



### Fight4thePJM Association

Complaints Officer,  
British High Commission,  
185 Jalan Ampang  
50450 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia

28th August 2006

Dear Sirs,

I wish to lodge a formal complaint regarding the article that Mr. Moody has placed in The Star - "UK Civilians Free To Wear Medal", 26/08/2006.

1. My complaint is that the article was written in his official capacity, from the British High Commission, but I contend that it was carefully worded to mislead the Malaysian people and British veterans. We are witnessing frequent examples of disinformation and repetition of spin and myths emanating from some Government Departments - and I view Mr. Moody's article as an extension of the process of official disinformation. It is a disquieting development and one that members of my Association will be asking their MP's to look into.

2. Disinformation: His article is headed: "UK civilians free to wear medal" - We are not. We have it in writing from the Government that the Queen approved acceptance on condition that the Malaysian medal is not worn by any British citizen.

---

Chairman, Fight4thePJM Association, 328 Hillcroft Street, Oshawa,  
Ontario, Canada L1G 2L9  
E: [john.fenton@fight4thePJM.org](mailto:john.fenton@fight4thePJM.org) W: <http://www.fight4thePJM.org>

3. Deliberately Misleading: He wrote: "normal rules which do not allow British servicemen and women to accept foreign awards" - As far as I am aware, there are no such prohibitive rules specific to British servicemen and women with regard to accepting foreign awards. The rules set out by the FCO refer to the basis on which Foreign medals (Decorations) can be accepted and they refer to 'British citizens'.

4. Publishing Myths: He wrote: "long standing custom in our armed services" - I shall arrange to send you, or you can see online - reference below - the Association's Rebuttal of the Ministerial Statement that underlines that it is a "long standing custom" to accept such awards. Foreign awards from many countries have been accepted for wear, including Russia, Malta, Kenya, Malaya/Malaysia, Ceylon, Brunei, South Africa, Iran, Oman, Nigeria, and Saudi Arabia.

5. More Disinformation: He wrote: "it is for individuals to decide whether they wish to wear the medal" - "No it isn't! The Queen decides - and she has, so far, said that we cannot."

6. Disregard for our Queen: From his words Mr. Moody is suggesting that our Queen and the Royal Prerogative, that ultimately govern these matters, are things of the past and are no longer applicable.

7. Dismissing our Queen: From what he writes, he suggests that the Queen's role is also a thing of the past, a non-event, and that her wishes and permission (or lack thereof) may be disregarded by veterans.

8. Disregarding the Fountain of all Honour: In my view it is wrong to derogate the Queen's role in this - She is officially, "The Fountain of all Honour" and we are officially told, ultimately it is She who approves what can and cannot be worn.

9. Encouraging Discourtesy to the Queen: Mr. Moody's implied recommendation that veterans wear their PJM is contrary to what we have been told. We have been informed officially, in writing, that if a veteran were to wear a medal without formal permission it would represent "grave discourtesy" to the Queen who approves all such awards and the conditions that apply to them.

10. Spin: Mr. Moody's careful use of the phrase 'some British veterans' is clearly designed to suggest a small and, perhaps even insignificant, number which runs contrary to the level of the support we have ... 50,000+ visits to our web site in a few months, nearly 1,200 registered supporters. We have

supporters on 5 continents and in 29 countries, the vast majority of whom are eligible British veterans. In addition, Mr Moody is being rather dismissive of the Field Marshals and Generals and many distinguished veterans who are entitled to the PJM and who overtly support our fight for their right to wear it.

11. Selective 'Reporting': Mr. Moody chooses not to be even-handed and so, while referring to two articles in 'The Star', he has not linked to another - the Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister's speech in London on the 19th July and reported in 'Opinion' in 'The Star' on the 20th July. This would have reflected the significance of the PJM to Malaysia and to Malaysians - an issue that is of paramount importance.

12. Selective 'Content': Mr. Moody does not mention the fundamental problem of the PJM Recommendation - that all other Commonwealth countries have asked the Queen to approve the Malaysian medal for acceptance and wear but She has been asked to approve acceptance by British citizens 'on condition that it is not worn'. Thus we have a clear case of discrimination - and the 'reasons' given for that discrimination are based upon myth and folklore (as we are able to substantiate).

13. Lack of Balance: The reader of Mr. Moody's article is not presented with a reasonably balanced submission - of a standard that one would anticipate from an Official. Mr. Moody has omitted all reference to Lord Healey's support for our right to wear the PJM (a Defence Minister in the mid-1960's); he does not refer to the support of the last MoD Veterans Minister nor to the support of the current Veterans Minister for the right to wear the PJM; nor to Don Touhig's Commons statement (July 6th) setting out some reasons for him making the case to the HD Committee for a review so that the PJM could be worn; nor to the support we have from dignitaries such as Dame Vera Lynn and Leslie Thomas; nor to our support from two holders of the Victoria Cross; nor to our support from Privy Counsellors such as the Rt Hon Michael Ancram QC. We have support from many MPs and from all ranks of the services, from Field Marshals and Generals, through to those many loyal veterans that Mr Moody wishes to help deny the pride of wearing the PJM with honour, and that can only be with the Queen's approval. And so it goes on - read <http://www.fight4thepjm.org> for more detail.

## References

I have set out a few references below - to 'The Star', 'The Rebuttal', and to some letters written post-Rebuttal. I have also referred to a few of the messages from ordinary men and women in Malaysia.

Better still, why not read the web site pages because there are a substantial number of other authoritative references contained therein.

### **Summary**

I must point out that I have a direct interest in the PJM issue. I am involved as Chairman of the Fight4thePJM Association seeking formal permission to wear the PJM.

Having said that, we are trying to conduct a fair and reasonable discussion in order to have a fair and reasonable hearing of our case. I was therefore very disturbed to read Mr. Moody's officially biased article, which is obviously designed to beguile the Malaysian people.

It is my view that Mr. Moody has deliberately endeavoured to obfuscate the truth in this case in an effort to make a political point. In so doing, it is my claim that he has misled the Malaysian people.

On that basis I submit this formal complaint and look forward to hearing that it will be looked in to.

Yours faithfully,



**John Gordon Fenton**  
Chairman,  
Fight4thePJM Association

### **May also be contacted at Association HQ:**

Fight4thePJM Association c/o Barry Fleming & Partners  
Trafalgar House  
110 Manchester Road  
Altrincham  
Cheshire, WA14 1NU  
United Kingdom

T: 0044 (0) 161 929 9857  
F: 0044 (0) 161 924 0321  
E: [hq@fight4thePJM.org](mailto:hq@fight4thePJM.org)  
W: <http://www.fight4thePJM.org>

**References:**

1. Opinion, The Star, 26 August 2006:  
(<http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2006/8/26/focus/15237691&sec=focus>)
2. The Rebuttal:  
([http://www.fight4thepjm.org/whatwesay\\_rebuttal.htm](http://www.fight4thepjm.org/whatwesay_rebuttal.htm))
3. Post-Rebuttal Letters:  
(<http://www.fight4thepjm.org/forum/viewforum.php?f=37>)
4. Messages from Malaysia:  
([http://www.fight4thepjm.org/the\\_pjm\\_Malaysian\\_comments.htm](http://www.fight4thepjm.org/the_pjm_Malaysian_comments.htm))