

[2.3.4] Are UK detention powers post-9/11 necessary? Debate!

Report Misuse

Pinned

[MatthiasMS](#) 9 days ago

Having considered the measures adopted by the UK government under the *Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001* and the information regarding the situation of the "Belmarsh Nine", please share your opinion on the following question: do the measures adopted by the UK government go beyond what is *necessary* for the legitimate aim of protecting the UK from a terrorist threat?

[garynewell](#)

7 days ago

No one should be held without trial or evidence for an indefinite time. Even the Greeks in ancient time knew that false information can be given for ulterior motives, that is why there are jury trials. So a person accused of a crime can face their accusers and refute the evidence brought against them. That is the fundamental basis of justice in civilized society. However, all societies have the right to protect themselves. Therefore, societies have the right to remove suspected terrorists for the public safety while information is gathered. If the government had enough evidence to accuse a suspect then it should be able to compile that within a "reasonable time." Three years is not a "reasonable time." According to <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/belmarsh-detainees-to-be-released-today-but-face-restrictions-6150639.html> the UK has finally done the right thing - that is release them on bail with strict restrictions including "...the radical Jordanian cleric Abu Qatada who was branded "a truly dangerous individual" by the Special Immigration Appeals Commission in 2003." If they cannot comply with or agree to the society's safety restrictions then there is sufficient evidence for their future detainment. The UK has the right, means, and the ability to safeguard society from "a truly dangerous individual," especially one on bail with restrictions. That is how civilized societies should deal with the accused by not proven. They should not exceed a "reasonable time" for detention, but provide a bail hearing for the judiciary to determine if there is sufficient evidence to warrant bail, how much, and what restrictions are necessary to safeguard society.

Report Misuse

1. Well written!

Report Misuse

-posted 6 days ago by [AnitaSweden](#)

2. I totally agree. Finally an argument with some reasonable sense of due process of law.

Report Misuse

-posted 5 days ago by [AndersonDias](#)

3. I agree. A troubling feature of the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act of 2001 was the lack of any guarantee that suspected terrorists detained under the Act would ever have their cases brought before a court of law, so that the accused could confront the Government's evidence, present their own arguments and evidence, and be found guilty or not guilty. The Government may decide to hold them indefinitely without trial and without giving the accused and their counsel detailed information about the basis for detaining them (this is because the evidence was at least partly obtained by means the Government wishes not to reveal, as a matter of

national security).

Report Misuse

-posted 5 days ago by [Mary3](#)

4. I also agree with Garynewell's comments. Even a suspected terrorist should be entitled to refute the allegations made against him/her. Just as police may arrest the wrong person for a crime, it must be possible that innocent people are arrested and detained on suspicion of being a 'terrorist'.

Report Misuse

-posted 5 days ago by [JudyF1957](#)

5. I agree, and would add an additional troubling aspect is the vagueness of the terminology "terrorist organisation" and "terrorist". It wasn't so very long ago that Margaret Thatcher called the ANC a terrorist organisation and yet much of the UK and the world joined in honouring Nelson Mandela. So while most can quickly agree with the necessity and legitimacy of applying this derogation to the desire for safety post 9/11 and 7/7, the broad sweep is ripe for State abuse.

Report Misuse

-posted 4 days ago by [MickMcMahon](#)

6. I agree with you, Garynewell.

Report Misuse

-posted a day ago by [Silviafran](#)

7. sometime on extreme situations somebody need to keep the order among everybody

Report Misuse

-posted about 23 hours ago by [aposligua](#)

8. They were detained for 3 years without a trial. I guess it depends on what one means by "reasonable time for detention"

Report Misuse

-posted about 5 hours ago by [_dave_](#)

9. No, I do not think the measures adopted by the UK government go beyond what is necessary for the legitimate aim of protecting the UK from a terrorist threat. I agree with the manner in which Gary Newell answered this question here as well and I have not had time to read them all.

- 10.