

# Speech: How Global Britain is helping to win the struggle against Islamist terror

## Global Britain is helping to win the struggle against Islamist terror

When in the course of a prolonged and vicious struggle you eventually record a success, then it is essential – with due humility and caution – to celebrate that success. So I draw your attention once again to the defeat of Daesh in Raqqa, and the victory of the 74-member coalition – in which the UK played a proud part.

It was 3 years ago that Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi stood forth in the pulpit of Mosul's biggest mosque and vowed to "conquer Rome" and "own the world". At one stage his domain had 10 million inhabitants, suffering under what may be remembered as one of the most depraved regimes in history.

They picked on the innocent. They hurled gays from rooftops. They enslaved women and children. They used the town square to crucify and behead anyone who dared oppose moral codes that I would call mediaeval if that were not an insult to the comparative civility of the Middle Ages.

And when they made their last stand in the football stadium in Raqqa, it may not surprise you that they fully lived down to expectations. They did not fight like lions, or die wrapped in their sinister black flag. They put up their hands and allowed themselves to be driven away in white buses.

And it is a pleasing irony that in the end they were out-shot, out-fought and out-generalled by a force that contained significant numbers of female Kurdish soldiers, the very women whose freedom they regarded as a Western abomination, and most of the fighters who inflicted this defeat were Sunni Muslims – the very people who Daesh purported to represent.

We should hail the fall of Raqqa and Mosul; because 96% of the so-called 'caliphate' is now gone, along with their pompous pretensions to statehood. Al-Baghdadi is a fugitive.

We have helped to disable the machine that drew in recruits from across the world, from Luton to Mindanao. They no longer have the land for training camps or a tortured population to plunder and tax.

We should offer ourselves this limited congratulation: that we have prevented a terrorist group from controlling territory in the Middle East.

And yet we know that we have not destroyed Daesh: not in Iraq, not yet in Syria, and certainly not across the world. We may have temporarily smashed the machine but we know the components are invisibly reassembling themselves.

They are even now seeking each other out in countries where governance is

weak. They are there in Afghanistan, Libya, Somalia, northern Nigeria; indeed for 5 months of this year the Islamic State (so-called) in the Philippines occupied Marawi City until they were driven out.

They are capable of operating even in places where government is comparatively stable, as they have tried to do in Tunisia and Egypt. A hundred of the foreign fighters in Syria came from Malaysia.

And of course we see their impact here in western Europe, in the concrete and steel chicanes that have been installed around our public buildings, in the endless boustrophedon queues at airports, in the recent attacks in Manchester and London.

We know that they are simultaneously moving up and down on the ladder of technological ambition. They are working on new bombs of all kinds, and new ways of eluding detection. They are enlisting everyday objects as terrorist weapons.

And I am sad to say that it has become all too commonplace to read that somewhere on our continent, someone chooses to announce that God is great while launching an attack on passers-by. In this country, MI5 and Counter-Terrorism Policing are now running well over 500 live operations – a third more than last year.

So now is the moment to draw confidence from our success against Daesh; and to consider how we are going to prosecute the struggle.

To answer that question – how do we win – we need to understand first who, or rather what, we are fighting. Because even if we were to capture every single Daesh fighter, even if all the jihadis in the world were either imprisoned or vaporized in drone strikes, we would still have failed to defeat the enemy.

This is neither a war against a conventional Westphalian state, nor do these terrorists have any remotely negotiable objectives. It is a struggle not against a religion but an idea, a perverse ideology.

So it may be more useful to switch metaphors. Perhaps we should think of a fight not against a military opponent but against a disease or psychosis – even though that metaphor is itself imperfect. The notion of a disease or contagion fails to do justice to the moral agency of the terrorists.

They have decided to take this path; they and they alone are responsible for their crimes. Perhaps we can say that as with every other form of criminal behaviour, we have to look at the social and emotional factors that combine to make people dedicate themselves to such comprehensive nihilism.

I appreciate the inadequacies of the phrase “Islamist terrorism”. If I could think of a better one I would use it. But we need to understand exactly why this type of terrorism has become associated with Islam in a way that 1.5 billion Muslims find both insulting and infuriating.

It is a very ancient idea, and common to virtually all religions – including Christianity – that any kind of worldly setback (military defeat, political

humiliation, even economic decline) must be the mark of some divine disfavour. For thousands of years human beings have postulated that the correct response must be to propitiate the Gods or God by some act of piety.

(Think of Agamemnon: he wanted a more favourable wind for his ships at Aulis. He believed he was being punished for a transgression. So he did what he thought was the obvious thing. He killed his daughter.) It is this same sort of expiatory thought pattern that persuades people to engage in movements that could be broadly described as puritan or fundamentalist.

In the last 150 years we have seen how a small number of Islamic thinkers have responded to what they see as the humiliations of the Muslim world. And this same logic applies to the individual as he or she is radicalized. Because of course the world is full of people who feel that they are not successful, or not powerful, or not in control of their lives.

And then suddenly – in a mosque, or in a prison, or increasingly online – someone hands them what seems to be this emotional universal spanner. They are told that all their disappointments are caused by their own refusal to adopt a jihadist ideology.

And they are told that if only they will turn to this extreme and violent theology then all their troubles will be gone and their lives turned upside down. And suddenly the world around them that had previously seemed to be alienating and intimidating now seems itself to be contemptible and corrupt; and deserving of reform by the application of their holy rage.

The process is not only very fast – Islamist jihadism has been compared in its addictive power to crack cocaine. It is also very hard to reverse.

And so we need to stop the spread of this malady. We need to confront it and wipe it out in all the ungoverned spaces where it breeds: in the Middle East and north Africa, in the foul rag and bone shops of the internet, in our own country, where it exploits the very freedoms of our liberal democracy, and in the wildest and least governed space of all, the human heart.

There are interlocking ecosystems of terror, domestic and international, contaminating each other online. We can stop both cogs turning. We can greatly reduce the threat. Yes, we can win.

But we need to understand not just whom we mean by the enemy. We need to understand who we are. Who are 'we' who are going to win?

There is an unedifying narcissism in the whole use of this first person plural, because I am afraid that all too often the term 'we' is taken to mean the West: it means the so-called advanced liberal democracies of Europe and America – and if that is all we mean by 'we' then the cause is hopeless.

Look at the death tolls from suicide bombs that now rate barely a paragraph in our papers, in Iraq or Somalia. Who are the principal victims of this global disease?

It is not Westerners, in spite of the recent increase in terrorist attacks.

The number of global terrorist victims has risen from 3,361 in the year 2000 to 25,673 in 2016; and the overwhelming majority of those victims, 98%, were innocent Muslims living in Muslim countries.

Since October, we have witnessed 2 of the deadliest terrorist attacks in modern history – in Mogadishu and Sinai – and of the 823 who died virtually all were Muslims; in Sinai the target of the atrocity was a mosque filled with Friday worshippers. The tragedy of their families was identical to the tragedy of the bereaved families in Manchester or London – and the perpetrator was the same enemy that we face in Britain.

But if we are going to win, then we need to scrap the idea that Western foreign policy is somehow the principal cause of the problem. It is a fallacy that is at once glib, egotistical and which simply feeds the narrative of the jihadis.

Yes it is true that we have made horrendous mistakes – even when our intentions have been broadly good.

Sir John Chilcot concluded: “The Iraq of 2009, when British troops withdrew, certainly did not meet the UK’s objectives as described in January 2003. It fell far short of strategic success.” That must be a competitor for understatement of the century.

In removing Saddam Hussein, without any clear programme for succession, we not only helped to cause chaos. We sent a troubling signal around the Muslim world.

Saddam was a monster, a mass murderer, but he nonetheless stood at the apex of the Iraqi political system and in toppling him with a flip of our fingers, we seemed to suggest a contempt for national political institutions in the Middle East and North Africa. In the last 15 years we have learned the hard way that these institutions – no matter how flawed – are more easily destroyed than rebuilt.

And so I am with the consensus that the war in Iraq – certainly in the absence of a clear plan – was a mistake.

But that war did not create the Islamist terrorist threat: far from it. It is almost as if people have forgotten that the 9/11 massacre – in which 3,000 died at the hands of Osama bin Laden – came before the Iraq war, not after it.

And to assert, as people often do, that the terrorism we see on the streets of Britain and America is some kind of punishment for adventurism and folly in the Middle East is to ignore that these so-called punishments are visited on peoples – Swedes, Belgians, Finns, or the Japanese hostages murdered by Daesh – with no such history in the region.

There is no consistency or no logic in this bashing of the West. We must not play their game. The truth is that, if anything, the Western powers have been bit players in a kaleidoscopic struggle between dynasties and sects and tribes and interests in which, over the last 30 years, Islamist extremism –

and in many cases terrorism – has been manipulated in order to serve some political end. Actually, the end is always broadly the same. It is the survival or strengthening of the regime.

But there are several distinct types of manipulation. There is simple appeasement, by which some governments – at least in the past – have condoned the financial support of highly dubious mosques or madrasas and turned a blind eye to preaching of hate or violence to buy the domestic support, for instance, of a conservative and reactionary clerisy.

Next there is the ingenious device of the false alternative, by which regimes will artfully contrive a choice, which they present to their own people and to the rest of the world. You either accept me, they say, with all my blemishes – cruel secret police, terrible human rights record – or else the Islamists will take over and we are back to the Middle Ages.

The most egregious recent exponent of this false alternative has been Bashar al-Asad. From the very beginning of the Syrian uprising in 2011 Asad worked assiduously to sharpen the dilemma. He contributed to the very creation of Daesh. He let their leaders out of jail and bought their oil. Until this year, he usually avoided fighting Daesh, reserving his most ruthless aggression for the civilian population of Syria.

And after 6 years of this Morton's fork, and 6 years of slaughter, we have to accept that the gambit appears to have paid off.

We have never been able to answer the question, 'who should follow Asad', because the prior challenge has been to get rid of Daesh, to defeat the Islamist terrorists. And yes, we celebrate the defeat of Daesh in Raqqa, but Asad has meanwhile recovered most of operational Syria.

That is how Islamist extremism has been for decades used as a tool for self-preservation. It's either me or the maniacs, a regime will say: which do you prefer? And the world says, well, in that case I suppose we had better hold our noses and have you.

In some cases, let us be frank, this arrangement works better than in others. Some governments, without being necessarily democratic, are able to hold things together without too much repression. But sometimes the lid is jammed down so hard on the pressure cooker that the resentment builds, and a campaign for political freedom becomes indistinguishable from a campaign for Islamist control.

So we end up with a lose-lose situation. If you have a chaotic state, then you have a breeding-ground for terror. If you have a strong but repressive state, then you also have a potential breeding-ground for terror.

And last there is a method of manipulation that even more pernicious than the false alternative. I mean the concept of 'forward defence', whereby a government or its agents will covertly support terrorist groups abroad: either to weaken that government's neighbours; or to diffuse any threat from those neighbours – real or imagined, or to export its own jihadi problem

outside its borders.

Or, most destructively of all, the objective may be to engage in a regional campaign for influence by exploiting the weaknesses of states, and by promoting fanatical or semi-fanatical militias to force other states to respond.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of these conflicts, you cannot credibly argue that they are the fault of the West, let alone that they are now being driven by Western powers. On the contrary, you could argue much more persuasively that the problems we are seeing today have been exacerbated not so much by Western meddling as by our aloofness.

We called on Asad to go. We set the red lines of what we would accept in his treatment of the Syrian population. And then we did nothing about it. We willed the end, and failed to will the means – leaving the pitch wide open for Russia and Iran.

I am afraid that we must now adjust to reality, but we do not walk away. We must collectively re-insert ourselves in the process because it is Western cash that will eventually rebuild Syria, and that can only happen in the context of a political transition away from the Asad regime in which the Syrian people – including the 11 or 12 million who have fled – are allowed to vote on their future in UN-monitored elections.

We can and should do more to resolve the conflict in Yemen where a humanitarian catastrophe is looming, and where Saudi cities are now facing the terror of Houthi missile attacks.

We have the opportunity to bring together the factions in Libya, who should seize this moment to put aside their differences for the good of that country.

The UK has played an important part in uniting the world around the plan of the UN envoy, Ghassan Salame.

We need more engagement, not less, because if you look at events since 2013, when the British and the US decided not to intervene in Syria even after Asad had used chemical weapons, you could not say that we managed to insulate ourselves from the region.

On the contrary, Europe had a tumultuous and tragic flood of migration from Syria. We are still seeing huge flows via Libya and the tempo of domestic terrorism would appear if anything to have increased.

We cannot create some Maginot Line in the Mediterranean. We cannot just seal off the whole of the Middle East and North Africa and give them 50 years to sort themselves out.

The problems will only get worse, not just for the Muslim countries who are in the frontline of the struggle but for us in Western Europe.

Above all, we must not be afraid. The easiest way to lose a war on terror is

to be terrified. We cannot afford to let them change the way we live our lives – no more than is strictly necessary. We should not minimize the threat we face. Neither should we exaggerate.

For whatever else it may be, Islamist terrorism is simply not an existential threat to Britain.

[political content removed]

It is a scourge, a disease, a malaise; but we can get on top of it, because for all its allegedly instant addictive power – there are in reality only a tiny, tiny minority of people who are going to be remotely vulnerable to its bombastic lunacies.

Anyone who actually went to Raqqa discovered that it was a hopeless and unsanitary dystopia. There proved to be a very limited market for that way of life.

We can defeat this scourge at home and abroad; we can stop both cogs turning at once.

We are working to get their videos down from the internet, and thanks to the efforts of both the Prime Minister and of Amber Rudd, we are beginning to see more co-operation from the internet companies, with hundreds of thousands of items removed.

We are going to continue the work of the Prevent programme, which is designed to spot vulnerable people and protect them from radicalization, and – despite its detractors – Prevent has had its share of success.

At the same time we in the UK, Global Britain, are helping to reverse the spread of the disease overseas, and in its most hideous and dangerous manifestations that will mean surgery. It will sometimes mean military action of the kind we have taken in the skies above Raqqa and Mosul, where the UK has been among the biggest contributors to a highly successful campaign of tactical air bombardment, second only to the US.

Contrary to some of the assertions you will have heard recently, I can tell you that every day around the world I can tell you that British serving men and women are putting their lives at risk to roll up terrorist networks, to expose what they are doing, to thwart them and bring them to justice.

And they are doing it not just on behalf of the British people, but for the sake of everyone. They are making good on what the Prime Minister has rightly called the [unconditional commitment of the British people](#) to the security of our European friends – not just in this continent but beyond. We have the best in the world – and they will be with our allies for the long term.

People should be immensely proud of the work of this country in the danger zones and the breeding grounds of terror. I have myself seen British forces training Nigerians to tackle the maniacs of Boko Haram. I have seen how we are helping the Libyans to tackle the people traffickers and gun-runners, and to stop the terrorists regaining a foothold in Sirte.

But we cannot win until whole populations are immunized from the virus, until the Muslim world is no longer vulnerable to the cancer. That struggle will only be over when across that huge arc of territory, from south Asia to the Middle East, we have managed to end the political manipulation of extremism and terror, and end the baleful logic of the false alternative.

We – and by ‘we’ I mean not just we the West but the whole Muslim world who will be the winners when there is a powerful and visible third option: neither the tyranny and repression of undemocratic governments nor the chaos and backwardness of Islamist regimes, but the real and viable possibility of pluralist, generous and tolerant societies that allow space for free speech and independent non-governmental organisations.

We all understand the reasons why this third alternative has been so rare and so hard to achieve. There is no tradition of secular political parties in many Muslim countries, and often the biggest, most efficient and most politically savvy competitor for political space are the Islamists.

The most effective of all is the Muslim Brotherhood. We must be clear-eyed about this organization. It manifests itself in different ways in different places.

It cannot be denied that Muslim Brotherhood parties represent a body of public opinion, if not the overwhelming current: in some countries they hold seats in parliament; in Tunisia they were part of an elected government.

We in the UK have received representations from friendly governments in the Middle East that would like us to ban that organization. In 2015, after long consideration, the government decided that the Muslim Brotherhood did not meet the threshold for a proscribed group.

But it is plainly wrong that Islamists should exploit freedoms here in the UK – freedoms of speech and association – that their associates would repress overseas, and it is all too clear that some affiliates of the Muslim Brotherhood are willing to turn a blind eye to terrorism.

It was disgraceful that when the Pope visited Egypt, the Muslim Brotherhood should call him “the Pope of terrorism” and accuse the Egyptian security forces that were tasked with guarding him of being “Christian militias.” They have repeatedly sought to obscure the crimes of Daesh. Even when Daesh had claimed an attack on St Mark’s Cathedral in Alexandria, on Palm Sunday, a Muslim Brotherhood spokesman blamed the Sisi government.

Of course we should challenge Egypt’s government when its standards on human rights and the rule of law fall short of their own country’s constitution – and suppress the open society that Egypt needs in order to succeed – but that is no excuse for the kind of poisonous rhetoric we are seeing from the Muslim Brotherhood. They are exculpating the true culprits and encouraging terrorism by making wild claims about the Egyptian government.

That is among the reasons why this government is applying greater scrutiny to the Muslim Brotherhood: of their visa applications, of their charity work,

and of their international links.

And if there is to be that third alternative, neither anti-democratic tyranny, nor Islamism, but pluralist and tolerant then we need to intensify our current work – the development aid programmes in which Britain, and DFID, leads the world.

We are helping by backing human rights groups and NGOs, and helping above all to change one of the most destructive imbalances, one of the greatest barriers to social and economic progress: the cultural and intellectual repression of women.

It is great news that women are finally going to be able to drive in Saudi Arabia – where they already comprise a majority of university students – and the world is willing on that brave programme of reform. But almost a third of Egyptian women cannot read. In Pakistan the adult female illiteracy rate is 60%.

And it is not just women who are being starved of intellectual sustenance. There is currently only one university in the Muslim world that makes the top 200.

Imagine the difference if those universities began to take off, in a spirit of real academic freedom. Imagine the growth in pride and confidence as those universities in Cairo, in Damascus, in Baghdad, in Tunis began to move up the world rankings, to take once again the positions of huge intellectual eminence that those cities occupied in the Middle Ages. Because in the end this is all about self-confidence and belief, not just in universities but in all national institutions.

One of my heroes is the 14th century Tunisian scholar Ibn Khaldoun. He was a great historiographer and economist – he showed that low taxes mean high yields long before Arthur Laffer – he's one of the founders of sociology.

He identified what is called 'asabiyyah', the cohesive loyalty to a group or tribe or sect or movement that propels a dynasty to power. And he showed how time and again that loyalty eventually breaks down, and the dynasty is swept away – usually by violence – in favour of another group.

That is why my friend the Secretary General of the Arab League, Ahmed Aboul Gheit, says that the problem of the Muslim world is that there is not enough nationalism.

Now nationalism is not a fashionable concept in some circles. But it can be immensely valuable. If people have a sense of loyalty and duty to their country, and to its institutions, then those institutions will endure and they will help to promote equity and fairness and respect in society because they command a devotion that goes beyond the narrow selfish imperatives of 'asabiyyah'.

That is why Britain seeks everywhere to help countries to develop their own respected national institutions: an independent judiciary and army, proud national educational institutions, a national broadcaster and independent

national journalists, and a legislature that protects the sovereignty of the people.

And more than anything else it needs people who can tell that national story, build a narrative of success that embraces everyone, brings people together Shia and Sunni in a project that transcends sect and tribe and class.

We are in need of a new school of leaders, women as well as men, and of course the UK can and is helping with our hundreds of Chevening and Commonwealth scholars every year. Never forget that of the current crop of kings queens, presidents and prime ministers, 1 in 7 was educated in this country. Our soft power brings together the development funds and expertise that can help produce the social, educational and political change that will immunize populations from Islamist terror.

And look at the reality of UK hard power: the second biggest defence budget in NATO, one of the few countries capable of deploying air power more than 7,000 miles overseas.

Look at the reality and we are not retreating from our role overseas. On the contrary we are learning what that retreat has cost us in the past. British foreign policy is not part of the problem; it is part of the solution.

And above all we will win when we understand that 'we' means not just us in the West but the hundreds of millions of Muslims around the world who share the same hopes and dreams, who have the same anxieties and goals for their families as we do, all of us, who are equally engaged with the world and all its excitements and possibilities, who are equally determined to beat this plague.

We can beat it together. And we will.

---

## **[Press release: Environment Agency announces £1.4m Anglian Waterways investment](#)**

Boaters are to benefit from a £1.4m investment into [Anglian Waterways](#), as the [Environment Agency](#) launches its latest improvement programme.

The Capital Investment Programme sets out the repairs and upgrades being made across Anglian Waterways' 353-mile network.

## Seven-figure investment

Eight locks across its most popular rivers are set for refurbishment. The seven-figure investment will ensure the structures remain in good working order for years to come.

The work covers locks at Wadenhoe, Woodford, Titchmarsh, Orton, Cotterstock, and Ashton on the [River Nene](#), and Eaton Socon and Brandon on the [River Great Ouse](#).

These are among the busiest locks on the Anglian Waterways network, giving access to around 7,000 boaters a year.

Work started in November and continues throughout the winter months, avoiding the peak boating season to minimise disruption for those on the river.

## Sign up for latest updates

The locks will have to close during the work to be drained of water and allow full access to the chambers and the gates. Boaters can get the latest information by [signing up for email updates](#) or calling the Environment Agency on 03708 506 506 and asking for Anglian Waterways.

The investment programme will also include de-shoaling work on the rivers Great Ouse and Nene. This will remove underwater gravel that builds up naturally and can hamper navigation.

Also included are investigations into improving the Nene's landing stages, where boaters can disembark, and upgrading control panels at the locks to the same model, making them consistent and easier to use and maintain across the region.

Neil Pope, Anglian Waterways assets team leader at the Environment Agency, said:

Our precious waterways are an important part of our nation's rich heritage and beauty. They are a national treasure, valued for their contribution to our environment, our health and wellbeing, and our economy. We're proud to play a part in caring for them, and we take that responsibility very seriously.

Maintaining them to a good, safe working standard is our number-one priority. We invest money very carefully to ensure the best value for every pound we spend. This means our waterways will continue to offer outstanding value to the many, many people who enjoy them every year.

The Environment Agency cares for more than 353 miles of navigable waterways in the Anglian region, as well as a vast network of associated facilities such as bridges, locks, moorings and toilets.

The two most popular rivers in this network – the Great Ouse and the Nene – attract more than 7,000 boaters and an estimated 1.1m other visitors every year.

## **Capital Investment Programme**

The work in the agency's investment programme is subject to change. The current schedule (7 December 2017) is:

- Wadenhoe Lock, River Nene, Northamptonshire: 3 January 2018 to 12 February 2018. Complete refurbishment.
- Woodford Lock, River Nene, Northamptonshire: 27 November 2017 to 22 December 2017 and 22 January 2018 to 23 February 2018. Complete refurbishment.
- Titchmarsh Lock, River Nene, Northamptonshire: 3 January 2018 to 16 March 2018. Complete refurbishment.
- Cotterstock Lock, River Nene, Northamptonshire: 22 January 2018 to 16 February 2018. Replacement of counterweight.
- Ashton Lock, River Nene, Northamptonshire: 16 February 2018 to 28 March 2018. Refurbishment of guillotine gate.
- Orton Lock, River Nene, Cambridgeshire: Dates to be confirmed. Re-painting.
- Landing stages, River Nene: November 2017 to April 2018. Investigate the possibility of additional landing stages along the Nene and repair existing ones.
- De-shoaling, River Nene: Dates to be confirmed. Remove gravel impacting navigation.
- Eaton Socon, River Great Ouse, Cambridgeshire: February 2018. Replace sweep arms on the mitre gates.
- Brandon Lock, River Great Ouse, Suffolk: March 2018. Repair footbridge walkway.
- De-shoaling, River Great Ouse: Dates to be confirmed. Remove gravel impacting navigation.

---

## **Speech: Nuclear Industry Association (NIA) annual conference 2017**

### **Introduction**

Good morning and thank you to the NIA for the opportunity to address you all today.

Firstly, I want to congratulate John Hutton on his new role as Chairman of Energy UK – which means I can look forward to him lobbying me on my entire brief!

I also want to thank John, his team and the many industry leaders here today, who have contributed to the development of the Nuclear Sector Deal.

## Clean Growth and Industrial Strategy

[Sector Deals](#) are a major component of the [Industrial Strategy](#), which we published just last Monday.

The strategy is one of this government's top priorities, because it sets out, in practical terms, how we intend to build a Britain fit for the future – a Britain ready to embrace the challenges and opportunities ahead.

By focusing on the 5 foundations of productivity: ideas, people, infrastructure, business environment and place, we can unlock our potential and in doing so build prosperous communities across the UK.

We also identified 4 [Grand Challenges](#) – areas where we can seize the initiative with the technologies and industries of tomorrow. One of these is clean growth.

This follows September's [Clean Growth Strategy](#), which set out how the whole country can benefit as we cement our place as the world leader in low carbon technologies and industries.

The nuclear industry is well placed to deliver against these important objectives – providing clean, reliable energy while growing the economy.

The sector provides tens-of-thousands of highly-skilled jobs and benefits diverse regions across the UK, from Cumbria to Somerset and from Wales to Oxfordshire.

Look at Hinkley Point C: when complete, the plant will provide enough clean energy to meet an impressive 7% of the UK's electricity needs...

...but the project has already begun to benefit the South West, which is now home to the 2,500 workers currently on site and where we have seen over £450 million in contracts let to local businesses in the first year.

We want to build on the momentum created by Hinkley and we continue to work closely with EDF, CGN, Horizon and Nugen on their proposals for future plants. I also welcome the news that Toshiba has selected a preferred bidder for the Nugen project, and we now look forward to continuing to work with KEPCO to discuss their plans.

At the other end of the fuel cycle, we continue to lead the way in waste and decommissioning and we are seeing the benefit of this at Sellafield. Today, our expertise across the nuclear sector is recognised throughout the world.

We have to use this as a springboard.

As the Industrial Strategy makes clear, we must build on the UK's strengths to take advantage of the opportunities of the future.

So I welcome [today's publication from the Nuclear Industry Council](#) of proposals for a sector deal which sets out a number of steps to deliver on that potential.

Boosting the competitiveness of the sector by driving down costs...

While supporting high skilled, well paid jobs in regions across the United Kingdom...

We will be working with industry over the coming weeks to explore their proposals in detail.

I am pleased with the progress of our discussions to date, and as co-chair of the Nuclear Industry Council, I have witnessed first-hand the determination shown by the industry's leaders to see it succeed.

Government too is committed to a thriving and innovative industry, so I am pleased to announce a package of new measures to boost innovation and provide greater clarity on our future plans.

## **National Policy Statement (NPS)**

Government recognises the value industry places on policy certainty, so today I am pleased to launch [a consultation on siting arrangements for large scale new nuclear plants](#). This will begin the process towards designating a new National Policy Statement for conventional nuclear power stations deployable between 2026 and 2035.

This initial consultation sets out the proposed siting process and assessment criteria for sites potentially suitable for nuclear plants with single reactor capacity above 1GW.

Having this new National Policy Statement in place will provide reassurance and certainty to developers into the 2030s.

## **Geological Disposal Facility (GDF)**

Looking further ahead, we recognise the need to implement a responsible long term solution for the disposal of higher activity radioactive waste.

That is why early in the New Year, we will be launching two consultations as part of the process to site a Geological Disposal Facility for higher activity radioactive waste. We will be consulting on a framework for future planning decisions and separately, on our approach to working with local communities in the siting process.

Internationally, it has been shown that 'willing host communities' are central to a successful siting of a Geological Disposal Facility. Strong, effective and lasting relationships, built on mutual trust and a shared vision of the long-term economic benefits for the host community, are key to successful delivery of a GDF.

These consultations will help reassure industry that investment in the supply chain, both in people and capability, will pay dividends once we move into the delivery phase of this project.

Again, this will support both the objectives of our Industrial Strategy.

On our current estimates, at the peak of construction, the site will support up to 1,000 jobs, with an additional 1,000 jobs in the supply chain.

When it's ready, the facility will sustain around 600 jobs a year for more than a century, while delivering significant investment and innovation to local communities.

## **Innovation and future technology**

Another key element of our Industrial Strategy is a big commitment to supporting innovation, with a pledge to raise R&D investment to 2.4% of GDP by 2027.

It is only by innovating across the nuclear supply chain that will we be able to maintain our competitiveness into the future.

This means new approaches to nuclear technology that drive down costs and improve safety.

I know you will be keen to maintain the pace.

After all, the UK has the potential to become a world-leader in developing the next generations of nuclear technologies.

Your appetite is clear; industry has repeatedly called for clarity on the government's plans for emerging nuclear technologies.

So today I am pleased to be able to set out the first steps in our proposed way forward.

We have spent the last 18 months working closely with you to understand new technological developments, and to assess their viability through the [Small Modular Reactor competition](#).

That exercise is now closed, but it has greatly informed the evidence base and helped shape our thinking in this area.

In particular, 3 key requests came through.

The first was that you want better and earlier access to Regulators.

So, as announced in the Clean Growth Strategy, we are providing up to £7 million of funding to regulators to build the capability and capacity needed to assess and licence small reactor designs.

This funding will also provide support for pre-licensing engagement between vendors and regulators. I'm pleased to say a very successful first event took

place in November with a focus on regulatory issues relating to smaller water-cooled reactors.

The second is to help turn new developer's ideas into detailed designs.

To help deliver this, over the next 3 years we will be providing up to £44 million pounds in R&D funding to support Generation IV advanced reactors.

The third request was to create the right market conditions to enable developers to bring new reactors to market.

A crucial element of this is demonstrating commercial viability – in particular, the ability of new designs and delivery mechanisms to attract investment and generate cost-competitive electricity.

Smaller scale designs, using modular and other modern manufacturing techniques offer the possibility of achieving these aims, and I am grateful to those developers who have shared their financial estimates with us.

But I want to go further, so I'm setting up an expert finance group to report to me by the spring on smaller scale designs, identifying the barriers to investment and how these might be overcome.

I will also be considering what further steps government might take to support smaller reactor designs and maximise the benefits to the UK supply chain.

In the Clean Growth Strategy we confirmed £460 million of funding to support work in areas including future nuclear fuels, new nuclear manufacturing techniques, recycling and reprocessing, and advanced reactor design.

As part of this I am happy to announce that we will soon be launching the second phase of the Nuclear Innovation Programme. This will include up to £8m pounds for work on modern safety and security methodologies and advanced fuel studies.

We have also recently awarded contracts worth over £5 million pounds for work on materials and manufacturing as part of the [Small Business Research Initiative](#) that we launched last year

... and I am happy that we will be working with AMEC, Nuclear AMRC, Fraser Nash Consultancy and the University of Sheffield on this essential work.

Our leadership in nuclear technology is not just about progress in fission technology. I also want to see us maintain our global advantage in fusion technology.

So I am delighted to confirm the announcement of £86m of funding to establish the National Fusion Technology Platform.

Our investment will support UK industry in targeting major contracts for nuclear fusion and build on our expertise in this potentially transformative field.

This builds on the pledge we made in June to underwrite our fair share of funding for JET until the end of 2020. These actions underline our commitment to close collaboration with our European partners on nuclear research and training as we prepare to leave the EU and Euratom.

## **Euratom**

While we are leaving the European Union, we have been clear that our decision to withdraw from the Euratom Treaty in no way diminishes our nuclear ambitions.

The objective for our negotiations is to seek maximum continuity with Euratom across nuclear trade, nuclear research and nuclear regulation.

And I am pleased to say that we are making good progress with our negotiations with the EU, with the IAEA, and with our key trading partners across the globe.

The first phase of EU negotiations has focussed on legal and technical issues related to nuclear materials and safeguards arrangements.

In his report, the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union noted that:

We are now close to reaching agreement on the vast majority of issues set out in our position papers on Euratom.

So we are keen to continue this good progress by moving on as quickly as possible to the negotiations on the future relationship with Euratom, with the aim of maintaining a very close a relationship.

But we don't underestimate the challenge we are facing. There are some areas, such as free movement of goods and services, which are linked to broader negotiations with the European Union.

That is why we are putting the necessary arrangements in place to provide certainty for the civil nuclear industry that it will be able to continue to be successful under any scenario.

This includes negotiating bilateral safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency...

... Negotiating bilateral Nuclear Cooperation Agreements with Japan, Australia, the United States and Canada...

... Delivering a new domestic nuclear safeguards regime, regulated by the Office for Nuclear Regulation ...

... Exceeding the standard that the international community would expect from the UK...

... And the Nuclear Safeguards Bill, giving government the power to establish that domestic safeguards regime. Good progress has been made on the bill, which passed Commons Committee Stage on 14 November.

We've also held many discussions with the nuclear sector to better understand your concerns, including my own attendance at September's industry forum.

Most importantly, we will continue to engage closely with you in parallel with our discussions with the EU...

... And I can announce that we will be holding further industry roundtables on a recurring basis.

Today is another opportunity to engage, and in a moment you will be hearing from David Wagstaff who is the head of EU Negotiations within the Euratom team.

We also have a team of Officials from the Civil Nuclear Directorate in the event space to answer your questions on any of the today's announcements.

## **Conclusion**

These announcements all point to the great opportunities facing the nuclear industry, but we know the sector also faces a big challenge to remain competitive going forward.

This is emphasised by the falling price of offshore wind. While this is great news for our clean growth agenda, it puts a spotlight on nuclear. And the advancement of technologies such as battery storage will only increase the pressure on nuclear to compete with other clean technologies.

To do this, it is clear we must reduce costs across the nuclear lifecycle – from new build to decommissioning.

Government will play a key role in this, but there is no doubt that industry has to lead the way.

So I'm pleased to see you publish your vision for enduring success, based on ambitious, specific cost reduction... and I look forward to discussing these further with John and his team.

This government is committed to a bold, new Industrial Strategy, with Clean Growth as one of the central components and it is clear nuclear has the potential to deliver against these ambitions.

With a clear commitment to cost reduction, I look forward to supporting a strong and innovative nuclear industry; one which is fit to deliver for decades to come.

Thank you.

---

## [Press release: Report 18/2017: Overturning of a tram at Sandilands junction, Croydon](#)

In its investigation into the overturning of tram 2551 in Croydon on 9 November 2016, the Rail Accident Investigation Branch (RAIB) found that the risk of trams overturning on curves was not properly understood by the tramway and so there were insufficient safety measures. All of the passengers who were killed, and many of those who were seriously injured, fell through the windows or doors as the tram tipped over. Today, the RAIB has made 15 safety recommendations to improve safety on UK trams.

**Simon French, Chief Inspector of Rail Accidents said:**

The RAIB's report into the accident at Sandilands will stand as the record of the events that led to the tram overturning and the terrible human consequences. Our careful analysis of the evidence, and identification of the causal and underlying factors, has enabled us to make a number of far-reaching recommendations. These will have a lasting impact on the way that the tramway industry manages its risk.

We are recommending action in five main areas. The first is the use of modern technology to intervene when trams approach hazardous features too fast, or when drivers lose awareness of the driving task. Tramways need to promote better awareness and management of the risk associated with tramway operations. Work needs to be done to reduce the extent of injuries caused to passengers in serious tram accidents, and to make it easier for them to escape. There need to be improvements to safety management systems, particularly encouraging a culture in which everyone feels able to report their own mistakes. Finally, greater collaboration is needed across the tramway industry on matters relating to safety.

UK tramways have been aware of our key findings and the focus of our recommendations for many months now. I am very encouraged by the progress that has already been made in addressing the recommendations and the collaborative approach that is being taken.

It is vital that the right action is taken to stop such a tragic accident from ever happening again.

## Summary

On the morning of 9 November 2016, tram 2551 reached the maximum permitted speed of 80 km/h as it entered the first of three closely spaced tunnels, which together extended for about 500 metres. When leaving the tunnels, the tram should have been reducing speed significantly as it was approaching the sharp curve round to Sandilands junction, where there is a 20 km/h limit. This was marked by a speed limit sign at the start of the curve. On the day of the accident, the tram was travelling at 73 kilometres per hour when it reached this sign.

The excessive speed caused the tram to overturn as it passed through the curve. Passengers were thrown around inside the tram and the tram slid along the ground on its side. Of the 69 passengers involved in this tragic accident, seven died and 61 were injured, 19 seriously.

Investigation methods included:

- obtaining data from the tram's onboard recorder and the tramway's signalling system
- conducting tests on the tram's safety systems
- using computer modelling to understand the minimum speed that would overturn a tram on the curve at Sandilands
- reviewing the design of the infrastructure
- reviewing the tramway's safety and risk management systems
- interviews with people and organisations involved
- surveying tram drivers to understand how trams were being driven on that route

The RAIB's investigation concluded that it is probable that the driver temporarily lost awareness on a section of route on which his workload was low. The investigation has found that a possible explanation for this loss of awareness was that the driver had a microsleep, and that this was linked to fatigue. Although it is possible that the driver was fatigued due to insufficient sleep there is no evidence that this was the result of the shift pattern that he was required to work.

It is also possible that, as he regained awareness, the driver became confused about his location and direction of travel through the tunnels. The infrastructure did not contain sufficiently distinctive features to alert tram drivers that they were approaching the tight curve.

The investigation found that:

- there was no mechanism to monitor driver alertness or to automatically apply the brakes when the tram was travelling too fast
- there was inadequate signage to remind drivers when to start braking or to warn that they were approaching the sharp curve
- the windows broke when people fell against them, so many passengers were thrown from the tram causing fatal or serious injuries

## Recommendations

The RAIB has made 15 recommendations intended to improve safety. Recommendation areas include:

- technology, such as automatic braking and systems to monitor driver alertness
- better understanding the risks associated with tramway operations, particularly when the tramway is not on a road, and the production of guidance on how these risks should be managed
- improving the strength of doors and windows
- improvements to safety management systems, particularly encouraging a culture in which everyone feels able to report their own mistakes
- improvements to the tram operator's safety management arrangements so as to encourage staff to report their own mistakes and other safety issues
- reviewing how tramways are regulated
- a dedicated safety body for UK tramways

## Video summary and animation

Overturning of a tram at Sandilands junction, Croydon

[Explanation of RAIB's investigation following a fatal accident involving a tram near Sandilands junction, Croydon, 9 November 2016. \(This video is narrated and captioned.\)](#)

Animated recreation of Sandilands derailment

[Animation explaining the derailment sequence following a fatal accident involving a tram near Sandilands junction, Croydon, 9 November 2016.](#)

[Microsleep – Unintentional periods of sleep lasting anywhere from a fraction of a second to a few minutes. They are often, but not always, characterised by the closing of eyes or head nodding actions.]

## Notes to editors

1. The sole purpose of RAIB investigations is to prevent future accidents and incidents and improve railway safety. RAIB does not establish blame, liability or carry out prosecutions.
2. RAIB operates, as far as possible, in an open and transparent manner. While our investigations are completely independent of the railway industry, we do maintain close liaison with railway companies and if we discover matters that may affect the safety of the railway, we make sure that information about them is circulated to the right people as soon as possible, and certainly long before publication of our final report.
3. For media enquiries, please call 01932 440015.

**Newsdate: 7 December 2017**

PDF, 20.4MB, 175 pages

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email [enquiries@raib.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@raib.gov.uk). Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.

---

## [News story: Queen welcomes Royal Navy's largest ever ship into the fleet](#)

The Queen spoke at a ceremony in Portsmouth's naval base this morning, attended by Her Royal Highness Princess Anne, Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson, Chancellor Philip Hammond and military chiefs.

In her role as the ship's Lady Sponsor Her Majesty addressed guests before the Ship's Commanding Officer, Captain Jerry Kyd, read the commissioning warrant. The iconic White Ensign was then raised, symbolising the commissioning of the nation's future flagship into the Royal Navy's fleet.

Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson said:

Today marks the start of a hugely significant chapter for the Royal Navy, and indeed the nation, as the future flagship is commissioned into Her Majesty's fleet. It is an honour to witness the crowning moment of an extraordinarily busy year for the Royal Navy that has seen us name the second carrier, HMS Prince of Wales, cut steel on the first Type 26 frigates and launch the National Shipbuilding Strategy.

Our new aircraft carrier is the epitome of British design and dexterity, at the core of our efforts to build an Armed Forces fit for the future. For the next half a century both carriers will advance our interests around the globe, providing the most visible symbol of our intent and commitment to protect the UK from intensifying threats, wherever they may come from.

Having successfully completed her second stage of sea trials off the south coast of England, the carrier is back alongside at her home port of Portsmouth. Over 10,000 people across the UK have contributed to the delivery of the ship under the Aircraft Carrier Alliance.

Completing final build activity and preparing for helicopter trials in the New Year, HMS Queen Elizabeth will head to the United States for initial flight trials off the coast in autumn 2018. There are currently 150 Royal

Navy and RAF personnel training in the US on our 13 F-35 jets.

The UK has worked closely on both the F-35 and carrier programmes with the US, our pre-eminent partner within NATO, enabling us to fly aircraft from each other's ships. Both of the UK's new carriers will be able to operate alongside NATO and coalition allies.

Admiral Sir Philip Jones, First Sea Lord and Chief of Naval Staff, said:

In hoisting the White Ensign from HMS Queen Elizabeth today, Britain has confirmed her place among the world's great maritime powers in the most majestic and muscular terms.

The Queen Elizabeth-class carriers will sit at the heart of a modernised and emboldened Royal Navy, capable of projecting power and influence at sea, in the air, over the land and in cyberspace, and offering our nation military and political choice in an uncertain world.

But our greatest strength of all is the young sailors and marines upon whose shoulders our continued security and prosperity rests. They are starting their careers as a new chapter opens for the Royal Navy – and like all those who have gone before them, they are ready to serve their Queen and Country.

Her Royal Highness Princess Anne also attended the commissioning ceremony. Crown Copyright.

Both new aircraft carriers will be able to perform a wide range of tasks, from humanitarian and disaster relief to fighting terrorism and high-end warfighting. In what has been termed, 'the Year of the Royal Navy' the second carrier, HMS Prince of Wales, was named in Rosyth and is structurally complete.

This year the Royal Navy has also had steel cut on the first of the Type 26 frigates and Dreadnought submarines, the launch of the National Shipbuilding Strategy, provisioning for a new class of frigate, the Type 31e, float out of the fourth Astute submarine, HMS Audacious, the naming of two Offshore Patrol Vessels and the arrival of our first two MARS Tankers in the UK.

Last month the Defence Secretary visited HMS Queen Elizabeth for the first time while at sea, meeting the crew and thanking them for their work towards UK defence.

Chief of the Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Stephen Hillier, said:

Congratulations from the Royal Air Force to the Royal Navy on achieving another important milestone in the UK's Carrier Strike capability. I know the RAF and RN F-35 crews are looking forward to starting to fly from HMS Queen Elizabeth next year.