



# How to WIN the Fight Against the National Identity Card and Associated National Identity Register

## A Guide to Countering pro-ID Questions and Arguments From Friends, Family, Colleagues, Media and the Government

### Background

In November 2003, the government announced its intention to introduce a compulsory National Identity Card as quickly as the technology can be proven and the population 'softened up' to accept it. Since that date it has worked tirelessly to push ahead with this agenda.

This booklet will be useful to you if:

- ✓ **You believe in privacy and freedom and are feeling uncomfortable about the government's new Citizen Database and ID card and the associated database of citizens called the National Identity Register.**
- ✓ **You are unsure about how to answer some of the pro-ID opinions you hear. Maybe some of the 'pro' arguments even seem convincing and you would like to be able to refute them.**

This booklet will go through the main pro-ID questions and arguments you may hear from friends, family, government officials and the media. Hopefully it will provide you with solidly reasoned counter-arguments to help get your point across.

### What We Stand For

**Here is a quick reminder about what NO2ID is all about:**

NO2ID is a single-issue pressure group established with the aim of stopping the government from introducing compulsory Identity Cards and a National Identity Register - the vast database that will be necessary to make the cards work. We are also against 'voluntary' Identity Cards as these are, by the Government's own admission, merely a step on the road to compulsion.

We are a concerned group of people from all backgrounds who wish to protect our fast-vanishing privacy and civil liberties. All our funding is from voluntary donations, grants and NO2ID-produced merchandise. We are completely non-partisan and are unaffiliated to any group, religion, political party or business.

We are not against all forms of ID. NO2ID's Constitution focuses us specifically on "issues concerning ID cards, centralised identity registers and schemes involving the creation of a unique identifying number and/or biometrically based identifier(s) for each and every citizen" and "initiatives that involve comprehensive data sharing without the fully-informed and explicit consent of the individual".

We are against compulsory entry onto a National Identity Register and the creation of a National Identity Register Number (NIRN) for each one of us, no matter how innocent the information linked by NIRN or held on file may be, i.e. we are against this on principle."

## **The Main Argument**

As a supporter, it is important that you always have in mind this issue of principle, even though you may choose to argue from on practical grounds ("It's expensive, it won't stop terrorism, it will criminalise ordinary people" etc.)

The reason for having principle as your guide is that practical arguments always carry less weight and are often easily refuted – and this means you are less likely to win converts.

To get this vital point across, consider slavery. Slavery is wrong *on principle* with no further discussion required. The principle here is that all people should be free from coercive force – free to choose their own path, free to pursue their own happiness and even free to make their own errors. That is the way to argue against slavery. It is *far* weaker to argue that slaves are, say, inefficient and that machines would be better. This just invites a long and heated discussion about the relative efficiencies of machines –v– muscle and entirely misses the point. You could easily lose a debate like this if your opponent were able to convince the audience that muscle is actually better/cheaper/more flexible or more efficient than a machine – which indeed it may be.

## **So What is the Principle Here?**

The principle is that you are a sovereign citizen and you do not live by 'government permission'. A government is (or should be) the *servant* of the people, not its master. Privacy and freedom are yours by right and we only give governments permission to curtail these freedoms in very limited and important circumstances. It is not a proper function of government to engage in blanket surveillance of law-abiding citizens; or to instigate systems of compulsory identification; or to open a file on each citizen; or to criminalise citizens who refuse to comply.

Although you should be constantly guided by such principles, in practice most people are hopelessly ill-equipped to argue from a position of principle having been brought up on a diet of sound-bite rhetoric and policies based on 'mood of the moment' expediency. We live in a pragmatic age where most people agree with the statement: "If it works – then to hell with principle."

Therefore unless you are engaged in debate with someone who understands the meaning of the word 'principle' it is better to soften your approach to one of 'balance' whilst holding the principle in your mind.

For example:

“We believe in finding a correct *balance* between preserving our freedom and privacy on the one hand, and satisfying our desire for safety and security on the other. Such a balance requires wise, benevolent government and constant vigilance from the population. **We must be prepared to challenge those who would violate our freedom and privacy for their own political or financial gain.**”

So a more easily digested line of argument is that because we live together in a society we must trade *some* freedoms in the name of a peaceful and smooth-running society for all. But we must be very careful about *which* freedoms we give away and what the motive is of those who would seek to remove our privacy and freedom. You would then move on to explain why a National Identity Register and ID card is a massive intrusion on liberty and freedom – or at the very least it enables such massive intrusion.

The National ID card and National Identity Register is a giant leap towards authoritarian control and fundamentally alters the balance of power between citizen and state.

The card itself is not the real problem. The concern is the vast National Identity Register with each citizen becoming a number on a government computer which would hold a file on each of us. Initially the file would contain very little (date of birth, current address...). But gradually (in the name of ‘preventing terrorism’ ‘stopping crime’ or ‘protecting children’) the file would contain or link to more and more personal information such as: your spending habits, your ethnicity, your religion, your sexual preferences, your political leanings, your health records, your criminal records, your driving record and convictions. Naturally the government currently have ‘no plans’ to add such data and maintain that they will have ‘adequate safeguards’ in place...

All practical arguments (cost, computer problems, etc.) are *secondary* to this main argument from principle – but obviously you will use these secondary arguments a great deal.

## **Argue From the Positive, Not the Negative**

Before we get into the strictly practical pro- and anti-ID arguments, here is another important point.

Whenever possible, argue passionately about what you stand FOR (privacy and freedom) rather than what you are AGAINST (ID cards and government databases). This has a much more powerful effect. Why? Because *everyone wants privacy and freedom* – these are not alien concepts to most people. Everyone gives these up reluctantly, and only after due persuasion that is for the best - although we are all far better at giving up *other* people’s freedoms of course! Very few people (we hesitate to say “nobody”) will make a statement such as: “Frankly I am appalled that anyone could want such disgusting things as privacy and freedom. It just goes to show the corruption we are facing in this world that anyone could have the nerve to suggest these things were good....”

So, always try and turn it around to the positive, as follows:

“Why are you so *against* these ID cards?”

“Before I answer that, I would just like to say that I am passionately *for* privacy and freedom; I am only against these cards because they seriously threaten the freedoms which I hold so dear.

Freedoms, by the way, which a million Britons found important enough to fight and die for in the last World War alone.”

## Argue About the Database, Not the Card

Most people see cards as unthreatening – they carry a wallet or purse full of them already. They simply cannot see that another ‘harmless piece of plastic’ is anything sinister. They are right in a way – it’s the database which is the danger, not the card. So try always to lead with the dangers of the National Identity Register, not the card itself. The dangers are having a file held on each citizen with ever increasing amounts of personal data being added and an increasing army of ‘authorised users’ having access to such data.

## How to Debate With People For Maximum Effect

You may often find yourself in a debate – sometimes heated – about privacy, Identity Cards, Big Brother, creeping statism and so on. It is not very efficient one-to-one to try to convince someone else of your views because, in general, people are very poor at thinking through their positions and holding logically consistent views. In particular they are unused to thinking from principle. They view principled arguments as ‘unbending’ or ‘extreme’.

Bottom line? You’ll have your work cut out – but it can be fun.

## The Players

Unlike more emotional subjects such as fox-hunting, vivisection, and abortion, it is unlikely that you will come across any *vehemently* pro-ID card arguments. Most people have not really considered the issue. If they have thought about it at all, they probably have some vague notion that ID cards will ‘somehow’ stop terrorism and crime (in some vague, undefined way) and they might have assimilated, and regurgitate a few sound-bites such as “If you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear.” Or “If it saves just one kiddie’s life, it’s worth it.”

Thus you are in competition with apathy and ignorance, rather than passion and certainty. You may also come across the rare person who holds very extreme (in our view) ideas along these lines:

“I would have a chip in everyone’s head controlling their thoughts, if that’s what it took to stop crime.” The more you press this person, the deeper they will dig-in, advocating life imprisonment for a first offence (“...they shouldn’t have done the crime if they didn’t want to go to prison.”) and the death penalty for many crimes. They do not think that the current two million spy cameras are anything like enough and would strongly advocate a spy camera in each of our homes, together with a microphone. They would state that only criminals could possibly protest such a move. When you explain that the price of low crime is totalitarian dictatorship, they will *agree* – **they just want that dictatorship as soon as possible**. Thankfully these people are rare. It is hard/impossible to get them to take a more reasonable stance. It is best to disengage.

In general *most* people won’t have thought about it at all, *some* will be strongly anti-Big Brother already and a few will be mildly pro-Big Brother.

This is good news for us as the vast majority of people are at least open to hearing our arguments and being converted to our point of view. Contrast this with contentious issues such as abortion where most people have firmly held views, issuing from deep moral or religious convictions one

way or the other. It is almost impossible to turn a pro-abortion advocate into an anti-abortion advocate, and vice-versa. Not so with our campaign, thankfully.

## **How to ‘Win’ an Argument**

The objective (in any argument or debate on any issue) is to try to get the other person to consider your viewpoint and hopefully change their own viewpoint as a result of their discussions with you.

**The objective is not to ‘win’ the argument and be ‘right’ by brow-beating the opposition with a stunning array of incontrovertible facts.**

When you set out to do this, people become alienated and even more firmly wedded to their viewpoint.

So here are a few tips for achieving the desired outcome of winning hearts and minds.

### **Tip #1: Stay Calm**

No matter how impassioned you feel about an issue, it is always alienating to be screamed at, lectured to or spoken to like an idiot. How do *you* feel when someone does this to you? It makes the other person go into ‘protective’ mode right at the point when you want them to listen sympathetically to your viewpoint. So, no screaming, wagging fingers, waving arms, thumping tables or condescension – and that includes ‘voice tone condescension’ even though the words you are saying are innocuous in themselves!

### **Tip #2: No Judgemental Language**

Do you want a sure-fire way of making someone switch-off to your viewpoint and become hostile and defensive? Use judgemental language and negative labels – or use a tone of voice which *implies* these things.

“Only a fool would believe...”

“What kind of moronic statement is that?”

“That’s just ridiculous and unreasonable.”

“Come off it! You *cannot* be serious, surely?”

“Listen, I’m going to explain this just once more, and s-l-o-w-l-y, ok?”

“That’s the sort of stupid question I have come to expect from fools like you.”

“Sigh... I’m wasting my time here. I thought you had a bit more intelligence.”

### **Tip #3: Listen to the Other Person and Respect Their Viewpoint**

“I don’t learn anything when I’m talking.” is a very true saying.

What do you most want from your encounter? You want the other person to listen to you considerately, hear your viewpoint, think about it intelligently, then hopefully (and it is a BIG hope) come on to your side, right?

The best way to achieve this is to give the other person the *same* respect – but this is so difficult to do when one of your deeply held beliefs is being challenged.

Although it might seem to you that the person challenging you is being deliberately stupid or acerbic, in reality people engage in such a debate either because they are curious or because they have some strongly held views of their own. Their views may be *wrong* (in your opinion) but they must be respected.

**Putting it simply, you *must start from where they are, right now, if you are to have the faintest hope of converting them.***

If they challenge your views, silently ask yourself a vital question: “What are they *needing* right now?” This allows you to connect to the person before you start giving intellectual water-tight arguments. The importance of this cannot be over-emphasised. Water-tight arguments in themselves *never* win battles in emotive issues – connecting person-to-person at least gives you a fighting chance.

**Hint:** 90%+ of people who take a pro-ID Card stance are acting out of fear. So their need is security and safety. They view the world as a dangerous place with criminals and terrorists lurking on every corner. Governments are delighted to aid them in this view if it helps their agenda. They are frightened and want protection – just like we *all* want protection. They see the ID card (and many other draconian security measures) as providing them with more safety. Their un-stated motto might be:

**“Safety and protection at ANY price.”**

Incidentally, many of us in the anti-ID card camp are also frightened and want protection. We are frightened that our hard-won liberties are being dismantled, and we want protection from over-arching Big Brother state control and interference.

### **Tip #4: Address Their Needs and Concerns FIRST**

So before you launch into the intellectual arguments, try to connect with and acknowledge the other person’s position first. If they are just mildly curious and have no strong feelings either way, you can proceed straight to the main arguments.

### **Example of Bad Argument**

John and Mary are discussing ID Cards. John is mildly in favour of them but hasn’t really thought about it that much. Mary has thought a lot about it and is passionately against.

This sort of response will get Mary nowhere:

**John:** “I think ID cards could be just what we need. They will stop these terrorists from attacking us. That’s *got* to be a good thing, surely?”

**Mary:** “Don’t be stupid! It has been scientifically proven that 89.37% of terrorists do not even have ID on them when committing their acts...blah, blah, blah.”

Hopeless! John will only dig-in deeper. Now compare with this:

## Example of Good Argument

**John:** “I disagree. I think ID cards could be just what we need. They’ll stop these terrorists from attacking us. That’s *got* to be a good thing, surely?”

(Mary first acknowledges John’s position before doing anything else.)

**Mary:** “So you’re worried about the increase in terrorist attacks recently and you want people to be safe?” (Guessing at, and then acknowledging John’s need for safety.)

**John:** “Well yeah! Aren’t you? I mean it’s getting ridiculous. There was that Istanbul bomb, and the World Trade Centre and Jakarta – I mean, who’s safe these days?”

**Mary:** “Sounds like you’re worried that terrorists might come into this country and plan attacks and that makes you fearful?”

**John:** “Well it’s certainly possible, isn’t it? And ID cards would let us know who these people were...”

[Okay, John feels listened-to now, his voice-tone is already calmer and more reasonable and Mary can progress.]

**Mary:** “Yeah, I want us all to be safe too, and if I thought ID cards would have any significant impact on terrorism, maybe I would be more in favour, but you know there is good reason to suppose that not only will they not stop terrorism, they could even *aid* terrorism...”

**John:** “Huh? How come?”

Now Mary is free to explain this strand of the argument to John – and most importantly, *John is listening*.

What a difference that way of talking makes. However, be warned, it’s not so easy to do in the heat of an argument!

## TIP #5 Change May Not Come Immediately

You’ve talked for an hour, listened to and acknowledged their concerns and produced a glittering array of unassailable points - but that pig-headed fool (to use judgemental language!) still has not changed his mind. **This does not mean that you have lost.** Often people feel the need to stick to their position, even when they know they are defending the indefensible. Haven’t we all done that at some time? Maybe later, or next day or next week something you have said will suddenly have an effect and they will come to you and say: “I’ve been thinking about what we discussed last week, and you know, I think you’ve got a point...”

## Tip #6 You’ve Heard it a 100 Times Before But THEY Haven’t

As a campaigner you must be prepared to repeat the same points, time and again like a broken record. You need to remember that most people have not thought this through and it will be the first time they’ve heard a sensible counter-argument to trite media sound-bites. There may be 1,000+ issues alive at any one time; everything from more funding for the ballet through to mothers against drunk drivers. It is not reasonable to expect people to be briefed on even 1% of

these campaigns. Our campaign is just another in a long list, so be prepared to be patient and to repeat yourself over and over again. No matter how many times you have heard the old “nothing to hide, nothing to fear” argument, try to avoid sighing and rolling your eyes before launching into the thousandth repetition of the argument against this. The message you are sending is: “Oh my God! I can’t believe you asked such a moronically obvious question. (Sigh). Oh well, I guess I’ll have to explain it s-l-o-w-l-y for you once again...”

### Key Point

Just because a particular proposal has *some* advantages (and a National ID card DOES have advantages, of course) that doesn’t mean it is good or should be adopted. Hopefully this is obvious. If not, consider the advantages of banning all cars or imposing a jail-on-sight, all-night curfew in cities from 6 pm until 6 am. Both could be shown to have *really massive benefits* (consider 3,000 deaths a year in vehicle accidents and drunken thugs in our city centres.)

Let’s now move on to the main practical arguments and questions you will come across, together with some suggested answers.

## The Main Arguments and Questions

There follows a very brief summary of our main points. Remember to argue from principle wherever possible and then to use these practical points as secondary ammunition.

### Who Gains From an ID Card?

**Government.** All governments of all persuasions in all countries constantly seek increased power and control – often, by the way, for genuinely benign reasons, but often not.

**Big Business.** They long for all ‘consumers’ to be logged, filed and classed according to demographics and spending profiles. This is not a sinister motive. It merely increases their profits as they can more carefully and cost-effectively target their marketing.

### “If you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear.”

This is the most popular sound-bite, endlessly regurgitated by media interviewers and hence picked up and repeated by the general public.

**Answer:** One good way to graphically illustrate the poverty of this argument is to counter with an example: “So you will not object to a government spy camera in every room of your house, including your bedroom, linked back to a police monitoring station? Apparently a lot of crime goes on behind closed doors. Child abuse, criminals conspiring, thieves dividing up their loot, drug dealers etc. The police could clear up a *lot* of crime with these new powers. Surely if you have nothing to hide you have nothing to fear?”

Or: “Spy satellite technology is now getting so sophisticated that the government may propose that a high-power camera in space can now track each citizen 24/7 and watch and record their every movement. If you have nothing to hide, why would you fear such a system?”

Interestingly, we have gone so far down the route of Big Brother State Control that some people hearing this would actually welcome the compulsory introduction of such cameras and satellites.

**More reasoned answer:** This needs restating to expose its true colours, thus: “So you are saying that if you are not a criminal then the government may use *any* surveillance and monitoring against you no matter how draconian and intrusive? All mail should be routinely opened, all telephone calls routinely recorded, cameras monitoring every movement you make?”

Your need for privacy does not, in any way, imply you have something to fear or hide. This is an entirely erroneous notion. To invade your privacy, someone should have a very good reason. One valid reason would be if you were committing criminal acts or strongly suspected of doing so. Then, with due process of law, the police could invade your privacy for a strictly limited period, associated with the alleged criminal activity. Only vicious, out-of-control dictatorial regimes believe in monitoring and controlling all citizens all of the time just ‘in case’ a tiny minority of individuals get up to no good.

### Key Point

ID cards will criminalise tens of thousands of ordinary people. The new Bill established a large number of new crimes and offences to ensure that people comply. Penalties already proposed include:  
**£1,000** fine for failure to notify the authorities of change of details.  
**£2,500** fine for failure to have a card.  
**Two years** in prison for refusal to pay the fine.

In fact it is the innocent who have the most to fear. Criminals and terrorists will simply find a way around these cards – it will be a minor irritation (or even a golden opportunity) to them. Only the careless and guileless will be caught up in the bureaucratic nightmare. It is they who will be fined and criminalised for any one of the proposed ‘ID crimes’ such as failure to renew on time.

### “But surely if it saves just ONE...”

...kiddie, life, victim of crime, terrorist attack, illegal immigrant...etc.

**Answer:** “So by your own logic, if I can prove that it *causes* just ONE death or harms just ONE child, the government will immediately abolish it?”

**More reasoned answer:** We do not apply this argument to any other aspect of society, so why should we for ID cards? We kill 3,000 and injure 30,000 on the roads each year yet we do not abolish cars. 120,000 die each year from smoking-related illness yet we do not abolish cigarettes. 80 people are killed each year falling from step-ladders – by the same argument we should abolish those, after all, if it saves just ONE life...

### “What’s wrong with having ID? Surely we need them in our modern world and I have a fist-full of the stuff already?”

**Answer:** No2ID does not oppose *voluntary* identity documents such as bus passes, library cards, bank cards, etc. Furthermore, we are not against any particular *methods* (e.g. biometric) of identification. Put simply, if you choose to have a biometric card issued by (say) ABC Bank, then this is your choice. You can bank there or not, carry their card or not – and sue ABC if they release your private information to a third party without your consent. **We are against the blanket, compulsory introduction of a National Identity Card for every UK resident, with**

**its associated National Identity Register run by government bureaucrats.** Such a database would grow year on year until eventually the government had a file on every person in the UK. The file (and card) could contain or link to financial history, health background, religion, ethnicity, criminal convictions, purchase history, physical whereabouts of the ‘target’ citizen, political profile, DNA profile etc. etc. Each passing year will hear a call for more data to be added to the system in the name of “anti-fraud” “anti-crime” “anti-terrorism” “protecting children” “anti tax-evasion” or any one of a number of similar reasons.

### **“Sounds a bit Big Brotherish I agree, but what makes you think this government want that kind of level of control?”**

**Answer:** All governments of all persuasions in all countries constantly seek increased power and control – often, by the way, for genuinely benign reasons, but often not. Successive governments-in-waiting in the UK have chattered about ‘rolling back the frontiers of the state’ – each elected government has done the exact opposite when in power – introducing more laws, higher taxes, more centralisation and stripping away more freedoms. It is central to our argument that a National ID Card and its associated National Identity Register are the ultimate enabling tools for corrupt regimes. *This* government may be benign – but the next? And the next *fifty* governments? Basically, **do you trust governments to have your best interests at heart now and forever?**

### **“Where is the *real* danger here?”**

**Answer:** Creeping statism. Each year seeing more and more bureaucrats having access to your citizen file, and more and more data being required to be placed on your file. It will also make us constantly and habitually defer to state control on a daily basis. Thus: “Have I got my ID card? What if I’m stopped? I must remember not to go out without it. I hope I’m not caught this time...” and “Should I buy this magazine on guns? What if it ends up on my record? Maybe I’d better not visit that country – it would look bad on my file. Maybe I won’t buy that extra bottle of wine – it could damage my health record and affect my insurance premiums...”)

### **“If it will stop terrorism then I’m in favour of it.”**

**Answer:** In fact it could make the terrorists life *easier*, if anything. Even the government dropped their tired ‘fighting terrorism’ slogan in 2002 regarding ID cards when they realised it didn’t stack up. The government has started using it again recently to bolster their other very weak arguments for this draconian measure. Imagine the Sept 11<sup>th</sup> terrorists abandoning their evil plan because...they didn’t have a valid ID card. That’s not very credible. Will lack of an ID card stop any determined terrorist? No. Also, many terrorists (e.g. Timothy McVeigh, Oklahoma bomber)

#### **Key Point**

ID cards will do little to stop terrorism and may even aid it. Some terrorists are ‘card-carrying’ citizens of the country in which they carry out their acts (E.g. Timothy McVeigh, Oklahoma bomber). Also, normal common sense anti-terrorism precautions will be dismantled and total reliance placed on the card.

“ID Cards won’t stop terrorism.” David Blunkett (prior to resigning.)

are ‘card-carrying citizens’ of their own countries. The National Identity Card can and *will* be faked (see below) allowing terrorists to enter the country with fewer security checks than at present. Why? If they carry the card, and their eye scan matches the database – then it will be “pass friend”, without a second glance.

## “I have heard that this will cost a lot to implement. Is this true?”

### Key Question

Why is the government intending to spend a *minimum* of 5.5 BILLION pounds on an ID card system, instead of using that money on schooling, housing or urgent infrastructure improvement?

**Answer:** The government’s own current estimate is over five and a half billion pounds. Add to that the usual mess-up caused when any government gets involved with impossibly large projects (Scottish

parliament, CSA computer fiasco, Air Traffic computer fiasco) and you can double or triple that estimate. This at a time when our hospitals are a disgrace, schools are in urgent need of repair, our public transport systems are a joke and children in deprived areas are living in squalor. Now ask yourself why a government would rather spend three billion on logging us all into a giant computer system, than on such essential social tasks.

It will create a vast bureaucracy of expensive employees to maintain the system of tagging citizens, issuing cards, handing out penalties and dealing with lost and stolen cards.

## “Who will pay for it?”

**Answer:** YOU will. Either directly (there are plans to charge you for the privilege of being turned into a number) or through increased taxation. Governments don’t have any money – it all comes from you and me, one way or another. And under a *compulsory* ID card system, you will be *compelled* to pay. You will not have a choice. Resistance will be met first with fines and then imprisonment. The government plan a large array of new ID-card crimes with associated penalties.

## “But surely it will reduce crime? That’s got to be a good thing.”

**Answer:** It may reduce Social Security ID fraud only (which is a miniscule percentage of the

### Key Point

The police so far have been very luke-warm about any alleged ‘crime reduction’ which will occur as a result of ID cards. Rather it will create a huge underground lucrative criminal trade in fake ID estimated to be worth billions. **That which can be made by man can be faked by man.**

Social Security budget and the *smallest* area of Social Security fraud). Most fraud is ‘understatement of circumstances’ not identity fraud. It would do nothing to stop other crime (burglary, assault, theft, fraud, rape,

mugging, murder...). All other major crime may even be aided by such a card. For reasons, see the question on terrorism. The proper way to tackle social security fraud is through proper identification of social security claimants – not blanket compulsory introduction of ID cards for all citizens, claimants or not. (The same class of argument would be the introduction of a compulsory National Identity Card for all because...people were borrowing books from libraries using fake names and address and not returning them. The answer – better ID for library users, not a compulsory ID card for everyone.) Also it is not a valid argument to say: “If X reduces crime, then X should be introduced.” This leaves the path open for hidden microphones on every street corner, routine taping of all telephone calls, opening of all private mail, etc. etc. All of these would greatly reduce crime.

The police rarely have problem identifying criminals once caught. They have problems gaining successful prosecutions and this has *nothing* to do with ID.

**“But these things cannot be faked, surely?”**

**Answer:** It’s a plastic card, made by man, with a chip, made by man. Anything made by man can be faked by man. You could not create such a fake card on your kitchen table. But what about an ultra-modern laboratory, run by the most sophisticated criminal minds on the planet, designed and built specifically to clean-up on the estimated 300 BILLION pound market in counterfeit cards?

Would this headline from *The Telegraph*, June 2007, surprise you?

**“Parliament Bombers Used Fake National Identity  
Cards to Gain Access to Westminster.”**

Or this one:

**“Counterfeit ID Card Ring Discovered in Taiwan.”**

Or this one:

**“Drug Barons Now Making More on Counterfeit ID  
Than Dope, Claims Report.”**

Also, these cards will be produced by people, working in factories (huge factories) staffed entirely by... people. These workers will be, in the main, minimum-wage employees. Do you think some of them might be tempted by a bribe of £500, £1,000 or £10,000 to run a few ‘specials’ through the system, or deliver 100 ‘blanks’ to a guy in the pub, no questions asked? If not them, how about the supervisors or managers? £100k a year ‘back-hander’ is pretty tempting.

**“I still don’t quite get it. How can an Iris scan or fingerprint be faked?”**

**Answer:** The *biometric* information *cannot* be faked (let us assume). In other words, your iris and your fingerprint are unique. It is the detail on the card that can (and will) be faked. Thus a terrorist will have a false card with *his* iris scan or *his* fingerprint, but a *fake* name address and citizen number – all illegally (but properly) registered on the National Identity Register by (say) a paid insider. When he uses the card at the airport, the iris scan will match the card and his record will come up as John Doe, 43 The Street, Anytown – whereas he is really Mr A Terrorist, c/o Osama Enterprises etc. Remember, there is no ‘iris’ or ‘fingerprint’ actually on the card – all that is there will be a lot of ones and zeros (a digital code) representing your iris and your fingerprint.

**“Are you saying that terrorists and criminals will be running around with fake ID, whereas the law-abiding citizens will be subjected to yet more government scrutiny, control, fines and inconvenience?”**

**Answer:** Yes. If this is hard to believe, consider guns. The government stripped tens of thousands of law-abiding citizens of their legitimate rifles and pistols and closed down every gun shop in the UK. Meanwhile, armed criminals now freely roam around our inner cities, laughing at such laws. The going price for a hand-gun in London is £50. £100 if you want fifty 9mm rounds with it. A sub-machine gun? Yours for £250. **The citizens suffer, the criminals laugh.** Again it is impossible to imagine criminals and terrorists going straight because they have to carry an ID card!

**“We had them during the war...”**

**Answer:** That ID was equivalent to the average library card. It is not what we are talking about here. Forget war-time ID cards – this is a whole different league. They just happen to be called the same thing.

**“What about Immigration. That’s a massive problem, surely?”**

**Answer:** Immigrants and asylum seekers are already subject to stringent ID checks and must have their fingerprints taken etc. Illegal immigrants often arrive with no ID whatsoever, having shredded their passports in an attempt to become faceless and backgroundless. A National ID Card will do precisely nothing to stop this problem. Many illegal immigrants knowingly face death to get to safer countries. Would ID cards stop people who are that desperate?

**“Surely we can’t have total individual freedom in society. Do you want government to grant us more freedom?”**

**Answer:** Our freedoms are not granted to us by governments! It does not work like that (at least it *shouldn’t* work like that). We have our freedoms *by right* – and then we employ servants (the government) to curtail those freedoms in certain strictly limited but essential ways. They should be able to clearly demonstrate a very good reason to curtail more of our freedom. It is the duty of every citizen to closely monitor the freedoms that are curtailed and the alleged reasons for doing so – and to protest vehemently if they disagree with the latest restrictions. We must very carefully balance the freedom of the individual with the needs of living in a social group and be constantly on the look-out for corrupt or spurious reasons for curtailing freedom.

**“Aren’t there other benefits of the card? For example, if it contained my health history, medicines I took, food allergies etc – wouldn’t that be useful if I collapsed in the street and an ambulance came?”**

**Answer:** Without doubt, if we all carried a National Identity Card and were logged and tagged on a government computer, there would be advantages. Interfacing with bureaucrats would be easier, for example. Just because something has advantages, it does not mean it should be implemented. (Example: Banning smoking would save 120,000 lives each year.) The specific answer to your question is this: If you think you are at risk, or you think you want a Medical Emergency Card, then you may have one and carry it always. This has nothing to do with the rest of us and we should not be forced to carry the same card.

**“They have them in other countries. They don’t seem to mind do they?”**

**Answer:** Again it is not a good argument for something to say it has been implemented in another country so why not here? (Example: They have banned Internet Access in Country X – so why not here? Thieves have their hands cut off in country Y – so they should do it here.) A few other countries have an ID card. It is often a piece of plastic with a photo and signature. This is not what we are protesting against. In our view, no government has the right to keep a database on each citizen and use force to ensure compliance in registration. Citizens who have accepted this are playing the very dangerous game of relying on a benevolent government now and forever.

## Six Point Action Plan

The purpose of this leaflet is to arm you with the answers to many of the arguments and questions you will hear. However, here are six things which you can do to aid our cause:

1. Become politically active. If you care about privacy and freedom, NOW is the time to stand up and be counted.
2. Become a paid-up member of NO2ID. Forms available on our website ([www.no2id.net](http://www.no2id.net)) or write to the address below.
3. Find and join your local NO2ID group or start one yourself. (Details on our web site [www.NO2ID.net](http://www.NO2ID.net))
4. Talk to as many people as possible and get them to join NO2ID. Also try to engage them in persuasive discussion.
5. Write to your MP. An oldie, but a goodie.
6. Write to the press (obtain a copy of our CD "How to Write a Letter to the Editor")

## Summary

Whatever the problem or question, a compulsory National Identity Card is not an acceptable solution. There are better, more workable, far cheaper solutions to any problem raised in support of such a card.

The time to fight this draconian legislation is right now. No matter how benign the current government appear to be, no matter how little data they promise to hold on each of us at the start, no matter what stringent safeguards they claim will be in place, **once the National Identity Register (the computer which will log each one of us) has been set up and ID cards issued each year will see a gradual decrease in personal privacy. Creeping statism will ensure that ever more personal information is added to your citizen file.**

NOW is the time to fight. Please help us.

**If you care about your privacy and freedom please join  
us in our fight to stop this right now.**

Happy Campaigning!

**The NO2ID Campaign Box 412, 78 Marylebone High Street, London, W1U 5AP  
[www.no2id.net](http://www.no2id.net)**