

STUDENT NAME	PORTIA BOATENG
STUDENT ID	2131530
PROGRAMME	BSC PROFESSIONAL POLICING
MODULE	PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COUNTER TERRORISM
MODULE CODE	BMPL6014
ASSIGNMENT TITTLE	CHALLENGES OF BALANCING NATIONAL SECUIRITY WITH THE PROTECTION OF CIVIL LIABILITIES

In modern society, the struggle to preserve a balance between national security and the protection of civil liberties has ended up increasingly complex. The UK government faces the challenging assignment of balancing the protection of person rights with the basic of countering terrorism (Walker, 2020). The adjusting act includes lawful, technological and moral dimensions. The United Kingdom, confronting the tireless danger of terrorism, has actualised different measures pointed at improving security and these measures regularly require observation, intelligence gathering, and limitations on development which can affect individual opportunities. In any case, these activities frequently raise concerns with respect to the potential infringement on person rights. Be that as it may, the government can utilise a few methodologies to play down infringements on civil liberties whereas successfully tending to national security concerns (Moran, 2020). Key methodologies may include administrative shields, legal oversight, human rights securities and transparency (Evans & Petty, 2022). This essay explores the challenges faced by the UK government in this delicate balancing act and suggests ways to ensure that individual rights are protected while effectively combating terrorism.

The essential objective of national security is to ensure the state, infrastructure, interests and its citizens are protected from the internal and external dangers, including terrorism, organised crime, cyberattacks, espionage and emerging threats such as pandemics and climate change (Muggah & Goldin, 2020). In England and Wales, the approach to national security issues is guided by several key documents, especially the National Security Strategy (NSS) and the Integrated Review, which contains the government's plan and strategies for resilience, defense, intelligence gathering or operations and the diplomatic

ways in responding to evolving threats. Some of the most visible agencies in the UK's national security methodology are the intelligence agencies MI5 (domestic security), MI6 (foreign intelligence), and GCHQ (cyber intelligence). These organisations collaborate to screen and neutralise security dangers, regularly working nearby international partners to handle cross-border issues. Since cyber threats have gotten to be progressively inescapable, the National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC), portion of GCHQ, plays a basic part in protecting the UK's digital infrastructure from state-sponsored attacks and cybercrime (NCSC, 2023).

The United Kingdom also emphasise community engagement in its national security technique, especially in counter-terrorism. The prevent technique points to hinder people from radicalisation, a foundation of efforts to avoid terrorism locally. Besides, international unions such as NATO and the Five Eyes intelligence-sharing network improve the UK's capacity to address dangers collectively and advance solidness on a global scale (Hernandez & Smith, 2022). In recent years, the UK has experienced critical challenges in this area, especially following high-profile terrorist attacks that have raised public mindfulness and fear. The government has reacted with enactment outlined to upgrade security, such as the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (2015) and the Investigatory Powers Act (2016). These laws empower authorities to conduct observation and assemble information in ways that a few argue compromise civil liberties. For instance, civil rights organizations like Liberty and Privacy International have raised issues about laws such as the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 that it may infringe on privacy rights.

On the other hand, England and Wales have a unique and enviable approach and traditions of civil liberties as compared to other countries. Civil liberties include the fundamental rights and flexibilities that people have in a democratic society. The rights and flexibilities protects citizens in the United Kingdom from and underserving government interferences and also ensure fair treatment and equal opportunities for all under the law. These include the right to security, freedom of expression, and the right to a fair trial. The danger to liberty is deceptive: it comes more from a disappointment to adapt to evolving conditions than intentional infringement of rights. Thus, the “gap between desire and reality”- the intent to uphold freedoms as against the challenges of implementing them in new contexts- can indirectly erode person’s rights (Smith, 1986). The challenge emerges when the measures taken to ensure national security struggle with these basic rights. The public's perception of security threats can lead to an environment where civil liberties are seen as secondary to safety, resulting in a move in approach and public discourse.

Legislation is one of the main challenge the United Kingdom faces when balancing national security with civil liberties. This challenge has heightens with the rise in computerised communication, terrorism, and threats to national security. Legislators frequently confront the sensitive assignment of surrounding laws that protect public security without infringing on individual opportunities. The Investigatory Powers Act (2016) engages security organisations with wide observation capabilities, including mass data retention and the capacity to intercept communications. Critics such as Liberty and Privacy International contend that this law compromises civil liberties by permitting

extensive governmental access to individual information with limited safeguards (Leigh, 2016).

The challenge is exacerbated by the need for transparent and effective oversight. The UK has set up the Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office (IPCO) to monitor the use of surveillance powers. Whereas IPCO speaks to a move towards more oversight, its viability is regularly questioned due to perceived limitations in controlling potential abuses of control. For example, watchdog organisations have criticised IPCO's dependence on self-reporting from intelligence organisations, possibly restricting its capacity to freely evaluate compliance with civil liberty measures (Liberty, 2020). Besides, the UK's enactment and oversight battle with technological advancements. Encryption, for instance, has become a point of dispute. Security offices contend that encrypted communications, whereas defensive of privacy, too make “safe spaces” for malicious actors (Amnesty International, 2021). The introduction of modern security legislation regularly happens in reaction to perceived threats. In any case, the speed at which these laws are sanctioned can weaken legitimate investigation and debate. For example, the Investigatory Powers Act (2016) allowed broad observation powers to law enforcement agencies such as Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) and local police forces. Faultfinders contend that such enactment needs satisfactory oversight and transparency, leading to potential abuse of power (Holt, 2020). Striking a balance between effective oversight and quick administrative activity is fundamental to secure civil liberties.

Balancing national security with civil liberties can be a complex challenge for the UK, as public fear and trust play a central part in forming policies. This balance frequently changes, impacted by public recognition of threats and the reliability of government activities. Public fear is regularly increased by events like terrorist attacks which can lead to broad support for restrictive measures. For instance, following the 2005 London bombings, the UK government presented more rigid observation and detention approaches to counter terrorism. The increased public fear within the wake of these attacks led to a greater tolerance for restrictive security arrangements, and individuals prioritised security over civil liberties (Huq, 2013). Essentially, legislative acts such as the Terrorism Act 2000 and the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 reflect this tension by growing government surveillance powers in reaction to seen threats. Critics contend that such laws excessively influence person security and civil liberties (McCulloch & Wilson, 2016), but public fear regularly shifts the balance towards tolerating expanded surveillance for perceived security. On the other hand, public believe altogether impacts the sustainability and acceptance of these measures. Trust in government educate is fundamental for public support of national security approaches, particularly when they infringe on individual opportunities. Studies demonstrate that when trust in government is high, citizens are more likely to acknowledge limitations on civil liberties for national security purposes (Huq, 2013). Then again, a decrease in trust can incite public opposition and demand for changes, as seen with the backlash against the UK's mass surveillance practices uncovered by Edward Snowden's leaks. These disclosures disintegrated public trust and started a debate on privacy rights versus security (Lyon, 2015). The risk of terrorism can incite fear among the public, which may lead to an

eagerness to give up certain rights for perceived security. In any case, this fear can also result in doubt towards the government and law enforcement organisations which includes MI5, MI6, and GCHQ. When people feel that their security is compromised, they may become less willing to coordinate with authorities. Hence, cultivating public trust is crucial in guaranteeing that citizens feel secure without fearing their own government (Bamford, 2021).

The quick evolution of computerised instruments has improved national security capabilities but has also raised ethical questions about surveillance and data security. For instance, intelligence organisations progressively depend on data to avoid criminal action and terrorism, accessing communications metadata—details about who communicates, when, and from where. This approach enables specialists to outline systems of criminal and terrorist movement, but it also implies an endless sum of individual data is available to the government, raising concerns around security and potential abuse of information. Advances in technology have changed the scene of surveillance and data collection. Whereas technology can upgrade security measures, it can also lead to significant privacy concerns. The use of facial acknowledgment technology and other observation devices raises questions around consent and the potential for abuse. The government must explore the fine line between leveraging technology for security and defending individual rights (Levin, 2019).

As a signatory to various universal human rights treaties, the UK has an obligation to maintain civil liberties. However, the usage of security measures can sometimes negate

these commitments. For instance, detention without trial, as seen in past counter-terrorism endeavors, raises genuine human rights concerns with examples including the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act (2001) which saw the UK detaining many foreign nationals in Belmarsh Prison without trial on the grounds of suspected involvement in terrorism and this led to a significant controversy which was challenged in the European Court of Human Rights and UK courts. The government must guarantee that its activities align with international measures whereas addressing security threats (Crawford, 2022). To ensure that security measures don't infringe upon the Right to Privacy, Right to Freedom of Assembly and the Right to Due Process, the UK government ought to strengthen oversight instruments for intelligence and law enforcement offices. Independent bodies ought to be built up to review and monitor the use of observation technologies and information collection practices. This oversight would increase transparency and responsibility, making a difference to revamp public trust.

Engaging the public on the need for public awareness is one of the ways to curb these challenges in balancing national security with civil liberties. The government ought to advance awareness campaigns that educate citizens about their rights and the suggestions of security measures. Making forums for public discourse can engage people to voice their concerns and contribute to policy discussions, cultivating a sense of ownership over their rights and security. For example, during the implementation of the Investigatory Powers Act (2016), civil liberties associations organised public forums and awareness sessions to educate and inform them of the scope and implications of the law (Liberty, 2017).

The government must ensure that any security measures actualized are proportionate to the risk confronted. This includes conducting careful evaluations of the need and adequacy of proposed measures. Policymakers ought to consider less intrusive alternatives before resorting to measures which will infringe upon civil liberties, guaranteeing that the reaction to dangers does not disproportionately affect person rights (Smith, 2023).

A holistic approach to counter-terrorism that addresses the root causes of radicalism is essential. This includes contributing in community programs, instruction, and social administrations that advance consideration and neutralize radicalization. The UK's "Prevent strategy" programme is part of the contest counter-terrorism programs which aims at engaging communities that are vulnerable to radical influences. Programmes such as the "Resilience Education" which was held in partnership with the "Educate Against Hate" provided resources and trained teachers to aid students identify and resist extremist ideologies. By tending to basic grievances, the government can diminish the offer of radical belief systems and minimize the requirement for obtrusive security measures.

To conclude, the challenge of balancing national security with the security of civil liberties may be a complex issue that requires careful thought and continuous discourse. Whereas the danger of terrorism is genuine and requests a vigorous reaction, the UK government must prioritise the security of person rights. By improving oversight instruments, advancing public engagement, and ensuring that security measures are proportionate

and compliant with human rights measures, the government can viably counter terrorism whereas maintaining the values of a democratic society. As society advances, so too must the approaches to security and respectful liberty, ensuring that both can coexist in a way that regards and secures the rights of all citizens.

References

Amnesty International. (2021). *Encryption: A Matter of Human Rights and National Security*. Amnesty International. Available at:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2021/04/encryption-human-rights-and-national-security/>. (Accessed 23 October 2024).

Bamford, J. (2021). *The Future of Privacy in an Age of Surveillance*. London: Penguin Books.

Crawford, A. (2022). *Human Rights and National Security: A Critical Examination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, M., & Petty, S. (2022). *Security and Civil liberties: Striking a balance in a modern state*. Oxford University Press.

Holt, T. J. (2020). *Legislating Security: The Impact of Policy on Civil Liberties*. *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*, 11(1), 25-47.

Huq, A. Z. (2013). "The Consequences of Surveillance for Citizens." *Harvard Law Review*. 126(6), 1854-1872.

Leigh, I. (2016). *The "Snooper's Charter" and its Implications for Privacy Rights in the UK*. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 45(3), 165-176.

Levin, A. (2019). *Surveillance, Technology, and the Right to Privacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyon, D. (2015). *Surveillance after Snowden*. Polity Press.

- McCulloch, J., & Wilson, D. (2016). *Pre-Crime: Pre-Emption, Precaution and the Future*. Routledge.
- Smith, R. (2023). *Counter-Terrorism and Civil Liberties: A Balancing Act*. *Security Studies*, 32(4), 563-580.
- Moran, J. (2020). *Surveillance, civil liberties, and the modern state: An analysis of UK policies on terrorism*. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 22(3), 457-474.
- Muggah, R., & Goldin, I. (2020). *Global threats to security in the 21st century: from terrorism to climate change*. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, Defence.
- Smith, A. (1986). *The Enduring Tension: Liberty and Modernity*.
- Smith, D. G. (1986). *British Civil Liberties and the Law*. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101(4), 637-660.
- Thomas, P. (2021). *Community-focused counter-terrorism: Evaluating the Prevent Strategy in the UK*. *Journal of Counter-Terrorism and Homeland Security*, 18(3), 127-143.
- Walker, C. (2020). *Terrorism and the Law in the United Kingdom*. Oxford University Press.