Australia, has approved the Medal, and this is widely viewed as an indicator that a similar award for the UK would be appropriate. The ADM criterion makes specific reference to the fact that National Service qualifies.

The military, in the broadest sense, of other countries in NATO, EU and the British Commonwealth, are highly respected. They are accorded the grateful thanks of their respective nations that include national honours and awards to commemorate and mark individual selfless service. An immediate example is France, who under Minister for Defence, Charles Hernu, and on the proposal of Gen de Boissieu, instituted the Medaille de la Defence Nationale for Servicemen, National Servicemen, reservists and civilians killed or wounded on national duty.

75% Support Honour

An article in *Soldier* magazine ('Chocolate box decorations') on veterans' anger at the increased appearance of unofficial medals and souvenirs on parades and at reunions, resulted in a flood of letters and emails to the magazine. Although there was little sympathy with those who wore insignia they were not entitled to, **more than 75% of those who contacted them believed the Government should recognise time spent in military uniform**, and in particular those who completed National Service. This was above and beyond the Veteran's Badge.

5. The HD Committee

The HD Committee has been mentioned in this paper several times. Since the end of World War Two, the HD Committee has maintained a policy that it will not consider the belated institution of awards and medals for service given many years earlier. The reason for this policy is that the present HD Committee cannot put itself in the place of the Committee which made the original decision and which would have been able to take account of the views of the Government and of other interested parties at the time of the decision.

However, the 'Canal Zone' was a retrospective award, though the HD Committee said "it was a one off", but there are many cases which have great merit, Cyprus being a good example. The qualification period of 120 days could make it a unique case. The policy has been exposed as a farce. The NDM has never been formally presented to the HD Committee, though possibly a National Service Medal has been refused (though we've not seen how the case was presented).

The HD Committee has made it clear on a number of occasions (most recently in February 2002), in response to requests for the institution of belated awards, that it will not reconsider this policy for cases that took place more than five years ago. If an exception were to be made for one case, then it would be almost impossible to refuse to re-consider every other claim for retrospective institution of an award or medal. The HD Committee does not feel obligated to acknowledge so-called precedents dating back to the 19th Century, when Queen Victoria instituted awards for service in the Napoleonic War, over 30 years later.

It is hardly reassuring to know that the HD Committee can choose to ignore precedents since this is tantamount to saying that it can do as it pleases, which we suppose is exactly the way it works. Why is the Committee so desperate not to review the policy. As we all know, policy evolves over time, and so to state a policy will not be changed defies all logic and reality. Is this really what our democracy has come to? Since the HD Committee has deferred the issue as a matter for the MoD, it begs the question as to what useful purpose does this body serve? The HD Committee rarely meets, lacks accountability and cannot change policy!

We applaud and support the recent Bill (A Matter of Honour: Reforming the Honours System –Fifth Report of Session 2003-03, Volume 1) to provide for parliamentary scrutiny of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals.

This powerful, secretive but completely unaccountable Committee which has caused, and continues to give, grave offence to veterans and to what is probably one of the few Muslim countries in the world that wants to honour British servicemen. Mr Don Touhig's Bill would require the Foreign Secretary, under whose jurisdiction the HD Committee falls, to publish an annual report on its work and to lay that report before Parliament. Within four weeks of its publication, there would be a debate in the House on a motion expressing approval for the report. Through that vote, the House could give its view on the Committee's actions during that year. But we are also aware that it was not moved in the House due to lack of time. We hope that this was not a convenient strategy to block the passage of a Bill which Ministers and Whips don't want to see passed. It will be interesting to monitor its future progress.

The HD Committee seldom meets. Business is normally transacted by correspondence. It has met on only a very few occasions since the end of the Second World War. The last time it met was on December 7th, 2005 when it discussed *the Pingat Jasa Malaysia (a Malaysian medal) and the policy on acceptance and wear of Foreign Awards*.

The matter of a National Defence Medal may have been discussed at the MoD, but at the time of writing this paper; we have no record of a case being put to the HD Committee.

The struggle to establish a National Defence Medal is akin to the problems being faced in the broader community as regards the disasters looming for many financial institutions. The executives in banking and other similar organisations are financially secure no matter what happens. They can and do make decisions that create very poor outcomes for their investors and shareholders, when this sees them removed from office, they go out with huge payouts and stock options to cushion the blow. There is no real incentive for them to do the job properly, or to look out for the lower echelons. Thus too with the Honours committee and the top brass of the MoD, their wellbeing is assured whether they function well or indifferently, they simply need to turn up and perform 'as required', with no incentive to do the right thing by those whose lives they govern. They are already well placed for advancement, recognition and properly funded retirements. In precisely the same way that investors and shareholders want to see their interests properly considered and tended to by those whose remit this comes under, so too do the veterans who have so diligently and loyally served in the uniform(s) of Great Britain expect to see some tangible return for their efforts from those set above them. Just a medal in fact, but also a bestowed emblem of thanks, in truth. Certainly a better indication of appreciation than the word 'Exemplary' casually written on discharge papers, and rarely ever seeing the light of day ever again, known only to the recipient,

Let us compare the HD policy with other successful policies:

The Canadian Special Service Medal was issued for service with NATO – NATO-OTAN – Sanctioned November 26th, 1992, for 180 days' service with NATO forces since its foundation on January 1st, 1951.

The Australian Service Medal 1945-1975 was established in 1995 to recognise a large number of Australian service personnel who did not receive any award for their non-warlike operational service in the period 1945-1975.

Instituted: 2006, the Medal may be awarded to a member, or former member, of the HM Forces who after September 3rd, 1945 has given qualifying service that is efficient service.

Instituted: 2000. Authorised Missions: many including: UNITED NATIONS COMMAND IN KOREA July 28th, 1953 to June 27th, 1957.

Examples of decision makers today righting oversights of yesteryear“(HD Committee please take note).

6. MoD Issued HM Armed Forces Veteran's Badge – HMAFVB

6.1 The Proliferation of Unofficial Badges

Mr Davies, as Under Secretary of State and Minister for Defence Equipment and Support, said (see the website link: <http://nationaldefencemedal.webs.com/politicalcomment.htm>):

“Medals are a matter for the services themselves and I do not believe that politicians should interfere in this field.”

This position is fairly clear if it was true, but it is clear politicians do get involved and a good example is the instigation and implementation of the Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal.

The MoD insists the issue of honouring servicemen is by not simply giving a medal but 'also' giving them some day-to-day symbol. That symbol exists with the HMAFVB and can be worn or carried in the same way that many

people wear the lapel badge showing that they have been awarded an MBE, OBE, CBE or whatever. Unlike the established honours the unofficial veteran's badge does not have the accompanying medal.

For many years there have been calls to recognise National Servicemen. Such a move would, of course, have proved a problem if regular soldiers were ignored. However the NDM concept has generally been accepted by all interested parties as the best solution for official recognition. The term '**official**' is used in the context of the definition offered by the Services Personnel and Veterans Agency to describe any medals or awards for which Her Majesty, or her predecessors, has given approval. The recent plethora of politically inspired badges do not meet this criteria.

Politicians have instigated:

- ATA Badge - The Air Transport Auxiliary badge Sponsored by the Department for Transport.
- UK Armed Forces Veteran's Lapel Badge - Sponsored by the MoD/Service Personnel and Veterans Agency.
- Land Girls Badge - Former members of the Women's Land Army and Timber Corps badge and sponsored by the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.
- UK Merchant Seafarers Veteran's Badge - This is the only variant of the HM Armed Forces Veteran's Badge and is also sponsored by the MoD/Service Personnel and Veterans Agency.
- Bevin Boys Badge - This Badge is sponsored by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform.
- The Artic Emblem - Sponsored by the MoD/Service Personnel and Veterans Agency.

So it is clear politicians 'do' badges but seem reticent to tackle the issue of medals, even though they were heavily involved in the Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal. Official recognition has still not been satisfied for many. The process for a service medal requires a case to be made to the HD Committee before submission to the Queen. The HD Committee, being an independent body, listens to the merits of a case. The Government clearly feels recognition is due as the examples above clearly demonstrate. So the question is; why can't it go that extra mile and take the case through the full and proper process for the correct body to finally sanction an OFFICIAL medal?

The Queen as we know has already sanctioned a similar award for Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders, so there is unlikely to be any objection from our Head of State, which should be good enough for anybody. We believe that this paper illustrates a very significant case for the issuance of an NDM, and so, with the help of our elected representatives, we now ask for their help, through official channels, to make the appropriate recommendation to the Queen for her approval of this medal.

6.2 What is a Medal?

"The badge was devised as the Government's answer to the demand for a medal to show who had served. By doing it this way they got round the need to involve the Queen, thereby fast tracking the procedure." [Ashley R Tinson, Honorary Medals Consultant, Royal British Legion]

The veteran's badge was introduced a few years ago. The Government believe it is esteemed, and more than 700,000 have been issued.

The HD Committee remit is inclusive of 'Honours, decorations **and** medals'. The badge itself is issued by the MoD, which is a direct departmental arm of the government, and like a medal the patent for the badge remains 'Crown' Copyright and carries the 'official' MoD emblem and Crown. Also, like a medal, the Veteran's Badge has criteria, linked directly to military service which must be declared to the MoD when applying for the badge.

Looking at the definitions of a medal it is interesting to note that it can be: "A small metal disc, cross or star struck to commemorate a particular event or service and awarded to individuals who become eligible for it, usually engraved with insignia, that is awarded to a person for athletic, military, scientific, academic or some other kind of

achievement. Also, because it is presented based on military service and intended to be 'worn', it might be reasonably argued that the badge, does indeed constitute a medal? Even if it is not a medal, it might also be deemed to be a 'decoration' and in either case could require HD Committee approval?

MoD spokesman, Commander Jardine, says that the HD Committee rules only apply to 'medals' and therefore the Veteran's Badge is exempt... as already demonstrated this is questionable.

The description of an honour, decoration or medal etc, is the same for both official and unofficial emblems – the key point being that they can be 'worn'. On that basis alone, the Veteran's Badge falls within this description.

A former Police Officer looking at the case understands that British Citizens are governed by three types of laws: 1. Statute Law. 2. Common Law. 3. Local bye-Laws. Anything else which carries no penalty under law CANNOT be enforced. Therefore the rules and protocols have no basis in law.

Her Majesty's Armed Forces Veteran's Badge (HMAFVB) might 'inadvertently' constitute an honour or decoration. If this is so, then the issuance of the badge by the MoD without the Sovereign's approval might also have been a mistake. Here are a few explanations provided by the MoD concerning the issuance of the HMAFVB:

1. Under the original concept it enables veterans to commemorate campaigns in which they participated and make overseas visits.
2. The decision was therefore taken to promote the HMAFVB as a survivor's badge that would act as a visible symbol of recognition.
3. As this was a Ministry of Defence driven initiative there was no requirement for a debate and therefore one was not held. So, it WAS designed and intended (albeit now extended) as a 'Commemorative' (not official) to be worn for recognition of participation in 'campaigns'. As such it is 'intended' to be a visible symbol of 'recognition' to all veterans as 'survivors'. Consequently, we have a ministerial arm of HM Government which is the sole authority on awarding medals for military service, providing a badge bearing the 'Crown' (a state emblem) to be 'worn' for defence, designed, intended and adapted for the exclusive use as a means of giving 'recognition' for Military Service. Because it is 'awarded', it is by definition an honour or award. By this criteria it should have been put before the HD Committee, but it was not.

Like Medals, the HMAFVB recognises and commemorates campaigns and acts of military service.

Like Medals, the HMAFVB is issued to all personnel, who qualify, upon leaving HM Armed Forces, based on criteria of having performed some form of military service.

Like Medals, veterans can apply to the MoD and will be awarded the HMAFVB upon proof of having met certain basic criteria.

Like Medals, the HMAFVB is only awarded to those who served, not family or friends.

Like Medals, the use of Royal images, such as the Crown, on any device including the HMAFVB, requires the permission of the Lord Chamberlain's Office who acts on behalf of the Sovereign in these matters.

All of the arguments for instituting various medals, such as a National Defence Medal, Cold War Medal and QGJM, can and are (unjustly) resisted by the MoD because of the existence of the HMAFVB, which the MoD deems sufficient recognition to relieve them from any obligation to make recommendations to the appropriate authorities for the institution of those medals or indeed for any other medal, the events for which it might have been awarded took place more than five years previously.

Certainly an NDM provides an opportunity to potentially cover all aspects of outstanding medal claims if the criteria for issuance are carefully established. One way of doing this might be to simply use the criteria established by the MoD for the HMAFVB, and their own argument of affording 'recognition' to all those who have served, and apply

them to the NDM. Surely the MoD cannot go against its own initiative! Veterans simply ask that they go through the full and proper process, i.e. the HD Committee and the Queen.

The HMAFVB can be argued, as the definitions indicate, to be a 'decoration' or 'honour' which has not been authorised by the HD Committee and approved by the Queen. Consequently, it shows that the whole process and need for an HD Committee is seriously flawed. The MoD cannot retract or demean the value of the Veteran's Badge, but it can be enhanced by making it an emblem for day-to-day wear of an official National Defence Medal to be awarded to veterans.

If any doubt remained then one need only look at the difference between a Government badge and the 'Official' Elizabeth II Cross.

6.3 What are the facts?

We have included this section, though there can be no misunderstanding or confusion about why the badge cannot be held up solely as 'Job done' when it comes to proper recognition. Below is the history and facts as stated by the MoD about the HM Armed Forces Veteran's Badge (HMAFVB).

(1) Whose idea was the Veteran's Badge?

"The authority for the instigation of the HMAFVB was the, then Minister for Veterans, Ivor Caplin MP. The original concept behind this Ministry of Defence initiative was for it to be made available to those Second World War veterans who applied for the Heroes Return scheme in 2004/5, which formed part of the celebrations for 60th Anniversary of the events that led to the end of the Second World War. This scheme formed part of the "Veterans Reunited" programme which focused on overseas visits for veterans, their spouses or widows and their carers and enabled veterans to make overseas visits to commemorate the campaigns in which they participated. The idea being that the badge would clearly identify the wearer as a veteran when undertaking such an overseas visit."

(2) Please name all parties involved in this decision.

"In addition to the, then Minister for Veterans, Ivor Caplin MP and MoD staff, Ex-Service organisations were also involved in the decision making process. The Ex-Service Organisations were represented by the Confederation of British Service and Ex-Service Organisations (COBSEO)."

(3) Did the idea need the agreement of the HD Committee?

"As it is a badge and not a commemorative award, the process that would be followed for the institution of a British award such as a campaign medal did not need to be followed as it was an initiative instigated by the Ministry of Defence."

(4) Was any other option debated in Parliament before the badge was created?

"This was a Ministry of Defence driven initiative and therefore there was no requirement for a debate." [emphasis added].

(5) Was the badge debated in Parliament before it was created?

"As this was a Ministry of Defence driven initiative there was no requirement for a debate and therefore one was not held."

(6) Was a medal considered first?

“It was a Ministry of Defence initiative to provide a means of identification to those veterans who applied for the Heroes Return scheme in 2004/5 so that they might be recognised as veterans when making overseas visits to commemorate the campaigns in which they participated. The instigation of a medal for this purpose would have been inappropriate and so it was not considered.” [emphasis added].

(7) Did the badge receive HM The Queen’s authorisation?

“The HMAFVB does not have the status of an official honour or award and so is exempt from approval by The Sovereign; unlike an award approved by the HD Committee which must be submitted to The Sovereign for approval.” [emphasis added]

(8) Who decided the qualification criteria?

“Initially, the HMAFVB was only intended for issue to those veterans returning to the battlefields of the Second World War; however, interest and demand was so great that the eligibility was then extended to all veterans of World War One, World War Two, and those in receipt of a widow(ers) pension. The decision was therefore taken to promote the HMAFVB as a survivor’s badge that would act as a visible symbol of recognition, intended to unite all veterans and raise the general public’s awareness of them. Consequently eligibility to apply for the HMAFVB was extended in tranches to allow the Veterans Agency (now SPVA) to cope with demand and achieve the current position where all veterans can apply for it. Personnel leaving the Armed Forces automatically receive a Badge within their Service Leavers Pack. All these decisions, and the qualification criteria, were endorsed by the Minister for Veterans.”

(9) Why was the current criteria chosen?

“Criteria evolved to satisfy the demand for all HM Armed Forces Veterans to have some form of recognition the MoD therefore used badge for this purpose.”

(10) Who has the authority to include the Crown on the design?

“In regard to the use of Royal images such as the Crown on any device, including the HMAFVB, in all instances permission is sought from the Lord Chamberlain’s office who acts on behalf of The Sovereign in these matters. The Sovereign is not directly involved. The HMAVFB image remains Crown Copyright and the Secretary of State for Defence on behalf of the Ministry of Defence is the holder of the European Community Design Registration Certificate for it.”

(11) What is the unit cost of a badge?

“The current cost per badge is £0.80p.”

(12) Where and who manufactures the badges?

“The Badges are manufactured by Toye, Kenning and Spencer. This company was selected after a very strict tender process. Toye, Kenning and Spencer are located at Regalia House, Newtown Road, Bedworth, Warwickshire CV12 8QR.”

(13) What is the replacement policy for lost, stolen or damaged badges?

“We do replace lost and stolen badges but generally only once (we are content for the SPVA to use some discretion and judgement on an individual basis). However, if the badge is broken and is returned to us then we will of course replace it.”

(14) Is it appropriate to wear as an official award on Royal occasions?

“The badge does not have the status of an official honour or commemorative award such as a campaign medal. It is issued to those veterans who apply for it and recipients are encouraged to wear it whenever they wish. There can be no overarching official ruling on when and where the badge should be worn, it is a matter of personal choice other than when attending a formal event, when the organiser may choose to advise those attending.”

(15) Confirm this is intended for informal general wear?

“Veterans are advised and encouraged to wear the badge in public whenever they choose as this serves to visibly raise awareness of the number and varying ages of veterans living in the community. Its symbolism is intended to unite all veterans in recognising the commonality of their service, to encourage a sense of community between surviving veterans and to ignite public recognition of current veterans and their continuing contribution to society.”

(16) What does the Royal British Legion ceremonial handbook say about wearing the HMAFVB?

“The Royal British Legion ceremonial handbook regulates against Standard Bearers wearing the badge when in uniform. This is to discourage the wearing of ANY Unofficial Medals, Emblems or Badges.”

Summary - The Veteran's Badge is a 'done deal' and should not intrude in any direct way into any negotiations for the NDM, as we have already been at pains to point out, its purpose is quite different. It is, however, worth mentioning that Canada has had a Veterans Pin for some considerable time before the UK adopted the HMAFVB, which illustrates the fact the MoD has already quietly taken a leaf out of the 'Colonials' book. Despite being repeatedly told the UK does not look to other Countries for innovative ideas, it clearly has already done so.

7. Armed Forces Recognition For The Fallen

On the 10 June 2008 parliament was informed by the then Secretary of State for Defence, the Right Honourable Des Browne, of plans to introduce a new national form of recognition for the families of those Armed Forces personnel who die on operations or as a result of terrorist activity whilst on duty. These plans were based on the recommendations of the military Chiefs of Staff. The Secretary of State said that the recognition would be in the form of an emblem for wear and a memorial scroll similar in concept to those that were issued to the families of those who died in the two World Wars and in Korea in the early 1950s.

The Elizabeth Cross and Scroll will be granted in national recognition of their loss and sacrifice to the next of kin of UK Armed Forces personnel who have died on operations or as a result of an act of terrorism. Eligible personnel to be remembered in this way are those who were serving with, or former members of, the Regular and Reserve Armed Forces or the Royal Fleet Auxiliary when deployed in direct support of a designated operation. It is important to make the distinction that this is not a posthumous medal for the fallen but national recognition for the family for their loss.

We applaud the desire of the MoD to recognise the suffering of the family. However, as regards the person who died, we believe it would be a very fitting posthumous tribute if a wreath or other suitable emblem be designed that could be attached to the campaign medal ribbon. For service personnel killed by terrorists outside of a medal earning theatre, then the same emblem, attached to a National Defence Medal ribbon would in our view be an appropriate and lasting form of tribute. The Canadians decided on a 'Sacrifice Medal' which received Royal approval in 2008 (see appendix 2, table 15).

In addition to recognising future operational deaths in this way and deaths in the circumstances outlined below, effectively all those that meet this criteria since World War II will be recognised retrospectively. Some may argue that the award to the family is a shrewd political act to perpetuate the HD Committee's 5-year retrospective policy for awards to serving armed forces personnel (ignoring the 'Canal Zone'), because the award is not to the fallen it side steps the protocol.

The next of kin of eligible personnel whose deaths fall into the following categories will be recognised in the following way:

1. Those who died from whatever cause whilst serving on a medal earning operation. Medal earning operations are those in which deployed personnel received a Campaign Medal, General Service Medal or Operational Service Medal which demonstrated the risk and rigour involved. Operations where a UN, NATO or other international body or other nations' campaign medal was accepted for wear, in the absence of a UK medal, also qualify.
2. Those who died as a result of an act of terrorism where the available evidence suggests that the Service person, whether on or off duty, was targeted because of his or her membership of the UK Armed Forces.
3. Those who died on a non-medal earning operational task where death has been caused by the inherent high risk of the task.
4. Those who died a subsequent and premature death as a result of an injury or illness attributed to the circumstances outlined above.

The National Defence Medal campaign is very focussed on scenarios 2, 3, and 4. All service personnel were deemed legitimate targets for terrorists and all were forced to act accordingly. The risks are obvious and far more so for the UK than other Commonwealth Countries (who already have recognition) not least due to the Irish Republicans' campaign of violence specifically directed at British Forces all over the globe. We would also suggest most if not all service personnel are subjected to operational tasks where inherent high risk tasks are undertaken. To survive in the circumstances outlined above does not mean the contribution is any less worthy of recognition, quite the opposite; these points reinforce the NDM case which could indeed be issued posthumously whatever the circumstances of the death in uniform.

We must also point out that the concept is not as innovative as the military chiefs would have us believe, the United Kingdom is yet again playing catch-up with our Commonwealth partners. The Canadians have had an almost identical award since 1919, the New Zealanders since 1960. 'Appendix 2' clearly demonstrates the similarity. Why has it taken so long for the United Kingdom to make this award? It appears that the UK can learn from the Commonwealth despite its rhetoric about a NDM.

As with all forms of recognition, there will be those who fall outside the qualifying criteria. There is a risk involved in much of what the Armed Forces do routinely. The Chiefs of Staff recommended this new recognition for the special circumstances of operational duty. In addition they considered that the terrible circumstances where an individual was targeted by terrorists because of their membership of the Armed Forces should be similarly recognised.

The Chief of Defence Staff, Sir Jock Stirrup said

"We owe a great debt of gratitude to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces and who have done so in the past. That debt extends to the families who support them and who bear the burden whilst loved ones are deployed away from home in all theatres (Medal or Non-Medal earning). I am delighted that the families of those who sadly die in the circumstances I have described are now to receive some tangible evidence of the Nation's gratitude in the form of the Elizabeth Cross and Memorial Scroll."

These are the very same arguments put forward by those who have volunteered or have been conscripted to serve the Nation with all the inherent dangers that accompany it. Those who have fallen in uniform but outside of the qualification of the Elizabeth Cross, and all the survivors who have served our great Nation have earned the right, in Sir Jock's words, "**to receive some tangible evidence of the Nation's gratitude**".

8. Previous Defence Medal

Arguments emanating from the MoD that there is no precedent for the institution of a general issue medal for all arms, is not in fact true at all. Examples of such medals do exist. Here is a clear example of the type of medal we are seeking, being widely issued to British military and civilian personnel engaged in the defence of the realm. At the end of World War Two a General Service Medal was issued to all ranks of the Armed Forces and also the Police, Fire Service and Ambulance Service. Clearly and unequivocally a universally awarded service medal by its actual title and therefore a valid precedent for the NDM.

Clearly, therefore there *is* a precedent for an NDM.

If it can be argued in justifying this award, for example, that the presence of the Home Guard acted as a deterrent to invasion in World War Two, then the same criteria MUST apply to the formations on permanent standby throughout the period known as the 'Cold War' and beyond. The threat of conflict in this period has been a constant one, as many recall from tours within BAOR. In the latter, the daily flights of the Photographic Reconnaissance Canberras stationed at RAF Wildenrath, checking for any movement of troops or armour by the Soviet forces 365 days of the year, are a good example. They flew in the foulest of weather and we had RAOC photographic interpreters billeted in with us Air Corps types, all very hush-hush. The threat was very real indeed! Or is their argument going to adopt the theme that the billions spent on defence during the Cold War was just a figment of our collective imaginations? If so, that is some collection!

Both as an Armoured Vehicle Mechanic and an Aircraft Technician, I and my contemporaries were always aware that we were part and parcel of a prime target for hostile action in the immediate outbreak of hostilities with the Soviet Union and its allies. Our training, deployments and standing orders all made that very plain. Decamping within minutes of an 'alarm' was a basic training requirement, to prevent being destroyed in situ. In the case of RAF Wildenrath, its importance to the V-Bomber deterrence force made it an absolute 'must' on any hit list employed by the Soviets.

Since the end of the Second World War, British forces have been employed in many parts of the world, where risks varied, as did the local 'comforts' available for exploitation by the serving men and women. No matter what, no matter where, those men and women went where sent and tolerated the local conditions plus whatever was demanded of them. The covenant was never broken by the vast bulk of the uniformed men and women, all of whom deserve a basic medal that overtly recognizes these facts. It is all very well to award medals for serving in certain places where the risk was deemed greater but the forces as a whole had to be employed at the Government's discretion, some to hold the ground, some to be seen and some to hold back the 'incursions' against the Empire. The point is that without all of the integral parts being in situ where required, none of what was needed could have been achieved by the whole. Therefore a genuine medal for the whole of the armed forces, as opposed to a 'Veterans Badge', is the only proper and just reward for services thus rendered.

Problematically, there has been a tendency to wait until the likely recipients are very few in number before any form of retrospective medal is issued.

Appeals for support for the NDM concept made direct to the military's top office holder have elicited little in the way of replies or sympathy, but contradictory to claims made by the office of the incumbent Chief of the Defence Staff, there is a clear precedent for intervention by the holder of an equivalent office in years gone by, regarding the issuance of medals. This is clearly shown by way of a Wikipedia entry relevant to Waziristan medal issues*. There really is no valid argument or sensible reason, for denial of a retrospective National Defence Medal.

*< The Medal with the Waziristan 1925 bar was awarded to only 46 officers and 214 men of the Royal Air Force who took part in Pink's War. It is by far the rarest bar given with an India General Service Medal and was only awarded after the then Chief of the Air Staff Sir John Salmond succeeded in overturning the War Office decision not to grant a medal for Pink's War. >

9. Case Studies

9.1 Post-Armistice Korea – 1953 to 1957 (by R. Farrar)

Imagine the situation

It is a cold, wet and blustery November morning by a village war memorial.

Remembrance Day.

Straining to get themselves as proudly upright as possible four slightly stooped septuagenarian veterans in their blazers and berets are standing with bowed heads while their local bugler once again lets forth his perennial rendition of the Last Post. Along with all the others on similar parades around the world this day, these four particular veterans sport in their berets the cap badges of corps, arms and regiments of Australia, Canada, New Zealand — and the United Kingdom.

Nothing extraordinary about that. Since November 11th, 1919 similar ceremonies have taken place annually in the UK and every corner of the Commonwealth – and long may they continue to do so. What is anomalous is that each of our four veterans happens to have served in Korea since July 27th, 1953. That is when the armistice was signed between the Communist and United Nations forces. The bitter three year conflict was ended: but – anomalously again – not the actual war itself. Over half-a-century later North and South Korea are still respectively poised 24/7 to unleash and defend once more. And, since the armistice was signed, 55 years ago, British, Commonwealth, American and United Nation troops have continued to man Korean foxholes and vantage points to help prevent confrontation breaking out again. Korea is a tough and rugged place which endures severe swings in climatic conditions, from a snowbound minus 40 degrees in winter to soaring, blood boiling summer temperatures.

But back to the blustery, rain drenched steps of our village war memorial.

Bruce, the Australian veteran, is wearing his Australian Service Medal with its Korea clasp, as well as his country's National Defence Medal. The Canadian, Tom, is sporting a Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal for service in Korea — and Syd, the Kiwi, is proudly wearing his country's General Service Medal — with its Korea 1954-1957 clasp. On the sound advice and recommendations of the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand, each of these old warriors' hard won and well deserved medals had been approved by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. They had been rightfully awarded with their countries' grateful thanks in recognition of the service they had given in Korea — and elsewhere, in defence of freedom.

However . .

Much to his ever-lasting embarrassment and the perennial puzzlement of his commonwealth comrades, our good old true blue British vet, Harold, has no medal whatsoever to display on his virgin breast, nothing at all to show for his service to Queen and country, even though he underwent the same levels of risk and rigour in Korea alongside his commonwealth comrades. But instead of being given a proper, grown-up medal like them, all he has to show for his service is an insignificant little lapel pin stuck barely able to be seen in his buttonhole, issued by the unimaginative and parsimonious UK government as a sop, known officially as HM Forces Veterans Badge, which had not even had to go through the bother of being submitted for approval by Her Majesty, but was issued by the Ministry of Defence with the compliments of the Under Secretary of State for Defence and Minister of Veterans. It had come attached to a directive that: "the recipient may wish to wear it on suitable occasions when dressed in civilian attire" . . . the clear implication being that the pin was not to be worn with official uniform.

The foregoing allegorical tale may be seen by some as being far-fetched. However, it is not, because British veterans have indeed suffered the indignity described many times before.

At a time in our country's history when British military personnel are suffering under extreme active service conditions, enduring widespread overstretch and deprivation and being killed or wounded in Afghanistan and Iraq, this might hardly seem to be an appropriate or auspicious time to submit a case for retrospective medal awards in recognition of campaigns, some of which were conducted over 50-years ago. Yet from the period immediately post Korea through to our current conflagrations, there is a whole generation of 'forgotten' service personnel out there who in many cases have no medals to show for their service to crown and country.

Successive British governments, supported by the economically inclined Ministry of Defence (MoD) and the HD Committee must have felt that 'bare breasts looked best'. A fuller description and role of the HD Committee can be found elsewhere in this paper. However, in order to assist some readers in understanding how the functioning of this committee affects the subject matter of this chapter, it would do no harm to highlight the pertinent points.

Evolving from a pre-war organisation named *The Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals in Time of War* to simply *The Committee of Honours, Decorations and Medals* (aka HD Committee), its role is to advise The Sovereign on matters affecting honours and medals. The Committee is chaired by the Cabinet Secretary and Head of the Home Civil Service. The other eight members of the Committee consist of (only) senior civil servants.

Qualifying periods for each award or medal are determined by consideration of the *risks and rigours* of the campaign. This is not standardised. In some circumstances, the qualifying period agreed has been as short as one day's service, whereas other medals or clasps require 90 days' continuous 'service'. At least one campaign medal

(the General Service Medal 1918-1962 with clasp “Cyprus”) required 120 days service to qualify. “*The case for each medal is considered on its own merits*” says the MoD. (Exactly!)

Since the end of World War Two, the:

“*HD Committee has maintained a policy that it will not consider the belated institution of awards and medals for service given many years earlier*” [Quote from Veterans UK website].

The reason given for this policy is that the present HD Committee cannot put itself in the place of the Committee which made the original decision and which would have been able to take account of the views of the Government and of other interested parties at the time of the decision.

“*The HD Committee has made it clear on a number of occasions, (most recently in February 2002), in response to requests for the institution of belated awards that it will not reconsider this policy. They will not reconsider cases that took place more than five years ago*” (emphasis added) [Quote from Veterans UK website].

The current argument is that if an exception were to be made for one case, then it would be almost impossible to refuse to re-consider every other claim for retrospective institution of an award or medal. Consequently, the HD Committee does not feel obligated to acknowledge so-called precedents dating back to the 19th Century, when Queen Victoria instituted awards for service in the Napoleonic War, over thirty years later. The Committee also, as we will see later in this chapter, does not feel obligated to follow the lead of several Commonwealth countries of note who are no longer constrained by the *Imperial Honours System*.

However, notwithstanding the above, one-time Royal Sussex Regiment Commanding Officer, the late Colonel P.S. “Pip” Newton, MBE, Secretary of the Ogilby Trust, spent 25 years after retirement from the army in 1972, fighting a long and hard battle for a retrospective (pre-1956) “*Canal Zone*” clasp to be awarded. Ultimately he achieved his aim, but at great cost to his health. The clasp was finally awarded at the time of his death, aged 82. It is affectionately referred to by those who now wear it, as “Pip’s Gong”.

Why, therefore, did the HD Committee agree in retrospect to the award of a “*Canal Zone*” clasp to the General Service Medal? Because says the MoD, it was a “*unique*” case. The MoD, on their own volition, had resisted the claim for a medal for many years, but the HD Committee was convinced by evidence submitted by “Pip” Newton and other veterans that this was the only example where there was contemporary evidence that indicated that a case for a medal had been submitted at the time, but had been for reasons unknown, overlooked by those then in command. Having looked at the evidence again from the point of view of those who might have considered it at the time, they agreed that the risks and rigours of the campaign between 1951 and 1954 justified the institution of a clasp.

“Pip” Newton was also a determined campaigner for the award of a *Special Service Medal* for prescribed peacekeeping or non-warlike operations where recognition had not previously been given – an aim that remains to be achieved. “Pip” served as a company commander in Korea with the 1st Battalion Royal Sussex Regiment and would, we are sure, be thrilled if members of his regiment and other regiments that preceded the Royal Sussex Regiment in Korea were awarded a medal for peacekeeping/containment operations whilst on “*Active Service*” in the post-Armistice period commencing July 28th, 1953. However, the HD Committee’s present, rigid 5-year rule would block this award.

Old Order

Such is the mounting degree of cumulative angst this parsimonious mindset has created in certain quarters, that something which hitherto would have been unimaginable among the disciplined and obeisant ‘Old Order’, for a while now has been shaping up to rebel.

Still steadfastly resisted by the government departments to which their representations are politely being submitted (and cavalierly rejected) for a long time now there has been a substantial and ever growing number of British ex-service personnel – veterans – consistently making the strongest, most well supported and persistent noises about the retrospective award of several overlooked and never awarded medals, one of which is highlighted in this Chapter

Officials at the MoD have been made very well aware that several Commonwealth countries have in recent years introduced new medals for past service performed in some cases more than fifty years previously, for which they requested and received Her Majesty the Queen's permission to wear. Such medals include an (Australian) National Defence Medal and medals for service in Korea after July 27th, 1954, the UN's arbitrarily imposed cut-off date for the issuance of the *United Nations Korea Medal*.

Why doesn't Great Britain follow suit?

The answer lies with the MoD who argues, forcefully, that since several Commonwealth countries – such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand – consciously withdrew some years ago from the fine sounding *Risk and Rigour* based Imperial Honours System to one of 'simply' recognising periods of military service, it is their business. There is no British Government inclination to follow suit and any suggestion that perhaps there is need for change is resisted with dogged determination. The MoD has also stated that as the HD Committee is the final arbiter, veterans should realise that medals are not the gift of the Ministry of Defence. However, the HD Committee advises that policy responsibility for the possible introduction of military medals, including a National Defence Medal, rests with the MoD. It is little wonder that veterans are bewildered by all this, especially when they learn that the HD Committee seldom meets and business is normally conducted by correspondence. In fact the Committee has met on very few occasions since the end of the Second World War.

A number of British veterans are pursuing the institution of an award similar to medals retrospectively issued by Australia, Canada and New Zealand for active service in Korea in the post-Armistice period. Absolutely not says the MoD. Why? It is the MoD's contention that:

"If the Military Commanders of the day, who had access to all the facts, had wanted a medal to cover the full period during which British troops were deployed in Korea, they had every opportunity to pursue this and could easily have submitted a case had they thought that the continuing risks and rigours for the Armed Forces personnel posted to Korea justified a medal. There is no evidence to prove that such a case was ever drafted or submitted for consideration by the Chain of Command or the HD Committee" [Quote from letter to a veteran from CDS dated July 3rd, 2008].

Had the Commanders of the day submitted a case for a medal or clasp to the Chain of Command for consideration and thence to the HD Committee, one can only speculate whether it would have succeeded? After all, unless those concerned could look into the future, it would not have been possible for them to have predicted what was in store for British troops during the five years of peacekeeping/containment operations in Korea after the Armistice Agreement was signed. This information, even though it is now available as evidenced by a 2005 Australian post-Armistice service review (see below), could never be considered because any submission based on events that took place more than five years previously – let alone over half-a-century ago – would be automatically rejected because of the HD Committee's 5-year rule.

The last British regiment to serve in Korea was 1st Battalion The Royal Sussex Regiment, which with a magnificent and well remembered ceremonial farewell parade held in conjunction with Her Majesty The Queen's official birthday that year, to great acclaim from Americans who flew in from far and wide to attend, finally left that (then) arduous and sorry land on July 26th, 1957.

Risk and Rigour

Consider the following: **Degree of Risk and Rigour experienced by medal-less British and other UN military personnel serving in Korea:**

From the signing of the 1953 Armistice agreement until 1999, there have been over 40,000 violations of the Agreement. These violations include serious acts of war involving the loss of US aircraft shot down. Over 1,200 US military personnel have been killed in action, not to mention over 200 wounded in action and 87 taken prisoner of war. In the same period there were more than 2,000 Republic of Korea (ROK) combat deaths, not including fratricide, accidents and other non-battle related deaths.

Total British casualties in the period following the Armistice agreement until the 1st Battalion The Royal Sussex Regiment departed in 1957, admittedly amounted to a mere fifty men from all causes. However, we had proportionately fewer men on the ground compared to US and ROK forces. When a young National Servicemen

named Private Newton in the Royal Sussex Regiment was drowned, his parents expressed the wish that his body be brought home to Sussex for burial, but were informed by military authorities that this could not be done as Korea was regarded as a war zone. This decision caused great distress to his parents and his mother remarked to the reporter from a Sussex newspaper covering the story:

"I thought the war was over. The Royal Sussex Regiment took him out there – I thought the least they could do was to bring him home!"

As the 1,000 strong English "*Point Battalion*", with defensive positions just south of the Imjin River, those who dug and manned the 1st Battalion Royal Sussex trenches and dug-outs were under no delusion whatsoever regarding their inevitable fate in the event of an (always expected) attack by communist forces. With only about 36-hours of ammunition with which to hold back the enemy, they were expected to be overrun. The reason for this was that their role was to create a delay in which to allow their US 24th Infantry Division allies' 21st Infantry Regiment (the renowned and very be-medalled *Gimlets*) further south, time to prepare to meet the inevitable breakthrough and onslaught. Thankfully, this scenario did not occur, but the risk that it might have was very real indeed.

And then there was the climate to contend with. Spring thaw was followed by monsoon rains which played havoc with the fabric of laboriously dug positions. With the coming of summer the heat became intense. Dust coated weapons, vehicles, food and clothing. British and other United Nations troops toiling up the mountainsides carrying heavy loads envied the much greater endurance and carrying power of the little Korean porters. Infection and disease prospered in this climate in the damp warmth of the bunkers and insects proved marginally more tolerable than the stink of the repellent issued to suppress them. Then came the winter and as men plodded between positions muffled by innumerable layers of clothing, they gazed in awed disbelief as the temperature dropped to sub-zero depths. Starting a vehicle engine was a major undertaking and any carelessness in exposing even a small amount of flesh to the naked air could result in frostbite.

So the question is: Should a medal be retrospectively awarded for service in Korea in the post-Armistice period to the men of the following units who were deployed after July 27th, 1953 and underwent the so called risks and rigours of the place?

1st Bn Royal Fusiliers*; 1st Bn Durham Light Infantry*; 1st Bn King's Regt*; 1st Bn Duke of Wellington's Regt; 1st Bn Royal Scots*; 1st Bn King's Own Royal Regt*; 1st Bn North Staffordshire Regiment*; 1st Bn Essex Regt; 1st Bn Royal Warwickshire Regt; 1st Bn Northamptonshire Regt; 1st Bn Royal Irish Fusiliers; 1st Bn Dorset Regt; 1st Bn Queens Own Cameron Highlanders — and lastly, 1st Bn Royal Sussex Regt.

* The tours of these regiments spanned the pre and post-Armistice periods.

The following elements of British Army supporting units were also deployed in Korea, in some cases spanning the pre and post-Armistice periods:

Royal Tank Regiment; Royal Artillery; Royal Corps of Signals; Royal Army Service Corps; Royal Army Catering Corps; Royal Army Pay Corps; Royal Army Ordnance Corps; Royal Engineers, Royal Army Medical Corps; Royal Military Police; Royal Army Chaplains' Department — and Royal Electrical & Mechanical Engineers.

The MoD thinks not.

If the HD Committee, or others responsible, could be so careless as to overlook the kind of evidence that "Pip" Newton and his colleagues presented in their hard fought campaign for a "*Canal Zone*" clasp, is it not conceivable that evidence of the risks and rigours outlined above faced by British troops in post-Armistice Korea, might also have been overlooked or perhaps not thoughtfully considered?

British veterans believe – like their Commonwealth allies who have been retrospectively awarded medals for service in post-Armistice Korea – that they too qualify for something a little more emotionally and morally tangible than just a lapel pin.

In response to various letters written by a veteran in December 2004 and early 2005 to the Right Honourable Geoffrey Hoon, MP, then Secretary of State for Defence, concerning the retrospective institution of a medal for post-Armistice service in Korea, he was informed by Mr R T Coney, a member of MoD secretariat, replying on Mr Hoon's behalf on February 17th, 2005, that:

“While conditions for those serving in Korea after 27 July 1954 were still most unpleasant and as you quite rightly mentioned in you letters, were still on a war footing, the United Nations and North Korean forces were not physically at war. Actual hostilities had ceased. The situation is still very similar today. There is still a truce, but the conflict has not been resolved to the satisfaction of all parties” [emphases added]

Mr. Coney concludes by saying:

“...We are aware that in recent years the Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Governments have agreed to allow veterans to both receive and wear certain campaign medals awarded by other foreign governments for service that had not previously been recognised, and have also instituted campaign medals of their own [such as for service in post-Armistice Korea] for which no direct equivalents have been issued by the British Government. However, these countries withdrew from the Imperial Honours System some years ago. Any approval which the Queen may have given, as Queen of Canada, Australia and New Zealand for Commonwealth citizens to wear particular medals, would have been given on the advice of the appropriate Commonwealth Ministers. These matters are now the sole responsibility of the countries concerned and have no bearing on any decisions that the British Government might make under similar conditions.”

“...There are no plans to institute any new British medals for past military service, or to extend the qualifying criteria for any existing medals which recognise service performed and completed more than five years previously...”

“...I am sorry to have to send you what I realise will be a disappointing reply.”

In a letter dated July 3rd, 2008 to the same veteran the CDS said that British campaign medals:

“...are awarded when the risks and rigours of the operations under consideration are sufficiently extreme, compared to the normal expectations of Service life [emphasis added], to justify the institution of a medal”.

To paraphrase the words of Mr Coney: (1) Conditions were most unpleasant – an understatement if ever there was one. (2) The war had not ended, but that does not matter. (3) The conflict has not been resolved to the satisfaction of all parties, but that too is of no relevance. (4) Other Commonwealth countries have, admittedly, seen fit to honour their Armed Services with a medal, but Britain has no intention of following their lead.

Contrast Mr Coney’s analysis of conditions in post armistice Korea with the following conclusion reached by an Australian report published in December 2005 entitled *“Report of the Post-Armistice Korean Service Review.”*

“There is no doubt, in the view of the Working Party, that personnel of the Australian navy, army and air force units deployed in Korea for the period 27 July 1953 to 19 April 1956 [the date when the last Australian combat troops were withdrawn] experienced climate extremes of heat and cold, lived and worked under harsh conditions, were justifiably conditioned physically and mentally to meet a perceived threat, and exercised standard operating procedures to maintain a high level of readiness for combat to meet an enemy offensive. They also experienced trauma of casualties, including deaths amongst members that resulted from operations at the extremes of service outside the warlike service envelope. In the judgment of the Working Party and by any criterion, this service was beyond the requirements of peacetime, training and garrison duties and included times when “enemy potential for offensive action in Korea has never been higher” [28th British Commonwealth Infantry Brigade Weekly Summary – August 1953]

The last British combat forces were not withdrawn until July 26th, 1957 and experienced no less risk and rigour than their Australian comrades; and one can only speculate how Mr Coney would have worded his letter had he considered these facts or even been aware of the tens of thousands of serious breaches to the 1953 Armistice Agreement, not to mention the thousands of battle-related casualties that occurred after the Korean Armistice Agreement was signed. Certainly, the next-of-kin of those killed in action and the soldiers and airmen wounded in action, would very likely strongly disagree with Mr Coney’s analysis of the situation in post-Armistice Korea. British Korean veterans would suggest that the *“risks and rigours”* faced by British troops in Korea after the 1953 Armistice could hardly be regarded as *“normal expectations of Service life”* as envisaged by the CDS.

Post Script

In November 2008, the Hon Dr Mike Kelly AM, (Australian) Parliamentary Secretary for Defence announced the implementation of the 2005 report referred to above and the eligibility criterion for the *Australian General Service Medal – Korea* (AGSM) and the *Returned from Active Service Badge* (RASB). In both cases, the eligibility criterion for former Defence Force personnel who served in Korea during the post armistice period from July 28th, 1953 to April 19th, 1956 is 30 days. This is consistent with the recommendations of the 2005 report. Striking of the new AGSM – Korea requires Royal Assent, and Dr Kelly has stated that the Government would write to The Queen seeking assent for creating the new medal. In relation to the medal, Dr Kelly said:

“The conditions under which these people served were at least as arduous and dangerous as the many subsequent operations which have attracted similar recognition, and 18 members lost their lives while engaged in this service.

These proud servicemen deserve the gratitude of our nation for their contribution to world peace in one of the more dangerous international situations since World War Two, which had the potential to escalate into a nuclear confrontation. I salute them and am delighted that the Rudd Labour Government has been able to help them achieve resolution to their cause, which should have happened long before now.”

Dedication

The determined and dedicated groups of HM Forces’ veterans, who have worked so diligently on behalf of all veterans for the retrospective award of these medals and others referred to in this paper, deserve our thanks, respect, congratulations, and encouragement.

Perhaps the fact that the Government’s standard response to letters that *“few people/veterans have written to the Ministry of Defence about the lack of recognition for the service they provided to the country”* in no way indicates a lack of interest in receiving such an award, but rather may be due to the fact that many of them, like myself, are into their twilight years.

Looking on the bright side of this tangled web, the present (2008) Shadow Defence Secretary, Dr Liam Fox, MP, has stated that his defence team are looking at the whole issue of medals and will revise the HD Committee on entering office – should that happen – and instruct the new committee to conduct a review of all outstanding claims. Dr Fox can rest assured that the veteran community will be monitoring this promise closely as events following the results of the next General Election unfold.

Information about certain military medals awarded by the Governments of Canada, Australia and New Zealand referred to in the body of this Chapter is provided in the Chart below and in Appendix ‘A’:

- Australian Service Medal 1945 – 1975 – Korea clasp
- Australian General Service Medal – Korea*
- Australian Defence Medal
- Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal
- New Zealand General Service Medal 1992.
- The New Zealand Operational Service Medal
- United Nations Korea Medal

* Subject to the formality of Royal Assent.

Comparison

The chart below illustrates the lack of medal recognition accorded British servicemen who were deployed in Korea under United Nations operational and tactical control in the post-Armistice period (Note * below), as compared to their Australian, Canadian, New Zealand and U.S. allies. Units from those Commonwealth countries were attached to and served in the British Commonwealth Brigade/Contingent in Korea in the same period as their British allies. British and other Commonwealth units were, in turn, attached to the US 24th Infantry Division:

Country	Service Medal	Campaign Medal for post Armistice Operations in South Korea	Lapel Badge
Australia	Yes – <i>The Australian Defence Medal</i>	Yes – <i>The Australian Service Medal 1945–1975 with Korea Clasp and The Australian General Service Medal–Korea</i>	Yes + Returned from Active Service Badge
Canada	No	Yes – <i>Canadian Forces Peacekeeping Service Medal</i>	Yes
New Zealand	Yes – <i>The New Zealand Operational Service Medal</i>	Yes – <i>The New Zealand General Service Medal, Korea 1954-1957 Clasp</i>	Yes
United Kingdom	No	No	Yes
U.S.A.	Yes – <i>National Defence Service Medal</i>	Yes – <i>The Korea Defense Service Medal</i>	Yes

* *The United Nations Korean Medal* was awarded for qualifying service from July 27th, 1950 until July 27th, 1954, when it ceased to be issued. An American organisation named *Korea Defense Veterans of America* (KDVA) <http://kdvamerica.org> has been lobbying for some time, without success, to persuade the United Nations to reinstitute the award of this medal. KDVA, a registered non-profit organization incorporated in The State of New Jersey, USA, is advocate for all US veterans, but focused on the Korea veteran. Its purpose is to bring recognition to post armistice Korea service veterans through public awareness and legislation at the federal and state levels. It is the veterans' organization of record with Congress and in this capacity was successful in having legislation passed to create the KOREA DEFENSE SERVICE MEDAL.

The decision by United Nations hierarchy to deny a medal to those who served in post – 1954 Korea seems to have been based principally on the command structure of UN ground forces there, without much consideration to the ever present risk of the resumption of hostilities by an unstable Communist regime in the North, and the difficult terrain and climate encountered by troops operating in a land that had not long before been devastated by war. Based on legal advice taken in February 2003¹ the United Nations state that the UN medal is awarded only to military personnel serving under the operational or tactical control of the United Nations. Personnel serving in a Security Council authorised mission that is not under the control and command of the United Nations are therefore not eligible for any United Nations Medal. The advice given was that the UNC in Korea since 1954 falls in the second category and thus military personnel assigned to the UNC are not eligible for the award. The United Nations later reaffirmed its position and believes that a change in eligibility criteria would blur the distinction between UN-led missions conducted by blue helmets² and UN-authorized missions conducted by multinational forces.

However, in what would appear to run counter to that position, in order to provide for the defence aspirations in Korea, the Security Council passed a resolution on July 7th, 1950 stating that military and other assistance contributed by UN Member States would be placed under a unified operational command headed by the United States. **The resolution is in effect to this day. The Commander-in-Chief, UN Command, had operational control of the multinational military forces³ supporting the Republic of Korea. This arrangement continued for some twenty-five years after the armistice until 1978**, when a bi-national headquarters, the South Korea-

¹ After consultation with the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, Major General Patrick C. Cammaert, Military Advisor, Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

² Blue berets and helmets were worn for the first time during peacekeeping operations following the 1956 Suez crisis, and are now one of the best known symbols of today's international peace support movement.

³ In addition to US and ROK armed forces, assistance during and after the conflict was provided by: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Columbia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom. Denmark, India, Norway and Sweden provided medical units and Italy provided a hospital.

United States Combined Forces Command (CFC) was created, and the South Korean military units with front line missions were transferred from UN Command to the CFC's operational control. The commander in chief of the CFC, a United States military officer, answers ultimately to the national command authorities of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

As mentioned previously in this Chapter, The Royal Sussex Regiment was the last British regiment (1956-57) assigned to peacekeeping/containment duties in Korea. All ranks, like the many British and (British) Commonwealth units that preceded the Royal Sussex, understood perfectly that they were under the operational and tactical control of United Nations Command. To underscore this understanding, the United Nations flag was flown outside battalion headquarters. On at least one occasion, the most senior military officer in Korea paid a visit to the battalion. He happened to be an American officer⁴, but he visited the Battalion, not as a representative of the US military, but as Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command.

Neither The Royal Sussex Regiment nor any other troops in Korea wore blue helmets. In the first place, they were not available in Korea at the time because they had not been invented and secondly, given the fact that a state of war still existed after July 28th, 1953, it would have been operationally foolhardy to do so. At the end the tour of duty of The Royal Sussex Regiment, President Syngman Rhee addressed all ranks and remarked:

"You are defending far more than your dear ones, your home and your country. You are defending civilization".

In June 2008, Colonel Rustam Patnaik of United Nations Chief Force Generation Service responding to a letter written by Richard Farrar, a post-armistice Korea veteran, seeking the reinstatement of the *United Nations Korean Medal* or the award of a similar medal for post 1954 Korea service, stated that Britain's Permanent Mission to the United Nations was responsible for reviewing requests regarding medals and that he should have his directed letter(s) to the Mission. Upon receiving this advice, Mr. Farrar then wrote to Sir John Sawers, Britain's Permanent Ambassador to United Nations, and on 19 August, received a reply on the Ambassador's behalf from Colonel Mark Bibbey RM, Military Advisor to Britain's mission in New York, who wrote:

*"I have consulted with the Service Personnel and Veterans Agency (SPVA), the UK agency who deal with medal requests on behalf of the MoD, and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) here in New York who have the final say on UN medal policy. SPVA are adamant that they have no sway over the eligibility rules for UN medals and DPKO are equally clear that since you and your colleagues served post 27 July 1954 you will not be entitled to the United Nations Korean War Medal. [emphasis added] I regret that they are not minded to review this decision..."**"This is not the news that you were hoping for, but I regret that there is nothing further I can do".*

When Mr Farrar pointed out to Colonel Bibbey that he and his colleagues had not requested a United Nations Korean War Medal, but merely that the *United Nations Korean Medal* be extended and reinstated for operations post July 27th, 1954, Colonel Bibbey replied:

"... As far as they (United Nations) are concerned, it does not alter their position. Concerning SPVA, you will have to deal with them directly. It seems to me that they are the key players here - the examples you give are of national rather than UN medals so I would have thought that something along the lines of an additional bar to the GSM would be appropriate, making this primarily a matter of UK policy." [Emphases added]

The end result of all this is that United Nations are not interested in reviewing their own position concerning the reinstatement of their own Korea medal, preferring that this be done by Britain's Permanent Mission to United Nations, who in turn referred Mr Farrar's request to the MoD (Mr R T Coney, perhaps?) who ducked the issue by stating that **'Britain has no sway over the eligibility rules for UN Medal policy'**. Colonel Bibbey was absolutely correct in the last sentence of his email in which he wrote:

"... I sympathise with your position; dealing with bureaucracies (UK, UN or wherever) is seldom rewarding, but I wish you every success."

⁴ General L L Lemnitzer, whose military title whilst in Korea was: *Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command.*

So the post-armistice Korean veterans' battle for recognition continues. They are not alone.

9.2 Cyprus – 1954 – 1959 (by Maj S Pollock)

The National Defence Medal is a most worthy idea and I wish everyone involved in obtaining it great success, it would certainly help many veterans of the Cyprus conflict come to terms with another example of mistreatment. As George Harris ex-Royal Engineer, 23 Field Sqn attached to 9 Para Sqn, said there are outstanding medal issues from the 1950s that also need addressing as a matter of priority. He has been fighting for many years to get recognition for British Servicemen's active Service in Cyprus 1958. It's another case of appalling treatment of British Forces, unrecognised and insulted ever since by the MoD, will it be righted before they die?

Synopsis

The Cyprus campaign was particularly brutal with a loss of more than 372 lives, and hundreds wounded many of whom were National Servicemen. Many other National Servicemen fell short of the unusually long 120 days qualification period by only a few days due to completion of their compulsory service or posting to another trouble spot so were therefore denied the award.

For many years, in the interest of fairness, attempts to have the "**Cyprus**" qualifying period reduced to 30 days bringing it in line with other dangerous campaigns have failed. Blanket resistance with the usual all too familiar response "**policy is not to review criteria after 5 years had elapsed**". As you are aware, recently and rightly Suez veterans were recognized with a medal after 50 years. Therefore, the policy to which they refer is null and void. MoD correspondence now contradicts their own "**alleged policy**".

In recent correspondence the MoD clearly state the matter is closed, to which veterans take great exception. This is wholly unfair and shows a total disrespect for our past troops, and is not in the spirit of the covenant.

The argument is for an equal qualifying period for the General Service Medals relating to similar campaigns. Below by way of example, are some of the glaring discrepancies for the same medal. The decision not to amend the time frames as in other campaigns is blatant discrimination.

Radfan:	(30 days)	Aden	(30 days)
Sierra Leone:	(30 Days)	Congo	(30 days)
Dhofar:	(30 days)	Oman	(30 days)

The badly treated Cyprus veterans are now showing solidarity and support for the NDM. It is a fundamental duty of Government to give proper recognition for service past or present, our safety depends on HM Forces to protect our freedom. Now on the 50th anniversary a monument bearing the names of 372 servicemen killed in Cyprus is to be unveiled, this is the perfect opportunity to reconsider decisions regarding the GSM (Cyprus). We can assure you, there is much resentment, regarding the treatment of Cyprus veterans and while the survivors still breath so will the quest for some kind of recognition.

No Arm, No Medal

One Cyprus Vets Association member, James Blaney, of the Wiltshire Regt (B Coy) in 1956 records a patrol on 17 March 1956 which was ambushed and hit by two bombs - killing Pte Ronnie Gould, wounding Cpl Jim Clements in the legs, and so badly wounding Pte Tony Cook that he lost his right arm. Tony was flown home, and then medically discharged. His reward was to be told that he was not eligible for the Cyprus General Service Medal because he had been there for only seven weeks - and not the 120 days required. WHAT A DISGRACE.

Under normal rules, Tony Cook would have got his medal even if he had never heard a shot fired in anger. But such fair play seems to have escaped the desk chaps in Whitehall. Major Sean Pollock is campaigning for this injustice to be remedied before the 50th anniversary and we shall support him in that. Tony would have got his medal if instead of losing his arm he had lost his life. Apparently being dead allows an exception to the rules. What bureaucratic nonsense that is. Will Whitehall think again? Does his service count, No GSM and No Service Medal.

Stonewalled

All efforts to have this injustice rectified have been stonewalled by Mr Coney and Mr Twigg with much of their correspondence contradictory to say the least. Indeed they have stated that they consider the matter closed! Major Sean Pollock replied: *"You may with respect Sir consider what you like, however it is only the veterans who can bring a close to this matter and their feelings at this time are getting angrier and angrier"*.

Once again in the words of ex Sapper George Harris (George Died January 2009):

"I feel we are approaching the dawn of success, I have never felt more confident since I left the Island in December 1958 of having my Active Service on the Island recognised, this is down to people like Sean Pollock and now the Association, for Donkey's Years I seemed to be on my own, I now know that is not the case!"

"The Men with whom I served in the 16th independent Parachute Brigade and its attached units served with distinction for 5 to 6 Months on active Service in two separate Countries. They received nothing, not even a free cup of tea in the NAAFI. IT IS A DISGRACE THAT MUST BE PUT RIGHT BEFORE THESE VETERANS ALL PASS AWAY, JUSTICE FOR THOSE IGNORED & INSULTED BY THE MOD FOR 50 YEARS MUST BE ACHIEVED OR THIS STAIN ON THE MOD WILL GO ON FOREVER." "Please get justice for those ignored for 50 Years Thank you in anticipation."

It seems paradoxical, wholly inconsistent and abstractly unfair that British Forces serving 30 days in Cyprus (outside of theatre) during 'Operation GRANBY' qualified for the Gulf War Medal. They were deemed to be at a sufficiently heightened risk through questionable rigour, because of their proximity to a potential Iraqi missile threat some 600+ miles away, no such threat ever manifested itself. Whilst those involved in fighting on the ground in Cyprus for up to 119 days 50 years ago received nothing.

If indeed you as a reader are serious about supporting our troops, then we assume you would also agree in equal treatment. Whatever your position you should intervene in this matter which is of great importance to Cyprus Veterans, we have earned proper recognition, do not let this opportunity pass again.

9.3 Irish Republicanism

Northern Ireland

This case study illustrates how a National Defence Medal would be fitting recognition for all personnel who answered the call of duty and faced a very real threat whether in Britain, Europe or beyond. All forces during these periods were involved in an anti-terrorist campaign against insurgent forces who had declared war against the United Kingdom and all her Military Personnel, wherever they served.

From 1969 until 1997 the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) conducted an armed paramilitary campaign within the United Kingdom which was not confined to Northern Ireland which extended beyond the UK's borders to anywhere that British troops were stationed. Their aim was the ending British sovereignty in Northern Ireland in order to create a United Ireland.

During the period of troubles in Northern Ireland, attacks on British troops, both in the Province and on the British mainland, Germany and Holland etc, accounted for 719 fatalities, a casualty rate only exceeded by the Korean War.

Whilst those who served directly in Northern Ireland received the General Service Medal, the fact remains that British forces throughout UK and in Europe were not only targeted, but attacked, wounded and killed. The IRA had boldly warned the British Government: "There will be no haven for your military personnel, and you will regularly be at airports awaiting your dead." These tactics were an effort by PIRA to demonstrate it could inflict damage on British Forces anywhere in the world not only in Northern Ireland. British Forces as a consequence were forbidden to wear uniform in public because of the accepted threat posed by the terrorists. This is just one example how our forces lived with a constant threat, and raises the notion of 'risk' for 'normal' service at the time.

A report in the *Times* newspaper of March 2008 stated: “The Prime Minister is to be presented with a report that will call for the widespread wearing of military uniforms to engender respect and appreciation for the Armed Forces. In the US service personnel wear their uniforms off-duty. This was banned in Britain in recent years because of the IRA terrorist threat.” In the same report, Squadron Leader Tony Walsh, a military spokesman from RAF Wittering, confirmed this: “During the troubles, the wearing of uniforms in public on the mainland was regarded as too risky.”

The heightened threat levels and risks to ‘ALL’ British Armed Forces serving both in Northern Ireland and outside of the province, has since been acknowledged by many military sources. This directly necessitated specific orders relating to dress code, individual behaviour on and off duty, unit behaviour in terms of checkpoints near military bases, patrolling and a generally more covert environment for fear of being identified, targeted and killed. It demonstrates beyond all reasonable doubt that they were on ‘operational’ service in a conflict that could have seen them awarded a General Service Medal. To date this service has been ignored.

The War Outside Of NI

PIRA were very candid in explaining why British service personnel stationed far away from Northern Ireland were legitimate targets, stating ***“Overseas attacks have a prestige value and internationalise the War in Ireland.”***

British Government officials and analysts from both sides of the Irish Sea ***‘confirmed’*** PIRA had stepped up its campaign of attacks on the British Military ***‘outside’*** Northern Ireland. One acknowledged reason for this was it had become increasingly difficult in Northern Ireland to attack soldiers, police officers, judges and Government officials, who often travelled through Ulster in armoured vehicles and who often lived and worked in fortified or heavily protected buildings. Personnel stationed outside of the province therefore became theoretically easier and more practical targets in which to engage their war.

However, let us not forget those republican forces who considered themselves to be on ***‘active’*** military operations against British troops both in and outside of Northern Ireland consisted of the ‘Provisional’ IRA, the ***‘Official’*** IRA and the Irish National liberation Army etc. To underpin how widespread the conflict had become outside of Northern Ireland, in 1988 three members of an IRA ***‘Active Service Unit’*** (ASU) were shot dead by British Forces in Gibraltar whilst they were planning to attack British Military personnel in a ‘Changing of the Guard’ ceremony near the British Governor’s residence. This was not the only ASU operating on continental Europe attacking bases in West Germany causing casualties and taking several lives.

The terrorists' target had been the band and guard of the 1st Battalion Royal Anglian Regiment. It is believed that members of the SAS had ambushed the IRA Active Service Unit and Army intelligence officers confirmed that they had been expecting an IRA attack for some months. Once again, proof that both the IRA and British Forces were fighting a conflict not confined to the province.

If you are still wavering in thinking our forces during this period simply served in normal service conditions browse through some of the British casualties inflicted outside of Northern Ireland:

11 soldiers killed and scores of others and injured during IRA bomb attacks at **Hyde Park** and **Regents Park** .

1974: 9 Soldiers killed in the **M62** Coach Bomb.

One soldier died when an IRA bomb exploded in **Woolwich**

10 servicemen injured in an IRA bomb attack in **Caterham**, Surrey

1981: 23 soldiers injured in IRA bomb attack at **Chelsea Barracks**

Bomb disposal officer killed in Oxford Street, **London**

1983: 3 Soldiers injured in bomb attack on Royal Artillery Barracks, in **London**

1987: 31 people injured in a car bomb attack at **Rheindahlen**, West Germany.

1988: A soldier killed and 9 injured in bomb attack at **Inglis Barracks**, North London.

1988: 3 RAF Regiment airmen killed and 3 injured in two separate IRA attacks in **Holland**

1989: Bomb attack at a British Army base in **Osnabruck**, West Germany

1989: 10 Royal Marines killed and 22 injured in bomb attack at their base in **Deal**, Kent.

IRA detonate a bomb under a Mini-bus Sgt Chapman killed & 4 others injured.

1990 Royal Artillery Officer killed by IRA in **Dortmund**, West Germany.

Air Chief Marshal Sir Peter Terry survives an IRA attack in **Staffordshire**.

This by no means covers all the incidents.

Britain's Formal 'Declaration Of War' Against The IRA

Following a 'DECLARATION OF WAR' in February 1971, against the IRA Provisionals by the Unionist Prime Minister Major Chichester-Clark who headed the Stormont Government, Reginald Maudling, the Conservative Home Secretary, stood up in the House of Commons just four months later and made a formal declaration that the British Government was **"at war with the IRA."** What had until then been seen as a conflict within the confines of Northern Ireland was now regarded and prosecuted by all sides as a **'war'** which in 1972 saw the IRA afforded formal political and quasi-POW status for its interned members after agreement was reached with the Northern Ireland Minister of the time William Whitelaw under the Ted Heath Government. This entitled the Republican Army Command structure to be identified and accepted by prison officials where IRA **'Officers'** were recognised as such and prisoners would be able to **liaise** with the prison governor through their own Commanding Officers. In Long Kesh interned prisoners had long enjoyed a POW lifestyle and were even permitted to drill with dummy weapons.

On July 28th, 2005 the then Prime Minister Tony Blair, in a televised response to the IRA's announcement that it had ceased its armed campaign against Britain stated: **"Today may be the day that peace replaced war."** The elected leader of the United Kingdom has publically acknowledged that the so-called conflict in Northern Ireland was nothing less than a war.

There is no hiding from the FACTS - history has recorded it was a WAR, the British Government made a declaration of WAR and it is because of this declaration that internment - detention without trial was introduced. Internment ran along the same lines as that for POWs in a more conventional war. The British Government (Reginald Maudling) declared the War in 1971 and the British Prime Minister said in 2005, that Peace had replaced **'War'**. The declared War therefore lasted from 1971 - 2005

Had the exact same medal criteria been applied to the 'Northern Ireland' issues as those which were applied to UK Forces serving in Cyprus during Operation Granby, then **'all'** members of HM Armed Forces would have qualified for a GSM: On the basis that Forces stationed (outside of theatre) in Cyprus, could in theory, be within reach of Iraqi Missile attack, they were 'all' awarded a Gulf War (1) medal, albeit that the threat did not manifest itself and they did not get drawn into direct action.

It is undeniable that all military personnel on the British mainland and in Europe were under constant threat from IRA attack, and as history has proven, they were frequently targeted and well within range of bombs and bullets from IRA Active Service Units. This demonstrates qualification rules have not been applied consistently and equally, especially when there was a clearly recognisable and heightened 'risk and rigour' for all British Troops?

The same argument could be applied equally to the period of the Cold War when all British Armed Forces were within direct reach of the Soviet missile threat.

Targets

During the period of troubles in Northern Ireland (1962 – 2005) **ALL** British Military personnel, where ever they served, were identified as legitimate targets in a 'guerrilla war' declared by insurgent forces. The day to day activities on all British Military bases at the time, included constant bomb and vehicle checks, armed control of entry points, high alert status and vigilance all to counter a 'campaign' of armed violence and insurrection.

The **facts** are that the war was fought both in the Province of Northern Ireland and on the British mainland and in Europe – the casualties are testimony to this. The acknowledgement by both British Government officials and insurgent forces that the conflict was not confined to Northern Ireland must give weight to the argument that all HM Forces personnel who served the 30 days during that period qualify for a General Service Medal (GSM) (Full details are laid out in DCI JS 22/92), remembering that its criteria is for campaigns or operations that fell short of full-scale war. Those who lost their lives or were injured as a result of the Northern Ireland troubles, whether in the Province or not, were equally as vulnerable and engaged in the same conflict. No one was safe, everyone was a target, all were in the line of fire, all were at risk, and no-one was hiding.

The General Service Medal (GSM) NI Clasp continued to be awarded to personnel after the IRA's announcement that it had ceased its armed campaign against Britain. It could be reasonably argued those serving on the UK Mainland and Europe at the peak of the troubles were at far greater risk and rigour than those receiving the award after that date. Northern Ireland was also an accompanied tour of two years and longer for many, this also reduces

the rigor argument. Compare that with other unrecognised operational tours such as the Falkland Islands or indeed Korea, were troops lived in flimsy ISO containers or worse, and without their family around for support. We are not suggesting for one minute that the GSM for NI shouldn't be issued, but in comparison other service could also have warranted a GSM. We have heard suggestions of a GSM '**National Defence**' clasp to cover periods of '**war**' when based outside the main theatre of operations, a little like the previous Defence Medal. It is also worth bearing in mind the current OSM is for '**Afghanistan**' not '**Helmand**' province, yet the GSM is not '**United Kingdom**' but is for a province of '**Northern Ireland**'.

Those who dismiss this argument might like to talk to the families of those who were killed outside of the province. The bullets and bombs that killed them were from the same people who were killing British Forces in Northern Ireland; it had the same affect and was fought as part of the same conflict.

Conclusion

The Northern Ireland troubles were in the whole sense of the meaning of being a '**Real War**', and extended well beyond the borders of Northern Ireland to the UK mainland and Europe, where both British and Republican forces engaged each other in active service.

All sides identified the threat both in and outside of Northern Ireland, which the Prime Minister Tony Blair described as a '**War**'. Because of the heightened risks to British Service personnel the British Government issued specific orders to all of its troops, including forbidding the wearing of uniforms in public, maintaining guards for 24 hours at all military bases with high vigilance and vehicle/bomb checks. Bikini states at all Military bases varied according to the threat.

Furthermore, British Forces were actively engaged in planned operations against Irish Republican Forces outside of the province of Northern Ireland and in doing so are bound to accede that the threat extended to all British Armed Forces, where ever they might be stationed.

Northern Ireland's First Minister Mr David Trimble MP who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize said of those who go without recognition:

"Naturally it is not possible to name each and every one of those heroes and heroines who make up the huge host of peacemakers who, even as we speak, are at work for peace around the world. But even if it is not possible to name them we can note their presence on the peace-lines around the world. Having said that, I am at the same time, anxious to allay any fears on your part that I might fail to pick up the medal or the cheque. The people of Northern Ireland are not a people to look a gift horse in the mouth. It is imperative that I take the medal home to Northern Ireland - if only to prove that I have been to Oslo. And the way politics work in Northern Ireland - if John Hume has a medal, it is important that I have one too."

It has come as no surprise that former Prime Minister Tony Blair, who is widely credited for his contribution towards assisting the Northern Ireland Peace Process by helping jointly to negotiate the Good Friday Agreement and deliver a power-sharing government, has been named as a recipient of the US Medal of Freedom.

For those British Servicemen and women who didn't receive a medal, let us follow the example of David Trimble and say to the British Government and MoD:

"It is imperative that all Veterans take home a medal – if only to prove that they have served. If our leaders have a medal, it is important that Veterans have one too."

Again the inconsistency arises. British Forces serving in Cyprus (outside of theatre) during the first Gulf War, or even stranger during the Falklands war 4000 miles away in Ascension Islands received medals. Had the same medal criteria been applied equally and consistently to personnel who served during the time of the 'Northern Ireland' war then 'all' members of HM Armed Forces would have qualified for a GSM (without clasp or rosette). Again It is undeniable that all military personnel on the British mainland and in Europe were under constant threat from IRA attack.

Whilst this service remains ignored, there have been suggestions that payments of £12,000 could be paid to the families of IRA activists killed during the war. Veterans have found this very insulting.

9.4 Active Service Post World War Two

Berlin Airlift

Germany recently marked the 60th anniversary of the start of the Berlin Airlift, celebrating an unprecedented undertaking that likely saved the city from falling to the Soviets and helped mend German-British wounds from World War Two. Often called the first battle of the Cold War, the airlift pitted the West and the Soviets against one another for the first time and set the tone for the decades to come. German Defence Minister Franz Josef Jung said at a ceremony in Wiesbaden, from which many of the flights originated.

"I find the courage with which this operation was carried out truly admirable,"

The airlift's significance wasn't immediately apparent, when it began on June 26th, 1948. The future looked "bleak" to Berliners at the time, there was no light at the end of the tunnel until the airlift began. If it hadn't been for the success of the airlift, history would have looked very different; it really is a turning point. The British and the USA launched "Operation Vittles" — an unprecedented airlift that would supply some 2 million West Berliners with food and fuel for 11 months until the Soviets lifted the blockade. It was not without a heavy price in human terms, 39 Britons, 31 Americans and at least 5 Germans were killed during the operation. American, British, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand, and South African pilots flew 278,000 flights to Berlin, carrying 2.3 million tons of food, coal, medicine and other supplies. War resentment erased.

Chief of the Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Glenn Torpy, said:

"The Royal Air Force and the United States Air Force, supported by civilian and allied aircrew from around the world, tackled the seemingly impossible task of keeping Berliners alive during the 10-month blockade of their city.

"This was a difficult, unglamorous and dangerous undertaking - the biggest humanitarian operation ever conducted. The operation demonstrated the strategic importance of air power but also the West's determination to prevent Soviet expansionism in the confused early days of the Cold War.

"The consequences of failure for the people of Berlin and Western Europe would have been profound and I therefore salute the achievements of everyone involved in the operation."

80-year-old Lee Hatcher from Llandoverly in Carmarthenshire, who had been an airframe mechanic on the Sunderland flying-boats which landed on the Havel river in Berlin, said:

"60 years on, people are still so very grateful for what we did. People realise the effort and danger we went to in bringing them food and fuel to keep them alive, and to prevent the city of Berlin falling to the Soviets."

Think about if something of this magnitude and importance was undertaken today. The dangers are obvious, now weight that against the backdrop of a world war, it multiplies those risks many times. It is inconceivable that this type of operation would go unrewarded by our current standards. Yet the brave participants 60 years ago remain overlooked.

British Army of the Rhine (BAOR)

The MoD Analysis Branch have confirmed that personnel serving in BAOR and Berlin were on active service until the Occupation of Germany effectively ceased at midnight on May 5th, 1955, with the Federal Republic of Germany being recognised as a sovereign state from May 6th, 1955 (leaving Berlin occupied until the 1990s, under a state of active service).

Declaring a state of active service requires specific disciplinary measures in place. The occupation of a foreign territory, as was the case in Germany, is a specific circumstance which Parliament, through the Manual of Military Law and the Army Act therein is fully defined.

The phrase '**peacetime conditions**' as used by several Ministers in the past has caused much offence to those in the theatre during the period. In fact the National Service Veterans Alliance (NSVA) raised the issue officially such was the strength of feeling. It was further evidence of the indifference some have to our veterans. Incidentally, despite the active service there was no active service pay either.

Whilst it is clear that those British Servicemen deployed during the Occupation of Germany were serving in a theatre where a state of “**De Facto**” active service existed, the MoD argue they did not face a direct threat from, or operations against, a specific enemy. But there were many at the time who were obviously not happy with occupation and tension could have resulted if the troops didn't conduct themselves in such a professional manner. The Eastern Bloc in particular posed such a threat.

In the context of recognition that personnel serving during the period concerned were on active service, the NSVA raised the possibility of specific recognition through an amendment to a serviceman's Army service record. The NSVA were advised that the Army service record generally reflects the personal occurrences affecting the individual serviceman. Service in a theatre where active service was declared, or existed, was not a personal occurrence. The existence of such a state of active service would have been notified in Routine Orders and required no entry to be made in the service records of individual servicemen. The MoD felt it would be highly inappropriate to make any such amendment to service records.

MoD Ministers, and the Government should recognise and appreciate the contribution of all those who served in Germany particularly during the period 1945-55, where by the full definition of Military Law were on active service. During this period of course the full threat of the Cold War developed. The UK once again ignored this service whilst others did not. We are sure you will have noticed a theme by now, our very closest of Commonwealth allies, New Zealand, Australia and Canada all recognise active service as they did for the Berlin Airlift and post war occupation, and the UK is left with yet another 'Unofficial' private commemorative.

Rest of the World

There were many British troops among the first occupational forces in Japan immediately after they surrendered. These forces although on active service for King and Country were never recognised by anyone. They did not get a medal for their efforts and many, have since died. Unlike after the Iraq war, when medals continued to be issued there was no such treatment of our post World War two troops. Securing a country devastated by Atomic weapons could not have been without rigours or risk, not least from Radiation. By today's standards it is inconceivable these men and women would not receive a medal of some description.

And the list goes on, Middle East Land Forces is another example, and other theatres where British troops had to secure the peace after the most destructive war in history. Is it right that no recognition was ever even considered? So now we have the opportunity.

9.5 The Cold War

The Cold War (1945–1991) has been described as the most dangerous time in modern history when NATO's (including the UK) forces were directly oriented against the particular enemy identified as the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact Countries for a specific scenario of global war. Their role was clearly defined by policies and strategies of the period. Likewise the Warsaw Pact alliance had identified and targeted the UK, as a part of NATO, with its weapons and Military powers.

There were definitely heightened risks associated with this period particularly that of a major threat on the European landmass, stemming from well armed nations with nuclear weapons and it is against these heightened risks that policies and strategies were developed and employed.

There has been much speculation about the deterrent of nuclear weapons between leaders who seem irrational by normal standards; the effectiveness of NATO's and the UK's conventional and nuclear forces was and remains wholly dependent on the qualification and training of the people responsible for operating and comprising them, and their willingness and preparedness to expedite war at a moment's given notice.

As well as needing to be effective, flexible, and survivable, our forces had to be supported by a planning system that was able to respond to all '**real**', '**perceived**' and '**unpredictable**' threats by adequate preparation and regular exercises. These were designed to gauge military effectiveness against very 'real' threats of a war with the Warsaw Pact but also the mechanisms enabling political control.

Taking the MoD's own argument that, the '**Cold War**' is a term that was used to describe the political relationship between the former Soviet Union and its allies and the Western Nations, in the period after the Second World War, it can easily be shown that political ideology, posturing and strategies were enacted through both the capability and

threat of the use of Military force and thus the MoD argument that there was 'no' link between political ideology and that military activity was 'not' the primary expression of the relationship between the two ideologies during this 'Cold War' period, can be seen to be an argument in tatters.

Service during the Cold War brought with it substantial risk other than that associated with the '*usual*' expectations of Service Life. Using the year 1982 as just a single example, figures show that during that one year alone, there was a total of 57,859 Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM), Sea Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM) and bombers primed and targeted between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. 33,952 of these belonged to the Soviet Union.

It is documented that the Soviet Strategy was that conflict was a '*realistic*' scenario and so planned for a massive nuclear strike that would pave the way for ground forces and in doing so would downgrade any Western deterrent and make the prospect of war a more perilous reality. According to Soviet Documents, plans were in place to advance into France within a few days of conflict breaking out and after capturing Lyon on the ninth day, it would turn Western Europe, including the UK, into a nuclear inferno. US Policy of the time identified the UK as part of the 'theatre' and an advanced deployment area, hence the reason that so many US Military personnel and weapons were deployed here. If this was purely an ideological war, why the need for so many weapons and troops to be ready for war?

The Soviet plan clearly demonstrates the very '*real*' threat posed by the Warsaw pact alliance, in contrast to the NATO doctrine of a flexible response based on deterrent. It shows that the Soviets were under no illusions about the threat of war, either conventional or nuclear and were ready and primed to engage in an all out conflict with the West.

The men and women of HM Armed Forces who stepped forward ready to engage in that war and defend this country during this period, were educated to the reality of the threat through the rigorous Military training which they all endured. No-one was under any illusions and the regular deployments and Military exercises underpinned the very real threat and heightened risks that they all faced.

The weapons were real, the plans were real, the targets were real, the training was real, and the expectation of war with the Soviet Union was very real indeed; so real in fact that the government built itself secure bunkers to protect and keep them safe. Our leaders have already acknowledged the dangers and heightened risks posed and have not been lacking in awarding themselves medals and honours in recognition of 'their' service during this period. If they are able to acknowledge the risks, why not the MoD who were and remain the servants of our government leaders?

One reason might be because it has come to light that NATO governments are so opposed to the issue of a Cold War medal is because of fears of upsetting former enemies, such as Russia, who are now regarded as international partners. Is this why former Soviet Leaders have received honours and medals from NATO governments? But doubt is shed upon this argument with the USA President elect [now President] Barack Obama endorsing a Cold War medal.

U.S. President Barak Obama said:

"The Cold War was a period that required both skilled diplomacy and military readiness. For veterans who had to be prepared to fight a war that most people agreed would be catastrophic, there certainly should be some recognition of service and willingness to defend and go to battle for the United States."

Speaking about how the USA award process, he continued:

"In each of the past two years, the Cold War Victory Medal has passed the House as part of its version of the annual defence authorization bill but has been stymied by influential members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I agree that the Cold War Victory Medal would be an appropriate honour and I certainly share the hope that this impasse can be broken soon."

The Home Service Force was established in 1982 because in part of the Cold War and the threat at that time. It was introduced to guard key points and installations likely to be a target of enemy Special Forces and saboteurs so releasing other units for mobile defence roles. It stood down in 1992 having played its part in the Cold War and

defence of the realm. The MoD would never create a force it didn't need, so its formation is testament to the dangers of the time.

During the Cold War the UK and all NATO troops without any question faced the real risk of missile attack from the Soviet Bloc. As already stated this fact has been enough in other theatres for medal qualification most notably for service in Cyprus during Op Granby.

This only reinforces the case for a National Defence Medal which whilst acknowledging the service given by veterans of the Cold War, would not offend former enemies.

9.6 South Atlantic

In 1982, Argentina and the United Kingdom engaged in a military conflict after diplomacy failed to resolve the issues over the disputed sovereignty of the Falkland Islands. On April 2nd, 1982 the Argentine government deployed members of its armed forces and reclaimed what they believed was part of their national territory known to them as the 'Malvinas'. In response Britain despatched a task force to retake the Islands, the rest as they say is history, and another fine example of HM Forces ability, professionalism and heroism.

There was never any formal declaration of war, and the conflict was contained almost entirely to the disputed territories of the Falklands, South Georgia and the exclusion zone. The sinking of the Argentine cruiser '*General Belgrano*' was a notable exception.

Because of the enormity of distance between the UK and the Falklands, Britain was granted permission to use Ascension Island, some 4,000 miles north of the conflict area. It provided a major supply base where arms and ammunition could be ferried to supply and support the Task Force. With its 10,000ft '*Wideawake*' runway, Ascension Island was the only forward base that could possibly be used. Yet it had almost no port facilities save for one small jetty and a loading crane situated in Clarence Bay, which wasn't always in service because of roughness the Atlantic waves. The single runway and limited dispersal areas meant that there were huge logistical challenges maintaining supplies, fuel and support to a conflict 4,000 miles away to the South West.

However, some reconnaissance, air drops and sorties were flown from Ascension Island. The British Forces Support Unit commanded by Royal Navy Capt R McQueen incorporated all three services, consisting of some 1,000 personnel. For example the Royal Engineers Postal and Courier Service handled 2 tons of airmail daily and 1,000 bags of parcels each week.

The Royal Navy largely contained the threat from the Argentine Navy, and the distance from the disputed territories meant there was never any real threat to Ascension Island from Argentine sea attack or amphibious assault. The sinking of the '*General Belgrano*' caused any Argentine Naval involvement to almost disappear and they kept their one remaining Carrier in Port, although there was no evidence and a questionable capability of them ever striking at Ascension in any case. Furthermore, an air attack by the Argentine Air Force was virtually impossible because with only two tanker aircraft (KC-130) to serve the whole Argentinian air force and navy, and considering its traditional hostilities with Chile, the Argentine Air Force was committed to other defensive priorities and therefore never posed any real threat outside of the conflict zone. It is safe to say that the '*risk*' to Ascension Island was actually '*nil*'.

There is no dispute that troops on Ascension performed an important support role, but it is also clear that there was never any heightened risks or rigour to the units there. Nevertheless, they did qualify for the South Atlantic Medal without rosette after 30 days, and rightly so. The role was clear but the simple omission of the rosette differentiated those recipients from those who served in the actual war zone. This was a simple and successful method to recognise all those involved in the effort. A method that if used consistently could have recognised many other support roles in other conflicts before and after this one.

Those who flew 1 operational sortie or who served in the Falkland Islands qualified after one day, with rosette. In what seems to have been a rare example of fair-mindedness, the HD Committee clearly recognised the role of support units, albeit they were operating in areas of absolute safety on this occasion

Another example is those serving aboard HMS Ledbury, HMS Brecon and RMS St Helena sailed as part of Operation Corporate from Rosyth on the 15th May 1982, before the Argentine surrender. As the war reached its conclusion it became clear that a major clearing-up operation would be required, with the intention of making the

islands coastal waters safe, this was achieved with total professionalism with these three ships playing a major role. They were denied the South Atlantic Medal due to lack of accumulated days before the war ended, however their task and the risks involved were still very real as they continued their operations.

The many other service personnel who reached the Islands immediately after the official end of the conflict did so with a clear threat still hanging over their heads. Conditions remained harsh, equipment was poor, there was much unexploded ordnance and mines (there still is today!). Interestingly a 'Mine Clearance' GSM has been issued in the past.

The Argentineans have not given up their claim on the Islands and the tour is still operational. Troops arriving in the area are left in no doubt about the threat and importance of their role. It is thought by many veterans who served in the Falklands conflict after the end of the official war that the award of a GSM would be a suitable and likely least divisive method of paying tribute to those who were subject to risk and rigour above normal service, but were given no award for their service.

9.7 British Nuclear Testing

Benjamin Browne, QC, speaking for around 1,000 servicemen who took part in the programme in the South Pacific said the Government has resisted "...with the utmost determination and all the colossal resources – legal, financial and scientific at its command...", the claims for compensation by the British Nuclear Test Veterans Association.

Yet even though the British Government accepted scientific evidence "...of the highest repute..." demonstrating a link between the veterans' exposure to radiation and cancer, their lawyers continue to "seek to rubbish that report at every turn". Ultimately the High Court will decide.

You may well ask what this has to do with a National Defence Medal and other medals mentioned in this paper? Well, there are some striking similarities with the arguments against overwhelming evidence. The latest, even though scientific information has only recently been made available, is that the case for compensation has been made far too late! A phrase the HD Committee is well versed with.

The nuclear testing was driven by the very real threat of the Cold War. Our forces were constantly exercised and drilled to repel an attack and weapons testing forms a part of that routine. This testing was not part of any campaign, as the MoD does not recognise the Cold War as a campaign or even service worthy of recognition. So by default, the appalling dangers these veterans were exposed to must have been viewed as a part of – in the words of the previous veterans minister Derek Twigg MP and Mr R T Coney – "normal service life".

We are told that the British awards system is based on 'Risk' and 'Rigour'. Would any Minister or senior civil servant at the MoD volunteer today for these tests? With the undisputed scientific data now available, we would suggest all would rather take their chances in a war zone, than made to sit and watch a Nuclear explosion, and soak up the resulting radioactive rays. The risks and rigours faced by veterans during nuclear testing in the '50s have sentenced many to tragic consequences and years of pain and suffering.

Contrast the British position to that of the New Zealand government which announced it had instituted a New Zealand Special Service Medal (NZSSM) to recognise service to New Zealand in very difficult, adverse, or hazardous circumstances, that do not fit the criteria of operational service.

The NZSSM is initially being awarded to New Zealand service personnel and civilians who formed part of official New Zealand presence at atmospheric nuclear tests. This includes attendance at British nuclear tests in the Pacific and Australia in 1956-58, American tests in 1957-58, and French testing at Mururoa Atoll in 1973. Mark Burton, New Zealand veterans affairs spokesman, said:

"Nuclear Test Veterans have fought for decades to have their concerns and grievances recognise. The medal presentation is another step taken by this government to address those grievances."

If there is any consistency to be found within the MoD and its modus operandi, it is in the way that it has consistently dragged its collective feet when it comes to recognition of the concept of 'duty of care'. The plight of those whose health has been shattered has come about because incumbents at the MoD and their predecessors have felt themselves to have complete indemnity as far as any adverse fallout from decisions taken by them is concerned. What a great pity this 'protection' never applied to the nuclear fallout that trusting troops were subjected

to as well! It is now evident that health problems resulting from radiation exposure will, for those who have been afflicted, most likely, extend through several generations – the sin being not of the fathers – but rather of the 'mothers' that deliberately exposed them!

But it isn't only these veterans who were exposed to radiation risks. I refer to the other forgotten soldiers: those who were occupying forces in Japan at the end of World War Two, working on what we call these days 'Ground Zero'.

Many veterans have nothing more than what amounts to a 'report card' containing the magic word 'exemplary'. Once again a private unofficial commemorative medal has been struck to try and give these brave veterans something they can proudly wear in honour of their and their families unquestionable sacrifice. Please do not leave it until the last few survive to give them a medal to wear when they will no longer be concerned about such vainglorious things.

9.8 Global War on Terror

We have won the '*Cold War*' and now have to fight the '*War on Terror*'. By virtue of Britain's declared war against the IRA, HM Armed Forces are already well versed in terror tactics. In combating this latest threat to our National Security, it is the first duty of our government to ensure the defence of our nation. Defence starts on the home front but can be far reaching. If the government assessments were correct, then the UK was just 45 minutes away from an Iraqi missile attack.

Because of the threat of Scud Missile Attack, service personnel in Cyprus were issued with campaign medals during the first Gulf War. If the same criteria was applied during the Cold War or the second Gulf War, then all service personnel who served during those periods would qualify for a medal, being that the UK was well within range of a very real and imminent threat of attack. Clearly the application of criteria is wholly inconsistent and divisive and, far from being standard, the risk and rigour argument applied to HM Armed Forces in Cyprus is either dubious or has been applied wrongly, selectively and unfairly. HM Armed Forces across the length and breadth of the British mainland as well as Europe, were certainly well within harms way during the War against the IRA, many paying with life and limb and if the same criteria were applied to them – fairly – they would have qualified for a medal.

There is however a principle, albeit implemented badly, that to recognise forces outside of theatre who either directly or indirectly support operations is correct and proper. This could be in the form of a GSM without a clasp or perhaps more suitably, with a National Defence Medal to reward operational support. As we have shown, our Armed Forces – no matter where they serve in the world today – are a target and well within reach of those who would plot against this country and its values.

9.9 Normal Service Life

Crews battled for 40 minutes to reach two Royal Navy sailors killed in a blast aboard a British nuclear submarine, an inquest has heard. The victims were trapped in a cramped compartment on HMS *Tireless* which was taking part in war games beneath the Arctic ice pack in March 2007. An oxygen processing machine blew up, filling their tiny compartment with smoke and buckling the hatch doors so rescuers could not get to them.

The incident happened in one of the harshest environments on the planet. HMS *Tireless* was submerged hundreds of feet under an ice pack about 170 miles north of Deadhorse, which is in Prudhoe Bay, Northern Alaska.

HMS *Tireless*, which had around 130 men on board, was not badly damaged and remained seaworthy. It had been taking part in a joint exercise with an American submarine, the USS *Alexandria*, to test their capability and tactics in Arctic waters.

The incident led to Armed Forces Minister Bob Ainsworth issuing an 'unreserved' apology in the Commons, after it emerged that the oxygen processing machine that exploded had been contaminated with oil. A Board of Inquiry heavily criticised the Navy and the Ministry of Defence and blamed 'systematic failings' within the organisations for the tragedy.

One of the submariner's parents condemned the Government for refusing to fund the family's lawyer. The MoD has said that all the old oxygen canisters have since been replaced by new, redesigned emergency oxygen generators. The inquest was heard without a jury.

Exercises and 'schemes' always produce some sort of casualty list and no matter how 'high tech' the equipment, extreme peril is part and parcel of a serviceman's lot, even when the bullets are not flying in earnest. Explained away as an equipment failure, this incident was actually a failure to equip with the best available tools for the job, very dodgy practice given the cost of a nuclear submarine that might have suffered catastrophic failure because of 'penny pinching' practices.

Failure by top management could be argued as the biggest single risk element, this applies to equipment and at times a lack of support from Whitehall for the troops at the sharp end.

Statements from the MoD insist this example does not meet any 'risk and rigour' criteria, and living or dying in these circumstances is 'part of normal service life'. If we looked at the many cases of death or injury of service personnel whilst not in a war zone, you will find that with the job comes very real risks and rigours. Perhaps the public do not realise this fact, perhaps a form of recognition to honour all these special people might educate the public and reward the loyal and brave. Our service personnel are not disposable assets and should never be treated as such.

9.10 Chemical Warfare Testing

Two papers published in the *British Medical Journal* report results from an independent scientific study of death and cancer rates in veterans who took part in the Ministry of Defence's Human Volunteer Programme (HVP) at Porton Down between 1941 and 1989. The Human Volunteer Programme tested the effects of exposure to chemical warfare agents on people, and the protective potential of respirators or clothing against these chemicals. This is the first time that information on the long-term health of veterans included in these tests has been assembled and published.

Over the course of study, 18,276 men were identified as having taken part in experimental tests at Porton Down and followed up for an average of 40 years between 1941 and 2004. Porton Down veterans (PDVs) were found to have a slightly higher death rate than a similar group of 17,600 veterans who did not participate. This increase was estimated to be 6% and is described as an excess of mortality. This means that 6% more men died over the course of the average 40 year follow up period in the PDV group than in the group of veterans who did not participate in the HVP.

Records show almost 500 different chemicals were used, including blistering weapons, like mustard gas, and nerve agents, including sarin. Volunteers say they were told they were helping find a cure for the common cold.

Last year, the Government agreed to pay £3m in compensation to a group of 369 veterans who sued over claims their health had been affected by deliberate exposure to nerve gases and other toxins. This retrospective payment is long overdue, as is the recognition of their service which could not even by service life ever be classed as 'Normal'.

10. A View From A Recognised Expert In The Field – Extract from an article in *Medal News* by Ashley Tinson.

10.1 Qualification Periods For Campaign Medals

"RECENTLY I have been working on my contribution to the medals section of the Royal British Legion website. It includes a lot of information on claiming medals and lapel badges.

For some time I have also included information sheets on the campaign medals of the two World Wars, illustrating ribbons and giving the basic qualifications and order of wear. As I have been getting an increasing number of queries on post war medals I recently compiled a similar set of information for campaign medals from 1945 to the present. Keeping up with this is a problem, especially now that the Police and other emergency services often get

involved in operations which earn medals unknown to the Armed Forces. Permission to wear these is often divorced from the familiar military documentation, so it is difficult to determine.

Anyway, the point of this article is to highlight trends which have diverged radically from the old familiar rules governing campaign medals. In the past it was sufficient to be present in a certain defined area, under a named commander and between certain dates to qualify for a medal. I once heard a very senior officer refer to the Indian General Service Medal (which he held) as the IWT (I was there) Medal. This attitude pertained right up to 1939 and, in the main, to awards for 1939-1945, though notable exceptions were the Atlantic Star and Defence Medal.

10.2 Post 1945

Post 1945, this attitude continued at first with the GSMs for SE Asia, Palestine and Malaya being given for one day in theatre, as was the Korea Medal. Then a couple of unfortunate experiments were conducted starting with the Africa GSM for Kenya which required 91 days to qualify for those on the ground. For some totally illogical reason, aircrew qualified after only 30 days. This was in a campaign where no aircraft was likely to be threatened by a home made gun, with which most of the opposition were armed. Pilots of the Kenya Police Reserve Air Wing, on whom the Army depended for resupply and location finding in an area with poor maps, probably justified this reduced period, but RAF bomber crews certainly did nothing to justify it. So we had a situation where those in three-year desk jobs in Nairobi were certain to qualify; and RAP aircrew on high level bombing missions qualified after only a month. Whereas those actually patrolling against the Mau Mau might be posted with their unit before qualifying so got nothing.

10.3 The Cyprus Travesty

Worse was to follow in Cyprus where the qualifying period was 120 days, four months. It is said that this was due to Field Marshal Sir John Harding, the Governor, being concerned that those who took part in the 1956 invasion of Egypt would receive two clasps for a short spell of action. This is probably true as the two clasps to the GSM were announced in consecutive Army Orders (AO 80/57 and AO 81/57). The result of this was that many who patrolled against EOKA terrorists in Cyprus failed to qualify because they were whisked off to Jordan to support the king. As there was no fighting in Jordan, there was no medal, and many did not return to Cyprus, so the four month qualifying period meant they got nothing. This has led directly to one of the more justifiable Commemorative medals which was instigated by Mr George Harris after he failed to get MoD to accept the case for an official medal. He organised the medal which was approved by, and bears the head of, HR1-I the late King Hussein of Jordan. All profits of which go to Forces charities.

10.4 Qualification Settles Down

After this most medals required a steady 30 days for qualification. There were still anomalies for no discernable reason. Those ashore in the Falklands got their medal with a rose emblem after one day, but in the Gulf War those taking part had to serve for seven days, though aircrew qualified after one sortie.

Latterly, things have got even more complicated with the Operational Service Medal (OSM). In Sierra Leone those engaged in two named operations got their medal and rose emblem for the one day of the operations. Others varied from 21, 30 and 45 days; all was for service in Sierra Leone however, the 45 day period included service in Senegal.

The OSM for Afghanistan, on the other hand, is given with clasp for those in the country for various periods of five days or one sortie, 21 days and 30 days. Without the clasp 14 days or 21 days were needed and the locations eligible include places as far from Afghanistan as Mombasa in Kenya and Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

The OSM for the Congo, with clasp DROC, required 25 days or five flights Entebbe-Bunia-Entebbe. Following the lead of the Gulf Medal, the Iraq Medal with clasp required seven days or three sorties, while without the clasp the periods vary from 30 days to 45 days or ten or 30 sectors for aircrew dependent on location and dates.

Whatever the justification for this variety of periods, made more complicated by an increasing use of continuous periods instead of aggregated service, there is little doubt that those compiling the rules never look back to compare past decisions with current ones. Why should one day in the Falklands qualify whereas those in the Gulf War or Iraq have to do seven days? In Afghanistan it is five, 21 or 30 days dependent on dates. In many cases the actual circumstances in these places must have involved very similar activities.

The rationale behind reduced periods for aircrew is also difficult to understand. No one would quarrel with a pilot or navigator qualifying by one sortie when this involves flying into enemy air defence zones, but surely there can be no reason for this preferential treatment where the danger is confined to the normal ones related to flying. Another injustice I have heard is that while RAF ground engineers on operational sorties are often classified as aircrew, RAF Regiment waist gunners in helicopters are classified as ground crew so do not benefit from the reduced periods.

10.5 The Answer; Defence Service Medal

It seems that the practice of awarding medals with clasps/roses to denote service at the sharp end and without these embellishments for service in support, will feed the ever present disapproval of those at the sharp end having their awards debased by those in rear areas getting the same medals. This will ever be the case, but giving a medal to someone in Mombasa for operations in Afghanistan does seem idiotic. That the added work due to operations should be recognised does not need emphasis, but this should not be an OSM or War Medal.

There is a case for something on the lines of the USA Defence Service Medal being given to all, after basic training, at times when the Armed Forces are engaged in operations. This would probably include almost every day since 1945 and would recognise the added work due to operations throughout the entire organisation.

It would be fiercely argued and, as with all medals, there will be arguments against, however, this would surely be preferable to giving a war medal to someone hundreds of miles from the action in order to recognise his or her contribution to the operations in hand.

If this had been done earlier, it might have lessened the popularity of, and need for, many of the "Bling" medals."

By Lt Col Ashley Tinson, Medal News, Medal advisor to the RBL.

11. A Proposal

There are so many legitimate claims for medals that we have only highlighted some of the better known of them. Each claim has its merits. If a consistent approach had been maintained to each claim then there would undoubtedly be less argument, however this is clearly not the case.

We have heard that retrospective claims will not be looked at, even this is contentious as the 'Canal Zone' GSM proves. So what is the way forward? There are many options; one need only look at the comprehensive and thorough approach of New Zealand. But we confine ourselves to a single proposal that will give all those who served the official award that so many should have earned, but sadly so far have been denied.

The National Defence Medal is a simple and all encompassing official award, with simple qualification criteria which is far less divisive than much we have talked about in this paper. It is not a step on a slippery slope to a devalued honours system, rather a decisive step to put right a long and ongoing injustice and insult to our Veterans.

The National Defence Medal (NDM) should be awarded to a member, or former member, of HM Forces who after September 3rd, 1945 has given qualifying service that is efficient service:

- (a) by completing an initial enlistment period; or
- (b) for a period of not less than 2 years service; or
- (c) for periods that total not less than 2 years; or
- (d) for a period or periods that total less than 2 years, being service that the member was unable to continue for one or more of the following reasons:
 - (i) the death of the member during service;
 - (ii) the discharge of the member as medically unfit due to a compensable impairment;
 - (iii) the discharge of the member due to a prevailing discriminatory Defence policy, as determined by the Chief of Defence Staff or Ministry of Defence.
 - (iv) redundancy from HM Armed Forces either voluntary or involuntary regardless of the length of service.

Notes:

The initial period is accompanied by a prerequisite of unbroken Good Conduct

Where a disciplinary offence is recorded during the initial period, that period shall start anew on completion of any penalties incurred

12. What is a Veteran?

We have used throughout this paper the word “veteran” also the term ‘ex-service’ personnel both are primarily used to differentiate between current serving members of the armed forces and those whom have left. For the purposes of this paper either should cover anyone who has served since the end of WW2 in 1945 to today’s date. It is interesting to see another definition for what a ‘veteran’ is. Taken from: “*The veteran comes back*”, New York: Dryden Press, Jones & Wessely (2005) p164. is the following quote from the sociologist Waller in his 1944 paper

“The veteran is always a powerful political force, for good or evil, because others cannot protect themselves from him. He has fought for the flag and absorbed some of the manna. He is sacred. He is covered with pathos and immune from criticism (Waller, 1944, p. 189).”

Jones & Wessely also states with respect to the quote,

“Writing at the time [1944], the sociologist, Waller, had described the strength of the veterans’ lobby, observations that remain true to this day.”

The quote is just as powerful and true in the context of this paper, and those people and organisations that have endorsed the concept of a National Defence Medal for all past, present, and future, United Kingdom armed forces personnel.

13. Conclusion

The case as outlined in the preceding chapters has been the result of comprehensive discussions with the public, veterans, serving personnel, politicians and civil servants. The report has sought to reconcile the desire for recognition and the proposals expressed in the submissions it received, with imperatives of government policy and practical considerations. It has sought to do so through applying a set of readily understood measures and principles.

Now that you have read the wealth of argument put forth in favour of the NDM concept and seen the evasive, and possibly dubious and reactionary responses from the small coterie that are empowered to place before the Sovereign any suggested amendments to the honours, awards and medals bestowed in her name. You will have recognised that the need is real, the cause is just and the support widespread throughout the entire community. It is not right, nor was it ever intended, that these people set themselves up as ‘Judge and Jury’ in matters relating to the awards system. By default they have assumed powers never intended for them and in so doing, have been exercising a power and influence of which they have no right.

In putting forth the campaign for an NDM, this usurpation of authority has been comprehensively exposed, so it must be argued that not only is the system of awards outdated to the point of being archaic but the ‘organisation’ set up to oversee it is also outdated, outmoded, out of touch and out of order! A ‘*dog in the manger*’ attitude that has become entrenched and indeed evolved into ‘*traditional*’ as regards the mindset of those entrusted with this task of looking after the honours system. It has become the mantra of these people that no change will be considered or tolerated and sadly, many of the current upper echelons of the Armed Forces seem to support this attitude of not disturbing ‘tradition’.

Some traditions are worthy of keeping – ‘*Trooping the Colour*’ springs to mind – but others are manifestly lacking and one such has clearly been identified here. It is not always a bad thing to preserve old buildings, or even the facades thereof, which are of architectural interest or significance. But preserving a prejudice based on a misappropriation of power can hardly be considered as right or worthy.

There are a number of recommendations and proposals in this paper which either represent a departure from current practice in the United Kingdom system of honours and awards, or which challenge or extend some aspects of existing policy. We make no apology for this. The mandate for this paper was to examine existing problems,

anomalies and other matters from a fresh perspective. That perspective will inevitably be different to the perspective of those who have developed and administered the honours system to date. The approach to the issues referred to is from the perspective of 2008 and of what is considered fair and reasonable today. We have sought to take account of changing attitudes in a changing world, to ensure that its recommendations will meet the needs of British society into the next century. We acknowledge that the approach taken towards the recognition of service with medals today is perhaps a little more liberal than the approach taken at the beginning of the last century.

Many of the submissions received during the extensive information gathering phase across the UK evidenced a passion and a depth of feeling which was, frankly, quite extraordinary. We simply note that there are a large number of ex-servicemen and women in this country and others who have worked in military-type conditions, who feel that they have not been given the recognition they deserve. In some cases, they have carried such a view for over 50 years. It may seem a small thing to give a service medal, but the symbolism of such recognition is so powerful that it is coveted by some to the exclusion of all other forms of recognition, all recommendations and proposals should thus be considered in this light.

There are considerable resources involved in administering our national system of honours and awards. We feel sure they will, if allowed, rise to the challenge to deal with a National Defence Medal with their usual diligence, commitment and the tactfulness discharging a job which is sometimes difficult and sensitive. The new award will have to be created, manufactured and issued. Each of these stages has its own difficulties - some are time consuming, others involve complicated record keeping and other administrative systems. All steps should be taken to allow the relevant issuing authorities to continue to meet the high standards they have set themselves. They will, after all, be performing a service of recognition on behalf of a grateful nation.

The Commonwealth nations that we share so much common history with have demonstrated quite clearly that while it is feasible to uphold the highest honour, the Victoria Cross (VC), as an exemplar that has become an inviolate and revered honour for all time, it is entirely impractical to try to extend a protection order that prevents any other changes to an otherwise archaic, confusing and inadequate system of military awards. The more so when the military awards are the only section of the honours system to which any sort of stasis is applied and the lack of restraint in apportioning other honours to unlikely and sometimes unworthy recipients is so blatant. That this is coupled with decisions which fly in the face of such 'rules' that are seemingly applied in a way that can be amended to suit the needs of the day, but are still said to be inviolable to outside pressure, add to the dismay and confusion of veterans. It is this that brings the present system into disrepute and angers so many veterans from all eras and it is this that causes so many veterans to seek out commercial medals that, while they have no 'standing', do at least demonstrate that a person did serve and where. Change is now desperately needed and change must perforce be implemented, before the military medals of Britain become quite meaningless and thus, devalued to the point of being deemed worthless.

The case for the issuance of a National Defence Medal for all ranks is impossible to argue against and it should be made a priority issue, not left until there are only a handful of 'Cold War' veterans or National Servicemen left to receive it in the very last moments of their dotage. Remember:

"There's nothing more important to troops than a medal - they are incredibly emotive and they mean the world to soldiers." Patrick Mercer, MP for Newark, and former infantry commander –
Daily Telegraph 19/04/2008

We thank you for your valued support!

14. NDM Society Committee

The National Defence Medal Society Committee wish to thank the many contributors to this report. There are far too many to list here, but rest assured your input has been greatly appreciated. Your committee is listed below:

Position	Name	Service
Patron	Mr Arnold Schwartzman OBE, RDI	Royal Sussex Regiment
Chairman	Mr Anthony Morland	Royal Signals, AAC (V)
Vice Chairman	Mr Charles Lovelace (Lt. RMV)	RM, RMV, Queen's 6/7 (V) HSF Lt.
Southern Hemisphere Officer	Mr Gerald Peck	REME
North American Officer	Mr Richard Farrar	Royal Sussex Regiment
Canada Coordinator	Major (Ret) Sean Pollock	Royal Canadian Air Force
South West Area Officer	Mr Andrew Davies	Royal Air Force
South East Area Officer	Mr Roy Wilson	Royal Artillery
Scotland Officer	Mr Stuart Mathewson	Parachute Regiment (V)
N. Ireland Officer	Mr A Gordon	Irish Guards
Midlands Officer	Mr David M Kelley, BSc	RAF Regiment
Northern Officer	Mr S E Willson	Royal Corps of Signals
NSVA Sub Committee Lead	Mr Franklin Hood, BEM	Royal Corps of Signals
NSVA Sub Committee Lead	Mr Derek Hughes	Royal Artillery
NSVA Sub Committee Lead	Mr Fred Flint	Royal Army Ordnance Corps
Treasurer	Mr Christopher Hill	

It is only right we mention Honorary Patron Charles Lionel Golder, MBE (RSM, REME 1928-63) and our Officer for Wales George Harris (Royal Engineers), both staunch supporters for a National Defence Medal but now sadly deceased. We dearly hope their families will eventually receive a posthumous award.

15. Reference Documentation

Ministry of Defence

Joint Service Publication (JSP 761) - The authoritative guide for Honours and Awards in the Armed Services
Medal Booklet - British Armed Forces Medals

Government

A Matter of Honour - Reforming The Honours System, Public Administration Select Committee, 5th Report
Bill to provide for parliamentary scrutiny - of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals
Retrospective Medal Campaigns - A Parliament briefing document, lacks depth and accuracy
Public Servants & Honours - Extract from the Wilson Report
Operation of the honours system - Public Administration Select Committee, minutes of evidence

NDM Campaign

Veterans Recognition Report (Draft) - NDM Campaign Report
House of Commons Debates 21 May 2008, Column 322 - Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals
Arctic Convoy Emblem Plan – BBC News

Conservative Party

Restoring The Covenant - The military covenant commissions report to the leader of the Conservative Party

Australian Military

S48-06 ADM - Australian Defence Medal Regulations 2006
Implementation of the (Australian) Korean Post-Armistice Service - Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Review October 2008
Report of the Post-Armistice Korean Service Review - Australian Government Department of Defence Report December 2005
Return From Active Service Badge - Parliamentary Secretary for Defence Post Armistice South Korea
Eligibility Criteria For ASM Clasps Australian service Medal - Australian Government Department of Defence
Australian Government Department of Defence – Eligibility Criteria For ASM Clasps Australian service Medal

Canadian Military

Canadian Military Medals & Decorations - Veterans Affairs Canada
Directorate of Honours and Recognition – Canadian Military Secretariat
Veterans Affairs Canada – Peacekeeping medal

New Zealand Military

New Zealand Campaign Medals - New Zealand Defence Force
New Zealand Defence Force – GSM Warlike 1992
New Zealand Defence Force – GSM Non-Warlike Clasps

USA Military

National Defense Service Medal - For United States military who served honorably during a designated time period

Norway Military

National Defence Service Medal - Awarded upon completion of 1 year military service

German Military

Bundeswehr Medal of Honour - An individual may become eligible after completing a minimum of seven months of service and being nominated for exemplary service within that period. But the award evolves in stages to recognise up to 20 years service.

French Military

Medal of National Defence - Rewards honourable military service, 3 echelons: **Bronze** 6 months of service – **Silver** 5 years of service – **Gold** 10 years of service.

Appendix A - Particulars of some of the Medals referred to in the report:

Table 1 - ADM


<p>Australian Defence Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2006</p> <p>The Australian Defence Medal may be awarded to a member, or former member, of the Defence Forces who after September 3rd, 1945 has given qualifying service that is efficient service:</p> <p>(a) by completing an initial enlistment period (National Service Qualifies); or (b) for a period of not less than 4 years service; or (c) for periods that total not less than 4 years; or (d) for a period or periods that total less than 4 years, being service that the member was unable to continue for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) the death of the member during service; (ii) the discharge of the member as medically unfit due to a compensable impairment; (iii) the discharge of the member due to a prevailing discriminatory Defence policy, as determined by the Chief of Defence Staff or Defence Ministry.</p>
--	--

Table 2 - ASM


<p>Australian Service Medal 1945 – 1975</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1995</p> <p>The Australian Service Medal 1945-1975 was established in 1995 to recognise a large number of Australian service personnel who did not receive any award for their non-warlike operational service in the period 1945-1975. The creation of this award was one of the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into Defence Awards that reported to government in 1994.</p> <p>The award's aim is to recognise service in prescribed peacekeeping or non-warlike operations during the period 1945-1975 where recognition had not been extended previously through an award.</p> <p>The Australian Service Medal is awarded for 30 days cumulative service in with British Commonwealth Forces.</p> <p>Most notable clasps of the 12 The Governor-General has approved include Korea, Berlin, Germany, and Middle East.</p>
---	--

Table 3 - CPSM


<p>Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2000</p> <p>The Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal (CPSM). The prestigious Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to all United Nations Peacekeepers in 1988 in recognition of their collective efforts in the cause of peace. This inspired the creation of the Canadian Peacekeeping Service Medal (CPSM) to acknowledge the unique contribution to peace that Canadian peacekeepers have made since 1947. Thousands of Canadian personnel have served in peacekeeping missions over the past 53 years. An incredible record and this tradition in the “service of peace” continues today.</p> <p>The Eligibility & Criteria Awarded for a minimum of 30 days cumulative service in a UN or international peacekeeping mission</p> <p>Authorised Missions: Many including: United Nations Command in KOREA July 28th, 1953 to June 27th, 1957.</p>
---	--

Table 4 - NZGSM


<p>New Zealand General Service Medal 1992 (Non-Warlike)</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1992</p> <p>The New Zealand General Service Medal 1992 was issued in bronze to recognise service in non-warlike operations for which no separate New Zealand, British Commonwealth, United Nations or NATO campaign medal was issued. Thirteen clasps have been issued for non-warlike (peacekeeping) operations since 1954 in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and the Pacific. In 2002, the NZGSM 1992 was replaced by the New Zealand General Service Medal 2002.</p> <p>The medal is awarded with a clasp to describe where an individual served. It is worn as a war medal, in order of date of qualification. The New Zealand General Service Medal 1992 has also been issued in silver for warlike operations.</p> <p>Requirement: 30 days cumulative service in Korea, its adjacent waters or Japan from 27/7/54 to 31/12/57 while part of British Commonwealth Forces attached to the United Nations Unified Command</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Clasps include:</td> <td>Korea 1954 – 57</td> <td>27 July 1954 and 31 December 1957</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Korea 1958 – 2000</td> <td>1 January 1958 to 31 December 2000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Iraq</td> <td>1 August 1991 and 31 January 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Arabian Gulf</td> <td>4 October 1995 and 31 December 2001</td> </tr> </table>	Clasps include:	Korea 1954 – 57	27 July 1954 and 31 December 1957		Korea 1958 – 2000	1 January 1958 to 31 December 2000		Iraq	1 August 1991 and 31 January 2003		Arabian Gulf	4 October 1995 and 31 December 2001
Clasps include:	Korea 1954 – 57	27 July 1954 and 31 December 1957											
	Korea 1958 – 2000	1 January 1958 to 31 December 2000											
	Iraq	1 August 1991 and 31 January 2003											
	Arabian Gulf	4 October 1995 and 31 December 2001											

Table 5 - KDSM


<p>Korea Defense Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2002</p> <p>The Korea Defense Service Medal is a United States military decoration and is authorized for those members of the U.S. military who have served duty in the Republic of Korea to uphold the armistice between South and North Korea. To qualify for the KDSM, a service member must have served at least thirty consecutive days in the Korean theater. The medal is also granted for 60 non-consecutive days of service which includes reservists on annual training in Korea.</p> <p>Exceptions are made for the 30/60 days time requirement if a service member participated in a combat armed engagement, was wounded or injured in the line of duty requiring medical evacuation, or participated as a regularly assigned aircrew member in flying sorties which totaled more than 30 days of duty in Korean airspace. In such cases, the KDSM is authorized regardless of time served in theater.</p> <p>The Korea Defense Service Medal is retroactive to the end of the Korean War and is granted to any service performed after July 28th, 1954</p>
--	---

Table 6 - NDSM


<p>National Defense Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2001 (2nd time)</p> <p>The National Defense Service Medal (NDSM) is awarded to anyone who serves on active duty in the United States military during specified time periods. For service in the Gulf War and War on Terrorism, it is also authorized for members of the Reserves or National Guard ordered to active duty or who are performing "reserve service in good standing" which normally translates as regular attendance at monthly drills and performance in yearly training.</p> <p>National Defense Service Medal has no other award criteria, except that a recipient must have performed duty for not less than 90 days or the completion of their initial entry training.</p> <p>The NDSM is authorized only for the time period: September 11th, 2001 to a date to be announced for service during the War on Terrorism.</p>
--	---

Table 7 - CSSM


<p>Canada Special Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1984</p> <p>The Canada Special Service Medal is awarded to members of the Canadian Forces for a service performed under exceptional circumstances in a clearly defined locality for a specified duration, not necessarily in a theatre of active operation. The letters patent were signed by Queen Elizabeth II on 16 June 1984. The medal will only be issued with a bar, representing the particular special service. Where a member serves in a locality to warrant the award of a second medal, a bar only will be added to the original medal. The bars awarded to date are:</p> <p>NATO + OTAN (Authorized by PC 1992 - 2436, 26 November 1992) Covering service in Post World War 2 West Germany.</p> <p>Awarded for an aggregate of 180 days of honourable service with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), since its beginning on 01 January 1951 and still continuing. The time need not be continuous. Time spent serving aboard ships sailing under NATO control, crew aboard aircraft flying under NATO control; and units or personnel deployed for reinforcement or exercise in Europe under NATO control also qualify. (Canada Gazette, page 5134, 16 December 1992)</p> <p>Other Bars are: Pakistan 1989 – 90, Peace – Paix, Alert, Humanitas, Jugoslavija</p>
--	--

Table 8 - NZOSM


<p>New Zealand Operational Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2002</p> <p>The New Zealand Operational Service Medal (NZOSM) was instituted in 2002 for award to New Zealanders who have served on operations since 3 September 1945. The NZOSM provides specific New Zealand recognition for operational service, and is awarded in addition to any New Zealand, Commonwealth or foreign campaign medal. It is awarded once only to an individual, regardless of how many times he or she has deployed on operations.</p> <p>Personnel and veterans who have been awarded a campaign medal for operational service since 3 September 1945 qualify for the award of the NZOSM, provided that the particular campaign medal has been approved for acceptance.</p> <p>In addition, personnel who, under certain circumstances, have not completed the qualifying period for an approved campaign medal, but who have completed a specific period of service in an operational area towards such a medal (generally seven days on the posted strength of a qualifying unit), are eligible for the NZOSM. Full details on eligibility criteria and qualifying service are contained in the Royal Warrant and Regulations for the award.</p>
---	---

Table 9 - NZSSM


<p>New Zealand Special Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2002</p> <p>This medal was instituted by Queen Elizabeth II in 2002 to recognise personnel who undertook special operations which are not normally recognised by a Campaign medal. The Royal Warrant allows for a number of variants of the award, and to date, three New Zealand Special Service Medals have been struck: the NZSSM (Nuclear Testing) (images shown above), the NZSSM (Asian Tsunami), and the NZSSM (Erebus).</p> <p>The NZSSM (Nuclear Testing) recognises the service of those personnel who were part of an official New Zealand Government presence at an atmospheric nuclear test between 1956 and 1973.</p> <p>The award of the NZSSM does not qualify a recipient for the award of the New Zealand Operational Service Medal.</p>
---	--

Table 10 - FNMD


<p>French Medal of National Defence</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1982</p> <p>This medal was created in 1982 by French Defence Minister Charles Hernu. He took the idea of the General of Boissieu, anxious to reward the service of members of the armed forces as well those on active service.</p> <p><u>Three echelons</u> :</p> <p><u>Bronze</u>; 6 months service</p> <p><u>Silver</u>; 5 years of service</p> <p><u>Gold</u>; 10 years of service</p>
---	--

Table 11 - FNMD



<p>German Bundeswehr Crosses & Medal of Honour (Defence Medal)</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1980 The decoration has five grades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Bundeswehr (<u>Basic</u>) Medal of Honour ("Ehrenmedaille der Bundeswehr") An individual may become eligible after completing a period of 7 months of service and being nominated for exemplary conduct within that period. * Bundeswehr Cross of Honour in <u>Bronze</u> ("Ehrenkreuz der Bundeswehr in Bronze") An individual may become eligible after completing a period of 5 years of service and being nominated for exemplary service within that period. * Bundeswehr Cross of Honour in <u>Silver</u> ("Ehrenkreuz der Bundeswehr in Silber") An individual may become eligible after completing a period of 7 years of service and being nominated for exemplary service within that period. * Bundeswehr Cross of Honour in <u>Gold</u> ("Ehrenkreuz der Bundeswehr in Gold") An individual may become eligible after completing a period of 20 years of service and being nominated for exemplary service within that period. * Bundeswehr Cross of Honour for Bravery ("Ehrenkreuz der Bundeswehr für Tapferkeit") An individual may become eligible after performing deeds which "greatly exceed the expected degree of bravery".
---	---

Table 11 - NNSM

<p>Norway National Defence Service Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: unknown</p> <p>The Norwegian National Defence Service Medal is awarded upon completion of military service (usually one year, six months for the Home Guard). The medal exists in four versions, one for each branch of service (army, air force, navy and home guard).</p> <p>The front of the medal shows the crest of the service branch, and the reverse has the name of the branch and the armed forces motto "for fred og frihet" (bm) or "for fred og fridom"(nn) ("for peace and freedom").</p>
---	---

Britain's Answer? 80p Badge



Thousands of British troops served in Korea alongside their British Commonwealth comrades during the post-Armistice period in which, more than five years afterwards, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America have issued medals.

According to an Australian document released in 2005 entitled: *Report of the Post-Armistice Korean Service Review*, that studied conditions of service in Korea from 28 July 1953 until the last Australian combat troops were withdrawn on 19 April 1956, conditions under which Australian combat troops served were at least as arduous and dangerous as the many subsequent operations which have attracted similar medal recognition.

British combat troops, who like their Australian and New Zealand allies, were 'On Active Service' at the time were subject to exactly the same levels of risk and rigour (please refer to Chapter 8). However, they have absolutely nothing to show for their service other than a badge which cannot be worn on official occasions or with uniform.

Shocking! Many more British service men and women served their country faithfully in other theatres, again without any recognition. What veterans do not understand, no matter what the Secretariat at the MoD says, is why is it, if Australia, Canada and New Zealand have honoured their military personnel, can't the British do the same? After all didn't all veterans of the UK and Commonwealth nations swear an oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth II and her predecessors?

The same can be said of other active service deployments, not least of which was in Post World War Two Germany.

What is particularly interesting about the Australian, New Zealand and Canadian medal systems is that separate medals are issued for warlike and non-warlike operations, and some of the medals have been issued retroactively to 1945. However, Australia has gone one step further for post-Armistice Korean service, by also instituting in 2008 its own **General Service Medal - Korea**, recognising that the extremely demanding service in Korea during the period 28 July 1953 to 19 April 1956, when the last Australian operational troops were withdrawn, warranted recognition beyond the *Australian Service Medal with clasp 'KOREA'*. Thus, for these Commonwealth countries, there is no such thing as a *five-year rule* arbitrarily imposed by the HD Committee.

In the chart above, pay special attention to the dates the medals were instituted. There is no reason why the United Kingdom cannot also look back in time beyond five years and finally recognise British veterans properly. The 5-year rule as clearly demonstrated by Canada, Australia and New Zealand is no longer a sustainable argument for doing nothing. All of the other countries we have focused on, in addition to awarding medals, have also issue badges for informal wear, the purpose for which, of course, is very different from a medal.

Appendix B - Particulars of some badges & emblems referred to in the report:

Table 12


<p>UK Elizabeth Cross</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2009</p> <p>The Elizabeth Cross was recommended by the military chiefs to Her Majesty to recognise the huge debt this country owes to the families those brave individuals have left behind" and the concept has been hailed as innovative.</p> <p>However, whilst we applaud any recognition given to our fallen and their families, we should point out that the concept is not as innovative as the military chiefs would have us believe, the United Kingdom is yet again playing catch-up with our Commonwealth partners.</p>
--	--

Table 13


<p>New Zealand Memorial Cross</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1960</p> <p>The New Zealand Memorial Cross, which was first instituted on 16 August 1960, was originally granted to the next-of-kin of persons who had lost their lives on active service with New Zealand Forces during the Second World War, or who had subsequently died of wounds or illness contracted during that conflict.</p> <p>The cross was given to the mother, as well as the widow or eldest surviving daughter or son of the fallen. The cross has been issued one hundred and twenty-five times since 1945.</p>
--	---

Table 14


<p>Canadian Memorial Cross</p> 	<p>Instituted: 1919</p> <p>The Memorial Cross (more often referred to as the Silver Cross) was first instituted by Order-in-Council 2374, dated December 1, 1919. It was awarded to mothers and widows (next of kin) of Canadian soldiers who died on active duty or whose death was consequently attributed to such duty.</p> <p>The crosses were sent automatically to mothers and wives who qualified, and can be worn by the recipients anytime, even though they were not themselves veterans. The cross is engraved with the name and service number of the son or husband.</p> <p>The design of the newly instituted Elizabeth Cross is almost identical to the Canadian Memorial Cross. In January 2007, the Canadian Federal Government made a revision to the way the Memorial Cross is awarded, so that all service related-deaths were to be recognised, not only those occurring in overseas operations, and allowing the serviceman or woman to designate up to three recipients of the cross.</p>
---	---

Table 15

<p>Canadian Sacrifice Medal</p> 	<p>Instituted: 2008</p> <p>The Sacrifice Medal is a medal created by Letters patent in 2008.</p> <p>The Sacrifice Medal was created to recognize a member of the Canadian Forces, a member of an allied force, or a Canadian civilian under the authority of the Canadian Forces who, as of October 7, 2001, died or was wounded under honourable circumstances as a direct result of hostile action. . It is awarded to individuals on the recommendation of a commanding officer.</p>
--	---

- END -