

Bulletin of the Committee on the Administration of Justice

## Bloody Sunday Inquiry

**An English judge once observed "it is the worst oppression, that is done by colour of justice". The trauma of Bloody Sunday was magnified by the process by which the 'colour of justice' - in the form of Widgery - was used to justify the events of 30 January 1972. Widgery corrupted the rule of law. One of the purposes of the Bloody Sunday Justice campaign was to repudiate Widgery, not just for the sake of those killed and wounded but also for the sake of the rule of law. Ironically, a campaign which was derided by the British establishment as 'subversive' was anything but: it was about preserving the rule of law rather than perverting it. It is a measure of the values of the state that a campaign to hold people accountable for loss of life was so widely decried.**

Not that this was unique: many of those who lost relatives at the hands of the state have suffered similar treatment. That pattern is woven throughout the conflict. In that respect what happened on Bloody Sunday and in its aftermath is totemic of the failure of the legal and political systems for the past three decades and the suffering those failures have produced.

So did the new Inquiry herald a new way of doing things? Three years on, the Inquiry, charged with inquiring "into a matter of urgent public importance" by carrying out a public investigation, has become mired in conflict.

This Tribunal has been hampered in its work by many factors. The amount of information it has uncovered and the statements it has taken are testament to its thoroughness, but it has made the process slower than anticipated. Whilst the experience of Widgery casts a long shadow, objective assessments of Lord Saville and his fellow judges conclude that they are fair and trying to do their best in difficult circumstances. Those circumstances have been made more difficult by the persistent judicial reviews of the Tribunal's rulings, principally on the issue of anonymity for the soldiers.

*This January edition of Just News has been dedicated to the Bloody Sunday Inquiry*

A central difficulty for this Tribunal is that the legal and political issues are intertwined and cannot - it seems - be separated. On the one hand there is the Prime Minister's avowal that the truth be established, yet on the other there is the MOD's increasingly contradictory approach. The MOD's counsel recently claimed that it "has no case to advance before this Tribunal." Many would dispute that. Earlier, the MOD had to explain its activities when rifles were destroyed, prompting a police investigation. The MOD has now issued Public Interest Immunity Certificates (PIIs) to prevent information being released to the Tribunal. So much for the government's desire to have the truth told. More intriguingly, it transpires that the controversial allegations about Martin McGuinness made by an informer ('Infliction') are highly questionable. David Shayler revealed recently that 'Infliction' was known by the security services to be unreliable and his services were dispensed with. This

information had not been supplied to the Tribunal, prompting even more speculation about what exactly the PIIs are being used to conceal.

The role of the IRA has also been controversial, due in part to the failure - so far - of some of its alleged former members to co-operate with the Tribunal. One criticism of the Tribunal has been its failure to appreciate the difficulty for anyone in naming IRA members and for former members in co-operating.

What lessons can therefore be drawn from the Tribunal as a prototype truth commission? First, such processes will only work if it is accepted that the truth is the property of neither one side nor the other. If truth processes are to succeed, then everyone has to co-operate with them.

The other lesson to emerge has been the human cost and the relatively low value placed upon the trauma triggered by Bloody Sunday and the experience of reliving it. Perhaps this process is ultimately, as one sage observer in Derry put it, all "too legal". Perhaps we should have fewer lawyers and more support services? We shall have many more months to explore all those issues, unless the Tribunal collapses under the weight of trying to find out the truth with one hand tied behind its back.

**Angela Hegarty**

*Guest Editor (for this month only)*

### Contents

<b>Setting the context</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Angela Hegarty</i>	
<b>How the inquiry works</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>An international perspective</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Fionnuala ni Aolain</i>	
<b>Ministry of Denial</b>	<b>4 - 5</b>
<i>Catherine McKenna</i>	
<b>Family perspective</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Tony Doherty</i>	
<b>Who's who?</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Diary of events</b>	<b>8</b>

## ***How the inquiry works***

**The Bloody Sunday Inquiry is supported by an integrated, state-of-the art Information Technology system, much of which was specifically designed or adapted for use by the Inquiry. All of the applications in use were selected by the Inquiry Team for the express purpose of streamlining proceedings during the hearings, and to allow the various legal teams involved in the Inquiry to work as efficiently and effectively as possible.**

The main applications in use by the Bloody Sunday Inquiry are:

### **TrialPro - Evidence Display System**

Every piece of documentary evidence used by the Inquiry has been uniquely numbered and scanned to ensure that the documents may be quickly and easily displayed in electronic format on the Evidence Display screens located in the various Inquiry premises in Londonderry. These paginated, scanned documents are held in a TrialPro database which allows simple retrieval within seconds, in addition to the enlargement and annotation of the documents if required, using the touchscreen allocated to each barrister. This approach has been shown to reduce the length of document-intensive Inquiries by between 20% and 30%.

### **LiveNote - Real Time Transcription**

LiveNote is a Real Time Transcription application, providing a 'live' transcript of the Inquiry proceedings to the laptop computers used by the various legal teams. The application, as well as receiving and displaying the transcript on the laptop computers, also allows the legal teams to manipulate, annotate and highlight their individual copies, as well as providing sophisticated search and reporting facilities.

### **Virtual Reality**

A virtual reality application has been developed specifically for use by the Bloody Sunday Inquiry in order to aid the orientation of witnesses when they give their evidence. The application consists of thousands of photographs and computer-generated images of Derry, both current day and as it was in January 1972. The combination of this application

and the touchscreen technology used in the hearing chamber combine to allow the user, whether witness or barrister, to virtually 'walk' the streets of Londonderry, and will add considerable clarity to the witness testimonies.

### **Video Distribution/ Closed Circuit Television**

The TrialPro evidence display and the Virtual Reality application are distributed to a number of screens throughout the main hearing chamber, with the barrister or witness currently speaking having control of the applications via the use of touchscreen technology. In addition, the Evidence and Virtual Reality applications are also displayed, along with CCTV images of the current speaker in the hearing chamber, to a further 8 locations in the Guildhall and a further 4 locations throughout Derry. These include the Rialto Theatre, which is used for public viewing of the Inquiry on a daily basis.

### **Sound System**

A sophisticated sound system is used, in conjunction with the CCTV system described above, to ensure that current proceedings in the main chamber are distributed to all locations, both within the Guildhall and throughout the city. This sound system is also used to automatically switch the cameras in the main chamber to display the current speaker, and several induction loops have also been installed in the Guildhall to ensure that hearing-impaired witnesses or members of the public can clearly hear proceedings.

### **Communications Network**

All of these applications are integrated via the use of a high-performance data communications network, which ensures distribution of the applications to all locations in real time. This network covers most of the inner city, and spans the Guildhall, Calgach Centre, Rialto Theatre, Bloody Sunday Inquiry Press Office and the Bloody Sunday Trust building.

This information has been extracted with permission from the Bloody Sunday Inquiry website @ [www.bloody-sunday-inquiry.org](http://www.bloody-sunday-inquiry.org)

The events of January 30<sup>th</sup> 1972 uniquely shaped the Northern Ireland conflict. The loss of life and injury, the failure of the state to investigate adequately, with the continued denial of state accountability created a deep reservoir of hurt within bereaved families and the community. Bloody Sunday was a mirror held up to the state's own rhetoric of rule of law and democratic participation. The state was found wanting. However, in its failure to respond to grave human rights violations, the United Kingdom is not alone. In many deeply divided societies in many parts of the world, long-standing human rights abuses have both defined and perpetuated conflict. Bloody Sunday itself, the Tribunals of Inquiry and the campaign to ensure truth have much in common with places as far apart as El Salvador, Guatemala, South Africa, Israel and Bosnia. It is these commonalties and the lessons for others to learn from Bloody Sunday that will briefly be outlined here.

From its earliest moments, Bloody Sunday was not a local matter. Media coverage ensured its images were instantly recognisable world over. However, focusing international legal and political attention was a different matter. The fourteen deaths were included in the *Ireland v. United Kingdom* case, alleging violation of the right to life as protected by the European Convention on Human Rights. Disappointingly this portion of the application was declared inadmissible on the grounds that there was a failure to exhaust domestic remedies. The result did not end the quest for legal accountability at the European level. In 1996, a case was taken by relatives of the deceased (*McDaid and Others v. United Kingdom*). Procedural obstacles again prevented a full hearing of the application. The case was rejected for being out of time.

Despite these legal setbacks, the appearance of the cases on the international legal stage kept the campaign for truth in the international spotlight. The Bloody Sunday deaths were raised at the United Nations, both under the 1503 procedure to deal with systematic violations of human rights and under the four yearly reporting cycle by the United Kingdom to the Human Rights Committee. They were also raised in ad hoc international reports by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights and in

the European Parliament and the United States Senate.

A key aspect of the Bloody Sunday campaign has been the notion of truth, and truth telling. In this the campaign echoed and pre-empted, the calls of victims in other countries for the right to the widest possible 'telling of their story'. The idea of legal remedy advocated by the Bloody Sunday Justice campaign was wide and comprehensive. The lengthy lobbying to ensure that a second Tribunal of Inquiry was created sought as wide a mandate as possible for the now functioning Saville Tribunal. Whether the Tribunal lives up to these expectations can only be judged at its closure. But, its very creation is a precedent for other situations in which the state must acknowledge a responsibility to probe extra-ordinary violations of human rights. It is a precedent for demonstrating that it is possible to investigate past events.

### The innovative aspects of the Saville Inquiry

- The use of revolutionary technology to 'recreate' the physical locales and to reconstruct the actions of those on the ground.
- The functions of the solicitor to the Tribunal in laying out as wide a spread of the legal, medical and

## International Lessons from the Inquiry

other evidence as possible at the opening of the proceedings. In countries where public hearing can be closed when the process becomes too uncomfortable for the state, this provides a procedural means to put as much information in the public domain as quickly as possible.

- The facilities for public access to the proceedings and the care given to respecting the privacy and dignity of bereaved families.
- Internationalising the Inquiry by appointing two non-British judges to sit on the Tribunal of Inquiry.
- Granting the right of family members to be legally represented throughout the proceedings.

Examples of good international practice found at the Saville Inquiry should be applauded and encouraged. Equally, dubious legal decisions and examples of official complacency should be pointed out and avoided both in Northern Ireland and elsewhere. These include undue deference to the claims of national security, particularly in the context of a gross violations of human rights, and undue protectionism to the military, when both individual and group accountability would be evaded as a result of such deference.

While the events of Bloody Sunday have been traumatic at both the personal and communal level, it has taught valuable lessons to those who experience human rights violations. Persistence is a valuable resource. The commitment of a cohesive and supportive community can empower the victims of human rights violations. Governments can evade accountability for human rights violations for a time, but cannot avoid the past indefinitely. Truth is a powerful weapon for the powerless.

**Fionnuala Ni Aolain**

# The Ministry of Denial - the po

## Two issues raised recently have focused attention on the role and conduct of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) at the Bloody Sunday Inquiry.

When the Inquiry resumed after the Christmas recess, lawyers representing the MoD made what they referred to as the MoD's 'opening statement.' The purpose of this statement was to answer criticisms levelled at the MoD by lawyers acting on behalf of some of the families of the deceased and wounded. Uniquely, the MoD were able to make an opening statement in spite of the fact that they are not formally represented as a party in the Inquiry.

On the same day, Lord Saville announced that the Tribunal's decision on the application for public interest immunity (PII) made in December by the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for Defence would be delayed. This was because of allegations published the previous day in the Observer newspaper. The former MI5 officer, David Shayler, alleged that the subject matter of the PII application was unreliable.

The question of MoD representation and Mr Shayler's allegations provide an opportunity to examine the position of the MoD at the Inquiry.

### Legal representation

Legal representation at the Bloody Sunday Inquiry is quite different from that at the Widgery Inquiry. At the Widgery Inquiry, the Army as a whole was represented as a single party. In contrast, the soldiers and military commanders are now represented as individuals by three different teams of lawyers.

The treatment of the soldiers as individuals could be viewed as a strategy ensuring that the Government, in particular the MoD, is distanced from any possible finding of responsibility for Bloody Sunday. This sidesteps the fact that the MoD was then and is now the government department responsible for the Army, and hence the soldiers. Added to that, the soldiers did not act as individuals on Bloody Sunday. They operated as an Army.

The fact that the Government is distancing itself from any responsibility for the events of Bloody Sunday was made explicit in the MoD's 'opening statement' when their lawyer, Ian Burnett QC, said 'the MoD of today has no case to put to, or to advance before this Tribunal, nor does it have a position to defend.'

Mr Burnett argued that there would be no benefit in the MoD having a permanent legal presence at the Inquiry. He said that the present arrangement is more efficient and effective.

Currently there is a team of civil servants from the MoD, the Bloody Sunday Inquiry Unit, in attendance at the Inquiry.

However, this arrangement is not as effective as Mr Burnett suggests. On a number of occasions questions have been raised about the time taken and the substance of the responses provided by the MoD. Answers are provided through correspondence rather than in the Guildhall at the time they arise. Lord Saville has noted that this method can create confusion and delay. In December he took the opportunity presented by having a lawyer for the MoD in attendance to ask about questions raised in June. He described the answers provided by the MoD as 'not entirely responsive' to the questions which had been asked. Lord Saville said that he had found the MoD's answers difficult to follow and that it took a great deal of work to decide whether a proper answer had been given. Indeed he went so far as to stipulate how the MoD should answer these questions (by placing the answer to each question directly beneath the question it was designed to answer.) He also asked for a clear timetable of when the answers could be expected.

### MoD Involvement

The MoD's involvement in aspects of the Inquiry show that they play a more significant role than simply that of a government department assisting the Inquiry with relevant information.

They arranged and fund legal representation for the soldiers. Mr Burnett said that this was in accordance with routine arrangements that exist to provide legal assistance to public servants who become involved in inquiries or litigation arising from their service. (The Northern Ireland Office funds legal representation for all the other interested parties.)

The MoD supported the soldiers in their successful applications for anonymity. Mr Burnett said that the MoD believed it had a duty to engage in that debate and listed the reasons why they had become involved. He said that the Tribunal had asked them to provide submissions because of their accumulated knowledge of the risks faced by soldiers; that as the employer of all of the soldiers who served on Bloody Sunday they were under a continuing obligation to protect the safety of soldiers and their families; that the interests of those soldiers who still had to be traced should be properly considered.

Mr Burnett said that the fact that the MoD supported the soldiers on anonymity did not mean that they wished to thwart the Inquiry or to be unfair to the families. He cited the stance taken by the MoD in the PII application, which was the opposite to that taken by the soldiers, as evidence of the MoD's impartiality.

# tion of the MOD at the Inquiry

Currently, the MoD appears to have the best of both worlds. They decide when and on what issue to become involved in the Inquiry, recasting their role to a position that suits them best. They can avoid the embarrassment of having to give answers to questions at the time they are raised in the Guildhall yet if they wish to respond to criticism they apply and are granted permission to make an 'opening statement.'

As past employers, the MoD arrange and fund legal representation and have made legal submissions on anonymity on the basis that they have a continuing obligation towards the soldiers. Yet at the same time they disassociate themselves from the actions of the soldiers, commanders and politicians by arguing that they are answerable as individuals for their actions.

## Public Interest Immunity

Light may be shed on the real position of the MoD by the findings of an investigation into David Shayler's claim that the subject matter of the PII application is unreliable. The Tribunal have postponed making their decision on the PII application until Mr Shayler's allegations are investigated.

The material in question is from a security service agent codenamed 'In infliction.' The agent allegedly said in a debriefing in 1984 that Martin McGuinness said that he had been the first to open fire on Bloody Sunday. The Home Secretary applied for the documents relating to this debriefing to be redacted and for a tape recording of the debriefing to be withheld.

Mr Shayler said that 'In infliction' was known as a 'bullshitter.' He had come across 'In infliction's' intelligence during his time in MI5's counter-IRA section and had been told by other MI5 officers in the same branch that the agent was not trusted. Mr Shayler said that MI5 had stopped using 'In infliction' as an agent and that his reliability was being 'reassessed.'

If Mr Shayler's claims are accurate it will be crucial to know whether the Security Services alerted the Tribunal to the fact that a question mark hung over the reliability of this intelligence material.

In his opening statement, Mr Burnett spoke with an air of incredulity that anyone should question the good faith of the MoD and said it was unthinkable that servants of the Crown would try and frustrate the work of the Inquiry. His approach was misplaced, if not insulting. The existence of the Inquiry, the first time a second public inquiry has been held into the same event, is evidence that the assurances of Government can never be taken at face value. The public has every right to question the involvement and co-

operation of the department of state that ultimately had responsibility for the Army on that day.

Mr Shayler's allegations provide a timely reminder of the need for constant vigilance and scrutiny of the workings, conduct and involvement of the MoD in the Inquiry.

**Catherine McKenna**

British Irish Rights Watch

***CAJ works for a just and peaceful society in Northern Ireland where the rights of all are protected.***

CAJ is an independent cross-community non-governmental organisation which works to ensure that the rights of everyone in Northern Ireland are respected and protected. We work closely with governmental and non-governmental bodies, trade unions, businesses, church bodies, community groups, and of course the victims of human rights abuses. At an international level, we work with groups like Amnesty International, the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch and - through our affiliation to the International Federation for Human Rights - we have been able to bring our concerns to inter-governmental fora such as the United Nations.

CAJ's aims are:

- To secure the highest possible standards in the administration of justice;
- Locally and internationally to defend and advance civil liberties and the rights and freedoms recognised by international law; and
- To increase public awareness of, and activism on, human rights issues.

CAJ produces Just News - a monthly newsletter covering current developments, recent publications, legislation reports and case commentary - this month's edition is dedicated to events surrounding the Bloody Sunday Inquiry. To subscribe to Just News or to apply for membership, to receive our publication catalogue or for further information, please contact CAJ on tel: (028) 90 961122, fax: (028) 90 246706 or visit CAJ's website on [www.caj.org.uk](http://www.caj.org.uk)

## A Relative's View of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry

**'Industrial' was how one local commentator described the Bloody Sunday Inquiry in Derry's Guildhall. He said that any sense of involving, in a humane way, those most deeply effected by the massacre of Bloody Sunday and its legacy, is just not evident on the floor of the Guildhall. Hence the word 'industrial' as in the modern sense of automation with a minimum of people contact.**

Criticising the efficacy of a Public Inquiry in dealing with an event such as this, he said: "There must be an easier way to get at the truth that is ultimately more fulfilling for those whose lives have been shattered by this event. Truth may come, but may be dressed in such a way that it will be difficult to recognise".

The Bloody Sunday Inquiry was established in January 1998. Things have come a long, long way since Mike Ritchie asked me to write a piece for Just News in 1992 introducing the Bloody Sunday Justice Campaign. By then, more than 20 years had elapsed since the relatives of the dead and the wounded, collectively, had to endure the obscenity of the Widgery Tribunal and the Report that was oft quoted by British Prime Ministers and other rogues in defence of their position. It is still incredible that, after two decades, the families were able to unite under the Campaign banner seeking truth and justice.

In the context of the publicity surrounding the Inquiry, it is worth reminding ourselves of the noble, though humble, beginnings of the Justice Campaign which demanded that the British Government:

- repudiate the Widgery Report
- establish the innocence of those killed and wounded on Bloody Sunday
- bring about the prosecution of those responsible for the

murders and attempted murders on Bloody Sunday.

There has been much debate over the years about British justice and how, in the context of the north, it has proved an impossible concept. As the introductory quote will tell you, the Bloody Sunday Inquiry, is arguably proving inadequate in respect of dealing with the human trauma of Bloody Sunday and what the civil rights marchers witnessed on the day of the killings. This is something that the families of Pat Finucane, Robert Hamill, Rosemary Nelson and possibly many others will need to be aware of in their own quests for truth and justice.

I have heard almost as much criticism as praise of Truth Commissions over the years. The Bloody Sunday Inquiry is far from a Truth Commission but conflict resolution and reconciliation are still more alien in the British/Irish context than they were in South Africa after the fall of the Apartheid regime.

To conclude, two things were obvious after the initial submissions had been made to the Tribunal by legal representatives for the deceased/wounded and the soldiers;

1. The initial and enduring myth, created by the killers and sustained by the Widgery Report, that some of those killed on Bloody Sunday may have been involved in shooting etc, was no more. However, Mr Edwin Glasgow QC for most of the soldiers then went on to create another myth which may turn out to be even more enduring: that another 34 people were shot and have since gone unaccounted for. I will leave that to himself.

2. Mr Glasgow and his colleagues were at the Inquiry to represent individual soldiers, not the British army, not the Parachute Regiment, not the Ministry of Defence! The MoD has since declared that it has no case to make. Indeed. We will see about that.

The more the Inquiry proceeds the bigger the picture becomes. My hope is that all those working for the civilian side see the big picture, see their place within it, and are aware of how history will record this. My fear is that many do not.

**Tony Doherty**

### In the Headlines

CAJ holds newspaper clippings on more than 50 civil liberties and justice issues (from mid 1987). Copies of these can be purchased from CAJ office. The clippings are also available for consultation at the office.

Anyone interested in this service, should phone (028) 9096 1122.



# Who's Who in the Inquiry

## Judges

The Honourable Mr. William Hoyt    The Honourable Lord Saville of Newdigate - Chairman    The Honourable Mr. John L. Toohy

Christopher Clarke QC    Alan Roxburgh    Cathryn McGahey    Bilal Rawat

## Counsel to the Inquiry

### Lawyers representing wounded and/or Families of deceased

#### SOLICITOR

Barr & Co, Solicitors, Derry  
 Brendan Kearney Kelly & Co. solicitors  
 Desmond J. Doherty & Co. Solicitors, Derry  
 MacDermott & McGurk Solicitors, Derry  
 McCartney & Casey, Solicitors, Derry  
 Madden & Finucane Solicitors, Belfast

#### LEADER

Eilis MacDermott QC  
 Declan Morgan QC  
 Michael Mansfield QC  
 Michael Mansfield QC  
 Lord Gifford QC  
 Seamus Treacy QC  
 Arthur Harvey QC  
 Arthur Harvey QC  
 Kevin Finnegan QC  
 Michael Lavery QC

#### JUNIOR

Michael Topolski  
 Brian Kennedy  
 John Coyle  
 Kieran Mallon  
 Richard Harvey  
 Fiona Doherty  
 Karen Quinlivan  
 Ciaran Harvey  
 Patricia Smythe  
 Brian McCarthy

#### PARTIES

Family of Patrick Doherty  
 Michael Bradley, Michael Bridge  
 Family of Bernard McGuigan  
 Family of William & Alex Nash; Daniel Gillespie  
 Family of James Wray  
 Families of Gerard Donaghy, Gerard McKinney,  
 William McKinney; Joseph Friel; Joseph Mallon  
 Families of Michael McDaid, John Young;  
 Patrick O'Donnell  
 Families of John Johnston; Damien Donaghy,  
 Daniel McGowan  
 Families of Patrick Campbell, John Duddy,  
 Michael Kelly; Patrick McDaid  
 Families of Margaret Deery, Hugh Gilmore,  
 Kevin McElhinney; Alana Burke

### Lawyers representing the soldiers:

Mr. Anthony Lawton,  
 Treasury Solicitor's Office

Ford; McLellan, Steele; Welsh; Wilford; A; AB; AC;  
 AD; B; C; D; F; J; K; M; N; O; P; Q; R; S; T; U; V; Z; 019; 200;  
 237; 77 other soldiers identified by Widgery number.

Mr. Robert Aitken  
 Treasury Solicitor's Office

334 soldiers by INQ number.  
 134; 138; 150; 202; 218; 229; INQ 101; INQ 351; INQ 374  
 INQ 569; INQ 709; INQ 1115; INQ 1868; INQ 1937;  
 Col. Overbury

Ms Jacqueline Duff Solicitor  
 Northumberland

Nicholas Moss  
 Ian Leist  
 11; 104; INQ 1165; INQ 1831; INQ 1836; INQ 1847; INQ 1848;  
 INQ 2064; INQ 2107.

## Diary of Events

**January 30, 1972** Soldiers from the 1st Parachute Regiment opened fire on unarmed and peaceful civilian demonstrators in the Bogside, Derry, killing 13 and wounding seventeen. One wounded man dies later. The shooting begins at the end of a Civil Rights Association rally attended by nearly ten thousand people. The day became universally known as "Bloody Sunday".

**January 31, 1972** The Prime Minister, Edward Heath, set up a public inquiry under the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Widgery. This Inquiry took place in Coleraine, County Derry, where Lord Widgery arrived on the 14 February and held a preliminary hearing. A total of 17 sessions were held between the 21 February 1972 and the 14 March 1972. 114 witnesses gave evidence. A further three sessions were held at the Royal Courts of Justice in London on the 16, 17 and 20 March. On the 10 April 1972 Lord Widgery submitted the report of his findings to Reginald Maudling, the then Home Secretary.

**April 18, 1972** Lord Widgery published his "*Report of the Tribunal appointed to inquire into the events on Sunday, 30<sup>th</sup> January 1972*". It was produced within 11 weeks of the incident, exonerating the soldiers. Whilst admitting that "None of the deceased or wounded is proved to have been shot whilst handling a firearm or bomb" and that in Glenfada Park, "...firing bordered on the reckless" he concluded that responsibility for events in Derry lay on the shoulders of the march organizers.

**August 1973** The inquest into the deaths on 'Bloody Sunday' was held.

**1974** In 1974, a total of £41,717 was paid in compensation to the relatives of the victims.

**Spring 1992** Following the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Bloody Sunday, relatives, wounded and their supporters came together to establish the Bloody Sunday Justice Campaign, a non-political organization committed to securing Truth and Justice. The objectives of the campaign are that the British Government should publicly acknowledge that all of those killed or injured were totally innocent; that the Government should repudiate the Widgery Report in its entirety; and that those responsible for Bloody Sunday be prosecuted.

**January 21, 1993** John Major rejects a request for an independent inquiry into Bloody Sunday but adds: 'The government made clear in 1974 that those who were killed ... should be regarded as innocent of any allegation that they were shot whilst handling firearms or explosives'.

**1995** Records held in London relating to the Widgery Tribunal were released, containing a letter headed "confidential" that contained a minute of a meeting between Widgery, the then Prime Minister, Edward Heath and the

then Lord Chancellor, Lord Hailsham on 1<sup>st</sup> of February 1972, the day after Bloody Sunday. During this discussion Heath outlined a number of issues that "he thought it right to draw to the Lord Chief Justice's attention" including that: "It had to be remembered that we were in Northern Ireland fighting not only a military war but a propaganda war."

**January 30, 1997** On the 25th anniversary 40,000 people marched demanding a new inquiry.

**1997** The Bloody Sunday Trust, a community based education and history organization was established.

**January 29, 1998** The Prime Minister Mr. Tony Blair, announced to the House of Commons "... that a Tribunal be established for inquiring into a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the events on Sunday 30 January 1972 which led to loss of life in connection with the procession in Londonderry on that day, taking account of any new information relevant to events on that day."

**April 3, 1998** Opening of the New Inquiry. The Inquiry, which will sit in the Guildhall, Derry, is being conducted by an international tribunal of judges, chaired by the Right Hon The Lord Saville of Newdigate. The other Tribunal members are the Honourable William L. Hoyt (formerly Chief Justice of New Brunswick, Canada) and Sir Edward Somers (a former New Zealand Appeal Court Judge).

**July 20/21, 1998** The new Bloody Sunday Inquiry held a preliminary hearing.

**March 27, 2000** The new Inquiry begins taking oral evidence. It is expected that the Inquiry will last for "at least" two more years.

**July 31, 2000** Sir Edward Somers resigned from the Tribunal for personal reasons.

**September 5, 2000** The Hon Mr John L. Toohey, who was a Justice of the High Court of Australia from 1987 to 1998, is appointed as a member of the Bloody Sunday Tribunal, in replacement of Sir Edward Somers.

*Compiled by Michael Frahm.*

## Just News

Just News welcomes readers' news, views and comments.

Just News is published by the Committee on the Administration of Justice Ltd.

Correspondence should be addressed to the Editor,

**Fionnuala ni Aolain, CAJ Ltd.**

45/47 Donegall Street, Belfast

BT1 2BR Phone (028) 9096 1122