



Medal Campaigns

Standard Note: SN/IA/2880

Last updated: 27 July 2012

Author: Claire Taylor and Louisa Brooke-Holland

Section: International Affairs and Defence Section

The Government announced a fresh review of the rules and principles governing the award of military campaign medals in October 2011. The review, led by Sir John Holmes, drew on the work already undertaken as part of an initial Ministry of Defence medal review completed in early 2011. An interim report was published on 17 July 2012. The Government has asked Sir John Holmes to lead a second stage of work to make further recommendations using the principles proposed in the Review, to be completed as soon as possible in the autumn.

The honouring of veterans for service in a variety of campaigns dating back to the Second World War has been an issue for many years. It gained further prominence in June 2003 after the Government announced that a new medal clasp for service in the Suez Canal Zone between 1951 and 1954 would be awarded to veterans.

This note examines the process by which campaign medals are instituted, the rules governing the acceptance and wearing of foreign medals, and some of the medal campaigns that are currently underway, including recognition for the personnel of Bomber Command and the campaign for the institution of a National Defence Medal to recognise service in the Armed Forces.

Information on the decision to award the Suez Canal Zone Medal, the eligibility criteria for the award and the application procedure are outlined in [Library Standard Note SN/IA/2202](#).

Information on the decisions to award the Arctic Emblem, the Bevin Boys Badge and the Women's Land Army/ Women's Timber Corps Badge is set out in the following Library notes:

- [SN/IA/3943, Arctic Emblem](#)
- [SN/IA/4564, Women's Land Army/ Women's Timber Corps Badge](#)
- [SN/IA/4384, Bevin Boys Badge](#)

Information on the Pingat Jasa Malaysia medal is available in [Library Standard Note SN/IA/3914](#). In February 2008 the Department of Transport also announced that a badge of recognition would be awarded to those individuals who had served with the [Air Transport Auxiliary](#) during World War Two.

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

Contents

- 1 Background 3**
 - 1.1 Policy on Non-Retrospection 4
- 2 Rules Governing the Acceptance and Wear of Foreign Decorations and Medals 5**
 - 2.1 Examples of Conferred Foreign Medals 7
- 3 Government Review of Honours and Decorations 9**
 - 3.1 Review’s view of long-standing campaigns 13
- 4 Medal Campaigns 13**
 - 4.1 Bomber Command 13
 - Medal Recognition 14
 - Memorial Campaign 17
 - 4.2 National Service Medal 18
 - 4.3 National Defence Medal 19
 - 4.4 Munitions Workers during World War Two 22
 - Background – First World War 22
 - Munitions Workers during World War Two 24
 - Campaign for Recognition 25
 - 4.5 Non-Conscripted Miners during World War Two 26
 - 4.6 Russian Arctic Defence Medal 28
 - 4.7 The Aden Campaigns 29
 - 4.8 Dunkirk Medal 31
 - 4.9 Submarine Service Medal (Cold War) 31
 - The US Position 32

1 Background

The process by which a British medal is instituted has been in place for many years. In the case of a campaign medal, the Commander-in-Chief of a particular campaign may make a recommendation for an award if they consider that service in that theatre, or under particularly rigorous circumstances, justifies the institution of a medal. That recommendation is passed to senior military officers who, if they are in agreement, submit the case to the Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS). If CDS approves the proposal the Secretary of State for Defence submits the case to the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals, which is often referred to as the HD committee, through the Ceremonial Officer at the Cabinet Office. Following agreement by the HD committee, the case is then submitted to The Sovereign for approval. This process can take up to two years.

Medals recognising service in World War Two were instituted in 1948 by the HD Committee, with approval from King George VI. These included eight campaign stars and medals for operational service in a number of campaigns including Burma, Africa, Italy, North West Europe, the Pacific and the Atlantic. In addition, the Committee also recommended the institution of two awards for general operational or non-operational service. At the time the King also ruled that no further awards should be instituted for service in World War Two. It was also agreed among the allied countries at the time that campaign medals would not be exchanged.¹

Since the end of World War Two, various conflicts have warranted the institution of a full campaign medal. In the last few years medals have been awarded for service in the Falklands (South Atlantic Star 1982), in the 1990-91 Gulf War (Gulf War medal), and in the conflict in Iraq (Iraq medal). The Iraq medal was also awarded with a bar for service specifically between 19 March and 28 April 2003.

The eligibility criteria for each award or medal are determined by consideration of the rigours of the campaign. This is not standardised and each medal is considered on its own merits. In some circumstances, the qualifying period agreed has been as short as one day's service, whereas other medals or clasps require 90 days' continuous service.

In 1962 the General Service Medal was also introduced across all three Services in order to recognise service in situations that were considered worthy of commemoration but not of a sufficient scale to warrant an individual campaign medal. The General Service Medal remained the same while each theatre of operation was denoted by the award of a specific bar. If a recipient had already been awarded the medal, additional bars would be added and worn in the order that they were earned. Since 1962 several bars to the GSM have been awarded including for service in Northern Ireland and in Iraq.²

In 2000 the GSM was replaced by the Operational Service Medal (OSM). Three campaign ribbons for the OSM have been awarded to date:

- For service in Sierra Leone between 1999-2002;

¹ Further information on the medals instituted for service during World War Two, including eligibility criteria, is available at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceFor/Veterans/Medals/WorldWarIIMedalSummary.htm>

² Further information is available at: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceFor/Veterans/Medals/GeneralServiceMedal1962.htm>

- Service in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2003
- Operation *Veritas* in Afghanistan 2003. This has now become the OSM for service in Afghanistan.³⁺⁴

1.1 Policy on Non-Retrospection

Since the end of the World War Two the HD committee has maintained a policy whereby it will not consider the institution of awards and medals for service given many years earlier or the institution of awards and medals for a theatre of operation which has already been recognised, what is commonly referred to as “double medalling”. On the issue of non-retrospection, the HD Committee considered that it could not put itself in the place of the Committee making the original decision who would have been able to take into account the views of the Government and other interested parties at the time.⁵ Reference to the ‘five year rule’ is also made in the *Foreign and Commonwealth Orders Regulations 1969* which deal with the acceptance and wear of foreign medals (see below). The Orders state:

In no case can applications be considered in respect of Orders conferred more than five years previously, or offered in connection with events so long prior to the proposal to award them.⁶

In February 2002 the HD committee met to discuss this policy of non-retrospection. The committee concluded that its policy would remain in force and that consideration would not be given to cases where service had taken place more than five years previously.

In a Written Answer on 24 July 2002 the then Parliamentary under Secretary of State, Dr Lewis Moonie, stated:

The Government considers it important to respect the principle that where there is a clear, demonstrable decision taken within five years of a campaign that a General Service Medal should not be awarded, that decision should not be reopened.⁷

That position was reiterated by the Government in December 2010:

It is long-standing policy that awards will not be approved for events or service that took place more than five years before initial consideration, or in connection with events that took place in the distant past. The rule is understood to have been laid down in the time of King George VI. It is based on the considered view that those closest to the activities in question are those best able to judge the appropriateness or otherwise of honours and decorations...⁸

There have, however, been a number of exceptions to this rule made over the years. In 2003 the Government announced that an exception to this rule had been approved with respect to those veterans who had served in the Suez Canal Zone between 1951 and 1954. In justifying the award of a new clasp to the GSM the then Prime Minister, Tony Blair, stated:

³ <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceFor/Veterans/Medals/OsmAfghanistan.htm>

⁴ The Government announced in August 2010 that changes to the eligibility criteria for the campaign medals for service in Afghanistan and Iraq would be instituted. Those changes will enable personnel with 45 days aggregated service in either theatre of operation, to receive the appropriate medal. Previously only personnel with 30 days continuous service were entitled to receive the award.

⁵ <http://www.veterans-uk.info/medals/instituted.html>

⁶ *Foreign and Commonwealth Orders Regulations 1969*

⁷ HC Deb 24 July 2002 c1106W

⁸ HL Deb 13 December 2010, c106WA

In examining this case so long after the events, the Committee on the Grant of honours, Decorations and Medals recognised that it had special features. Although it had been established that the commander in Chief at the time made a request for a medal there was no conclusive evidence that the case was every fully considered and a formal decision reached. Nor had the deployment been recognised by the aware of any other campaign medal.⁹

Exception has also been granted to a number of medals conferred by foreign governments. Most notably permission was granted in 1994 for the Russian 40th Anniversary of Victory Medal to be awarded to veterans of the allied Arctic convoys;¹⁰ while in early 2006 the Government announced that exceptions had been made with respect to the award of the Pingat Jasa Malaysia medal (see section 2.1).

The Military Medal Review, published on 17 July 2012, looked at both the five-year rule and the question of double-medalling. The Review endorsed the cut-off point being five years but said this rule should not be “elevated into a blanket refusal to reconsider cases”. It said avoiding double medalling should continue to be “an absolute rule” for British medallic recognition.¹¹

2 Rules Governing the Acceptance and Wear of Foreign Decorations and Medals

The Rules Governing the Acceptance and Wearing of Foreign Orders, Decorations and Medals were originally contained in the *Foreign and Commonwealth Orders Regulations 1969*. They have since been re-issued, in more detail, and a copy has been placed in the Library of the House (ref: MGP 05/2687).

In summary, those rules set out the following principles and guidelines:

- No UK citizen may accept and wear a foreign award without The Sovereign’s express permission.
- Permission for a UK citizen to accept an award offered by a foreign state will only be considered if the award recognises specified services rendered to the interests of that foreign state.
- Permission to accept a foreign award will not be given if a UK award for the same service has been, or is expected to be, awarded.
- Requests made in respect of services rendered more than five years previously, or in connection with events in the distant past (e.g. commemorative awards), will not be considered.
- Each request will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Approval of a similar application in the past does not imply that permission will automatically be granted.
- Approval will only be considered for awards given by Heads of State or Government recognised as such by The Sovereign. It will not be considered for foreign awards

⁹ HC Deb 11 June 2003, c869W

¹⁰ It should be noted that approval for the award of the Russian 50th Anniversary of Victory Medal was subsequently denied in 1995.

¹¹ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12-13

conferred by private societies or institutions, with the exception of international organisations such as the UN, NATO or the EU.

Permission to accept and wear a foreign award will be granted on either:

- An unrestricted basis – allowing the award to be worn on any occasion.
- A restricted basis – allowing the award to be worn only on particular occasions associated with the foreign state that conferred it.

However, unrestricted permission will only be considered for foreign awards conferred for services under the following circumstances:

- Relating to saving, or attempting to save, a life.¹²
- By any member of the UK Armed Forces or other UK official on exchange, loan or attachment to a foreign state who is involved in a military operation or emergency on behalf of that state.
- By any member of the UK Armed Forces serving in a UK unit within a bi-lateral force under the command of another country who renders special service to the country's forces in a military operation or emergency.
- In military operations under the auspices of an international organisation such as the UN or NATO.

The granting of restricted permission will also only be considered in the case of foreign awards conferred in the following circumstances:

1. On the occasion of, and in connection with a State or official visit by a Head of State or Government.
2. In connection with a State visit by The Sovereign.
3. To members of Special Missions when The Sovereign is represented at a coronation, wedding or funeral or other similar occasion; or on any Diplomatic Representative when specially accredited to represent The Sovereign on such occasions.

In all other circumstances permission (unrestricted or restricted) will not be granted to Crown servants generally; to Heads or other members of HM Diplomatic or Consular establishments abroad; and senior officials, whether military or civilian, visiting foreign states.

Applications by a foreign government to confer a medal must be sought in the first instance from the Honours Secretariat at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The Secretariat, in conjunction with the Ceremonial Secretariat of the Cabinet Office through the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals will then take the decision on whether to seek approval from The Queen.

On the whole approval for the conferral of a foreign medal is rarely given and any foreign medals that are conferred are generally acknowledged to be regarded as 'keepsakes' and are not intended to be worn.

¹² This includes medals issued by life saving societies and institutions, although any medals conferred must be worn on the right breast and not the left.

The Military Medal Review, published in July 2012, outlined the rules and processes in awarding and receiving foreign medals. It concluded:

The so-called rule about double medalling is in a muddle where international medals are concerned, with exceptions proliferating, a good deal of dissatisfaction about how it operates, and no consistency with how other countries treat these issues.¹³

It also noted it is “not helpful” to relations with other countries because of the risk of causing offence without fully convincing arguments.

The Review said “there is a strong case for the current rules to be reconsidered and brought more into line with current reality.” It particularly highlighted the distinction between accepting and wearing international medals “lacks credibility”. It recommends the FCO, MOD and Cabinet Office work together:

As a matter of some urgency to elaborate a new, effective, simple and fully defensible policy about medals from other countries and international organisations, reflecting the observations above. This should include a study of how other comparable countries deal with these issues. We recommend in particular the appointment of an independent expert or group of experts to conduct a review, including such a study, as the basis for a genuinely fresh look. The new policy should be agreed by HD Committee and The Queen, and then published.¹⁴

2.1 Examples of Conferred Foreign Medals

There are a number of examples since the Second World War where countries have been given approval to confer medals on British Service personnel or ex-Service personnel. In a letter placed in the Library of the House in July 1990 the MOD set out those countries which, by that time, had been granted permission to confer an award, although it did not provide any detail on the particular medals concerned. Those countries were as follows:

Brunei

Ceylon

Ghana

India

Jamaica

Kenya

Malawi

Malaya

Malaysia

Nigeria

Oman

Pakistan

¹³ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p24

¹⁴ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p25

Sierra Leone

Singapore

Uganda

United Arab Emirates

Vanuatu

Zimbabwe.¹⁵

In 1994 permission was also granted for the Russian 40th Anniversary of Victory Medal to be awarded to veterans of the allied Arctic convoys.¹⁶

It is also not without precedent for foreign medals to be awarded but permission to wear them to be denied. Following the Gulf War in 1991 the Kuwaiti Liberation Medal and was awarded to British Service personnel by the Government of Kuwait. To date, permission to wear that medal has been denied.

In addition, permission to wear the Saudi Arabian Medal for the Liberation of Kuwait, which was subsequently awarded in 1992 to all British personnel who had served in the Gulf conflict, was reportedly only granted to a small handful of those personnel in receipt of that award.¹⁷

In January 2006 the Foreign and Commonwealth Office also announced that permission for eligible veterans to receive the Malaysian Government's Pingat Jasa Malaysia medal for Service in Malaysia between August 1957 and August 1966 had been granted by HM The Queen. However, permission to wear that award was not granted. Announcing approval for the PJM to be received, but not worn, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office stated:

Her Majesty's Government welcome, and believe it is important to recognise, the generous gesture by the King and Government of Malaysia, and their wish to acknowledge the service given by veterans and others in the years immediately after Malaysian independence. The exception recommended reflects this and our strong and important relationship with Malaysia.

The Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals reviewed the five year and double medalling rules, and considered that, while there were sound reasons why they should be retained, there will be occasions when specific circumstances require exceptions to the rules to be recommended. When such exceptions are contemplated, the Committee will consider each request on a case by case basis, taking into account any special circumstances at the time. The fact that a similar

¹⁵ Letter from The Earl of Arran to Derek Conway, 26 July 1990

¹⁶ Further information on this award is available in Library Standard Note, SN/IA/2880, *Retrospective Medal Campaigns*. It should be noted that approval for the award of the Russian 50th Anniversary of Victory Medal was subsequently denied in 1995.

¹⁷ Reference to a few of the 45,000 British servicemen that were awarded this medal being granted permission to actually wear it is widespread among the publicly available medal reference books and buyers guides, for example the *Medal Yearbook 2010*. Among various discussion forums, such as the [forum](#) of the National Gulf Veterans and Families Association, it has been suggested that permission to wear the medal may have been granted to personnel such as defence attaches who may not have been in receipt of the British campaign medal for this theatre of operation. These comments are without citation, however, and should be treated with caution.

request has been approved in the past will not mean that permission will be granted in future cases.¹⁸

This issue is examined in more detail in [Library Standard Note SN/IA/3914](#).

3 Government Review of Honours and Decorations

In its 2010 *Armed Forces Manifesto* the Conservative Party set out a commitment to review the rules governing the award of medals should they form the next Government. The Coalition Government initiated an internal MOD review of the principles underpinning the award of medals.¹⁹

In answer to a Parliamentary Question on 28 February 2011 the Minister for Personnel, Welfare and Veterans, Andrew Robathan, confirmed:

The Coalition undertook in its programme for government to review the rules governing the award of medals for the armed forces. This review has considered campaigns by veterans and other interested parties for new awards, including the campaign to institute a medal for service in Bomber Command during world war two. The review recently reported its findings to Defence Ministers and is now with the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister for their consideration.²⁰

The outcome of that review was not made public and in October 2011 the Government announced plans to hold a fresh review with a broader scope and an independent lead. Lord Astor of Hever, in announcing the review, said it will address concerns about double-medalling and about the rules setting fixed time limits for the award of decorations. He also said “the rules need to be reviewed from first principles to see whether they remain fit for purpose.”²¹

The terms of reference were announced by the Prime Minister on 30 April 2012. He said “the review will make recommendations where appropriate for any change” and it will report by the summer.

The terms of reference:

The review will:

- Consider the current medallic situation and examine the rationale for existing guiding principles, including the 5 year rule; double medalling; risk and rigour and the HD Committee process. The review will examine the background to the current arrangements, the pros and cons of them and make recommendations where appropriate for any changes, and;
- Make recommendations on how retrospective claims for medals for earlier campaign service should be assessed in light of the guiding principles recommended by the review.

Consultation

¹⁸ HC Deb 31 January 2006, c11-12WS

¹⁹ HC Deb 8 February 2011, c55WH

²⁰ HC Deb 28 February 2011, c85-6W

²¹ HL Deb 26 October 2011, c856-8

The review should consult widely and those consulted should include: CDS and the Chiefs of Staff; Buckingham Palace; personnel from all three Services (from a range of ranks); representatives from veterans groups who have campaigned for further recognition; representatives from veterans organisations such as the Royal British Legion, officials involved in medal policy matters in the Cabinet Office, Ministry of Defence and the Foreign Office.

Assumptions

The review will consider the arrangements relating to military medals only and is not to review state honours and awards (including national gallantry awards) or Long Service and Good Conduct Medals.

The review should draw on, but not necessarily be guided by, the work already undertaken as a part of the initial Ministry of Defence medal review. This should include consideration of the responses to that review by the veterans groups consulted.

Any changes recommended should consider the cost to the taxpayer of any such changes.²²

The review was led by Sir John Holmes, Director of the Ditchley Foundation, and supported by a team in the Cabinet Office. The [Military Medals Review](#) was published on 17 July 2012. The Prime Minister described it as an interim review and has asked Sir John Holmes to lead a second stage of work, to be completed in the autumn. No further terms of reference are expected to be published at the time of writing.²³

The Prime Minister made the following statement:

The interim report brings welcome transparency to these arrangements. It finds that the overall approach is reasonably based. However, it also identifies areas where it is worth considering whether the rules could be applied with greater flexibility and transparency. It proposes ways forward to address some past grievances while maintaining the distinctive British tradition that military medals are hard earned. I hope this will help to draw a line under past campaigns and provide a more open decision-making process in future. I welcome the report and have asked Sir John to lead a second stage of work to make further recommendations using the principles he has proposed to implement his findings. This work will be completed as soon as possible in the autumn.²⁴

The Review notes that the UK takes a “distinctive approach” to the award of military campaign medals, viewing them as something that must be awarded sparingly “on the basis of genuine risk and rigour.”²⁵ It observes some countries adopt a freer approach to awarding medals but came across few during the review process who favoured loosening the restrictions too much. The Review’s principle conclusion is “there is no good reason to change the basic approach” but “there is room for greater transparency and flexibility in how some of the current rules are framed and applied and for a broader-based decision-making in the future.”²⁶

²² Military Medals Review – terms of reference, DEP2012-0706

²³ Cabinet Office advice to House of Commons Library specialist, 27 July 2012

²⁴ HC Deb 17 July 2012 c132WS

²⁵ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12

²⁶ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12

The Review takes a detailed look at the current principles, rules and process of awarding military medals. It makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

The risk and rigour principle should remain the basis of decisions about campaign medals. Particular care needs to continue to be taken about consistency in setting the qualifying criteria for individual medals, to ensure both fairness for that medal, and fairness compared to other comparable medals. There is also a strong case for a separate medal for campaign support, particularly as the nature of warfare changes.

Recommendation 2

Campaign awards should continue to be determined in a timely fashion, with a strong presumption that they should not be revisited later. Five years after the conclusion of the operations concerned is a reasonable cut off and review point for this. However this should not be elevated into a blanket refusal to reconsider cases where the criteria set out in paragraphs 30-33 of Section 3²⁷ are met, leading to a prima facie case that the original decisions may have been unsound or unfair in some way. The existence of a strong campaign in favour of a review of a particular past decision should not be a deciding factor in favour of a review itself or a change of mind but can strengthen the presumption of the need for such a review.

Recommendation 3

Avoiding double medalling for the same operational service should continue to be an absolute rule for British medallic recognition. It should also remain an important aim in cases where a combination of a British medal and a medal or medals from another country or international organisation is offered. However the current muddle about how the latter policy is applied, and how international medals are dealt with overall, should be reviewed by the MOD, FCO and Cabinet Office as a matter of urgency, on the basis of a fresh study of international comparisons, with a view to new, simpler and more consistent rules about when international medals can be accepted and worn.

Recommendation 4

The membership of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals (HD Committee) should be broadened to reflect outside views, expertise and interests, and a new sub-committee should be created to look specifically at military issues. As well as appropriate officials, up to five outside members should be appointed to this sub-committee, which could be broken down as follows: three experienced and credible figures not active in front line politics, and representing a broad spectrum of views; an independent military expert; and a representative of the Armed Forces Covenant Reference Group. The Committee itself should meet in person more regularly, particularly when there are controversial issues to discuss, and the sub-committee as often as necessary.

²⁷ The criteria includes: evidence the issue was never properly considered at the time; significant new information becoming available; facts relied on at the time being shown to be unsound; original decision manifestly inconsistent with those for other similar campaigns; decision taken for reasons which have nothing to do with risk and rigour. In addition, although existence of a campaign cannot be a reason for reopening a decision by itself but the degree of public and other support should be taken into account; decision whether to take another look at a decision should not rest with the MOD but with the HD committee; and finally there would need to be "at a minimum" evidence of a significant injustice or inconsistency affecting a substantial group of individuals, a sufficient degree of assurance that the requirements of risk and rigour were genuinely met, and satisfaction that new inconsistencies were not being created. See p21 of [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 for the exact wording.

Recommendation 5

The reconstituted HD Committee, on advice from the new military sub-committee, should be asked to look again rapidly at the main long-standing controversies to try to draw a line under them, on the basis of the criteria set out in paragraphs 30-33 of Section 3. It should start with the longest-standing issues, notably that surrounding the Arctic Convoys from the Second World War. An independent expert should be commissioned on a temporary basis to advise the sub-committee on these controversies rapidly but fully, starting from the material provided to the Review.

Recommendation 6

The reconstituted HD committee, having taking advice from the new subcommittee, should recommend to The Queen texts codifying the basic principles and rules underlying campaign medal decisions, based on the conclusions of this Review. These texts should then be promulgated publicly, in order to provide greater transparency and a fully agreed basis for future decision-making.

Recommendation 7

The idea of a National Defence Medal as a recognition of military service of whatever form is worthy of consideration but is in a separate category from military campaign medals and should be treated accordingly. Its merits, and examples from other countries, should be looked at by a Cabinet Office-led working group in the first place, before consideration by the reconstituted HD Committee and its sub-committee. Any recommendations should be made initially to the government, rather than The Queen, and would then need to be the subject of wider political and other consultation, since this is a decision of broad national significance which would require a broad political and public consensus.

Recommendation 8

In the event of changes to past medalling decisions with significant cost implications, veterans should not be asked to pay for their medals, but the direct cost to the MOD budget should be minimised where possible through recourse to different kinds of volunteer funding, in particular to cover extra administration costs.²⁸

In addition to the recommendations listed above, the Review suggested the new sub-committee of the HD committee might wish to:

- Review the decisions on qualifying criteria for individual medals, which would help prevent future long-running campaigns.
- Consider making the arguments regarding the awarding of particular medals public, particularly why the criteria of time and space were drawn, in the interests of transparency and consistency.

The Review includes in its annex the rules governing the acceptance and wearing of foreign orders, decorations and medals by citizens of the United Kingdom and her Overseas Territories. It also provides tables of campaign and other operational awards authorised for wear by the Armed Forces since 1939 and tables of foreign and international awards approved for wear by UK citizens.

²⁸ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12-14

3.1 Review's view of long-standing campaigns

The Review is at pains to make it clear that it was not tasked to or able to take a definitive view in any particular case. It did however say it was “sufficiently impressed by the arguments of some of the campaigners” and some campaigns seemed to “reflect a prima facie case for a fresh and independent look” to recommend that there should be a “rapid but in-depth independent look at the main controversies, to try and draw a line under them.”²⁹

The Review states it is anxious to “avoid raising public expectations by naming names” but it goes on to say top priority should be given to looking at those involving veterans from the Second World War, such as the campaign over the Arctic Convoys, for obvious reasons of the age of those concerned.³⁰

The Review does not believe an appeals mechanism, such as the one set up by the Australian Government to consider appeals against decisions made, is appropriate or necessary.

In addition, the Review suggests the principles and rules which underlie future decisions should be set out clearly and explicitly for all to see, and advises the HD committee to publish these once approved.

4 Medal Campaigns

The honouring of veterans for service in a variety of campaigns dating back to the Second World War has been an issue for many years. The Military Medal Review led by Sir John Holmes also looked at some, but not all, of the campaigns mentioned below and references are made to the relevant pages of the Review.

4.1 Bomber Command

After the Allied retreat at Dunkirk in 1940 until D-Day in June 1944, Britain and her allies had to rely on long-range bombing in order to attack the military and industrial strength of the German war effort. That task fell to RAF Bomber Command. However, air crews of Bomber Command also carried out other roles, including low-level daylight bombing raids against shipping targets; the laying of thousands of mines at sea; supporting the Allied armies before and after D-Day; the ‘dambusters’ raid and the sinking of the German battleship the *Tirpitz*.

Over 10,000 aircraft were lost; 55,573 out of a total 125,000 aircrew lost their lives, including personnel from the Commonwealth and other Allied nations; a further 8,000 were wounded and 10,000 became Prisoners of War. The average age of the RAF aircrews in Bomber Command was 22 years.³¹ To date, the contribution of Bomber Command has not been recognised by the institution of a separate campaign medal or bar, or a national memorial. In contrast the personnel of RAF Fighter Command who flew in the Battle of Britain were awarded a separate bar to the 1939-1945 Star, a point that has been raised by campaigners.

As an article in *The Daily Telegraph* summarised in March 2008:

During the course of the war, 125,000 aircrew of Bomber Command carried out a total of 366,514 sorties. Of these, 297,663 were by night. During these sustained operations, 55,573 pilots and crew were killed.

²⁹ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12 and p20

³⁰ Ibid p28

³¹ Further information on RAF Bomber Command is available online at: http://www.rafbombercommand.com/master_welcome.html

The dead included 38,462 Britons, 9,980 Canadians (58 per cent of the Canadians who flew with Bomber Command were killed), 4,050 Australians, 1,703 New Zealanders, 977 Poles, 218 Free French, 68 Americans attached to Bomber Command from the United States Army Air Force, 34 Norwegians and three Indians - as well as 1,479 ground crew.

Ninety-one members of the Women's Auxiliary Air Force also died while on duty with Bomber Command. 10,999 members were taken prisoner of war; as many as a thousand evaded capture after being shot down, most making their way back to Britain to fly again.

In all, Bomber Command was awarded 19 Victoria Crosses, nine of them posthumously [...]

125,000 aircrew still await a campaign medal for outstanding bravery, where the chances of survival were about one in two [...] the time has surely come for a campaign medal – and also a monument in London to these brave men.³²

Medal Recognition

Service in Bomber Command during World War Two was recognised in the eligibility criteria for several other campaign medals which were instituted at the time. As outlined above, successive governments have supported the view that medals should not be instituted for theatres of operation which have already been recognised or occurred more than five years previously. This was addressed by the MOD in answer to a Parliamentary Question on 4 July 2007:

The creation of medals is the prerogative of the Sovereign. The Sovereign takes advice from the Government of the day, who, in turn, are advised by the inter-departmental, non-political Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals (known as the HD Committee), on which the armed forces are represented. In the case of campaign medals for service during the second world war, the issue was discussed exhaustively by those in command at the time and by the HD Committee. Those who served in Bomber Command during the second world war could qualify for one of the Stars instituted for campaign service for example the 1939-45 Star, the much prized Aircrew Europe Star or the France and Germany Star. World war two campaign medals were instituted for periods of military service in specified geographic areas and did not relate to individual battles, operations or military commands. The HD Committee has made it clear on many occasions that it will not revisit cases for service performed many years previously or where medals already exist for specified periods of service, both of which apply for service in Bomber Command.³³

The eligibility criteria for the France and Germany Star, the Aircrew Europe Star and the 1939-1945 Star were as follows:

- The 1939-1945 Star was awarded for six months service, or 2 months for operational aircrew, under operational command between 3 September 1939 and 15 August 1945. A Battle of Britain bar was awarded for the aircrew of fighter aircraft engaged in the Battle of Britain between 10 July and 31 October 1940.

³² "Bomber Command Deserves a Medal", *The Daily Telegraph*, 13 March 2008. See also Max Hastings writing in *The Daily Mail* on 4 April 2008 ("Why political correctness has denied wartime bomber crews the honour they deserve").

³³ HC Deb 4 July 2007, c1041-2W

- The Air Crew Europe Star was awarded for two months of operational flying from UK bases over Europe between 3 September 1939 and 4 June 1944. However, the Air Crew Europe Star could not be awarded until after the 1939-1945 Star. Therefore, the total requirement to earn both stars was four months. The Air Crew Europe Star was not awarded after D-Day and subsequent entitlement to the France and Germany Star or the Atlantic Star was denoted by bars on the Air Crew Europe Star.
- The France and Germany Star was awarded for operational service in France, Belgium, the Netherlands or Germany from 6 June 1944 to 8 May 1945. Service in the North Sea, English Channel, and the Bay of Biscay in connection with the campaign in Northern Europe also qualified. The Atlantic bar was awarded to those personnel who qualified for the Atlantic Star, having already received the France and Germany Star.

Personnel who served in Bomber Command would also have been eligible for the Defence Medal and the War Medal 1939-1945:

- The Defence Medal was instituted for three years service in the UK or six months non-operational service overseas in an area subject to air attack between 3 September 1939 and 2 September 1945. Personnel of anti-aircraft command, RAF ground crews, dominion forces stationed in the UK, the Home Guard, Civil Defence, the National Fire Service and other civilian units also qualified for the medal.
- The War Medal 1939-1945 was awarded to all full-time personnel of the armed forces with 28 days service in any theatre of conflict between 2 September 1939 and 2 September 1945. It was granted in addition to the campaign stars and the Defence Medal. A few categories of civilians, such as war correspondents and ferry pilots who had flown in operational theatres also qualified. Members of the Merchant Navy qualified after 28 days at sea.

However a campaign to gain specific recognition for those individuals who served in Bomber Command has been underway for several years. In addition to the construction of a national memorial (see below) campaigners are also calling for a Bomber Command campaign medal to be instituted in recognition of those whom they consider to be the “forgotten heroes” of World War Two. In the 2007-08 parliamentary session an Early Day Motion (EDM) was tabled by Austin Mitchell which stated:

That this House considers that it is more than time that a campaign medal should be issued for those who served in Bomber Command between 1940 and victory in 1945; recognises the enormous achievement of Bomber Command's volunteer pilots' air crew in crippling the Nazi war machine and paving the way for the 1944 invasion of Europe, in the course of which Bomber Command lost 1,500 heavy bombers and 56,000 lives, mainly air crew, all sacrificed for their country; and further considers that the failure of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals at the end of the war to recognise service in Bomber Command as an operational qualification for decorations was a mistake that should now be rectified for this unique service.³⁴

By the end of that session the EDM had attracted 209 signatures.

³⁴ EDM 218, Session 2007-08

Since then this issue has received increasing support from across both Houses of Parliament. During a Westminster Hall Debate on 26 February 2008, Andrew Mackinlay commented:

I want to use this occasion to refer to our establishment's failure to address the issue of Bomber Command. I know that the issue is surrounded by controversy and that the Government's recent replies indicate that they will not change their minds, but that simply is not good enough, because a wrong has been committed that still cries out to be remedied. I recently read the pamphlet by the distinguished historian Sir Martin Gilbert, who presses the point.

...The controversy relates to the operation of Bomber Command, although it would be highly inappropriate to discuss it in detail now because time does not allow me to do so. However, some 55,500 aircrew in Bomber Command, whose average age was 22, lost their lives, but they received no recognition; indeed, political decisions have excluded those brave men from obtaining a medal. I urge the Minister to reflect on that because I would like the issue to be addressed with some dispatch. A number of Bomber Command veterans are still alive, and they, as well as spouses and loved ones, would like some recognition.'

...The fact is that many other operations have distinctive medals, but there is no recognition of the fact that Bomber Command was unique. Winston Churchill said that the Spitfires were our salvation, but that the bombers were our means to victory. There is a self-evident case for awarding a medal with some dispatch.

...I do not want to labour that point, however, because this morning's central theme is the need to press the Government on the issue of those of our servicemen and women who have served and made a sacrifice in Iraq, Afghanistan and other contemporary theatres. The "Honour the Brave" campaign is overwhelmingly supported by Members of Parliament. However, I hope that, in summing up, the Minister will at least be prepared to listen and to look again at the issue of Bomber Command. Will he agree to have a meeting with me, Sir Martin Gilbert and one or two others from the Bomber Command Association so that we could at least present our case to him in his office? If he is agreeable to that, our attendance this morning will have been worthwhile as far as that issue goes.³⁵

A short debate calling for formal recognition was held in the House of Lords on [14 May 2009](#); while more recently this issue has been the subject of numerous Parliamentary Questions and EDMs. The most recent EDM, tabled in November 2010 by Austin Mitchell, states:

That this House considers that it is more than time that a campaign medal should be issued for those who served in Bomber Command between the start of World War Two in 1939 and victory in 1945; recognises the enormous achievement of all Bomber Command's volunteer members of the bomber crew acting as a team in crippling the Nazi war machine and paving the way for the 1944 invasion of Europe, in the course of which Bomber Command lost 1,500 heavy bombers and 56,000 lives, mainly air crew, all sacrificed for their country; and further considers that the failure of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals at the end of the war to recognise service in Bomber Command as an operational qualification for decorations was a mistake that should now be rectified for this unique service.³⁶

To date, that EDM has received 133 signatures.

³⁵ HC Deb 26 February 2008, c192-3WH

³⁶ EDM 1010, Session 2010-11

In response the Minister for Veterans, Andrew Robathan, has confirmed that the campaign for recognition of Bomber Command personnel is being considered as part of the Government's wider review into medals that is expected to report shortly.³⁷

Sir John Holmes's Military Medal Review said it received no formal submission for a campaign medal and notes the Bomber Command Association has not campaigned for medallic recognition for some years, having decided to focus efforts on the recently unveiled Hyde Park Memorial.

Memorial Campaign

The personnel of RAF Bomber Command are commemorated at memorials at Runnymede and in Lincoln Cathedral, and by the statue of Bomber Harris outside the RAF church of St Clement Dane's in the Strand. However, support for the erection of an appropriate national memorial to the member's of RAF Bomber Command has also been widely expressed.

It has been the long-standing policy of successive governments that the cost of war memorials and associated projects is met from private donations or public subscriptions. In 2008 the Bomber Command Association, with the assistance of the Heritage Foundation and *The Daily Telegraph*, subsequently launched a national memorial fund in the hope of raising £4m to erect a national monument in central London. The MOD gave their support to the campaign. The then Chief of the Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Glenn Torpy, commented:

In essence, many people know about the magnificent efforts of "The Few" during the relatively short period of the Battle of Britain, but sadly much less is known about the enormous sacrifice made by the men of Bomber Command, who flew night after night deep into enemy territory, and suffered huge losses throughout the war [...]

So I am happy to add my support to this campaign, as are Ministers, as we are working closely with the Bomber Command Association and Heritage Foundation, as well as the planning authorities, to achieve this aim.³⁸

That position was supported across the House of Commons. In the 2007-08 parliamentary session an EDM tabled by Greg Pope received 53 signatures. That EDM was subsequently re-tabled in the 2008-09 Parliamentary session and stated:

That this House supports fully the campaign to build a permanent memorial to the sacrifice and courage of the men who served in the Bomber Command during the Second World War; recalls that 55,573 men gave their lives serving in Bomber Command, almost half of the total who served; recognises that this was a higher proportion than in any other branch of the armed forces; believes that the freedoms which we enjoy today are their legacy; and further believes that we should now honour them with a permanent memorial.³⁹

In November 2008 Westminster City Council agreed to provide a site in Central London for the memorial once the funding had been achieved. Permission for the memorial to be erected at the Piccadilly entrance to Green Park, opposite the RAF Club, was subsequently given by the Council in May 2010.

The Memorial was dedicated and unveiled at a ceremony on 28 June 2012, attended by Her Majesty the Queen.

³⁷ HC Deb 28 February 2011, c85-6W

³⁸ MOD Press Release, 29 October 2008

³⁹ EDM 450, Session 2008-09

Further information on the RAF Bomber Command memorial appeal is available at:

<http://www.rafbombercommand.com/memoralfund/>

<http://www.bombercommand.com/>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/rafbombercommand/>

4.2 National Service Medal

For several years veterans, in particular the National Service Veterans Alliance, have been calling on the Government to institute a new medal for those who were conscripted for military service, particularly in the period following the Second World War. Advocates of the campaign have argued for recognition on the grounds that conscription was mandatory; it disrupted lives, education and employment and led to the untimely deaths of many young men while in the service of their country. Personnel who served on National Service, both during World War Two and in the post-war years, were, however, eligible for the medals and medal clasps instituted for the various campaigns in which they served.

During Oral Questions on 5 June 1997 the then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Defence, John Spellar, stated:

National servicemen were eligible to receive the full range of campaign stars and medals available to the Armed Forces, subject to individual qualification. Service between 1939 and 1945 was recognised by the 1939-45 Star, 1939-45 War Medal, the Defence Medal and the Campaign Stars for the various campaigns in which they served.

Similarly, servicemen called up between 1946 and 1963 were eligible for the various clasps to the General Service Medal for the operations in which they served for example, Palestine, Malaya or Cyprus, and those who served in Korea were also eligible for the campaign medal and the United Nations Service Medal Korea. There are no plans to institute any additional awards for service during the above periods.⁴⁰

The Service Personnel and Veterans Agency has stated:

There is no official British medal specifically for those who performed a period of National Service and there are no plans to institute one. Campaign medals are instituted to recognise particular periods of service where the perceived risk and rigour of deployments and operations are considered to be more difficult and/or dangerous than the usual expectations of Service life. Unlike some countries, in the United Kingdom medals are not issued as a record of an individual's military service. As a result it has never been the Government's policy to consider service in the Armed Forces as the sole justification for the institution of a medal.

In the case of the estimated two million people who were conscripted into the Armed Forces in the post-war years, those who did take part in campaigns or operations for which medals were subsequently awarded, had an equal right to receive them as did their Regular colleagues. Conversely, those who spent their National Service in the UK or with the British Army of the Rhine did so alongside Regular personnel who, likewise, did not receive a medal.

It would be divisive to offer National Servicemen a medal for being conscripted, when those who volunteered for service would be excluded from receiving any award. Even

⁴⁰ HC Deb 5 June 1997, c223

today, many people leave the Armed Forces without having received a campaign medal during their service. This does not imply that their contribution to the defence of the country has not been appreciated.

The introduction of the Armed Forces Veterans Badge a few years ago was considered an appropriate way for veterans, including former National Servicemen, to demonstrate that they had served their country as members of the Armed Forces. The lapel badge was considered to be more discreet and adaptable for daily wear than a medal. Such has been the success of the project that over 700,000 have been issued to date.

A national memorial to all those who undertook National Service is located at the National Memorial Arboretum (NMA), near Lichfield, Staffordshire, details of which can be accessed via their website at www.nationalmemorialarboretum.org.

In addition, the veterans' community has acknowledged the last Sunday in June each year as National Service Day. The National Service Veterans Association also organises an annual service of commemoration at the NMA each year. Details of the event can be obtained from the Association via their website: <http://www.seniorsnetwork.co.uk/nsva/index.htm>.

The country has recognised all Service personnel, including National Servicemen, who have died since the end of the Second World War, while on duty or as a result of terrorist attack, by the creation of the Armed Forces Memorial, which is also located at the NMA. Details can be found at <http://www.forcesmemorial.org.uk/>.⁴¹

This is a position which successive Governments have adopted, including the previous Labour administration.

4.3 National Defence Medal

The [Military Medals Review](#) published on 17 July 2012 outlines of the arguments for and against of a National defence Medal (p38-41). One of the Review's principal conclusions is:

The case for some form of National Defence Medal, to recognise all military service, is a larger issue which needs further study and should then be considered by the government as a whole, in consultation with other political parties and concerned organisations.⁴²

The Review recommends:

The idea of a National Defence Medal as a recognition of military service of whatever form is worthy of consideration but is in a separate category from military campaign medals and should be treated accordingly. Its merits, and examples from other countries, should be looked at by a Cabinet Office-led working group in the first place, before consideration by the reconstituted HD Committee and its sub-committee. Any recommendations should be made initially to the government, rather than The Queen, and would then need to be the subject of wider political and other consultation, since this is a decision of broad national significance which would require a broad political and public consensus.⁴³

For several years various campaigners have been calling for a medal to be instituted that recognises service in the Armed Forces and the contribution and sacrifices that military

⁴¹ http://www.veterans-uk.info/medals/national_serv.html

⁴² [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p12

⁴³ [Military Medals Review](#), Cabinet Office, 17 July 2012 p13

personnel have made in the service of the nation. For example, an EDM tabled in December 2009 stated:

NATIONAL DEFENCE MEDAL

02.12.2009

Mates, Michael

That this House notes the significant personal sacrifice armed forces personnel make in their service to the nation once they take the oath or affirmation of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen; acknowledges that ex-service personnel are proud to receive and wear Her Majesty's Veterans Badge, but notes that it is not awarded posthumously and it is considered by many to be insufficient recognition for the contribution veterans have made to the safety of the nation since the ending of the Second World War; and therefore calls on the Government to rescind its recent decision not to more appropriately recognise the veterans by the award of a national defence medal and instead to establish a working group to work with the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals, with a view to implementing a national defence medal as soon as possible.⁴⁴

Unlike some countries, in the UK medals are not issued as a record of an individual's military service. Equally, tours of duty are not automatically recognised by the institution of a campaign medal. Campaign medals are only instituted to recognise particular periods of service where the perceived risk and rigour of deployments and operations are considered to be more difficult and/or dangerous than the usual expectations of Service life.

As a result it has never been the policy of successive Governments to consider service in the Armed Forces as the sole justification for the institution of a medal, and many people leave the Armed Forces without having received a campaign medal during their service.⁴⁵

The introduction of the Armed Forces Veterans Badge in 2004 was considered an appropriate way for veterans to demonstrate that they had served their country as members of the Armed Forces. The lapel badge was considered to be more discreet and adaptable for daily wear than a medal.

In answer to a Parliamentary Question in the House of Lords in January 2010, the MOD confirmed:

The arguments in favour of the medal were set out in May 2009 in a document prepared by the National Defence Medal Society entitled, the *National Defence Medal-Veterans Recognition Report*. The points made in the report have been carefully considered. My honourable friend, the Minister for Veterans, wrote to the society on 20 September 2009, stating that it has been concluded that it is not appropriate to institute a new national defence medal.

The HM Armed Forces Veterans Badge was introduced in May 2004. The lapel badge is a fitting tribute, where veterans can demonstrate that they have served their country as members of the Armed Forces. Many veterans wear the badge on a daily basis and many more on parades.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ EDM 327, Session 2009-10

⁴⁵ http://www.veterans-uk.info/medals/national_serv.html

⁴⁶ HL Deb 15 January 2010, c190WA

It is also worth noting that a separate campaign to recognise those individuals who were conscripted for military service, particularly in the period after the Second World War, has also been underway for a number of years. Although the issue relates to a specific group of individuals, many of the arguments for the institution of a medal, and the government's response to those, are the same.

In November 2010 the Minister for Defence Personnel, Welfare and Veterans, Andrew Robathan, reiterated the Government's position on the institution of a National Defence Medal, as part of the overall review on medals:

Lorely Burt (Solihull) (LD): If he will bring forward proposals for a national defence medal to recognise non-operational military service. [22170]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence (Mr Andrew Robathan): The Government hold the professionalism, courage and contribution of all those who serve or who have served in the armed forces in high regard. I understand that some people believe that their service, and the service of all personnel, should warrant a medal. The coalition Government are committed to reviewing the rules governing the award of medals. However, at present, there are no plans to recommend to Her Majesty the introduction of a national defence medal.

Lorely Burt: I very much welcome the review. We are just a few days away from Remembrance day, and since 1919 we have been remembering the sacrifice of our armed services. Today, however, we have much improved media and greater transparency, and we understand more the mental, emotional and physical sacrifice that all our armed services personnel make. Is now not the time to include a national defence medal in that review?

Mr Robathan: We are going to have that review, and may I recommend to the hon. Lady that she puts forward her views at that time? Indeed, I know that they represent her party's policy, which it adopted at a recent conference. Medals are awarded for campaign service because they recognise the risk and rigour of deployment, which is considered to be more extreme than when, I am afraid, people are in a barracks or at home on a base.

Mr Denis MacShane (Rotherham) (Lab): May I urge the Minister to err on the side of generosity? The previous Government could not take on the review committees of retired colonels and General Blimps, who refused to order even a Bomber Command campaign medal. People like to wear medals and are very proud of the Army now, and they also serve who serve in this country. I hope that the Minister will not shove the idea out to a review. He should come back and accept the hon. Lady's suggestion.

Mr Robathan: As I have said, we are not shoving the idea out but having a review. Some who have served would like to see a national defence medal, but my experience is that probably the majority of those who have been in the armed forces and then left accept the decisions that were made when they were serving and do not wish to revisit history in that way.⁴⁷

In answer to a follow up question he went on to argue:

Bob Russell (Colchester) (LD): I thought that the Minister's response to the question from my hon. Friend the Member for Solihull (Lorely Burt) was lacking in political direction and conviction. Bearing in mind that Her Majesty the Queen, as the Head of State of both Australia and New Zealand, has graciously authorised the award of a

⁴⁷ HC Deb 8 November 2010, c10

national defence medal, can we not have that in the United Kingdom for those who have served?

Mr Robathan: We are certainly never lacking in direction. What I would say is that when the Queen is dealing with matters in New Zealand and Australia, she is the Queen of New Zealand and Australia, and that does not necessarily mean that we will follow exactly what happens in New Zealand and Australia. We are reviewing matters, but as I said before, campaign medals are awarded for the deprivations of campaigns and the extra need to recognise people for their hard work on campaigns. That is not to denigrate service in barracks, but it is a very different thing, if I might say so.⁴⁸

A Westminster Hall debate on the institution of a National Defence Medal was held on 8 February 2011. A copy of that debate is available online at: [Hansard 8 February 2011](#).

4.4 Munitions Workers during World War Two

Background – First World War

During the First World War, in addition to joining the auxiliary services,⁴⁹ approximately 2 million women took up occupations on the “Home Front” in order to support of the war effort. Among other things, women were employed as drivers, farm workers, shipyard workers and in the munitions factories and other areas of heavy industry. The attraction in taking up such roles was higher wages, better conditions and greater independence than that which could be offered in domestic service. However, the roles were also often physically exhausting and the hours were long (often 12 hour shifts, seven days a week). For those working in the munitions factories the work was also unpleasant and even dangerous.

In taking up these roles women were also often criticised for taking men’s jobs whilst they were away serving their country. However, women and women’s organisations fought back, arguing that they were also serving the nation in wartime, no less than the men on the front. For many women it was also a necessity given the loss of the main breadwinner in the home. Indeed, following the introduction of compulsory military service for men between the ages of 18 and 41⁵⁰ in January 1916, the government began to actively encourage women to join the labour force and take up essential roles from men who had been released from their normal occupations to serve at the front.⁵¹

With respect to the munitions industries specifically, during the early stages of the war there was a recognised munitions shortage and the Government quickly moved to appoint a Minister for Munitions, Lloyd George, who was then tasked with resolving the crisis. In the years that followed the subsequent expansion of the munitions industry in the UK was significant. The munitions industries produced the metals, chemicals, weapons, ammunition, textiles, food and other equipment required by the armed forces. Those industries included government-owned arsenals, dockyards and factories as well as private firms across all manufacturing sectors, some of which came under national control during the war. In July 1914 approximately 212,000 women, nicknamed “Tommy’s sisters”, worked in the engineering and munitions industries. Some women were trained to do exactly the same jobs using the same machinery as men, while others were taught only a component of a skilled man’s job or were trained on new machinery.

⁴⁸ Ibid, c20

⁴⁹ Such as the Women’s Auxiliary Corps and the Women’s Voluntary Service

⁵⁰ With some exceptions for those in essential occupations, those deemed medically unfit, religious ministers and conscientious objectors.

⁵¹ An example of the propaganda campaign is set out in Katie Adie’s book *Corsets to Camouflage*. I attach a copy of that section for information.

As a result of the mass expansion of the munitions industry, nearly all of which at some point relied on women workers, and the introduction of conscription in 1916, by the end of the war the number of women working in the engineering and munitions industries totalled almost one million. By the end of 1918 British industry had also produced more than 4 million rifles, 250,000 machine guns, 52,000 airplanes, 2,800 tanks, 25,000 artillery pieces and over 170 million artillery rounds.

In the book *On Her Their Lives Depend* by Angela Woollacott, a breakdown of the role of women munitions workers is set out, as originally reported in the *Daily Chronicle*, 21 December 1918. That book highlights:

Table Two: Breakdown of Women
Munitions Workers by Area of Work

Area	Number of Workers
Ministry of Munitions	
Shell Manufacture	183,000
Filling Shells	64,500
Ordnance	18,900
Rifles, Machine Guns	8,800
Small arms ammunition	31,800
Trench warfare	24,900
Explosives, chemicals	35,900
Aeronautical supplies	63,700
Mechanical warfare	3,500
Railway material	3,100
Optical munitions, glass	3,800
Mechanical transport	18,400
Iron, steel	30,100
Nonferrous metals	10,800
Construction engineering	26,100
Machine tools	6,600
Gauges, tools, screws etc	20,100
Inspection	40,600

Subtotal	594,400
	[should be 594,600]
Admiralty	114,800
War office, misc	60,400
Other government work	39,500
Work for allies	5,700
Total	814,800
	[should be 815,000] ⁵²

As outlined above, working in the munitions factories was often unpleasant, hard and dangerous. The hours were long, while the work was repetitive and strenuous. Strict regulations on dress and appearance were put in place and the punishments for infringing the regulations were severe, often a fine of up to two weeks pay. The exposure to TNT, cordite and other chemicals also had health implications, inducing headaches, hysteria and epilepsy. Toxic poisoning from TNT resulted in jaundice, which occasionally proved fatal. Hundreds were also badly injured in explosions and other accidents and during the period of war approximately 400 women were estimated to have died in the factories.⁵³

A journalist who visited the government's munitions complex at Gretna Green in 1916 was reported as commenting "the girls who take up this work sacrifice almost as much as men who enlist".⁵⁴

Munitions Workers during World War Two

In contrast to the situation in 1914, the presence of women workers in factories at the onset of World War Two was not uncommon. However, as more men were called up to join the armed forces women were once again needed to replace them in the workforce. Thousands volunteered for work on the land and in the factories producing among other things aircraft, munitions, uniforms, tents and parachutes. Munitions workers came under the control of the Ministry of Labour.

During the first two years of the war, however, it became clear that volunteers alone were not going to meet the demands of wartime production. Indeed, over 60 munitions and armaments factories had been established at the beginning of World War Two in order cope with demand. In 1941 the *National Service Act* was consequently passed which, for the first time, made the conscription of women legal. As part of the conscription requirement women had to choose whether to enter the armed forces or work in farming or industry. In reality

⁵² Angela Woollacott, *On Her Their Lives Depend*, 1993, p.31

⁵³ Angela Woollacott, *On Her Their Lives Depend*, 1993

⁵⁴ Devil's Porridge Exhibit, Gretna Green:

(http://www.iknow-scotland.co.uk/tourist_information/south_west/gretna_green/womens_roles_munitions.htm)

however, the forces of supply and demand meant that the majority of women were conscripted into industry, and specifically the munitions industry. At first only single women aged 20-30 were called up. However by mid-1943 almost 90 % of single women and 80% of married women were employed in essential war work and one in three factory workers was female. Over the total period of the war an estimated 7 million women were employed in the war effort, with one and a half million of those women directly employed in the engineering and munitions industries.

The disadvantages of such work, particularly in the munitions industries, were largely same as in the First World War. The hours were long (often 12 hour shifts) and the work unpleasant and dangerous. Resentment in the work place was also common as many men did not like working with women, and the women were generally paid less than the men for the same job. However, in addition to the health risks and the possibility of accidents, the technological advancements of World War Two also meant that the factories were also constantly at risk from enemy bombing raids. In the knowledge that the Germans would inevitably target munitions factories during bombing raids, secrecy surrounded their existence.

Campaign for Recognition

The women working in the munitions industries have never received formal recognition of their contribution to the war effort in either the First or Second World Wars, even those who were conscripted during World War Two. In contrast to the women who served in the auxiliary forces, the Women's Voluntary Service and other similar organisations, they were not recognised in any of the eligibility criteria for the medals instituted for service during World War Two, including that of the Defence Medal which was issued in recognition of non-operational service in the UK. In addition, these women are not eligible to receive the recently instituted Veterans Lapel Badge.

At the beginning of June 2008 David Jones MP tabled an EDM calling for recognition to be extended to those individuals who were conscripted into the munitions factories during the Second World War. That EDM stated:

That this House acknowledges the contribution made by munitions workers to the defence of the United Kingdom in the Second World War; notes that many such workers were women conscripted under the provisions of the National Service Act 1941; considers that the contribution of munitions workers proved crucial in securing victory in 1945; regrets that that contribution has never been formally recognised; and calls on the Government to recognise the effort of former munitions workers in maintaining the security of this country.⁵⁵

That campaign also received some attention in the press including an article in *The Sunday Telegraph* on 22 June 2008.⁵⁶

Over the last two and a half years the campaign to achieve recognition for this group of people has continued unabated. In response to that campaign, in March 2010, the then Labour Government indicated that "careful consideration has been given to this issue. However, there are no present plans to introduce a lapel badge".⁵⁷

⁵⁵ EDM 1764, Session 2007-08

⁵⁶ A copy of that article is available online at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/2170652/Women-war-munitions-workers-seek-medal.html>

⁵⁷ HC Deb 25 March 2010, c503W

In February 2011, however, the Minister of State for Business and Enterprise, Mark Prisk, indicated that the current Government were giving consideration to this issue. He stated:

Mr Marcus Jones: To ask the Secretary of State for Defence whether he has plans to bring forward proposals to recognise the contribution made by munitions workers to the defence and security of the UK during the second world war. [37096]

Mr Prisk: I have been asked to reply.

The Government fully recognise the courage and fortitude of those who worked in munitions factories during world war II. I am considering how we can best acknowledge the contribution they made to the war effort and will provide a substantive response in due course.⁵⁸

It is possible that a decision may form part of the wider review of medals which is currently being examined.

4.5 Non-Conscribed Miners during World War Two

During the war it was considered essential that a male workforce be kept back from active military service to be employed in skilled jobs that were deemed vital to the survival of the country. Those protected occupations were set down in the *Schedule of Reserved Occupations* which was established in 1938. Mining was identified as one such reserved occupation, alongside doctors, farmers, railway and dockworkers, school teachers, utility workers, scientists and merchant seamen, among others.

The reserved occupation scheme was a complicated one, covering approximately five million men in a vast range of jobs. The ages at which occupations were reserved also differed greatly. Within the mining industry a significant number of roles were designated as reserved, regardless of age; although some roles, such as a haulier, had a reserve age of 23.⁵⁹

A significant number of men in reserved occupations struggled with their status as reserved labour and indeed, a number tried to join the Armed Forces regardless. Having been refused, many were forced to resume their jobs and on occasion faced disciplinary proceedings. An article on the website of the Second World War Experience Centre makes reference to one such incident:

[Jack S.](#) a miner from South Yorkshire, had been refused entry into the Navy, because mining was a reserved occupation. Frustrated, he ran away to Liverpool, hoping he could join the Merchant Navy. However, he was caught by the police and sent back to Yorkshire, where he had to face a pit tribunal:

I was tried ... for being away for ten weeks, and I was fined a pound and told if I did nothing wrong in a month I could have it back, and then I was tried at Doncaster Court ... I was bound over for two years ... because it was essential work. So it was like desertion ... I came out of the courthouse and said 'I still don't want to go down pit' but they forced us. I told the judge ... 'put me in the Army, I don't want no training. Send me overseas because I am that eager to go in the forces'.⁶⁰

Many miners subsequently took up voluntary positions in the Civil Defence Forces, such as the Home Guard, in addition to their main jobs.

⁵⁸ HC Deb 3 February 2011, c938W

⁵⁹ *Schedule of Reserved Occupations, Revision 1939*, Cm 6015

⁶⁰ <http://www.war-experience.org/history/keyaspects/home-british/pagetwo.asp>

For several years campaigners have been seeking to get recognition for those individuals who were already employed in the coalmines at the outbreak of the war and were required to stay in this reserved occupation. Many have argued that recognition of the contribution made by those individuals who were conscripted into the coalmines during this period (the Bevin Boys) warrants equal acknowledgement. Miners already employed in the coalmines were not eligible to receive the Bevin Boys Badge.

This matter was raised in the House in May 2008:

Jon Trickett (Hemsworth) (Lab): If he will consider the merits of providing an award for those miners who worked in the mines during the second world war equivalent to a Bevin Boys badge; and if he will make a statement. [206979]

The Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (Mr. John Hutton): The purpose of the Bevin Boys badge is to recognise those who, through conscription, served in the pits during the war. Miners who were already employed in the pits made an enormous contribution to our successful war effort, but were not conscripted, as their role was that of a reserved occupation. On that basis, we have no plans to introduce such an award.

Jon Trickett: I understand my right hon. Friend's reply, but does he agree that wars are won first by the heroism of our troops and our service people, but also on the home front? The Government have clearly acknowledged that in awarding the Bevin badge to people conscripted into the mines. However, many people already in the mines were prevented from joining the services as they might have wanted because they were in a reserved occupation. As a consequence, there is an anomaly. Does my right hon. Friend agree that the men who worked alongside the Bevin boys but have not been recognised regard the situation as an anomaly? Will he or one of his ministerial team meet us to discuss the matter further?

Mr. Hutton: I agree very strongly with what my hon. Friend has said. We were successful in that titanic conflict because the whole resources of the nation were mobilised to defeat the fascist enemy that we were confronting. The miners in the pits made an heroic contribution to the success of that overall war effort and no one should question that. I would be happy to meet my hon. Friend and others who represent mining constituencies to discuss that important issue further.

Mr. Nigel Evans (Ribble Valley) (Con): I am delighted that the Secretary of State has said that he will meet a delegation. He has just recognised the importance of the miners during the war, so why is there so much intransigence from the Government about giving proper recognition to those miners? We know that they played a valuable role. If everybody had left the mines to join the armed forces, the whole country would have ground to a halt. What is holding the Government back from giving proper recognition to the miners?

Mr. Hutton: I do not accept that this is intransigence on the part of the Government and it should be borne in mind that since the second world war all Governments—Conservative as well as Labour—have taken the same view. There are obvious practical difficulties, of which I am sure the hon. Gentleman is aware, including—we should not underestimate this—the issue of accurate records to confirm employment in the pre-nationalised mining industry. As I said, I am happy to have discussions, and if there is a way forward, we should find one.

Mr. David Hamilton (Midlothian) (Lab): I thank my right hon. Friend for agreeing to meet a delegation and I hope that my hon. Friend the Member for Hemsworth (Jon Trickett) will invite me along. May I remind hon. Members that 5,000 miners gave their

lives and 20,000 lost their lungs during that war? My constituent Mr. Abe Moffatt, son of Alex Moffatt, was one of hundreds who tried to get into the armed forces, including the RAF, but could not get in and were dragged back to work in the pits. I believe that their contribution should be recognised in some fashion or other.

Mr. Hutton: As I said, I do not think any Member would be wise to call into question the record of service and sacrifice of our miners in the second world war. I am certainly not doing that; as I have said, they made an heroic contribution. I can only repeat what I said earlier: I am very happy to have further discussions with Members on both sides of the House.

Nia Griffith (Llanelli) (Lab): I find myself in a very embarrassing position, because my father was a Bevin boy, as he happened to be the right age at the call-up time and was sent to the mines in his home village. He of course worked alongside many others who did not have the opportunity to be called Bevin boys. That is why I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Hemsworth (Jon Trickett) for raising the issue. It is an embarrassment to me that my father should be entitled to the badge when so many others in his village and my constituency who did exactly the same work have not been recognised.

Mr. Hutton: My hon. Friend has made a very powerful point, which we need to reflect on. I hope that there is consensus in the House about the importance of recognising the service of the Bevin boys. I had the great privilege of attending the reception in No. 10 Downing street when the Prime Minister made the presentation of the badges to the Bevin boys. There was no question but that there were men in that room who had made history. They decided the outcome of a huge conflict and we have all benefited from that successful outcome. If there is a way forward, we should try to find it; and we should do so in a way that is consistent with the service given not just by the miners, but by those in other reserved occupations, too.⁶¹

To date, no formal recognition has been granted to this group of individuals.

4.6 Russian Arctic Defence Medal

In addition to the campaign for service on the Arctic convoys to be recognised (see SN/IA/3943), veterans have also been campaigning since 2001 for those who served in the allied Arctic convoys to receive the Russian Arctic Defence Medal⁶² from the Russian Government.

Allied veterans of the convoys have already received the 40th Anniversary of Victory Medal from Russia after permission to receive and wear them was granted by The Queen in 1994. Approval was given in light of the changed circumstances in Russia since the medal was first issued in 1985; the improvement of relations between the UK and Russia and the fact the medal was a commemorative award rather than a campaign medal. Approval for the award of the Russian 50th Anniversary of Victory Medal was refused in 1995, however, as awards commemorating an anniversary where permission has already been granted to receive and wear an award for an earlier anniversary of the same event, are not recognised.

The Arctic Defence Medal is of a higher standing than the Anniversary of Victory Medals as it is a battle decoration. Therefore the rules on the acceptance and wearing of foreign medals, as outlined above, are more stringently applied. At the end of the Second World War it was

⁶¹ HC Deb 22 May 2008, c379-381

⁶² Also referred to as the Soviet Arctic Region Medal.

also agreed by the Allied countries at the time that campaign medals would not be exchanged.

In June 2002, however, the Russian Ministry for Foreign Affairs approved the decision to award the Arctic Defence Medal to all veterans of the allied arctic convoys. According to several press reports, a proposal was put before the UK Government in July 2002, which had subsequently been rejected.

In a Written Answer on 21 October 2002, however, the then Prime Minister refuted these allegations:

We have received no formal request from the Russian Government asking that permission be granted to issue the Defence of the Soviet Arctic Region Medal to British veterans. Were the Russian authorities formally to ask for this campaign medal to be officially recognised in this country, the Government would consider it carefully and discuss with relevant groups.⁶³

This position was reiterated by the then Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, on 4 November 2002 and the then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Defence, Dr Lewis Moonie, on 19 November 2002.⁶⁴ However, in late 2003/early 2004 the Government confirmed that it was considering the possibility of allowing an exception to the rules on the acceptance and wear of foreign medals in order to allow veterans of the convoys to receive the Russian Arctic Defence Medal.⁶⁵ In a Written Answer on 22 June 2005 Mr Straw indicated that the issue was, however, no longer under review:

Mr. Benton: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs pursuant to his answer of 24 May 2005, *Official Report*, column 1355W, on world war two medals, whether he has made a decision on the possibility of an exception to the rules governing the acceptance and wearing of foreign awards to enable British veterans who served on Arctic Convoys during the second world war to receive the Russian Defence of the Soviet Arctic Region medal. [6301]

Mr. Straw: No final decision was taken on this matter because, in December 2004, the Russian authorities made known that they were no longer considering conferring the medal for the Defence of the Soviet Arctic Region on foreign war veterans.

4.7 The Aden Campaigns

Three medals were instituted for service in the military campaigns in Aden between 1957 and 1967, although they do not cover the entire period of operations there:

- Operational service in the Arabian Peninsula in resistance to border raids and against bands of dissidents between 1 January 1957 and 30 June 1960 was recognised with the “Arabian Peninsula” clasp to the General Service Medal 1918-1962 and the Naval General Service Medal 1915-1962. The minimum period of service determining eligibility was 30 days, not necessarily continuous.⁶⁶ The clasp was also awarded to eligible members of the local armed forces and certain civilians.

⁶³ HC Deb 21 October 2002, c80W

⁶⁴ HC Deb 4 November 2002, c77W and HC Deb 19 November 2002, c35W

⁶⁵ See HC Deb 22 October 2003, c618W and HC Deb 24 May 2004, c1355W

⁶⁶ Cm 1277, Session 1960-1961

- Service in the Aden theatre of operations between 25 April and 31 July 1964 was recognised with the “Radfan” clasp to the General Service Medal (GSM) 1962.⁶⁷ The minimum period of service was 14 days of continuous service in the South Arabian Federation. The clasp was also awarded to designated civilians.⁶⁸
- Service in the Aden theatre of operations between 1 August 1964 and 30 November 1967 was recognised with the “South Arabia” clasp to the GSM. The minimum period of eligible service was 30 days or more continuous service (Army, RAF and Royal Navy and Royal Marines posted ashore), and 30 days or more, not necessarily continuous, for Royal Navy and Royal Marines afloat in the South Arabian Federation. Again, certain categories of civilian were also entitled to receive the award.⁶⁹

The Aden Veterans Association has been campaigning for the Government to extend the qualifying period of either the “Arabian Peninsula” GSM/NGSM or the “South Arabia” GSM to cover operational service between July 1960 and 1964 which is not currently recognised by any of the clasps to the GSM. It is worth noting that the GSM with “Radfan clasp” is not mentioned in the AVA’s literature on this campaign.⁷⁰

In response to this campaign the previous Labour Government made the following comments:

The Command Paper for the NGSM and GSM with clasp ‘Arabian Peninsula’ provided for the possible extension of the published end-date, subject to a case being submitted to the HD committee. The contemporary papers were revisited afresh fairly recently.

As far as could be determined, no case was ever made and it had to be concluded that those in Command at the time felt that the scale and scope of the border raids and terrorist attacks from dissidents in Aden did not justify the extension of the qualifying period for the medal. However, it is apparent that the situation had again deteriorated in 1964, by which time original two medals had been replaced by the new tri-service GSM 1962. Accordingly the ‘Radfan’ clasp was instituted for service in the South Arabian Federation between April and July 1964, followed shortly afterwards by the clasp ‘South Arabia’ which included service in Aden.

Those in Command had every opportunity to reconsider the earlier medal and extend its qualifying period at that time while the events were still relatively fresh and could easily have closed the gap so that service in Aden could qualify for medals throughout the early 1960s, but they decided not to. The HD Committee will not attempt to second guess decisions made many years ago and it is clear from the institution of the later medals that the matter was not overlooked at the time, so at this late stage there are no plans to amend the qualifying criteria for any of the medals for service in Aden.⁷¹

This position was once again reiterated by the then Minister for Veterans, Kevan Jones, in answer to a parliamentary question in March 2010.⁷²

⁶⁷ The GSM 1918-1962 and the Naval GSM 1915-1962 were amalgamated into one generic tri-service medal in December 1962.

⁶⁸ Cm 2732, Session 1964-65

⁶⁹ Cm 3041, Session 1966-67

⁷⁰ Further information is available online at: http://www.adenveterans.org.uk/gsm_qualifying.htm

⁷¹ Letter from the MOD dated 21 May 2007 and made available at: <http://www.adenveterans.org.uk/medal.htm>

⁷² HC Deb 9 March 2010, c170W

The [Military Medals Review](#), published on 17 July 2012, provides a short summary of the Aden Veterans campaign on p36.

4.8 Dunkirk Medal

A separate medal for involvement at Dunkirk was not issued by the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals in 1946. However, service at Dunkirk was recognised by waiving, for those involved, the eligibility criteria for the 1939-1945 Star.⁷³

In 1948 the Dunkirk Commemorative Medal, which is also referred to as the Dunkirk Star, was established by the French Government, under the patronage of the town of Dunkirk. In 1970 authority was given by The Queen for the medal to be awarded to British personnel who served in operations at Dunkirk in 1940.⁷⁴ Medals given by foreign governments may not be worn alongside, or in line with, medals or awards instituted and approved by the Sovereign unless express permission is also given.⁷⁵

In December 1986 representations were made to the Government at the time for the institution of a bar to the 1939-1945 Star recognising service at Dunkirk. In a Written Answer the then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Defence, Roger Freeman, outlined the Government's position:

Mr Holt asked the Secretary of State for Defence if he will make it his policy to provide Dunkirk clasps to the 1939-1945 medal for surviving veterans of that event; and if he will make a statement.

Mr Freeman: No. All significant operations and battles of the 1939-1945 war were carefully considered by the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals in 1946. The importance of the Dunkirk operations was recognised by the waiving for those involved the normal qualifying period for the 1939-1945 star. It has remained policy since 1946 that no further awards should be introduced in respect of service in the 1939-1945 war.⁷⁶

4.9 Submarine Service Medal (Cold War)

Various British gallantry medals were awarded to individual submariners for acts of bravery during the Cold War. A number of British campaign medals, or bars on the Naval General Service Medal and General Service Medal, were also awarded to a number of submariners during this period. Bars on the General Service Medal were instituted, for example, for service in the Korean War and in the Suez Crisis in 1956.

However, an all encompassing medal, or bar, for British submarine service during the Cold War was not issued. Service in the Royal Navy, Army and RAF during this period was also not recognised by an individual service medal or bar.

In a debate on 19 December 2002 Dr Bob Spink raised the issue of awarding British submariners for the role they played during the Cold War. He stated:

⁷³ The qualifying criteria for the 1939-1945 Star were six months service (two months for operational aircrew) between 3 September 1939 and 15 August 1945 under operational command.

⁷⁴ Authority for the acceptance and wearing of foreign medals, both campaign and commemorative, must be given by The Queen.

⁷⁵ Letter from the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Defence, the Earl of Arran, on 26 July 1990. A copy of this is available from the Library.

⁷⁶ HC Deb 10 December 1986, c205-6W

Another Member spoke earlier about the need for a Suez medal, and I agree entirely. However, I want to raise a new matter in connection with medals.

Will the Prime Minister consider awarding a campaign medal to recognise the service given and sacrifices made by the men who served in Polaris and Hunter-killer submarines during the cold war? They maintained the peace for many years, but the people involved in the campaign have received no recognition. They were effectively on active deterrent patrol all year round, including at Christmas and the New Year. A constituent of mine once left his wife over the New Year to go on patrol, leaving her with one child aged five years, and one aged three days. There was no paternity leave for him, and I think that he deserves a medal. The Prime Minister had paternity leave so I hope that he will award a medal to reward those people. At this time, many of our service men and women are getting ready to fight for world freedom from terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, and they go with our blessings and good wishes.⁷⁷

In a letter placed in the Library of the House on 30 January 2003 the then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Dr Lewis Moonie, stated:

There is no doubt that the Country and, indeed, the world, owes a debt of gratitude to all British Service personnel, and the Armed Forces of the whole NATO Alliance, for their efforts in maintaining and preserving peace during the Cold War years. There is also little doubt that for some personnel the Cold War was more dangerous, arduous, trying and less visible than for others. The patrols undertaken by the Royal Navy's Submarine Service are a prime example of this, and our submariners can be justifiably proud of their significant contribution to world security.

It would, however, be invidious to single out for recognition the contribution of one small group of people amongst so many others. It would also be impossible to do so without, in some way, being seen to regard the contribution of others as somehow of less worth. Whilst, therefore, the Government recognises the very important role that personnel of the Royal Navy's Submarine Service played during the Cold War, there are no plans to consider the institution of an award to submariners for this service.⁷⁸

There are a number of commemorative medals that recognise the service of submariners during this period. The International Submarine Service Medal, commissioned by London Submariners and supported by the International Submarine Association, is one such example. However, these medals are not official decorations and therefore cannot be worn alongside other formally constituted military medals.

The US Position

In April 1999 former Secretary of Defense William Cohen approved the creation of a Cold War Certificate, recognising the contribution of all service members and federal employees who served the US military during the Cold War period.⁷⁹

However a majority in the US Congress were in favour of recognising military service during this period with the award of a Cold War medal. Consequently, the US *Defense Authorization Act* 2002 formally recommended for the first time that the Secretary of Defense consider authorising the design and award of the Cold War Service Medal. However, in January 2003 the Department of Defense announced that it would not be creating and issuing a medal in recognition of Cold War service.

⁷⁷ HC Deb 19 December 2002, c1084

⁷⁸ DEP 03/394, 30 January 2003

⁷⁹ Further information is available online at: http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Apr1999/b04051999_bt146-99.html

Brad Loo, Deputy Director of Officer and Enlisted Management Personnel for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, stated:

After careful consideration, it was decided not to create a medal. Throughout the Cold War years, commanders used a full spectrum of individual unit and service awards to recognise the achievements and sacrifices of service members.⁸⁰

In January 2003 a memorial honouring Cold War submariners was unveiled at the Patriots Point Naval and Maritime Museum. Constructed with funding from the Cold War Submarine Memorial Foundation, the memorial also recognises the service of submariners of the British Royal Navy.⁸¹

A commemorative Cold War Medal is also available, although it is not officially recognised by the US Government.

⁸⁰ More information on the memorial is available online at: <http://www.cwsmf.org/>

⁸¹ "DoD decides not to create Cold War medal", *Army News Service*, 23 January 2003