



Gerard Batten MEP

UKIP Spokesman on Security & Defence

The Threat Facing Britain & How To Deal With it

A Personal View

Successive British governments are to blame for the terrorist threat now facing Britain.

The terrorist threat we face following the successful and unsuccessful suicide bombings of July 2005 cannot be underestimated. Britain is used to living with the threat of terrorist attacks; most notably from the IRA, but the new breed of terrorists represent a new kind of threat. They do not have negotiable political objectives, shameful as surrender to their demands might be: they want to die with their bombs and cause as much death and destruction as possible.

The death and maiming of innocent civilians is bad enough but if nuclear material were used in a so-called 'dirty-bomb', or if a nuclear device were detonated in central London then not only would untold lives be lost but Britain's very survival as a world economy would be at threat. Imagine London rendered uninhabitable for decades or hundreds of years and you can see the threat facing Britain. It is believed that a number of nuclear bombs have gone missing

from the former Soviet Union. We know that the terrorists have money and technical know-how at their disposal. Their beliefs may be primitive but they can call on the resources and knowledge of the modern world to express them.

Successive British governments are to blame for the situation in which we now find ourselves. They have allowed into Britain people who openly preach hatred, intolerance and the overthrow of the values of the very country that offers them sanctuary. Even following the atrocities on 9th September 2001 they failed to act against them. At the heart of the problem lies Britain's indiscriminate right of entry to those who do not share our values, and our failure to assimilate some sections of our immigrant population. How do we now rectify the situation? I suggest twelve basic measures below that we should adopt to address the immediate security issues.

1) Implement a Full Public Enquiry into the Terrorist Attacks of July 2005.

A full public enquiry should be launched into the background and events leading up to the terrorist attacks in July 2005. The public have a right to know what the security services were aware of, and what they reported to the government. Why have terrorist suspects been allowed into Britain over a long period of time and permitted to continue propagating their messages of hate and intolerance? Why did foreign governments and their security services look on with incredulity as the British government harboured known terrorist suspects and allowed the creation of 'Londonistan' as a hub of world terrorist activity? Britain has taken tolerance to a degree that threatens the safety of its own citizens. The British people have a right to know if this was a failure of the security services, the government, or both. An independent enquiry should be implemented and its findings reported to Parliament.

2) Repeal of Human Rights Act

Britain should repeal the Human Rights Act implemented by the Labour Government in 1998 which incorporated the European Convention on Human rights into UK law. The Convention gives people the right not to be returned to countries 'where they may face degrading or inhumane treatment'. But this has allowed

suspects wanted for alleged serious offences to stay in Britain even though it is against our best interests to keep them here. It should not be for Britain to judge the criminal justice systems of other countries in respect of their own nationals if this means harbouring those who present threats to our own security.

Britain should also withdraw from the European Convention on Human Rights. Britain had perfectly good human rights observance under our own law before the Human Rights legislation was introduced and we can again.

3) Withdraw from the UN Convention on Refugees

The 1951 United Nations Convention on Refugees theoretically allows governments to deny or revoke refugee status to those who conspire against their host nation. British judges have interpreted the Convention as denying the government the right to refuse admission to undesirables and to deport those already here. In my view, Britain should withdraw from the Convention and set its own criteria for the admission of genuine asylum seekers by Act of Parliament. In the age of affordable international travel the asylum laws have been used as a racket to circumvent the immigration laws and allow economic migration. The number of genuine potential asylum

seekers runs to tens if not hundreds of millions of people. For example, the government of China is a communist tyranny and the entire population of China, 1.3 billion people, could legitimately claim asylum. Many countries in the world have undemocratic and often repressive governments. Britain cannot offer refuge to all their citizens. Britain must decide, in its own interests, the rules we apply to admit them, and the numbers that can be permitted.

4) Redefine the Treason Laws

Britain's ancient treason laws should be brought up-to-date and clarified, along the lines of the definition of treason contained in the Constitution of the USA. For example, treason could be redefined as 'making war on the realm of the Monarch, aiding, abetting or giving comfort to their enemies, and espionage'. The harshest penalties should be available to the courts, and applied, for those found guilty. This would serve two purposes: it would allow terrorists and their accomplices to be dealt with effectively; and it would send a clear message that terrorist offences are not just crimes but an attack on the very state and its values to which all citizens, and those living within its borders, owe loyalty.

5) Use the Existing Laws of Sedition & Crack Down on Extremists

The laws of sedition should be

used against those who preach hate and violence. We do not need gimmicky new laws such as the 'glorification of terrorism'. Sedition may be defined as, 'conduct or language inciting rebellion against the authority of the state', or, 'the crime of creating a revolt, disturbance, or violence against lawful civil authority with intent to cause its overthrow or destruction'. The activities and pronouncements of certain Islamic clerics as reported in the media would seem to fall under these definitions. The enforcement of the law of sedition would also enable the prosecution of those British citizens publishing or contributing to websites calling for the 'jihad' or holy-wars. There are adequate laws in place to deal with them, there is just a lack of political and judicial will to do so.

6) Reintroduce Effective Border Controls

As a member of the European Union, Britain has lost control of its own borders. Over 400 million Europeans have right of entry to Britain, and under plans for EU enlargement, admitting Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, another 95 million people could be given entry over the next few years. Britain must regain control of its borders. Britain must introduce border controls such as are in place in the USA for those foreign nationals for whom it is deemed necessary. Embarkation and visa controls should be re-introduced so that those entering and leaving

Britain can be recorded. Those who overstay should be identifiable and traceable. Those who overstay should pay a penalty by being deported and not being allowed entry again for a specified period of time (e.g 10 years). Only when laws are clear and enforced will they be obeyed. Effective border controls would mean that illegal immigrants and illegal asylum seekers can be returned to their place of embarkation without delay.

Health tourism could be stopped by the requirement that any foreign national entering the UK should have adequate health insurance cover. Anyone unable to produce this, or pay for it at their point of entry, should be refused entry.

7) Allow the Police to do their job.

The police must be freed from unnecessary and burdensome paperwork in the pursuit of their duties. Following the McPherson Report of 1999 the police are required to fill in a forty-question form after stopping a suspect in order to report the encounter and including information on the ethnic origin of the suspect. This politically correct nonsense has to stop if the police are to do their job effectively, especially now that lives may depend on it.

The judiciary are also guilty of interpreting the law in favour of the terms of the Human Rights industry rather than in the spirit of

Acts of Parliament. Withdrawal from the Human Rights Act and the UN Convention of Refugees will help to rectify this.

8) Allow Intercept Evidence in Court

Any electronic communication, whether telephone call, text message, fax message or email can be read at will by government security agencies through its intercept sites, such as GCHQ at Cheltenham. Indeed it is the electronic tracking and surveillance dimension of modern digital technology that has enabled the effective investigation, and in some case the prevention, of terrorist activity. It is a fiction to believe that the security agencies cannot, if they choose, intercept any electronic communication that they wish to. We should recognise that fact that no communications are truly private in the digital age. We should therefore allow information gathered in this way to be admissible in courts of law as evidence against those on criminal charges, or charges of treason and sedition. A new Act of Parliament should set out the terms on which such evidence may be used in courts of law.

9) Tighten Social Security Rules

One of the scandals highlighted following the terrorist attacks was the fact that a number of those foreign nationals and asylum seekers who have for years been preaching hate and intolerance in

Britain were living on state benefits. This is also true of a number of the suicide bombers themselves, and those arrested subsequently as suspects. While the asylum system has for years been used as racket to circumvent the immigration laws, Britain's benefits system has been an incentive to attract illegal entrants and criminals. There needs to be fundamental reassessment of the welfare system to ensure that it is not misused. For foreign nationals and asylum seekers any receipt of benefits should be dependent on a code of conduct; if this is breached benefits may be withdrawn.

10) Registration of Military Training Abroad

A number of British citizens are reported to have trained in terrorist camps abroad. British citizens have committed suicide bombings in Israel. British citizens should be required to register any training that they have undertaken abroad concerning the use of firearms, explosives and chemical or biological agents. This registration should also operate retrospectively. Retrospective registration of past activity should not carry a penalty; however, failure to register any such training previously undertaken could carry a prison sentence if a court decided that the training received constituted preparation for terrorism. Anyone wishing to carry out such training in the future should first be required to secure a permit from

the Home Office. If this permit is refused it would be a criminal offence to proceed.

Such legislation might appear difficult to enforce but if it would make it plain that terrorist training is an illegal activity, whatever the intended target. With the allowance of intercept evidence in court (item 9) then detection and conviction would be possible.

11) Assert British identity

Much hot air and newsprint has been expended regarding the assertion of 'British values'. It will be difficult to assert values when a common definition of what they are cannot be agreed, and when British independence and the value of our national institutions have been so radically undermined by successive British governments. What needs to be re-asserted is British identity.

Even some of the proponents of multi-culturalism now accept that it has gone too far and is counter-productive. A multi-ethnic society will work where people believe and invest trust in common national institutions (i.e. Parliament, the Law etc), but a multi-cultural society is a recipe for division. One of the reasons highlighted by commentators for the failure of some immigrant populations to fully assimilate has been the use of language, or rather the lack of use of the English language. This is an area

where the government can show immediate action and leadership.

British citizens who cannot speak English should be given every assistance to do so. No future migrant should be allowed entry unless they have a reasonable command of English (fluency in the national language is a common requirement for citizenship of most countries). The use of foreign language signs in public places, such as hospitals, schools, public buildings etc, should be discontinued. This would not stop terrorists who already speak English but it would aid longer-term integration and assimilation of migrants into British society. UK Citizenship should be granted on a provisional basis (e.g. five years) and could be revoked during this period under some circumstances.

12) Leave the European Union

The discerning reader will know that few if any of these provisions could be implemented inside the European Union. The European Union now controls Britain's borders, to whom we allow right of entry, and our policy on asylum. Other measures would not be permissible under the European Convention on Human Rights. In order to regain control of our own country and implement the measures needed to protect ourselves in our own country Britain must leave the European Union.

Contacts

Gerard Batten, Member of the European Parliament for London 020 7403 7174 gerard.batten@btinternet.com
Lynnda Robson, Researcher & Press Secretary: 020 7403 7174 robson.lynnda@btinternet.com
Lawrence Webb, London Regional Organiser: 020 7403 7175 lawrencejwebb@btinternet.com

PO BOX 51542, London, SE1 3XS