

STAFF - INVESTIGATION  
OFFICER ONLY

807

Case Ref No: 64695/03

MOD Form 266A/B  
(Introduced 12/03)SERVICE POLICE  
WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, S.9; MC Act 1980, SS.5A (3a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r70)

Statement of:	Andrew Peter RIDGWAY CB CBE	
Rank/Status:	Lt Gen	
Age if under 18: (if over 18 insert "over 18")	Over 18	Occupation: HM Forces (Army)
This statement (consisting of 2 pages each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.		
Signature:	AP RIDGWAY	Dated the 27 <sup>th</sup> day of March 2006.

I am Lt Gen AP Ridgway, CB CBE.

Further to my previous statement dated 21 Jul 05.

I have today, Mon 27 Mar 06, been asked a number of questions by WO2 Spence, RMP (SIB), as detailed below:

In respect of Maj Peebles, what were his responsibilities and duties as the Battle Group Internment Review Officer (BGIRO) towards detainees?

I am not aware of his specific duties and responsibilities at the time as they would have been given to him through his Chain of Command.

In respect of WO2 Davies, likewise what were his responsibilities and duties as the Tactical Questioner (TQ) towards detainees?

I am not aware of his specific duties and responsibilities at the time as they would have been given to him through his Chain of Command.

Having regard to the use of stress positions if they are not part of the TQing process, in what circumstances should they be used? If any?

Signature: AP RIDGWAY

Signature Witnessed by: DPW SPENCE

-1

OFFICER ONLY  
STAFF - INVESTIGATION

CD

MOD000807

808

STAFF - INVESTIGATION  
OFFICER ONLY

(Continuation Sheet)

Sheet No	2	Case No:	64695/03
Continuation of statement of:	Lt Gen AP RIDGWAY		

There is nothing inherently wrong with the denial of vision or the use of stress positions if they are deemed necessary by the Operational Situation, but they may not be used as part of the Tactical Questioning or Interrogation processes. Neither may they be used in preparation for the Tactical Questioning and Interrogation processes. In the case of hooding to deny vision, this has been specifically forbidden due to difficulties it can cause with breathing and where vision is to be denied this is to be done with goggles.

Are the use of stress positions to achieve the objective required of Tactical Questioning considered contrary to the Geneva Convention and the Laws of Armed Conflict?

The application of International Law is complex and depends extensively on interpretation and that is why our commitment to International Humanitarian Law is supported by Policy Statements. This explains why several of our allies, who are equally committed to compliance with International Humanitarian Law, have difference interpretations as to what is and what is not acceptable. The use of sensory deprivation, which includes activities such as hooding, sleep deprivation and stress positions, was forbidden to UK Forces as part of the Tactical Questioning and Interrogation processes following a Ministerial Statement in 1972. Since that time it has neither been taught nor practised on any formal UK Tactical Questioning or Interrogation course. Indeed instruction on these courses specifically forbids the application of these techniques.

I have been briefed that the persons detained by 1 QLR during the enquiry under investigation may have been held in stress positions albeit intermittently for 36 hours, and whether this in any circumstances could be considered necessary?

Stress positions, as I have stated, may not be used in preparation for Tactical Questioning or Interrogation nor as part of Tactical Questioning and Interrogation irrespective of the time period. However, there may of course be other operational reasons which justify their use.

Having regard to the use of sleep deprivation as part of the TQing process, in what circumstances should it be used? If any?

Lack of sleep is an integral part of Military Operations, but the deliberate deprivation of sleep may not be used as part of the preparation for Tactical Questioning or Interrogation nor during the Tactical Questioning and Interrogation processes.

Is the use of sleep deprivation to achieve the objective required of Tactical Questioning considered contrary to the Geneva Convention and the Laws of Armed Conflict?

The deliberate deprivation of sleep as part of the Tactical Questioning and Interrogation processes is considered by the UK to be contrary to International Humanitarian Law.

Signature: AP RIDGWAY

Signature Witnessed by: DPW SPENCE

-2

OFFICER ONLY  
STAFF - INVESTIGATION

CD

MOD000808