

Civil liberties at risk in forthcoming UK-EU security deal?

Yesterday's *Times* reported as follows:

*'A Brexit trade, **security** and fishing deal could be in sight early next week as Michel Barnier, the European Union's chief negotiator, prepares to come out of coronavirus quarantine for the final round of talks. Negotiators continued line-by-line talks on a draft legal treaty text yesterday as talks enter the last stage. There was an outbreak of the virus in the European team last week. While opening a new customs facility at Dublin port yesterday, Micheál Martin, the Irish prime minister, said that negotiators were working on "texts now in all areas" and the EU's assessment was the most hopeful to date.'*
[emphasis mine]

Yet the public knows nothing about the content of the security section of this deal. What does the government want on this issue? What are the terms being negotiated? Does the government have any red lines? We have been kept completely in the dark as regards the government's intentions in this regard.

It has not been debated in Parliament, or in any of the mainstream media. This is utterly disgraceful. Worse, it is sinister.

Security is the heart of state power. External security means tanks, guns, bombs, fighter jets, battleships etc. But there is also domestic security. This means criminal law, police, prisons, forcible confiscation of goods, and other means of exercising legal violence over the bodies of the citizens, whether they be actually criminals or not, convicted or under

investigation, under the criminal law provisions of the State concerned.

Whoever controls security in a State controls that State, and all the people in it. The EU aims openly to fuse its member states into a single state, and at this point it appears to want the UK as a satellite state.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch has tabled a question for written answer, to ask HMG,

'whether they intend any extradition from the UK to any EU jurisdiction after the end of transition period to be possible only with a court ruling that there is a prima facie case to answer; and if not, why not.'

Alas, the Home Office's answer to this question is only due on 1 December, by which time it is forecast that a deal will have been clinched. So are the people of Britain to be presented with a *fait accompli*?

This is a crucial issue, for without the power of a UK court to decide whether an extradition request is well-founded on sufficient evidence of guilt, the personal freedom of each and every UK citizen in the country lies entirely at the quite arbitrary mercy of any continental court – or indeed any continental prosecutor, considered even by our own Supreme Court to be a 'judicial authority'.

Must we presume that behind this reticence lies the present government's hidden intention to continue May's and Rudd's declared intention to maintain us within the European Arrest Warrant, or a replica thereof, after 1 January 2021?

If so, any EU prosecutor will be able to continue to arrest anyone in the UK, showing no evidence, and transport them to lengthy imprisonment 'pending investigation' under continental jurisdictions where our Habeas Corpus safeguards are unknown.

Hardly anybody in the UK is aware that the EU institutions have selected as their supremo European Public Prosecutor a prosecutor from Romania, where arbitrary judicial power of arrest and lengthy imprisonment, on charges that may be quite spurious, is regularly used and abused as a battering-ram against political opponents.