



EMBARGOED UNTIL 00.01 SUNDAY 6 JULY

## RESEARCH NOTE 32 THE COST OF BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT

By Glyn Gaskarth and Nicholas Connor

With the by-election in Haltemprice and Howden scheduled for 10 July, civil liberties and the way in which the Government is tackling the terrorist threat are central issues. Politicians on both sides of the debate have argued that their policies best represent the interests of taxpayers. Whatever one's views on the merits of 42 days' detention, where do the interests of taxpayers really lie? This research note analyses the cost and effectiveness of the different measures the Government has used to combat the terrorist threat to Britain, which some would argue have amounted to a new "Big Brother Government". The key findings of the report are:

- The **total cost of Big Brother Government is almost £20 billion** (not an annual cost). This works out at almost **£800 per household**. This includes spending on the following measures:

Table 1: The cost of Big Brother Government

Big Brother measure	Cost
ID cards	£19,000 million
CCTV	£500 million
DNA database	£300 million
"Chip and bin" schemes and misuse of anti-terror laws by local authorities	£68 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>£19,868 million</b>

- Despite the enormous cost of these measures, the Government has been soft on the preachers of hate and other extremists who pose a real threat to the safety of British citizens:
  - **Abu Hamza**, despite being convicted of a number of charges in the UK in 2006, has still not been deported to the US, who first requested extradition in 2004 on terror charges. The **total cost** to taxpayers to date of **welfare benefits, council housing, NHS treatment, trials, legal appeals** and **incarceration** is **£2.75 million**.
  - **Abu Qatada**, a preacher who has openly advocated the murder of non-Muslims and who is known as Osama Bin Laden's "right-hand man" in Europe, has not been deported to Jordan to face terror charges because of human rights legislation. The **total cost** to taxpayers to date of **welfare benefits, incarceration, legal appeals** and **police monitoring** is almost **£1.5 million**.

- Unfortunately Abu Hamza and Abu Qatada are not isolated examples of the Government's failure to deal effectively with extremists. This report gives details of a number of similar cases, together with the costs to taxpayers, which total over **£5 million**.

Table 2: The hate preacher "rich list"

Name	Total cost to taxpayers of welfare benefits, legal appeals, incarceration etc
Abu Hamza	£2,750,000
Abu Qatada	£1,468,000
Omar Bakri	£531,000
Khalidal-Fawwaz and Adel Abdelbarry	£423,000
Sheikh Abdullah Faisal	£151,000
Anjem Choudray	£75,000
Abu Izadeen	£50,000 (plus additional £157,500 planned to keep him in prison for 4½ years)
<b>Total</b>	<b>£5,448,000</b>

- A real boost to counter-terrorism efforts could be made by spending a fraction of the £20 billion currently spent on Big Brother Government on schemes that would have real, tangible benefits at little or no cost to taxpayers:
  - **Introduce a national border police force that would record when people enter and leave the country.** The Government has estimated that it would cost £104 million a year to provide 24-hour cover at all ports of entry to the UK.
  - **Replace CCTV with improved street lighting.** This could be funded entirely from the savings made by reducing the number of CCTV cameras.
  - **Allow intercept evidence in court.** This would represent a negligible cost.
  - **Better enforce existing legislation.** This would also be a negligible cost.
  - **Pull out of the European Convention on Human Rights.** This would not represent an extra burden on the taxpayer.
  - **Ban Hizb ut Tahrir.** The Government itself has promised to do this, but has so far failed to carry it out.

**Glyn Gaskarth**, Policy Analyst for the TaxPayers' Alliance, said:

*"The Government's £20 billion Big Brother measures are a costly way of making us less free but no more secure. The Government should target the real extremists rather than eroding the civil liberties of ordinary, law-abiding people, and in the process, wasting billions of pounds of our money."*

# 1. The cost of Big Brother Government

## Identity cards

When the Government proposed identity cards it argued that the scheme would “better protect ourselves and our families against identity fraud, as well as protecting our communities against crime, illegal immigration and terrorism”,<sup>1</sup> while the cost was estimated by the Home Office to be £5.8 billion over ten years.<sup>2</sup> Academics at the London School of Economics have, however, estimated the ten-year cost of ID cards at **£19 billion**, citing numerous errors and omissions in the Home Office’s estimate.<sup>3</sup> In addition to representing an unwarranted intrusion into the lives of individuals, ID cards are likely to fail in their objectives. As the ID card programme director put it: “No one has proven the technology on anything like the scale required by the card”:<sup>4</sup>

- **Preventing terrorism.** ID cards in Spain did not prevent the Madrid bombing of 2004; indeed the bombers themselves possessed ID cards. The Government also admitted that ID cards could not have prevented the 7/7 bombings in London in 2005.<sup>5</sup>
- **Reducing fraud.** Experts at the Dutch security company Riscure have discovered how to ‘skim’ data from a ‘contactless chip’, (the same technology which will be on the UK ID cards), from 10m (30ft) away, and decode it within two hours.<sup>6</sup> The Government has also lost the following information since it announced plans for a unified National Identity Register:
  - National insurance records of 25 million individuals.<sup>7</sup>
  - 3 million details of learner drivers’ theory tests, including names, addresses and telephone numbers.<sup>8</sup>
  - Details of 600,000 applicants to the RAF, Royal Marines and Royal Navy, including the passport numbers, National Insurance numbers and bank details of many of the people concerned.<sup>9</sup>
  - Top secret British intelligence assessment of Al Qaeda and the Iraqi security services, which was left on a train, found by a passer-by and handed to the BBC.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> National Identity Cards Scheme Delivery Plan, as referenced on p.70 *Home Affairs Select Committee, Surveillance Society? Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1*

<sup>2</sup> *The Independent*, 17 November 2005

<sup>3</sup> LSE Interim Report, *The Identity Project: An assessment of the UK Identity Cards Bill & its implications*, March 2005, p.6

<sup>4</sup> Katherine Courtney, who is the ID card programme director, and Ian Watmore, the Chief Information Officer, *The Guardian*, 15 September 2005

<sup>5</sup> *The Evening Standard*, 8 July 2005

<sup>6</sup> *The Times*, 03 February 2006

<sup>7</sup> P.33 *Home Affairs Select Committee, Surveillance Society? Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1*

<sup>8</sup> BBC News, 17 December 2007

<sup>9</sup> Sky News, 21 January 2008

- Top secret details on the US Supersonic Joint Strike Fighter.<sup>11</sup>
- Communities Minister Hazel Blears' laptop.
- **Reducing costs.** According to the UK Passport Service a family of four would have had to pay £134 on 2 October 2003 for four passports (£42 each for adults, £25 each for children). With the introduction of identity cards, that cost would rise to £372.<sup>12</sup>

The Government's appalling record in implementing IT projects does not bode well for the success of any ID cards scheme:

- **Asylum Seeker Processing System.** With a budget of £80 million and managed by Siemens, the project was scrapped after it was found to be 'flawed'.<sup>13</sup>
- **Child Support Agency Pathway.** The £468 million scheme was abandoned after four years after it emerged that the magnetic swipe technology used in the card was out of date. £1 billion in claims were written off.<sup>14</sup>
- **Independent Learning Accounts.** A 2001 scheme to give adults £150 for educational use was abandoned after fake applications were made en masse by fraudsters. The cost was £97 million.<sup>15</sup>
- **NHS National Programme for IT (NPFIT).** The NPFIT is £10 billion over budget; it is two years behind schedule in delivering the patient clinical record, while other areas of the programme are even further behind schedule; and it has been urged by the Public Accounts Committee to prioritise the most valuable functions given that the system as a whole is unlikely to deliver.<sup>16</sup>
- **Passport Agency.** A new IT system from Siemens was budgeted at £230 million. The delivery was delayed and the final cost was £12.6 million over budget.<sup>17</sup> Ensuing failings of computer databases led to more than 500,000 people waiting for passports in early summer 1999.<sup>18</sup>

## CCTV

There are 4.2 million CCTV cameras in the UK, one for every 14 UK citizens. This is the highest camera/citizen ratio in the world. The number of CCTV cameras in Britain is more in absolute terms than the rest of the EU put

---

<sup>10</sup> BBC News, 11 June 2008

<sup>11</sup> *The Guardian*, 6 February 2001

<sup>12</sup> UK Passport Service, Payment Leaflet

<sup>13</sup> *The Times*, 14 August 2002

<sup>14</sup> *The Guardian*, 5 January 2008

<sup>15</sup> *The Guardian*, 5 January 2008

<sup>16</sup> "Department of Health: *The National Programme for IT in the NHS*", House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, Twentieth Report of the Session 2006-07, March 2007

<sup>17</sup> *The Times*, 14 August 2002

<sup>18</sup> *The Guardian*, 21 September 2002

together. The Home Office has spent **£500 million** on CCTV over the last decade, which represents 78 per cent of its crime prevention budget.<sup>19</sup> CCTV, however, is failing in its key objectives:

- **Deterring criminals.** Only 3 per cent of crimes are solved by CCTV.<sup>20</sup> Four out of five London boroughs with the highest number of CCTV cameras have lower than average crime detection rates.<sup>21</sup> After surveying the effects of CCTV installation in 13 areas, the Home Office has concluded that CCTV has “little overall effect on crime levels”.<sup>22</sup> The Government has also admitted that there are no definitive national studies that find a positive deterrent effect of CCTV.<sup>23</sup>
- **Detecting crime.** Only half of surveillance control rooms are staffed 24 hours a day.<sup>24</sup>
- **Solving crime.** CCTV only produces images that enable the police to identify criminals in 15-30 per cent of cases,<sup>25</sup> while 90 per cent of cameras violate the Information Commissioner’s Code of Practice on the use of CCTV cameras, as they could be breaking the Data Protection Act.<sup>26</sup>

## National DNA database

The Government has amassed the largest DNA database in the world. Four million citizens – 5.2 per cent of the UK population – are on the DNA database.<sup>27</sup> The next largest is Austria which has less than 1 per cent of the population on its database.<sup>28</sup> This compares with 0.5 per cent of the American population being on the US database – a country subject to an equal if not greater terrorist threat.<sup>29</sup> It costs £4.50 to take a DNA sample from one person and store it for five years.<sup>30</sup> There are 4 million such samples, making the total cost £18 million. In addition there are administration costs. The Government estimates that it has spent “over

<sup>19</sup> Gill and Spriggs, *Assessing the Impact of CCTV* (London: Home Office Research, Developments and Statistics Directorate, 2005), pp 43, 60–61; Surveillance Studies Network, *A Report on the Surveillance Society: Full Report: revised with a new Postscript*, March 2007, p 19, para 9.5.3

<sup>20</sup> BBC News, 6 May 2008 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7384843.stm>

<sup>21</sup> *Evening Standard*, 19 September 2007 <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-23412867-details/Tens+of+thousands+of+CCTV+cameras,+yet+80per+cent+of+crime+unsolved/article.do>

<sup>22</sup> P.63, *Home Affairs Select Committee, Surveillance Society? Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1*,

<sup>23</sup> Minister of State for Security, Counter-terrorism, Crime and Policing, Rt Hon Tony McNulty MP, p.65 *Home Affairs Select Committee, Surveillance Society? Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1*

<sup>24</sup> Home Office Study, 2005, cited in *The Guardian*, 12 October 2007

<sup>25</sup> Davies, G. and S. Thasen (2000) ‘Closed-circuit television: How effective an identification aid?’ *British Journal of Psychology*, 91: 411-426

<sup>26</sup> *The Telegraph*, 2 June 2007 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1553090/Majority-of-UKper-cent27s-CCTV-cameras-per-cent27are-illegalper-cent27.html>

<sup>27</sup> *The Guardian*, 5 September 2007

<sup>28</sup> DNA Expansion Programme 2000-2005: Reporting Achievement, Forensic Science and Pathology Unit, October 2005, P4.

<sup>29</sup> *The Telegraph*, 06 January 2006

<sup>30</sup> *BBC News*, 18 September 2005

**£300 million** over the last five years” on “maintaining and developing the database”.<sup>31</sup> The DNA database is a repressive measure that will not work effectively:

- **Criminalisation of innocent citizens.** 1 million innocent citizens have their information stored on the database.<sup>32</sup> Police are seeking the power to collect DNA samples from people cautioned for non-arrestable offences such as speeding or littering.<sup>33</sup>
- **Inaccurate data.** 550,000 entries are incorrectly matched against fake or misspelt names.<sup>34</sup> 1,500 administrative mistakes have been identified in the DNA database, including “incorrect spellings, dates, police crime codes and duplications”.<sup>35</sup> This means that innocent citizens could be arrested for crimes they did not commit based on information incorrectly logged on the database.

### Local authorities’ “chip and bin” systems and misuse of terror laws

Local authorities are some of the worst offenders. At a cost of **£68 million**, councils have trialled “chip and bin” systems with a view to charging citizens for the disposal of their waste and regulating the amount of waste they can produce.<sup>36</sup> Local Authorities have also used powers granted to them and to 300 other organisations under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 – which were designed to counter terrorism – against ordinary British citizens.<sup>37</sup>

- A council in Dorset used anti terror legislation to spy, through their telephone, on a family; it thought was misusing school catchments area rules.
- Bolton council used this Act to check the mobile phone records of someone they suspected of not burying an animal.
- Kent used this Act 23 times including on someone they thought had brought a dog in the country illegally.
- Sandwell Metropolitan council used this Act to try to find a bogus faith healer.

---

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/science-research/using-science/dna-database/>

<sup>32</sup> *The Mail*, 23 May 2007

<sup>33</sup> *The Times*, 02 August 2007

<sup>34</sup> *The Telegraph*, 19 April 2008 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1561414/Outrage-at-500,000-DNA-database-mistakes.html>

<sup>35</sup> *The Telegraph*, 26 November 2007

<sup>36</sup> The initial “chip and bin” trial in South Norfolk in 2002 cost £1 million and failed to achieve the desired results, resulting in an increase in fly tipping. 68 authorities have tried this since. Assuming that each council spent the same as South Norfolk, “chip and bin” has to date cost £68 million (*The Guardian*, 17 June 2008)

<sup>37</sup> *The Telegraph*, 5 June 2008

## 2. Failing to deal with real terrorists and extremists

The following examples illustrate how, in too many instances, foreign extremists' right to protection from their governments often comes before British citizens' right to protection from the actions of terrorists:

### 1. Abu Hamza

#### Threat to Britain

- He "issued religious decrees (fatwas) allowing Algerian terrorists to commit murder in the name of God, and raised hundreds of thousands of pounds for Islamists to carry on the war against Russia in Chechnya".<sup>38</sup>
- Shehzad Tanweer, Jermaine Lindsay and Muhammed Sidique Khan (the 7/7 bombers) all heard Abu Hamza preach. Richard Reid (the shoe bomber), Feroz Abbasi (captured fighting in Afghanistan) and Zacarius Moussaoui (only person convicted of involvement in 9/11 conspiracy) all attended Finsbury Park Mosque to hear him preach.
- His sermons described Jews as the "enemy of Islam", told followers to "bleed" the enemies of Islam and said they should not rest until they created a "Muslim state".<sup>39</sup>



#### Government response

Two attempts by Scotland Yard to prosecute Abu Hamza in March 1999 and June 2003 were rejected by the CPS on the grounds the evidence was "clearly insufficient". He proceeded to preach for 5 years without being charged by the authorities. The US requested his extradition in 2004 on links with an act of terrorism in Yemen. Hamza was held in custody under this American warrant. He was then convicted in 2006 on 6 charges under the 1861 Offences Against the Person Act, three under the 1986 Public Order Act and one under the Terror Act 2000. He is expected to be deported to the US when he has served his prison sentence in the UK, although he is still appealing.

---

<sup>38</sup> P.29 *The Suicide Factory, Abu Hamza And The Finsbury Park Mosque*, by Sean O'Neill & Daniel McGrory

<sup>39</sup> BBC News, 7 February 2006

## Cost to taxpayers<sup>40</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Welfare benefits	£500,000	His family receive £680 a week in benefits
Accommodation	£600,000	Value of council house in which his wife and seven children live
Incarceration	£150,000	His detention in Belmarsh has cost £38,000 a year since he was arrested in 2004
Trials	£1,100,000	Legal aid bill
Legal appeals	£300,000	£250,000 estimated amount spent trying to avoid deportation to the US, and £50,000 on his citizenship appeal
NHS treatment	£100,000	Mainly for operations on his arms
<b>Total</b>	<b>£2,750,000</b>	

## 2. Abu Qatada

### Threat to Britain

- He is described as Osama Bin Laden's spokesman in Europe and is under worldwide embargo by the UN Security Council Committee 1267 for his association with Al Qaeda.<sup>41</sup>
- Qatada has advocated the murder of non Muslims – "our countries have been infiltrated by Kaffirs. It is a farid [duty] for us to turn our swords on to them and kill them".<sup>42</sup>
- He also advocates a holy war against all non Muslims: "there will be a great battle against wathaniyah [pagans, Jews and Christians] where the saviour will come back to this earth, the king with an army in the sky, killing the Jews, to wipe them out and rid of the planet of the Jews".<sup>43</sup>
- He is alleged to have provided "spiritual advice" to would-be shoe bomber Richard Reid and Zacarias Moussaoui. Videos of Abu Qatada were found in the Hamburg flat of Mohamed Atta, ringleader of the 9/11 attacks.



### Government response

- He cannot be deported to Jordan because he might be tortured. This is despite the fact that the British government has reached an agreement with the Jordanian government that they would not torture him or subject him to the death penalty were he to be deported.

<sup>40</sup> *The Mail*, 20 June 2008

<sup>41</sup> UN Security Council Committee 1267 - <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/consolist.shtml>

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.socialcohesion.co.uk/press/TheCentrerevealsAbuQatadastalksonJihad.html>

<sup>43</sup> *Virtual Caliphate*, Centre for Social Cohesion

- Under the Government's Human Rights legislation he has a right to protection by the UK Government. This right supersedes the right of British citizens to protection from Abu Qatada.<sup>44</sup>
- He travelled to the UK on a forged passport and was granted asylum after claiming religious persecution. He is in receipt of state benefits thought to total £1,000 per month.<sup>45</sup>
- When questioned in the UK in February 2001, Abu Qatada was in possession of £170,000 cash, including £805 in an envelope labeled "For the Mujahedin in Chechnya". He was not charged.<sup>46</sup>

### Cost to taxpayers<sup>47</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Welfare benefits	£168,000	From 1993 until 2002 – average welfare benefits of £1000 per month. Now his wife and family receive average welfare benefits of £800 per month totalling £60,000 over the 6 years.
Incarceration	£300,000	Incarcerated over the last 6 years
Legal appeals	£500,000	Spent trying to avoid deportation to Jordan
Police monitoring	£500,000	Spent providing an MI5 safe house and monitoring Abu Qatada 24 hours a day.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,468,000</b>	

### 3. Omar Bakri

#### Threat to Britain

- He is the former head of Al Muhajiroun, a group proscribed because of its links with terrorism.
- He has stated that Britain is Dar ul Harb [the land of war] and said "I blame the British Government and I blame the British people" for the 7/7 attacks.<sup>48</sup>
- He has advocated holy war by Muslims against non Muslims proclaiming that "the jihad is halal [permissible] for the Muslims wherever they are, the whole ummah [Muslim community] wherever they are. OK brothers - wherever you are, do it".<sup>49</sup>
- He has said that homosexuals should be "thrown from Big Ben".<sup>50</sup>



<sup>44</sup> *The Times*, 18 June 2008

<sup>45</sup> *The Mail*, 19 June 2008

<sup>46</sup> *The Telegraph*, 18 June 2008

<sup>47</sup> *The Mail*, 19 June 2008

<sup>48</sup> *The Times*, 21 July 2005

<sup>49</sup> *The Times*, 21 July 2005

<sup>50</sup> *The Mail*, 06 August 2005

### Government response

The Government failed to deport him. He left Britain of his own accord for the Lebanon. He is now prohibited from re-entering Britain.

### Cost to taxpayers<sup>51</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Welfare benefits	£300,000	£1,300 a month
Accommodation	£200,000	His family is resident in a £200,000 council house
Car	£31,000	Toyota people carrier under the Motability Scheme
<b>Total</b>	<b>£531,000</b>	

## 4. Khalid al-Fawwaz and Adel Abdelbarry

### Threat to Britain

Alleged associates of Osama Bin Laden, arrested after the Dar es Salaam and Nairobi bombing arrested in 1998.

### Government response

They have fought extradition to America for 7 years after the High Court ruled in December 2001 that jurisdiction of a state could apply more widely than acts perpetrated within its borders, thereby validating the American extradition warrant. A series of costly appeals have ensued.

### Cost to taxpayers<sup>52</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Legal appeals	£423,000	As of 2003. Five years of additional legal proceeding since.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£423,000</b>	

## 5. Sheikh Abdullah Faisal

### Threat to Britain

He was convicted of soliciting murder in 2003.



### Government response

Served 4 years of a 7 year sentence and then was deported to Jamaica. He now spreads his message of hate in South Africa.

<sup>51</sup> *The Telegraph*, 12 August 2005 and the *The Mail*, 06 August 2005


<sup>52</sup> *The Telegraph*, 04 May 2003

## Cost to taxpayers<sup>53</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Incarceration	£140,000	£35,000 per annum over four years
Deportation	£11,000	Average cost of deportation
<b>Total</b>	<b>£151,000</b>	

### 6. Anjem Choudary

#### Threat to Britain

- 
 Former second in command of Al Muhajiroun and later involved in Al Ghurabaa, both of which were proscribed for their links to terrorism.
- He praised the 9/11 bombers and condemned non Muslim victims of 7/7. He declared the 9/11 bombers to be "the magnificent 19" who had by their act "split the world in two camps, the camp of Islam and the camp of non Islam or kuffar, those who revived the obligation of Jihad worldwide." Non Muslims killed on 7/7 were, he said, by definition not innocent.<sup>54</sup> He has also envisaged more 7/7s, saying: "The fact is that 7/7 was brought upon the people of London and Britain by the foreign policy of Tony Blair. There is no reason why there should not be more suicide bombings in London".<sup>55</sup>
- He called for the execution of the Pope: "Whoever insults the message of Mohammed is going to be subject to capital punishment".<sup>56</sup>
- He has said that anyone who supports Israel is a "legitimate target". Choudary said "the Qur'an is explicit in making Israeli aggressors and occupiers legitimate targets for Muslims wherever they may be" and that "if you support Israel financially, verbally or physically you will become part of the conflict".<sup>57</sup>
- He has said that British troops are a legitimate target: Any "aggression" against "Muslim property or land by any Kuffar or non-Muslim forces whether American, British or the Jews of Israeli makes Jihad (i.e. fighting) against them an obligation upon all Muslims".<sup>58</sup>

#### Government response

Remains at liberty and receives state benefits. He organised the Danish Embassy protests at which people carried placards for those insulted Islam to

<sup>53</sup> BBC News, 25 May 2007 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6692243.stm>. Prison Costs: *Locked Out*, Citizens Advice Bureau Evidence on prisoners and ex offenders, 20 March 2007, Deportation: <http://www.dianeabbott.org.uk/index.php?article=121>

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ifYtkMA33N4&feature=related>

<sup>55</sup> *The Guardian*, 4 February 2006

<sup>56</sup> *Evening Standard*, 26 June 2008

<sup>57</sup> *Fatwa against Israel*, 2 October 2000, Al Muhajiroun Statement

<sup>58</sup> *Fatwa against Israel*, 2 October 2000, Al Muhajiroun Statement


be slain/ beheaded. For this he was fined £500 for failing to inform the police of the demonstration.

### Cost to taxpayers<sup>59</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Welfare benefits	£75,000	Includes payments to his wife Rubana of around £1,000-a-month housing benefit, £360 income support, £160 child benefit and £192-a-week child tax credits. Remains on state benefits – £75,000 for the three years until 2008.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£75,000</b>	

## 7. Abu Izzadeen

### Threat to Britain

- 
 He has praised the 7/7 bombers – they are “completely praiseworthy”.<sup>60</sup> He also says he would stand with jihadists against Britain: “If I see mujahideen attack the UK, I am always standing with the Muslims, never against the Muslims”.<sup>61</sup>
- On British law, he has said: “If you live in a society where Islam is not in the ruling system you need to work to change that. It means if there is a contradiction with Islamic law and a British law, British law can go to hell”.<sup>62</sup>
- He has threatened more 7/7s: “I think the will of Saddique Kahn [7/7 bomber] says it, if you stop you will be saved if you don’t stop you will be killed indiscriminately. We are talking about people who like to die the way you like to live”.<sup>63</sup>
- He has said that terrorism is a religious duty: “Terrorism is part and parcel of Islam, terrorism is part of the dean of Islam. Allah said to terrify the enemies of Islam we should prepare ourselves ... It is an obligation as a farther to teach your sons to become a mujahed ... They want you to say to you Islam is only self defense Islam is not offensive. Jihad, my dear Muslim brothers Jihad is two types, a offensive Jihad to conquer and spread the authority of the Sharia and defensive Jihad to protect Muslim lands”.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup> *News of the World* [http://www.newsoftheworld.co.uk/2303\\_hate\\_preacher.shtml#cid=OTC-RSS&attr=news](http://www.newsoftheworld.co.uk/2303_hate_preacher.shtml#cid=OTC-RSS&attr=news)

<sup>60</sup> *The Guardian*, 11 February 2006

<sup>61</sup> *The Mail*, 26 September 2006

<sup>62</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f0phJ9XZ2dw>

<sup>63</sup> [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PWuKSYd\\_Xh0](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PWuKSYd_Xh0)

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nU6OPcj5qT0>

## Government response

Sentenced to 4½ years in prison for his connections with terrorism.

## Cost to taxpayers<sup>65</sup>

Area	Cost	Notes
Welfare benefits	£50,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£50,000</b>	Now costing taxpayers an additional £35,000 per annum while in prison

## 3. Proposals

The Government should consider the following clear, cheap and simple proposals to prosecute the terrorists and protect ordinary British citizens.

### 1. Introduce a national border police force that would record when people enter and leave the country

Recording when people enter and leave the country is essential to maintaining control of Britain's borders. To do this a border police is necessary. The Government has estimated that it would cost £104 million a year to provide 24-hour cover at all ports of entry to the UK, a mere fraction of the cost of ID cards.<sup>66</sup>

### 2. Replace CCTV with improved street lighting:

The National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) produced a report which indicated that improved street lighting was proven to cut crime by up to 20 per cent.<sup>67</sup> It recommended that the money on CCTV would be better spent on street lighting.

### 3. Allow intercept evidence in court:

It is ridiculous that the police cannot use evidence against terrorists in our courts but foreign police services can use this evidence in their courts. Allowing intercept evidence in court would represent a negligible cost to taxpayers.

### 4. Enforce Existing Legislation

Existing legislation should be better enforced, which would not cost taxpayers extra. For example, in 1991 an MP asked for Omar Bakri to be

<sup>65</sup> *The Sun*, 18 April 2008

<sup>66</sup> Lords Hansard, 2 July 2007, Col. GC34

<sup>67</sup> *Evening Standard*, 19 September 2007 <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-23412867-details/Tens+of+thousands+of+CCTV+cameras,+yet+80per+cent25+of+crime+unsolved/article.do>

prosecuted for incitement to murder relating to statements he had made.<sup>68</sup> 14 years later Omar Bakri left Britain of his own accord without being prosecuted for his incitement to murder. During this time he had founded two organisations with links to terrorism.

## 5. Pull out of ECHR

By incorporating the European Convention on Human Rights into British law the Government put the right of hate preachers and foreign criminals to not be deported to unsavoury regimes ahead of British citizens' right to be protected from these hate preachers and foreign criminals. The Government must put the right of Britons to protection above that of foreign criminals to sanctuary. If anything, this would reduce legal costs that taxpayers are forced to pay.

## 6. Ban Hizb ut Tahrir

The Government promised to do this as Point 9 of their 12 Point Terror Plan. It is time they did so. Preaching the violent overthrow of British Middle Eastern allies and their replacement by an Islamic Caliphate dedicated to conquer the world poses a clear threat to the long term security of this country and the integration of British Muslims into Britain. Needless to say, the cost would be negligible.

## 4. Conclusion

The stakes couldn't be higher in the debate over terrorism and the appropriate response. The public are right to be concerned about the threat of a further terrorist attack, but at the same time, they don't wish for their long-standing civil liberties to be undermined by the extension of Big Brother Government. Rather than erode these liberties further, the Government should move towards more targeted action which would not only be more effective, but would also prevent a huge waste of taxpayers' money.

---

<sup>68</sup> House of Commons Hansard, 6 March 2001, col 150  
<http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:zYBmFMCNZKoJ:www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199091/cmhansrd/1991-03-06/Writtens-1.html+the+cost+of+omar+bakri+mohammed&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=14&gl=uk>



To discuss the research, please contact the authors:

**Glyn Gaskarth**

Policy Analyst, The TaxPayers' Alliance  
[glyn.gaskarth@taxpayersalliance.com](mailto:glyn.gaskarth@taxpayersalliance.com), 07920 245 453

**Nicholas Connor**

Policy Analyst, The TaxPayers' Alliance  
[nicholas.connor@taxpayersalliance.com](mailto:nicholas.connor@taxpayersalliance.com), 07936 770 664

To arrange broadcast interviews, please contact:

**Mark Wallace**

Campaign Director, The TaxPayers' Alliance  
[mark.wallace@taxpayersalliance.com](mailto:mark.wallace@taxpayersalliance.com); 07736 009 548