

Orwellian Secret Courts in the UK: Britain on the Brink of Tyranny

Judicial trials to be held in secret

By [Global Research News](#)

Global Research, March 10, 2013

Berkshire 9/11 Truth Movement

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

Britain is on the brink of tyranny. The Justice and Security Bill, if it becomes law, will enable judicial trials to be held in secret, and it will even be illegal to tell anyone about them. The bill has now gone through all stages in the House of Commons, and will now go to the House of Lords for consideration. In other words, it's nearly there (<http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2012-13/justiceandsecurity.html>).

The bill's sponsor in the Commons is Justice Minister Kenneth Clarke, who is widely believed to be on the steering committee of the highly secretive Bilderberg meetings. In a foreward to a consultation document, he explains that the purpose of the bill is to enable the government to defend itself against civil claims, with claimants typically seeking significant amounts in damages, but where the facts of the case turn on highly sensitive information (<http://consultation.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/justiceandsecurity/>).

But it seems that's just the gloss. Richard Cottrell, in his book 'Gladio: NATO's Dagger at the Heart of Europe' (<http://progressivepress.com/book-listing/gladio-natos-dagger-heart-europe>) wrote a lot about this bill. At the time it had been rejected, but he rightly predicted that it would return. He wrote to me: "The Justice and Security Bill has been around for some years, since 7/7 hardly by co-incidence. It proposes that secret courts will inquire into any matters concerning individuals or events that the authorities decide they want to keep secret. This will apply in the case of the as yet unheld inquests on those blamed for 7/7.

"It was also to apply to living accused persons who would be denied under this Orwellian draft the right to represent themselves or have their own lawyers represent them. Nor will they be allowed to know what they are accused of. In the Soviet Union this was perfectly normal. In the place of legal representation the state will appoint Special Advocates who will not be under any responsibility to represent the accused, or explain to that person of what he is accused, and nor will they be under any responsibility to offer a defence.

"The Bill was savaged by the Lords, but returned to the Commons with all the Lords' amendments struck out. On the day of the vote on gay marriages it slipped through the vote in the select committee with the vote of one backwoods Ulsterman rushed in at the last minute. (The vote was held at the same [time] as members were in the lobbies voting on the gay marriage Bill). ... This law when passed, as it will be, can then be applied to all and any offence, even as lowly as a traffic accident. Accused persons will never be told of what they are charged and of course it is very unlikely they would be found 'not guilty.'"

The British press is now very quiet on this, though the Daily Mail published an article on 10 February headed 'Last week MPs revived the corpse of the 'Secret Justice' Bill. Here we spell out the full terrifying implications of life in... Secret Britain' (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2276327/Last-week-MPs-revived-corpse-Secret-Justice-Bill-debating-gay-marriage-time-noticed-Here-spell-terrifying-implications-life-Secret-Britain.html>). Interestingly, their sister paper, The Mail on Sunday, is about to take legal action to make public a secret judgement issued in an Afghan alleged torture case two years ago, which resulted from an earlier form of secret hearing, now deemed illegal by the Supreme Court (<http://www.leighday.co.uk/News/2013/January-2013/Secret-evidence-challenge-by-Mail-on-Sunday>). Also, political campaigner Chris Mullin gave a warning in The Guardian website on 28 January, headed 'Justice and security bill: last chance to back away from secret justice' (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/2013/jan/28/justice-security-last-chance-secret-evidence>).

And now Big Brother Watch has launched a campaign, asking people to write to their MP (<http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2013/03/write-to-your-mp-about-the-justice-and-security-bill-today.html>). Someone commented "What's the point?". OK, write to your local newspaper then.

Whistleblowers gagged – and there's worse to come

Another piece of legislation which could make it difficult to expose possible government crimes is a proposed amendment to the 1984 Police and Criminal Evidence Act, as proposed by the Leveson Inquiry into phone hacking. This would make it easier for the police to seize confidential material from journalists, and it would weaken protection for whistleblowers (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/feb/13/whistleblowers-press-new-police-powers>). A leading barrister warned of a potential breach of European human rights law, the article states. But now the Government intends to do away with European human rights law (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/mar/04/theresa-may-human-rights-stunt>). It looks as if the question of UK membership of the EU is being used as cover for this.

An editorial in The Guardian four days later drew attention to the general vulnerability of whistleblowers, as in the case of a former chief executive in the National Health Service, Gary Walker, who had been told that he would have to pay back any compensation payment arising from his dismissal if he spoke out (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/feb/17/journalistic-sources-law-editorial>). But the problem was bigger than that. 'NHS spends £15million (the same as 750 nurses' salaries) on gagging 600 whistleblowers' announced the Daily Mail (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2282600/NHS-spends-15million-750-nurses-salaries-gagging-600-whistleblowers.html>), saying that this had cost the lives of 1 200 patients. The new legislation will make it even more difficult to blow the whistle, even when many lives are at stake.

"Democracy cannot work when secrecy exceeds its proper limits", states the Guardian editorial, adding that hospitals, banks, corporations, meat producers and police forces alike must be open to scrutiny. I would add even humble membership associations to that list; that is something we can all do something about. Whenever we are met with indignation, having asked such basic questions as "Have these accounts been audited?", "What is the basis of your proposal?", or "How much money do we have?", or in trying to raise perfectly legitimate issues, we need to stand up to such negative reactions. You're standing up not

just for your cause, but for your just cause of democracy.

The original source of this article is Berkshire 9/11 Truth Movement
Copyright © [Global Research News](#), Berkshire 9/11 Truth Movement, 2013

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Global Research
News](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca