



THE FACE OF ALAN SUTCLIFFE after his release. Sgt Moore said he did it all. With his left fist.

IN THE SMALL HOURS of February 3rd, 29-year-old Alan Sutcliffe was suspected of stealing a car — and arrested.

Later that day he appeared in court with a broken nose, a black eye, blood on his right ear, grazes on the left of his forehead, bruises on the right of his neck and eight severe bruises on his shins.

Also, he faced four serious charges: Two of causing grievous bodily harm (by injuring Det Sgt Lawrence Moore's knuckles); assaulting Det Sgt Lawrence Moore; and assaulting Det Con Mervyn Davies.

Alan Sutcliffe was no longer suspected of stealing a car.

In Liverpool Crown Court on May 17 he denied all four charges. The police, he said, were just not telling the truth. The police account failed to convince a jury and Alan Sutcliffe was acquitted.

He has made a complaint against the police, alleging brutality. And there are strong grounds for believing that the detectives involved used far more than "reasonable force".

What is more, the truthfulness of their evidence is in serious doubt. The jury took only 35 minutes to agree — unanimously — that Alan Sutcliffe was innocent.

In addition, the case has revealed some police practices which are highly questionable, if not illegal.

Below we print the story, as it unfolded in court.

SHORTLY before 2.30 a.m. on February 3, Alan Sutcliffe and his friend John Garner left the Tudor Club in Upper Parliament Street and were driving towards Duke Street.

At the corner of Hope Street and Duke Street the car hit a bollard. Alan Sutcliffe says he had swerved to avoid a pedestrian. Neither he nor his passenger was hurt and the car — which had been borrowed from a friend — was not badly damaged. They locked the car and walked off, intending to report the accident.

At this point they were stopped by two men in a silver-grey Cortina. The men, who were in plain clothes, later turned out to be Det Sgt Lawrence Moore and Det Con Mervyn Davies. There are two different versions of what happened next.

ALAN SUTCLIFFE said in his statement: "The taller man said fairly aggressively, 'Where do you think you're going?' I replied, 'What has it got to do with you?'"

"They both grabbed hold of me, forcing me against their car, and began to beat me about the face with their fists. The tall man said 'We're CID' and carried on beating me."

"I asked them for their identity cards and one of them said 'Funny fucker, get in the car, sonny.' I insisted on seeing their cards, but they just kept on beating me."

"John was standing at one side. He said 'Get in the car, Al, before they kill you.'"

"I got into the back of the car, followed by Davies. I was repeatedly asked 'Whose is the fucking car?' and 'Where did you get the fucking car?' These questions were accompanied by blows to my face. Then we arrived at the police station."

Alan Sutcliffe maintains he received all his injuries between the time he was stopped and the time he arrived at the police station.

The two detectives were also hurt. Constable Davies (the senior police surgeon reported) suffered "a moderate nervous upset" and a bruise over his left eye.

Sgt Moore suffered "mild shock", had a bruise on his lower lip, grazes on the back of his left hand and a big bruise around the third, fourth and fifth knuckles of his right hand. (A small bone in this hand, the fifth metacarpal, was later found to be broken. This fracture was the basis of the "grievous bodily harm" charges.)

Alan Sutcliffe said these injuries were caused accidentally by his attempts to dodge blows from the detectives — at no time did he hit the police. The broken bone could have been caused by Sgt Moore aiming a

blow, missing his target and striking the police car with the back of his hand.

The police surgeon was non-committal on the cause of the fracture: It could have been caused either by the sergeant hitting something hard with the back of his hand, or by something coming down on his hand.

Besides the head injuries, Alan Sutcliffe had eight bruises on his shins. They are still clearly visible more than three months later. He said these had been caused by the detectives kicking his legs to try and get him into their car.

Alan Sutcliffe's theory is that by their action, the police found themselves with a battered prisoner who had committed no crime. It would be embarrassing to release someone in such a state without having a charge to bring against him.

Alan, incidentally, has no previous conviction apart from two speeding offences three or four years ago. The police have taken no action over the car crash which started the whole business.

DET. SGT. MOORE told the court that he and Det Con Davies stopped the two men, said they were CID, and asked who owned the car.

According to Moore, Alan Sutcliffe replied: "I don't know what you're talking about."

Moore continued that he said he had seen them getting out of a car. Alan Sutcliffe was alleged to have answered: "What car?"

The detectives said they cautioned both men and arrested them on suspicion of stealing a vehicle. According to the sergeant, "Sutcliffe was struggling a little, but not violently... I asked him to get into the back of the (police) vehicle but he didn't get in. He said 'I'm not going. I want to see your identity'."

Sgt Moore said he told Con Davies to show his warrant card, but did not show his own. He said Sutcliffe eventually got into the car, persuaded by John Garner, who said: "Get into the car, sonny."

Sgt Moore claimed that when Sutcliffe arrived at the police station "he was completely uninjured about the face." All the injuries to his face were inflicted inside the station, the sergeant said. Constable Banks, who was on desk duty at Copperas Hill when Alan Sutcliffe was brought in, said in court he did not remember whether or not he was injured.

At Copperas Hill, according to the police, Alan Sutcliffe and John Garner were taken upstairs to the CID officers. Garner went into one room with the sergeant and Sutcliffe went into the CID General Office with Con Davies.

## The night the sergeant hurt his knuckles

Davies said he made Sutcliffe sit down then walked round him, moving away from the door. Sutcliffe, he claimed, then hit him above the eye and he fell to the floor, shouting as he fell.

Why an experienced detective should walk away from the door, leaving an escape route for his prisoner, is a mystery. However a walk in this direction would have put Con Davies in an ideal position to view what is supposed to have happened next: for he fell, he said, propped up against a radiator... and facing the door.

Only one man claims to have heard Davies shout: Sgt Moore. If Con Banks or any other policeman in the building heard a shout they did nothing. John Garner, who was in the same room as Moore, said he heard nothing.

So the sharp-eared sergeant dashed to the rescue. He started to open the General Office door, he said, using

his left hand. (The knob, significantly is on the right, and Sgt Moore is right-handed.)

"The door was pulled open violently from the inside. It was Sutcliffe," Moore said he was then hit on the lower lip by Sutcliffe and fell forward onto his hands and knees in the doorway. He grasped Sutcliffe's right leg with his left hand and "Sutcliffe brought his left heel down on the back of my right hand." (The alleged cause of the broken bone).

"I hit Sutcliffe three or four times in the face to prevent his escape and to stop him doing me any further injury. I knocked him down."

Shown the photographs of Sutcliffe's face after his release, Sgt Moore said he had caused the injuries with his left fist (an achievement which would have made many a champion boxer jealous).

## Doubts about the police...

● Alan Sutcliffe's face was injured in five places. Could Sgt Moore really have done all that damage — and knocked Sutcliffe down — with three or four blows of his left fist?

● Why did Sgt Moore say he used his left hand to open the office door (BEFORE the alleged struggle)? Was it because his right hand was already injured?

● Constable Davies said that when he fell he was "not stunned, but dazed." Too dazed to get up, he apparently stayed in his grandstand seat to watch the Big Fight — then wrote a vivid blow-by-blow account in his notebook. Is this credible?

### JOHN GARNER'S STATEMENT

● Alan's friend, John Garner was called as a witness for the prosecution. The police had a statement signed by John in Copperas Hill on the night of the arrests. The statement supported the police version, but in court John contradicted it and backed up Alan's story.

The statement was in Con Davies' handwriting. John was not an articulate witness in court, yet the style of the statement was precise and orderly — more that of a policeman than an arrested man. Con Davies said the statement was based on an interview with John.

At the bottom of each page of the statement was a printed warning that anyone making a false statement

was liable to be prosecuted. Mysteriously, on the final page this warning was crossed out. A 'clerical error' was one explanation suggested in court.

What's more, John seems to have signed the statement in exchange for his release. Davies allegedly told him he could go after making a statement — ambiguous words which apparently made John think he could NOT go UNTIL he had signed. In fact he was free to go without signing. The judge noted: "It should be made clear to a person that once he is no longer arrested he is free to go without making a statement."

● There was a great deal of agreement between the two detectives' accounts when they gave evidence in court. Both relied on a notebook to refresh their memories... the same notebook. It belonged to Con Davies, and Sgt Moore made no secret of the fact that he had borrowed it.

● After his arrest Alan Sutcliffe was examined by the senior police surgeon but received no medical treatment until after he had appeared in the Magistrates' Court and been released on bail.

● After being charged he was taken to Cheapside and put in a cell with ten other prisoners. At Cheapside, he says, he was photographed and fingerprinted... despite protests. Legally the police can only do this with a magistrate's permission.

Clearly prejudice in this country

## What the report shows

● The report shows there is a far higher proportion of black children in special schools for the educationally subnormal in the city than there should be. There are 76 black children (all but one born in Britain) in the ESN schools, which have a total of 2,147 pupils. That is — about 3.5% of ESN children are black, whereas only 1.9% of the children in Liverpool are black.

### FACTUAL ACCOUNT

● Academic standards of black children are not as good as those of white children. A white pupil has twice as much chance of reaching A-level standard as a black pupil.

The majority of immigrants (64.3%) and the majority of British-born black children (55.5%) take CSE exams, while the majority of white children (51%) go a step higher and take O-levels.

### BRITISH BLACK YOUNGSTERS

● British black youngsters on the whole expect to get the worst and lowest paid jobs. "This might well be due to experience of life in this country and the feeling that there is a pointlessness about trying to aim really high..." says the report with considerable insight.

### BLACK YOUNGSTERS

● Black youngsters find it far more difficult to get work. This is not spelt out in the report, which merely points out that 1,632 young people were registered as unemployed in April and that a person's colour is not marked on their employment records.

But the evidence given by the careers master at Paddington shows a startling situation. Last year 18 out of the 23 black male school leavers (more than 79%) didn't have a job to go to. Three weeks later only two more had found jobs, leaving over 69% still unemployed. The situation was very similar for girls — 15 out of 19 girls (over 78%) left before finding a job.

White school leavers didn't exactly find it easy. But only 19 out of 50 white boys (38%) were unemployed in their first week. This dropped to 12 (24%) three weeks later.

## WHY COLOUR-BLINDNESS IS HARMFUL

SOME CHILDREN in Liverpool learn the importance of the colour of their skin by the age of seven or eight.

For some it is a source of pride, for others a source of humiliation. Mr J Redmond, headmaster of St Margaret's Church of England Primary school, which has 182 black youngsters, has seen the taunts children with dark skins have to face. He says in his report to the Parliamentary Select Committee:

"In the nursery and infants department the colour problem does not arise, and the children are fully integrated. As they approach Junior school age they become aware of colour."

"In fact coloured children will insult other coloured children by referring to their colour. Colour is looked upon as an insult and never as a reason for esteem. The whites of course use colour in the same way."

One of the aims of the questionnaires sent out to all headmasters in Liverpool was to find out what schools were doing to challenge the attitude that coloured or black people are somehow inferior to white people. Clearly prejudice in this country

# RACE AND OUR SCHOOLS



MORE THAN 79% of black school leavers from one Liverpool comprehensive school walked straight through the school gates into the dole queue last year.

Three weeks later most of them were still unemployed.

These facts are included as evidence in a stunning report which shows the failure of many schools in Liverpool to cater for the needs of British-born black and immigrant children.

### FACTUAL ACCOUNT

The report has been presented by Liverpool Education Committee to the Parliamentary Select Committee on Immigration, which is currently looking at race and education.

It was intended to be the first factual account of the numbers and progress of the black youngsters in Liverpool schools, and of the way teachers are trying to foster good relations between children of different races.

But despite the moderate language and the bureaucratic reasoning of the officials who drew it up, the report's implications are horrifying.

The education department are forced to admit a number of disturbing facts: Black children are more

likely to attend special schools for the educationally sub-normal, and more likely to do badly at school compared with white children. And they expect to get the worst jobs when they leave school.

The report, without intending to, also reveals the sheer complacency of most head teachers and their inability to understand, let alone tackle, the problems of educating children to live in a multi-racial society.

Every head teacher in the city was asked to fill in a questionnaire, giving numbers and work records of their black children, and the methods used by the school to try and prevent misunderstanding between children of different races.

Anyone would have thought that recent events in Liverpool would have made them think seriously about these questions.

After all, less than a year ago the fighting between young black and white gangs resulted in barricades being built in Falkner Place, and the gleeful "race war" headlines being spread across newspapers.

Nearly 100 young people, both black and white, were picked up by the police around Sussex Gardens during a number of particularly heavy barrages of bottles

# WHAT CHANCE HAS HE GOT?

and bricks between the gangs.

Police have even been called in to Paddington School to separate children of different races. And Paddington is less than half full because parents in the area have refused to send their children there... even though it is one of the best-equipped and most imaginatively-run schools in Liverpool.

Gang warfare has increased all over Liverpool in the last two years and there are many other reasons for the fighting besides race. But still a number of social workers, fearing that adults might start taking sides, consider the situation "potentially explosive."

With this background, head teachers should have welcomed the chance to say what they were trying to do in school to educate youngsters to live in a multi-racial society. But the response was exactly the opposite in most cases. The questionnaire provoked anger, resentment and abuse.

It may be difficult to believe, but one school staff meeting actually passed a resolution saying that such questionnaires "exacerbate the problems instead of solving them." And many heads echoed this message.

The heads of 86 colleges and schools didn't bother replying, while one lady teacher showed the depth of her critical faculties:

"Immigrants do not create problems in this school, and I do not intend to create problems by asking questions," she commented.

### INNER CITY AREAS

In Liverpool there are about 1,450 British-born black children and about 800 immigrants (including 242 Asian, 138 West Indian and 121 African). Altogether they make up just 1.9% of the city's school population.

But by far the largest number of these live in the decaying and ignored inner city area, so that in Exchange Ward, for example, 4.9% of the children are coloured.

Naturally there are other reasons for the comparative failure of black youngsters rather than just failings of the school. Black people are generally the most exploited section of society — and have to face racism as well.

Many end up living in some of the most dismal areas, often in multi-let premises. Mr J Redmond, headmaster of St Margaret's Primary School, Toxteth, wrote: "There are cases where coloured children show considerable early promise, but due to home and environmental backgrounds their performance deteriorates as they move up the school."

On the one hand head teachers said blandly they knew the needs of immigrants and then showed by their answers to other questions that they didn't.

89 county primary schools in the city have some black youngsters, but only 21 said they organised their curriculum to take account of immigrants, and in most cases this was because the needs of immigrants coincided with the needs of other pupils.

### CONDITIONING CHILDREN

Miss Dorothy Kuya, Liverpool's Senior Community Relations Officer, recently pointed out that textbooks "can condition children, both black and white, to think of black people as always living in huts, of having no culture, no history or political organisation. They particularly affect the black child's image of himself..."

However the questionnaires show that the majority of head teachers had not even considered that text books could be distorted or even hurtful to the black pupils.

Only one school banned books which equated black with evil. Most

heads in Church of England primary schools said they didn't know there was any bias in textbooks, while seven head teachers said: "We are living in a white-dominated society" and as they wanted a realistic education for their children they would not change the books.

The most abusive replies to the questionnaire were on the question: "What steps have you taken to ensure your staff are open minded and without prejudice?"

One teacher replies: "An impudent and stupid question." And only five of the 133 county primary head teachers who replied to the questionnaire said they looked for signs of any prejudice at interviews.

The normal replies from Roman Catholic schools were along the lines of "a staff with good Christian principles has no room for prejudice," which is rather optimistic in view of the violent history of the Church.

The report does reveal a serious shortage of trained staff in schools to help immigrants learn English. At Paddington Comprehensive there is a language centre and three teachers qualified to teach English to immigrants are based there. These are

peripatetic teachers who also go to teach at six county primary schools where there are a number of black youngsters.

Only two other similarly trained teachers are employed in secondary schools, and it is clear more are needed in other schools.

Mr Redmond, head of St Margaret's says: "A peripatetic teacher of English as a second language visited the school for an hour on three mornings a week, which is quite inadequate."

And Mr Ken Vaux, head of Paddington Comprehensive, warns that there are still many immigrant pupils who need special help, but which they can't provide.

"The number of pupils needing help from the peripatetic teachers of English to immigrants has increased over the last two years, and the help they have been able to give has diminished."

And so the picture is grim. British-born black kids, rightly will no longer put up with the insults about their colour in the future. But most headmasters in Liverpool have only one policy on colour. They pretend it doesn't exist and assume all the problems will somehow disappear.