

**Motion against CTSB (Counter Terrorism and Security Bill) and the Prevent strategy
by Imperial College London Student Union**

Proposer: Jawaad Farooq

Seconder: Nida Mahmud, Shamim Ahmed

This Union Notes:

1. On 26 November 2014, the Home Secretary Theresa May introduced the **Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill** (CTSB) to Parliament highlighting some revised and new counter-terrorism powers that would be placed on a statutory basis.
2. That Student Unions including those of SOAS, UCL KCL, QM and LSE have all passed motions condemning and disassociating itself with the CTS Bill and the Prevent Strategy, deeming the latter to be a failed and counter-productive policy.
3. The Union currently carries out speaker approval and event monitoring scheme set in place to see that external speakers and events comply with union regulation by working with student societies, campus security and college. Whilst not run under the PREVENT strategy, the procedure is currently sufficient to maintain the confidence of the local police force in the College and Union combatting extreme radical views on campus.
4. **The new bill seeks to impose:**
 - a) That CTSB seeks to make the controversial **PREVENT and CHANNEL strategies statutory** upon institutes of higher education such as universities.
 - b) The duty upon staff and lecturers to actively keep an eye out for potential 'radicalisation' and 'extremism' on campus amongst students and work colleagues.
 - c) To vet every speaker by demanding material to be presented for scrutiny to the College beforehand and giving the PREVENT officer/team in contact with the university the final say on what to accept or reject as appropriate.
 - d) A broad ranging set of powers to authorities based on poorly defined terms and categories, which may impact civil liberties and basic human rights.
5. **Implications/concerns with the bill**
 - a) Universities UK have expressed **concerns about academic freedom** in their parliamentary briefing on the counter terrorism and security bill.
 - b) Former chief of MI5 and the current chairman of Imperial College London, Eliza Manningham-Buller has **condemned the bill** with concerns of it suppressing the very values 'we are seeking to protect' and that we should avoid 'double standards'.
 - c) That the **PREVENT strategy guidance in 2011** stated that university staff, lecturers and chaplains should report to the police any Muslim students who

are isolated or depressed, thereby creating a culture of fear and stigmatisation surrounding Muslim students.

- d) That according to the current Prevent Strategy, potential indicators of “radicalism” or “extremism” include:
 - “A need for identity, meaning and belonging.”
 - “A desire for political or moral change.”
 - “Relevant mental health issues.”
- e) That the bill will mean the Union and College lose their internal control over what events are run on campus.

The Union Believes:

1. The Counter Terrorism and Security Bill discourages the free expression and analysis of ideas.
2. The monitoring and exclusion of ideas from public debate opposes a basic function of universities: introducing students to a variety of opinions and encouraging them to analyse and debate them.
3. That the best way to counter ‘extreme’ narrative is to expose it through academic discourse at Imperial.
4. That while the further expectations from the student unions not only violate liberty and fundamental human rights, they also create unrealistic expectations of what students unions, lecturers and public institutions are expected to monitor and thus, just considering the notion logistically, one must conclude that it is unworkable.
5. That by risking the ability of a scope of events taking place from controversial speakers to student led events, the bill will simply drive certain activities off campus where they are currently held and regulated and as such any radical elements will be allowed to flourish unchecked without oversight that is now currently in place.

This Union Resolves:

1. That Imperial College Union (ICU) supports an enquiry into the legality of the proposals under the Equality Act 2010 and the Education Act No. 2 1986.
2. That ICU should issue a public statement condemning the PREVENT strategy and the government’s Counter Terrorism and Security bill.
3. For ICU to work with campus trade unions on combatting the PREVENT strategy and lobby them to condemn the Counter terrorism and Security bill.
4. That ICU will issue a formal statement to the college regarding PREVENT, asserting it to be a failed strategy with a counter-productive approach to tackling the issue of people being drawn into terrorism, and urge the university to reassess its ties with PREVENT.

5. That ICU should lobby local MPs urging them to speak out against the PREVENT policy, lobby to change the official understanding on the causes of radicalisation and subsequently change the approach PREVENT takes in its counter radicalisation measures.
6. To document all cases of any perceived abuse or intimidation reported by individuals as a consequence of PREVENT policies on campus and support those students through the relevant channels.
7. To mandate the Student officers to report on how PREVENT, CHANNEL and other similar initiatives are attempting to engage with the university and vice versa.
8. That ICU will educate students and help initiatives by students to educate and debate on the dangers that the counter terrorism and security bill (CTSB) and the PREVENT Strategy pose to academic freedom and individual liberties of the student body.
9. To counter 'extreme' narrative by engaging in open dialogue and discussion while maintaining mutual respect and trust with the students and acknowledging that this is the best form of countering 'extreme' and 'radical' ideas.