

BRITISH PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON COUNTER TERRORISM

'Let no one be in any doubt. The rules of the game are changing.'

On August 5, British Prime Minister **Tony Blair** announced stringent new measures to be taken by his government to combat terrorism. The approach Mr. Blair outlined is a radical escalation in the war against terrorism and can be expected to have a significant impact, not only in the UK, but also perhaps in other countries around the world grappling with extremism. We feel that of the extraordinary sweep of the proposed measures and the seriousness of the implications for the future warrant the full text of Mr. Blair's address being reproduced below for our readers.

SINCE 7 July the response of the British people has been unified, dignified, and remarkable. Of course there is anxiety and worry. But the country knows the purpose of terrorism is to intimidate and it is not inclined to give in to such intimidation. Of course, too, there have been isolated and unacceptable acts of a racial or religious hatred. But they have been isolated. By and large Britain knows it is a tolerant and good-natured nation, is rather proud of it, and has responded to this terrorism with tolerance and good nature in a way that has won the admiration of people and nations the world over.

However, I am acutely aware that alongside these feelings is also a determination that this very tolerance and good nature should not be abused by a small, but fanatical minority; and an anger that it has been.

Time and again, over the past few weeks, I have been asked to deal firmly with those prepared to engage in such extremism; and most particularly those who incite it or proselytise it. The Muslim community are our partners in this endeavour. Much of the insistence on strong action to weed out extremism is coming most vigorously from Muslims themselves, deeply concerned lest the activities of the fanatical fringe should contaminate the good reputation of the mainstream community.

Such action in the past has been controversial. Each tightening of the law has met fierce opposition. Regularly we have had defeat in Parliament or the courts. The Anti-Terrorism legislation, passed in 2001 after September 11th was declared partially invalid. The successor legislation hotly contested.

But, for obvious reasons, the mood now is different. People do not talk of "scare-mongering." To be fair, the Conservative leadership

has responded with a genuine desire to work together for the good of the country as have the Liberal Democrats.

Over the past two weeks, intensive meetings across government have taken place to set a comprehensive framework for action in dealing with the terrorist threat in Britain. Today I want to give you our preliminary assessment of the measures we need urgently to examine.

In the meantime, insofar as administrative measures, not requiring legislation, can be taken, we will act with immediate effect.

In looking both at the law and administrative measures, we have surveyed extensively practice in other countries, including in particular other European countries. There will be a series of consultation papers over the coming weeks starting with a research paper that will detail experience in other countries. There will also be a cross

government unit staffed by senior hand-picked officials to drive this forward framework for action under the guidance of Bill Jeffrey, the Intelligence and Security Coordinator and the Cabinet Committee on Counter Terrorism which I chair. The Home Secretary with whom I have been talking closely in the past week, will have the Cabinet responsibility for coordinating this.

Here are the measures either being taken now, immediately, or under urgent examination.

1. The Home Secretary today publishes new grounds for deportation and exclusion. Deportation is a decision taken by the Home Secretary under statute. The new grounds will include fostering hatred, advocating violence to further a person's beliefs, or justifying or validating such violence. These grounds will be subject to a short consultation period which will finish in August. Even under existing grounds, we

are today signalling a new approach to deportation orders. Let no one be in any doubt. The rules of the game are changing.

These cases will, of course, be tested in the courts. Up to now, the concern has been that orders for deportation will be struck down as contrary to Article 3 of the ECHR, as interpreted by the European Court in the Chahal case in 1996; and indeed have had such cases struck down.

However, the circumstances of our national security have now self-evidently changed and we believe we can get the necessary assurances from the countries to which we will return the deportees, against their being subject to torture or ill-treatment contrary to Article 3. We have concluded a Memorandum of Understanding with Jordan and are close to getting necessary assurances from other relevant countries. For example, I have had very constructive conversations



yesterday with the leaders of Algeria and Lebanon. There are around 10 such countries with whom we are seeking such assurances.

France and Spain, to name just two other European countries, do deport by administrative decision. The effect is often immediate and in some cases the appeal is non-suspensive, i.e. it takes place outside the country. The assurances given by the receiving nation are adequate for their courts and these countries are also subject to the ECHR and apply it directly.

So it is important to test this anew now, in view of the changed conditions in Britain. Should legal obstacles arise, we will legislate further, including, if necessary amending the Human Rights Act, in respect of the interpretation of the ECHR. In any event, we will consult on legislating specifically for a non-suspensive appeal process in respect of deportations.

One other point on deportations. Once the new grounds take effect, there will be a list drawn up of

specific extremist web-sites, bookshops, centres, networks, and particular organisations of concern. Active engagement with any of these will be a trigger for the Home Secretary to consider the deportation of any foreign national.

2. As has been stated already, there will be new anti-terrorism legislation in the Autumn. This will include an offence of condoning or glorifying terrorism. The sort of remarks made in recent days should be covered by such laws. But this will also be applied to justifying or glorifying terrorism anywhere, not just in the UK.

3. Anyone who has participated in terrorism or has anything to do with it anywhere will automatically be refused asylum.

4. We have already powers to strip citizenship from those individuals with British or dual nationality who act in a way that is contrary to the interests of this country. We will now consult on extending these, applying them to naturalised citizens engaged in

extremism and making the procedures simpler and more effective.

5. Cases such as Rashid Ramda, wanted for the Paris metro bombing ten years ago and who is still in the UK whilst France seeks extradition, are completely unacceptable. We will begin consultation, on setting a maximum time limit for all future extradition cases involving terrorism.

6. We are already examining a new court procedure which would allow a pre-trial process. We will also examine whether the necessary procedure to give us a way of meeting the police and security service request that detention pre-charge of terrorist suspects be significantly extended.

7. For those who are British nationals and who cannot be deported, we will extend the use of control orders. Any breach can mean imprisonment.

8. To expand the court capacity necessary to deal with this and other related issues, the Lord Chancellor will increase the number of special judges hearing such cases.

9. We will proscribe Hizb-ut-Tahrir and the successor organisation of Al Mujahiroun. We will also examine the grounds of proscription to widen them and put proposals forward in the new legislation.

10. It is now necessary, in order to acquire British citizenship, that people attend a citizenship ceremony, swear allegiance to the country, and have a rudimentary grasp of the English language. We will review the threshold for this to make sure it is adequate and we will establish, with the Muslim community, a commission to advise on how, consistent with people's complete freedom to worship in the way they want, and to follow their own religion and culture, there is better integration of those parts of the community presently inadequately integrated. I have asked Hazel Blears to make this part of the work she is currently undertaking.

11. We will consult on a new power to order closure of a place of worship which is used as a centre for fomenting extremism and will consult with Muslim leaders in respect of those clerics who are not British citizens, to draw up a list of those not suitable to preach who will

be excluded from Britain.

12. We will bring forward the proposed measures on the security of our borders, with a series of countries specifically designated for bio-metric visas over the next year. Meanwhile, the Home Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office are compiling an international database of those individuals whose activities or views pose a threat to Britain's security. Anyone on the database will be excluded from entry with any appeal only taking place outside the country.

We will extend widely on these measures, including the other political parties. This is evidently a heavy agenda to take forward. But it is necessary. Let me also make it clear. If legislation can be made ready in time and the right consensus is achieved, we are ready to recall Parliament in September, at least to begin the debate over the measures.

I want to make it clear, yet again, that this is not in any sense aimed at the decent, law-abiding Muslim community of Britain. We know this fringe does not truly represent Islam. We know British Muslims in general abhor the actions of the extremists. We acknowledge Muslim contribution to our country and welcome it; welcome those who visit in peace; welcome those who know that in this country, the respect and tolerance towards others, which we believe in, is the surest guarantee of freedom and progress for people of all religious faiths.

But, coming to Britain is not a right. And even when people have come here, staying here carries with it a duty. That duty is to share and support the values that sustain the British way of life. Those that break that duty and try to incite hatred or engage in violence against our country and its people, have no place here. Over the coming months, in the courts, in Parliament, in debate and engagement with all parts of our communities, we will work to turn those sentiments into reality. That is my duty as Prime Minister.



Security tightened in London.

A call for certifying healthcare providers

SYED SAAD ANDALEEB

PEOPLE in Bangladesh are intensely service-deprived and need more and better services from various sectors including education, healthcare, water, electricity, banking, and so on. Among these services, healthcare services are crucial, with long term ramifications. While it is generally assumed that good health is a direct outcome of strong economic development, a report commissioned by the World Health Organization contends just the opposite: that strong economic development is an important outcome of improved health. The contention is: better health would fuel stronger economic development. The question is whether the country's healthcare providers have served their constituencies and played their role in economic development?

It is perhaps true that some health indicators like infant and maternal mortality have improved. Attainments in crude death rates, weight at birth, and related measures of health also show favourable signs. At least that's what we are told in the documents of the ministry (MOHFW) and other international bodies. Are these documents reliable? Have they been externally validated? I raise these questions because the evidence about healthcare in publicly available documents -- especially in the media -- paints a completely different and rather foreboding picture. Here's a minuscule sampling of the daily headlines:

- 74% doctors dodge duty (DS: Sept 22, 2003)
- Banned drugs on sale (DS: Nov 14, 2003)
- Anomalies, corruption rule Nalitabari health complex (DS: Nov 21, 2003)
- Giant health plan, little success (DS: Jan 3, 2004)
- Trolley touts, clinic brokers rule the emergency units (Independent: Oct 25, 2003)
- Health practitioners: Above the law? (DS: Feb 26, 04)

For a service that is best classified as credence-based, where the consumer has little knowledge or understanding of what (s)he receives for the money paid or the tribulations endured, the above headlines can be very unsettling. What is most troubling is the growing evidence that people's trust in healthcare providers is low or one of calculated ambivalence. The number of people seeking health services abroad is one strong indicator of this lack of trust. Unless this trust can be boosted, the prognosis for the nation's physical, emotional, and economic health is dire.

In an era, when there is much talk about transparency and accountability, periodic certification of healthcare providers can play a crucial role in gaining public confidence. Certification serves as a mechanism to ensure that healthcare providers are up-to-date on their knowledge

There is a great deal more that needs to be done to improve healthcare services. Primarily, however, the trust of the public must be re-established. To that end, certification provides renewed hope for the healthcare industry to redeem itself.

and skills while adhering to best practices. By making them undergo regular and periodic certification, and by requiring this certification to be openly displayed in the nation's health system, the public's confidence can be given a huge lift. It is pertinent to note that Bangladeshi healthcare personnel who work in other countries are subjected to rigorous certification procedures periodically. Most of them are also able to rise to the challenge. Certainly, it is also conceivable for Bangladeshi healthcare providers to be subjected to similar and rigorous certification procedures that they should be able to surmount. This process must be locally relevant, adapted to the context, and incorporate the need for periodic upgrading of standards to "raise" the quality of health care delivery over time.

The program must primarily be developed and administered by professionals from the healthcare area and vetted by healthcare recipients and regulatory bodies. Those in charge must only be responsible for developing and maintaining the program with strict oversight responsibilities. To gain public trust quickly, it may be necessary initially to use experts from abroad with stellar credentials to set up and administer the certification process. Competitive benchmarking may be used to identify, introduce and incorporate higher standards from neighbouring countries as the system evolves. Through the certification process,

health care providers would have to "earn the right" to practice and maintain this right over time. Obviously, severe penalties must be incorporated and invoked for those who do not measure up, fail to comply, or try to bypass the system. Legal sanctions are also necessary to induce good service.

Interestingly, the country's healthcare providers have ensured, until now, that they cannot be held legally accountable or taken to task for their mistakes, especially the egregious one causing loss of life or limb. A bill was passed by the cabinet to punish them for negligence leading to death, serious and sustained mental suffering, or loss of limb. The proposed punishment included cancellation of practitioner's license, ten years rigorous imprisonment, and/or a penalty of Tk. 10 lakhs. Unfortunately, it was withdrawn under tremendous pressure from the health practitioners. It is now time for service "recipients" to create equal or greater pressure for health practitioners to comply with basic standards incorporated in the certification process or be held accountable legally.

It is also vitally important that the certification process be understood by the general public; it must have components that they can comprehend. Rating scales, something akin to those applied to financial, educational, and even healthcare institutions in advanced countries could be established to rate the hospitals and their services. Such ratings could be based on hospital

facilities, past performance records, patient evaluations and a host of other vital factors. To make things easier for those uninterested in details, certified hospitals and healthcare providers may be graded or ranked as diamond, platinum, gold, silver, and bronze that the public can readily understand. It goes without saying that it would be important to determine, specify, and strongly enforce sanctions for tampering with past records and any type of evaluations.

In addition, the certification information must be widely available to the public through mandated hospital and related information centers. Hospitals should also be required to offer only a government- or professionally-certified list of services and nothing else, thereby restricting their services to their established competencies. The list of services a hospital is "allowed" to provide should be available to patients on demand.

There is a great deal more that needs to be done to improve healthcare services. Primarily, however, the trust of the public must be re-established. To that end, certification provides renewed hope for the healthcare industry to redeem itself. I might add that there are other practitioners such as teachers or engineers who also affect human lives; they must also be brought within the ambit of a certification apparatus so that their services to the public can be measured, valued and rewarded as needed.

Dr. Syed Saad Andaleeb is Professor and Program Chair, Sam & Irene Black School of Business, The Pennsylvania State University, Erie, USA.



A great deal more needs to be done to improve healthcare services.

Good-bye, Sudan

SAAD S. KHAN

SUDANESE Peoples Liberation Army chief John Garang died just three weeks after the long-awaited Final Agreement was signed between his SPLM and the Sudanese junta led by Gen. Omar el-Bashir, after a long and protracted civil war lasting over two decades and costing as many million lives. Far from being a harbinger for a better tomorrow, the agreement has all but sealed the fate of Sudan, its stability and territorial integrity, assuming that there was any, and that of quite a few of the neighbouring states.

The new constitution signed in July 2005, is a sequel to the January 2005 peace treaty, ending bloodshed. The deal makes Beshir the President, Garang the First Vice President, which is nothing but a euphemism for two independent Presidents for the Muslim North and the animist South of the country. The share in cabinet posts is 52 percent for Beshir's nominees, 28 percent for Garang's men and remaining 20 percent for smaller groups. This is a six year transition arrangement, following which a referendum on independence shall be held in the South. Three central regions of the Nuba mountains, blue Nile, and oil-rich Obiye have been given special status since both North and South believe them to be their part. Literally all the contentious issues remain unresolved and this is likely to trigger acrimonious disputes sooner than later, as would the simmering discontent among the various disgruntled segments all over the country who are uncomfortable with the concessions given to Garang and his allied warlords.

Sudan derives its name from the Arabic phrase *Bilaad-us-Soudan* (literally: the regions inhabited by the blacks), as it was known to the Arabs inhabiting in the lower Nile, presently Egypt. This unique country had the double distinction of being area-wise the largest country in the Muslim world as well as that in continental Africa. A short time hence, this fact will be history, and it is debatable whether even the areas around Khartoum would like to remain being known as Sudan. While celebrating what the peace agreement says, a vigilant press and a vibrant civil society is the only path to national integration. And that a pact between tyrants, war criminals, and liars is not worth the paper it is written upon.

Sudan is a big potential volcano, and the civilised world needs to act now to preempt the destabilising and debilitating effects that loom large for Africa. The United Nations should launch a special non-military operation in Sudan, to assist the country in moving towards multi-party democracy, rule of law, and free market economy.



The widow of Vice-President John Garang, Rebecca Nyandeng, speaks at the final service at Juba as Garang was buried 06 August there.

Sudan is a chronic case of state failure, only that it was not suggested so in writing, that has been mercifully done now. Rich in oil and gold deposits, fertile in land and alluvial assets around the blue Nile, booming in cotton and food harvest, and a teeming enterprising nation, it missed in just two elements; democracy and the rule of law. And this duo is the thing that determines the fate of the state. Dictators disintegrate their countries; Said Barre broke Somalia, Yahya Khan broke Pakistan, Suharto broke Indonesia and the list awaits the inclusion of Bashir for being the last ruler of the Sudan with its present boundaries. Sudan is a chronic case in many respects, but not an exception, as decency and democracy, not tyranny, is the exception in the developing world. From Morocco to Angola to Indonesia to Uzbekistan, autocracy is the norm, albeit in democratic facade. One could wish that the G-8 leaders understand the annual \$50 billion aid projected to Africa, will exacerbate the poverty and disparity in Africa to astronomical proportions, unless and until the era of sham democracy, manipulated parliaments and judiciary, and crony capitalism is shown the door.

On paper, Sudan is a democracy, where general rule by "getting elected" by killing, incarcerating and maiming all the prospective competitors. The SPLA and SPLM are putatively "people's movements" where their only "treatment" to people is that they have been killing their own people. The world tries to paint Bashir as an Islamist theocrat, although, to be fair to the devil, this is one thing he is not. He somersaults his ideological identity

triennially on the average. He rebelled against the constitution and law by overthrowing a democratic civil government through a military coup in 1989. Ever since, he has been in search of legitimacy.

First, he thought he was a revolutionary leader but then dissolved his handpicked Revolutionary Command Council, eliminating a few powerful generals in the process, and became a self-proclaimed third world hero, a la Qaddafi-style. When the US bombed him in 1998, he became an Islamist and adopted Shariah Law. And when this did not work as the anticipated Arab petro-dollars did not flow in to prop up his regime in the name of Islam, he started jailing and torturing his religious allies including his spiritual ideologue Hassan Turabi. He chose to become a democrat by holding farcical polls and trying to pose as elected President, as this sells easily with the donor agencies, but when Parliament asserted its powers, he dissolved it on treason charges and these days the general is "busy" fighting the politically-correct war on terror. Under his rule, one of the greatest genocides against Muslims is being religiously carried out in Darfur.

John Garang was as much a devout Christian as Bashir is a *mullah*. Garang, a Ph.D in agro-economics from the US, was a graduate of Grinnell College, Iowa, and later Fort Benning Military Institute. Much as he would pose as champion of Christianity, he was born in 1945 in sky-worshipping Dinka community in the South. An officer in the Sudanese army, while on a mission to quell a mutiny in 1983, he himself quelled against the lawful authority in 1983, and became an outlaw. His ideological

convictions, mercifully, he did not know. He was nationalist, and in the days leading to his death was a Christian fundamentalist, exploiting his links with such groups during his sojourns in the United States, in channelling money for his militant activities. And this aid from Christian extremist groups worldwide explains the swelling of SPLA/SPLM ranks to 50,000 plus, from the peak of twelve poorly equipped and loosely commanded units consisting of 12,000 men in all, in the mid-1980s and the financing of his "Voice of Hope" clandestine radio station, operated by Christian extremists from neighbouring Uganda.

The commonalities between the two great sons of Sudan, Beshir and Garang are their cunningness, opportunism, and vindictiveness. Both eliminated dissent in their ranks with ruthless murders, both survived many life attempts (Garang's death was a natural accident) and both killed countless numbers of their own peoples. The agreement between them has converted the *de facto* bifurcation of Sudan into a *de jure* one. South was practically independent and the dusty town of Rumbek, a combo of hundreds of destroyed hamlets with no electricity, water, or sewerage, has been off bounds for Khatoun rulers from as far back as in early twentieth century.

Neither Beshir, nor Garang was sincere in embracing the other. Beshir wants a breather to spare his troops for throttling political dissent in the North, while Garang wanted to cement his iron grip in the South. Fate decreed otherwise and he died in a helicopter crash. The arrangement envisaged raising the 320,000 barrels per day output to nearly half a million bpd by next year, to be shared equally between the North and South. With oil prices soaring at sky-high \$62 a barrel, the accruing petro-revenues will make the two sides fight like hell. Egypt's unease at another upper riparian state on the Nile with Israel's obduracy to finance SPLM on his Islamophobic antics, means that Sudan's problems would have wider regional ramifications. The SPLM, with commitments of \$4.5 billion from Christian groups, already in its pocket, is prompting Islamic organisations worldwide to be sympathetic to Beshir.

Sudan is a big potential volcano, and the civilised world needs to act now to preempt the destabilising and debilitating effects that loom large for Africa. The United Nations should launch a special non-military operation in Sudan, to assist the country in moving towards multi-party democracy, rule of law, and free market economy. Otherwise, the signs on horizon are foretelling doom.

Saad S. Khan is an Oxford-published author and a widely read analyst on politics, law, and governance in the Muslim world.