

and mentally unhealthy individuals", the report found. It said the team was isolated from the rest of the health trust and from other prisons, and there were "significant funding issues", contributing to a "very difficult working environment". The report found that while Mr A's violent behaviour was predictable, it could not be anticipated that he would kill someone unless there was a contributory factor - in this case, Mr Haynes's pre-existing heart disease. The panel did not believe Mr Haynes's death could have been prevented by the MHIRT.

Cambridge and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, which provides health services in Whitemoor, Littlehey and Peterborough prisons, said that the care it provided had changed "a great deal" since 2008. It said it had commissioned its own independent review in 2009 and had drawn up an action plan to address the latest recommendations. "Patient care is our number one priority - whether they are in our wards, in the community or in prison - and we will always co-operate with local authorities and other independent agencies to ensure we are delivering the highest quality services," it said.

Dale Cregan Goes on Hunger Strike

He is now refusing food at HMP Full Sutton, near York, reportedly in an attempt to get transferred to Strangeways prison in Manchester. Which is closer to the notorious gangster's hometown of Droylsden, Greater Manchester, and his family. He is currently believed to be in segregation at Full Sutton to shield him from ongoing safety threats, with reports suggesting there is an underworld reward of £20,000 for anyone who damages his remaining good eye.

A Prison Service spokeswoman refused to comment on Cregan's status or condition, but added: "We take food refusal extremely seriously. "If a prisoner chooses to refuse food for any reason, the Prison Service works with healthcare staff to monitor their physical and mental health. Prisoners who are considered mentally capable are entitled to refuse health interventions, provided they fully understand the consequences of their decision." He was given a whole life sentence at Preston Crown Court in June.

Bolivia Prison Riot leaves at Least 29 Dead

A riot at a jail in eastern Bolivia has left at least 29 people dead and more than 50 injured, officials say. The head of police, Alberto Jorge Aracena, said many of the bodies had been badly burnt. He said fighting broke out early on Friday between inmates at the maximum security area of the Palmasola jail in the city of Santa Cruz. "There was a fight for control in two cellblocks in the prison," said Mr Aracena. He said prisoners in one of the blocks had blown up a metal propane tank in another block around dawn. Local media reported that shots had been heard after the explosion. A fire that broke out shortly afterwards took almost two hours to put out.

Hostages: Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva, Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, Sam Hallam, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Romero Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan Thakrar, Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Frank Wilkinson, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan, Ihsan Ulhaque, Richard Roy Allan, Sam Cole, Carl Kenute Gowe, Eddie Hampton, Tony Hyland, Ray Gilbert, Ishtiaq Ahmed.

Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Fax: 087 2023 1623

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 440 (29/08/2013)

False Abuse Allegations May Increase After New Guidelines

Raymond Peytors - theopinionsite.org, August 17, 2013

New guidelines to police and CPS are likely to result in more false allegations of abuse

The recent acquittal of former news tycoon Eddie Shah, after being found not guilty of raping a 12 year old girl years ago, demonstrates clearly that despite the bleating of National Association for People Abused in Childhood (NAPAC), the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) and other so-called 'charities', complainants of 'historic' abuse do not always tell the truth.

Despite new guidelines given to the police and CPS, it follows therefore that these so called 'victims' should NOT automatically be believed but should instead be investigated and have to prove their case with real evidence, even if that means their lives are turned inside out by the police – as will be the case for their alleged abusers. Without the requirement that REAL proof of abuse must be produced, false allegations are likely to continue to rise in number and claiming, as charities and MPs do, that accusers will not come forward if they have to produce concrete evidence, is no excuse.

It is to be noted that following Shah's acquittal and contrary to what would have been the case had he been convicted, neither the police nor the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) were anywhere to be seen – let alone standing on the steps of the court where, instead of claiming victory in their normal, cynical manner, they would have had to apologise to the falsely accused defendant. Whilst Eddie Shah received justice and is still a free man, it cost him £700,000 to achieve that outcome. Such a sum would be unavailable to most people who would have to rely on legal aid and a sub-standard defence barrister.

In a country fuelled by hatred and revenge – largely driven by self-serving charities, newspapers and politicians – it is important that the police remain truly impartial and look for evidence that could support the accused as well as the accuser. Instead, we now have senior police officers deciding from the outset that anyone who makes an accusation of abuse must be telling the truth and that the accused is therefore guilty by default. For example, Supt Helen Chamberlain, who leads investigators in Nottinghamshire, says police will "always believe" the story they are told by a victim, but warns every detail will be investigated. So, to be clear, whilst 'victims' and 'perpetrators' will always be investigated, 'victims' will always be believed – by default.

That seems to TheOpinionSite.org – and probably to most sensible people – a very one-sided approach to take. When interviewed on BBC Radio Five following his acquittal, Mr Shah made a very obvious but hardly recognised point when he said: "Anybody walking down the street can point at a celebrity and say, 'he raped me'." Shah should in our view have added the words, "...and be automatically believed – by default"

There are of course real victims of abuse and every genuine case is a tragedy of one kind or another for everyone involved. Families, the wider community and of course the involved individuals themselves will all suffer, be they victim, perpetrator, relative or friend. Which is precisely why the current plethora of 'reviews' and 'investigations' (into the alleged actions of mainly dead people one should add) that are being carried out by various churches, local authorities, schools and inevitably the BBC, serve no purpose whatsoever other than to try and maintain the good name of the organisations and managers concerned. Nor is it an acceptable argument to suggest that such inves-

tigations – including those being made by policemen advised by the CPS – will ever bring ‘closure’ to the alleged victims. Hundreds of complaints made to police following an invitation in the press and on TV to do so do not prove anything.

So many complaints do however indicate that many people are prepared to make accusations against wealthy institutions and individuals in the hope that money will end up in the pocket of the accuser. This small but rather obvious observation may be distasteful to children’s and feminists’ “charities” but the facts speak for themselves:

If for example one takes the trouble to fully read the report into Jimmy Savile that was jointly released by the police and the ubiquitous NSPCC, all the reader will discover is a very long list of accusations and some highly dubious assumptions. There is actually no REAL evidence there at all.

The policeman in charge of Operation Yewtree, Peter Spindler said on TV: “We are dealing with alleged abuse on an unprecedented scale. The profile of this operation has empowered a staggering number of victims to come forward to report the sexual exploitation which occurred during their childhood.” Readers should note however that in the above paragraph, the word ‘alleged’ was soon dropped and the ‘sexual exploitation’ referred to is therefore to be regarded as proven fact, even though in truth, nothing has actually been proved at all.

John Cameron of the NSPCC –obviously not wishing to digress from the accepted dogma said that Savile was, “a well-organised prolific sex offender, who’s used his power, his authority, his influence to procure children and offend against them.” – though how Cameron knows this is a mystery as he cannot produce any real evidence either.

Peter Spindler was also apparently quoted by the BBC as saying, “So many people are saying the same thing, it must be true.” However, ‘saying the same thing’ was hardly a difficult thing to do as every day there were more and more ‘victims’ being quoted in the media, thus offering a perfect script to anyone who wanted to take their chance on the passing bandwagon in the hope of getting some cash, sympathy or even fame.

Spindler unexpectedly quit Operation Yewtree shortly after the publication of the report, presumably to get out of the hole that he had so successfully dug for himself and for others. Spindler has also faced considerable and well-founded criticism over the strategy of arresting people – 12 so far, including celebrities – when in some cases there appears to be insufficient evidence to bring charges. When asked, a Metropolitan Police spokesman said, “He {Spindler} decided to take a new post...that was his desire.” Given that Spindler’s new post is in the Inspectorate of Constabulary, TheOpinionSite.org might suggest that there is little hope for restoring impartiality in police forces across the country. Any genuine victims of Savile meanwhile are unlikely to receive justice but they might get compensation, if the solicitors dealing with the case (who are making a very tidy income out Savile) are to be believed.

The Stuart Hall case is another example of how cases and lack of evidence are manipulated, this time principally by the CPS who, having had their charges of indecent assault categorically denied by Hall, suddenly came up with an accusation of rape – which immediately meant a potential life sentence instead of a maximum of 5 years. Hall suddenly pleaded guilty to the indecent assaults and – surprise, surprise – the rape charge equally suddenly disappeared. Some observers might be tempted to use the word blackmail.

Not content with that, the Attorney General, Dominic Grieve – who despite what he has said previously in their support, obviously does not trust Crown Court judges when they make unpopular decisions – immediately reverted to being an MP, caved in to the whining of revenge seeking individuals and charities and appealed Hall’s sentence. Grieve suggested to the

Prisoners who 'Held Guard Hostage' Charged With False Imprisonment

Three prisoners have been charged with false imprisonment after allegedly holding a guard against his will following an investigation by counter-terror police. Feroz Khan, 26, Fuad Awale, 25, and David Watson, 26, were all inmates at HMP Full Sutton in East Yorkshire when it is claimed they held the guard hostage on 26 May. Khan and Awale are also accused of threatening to kill the officer, and Khan is charged with grievous bodily harm on the guard, and assault occasioning actual bodily harm on a second officer. All three men appeared before Westminster Court via video link from three separate prisons. The case has now been transferred to the Old Bailey where the next hearing will take place on 27 September. A spokesperson for the Crown Prosecution Service, said: “Following an investigation by the police’s north east counter terrorism unit, the Crown Prosecution Service has authorised charges against three men currently detained in prison. “It is alleged that on May 26 2013 Feroz Khan, Fuad Awale and David Watson, all of whom were at that time prisoners at HMP Full Sutton, unlawfully imprisoned a prison officer and detained him against his will. They will be jointly charged with one count of false imprisonment, contrary to common law. “A number of demands were made during the incident which resulted in the case being handled by counter-terrorism officers and specialist prosecutors.”

Gary Smith, and Lee Newell, trial set for 9th September 2013 for allegedly murdering Subhan Anwar in HMP Long Lartin, last February

Jahnel Faure, Jermaine Christie, Paul Coulter, and Barry Mundle, trial set for 21st October 2013, for allegedly murdering Adnan Rafiq - in HMP Hewell, last January

Glitterlips' Drag Queen Jailed For Benefits Fraud

A man who wrongly claimed £88,000 in benefits while performing as a high-heeled drag queen on stage has been jailed. Mark Hawthorn, 49 - better known on the entertainment circuit as part of duet act Glitterlips - was jailed for six months for making fraudulent benefit claims between November 2003 and March 2012. Sentencing him at Stafford Crown Court, Judge Michael Challinor said Hawthorn was guilty of "breathtaking" fraud. He said: "You should have confined your acting ability to female impersonation rather than defrauding the state."

HMP Peterborough Death 'Not Preventable'

BBC News, 22/08/13

The death of an inmate in a violent attack at Peterborough Prison could not have been prevented by the jail's mental health team, a report has found. One of the prisoners who killed Brian Haynes in 2008 was known to be violent, but his role in the killing could not have been predicted, it said. But the investigation found the care he received was "at best cursory". Cambridge and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust said it had already acted on the report's recommendations. It was produced by an independent panel commissioned by the NHS.

Although the report does not name individuals, the BBC understands it refers to death of Mr Haynes, 33, who died of a heart attack after he was beaten in his cell on 11 September 2008. Three fellow prisoners - Sebastian Waller, Shane Farrington and Paul Jefford - were later jailed for his manslaughter. It is not known which of them is the prisoner referred to in the report as "Mr A". 'Difficult working environment' The report said Mr A was displaying a potential personality disorder when he sought help from the prison's Mental Health In-Reach Team (MHIRT).

But the team missed opportunities to help him, and he was twice assessed by people who were not qualified. The unit soon faced a "very heavy caseload of some very vulnerable

quality. Most practical resettlement services were good, with the exceptions of work to help prisoners manage their money better and the education, training and employment pathway, which compounded the failures of activity provision more generally. The development of a specific resettlement wing was a good initiative but it had yet to deliver its potential and there was some confusion about its purpose. For many of the young men held, their family would be the most important resettlement agency. There was some good family work but visit arrangements were poor and restricted actual visiting time. As many visitors had to travel long distances to reach Aylesbury because of its national remit, that was a serious problem.

Overall, it was encouraging that HMYOI Aylesbury was improving and we saw concrete evidence of plans to develop that improvement further. However, the prison is very much on a journey and some significant weaknesses remain. The most concerning of these was the poor quantity and quality of activity - unacceptable in any prison but particularly so in one holding young men for such long periods. This should now be the priority for improvement.

HMP Oakwood/Drake Hall Inmates Working In Prison Call Centres *BBC, 21/08/2013*

Convicted criminals in the West Midlands are being paid to work in call centres inside their prisons. Inmates at HMP Oakwood, a male prison near Wolverhampton, and Drake Hall a woman's prison, in Staffordshire, carry out market research for insurance companies.

The Centre for Crime Prevention said the project was "incredibly naive". But the Ministry of Justice said it was a pilot scheme which may be rolled out further if it is successful, and added the prisoners have risk assessments. A spokeswoman for the Ministry of Justice said: "We do not want prisoners sitting idle in their cells when they should be working towards their rehabilitation. We prepare offenders for work inside prison so they can get a job after release - this reduces the chances that they will reoffend in the future, meaning lower crime and fewer victims. All prisoners working in call centres are risk-assessed and stringent security measures are in place, with calls supervised and recorded." She said the small pilots are being monitored and would only be increased to other prisons if they were deemed successful. She added the workers cannot see sensitive information about the people they are calling, such as addresses.

The phone numbers of customers are also protected as all calls are routed through a computer. "At no point can they ask the value of items, record data outside of the secure systems or deviate from a carefully-worded script," she added. The spokeswoman could not say whether any other prisons have similar schemes, nor which companies run the ones mentioned above. She confirmed the work is taking place within the confines of the prisons. On their websites, both facilities say work opportunities are available for inmates.

'Risk assessed': Alex Hewson from the Prison Reform Trust said they supported the scheme. "We encourage this type of scheme because it develops skills that may prove to be useful for the workplace generally, and gives prisoners a greater chance of getting employment on release," he said. I can understand why there may be concerns but the scheme is risk-assessed and I think it's really important those people get opportunities to help them resettle."

A statement from G4S, which runs HMP Oakwood prison, said: "The call centre at HMP Oakwood is one of many partnerships we run with businesses, and enables prisoners to work towards apprenticeships and industry-recognised qualifications. All the prisoners are carefully security checked and interviewed before working in the centre, calls are made remotely by computer, and every conversation is closely monitored by supervisors. No information from the calls is stored and there is no way any personal information can be used for any criminal purposes."

Appeal Court judges that if just one of the existing 15 month concurrent sentences were to run consecutively instead of concurrently, Hall's sentence could be doubled at the stroke of a pen...which is precisely what happened. Such manipulation of a sentence is a disgrace, even in today's Britain where judges are as terrified of the media as are politicians.

All these cases rely not on real proof but on what is known as 'similar fact evidence'; in other words, a number of people saying broadly similar things, be they accurate or not. The fact that more than one person is saying something happened makes it the truth, even where there is nothing else to back it up.

In this world of Google, 24 hour news, FaceBook and Twitter, a list of people "all saying more or less the same thing" is no substitute for real evidence, no matter how many people are saying it. Nor does it help justice when police officers not only write – and word – the statements of witnesses and 'victims' but also frame questions in such a way as to get a predictably consistent response from those making the allegations.

It is obvious to TheOpinionSite.org and many others that people DO in fact lie about being abused, knowing full well that they will be able to hide behind an impenetrable screen of anonymity whilst in some cases making a lucrative deal with a tabloid newspaper. It can be no coincidence that the number of claims against the BBC, the Catholic and Anglican Church and wealthy private schools are increasing and being encouraged by organisations who stand to make money from supporting 'victims'. Where the alleged abuser or the responsible organisation has little money and few assets however, the likelihood of a claim for compensation succeeding is much less.

The police love historic abuse cases, as do the CPS; little evidence is needed, trawling is easy and prosecution and conviction is normally a foregone conclusion, the CPS never being willing to explain WHY it is in the 'public interest' to prosecute an old man when no real evidence exists. The case rests solely on the memory and the word – false or otherwise – of the individuals involved.

Any other country in Europe would be ashamed to proceed on such a basis when an individual's future, reputation and sometimes even their life is at stake. The British on the other hand – probably because they are often weak and generally selfish – love revenge, love hatred and are always keen to offload the responsibility for their dissatisfaction with their own lives onto someone else.

A senior barrister told TheOpinionSite.org - and we make no apology for the direct quote: "This country is now completely fucked-up over anything to do with accusations of abuse; it's produced a licence for the individual to get compensation and for charitable organisations to bleed people dry, all in the name of protecting children.

Everyone is afraid to criticise today's abuse gravy train for what it is and the built in bias of the police and CPS has provided both the perfect blunt weapon for anyone looking to take revenge against someone they don't like and a simple way for opportunistic individuals to make some money."

Remember those words next time the NSPCC or NAPAC ask you for your money or next time a celebrity (or anyone else) gets arrested or charged for a so-called 'historic' offence. Try asking where the REAL proof is and see if you get a sensible answer, though it is unlikely that such an answer will ever be forthcoming – be it from politicians, charities, the police or the CPS.

Ex-Police Officer 'Filled Wife's Hot Tub With Manure'

A retired Canadian police officer has been arrested for allegedly filling his wife's hot tub with manure after being served divorce papers. Police in Quebec went to the house, in the small town of Sainte-Émélie-de-l'Énergie, On site, the officers saw a man with a tractor placing manure in the spa, or the hot tub, of his ex-wife and at the front door.

Sodexo Justice Services Hold Woman in Segregation for 6 Years

Her cell was unkempt and squalid and she seldom left it. Her prolonged location on the segregation unit amounted to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment - and we use these words advisedly. The treatment and conditions of other women held for long periods in segregation was little better.

Report on an Unannounced Inspection of HMP Bronzefield

Bronzefield is privately run by Sodexo Justice Services and is a local closed women's prison holding restricted status, remand short-term convicted and life-sentenced prisoners.

Inspection 8/19 April 2013 by HMCIP, report compiled June 2013, published 21/08/13

Inspectors were concerned to find that:

- arrangements for transporting women to and from the prison were unacceptable, as women were carried in vehicles containing men and spent very long periods in the van;
- offender management needed to be better coordinated with the generally very good practical resettlement services; and
- work to support women in maintaining positive relationships with their families was underdeveloped.
- The prison held a small number of 'restricted status' women, some of whom had severe personality disorders.
- One woman was found, at the 2010 inspection, to have been held in the segregation unit for three years with very little human contact and little to occupy her. She was still there in 2013. Although more activities had been organised for her and better support was available, her prolonged location amounted to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment. Much of this was outside the prison's direct control and required a national strategy for meeting the needs of these very complex women, as exists in the male estate.
- Women were concerned that small children were searched, and in our view this could only be justified if there was compelling intelligence to support it.
- Inspectors made 101 recommendations

Introduction from the report: HMP Bronzefield is a closed women's local prison run by Sodexo Justice Services that at the time of this inspection held 446 women on remand or serving sentences ranging from a few weeks to life. About one in six of those held had been in the prison less than a month. They ranged in age from 18 to 79. Almost 30% were foreign nationals. As at our last inspection, and typical of a women's prison of this type, the women held presented a wide variety of complex needs: about half had children under 18; about one in three told us they felt depressed or suicidal when they first arrived at the prison, had a disability or had a problem with drugs; and one in five had a problem with alcohol.

Overall, the prison's response to this complex population had improved since our last inspection and some of the areas that remained of most concern were outside its direct control. The arrangements for transporting women to and from the prison were unacceptable. They were carried in vehicles containing men, they spent very long periods in the van - possibly because they had to wait while male prisoners were dropped off first - and 15% told us they did not feel safe on the journey. However, once at the prison, reception, first night and induction arrangements were all good. There was very good support for women with substance misuse problems that continued throughout their time in the prison; support for the significant number of women with alcohol problems was particularly impressive and best practice.

These early day processes reflected generally good care for the most vulnerable women. There had been no self-inflicted deaths since the prison opened and the number of self-harm incidents had reduced dramatically year on year. The support provided to the most vulner-

Aylesbury held some young men whose behaviour was very challenging and others who were very vulnerable - and plenty who were both. Holding them all safely was a challenge. Most prisoners did feel safe at the time of the inspection, and levels of violence had reduced since the short-follow up inspection and were now comparable with other similar establishments - although that is by no means low enough. However, when assaults did occur they were often serious, and levels of violence against staff were concerning and higher than elsewhere. The overall reduction reflected good strategies and processes but we identified examples where the handling of individual incidents and perpetrators was weak.

Prisoners who were identified as poor copers and who might be particularly vulnerable to bullying were held on F wing where they were well looked after and their interactions with other prisoners managed safely. There were a high number of self-harm incidents and there had been two self inflicted deaths since the last inspection. Care for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm was now generally good, and action plans that had been developed after the two deaths were being actively implemented.

There needed to be a better grip on some security and discipline measures. The use of force by officers was a little higher than in similar establishments but the use of batons, although reduced since the last inspection, was much higher than the comparator. We were not confident that there was sufficient scrutiny of baton use to ensure it was always necessary. The number of adjudications had also reduced since the last inspection but the use of 'minor reports', which did not have the same levels of governance, was high, some appeared to be for petty reasons and some punishments were severe. In a similar vein, we found one prisoner who had been placed on the 'escape list', with the very severe consequences that entails, as a result of what appeared to be some childish behaviour that could have been dealt with in a more proportionate way. The regime for segregated prisoners was too limited. More prisoners than in comparable establishments told us it was easy to get drugs in the prison and the positive drug testing rate was high' but the suspicion testing process was weak. There was good support for prisoners with a substance misuse problem.

Safety, of course, is not just a matter of locks, bars and procedures but is inextricably linked to the quality of relationships between prisoners and staff. These had much improved since the last inspection and staff routinely used prisoners' first names. A few staff still had an indifferent and unhelpful attitude. Prisoners from black and minority ethnic groups reported much less favourably about their interactions with staff than other prisoners but, on the whole, prisoners with protected characteristics were positive about their treatment. The environment was poor and many areas were dirty and shabby. Health care was good.

Relationships may have been generally friendly enough but they were too often characterised by low expectations. This was reflected in the quantity and quality of purposeful activity available - which was a gaping chasm in the overall trend of improvement. Aylesbury held young men long enough to give many of them good skills and experience, as well as the habits and attitudes that would help them get and hold down a job when they were released - essential if they were to stay out of trouble. Instead, young men spent much too long locked in grubby cells, and when they did go to activity, it was too often of poor quality, with inexperienced staff and bad behaviour. This has been the case too long at Aylesbury and needs to improve quickly.

The other work the prison was doing to help its prisoners stay out of trouble was generally good. Offender management work, in particular, was never less than adequate, but excellent if you had a probation officer as an offender supervisor. It should all have been of that high

decentralized peer-to-peer tools might meet this criteria, but for the foreseeable future these tools will not have the features or usability that people have grown accustomed to.

In the coming months, the Riseup birds plan to begin rolling out a series of radically new services, starting with encrypted internet, encrypted email, and encrypted chat. These services will be based on 100% open source and open protocols, will be easy to use, and will protect your data from everyone, even Riseup. This is a massive undertaking, made in concert over the last year with several other organizations, and will only work with your support. We need programmers, particularly those experienced in Python, C, Ruby, and Android development, and sysadmins interested in starting their own secure service providers.

Report on an Unannounced Inspection of HMYOI Aylesbury

Inspection by HMCIP, 2–12 April 2013, report compiled June 2013, published 20/08/13

Aylesbury held some young men whose behaviour was very challenging and others who were very vulnerable - many were both. Holding them all safely was a challenge.

Inspectors were concerned to find:

- when assaults occurred they were often serious and levels of violence against staff were concerning and higher than elsewhere;
- the use of batons, although reduced, was much higher than in most other prisons and inspectors were not confident that there was sufficient scrutiny to ensure it was always necessary;
- use of 'minor reports' was high, some appeared to be for petty reasons with severe punishments;
- more prisoners than in comparable establishments said it was easy to get drugs in the prison;
- quantity of purposeful activity was poor and young men spent too long locked in grubby cells;
- work, education and training opportunities were often of poor quality with inexperienced staff and bad behaviour;
- visits arrangements were poor, which was a serious problem as many visitors had to travel long distances to reach Aylesbury.
- There were a high number of self-harm incidents and there had been two self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection

Introduction from the report: HMYOI Aylesbury holds about 400 young men aged between 18 and 21, all of whom are serving long sentences. They come from right across the country and many are a long way from home and family.

Our last full inspection of Aylesbury was in 2009 when we found outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good in most areas, apart from the provision of purposeful activity. However, when we checked progress in a short follow-up inspection in 2011, we were concerned that the establishment was slipping backwards and outcomes were deteriorating. This inspection found that the downward slide had been reversed in most areas, although the quality and quantity of purposeful activity remained unacceptably poor.

Aylesbury has a grim reputation, perhaps not helped by a recent TV documentary, and prisoners told us they had been very anxious when they first arrived. These anxieties appeared to have been stoked by staff and prisoners in their sending establishment, and were not assuaged by the grubby, restrictive and un-welcoming first night and induction wing.

However, the week before the inspection began a new, much better, reception area had opened. Reception and first night processes themselves were efficient and, although the environment was poor, the care provided for prisoners when they first arrived was good. Induction took too long and prisoners spent much of it locked in their cells; some vulnerable prisoners missed it altogether.

able women was sensitive but effective; strip clothing, the use of 'constant watches' and managing women in health care had largely been replaced by good quality planning and active, thoughtful engagement by the safer custody team. Nevertheless, there was room for some improvement in the quality of suicide and self-harm prevention (ACCT) procedures. Most women told us they felt safe and there was little evidence of physical assaults and fights.

At our last inspection in 2010 we reported: The prison held a small number of 'restricted status' women, some of whom had severe personality disorders. Their needs could simply not be met by the prison. One woman, who had exhibited unpredictable and violent behaviour, had effectively been held in the segregation unit for three years with very little human contact or activity to occupy her. The conditions in which she was held seemed likely to lead to further psychological deterioration and were completely unacceptable. There was little evidence that senior staff in the Prison Service had oversight of women segregated for long periods to ensure their conditions were humane. Bronzefield is not an appropriate place for women with these needs and there was a lack of a national strategy to manage women with such complex demands.

We were dismayed that the woman who had already been in the segregation unit for three years in 2010 was still there in 2013. Her cell was unkempt and squalid and she seldom left it. Although more activities had been organised for her and better multi-disciplinary support was available, she still had too little to occupy her. Her prolonged location on the segregation unit amounted to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment - and we use these words advisedly. The treatment and conditions of other women held for long periods in segregation was little better. Much of this was outside the prison's direct control and required a national strategy for meeting the needs of these very complex women - as exists in the male estate. However, Bronzefield itself needed to do more to ameliorate the worst effects of this national failure.

The situation for most of the women held at Bronzefield was very different. The standard of accommodation was good, although too many women shared cells. Staff had a good knowledge of the women in their care and most women felt there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. Diversity and equality arrangements were reasonable, but the needs of women with disabilities needed more attention. We were not assured that the distinct needs of the sometimes very young women held were identified or met. The mother and baby unit was an excellent resource. Health care, which had been a major concern at the last inspection, was now much improved and was reasonable overall. However, there were still some weaknesses in provision, particularly the management of medications, delays and access to female GPs.

Time out of cell was reasonable for most women and there were enough activity places to meet the needs of the population - better than we see in most local prisons. However, the range of activity was too narrow and the level insufficient to support women to gain employment, education or training on release. This was compounded by poor careers guidance and weak links with potential employers; the prison was taking steps to address this.

The strategic management of resettlement was underdeveloped and offender management needed to be better coordinated with practical resettlement services. These practical services were generally good and innovative. Among other very good chaplaincy services, volunteers escorted some women to the local railway station on release. Uniquely, the prison had its own Women's Institute branch and this provided an opportunity for continuing support for some women after they left the prison. There were good arrangements to link women with the effective professional resettlement services available. However, despite determined efforts by the prison, for a few women it could do little more than provide a sleeping bag, warm clothing or food parcels on release.

Work to support women in maintaining positive relationships with their families was adequate but underdeveloped and not sufficiently linked with offender management or wider resettlement work. The prison did not know which women were primary carers or whether they received visits from their children.

There were 12 visiting days a year for children, their mothers and grandmothers only - but the activities available on these occasions had reduced since the last inspection. Visiting entitlements were generous but arrangements for booking visits were limited. Women were concerned that small children were searched, and in our view this could only be justified if there was compelling intelligence to support it.

This inspection took place while the government was conducting a review of the women's custodial estate. HMP Bronzefield illustrates some of the challenges that review should address. It is a credit to the managers and staff at Bronzefield that they meet these challenges as well as they do. There is more that can be done locally, but some of the issues identified in this report require a fundamentally different approach to the imprisonment of women at national level.

Patrick Docherty to the High Court of Justiciary

On 1 March 2005, at Kilmarnock High Court, Mr Docherty was convicted of murder and sentenced to life imprisonment with a punishment part of 25 years. The Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission has decided to refer the case to the High Court because the Commission believes there may have been a miscarriage of justice. The Commission is also satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the case be referred. In accordance with the Commission statutory obligations, a statement of reasons for its decision has been sent to the High Court, to the applicant and his solicitors, to the Lord Advocate and Crown Office. The Commission has no power under its founding statute to make copies of its statements of reasons available to the public. -

Patrick Docherty: 17841, HMP Shotts, Cantrell Road, Shotts ML7 4LE

John McGranaghan Born 1941 Passed August 2013 A 'Convicts Convict'

On the eighth of August 2013 John McGranaghan passed away from heart failure. He was 72 years old. McGranaghan was jailed for life in 1981 after being found guilty at the Old Bailey of a rape and indecent assaults against three women between 1978 and 1980. But following a campaign by Rough Justice, he was freed after forensic evidence showed there had been a "miscarriage of justice", according to appeal judges.

During his ten years of imprisonment John suffered horrendous repression and as a consequence of resisting and fighting back he spent at least eight years in solitary confinement. As a direct result of his inhuman treatment in jail John's physical and mental health was irreparably damaged and this eventually killed him.

Throughout his time in prison, most of it spent on the "ghost-train" (being moved constantly around the prison system), John was known as a fearless and determined fighter for and defender of prisoner's rights and was involved in what his captors described as "concerted acts of indiscipline", i.e. acts of rebellion and resistance. For this he was savagely punished.

John will be remembered as a "convict's convict", someone who instinctively and whole heartedly gave his life to the struggle in prison and constantly tried to create and inspire solidarity amongst the imprisoned. He will be greatly missed.

John Bowden, HMP Shotts, August 2013

...serving terms of more than 25 years. It could mean killers such as Ian Huntley, the Soham murderer, and Roy Whiting, who murdered eight year-old Sarah Payne in 2000, could bring challenges in the future. Hutchinson's fresh appeal is likely to be accepted by the European judges in light of their decision on the Bamber case, said Kirsty Brimelow QC, chairwoman of the Bar Human Rights Committee. "I'm not surprised there is another appeal on the back of the earlier case," she said. "We would expect the judges to be consistent with the principles enunciated in the Bamber appeal, namely that every prisoner is entitled to have their sentence reviewed."

Space for Dissent

It is a mistake to frame the recent US and European massive surveillance revelations in terms of the privacy of individuals. What is at stake is not privacy at all, but the power of the state over its citizenry. What surveillance really is, at its root, is a highly effective form of social control. The knowledge of always being watched changes our behavior and stifles dissent. The inability to associate secretly means there is no longer any possibility for free association. The inability to whisper means there is no longer any speech that is truly free of coercion, real or implied. Most profoundly, pervasive surveillance threatens to eliminate the most vital element of both democracy and social movements: the mental space for people to form dissenting and unpopular views.

Many commentators, and Edward Snowden himself, have noted that these surveillance programs represent an existential threat to democracy. This understates the problem. The universal surveillance programs in place now are not simply a potential threat, they are certain to destroy democracy if left unchecked. Democracy, even the shadow of democracy we currently practice, rests on the bedrock foundation of free association, free speech, and dissent. The consequence of the coercive power of surveillance is to subvert this foundation and undermine everything democracy rests on. Within social movements, there is a temptation to say that nothing is really different. After all, governments have always targeted activist groups with surveillance and disruption, especially the successful ones.

But this new surveillance is different. What the US government and European allies have built is an infrastructure for perfect social control. By automating the process of surveillance, they have created the ability to effortlessly peer into the lives of everyone, all the time, and thus create a system with unprecedented potential for controlling how we behave and think. True, this infrastructure is not currently used in this way, but it is a technical tool-kit that can easily be used for totalitarian ends.

Those who imagine a government can be trusted to police itself when given the ominous power of precise insight into the inner workings of everyday life are betting the future on the ability of a secretive government to show proper self-restraint in the use of their ever-expanding power. If history has shown us anything, it is that the powerful will always use their full power unless they are forced to stop.

So, how exactly are we planning on stopping them? We support people working through the legal system or applying political pressure, but we feel our best hope of stopping the technology of surveillance is the technology of encryption. Why? Because the forces that have created this brave new world are unlikely to be uprooted before it is too late to halt the advance of surveillance. Unfortunately, most existing encryption technology is counterproductive. Many people are pushing technology that is proprietary, relies on a central authority, or is hopelessly difficult for the common user. The only technology that has a chance to resist the rise of surveillance will be open source, federated, and incredibly easy to use. In the long run,

Legal experts feared the initial challenge by Bamber and two other killers would lead to a deluge of similar claims, at great expense to the taxpayer, by all 49 killers and rapists serving whole life tariffs, as well as other murderers handed long sentences. The British government has already been asked to provide an official response to Hutchinson's claim, which could lead to a full hearing next year. If, as expected, judges rule in his favour Hutchinson could ultimately win the right to be freed. Dominic Raab MP, who is campaigning for human rights reform, said: "You couldn't get a better example of a case where 'life should mean life'. "UK democratic accountability over our criminal justice system is yet again being threatened by the insatiable appetite of the Strasbourg court. Parliament must rebuff any further mission creep from these unaccountable European judges."

Hutchinson's trial heard he broke into the home of Basil and Avril Laitner in October 1983, armed with an eight inch bowie knife. Just hours after the family had celebrated the wedding of elder daughter Suzanne, Hutchinson killed Mr Laitner, 59, a solicitor, and his wife, 55, in a frenzied attack. Mrs Laitner was stabbed 26 times. Their son Richard was also slain at their home in Dore, Sheffield. Hutchinson took an 18 year-old woman who was staying at the house from her bed at knifepoint. Bragging that he had already slain the Laitners and forcing her walk through a pool of blood, he took the teenager to a marquee in the grounds where she was tied up and raped. The killer fled leaving the young woman bound in her bedroom. Hutchinson went on the run for weeks and dubbed himself "The Fox" but was traced and convicted thanks to the rape victim's testimony and a wealth of forensic evidence, including his palm print on a bottle of champagne at the wedding reception. The killer was wanted for rape at the time of the attacks on the Laitners and had already served five years' imprisonment for the attempted murder of his brother-in-law. The judge at Hutchinson's trial at Sheffield Crown Court ruled that he should serve 18 years but then home secretary Leon Brittan later ruled he should face the whole life tariff.

Just five years ago the Court of Appeal ruled there was "no reason at all" to depart from the whole life tariff. Mr Justice Tugendhat said: "These were exceptionally serious murders, and it is right that the applicant should remain in prison for the rest of his life by way of punishment."

Despite a thorough examination of Hutchinson's sentence by British judges the Strasbourg court's decision will allow Hutchinson and others to bring new challenges under human rights laws. The European court's ruling proposed that those serving life with no possibility of parole should instead have their cases reviewed after 25 years, following which they could be freed if they persuaded a panel they were no longer a danger to the public. The appeal was brought by Bamber and two other killers - Douglas Vintner, who stabbed his wife to death less than three years after being released from prison for a previous murder; and Peter Moore, a serial killer.

Chris Grayling, the Justice Secretary, said at the time it made him more determined to "curtail" the Strasbourg court's role in this country's legal affairs. Responding to the latest development Mr Grayling said: "I have repeatedly made clear how profoundly I disagree with the recent ruling by the European court. Our judges should be able to tell those who commit the most heinous crimes imaginable that they may never be released. To be told this breaches human rights is absurd – and an insult to those who wrote the original human rights convention. What about the rights of the victims and their families? "I continue to strongly believe that whole life tariffs are appropriate for the worst murder cases. This is why I want wholesale reforms to our human rights laws."

It is feared the Strasbourg ruling will have an even wider impact than first feared because it could create sentencing discrepancies for other murderers who, although not on whole life tariffs, are

Charles Bronson: Time For him to be Released?

Thanks to his violent behaviour in prison, he has been behind bars for for 40 years, since his conviction for robbing a post office in 1974. But surely he has now served his time?

On 31 August, supporters of the prisoner Charles Bronson will deliver a 10,000 signature petition to 10 Downing Street calling for his release. Bronson, now in his 40th year of imprisonment, more than 30 of which have been spent in solitary confinement, is one of the UK's longest-serving prisoners. He has spent more years inside than most convicted murderers or sex attackers ever will – yet he has never killed or sexually molested anyone.

That he has been a problem for the prison system since his conviction in 1974, when he was sentenced to seven years for the £26 armed robbery of a post office when he was just 21, is beyond dispute. By his own admission, he was a handful as a youngster. Prisons do not like people they can't control and Bronson's response to much of what he saw as the system's petty and demeaning treatment of prisoners was violence.

Declared "insane" by a prison doctor in HMP Parkhurst in 1978, Bronson was sent to Broadmoor special hospital for treatment. Forcibly drugged and allegedly beaten, he rebelled by taking to the roof and causing hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of damage before being talked down by his family. Five years of special hospital "treatment" later, he was declared sane and sent back to prison.

Since then, whenever he has felt aggrieved, he has taken hostages: a prison governor, a librarian, and two Iraqis who had hijacked a plane to seek refuge in the UK, only to find themselves subject to Bronson on a day when he was in a hostage-taking mood. (Myths abound about Bronson's feats of strength – that he is a champion dwarf-thrower or that he can bend cell doors with his bare hands. What is true is that he forced one of his Iraqi captives to tickle his feet, explaining later: "I hadn't had them tickled for a while.") His last hostage victim was prison art teacher Phil Danielson. In Hull prison special unit in 1999, Danielson was tied to a leash and led around the unit, "like a dog". Bronson was cleared of threatening to kill him, but Danielson was so traumatised by what happened that he has never worked since.

For that offence Bronson received a life sentence, eligible for parole after three years. Ever since then he has been isolated in one of the most secure cells in the country, next door to a man who has killed three fellow prisoners. He has been given no opportunity to demonstrate a positive change of attitude or behaviour. But the time that Bronson has spent in prison is disproportionate to his crimes. He is now being punished simply for being Charles Bronson.

Charles Bronson's Prison Hostage Conviction Set For Review

Criminal Cases Review Commission to consider new evidence over incident at Hull prison in 1999: Charles Bronson, often dubbed Britain's most dangerous prisoner, is to have his conviction and life sentence for a hostage-taking incident in 1999 reviewed by the Criminal Cases Review Commission. Bronson, believes his case should be sent back to the court of appeal because the judge, Ronald Moss, allowed his trial to proceed after Bronson had dismissed his legal team, and then denied him the opportunity to enter a plea that he had acted under "circumstances of duress". It meant the jury were left with no option but to find Bronson guilty of falsely imprisoning Phil Danielson, a prison teacher whom he held hostage in Hull prison's secure unit for 44 hours, and causing criminal damage to prison property. He was cleared of threatening to kill Danielson. The incident was portrayed in the 2009 film about Bronson's life, titled Bronson. After the film's screening, Danielson said: "I hope he never gets out. I went through hell. I have nightmares. I've suffered post-traumatic stress, had three nervous breakdowns and never worked since." Bronson has

always maintained that he only took the teacher hostage because he was terrified of being sent to the secure unit in Woodhill prison, where he had been held previously and where he says he believed he would be mentally tortured if he returned. An appeal on similar grounds in 2004 failed. But the Criminal Cases Review Commission has now agreed to look at new evidence. Bronson's solicitor, Robert Normile, said: "New medical evidence only alluded to previously potentially raises a significant question mark over the safety of Mr Bronson's conviction." While in solitary confinement Bronson has smashed world records for pressups and situps, written a dozen bestselling books and created his own brand of artwork, originals of which sell for large sums on eBay and earn money for children's charities. Sally Berlin, director of caseworker operations at the CCRC, confirmed that Bronson's case was "awaiting allocation for review". Having his case reviewed afresh by the CCRC may be his final attempt to secure his freedom. In a letter to a friend recently, Bronson said he felt he was now at a crossroads. "I'm still a category A prisoner, still in a cage, still isolated. I'll either walk free from this appeal or I'll die a very old man in prison," he wrote.

You Should Not Put People With Complex Mental Health Issues In Prison

Dano Sonnex is currently located to the Close Supervision Centre (CSC) Unit in HMP Wakefield. Dano is now being held in the segregation unit on basic regime with nothing other than a bed and four walls to look at daily, after an alleged attack on prison officers of which Dano is awaiting to be interviewed by police. Not a good situation for someone with such complex mental health needs, it has been well established that prison cannot meet his needs.

When will the system realise that Dano needs specialist help, you cannot and should not put people with complex mental health issues or anyone else into the CSC units in this country but unfortunately for the few they do. These inmates are caged like animals it is inhumane treatment and should be stopped.

Nick Hardwick HMCIP in his inspectorate report for HMP Wakefield 2012 clearly states 'the prison had been unable to address the physical environment of F Wing, which housed the CSC and segregation unit and remained very poor'.

Dano has Asperger syndrome, complex personality disorders and paranoid psychosis he had been diagnosed by two of the top forensic psychiatrists in the UK. One of these being an expert in the field of Autism, who knows that he should be placed in the correct environment something that isn't being adhered to.

On enquiry to the prison governor about a care plan for Dano the reply received states, that there is a care plan in place of which Dano sees the prison 'mental health inreach team' and also a psychiatrist. Dano doesn't liaise with them anymore as he was told by part of the 'inreach team' that he is a paranoid schizophrenic which was never part of his diagnosis whilst in Broadmoor and will not take medication to control the worrying aspect of his illnesses Paranoid Delusional Disorder.

Dano has also been charged whilst in HMP Wakefield with a section 18 for the alleged assault on Broadmoor staff and a trial at a later date. Broadmoor say that Dano is too violent to be held there!!! surely 85% of patients in Broadmoor are violent.

Dano was forced to take medication whilst in Broadmoor and at CPA meetings in Broadmoor Dano was informed by doctors that prison isn't the place for him yet strangely he was transferred back to prison on an emergency warrant after the alleged assault issued by the Secretary of State and signed by two doctors that Dano could quite easily be cared for if medicated but if Dano was to deteriorate then he could be transferred back to hospital .

Dano has deteriorated both mentally and physically yet is still held in the CSC at HMP Wakefield. Dano should be back in hospital as the prison cannot deal with his needs.

We have no faith in his present solicitors who have done absolutely nothing for him.

I and my younger son George visited Dano last Sunday 17/08/13 and we are always upset when we leave because we can see the deterioration in him....he is imagining all sorts of invisible entity's touching and grabbing him the paranoia he is experiencing is horrendous.

The System has failed Dano since a very early age and continues to fail him.

Best Wishes, Kathy Sonnex mother of Dano

MoD Says It Will Comply With Court Ruling On Loughgall Killings *BBC 21/08/2013*

The MoD has said it will take "all necessary steps" to comply with a High Court ruling to hand over papers connected to the killing of eight IRA men and a civilian in Loughgall. At the High Court on Tuesday Master Bell made the order against the MoD after saying it was imperative that the case moved on.

The case for the disclosure of files was brought by the families of three of Declan Arthurs, Patrick Kelly and Padraig McKearney the IRA men who died. They want the papers to help their lawyers to prepare a civil action against the MoD. The relatives claim the killings were "unlawful". Declan Arthurs' brother Brian said he welcomed the court's decision and said the families wanted full disclosure from the MoD, adding: "We don't want a charade".

Undercover soldiers shot the IRA men as they approached Loughgall police station with a 200 lb bomb in the bucket of a hijacked digger in May 1987. A civilian, Anthony Hughes, was killed and his brother badly wounded when they were caught up in the gunfire. A civilian, Anthony Hughes, was killed and his brother badly wounded when they were caught up in the gunfire.

In a statement, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) said it was "clear that these deaths resulted from the use of lawful force, carried out by soldiers with great professionalism in circumstances of grave danger to themselves. We do however regret that an innocent civilian was killed while military acted in response to a blatant act of terrorism. We will of course take all necessary steps to comply with the order made against us for disclosure of papers connected with the incident."

The relatives want the papers to help their lawyers to prepare a civil action against the MoD over what they've called the 'unlawful killings' Undercover soldiers shot the IRA men as they approached Loughgall police station with a 200 lb bomb in the bucket of a hijacked digger in May 1987.

Hutchinson Lodges 'Whole Life' Appeal in Wake of ECtHR Judgement

David Barrett, Telegraph 20 August 2013

A triple murderer has lodged the first challenge of a "life means life" jail sentence following a controversial ruling by the European Court of Human Rights, in a move which could force ministers to water down the way Britain's most heinous criminals are punished. Arthur Hutchinson is serving a "whole life" tariff for stabbing a wealthy couple to death after breaking into their home on the night of their daughter's wedding, then killing one of their sons and repeatedly raping another wedding guest. Strasbourg judges ruled last month that a tariff which forces murderers to die in jail was "inhuman and degrading" following an appeal by three killers including Jeremy Bamber, who shot dead five members of his family in 1985. Now Hutchinson has become the first killer to capitalise on the ruling and attempt to have his own sentence declared a breach of his human rights. Hutchinson's legal bid has emerged within just six weeks of the Strasbourg ruling.