

From Sea to Shining Sea by James Alexander Thom,

Pages 202 – 205, excerpt on “Jersey” Revolutionary War Prison Ship.

Thom tells an excellent story about the Clark family, and he has done extensive research. This is an appropriate historical fiction book to use as a dramatic reading/hook. Johnny Clark is depicted in this historical fiction book as a prisoner on the Jersey. He is the brother of William Clark, of the famed Lewis and Clark journey as well as the brother of George Rogers Clark, Revolutionary War hero. This dramatic reading is well written and will intrigue students with its gruesome nature. It is suggested that the teacher read this aloud with a tone of dread:

It was the grimmest, darkest, most ominous sight Johnny Clark had ever seen, that prison ship, and his soul sank a little deeper with every stroke of the oars that pulled him toward it.

The hulk lay there in the choppy cold water ahead, without the masts or spars or even the flag that give a ship the look of life; it lay like an enormous floating coffin, between a harbor and a sky as somber as death. From somewhere forward on its deck, black smoke rose and was whipped away into the snow by the raw channel wind.

The oars of the cutter rose and fell rose and fell, and the side of the prison ship slowly loomed closer and higher. Johnny was one of twenty prisoners being rowed out to the ship. The rest were enlisted men, sitting in their thin and tattered clothes, hugging their knees, their leg-irons hanging between their ankles. The eight rowers, dirty Brooklyn waterfront wretches, looked as if they could be Charon’s own oarsmen. Two middle-aged British soldiers with pistols and muskets stood over the prisoners, cloaks wrapped about their faces. The chubby British ensign in charge of the rowboat stood beside Johnny, an arm over the charge of the rowboat stood beside Johnny, an arm over the tiller, constantly running his tongue over his chapped lips.

As they drew near the hulk, two dark figures appeared at the rail above, their heads and shoulders visible; they seemed to be carrying something heavy between them. Then two more appeared, also carrying a burden. They moved to the head of a gangway ladder, which slanted down the ship’s side to a floating platform alongside. There was a rowboat tied to that platform with four men in it.

Now the figures started down the gangway, and Johnny saw what they were carrying: man-size bundles wrapped in canvas. One carrier at the head and one at the feet of each bundle, they labored down the gangway and put the corpses down....

“Well, there’s shore leave for two more Yankee Doodles,” the British ensign said with a sharp, barking laugh. He shook his head. “Take off two and put on twenty. Keep that up and she’ll get pretty crowded, what?”

Johnny looked at the ensign with distaste. “You’re a sorry joker,” he said.

“Hey! I’m not joking. That’s the only way I’ve ever seen any Yankee Doodles get off the Jersey.” ...The ship stank of decay and filth. Even the north wind knifing down the off New York Harbor failed to blow the stench of the grave off the Jersey’s sides.

Johnny followed the ensign up the gangway first. The enlisted men came dragging their rattling chains up after him, the armed guards following. ...

Johnny paused ... There was only the windswept deck, below which he knew not how many American soldiers were confined, and, all around, the iron-gray, white-rotting hull, waters too cold and swift and wide for anyone to think of swimming, and in the distance, the low, dark shores of British-held New York and Long Island. Johnny had a notion, almost a certainty, as he stepped into the fetid gloom of the quarterdeck and started down a steep companionway, that he would never leave this foul hulk until he was carried down the gangplank in a canvas shroud.

A)Revolutionary War Prisoners of War

<http://www.myrevolutionarywar.com/records.htm>

OVERALL FACTS:

1. There were thousands of American prisoners held by the British during the war.
2. Of all of the prisoners held in captivity, 4 out of 5 men died.
3. New York City was the main city where prisoners were held.
4. By the end of 1776, there were over 5,000 prisoners held in New York City. More than half of the prisoners came from the soldiers captured at the battle of Fort Washington and Fort Lee. With a total population of New York City around 25,000, this meant that 1 out of every 5 people in the city were prisoners.
5. During the war, more military men on the British prison ships than were killed in battle.
6. A Prisoner Exchange Program was used between the British and American forces during the American Revolutionary War. The premise of the exchange was to be able to exchange a sailor for a sailor, a soldier for a soldier, with the prisoners being of equal rank. Later on in the war, the exchange program was stopped by the British in 1780. The reason being that with the American forces being smaller than the British forces, the British didn't want to let the Americans get back more of their men by using the rate of attrition being that the Americans didn't have nearly as many military personnel as the British.
After the major British defeat at the battle of Yorktown in 1781, the British wanted to restart the program due to the severe shortage of soldiers and sailors in the British military. Gen. George Washington realized this, and with the war coming to an end with the Americans seeing that they were going to be victorious, decided to not start the program back.
7. Prisoners onboard the British prison ships could win their release if they signed an oath to serve as sailors with the British Royal Navy.
8. In the latter years of the war, the number of enlistments of British sailors were becoming smaller and more difficult to fulfill. To offset the low recruiting numbers, the British government authorized a plan whereas the American prisoners would be allowed to sign an oath to serve in the Royal Navy in exchange for being released from captivity as prisoners of war.
9. By the end of the war, almost 25% of the sailors serving aboard ships in the British Royal Navy were former American prisoners who signed the oath.

BRITISH PRISON SHIPS:

The number of American prisoners continued to grow with the progression of the war. The British were having trouble with finding enough places to house these captured Americans. There was only 1 prison building in New York City at this time. The British had already taken over most of the empty buildings in the city for use as prisons, and there still wasn't enough room for the prisoners. Since it would be too expensive to build enough prisons to facilitate the number of prisoners on hand, plus the estimated number of future prisoners, the British had to come up with a solution.

There were about a dozen Royal Navy ships in the New York City area not being used. This was because the ships weren't seaworthy. It was decided to use these ships as prisons for the captured Americans since it was cheaper to build a ship than a prison. The ships had their masts removed and the gunports nailed shut. The ships were put at Wallabaugh Bay, which is near Brooklyn. The Wallabaugh Bay was really nothing more than mud flats because of the shallow water depth not being deep enough for a regular ship to navigate in.

The most infamous British prison ship was the H.M.S. Jersey. It was a decrepit, former hospital navy ship that was dilapidated and in serious need of repair to become seaworthy again. Normally, the ship would have a crew of about 350 sailors. When it became a prison ship, it held over 1,000 prisoners.

During the daytime, the prisoners were allowed above deck to walk around and get some fresh air. At sunset, they were sent back into the holds of the ship and locked up. The only ventilation while below deck was from a few windows with iron bars on them. It was almost completely dark in the holds. The latrines were buckets located with the prisoners. They would normally overflow from being full during the night, with its contents running over into the sleeping areas.

They were given only 1 cup of water once they went below deck. The prisoners had a ration issued to them in the morning. Most of the rations were inedible. They were left over rations from England and very old. The total amount equaled to about 1/2 of a normal British sailor's ration. Hunger and diseases were prevalent among the prisoners. Every prisoner suffered from vitamin deficiency, typically it would be scurvy.

By 1781, the H.M.S. Jersey held over 1,100 prisoners. Smallpox and yellow fever outbreaks were at an epidemic proportion among the prisoners.

Every few days, some doctors would come aboard the ships and take the extremely sick prisoners off and transfer them to 1 of 3 hospital ships in the bay. The bad part of this is that the sick prisoners rarely left alive from the hospital ships. The prisoners who died on the ships during the night were put in a corner of the ship's hold until morning. The following day, the dead were bundled up, tied together, and hauled up to the top deck. They were then sent to the adjoining shoreline of the bay, where they would be buried. On the shoreline, from the waterline to about 30 yards away was a marshy shore. It was here that the dead would be buried. A group of prisoners would volunteer for a burial detail and go with the dead bodies, under heavy guard, and bury the bodies. On average, 5 to 6 prisoners a day died aboard the H.M.S. Jersey and likewise on the other prison ships.

The ship's guards were notorious for being very brutal. They would try to cheat the prisoners out of anything that they could. It was also known for them to torture the prisoners with the threat of injury and actually injuring or accidentally killing the prisoners. The prisoners couldn't do anything about it, though. At the closing months of the war, when the British realized that they were going to lose, the treatment of the prisoners by the guards improved dramatically. Anytime a prisoner was caught trying to escape, or captured after escaping, was shot on the spot.

During the Revolutionary War, the management and treatment of prisoners was very different from the standards of modern warfare. Modern standards, as outlined in the Geneva Conventions, expect captives to be held and cared for by their captors. One primary difference in the 18th century, was that care and supplies for captives were expected to be provided by their own army, their government, or private resources.

Throughout the war, there were exchanges of prisoners. These might be made in the field or at higher levels of organization. Usually high ranking officer exchanges would be negotiated for specific named people. There were some exchanges based on numbers for lower ranking people, but these were so limited as to be rare events.

Three other aspects were different than those normally seen in modern warfare. The first is that letters were permitted, and sometimes even encouraged. Prisoners could buy or exchange for food and clothing, including any money sent by their families. The second was the use of "Parole" by both sides. This would allow prisoners some freedom, in exchange for their promise not to resume the war. The last is that prisoners were encouraged to enlist in the army of the other side. Over the course of the war, as much as a quarter of each army had actually seen service on the other side.

The British forces held relatively few places in strength for long periods. American prisoners tended to be accumulated at these sites. New York City was the major site, Philadelphia in 1777 and later Charleston, South Carolina were also important. Facilities at these places were limited, sometime severely. At times the occupying army was actually larger than the total civilian population.

The British solution to this problem was to use obsolete, captured, or damaged ships as prisons. Conditions here were appalling, and as many men died imprisoned as were killed in actual combat. While the Continental Army named a commissary to supply them, the task was almost impossible. Elias Boudinot, as one of these commissaries, was competing with other agents seeking to gather supplies for Gen. George Washington's army at Valley Forge.

B) Everyone Read

Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

<http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0 YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en> April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

The Hague

In 1899, the term "prisoner of **war**" was originated at the Hague Conference, which set forth the basic principles governing the definition of a POW and the treatment afforded them. 16 The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, and the subsequent Geneva Conventions of 1929, established ground-rules for managing POWs, but there was no guarantee that every country would follow them. While it is not unreasonable for a nation to expect fair treatment of its Soldiers if they are taken prisoner by the enemy, the expectation is flawed because it presupposes that the enemy can understand the principle of surrender.

DISCLAIMER

The definition and use of the term prisoner of war or enemy prisoner of war after 1949 are specifically outlined in the **Geneva Conventions of 1949**, Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War:

Art 4. A. Prisoners of war, in the sense of the present Convention, are persons belonging to one of the following categories, who have fallen into the power of the enemy:

- (1) Members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict, as well as members of militias or volunteer corps forming part of such armed forces.
- (2) Members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organized resistance movements, belonging to a Party to the conflict and operating in or outside their own territory, even if this territory is occupied, provided that such militias or volunteer corps, including such organized resistance movements, fulfill the following conditions:
 - (a) that of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;
 - (b) that of having a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance;
 - (c) that of carrying arms openly;
 - (d) that of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.
- (3) Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the Detaining Power.
- (4) Persons who accompany the armed forces without actually being members thereof, such as civilian members of military aircraft crews, war correspondents, supply contractors, members of labour units or of services responsible for the welfare of the armed forces, provided that they have received authorization, from the armed forces which they accompany, who shall provide them for that purpose with an identity card similar to the annexed model.
- (5) Members of crews, including masters, pilots and apprentices, of the merchant marine and the crews of civil aircraft of the Parties to the conflict, who do not benefit by more favourable treatment under any other provisions of international law.
- (6) Inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

Terrorists do not meet the requirements above and are thus referred to as "unlawful enemy combatants/detainees." Those captured in Iraq after the official cessation of war are referred to as "civilian internees/detainees."

C) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

<http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0 YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en> April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

"The Jersey"

During the American Revolutionary War, it was obvious the British failed to plan for handling thousands of POWs on foreign soil. With limited facilities in New York City and funds not available to build, the British decided to convert a dozen or so un-seaworthy Royal Navy ships harbored in the area into POW facilities. The most infamous of these was the HMS Jersey, a former British hospital ship in Wallabout Bay near Brooklyn, New York. The ship was originally built as a destroyer in 1736, but was converted by removing the masts and nailing up the gun ports. The Jersey was decrepit and conditions harsh, with overcrowding an immediate and ongoing problem. Normally, the HMS Jersey was manned by a crew of about 350 sailors, yet as a prison ship it housed over a thousand POWs. Overcrowding only worsened as the war progressed, due in large part to issues with prisoner exchange (the British captured thousands of prisoners and George Washington did not favor exchanging veteran British Soldiers for sick, untrained Americans who were often Privateers). The Department of Defense currently lists 4,435 US battle deaths during the Revolutionary War. Another 20,000 died in captivity from disease or for other reasons. Historians estimate the total number of prison ship deaths between 8,000 and 11,644. An estimated 4 of every 5 prisoners on the HMS Jersey died and as many as 8 corpses a day were "buried in Wallabout Bay." The atrocious sanitary conditions were ultimately responsible for a great majority of the deaths: communal buckets for defecating resulted in widespread dysentery and cholera; thousands of men crammed below decks without light or fresh air aided transmission of diseases such as tuberculosis, smallpox, and yellow fever; and lack of fruit and vegetables guaranteed scurvy among many prisoners. What sparse food was provided to the prisoners was normally maggot-infested, moldy, or simply rotten beyond consumption. The political situation only worsened the prisoners' fate as British tensions led to increased mistreatment. With no threat of retribution, guards imposed inhumane and degrading treatment on prisoners, often leading to injury and/or accidental death. The Revolutionary War provided firsthand experience for American Soldiers and leaders on the ramifications of poor planning and mismanagement of prisoners captured in combat.

D) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

http://74.125.155.132/scholar?g=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Andersonville, Georgia

Civil War POW camps would enter the realm of infamy. Andersonville, the infamous POW camp established by the Confederacy in a small village of the same name in Sumter County, Georgia, was one of the largest Confederate military prisons established during the Civil War. Although originally established to move prisoners from the Richmond area to a more secure location where food was abundant, the 26.5 acre stockade with its minimal staffing could not adequately support the more than 45,000 Union Soldiers confined inside its walls. Originally built to house only 10,000, it was obvious why conditions at Andersonville are described as worse than any other prison camp, north or south. Severe overcrowding, lack of shelter, diminishing resources, and the inevitable contamination of the stream providing the only water to the camp led to a 30% mortality rate. By the end of Andersonville's 14-month life, nearly 13,000 men were dead from malnutrition and the diseases associated with the deplorable conditions. As the former prison grounds appear now, one would find it difficult to imagine the conditions and challenges of running the camp in 1864, however, the history of Andersonville tells the story of an army unprepared for vast numbers of prisoners, a lack of understanding or guidance of how to take care of them, and an unfortunate officer, CPT Henry Wirz, who "wore the blood of all prisoners on his hands." CPT Wirz was not the first officer to take charge of the Andersonville prison, nor was he solely responsible for the lack of funds, resources, or personnel to run the facility. However, when people in the north learned of the horrors there, he became the most convenient target. Although testimony from his trial indicates that CPT Wirz did make an effort to improve conditions after his arrival at Andersonville, the reality was that prisoners were dying every day (one every 11 minutes on one particularly bad day) of typhoid, gangrenous infection, and communicable disease. To make matters worse, the War Department stopped the prisoner exchange program, further stressing local families and contributing to the demand for vengeance. Since there was no plan for how to handle the situation at Andersonville or northern prison camps, creating a spectacle out of the Wirz trial deflected attention away from the north and the US government. Ironically, CPT Wirz's trial and subsequent hanging appeased the population which had been so appalled by the conditions at Andersonville—conditions which were in part a result of the War Department's termination of the exchange program.

E) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

http://74.125.155.132/scholar?g=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Civil War: **Camp Douglas**, Chicago, Illinois

The hasty placement of a POW camp in Chicago was a tactical error on the part of the Union Army, considering the city was filled with spies and southern sympathizers who made efforts to arm the prisoners. Initially, the location may not have seemed ill conceived as the city residents regularly visited Camp Douglas to gawk at the Confederate prisoners, and an observation platform was even constructed to aid the citizens' viewing. Conditions inside the camp were so deplorable that Henry Whitney Bellows, president of the US Sanitary Commission, wrote to Colonel Hoffman, his superior, after visiting the camp: Sir, the amount of standing water, unpoliced grounds, of foul sinks, of unventilated and crowded barracks, of general disorder, or soil reeking miasmatic accretions, of rotten bones and emptying of camp kettles, is enough to drive a sanitarian to despair. I hope no thought will be entertained of mending matters. The absolute abandonment of the spot seems to be the only judicious course. I do not believe that any amount of drainage would purge that soil loaded with accumulated filth or those barracks fetid with two stories of vermin and animal exhalations. Nothing but fire can cleanse them. Inside the prison, multiple methods of torture, such as reduced food rations, prisoner executions, isolation in the "white oak" dungeon, hanging by thumbs, or being forced to ride on Morgan's wooden mule (with weight hung on their feet to make it more painful) were regularly utilized to keep the prisoner population down, to maintain order, and to extract information. In 1863, 75 prisoners made a timely escape and managed to avoid the fate of over 11,000 prisoners who died the following year. Camp Douglas was closed in 1865 when the remaining prisoners were asked to take a loyalty oath to the US and then set free. Despite fewer pages in the history books, the Union prison camps are nonetheless evidence that during the Civil War, neither side was prepared to handle POWs and neither figured out how to successfully remedy the situation once it presented itself. Repeating the same mistakes as others, from the atrocious depravities to establishing inadequate facilities, Americans had failed miserably at their first test as guardians of POWs.

F) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.
http://74.125.155.132/scholar?g=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Elmira, New York

Conditions at the Union POW facilities at Camp Douglas in Chicago and the lesser known prison at Elmira, NY, (frequently referred to as "Helmira") rivaled those at Andersonville, although history less willingly tells their story, and no Union commander would ever die for the atrocities committed there.

The Federal Confederate Prisoner of War Camp at Elmira

By **[George R. Farr](#)**, Historian, Town of Elmira

<http://www.joycetice.com/military/elmcivwr.htm>

Chemung County, New York State

The American Civil War or the War Between the States or whatever you may call the most destructive war in the history of the United States, wreaked havoc on the prisoners of war on both sides of the conflict. Neither the North nor the South could overcome the conditions brought on by the war that led to the deaths of many of the prisoners of war.

Neither side should receive a greater portion of the blame for the tragedies that were the prisoner of war camps.

The most notorious camp of the North was located in Elmira, New York where one of the four camps that made up the western New York Union Army rendezvous was refitted for use as a prisoner of war camp. Originally known as Camp Rathbun and designated as Camp No. 3, this camp during the course of its existence from the summer of 1864 until the end of the war housed approximately 12,000 Confederate enlisted men. Of this number approximately 3,000 died. The camp was located facing West Water Street between Hoffman and Guinnip Avenue. The rear of the camp was almost to the banks of the Chemung River.

Confederate prisoners of war were transported mostly from the prison at Point Lookout, Maryland by rail to Elmira. Some groups came from Old Capitol Prison in Washington and some from as far away as Louisiana. For the most part their physical condition on arrival was poor, and their numbers soon overwhelmed the facilities at the camp. During the summer and fall months the weather was mild, however 900 prisoners were not housed in barracks until the first week in January. The coming winter would prove to be one of the harshest seen in Elmira with severe freezing temperatures and a heavy snowfall.

Until they were moved into barracks the prisoners were housed three in a tent. The tents were erected on the parade ground in front of the previously existing Union army barracks. The tent's floor was dirt and each tent had a stove for heating purposes.

The prison records show that prisoners typically died from Typhoid Fever, Chronic Diarrhea and Pneumonia. What the records do not show is that the cause of death was often partly due to malnutrition. It is evident that military officials, many with a strong hatred of the South, from Secretary Stanton on down had some part in preventing adequate supplies of food being furnished to the prisoners. There can be no other explanation because this prison was located in a fertile rich agricultural part of New York State where food shortages just did not exist.

The same was true for the medical treatment of the prisoners. While some of the local military officials protested the lack of supplies, there was not enough to provide proper medical care. The most tragic sight was that of the small pox hospital which mainly consisted of several remote tents where the sick were moved and literally forgotten. It was not uncommon to see a stiff frozen body lying outside a tent waiting to be loaded on the buckboard for transportation to the cemetery.

Another contributing factor to the problem of disease was stagnant pool known as Foster's Pond. This pond stood between to camp and the river. Although it was eventually reconfigured to allow the river to flow through it, it should have been done much earlier when the camp was first established.

If these conditions were not bad enough there were more. The barracks were poorly heated and, there were insufficient blankets. Monthly clothing shipments to the prisoners were delayed adding to their discomfort and misery.

Each day the deceased were placed in coffins and loaded on to a buckboard, nine at a time. The wagons accompanied by prisoners and their guards traveled approximately a mile and a half to the cemetery. At the cemetery a long trench was dug and the coffins placed in it side by side. The cemetery's sexton John W. Jones made a record of each burial. Each coffin had the soldiers name, regiment and company painted on the cover as well as a small bottle with the same information placed in the coffin. Afterwards a wooden marker was erected with the soldier's grave number, name, regiment and company.

The wooden markers, badly deteriorated, were replaced with stone markers in 1908. Today the Confederate soldier's graves are part of the Woodlawn National Cemetery and are maintained in the very best condition as befits soldiers who sacrificed their lives for their country. The Confederate section of the cemetery is identified by an almost life sized statue of a Confederate soldier placed there by the Daughters of the Confederacy in 1937.

Beginning in February of 1865 prisoners who swore an allegiance to the Union were classified for release. Subsequently groups of approximately 500 were each given a food ration, money and or transportation vouchers and placed on a train for City Point, Virginia. City Point was the major Union army supply depot in northern Virginia and from there each prisoner was provided assistance to his home destination. However, due to the fact that the war was still ongoing and the overall condition of transportation in the South was poor it is very conceivable that these men had a difficult time reaching home

Those soldiers who survived were released in groups at the end of the war and provided the same assistance for returning to their homes in the South. Approximately 140 were released to the regional army hospital in Elmira where they were treated until they were fit to travel. Unfortunately seventeen of them never recovered.

By the end of 1865, the camp was fully closed, all buildings torn down or moved to nearby locations. Today a few buildings remain near the site of the camp and a memorial has been erected within the site of the camp.

The camp is all but forgotten to most of the citizens of Elmira. It may be hard to understand, but most of them probably don't know that it ever existed. It certainly isn't something that the city is proud of, but neither is it something that is deliberately hidden.

There are a number of Elmirans who are aware that it did exist, and they try to do everything they can to make people understand what happened here. Annual tours, and memorial services are a common occurrence, and the local historical society attempts to provide help to all persons arriving here from the south seeking information about their ancestors who were held prisoner at Elmira.

G) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Camp O'Donnell

While there are many examples of mistreatment of POWs by our enemies (ie, the Germans at Berga and the Japanese at Cabanatuan), few examples compare to conditions at Camp O'Donnell, the transient camp in the Philippines situated at the end of the Bataan Death March route. Camp O'Donnell has been referred to as "Andersonville Revisited" for good reason. Despite the passage of 80 years and multiple documents outlining acceptable treatment of POWs, many of the Filipino and American prisoners held at Camp O'Donnell faced the same horrors of those interned at Andersonville. One difference between the situations was that during the Civil War, ignorance, lack of resources, and malice were often the reasons for the conditions, while at Camp O'Donnell, the primary issue behind the maltreatment of prisoners was the Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution inability of the Japanese to understand or accept that honorable men were capable of surrender. To the Japanese, the troops who survived the Bataan Death March to reach Camp O'Donnell were not POWs, they were nothing. Camp O'Donnell was originally a Filipino Constabulary Post, partially constructed and with little infrastructure. Like Andersonville, Camp O'Donnell contained only one water spigot for approximately 50,000 prisoners and it was not unusual for a prisoner to die in line after waiting all day and night for his turn. In the first 2 months at Camp O'Donnell, more than 1,500 American and 20,000 Filipino Soldiers died, an average of 358 per day.

The sanitary conditions in the camp were so deplorable that the meager servings of rice received by the prisoners were inevitably consumed while covered with blue and green bottle flies. Gravedigger detail was a common requirement for prisoners strong enough to dig, and dig they did, sometimes burying 400 bodies a day. The graves were large shallow holes, which were dug up by dogs each night creating festering pools of disease. There was, surprisingly, a hospital at Camp O'Donnell, although among the prisoners it was basically considered a place where one went to die. It is difficult to fathom that a group of civilized people could allow and even condone the conditions at Camp O'Donnell, but the Japanese government had not signed nor approved of the Geneva Convention, and therefore did not believe American and Filipino prisoners were entitled to any safeguards. 18 Ultimately, even the Japanese recognized the potential backlash resulting from Camp O'Donnell and moved the prisoners to Cabanatuan in June 1942, where many more would die before the Rangers executed a successful raid on the camp. Unfortunately, POW camps in WWII would not be the last time in the 20th century that the Geneva Conventions were ignored an enemy significantly misunderstood.

H) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

http://74.125.155.132/scholar?g=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Korean War: Hills 312 and 303 During the Korean War, a lack of planning for and management of Korean and Chinese POWs taken by US and United Nations (UN) forces was an unsurprising shortfall in the disjointed and limited preparation for that conflict. While food, clothing, and housing were listed as adequate by the International Red Cross, the large number of captives, at one time over 80,000, made close supervision difficult. Maintaining good order was nearly impossible, with bloody clashes a common event inside the camps. UN POWs held by North Koreans and the Chinese, however, did not fare as well. It is alleged that North Korean forces subjected UN POWs to forced labor, beatings, starvation, and summary executions/massacres such as those at Hills 312 and 303. American POWs were further subjected to physical abuse and torture at the hands of the Chinese. US Army POWs died in large numbers during the first part of the war with a mortality rate of 40% while confined, generally due to unchecked diseases, untended wounds, malnutrition, and extreme cold. Alarmed at the extremely high death rate, the Chinese eventually started to improve conditions at POW camps and supplied food and medicine.

I)Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0_YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Hanoi Hilton

In Vietnam there was plenty of time prior to major hostilities when both sides could have planned for the inevitable POW situation that would arise. In the case of the North Vietnamese, it was not a lack of planning, rather a pure disdain for the enemy and disregard for the provisions of the Geneva Convention which were updated in 1949. In a show of somewhat poetic justice, the Hoa Lo, a prison built by the French to hold Vietnamese prisoners captured fighting for their independence from French Indochina, was used by the North Vietnamese to imprison Soldiers, Department of State personnel, and supporters of the US effort. The Hoa Lo became one of the most famous POW camps in history, heretofore known as the "Hanoi Hilton." As is the case with the majority of the POW camps immortalized in historical records, the conditions at the Hanoi Hilton were deplorable. Not only were more than 300 prisoners subjected to miserable sanitary conditions and regular bouts of tropical disease, there is significant evidence that the prisoners at the Hanoi Hilton were systematically abused, both physically and psychologically. This is seemingly a fact, although the Vietnamese government still denies it and the US government failed to ever take any action on it. None of the Vietnamese officials implicated in the abuse have ever been formally charged by the US or its allies nor has extradition ever been demanded. The information regarding abuse was first revealed in the late 1960s when release of prisoners began, but was not made available to the general public for fear that retaliation would be inflicted on those still in captivity. It is widely known by the American public and much of the world that American prisoners were tortured in North Vietnamese prison camps, however, the fact that little if any action was taken or even threatened against the government responsible for that torture left the status of POWs in future wars potentially uncertain.

J) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

<http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0 YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en> April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Bagram, Afghanistan

After the shock of September 11, 2001, the US government vowed that the victims of that day did not die in vain. Over the next 18 months, 2 very different fights were initiated in Afghanistan and Iraq as part of the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). While many problems in the GWOT have been excruciatingly dissected by armchair quarterbacks around the globe, there is no argument with the fact that the incidents which took place at the Bagram and Abu Ghraib prison facilities (although realistically not comparable to stories of prison camps past) put an indelible black mark on US efforts in both countries, and that a lack of planning for handling prisoners of war was in part responsible. In Afghanistan, it was obvious from the beginning of the conflict that US military leaders failed to appropriately plan for housing detainees (unlawful enemy combatants) as the selected Bagram Theater Internment Facility (BTIF) was not an ideal location. Originally built by the Soviets in the 1980s as an aircraft machine shop, the facility was retrofitted with wire cages and wooden segregation cells (later upgraded to concrete segregation rooms with latrine and sink). Initially intended to serve as a temporary facility, the BTIF has now housed detainees longer than Guantanamo Bay. In the early days of the conflict, conditions inside the BTIF mirrored those of US Soldiers (except for the wire cages) to include burn out latrines and makeshift wooden flooring. Over the next several years, numerous upgrades and expansion projects ensued. Nevertheless, even today, guard force personnel remain extremely limited in the number and quality of improvements they can make due to the physical location of the facility and land space allocation. With limited planning, little to no formal training in handling detainees or managing detainee camps, shortfalls in military reference material, and the issuing of confusing, often conflicting, higher headquarters' guidance, it did not take long for allegations of abuse, torture, and maltreatment to surface, even though most were unsubstantiated. One such event involved the deaths of 2 Afghan detainees in December 2002, while in the custody of US forces at the BTIF. Allegations of beatings, blunt force trauma, and degrading treatment, as well as the alleged cover-up of the circumstances surrounding their deaths quickly reached several news outlets. The US Criminal Investigation Command initiated an investigation and in October 2004, determined there was probable cause to charge 27 Soldiers with criminal offenses. During this investigation it was also discovered that some of these indicted Soldiers had deployed and helped establish the interrogation and debriefing center in Abu Ghraib, Iraq.

K) Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

<http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0 YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en> April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Abu Ghraib, Iraq

In late 2002, LTG Richard Cody directed a bottom-up review of the Military Police Corps (MPC) structure; largely as a means of making it better suited to handle the internment/resettlement (I/R) mission, and potentially as a result of the incident at the Bagram Theatre Internment Facility (BTIF). This indicates the likelihood that someone, somewhere recognized the potential for a POW situation to develop in the pending war in Iraq, and the need for a means of dealing with it. Unfortunately, that foresight did not change the fact that, although significantly limited at the time, the existing I/R assets of the Military Police Corps may have had a positive impact on the detainee situation in Iraq and could have lessened the likelihood of a detainee-related scandal had they been deployed. Instead, the potential for a significant POW situation was underestimated, the power of human nature was once again denied or at best misunderstood, and military policemen and women whose fellow Soldiers were simultaneously threatened on the streets around Baghdad daily were expected to deny their instinctive desire for vengeance and guard enemy prisoners without incident.

Not only was this a task they were not properly trained to execute, but also a task that their nonhabitual higher chain of command was not trained to supervise. While we do not by any means condone the actions of the Soldiers involved, it was likely inevitable that a scandal of this nature would occur, considering the circumstances and the power of human nature. The Baghdad Central Confinement Facility (BCCF) was established at the Abu Ghraib prison compound, 32 km west of Baghdad. Internationally known as Saddam's "torture house," the facility was used by the Ba'ath government to torture and execute presumed dissidents. It was renamed BCCF after US forces expelled the former Iraqi government. The decision to use this facility as a POW (detainee) camp, already Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution tainted internationally due to the thousands executed by the Saddam regime, was presumably a tactical error. Difficult to resupply due to its close proximity to Fallujah and major combat operations early in the war, Abu Ghraib also stood among heaps of trash and, allegedly, the bones of previous occupants. Soldiers were housed in former prison structures, complete with torture hooks and the ghosts of the past. Ironically, in close proximity to the hard site (now infamous as the site where US forces abused detainees), several tent camps were constructed to hold the ever-increasing number of detainees, a necessary action reminiscent of conflicts past. A number of factors contributed to the overall situation and mindset of both guards and prisoners: harsh environmental conditions, lack of adequate infrastructure to provide basic sanitation and hygiene conveniences, and a shortage of overhead protection from combat operations within these tent camps. These were problems that only exacerbated the challenges at Abu Ghraib. In addition, the sheer craftiness of detainees to continually circumvent and negate any attempt by the guard force to improve conditions for them set the stage for a battle of human will and nature.

L) Everyone Read

Caci, Jennifer and Cline, Joanne. "Prisoner of War Camps: Lack of a Revolution." 20 Oct 2009. The Army Medical Department Journal.

<http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:wqvaJsHB0 YJ:scholar.google.com/+Jennifer+caci+and+Joanne+Cline&hl=en> April – June 2009 pp. 37 -43.

Stanford Prison Experiment:

A window into this darker side of human nature was illuminated over 30 years ago during the Stanford Prison Experiment led by Professor Philip Zimbardo. The study selected college-aged men with positive attitudes and apparent good mental health and then studied the situational forces and psychological effects of them becoming either a prisoner or prison guard. Zimbardo writes: "My guards repeatedly stripped their prisoners naked, hooded them, chained them, denied them food or bedding privileges, put them into solitary confinement, and made them clean toilet bowls with their bare hands." The study was halted after only 6 days due to the severe treatment of prisoners and the resulting psychological trauma. Zimbardo concludes: In a situation that implicitly gives permission for suspending moral values, many of us can be morphed into creatures alien to our own nature.

American Revolutionary War Leaders

<http://www.myrevolutionarywar.com/records.htm>



American Leaders

- [General George Washington](#)
- **Gen. William Alexander "Lord Stirling"**
- [Brig. Gen. Benedict Arnold](#)
- **Gen. John Ashe**
- [Lt. Col. George R. Clark](#)
- **Gen. George Clinton**
- **Gen. William L. Davidson**
- [Maj. Gen. Charles Lee](#)
- **Maj. Gen. Henry Lee**
- [Maj. Gen. Benjamin Lincoln](#)
- [Brig. Gen. Horatio Gates](#)
- [Brig. Gen. Nathanael Greene](#)
- **Brig. Gen. William Heath**
- **Gen. Robert Howe**
- **Brig. Gen. Isaac Huger**
- [Capt. John Paul Jones](#) (Navy)
- [Col. Henry Knox](#)
- [Brig. Gen. Marquis de La Fayette](#)
- **Brig. Gen. John Lacey**
- [Brig. Gen. Francis Marion](#)
- **Gen. William Maxwell**
- [Brig. Gen. Richard Montgomery](#)
- [Brig. Gen. Daniel Morgan](#)
- **Brig. Gen. Andrew Pickens**
- **Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski**
- [Maj. Gen. Isreal Putnam](#)
- **Gen. Dickinson Raritan**
- [General Arthur St. Clair](#)
- [Maj. Gen. Philip Schuyler](#)
- [Brig. Gen. John Stark](#)
- **Friedrich von Steuben (Prussian Army Officer)**
- [Brig. Gen. John Sullivan](#)
- [Brig. Gen. Anthony Wayne](#)
- [Maj. Gen. Artemas Ward](#)

British Leaders

- [King George III](#)
- [Gen. Thomas Gage](#)
- [Lt. Gen. John Burgoyne](#)
- [Maj. Gen. Guy Carleton](#)
- [Gen. Sir Henry Clinton](#)
- [Gen. Charles Cornwallis](#)
- [Gen. Sir William Howe](#)
- [Gen. Francis Rawdon-Hastings](#)
- [Gen. Sir Banastre Tarleton](#)
- **Maj. Gen. James Grant**
- **Maj. Gen. Charles Gray**
- **Brig. Gen. Charles O'Hara**
- **Gen. Charles Preston**
- **Brig. Gen. Simon Fraser**
- **Brig. Gen. Baron von Riedesel**
- **Gen Sir Robert Pigot**
- **Gen. Richard Prescott**
- **Lt Col. Mark Prevost**
- **Gen. John Campbell**
- [Adm. Richard Howe](#)
- [Chief Joseph Brant](#) (Indian)
- **Gov. William Tyron**

Lengthy explanation if needed:

<http://frank.mtsu.edu/~baustin/hague2.html>

Hague Convention II (29 July 1899)

Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land

Articles 1 - 60

Entry into Force: 4 September 1900

His Majesty the Emperor of Germany, King of Prussia; [etc.]:

Considering that, while seeking means to preserve peace and prevent armed conflicts among nations, it is likewise necessary to have regard to cases where an appeal to arms may be caused by events which their solicitude could not avert;

Animated by the desire to serve, even in this extreme hypothesis, the interest of humanity and the ever increasing requirements of civilization;

Thinking it important, with this object, to revise the laws and general customs of war, either with the view of defining them more precisely, or of laying down certain limits for the purpose of modifying their severity as far as possible;

Inspired by these views which are enjoined at the present day, as they were twenty-five years ago at the time of the Brussels Conference in 1874, by a wise and generous foresight;

Have, in this spirit, adopted a great number of provisions, the object of which is to define and govern the usages of war on land.

In view of the High Contracting Parties, these provisions, the wording of which has been inspired by the desire to diminish the evils of war so far as military necessities permit, are destined to serve as general rules of conduct for belligerents in their relations with each other and with populations.

It has not, however, been possible to agree forthwith on provisions embracing all the circumstances which occur in practice.

On the other hand, it could not be intended by the High Contracting Parties that the cases not provided for should, for want of a written provision, be left to the arbitrary judgment of the military Commanders.

Until a more complete code of the laws of war is issued, the High Contracting Parties think it right to declare that in cases not included in the Regulations adopted by them, populations and belligerents remain under the protection and empire of the principles of international law, as they result from the usages established between civilized nations, from the laws of humanity, and the requirements of the public conscience;

They declare that it is in this sense especially that Articles 1 and 2 of the Regulations adopted must be understood;

The High Contracting Parties, desiring to conclude a Convention to this

effect, have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries, to wit:

[Here follow the names of plenipotentiaries.]

Who, after communication of their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed on the following:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties shall issue instructions to their armed land forces, which shall be in conformity with the "Regulations respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land" annexed to the present Convention.

Article 2

The provisions contained in the Regulations mentioned in Article 1 are only binding on the Contracting Powers, in case of war between two or more of them.

These provisions shall cease to be binding from the time when, in a war between Contracting Powers, a non-Contracting Power joins one of the belligerents.

Article 3

The present Convention shall be ratified as speedily as possible. The ratifications shall be deposited at the Hague.

A procès-verbal shall be drawn up recording the receipt of each ratification, and a copy, duly certified, shall be sent through the diplomatic channel, to all the Contracting Powers.

Article 4

Non-Signatory Powers are allowed to adhere to the present Convention.

For this purpose they must make their adhesion known to the Contracting Powers by means of a written notification, addressed to the Netherland Government, and by it communicated to all the other Contracting Powers.

Article 5

In the event of one of the High Contracting Parties denouncing the present Convention, such denunciation would not take effect until a year after the written notification made to the Netherland Government, and by it at once communicated to all the other Contracting Powers.

This denunciation shall affect only the notifying Power.

In faith of which the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and affixed their seals thereto.

Done at the Hague the 29th July 1899, in a single copy, which shall be kept in the archives of the Netherland Government, and copies of which, duly certified, shall be delivered to the Contracting Powers through the diplomatic channel.

[Here follow signatures.]

Annex to the Convention

REGULATIONS RESPECTING THE LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF WAR ON LAND

SECTION I.--ON BELLIGERENTS

CHAPTER I.--On the Qualifications of Belligerents

Article 1

The laws, rights, and duties of war apply not only to armies, but also to militia and volunteer corps, fulfilling the following conditions:

1. To be commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates; 2. To have a fixed distinctive emblem recognizable at a distance; 3. To carry arms openly; and
4. To conduct their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

In countries where militia or volunteer corps constitute the army, or form part of it, they are included under the denomination "army."

Article 2

The population of a territory which has not been occupied who, on the enemy's approach, spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading troops without having time to organize themselves in accordance with Article 1, shall be regarded a belligerent, if they respect the laws and customs of war.

Article 3

The armed forces of the belligerent parties may consist of combatants and non-combatants. In case of capture by the enemy both have a right to be treated as prisoners of war.

CHAPTER II.--On Prisoners of War

Article 4

Prisoners of war are in the power of the hostile Government, but not in that of the individuals or corps who captured them.

They must be humanely treated.

All their personal belongings, except arms, horses, and military papers remain their property.

Article 5

Prisoners of war may be interned in a town, fortress, camp, or any other locality, and bound not to go beyond certain fixed limits; but they can only be confined as an indispensable measure of safety.

Article 6

The State may utilize the labor of prisoners of war according to their rank and aptitude. Their tasks shall not be excessive, and shall have nothing to do with the military operations.

Prisoners may be authorized to work for the Public Service, for private persons, or on their own account.

Work done for the State shall be paid for according to the tariffs in force for soldiers of the national army employed on similar tasks. When the work is for other branches of the Public Service or for private persons, the conditions shall be settled in agreement with the military authorities.

The wages of the prisoners shall go towards improving their position, and the balance shall be paid them at the time of their release, after deducting the cost of their maintenance.

Article 7

The Government into whose hands prisoners of war have fallen is bound to maintain them.

Failing a special agreement between the belligerents, prisoners of war shall be treated as regards food, quarters, and clothing, on the same footing as the troops of the Government which has captured them.

Article 8

Prisoners of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders in force in the army of the State into whose hands they have fallen. Any act of insubordination warrants the adoption, as regards them, of such measures of severity as may be necessary.

Escaped prisoners, recaptured before they have succeeded in rejoining their army, or before quitting the territory occupied by the army that captured them, are liable to disciplinary punishment.

Prisoners who, after succeeding in escaping are again taken prisoners, are not liable to any punishment for the previous flight.

Article 9

Every prisoner of war, if questioned, is bound to declare his true name and rank, and if he disregards this rule, he is liable to a curtailment of the advantages accorded to the prisoners of war of his class.

Article 10

Prisoners of war may be set at liberty on parole if the laws of their country authorize it, and, in such a case, they are bound, on their personal honor, scrupulously to fulfill, both as regards their own Government and the Government by whom they were made prisoners, the engagements they have contracted.

In such cases, their own Government shall not require of nor accept from them any service incompatible with the parole given.

Article 11

A prisoner of war can not be forced to accept his liberty on parole; similarly the hostile Government is not obliged to assent to the prisoner's request to be set at liberty on parole.

Article 12

Any prisoner of war, who is liberated on parole and recaptured, bearing arms against the Government to whom he had pledged his honor, or against the allies of that Government, forfeits his right to be treated as a prisoner of war, and can be brought before the Courts.

Article 13

Individuals who follow an army without directly belonging to it, such as newspaper correspondents and reporters, sutlers, contractors, who fall into the enemy's hands, and whom the latter think fit to detain, have a right to be treated as prisoners of war, provided they can produce a certificate from the military authorities of the army they were accompanying.

Article 14

A Bureau for information relative to prisoners of war is instituted, on the commencement of hostilities, in each of the belligerent States, and, when necessary, in the neutral countries on whose territory belligerents have been received. This Bureau is intended to answer all inquiries about prisoners of war, and is furnished by the various services concerned with all the necessary information to enable it to keep an individual return for each prisoner of war. It is kept informed of interments and changes, as well as of admissions into hospital and deaths.

It is also the duty of the Information Bureau to receive and collect all objects of personal use, valuables, letters, etc., found on the battlefields or left by prisoners who have died in hospital or ambulance, and to transmit them to those interested.

Article 15

Relief Societies for prisoners of war, which are regularly constituted in accordance with the law of the country with the object of serving as the intermediary for charity, shall receive from the belligerents for themselves and their duly accredited agents every facility, within the bounds of military requirements and Administrative Regulations, for the effective accomplishment of their humane task. Delegates of these Societies may be admitted to the places of interment for the distribution of relief, as also to the halting places of repatriated prisoners, if furnished with a personal permit by the military authorities, and on giving an engagement in writing to comply with all their Regulations for order and police.

Article 16

The Information Bureau shall have the privilege of free postage. Letters, money orders, and valuables, as well as postal parcels destined for the prisoners of war or dispatched by them, shall be free of all postal duties both in the countries of origin and destination, as well as in those they

pass through.

Gifts and relief in kind for prisoners of war shall be admitted free of all duties of entry and others, as well as of payments for carriage by the Government railways.

Article 17

Officers taken prisoners may receive, if necessary, the full pay allowed them in this position by their country's regulations, the amount to be repaid by their Government.

Article 18

Prisoners of war shall enjoy every latitude in the exercise of their religion, including attendance at their own church services, provided only they comply with the regulations for order and police issued by the military authorities.

Article 19

The wills of prisoners of war are received or drawn up on the same conditions as for soldiers of the National Army.

The same rules shall be observed regarding death certificates, as well as for the burial of prisoners of war, due regard being paid to their grade and rank.

Article 20

After the conclusion of peace, the repatriation of prisoners of war shall take place as speedily as possible.

CHAPTER III. -- On the Sick and Wounded

Article 21

The obligations of belligerents with regard to the sick and wounded are governed by the Geneva Convention of the 22nd August, 1864, [FN:5 TS 377, ante] subject to any modifications which may be introduced into it.

SECTION II. -- ON HOSTILITIES

CHAPTER I. -- On means of injuring the Enemy, Sieges, and Bombardments

Article 22

The right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited.

Article 23

Besides the prohibitions provided by special Conventions, it is especially prohibited:--

- (a.) To employ poison or poisoned arms;

(b.) To kill or wound treacherously individuals belonging to the hostile nation or army;

(c.) To kill or wound an enemy who, having laid down arms, or having no longer means of defence, has surrendered at discretion;

(d.) to declare that no quarter will be given;

(e.) To employ arms, projectiles, or material of a nature to cause superfluous injury;

(f.) To make improper use of a flag of truce, the national flag, or military ensigns and the enemy's uniform, as well as the distinctive badges of the Geneva Convention;

(g.) To destroy or seize the enemy's property, unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war.

Article 24

Ruses of war and the employment of methods necessary to obtain information about the enemy and the country, are considered allowable.

Article 25

The attack or bombardment of towns, villages, habitations or buildings which are not defended, is prohibited.

Article 26

The Commander of an attacking force, before commencing a bombardment, except in the case of an assault, should do all he can to warn the authorities.

Article 27

In sieges and bombardments all necessary steps should be taken to spare as far as possible edifices devoted to religion, art, science, and charity, hospitals, and places where the sick and wounded are collected, provided they are not used at the same time for military purposes. The besieged should indicate these buildings or places by some particular and visible signs, which should previously be notified to the assailants.

Article 28

The pillage of a town or place, even when taken by assault, is prohibited.

CHAPTER II. -- On Spies

Article 29

An individual can only be considered a spy if, acting clandestinely, or on false pretences, he obtains, or seeks to obtain information in the zone of operations of a belligerent, with the intention of communicating it to the hostile party.

Thus, soldiers not in disguise who have penetrated into the zone of

operations of a hostile army to obtain information are not considered spies. Similarly, the following are not considered spies: soldiers or civilians, carrying out their mission openly, charged with the delivery of despatches destined either for their own army or for that of the enemy. To this class belong likewise individuals sent in balloons to deliver despatches, and generally to maintain communication between the various parts of an army or a territory.

Article 30

A spy taken in the act cannot be punished without previous trial.

Article 31

A spy who, after rejoining the army to which he belongs, is subsequently captured by the enemy, is treated as a prisoner of war, and incurs no responsibility for his previous acts of espionage.