

Redacted-RE .txt

From:
Sent: 14 October 2014 09:35
To:
Subject: RE:

Concur we should not be seeking PTW for this medal. The threat is almost incidental - the Force is not being deliberately targetted. This reflects that medals are blunt instruments of recognition which, once we've got them, should not be turned on and off as intensity fluctuates. If PTW is given for this one individual for this current period it becomes difficult to defend not allowing retrospective and future PTW when the mission did not, and may not in future, justify medallie recognition, thereby diluting the whole purpose of medals to the detriment of them all. This type of deployment justifies the X Factor.

From:
Sent: 13 October 2014 07:52
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE:
Importance: High

Interestingly I found advice from FCO, dated 2010 which repeated the information in the letter that you found. I went back to PJHQ and they asked that I approached FCO again to see if anything had changed. FCO has now come back with the following:

"The short answer to this is that I don't know. The longer answer is that this is not a state award and therefore the FCO would not normally be involved in giving permission for it to be accepted or worn. The rules say the following:

6. Requests made by certain international organisations (e.g., the United Nations and NATO) in respect of service in operations under their auspices should be made to the Defence Services Secretary in the Ministry of Defence.

From a quick look at Wikipedia, there are three MFO awards. One for military personnel and one for civilian personnel which are awarded for a six month and twelve month tour of duty respectively and the Director General's Award which is awarded to military or civilian personnel for outstanding service or action on behalf of the MFO.

As this is an award made by an international organisation it seems that this is an MOD matter rather than an FCO one."

This would seem to indicate confusion in their position, and in light of this I would welcome the views of the experts on whether I should suggest that it is

Redacted-RE .txt

discussed by the OMWG. My personal view is that it shouldn't as making the medal available for wear now, based on the case of one individual, when, as points out in his e-mail, it has been denied to hundreds previously would seem to be wrong, and I'm not sure that we really want to get into cases of retrospection.

However, I would welcome all your views by COP 15 October please.

Many thanks

Ministry of Defence
MOD Main Building | Whitehall |
London | SW1A 2HB

P Save a tree...please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to

From:
Sent: 10 October 2014 19:51
To:
Cc:
Subject:

I happen to be reviewing some old medal files kept by PS12 and came across a letter which I think answers the question on the MFO medal fairly clearly.

It would be invidious in the extreme to allow the current individual to wear it when it was denied to several hundred UK military observers shortly after the war.

Note also that there was quite a lot of discussion in 2000 on the introduction of a Humanitarian Medal. Unfortunately the file goes no further so I have no record of what finally killed the idea of such a medal.

Regards

Redacted-RE .txt

D Pers Ops PS12(A)

Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.