

THE MILSTEIN CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY FORUM



HOWARD P. MILSTEIN

Since 2002, the Citizens Crime Commission of New York City has presented a series of Criminal Justice Policy lectures sponsored by Edward L. and Howard P. Milstein through the Milstein Brothers Foundation. Each event features a nationally, or internationally, prominent speaker who addresses the Commission on such issues as crime, criminal justice or terrorism. The formal remarks are followed by a question-and-answer period. Each meeting is open to the media.

Attendance is limited to 150 invited guests drawn from the top ranks of the New York City business and law enforcement communities. Each lecture is printed and distributed to top business, civic and law enforcement leaders.

The Citizens Crime Commission of New York City is an independent, non-profit organization working to reduce crime and improve the criminal justice system in New York City. The Commission is supported by the business community; its board of directors is drawn from top corporate executives and members of major law firms. The Commission was established in 1978.

Howard and Edward Milstein are prominent New York bankers and real estate owners. They have a long record of working with the New York City criminal justice system to create and support innovative programs. They are also active in national crime prevention issues.

Introduction by Richard Aborn

Good morning. I am Richard Aborn. I am the President of the Citizens Crime Commission and I'm delighted that you are all here this morning. I have to tell you I feel a bit like the airline agent that confidently overbooks expecting some number to drop off, and that didn't happen.

So we had a bit of a sell out. The John Jay College is offering some compensation for anybody who wants to give up their seat.

This is a very special event for us on a number of levels. Clearly having the Home Secretary of the United Kingdom is a great pleasure for us. It is also a special event for the Crime Commission, frankly for me personally, to be here at John Jay.

Jeremy Travis has been a long time friend to law enforcement, an active participant in law enforcement. I don't want to embarrass him by saying he is one of the better thinkers in law enforcement. And on a personal level, a good friend of mine.

I've always appreciated that friendship. We've been through many a battle together, both in Washington and here, and mostly successfully. And I'm sure we'll have many more coming up. So Jeremy, I thank you for hosting us. And I thank your staff in particular. They've been wonderful to work with.

I really appreciate that. Thank you for having us. I also want to thank up front the staff of the Home Secretary's Office and the British Consulate. I welcome all of our friends from the United Kingdom, and I greatly appreciate the support of both the Consulate staff and the Home Secretary's personal staff in putting this together.

I must say you're an absolute pleasure to work with. So now let me get to the program for today. We will run today the way we always run our Crime Commission events, which is I'll make a few introductory comments and introduce the man who has brought this lecture series together, who will in turn introduce the Home Secretary.

The Home Secretary will make some remarks of whatever length he chooses, and then we will have what I hope to be an active Q and A. I've had the pleasure of spending some time with Dr. Reid and I can tell you he is terrific at answering questions.

He's an engaging speaker and engages well in the Q and A process. I don't know why that is. He may have had some experience with that somewhere along the line. But he certainly has honed that skill to a very high level.

And I'm sure it serves his nation and perhaps the world quite well. After that, I will invite questions from our guests. And that's where we will have the Q and A and then I will invite questions from the press. And I would just ask that the questions try and remain on topic.

Let me set this up a little bit and then introduce Howard. Those of you that have been with us for one or all of the speakers that we've had in this series, I think would agree, that perhaps the common theme that has emerged, not articulated, but nonetheless a motif, has been the idea of transitions.

How is policing transitioning? How is government national and foreign policy transitioning because of the new threat of terrorism? New in some ways to the U.S., not as new, tragically, to the UK. The idea of transitioning, however, is certainly not new to policing.

If you think in very large chunks, going back to the mid 20th Century, patrolling had

already been replaced by the advent of the car. But the 911 system was introduced which transitioned from normal patrolling into response.

We began to time response. How quickly could we get from a 911 call to a scene? That lasted up until probably the early '90s when actually in this City, there was a tremendous amount of work done in response to the very high crime rates around using the emerging computer technology to apply that to crime fighting.

How can we take the amount of data that we were gathering out there and use it in a format that will allow us to hold police officers and their commanders accountable? But at the same time develop sessions, Compstat, that transferred knowledge from senior commanders who were highly experienced to field commanders who had problems in their commands and needed a venue in which to discuss them. And those of you that know New York Compstat, I use discuss in quotes.

It was more than just a discussion at times. Compstat really took hold in this nation, and to some extent around the world, and really became the dominant police accountability, police management tool.

We then, tragically, I might say, because of the attacks here in the United States and to some extent because of the history of the UK, transitioned into taking that basic computer model and really focusing a lot on the information that we were gathering.

And then converting that information into intelligence. Meaning, what lessons are we deriving from the information? Until we now have a model that the UK has had for a while and we now have in the U.S. which is really intelligence led policing.

I can say with confidence that the police forces in this country, certainly in the UK, are at this point, at the top of their game. We are

seeing crime fighting capabilities throughout the Western world. There are unprecedented and, frankly, sustained declines in crime.

And the United Kingdom announced some astonishing numbers regarding their declines. So now, what is the next transition? And I think we are probably coming up to one.

How do we take those core policing services and apply, to use a military term, force multipliers? How do we get beyond just using traditional police and look at the other resources that government has, the resources that industry has and resources that the citizenry has and marry those into more effective forces?

And you see this beginning to emerge around the world as well. Real quickly, I was in North India just a month ago working with the police in Rajasthan as they convert from their style that frankly has had a lot of problems with corruption, into a more community oriented process.

I was in London just last week where I do a lot of work with the British Transport Police and the Met and Transport for London, thinking about the issue, of the fear of crime in public transport systems in London. How do you tackle the fear of crime?

Not the reality of crime, but the fear of crime. Because the London transport systems have extremely low rates of crime. It's unbelievable how low they are. But yet there's a high level of fear.

So how do you approach that fear issue? That psychological issue, both in a policing environment and in a broader environment? And we now have to ask those same questions about terrorism.

How do we take the forces we have, internationally, military, nationally police and intelligence agencies, use that information but also multiply that to get at some of the thinking

behind why people radicalize? And then how do we get them to de-radicalize, to use the emerging term?

And if you think about that, that actually transcends not just terrorism, but all the issues of traditional crime fighting that we deal with. Why do people become gang members? Why do young kids become shooters? Why do people coming out of jail recommit?

How do we stop those? That's a different question than we've asked in the past. So it's these transitions. And both the UK and the United States are entering periods of transition in their political apparatus. So with that thought in mind, that has been, I think, the theme of the series that Howard Milstein has brought us.

Howard, as I've had the great pleasure of introducing a number of times for you, is truly one of the great philanthropists in town. He is well known for that. He is extremely well known for his business acumen. But what I want to make sure is crystal clear is what a tremendous friend to law enforcement he has been, both at the Federal level and at the State and the local level.

And I could go on for half an hour about the things that he's done. But he hasn't just given of his time and his resources. He's also been out there thinking about this issue. He is actually one of the first people to call for the citizenry to mobilize in a way that acts as second responders, if you will, and helps police and emergency services in response to national events. Both in natural and intentional events.

And Howard, as you know, has been the sponsor of this series. Without him, we would not have had the Milstein Criminal Justice Lecture Series. We've had a terrific series of speakers. So Howard, I thank you for all that you've done and I'd invite you to introduce the Home Secretary. Thank you very much.

Introduction by Howard P. Milstein

It is truly a special honor and privilege for me to introduce today's Criminal Justice Policy Forum lecturer. Since the days of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, Americans have spoken of a "special relationship" between the United States and the United Kingdom. While we may be separated by a common language... we are uniquely united in our heritage, our traditions, and our deep commitment to freedom and democracy.

In times of great historic global challenges, there are no two countries closer in spirit or commitment. From World War II through the Cold War, from the iron curtain to the war on terror, Britain has been led by truly great statesmen who have forged close relationships not just with our American presidents, but also with the American people. Churchill... Thatcher...and for a few more days, Tony Blair.

Few people have served Tony Blair with such distinction or breadth of experience as today's speaker, Dr. John Reid.

Dr. John Reid, Britain's Home Secretary, has been a key ally and leader in the effort to restore domestic security and international tranquility in these difficult times. The Home Office, as it is called in Britain, is responsible for homeland security, counter-terrorism, civil emergencies, and the day-to-day effort against crime — and Dr. Reid has been a friend and partner with the U.S. in these and in so many other areas. Having also served as Secretary of State for Health and for Defense, there's hardly a topic he cannot address nor a question he cannot answer.

Of particular interest are Dr. Reid's outreach efforts to the Muslim community, his views

about the balance between state security and individual liberty, and what America, Britain and the world can do together, in partnership, to reduce global tensions and increase international dialogue.

But don't let his pleasant Scottish demeanor fool you. When it comes to fighting criminal behavior, this man is tough as nails, and deadly serious.

Please join me in a New York welcome for an international statesman, Dr. John Reid.

Remarks by Dr. John Reid

Thank you very much. Don't believe a word he says. I'm from Glasgow. I'm one of those delicate flowers from the West of Scotland. Can I say I'm absolutely delighted to be here today. And I give my thanks to Jeremy, who I met this morning. To Richard for his kind words in introduction. And particularly to Howard there.

I'm delighted that you have confessed that you are involved in what you called a sell-out, Richard, and I've been accused of that by the left-wing of my Party for decades now. A continual process of selling out, they said. I'm also delighted to be here in New York.

I had an interesting time in Washington. I met a range of people. Michael Chertoff, Alberto Gonzales, Fran Townsend at the White House and Condi to discuss all of these issues as well as a lot of practitioners in the whole area of counter-terrorism and policing.

But I always like to come to New York. Because I think, and what we have had to face in the United Kingdom, there are so many points at which we have related to, in common effort, the people of the United States and in some occasions, specific with the people of New York.

We came through on July 7th two years ago, some of the anguish that you felt. Not in the scale. I always think that like experiencing war, until you have come through something like a tragedy of that nature, you can't really understand what it's like.

And after, the bonds that are forced in the crucible of adversity and tragedy are more lasting than perhaps other bonds of friendship. And also because in many endeavors we had during the difficult times Howard, you

mentioned the struggle for the resolution of the problem in that beautiful island of Ireland.

People in New York were staunch, sometimes not uncritical, friends of the efforts we made. And I was Secretary of State for Northern Ireland for a couple of years. It was a huge experience. They give you a castle. I don't know about you, but I had never had a castle before.

And they give you an experience which it's hard to describe. For somebody like me — I'm a sort of mongrel. My grandfather was a good Scottish Presbyterian. My grandmother was a staunch Irish Catholic, and a bit of a rebel at that.

So to have gone through that and then to have ended up on my birthday on the eighth of May standing in front of the new building watching Ian Paisley and Martin McGinnis, that dream ticket, become the First Minister and Deputy First Minister of Northern Ireland, I have to say to you is one of the most moving experiences of my life.

I often think that if the government had never done anything else, just to bring to an end eight centuries of war and terrible, terrible tragedy on that beautiful island, it would've been worth having a labor government just for that.

And certainly it was one of the things that makes me think that my contribution, however modest, and my participation in that government was worth all of the effort that we made. Next week, Tony Blair stands down. It will come as no surprise to anyone in the United Kingdom when I say I think he's been a fantastic Prime Minister.

I'm proud to have served with him. And I will stand down with him. So I'm very glad to hear Richard say you can do business with me. My staff will give you my phone number from next Friday.

I felt it appropriate to step down when Tony has stepped down. You won't know it from his accent, but he's a Scotsman. You probably don't know it from my cultured BBC accent, I'm a Scotsman.

The new Prime Minister who's coming in, a great friend of mine, Gordon Brown is a Scotsman, but we'll be sure to give some of the minor posts to the English just to balance out the situation. In the meantime, I have had the task, the latest task after defense of dealing with some of the great issues that confront all of us.

Managing in a world of huge mobility, migration in a fair and effective fashion. Reducing crime, which is the blight of the life of ordinary people. And countering terrorism, which is the threat to our freedoms and our liberties and our livelihoods.

As well as to our lives. And I believe that there are no more important issues which face the people of all countries, certainly, than the great challenges of that world. I would have wished that with the end of the Cold War we could've looked forward to a period of more serene and less insecure challenges.

But alas, that is not the case because in a perverse sense, those great glaciers of the Cold War held everything frozen. It suppressed old rivalries. Ethnic tensions. Religious extremism.

It stopped mobility of people. It stopped mobility of criminality as well. And one of the things that's happened after it, is we've gone from a static world to a very fluid world. But with that fluid world comes not only opportunities, great opportunities economically and travel and experience— but assisted by transportation and the internet, great challenges as well.

And that is the nature of progress, isn't it? It's the nature of what was called transition.

That as we move from one face to another, that dynamism that takes us there affords great opportunities for individuals. But almost always brings another side of the coin, which is great dangers and challenges as well.

And that's basically what I want to say today. Now, I want to keep it now from now on as tight as possible. But let me just spend a few moments saying a couple of things about this issue of transition, dynamism.

Particularly following on in sequence from what was said there, Richard, I noticed, talked about the policing input. The people on the ground doing things with technology and so on. Howard is associated with saying "yes", but on it's own, that isn't good enough. Because you've got to liberate the whole community, whether it's in counter-terrorism or whether it's fighting crime and bring them into it.

The question of both of those, I want to go slightly further, particularly in crime, and suggest that actually is not just producers and providers of order. It is not just the citizenry but actually sometimes the manufacturers and producers of the commodities which enhance the attractions of crime in a demonic world where consumers are consistently producing more commodities which give great opportunities to ordinary citizens, new inventions.

New gadgets. New information models. But the very things that give the opportunities and the attraction to the citizen become a new arena and a new attraction for the thieves. For the criminals. Whether it's the internet being used by international terrorists or whether it's the iPod and the phone being used by the criminals themselves because a new market opens up.

So what I'm going to suggest in the course of what I say is that it is not only the providers of law and order that matter, it's not only the

citizenry who are the consumers, if you like. The beneficiaries of that order. But it's also those in the market and the manufacturers who are producing beneficial commodities but also commodities which play into the growth of new crime areas.

The dynamism of this transition. So every time we catch up, I think it was Gladstone who said, "The problem with the Irish question is every time the British put forward with an answer, the Irish change the question." That may or may not be true.

But it certainly is true in the field of crime. That every time we find a solution to one, then the criminals shift on to another. Because they're as ingenious as the best marketing man. Now, we can struggle with that, but we do not struggle as isolated towns, cities or individuals or indeed nations.

We face it together in so many ways. And that's why I'm glad to be here in New York, because you share, not only the capital city, but with other cities in the United Kingdom, so many things. You have to deal with criminality, very successfully. You have to deal with a terrible, terrible terrorist attack as London has.

And to raise the morale of people afterwards. So that is appropriate for the British Home Secretary to be here with those challenges that we face together. And some of them, we have, insofar as our culture and our history allows, forward parallel tracks in a sense, because one of our great successes in Britain in tackling crime in recent years and immensely popular has been the reintroduction of neighborhood policing.

Getting police out of the back offices, out of cars and onto the streets. And the few words I use are visible, accessible and responsive. That is what people want. Supplementing it with police community support officers who are even more entrenched in the community

and wardens so that you form neighborhood policing teams.

Get it out there. And the fascinating thing about them is it tackles— and I know that that's part of getting out into the communities being part of the policing here. But in our case, it's addressed a second, sort of similar phenomena, that questioned neighborhood policing because here you've had to deal with the time lag between the reality of better policing and crime reduction and then the perception of it by the public.

And, in New York, it's probably taken eight, nine, ten years before it became fully appreciated. In Britain, the fascinating thing is not so much the time lag differential, it is the differential in perception of security, between those areas that have neighborhood policing and those that don't.

In short, even in areas where you have an equal reduction of crime — in two different areas, where you have that accompanied by neighborhood policing in the streets, people believe there has been a reduction in crime. There's a reduction in fear and an increase in the feeling of security.

In areas where you have a reduction of crime but it's not accompanied by neighborhood policing, by people seeing the police on the street, they're far more likely to tend not to believe there has been a reduction in crime.

So you reduce it in reality but from the point of view of the citizen, the citizen doesn't feel any more secure or any less fear than they previously did. And that is a differential phenomena I think in which there is some overlap between our experience and that of elsewhere. And then this question of the dynamism.

There are probably not that many cities which are at the forefront of new commodities.

Hip, new gadgets. You know, being “with it” than New York and London. Because you know, when I come here, the thing that I notice is everybody sounds to me a lot like Robert DeNiro.

You know, the first time I came to New York the policeman just met me and he was sort of dynamic. There was this throbbing sort of dynamism about this town that I just love. And part of that is people have been with it, with gadgets, the latest sort of technology that’s put at their disposal.

And to some extent that’s the same in London as well. And we are going through a transition in policing partly because we’re going through unprecedented rate of change in the world. Particularly in what you could call the Western world. Now, I mean we’ve been around in this planet about 500,000 years.

And yet, half of the knowledge has been gained in the last 50. So we have increased our knowledge base in the last 50 years by as much as we did in the first half a million years. And that is leading to a plethora of new commodities which, again, as I said earlier, increase the challenge.

So the unprecedented speed of change and development in the 21st Century provides us with those unique opportunities. We’re wealthier. We’re more mobile. We’re more knowledgeable than before. But as citizens benefit from those opportunities, so do the terrorists who exploit them or the criminals who find new paths.

And that then presents us, in cities like New York and London and in both our countries, with hitherto unknown challenges. And I just want to say something about that, about the significant nature of the challenges we face and how we, public and private sectors, can address these challenges as we go forward.

The threat we face from international terrorism is unprecedented in scale but also in its approach and its complexity. For the first time, probably, the world is engaged in a struggle with an aggressor whose identity, motives and tactics are often unclear or unknown. This is not like old conflicts where there are definable enemies, the states with definable areas and territories and a definable time period, at the end of which there will be a definable de-engagement and we will all abide by the rules of the Geneva Convention and transfer prisoners and so on.

This is a conflict that really is new in its character as well as in its scale. It's a new type of struggle. But however you face this, through military security, policing, armed forces, intelligence, security agencies, let me make my position absolutely clear. At heart, this is a struggle for values.

It is a struggle for ideals and values. Two competing sets of them. Now in case you think that is just the idea of some sort of UK liberal which will be the first time in my life that has been given to me, let me just remind you of the phrase that everyone knows but very few people actually understand of that great student of war and conflict, Von Clausewitz.

He said in a much quoted phrase, "War is the extension of politics by other means." What he actually was asserting was the primacy in strategic terms of politics. The engagement of ideas and values. And that war was merely one way in which that gets fought out when you can't resolve the strategic issue at the center of it.

So however we're fighting, whether it's armed forces in Afghanistan or Iraq, whether it's our security and intelligence forces in London and New York, at heart this is a clash of values. It is people who want to impose upon us a set of values that we do not want, and by the way, want to impose on everyone;

including Muslims that don't agree with them, who will be branded betrayers of the Muslim faith. And they will be massacred just as surely as some people were when the witch hunts were being carried out or the crusades which started against Christian heretics.

That was the first crusade. So this isn't a new phenomena. But you know it is a battle at heart for values. And it's the commonality of our cause with everyone including the vast majority of Muslims that is necessary in order to defeat that enemy. Having said all that, it is of a complexity in character that we're not used to and therefore we'd better be under no illusion.

It will be a long and a wide and a deep struggle. It will be generations in length. It will be fought at every single level, but at heart it will be a battle between us and others over this essential series of values which you could, I suppose, talk about in terms of toleration of other people's point of view.

Freedom of speech and expression and argumentation within the law. Equality of all the citizens, including women. There's no second. With no one backing any of these, you can't compromise in any of these, just because you claim you've got better conscientious views than everyone else.

And the resolution of our difficulties and disputes and arguments through democratic means. That is a set of values which are worth defending from those who would impinge upon all of them. Now, if I just say something briefly on the crime side. It would be naive to look at terror as a threat which is independent of the other challenges we face in the world.

It is international— and organized crime very often supports and fuels the actions of terrorists. And only by addressing all of these issues can we defeat the terror threat. And particularly, aggressors exploit so called white collar crime.

Identity theft. Credit card fraud. Financial conspiracy. All of that is increasingly being linked to the terrorist's struggle against us. And one of the people I met that I didn't mention earlier, but at the request of Prime Minister to be Brown, I met with Henry Paulson at the Treasury, Secretary Paulson—to discuss some of these issues.

Now, I don't need to tell you here, in New York, I'm absolutely certain the vast majority of people here are aware that the 9/11 hijackers used 30 false identities. In one case to obtain credit cards and \$250,000 worth of debt. And I don't need to tell you, either, of al Qaeda's threat to bleed us to bankruptcy.

So there are a number of fronts in this, including the link between criminality fraud and terrorism and the alleged plot last year in August, which fortunately we managed to foil. Which had been not only an attempt to take life but to destroy the commercial and business confidence of the world and the UK and the United States. And certainly to make sure that people did not want to travel to those two countries if that alleged plot had been successful.

So there is an element of a linkage between massive organized crime, white collar crime, and terrorism itself. So how do we combat this going forward? How do we ensure the security? People combat the criminals and the terrorists and ensure their values and their economies are safer than they would be. How do we develop a response that is fit for the 21st Century?

I have refocused the Home Department towards immigration, counter-terrorism and crime and international crime. We used to do lots of things. The Home Office, which I have the honor to preside over, has been around for 227 years.

Some people think that's a very good reason not to change it. I think if you've been around for 227 years with the same format it would be an idea just to update occasionally. So we have readdressed and refocused the Home Office towards those three great challenges.

But we have to basically make sure that the characteristics of the threat against us, which is that it is seamless. It is a long term generational. It is politically driven. It has a core mission based on a misrepresentation of history but it's about values and politics there.

Above all, it is innovative. The terrorists constantly look for new ways of attacking us, that that is replicated in our response. And that's what I've tried to do within the new Home Office and the formation of the Office of Security and Counter-terrorism, within which there is a research information communications unit.

That is a unit capable of arguing, of addressing the big battle of ideas and values. So the only way we will identify, understand and ultimately defeat the challenges and threats we face is by continuously evolving our approach to stay one step ahead of our opponents. And that's the point about transition.

We are trying to do that in terrorism. We also have to do it in terms of crime. And that's when I come to the private sector. Not just the police and the authorities, but those who are the manufacturers of those things which are leading to increased crime.

That is, the producers, the manufactures. Industry themselves. They are the people who, through a public-private partnership can help us to get ahead of the latest crime wave. The creativity and commercial knowledge of business must be utilized in our efforts to combat international terrorism but also organized crime.

Because with a larger range of prevention methods and detection techniques, a fingerprint— tips, the public will rightly expect us to use them to reduce crime and ensure their protection. I know in some areas these are controversial. Identity cards. CCTV. But I firmly believe that if we are not using the latest means of technology which will improve independent of politicians, the great driving force of technology knowledge will go on. And it will be deployed and when it's deployed it will be used by our opponents, that is the terrorist and the criminals. And if we're not prepared to use it as part of our armory of weaponry to defend the ordinary citizens, then we will fail in our duty. And that's why when I formed the Office of Security and Counter-terrorism, to strengthen our counter-terrorist effort, I made the involvement in the private sector a key objective.

It is why, for instance, in the United Kingdom, we've already launched the Security Industry Suppliers Council as a vehicle to encourage innovation within the commercial sector to combat terror. And the organized crime which fills it.

And it is also why, at a more street level oriented arrangement, we have already joined with Telecom's Network Providers in the UK to ensure that stolen mobile phones are unusable by the thief. Not just the SIM cards but the phone. Because if you can not use a phone within 48 hours of it being stolen, the market for thieving phones just goes.

And therefore by using the technological means of switching off a phone, you actually combat the impetus to crime in the first place. To design out crime. Design it out. In the new commodities, the way we designed it out so successfully in many areas by working with car manufacturers. We have now done that with phone providers, who can switch off telephones of a mobile nature within a

couple of days. We're heading for an 85 percent success rate and I'm sure it will be a major weapon.

But now we face a new technology. Here in the United States next week we're launching a new phone. A smart phone. A multi-function phone which will allow you to photograph, telephone, download music. I mean in my day you sang in the bath.

Now you can talk to someone while playing music and photographing anything you want to do. The minute that comes onto the market next week, there will be a huge new expansion of the criminal direction towards stealing it. Because they went from mobile phones when we designed it and now they go to Sat-Navs in cars. Now they will go to that.

So if we're going to do an effective job in protecting that, the engagement has to be a two-way business. The United Kingdom government is keen to engage with business and industries on how we can tackle crime on the local, national, international scale.

Because only by working together with industry can we get ahead of the criminal himself. So we rely on those working in industry to work with us. A recent forum on mobile phone theft was pretty well attended by key players in the industry. However, I would like to have seen there Samsung, Panasonic, NEC and HTC who are key to develop a range of the people that we're working with.

And I believe that this is now a crucial opportunity for these big organizations, you may be associated with some of them, to come together with the authorities to help us to get one step ahead of the criminal by designing out crime. And is a classic public private partnership for the benefit of all of our citizens.

And of course when we do that, we need to learn from our international partners because when new technologies and products are introduced abroad before the United Kingdom, like here, we rely on our friends to share their potential. How can they help us to stay ahead of the curve but also to warn us about how they have been targets by the criminal element. So manufacturers on one side but also people like yourself, Howard, and all of these who are here today.

Integrated between the providers and the citizens, but I also believe private and often small industry are the driving force of innovative thought. That means working together right across it.

Culminating in meeting Mayor Bloomberg who has done me the favor of making a big announcement today. I just want to ensure you that this meeting is not so that I can announce that I'm leaving the Labor Party. But that would start rumor mills running everywhere in the world.

Questions & Answers

Dr. John Reid

You now have the opportunity to question, criticize, abuse, give me a standing ovation... No, no, I didn't mean it. Seriously.

But I do thank you in advance and I'm going to take some questions now go ahead. Fire away.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I've got to tell you first of all, I've seldom heard this kind of clarity of thought on this issue maybe since I've heard the Prime Minister of Australia say that we live with our plurality but if you want to live by Shapia you have to get out. He said it. And you have a similar clarity of thought. But what I want to ask you is the following.

Obviously in your position, you need to be optimistic. But if you have a situation where, certainly I can tell you as a Trustee of the University in observing academia nationally and in particular the British union of professors of late, I'm not overly optimistic that the political leadership rises to this occasion because I think they are more like the Lord Mayor of London than they are like you. And therefore, I'd like to ask you, do you think that the world political leadership in the West can rise to this occasion the way the Prime Minister of Australia has?

A. Well, I have a great respect for John Howard. I've met with him a couple of times and he is an outstanding politician. No question about that. There is an old phrase which I'm quite fond of which I think is a good guide to the way we should approach this.

It is "Pessimism of the intellect, Optimism of the will." I think we have to be big enough to face up to the fact that when we talk about the nature of this threat and the potential

duration of it, that we are not scared. When we talk about the implications of losing in this, that we aren't doing it for the purpose of depressing people, but we are doing it for the purpose of being realistic and measuring the scale of the challenge which faces us.

But accompanying that realistic appraisal, which is the pessimism of the intellect, I have always believed in optimism of the will and the capacity of human beings ultimately to rise to the challenge to defend that which is of a higher moral value than those which aren't. And I think there are people who have done that, who have articulated it.

And one of them is my own Prime Minister, Tony Blair. I have to tell you on these great issues, the one we discussed that are in the cabinet table, I was party to those decisions. I was there.

I took the decision. On Iraq. On Afghanistan. I had the impression at the time that there was lots of other people around the table. That may be wrong, I understand now. Some of them may have been making telephone calls or having coffee outside or didn't quite know what was going on.

I did. And when you take that decision, yes, you go through a very difficult period because it's in the nature of conflict that there are deep dark valleys as well as sunny glens. And sometimes that conflict goes on for a long time. And I understand how difficult it is for people in your country and in my country to understand in the middle of that, the assuredness of winning through it.

But I think we have to and that leads me to a second quote which is a favorite of mine, and I think it applies to politicians as well as to soldiers to whom it was originally applied by Napoleon. Napoleon once said that the chief characteristic of a soldier ought to be not courage, though that was important, but endurance.

The capacity to keep going when things look very difficult. I think that in the West we have that capacity. I think at times others may doubt it. Others may think that we are weakened by materialism. That we are unprepared to continue a long struggle to protect non-material things, like a way of life, a freedom of speech and so on. I think that is wrong.

But the front thing is this, that I think it's a common threat to all who support those values. Not just to Christians or Jews but to the vast majority of Muslims who appreciate and stand by that set of values. Because in my reading, they're not just British values or U.S. values or human values.

They're also Koranic values as well. It is not for me to say that. That is for the Muslim people themselves to debate. To discuss. But those set of 21st Century values I believe have, in general, given the condition of human beings greater liberty and greater dignity than ever before.

And I think that ultimately is what will inspire us to go through. Now I know that Gordon Brown takes the view about the battle for values, indeed I think in one of our newspapers this morning he's repeated, some of this in almost exact terms. So I think there will be the courage and the character among politicians to go to, and I give to you that although I'm stepping down from government, as Jerry Adams once famously said of the IRA, "We're not going away, you know."

So I'm not going away either. Because I think there's an obligation upon all of us, whether it is citizens, business leaders. However humble the task we are doing, to stand shoulder to shoulder with each other and to defend that corpus of values that gives us such meaning to our life. Because without it, all the material benefits we have are very little.

If you don't have that. And we've seen that sometimes in some of the worst episodes of European history. So, we're not going to go back to that.

Q. What you said about technology as a facilitator of our opponents in the struggle is very important. Hard wires are relatively stable and invulnerable to modern technological disruption. Has any thought been given to the value of old technology from a security point of view?

A. I don't know if everybody heard that, but basically the old methods of transmitting, like wired telephones and so on, make us less vulnerable to a complete intervention by terrorists or whatever who can destroy a whole system. Well in a sense every system's vulnerable.

You know, I suppose you can shoot down pigeons. So any way of sending messages can be disrupted. But you are right, there are two problems of the huge advance in and reliance in technological systems of that nature. One is that they become so integrated and diffuse and absolutely necessary to carry out the whole business and so on of a nation that you become hugely vulnerable by dependency on them.

Ironically of course, this is one of the reasons we started off with the transmitting of messages through ISP and the internet, which was to make sure there was no vulnerability to an intervention in the order chain for the use of nuclear weaponry. I think. Probably now have to get shot because I breached some great secret. But I think I'm right in saying just the same way computers were developed by IBM, you know, with particular security motivations.

That that was also part of the reason for developing the sort of voice over ISP

type system for the chain of command. So originally they were brought in to give a degree of security from that vulnerability. But of course the utter dependence in the Western electronic communication means that we are very vulnerable.

And yes, thought has been given to that. There is another area in which thought is being given and that has implications for ways in which messages are transmitted from you to me. It no longer is possible just to listen to me talking to you on the phone increasingly because it will go by various other routes.

So all I can say without going too deep in this is yes, like most technological advances, it has huge benefits for civil society, but offers huge opportunities to damage civil society by those who are of a malevolent disposition. And a lot of thought has been given to it.

I'm not sure we've got the answers to it all yet, but you're absolutely right. You're hanging on to your old land line, are you? Yeah, you don't keep pigeons as well, do you? I know, you're on iPod's now. We used to use these things.

Q. Two questions. First, it's a hot button issue here in New York, the implementation of a security camera system like they have in London.

Do you think New York is missing the boat on this and the benefits of implementing such a security system outweighs any concerns about restrictions of civil liberties?

A. Look, all of us have got to decide how to use technology. Commensurate with their own history and culture and public opinion. That goes without saying.

So I can't tell you what you should do in New York. All I can tell you is what happens in the United Kingdom. And that is we are probably the first government, certainly in

modern history, where, at the point at which the Prime Minister leaves after ten years, we have achieved a 35 percent reduction in crime.

That is a huge reduction. There's all sorts of reasons for that. But one of them, I think, is our use of anti-social behavior orders to intervene early. It doesn't go as far as your zero tolerance policy, but it's the same sort of idea. Early intervention.

The second one is better, more efficient use and effort by our policing better use of technology. Now, you here, you've been issuing Blackberries to people for communication. Great ideas. We don't do that, but we use CCTV cameras more widely. Point one, they are greatly welcomed by the vast majority of people.

If you look at subjects like ID cards in the United Kingdom, you know, biometric ID cards, we got 75 to 80 percent support of that. Because most, what I would call punters, though I believe that has a different connotation in the United States— it just means members of the public in Britain, take the view, "Well, if this safeguards us, why wouldn't we want to do it and why are those people who are against it so against it if they are not doing anything they ought to be ashamed of?"

Now, that's a very simple way of saying what the public think, but that is what the public think. And therefore they take the same view in the United Kingdom about CCTV cameras. We have a lot of Closed Circuit Television Cameras.

They are immensely popular by ordinary working people. Middle class people. Particularly in areas like urban areas and the middle of cities. I'm absolutely certain that they have contributed towards a reduction in crime. And even more, I'm absolutely certain they have contributed to a feeling of greater security.

Because if you're going out in the city at night and you know that there are CCTV cameras around, you do feel a bit more safe than would otherwise be the case. Indeed, in one city, they're so popular that they have combined CCTV cameras with an audio so that if you're beginning to give somebody hassle in the middle of the city, you're liable to hear a voice saying, "Please sir, don't do that. You know, otherwise you'll end up in trouble."

If you're throwing beer cans in the street, the voice will say, "Would you please pick that up and put it away?" If you're asking awkward questions at a breakfast, it'd say—not yet. Not yet. Now, this is in one city. And it's being tried as a pilot.

But it's immensely popular. Now, on the other hand, the Westminster elite—they find this all very difficult to understand. Which is fine because they get protection. They get chauffeur driven cars. They don't stand in bus queues and have people abuse them.

So there is something of a difference you know, there's an ongoing debate, but all I would say is that for the vast majority of people in the UK, this is something that they don't overly worry about. It is the job of politicians always to make sure that when we strengthen any form of surveillance, however, that we, even where it is on such a potentially disastrous crime as terrorism, that we try and buttress strength and powers with strength and scrutiny.

So that, you know, in the case of CCTV and the United Kingdom, this would be taken by the local elected representatives who are nearer to the local people, who can be removed more easily, in conjunction with the local police. It isn't, you know, the central government that is saying that this will be done.

So it's been done in response to local people. It's very well supported. It's contributed towards the reduction in crime. And it's also contributed towards an increase in feeling of security.

But it's for New York to decide what happens in New York. You know, I wouldn't dream of telling you. You wouldn't dream of listening to me anyway. You know, this is New York. You do things your way. But that's how we feel in the UK.

Q. In the United States now, a big issue is immigration. And as some reporters say, illegal immigration. In the UK, if you have illegal immigrants enter the country, are they given, quote, amnesty if they've been there for a period of time?

What do you do with them? Do you send them back to the countries where they came from? Depending upon the size and the number of people who are, quote, illegal immigrants? This is a very, difficult issue now for many people.

A. Okay, it is a difficult issue but it's one which has got to be faced up to. And I mentioned Mayor Bloomberg this morning. I'll be meeting him later today. And I mean I think that he's been a highly successful mayor. I think whatever party you're in, he's a man of considerable standing and stature.

And that won't be affected by his party affiliation. And one of the reasons I'm delighted I'm seeing him today is because I think he faces up to big questions like this. Whether it's, you know, climate change or immigration or guns and their effect. And we all as politicians have a duty to face up to these questions.

In the United Kingdom, that is reinforced by the fact that if you ask people what are their biggest concerns, ten years ago when

the Labor Government came in, the biggest concern was unemployment. The fear and insecurity of unemployment and economic failure.

Now, the good news is that unemployment and its associated ills is still the highest concern of everyone in France. But not in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, it has gone down hugely. And whereas we used to worry about that issue, people now rightly, wrongly, worry about immigration and insist that it is the top priority that be managed fairly and effectively.

Second, by the way, is reducing crime and countering terrorism and foreign affairs defense associated issues. So we have to face up to this. And we have an unknown quantity of illegal immigrants in this country. Ever since the last conservative Home Secretary admitted openly that we didn't have a figure for it.

Because, almost by definition, it was difficult to count. But no one has suggested is anything like the problem in terms of numbers here I've heard figures of 11 million and so on mentioned here. So I'm not suggesting at all that anything that we think about this issue somehow can just be replicated here.

I understand that you are having a lively debate. I met Ted Kennedy yesterday among others and I've discussed immigration with Michael Chertoff. And I know the discussion's going. You must make that decision here in the context of the United States.

A country that's been based on immigrants coming. A country that has been hugely dynamic in terms of its economy where immigrants have played a huge role. So the circumstances here are different from ours. But in my country, the key it is the truth that up until a few years ago, we had a huge influx of potentially illegal immigrants.

Some of them claiming asylum on false grounds which is not only a threat to our system of managing fairly and effective immigration. But also I believe was a danger to our genuine wish to protect genuine asylum seekers and genuine refugees which is what we would all do.

And if the system was misused and brought into disrepute on a wide scale, then we would begin to lose that possession—with the public guaranteeing protection for asylum seekers and genuine refugees. So we have brought in stricter controls. Reinforced the borders. New technology.

Exported our borders so that people have to have biometric passports or visas. Fingerprint. All this is before they come to our country. So when they arrive in the United Kingdom, they can't just claim they've lost all their papers. Because you have an identity. Something they can identify when they come in.

And in the course of that, all of that renovation, people have suggested to me that we should have an amnesty. I have rejected that and I've rejected it primarily because in the United Kingdom situation, I think it would send a signal to the world that says all of these measures that we have just taken to try and diminish the misuse of our system of immigration, actually they don't really matter, because if you do manage to come here and stay for a while illegally, then we'll just incorporate you within the UK.

But as I say, that isn't necessarily to say that this is a solution to your question here. You have to decide it on U.S. grounds. And I know that John McCain, Ted Kennedy, all sorts of people have been trying to get this through in a way that balances right across the political spectrum.

Q. You talked about the need to address why people become radicalized in the context of terrorism. In Pakistan in the last few days, they've been very angered by the British decision to award a Knighthood to Rushdie and somebody even said that this was likely to fuel terrorism. How does these kind of decisions work in the international arena and what do you think of that reaction?

A. Well, as I said, I think we have a set of values that accord people honors when they contribute towards literature, even when we don't agree with their point of view. I think it was one of the great figures of the enlightenment said I don't agree with your point of view but I'd die for your right to express it. That is our value.

That's what we stand by. And a lot of people were upset when John Cleese made *The Life Of Brian*. A lot of Christians were upset. A lot Jewish people were upset when Mel Gibson made a film. So we have to be sensitive to the views of people of religion.

People who have very strong views. Of course we do. But I think that we all appreciate that in the long run, a protection of the right to express your views in literature, in argument, in politics is of overriding political value to our societies. Always within the law and within that legal frame that we in the United Kingdom are actually more strict than, say, the United States.

We have very strong laws against promoting racial intolerance. Encouraging violence against others. We have introduced new laws against glorifying terrorism. So it isn't a free for all. We have thought very carefully about it.

But wherever possible, what ought to be protected is the right to express your opinion. The tolerance for each other's points of view. And that is a central part of our beliefs. And I don't think we should apologize for that.

Q. Dr. Reid, in New York we have a program— it's a campaign, if you see something, say something. And despite 9/11, now there still seems to be an apathy concerning New Yorkers and trying to change their mindset to actually engage in that area. There have been some wonderful initiatives, for example, where community members are trained to engage other individuals in the event of an emergency. But in addition to that, do you have some suggestions on how we could internalize that type of concept for New Yorkers?

A. Well, I don't have any magic bullet to do that. On one occasion I went to engage with members of a Muslim community in an area in London. And found myself being screamed and shouted at by one of these bullies who do not want other people to be able to express their opinion.

And they did it. Well, whether or not they did it to frighten me, that isn't going to work, but I suspect it was actually to intimidate the members of the Muslim community themselves, including women. And I believe that we have to create the space where members of the Muslim community are helped to stand up against the bullies in their midst. And that is particularly true of women who would suffer most in the deprivation of their equal citizenship if some of these people had their way.

Not true Muslims. Not the majority of Muslims. But the fanatics who want to impose their views on others. And that leads me to the center part of your question. And it is my profound belief that while intelligence and security forces and police are necessary to defeat terrorism, it will never be sufficient unless the whole community is engaged against the terrorist.

And it is our job to unite that community. To get everyone to recognize that this threat

is common to all of us. And it will only be defeated by a response that is from all of us. And there are two groups of people who want to divide as we are trying to unite.

And both of them are of fascist disposition. On one wing are the apologists and advocates of al Qaeda who want untruthfully to argue that there is a war by everyone else on Islam. That it's everyone against Islam. It is untrue but that's their narrative.

And then you've got the mirror image in certain parts of Europe, including in our country where the more traditional European fascists who argue that the great problem is that there's a war by all Muslims against the rest of us. That it's Islam as a whole and everyone in it who wants against us.

Who want to defeat us. That is absolutely untrue as well. But the irony here is that if both of those extremes are actually arguing the same thing in order to divide us. And we have to assert very profoundly, continually, that this is a common threat of all of us against the extremists.

It is not a battle between civilizations. It is a battle of civilization against those who would destroy all the civilized tenets that we have come to recognize as being true human values.

And that is the answer to your question. Yes, whether it's New York or London or anywhere else, we will only truly defeat those who wish to impose their views upon us by blind force, including impose their views on other Muslims, if all of us stand shoulder to shoulder together against that. And that must be our primary objective.

And in doing that, I come back to the phrase I used at the beginning. Yes, I think it can be done. I think we can endure. And I think we can come through it in the end.

And it is proper that we look pessimistically and realistically at it, but have optimism in the world because the indomitable nature of human spirit and the protection of our central values and our freedoms is immeasurably stronger than the bombs and bullets and terrible atrocities of the terrorists.

They may win the minutes in this place or that place, but eventually, that set of values that we represent will win through.

Thank you very much indeed for the chance to come and give you that picture.

RICHARD ABORN: Well, I don't think anyone could have more eloquently explained the fight that's in front of us and the best tool we have to fight. Now Home Secretary, I just can not thank you enough for your remarks. They were truly wonderful, incredibly comprehensive and very thoughtful.

Thank you all very much. And thank you all for attending. I wish you all a good summer and we will see you again in the Fall. Thank you for being with us. ■

Citizens Crime Commission of New York City, Inc.

217 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

212-608-4700