

NOTE OF A MEETING BETWEEN THE NICRC SECURITY WORKING GROUP
AND THE ARMY AT HQNI LISBURN, ON TUESDAY 3 SEPTEMBER, 1991

Present: NICRC representative

Dr J Hawthorne Brig. Richard Lowe, Chief of Staff of the
Dr M Fitzduff Brig. Angus Ramsay interface from an
Mr P Arthur International Mr Michael Clarke, Civil Adviser to GOC
Mr C Ryder
Mr J Walker increasingly local people and community groups are

looking to GCRU to address local issues on the
ground, including interface issues with the
security forces

1. The Army's View of Community Relations (CR)

- security forces need continuously to be conscious
- the principles underlying good CR are consistent with the general policy and practice adopted by the Army in its role in support of the RUC
- it is quite likely that security forces and
- the Army devotes a lot of time to the training of incoming units/recruits on CR issues as simple CR and the other as seeking to promote behavioural and
- the RUC has a major input to the Army CR training programme, including training in advance of the arrival of units differences in perspectives, there is great scope for more frequent contacts
- examples of major issues raised in training are:-
- there is scope for greater involvement of
- stressing the fact that not everyone the Army meets in the streets is a terrorist
- the need to treat everyone as they would like their own families to be treated

- the need to be aware of the CR impact of Army actions

- the value of getting to know local leaders

2. The NICRC Perspective

- predictably, the Council get a picture of the civilian/security force interface from an alternative perspective

- increasingly local people and community groups are looking to CCRU to address local issues on the ground, including interface issues with the security forces

- security forces need continuously to be conscious of the negative effects which their actions can have on CR work on the ground

- it is quite likely that security force and community definitions of CR differ widely. At the extremities, one might be described as simple PR and the other as seeking to promote behavioural and attitudinal change

- given the likely differences in perspectives, there is great scope for more frequent contacts

- there is scope for greater involvement of non-Army/security force personnel in Army training and in evaluation of training practices

3. Individual Issues Discussed

- complaints procedure. Army are upgrading literature
- rules and procedures of accompaniment and why it is necessary
- follow-up procedures on house searches
- value of neighbourhood watch concept
- means of Army relating to local communities and taking account of their views
- public confusion about respective roles and responsibilities of security forces, ie RUC, Army, UDR and on how to communicate with security forces
- case for Army wearing numbers as a means of identification

4. Future issues likely to impact on Community Relations

- the gap between the Army and civil government. Both are addressing the same problems but from different angles. There is scope for developing the middle ground to improve co-operation and effectiveness
- Army would welcome advice on how it could develop its CR role
- good progress has been made in Londonderry, on foot of very close co-operation between the security forces and community groups. The strength of this

link is being further tested with the arrival of a new regiment, the Anglians. If the partnership holds, Londonderry may be a model for other areas in NI.

5. Conclusion

- a very useful meeting which benefited from the frank but constructive exchange of views. The frank exchanges raised the temperature considerably at certain points but the lid stayed on - even if it wobbled a little
- value in having more regular meetings
- may be value in meeting with Brigade Commanders

JW1515/9