

## Northampton University and The Metropolitan Police Service

Tony Shell

The Radicalism and The New Media group (the RNM Group) is based at the University of Northampton, and was established in 2009.<sup>1</sup> The declared aim of the RNM group is to: “bring together experts in Law, History, Media and Psychology from across the University, to work with organisations including the Police, Local Authorities and the Home Office” – with the RNM Group reporting that: “Projects already underway include collaboration with regional Police authorities to look at public safety and radicalisation. The [RNM] Group is also in direct contact with SO15 [The Counter Terrorism Specialist Operations branch within London’s Metropolitan Police Service] ...”<sup>2</sup>

The Counter Terrorism Command (the CTC, also designated as SO15) is based within the Metropolitan Police Service in London. The duties of the CTC, through its National Co-ordinator Domestic Extremism section (NCDE)<sup>3</sup>, include intelligence gathering and the policing of public protest.<sup>4</sup> The CTC works closely with both the UK Security Service (MI5) and the Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) – as well as with the law enforcement and intelligence agencies of other countries.

On the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2011 the Metropolitan Police Service was asked: “whether or not the Home Office approved the working contacts between the Metropolitan Police Service (the MPS) and the Radicalism and New Media Research Group (the RNM Group)? Who approved and authorised that particular collaborative effort?”<sup>5</sup> A response was received from a representative of the Specialist Operations (SO15) branch of The Metropolitan Police, on the 5<sup>th</sup> January 2012, saying: “I can confirm that Assistant Chief Constable Setchell, who was the head of the National Public Order Intelligence Unit, commissioned RNMG to undertake academic research relating to public protest.”<sup>6</sup>

The University of Northampton’s RNM Group claims to be concerned with ‘radicalism’. However it is considered most extraordinary that the RNM Group shows no interest in the problems of Islamist radicalism and terrorism – especially so, given that independent research shows that: “... Since then [the 1990s], British universities have consistently acted as breeding grounds for extremism, with British university graduates joining jihadist movements in Iraq, Kashmir, Israel and elsewhere.”<sup>7</sup>

Other research has shown that: “More than 30% of individuals involved in Islamist terrorism in the UK were educated to degree level or higher. Of these, 19 individuals studied at a UK university; 16 were graduates; three were postgraduate students and one had achieved a postgraduate qualification. At least four individuals involved in acts of terrorism in the UK were senior members of their university ISOC [Islamic Society] and a further six were studying at a UK university at the time of arrest.” Interviews, concluded as part of that research, have also revealed: “students who are active in their university Islamic society were twice as likely as non-members to hold extreme views, including that killing in the name of religion was justified ... Three fifths of active ISOC members said killing in the name of religion can be justified.”<sup>8</sup>

The attitude of the RNM Group appears to be very clear – that those within the UK who are driven to anger by Islamist extremism and terrorism, and who express that anger through protest, should be subject to ridicule, vilification and “curtailment”.<sup>9</sup> What, therefore, should we conclude?

However it is of crucial importance to distinguish between the teachers of hate – and the vulnerable (and often very impressionable) students who are subjected to such odious forms of political control.

From the material published by the RNM Group, it seems very clear that the Group believes its work to be more than just an investigation of public protest, but has clear political purpose – and that that purpose is given State endorsement through the involvement of the Metropolitan Police Service. In the space of just two years the RNM Group has established close working links with senior UK police officers, including representatives for the National Coordinator Domestic Extremism (NCDE) within the CTC<sup>10</sup> – as well as with extremist political groups including the US-based Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), the US-based Political Research Associates (PRA), and the UK-based Searchlight organization.<sup>11 12 13</sup>

It is the activities of the SPLC, the PRA and Searchlight that provides the clearest insights into the intended political nature of the academia/police (Northampton-RNM/SO15) collaboration. It is drawn from a 'progressive' ideology that concocts political justification for: anti-native hatemongering;<sup>14 15</sup> mass immigration;<sup>16 17</sup> abortion as "*reproductive justice*";<sup>18 19</sup> the injection of hate narrative into the Criminal Justice System;<sup>20</sup> the use of 'false flag' deceptions and violence;<sup>21 22</sup> the undermining and destruction of Christian heritage;<sup>23 24 25</sup> and the psycho-sociological abuse of children and infants.<sup>26</sup>

There is a refusal by the 'progressives' to engage in debate, with vigorous attempts to suppress counter-arguments through the use of personal attacks, smears, innuendo, misrepresentation, and abusive comment.<sup>27</sup> In particular, and in the context of this report, there appears to be an attempt to stifle legitimate concerns regarding the presence of University-based Islamist extremism.<sup>28</sup>

A posture of craven appeasement to the aggressive demands of both political 'progressivism' and Islamist extremism has been adopted by the offices of Government and State – and most especially so, within the Home Office, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. This has been fully exposed in a detailed investigation, based on leaked HO and FCO documents, by The Policy Exchange in 2006.<sup>29</sup>

Such research strongly indicates that the main aim of the State has been, through appeasement, to prevent political or revolutionary Islamists becoming violent Islamists or Salafi-jihadists. However the recommendations from such research is that that approach is wrong, and that all Islamist (political) ideology should be directly challenged – with appropriate 'ways and means' being incorporated into an updated version of the Government's CONTEST/PREVENT strategy.<sup>30</sup> However it is very disturbing to see that there are still calls for the State to appease political Islamists and jihadists.<sup>31</sup>

In regard to concerns raised in this report, the conclusions of a study into Islamist extremism by the Quilliam Foundation are especially relevant. The researchers recommended that: "*Assessment and inspection regimens need to be improved to ensure that lecturers and teachers who subscribe to an extreme ideology are not using their academic positions to spread their ideology to students, as is currently the case in several university campuses.*"<sup>32</sup> Yes, quite so.

A copy of this report is being sent to the Special Operations branch of The Metropolitan Police Service, at New Scotland Yard, with a strong recommendation that the MPS sever all links with the Northampton University RNM Group.

END

## Notes and References

- <sup>1</sup> 'Radicalism and New Media – about us', Radicalism and New Media Research Group at the University of Northampton', downloaded on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2011
- <sup>2</sup> 'Counterterrorism Review at The University of Northampton, Radicalism and New Media Research Group at the University of Northampton', 05 2010, source: <http://www.radicalism-new-media.org/?p=196> downloaded on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2011
- <sup>3</sup> 'About NCDE', the Association of Police Officers, downloaded on the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2011 from the ACPO website: <http://www.acpo.police.uk/NationalPolicing/NCDENationalCoordinatorDomesticExtremism/AboutNCDE.aspx>
- <sup>4</sup> 'ACPO Job Description: Head of Confidential Intelligence Unit (CIU), National Public Order Intelligence Unit (NPIOU)', undated, p2454 Thames Valley Police, references to CIU activities, as a part of the NPIOU, NCDE of ACPO TAM, and to the use of CHIS assets,
- <sup>5</sup> The Metropolitan Police Service failed to acknowledge receipt of the letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2011. Therefore a further letter was sent on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2011, again requesting information regarding collaboration between the MPS and the RNM Group.
- <sup>6</sup> Letter received from the Specialist Operations branch of The Metropolitan Police Service, New Scotland Yard, on the 5<sup>th</sup> January 2012 (letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> December 2011).
- <sup>7</sup> 'British Universities Continue to Breed Extremists', by James Brandon, CTC Sentinel January 2011 Volume 4 Issue 1, Combating Terrorism Centre at West Point
- <sup>8</sup> 'Radical Islam on UK Campuses – A Comprehensive List of Extremist Speakers at UK Universities', The Centre for Social Cohesion, April 2010
- <sup>9</sup> For example, the so called 'Unite Against Fascism' – a racist (anti-white/English) hatemongering organisation that routinely mobilises young people to physically oppose those protesting against Islamist extremism and jihadism. Protestors are abusively labelled as "*fascists*", "*Nazis*", et cetera. Support for the UAF is drawn predominantly from within the universities and colleges (students and staff). See: 'Institutionalised Extremism', by Tony Shell, first published in the independent newspaper UK Column, issue N° 3, 2011
- <sup>10</sup> 'Forthcoming Conference: Think Global, Hate Local: Britain's Far-Right in Focus', 15<sup>th</sup> April 2011, Radicalism and New Media Research Group at the University of Northampton', downloaded on the 8<sup>th</sup> November 2011. Participants included the police (NCDE), and the extremist political organization Searchlight.
- <sup>11</sup> 'Fascist Radicalism and The New Media', Symposium at The University of Northampton Park Campus, 17<sup>th</sup> September 2010, conference call, downloaded on the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011. Participants included the extremist political group Searchlight.
- <sup>12</sup> 'Links: Radicalism and New Media - Radicalism and New Media Research Group at the University of Northampton', downloaded from: <http://www.radicalism-new-media.org> on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2011. Lists include to the extremist political organizations Southern Poverty Law Center (US-based), Political Research Associates (US-based), and Searchlight (UK-based).
- <sup>13</sup> 'Editorial October 2011', Searchlight Magazine
- <sup>14</sup> An anti-native ideology therefore features prominently within the RNM Group's political output. A recent report by the RNM Group states: "*The opening keynote was delivered by Hans-Georg Betz, who gave a fascinating lecture about populism, nativism and its legacies in contemporary far-wing [sic] ideology. This set the tone for the entire conference, and throughout the day, academics presented in parallel sessions exploring the far right across Europe today*". The derogatory attribution of "nativism" to native people of Europe exposes a contempt towards those native people (such as the English). See: 'Conference Report on Populist Racism in Britain and Europe Since 1945', reference to a lecture by Hans-George Betz on 'nativism', second paragraph, Radicalism and New Media Group, University of Northampton, 19<sup>th</sup> November 2011, downloaded on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011
- <sup>15</sup> Such as in the bizarre assumption of the RNM Group that the report: 'Colin Jordan's "Merry England" and "Universal Nazism"', (Dr. Paul Jackson, Radicalism and New Media, Working Papers, Volume 1, N° 2, May 2011) has any kind of contemporary relevance. However the choice of this subject, as a seminal piece of RNM Group research, indicates how the RNM Group prefer to see the English people (and how it wishes the English to be seen by others, including members of the ethnic minority community).
- <sup>16</sup> 'A Guide to Understanding The Tactics of The Southern Poverty Law Center in The Immigration Debate', Federation for American Immigration Reform', September 2009
- <sup>17</sup> The linking of "*nativism*" with "*the far right*" is a political construct used to demonize native populations, and to justify the creation of a racist political State able (ultimately) to pursue population replacement. See, for example: 'Genocide – A Modern Crime', by Dr. Raphael Lemkin, Free World magazine, Vol.4, April 1945, pages 39-43, 'Techniques of Genocide'
- <sup>18</sup> See, for example, 'Continued Threats to Reproductive Rights', The Public Eye, a publication for the Political Research Associates, Fall 2009, Volume XXIV, N° 3, pages 3 and 6, reference: [pe-fall-09.pdf](http://www.publiceye.org/ark/reproductive-justice/new-overview.php)
- <sup>19</sup> 'Polished Lenses and Focused Targets: Defending Reproductive Justice', by Pam Chamberlain, Political Research Associates, 2009, source: <http://www.publiceye.org/ark/reproductive-justice/new-overview.php>
- <sup>20</sup> For example: Although a North American organization, the PRA recently launched a vitriolic attack against the UK-based Fathers4Justice movement (F4J). The F4J movement was formed to raise public awareness regarding court judgments following a divorce that (through intervention by the State-run Child Support Agency) have all-too-often resulted in the access of fathers to their children being severely limited (or denied). The PRA claims that: "*By deliberately spreading misinformation, father's rights groups have managed to shift the grounds for discussion about violence against women from a feminist challenge to men's physical power to a male-centered attack on women*". What is very evident, here, is the totally dishonest tactic of conflating two different issues –

of domestic violence (that is committed by both men and women), and that of the natural right of a father to have access to his children. It is a tactic driven by political dogma, by an extremist ideology that purposefully seeks to foment distrust, hate and conflict. The final conclusions of the PRA article on this subject state: “*Practitioners of feminine family law ... should alert progressive judicial watchdogs to scour the courts for changes in patterns of legal judgments. Such vigilance will reduce the amount of havoc such groups [as the F4J] can inflict on women, children and the culture as a whole.*” This is therefore an attempt by political extremists to introduce crude political ‘hate narrative’ into judicial proceedings. It is totally contrary to the principles of Common Law. See: ‘Father’s Rights Groups Threaten Women’s Gains – And Their Safety’, by Pam Chamberlain, *The Public Eye*, a publication of the Political Research Associates, Spring 2011, Volume XXVI, N° 1, page 20.

<sup>21</sup> Recently published research has exposed the past involvement of senior Searchlight staff in helping to establish; giving assistance to; and of representing far right groups within England (from the mid-1970s onwards). It is now known that those groups were linked to neo-Nazi gangs, located within the European mainland, and operated by the foreign section of the East German Ministerium für Staatssicherheit (the MfS/HVA, under Markus Wolf). See: ‘State Instigated, False Flag Terrorism’, by Tony Shell, October 2011, document reference: special\_projects\_07.pdf, first published in the UK Column, issue N° 4 2011

<sup>22</sup> In 1980, a leaked London Weekend Television memorandum revealed that Searchlight had been feeding the news media with ‘intelligence’ information on UK-based left-wing activists supportive of the PLO. Such behaviour (in 1977) is one of the earliest demonstrations of Searchlight’s anti-nativist extremism (in that particular case, with regard to the struggle of Palestinian people within the Occupied Territories). The *New Statesman* article (that exposed the LWT/Searchlight memo) also revealed evidence of other ‘dirty tricks’ being used against pro-Palestinian groups – including efforts by *agent provocateurs* to create an appearance of “*violent anti-Semitism*” within those groups. See: ‘Destabilising the Decent People’, Duncan Campbell, Bruce Page and Nick Anning, *The New Statesman*, 15<sup>th</sup> February 1980. Analysis of the ‘LWT memorandum, 2<sup>nd</sup> May 1977’ is based upon a London Library copy of the original *New Statesman* article.

<sup>23</sup> For example, of making unsubstantiated accusations against a prominent US-based conservative Christian, and pro-life supporter, of having: “*served an array of unpleasantness around the world: Latin American death squads, anti-abortion and anti-gay extremists, theocratic Christian nationalists, faith-based fascists and covert CIA operations.*” Reference: ‘Disciples of Blood’, by Michael Reynolds, *Searchlight Magazine*, March 2003, pages 30-31. The source is scanned images from the original magazine, obtained from the University of Glasgow.

<sup>24</sup> ‘The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Hate-mongers – On The Southern Poverty Law Center’, by John Vennari, *Catholic Family News*, source: <http://www.cfnews.org/SPLC.htm>

<sup>25</sup> For example the attempt by Chip Berlet, a senior analyst for Political Research Associates, and close associate of the RNM Group, to connect the murderous attacks by Anders Breivik in Oslo on the 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011 to the “*Christian Right*”, to a “*reconstituted and traditionalist Catholic Church*” and to “*European Christendom*”. This dangerous nonsense was spouted by Bertlet (and repeated by others) despite the fact that Breivik was not a Christian (he was a member of the Masonic Brotherhood). Significantly, it is now known that Anders Breivik had three particular targets for assassination on the island of Utøya: Norwegian Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre, former Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, and AUF (Workers’ Youth League of the Norwegian Labour Party) leader Eskil Petersen. These three people were very active in Norway (and throughout the World) in promoting Palestinian rights, for Palestine to be granted recognition as a sovereign state by the United Nations, and for a boycott of Israel in protest to the conditions in Gaza and the West Bank. See: ‘Analysing Breivik’s Ideology with Social Network Research’, by Chip Bertlet, *e-Extreme*, Volume 12 No 3 October 2011; and ‘Breivik and His Enablers’, by Roger Cohen, *The New York Times*, 25<sup>th</sup> July 2011, reference source: <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/26/opinion/26iht-edcohen26.html>

<sup>26</sup> Of, for example, the sexualisation of children and infants for the purpose of exploitation and control; the promotion of moral relativism and amoral thinking; ‘race awareness’ training; encouraging contempt for parental care and authority; and the inculcation of unjustified feelings of anger, grievance, guilt or shame based according to ethnic or ‘racial’ identity (re. ‘critical whiteness studies’).

<sup>27</sup> Much of the style and content of the work of the RNM Group appears to have been drawn from the SPLC. In March 2010 **Pulitzer-Prize-winning journalist** Jerry Kammer published a damning report on that organization – and, most especially, on the manner in which the SPLC indulges in hatemongering against so called “*nativist extremists*”. Mr. Kammer concludes by observing: “*In the name of defending democracy, it [the SPLC] seeks to stifle one of democracy’s most vital functions, the vigorous discussion of important public issues. It demonstrates that the Southern Poverty Law Center has become a peddler of its own brand of self-righteous hate. It is a center of intolerance, marked by a poverty of ideas, a dependence on dishonesty, and a lack of fundamental decency.*” See: ‘Immigration and the SPLC: How The Southern Poverty Law Center Invented a Smear, Served La Raza, Manipulated The Press, and Duped Its Donors’, by Jerry Kammer, the Center for Immigration Studies, March 2010, source: <http://www.cis.org/immigration-splc>

<sup>28</sup> Disingenuously referred to as “*Islamophobia*” – a political illness

<sup>29</sup> ‘When Progressives Treat With Reactionaries – The British State’s Flirtation With Radical Islam’, by Martin Bright, *Policy Exchange*, July 2006

<sup>30</sup> ‘Preventing Terrorism: Where Next For Britain?’, [Strategic Briefing Paper for Charles Farr, Director General For The Office For Security and Counter Terrorism, The Home Office – NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE], edited and presented by Maajid Nawaz, The Quilliam Foundation, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2010.

<sup>31</sup> ‘Islamic Terrorism in The UK Since 9/11: Reassessing The “Soft” Approach’, by Jay Edwards and Benoit Gomis, *International Security Programme Paper – ISP PP 2011/03*, Chatham House, June 2011

<sup>32</sup> ‘Preventing Terrorism: Where Next For Britain?’, [Strategic Briefing Paper for Charles Farr, Director General For The Office For Security and Counter Terrorism, The Home Office – NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE], edited and presented by Maajid Nawaz, The Quilliam Foundation, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2010 – Business and Innovation Skills (BIS) section.