

decision, I was instructed by POLAD NCC (1* equivalent) not to speak at the meeting. I believe this was because she did not want a contrary view being put at the meeting, but she did not explain why she told me not to speak.

49. At the meeting, the ICRC representatives expressed their concerns about the treatment of PW's and reported [REDACTED] hooding of PWs which violated the Geneva Conventions. The ICRC informed the meeting [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Some of the participants at the meeting (S002 ; David Frennd and Gavin Davies) tried to justify the UK approach to hooding on the grounds of security, both for the interrogators and the prisoners themselves.

50. There was also a discussion on blindfolding or using sunglasses as a (legal) alternative to hooding; one with which I also did not agree. I cannot recall the names of the ICRC delegates but one of the delegates [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. I am afraid that I am unable to identify her now. I was so appalled by the attempts to justify the conduct of the United Kingdom that I walked out of the meeting and went to get some fresh air.

51. At the end of the meeting however, I spoke to the female ICRC delegate and explained that I had been ordered not to speak at the meeting and assured her that I did not agree with the views that were being put forward by some of those at the meeting. She gave me her card (but I have been unable to find it since). I also spoke to S034 and expressed the view that I would "win" the debate over the treatment of PW's (MOD019893).

52. From my perspective, the issue of hooding was now in the hands of the NCC. I had no doubt that, given the seriousness of the situation; it would be staffed to PJHQ and to Ministers as there was going to be an official complaint to the UK Government by the ICRC. However, although a Theatre policy was adopted as a pragmatic way of solving the legal dispute between the NCC and HQ 1st (UK) Armoured Division, I was advised by PJHQ that they only endorsed my legal