



Submission No 105

**Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation**

**Organisation:** Ms Janis Embury

Ms Janis Embury

---

---

16<sup>th</sup> August, 2012

The Committee Secretariat  
House of Representatives Committee  
Parliament House  
Canberra  
ACT 2600  
Australia

Submission

**Inquiry into Potential reforms of National Security Legislation :**

as it pertains to domestic threats to “national security”, principally in the area of “secrecy” and media and public service censorship, and therefore particularly, ASIO’s and intelligence powers to enforce secrecy, domestically.

There are six noticeable areas in which this problem exists in Australia:

1. In the reasons for the US-led invasion of Iraq and the question of whether oil was the motive behind the invasion. Importantly here, admissions, confirming that oil was the motive are publicly available, including by Opposition Leader Tony Abbott, in a recent address to the U.S. Heritage Foundation (video available on their website). I provide two highly reputable sources confirming this, below. It is has been made public in the U.K. for example by the U.K. Guardian.
2. Investigative detail on the 1975 invasion of East Timor and the related Timor Sea oil resources
3. investigative reporting on oil resources and information which would fall under the heading of “resource wars” and, in addition, information quite separately, which is seriously critical of the oil industry.

AND far more importantly, and directly related to the above, the politization of the Sciences, contrary to the national interest. I include the evidence below, and source President Barak Obama’s public discussion on this problem in the U.S., which occurred under previous Republican administrations. Video of this address to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences is available on the internet. Unlike Barak Obama, Australia is not addressing this serious problem, which is seriously contrary to the national interest, but is maintaining the secrecy, despite past CSIRO protest (on ABC 4 Corners for instance), and which I include below.

4. CSIRO research into alternatives to oil, and
5. The politicization of the CSIRO and the state federal Geological Surveys, now known as Geosciences.
6. The politicization of Australia's Intelligence services.

Recently, and relevantly, former Australian Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, drew public attention to the question of a number of illegalities surrounding Australia's decision to join the US-led invasion of Iraq, and therefore, I argue, he raised questions as to the spurious legal grounds on which matters of "national security" in relation to domestic "secrecy", were and are, decided and legally enforced within the above contexts.

He and others, privy to the decision-making in the lead up to Australia's involvement in the US-led invasion of Iraq, are currently urging Australia to hold an independent Inquiry into the Iraq war.

My submission supports this call, and I provide overwhelming and concrete evidence that the censorship and secrecy imposed on Australians, within the context of the Iraq invasion and oil particularly, continues to be, seriously contrary to the national interest.

Yet, that secrecy was and is enforced across the board here in Australia.

I provide overwhelmingly evidence of this below, which merely involves bringing together already published evidence, to establish a resounding case for change.

Therefore, I argue that the current powers provided to ASIO particularly, against Australian citizens, in the above circumstances, not only be revoked, but further, any widening of these powers not be granted.

And although not relevant to this specific Inquiry, I argue the need for effective legislative protections for whistleblowers, which include a national interest defence for Public Servants, and which therefore recognizes that Public Service "confidentiality", "secrecy law" and "treason" can, in certain circumstances, be contrary to the national interest. The evidence I list below, provides overwhelming grounds for this call also.

Relevantly, former Senior Intelligence officers, Lance Collins and Warren Reed, condemn the politicization of the Intelligence services in their book *Plunging Point*, which includes evidence and detail of various methods used by Intelligence agencies in this country, to thwart individuals who wish to speak out in the national interest.

A number of these tactics have been used against me, a qualified Science Journalist, here in Australia, and include in addition, an attempt on my life in Australia, where, in conjunction, I was verbally abused on the grounds that my 2003 Submission to the Australian Parliamentary Inquiry into Intelligence on WMD's, was supposed evidence of "delusion", "fixation" and "paranoia". This 2003 submission was made publicly available on the Australian Parliament

House website in 2003/4, and can be downloaded and located by googling my name.

I commence my submission with the recent calls for an independent inquiry into Australia's involvement in the invasion of Iraq, and the legal grounds for that Inquiry, because, as stated, this argument is directly relevant to governments determining what is, and isn't in the national interest in a "national security" sense, and therefore, what does and doesn't fall within legislative provisions concerning such serious matters, as "secrecy" and "treason" or, in other words, what is and isn't censored for public debate. I therefore include two legal arguments questioning the legality of the US-led invasion of Iraq below:

Source : ABC Network News :

## **“Australia urged to hold Iraq war inquiry**

**Updated Thu Aug 16, 2012 4:47pm AEST**

**Eminent Australians, led by former prime minister Malcolm Fraser, are calling for an independent inquiry into the decisions which led to Australia joining the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.**

It follows similar independent inquiries initiated in the UK and Netherlands.

On March 20, 2003, a US-led coalition which included Australia launched an invasion of Iraq with the aim of finding what the US believed were weapons of mass destruction held by former leader Saddam Hussein.

Mr Fraser has told ABC News Breakfast an inquiry in Australia is overdue.

"Going to war is a really serious matter," he said.

"I do not believe that any one person in Australia should have the power to take this country to war, especially when due process has not been followed.

"We know the war was begun on a lie, we know the evidence was fabricated.

"We know that, certainly in Britain and the United States, they knew that the claims about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction were in many respects false, and yet they still went to war on that basis."

.....

Former Assistant Attorney General under then U.S. President, George W. Bush, Jack Goldsmith holds a similar legal position in relation to the US decision to invade Iraq and in the conduct of that war.

In his book, *The Terror Presidency*, published in 2007, Jack Goldsmith, now Professor of Law at Harvard University, presents the case that "the legal framework governing the conduct of the military and intelligence agencies in the war on terror, was deeply flawed".

“Jack Goldsmith’s duty as head of the Office of Legal Counsel was to advise President Bush what he could and could not do ... legally. After taking the job in October 2003 he found his predecessors’ opinions, which were the legal framework governing the conduct of the military and intelligence agencies in the war on terror, to be deeply flawed”. (Source : back cover *The Terror Presidency*).

.....

Legal argument can therefore be put, it seems to me, (bearing in mind that I am simply a Science Journalist, whose career has been seriously affected by this secrecy), that on the issue of Australia’s domestic intelligence services policing domestic censorship on “national security” grounds, the legal basis behind these powers are “deeply flawed”, and perhaps, just plain unlawful, in circumstances where these powers are invoked within the contexts detailed above.

My direct experience of the consequences of the decision-making in this area, is as a qualified Science Journalist, graduating from university in Australia in the early 1980’s, with a specialization in Journalism, Earth Sciences, Geophysics and Environmental Science.

My chosen specialization was, and is, in global mineral and energy resources, particularly global oil.

However, as an **investigative** journalist, I have been unable to publish in the mainstream media in Australia on the issues covered in this submission, apart from one article on the oil resources of the Antarctic, published in the Geelong Advertiser in 1983.

The stifling of public debate on oil/Iraq and the Timor Sea oil resources/invasion of East Timor, in Australia, I argue, is as a direct result of the “secrecy” and “national security” measures surrounding the 1975 invasion of East Timor and the subsequent divvying up of the oil and gas resources in the Timor Sea, and the US-led invasion of Iraq, and in conjunction with this, the oil industry’s own marketing-based histories, promotional campaigns and press releases and the oil industry’s considerable political influence, in both the United States and at a state and federal level, here in Australia.

To quote respected U.S. Petroleum geologist, and author of *Geodesinies*, Walter Younquist, “although oil ... enters into the life of nearly every American every day, the public knows amazingly little about oil consumption and production in the United States, and about U.S. oil and gas reserves. It is important in a democracy that citizens know the facts relating to a given situation so that rational decisions can be made about the future ...” (p.164).

I cover below, issues he raises which are also central to Australia’s national security, and of which Australians “amazingly” know little, fifteen years after Walter Younquist published the above in *Geodesinies* in 1997.

My aim, which was, and is, to publish overwhelming evidence, that western oil security is of serious national interest and that, the solutions now available to reduce oil consumption and convert to already developed alternative technologies, (see details below) in Australia, requires urgent implementation. Unlike Europe and the United States under the Obama Administration, Australia is failing to address these issues with the urgency required and the urgency with which this issue is being addressed overseas.

I also, provide evidence of the politization of state and federal government scientific bodies, such as the CSIRO and the state and federal Geological Surveys [Geosciences]. I establish that this politization includes, censorship and secrecy, and that this is combined with a lack of effective legal protections and remedies enabling scientists to speak publicly and freely on matters, which, while they are of considerable national interest and are in the national interest, are instead 'secret' or 'confidential'.

There is evidence of state Liberal Premiers and former Queensland Premier, Joh Bjelke Petersen withholding key detail on the already discovered, Timor Sea oil and gas fields, from then Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam in 1974 and 1975 in circumstances where he was discussing the fate of East Timor with Indonesia. It did not help either that the fact finding mission Gough Whitlam sent to East Timor, got all the facts on the key Australian oil explorer, Timor Oil, wrong, (in James Dunn, *Timor : A People Betrayed*). Facts which could have been obtained then from Geosciences Australia in Canberra, and in greater detail, from the Victorian Geological Survey, now known as Geosciences Victoria. I cover the reasons why below.

One example of the wider implications of this censorship, is covered in the 'History and Role of Government Geological Surveys in Australia' (1976), Editor, R K Johns, who sums up the Survey's role and it's conflicts with Government:

"Geological Surveys are a feature of government science and technology in practically every country in the world and governments have generally found it necessary to establish a body to advise on mineral resources. But the geologist's and the politician's views on how this can be done have frequently been in conflict. Governments in the past have sought quick answers to short-term problems ..."

Further, in an audio interview (available via Google), former Geologist of the Victorian Geological Survey, Jack Douglas, (in the middle of what is quite a long interview), states that around 1975, the Survey lost its status within the Victorian Public Service and their offices were suddenly, and without explanation, dominated by substantial security measures which seriously impinged on the way the Survey was used to working, that is, geologists were used to working with directness and openness in their dealings with the public, he said. I cover the possible reasons for this below.

It is important to include here, that U.S. scientists have been subjected to the same censorship, an issue U.S. President Barak Obama discussed openly, in

an address to the National Academy of Sciences on April 27, 2012 where he stated, "... We have watched as scientific integrity has been undermined and scientific research politicized in an effort to advance predetermined ideological agendas ... we know that our country is better than this ... in no area will innovation be more important than in the development of technologies to produce, use and save energy. ... to break our dependence on fossil fuels..."

President Obama quoted Abraham Lincoln, who founded the Academy of Sciences, saying "... we must add the fuel of interest to the fire of genius in the discovery of new and useful things".

The full video of President Obama's speech, which details U.S. Science and Technology policy is available on the Home Page of the National Academies Press at [www.nap.org.edu](http://www.nap.org.edu) . This address, was so long overdue in the United States, that it was not only a standing room only affair, Scientists, from all fields were banked up in the corridors!

My background, passion and values are grounded in Australia's sustainability movement. This movement, (also known as the alternative lifestyle movement), emerged in Australia in the 1960s and 1970's, in such centres as, Eltham/St. Andrews, Healesville and Daylesford in Victoria and Maleny and the Sunshine Coast hinterland, in Queensland. It is a quiet, but flourishing, non-political movement throughout the country, with its own magazines and resources. In the 1970s, I was one of the first women in Australia to owner-build a mud-brick house - located in Blighs Road, Trentham, Victoria.

My approach to oil, has always been based on the argument and evidence that Australia must urgently address the issue of "oil security" by embracing alternatives to oil and reducing oil consumption, and that *this in itself is a matter of national security*. Relevantly I include below, excerpts from a U.S. military oil security report which received wide publicity in the West, but not in Australia.

The same scientific and political debate on reduction of oil consumption and urgent pursuit of alternatives to oil also took place in the U.S. in the 1970s. However, this pathway forward was trampled by the powerful oil industry, to an extent, oil industry interests/profits, won out. I cover the details of the 1970s public debate in the United States, below.

Australia's CSIRO scientists, have been censored in relation to scientific research developments into alternatives to oil – as revealed in two 4 Corners programs.

An excerpt from one ABC's 4 Corners program, is copied and pasted from the ABC's website, and included here:

"Australian Broadcasting Corporation

## **FOUR CORNERS**

Investigative TV journalism at its best.

## **Program Transcript**

Read the full transcript of Janine Cohen's report "The Greenhouse Mafia", Four Corners, Monday 13 February, 2006.

Reporter: **Janine Cohen**

Date: **13/02/2006**

" ... BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: The proud people are still there. CSIRO is populated by some of the best in the world. But what has changed, if you like, it's now more perceived to be a government research organisation. And to some degree, without fiddling the books and changing the data, we do what the government tells us to do.

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: We're not censoring scientists.

JANINE COHEN: And are there any directions coming from the Federal Government about what scientists are allowed to say?

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: No.

JANINE COHEN: Barney Foran says he was another one of those scientists who were censored. He worked at the CSIRO for almost 30 years but recently retired. **One of his areas of interest is on alternative fuels for motor vehicles. Have you ever been censored from this scientific public debate?**

**BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: Oh, it happens all the time. Just recently in August, I was back at work late in the afternoon, took a call from our corporate centre saying, "Barney, how are you?" "OK, mate." He said, "Barney, we've just had a call "from the Prime Minister's Department. "They'd really appreciate it if you didn't say anything about ethanol."**

JANINE COHEN: And what? Had you been talking about ethanol?

BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: I'd been doing a few radio interviews that day on the broad-scale work on bio-fuels that I'm working on.

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: Well, this is news to me.

JANINE COHEN: Why do you think he would have got a direction like that?

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: Er, because I don't know the story. How can I comment?

JANINE COHEN: Well, if he's saying... If what he's saying is true, do you agree with getting that direction?

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: Er, that's not... No, it wouldn't be valid. I mean, we have a reputation for integrity and independence and that's not the right approach.

JANINE COHEN: Barney Foran says his muzzling followed the release last August of a Prime Ministerial task force report on a range of bio-fuel options for motor cars which strongly recommended ethanol. He believes there was a fear he was going to be critical on radio of ethanol as an alternative fuel that might



help reduce greenhouse emissions.

JANINE COHEN: So, the phone call comes from a manager, who has spoken to someone in the Prime Minister's Department. Do you find that extraordinary?

BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: No. That's how the system works these days. As a scientist, as a operating scientist, in whether it be CSIRO or any organisation, I guess you've always got these powerful force-fields sitting around your work. And if you want your work to continue, sometimes you have to give a bit you have to live a bit longer in the attempt to get a bigger picture out or maintain your funding, funding...

JANINE COHEN: You're talking about compromises?

BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: You're talking about taking a hit in the short term to make sure you can keep your work going long enough to get a bigger, more powerful conclusion out.

JANINE COHEN: Barney Foran says if scientists fight too hard against the situation, there will be no funding. Is that true?

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: Of course not.

JANINE COHEN: Barney Foran also says he doesn't find the situation extraordinary at all. He says, "That's how the system works these days."

DR STEVE MORTON, CSIRO EXECUTIVE: Well, he's free to hold his view. I have a different view.

PROF. SNOW BARLOW, SCIENTIFIC & TECH SOCIETIES 2002-2005: I think there are two points here. One is, there is government policy but then there's the science that underpins that policy. And if a scientist is actually talking about the science, not the policy, I think they should be free to talk about that.

JANINE COHEN: Four Corners spoke to several scientists off camera, who claimed they'd been censored but weren't willing to go public for fear of losing their jobs or funding. Scientists say much of the censorship at the CSIRO is a result of management's determination not to offend its political masters. But scientist Barney Foran believes the muzzling sometimes comes from government too.

BARNEY FORAN, CSIRO SCIENTIST 1976-2005: It would never start with a minister but it might start with a ministerial advisor. And they're powerful and quite feared people and all they have to do is... They know everyone in the chain and it just chains down. If you fight too hard and too strong against that situation, well, no funding, perhaps no job... "

.....

In 2003 I discussed alternatives to oil with Barney Foran, at a time when the CSIRO was about to release, with much "media fanfare", his report on the conversion of Australia's road transport to Biofuels, which included from

memory, a timeline for its introduction. He told me that he considered biofuels to be a transition fuel, leading to an eventual, Hydrogen Economy.

Hydrogen fueled road transport, effectively runs on water. Hydrogen fuel cell technology splits water. The obvious implication for the oil industry is, that there are no profits in this technology for them.

At the time I spoke to Barney Foran in 2003, I conducted a search on the internet for research on hydrogen fuel cells in Australia and established that engineers at ANU were developing hydrogen fuel cells using nanotechnology.

Yet I have not noticed any public or government/political debate on this science here in Australia.

Whereas, the following article in the UK Guardian establishes that Germany and other European countries are well on the way to adopting this technology now:

## “Germany to create national hydrogen fuel network by 2015

Germany speeds up the adoption of hydrogen fuel cell technology with countrywide hydrogen fuelling network. From [Inhabitat](#), part of the [Guardian Environment Network](#)

[Inhabitat](#), part of the [Guardian Environment Network](#)  
[guardian.co.uk](#), Tuesday 15 September 2009 13.36 BST



Nissan hydrogen fuel cell vehicle: such cars would be able to easily refuel in Germany if a plan for a nationwide hydrogen network by 2015 becomes reality. When it comes to the future of automotive technology, electric cars get the lion's share of the attention. But hydrogen-powered vehicles are slowly gaining traction, first with an [announcement](#) last week that auto companies are spending billions on fuel cell vehicles, and now with [news that Germany is planning](#) to launch a countrywide hydrogen fueling network by 2015.

A total of eight companies (Daimler, EnBW, Linde, OMV, Shell, Total, Vattenfall and the NOW GmbH National Organisation Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technology) are working to bring the fueling network to fruition. In its first phase, scheduled for 2009-2011, the companies involved will lobby for public support and begin fuel station installations. The second phase will see the mass rollout of hydrogen-powered cars along with an accompanying fuel network.

Germany isn't the only country trying to speed up the adoption of hydrogen fuel cell technology. Canada is working on a hydrogen highway to link Vancouver and Whistler in time for the 2010 Winter Olympics, while Denmark is planning a hydrogen network to connect Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Germany.

- This article was shared by our content partner [Inhabitat](#), part of the [Guardian Environment Network](#)"

.....

Returning to my conversations with Barney Foran, in that same week, I was also in telephone conversation with the Editor in Chief of The Bulletin, Gary Linnell, where he refused to publish my work on oil as the driver for the invasion of Iraq, and where I raised questions about the failure of the West to adopt alternatives to oil, such as gas and electric cars. Gary Linnell refused to publish my work on the grounds, he said, that it was supposedly "polemic". This same work was however, as stated above, then published, later that year on the Australian Parliament House website, as a submission to the Australian Parliamentary Inquiry into Intelligence on WMD's. I simply changed the introduction. The essence of my submission was/is that oil was the driver for the invasion of Iraq and I raised serious questions in that submission, as to why alternatives to oil had not been pursued instead.

There is an important argument to add here, and that is that the technology to produce biofuels has been around for centuries. It is the same technology used to produce alcohol, and more commonly known as a "still". Ethanol powered the first Model T Ford up until 1906, for instance.

Electric cars were also manufactured and on the road in the United States, prior to the internal combustion engine. See section below on the Electric Car.

Further, in that same conversation with Gary Linnell, I provided him with details of Barney Foran's work and advised that it was about to be released to the media that week, and asked him to consider publishing this CSIRO work on biofuels in The Bulletin. He did not respond to my request.

The public release of Barney Foran's report, due to happen that week, did not happen! CSIRO's Marketing Department people also had told me that the release of this report, "with much media fanfare", was to happen in that same week.

I return to the censorship of CSIRO's work on Biofuels again below.

Also, at that time, I mailed the same researched submission, to Kerry O'Brien then anchor of the ABC's, 7.30 Report, George Negus, then anchor for SBS Dateline and did not receive a reply, nor was the story given air time.

.....

Relevant to this submission to the **Inquiry into Potential reforms of National Security Legislation**, I include here as referred to above, that in association with an inability to publish, since 2003 I have experienced, what I presume was targeting by ASIO. Experiences range from verbal abuse, to computer hacking and harassment, one attempt on my life, and my life made hell within communities I have resided. These were daily problems, to an extent my life was dominated by this, rather than writing and publishing.

Since August 2009, I have pursued two possible avenues for solutions, via a request for support and assistance to solve the above problems, including to the Australian Government. I have received considerable assistance mixed with periods of serious problems. I cannot speak with any clarity on the assistance I have received, as I did not receive replies to my request, nor has anyone communicated with me, but I have been given considerable assistance by people who are around me 24/7 and who will probably never introduce themselves, but I am immensely grateful for their extraordinary assistance.

It is important to include here that problems have included the theft of a notebook of key research sources and detail, covering the Timor oil and gas resources and the lead up to the 1975 invasion of East Timor, by the Chinese. So that I have also had problems with, I presume therefore, the Chinese Government.

It is important here, to say, that at one point in 2006 I came close to suiciding as a consequence of these problems. The only reason I have not suicided, is because Lance Collins and Warren Reed spoke publicly and published on this precise problem and from then on I understood what was happening.

I am a law abiding Australian citizen. The incessant problems were intended clearly to thwart and block my research, and the publication of that research.

In 2009, I wrote to the Australian Government asking for assistance with these problems.

However, I do support increased powers as proposed to fight corruption and crime, including cyber attacks and cyber bullying.

---

At this point, I will tackle each issue separately on the evidence, and then bring the evidence together.

Firstly, I provide here, published evidence/admissions that the US-led invasion of Iraq was driven by oil, and **secondly** I continue looking at the argument that the Secrecy surrounding oil has been seriously contrary to the national interest, in that for instance, unlike Europe, the U.K. and the United States under the current Obama administration, the **Australian government, as a consequence, lacks a coherent, worthwhile and sufficiently pro-active oil security policy:**

1. In September 2007, The UK Guardian, quoted the former Chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, under the headline, "Invasion of Iraq – motivated by Oil says Greenspan", and again in 2008 with the following article, which I have copied and pasted from the UK Guardian website:

## "British and US companies win Iraq oil contracts

**Matthew Weaver**

[guardian.co.uk](http://guardian.co.uk), Monday 30 June 2008 10.12 BST

The Iraqi government is to award a series of key oil contracts to British and US companies later today, fuelling criticism that the Iraq war was largely about oil.

The successful companies are expected to include Shell, BP, Exxon Mobil, Chevron and Total.

Non-Western companies, notably those in Russia, are expected to lose out.

The technical support contracts will give the companies access to Iraq's vast untapped oil fields. Oil production in Iraq is at its highest level since the invasion in 2003. The Iraqi government wants to increase production by 20%, as the country has an estimated 115bn barrels of crude reserves.

The US state department was involved in drawing up the contracts, the New York Times reported today.

It provided template contracts and suggestions on drafting but were not involved in the decisions, US officials said.

Democratic senators last week lobbied that the awarding of the contracts should be delayed until after the Iraqi parliament passes laws on the distribution of oil revenues.

Frederick Barton, senior adviser at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, told the paper: "We pretend it [oil] is not a centerpiece of our motivation, yet we keep confirming that it is." Last year Alan Greenspan, the former chairman of the Federal Reserve said: "Everyone knows: the Iraq war is largely about oil."

---

2. On 17 July, 2012, Federal Opposition Leader Tony Abbott addressed the Heritage Foundation, (the United States Conservative think-tank), on America's global role, the Australia-U.S. relationship, and the role of the Australia-U.S. security alliance in the Asia-Pacific region.

His address included the admission that the invasion of Iraq was motivated by oil, and appears to infer that Australia's involvement in East Timor was similarly motivated. Full video/transcript of the speech is available at [www.heritage.org/events/2012/07/tony-abbott](http://www.heritage.org/events/2012/07/tony-abbott)

*" ... Narrow self interest, would have kept America out of Iraq, as it did the French and German governments at the time.*

*It would have kept Australia out of East Timor.*

*Likewise, narrow self-interest would have kept America out of the toughest parts of Afghanistan; at least once the Taliban had been defeated.*

*Money, not military power, would have been enough to secure oil supplies. Standoff missiles, not boots on the ground, would've normally been enough to eliminate terrorists and degrade their bases.*

*America's military expeditions may sometimes be mistaken, but they are always well intentioned even if others are tempted to conclude with Graham Greene, of *The Quiet American*, that, "he had never known a man with such good intentions, for all the trouble he caused ...".*

Despite the Federal Opposition Leader's admission, and although the full video of this address was shown on ABC TV News 24, Australia's media headlines during the week, were dominated by the Ford bailout. The bailout was defended by the Federal Government, despite the satirical response by newspaper cartoonists and TEN's The Project, that the bail-out supported the manufacturers of 'gas guzzlers' :

## **Governments defend Ford bailout despite job cuts**

Updated July 18, 2012 05:43:39 ABC News

**The Victorian and Federal governments are defending their decision to give Ford a multi-million-dollar bailout, despite the car maker's plans to axe hundreds of workers.**

On Tuesday Ford announced it would cut car production by almost a third, forcing up to 440 jobs to be made redundant at its two Victorian plants, starting in November.

The move comes despite a \$103 million investment lifeline being thrown to the company in January, made up from Federal and State government money as well as from Ford's parent company.

The investment was made to ensure Ford keeps production in Australia until at least 2016.

Prime Minister Julia Gillard says the Commonwealth's \$34 million contribution was worth it.

"We've seen these job losses today and that's very sad news, but if we hadn't stepped forward to work with Ford we would be talking about job losses in their thousands," she said.

Ms Gillard says the industry is facing significant challenges but is not at risk of moving offshore.

"We are keeping Ford jobs here," she said.

**Funding rethink?**

The Federal Opposition has previously floated the idea of slashing \$500 million of government subsidies for the car industry.

The Coalition's industry spokeswoman, Sophie Mirabella, says Tuesday's announcement shows January's bailout did not work.

"There was no real transparency in the funding grant and it raises a lot of questions about industry policy from this Government," she said.

Ms Mirabella says the Coalition supports the car industry, but it is not happy with the current funding program.

"We have said publicly, and to the car companies, we want to support them, but we think there needs to be a better way forward," she said.

"That better way involves working with the Productivity Commission and the industry itself to come up with a clear and transparent funding program that is determined at arm's length with clear benchmarks and guidelines."

Federal Industry Minister Greg Combet says although the car industry faces significant challenges, it still has a future in Australia.

"This industry is going through a period of significant structural adjustment, and of course there has been a good degree of discussion about Toyota and Holden

in recent months as well," he said.

"I want to make it very clear that the Government is very committed to working with the manufacturers and the component suppliers who are crucial to that industry."

.....

In the 2005 film, *The Constant Gardener*, the main character's protest is worthy of inclusion here:

*" ... Whose map is Britain using when it completely ignores the United Nations and decides to invade Iraq. Or do you think it's more diplomatic to bend to the will of a super power and politely take part in Vietnam the sequel.*

*We have taken sixty years to build up this international organization called the United Nations, which is meant to avoid wars and now we just blow it up because our cars are running out of petrol.*

*Explain to me why we've burnt our diplomatic credentials and why we're killing thousands of innocent people just for some barrels of oil and a photo opportunity on the Whitehouse lawn.*

*Why? ... "*

The original reasons for Australia's involvement in Iraq and East Timor, were, until Tony Abbott's recent admission, with limited media release in this country, shrouded in secrecy, and based simply on the discredited WMD's motive as former Prime Minister Fraser points out.

.....

**Why Australia urgently needs an oil security policy & publicly debate on this matter, in Australia, in the same way that it is in the U.K., Europe and in the U.S.**

Oil in context:

QUOTING GEOFFREY BLAINEY from *A Short History of the World*, pp 428-429:

*Between 1759 and 1850 ... came hints of dramatic change. Britain especially showed signs of a leap forward. Its population grew rapidly but the standard of living of most families was also rising above its humble base. Prosperity was increasing not because of a fortunate sequence of fine summer and lush crops, but because of the application of ingenuity to daily work in all its forms, on sea and land, on farms and in factories.*



*At the time it was impossible to understand the cause of the increasing prosperity, and even now it is not easy, but a long-lasting deadlock was being broken. The deadlock rested on a shortage of land and food. In the closely settled regions of Europe, all the land was already being used for crops and animals and the growing of timber. But if coal and, later, oil could be used as fuel instead of timber, and if the steam engine could replace horses and oxen for transport, ploughing and other heavy work, a vast area of land would be released for the growing of food for human consumption. In effect the farmlands for the first time could feed and support very large cities.*

*When farms became more skilled in breeding livestock and plants, and in maintaining the fertility of the soil, then one small farm could produce more food than ever before. And if transport was improved by canals and stronger roads and later by railways and steamships, then each district or each country could specialize in the kind of economic activity for which it was best suited, and exchange its products in return for others. In essence, if ingenuity was applied to all kinds of daily work, and not least to transport, the output of food and other products would multiply faster than the population increased. And more food, fuel and shelter and clothes and leisure would potentially be available for each family, at least in the more efficient nations.*

*This interplay of events and trends was to shape the following two centuries. It was to disrupt all traditional ways of life, but its rewards would be large. In the favoured countries the standard of living of the people standing on the lower rungs of the income ladder would become almost as high as the standard had traditionally been for those standing on the upper rungs.”*

QUOTING from Walter Youngquist, *Geodestinities : The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources over Nations and Individuals*, in the United States Geological Survey's Introduction to 2000 *World Petroleum Assessment*. [The United States Geological Survey is the leading authority on the world's mineral and energy resources].

*The importance of mineral and energy minerals resources cannot be overestimated. Most critical among the resources is energy. Energy is the key which unlocks all other natural resources. Without it the wheels of industry do not turn, no metals are mined and smelted. No cars, trucks, trains, ships or airplanes could be built and if built, they could not move without energy. Without energy, houses would remain cold and unlighted, food would be uncooked. Fields could not be ploughed nor planted with the ease and on the vast scale they are today by means of relatively little human labour. Military defence as we know it today would not exist. Without energy resources we would literally be back in the Stone Age. And without the use of energy and metals as we use them*

*today, it is probable that the world's population would be reduced by at least one-half, some estimates say by 90 percent.*

QUOTING from Walter Younquist, *Geodestinities : The Inevitable Control of Earth Resources over Nations and Individuals*, pp 166-167 :

***USA is where it started***

*The United States is the birthplace of the modern oil industry, and the United States produced the first group of oil-finders, who quickly spread across the country discovering oil from coast to coast ...*

***U.S. oil dominance – for a time***

*In 1920, more than two-thirds of the world's oil came from wells in the United States. During the period 1859 to 1939, 64 percent of all the world's oil produced came from the United States, and the United States had used that oil to help it to become the world's economic leader, with the world's highest standard of living. Even as late as 1950, the United States still produced half the world's oil. It was far more than self-sufficient, and was a major oil exporter.*

***Growth and dispersal of the oil industry***

*But the importance of U.S. oil production in terms of world production was dropping. From producing more than two-thirds of the world's oil in 1920, the United States in 1996 was the source of only about 11 percent of world crude oil supplies. The center of oil production had moved, and become less concentrated. Sixty-six countries now are oil producers [i.e at publication date in 1997]. In the 1980s the Soviet Union was the world's largest single oil producer, with the United States second. Saudi Arabia had the potential at that time to be the world's largest producer, but wanting to stabilize oil prices, the Saudis were only producing about four and one-half million barrels of oil a day. But the oil situation changes. Saudi Arabia is now first in oil production, the United States second, and with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Russia proper is now third...*

***Minerals in Economic and Political Warfare (pp 58-59)***

*“... The first use of oil in economic warfare occurred when Britain tried to maintain control of the Suez Canal in the 1950s. In support of Egypt, Saudi Arabia cut off oil supplies to Britain, but at that time, the United States still had surplus oil producing capacity and simply opened the oil well valves wider and supplied Britain's needs.*

*The Arabs lost that economic skirmish (although the Suez Canal eventually did go to Egypt). But in the 1970s the Arabs and Iran realized that the United States was no longer self-sufficient in oil. As a result, the Persian Gulf Muslim nations were able to do two things.*

*They could exert economic/political influence on the United States (with regard to the Israeli situation) and they also realized they could begin to take control of their own economic destinies as industrial competitors with the western world.*

*... Against the military might of the West they would be powerless, but their oil weapon verified the saying that “power now does not come out of the barrel of a gun but out of a barrel of oil”. When Arab-Israeli fighting began in 1973, the oil producers of the Middle East declared a selective boycott against consuming countries, in particular the United States, because of its long-standing support of Israel. OPEC using its new found economic power, raised the price of oil from three dollars a barrel in September 1973 to \$11.65 in December, a near quadrupling of the price. Henceforth neither the oil companies nor their western governments could control the price of oil. The best that could be done was to convince the oil producing nations that their interests were intertwined with those of the West, and that reasonable prices were vital to preserving their oil markets. For the most part, this logic has since prevailed ... [at publication in 1997].*

**U.S. production peaks – dependence on foreign oil begins** [pp173-175].

*Late in 1970, even with wells running open to their maximum efficient rate of production, the oil needs of the United States were not completely satisfied. The curves of production and consumption crossed. Production began to decline but consumption continued to rise. At that point the United States became increasingly and permanently dependent on foreign oil, and lost control of the price of oil. Saudi Arabia became the “swing producer” meaning it had “shut in production” by means of which it could increase or decrease the world oil supply and therefore influence if not control its price. This marked an economic milestone. From then on, the United States would never again control oil prices. It lost an economic weapon which passed to other countries. By this fact, determined by its geological inheritance, the U.S. lost control of an important part of its economic destiny, as the oil crises of 1973 and 1979 showed. It was an unpleasant surprise to the American public...”*

It is not surprising therefore that serious debate emerged in the United States in the 1970s focusing on the need for the United States to begin looking seriously at reducing oil consumption and finding alternatives to oil.

This did not happen, vested oil interests won out. I provide the evidence below. And it is also important to include here, that U.S. oil corporations were, (from the late 60s/early 70s), then forced to find oil offshore and in other countries, to remain in business. It was also not in the oil industry’s interest for consumers to reduce their oil consumption and find alternatives to oil.

I quote here one example of the scientific argument/debate calling for the substantial reduction oil consumption, published at the time in the *American Scientist* by Eric S. Cheney, and titled "U.S. Energy Resources: Limits and Future Outlook" 62:14 (1974) 6. Cheney also cites the published works of other scientists, from previous years, including Hubbert, who accurately predicted the problem (as covered below) in the late 60s. It is a widely known prediction in oil industry and geology circles, and included in the Earth Sciences lectures I attended at University here in Australia. I should add, that most of the material, covered in this submission was included in my Earth Sciences lectures at University in the early 1980s, and were openly covered in Geology lectures at western Universities, from the late 60s. That is, the urgent need for alternative energy sources.

In 1974, Eric S Cheney writes:

*There are three critical concepts of worldwide significance that have emerged from previous discussions of energy crises: (1) the conventional energy sources are not inexhaustible; (2) the world's consumption of energy is doubling every decade (which is equivalent to a growth rate of 7% per year); and (3) this exponential exploitation of finite natural resources may be one of the major limits to growth of the world's population and industrial society within the next century (Meadows et al. 1972). Table 1 summarizes Hubbert's (1971) estimated lifetimes of the world's important energy sources. Virtually all of the world's coal and petroleum will be burned in the present millennium of the entire life span of civilized man on earth (Hubbert 1969). Because of the consequent environmental problems, the burning of fossil fuels has been termed man's greatest geochemical experiment (Holland 1972).*

*... Hydrogen has been suggested as the synthetic fuel of the future and as a method of converting and storing electricity for use as peaking power (Maugh 1972) ...*

*... The automobile is responsible for many of the crises we face. The United States had 46% of the world's passenger vehicles in 1970 (Motor Vehicle Manufacturing Association, 1972), and they consumed 21% of the nations energy (Hammond 1972).*

*... The United States is becoming progressively less self-sufficient in meeting its energy requirements. The economic, social and military dangers of not being self-sufficient in resources in this industrial era are well known (Cheney 1967). The United States probably does have the technological and financial resources both to solve its energy crises and have its expanding economy as well, although to do so probably would invite unacceptable environmental and political risks. The only way our national crises can be solved without these grave risks is to initiate a very radical conservation of energy resulting in the permanent lowering of per capita consumption of energy. This probably cannot be done voluntarily but will be accomplished by the effective rationing mechanisms of increased prices and taxes. Every energy consumer should, therefore,*

*be prepared to see fuel costs increase by a third in the next 10 years and double before the 21<sup>st</sup> century.*

*The international picture is much bleaker. Although the per capita consumption of agricultural and forest products in industrial countries eventually levels off, the per capita consumption of mineral resources, especially fuels, has always increased over the long term (Potter & Christy 1962). Most of the rest of the world is growing at a faster rate than the United States and its industrial allies, both in terms of population and in industrial output. The world's biggest political problem is that the present industrial nations (with large per capita consumptions of energy) can hardly say to the billions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that, for environmental and economic reasons, we will not tolerate your appetite for mineral resources and the fruits of industrialization. For this reason alone, the United States would do well to practice zero per capita power growth."*

### **U.S. Oil, Divestiture and National Security**

The published debate on this topic is being emailed to the Committee Secretariat, as a separate pdf.

### **Defence, Warfare and Oil**

Another problem covered in my Earth Sciences lectures at University in the early 1980s, was that the largest consumer of mineral and energy resources is warfare.

Developments in thinking on Defence/military oil security in the United States, are summarized in the following November, 2011 article copied and pasted from the UK Guardian website:

“**theguardian**

## **Military thinktank urges US to cut oil use**

Report from Military Advisory Board says US must reduce energy imports over the next decade as a national security imperative  
[guardian.co.uk](http://guardian.co.uk), Wednesday 2 November 2011 02.00 GMT

An influential military thinktank is urging America to cut its oil use by 30% over

the next decade, as a national security imperative.

In its report, the Military Advisory Board said the US should aim to drastically reduce its [energy](#) imports over the next decade – or else risk exposing the economy to devastating oil price shocks.

"This is a national security threat that grows ever year, and we as a nation need to recognise is at such," said vice admiral Dennis McGinn, a former deputy chief of naval operations, and one of the authors of the report.

"This isn't just about the volatility of gas prices at the pump. This isn't just about big oils vs the environment. This is a national security problem, manifesting itself economically, diplomatically and militarily, and it is not just going to go away."

The report, entitled [Ensuring America's Freedom of Movement: a National Security Imperative to Reduce America's Oil Dependence](#), describes America's reliance on imported oil as the "Achilles heel of our national security".

It deploys strong language to describe the consequences of this dependence. "Our reliance on this single commodity makes us vulnerable ... We are held hostage to price fixing by a cartel that includes actors who would do our nation harm, and we are too often called upon to risk the lives of our sons and daughters to protect fragile oil supplies from this very cartel," the report says.

It goes on to envisage a scenario in which the [Strait of Hormuz](#), a narrow waterway that is the entrance to the Persian Gulf, is subject to a shutdown for up to 60 days, detailing the impact on US prices and jobs.

"The thing that bothers us is that there are some circumstances in the world that could literally cause this cascading economic duress that would make the recession of 2008 and 2009 look like the good old days," McGinn said.

The report, which will be formally unveiled on Wednesday at two briefings for members of Congress, is the fourth from the [Military Advisory Board](#).

The group of recently retired three and four-star generals was first convened in 2006 by the Institute for Public Research and the Centre for Naval Analyses to help guide the Pentagon's response to climate change.

Now, with all the branches of the military embarked on ambitious projects to reduce their own energy use, the thinktank is trying to exert some influence on civilian habits.

It puts forward nine different alternatives to conventional oil and gas – from algae-based biofuels to compressed natural gas, plug-in cars and propane. Most of those technologies are already available or will be within five years, the report says.

The most promising in the short-term are methanol, biofuel ethanol, electric vehicles and natural gas. But the report is cautious about the use of the most

widely available biofuel in the US, corn ethanol, because of its effects on global food supply.

The report also offers policy guidelines for achieving the 30% reduction such as more rigorous fuel economy standards in passenger cars. Commercial trucking businesses could explore using compressed natural gas, it says. The government could expand the use of plug-in cars and biofuels on its fleets, it adds.

It dismisses the argument – put forward by Republicans and industry – that America can insulate itself by sourcing its oil from friendly sources such as Canada and Mexico or by increasing domestic drilling.

A disruption in oil supplies anywhere in the world will drive up the price of oil, it said. "We really can't differentiate in a realistic way between oil from Venezuela or Iran or Canada," said McGinn.

Since the board's first report, the Pentagon has embarked on an ambitious project to reduce its own use of energy. The US navy is working to get half of its energy from nuclear and renewable fuels by 2020. The army wants to get 25% of its energy from renewables by 2025. The air force has been conducting test flights of its aircraft on a mix of conventional and biofuels, and the marine corps has been testing small solar power facilities in the combat zones of Afghanistan.

"I don't really see myself as a treehugger in any way. I look at it as an issue of national security," Howard Snow, a former deputy assistant secretary of the Navy who was not involved in the report, told a recent seminar.

The federal government has also been working to increase its use of renewable fuels – although with much more modest targets – since George Bush was president.

But the move away from conventional fuels is a harder sell among civilians, particularly in the current political climate, McGinn acknowledged. Still, he said he was hopeful that the recommendations would gain some traction. "We are going to do something about this as a nation. There is no other way," he said. "It's just a question of whether we do it proactively or find ourselves somewhere down the road facing disruptions because of a closure of petroleum supplies. It's just a question of how much pain do we need to go through as nation before we really get it and fix this in a long-term way."

Recent DEFENCE WHITE PAPER QUOTES are included below, from Stephen Smith's address to the Lowy Institute on 10/8/12 cover Australia's current defence/oil security needs:

### ***"Logistics***

The Review considered strategic logistics such as munitions and fuel

availability, supply and storage.

Fuel supply is a critical factor in sustainability. The Review underlined key risks affecting Northern bases such as the storage capacity of some air bases, especially the bare bases and the dependence of Curtin, Learmonth, Scherger and Tindal on fuel supply by road, challenging during protracted high tempo operations, with some routes also vulnerable to closure during the wet season.

While the fuel supply chain can meet current requirements, its resilience under the stress of major operations is much less certain.

No decisions have been made about individual proposals in the Force Posture Review and these now all fall for consideration in the 2013 White Paper process.”

Options for Australia’s Defence forces stationed in the northern part of the country would, I imagine, include biofuels and hydrogen fuel cells.

Yet, the CSIRO’s research on converting all of Australia’s road transport to Ethanol was censored by the Howard Government from 2003 onwards (as covered above) and as a member of the public not privy to the options being considered, I am including a discussion of this issue, just in case the Government not on the ball in this area either.

One solution for our Defence forces would be biofuels made from Gamba grass, known in Darwin as the “long grass”. It is a grass, introduced into Australia in the 1930’s as a pasture grass. It grows to 3-4m, sprouting in the monsoon season from seeds dispersed the previous year, and matures within six months and therefore would be harvested in the dry season. It is a dense green crop, which is shown in the photograph below in it’s dead state at the end it’s growing season. It does not require fertilisers, grows in seriously depleted soil/ferrecrete and does not require watering/irrigation, so that it does not compete with soils set aside for food crops. It self seeds. See Appendix 1 below, for a University of Queensland paper on grasses suitable for biofuels, which include that “Brazil is committed to spending substantial funds on the evaluation of one of its native grasses – Gamba grass (*Andropogon gayanus*)”. Brazil is currently the largest producer of ethanol in the world.





**Source of photo :**  
**<http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&ibra=all&card=G04>**

It is likely to be an economic proposition now, because petrol at the pump in the Northern Territory is approximately 15c to 20c litre more expensive than in Sydney for instance.

Biofuels are successfully produced in Australia now, particularly by Macquarie Oils in Tasmania (utilizing refuse from poppy crops) and from refuse from sugar crops, in Mackay Queensland (see ABC's Landline).

It would mean that our Defence forces could access oil supplies anywhere biofuels plants could be built, including in the indigenous communities across northern Australia, (with technology making the ethanol undrinkable), from WA, throughout the Top End to Queensland.

## The Electric Car

In order to complete this submission by the deadline, I will list resources with a short summary:

### Detroit Electric



<b>Former type</b>	Automobile Manufacturing
<b>Industry</b>	<a href="#">Automotive</a>
<b>Genre</b>	Electric automobiles
<b>Founded</b>	1907
<b>Defunct</b>	1939
<b>Headquarters</b>	<a href="#">Detroit, Michigan, United States</a>
<b>Area served</b>	<a href="#">United States</a>
<b>Products</b>	<a href="#">Vehicles</a> <a href="#">Automotive parts</a>
<b>Parent</b>	Anderson Electric Car Company

Source :Wikipedia

The above, one source establishing that electric car technology has been available for over one hundred years.

The U.S. Documentary *Who Killed the Electric Car* which establishes with indisputable evidence, for instance :

1. That U.S. oil transnational Chevron, purchased a majority share in the patent for the then, most powerful electric car battery available in the U.S., and took it off the market.
2. That the George W. Bush administration gave \$US600,000 in tax breaks to all purchasers of Hummers.

3. That under the George W. Bush administration, GMH's brilliant fully electric car, which it had successfully developed and built, and was leasing to purchasers, was suddenly, without warning, withdrawn from sale, and the leased vehicles forcibly taken from the public who wished to keep them, and then crushed and disposed of. This action, brought to an end electric car development in the U.S. until events, as shown in the new Documentary, *Revenge of the Electric Car*, occurred.

A comprehensive history of the electric car in Australia, is available from the Alternative Technology Association at [www.ata.org.au](http://www.ata.org.au) in back issues.

Back issues establish that fully developed electric cars have been available overseas, but not introduced to Australia.

One such car, developed in India, has been inexplicably held up by beurocractic red-tape, and therefore effectively prevented from sale here.

This year, Victorian Premier, Ted Bailleau brought this car to Australia, where it is being developed with two Melbourne based universities.

## **Petrochemicals – CSIRO**

Reduction in oil consumption, must also include alternatives to petrochemicals. The CSIRO has developed one such alternative as covered below, a pdf copied and pasted from the CSIRO's website. In my haste to complete this submission today, I failed to locate, already published media article, announcing that the CSIRO has in fact developed a crop plant, ready for production in Australia.

“In the next phase of the Crop Biofactories Initiative, CSIRO and the Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) are investing a further \$13 million to accelerate the development of genetically modified (GM) safflower to deliver important fatty acids and oils for the chemicals industry as potential replacements for petrochemicals in the manufacture of industrial products.

Companies across the world are investing in the development of cost-competitive, reliable and environmentally friendly sources of bio-based raw materials. CSIRO's expertise across plant biochemistry and material sciences, and its strong base of existing research in crop biofactories, could see Australia become a significant global player in the field.

### **Industrial chemicals**

Many everyday items that we use are made from industrial chemicals including:

Plastics – used in food wraps and containers, electrical goods, garden furniture and cars;  
Adhesives – for everyday applications such as superglue and PVC wood glue;  
Lubricants – planes, trains and cars;  
Paints – for around the house and industrial projects; and  
Textiles – including nylon and polyester ....”

### **How the oil industry rewrites history and so gains public support for it's own goals in Australia:**

Central to my own research on the history of the discovery of the oil and gas resources of the Timor Sea, is the biography of the Australian Government Geologist responsible for initially pinpointing and promoting to the oil industry, all three of Australia's offshore oil and gas fields: Bass Strait, NW Shelf and the Timor Sea, Dr Nicholas Boutakoff.

Dr Nicholas Boutakoff was also Chief Geologist for Timor Oil for the ten years leading up to the 1975 invasion of East Timor, having resigned from the Victorian Geological Survey in 1962, where he was Deputy Director. Prior to his resignation, he had discovered the NW Shelf for Woodside and is credited with that discovery.

Dr Boutakoff, began his career in Australia in 1949, as Petroleum Geologist for the Victorian Geological Survey, now known as Geosciences Victoria.

Dr Boutakoff was, not only was responsible for the NW Shelf discovery, he personally applied for the leases on Woodside's behalf, and as the son of a diplomat, was, in his own words, “the central figure in the Burmah-Woodside alliance in London in 1963” and “visited the Hague on 30 September, 1963 and persuaded Shell to join the Burmah-Woodside alliance. Shell entered on 10 October, 1963”.

Dr Boutakoff died in Melbourne in January 1977, in circumstances where, according a former colleague, he died “penniless and virtually unknown”. His relationship with Woodside had also deteriorated in the 1960s to such an extent, according to former colleagues, that he was forced to take Woodside to the High Court. And while I do have to obtain confirmation that the case was Harlowe's Nominees v Woodside (1966), nevertheless, included in the summing up of that High Court case, is scathing criticism of Woodside's founding Managing Director, Rees Withers:

*“10. The man who took the most active part in the whole affair was the Managing Director, Withers, whom the judge regarded as an unsatisfactory witness and a “single-minded opportunist who was not*

*handicapped by any scruples or feelings of loyalty ... in the end, the judge ... regarded his evidence with suspicion and distrust ..."*  
(Source : <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/HCA/1968/37.html>)

Dr Boutakoff's discovery of the NW Shelf, also followed the initial oil discovery at nearby Barrow Island, made by another Government Geologist, Dr Harold Raggatt, who headed the Bureau of Mineral Resources, Canberra, (now Geosciences Australia). Sir Harold Raggatt was also responsible for advising then Prime Minister Ben Chifley, that Australia urgently needed, amongst other things, alternatives sources of energy. Raggatt successfully recommended, and is responsible for the siting of, the Snowy Mountains Hydro Electric Scheme.

Harold Raggatt also promoted the Barrow Island oil potential to early Australian oil explorer Ampol, who developed the Barrow Island field, a company which operated quite differently to many oil explorers today. That is, in the public interest! Ampol's CEO, was New Zealander, William Walkley of the Walkley Journalism awards.

On a side issue, but directly relevant to secrecy and this submission; in an audio interview available via Google, former Victorian Geological Survey Geologist, Jack Douglas, recounts that around 1975, for reasons he could not fathom, the Survey lost its status at the top of the Victorian Public Service, in conjunction with this, there was a substantial increase in the implementation of security measures in the Survey's offices in Melbourne, to the extent that the Survey's geologists were not able to interact with the public as freely as they had done up to that time.

This is also the same Geological Survey responsible for employing the Petroleum Geologist, Dr Nicholas Boutakoff, who pinpointed and promoted, to the oil industry, Australia's three major oil and gas fields. Dr Boutakoff wrote, (and these letters are included in his personal papers stored in the Victorian State Library archives), that he had not wanted to come to Australia following WWII, and only did so, in response to the job offer and the invitation, made then by the then head of Geology at the University of Melbourne.

Had Gough Whitlam's fact finding mission consulted Geologists at the Victorian Geological Survey in 1975, they would have obtained an accurate and detailed account of Dr Boutakoff's work in the Timor Sea, including details of the exploratory wells had already discovered gas condensate on the East Timor side of a mid-way boundary, prior to that boundary being settled. Geologists would have also provided the fact finding mission with Dr Boutakoff's contact details so they could speak with him directly, as he was based in Melbourne.

There is also no doubt, that had Dr Boutakoff not died in early 1977, that he would have publicly challenged Woodside's and the oil industry's history of Australia's offshore oil and gas resources.

It is worth adding, that Australia's government geologists have contributed substantially to most mineral and energy discoveries in Australia, and this

becomes relevant to such issues, the rights of Australians to a greater share in Australia's resource income.

Another area of interest for me, is the lack of public debate and government insight into Australian public concerns that Australia minerals and energy resources are being exploited at a rapid rate and without proper consideration to the future availability of resources. Nor is the Australian Government, unlike that of the U.S. for example, looking seriously and publicly at such issues as the world's critical and strategic minerals.