

# **RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE**

*A JOURNAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC RESISTANCE*

*OCTOBER 2012*

---

## **CONTENTS**

### **EDITORIAL**

**THE COMMONING OF THE LAW  
'TERRORISM' AND THE WAR ON DISSENT**

---

**FIGHTING 'TERRORISM' OR REPRESSING DEMOCRACY? BRITAIN'S  
SYSTEM OF MASS SURVEILLANCE**

*Dr. Paul Anderson; Global Research*

**BRZEZINSKI: "POPULIST RESISTANCE" IS DERAILING THE NEW WORLD  
ORDER**

*The European Union Times; via Martin Crutwell*

**SMARTWORLD - IDENTITY ECOSYSTEM - PART 2: IDENTITY PROFILING**

*Julie Beal; Activist Post*

**WARNING OVER SECRET DATABASE FEATURING 8M CHILDREN**

*Graeme Paton, Education Editor, Daily Telegraph; via John Newell*

**FLAT PACK DEMOCRACY ....THIS COULD BE THE ANSWER YOUR  
COMMUNITY IS SEEKING**

*from Jimmy Devlin; North West Tenants*

**AN INTERVIEW WITH CONRAD JAEGER - WHAT IS "THE DEEP WEB"?**

*From Nathan Allonby*

**POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN**

*Positive Money Team*

# EDITORIAL

## THE COMMONING OF THE LAW

The recent Quilligan Seminars and New Putney Debates have brought consideration of the the Commons back to the fore. The idea of the Commons or the Common Weal pre-dates modern concepts of socialism ... certainly in any sense of state socialism which, to a degree, hijacked the idea of the Commons ... by many centuries. Indeed, the origins of the Commons can be traced back into the mists of tribal Europe and beyond.

I am also encouraged to see that a new generation of activists are taking an interest in the true nature, origin and purpose of Common Law. This may ... hopefully ... be a fortuitous collision of priorities.

There are several essential elements to Common Law. Firstly, that the state, indeed any public authority, is subject to law and not above law. This stands in contrast to the central dictum of Roman Law that law is the king/prince/fuhrer speaking. In the Charter of Liberties (1101), The Magna Carta (1215) and the Declaration and Bill of Rights (1688/9), the Crown submitted to law.

Secondly, that there is a single law applying to the whole realm and to be adjudicated by independent circuit judges. This is the central theme of the Assize of Clarendon (1166).

Thirdly, that law should properly be rooted in natural justice and morality. In 1189 *lex non scripta*, or unwritten law, defined as 'that law which existed from before the time of memory' was granted equal status as statute law.

Fourthly, Common Law is to be governed by the jury system.

### Jury Nullification

In the famous Bonham's Case (1610) Sir Edward Coke, one of the greatest of our justices, had ruled that if a statute was 'above common right and reason, repugnant, ... or impossible to perform ... ' then that statute would be ' ... void and without force.' He was citing earlier authorities such as Bereford, and in turn was to be cited, amongst many others (and we might include any number of rebel causes, including many Founding Fathers of the USA) by John Lilburne, in his treason trial in 1649.

Coke's message was simple. Law must be rooted in the higher authority of natural justice and morality. If any statute is not so rooted then the legitimacy of that statute comes into question.

This vital element has been lost with the progressive ingress of Legal Positivism (a law is a law because the state so decrees), and Roman Law (often in the form of so-called 'administrative law') into our system ... a process vastly accelerated by our involvement with the European Project.

In fact a jury is sovereign. A jury can come to any decision it pleases, for any reason it pleases, and is answerable to no-one. For this reason a jury is (or ought to be!) able to determine not merely the facts against the accused, but whether the law itself, either in the specific circumstances of the case in question or as a matter of general principle is just, reasonable and proportionate. Members of the legal profession may shake their heads and click their tongues at what they describe as 'perverse verdicts', but that is how it should be.

However, no jury will ever be told of that power in summing up. The establishment does not like the idea of the law itself being put on trial. Indeed, there have been a number

of establishment efforts over at the the last 30 years to severely curtail, or even abolish. trial by jury. This has included proposals that juries should only be permitted to pass narrative verdicts, giving full explanations of their decisions.

It is therefore not surprising that instances of Jury nullification are rare. Perhaps the last example on the UK was the acquittal in 1996, against the evidence, of four Greenpeace campaigners for criminal damage to a Hawk jet bound for Indonesia. There have been a few recent examples in the USA, for example of aquittal for the medical possession of cannabis, reported in Activist Post.

The central question is from where does authority derive its legitimacy and to whom does the law belong? The fact is that, were Common Law functioning properly, jury nullification, ... instances where the moral imperative outweighs the statutory letter ... might well be a much more frequent event.

There can be no more fundamental component of the Commons than the law itself ... that all authority emanates, not from any political, legal or administrative High Priesthood, but from the sovereignty of the people ourselves. The restoration of full jury powers ... that the people through their peers on a jury ... determine what is just, reasonable and proportionate not simply on the facts but on the law, must rank high in any priorities for the Commons to take control.

## 'TERRORISM' AND THE WAR ON DISSENT

Dr Paul Anderson's article once again underscores the danger presented by the Orwellian mass--surveillance panopticon being introduced under the guise of some so-called War on Terror ... what he characterises as, '*... a climate of fear and obsession with security, which is itself a veiled form of permanent terror.*' Although a lengthy article, it is well worth absorbing.

He cites Stella Rimington's candid observation that we are now living in a police state, as well as the concerns of Charles Clarke. It is always so easy to be wise after leaving office!

Dr Anderson highlights a useful differentiation between 'retail' and 'wholesale' terrorism. He compares the domestic fatalities in the present War of Terror to the numbers killed by bee stings. Indeed we might compare that three-score total with the more than 60,000 who died as a result of German bombing during World War II, and the near 4000 victims in Northern Ireland since the early 1970's.

Of greatest concern is the drift in the definition of terrorism. No longer is violence, or the intention of causing violence, a necessary condition of 'terrorism'. All that is required is 'disruptive behaviour'. This definition, together with the definition of what constitutes an 'emergency' ... thus enabling ministers to govern by decree, in a manner reminiscent of Hitler's Enabling Act ... is highly subjective. As is so often the case this new dispensation is reflective of EU policy, law, and corporate rhetoric.

It might be added, as has been remarked before in these pages, that this in turn is reflective of the new dispensation in 'insulting behaviour'. No longer is there any need to prove intent to incite violence or disorder. It is now sufficient that a party merely feels insulted or distressed. Again this might often be a highly subjective matter, and potentially open to any amount of malicious manipulation.

The case of John Terry typifies the situation. Had Terry said what he is alleged to have

said over the stadium tannoy, there might well have been good reason to arraign him in the dock.

However the mere expression of any view or opinion, however obnoxious or unpleasant, should not of itself be cause for prosecution unless there is also the intention to provoke violence or disorder ... a position expressed consistently by Peter Tatchell amongst others. This redefinition of 'terrorism' and 'insulting behaviour' directly opens the doors to the curtailment of free speech. That, in turn, opens a major front in the War on Dissent.

*Frank Taylor*

## **FIGHTING 'TERRORISM' OR REPRESSING DEMOCRACY? BRITAIN'S SYSTEM OF MASS SURVEILLANCE**

*Dr. Paul Anderson; Global Research*

Url of this article: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/fighting-terrorism-or-repressing-democracy-britains-system-of-mass-surveillance/5311802>

The focus of critiques of authoritarianism today lies increasingly in the use by liberal governments of 'exceptional' powers. These are powers in which an imminent threat to national security is judged to be of such importance as to warrant the restriction of liberties and other socially repressive measures in order to protect national security. 'Terrorism' has offered a particularly salient source of justification for a level of social repression that would be intolerable in normal times. A dominant line of criticism is that the use of exceptional powers to this end has gone too far. Critics emphasise the need to curtail such power by bringing it into line with basic human rights standards.[1]

As pertinent as this critique may be, focus on the proper extent of the social repression tends to assume, Scheuerman, Herman and Peterson point out, that there is a real threat (e.g., terrorism) and that repression by an expansion of executive authority is itself an appropriate response to that threat.[2] A less noticed yet critical feature of governments' use of anti-terror power is the prior erosion of democratic oversight and control which has enabled repression to appear a plausible response to what is, in many respects, an as yet unspecified threat.[3]

The erosion is essentially three-pronged. The first aspect of democratic control to have been eroded is the power to define what constitutes a threat. In the absence of meaningful control, governments are able, Clive Walker explains, to ascribe to whatever political violence is being encountered, attributes of novelty and extraordinary seriousness so as to justify correspondingly alarming incursions into individuals rights and democratic accountability.[4]

Governments are able to do so in no small part because of the semantic fog that surrounds the core concepts of national security, threat and terrorism by which exceptional powers are usually evoked. Terrorism, for instance, is a concept that resists consistent definition.[5] Commonly understood by governments as the use or threat of use of serious violence to advance a cause, the term elides legitimate resistance to occupation and oppression with 'senseless destruction'. Furthermore, by relegating all terrorists to the criminal sphere, the term delegitimises any political content that acts regarded by authorities as terrorist may have. This helps to obscure from the public the reasons why people resort to such acts.[6] It also enables the police character of the proper response to be presumed.

This brings us to the second aspect of democratic control to have been eroded, namely, the power to determine proper responses to threats. Responses are deemed automatically to require a dramatic expansion in the scope of executive authority, a requirement that is heightened the more an atmosphere of fear can be created such as by declaring a 'war on terror'.[7] This response is alarming, Walker suggests, because governments may assume repressive powers unimaginable outwith dictatorial states. In Britain, for example, these now include powers to curtail critical liberties (e.g., speech, movement, assembly, protest, work, privacy), suspend habeas corpus and use armed forces to deal with domestic disturbances – all on the basis of 'threats' which the government assumes the power to define.[8]

The third aspect of the erosion concerns the capacity to review the use of both powers. Incursions into democratic accountability include, Walker continues, growing immunity from parliamentary and judicial control in the exercise of these powers.[9] It goes without saying, Girvan LJ points out, that the “dangers to the integrity of society and of citizens’ lives” of undermining accountability in the use of exceptional powers were “amply demonstrated in the Fascist and totalitarian regimes of Europe”.[10]

In short, the reported terrorism crisis is also part of an ongoing actual crisis of democracy.

A case in point is the British government’s plans to monitor the entire population’s electronic communication on grounds that this is ‘necessary to fight serious crime and terrorism’.[11] Criticism of the plans is various and detailed, and has centred on the invasion of privacy.[12] Many regard plans for intensified surveillance as a ‘snooper’s charter’. This is because they mandate a shift from monitoring communications on the basis of individual suspicion to the indiscriminate stockpiling of individual data – essentially blanket surveillance of the population – for a future unspecified purpose.

As pertinent as the objection may be, limiting criticism to the extent of the government’s response leaves unquestioned the plausibility of the alleged threat and the merits of expanding executive power as a proper response to that threat. It would be useful to broaden criticism to take account of how the threat has been defined, and the proper response to it determined. To do so, it must look deeper into the extent to which democratic control has been eroded, as this is an obstacle to any viable opposition to mass surveillance and related socially repressive measures. Doing so would enable criticism to cast into sharp relief some of the most pressing questions concerning democracy and liberty in our times.

As part of a more precise characterisation of the erosion of democratic control, it would also be useful to see outlined some legally relevant aspects of this process, particularly given that legal challenge is likely if the government’s surveillance plans become law. Three aspects stand out. They follow from the fact that because mass surveillance would breach of peoples’ right to privacy guaranteed inter alia under the European Convention on Human Rights, the onus will be on the government to demonstrate that this breach is nonetheless justifiable. To do so, the government must show that mass surveillance is (a) necessary in a democratic society for (b) the achievement of a legitimate end and (c) is proportionate to that end. The more any legal challenge takes account of the wider decline of democratic control, the less likely it is that the government should be able to show, in each of these three respects, that mass surveillance is justified.

### ***Legitimate end?***

An example of a significant end that could justify breaching the right to privacy may be reasons of national security. Since fighting terrorism is such a reason, mass surveillance could, according to official views in Britain and the EU, be justified as a way of preventing acts or threats intended to influence the government or intimidate the public which, for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause, are violent, damaging or disrupting and which include those that seriously destabilise the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country.[13]

Two difficulties undermine the idea that ‘fighting terrorism’ might serve as a legitimate end by which to justify mass surveillance.

### ***Repressing democracy***

The first difficulty is a growing tendency to expand the use of anti-terror powers from suspects to the public, especially certain non-violent social movements.[14] This problem is made possible by the breadth of official definitions of terrorism: the very purpose of many social movements is to ‘influence governments’ by means such as protest which is by definition ‘disruptive’. Particularly targeted are movements from environmental to social movements such as Occupy which are unified by resistance to the kind of ‘destabilisation of basic political, constitutional, economic and social structures’ that, it is claimed, follows from re-organisation of society around the market, in particular, financial markets.[15] The problem for government lies in showing how repressing popular democratic expression in this way – a litmus test for the democratic constitutional state, according to Jürgen Habermas[16] – could possibly be a legitimate end in a democratic society. This problem turns not only on a definition of terrorism that is sufficiently broad to permit authorities to generalise suspicion, criminalise certain behaviour and sanction surveillance and preventative detention. The problem also turns, more fundamentally, as is explained below, on a basic incoherence in the government’s view of democracy itself.

### ***Involvement in terrorism***

Even if it can be somehow shown that repressing democratic expression is legitimate in a

democracy, a second difficulty lies in the government's involvement in terrorism, as defined. The definition preferred by government is sufficiently broad to capture two forms of terrorism with which it has involvement. For the sake of simplicity, these may be regarded, following Edward Herman, as 'retail' and 'wholesale' forms.[17]

'Retail terrorism' refers to individuals and small groups which are typically responsible for several hundred to several thousand casualties per year worldwide.[18] Recent analysis reveals involvement by successive British governments in financing, the training of, and logistical support and component supply for many groups.[19] Analysis suggests that involvement is motivated chiefly by ideological causes (a) of maintaining influence in world affairs, which helps explain why involvement centres on resource-rich and strategically useful countries, and (b) of protecting that influence from threats, which helps explain why support is given to groups in those countries unified by a common hostility to popular democracy, socialism and national secularism.[20]

'Wholesale terrorism' refers to the activities of major institutions capable of far greater harm such as states which, Mark Curtis explains, are "responsible for far more deaths in many more countries than [retail] terrorism".[21] Government involvement in wholesale terrorism is widespread.[22] Two areas stand out. The first is repressive geo-strategic foreign policy. Motivated by similar ideological aims of maintaining influence and of enabling concentrations of private power to shape foreign economic affairs, repressive foreign policy from Malaya, Kenya and Iran to more recent examples such as Chechnya and Iraq has ranged from illegal sanctions and covert operations to active support for other government's violence.[23] Since World War II, it is possible to attribute, Curtis continues, several million deaths to such policies.[24] It is also possible to attribute to them an appreciable if unsurprising escalation in the risk of (retail) terrorism – a risk heightened where local resistance is criminalised and denied restitution.[25]

The second area in which the government has involvement lies in domestic policies which permit, rather than (say) criminalise, wholesale harms from private power itself. Permitted for similar ideological reasons, harms include (a) the 'destabilisation of the basic structures' of entire countries by financial institutions such as by means of induced crises forcing 'austerity' onto sovereign nations; (b) the 'intimidation' of governments by multinational corporations in order to drive political change to provide suitable investment climates by means of capital flight, investment strike and attacks on currencies; and (c) various kinds of direct 'violence and damage' to people, property and planet.[26]

Taken together, the problem the government would face is to justify mass surveillance as means of fighting terrorism in light of mounting evidence that certain forms are permitted, supported, created and perpetrated.

### ***Proportionate?***

Even if a legitimate end can be established, doubts arise about whether surveillance is proportionate to that end.

### ***A selective response?***

It is unclear why, when appeasement characterises government policy to (much) wholesale terrorism in ways indicated above, the comparatively limited effects of retail terrorism – in the range of up to several thousand casualties per annum worldwide – should warrant such pervasive and repressive domestic measures as mass surveillance.

A crude comparison with resources devoted to public survival elsewhere may be instructive. The current expenditure on counter-terrorism measures of some £3 billion per annum[27] and an annualised average death rate in Britain attributed to terrorism of five – a number that compares with those killed by wasp and bee stings and is one-sixth of the number of people who drown in the bath each year, – amounts roughly to £60 million per fatality.[28] In contrast, at £18.2 billion government spending on cardiovascular disease healthcare and research, which kills some 250,000 people annually, works out roughly at £7-10,000 per fatality.[29] Similar figures are found for annual deaths from cancer (150,000), air pollution (39,000; much of it from traffic) and traffic accidents (3,000).[30] Although the comparison is crude, it follows at least that even a small increase in efforts to combat these and other serious non-terrorist threats would, Thomas Pogge explains, do much more to protect public survival, at lower cost, than would escalating a fight against an unspecified, perhaps unspecifiable, threat.[31]

### ***Advancing the goals of terrorism?***

A further problem lies in ways in which mass surveillance advances the apparent aims of certain retail terrorists. These aims, as former Home Office secretary, Charles Clarke declared to the European

Parliament, are to destroy “many hard-fought rights [such] as the right to privacy [and] the right to free speech”. Mass surveillance undermines these rights – and thus appears disproportionate – because it obliterates any distinction between law-abiding and law-breaking citizens: every citizen is to be treated like a potential criminal to be monitored without warrant or reason.

The suspicion of disproportionality deepens in light of two wider, disturbing incursions into individual rights and democratic accountability with which surveillance plans are linked. The first concerns wider surveillance measures developed by the EU to create a database on all European citizens.[32] The aim, as an EU Council Presidency paper makes plain, is to create a detailed digital record... [of] every object the individual uses, every transaction they make and almost everywhere they go.[33]

The second incursion follows from the ever-increasing scope of executive power. Incursions, to expand upon some already indicated, follow from the executive's

- power to curtail critical liberties, suspend habeas corpus and use armed forces to deal with domestic disturbances;
- growing immunity from parliamentary and judicial control in the exercise of these powers; and
- power, reminiscent of the German Enabling Act 1933, to amend and repeal almost any legislation, subject to vague and entirely subjective restraints, by decree and without recourse to Parliament – such as might render legal the government's involvement with the US in abduction, torture and assassination.[34]

Such is the extent of these incursions into ‘hard-fought’ individual rights and democratic accountability that former MI5 chief, Stella Rimington, concedes that, unbeknown to much of the public, Britain appears to have been turned into a police state.[35] If one adds to these incursions the proposed surveillance, then it is difficult to escape the conclusion, Curtis continues, that the greater threat to the public, to its liberty and to what remains of democracy lies in “the policies of our own government”. This outcome appears a qualified victory for certain terrorists. For they have, Jean Baudrillard notes, induced in the West a climate of fear and obsession with security, which is itself a veiled form of permanent terror.[36]

### ***A proportionate response***

This idea of ‘fighting terrorism’ by means which actually advance its alleged aims should be contrasted with more mature responses such as that of Norway. Barely five days after Anders Breivik murdered 77 people, the Norwegian prime minister responded not by cracking down on civil liberties but by a pledge not to allow a fanatic to succeed in eroding Norway's democracy: the Norwegian response to violence is more democracy, more openness and greater political participation.[37]

### ***Necessary in a democratic society?***

Even if mass surveillance might be proportionate to a legitimate end, it must also be shown to be necessary in a democratic society. Problems here are both specific and general in nature.

### ***Specific difficulties***

While mass surveillance may well help fight serious crime and terrorism, this does not mean that it is necessary to that end. It merely means that it is expedient to that end. To claim that mass surveillance is necessary implies that these problems could not be resolved unless it were imposed. This assumes that the police would be ineffective without it. The assumption is difficult to sustain for two reasons. First, mass surveillance is proposed at time when killings and related serious crime are fewer than at any time in almost thirty years[38] and when, according to the Home Office, “counter-terrorism work has made significant progress over the last ten years” to such an extent that “al Qa’ida”, for instance “is weaker than at any time since 9/11”. [39] Second, it is already quite possible with proper permission and oversight to monitor people suspected of terrorism and serious crimes. Consequently, the claim to be unable to deal with serious crime and terrorism except by removing what remains of personal privacy seems at best an admission of incompetence.

In any case, the government's involvement in terrorism undermines the argument for necessity. It is actively preventing the achievement of the declared legitimate end (fighting terrorism) for which surveillance is supposedly necessary means. If the government were at all serious about fighting terrorism then it should, as Chomsky remarks, first stop participating in it.

## **General difficulties**

Proving the necessity of mass surveillance requires, Keith Ewing explains, a “theory of democracy by which to determine whether a restriction on a [European] Convention [on Human Rights] right can be justified”.<sup>[40]</sup> A problem lies in the fact that, as Girvan LJ suggests, mass surveillance, while acceptable with totalitarian regimes, is antithetical to a democratic society. It is antithetical because, as the House of Lords Constitution Committee explains, since privacy is an essential pre-requisite to the exercise of individual freedom, its erosion weakens the constitutional foundations on which democracy... ha[s] traditionally been based.<sup>[41]</sup>

The difficulty of formulating a theory of democracy by which the breach of privacy may be justified deepens in light of incoherence in the government’s view of democracy. The incoherence may be observed in the argument for exceptional powers in general and for mass surveillance in particular. It is an argument, Tony Bunyan notes, that assumes that “everyone accepts that the “threats” which the government proclaims are real and that addressing them requires incursions into civil liberty and democratic accountability.<sup>[42]</sup> It follows that if national security requires, Bunyan continues, that the state

*sets the limits, boundaries and sanctions of all peoples’ actions [including peoples’ telecommunication, then] there can be no individual freedom, except that sanctioned by the state.<sup>[43]</sup>*

This is to say that when the state assumes exclusive power to define the nature of a threat, and the appropriate means to deal with that threat, it may also define the extent of individual liberty. Individual freedom becomes at most little more than a discretionary grant subject to executive will; at worst, national ‘security’ becomes code for social repression.

In a framework in which the state determines which liberties to grant to which individuals, political liberty is effectively possessed by the state. The source of sovereignty resides in the state, much as it did for Hobbes, rather than in the individual. As Karma Nabulsi explains, this kind of ‘social contract’ affirms a theory of state, but it is far from a democratic one.<sup>[44]</sup> Elementary to a nominally democratic social contract (or similar democratic model) such as those expressed by the likes of J.S. Mill, Kant and Rousseau is the view that protection of citizens’ liberty, particularly political liberty, is a supreme good. In this contract, the sovereign citizen does not surrender sovereignty, but instead delegates specific powers and functions to the state. Because political sovereignty is not transferred to the state, both civil rights and political liberties are inalienable. These include the right to define the public good and threats to it, the right to deliberate and determine laws including those which address threats, and the right to adequately review both.

Genuine democratic governance would by definition structure political power toward the public good. It would do so in part by encouraging, rather than excluding, considered public participation in the definition and determination of the public good. An essential preliminary to this would be to prevent those who benefit from social repression from exerting undue influence on the exercise of that power. A particular priority would therefore be to dismantle the growing union of state and private power – some harmful consequences of which have been observed (see ‘legitimate end’). In their place would appear viable and legitimate ways and means of addressing violence, of which Norway’s response appears one example.<sup>[45]</sup> In short, such governance would mean that the reported crisis of terrorism would no longer automatically mean an actual crisis of democracy.

*Dr Paul Anderson is a philosopher, lawyer and ecologist with interests in contemporary public and environmental concerns. His book, *Critical Thought for Turbulent Times: Reforming Law and Economy for a Sustainable Earth* (Routledge), is forthcoming. Details about his research, advocacy and consultancy are available at [www.chapter5.org.uk](http://www.chapter5.org.uk).*

## **References**

- [1] HRW. 2011. ‘UK – proposed counterterrorism reforms fall short: authorities should rely on criminal prosecution to combat terrorism’, Human Rights Watch, 11 February; see also Protection of Freedoms Bill 2011-12, Liberty.
- [2] Scheuerman, W. 2002. ‘Rethinking crisis government’, *Constellations*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 492-505; Herman, E. and D. Peterson. 2008. ‘There is no ‘war on terror’’, ZNet, 17 January.
- [3] For general comment, see, for example, Kolin, A. 2011. *State Power and Democracy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; European Association of Lawyers for Democracy and World Human Rights, 2005. ‘Suspect Communities: The Real “War on Terror” in Europe’ (Proceedings of the Conference), International Conference held at London Metropolitan University, 21 May; Gearty, C. 1997. *The Future of Terrorism*. London: Phoenix; Lobel, J. 1989. ‘Emergency power and the decline of liberalism’. *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 98, no. 7, pp. 1385-1433.
- [4] Walker, C. 2009. ‘Book review: Executive measures, terrorism and national security: have the rules of the game changed? by David Bonner’, *European Public Law*, vol. 15, pp. 662-665.



- [5] Meisels, T. 2009. 'Defining terrorism – a typology'. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 331-51; see also Schechter, D. 2012. 'When is a terrorist no longer a terrorist?' *Global Research*, 24 September.
- [6] Milne, S. 2001. 'Terror and tyranny: What powerful states call terrorism may be an inevitable response to injustice', *The Guardian*, 25 October.
- [7] See, for example, Curtis, A. 2004. *The Power of Nightmares: the Rise of the Politics of Fear*.
- [8] See, for example, Walker, C. 2011. *Terrorism and the Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Head, M. 2010. 'Calling out the troops and the Civil Contingencies Act: some questions of concern'. *Public Law*, April, pp. 340-61; Rayner, J. 2012. 'Secret courts 'will conceal UK complicity in torture'', *The Law Society Gazette*, 12 September. See also generally, *the Convention of Modern Liberty*.
- [9] Walker, *Terrorism and the Law*, and 'Book Review' (above).
- [10] *Girvan LJ, R A's Application [2010] NIQB 99 at §1*.
- [11] On the draft Communications Data Bill, see, for example, Editorial, 2012. 'After the Queen's speech: who will speak for liberty now? A blanket licence for electronic monitoring could slowly strangle private life', *The Guardian*, 11 May. On grounds for the Bill, see, for example, 'Theresa May sets out plans to monitor internet use in the UK', *BBC News online*, 14 June 2012.
- [12] See, for example, Liberty, 2012. 'Liberty's Submission to the Joint Committee on the Draft Communications Data Bill', August; Bernal, P. 2012. 'The draft Communications Bill and the ECHR' *UK Const. L. Blog*, 11 July (available at <http://ukconstitutionalaw.org>) and generally, the *Surveillance Studies Network*.
- [13] See, for example, the European Union Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism (2002/475/JHA) and the UK Terrorism Act 2000 (as amended).
- [14] Evans, R. and P. Lewis. 2009. 'Civil servants attacked for using anti-terror laws to spy on public', *The Guardian*, 28 February; Anon. 2002. 'Anarchists to be targeted as 'terrorists' alongside Al Qaeda', *Statewatch*, 25 February.
- [15] On the use of emergency power against social movements, see, for example, Cunningham, D. 2007. 'Surveillance and social movements: Lenses on the repression-mobilization nexus'. *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 120-125; Welsh, I. 2007. 'In defence of civilisation: terrorism and environmental politics in the 21st Century'. *Environmental Politics*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 356-75; Hyland, J. 2007. 'Britain: Police use anti-terror powers against environmental protest'. *World Socialist Web Site*, 16 August; Chomsky, N. 2007. 'Democracy promotion at home' in *Failed States*. London: Penguin; Bunyan, T. 2002. *The war on freedom and democracy: an analysis of the effects on civil liberties and democratic culture in the EU*, *Statewatch*. For a classic statement on the re-organisation of society around markets, see Polanyi, K. 2001 [1944]. *The Great Transformation: Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press; see also, for example, Wolin, S. 2008. *Democracy Inc.: Managed Democracy and the Spectre of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [16] Habermas, J. 1985. 'Civil disobedience: Litmus test for a democratic constitutional state'. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, vol. 30, pp. 95-116.
- [17] Herman, E. 1996. 'Terrorism: the struggle against closure'. Martin, B (ed.) *Confronting the Experts*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 77-97.
- [18] Smyth, M. et al. 2008. 'Critical terrorism studies – an introduction'. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1-4; see also Mueller, J. and M. Stewart. 2012. 'The terrorism delusion: America's overwrought response to September 11'. *International Security*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 81-110.
- [19] Curtis, M. 2012. *Secret Affairs: Britain's Collusion with Radical Islam* (2nd ed.). London: Profile Books. Support includes indirect supply, such as coalition forces in Iraq allowing systematic looting of Iraq's nuclear facilities previously monitored by the IAEA (Penketh, A. 2004. 'Nuclear material has 'gone missing' since war'. *The Independent*, 13 October). See also Anderson, P. 2004. 'Governance by universal justice or serial warfare?' *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 143-154.
- [20] Curtis, M. 2010. 'Interview: Colluding with extremists'. *New Left Project*, 8 March.
- [21] Curtis, M. 2004. *Unpeople: Britain's Secret Human Rights Abuses*. London: Vintage; Curtis, M. 2003. *Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World*, London: Vintage; Chomsky, N. 2002. 'Who are the global terrorists?' in Booth, K. and T. Dunne (eds.) *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; Chomsky, N. 2000. *Rogue States: the Rule of Force in World Affairs*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- [22] Curtis, *Secret Affairs*; Stohl, M. and G. Lopez (eds.) 1984. *The State as Terrorist: The Dynamics of Governmental Violence and Repression*. Westport, CT: Greenwood; Herman, E. 1982. *The Real Terror Network: Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- [23] MediaLens, 2007. 'The media ignore credible poll revealing 1.2 million violent deaths in Iraq'. *MediaLens*, 18 September; Curtis, M., 2003. 'British state terror'. *Red Pepper*, July; Chomsky, N. 2003. 'Wars of terror'. *New Political Science*, March; Mueller, J. and K. Mueller, 1999. 'Sanctions of mass destruction'. *Foreign Affairs*, May/June.
- [24] Curtis, *Unpeople*.
- [25] On policies escalating the risk of (retail) terrorism, see, for example, Anon., 2010. 'Iraq inquiry: ex-MI5 boss says war raised terror threat'. *BBC News Online*, 28 July. See also Silke, A. 2005. 'Fire of Iolous. The role of state countermeasures in causing terrorism and what needs to be done' in T. Bjørge (ed.) *Root causes of terrorism. Myths, reality and ways forward*. London: Routledge. Among examples of the continued denial of restitution, see, for example, Dowell, K. 2012. 'Matrix and Doughty Street win latest victory for Mau Mau Kenyans'. *The Lawyer*, 5 October.
- [26] For accounts of various forms of intimidation, destabilisation and harm from private power, see, for example, Chernomas, R. and I. Hudson, 2008. *Social Murder: and other Shortcomings of Conservative Economics*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Arbeiter Ring; Klein, N., 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: the Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. London: Penguin; Perkins, J. 2005. *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*. London: Ebury Press. Palast, G. 2001. 'The globalizer who came in from the cold', 10 October; McMurtry, J. 2002. *Value Wars: the Global Market versus the Life Economy*. London: Verso; Punch, M., 2000. 'Suite violence: when managers murder and corporations kill'. *Crime, Law & Social Change*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 243-80; Gill, S., 1995. 'Globalisation, market civilisation and disciplinary neoliberalism'. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, vol. 24, pp. 339-423. See also 'Discover the dark side of investment', *Transnational Institute*

(2012).

[27] Anon. 2009. 'Anti-terror spending to rise £1bn'. BBC News Online, 9 October.

[28] Beckford, M. 2012. 'Bee stings killed as many in UK as terrorists, says watchdog'. Daily Telegraph, 28 June; see also see also Mueller and Stewart, 2012. 'The Terrorism Delusion'.

[29] On government healthcare spending, see, for example, Luengo-Fernández, R. et al., 2006. 'Cost of cardiovascular diseases in the United Kingdom'. *Heart*, vol. 92, no. 10, pp. 1384–1389. On government research spending, see, for example, Luengo-Fernández, R. et al., 2012. 'UK research expenditure on dementia, heart disease, stroke and cancer: are levels of spending related to disease burden?' *European Journal of Neurology*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 149-54.

[30] See, for example, Pogge, T. 2008. 'Making war on terrorists – reflections on harming the innocent'. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1-25; Monbiot, G. 2005. 'Will they never stand up to carmakers and save our lungs?'. *The Guardian*, 1 November.

[31] Pogge, 'Making war on terrorists'. See also Frank, E. 2005. 'Funding the public health response to terrorism'. *British Medical Journal*, vol. 331 (7516), pp. 526-7.

[32] Bunyan, T. 2009. 'The surveillance society is an EU-wide issue: The EU's new five-year plan for justice and home affairs will export the UK's database state to the rest of the EU'. *The Guardian*, 28 May.

[33] Cited in Bunyan, T. 2008. 'The Shape of Things to Come'. *Statewatch* (September), pp. 1, 55. See also generally *Statewatch Observatory on Surveillance in Europe*.

[34] Rayner, 'Secret courts 'will conceal UK complicity in torture'', *Law Society Gazette*. See also generally, Hosenball, M. 2011. 'Secret panel can put Americans on 'kill list''. *Reuters*, 5 October; Greenwald, G. 2012. 'Obama moves to make war on terror permanent'. *The Guardian*, 24 October; and the *Convention of Modern Liberty*.

[35] Booth, J. 2009. 'Ex-spy chief Dame Stella Rimington says ministers have turned UK into police state'. *The Times*, 17 February.

[36] Baudrillard, J. 2002. *The Spirit of Terrorism and Requiem for the Twin Towers*. London: Verso; see also the notion of 'security theatre'.

[37] Pidd, H. and J. Meikle. 2011. 'Norway will not be intimidated by terror attacks, vows prime minister: Jens Stoltenberg condemned Anders Behring Breivik's brutal assault and said country 'would stand firm in defending values''. *The Guardian*, 27 July.

[38] Office for National Statistics. 2012. *Crime in England and Wales, Quarterly First Release to March 2012*. UK Government, 19 July.

[39] Home Office. 'CONTEST: Counter-terrorism Strategy'. UK Government (accessed 12 November 2012).

[40] Ewing, K. 2000. 'The politics of the British constitution' *Public Law* (Autumn), p. 433.

[41] House of Lords Constitution Committee. 2009. *Surveillance: Citizens and the State*, UK Parliament, §14.

[42] Bunyan, 'The Shape of Things to Come, p. 36-7.

[43] Bunyan, 'The Shape of Things to Come, p. 7. See also De Graaf, B. and B. de Graaf. 2010. 'Bringing politics back in: the introduction of the 'performative power' of counterterrorism'. *Critical Terrorism Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 264.

[44] Nabulsi, K., 2006. 'Don't sign up to this upside down Hobbesian contract: The government insists it can only protect us if we surrender freedoms, but such a grim pact has no place in a democracy'. *The Guardian*, 22 March.

[45] Martin, B. 2006. 'Instead of Repression'. *Social Alternatives*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 62-66. See also, for example, *Building Bridges for Peace*.

# **BRZEZINSKI: “POPULIST RESISTANCE” IS DERAILING THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

*The European Union Times; via Martin Crutwell*

During a recent speech in Poland, former US National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski warned fellow elitists that a worldwide “resistance” movement to “external control” driven by “populist activism” is threatening to derail the move towards a new world order.

Calling the notion that the 21st century is the American century a “shared delusion,” Brzezinski stated that American domination was no longer possible because of an accelerating social change driven by “instant mass communications such as radio, television and the Internet,” which have been cumulatively stimulating “a universal awakening of mass political consciousness.”

The former US National Security Advisor added that this “rise in worldwide populist activism is proving inimical to external domination of the kind that prevailed in the age of colonialism and imperialism.”

Brzezinski concluded that “persistent and highly motivated populist resistance of politically awakened and historically resentful peoples to external control has proven to be increasingly difficult to suppress.”

Although Brzezinski delivered his comments in a neutral tone, the context of the environment in which he said them allied to his previous statements would indicate that this is not a celebration of “populist resistance” but a lament at the impact it is having on the kind of “external control” Brzezinski has repeatedly advocated.

The remarks were made at an event for the European Forum For New Ideas (EFNI), an organization that advocates the transformation of the European Union into an anti-democratic federal superstate, the very type

of bureaucratic “external control” Brzezinski stressed was in jeopardy in his lecture.

In this context, it must be understood that Brzezinski’s point about “populist resistance” being a major hindrance to the imposition of a new world order is more of a warning than an acclamation.

Also consider what Brzezinski wrote in his book *Between Two Ages: America’s Role in the Technotronic Era*, in which he advocated the control of populations by an elite political class via technotronic manipulation.

“The technotronic era involves the gradual appearance of a more controlled society. Such a society would be dominated by an elite, unrestrained by traditional values. Soon it will be possible to assert almost continuous surveillance over every citizen and maintain up-to-date complete files containing even the most personal information about the citizen. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities,” wrote Brzezinski.

“In the technotronic society the trend would seem to be towards the aggregation of the individual support of millions of uncoordinated citizens, easily within the reach of magnetic and attractive personalities exploiting the latest communications techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason,” he wrote in the same book.

Brzezinski’s sudden concern about the impact of a politically awakened global population isn’t born out of any notion that he identifies with their cause. Brzezinski is the ultimate elitist insider, the founder of the powerful Trilateral Commission, a Council on Foreign Relations luminary and a regular Bilderberg attendee. He was once described by President Barack Obama as “one of our most outstanding thinkers”.

This is by no means the first time Brzezinski has lamented the burgeoning populist opposition to external domination by a tiny elite.

During a 2010 Council on Foreign Relations speech in Montreal, Brzezinski warned fellow globalists that a “global political awakening,” in combination with infighting amongst the elite, was threatening to derail the move towards a one world government.

## **SMARTWORLD - IDENTITY ECOSYSTEM - PART 2: IDENTITY PROFILING**

*Julie Beal; Activist Post*

Even as the corporate giants position themselves for control of our identities, the minute details of our lives are already being scrutinised and analysed and completely and utterly bastardised. They can never truly know who we are, for we are forever changing, and self-understanding is a lifelong process.

Inside knowledge has always been sought by the power-hungry; it’s an age-old thing. Knowledge is power. So our profiles are built, and updated, and said to constitute who or what we are. Our personal data is used to feed super-brain computers in an attempt to control and enslave and profit from us.

They think they have our identities. But what can they do with what they’ve got? Well, we all know that companies are collecting information about our habits, and selling it to advertisers. This data forms a rude sketch of our identity (I am more than my ID profile!), as it is often erroneous and, above all, incomplete. However, surveillance techniques are becoming more and more sophisticated and widespread, as are the methods being employed to analyse and share the data being compiled. These techniques constitute the profiling of our identities on a global scale: by government and law enforcement, businesses, and academics.

### ***Data-mining***

Every time you go on the Internet you are creating a trail of data – crumbs of personal information which combine to become highly valuable. Each crumb is worth about two-fifths of a cent, and is collected and sold to advertisers. Information can be gathered in a number of ways; for instance, cookies which can track your every move as you click through webpages, and apps that can look at your contact list and even your location.

Other personal data such as credit card transaction details also offer insight into a person’s

identity. This personal data is being bought and sold for marketing purposes, and anyone else who wants to try to predict what people's future behaviour is going to be – many businesses use profiling on current and potential employees.

Even insurance companies are mining our personal data in order to "analyze risk". Kevin Pledge, the boss of Insight Decision Solutions, an underwriting-technology consultancy based near Toronto, is developing a system that will analyse social media profiles to obtain a fuller picture of clients. He predicts that eventually insurance firms will analyse grocery purchases for further identity data - someone who smokes or eats junk food would have a higher premium to pay.

Joel Stein, a journalist writing for Time, asked several datamining companies to tell him what profile they had recorded for him. He found that not only were many of the details incorrect, but that some of them noted him as being Jewish – a company called Intellidyn actually listed him as a "highly assimilated" Jew. Noting the lack of regulation in the datamining industry, Stein quotes Senator John Kerry, who had argued,

*"There's no code of conduct. There's no standard. There's nothing that safeguards privacy and establishes rules of the road."*

A multitude of businesses are able to offer low-cost or 'free' services to internet users because they profit from the data they gather from their users, which can be used to target revenue-earning advertising and services at them:

This information may be about purchasing preferences, hobbies, geographical location, friends and family, political affiliation, entertainment interests and so on. In short, any and all components of a biographical identity may be discernible.

CIA Director David Petraeus, at a summit for In-Q-Tel, the CIA's venture capital firm, praised the Internet of things, and quipped that the abundance of household spying devices now available will change "our notions of identity and secrecy."

In recent years, there has been a discernible surge in tailored advertising on the Internet but Stein doesn't feel threatened by it, and reasons it's just an impersonal algorithm. He does, however, admit to feeling a little 'creeped out' by this:

*"Right after I e-mailed a friend in Texas that I might be coming to town, a suggestion for a restaurant in Houston popped up as a one-line all-text ad above my Gmail inbox."*

A huge amount of information can be gleaned simply from a mobile phone alone – contextual and behavioural data, for instance. This data can be enriched by including profiles of associates of an individual – especially when contact with these people is regular.

A study by MIT analysed mobile phone use within a cohesive group (i.e. the students at MIT), enabling the researchers to understand relationships within the group, from factors such as proximity to others and patterns of phone use.

The data can even be used to predict future movements.

In 2010, DARPA ran an experiment called the Network Challenge, which involved releasing ten red weather balloons (8 ft big), and offering a \$40,000 prize to the first group to find and report on the location of the balloons.

The Human Dynamics Lab at MIT decided to offer a sophisticated incentive structure for their group, to encourage them to recruit more people. This was highly successful as in the two days leading up to the challenge, they managed to recruit another 100,000 people to help the team.

Hundreds of these recruits had sensors placed around their necks, and tracking software installed into their mobile phones, which recorded all their movements, who they interacted with, the particular way they moved their bodies, and voice properties. From this huge amount of data, they were able to figure out who was the real manager of the group, which member of the group was the most productive, and even which person tended to dominate conversations.

Universities are now training students in the art of data mining analytics.

Learning itself is even being analysed, and profiling is suggested as a way to improve the learning experience - this has already been implemented in Arizona, where students are

continuously monitored in their learning; personal data, including Facebook activity, is tracked and analysed, and a computer algorithm decides which courses they should take, and how their learning should be structured.

### **On Phorm**

The most intrusive data mining company seems to be Phorm, which has been rebuked by many for their hugely intrusive collection of personal information. They have had to retreat from a scandal regarding three of the UK's largest ISPs (Virgin Media, BT and TalkTalk) selling people's private browsing histories. A website campaigning against 'deep packet inspection' has documented the company's abuse of the Open Identity Exchange:

*"Phorm's latest method of involuntary eavesdropping and surveillance involves intercepting and hijacking image requests, and redirecting them to Phorm's OIX domain. Once redirected to the OIX domain, Phorm can then read the unique OIX user ID cookie to identify the subscriber. At this point Phorm have access to the subscriber's IP address, OIX UID cookies, date/time of access, referring page content (& cookies) ... giving them enough information to profile the subscriber. (Dec 2011)"*

### **Pre-crime detection**

Data obtained from consumer behaviour analysis can be put to use by a variety of other groups, such as academics and researchers, but the most troubling use of the data comes from those who are meant to protect us: the profiling of individuals to predict crime has become highly sophisticated.

Jesus Mena, in his book *Investigative Data Mining for Security and Criminal Detection*, notes:

*"The same data mining technologies that have been used by marketers to provide 'personalization' which is the exact placement of the right offer, to the right person at the right time can be used for providing the right inquiry to the right perpetrator at the right time: before they commit the crime. Investigative data mining is the visualization, organization, sorting, clustering, segmenting and prediction of criminal behavior using data attributes such as age, previous arrests, modus operandi, type of building, household income, time of day, geo code, countries visited, housing type, auto make, length of residency, type of license, utility usage, IP address, VISA type, number of children, place of birth, average usage of ATM card, number of credit cards, etc., the data points can run into the hundreds. Pre-crime is the interactive process of predicting criminal behavior by mining this vast array of data using several artificial intelligence technologies, including:*

*Link Analysis - for creating graphical networks to view criminal associations and interactions.*

*Intelligent Agents - for retrieving, monitoring, organizing and acting on case related information.*

*Text Mining - for searching through gigabytes of documents in search of concepts and key words.*

*Neural Networks - for recognizing the patterns of criminal behavior and anticipating criminal activity*

*Machine Learning Algorithms - for extracting rules and graphical maps of criminal behavior and perpetrator profiles."*

So there are computers that can 'think' like humans, by 'understanding' natural language and associations, as they are modelled upon the human brain. They are able to cope with huge amounts of data, which is constantly fed in so that the program can perform analytics 'in real-time'. They can also 'learn', and thus update their 'behaviour' or decisions. These neural network models use powerful 'fuzzy logic', and genetic algorithms which can "rapidly tune the model based on historical data as well as adaptive feedback from the model itself."

This is also known as complexity modeling, as used by the DOD. One of the reasons for this development is the sheer volume of data now available to us. There has been such a huge explosion of information, that the amount of data being generated can only be effectively analysed (or 'managed') by a computer, and control of this data is dominated by corporate giants, especially

IBM.

90% of data in the world today has been created in the last 2 years alone!

Mankind barely noticed when the concept of massively organized information quietly emerged to become a means of social control, a weapon of war, and a roadmap for group destruction ... Hitler and his hatred of the Jews was the ironic driving force behind this intellectual turning point. But his quest was greatly enhanced and energized by the ingenuity and craving for profit of a single American company and its legendary, autocratic chairman. That company was International Business Machines, and its chairman was Thomas J. Watson." (Edwin Black, IBM and the Holocaust, 2001)

IBM are still in the business of information control and identity classification, with the aid of a supercomputer called Watson which performs predictive analytics on a global scale, in order to 'improve' financial markets and healthcare systems, and help police predict crime. It uses natural language analytics to make complex decisions.

This video below was posted by IBM and boasts of the reduction in crime rates since police in the US began using IBM's predictive analytics. This technology is the most significant development when it comes to surveillance; you could have a hundred cameras watching your every move but without someone to watch and interpret them the data is useless. It's like having the perfect evidence but no way to find it. IBM have solved this problem, by sorting and organising the data so that it can be understood, enabling the software to analyse all incoming data, and make predictions.

IBM is a key player in the global identity ecosystem, and evidence the fact that identity management is about much more than verification: analytics intrudes into our lives, feeding supercomputers with our most intimate details. The company even has identity management software which assesses details of an individual's relationships to give a fuller picture of their identity, and to facilitate identity analytics.

Surveillance efforts have been ramped up in the greedy scramble for data – the success of AI analytics increases exponentially as more data is fed in to the computer for it to learn and, well, develop. The more it learns, the better it gets. Not only that, but data has become so big, only a computer can handle it. The system is modeled on human intelligence: it needs a good all-round view to really get the picture. Even variables such as weather patterns, and 'sentiment data' culled from Twitter feeds, are factored into analyses, along with any other correlated information.

Trapwire is currently creating a real stir with reports that claim the surveillance program uses techniques which are more accurate than facial recognition technology; it has been used for several years now (e.g. 2005 and 2009) along with a variety of other data-gathering and sharing systems, many of which will now be using software programs which are far more advanced, especially with the capabilities of IBM's suite of i2 products, which combine "rich analytical and visualization capabilities with real-time information sharing, providing an end-to-end solution that assists analysts and intelligence teams through all phases of the intelligence lifecycle."

IBM is helping police to predict crime in a number of ways, from sharing their analytics tools with other software developers, to tailored programs like CRUSH (Crime Reduction Using Statistical History; the program began in 2010 under the name 'Blue CRUSH') and COPLINK, one of the biggest data-sharing programs in the world, which is able to "seamlessly" aggregate surveillance data from cameras, individuals, and police departments, and then perform deep analytics, which are capable of "revealing relationships up to eight levels deep among people, places and things." It enables police officers on the beat to search for an individual's profile with only the minimal information which is observable during an 'incident', helping them to "generate more actionable leads".

Police departments can use IBM's Analyst's Notebook and iBase together with COPLINK, which "further enriches the capacity to not only generate leads in solving crimes, but also use existing data in making non-obvious connections between people, places and other entities, including mobile devices, phone records and vehicles." COPLINK can also be used in conjunction with IBM's Intelligent Operations Center for Smarter Cities, which aims to streamline local administration of services using complex modeling.

ECM Universe's Rapid Content Analytics (RCA) for Law Enforcement was officially launched this year at GovSec – the Government Security Conference & Expo. This will provide content analytics, eDiscovery and document management solutions on the IBM FileNet platform to all federal, community and campus police agencies previously only available to 'elite agencies'. IBM's Natural Language Processing Engine generates 'threat alerts'; the data can be used to predict crime, and to find statements which can be used as evidence in an investigation. The software can gather almost all data it needs – name, address, D.O.B., etc – to combine it with the social media data, although they claim not to be able to access geolocation information unless it is shared through social media. In the future, the software will include criminal psychological profiles to aid in surveillance.

RCA for Law Enforcement can do data mining on any textual data source; for example, storage media obtained from mobile phones, iPad@s, notebooks and other storage devices.

Various analytic views allow investigators to rapidly identify patterns and relationships, and perform investigative discovery on large amounts of data rapidly.

Scott Raimis of ECM described the use of this technology as a 'just in case' approach: "Think of it just as a street surveillance camera gathering evidence in the event that it's needed."

AISight® (pronounced 'eyesight'), for instance, connects CCTV to an artificial neural network to enable advanced analytics, to counter crime. Behavioral Recognition Systems, Inc. (BRS Labs) invented the world's first reason-based video surveillance behavior recognition software, i.e. a computer program which can learn and reason much like humans do. A security guard studying CCTV video will pick up on 'unusual behaviour' (an anomaly), and take action, in the hope of preventing a crime taking place. If not, the guard might be able to intervene, or at least evidence of the crime would be available. The software invented by BRS Labs is an artificial intelligence based technology that serves as the foundation for its AISight® 3.0 video surveillance software platform. It takes the place of the security guard because it can adapt and learn behaviour patterns in complex environments, and alert the relevant agents. According to the Daily Mail,

*"In its latest project BRS Labs is to install its devices on the transport system in San Francisco, which includes buses, trams and subways. The company says will put them in 12 stations with up to 22 cameras in each, bringing the total number to 288. The cameras will be able to track up to 150 people at a time in real time and will gradually build up a 'memory' of suspicious behaviour to work out what is suspicious."*

Other monitoring systems use cameras which each have to be programmed individually for a designated task, such as what kind of anomalies to look out for, but they often raise false alarms. AISight® is unique because its software will learn for itself what constitutes an anomaly – it does not need to be told. After watching for a while, it 'knows'. It stores the data it learns as memory - it can, for example, recognise a person it has seen before, such as their body mass and gait, and understand that they are not a threat. They can also be programmed to react to specific individuals or events.

BRS Labs have partnered with numerous security and ICT firms, (IBM, SAIC, UNISYS and Raytheon among them) and won an award for AISight® at London's Counter Terror Expo in May. The danger is that AISight could be used in combination with 'identity screening'; where scanners detecting ID-chips, personal devices and biometrics can supplement the learning of the AISight program. AISight claims it is already being used by law enforcement agencies, and by the military (including successful deployment in a "challenging beachfront setting").

The most disconcerting element of this capability is what it enables police to do with the information they gain – the video produced by BRS Labs to promote AISight points out that just "a fraction of 1%" of the world's security forces actually monitor their cameras: the video on their home page affirms, "there are too many to watch, and the human attention span is too short to be reliable. Video analytics was created years ago to address this problem but has fallen short of expectations and needs .... ". So basically, for all who thought we were being watched, it's only now that the ability for Big Bro to 'see' us has finally come to fruition.

The system empowers every single camera in the network with a truly staggering power. Talk about artificial intelligence and the all seeing eye ... each camera is able to learn and develop, and to understand what it is seeing. Like an ant colony, the cameras join together, and they form a formidable network of watchers.

The video goes on to describe how the systems currently in place are time consuming and inaccurate, because they use, "rule-based logic", meaning that a rule must be created for each action or object that the user wants to catch: no rule, no alarm. This rule-based technique has created three very severe problems, which until now have never been addressed...

the cost of installation – user, engineer, or computer programmer must define and set up each of these rules for each individual camera. This can take hours, to days, to set up each camera.

maintenance costs – you cannot move the camera or significantly change the layout of the camera view. If the camera moves, even slightly, or the objects and background the camera is focused on changes, the installation process must be repeated for the affected cameras.

(the most important) real-world situations cause lots of false and missed alarms. Small things such as a shadow moving over a trapwire, or the glare of a sunbeam, or a headlight from an automobile, can cause these systems to generate hundreds of false alarms per day . So real alarms are missed because operators are busy with false alarms.

Thus, AISight differs radically to the current surveillance camera networks, which simply supply footage; its ability to reason means that AISight can boast its ability to deliver “actionable intelligence”. It can transform an organisation’s existing camera network into a many-eyed, all-knowing beast.

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has recently expanded the Pre✓™ program, which screens the identity of passengers who opt-in to the service, and is now available at several airports across America, with more to come. This might appeal to the public, who have been in uproar at the number of patdowns they have had to endure (even children), and who object to going through body scanners: by screening the identity of travelers, the TSA can cut down on these checks substantially; they only target those who are flagged by the system. Eventually, when most people have enrolled to become a Trusted Traveler, the people waiting in the queue to be scanned will be automatically viewed with suspicion.

So, just how much do they know? In an interview with Doug Wylie, PoliceOne Editor in Chief, IBM’s Director of Public Safety, Mark Cleverly, insists that police forces are only able to predict ‘types’ of crime, and the time and place they will probably occur. Wylie questions Cleverly on the future of the technology, wondering how far it will be scaled for fighting crime.

Taking Cleverly’s statement about possible interest from America’s intelligence community one step further, a Watson-like supercomputer can easily be used by state, local, and federal law enforcement entities to analyze ‘open source’ information such as social networking sites and other areas of the Internet where known offenders tend to share details of their wrongdoing.

At the very least, you could apply a Watson-like solution to triage non-emergency calls to the dispatch center — essentially creating an automated, intelligent, sorting mechanism based on a series of data points that are collectable, measurable, and understandable and taken in sum point to specific situations or scenarios.

*'Let me make the caveat that this is all very early thinking — there’s nothing out there now that does that — but there’s enough capability in the Watson-like arena that you can see some of these things being possible,' Cleverly said.*

It would seem the ‘Watson-like arena’ would refer to all the other types of information being collected (and analysed) from BRS Labs, Geoeye, GRIP, COPLINK, RCA for Law Enforcement, Trapwire, etc, etc. – is it the aim of IBM to enable Watson to take them all on? Could it one day combine all of the data into one database for Watson to analyse, after it has ‘learnt’ about all the individual ‘nodes’, and modeled them using a program like that at Purdue? “One mainframe to rule ‘em all” indeed.

But we’re not there yet: the point has been made (see this, for example) that - for all the



surveillance and pre-crime profiling and analytics - Watson failed to spot Holmes, the man accused of the 'Dark Knight' Colorado shootings. Though the data generated by false flags may well not be entered into the system!

### ***Gotta be good***

When people know they are being watched, it creates an effect much like Foucault's panopticon; they will start to police themselves, and regulate their own behaviour according to the requirements of those in charge. Surveillance, and even news of surveillance techniques, can play a significant role in social control; people will try to 'be good to get by', or they can go one stage further and establish their identity as someone who is actively seeking to make society 'better'. Numerous initiatives exist which claim that people can become good little citizens by spying on their neighbours (such as the 'See Something, Say Something' program in America).

Another resource debuting at GovSec is Spypedia, "the world's most comprehensive and informative resource on spies and terrorists". There is a meta-narrative to history and espionage, 'a story about a story' – SPYPEDIA gives you that story.... History is repeating itself. You are living through it.

Spypedia is hosted by the Centre for Counterintelligence and Security Studies (CICENTRE) and constitutes an online encyclopaedia of information related to spies and terrorists. It is a site which can be used by businesses looking to counter economic espionage, as well as hobbyists and patriots who take an interest, sanctioning surveillance and keeping the whole terrorist yarn alive. A large part of the website is devoted to kids and educators, with games, a handbook of 'spying words', and even a Spy-in-Training Program!

The resource for educators on 9/11 lists specific activities for students to do, together with specific expected outcomes of a student's 'understanding'. The activities involve analysing supposed 'intelligence' put before President Bush, and for students to imagine what action they would take if they had been in his position. This encourages the students to, a) believe they are being presented with facts, b) form emotional responses to the data, c) exercise higher analytical faculties, d) form beliefs about 9/11 'truthers', e) feel that more 'intelligence' should be gathered to make the nation secure, and f) allocate all activists/dissenters to the modern genre of 'radicals'.

The resource also claims that intelligence agencies were not able to efficiently share all information with other agencies, implying this could be remedied by not only increasing the amount of intelligence collected (of which identity plays a crucial part), but of creating, essentially, a huge database of profiles and 'facts' which can be used for pre-crime analytics. It even goes so far as to propose students should, "Design and implement an education campaign in which they provide accurate information about the perpetrators if they notice a trend toward misunderstanding or doubt on the part of the public" in regards to 9/11.

It would appear that the introduction of 9/11 'education' into the school curriculum is about much more than adding credibility to the official version of that day; it may herald a new attack on 'conspiracy theorists', and labeling activists like Julian Assange as terrorists. Infowars reported on this issue, citing several cases where public figures and the media have discredited those with non-mainstream views.

Encouraging students to spy and report on 'radicals' takes on a whole new meaning when the definition of radical in America has broadened to:

Americans who believe their "way of life" is under attack.

Americans who are "fiercely nationalistic (as opposed to universal and international in orientation)/

People who consider themselves "anti-global" (presumably those who are wary of the loss of American sovereignty).

Americans who are "suspicious of centralized federal authority".

Americans who are "reverent of individual liberty".

People who "believe in conspiracy theories that involve grave threat to national sovereignty and/or personal liberty."

This was documented by Paul Joseph Watson and highlights the sinister turn profiling has taken.

When I was young the newsreaders spoke about freedom fighters; now dissenters are labeled as extremists or terrorists. We can even ‘be radicalised’ – a newspeak way of implying it can be ‘done to us’, against our will, even. That those who think for themselves, who question the status quo, are ‘crazies’, instantly dismissed.

The SpyMuseum hosted a presentation entitled ‘9/11, False Flags, and Black Ops’, with speakers David Frum, Jonathan Kay, and Webster Tarpley. In this YouTube video, Jonathan Kay, author of *Among the Truthers: A Journey Through America’s Growing Conspiracist Underground*, remarks,

*"Once they see the world through distrustful eyes, and they think they're being lied to, that colours their perception of all subsequent events . . . Real life conspiracies tend to be small and grubby and primarily about money and sex."*

Webster Tarpley was then invited to give “his version of reality”, and was gently but resolutely mocked by the other speakers. It would seem he was being used as an example of ‘one of them’, not to be taken seriously. The message being, domestic dissenters are to be humoured. They just have “theories” about “nefarious plots”; a less harmful sub-set of radicals.

An older resource document for educators, ‘The Enemy Within’, characterises radicalism as “early 20th Century anarchism”, and suggests one of the solutions to the threat of terrorism could be to, “adopt profiling as standard practice at airports, transportation centers, and other key public spaces”. The ultimate aim of the exercise is to figure out how to identify ‘the enemy’.

In the UK, several offences are being re-labeled as ‘hate crimes’. The offenders are the enemy within; the scourge of society because they ‘go too far’. And now, a ‘hate crime app’ has been invented, which will encourage citizen-spies to report ‘suspicious’ (out of the ordinary!) behaviour to the authorities. If someone has information on an incident which might constitute, or lead to, a hate crime, they can upload geolocation data, as well as audio or video data, using smartphone capabilities.

No-one likes a snitcher. Or a nosey parker. But with the media hype, social values are being changed.

Fostering the managed transition from a world of private sovereign individuals, to one of global digital citizen do-gooders, UNESCO and the Rockefeller Foundation have helped support the ‘Global Cyber Ambassadors for Peace’ (GCAP) initiative, launched in 2011. The twisted communitarian ethos being foisted upon us from all angles is, after all, virtual and electronic.

This is the age of ‘do the right thing’ – how to behave has been decided. We are the enemy who must be controlled. Dissent is a thought crime, and hate crimes mean jail time.

Do not deviate from the norm.

Maintain the average.

Do the right thing.

... Or rather,

Remember there is no norm.

Averaging is just maths.

The ‘right’ thing to do is a daily personal choice which makes us human and free. The context is infinitely complex.

Those choices are our identity.

*Julie Beal is a UK-based independent researcher who has been studying the globalist agenda for more than 20 years. Please visit her website, [Get Mind Smart](#), for a wide range of information about Agenda 21, Communitarianism, Ethics, Bioscience, and much more.*

# WARNING OVER SECRET DATABASE FEATURING 8M CHILDREN

*Graeme Paton, Education Editor, Daily Telegraph; via John Newell*

*A huge database containing the personal details of around eight million schoolchildren is being created without parents' knowledge, it emerged today. A new database created by Capita features the personal details of 8m schoolchildren, it has emerged.*

IT specialists from one of Britain's biggest private companies are compiling the system, which features information on pupils' age, sex, address, exam results, absenteeism and disciplinary record, it was revealed.

The database – set up by Capita – is reportedly being used by around 100 local authorities to act as a single source of information for officials working with children.

But the move raised fresh concerns about data security. It comes just two years after Labour's controversial ContactPoint system – containing the personal details of all children in England – was scrapped because of major fears that it was vulnerable to hackers.

Nick Pickles, director of the civil liberties group Big Brother Watch, told The Sunday Times: "It is ContactPoint by another name. Parents will be shocked that they are being kept in the dark about how their child's information is being gathered and exactly what it is used for."

According to reports, teachers are currently uploading information on pupils to the "Capita One" database as often as six times a day.

Capita also hires photographers to take pictures of pupils, which are offered for sale to parents before being uploaded onto the database, it emerged.

The data is currently employed by local authorities but it is thought that other organisations working with children, including youth offending teams and police officers, will also be given access.

Capita said the information provided a "single view" of a child in each local area but insisted schools and councils took data protection seriously.

A spokesman told The Sunday Times: "Each local authority holds and manages permission and access to its own information held in its Capita One database. Capita One is not a centralised database for the whole country.

## **Related Articles**

ContactPoint child database scrapped[ 06 Aug 2010

ContactPoint database of 11million children's details to go ahead despite security fears; 07 Nov 2009

Children's database unveiled despite safety fears; 26 Jan 2009

Internet records to be stored; 05 Apr 2009

National database dropped but all our communications will still be monitored; 28 Apr 2009

Labour 'wastes' £61,000 promoting ContactPoint database; 30 Apr 2010

# FLAT PACK DEMOCRACY ....THIS COULD BE THE ANSWER YOUR COMMUNITY IS SEEKING

*from Jimmy Devlin; North West Tenants*

*(This is a little beam of sunshine emerging from our largely moribund democratic structures. The powers of a town council are very limited, so how much more could be achieved if we had proper local democracy, perhaps along Swiss lines, and where their form of direct democracy, the landsgemeinde, rules in many such places. It might also be remarked that it is not necessary to get elected to the local council in order to start the revitalisation of the local community - Ed)*

What a democratic revolution in the Somerset town of Frome could teach our political class. Three hours in the company of boisterous local volunteers gave our writer a precious insight into the regeneration of civic society in Britain.

As far as local government meetings go, it's an unusual one. I am seated at a large wooden table in a low-beamed kitchen; it's late evening, the red wine is flowing liberally and a stranger to my left is enthusiastically relating an anecdote about loincloths. Now, for most people, the words "local government" will conjure up torturously dull images of grey, fusty, middle-aged doctrinaires sat in drab council chambers, but I'm in Frome, Somerset: a town which has a group of councilors quite unlike any other.

This is their "unofficial" monthly meeting and the man talking about loincloths, Peter Macfadyen, is an elected councilor. He is describing the costume he wore to a recent parade in the town centre; an event that also involved the Mayor, some giant palm leaves and copious amounts of gold body paint. Peter and the nine other councillors sitting around this kitchen table together form the core of "Independents for Frome" (IfF). It is a project that was first instigated in January 2011 by a rebellious band of disenchanting local people; united in being fed up with their town council's institutional wrangling and party-political self-interest. IfF resolved to address the apathetic disengagement, which plagued local ballots by empowering ordinary people to reclaim responsibility.

In an election that May, after encouragingly boisterous early debates in pubs and community halls, the movement selected and fielded seventeen independent candidates (united under a common set of values) to contest every ward seat in the town. The ensuing campaign saw IfF sweep to victory; their candidates claimed ten of the ward seats, took control of the town council majority and caught the established parties completely off guard in a triumph of local democracy.

Since then, this merrily heterogeneous gang has set about making their town a better place to live. The story, which emerges during the three or so hours I spent in their company, is an irresistible tale of mayoral pub crawls, wearing shorts to meetings and unassailable community spirit. Moreover, the real changes in attitude they have brought about locally were kick started in reaction to failures of governance, which are a familiar story across the UK – not least in Westminster itself.

## **Regeneration**

Frome is a market town and former industrial centre of 26,000 souls located on Somerset's hilly eastern fringe. The clanking mills and factories which at one time underpinned the local economy have long since fallen silent, and these days roughly 50% of the working population commute to office and service jobs in nearby Bath, Trowbridge or further afield. In stark contrast to the depressingly familiar pattern of post-industrial desolation in northern towns and cities, Frome has successfully regenerated itself to become a bustling hub of arts and culture. Unemployment is below the national average, few shop frontages stand empty along the steeply sloped cobbles of the scenic town centre and the area is highly sought after by young families – so much, in fact, that there aren't enough houses to go around. In the years preceding IfF, residents had endured a string of bungled projects and failures of consultation by an out of touch, politicised town council. Immediately after their election victory, the new cohort wasted no time in dismantling the counterproductive, overly-bureaucratic council structure; replacing that moribund system with a new model based on cooperation, goodwill, common sense, and most importantly, putting Frome's best interests ahead of party interests.

All ten councilors agree that the quarrelsome, point-scoring culture of party politics stifles genuine initiative and debate, and should therefore have no place at local level. Their new emphasis on empowerment favours consulting with community members who have relevant expertise and then actually entrusting them with responsibilities: "The attitude we have, that the established parties never did, is that just because we're elected it doesn't mean we know everything", ruminates Dave Anderson, a local builder and councilor for the Keyford ward, "top-down governance doesn't work at the local level; it's the people who live in Frome that know what's best for the area".

Projects currently under way include a re-modeling of the town centre, investment in sports facilities and the planning of new homes. The IfF councilors are a slightly mischievous bunch; their anti-red tape, can-do approach means they aren't averse to ruffling feathers or, on occasion, even indulging in a bit of casual rule breaking to make their point. The ten have frequently faced hostility, stonewalling and outright non-cooperation from the established parties and the District Council, who are still no doubt somewhat miffed at having their quiet boat rocked.

## **Strength**

The attitude of Mel Usher, councilor for the Market ward, is to rise above such pettiness and not get drawn into any mudslinging. Furthermore, he believes it a sign of strength to be able to apologise

when mistakes are made, as inevitably happens on occasion: "It's very disarming for your opponent", says Mel, "when you are able to stand up and admit you got something wrong... these people thrive on argument so by being honest you take their artillery away".

The reaction of the townspeople themselves has, overall, been substantially more positive: many agree that there has been a noticeably cheerful shift in local mood. The 2011 election saw an incredible 75% increase in voter turnout; demonstrating an optimism which has been maintained through the first eighteen months of the four year term. With new converts still being picked up along the way, what do the councilors put their success down to? For Dave Anderson, it's simple: "Listening", he shrugs, "and openness... we make ourselves approachable".

In many ways, the Independents for Frome story is emblematic of the national failure of politics in the United Kingdom. Research data and polls such as the British Social Attitudes survey paint a dispiriting picture of apathy, disillusionment, misrepresentation and falling voter turnout across swathes of the country. In Westminster as in Frome, most elected officials toe their party line and avoid contentious issues; maintaining the status quo to the detriment of progressive debate. Always eager to discredit their opponents, but much more reticent when it comes to their own ideas on subjects such as, say, the third runway at Heathrow (yet another hot topic delayed until after the next election), the sole aim of the main political parties is not public service, but to get power – and once they have it – to cling on at all costs.

In contrast to this partisan deadlock, the IfF councilors are proud to point out that their differing ages, backgrounds and variegated political hues have in no way held back their ability to make decisions. In fact, they have not yet once failed to reach a democratic consensus on any issue. Admittedly, one thing they are divided over is whether their achievement is something that is scalable to a national level.

### **Success**

They are planning to put together a "Flat pack Democracy" guide to encourage others to try and replicate their success, but are keen to emphasise that every community must shoulder the responsibility for itself. Mayor Pippa Goldfinger sums it up with a favourite quote of hers from the academic Susan Fainstein: "At the level of the neighbourhood, there is the greatest opportunity for democracy but the least amount of power. As we scale up, the amount of decision making power increases but the potential of people to affect outcomes diminishes".

So what of the future? Well with characteristic sense of fun, the councillors are planning their upcoming "party conference" ("It's a party and a conference combined!" says a gleeful Pippa), and they will of course continue to fight for Frome's best interest on local issues. After the term ends in 2015, post-IfF plans are more varied: the possibility of contesting the district authority is "a debate yet to be completed", and at least one of the councillors is planning to run for parliament.

Others intend to bow out gracefully, but one thing they all agree on emphatically is that things can't simply go back to the way they were. In the meantime, many others in the UK would do well to heed their example. The wine has long since dried up and people are preparing to hurry home, but before they leave for their respective wards there's just time for a parting shot. Asked to sum up the IfF ethos in one sentence, they all without hesitation reply: "Just do it!" I couldn't have put it better myself.

## **AN INTERVIEW WITH CONRAD JAEGER - WHAT IS "THE DEEP WEB"?**

*From Nathan Allonby*

*(I would certainly like to hear from anyone who has entered and explored this 'Deep Web' -Ed)*

<http://activist-post-forum.947009.n3.nabble.com/Book-Festival-and-Giveaway-An-Interview-with-Conrad-Jaeger-What-is-quot-The-Deep-Web-quot-td4025454.html>

The Deep Web is vast, I mean it is staggeringly huge compared to what I now call the Surface Web, the one we all use every day. In a nutshell, the Deep Web is everything that can't be picked up by the conventional search engines like Google. By that, I mean it's a lot of data stored in cyberspace that most Google users have no interest in so it's not logged and listed.

And, because it's so vast and largely uncharted, people have learnt to hide themselves down there and have set up hidden networks that allow them to access the Surface Web in such a way that they cannot be tracked and profiled or analyzed by Big Business or by governments. On another level, the Deep Web is much like the one we know with all the usual features like chat rooms, bulletin boards and websites. There are even clones of Twitter and Facebook down there.

It seemed to me that more people should know about this because too many governments around the world are tightening up on Web freedom and this offers the only way to communicate in total privacy.

The people using it now are all sorts, from my private detective friend to other journalists, especially those that want to communicate in confidence with whistleblowers or dissidents. Aid agencies use it to avoid having their emails and messages read by dictatorial regimes. Academics use it to research sensitive subjects. Equally, a lot of crooks use it too, as do terrorists and, for that matter, spies and the military.

But getting in and having a look around is easy. All you have to do is download a special free web browser and tweak just a little bit with the settings and, hey presto, you are in. Anyone who can use the Internet can visit the Deep Web. And, like I say, you need to know the right entry points depending what you want to do down there. But if you just want to visit a banned website on the Surface Web, all you need do is type the web address into the browser and there it is.

You can send emails that nobody can intercept or track back. There are ways of sending secret messages that self-destruct and you can hide documents and even small movies inside digital photographs and music tracks. There are endless possibilities.

Travelling around the Deep Web is no more complicated than visiting Amazon or sending a Tweet.

The author has written a guidebook to the Deep Web

Amazon.co.uk: Deep Web Secrecy and Security - an inter-active guide to the Deep Web and beyond: Books

Deep Web Secrecy and Security - an inter-active guide to the Deep Web and beyond (Deep Web Guides) eBook: Conrad Jaeger: Amazon.co.uk: Kindle Store

Enter the Dark Net - The Internet's Greatest Secret eBook: Conrad Jaeger: Amazon.co.uk: Books

## POSITIVE MONEY BULLETIN

***Positive Money team***; [www.positivemoney.org.uk](http://www.positivemoney.org.uk)

This week we've grown the team by 50% - now there's six of us! Fran and Miriam are both dedicated to social justice and sustainability of our environment and enthusiastic about making changes to our broken monetary system. They're already bringing new fresh energy, ideas and lots of experiences to our campaign for a socially useful monetary system. We are extremely pleased to introduce them to you:

### ***Positive Money Conference 2013 - Sat 26th January***

On January 26th 2013 Positive Money will be hosting its 3rd Annual Conference. With our economy stagnating and our political leaders still not having a clue about what to do to change the course, a conference entitled "Modernising Money" might be the most insightful event to attend that will give clear vision of what exactly can be done to get us out of the debt crisis, to enable prosperity and to ensure (or at least move towards) social justice. We're happy to let you know that from today you can register to secure your participation in it.

This exciting conference will be more interactive than ever before! It will be more about campaigning and action rather than knowledge. It will consist of a combination of lectures, participatory workshops and some short videos from selected high profile supporters. We are honoured to include several outstanding keynote speakers, the details will follow soon. We have secured a great venue in the heart of London.

This is what the attendees of 2nd Positive Money conference say:

*'If you feel helpless, Positive Money offer a real, viable model by which true democratic change can be effective' 'Everyone should come to a Positive Money conference'*

*'You can choose to know or not know about the monetary system, but you can't escape its consequences.'*

*'Understanding money is the key to planning for the future. However few people understand money creation and most of what you have been told is wrong. This conference gives you the facts.'*

### **Welsh Assembly's Cross-Party Group on Monetary Reform**

On Tuesday 13th November we hosted the inaugural meeting of the Welsh Assembly's Cross-Party Group on Monetary Reform. It was attended by 7 Assembly Members and numerous researchers, interns and a few members of the public. Ben Dyson explained why the common understanding of the financial situation facing local and national governments is flawed, and why, although it's been a struggle to find £2 billion to rebuild schools, it was no struggle for banks to create up to £4 billion a week in order to fund mortgages and personal loans.

### **Success of our Newcastle supporters**

The team of Positive Money supporters in Newcastle has organized a big successful event, attended by over hundred people.

### **Upcoming Events**

Screening of "97% Owned", London, Wed 5th Dec 2012  
Screening of "97% Owned", Manchester, Tue 11 Dec 2012

### **Important words by one of the most important people in finance**

After two years of campaign, our argument that the financial crisis was caused by the ability of banks to create money was vindicated by none other than the UK's chief regulator. Nine days ago, Lord Adair Turner, chairman of the Financial Services Authority, said that:

*"The financial crisis of 2007/08 occurred because we failed to constrain the private financial system's creation of private credit and money."*

This is exactly what we've been saying since the beginning of Positive Money: that if we allow banks to create money effectively out of nothing, in the way that we're doing at the moment, then sooner or later we're going to end up with a financial crisis, debt crisis and the situation that we find ourselves in today.

But this, coming from a chairman of FSA, is the clearest explanation of what is going wrong with our current economic system that has ever come from one of the people who are in charge of regulating the system.

### **More from the Blog:**

Change money, change the world  
There are many a true saying!  
Criticisms of Positive Money by Mike Robinson of UK Column  
"Hyperinflation, famine and bloodshed" – Twisting History to Preserve the Status Quo  
Positive Money New Zealand celebrates one year  
Full Reserve Banking Is No Bailout  
Do Bitcoin, Paypal etc threaten Positive Money's ideas?  
Public Service Europe: Parliament's Power is being passed to the Banks  
Still unconvinced that banks create money? Ask the Governor of the Bank of England...  
Sir Mervyn King: Banks Create Money  
Steve Baker MP Seeking Election to the Treasury Select Committee  
Telegraph: IMF's Epic Plan to Conjure away Debt and Dethrone Bankers

### **Two new videos:**

Why is there so much Debt? Individuals and families in the UK have a total of £1,170 billion of debt. But who did we borrow all this money from? Was it from an army of grannies who have spent their whole lives putting money away for a rainy day?

Power of Banks vs Democracy You've probably heard the idea that money is power. If that's true, then imagine how much power you'd have, if you could CREATE money.

Although we have been on BBC recently and we're gaining more interest from the media, we still rely on you to spread the message. To be successful this campaign needs you - our supporters - people who understand the importance of reforming money in order to be able to fix the most serious economic and social problems. Please send the links to these videos to your friends, share them on Facebook, Twitter etc. Share "Why is there so much Debt?" and "Power of Banks vs Democracy"

There is more you can do. Here are some ideas.

### ***Positive Money on BBC Radio 4***

Ben Dyson, the founder of Positive Money gave a talk for BBC Radio 4 on the fundamental flaws in our banking system, his frustration with mainstream economics and the need to reform the monetary system to prevent banks creating money. As far as we know, this is the first ever clear explanation of the monetary system on British mainstream media. You can download the podcast, which has also an extended Q&A at the end which wasn't on the broadcast.

Can you help spread this important message? Please send an email to your friends or post it to your social media to help spread the awareness.

### ***A few suggested tweets/posts:***

Where does money come from? Who actually creates it? Listen to @BBCRadio4: <http://ow.ly/eGL7o>  
@positivemoneyuk

#BBCRadio4 with @positivemoneyuk: There are some very basic questions that are almost completely ignored by economists. <http://ow.ly/eGL7o>

.@BBCRadio4: Money today is created through an accounting process used whenever a bank makes a loan. <http://ow.ly/eGL7o>

The Bank of England creates just 3% of the money supply. Where does the rest come from? #BBC:  
<http://ow.ly/eGL7o>

If you follow us on Facebook or Twitter, please support us by sharing / retweeting our posts over next few days.

**EDITED BY;-**

**FRANK TAYLOR  
2 CHURCH VIEW  
ST GILES TERRACE  
CHETTON  
BRIDGNORTH  
SHROPSHIRE  
WV16 6UG  
Tel; (01746) 789326  
[frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk)**