

Yarl's Wood: Propaganda And Lies

By **Alexander Baron** - Jul 3, 2015



Yarl's Wood immigration centre

16
SHARES

The **Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre** is back in the news again, for all the wrong reasons, as usual, but how many of the claims made about it and its staff have any credibility?

If one is to believe the company that controls it, Searco, it is more of a holiday camp than a detention centre. While a claim of that nature should be taken with a grain of salt, the claims of most of its detractors have even less credibility, although you wouldn't think so from the propaganda which bombards the liberal and at times the not-so-liberal media.

An **on-line petition** to close it down started by a former Yarl's Wood detainee has currently attracted over 100,000 signatures, up from just over 50,000 before Christmas last year. But how bad is it?

On March 14 this year, Channel 4 News uploaded to YouTube **14 minutes plus** footage of an undercover investigation. It goes without saying that this covert video makes out the strongest case possible against Yarl's Wood, but although it raises questions about the treatment of particularly female detainees, it falls a long way short of indicting either the institution or the company that runs it. One former detainee claimed she felt like she had been treated like an animal. The reason? They were counted in the morning and at night. And like a prisoner. Technically that is what you were, dear; if you enter the UK or any other country illegally, if you enter legally but outstay your welcome, if there are queries about your status, you will end up in some form of detention until you can be deported, or processed and released to the satisfaction of the authorities. That may not be desirable for you, but that is the way the system works.

The claim was made too that like 85% of the women in Yarl's Wood, this woman was a victim of sexual violence in her native land (Ghana). This is a claim that is made routinely by female asylum seekers (read economic migrants and illegal immigrants) worldwide. Many claim to have suffered at the hands of violent husbands (so they have to move to the West?) or to have been raped by soldiers. Unquestionably most of these allegations are false, probably the overwhelming majority. In May 2011, one such former asylum seeker was at the centre of what was almost certainly a genuine allegation of sexual assault. Nafissatou Diallo was a New York hotel worker when she claimed to have been subjected to a bizarre attack at her workplace by a prominent politician, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, who was then currently head of the International Monetary Fund.

The case against Strauss-Kahn was extremely compelling, but proceedings were stayed by the District Attorney when Diallo's credibility was undermined by, among other things, false claims that she had been gang-raped by soldiers in Guinea. She was said to have told that story to prosecutors twice, both times with great emotion, precision, and conviction, including: tears; halting speech; the number and nature of her attackers; pointing out scars that were supposedly from the attack; and how her young daughter had been present. It turned out to be a total fabrication!

Why should we believe any such claims, and in the case of those few that may be true, how are these grounds for asylum? Rape is a serious criminal offence everywhere, and

allegations of rape should be dealt with in the countries where they occurred.

Some of the recent allegations about Yarl's Wood concern sexual impropriety by male guards ranging from walking into women's rooms without knocking (in order to catch them naked), and propositioning women sexually, all the way up to actual rape. What are we to make of this? The counter-claims include that some women remove their clothes as a form of protest, and self-harm simply to seek attention, propositioning works both ways, and most such allegations are simply try-ons.

Having said that, there is a very simple solution to this problem, which never used to arise before the era of political correctness: women and girls should be guarded as far as possible by female staff, males should never be left alone with female detainees, and the person in charge should be a woman. Only female guards/officers should hold important keys.

There are pregnant women at Yarl's Wood, but Channel 4 unearthed no evidence that the strict protocols concerning them had been broken; there are also elderly and disabled people housed there, but what was not and is not mentioned is that there have been assaults on staff too. Not all those detained are women, and not all those detained are suitable candidates for asylum, much less citizenship.

Yarl's Wood opened in November 2001, shortly, some of these poor, persecuted, *oppressed* people **started a fire** at the centre causing tens of millions of pounds worth of damage; staff were threatened, and lives were endangered, including of course the lives of detainees. Do we really want psychopaths like that being turned loose on the British people?

It is time we stopped paying unwarranted attention to the **crying jag propaganda** of Women For Refugee Women and other noisy pressure groups, and concentrated on putting the interests of Britons first. All undesirables should be processed as expediently as possible, and kicked out, which is probably the majority of them. Those who are granted permission to stay should remember this is a privilege, not a right, citizenship even more

so. That applies across the board, to Britain and every other country in the Western world and indeed the non-Western world to which self-styled asylum seekers seek to emigrate.

16
SHARES



Alexander Baron

<http://www.infotextmanuscripts.org>