Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Email: mojuk@mojuk.org.uk Web: www.mojuk.org.uk

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 764 (23/10/2019) - Cost £1

Oval Four' Could be Cleared After 47 Years in Wake of Corrupt Officer Case

Duncan Campbell, Guardian: Nearly 50 years after they were jailed for theft and assaulting the police in a highly controversial case in which they claimed to have been framed and beaten, four black men from south London could finally be cleared. Winston Trew, Sterling Christie, George Griffiths and Constantine "Omar" Boucher were arrested in March 1972 after a group of undercover police officers confronted them at Oval underground station and aggressively accused them of "nicking handbags" on the tube. They were held overnight, beaten in the cells and charged with attempting to steal, theft, and assault of the police. After a five-week trial at the Old Bailey, all four were convicted and jailed for two years in November 1972. At the time, mugging was a high-profile issue and routinely blamed on young black men. Last year, after another case involving the corrupt officer who led the operation that resulted in a conviction being overturned last year, one of the "Oval Four" applied to the Criminal Cases Review Commission. It is now referring the convictions to the court of appeal. The CCRC only refers a small number of cases each year and submission is typically viewed as highly likely to result in success. "It has been a long time coming," said Trew, now 69. "Finally we are getting justice."

The campaign in support of the Oval Four after their conviction featured marches and meetings at Lambeth town hall in Brixton. Eventually they were granted an appeal at which they were represented by the distinguished barrister, John Platts-Mills QC. Their sentences were reduced but their convictions upheld. The appeal court judge, Lord Justice James, told them that he hoped they appreciated the "gravity" of their offences and would not see the small reduction of their sentences as a "sign of weakness".

The detective sergeant who led the arrests was Derek Ridgewell, who had previously served with the Southern Rhodesian (now Zimbabwean) police. His practice, which led to many convictions, was to confront young black men at underground stations, accuse them of theft and then attribute incriminating remarks to them. If they resisted arrest, they were also accused of assaulting the police. Along with the Oval Four, he also arrested those who became known as the Stockwell Six, the Waterloo Four and the Tottenham Court Road Two. It was during the last of these cases that the courts finally realised that something was amiss. The two young men arrested at Tottenham Court Road underground station in 1973 were devout Jesuit students from Oxford University and the judge, Gwyn Morris, halted their trial and said: "I find it terrible that here in London people using public transport should be pounced upon by police officers without a word."

Ridgewell was quietly moved to a post investigating mail theft. He joined forces with a pair of career criminals with whom he split the proceeds from stolen mailbags before finally being arrested himself and jailed for seven years. Asked by the governor at Ford prison how he had become involved, his response was: "I just went bent." At the age of 37, he suffered a heart attack in jail and died. During his time on the mail theft squad, he used a similar arrest technique on three young white men who thought, when they were approached by the police in their car in south London, that it was merely because the music on their car radio was too loud. They soon found themselves charged with mailbag theft and being told by the duty solicitor that it would be inadvisable to accuse the police of lying when they came to court. They continued to protest in favour of their innocence but were all jailed in 1976.

One of their number, Stephen Simmons, who became a successful businessman, was always angered by his conviction, not least because his own parents did not believe the police would lie. A few years ago, he decided to investigate the case and came across the information that the man who had arrested him was himself a mailbag thief. He also found Trew's book, 'Black for a Cause…Not Just Because', published in 2010, which included his research on Ridgewell Adam Bell, a case worker for the CCRC, investigated the case and it was referred to the court of appeal. Simmons's conviction was quashed last year. The lord chief justice, Lord Burnett, expressed regret that the case had taken so long to come back to court and said that the evidence before him was "extremely telling". After being cleared, Simmons, now 63, said: "That man Ridgewell ruined three lives for no reason and I am sure many, many more and if this can help someone else who was also arrested by him then at least something will have been achieved." This week he reacted to the news of Trew's case, saying: "I am very happy to hear Winston's news. The more the merrier." Trew paid tribute to his CCRC case worker, Anona Bisping, saying: "She did a fantastic job of pulling everything together." Trew, along with Christie, will now have their cases referred to the court of appeal. The other two left the UK many years ago and could not be contacted but their cases would also automatically be referred back if they were ever found.

The CCRC said it had been a complex case to investigate. Helen Pitcher, CCRC chair, said: "The age of the case meant that almost all of the information that we usually have to go on – such as police material and prosecution and court files – had long ago been destroyed so we had to go to great lengths to piece things together."Tthe significance of judicial comment and acquittals in three other London Underground cases investigated by DS Ridgewell: R v Freeman, Gordon, Morgan and Morris (the 'Waterloo 4') at Southwark Juvenile Court in April 1972; R v Chikuri and Swelah (the 'Tottenham Court Road 2') at the Central Criminal Court in April 1973; and R v Mullins, Davison, De Souza, Green, Harriott and Johnson (the 'Stockwell 6') at the Central Criminal Court in September 1972. The quashing of the conviction of Mr Hasan (R v Hasan, Peterkin, Campbell and Ogunshola, 13 January 1978) which raised concerns about the credibility of DS Ridgewell. Neither Mr Trew nor Mr Christie were legally represented during their applications to the CCRC.

Sharp Rise in Suspects Being Released Without Bail Conditions

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Law Society says risk to public growing with alleged violent offenders among those freed. Tens of thousands of suspects including some accused of violent crimes are being released by police without bail restrictions, leaving victims and the public increasingly at risk, the Law Society has warned. Figures obtained from police forces across England and Wales show the number of those released under investigation (RUI) has ballooned since the practice became legal in 2017 – resulting in suspects, victims and witnesses waiting months and even years for justice. Without bail conditions – often requiring those under investigation to live at a particular address, avoid certain areas or people and report to a police station – being imposed, cases are being allowed to drift without fixed time limits, according to the Law Society. The Labour MP and shadow justice minister, Yasmin Qureshi, has used parliamentary questions to expose growing delays in processing rape, sexual violence and burglary cases.

Figures show the average number of days for the Crown Prosecution Service to process rape allegations, from when the case was first referred to the CPS to completion, has lengthened from 321 in 2008-09 to 495 in 2018-19. For sexual violence cases, CPS returns over the same period show the time from referral to finalisation has stretched from 294 to 390 days. For burglary, it has increased from 201 to 245 days. Qureshi said: "These figures show the government's soundbite claim that

they are 'on the side of victims' is a cynical spin. Every extra day a case is prolonged is another day when victims have their lives placed on hold. "Our justice system urgently needs to be properly funded so that cases can be processed and justice delivered. That means keeping our courts open, funding legal aid and recognising that access to justice is a right not a privilege."

The problem of RUI has been identified before, but the Law Society survey, acquired through freedom of information requests, is more wide-ranging and draws on replies from 31 police authorities. RUI was introduced by the Policing and Crime Act 2017. The number of suspects freed on bail has decreased dramatically, appearing to have been replaced almost entirely by RUI in some police authorities: • In Thames Valley, the number of suspects released on bail between 2016 and 2017 was 13,768. By 2017-18, this had fallen to 379, as the number released under investigation rose to 11,053. • In Nottinghamshire, 7,932 people were released on bail in 2016-17 but the number dropped to 562 in 2017-18. The number of suspects released under investigation by police reached 4,728 in the same year. • In Surrey, officers released 5,280 suspects on bail in 2016-17 and 1,033 in 2017-18, but released 4,788 under investigation that year.

The Law Society president, Simon Davis, said: "Thousands of suspects are being released under police investigation. With no fixed time limit, cases can take months or even years to go to court. Suspects are left with uncertainty; victims of crime often live in fear of being confronted by the accused." Jenny Wiltshire, the head of general crime at the law firm Hickman & Rose, said: "I obtained these statistics because I am very concerned about the impact on our creaking criminal justice system of releasing thousands of suspects under investigation. "RUI was intended to end the scandal of accused people, many of whom are innocent of any crime, having to wait months and sometimes years before being able to clear their names. But in reality, it has made the situation far worse. Not only are people released under investigation for longer than they were kept on police bail, but the absence of proper scrutiny means police do not keep suspects updated as to the progress of an investigation."

The National Police Chiefs' Council said the figures predated the guidance currently being implemented by forces, but officers had been told bail can still be used to protect victims and vulnerable people "where necessary and proportionate". Darren Martland, the chief constable of Cheshire police and NPCC lead for bail management, said: "The 2017 changes to bail presented significant challenges for the police service. "They were a simplistic solution to a complex problem, and we are now beginning to understand some of the unintended consequences. At this time, there's currently insufficient evidence to judge whether increased use of release under investigation by police puts vulnerable victims at greater risk, but we have opted to minimise any potential risk through the introduction of new guidance to police officers."

Prison Officer Jailed For Inappropriate Relationship With Prisoner

A prison officer has been jailed for misconduct in a public office after having an inappropriate relationship with a serving prisoner. Prison officer Rachel Barnes, 29, became involved in the inappropriate relationship with Sebastian Vassell, 28, while working at HMP Belmarsh. Upon discovery of the relationship, Barnes was charged with misconduct in a public office and Vassell with sending messages from prison unauthorised. They both pleaded guilty to the respective charges at previous court hearings. On Thursday, 10 October 2019 Barnes was sentenced to 10 months in jail, and Vassell was sentenced to six months concurrent on each charge, but consecutive to the sentence he is currently serving, at Croydon Crown Court. Suspicion was raised when Barnes started going

missing for extended periods whilst on shift at HMP Belmarsh. This led to Barnes being invited to a 'challenge meeting', by management where she denied all wrongdoing. However, when she was told that there was CCTV available of her missing for periods of time, Barnes became emotional and confessed to being in an inappropriate relationship with Vassell. A search was then conducted of Barnes' locker and car, where messages were found on her phones to Vassell. Vassell was found with two prohibited phones in his cell. Preetpaul Dhillon, from the CPS, said: "Barnes was working in a high security prison in a position of paid employment amongst dangerous lawbreakers. Vassell was an offender serving a sentence for serious firearm offences. On one occasion when Barnes was on duty, she was in a cell for 19 minutes engaging in inappropriate behaviour with Vassell. She hid from her colleague when he checked the cell on two occasions, clearly showing she recognised what she was doing was wrong. However, this was not a one-off incident. Rather, it was a pattern of behaviour in which she allowed a prisoner to have the use of a mobile phone and sent him repeated messages, some of which were of a sexual nature. Barnes' behaviour clearly falls into the category of wilful misconduct, and to such a degree that it amounted to an abuse of the public's trust. She will now have to face the consequences of her actions in relation to future employment opportunities."

Operation Midland - Cowardice and Chicanery

Simon War: Sadly, it seems that the police have learned nothing whatsoever from the whole shameful Operation Midland fiasco. What does shine through is the invincible, damnable arrogance of the Met's most senior officers, some of whom have been promoted, despite their roles in the Beech affair. Perhaps they really don't care. The sad thing for me is, through my own unfortunate experience, I am not in the least surprised by any of this cowardice and chicanery.The concepts of accountability and modern-day policing seem to exist in parallel universes. This is the main lesson to be rlearned from the belated publication of a still-redacted version of the Henriques Report into the ill-fated fiasco known as Operation Midland – probably the worst scandal in UK policing since the exposure of widespread organised corruption in the Flying Squad and elsewhere back in the late 1970s and early 1980s, when over 250 London police officers resigned in the wake of Operation Countryman (another damning inquiry report that has, by the way, never seen the light of day).

This is not the first edition to be released to the public of former high court judge Sir Richard Henriques' report of an inquiry into the Metropolitan Police's conduct during Operation Midland. An even more heavily-edited version was grudgingly circulated back in 2016. However, despite repeated promises by Met chiefs that the Henriques' report would appear in full after the trial of Carl Beech (aka 'Nick'), the key hoaxer and fraudster behind Operation Midland, there are still substantial parts of the document that remain redacted. Why? What else – beside professional embarrassment – are the police still trying to hide from the public? Perhaps we'll never know, although the very fact that some of the inquiry findings are still being withheld inevitably fuels suspicions of an ongoing whitewash.

So what are the main revelations – laughingly referred to by the Met top brass as 'learning points'? Perhaps one of the most serious issues is that the inquiry concluded the search warrants used by the Operation Midland team to search the homes of suspects such as Lord Bramall, Leon Brittan and Harvey Proctor had been unlawfully obtained because officers had misled the district judge, Howard Riddle, about Carl Beech's consistency of claims and his overall credibility. These searches – which caused catastrophic distress to the men and their families – appear to have been nothing more than a police 'fishing expedition', designed to add weight to a very flimsy case. (My own

home was raided in 2012 by the Suffolk police and I've since wondered how on earth they managed to convince a district judge or magistrate that there was a good reason to invade every area of my private life simply on the word of a repugnant fantasist, without a smidgen of actual evidence).

The Henriques' Report also focuses on the infamous statement made to the media by Detective Superintendent Kenny McDonald that 'Nick' (as Beech was then known publicly) was making claims that were "credible and true". What the latest version of the report reveals is that McDonald's boss, the Met's Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Steve Rodhouse, personally authorised confirmation that the police believed 'Nick' in order to show the public that they were out to nail anybody, no matter how rich and famous, who was accused of historical abuse. They were collectively embarrassed after having failed to prosecute Savile and they were now going to show everyone that they were going to make good their previous errors. This authorisation from Rodhouse blows sky-high any attempt to attribute the disastrous claim to a slip of the tongue by McDonald. In fact, we now know that it was official Met policy.

As Henriques observes in his report, "I cannot conceive that any fully informed officer could reasonably have believed 'Nick'. Yet they did. And they said so very publicly. In fact, Henriques points out that the investigating team behind Operation Midland should have recognised that Beech's various accounts, including his blogs and personal writings of what he claimed he'd experienced, were full of inconsistencies and of claims which were palpably incredible. Sir Richard highlights the fact that there was no factual evidence of any kind to support Beech's lurid allegations that he was regularly abused in the most violent physical manner by his 'torturers': no medical evidence, no scars, no bruising or cuts that would surely have been noted by his own mother at the time. Nor was there any evidence that he had been absent from school frequently. There was no sign of any missing, murdered boys as Beech claimed. There was absolutely nothing.

Reading the report, the extent to which police seem simply to have accepted the most preposterous nonsense and perverted sexual fantasies being spouted by Beech as credible evidence of an organised VIP paedophile ring becomes painfully clear. Yet none of the supposedly trained and experienced detectives appears to have spotted that they were dealing with a compulsive liar and fraudster. Or if they did, they didn't dare to speak up and risk challenging the 'you will be believed' dogma imposed by successive Directors of Public Prosecutions. There was a culture of collective mindset, with no room for any ostensible doubt.

And then there was the malign role played by Beech's cheerleaders, including specific journalists and the disgraced Exaro agency. In fact, the Henriques' report goes as far as stating that Exaro and its team actually 'misled' the police during Operation Midland. There was also evidence of active interference during the investigation, including reporters showing Beech photographs of suspects and taking him on a tour around London to identify specific locations where he had claimed he'd been abused, thus wholly contaminating the case. Sir Richard Henriques names names and it remains to be seen whether any of those he singles out for criticism will ever face any legal consequences in court. I won't be holding my breath.

This latest, less redacted, version of the report also shines a very unflattering spotlight on the political pressures that were being brought to bear on the Met, especially by the now Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, Tom Watson MP. Although at the time of Operation Midland Mr Watson was only a backbencher, he had met Beech personally and then proceeded to pass 'hundreds of pieces of information' to the Met, according to the report. I presume much of this was perverted twaddle and lies that the MP was being fed by Beech and his enthusiastic supporters at the Exaro news agency. It should be remembered that Mr Watson was responsible

for the vicious and vile ad hominem attack launched against Lord Brittan shortly after the former Conservative Home Secretary's death in 2015. Now, why would Watson want to traduce a prominent Tory in this ruthless manner? It doesn't take much working out.

In the aftermath of the strident criticism made in the Henriques report, Mr Watson's continued role in political life must surely be called into question. Yet, he seems determined to play Pontius Pilate and wash his hands of the whole sordid affair, in which we now know he played so central a part. Any chance of a resignation? I very much doubt it. An apology? No chance.

Despite the Met claiming that 'lessons will be learned' from the Operation Midland fiasco, senior officers are still determined to reject some of Henriques' key findings. There seems to be no genuine awareness of the reputational damage that the Met has suffered, nor any acceptance that the cultish dogma of 'believing' each and every complainant - and referring to them as 'victims' from the outset - undermines the presumption of innocence of the person accused.

How can a so-called investigative team conduct a fair, balanced investigation if it takes sides from day one? All this is not rocket science. Yet the College of Policing, which is the professional body responsible for police training, as recently as last month reconfirmed, in an official policy document, that anyone making a claim of sexual abuse should be considered as a 'victim' from the start. It goes even further and states that in the event an investigation ends with no charges being brought, 'victims should not be left feeling they have not been believed'. Presumably, unless they are Carl Beech… or Jemma Beale… or any of the other notorious liars and fraudsters who have been caught lying their heads off and are now serving time in prison - not to mention the myriad liars and perjurers who have got away with their deceit. This is the reason the two friends who accused me have not faced any consequences for their false allegations, despite it being obvious they lied and lied to the police and then committed perjury at Ipswich Crown Court in 2014.

Torture Inquiry: MP David Davis Takes Legal Action Against Government

Aaron Walawalkar, Human Rights News: Conservative MP David Davis is taking the government to court over its refusal to hold an independent, judge-led inquiry into the UK's involvement in torture since 9/11, contrary to UN recommendations. Renewed calls for an independent inquiry were sparked in June last year after reports published by a parliamentary committee found 19 allegations that UK personnel committed acts of torture. The government said at the time that it would announce "within 60 days" whether it would hold such an inquiry. But it was not until July this year that former Cabinet Office minister David Lidington told the House of Commons the government had "no legal obligation" or "policy reason" to do so. Davis, a conservative stalwart and lifelong civil liberties campaigner, is now bringing a legal challenge alongside Labour MP Dan Jarvis and human rights charity Reprieve.

On launching the legal bid, Davis said: "When the government finally admitted that it had no intention of holding a full and proper inquiry into torture, after years of dither and delay, I was frankly exasperated. And when I said in parliament 'see you in court', I meant it "Torture doesn't produce reliable intelligence, and involvement in it makes everyone in this country less safe. We must take a clear-eyed look at this dark period in our recent history, and give victims the redress and accountability they were promised, and face the future with a clear conscience and determination not to repeat the mistakes of the past."

What Torture Allegations Does The UK Face? Parliament's Intelligence and Security Committee released two reports in June last year – one into Detainee Mistreatment and Rendition from 2001-2010, and another focused on the guidance given to intelligence offi-

cers. The key findings by the ISC include: 19 allegations that UK personnel themselves committed acts of torture At least 2 instances where UK personnel "directly engaged in the mistreatment of a detainee by others"; At least 232 cases where UK personnel "continued to supply questions or intelligence to liaison services after they knew or suspected [or should have suspected] that a detainee had been or was being mistreated". 198 occasions where UK officers received intelligence from detainees they knew were being mistreated, and 128 occasions of receiving intelligence after being told of mistreatment by foreign partners. Extensive efforts by UK intelligence agencies to block reporting of incidents of mistreatment, including attempts to keep evidence from reaching the ISC during its previous investigations. Evidence that suggests Government officials in one case successfully blocked criminal investigations of breaches of the Geneva Conventions. The report came following a four-year inquiry run by the ISC, but – in delivering its report – it accepted that its findings could only be treated as provisional, as Downing Street had blocked it from interviewing multiple witnesses.

Doomed To Repeat Our Past Mistakes? Article 3 of the Human Rights Convention prohibits torture and inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment – it is one of our most fundamental rights. The UN Convention Against Torture, which the UK signed up to in 1988, obliges parties to criminalise torture under their domestic law. It defines torture as an act by which severe pain and suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on someone for the purposes of obtaining information, for punishment, or intimidation. The right to be free from torture is absolute. This means that it is never justifiable to torture someone, whatever the circumstances. Inhuman or degrading treatment is also prohibited: Treatment is considered inhuman when it causes intense physical or mental suffering Treatment or punishment is degrading if it humiliates and debases a person beyond that which is usual from punishment.

Article 3 of the Human Rights Convention requires governments to conduct official, effective investigations into credible allegations of serious ill-treatment by public officials, and to take positive steps to prevent it. UK courts and tribunals cannot rely on evidence obtained through torture, no matter which country it took place in. The Human Rights Convention and the Convention Against Torture also prevent the government from deporting or extraditing people to another country where they would likely face torture. Maya Foa, Director of Reprieve, said: "When the government broke its promise to torture survivors, it also broke the law. The powerful must be held to account so that victims can move on with their lives, but just as importantly because if we do not fully investigate our past mistakes, we are doomed to repeat them."

Aristotle and the Three Pillars of Advocacy or A Few Thoughts From The Coal Face

Richard Barraclough QC draws on his experience of advocacy and discusses his own principles and methods of effectively presenting a case – both for the defence and the prosecution.

1. We teach advocacy using the Hampel method. It is a supremely effective and invaluable tool.

2. We should not however forget the ancient principles of Rhetoric in the teaching of advocacy. Rhetoric is the art of persuasion. Together with Grammar and Logic or Dialectic, it is one of the three ancient arts of discourse. Aristotle defines Rhetoric as the "faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion".

3. The three pillars of advocacy or persuasion or modes of proof are described by Aristotle: "Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker (ethos); the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind (pathos); the third on the proof, or apparent proof provided by the words of the speech itself (logos). Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible".

4. Fleur Kingham the President of the Land Court of Queensland in her lecture "Maximising your Impact as an Advocate: A view from the Bench" said: "Logos targets the brain; it is the logical rational aspect of argument. Pathos is about the heart; moving the listener to want to accept the proposition. Ethos appeals to the gut – the instinctual response to the person – that sense of whether we can trust what we are being told".

5. It is said that modern advocacy focuses more on the rationality based form of discourse than ethos and pathos as juries become more sophisticated than the audience assumed by Aristotle to be an audience of "untrained thinkers".

6. Oliver Wendell Holmes asserted: "the life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience". McCormack (Ethos Pathos and Logos: The Benefits of Aristotelian Rhetoric in the Courtroom) continues: "experience in all of its plasticity and subjective bases, necessitates a hard look at the capability of the human race as a whole as well as jurors, judges ,and litigators themselves to utilize logic consistently and similarly over time. While this seems possible to a certain extent based on the influence that the reliance on logic and rational decision making has had on trial procedure, it does not eliminate the need for or the benefits that may be derived from the use of an attorney's appeals catered toward the other two modes of proof, ethos and pathos"

7. ***Pillar 1 Ethos*** is about making the advocate credible or apparently credible as a source (persuader credibility). It is designed to make the audience unconsciously or consciously feel that they trust the advocate. To that end the advocate must demonstrate practical intelligence, a virtuous character, reputation and good will, honesty and candour.

8. Aristotle held that "we believe good men more fully and more readily than others. This is true whatever the question is and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided". In Richard II, Thomas Mowbray is accused of treason and says of his distress, "The purest treasure mortal time afford is spotless reputation; that away, men are but gilded loam or painted clay". It is Aristotle's view that "character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion (the advocate) possesses"

9. Ethos encompasses (1) bodily eloquence including posture, gesture, facial expression, eye contact, body language and movement, proxemics (space between the advocate and the audience) and (2) the use of the voice and how we say the words used. The whole provides a collective signal to the jury.

10. The voice conveys elements of ethos. It involves pitch, speed, volume, tone and rhythm. It permits the advocate to convey emotional intention. Pauses are crucial. They can be used as thinking pauses or pauses to raise tension.

11. One of the social aspects of ethos or credibility is about identity and membership of the group. Research suggests that that the speaker must portray himself as belonging to the group rather than above it.

12. Ethos is transmitted through the advocate's self portrayal. It includes the advocate's clothes, vocabulary, hints at social rank. The advocate can use statements to suggest social hierarchy, preferences and distastes.

13. Ethos will involve practical intelligence in the sense of choosing the most credible arguments making sensible and reasonable concessions.

14. **Pillar 2 Pathos** encompasses emotional influence the advocate has on her audience.

It is necessary to put the audience in the appropriate emotional state. Norbert Schwarz (Emotion, Cognition and Decision Making): "Our everyday experiences leave little doubt that our emotions can influence the decisions we make, much as the outcome of our decisions can influence the emotions we experience". Aristotle: "Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile". Uffelman (Hamlet was a Law Student. A Dramatic look at Emotions Effect on Analogical reasoning): Emotion is "what releases the legal imagination to see relevant similarities and therefore permits the final leap to judgment".

15. Pathos permits the audience to place itself in the shoes of the litigant. That is not to say that emotion is to be overdone. Juries are directed to judge a case on the evidence and not emotion. Thus the pathos element of advocacy in jury trial must be finely judged. As Uffelman said: "If the ultimate goal of the legal process is justice then….we should desire the most sensitive understanding of the intersection of emotion and reason in order to maximise the breadth and depth of the (audiences) imagination in conceiving justice"

16. Thus: "The emotions are all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments and that are also attended by pain or pleasure. Such are anger, pity, fear and the like with their opposites. We must arrange what we have to say about each of them under three heads. Take for instance, the emotion of anger: here we must discover (1) what the state of mind of angry people is (2) who the people are with whom they usually get angry and (3) on what grounds they get angry with them".

17. Pathos requires the audience to identify with the advocate. It requires the advocate to know the audience, its value and belief systems. The advocate has techniques and styles which create or enhance emotions which impacts on the critical faculty of the audience. It is the emotional influence of the speaker on the audience. The advocate achieves this in part by the correct use of figures of speech, putting content and arguments in the fore or background, clarity in the sense of intellectual comprehensibility and propriety where the style is appropriate to the issue and context. Brevity is important but not so as to limit clarity.

18. Story telling is used to give a personal touch and create curiosity in the audience. The story allows the speaker to raise emotion and link with eg childhood memories.

19. Pathos may bite at the beginning and end of the speech grabbing the attention of the audience and leaving them with conviction.

20. ***Pillar 3 Logos:*** "Thirdly persuasion is effected through the speech itself when we have proved a truth or an apparent truth by means of the persuasive arguments suitable to the case in question".

21. There are different forms of proofs: the natural and the artificial/ technical proof. Natural proofs are those that are based on data, testimonies etc. Artificial or technical proof are those created with a combination of information, hints, examples and the art of logic.

22. Logos deals with content, structure and argumentation of a speech in contra distinction to style and expressive qualities. It is the relationship of facts with reality. It is the appeal to logical reason. The argument must appear sound to the audience. The advocate will express information, argumentation and structure clearly and explicitly so that the audience is able to follow his reasoning. The structure of the speech supports the listener to understand and enjoy the content of the speech, to memorise and process the information given.

23. Cogitation. So what does this mean for the criminal practitioner? Caldwell (Primacy, Recency Ethos and Pathos. Integrating Principles of Communication into the Direct Examination): "In the courtroom the advocate must inform and persuade; he must respect the cumbersome rules of the court but still present the facts in a memorable and compelling way. That is the advocate's message must be accurate, factual and legally adequate but also

absorbing, captivating and emotionally forceful. Similarly the advocate as messenger must not only be lawyerly making sure that all the "Is" are dotted and "ts" are crossed but also credible and likeable. Both message and messenger play critical roles in the communication process".

24. Scharffs (The Character of Legal Reasoning) summarised the Aristotelian theory as accounting for both practical wisdom in that it 'imbues craft with a moral dimension that it otherwise lacks' by mandating the use of logic and rational arguments through logos as well as the existence of a goodness in the persuader through ethos" (McCormack).

25. A few thoughts whether prosecuting or defending:

i. When defending I get to know the client perhaps more deeply than he/she has ever known. Gone are the days when Leading Counsel did not see her client. By getting to know our client well we are able to identify with him/her. We are able to glean tiny but precious parts of his character which we can then adduce before the jury. In one case it was weeks before we established that a man on trial for an associated role in a gang execution with a substantial criminal record, translated books for children into braille and worked in prison as a Samaritan whilst at the same time describing himself as a "scroat". When prosecuting the victim is not just a name. He or she is a person and the jury is entitled to know how he or she appeared in life.

ii. I structure my examination in chief or cross examination (normally in writing and contributed to by Junior Counsel and Solicitor) and when defending make sure that the client understands exactly what we are seeking to elicit from him in the witness box. If the client is not prepared then the entire case can be lost by reason of this gross disservice. The client and the advocate will lose all credibility or ethos.

iii. Whatever the time available I spend it on the case, thinking, working on cross examination, theories, speech. I always visit the scene of a murder to get a feel for the place. Whatever the detective work we may see something no one else has seen – rarely but it may happen.

iv. Even if interviews are "no comment" interviews someone on the team listens/watches them both for the defendants and any ABE. We may get a feel for the characteristics of the individual

v. More important than anything is to be able to "tell them (the jury) the story" as the old barrister in Brothers in Law advised.

vi. Successful advocacy requires mastery of the brief, consideration of every and all permutations of fact and inference, rigorous analysis, time to reflect, revise and where necessary to delete.

vii. I seek to establish Ethos from the beginning, the first moment when introduced to the jury. That means appearance must attract. The uniform is there for a purpose. We use it. Our collars must be clean. More than that I may be seen outside court as the jury arrive or leave after the court day. If I am scruffy, if I am not wearing my collar and tie even in the heat, the jury will see.

viii. The entire trial is founded or predicated on the speech. Every question must be asked for the purpose of the speech. We do not ask anything, do not say anything unless it is to be used for the speech.

ix. The jury will see interactions with the judge and any opposing counsel. Whatever the provocation, the jury will be far more impressed by an advocate who is polite and reasonable. Rarely have I found that interjections assist the speech unless absolutely necessary. The purpose of the advocate is not to disparage ones opponent and turn the jury away from the other side but rather to bring the jury onto his client's side.

x. When it comes to the speech, I write it out word for word unless I consider myself a natural orator (of whom there are few). Most of the great orators I have known have sweated blood over their speech.

xi. I build the speech on the principles of ethos pathos and logos but directed towards the essence of the case being presented.

xii. I seek to know my speech so well that I can read it without looking at the notes. Thus I will always be able to look the jury in the eye. If we have the written speech we can, should the whim or audience reaction provide the opportunity, fly from it knowing that we can return to the safety of the structure of the nest without faltering. I read the speech again and again and revise it time and again before I deliver it. I read it aloud in the privacy of my study or hotel room, to get every tone of voice, every turn of phrase perfect. A prolix, rambling and obtuse speech will not persuade.

xiii. Before delivering the speech, I prepare by standing at the lectern before the court assembles; I judge the distance between me and the jury; I make sure they can all see me and just as important I can eye ball each of them.

xiv. I empty my pockets. I do not want anything to detract from me, the advocate which will surely happen if I am jangling keys.

xv. When delivering the speech I do not rush, I stand straight, I look at the jury. I do not drop my eyes to the page as I make the crucial point. To do so will suggest that I do not believe in my own argument.

xvi. Where sensible, I have every single exhibit or page of the jury bundle available for reference unless it is easier to quote in the speech in which case I type it out word for word so that there is no stumbling.

xvii. I monitor speed of delivery. I sometimes try to inject some humour but am very careful - humour is difficult in a gang execution but even there it is possible.

xviii. I try to use some local knowledge so as to get close to a local jury. In a recent murder trial in Chapeltown Leeds, when defending I was able to use the following: "The Ralph Thoresby School is in Cookridge. Ralph Thoresby was an 18th century antiquarian and merchant. He described Chapeltown as "well situated in pure air upon a pleasant ascent which affords a prospect of the country for 10 or 12 miles". Chapeltown Moor was the site of one of the first Yorkshire cricket matches between the gentlemen of Chapeltown and the gentlemen of Sheffield. It remains an area where as (the police intelligence officer) described most people play out their lives in a decent and respectable way. It has beautiful parks and well stocked children's playground. It is however plagued by those who mercilessly lacerate it with their drug dealing and associated violence".

xix. I embrace Ethos. I make myself known to the jury. I open myself up. I never speak down to the jury. I am never pompous. I always defer to the jury. I make them feel as they are, significant. I have used an introduction, again when defending: "I am acutely aware that although I am older than each of you, together you are collectively far older than I. I have some experience of life but together you have more experience than I could ever hope for. I have my trade. You have or have had yours whether paid or unpaid. Thus you have more knowledge of work whether in the home, with children or beyond. You have suffered life's tragedies, you have experienced life's many joys. It is that experience of life which you will obviously bring to bear on this case as you follow your own lines of logic. One thing I can be fairly sure of is that you have not experienced what you are now experiencing in this court. But even there I could be wrong. You may be lawyers, judges, police officers, I do not know. And so do not blame me if I address you on matters which you may well know. Please forgive me if individually or collectively you consider that anything I might say makes little or no sense"

xx. I look at the entire jury ranging from 1 to 12. If necessary and I need a friendly face I turn to the juror who I rightly or, in my sense of delusion, believe to be on my side.

xxi. I do my best to follow this advice.

26. Sometimes, just sometimes when defending I may be able to tell the jury about Aristotle and turn it towards the defendant. In a gangland execution case where there were cut throat defences, having dealt with the usual burden and standard of proof, I intended to say: Our case depends on three things: what you think of (the defendant) when you see him and hear him, a logical analysis of the prosecution case and the incoherence of the case for the other defendants. I have my own rules in criminal trials based on what those of us who are rather ancient were taught when learning our trade. They are based on the great Greek philosopher Aristotle, who taught that the art of advocacy is built on three pillars - logos (the logic or reasoning supporting the speaker), ethos (the credibility of the speaker) and pathos (emotional appeal of the speaker). And so I look for the logic of a case, the credibility of the defendant and any emotional aspects of the case which I may be able to suggest goes to support the defendant.

In this case the three pillars are built: a. on the notion of (the defendant) being the spotter as so lacking logic as to be absurd; b. the defendant himself when examined and considering his flaws and defects and criminal past is not in truth the sort who would become involved in this horrendous execution committed by a gang; c. the last interview where he describes his terror of those of whom he was to tell the truth. d. Bound up in that analysis and part of the logic is the bewildering lack of integrity of the gang members and in particular the case for (the co-defendant)".

27. My far wiser Junior advised against it. She was right to do so in that case but I have used the device but once!

28. I appreciate that many will have their own experiences and principles of advocacy and may well hold that my ideas are insignificant or worse. I just thought I might provide a little of my experience.

29. McCormack says, "the intersection of Aristotle's three modes of proof is what creates true, beneficial and just persuasion in the courtroom. A trial attorneys appeals to logic after carefully considering his position and thoroughly researching his topic can be considered by his audience, the judge and jury in their deliberations of the case. Such appeals also lend themselves to the judge and jury members perception of the attorney's credibility as a well-researched well prepared attorney particularly one who can communicate his position with confidence, is in all cases more trustworthy than one who cannot and does not have full command of the relevant law" Richard Barraclough QC Six Pump Court

Would Make You Pull Your Hair Out

A policeman who refused to shave his beard has been awarded £10,000 by an employment tribunal. Constable Gordon Downey had been transferred from an armed response unit after refusing to abide by a policy that officers be clean-shaven. It was argued on behalf of the Police Service of Northern Ireland that his facial hair would interfere with breathing apparatus officers in the unit are equipped with. He shaved his beard down to a moustache but this was still deemed unacceptable. An expert at the tribunal said that he would need "a moustache like a walrus" for it to cause a problem with the mask. The tribunal unanimously agreed that he had suffered discrimination contrary to the Sex Discrimination (NI) Order 1976. Speaking to BBC News NI, Constable Downey said: "The policy itself, which was first introduced in 2017, was being enforced against men under health and safety grounds, yet females within our unit had hair in contravention of the same policy — not facial hair but head hair, where there was a grab risk. "The policy was being enforced against men, not against female officers. As an older person with a receding hairline and alopecia who is slightly overweight, all I can do is grow a bit of fur on my top lip. To have that removed for absolutely no reason is wrong."

Watchdog Finds 'Emergency' Conditions in Scottish Prisons

Libby Brooks, Guardian: Anti-torture group highlights overcrowding, rising violence and overuse of segregation. The report was most critical of the treatment of inmates at Cornton Vale women's prison. Photograph: Murdo Macleod/The Guardian Europe's anti-torture watchdog has described conditions in Scotland's overcrowded prisons as an emergency situation, in a damning report that highlights a rise in drug-related violence, the overuse of segregation, and inmates confined to their cells for lengthy periods of time, sometimes in less than 3m2 of living space. Julia Kozma, who led the delegation of the Council of Europe's Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) when they visited five Scottish prisons last October, described witnessing an influx of new arrivals at HMP Grampian. She said it was "like an emergency situation" as staff searched frantically for spare mattresses. "We don't see the numbers going down so the emergency is becoming more and more the norm," she added. However, Kozma told the Guardian it was difficult to blame the authorities when she believed the problem of prison overcrowding in Scotland, which has the second highest imprisonment rate in western Europe, was rooted in the attitudes of the judiciary.

The report reserves its greatest criticisms for the treatment of inmates at the Cornton Vale women's prison, where the delegation found "women who clearly were in need of urgent care and treatment in a psychiatric facility, and [who] should not have been in a prison environment". They included one woman who had bitten through the skin and muscle of her arm down to the bone and another who set fire to her hair in her cell. Since the delegation's visit it is understood these women have been transferred to a medium secure psychiatric facility. While the committee heard no complaints of deliberate ill-treatment by prison staff, the long-term effects of overcrowding alongside very little out-of-cell activity – often limited because of staff shortages – had a significant impact on prisoners. In Grampian prison, the CPT delegation found mattresses had been put on the floor under bunk beds to accommodate three people in double-occupancy cells. The report notes the rise of inter-prisoner and inmate-on-staff violence, which it links to "large amounts of synthetic drugs flowing into Scottish prisons", often soaked into letters which prisoners then smoke. It also described an "intractable" issue of many prisoners being segregated from the main prison population for long periods of time, months and sometimes years, with some becoming institutionalised in segregation "despite living in virtual solitary confinement".

The Scottish Prison Service said the women's estate in particular was at an advanced stage of reform, with Cornton Vale set for closure and new community custody units under construction across the country. It said the reduction of mental health services meant women with such issues were often criminalised instead. The SPS added that it was trialling new scanners to detect synthetic drugs entering prisons, and linked the rise in violence to an increase in the number of inmates involved in organised crime The CPT report notes the Scottish government has embarked on an agenda of reform, especially regarding female prisoners and young offenders, but also observes that these reforms are still at a "nascent" stage.

The Scottish government said it would carefully consider the committee's findings. "We want to ensure Scotland is a modern, inclusive nation that protects, respects and realises internationally recognised human rights. We actively engage with international human rights monitoring mechanisms and value the expert insight they provide on human rights issues." Humza Yousaf, the Scottish justice secretary, has previously said the rise in the prison population was partly because police and prosecutors had placed a greater focus on serious organised crime and sexual offences. Ministers have recently introduced a presumption against putting offenders in prison for sentences of less than 12 months, in an attempt to reduce overcrowding, but Kozmo said she believed the Scottish government accepted this would have minimal effect. "It is difficult to blame the authorities when the issue is rooted in the judicial system that hands down long harsh sentences and is unwilling to look at alternatives. If we want to see an alleviation in overcrowding it has to include the judiciary looking at sentencing policy."

'Lynch Mob Politics': Experts Denounce Plans For Longer Jail Terms

Owen Bowcott Legal, Guardian: Prison reform charities have condemned the government's enthusiasm for extending minimum prison terms as "the politics of the lynch mob" and an unnecessary duplication of existing judicial powers. Proposals in the Queen's speech to ensure violent and sexual offenders serve a minimum of two-thirds of their sentence – compared with half under current guidelines – before becoming eligible for release on licence have attracted widespread criticism. Frances Crook, the chief executive of the Howard League for Penal Reform, said: "This is not a sensible, evidence-based policy; it is the politics of the lynch mob. This is about making people spend more time in prison, which will affect thousands of men and will probably put staff in danger by taking hope away from people. "We already know that prisoners are in appalling conditions, with a lot of violence, injury and suicides. A lot of it is directed at staff. This is very irresponsible."The Prison Reform Trust pointed out: "Judges can already hand down two-thirds sentences in certain cases, for example if it's one of 100 specific offences or if the person poses a risk to the public."

Chris Daw QC, a criminal and fraud expert, tweeted: "Make no mistake, the current Tory approach to crime and punishment is just dangerous, populist electioneering. Nowhere in the free world do longer and longer prison sentences do anything good for society." The government's emphasis on ramping up punishments was contrasted by many commentators with its failure to pay for judges to hear backlogs of cases and the protracted underfunding of the justice system. Richard Atkins QC, the chair of the Bar Council, which represents barristers across England and Wales, said the Queen's speech "acknowledged that public confidence needs to be restored in the criminal justice system. I hope that this is an acceptance of what we have long warned, that our criminal justice system can bear no more. "For the last decade, the Ministry of Justice has been in dire need of rescue as it has buckled under the strain of greater budget cuts than any other Whitehall department – 40% since 2010."

Louise Haigh, Labour's shadow policing minister, was more dismissive, tweeting: "Many of the criminal justice #QueensSpeech measures had already been announced by May's Govt. The 20,000 officers we already know won't be going to the frontline. No new ideas, not enough new cops and no acknowledgement that austerity has destroyed the criminal justice system." The Criminal Bar Association (CBA), which represents English and Welsh barristers working in the criminal courts, highlighted the fact that many suspects in serious crimes were being released under investigation, without being subjected to bail restrictions. Caroline Goodwin QC, the CBA chair, said: "Fewer prosecutions does not mean less crime is being committed – quite the reverse. More crimes are being reported and yet fewer are being prosecuted. "At present, the rate of 7.8% of all crimes reported to police resulting in a charge or summons is simply unacceptable. Exactly how is the general public to have faith in our criminal justice system? That rate has broadly halved in under a decade." The Law Society, representing solicitors in England and Wales, said it was concerned by government proposals for weakening the Ministry of Defence's legal and public accountability. The society's vice-president, David Greene, said: "The UK upholds and respects the rule of law on and off the battlefield across the world. The rule of law dictates that everyone should be held accountable within our framework of laws. It must not matter how the accused or defendant may be perceived by the public, media or government."

Scotland: Pardon For Gay Men Convicted Under Discriminatory Laws

Scottish Legal News: Men prosecuted for same-sex sexual activity which is now legal can apply to have their convictions erased under the Historical Sexual Offences (Pardons and Disregards) Act 2018. The legislation, previously passed by the Scottish Parliament, is now in force and grants an automatic pardon to every gay and bisexual man in Scotland convicted under discriminatory laws. Men with such convictions can now also apply to have them removed from central criminal records under a 'disregards' scheme. Justice Secretary Humza Yousaf said: "There is no place for homophobia, ignorance and hatred in modern Scotland. This landmark legislation provides an automatic pardon to men convicted of same-sex sexual activity, which is now entirely legal. We have been working closely with Police Scotland and other partners to ensure the 'disregard' scheme is clear and effective and has appropriate safeguards in place. This legislation makes good on the commitments made by the First Minister, who gave an unqualified apology for the now outdated and discriminatory laws, and for the harm they caused to many."

Tim Hopkins, director of the Equality Network, said: "This is a historic day for Scotland. For centuries, sexual relationships between men were criminalised. Criminal law on same-sex and mixed-sex relationships remained seriously discriminatory until as recently as 2001. Today, all those discriminatory convictions are pardoned. The purpose of this act is to acknowledge the wrongfulness and discriminatory effect of past convictions for relationships between men. People living with those convictions on their record now have confirmation that they did nothing wrong – it was the law that was wrong – and the government has apologised for that wrong. People can now fill in a form to have all records of their conviction deleted. For those who passed away before seeing this day, the pardon applies to them too and their suffering is also acknowledged."

Sophie Bridger, campaigns, policy and research manager for Stonewall Scotland, said: "The new disregards process is a positive step in righting historical wrongs that punished people in same-sex relationships. Along with the hurt and damage that came with being prosecuted for who they loved, some people have been carrying a criminal record for something which should never have been illegal. They will now finally have the chance to delete these former offences from their criminal record. We hope this will bring comfort and closure to those affected and draw a line once and for all under this dark piece of Scotland's history."

England: Number of Collapsed Trials Doubles In Four Years

Scottish Legal New: Failures to disclose evidence to defence lawyers have resulted in the number of collapsed criminal cases almost doubling in four years, The Times reports. Figures obtained from the Crown Prosecution Service show that, on average, about two cases were dropped per day last year as a result of delays in bringing them to court or because of an abuse of process. The data show that 1,078 cases were dropped because of failures in disclosure during the first nine months of last year, up from 567 in the whole of 2014. A CPS spokeswoman said: "There has been an unprecedented effort by the CPS and police in the last two years to overhaul working practices and make sure we are getting disclosure processes right. We have been clear these significant cultural changes will not happen overnight." There is a legal obligation on police and prosecutors to disclose any material that may assist the defence. Caroline Goodwin QC, chairwoman of the Criminal Bar Association, said: "Disclosure of unused material in criminal cases is a core justice duty. The government has a constitutional and moral duty to ensure that there is sufficient funding across the system to ensure a good and proper disclosure regime. This starts at the grass roots, from the commencement of an investigation, with sufficient and appropriately trained police officers, to source, locate and retrieve material relevant to an inquiry."

Jeremy Bamber: 'New Evidence' That Could Free Him After 33 Years Behind Bars

Mirror: JB claims he has unearthed phone call evidence that could set him free, 33 years after he was jailed for slaughtering his family. Bamber, 58, has found a phone log he says proves he did not shoot parents Nevill and June, model sister Sheila "Bambi" Caffell, and her six-year-old twin sons Daniel and Nicholas in August 1985. Bamber is serving a full life tariff for the massacre at White House Farm in Essex. His legal team say a police record referring to a call made by Bamber on the night of the White House Farm massacre in 1985 proves he was not there at the time and could form the basis of an appeal. They say it backs up the theory that Bamber's sister Sheila Caffell, 26, murdered their parents Nevill and June, both 61, then shot her own sons, twins Nicholas and Daniel, six, before killing herself. Bamber's lawyer Mark Newby said: "The evidence strongly suggests the chain of events could not have been what the prosecution alleged." The phone call evidence forms one element of a huge bundle Bamber's team will soon submit to the CCRC. The previously unseen police document appears to back up Bamber's story that two calls were made to police on the night of the murders, one from his father and one from him after Nevill rang saying Sheila had "gone crazy". At his trial, the prosecution said only one call was made to police – from Jeremy Bamber at 3.26am from the crime scene, White House Farm in Tolleshunt D'Arcy, Essex. But the new document describes a call to police from Jeremy Bamber timed at "approx 3.37am". His legal team argue it shows Bamber could not have made the 3.26am call from the farm and returned to his home 3.5 miles away in Goldhanger to make the second call. The "3.37am" note came from an interview with a PC Myall, of Essex Police, during the Dickinson Inquiry into the force's handling of the case after Bamber's conviction in November 1986. The note was found by Bamber among thousands of police documents released to him in 2011. PC Myall is noted as telling Dickinson: "We received a telephone call at the P.Stn (Police Station, Witham). "The officer (PC West) at CD Control (Chelmsford) was on the phone and told us that he was relating information to us and still had the informant (Jeremy Bamber) on the other telephone." The trial judge had instructed the jury to disregard Bamber's claims that he had called police from his home at 3.36am. And prosecutors told the trial Bamber had invented the call from Nevill to lay the blame on schizophrenic Sheila, known as Bambi when she worked as a model. Bamber was convicted by a 10-2 majority of murdering his family to claim a £436,000 inheritance. He was initially sentenced to five life sentences, to serve a minimum 25 years, but that was increased to a whole life tariff in 1994. The Mirror revealed in 2010 how lost phone logs showed it was Nevill who called police at 3.26am. A further record submitted to the Criminal Case Review Commission in 2010 showed a 3.36am call to police from Jeremy Bamber. But the CCRC ruled the 3.36am call was noted in error and that there was just one call, from Jeremy not Nevill, made at 3.26am from White House Farm scene.

The new "3.37am" note is said to prove the existence of the second call.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva,Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Robert Knapp, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.