



The Secretary
Senate Inquiry on Terrorism Bill (No 2)
Senate
Australian Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600



Dear Sir,

I wish to make a submission to the Senate Committee looking into the Terrorism Bill, which has a closing date of next Friday, seems to have invited submissions from people who are on the Internet, this would seem to set limitations on the ability of "ordinary Australians" to participate in the discussion.

The problem seems to be that we have a government who simply refuses to be open and transparent with the citizens whom are supposedly there to give consent to be governed.

I draw your Committee to the extracts from Mikhail Gorbachev's book Perestroika, subtitled, New thinking for our country and the world. If his book is to be accepted literally then on pages 230 and 231 he sets out the **Fundamental Principals** that make up the Perestroika Accords.

The Perestroika Accords make up only half of the New World Order, the Accords of the "West" seemed to concentrate on economic matters and "democratization" of some selected countries, while ignoring others.

Our government seems to lean towards the concept of "dumbing down" it's citizens and hoping they don't discover the truth.

If this all sounds a bit like the Ministry of Truth from George Orwell's book 1984 then its what people are thinking, and it's nowhere as effective.

The media deliberately ignores questions "Ordinary Australians" are asking each other. And the politicians are avoiding answering these questions. Our local member, who is a Junior Minister arrives at public meetings and announces that he has to attend a meeting in 10 minutes, and so can only make a brief statement and must then leave, so no questions can be asked.

Questions like:

When was British Common Law abolished? When I went to school we were taught that our Rights, Freedoms and Liberties were all derived from **Magna Carta** and the **Bill of Rights of William and Mary**, which spread Rights to all British citizens. From the British Common Law we get Trial by Jury, Habeas Corpus, Rights to own private property (freedom from search and seizure) that has been our law for these past 550 years, is that still our law? If that is the case, how is it possible to have a Terrorism Law that allows setting up concentration camps, into which citizens can be thrown without being charged with anything.

I would ask your committee to look at the lessons of history, when Adolph Hitler asked for emergency laws to restore law and order to the streets of Germany in 1933, most Germans would have agreed that it was a good law and much needed, later on once the camps were in full swing, the list was expanded. The question this history lesson asks is: What are the groups who are to be included in the future.

Magna Carta

English ^{GREAT CHARTER} the charter of English liberties granted by King ^{JOHN} in 1215 under threat of civil war and reissued with alterations in 1216, 1217, and 1225.

The charter meant less to contemporaries than it has to subsequent generations. The solemn circumstances of its first granting have given to Magna Carta of 1215 a unique place in popular imagination, quite early in its history it became a symbol and a battle cry against oppression, each successive generation reading into it a protection of its own threatened liberties. In England the Petition of Right (1628) and the Habeas Corpus Act (1679) looked directly back to clause 39 of the charter of 1215, which stated that "no free man shall be . . . imprisoned or disseised [dispossessed] . . . except by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." In the United States both the national and the state constitutions show ideas and even phrases directly traceable to Magna Carta.

Earlier kings of England, Henry I, Stephen, and Henry II, had issued charters, making promises or concessions to their barons, but these were granted by, not exacted from, the king and were very generally phrased. Moreover, the steady growth of the administration during the 12th century weakened the barons' position vis-à-vis the crown. But the need for heavy taxation for the Third Crusade, and for the ransom of Richard I after his capture by the Holy Roman emperor Henry VI, increased his successor's difficulties. John's position was further weakened by a rival claim to the throne and the French attack upon John's Duchy of Normandy. In 1199, 1201, and 1205 John's barons had to be promised their "rights"; his financial exactions increased after his loss of Normandy (1204), and, during his quarrel (1208-13) with Pope Innocent III, he taxed the English church heavily. It is, therefore, not surprising that after 1213 Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, directed baronial unrest into a demand for a solemn grant of liberties by the king. The document known as the Articles of the Barons was at last agreed upon and became the text from which the final version of the charter was drafted at Runnymede (beside the River Thames, between Windsor and Staines, now in the county of Surrey) and sealed by John on June 15, 1215.

Although written continuously, the charter has been traditionally discussed as consisting of a preamble and 63 clauses. Roughly, its contents may be divided into nine groups. The first concerned the church, asserting that it was to be "free." A second group provided statements of feudal law of particular concern to those holding lands directly from the crown, and the third assured similar rights to subtenants. A fourth group of clauses referred to towns, trade, and merchants. A particularly large group was concerned with the reform of the law and of justice, and another with control of the behaviour of royal officials. A seventh group concerned the royal forests, and another dealt with immediate issues, requiring, for instance, the dismissal of John's foreign mercenaries. The final clauses provided a form of security for the king's adherence to the charter, by which a council of 25 barons should have the ultimate right to levy war upon him should he seriously infringe it.

Councillors for John's young son ^{HENRY II} reissued the charter in 1216 and 1217, omitting all matters relating only to the political situation of 1215. In 1217 clauses relating to the forests were transferred to a separate forest charter. The great reissue of 1225, given by Henry III himself after his coming of age, differed little from that of 1217, and it was probably already realized that efforts to keep the charter up to date were impracticable. Thus the charter of 1225, again reissued by Henry III in 1264 and "inspected" and enrolled on his new statute rolls by Edward I in 1297, gradually became less a statement of current law than a source book of basic principles. There are four extant "originals" of the charter of 1215, one each in Lincoln Cathedral and Salisbury Cathedral, and two in the British Museum. Durham Cathedral possesses the charters of 1216, 1217, and 1225.

[Click here for a translation of the Latin text of](#)

Gorbachev suggests some groups in 4 (ii) of his Accords, and suggests nationalist, religious groups and other acceptable (now) groups. And I'm afraid it could include most of your committee.

The word Gorbachev uses "extirpation", is derived from the word "exterminate". That should tell you what Gorbachev understood about democracy.

People everywhere are asking the other question thrown up by this whole experience, and by that I do mean all "western" countries where New World Order has been installed. The question being, if these people who find their "adopted" countries so horrible and disgusting that they would want to "trash" the place and kill the people of the host nation. Then, why are they here? And why isn't this question allowed to even be asked?

The New World Order meant we, the Ordinary Australians lost our voice, our free speech, our "Loyal Opposition", our "Free Press" and the ability to hear open debates on our TV. What we hear now is "managed debates." Anyone who was previously in a communist nation recognizes these ideological concepts immediately. But why are they here under the heading of "Democracy"?

Can you please look into these issues for me and in doing so I will promise to send your information on to everyone I can contact and inform?

Along the way can you please define exactly what a Terrorist is?

Yours faithfully,



7th November 2005.

Where has all the good sense gone?

THE 1950s were seriously scary times. Communism had overrun eastern Europe, Joe Stalin was still alive and ravenous, Mao had taken over China, we were engaged in a war in Korea, and Reds were said to be undermining key institutions in our society.

Prime Minister Bob Menzies responded to the fear factor by trying to ban the Communist Party, a dictatorial move that the High Court invalidated, and so he put it to the people in a referendum on September 22, 1951.

To their everlasting credit, the Australian people rejected this dictatorial measure, albeit by the slim margin of 50,082 votes out of 2.3 million.

And, it must be noted, Labor-ruled Queensland was the most ferociously anti-communist of all the states.

Despite the closeness of the vote and the passions of the time, it was later held up as one of the proudest days in our political history, evidence of our national tolerance and the splendour of our democratic institutions.

Don't take my word for it. This was what I was told by teachers who would rather have dropped their bell-bottom trousers in public than support communism.

The Australian people refused to be panicked by cynical government in even the most desperate of times.

Perhaps they remembered the shameful abuses of wartime emergency laws, which were designed to shore up our security and to snuff out a (largely non-existent) fifth column of fascists but quickly became the spurious legal framework for government abuses of power.

How quickly those historical lessons are lost, particularly among those of the Fourth Estate who should be loudest in their defence of liberties and, often, are the first to suffer at the hands of tyranny.



REJECTED: Sir Robert Menzies, who tried to ban the Communist Party

Look at us now. In the face of intolerance and terror abroad, we have surrendered some of our treasured liberties and the Federal Government is about to take away more.

Spooks can intrude on our lives, freedom of speech and action are curtailed, and Australian citizens can be locked up without trial, in secrecy and silenced.

Totalitarian phrases such as "preventative detention" and "control orders" are part of the currency of debate and legislation.

Our Government is silent as a citizen is incarcerated in a Caribbean gulag

and threatened with a military show trial.

Our best and bravest young men and women are sent off to a war that was foolishly conceived, duplicitously launched and is now hopelessly prosecuted.

Fear and secret scare-mongering by spooks with a track record of ineptitude have addled the brains of our Government and enfeebled opposition parties who should protect our liberties.

Cynically, they fear not for us or our liberties but for their own reputations should terrorists strike.

Terrorist bombers may be in our midst and they may still light their fuses, but there is nothing to demonstrate that this surrender of our rights will do anything much to curb their foul ambitions.

But they need not even plant their bombs because they are winning the battle, having stamped us down the road of intolerance and illiberality towards the sort of society to which they aspire.

We are indebted to former prime minister Malcolm Fraser for reminding us of the words of Winston Churchill who in 1943 referred to the "great principle of habeas corpus and trial by jury, which are the supreme protection invented by the British people for ordinary individuals against the state".

"The power of the executive to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law, and particularly to deny him judgment by his peers for an indefinite period, is in the highest degree odious, and is the foundation of all totalitarian governments," he said as his nation battled against the evils of Nazism and militarism.

The moral heroism of 1943, the collective good sense of 1951, and now the cowardice and cynicism of 2005!

• Terry Sweetman's columns also appear in the *The Courier-Mail* on Fridays

PERESTROIKA

Perestroika, which means 'restructuring', is Mikhail Gorbachev's own unprecedented account of the revolution he is at present implementing in the USSR: a revolution in attitudes, in ideas and in practice that entails a radical alteration of both domestic and foreign policy. For perestroika is the next stage in socialist history, when greater responsibility, initiative, openness and a spirit of 'emulation' are to be strongly encouraged in the people through a real tenure of personal involvement.

Global peace is the fruit for which perestroika is potentially the seed. Frank in his criticisms of the past, trenchant in his recommendations for the present, the General Secretary is unwavering in his conviction that the needs of the world are inseparable from those of his country in the search for a nuclear-free, non-violent world'. *Perestroika* is a coherent, inspiring vision for an international political scene as fraught and divided as it has ever been, and must be one of the most important political documents of our times.

This updated edition includes both Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the closing of the June 1988 Party Conference and its resolutions, which presage excitingly the next phase of perestroika and the translation of its ideals into action.

**'GORBACHEV'S GRAND DESIGN
FOR THE RENEWAL OF MANKIND...
IS BREATHTAKING'**

THE TIMES



ISBN 0-00-637356-9



9 780006 373568

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

PERESTROIKA

UPDATED TO INCLUDE MIKHAIL GORBACHEV'S
JUNE 1988 SPEECH TO THE PARTY CONFERENCE



NEW THINKING FOR OUR COUNTRY
AND THE WORLD

chiefly the reason why it was possible for our economy to develop extensively for decades.

Accustomed to giving priority to quantitative growth in production, we tried to check the falling rates of growth, but did so mainly by continually increasing expenditures: we built up the fuel and energy industries and increased the use of natural resources in production.

As time went on, material resources became harder to get and more expensive. On the other hand, the extensive methods of fixed capital expansion resulted in an artificial shortage of manpower. In an attempt to rectify the situation somehow, large, unjustified, i.e. in fact unearned, bonuses began to be paid and all kinds of undeserved incentives introduced under the pressure of this shortage, and that led, at a later stage, to the practice of padding reports merely for gain. Parasitical attitudes were on the rise, the prestige of conscientious and high-quality labor began to diminish and a "wage-leveling" mentality was becoming widespread. The imbalance between the measure of work and the measure of consumption, which had become something like the linchpin of the braking mechanism, not only obstructed the growth of labor productivity, but led to the distortion of the principle of social justice.

So the inertia of extensive economic development was leading to an economic deadlock and stagnation.

The economy was increasingly squeezed financially. The sale of large quantities of oil and other fuel and energy resources and raw materials on the world market did not help. It only aggravated the situation. Currency earnings thus made were predominantly used for tackling problems of the moment rather than on economic modernization or on catching up technologically.

Declining rates of growth and economic stagnation were bound to affect other aspects of the life of Soviet society. Negative trends seriously affected the social sphere. This led to the appearance of the so-called "residual principle" in accordance with which social and cultural programs received what remained in the budget after allocations to production. A "deaf ear" sometimes seemed to be turned to social problems. The social sphere began to lag behind other spheres in terms of technological development, personnel, know-how and, most importantly, quality of work.

Here we have more paradoxes. Our society has ensured full employment and provided fundamental social guarantees. At the same time, we failed to use to the full the potential of socialism to meet the growing requirements in housing, in quality and sometimes quantity of foodstuffs, in the proper organization of the work of transport, in health services, in education and in tackling other problems which, naturally, arose in the course of society's development.

An absurd situation was developing. The Soviet Union, the world's biggest producer of steel, raw materials, fuel and energy, has shortfalls in them due to wasteful or inefficient use. One of the biggest producers of grain for food, it nevertheless has to buy millions of tons of grain a year for fodder. We have the largest number of doctors and hospital beds per thousand of the population and, at the same time, there are glaring shortcomings in our health services. Our rockets can find Halley's comet and fly to Venus with amazing accuracy, but side by side with these scientific and technological triumphs is an obvious lack of efficiency in using scientific achievements for economic needs, and many Soviet household appliances are of poor quality.

This, unfortunately, is not all. A gradual erosion of the ideological and moral values of our people began.

It was obvious to everyone that the growth rates were sharply dropping and that the entire mechanism of quality control was not working properly; there was a lack of receptivity to the advances in science and technology; the improvement in living standards was slowing down and there were difficulties in the supply of foodstuffs, housing, consumer goods and services.

On the ideological plane as well, the braking mechanism brought about ever greater resistance to the attempts to constructively scrutinize the problems that were emerging and to the new ideas. Propaganda of success—real or imagined—was gaining the upper hand. Eulogizing and servility were encouraged; the needs and opinions of ordinary working people, of the public at large, were ignored. In the social sciences scholastic theorization was encouraged and developed, but creative thinking was driven out from the social sciences, and superfluous and voluntarist assessments and judgments were declared indisputable truths. Scientific, theoretical and other discussions, which are indispensable for the development of thought and for creative

strength and the courage to soberly appraise the situation and recognize that fundamental changes and transformations are indispensable.

An unbiased and honest approach led us to the only logical conclusion that the country was verging on crisis. This conclusion was announced at the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, which inaugurated the new strategy of perestroika and formulated its basic principles.

I would like to emphasize here that this analysis began a long time before the April Plenary Meeting¹ and that therefore its conclusions were well thought out. It was not something out of the blue, but a balanced judgment. It would be a mistake to think that a month after the Central Committee Plenary Meeting in March 1985, which elected me General Secretary, there suddenly appeared a group of people who understood everything and knew everything, and that these people gave clear-cut answers to all questions. Such miracles do not exist.

The need for change was brewing not only in the material sphere of life but also in public consciousness. People who had practical experience, a sense of justice and commitment to the ideals of Bolshevism criticized the established practice of doing things and noted with anxiety the symptoms of moral degradation and erosion of revolutionary ideals and socialist values.

Workers, farmers and intellectuals, Party functionaries centrally and locally, came to ponder the situation in the country. There was a growing awareness that things could not go on like this much longer. Perplexity and indignation welled up that the great values born of the October Revolution and the heroic struggle for socialism were being trampled underfoot.

All honest people saw with bitterness that people were losing interest in social affairs, that labor no longer had its respectable status, that people, especially the young, were after profit at all cost. Our people have always had an intrinsic ability to discern the gap between word and deed. No wonder Russian folk tales are full of mockery aimed

¹ The April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee put forward and substantiated the concept of accelerated socio-economic development for the USSR. This formed the basis of the new edition of the Party Program, later endorsed by the 27th Party Congress as the Party's general policy line.

against people who like pomp and trappings; and literature, which has always played a great role in our country's spiritual life, is merciless to every manifestation of injustice and abuse of power. In their best works writers, film-makers, theater producers and actors tried to boost people's belief in the ideological achievements of socialism and hope for a spiritual revival of society and, despite bureaucratic bans and even persecution, prepared people morally for perestroika.

By saying all this I want to make the reader understand that the energy for revolutionary change has been accumulating amid our people and in the Party for some time. And the ideas of perestroika have been prompted not just by pragmatic interests and considerations but also by our troubled conscience, by the indomitable commitment to ideals which we inherited from the Revolution and as a result of a theoretical quest which gave us a better knowledge of society and reinforced our determination to go ahead.

Turning to Lenin, an Ideological Source of Perestroika

The life-giving impetus of our great Revolution was too powerful for the Party and people to reconcile themselves to phenomena that were threatening to squander its gains. The works of Lenin and his ideals of socialism remained for us an inexhaustible source of dialectical creative thought, theoretical wealth and political sagacity. His very image is an undying example of lofty moral strength, all-round spiritual culture and selfless devotion to the cause of the people and to socialism. Lenin lives on in the minds and hearts of millions of people. Breaking down all the barriers erected by scholastics and dogmatists, an interest in Lenin's legacy and a thirst to know him more extensively in the original grew as negative phenomena in society accumulated.

Turning to Lenin has greatly stimulated the Party and society in their search to find explanations and answers to the questions that have arisen. Lenin's works in the last years of his life have drawn particular attention. I shall adduce my own experience to corroborate this point. In my report of 22 April 1983, at a gala session dedicated to the 113th anniversary of Lenin's birth, I referred to Lenin's tenets on the need for taking into account the requirements of objective

approach would be simply unrealistic. On the basis of this program our representatives tabled major compromise proposals at the Geneva talks. They touched upon medium-range missiles, strategic offensive weapons, and non-militarization of outer space.

The Statement of 15 January was of a policy-making nature. We wanted to single out the main threat to civilization related to nuclear weapons and nuclear explosions, without overlooking the questions pertaining to the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and a drastic reduction in conventional armaments. This was a set of measures in general outline. The overriding principle in operation at all stages was the maintenance of a balance. No political games or ruses are needed, but political responsibility and a clear understanding that no one is out to deceive anyone else when the issue at stake is as sensitive as a state's security.

Such a step as the one we took on 15 January 1986 required not only an understanding of our responsibility, but also political resolve. We proceeded from the need for new approaches to security issues in the nuclear space age. This was the will of our entire people. In taking this step, the last thing we contemplated was a propaganda dividend to outdo the other side. The move was dictated by a sense of responsibility about preventing nuclear war and preserving peace. Our stance here accorded with world public opinion; among other things, it was a response to the appeal of the Group of Six (India, Argentina, Sweden, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania).

We are profoundly devoted to the idea of a nuclear-free world. Enriched by the Indian political tradition and the specifics of Indian philosophy and culture, this idea was developed in the Delhi Declaration on Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World. For us this is not some slogan that was invented to stagger the imagination. Security is a political issue, not a function of military confrontation. Failure to understand this can only result in war with all its catastrophic consequences. If the huge stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and other weapons that have been accumulated are unleashed, nothing will remain of the world. What we are talking about is the survival of humanity. For us the idea of a nuclear-free world is a conviction which we arrived at through a great deal of suffering. We regard security as an all-embracing concept which incorporates not only military-political aspects, but economic, ecological and humanitarian ones as well.

At the 27th Congress of the CPSU we substantiated from all angles the concept of building an all-embracing system of international security. We presented it to the entire world, to the governments, parties, public organizations and movements which are genuinely concerned about peace on Earth.¹

We are not renegeing on any of the proposals in our Congress

1. We see the Fundamental Principles of this system as follows:

- i. *In the military sphere*
 - i renunciation by the nuclear powers of war—both nuclear and conventional—against each other or against third countries;
 - ii prevention of an arms race in outer space, cessation of all nuclear weapons tests and the total destruction of such weapons, a ban on and the destruction of chemical weapons, and renunciation of the development of other means of mass annihilation;
 - iii a strictly controlled lowering of the levels of military capabilities of countries to limits of reasonable sufficiency;
 - iv abandonment of military alliances, and, as a stage toward this, renunciation of their enlargement and of the formation of new ones;
 - v balanced and proportionate reduction of military budgets.
2. *In the political sphere*
 - i strict respect in international practice for the right of each people to choose the ways and forms of its development independently;
 - ii a just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts;
 - iii elaboration of a set of measures aimed at building confidence between states and the creation of effective guarantees against attack from without and for inviolability of their frontiers;
 - iv elaboration of effective methods of preventing international terrorism, including those ensuring the safety of international land, air and sea communications.
3. *In the economic sphere*
 - i exclusion of all forms of discrimination from international practice; renunciation of the policy of economic blockades and sanctions if this is not directly envisaged in the recommendations of the world community;
 - ii joint quests for ways of a just settlement of the problem of debts;
 - iii establishment of a new world economic order guaranteeing equal economic security to all countries;
 - iv elaboration of principles for utilizing part of the funds released as a result of a reduction of military budgets for the good of the world community, of developing nations in the first place; the pooling of efforts in exploring and making peaceful use of outer space and in resolving global problems on which the destinies of civilization depend.
4. *In the humanitarian sphere*
 - i cooperation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament, and international security; greater flow of general objective information and broader contact between peoples for the purpose of learning about one another; reinforcement of the spirit of mutual understanding and concord in relations between them;
 - ii extirpation of genocide, apartheid, advocacy of fascism and every other form of racial, national or religious exclusiveness, and also of discrimination against people on this basis;
 - iii extension—while respecting the laws of each country—of international cooperation in the implementation of the political, social and personal rights of people;
 - iv solution in a humane and positive spirit to questions related to the reuniting of families, marriage, and the promotion of contacts between people and between organizations; strengthening of and the quests for new forms of cooperation in culture, art, science, education, and medicine.