

12 February 2021

Committee Secretary
Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

Dear Committee Secretary,

Re: Inquiry into extremist movements and radicalism in Australia

I am writing to provide my perspectives to the current inquiry by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security (PJCIS) into extremist movements and radicalism.

I note that according to the inquiry's terms of reference as submitted by the Minister for Home Affairs (the Minister), the Minister is interested in learning about the 'motivations, objectives and capacity for violence' of far-right extremist groups.

Moreover, I note that according to the testimony given by Ms Heather Cook, the Deputy Director-General, Intelligence Service Delivery, Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) to the PJCIS on 22 September 2020, ASIO's counter-terrorism case load involving 'right wing extremism' now amounts to approximately 30 - 40 per cent of ASIO's total counter-terrorism caseload¹ up from 10% - 15% in 2016.

I understand that the increased caseload experienced by ASIO is one of the primary motivations of the current inquiry.

Within this context, I am writing to express my concerns which I would like the committee to take note of.

About John Adams

I am writing in my personal individual capacity as an Australian citizen. I have prepared and lodged this submission independent of any external commercial or political relationships/associations and affiliations. This submission reflects my own research and private views.

For the record, I am not currently a member or associate of any political party or political organisation.

By way of professional background, I am a professional independent economist having worked in both the public and private sectors including as a Commonwealth and NSW public servant as well as management consultant for a Big 4 accounting firm.

I also participated in academic political science research into modern populist movements at the University of Wollongong in 2016-17. This research has informed some of the views expressed in this submission.

By way of ethnic background and history, I was born in Australia to immigrant parents who descend from the western region of Asia. I therefore classify myself as Asian-Australian. I make this specific unorthodox

¹ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-09-22/right-wing-extremists-asio-islamic-state-tactics/12690002>

admission given that some literature relevant to this inquiry has associated far right extremism with ideological attachments to 'white supremacy'.

For the record, I do not classify myself as white nor do I believe in white supremacy as a political philosophy.

Concern 1 – Inappropriate Interference in Domestic Political Disputes

The Commonwealth legal framework and main activities of Commonwealth agencies that seek to address extremism and radicalism is outlined at [Attachment A](#).

Within this legal framework, significant ambiguity still exists within Commonwealth law (e.g. *Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979* and the *Criminal Code Act 1995*) when defining critical terms such as 'right-wing extremism' or 'left-wing extremism'.

Such ambiguity provides significant scope for commonwealth as well as state and territory government agencies (including law enforcement) to intrude into domestic political controversies and to unduly influence either:

- the actions of individual Australians or groups; or
- the outcomes of such controversies

through actions such as:

- surveillance (and potential harassment);
- controlling the free exercise of speech or association either in a physical or online environment (e.g. manipulating social media platforms such as Facebook);
- detention through the execution of control orders; or
- arrest.

This submission argues that it is inappropriate for government agencies and taxpayer funds to be used to either interfere or influence in domestic political disputes or grievances, even when political positions or opinions are either extreme or non-conformist relative to the contemporary consensus. This includes disputes relating to:

- theological influence on Australian politics and culture;
- the ethnic or religious composition of the Australian population;
- Australia's constitutional arrangements;
- Australia's political structure and form of government;
- Australia's immigration or foreign policy;
- definitions of Australian nationality;
- past or current activities of Australia's sovereign, her heirs, the sovereign's representatives or Members and Senators of the Federal Parliament;
- what constitutes acceptable theological and cultural norms;
- relative cultural analysis;
- public policy responses to public disasters (including pandemics);
- potential instances of corruption; or
- interpretations of real-world events whether contemporary or historical.

Given the definitional ambiguity which exists in the law, it is concerning that academic studies have attempted to label non-conformist or anti-establishment opinions or discussion against the standards of 2020 as a so-called 'creeping threat'.

For example, in October 2020 the Department of Security Studies and Criminology from the Faculty of Arts at the Macquarie University published a report titled: *Mapping Networks and Narratives of Online Right-Wing Extremists in New South Wales*². This report found that a level of risk in NSW is:

“shifting of the acceptable window of social and political discourse towards an extreme end point, described as a shifting of the Overton window, creates an insidious and creeping threat to political and social norms in Australia.

“This environment is characterised by narratives that challenge the fundamentals of pluralist liberal democracy through exclusivist appeals to race, ethnicity, nation, and gender. These are highly social environments with users expressing beliefs through appeals to critical thinking, a rejection of political correctness, the posing of alternative conspiracy theories, and the use of humour and satire that is designed to shock and offend.”

This submission argues that this description should be out of the purview of federal as well as state and territory policy makers as discussion of such topics fall within the bounds of the implied right to free political communication, which as noted by Griffiths (2005) limits legislative and executive power to intervene in political discussion³.

This submission further argues that it is legitimate to consider such academic studies as an attempt to use public institutions and resources to suppress domestic public opinion which is inconsistent with the views of:

- elite civic institutions such as the mainstream media, academia and large corporations;
- current policy makers;
- the policies being enacted by executive governments across Australia; and
- laws being enacted by legislatures within Australia.

Recommendation 1

Federal, State and Territory policy makers as well as government intelligence and law enforcement agencies should avoid to use public resources unduly influence or interfere in domestic non-conformist or anti-establishment political discourses that do not pose an immediate threat to public safety.

² <https://zenodo.org/record/4071472#.X-99djTiuUJ>

³ See the following paper by Griffiths, L., (2005), <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/JCULawRw/2005/5.txt/cgi-bin/download.cgi/download/au/journals/JCULRev/2005/5.pdf>

Concern 2 – Failing to Recognise the ‘Jefferson Doctrine’

This submission is concerned that the PJCIS and Commonwealth law during the course of the current inquiry will fail to recognise the political and philosophical contributions of Thomas Jefferson who was the:

- author of the American Declaration of Independence; and
- third president of the United States of America

and how those contributions remain relevant to Australians in the 21st Century.

In particular, this submission wishes to highlight Thomas Jefferson’s specific doctrine (referred to in this submission as the ‘Jefferson Doctrine’) in which violence against government by a broad-based contingency of a country’s citizenry in order to defend their natural rights is both necessary and justified if particular circumstances arise.

Specifically, the Jefferson Doctrine was expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the 1776 United States Declaration of Independence in which he stated (emphasis added):

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --**That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government**, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”⁴*

The Jefferson Doctrine was reaffirmed by Thomas Jefferson, on 8 May 1825, when he noted:

“When forced, therefore, to resort to arms for redress, an appeal to the tribunal of the world was deemed proper for our justification. This was the order of the Declaration of Independence. Not to find out new principles, or new arguments, never before thought of, not merely to say things which has never been said before, but to place before mankind the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent and to justify ourselves in the independent stand we are compelled to take.”

This submission also wishes to highlight that the Jefferson Doctrine is not purely a statement of political philosophy, but also a statement of practical political action.

Is Thomas Jefferson a ‘far-right extremist’ under Australian Commonwealth law?

A core element of what may, by some, be described as ‘right wing’ extremism or radicalism is the act of:

- thinking, writing or discussing violence against government,
- citizens assembling to discuss the use of violence against government; and
- citizens performing violence against government.

Such acts would fall under the definitions of ‘communal violence or politically motivated violence’ as per Section 4 of the *Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979* as well as divisions 80.1, 80.1AC, 80.2 and potentially 83.4 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995*.

Given the current legal definitions outlined *Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979* and the *Criminal Code Act 1995*, it is arguable that the practical remedy against tyrannical government as offered by the Jefferson Doctrine would be illegal under the existing Australian Commonwealth law.

⁴ <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>

Given this, it is likely that in the hypothetical situation that if Thomas Jefferson was alive today and living in Australia as an Australian citizen, Commonwealth agencies such as ASIO and the AFP would categorise Thomas Jefferson as a 'right wing' or a 'far-right' extremist.

This submission argues that labelling Thomas Jefferson as a 'right wing' or a 'far-right' extremist would be offensive to many Australians as well as Australia's primary strategic ally the United States of America.

This submission argues that in the context of defining political extremism or radicalism, the PJCIS formally acknowledges that Thomas Jefferson is neither a 'right wing' or a 'far-right' extremist.

Recommendation 2

That the PJCIS recognises the contributions of Thomas Jefferson and formally acknowledges that the writings of Thomas Jefferson which advocate the use of violence to defend natural rights does not deem Thomas Jefferson is 'right wing' or 'far-right' extremist.

Moreover, this submission argues that it is inappropriate for the Parliament of Australia or Commonwealth agencies such as the Australian *Security Intelligence Organisation*, the Department of Home Affairs or the Australian Federal Police to label all forms of violence against government (whether federal, state or local) as 'extreme' or 'radical' and that:

- the context in which this violence occurs; as well as
- the purpose for why this violence occurs;

are material in defining key distinctions.

The Necessity of the Jefferson Doctrine

This submission argues that the Jefferson Doctrine is both an important and relevant political (both philosophical and practical) doctrine to Australians in the 21st Century. This submission argues that the 'Jefferson Doctrine' has its origins in English political philosophy and English history and has relevance to Australia's political and constitutional arrangements.

Importantly, this submission wishes to highlight that the history of English-speaking peoples (including the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA) and Australia) over the many centuries has been both an evolutionary and at times a revolutionary journey toward the legal acknowledgement of rights and liberties which are inherent to humanity.

These rights and liberties have from time to time through history be infringed and even suspended for unjustifiable reasons. It is in these moments that the Jefferson Doctrine is required as a last resort.

This is supported by John Adams (the 2nd President of the USA) who, in the context of the American revolution, stated:

"This writer is equally mistaken, when he says, the people are sure to be losers in the end. They can hardly be losers if unsuccessful; because, if they live, they can but be slaves, after an unfortunate effort, and slaves they would have been, if they had not resisted. So that nothing is lost. If they die, they cannot be said to lose, for death is better than slavery. If they succeed, their gains are immense. They preserve their liberties."⁵

Moreover, writing on 25 August 1775 to John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

⁵ See footnote 5

“We are reduced to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated Ministers, or resistance by force. The latter is our choice. We have counted the cost of this contest, and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honour, justice, and humanity, forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We cannot endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them, if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them.”⁶

Finally, Jefferson noted that throughout the course of history tension exists between government, who is eager to amass power, and citizens who are eager to maintain their rights. Writing in a letter to William Stephens Smith in 1787, Jefferson wrote (emphasis added):

*“what country can preserve it’s liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? **The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.** It is it’s natural manure”⁷*

Is the Jefferson Doctrine purely an American political philosophical principle?

In short no. As noted in the Thomas Jefferson quote from 1825 (as described above), the ‘Jefferson Doctrine’ is derived from the evolution of English political philosophy in the context of the British sovereign, the same sovereign which is identified in both the Australian Constitution and Australian law such as the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (see section 1 above).

As noted by O’Toole (2011)⁸, the right of the people (citizens or subjects) to rebel or to revolt against government has been subject to intense debate in England over centuries including by philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. At the core of the debate is:

- the source of authority and power of the sovereign; and
- the fallibility of the sovereign.

According to Hobbes, the people possessed no natural right to rebel or revolt against the sovereign or his government given that the sovereign was infallible. Alternatively, Locke argued that the sovereign was fallible thus providing a natural justification for rebellion or revolt against the sovereign of their government in the most extreme circumstances.

In drafting the US Declaration of Independence, Jefferson and the American Continental Congress drew from the argument of Locke to declare a universal right of the people to rebel or revolt against government.

Moreover, writing in 1765 (11 years before the American Revolution) about the rights afforded those under the British Crown, John Adams in his publication *“A Dissertation on Canon and Feudal Law”*⁹ stated:

“Let it be known, that British liberties are not the grants of princes or parliaments, but original rights, conditions of original contracts, coequal with prerogative, and coeval with government; that many of our rights are inherent and essential, agreed on as maxims, and established as preliminaries, even before a parliament exist.”

⁶ Appleby, J., and Ball, T., (1999), *“Jefferson Political Writings”*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom

⁷ <https://www.monticello.org/site/research-and-collections/tree-liberty-quotations>

⁸ O’Toole, J., (2011), *“The Right of Revolution: An Analysis of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes’ Social Contract Theories”*, submitted senior honours thesis, Boston College <https://dlib.bc.edu/islandora/object/bc-ir:102351/datastream/PDF/view>

⁹ Diggins, J., (2004), *“The Portable John Adams”*, Penguin Group, New York, USA

“Let them search for the foundation of British laws and government in the frame of human nature, in the constitution of the intellectual and moral world. There let us see that truth, liberty, justice and benevolence, are its everlasting basis; and if these could be removed, the superstructure is overthrown of course.”

“Be it remembered, however, that liberty must at all hazards be supported. We have a right to it, derived from our Maker. But if we had not, our fathers have earned and bought it for us, at the expense of their ease, their estates, their pleasure, and their blood. And liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right, from the frame of their nature, to knowledge, as their great Creator, who does nothing in vain, has given them understandings, and a desire to know; but besides this, they have a right, an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean, of the characters and conduct of their rulers.”

“Rulers are no more than attorneys, agents, and trustees, for the people; and if the cause, the interest and trust, is insidiously betrayed, or wantonly trifled away, the people have a right to revoke the authority that they themselves have deputed, and to constitute abler and better agents, attorneys, and trustees.”

The Necessary Prerequisites for the Jefferson Doctrine to be Employed

This submission wishes to highlight that the Jefferson Doctrine has long been regarded as a last resort mechanism when political, civil and judicial avenues of redress have been exhausted by aggrieved citizens.

Indeed, John Adams (the 2nd President of the USA) who participated in the American Revolution outlined the necessary conditions that must exist that would justify the initiation of the Jefferson Doctrine as follows (emphasis added):

*“When we speak of a tyrant that may lawfully be dethroned by the people, we do not mean by the word people, the vile populace or rabble of the country, nor the cabal of a small number of factious persons, **but the greater and more judicious part of the subjects, of all ranks. Besides, the tyranny must be notorious, and evidently clear, as to leave nobody any room to doubt of it.**”¹⁰*

Relevant Case Studies of the Jefferson Doctrine being Implemented

This submission wishes to highlight to the PJCS historical situations in which politically motivated or communal acts of violence against government in the form of sedition, rebellion or revolution resulted in appropriate redress to legitimate grievances, including the establishment of newly defined political rights.

These historical situations are outlined in Table 1.

¹⁰ Thompson, C., (2000) *“The Revolutionary Writings of John Adams”*, Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA

Table 1: Historical Case Studies of when the Jefferson Doctrine was implemented

No	Case Study	Location and Year	Description
1	Magna Carta	England, 1215	<p>Magna Carta ("Great Charter") is a royal charter of rights agreed to by King John of England at Runnymede, near Windsor, on 15 June 1215. Magna Carta was agreed to as part of the First Baron War which was initiated by a group of rebel barons.</p> <p>Magna Carta limited the powers of the English crown and established rights including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the protection of church rights; - the protection against illegal imprisonment; - access to swift justice; and - limits to feudal payments to the English Crown. <p>Magna Carta was formally confirmed as part of England's Statute law in 1297 by King Edward I.</p>
2	Peasants Revolt	England, 1381	<p>The Peasant's Revolt of 1381 was first popular rebellion in English history and was triggered largely by the administration of an unpopular poll tax.</p> <p>Under the poll tax, all English subjects 14 years or above were required to pay tax to the King's treasury. Given systemic tax avoidance attempts, English tax collectors began to inspect the genitalia of English girls as an attempt to establish their age and thus their potential tax liability.</p> <p>The imposition of the tax, but more importantly the sexual depravity of English tax collectors led to a revolt of common people in the English villages of Essex and Kent.</p> <p>As result of the Peasant's revolt, no English monarch or parliament attempted to introduce a poll tax until the British Government of Margaret Thatcher of the 1980s more than 600 years after the event.</p>
3	English Civil War	England, 1642 - 1651	<p>The English Civil War (1642–1651) was a series of civil wars and political machinations between Parliamentarians ("Roundheads") and Royalists ("Cavaliers"), mainly over the manner of England's governance and issues of religious freedom.</p> <p>The English civil war was concerned with how the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland were to be governed.</p> <p>The outcome was threefold: the trial and execution of King Charles I (1649); the exile of his son, Charles II (1651); and the replacement of English monarchy with the Commonwealth of England, which from 1653 unified the British Isles under the personal rule of Oliver Cromwell (1653–58) and briefly his son Richard (1658–59).</p> <p>As result of the civil war, the monopoly of the Church of England on Christian worship was ended. Constitutionally, the wars established the precedent that an English monarch cannot govern without Parliament's consent, although the idea of Parliamentary sovereignty was only legally established as part of the Glorious Revolution in 1688.</p>

No	Case Study	Location and Year	Description
4	American Revolution	United States of America, 1776 - 1783	<p>The American Revolution was declared after 13 American colonies via a Continental Congress declared independence from the UK in 1776.</p> <p>The declaration came after a set of grievances from the colonies were left unanswered by King George III and the British Parliament. These grievances included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - imposing taxes without parliamentary representation as promised under magna carta; - dissolving and suspending colonial legislatures and laws and thus imposing arbitrary government; - refusing to approve new necessary laws; - denying trial by jury; - appointing judges solely loyal to the crown and denying independent judicial powers - imposing severe trade restrictions; and - imposed large numbers of standing arms as an act of domestic harassment. <p>The declaration led to a war of independence between the colonial and British armies which was concluded with the colonies being victorious with financial and military assistance of France, Spain and Holland.</p> <p>The military victory resulted in the drafting and ratification of the US Constitution in 1788.</p>
5	Haitian Revolution	Haiti, 1791 - 1804	<p>The Haitian Revolution was a successful insurrection by self-liberated slaves against French colonial rule. The revolution was the only slave uprising that led to the founding of a state which was both free from slavery, and ruled by non-whites and former captives.</p> <p>The revolution represented the largest slave uprising since Spartacus' unsuccessful revolt against the Roman Republic nearly 1,900 years earlier and challenged long-held European beliefs about alleged black inferiority and about enslaved persons' ability to achieve and maintain their own freedom.</p>
6	Eureka Stockade	Ballarat, Victoria, 1854	<p>The Eureka Stockade was an armed rebellion against the Victorian Government resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exorbitant taxes in the form of mining licence fees; - aggressive tax collection tactics by the Victorian police, including a significant number of arrests for infractions; - the murder of miner James Scobie; and - judicial corruption in the Scobie inquest by Magistrate John Dewes. <p>As result of these grievances, the Ballarat Reform League submitted a charter of demands to Lieutenant Governor Hotham who refused it. This resulted in armed conflict with Victorian police and British Soldiers leading to a gun battle on 3 December 1854.</p> <p>As a result of the Eureka Stockade, important political and legal reforms were implemented in Victoria to address the grievances of the mining community, including the adoption of the secret ballot (also known as the Australian ballot) which became the international gold standard for democratic elections.</p>

No	Case Study	Location and Year	Description
7	Operation Valkyrie	Germany, 1944	<p>Operation Valkyrie was a German World War II emergency continuity of government operations plan issued to the Territorial Reserve Army of Germany to execute and implement in case of a general breakdown in civil order of the nation.</p> <p>Grossly dissatisfied with the conduct of WWII by the Hitler Government, the German High Command led by German Army officers General Friedrich Olbricht, Major General Henning von Tresckow, and Colonel Claus von Stauffenberg modified the plan with the intention of using it to take control of German cities, disarm the SS, and arrest the Nazi leadership once Hitler had been assassinated.</p> <p>Hitler's death (as opposed to his arrest) was required to free German soldiers from their oath of loyalty to him.</p> <p>Operation Valkyrie was initiated on 20 July 1944 but failed to achieve the mission's objectives.</p>

Formal Recognition of the Jefferson Doctrine in Mexico

It is important to note that the Jefferson Doctrine is currently legally recognised by other countries internationally which demonstrates that the doctrine is neither extreme or obscure nor purely historical. For example, the Jefferson Doctrine is enshrined in the constitution of Mexico at article 39¹¹. Specifically, article 39 states:

“The national sovereignty is vested, originally and essentially, in the people. Public power comes from the people and it is institutionalized for the people’s benefit. People, at all times have the inalienable right to change or modify its form of government.”

Australia has no formal position

Unlike the USA, the UK or France, Australia since the arrival of the First Fleet in 1788 has never experienced a revolution and thus has never been forced by circumstance to make any formal declaration, either via our founding documents or a political or legal entity, as to the status of the Australian people from a stand point of:

- sovereignty;
- political and civil rights and whether they are natural and inalienable;
- obligations to the British Crown; and
- the ability to secure these rights when either the Crown or Parliament infringes on these rights.

Unlike the Mexican Constitution, the Australian Constitution is silent on the question of whether Australians possess inalienable natural rights and what political and legal avenues do Australians have in order to secure them.

¹¹ https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Mexico_2015.pdf?lang=en

As noted by University of New South Wales Law Professor George Williams:

“What are the rights and responsibilities of Australian citizenship? Our system of government does not provide answers to these questions. In 1901, the framers of our Constitution avoided such issues. For nearly 100 years, we have continued to do the same. Our democracy is the poorer for this failure.”¹²

Australia should recognise the Jefferson Doctrine

While Australia has no formal position, this submission argues that the PJCS should recommend that the Federal Parliament should:

- formally recognise that Australians possess inalienable natural rights derived from God (or a universal power); and
- that Australians possess the ‘right of lawful rebellion’ or the ‘right to revolution’ consistent with conventions established throughout English history (such as the English Civil War) and the writings of English political philosopher John Locke.

Recommendation 3

That the PJCS should recommend that the Federal Parliament should:

- **formally recognise that Australians possess inalienable natural rights derived from God (or a universal power); and**
- **that Australians possess the ‘right of lawful rebellion’ or the ‘right to revolution’ consistent with conventions established throughout English history (such as the English Civil War) and the writings of English political philosopher John Locke.**

In making this argument and noting Australia’s current constitutional silence, it is important to note that Australians are entitled to look beyond the Australian Constitution to seek answers to these questions as noted by at John Cockburn at the 1891 Australian constitutional convention when he stated:

“As has been well said by an authority on constitutional law, constitutions are devices founded on expediency and possess no intrinsic right of existence. So that, whatever the form of government may be – whether it is that of separate States, or the intermediate stage of federation, or whether it is on the highest level of all, that of unification – still I think we shall best serve the real object of government if we regard all these, not an ends in themselves and therefore not as entitled to idolatrous reverence, but as strictly utilitarian institutions devised as a means towards the one object in view – that of good government.”¹³

While, as noted by McKenna (1996)¹⁴, the Preamble to the Australian Constitution is technically not part of the constitution, but has been referred on several occasions by the High Court of Australia as ‘guidance’ as to the intentions of those who responsible for its construction.

¹²https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Senate/Powers_practice_n_procedures/~~/link.aspx?id=462B3C82F7A04CA89A8C6B53471EBCA3

¹³ Crisp, L., (1960), *“The Parliamentary Government of the Commonwealth of Australia”* (3rd Edition), Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, London, United Kingdom

¹⁴ McKenna, M., (1996), *“The Need for a New Preamble to the Australian Constitution and/or a Bill of Rights”*, https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/RP9697/97rp12

McKenna notes that:

“The preamble reflects the values and priorities which were prevalent at federation. The preamble had its origins in the National Australasian Convention of 1891 and was further revised at the Australasian Federal Convention of 1897-1898 before finally being accepted in 1898, after colonial legislatures and petitioners successfully insisted on the inclusion of ‘Almighty God’.”

Alternatively, as noted by McKenna, arguments have previously been made that preamble to the Australian Constitution carry greater significance than mere guidance:

“In his advice to the Republic Advisory Committee in 1993 the Acting Solicitor-General stated that in the light of recent High Court decisions [in particular Leeth v the Commonwealth (1992) 174 CLR 455], preambular declarations undoubtedly carry ‘potential legal significance’.”

Given this, it is important to consider the words of the preamble to consider whether any guidance can be derived in assessing the applicability of the Jefferson Doctrine to Australia. Indeed, in *Lange vs Australian Broadcasting Corporation*¹⁵¹⁶, the High Court of Australia ruled that the text and structure of the constitution gave rise to the implied freedom of political communication.

Within this context, the key words contained in the preamble of relevance is **‘Almighty God’** and **‘Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland’**.

While not definitive, the recognition of God in the preamble invites theological arguments to be considered in the Australian context similar to how theology was used during the evolution of the British Constitution in the 16th and 17th Centuries, especially if Australians possess natural rights derived from God which are inalienable either by the Australian Constitution or Australian law.

Moreover, the recognition of the ‘Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland’ invites Australians to explore the constitution and history of the UK to determine whether there are any laws, traditions or conventions which may give rise to determining whether Australians possess natural rights and what remedies are available to Australians to secure these rights.

Thus, consistent with the 1765 writings of the John Adams (as noted above) this submission argues that Australian rights and liberties, consistent with British liberties, are original rights and that they are inherent and essential and pre-date the establishment of the Australian constitution or the formation of any Australian colonial parliament in Australia.

Moreover, this submission argues that the Federal Parliament lacks the authority to extinguish the natural rights of Australians or the ability to secure those rights.

¹⁵ See the following paper by Griffiths, L., (2005), <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/JCULawRw/2005/5.txt/cgi-bin/download.cgi/download/au/journals/JCULRev/2005/5.pdf>

¹⁶ Legal reference to the case is (1997) 145 ALR 96 (Brennan CJ, Dawson, Toohey, Gaudron, McHugh, Gummow and Kirby JJ)

Concern 3 - Diminishing Trust in Australian Institutions

It is imperative for the PJCS to investigate the relationship between growing radicalisation and extremism in Australia and the observed collapse in trust with Australian institutions.

Ever since the conclusion with the Howard Government at the 2007 election, Australia has witnessed a collapse in trust and confidence in its political institutions as measured by the 2019 Australian Election Survey¹⁷ (AES) conducted by the Australian National University¹⁸. The AES was conducted during the 2019 Federal Election. According to the AES:

- Satisfaction with Australian democracy is at its lowest level (59%) since the constitutional crisis of the 1970s;
- Trust in the Federal Government has reached its lowest level on record, with just 25% believing people in government can be trusted;
- 56% of Australians believe that the Federal Government is run for ‘a few big interests’, while just 12% believe the government is run for ‘all the people’; and
- 21% of Australian voters do not align with any political party.

Importantly, this phenomena of collapsing trust and confidence is not just exclusive to Australia, but can be observed internationally as well. As noted in 2019 by the Organisation for Economic Development (OECD)¹⁹, a collapse of trust can be witnessed especially throughout the OECD with only 45% of citizens trusting their national government and 56% trusting their judicial system.

This submission argues that:

- disturbing trends in Australian public policy;
- a series of poor public policy outcomes; and
- both domestic and international public scandals

are the main source as to why public trust in Australian institutions has collapsed.

Furthermore, this submission argues that these elements have created a legitimate source of grievances which is fuelling the formation of non-mainstream groups and dialogues given that these grievances have not been addressed by Australia’s political and civil institutions.

Recommendation 4

The PJCS should, as part of this inquiry, investigate any linkage between a decline in trust and confidence in Australia’s political, judicial and civil institutions and the patters within ASIO’s counter-terrorism caseload.

¹⁷ [The-2019-Australian-Federal-Election-Results-from-the-Australian-Election-Study.pdf](#)

¹⁸ <https://www.anu.edu.au/news/all-news/trust-in-government-hits-all-time-low>

¹⁹ <https://www.oecd.org/gov/trust-in-government.htm>

Disturbing Trends in Public Policy

Throughout Australia there have been several disturbing trends in public policy which have undermined trust and confidence in mainstream Australian institutions. These trends include:

- **Forced confiscation of Australian Children** - Section 25A of the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020*²⁰ (South Australia) provides 'authorised officers' with the legal authority to forcibly remove children.
- **Forced mandatory vaccination** – Section 158 of the *Public Health Act 2016* (Western Australia)²¹ states that an authorised officer or police officer may use reasonable force to apprehend or detain a 'relevant person' in order to execute a direction issued by the WA Government which required forced vaccination.

Section 158 provides either the authorised officer or police officer with the legal authority to remove all clothing including underwear.

- **Implementation of Gender Fluidity Theory** – the attempt to implement controversial political theories about gender in order to remodel Australian society. This includes suggesting that influencing Australians to not accept their biological endowment and to accept the gender identification of their choice²².
- **Implementation of a Cashless Society** – the Morrison Government, the Reserve Bank of Australia and commercial banks in recent years have sought to reduce the availability and usage of physical cash within the Australian economy. The *Currency (Restrictions on the Use of Cash) Bill 2019* (which was proposed by the Morrison Government) was one example which undermined the freedom to use physical cash within Australia.
- **Unconventional monetary policy** – extreme policy settings by the Reserve Bank of Australia in 2020 including ultralow interest rates and the creation of fiat digital currency that facilitates quantitative easing and yield curve control leads to significant asset price inflation and undermines confidence in Australia's macroeconomic policy settings.
- **Dramatic growth of public sector debt** – During the course of 2020, Australia has witnessed an unprecedented growth in public sector debt by the Commonwealth as well as State and Territory Governments through unprecedentedly large fiscal deficits. No plan was offered by any level of government within Australia on how to balance their budgets and to repay the accumulated public sector debts.
- **Cancellation of Australian cultural symbols and activities** – the overt attempt by politically motivated interest groups to radically alter or even cancel Australia's national symbols or major national events such as attempting to cancel Australia Day²³.

²⁰ <https://legislation.sa.gov.au/LZ/C/A/COVID-19%20EMERGENCY%20RESPONSE%20ACT%202020/CURRENT/2020.7.AUTH.PDF>

²¹ https://www.legislation.wa.gov.au/legislation/statutes.nsf/main_mrtitle_13791_homepage.html

²² <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/it-s-dangerous-and-wrong-to-tell-all-children-they-re-gender-fluid-23-july-2017>

²³ <https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/scott-morrison-warns-against-cancelling-australia-day-20210126-p56wvq>

Poor Public Policy Outcomes

Poor public policy outcomes which have undermined trust and confidence in mainstream Australian institutions include:

- **Chronic structural Australian economic imbalances (household and foreign debt bubbles)** – Currently, Australia has the largest household debt bubble in its history as measured by household debt to gross domestic product or household debt to net disposable income²⁴ or second highest in the world behind Switzerland.

Moreover, Australia's gross and net foreign debt are at record nominal highs and are at structurally dangerous levels relative to gross domestic product.

- **The cost of housing** – the dramatic increase in the cost of housing and land across Australia since the late 1990s resulting from the formation of the largest household debt bubble in Australia history has undermined economic confidence and placed undue economic pressure on middle class Australian households.
- **Skyrocketing public sector debt** – as noted above, unprecedented fiscal stimulus packages in response to the COVID-19 pandemic have left governments across Australia drowning in debt with public sector with chronic structural deficits and no plan to balance their budgets and repay the incur the public sector debt.
- **Declining educational attainment levels** – According to the 2018 Programme for International Student Assessment²⁵, Australia recorded its lowest attainment levels in mathematics and science and continued a long-term decline in educational attainment levels across mathematics, science and english.
- **Declining population health** – According to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare:

"In 2017–18, an estimated 2 in 3 (67%) Australians aged 18 and over were overweight or obese (36% were overweight but not obese, and 31% were obese). That's around 12.5 million adults. In 2017–18, an estimated 1 in 4 (25%) children and adolescents aged 2–17 were overweight or obese (1.2 million children and adolescents). Of all children and adolescents aged 2–17, 17% were overweight but not obese, and 8.2% were obese."²⁶

- **Declining mental health outcomes** – As one example of the declining mental health of the Australian people, one longitudinal study of 7,000 Queenslanders called the 'Our Lives' study²⁷ found a long downward trend in the mental health the cohort prior to COVID-19 and a sharp decline in mental health from June 2019 to June 2020. Economic anxiety driven by insecure work and those either single or living with parents were major contributing factors in the mental health decline.

²⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/jan/02/young-people-drowning-in-debt-dont-borrow-your-way-out-of-a-recession>

²⁵ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-12-03/australia-education-results-maths-reading-science-getting-worse/11760880>

²⁶ <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-health/overweight-and-obesity>

²⁷ <https://theconversation.com/weve-been-tracking-young-peoples-mental-health-since-2006-covid-has-accelerated-a-worrying-decline-147657>

- **Rampant use of narcotics** – according to the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission’s *Illicit Drug Data Report*²⁸, illegal drug use in Australia is rampant and continues to grow. For example, the *Illicit Drug Data Report* cites:

“Over the last decade, during which time the Australian population increased around 13 per cent:

- *the number of national illicit drug seizures increased 77 per cent (from 63,670 in 2009–10 to 112,474 in 2018–19)*
- *the weight of illicit drugs seized nationally increased 241 per cent (from 7.8 tonnes in 2009–10 to 26.6 tonnes in 2018–19)*
- *the number of national illicit drug arrests increased 80 per cent (from 85,252 in 2009–10 to 153,377 in 2018–19).”*

Moreover, the *Illicit Drug Data Report* cites that:

“The amphetamine-type stimulants market, which in Australia is primarily comprised of methylamphetamine, is large and expanding.

- **Structurally flawed buildings** – high rise buildings such as Opal Tower and Mascot Tower which have either been found to be structurally flawed or who either possess inferior building materials (such as flammable cladding) has caused significant financial and emotional harm for property owners.

These scandals have undermined confidence in the Australian building industry, especially given the lack of government oversight and appropriate accountability for those responsible for the scandal.

Domestic Australian Public Scandals

Australian domestic scandals which have undermined trust and confidence in mainstream Australian institutions include:

- **Misconduct by Financial Services Organisations** – The Royal Commission into Misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry (Hayne Royal Commission) found widespread misconduct by financial services institutions. The Hayne Royal Commission final report²⁹ found that:

“conduct by many entities that has taken place over many years causing substantial loss to many customers but yielding substantial profit to the entities concerned. Very often, the conduct has broken the law. And if it has not broken the law, the conduct has fallen short of the kind of behaviour the community not only expects of financial services entities but is also entitled to expect of them.”

The Hayne Royal Commission also found:

“too often financial services entities that broke the law were not properly held to account.”

- **Systemic paedophilia and child sex abuse** - In December 2017, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse³⁰ published its final report after 5 years of investigation. The Royal Commission found that:

²⁸ https://www.acic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-09/illicit_drug_data_report_2018-19_internals_v10_full.pdf

²⁹ <https://www.royalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-02/fsrc-volume-1-final-report.pdf>

³⁰ <https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/final-report>

“We heard of child sexual abuse in institutions that spanned the past 90 years. Tens of thousands of children have been sexually abused in many Australian Institutions. The problems have been so widespread, and the nature of the abuse so heinous, that it is difficult to comprehend.”

- **The potential cover-up elite paedophilia in Australia** - On 20 October 2015³¹, the then Senator for NSW Bill Heffernan questioned the then Commonwealth Attorney-General Brandis over allegations relating to 28 prominent Australians comprising of Australian judges and a former Prime Minister of being involved in paedophilia and child sexual abuse.

Former Senator Heffernan also alleged that neither the 1995 NSW Wood Royal Commission into Police Corruption or the 2013 Commonwealth Royal Commission into the Institutional Responses into Child Abuse were willing to investigate the allegations resulting in Australia’s core public institutions being compromised.

- **The covert implementation of the Safe Schools Program** - According to the Daily Telegraph³² in September 2020, the NSW Department of Education were exposed in covertly implementing the Safe Schools Program (under the guise of the ‘Wear it Purple Day’) in NSW Public Schools without parental consent or knowledge after the NSW Government promised to end the program in 2017 after community outrage.

The Safe Schools Program teaches gender fluidity theory which includes providing children with instructions on *“penis tucking, chest binding and cross dressing.”*

- **Unbecoming behaviour in public office** – multiple high profile Australian politicians have been either found either guilty by an Australian court of public misconduct or have been forced to be to resigned for questionable conduct. Examples include:
 - Sussan Ley – As reported by news.com.au³³, the then Federal Health Minister Sussan Ley MP was forced to resign from the Federal Cabinet due to questionable expenses claims.
 - Sam Dastyari - As reported by the ABC³⁴, Former NSW Senator Sam Dastyari was forced in December 2017 to resign from the Australian Senate for:
 - contradicting ALP policy on the South China Sea;
 - informing a Chinese-Australian businessman that he was under surveillance by the intelligence services for links to the CCP;
 - having his office expenses paid by the same Chinese-Australian businessman.

³¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8YDTHKft9R4>

³² <https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/opinion/zombie-safe-schools-program-back-from-the-grave/news-story/bf9bbdff878d361b28f7d30e5d6faf9>

³³ <https://www.news.com.au/national/politics/sussan-ley-resigns-as-malcolm-turnbull-announces-new-watchdog-to-oversee-mp-expense-claims/news-story/8f718f6f7c1970c7dc179ad30ae11f6f>

³⁴ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-12-12/sam-dastyari-resigns-from-parliament/9247390>

- Craig Thompson - As reported by the ABC³⁵, Former Federal Member of Parliament Craig Thompson was found guilty of defrauding the Health Services Union and was sentenced to 12 months jail, with a 9-month suspended sentence.
- Eddie Obied - As reported by the ABC³⁶, former NSW Minister Eddie Obeid was sentenced in 2016 to jail for five years over a corruption scandal which found him guilty of misconduct in public office.
- **Exaggerated COVID-19 Public Health Risk Modelling** - In March 2020, the Doherty Institute released exaggerated modelling based on flawed modelling methodology and data suggesting that up to 150,000 Australians may die from COVID-19 if left unmitigated³⁷.

Academics experts such as UNSW Business School professor of economics Gigi Foster and ANU infectious diseases professor Peter Collignon confirmed that the modelling provided to the Australian Government was exaggerated.

- **Mismanagement of the COVID-19 Public Health Risk** – The management of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia was mismanaged (especially in Victoria) which generated severe economic and social distress. The lockdown policies implemented in Australia (especially Australia) were inconsistent with international best practice given that the World Health Organisation advocated that lockdowns were to be avoided given the costs outweighed the benefits.
- **Excessive Jail Sentences for Government Whistle-blowers** - As reported by the ABC³⁸, a whistle blower from the is potentially facing a jail sentence of 161 years for blowing the whistle of debt collection tactics deployed by the ATO, which are especially targeted at the Australian small business community.
- **Establishment of Secret Government Trials** – As reported by the ABC³⁹, the Australian Government established secret government trials for the so-called ‘Witness K’ and his legal counsel in order to avoid international embarrassment and liability for breaching international law during commercial negotiations with East Timor.
- **Lawyer X Scandal** – As reported by the Conversation⁴⁰, the Victorian Government engaged a criminal defence lawyer to be a government informant which violated client attorney privilege and undermines the Victorian legal system.
- **Mass Domestic Surveillance** – As reported by the BBC in 2015⁴¹, American Journalist Glenn Greenwald who reported on the Edward Snowden whistle blower saga (see below) revealed that Australia conducts one of the world's most aggressive mass surveillance programmes.

³⁵ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-03-25/craig-thomson-fraud-hsu-sentencing/5342428>

³⁶ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-12-15/eddie-obeid-sentenced-five-years-jail-misconduct-public-office/8122720>

³⁷ <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/thousands-of-predicted-covid-19-deaths-never-eventuated-was-it-poor-modelling-or-our-response-20200527-p54wsn.html>

³⁸ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-06-03/ato-whistleblower-facing-prison-says-he-almost-died-from-stress/11167954>

³⁹ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-06-21/can-secret-trials-be-held-like-witness-k-lawyer-bernard-collaery/12376546>

⁴⁰ <https://theconversation.com/the-lawyer-x-scandal-is-a-massive-blow-to-the-criminal-justice-system-heres-why-111342#:~:text=The%20Lawyer%20X%20scandal%20is%20a%20massive%20blow,%E2%80%93%20was%20only%20pretexting%20to%20work%20for%20you.>

⁴¹ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-33017638>

- **Illegal Police Raid of Journalist Home** – As reported by the Australian Financial Review⁴², the High Court of Australia unanimously found that the Australian Federal Police conducted an illegal raid of the home of Australian journalist Annika Smethurst.

International Public Scandals

International scandals which have undermined trust and confidence in mainstream institutions both in Australia and around the world includes:

- **Global Financial Crisis (GFC)** – the GFC which created tremendous economic and social harm across the world was caused by major Wall Street financial institutions through activities with sub-prime mortgages. No major financial institution or their executives were held to account by American or international regulators.
- **Banking Scandals** – since the GFC there have been multiple scandals within the banking and financial services industry including:
 - Cases of rigging of financial markets, including of key interest rates such as Libor (Europe)⁴³, Bank Bill Swap (Australia)⁴⁴ or the 'ISDAfix benchmark' (US, UK and Europe)⁴⁵.
 - Financial crisis in Cyprus leading to the forced conversion of bank deposits at the Bank of Cyprus into bank equity in 2012⁴⁶ (otherwise known as bail-in).
 - The admitted manipulation of the silver market by JP Morgan resulting in the payment of almost a \$US 1 billion fine⁴⁷.
- **Tax Havens** - the release of the Panama Papers in 2016 (Harding 2016) and Paradise Papers in 2017 (Garside 2017) revealed the extent to elite corporations and high net worth individuals utilise tax havens to avoid paying domestic taxes which are levied on ordinary citizens.
- **The protection, concealment and cover-up of paedophilia by the British and American elite** – including Lord Mountbatten⁴⁸, former British Prime Minister Ted Heath⁴⁹, BBC Presenter Jimmy

⁴² <https://www.afr.com/politics/afp-search-of-journalist-s-home-was-illegal-high-court-20200415-p54jxv>

⁴³ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2017/jan/18/libor-scandal-the-bankers-who-fixed-the-worlds-most-important-number>

⁴⁴ <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-12-13/anz-management-knew-of-bbsw-rigging/10600590>

⁴⁵ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-goldman-sachs-manipulation-idUSKBN14A1OT>

⁴⁶ <https://www.forbes.com/sites/nathanlewis/2013/05/03/the-cyprus-bank-bail-in-is-another-crony-bankster-scam/?sh=64202d822685>

⁴⁷ <https://www.cNBC.com/2020/09/29/jp-morgan-settles-spoofing-lawsuit-alleging-fraud-in-metals-trades.html>

⁴⁸ <https://www.news.com.au/entertainment/celebrity-life/royals/fbi-files-claim-lord-louis-mountbatten-had-a-perversion-for-young-boys/news-story/3647da9b3e938ae4aa5d0f3608639479>

⁴⁹ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/19/claims-sir-edward-heath-paedophile-120-per-cent-genuine-police/>

Saville⁵⁰, Jeffrey Epstein as well as the British Parliament (including cabinet), MI6, the police and the diplomatic service as reported by 60 Minutes Australia in 2015⁵¹.

- **British Grooming Gangs** – as reported by the UK Independent⁵², hundreds of innocent British young women and girls were subject to ongoing sexual assault by organised ethnic groups without effective policing or the administration of justice. In some instances, victims were punished by local police and perpetrators were allowed to walk free.
- **Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Iraq War** – as reported by the Chilcot Inquiry⁵³, the Iraq War was launched on fraudulent intelligence which exaggerated the security risk posed by Iraq and Saddam Hussein.
- **Destabilisation of Libya** – the 2011 NATO invasion of Libya⁵⁴ led to destabilisation of the country, multiple civilian atrocities and the expansion of the Islamic State⁵⁵.
- **Hillary Clinton E-mail Scandal** – As Secretary of State in the Obama Administration, Hillary Clinton used a private server to transmit both private and government information to parties which could not be viewed or recorded by US Government officials or IT systems. A portion of the information transmitted was classified US Government material which is criminal act under US federal law. Rather than complying with a subpoena from the US Congress to hand over approximately 33,000 e-mails which were recorded on the private server, Secretary of State Clinton and her aides deleted the e-mails and destroyed multiple election devices.

An FBI investigation into the matter concluded that no criminal charges could be brought against Clinton, even though other US Government officials have been jailed for similarly and illegally transmitted classified information. During an interview with FBI, Hillary Clinton was not put under oath⁵⁶ and no transcript of the interview was recorded⁵⁷.

- **Joe Biden/Hunter Biden Ukraine/China Corruption Scandals** - As reported by the New York post, a laptop owned by Hunter Biden (the son of current US President Joe Biden) contained detailed business records of the Biden family engaged in illegitimate international business arrangements with foreign government and companies in which President Biden received financial kickbacks.

⁵⁰ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/06/27/how-bbc-star-jimmy-savile-got-away-with-allegedly-abusing-500-children-and-sex-with-dead-bodies/>

⁵¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ngW5p9McZIQ&t=2405s>

⁵² <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/grooming-gangs-uk-britain-newcastle-serious-case-review-operation-sanctuary-shelter-muslim-asian-a8225106.html>

⁵³ <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/06/iraq-inquiry-key-points-from-the-chilcot-report>

⁵⁴ <https://theconversation.com/libya-ongoing-atrocities-reveal-the-trouble-with-international-military-intervention-119918>

⁵⁵ <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/islamic-states-expansion-libya>

⁵⁶ <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3679663/FBI-didn-t-Hillary-Clinton-oath-email-interview-no-recording-don-t-worry-s-normal.html>

⁵⁷ <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2020/01/10/years-later-more-illicit-hillary-clinton-emails-emerge/>

The business arrangements which included Joe Biden were confirmed by Hunter Biden's former business partner Tony Bobulinski⁵⁸.

- **Unconstitutional mass domestic surveillance in the United States** – Whistle blower Edward Snowden revealed a domestic mass surveillance program within the United States run by the National Security Agency (NSA) which is arguably unconstitutional and illegal⁵⁹. Snowden's revelations also exposed James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence who lied to the US congress about the mass surveillance program⁶⁰.
- **Operation Mockingbird** – Operation Mockingbird is a covert program by the Central Intelligence Agency which was revealed by American Journalist Carl Bernstein in a 1978 Rolling Stone publication⁶¹ in which Central Intelligence Agency either had a series of secret agreements with media organisations or individual journalists working for the agency in which either media companies or individual journalists would either publish or broadcast CIA talking points or narratives as legitimate news without revealing that the information was from the CIA.
- **President Trump and the Russia Collusion Hoax** – As reported by American Journalist John Solomon, via the online publication 'Just the News'⁶², the allegation that presidential candidate Donald Trump illegally colluded with the Russian Government in order to win the 2016 US election was fabricated by Hillary Clinton and her campaign in order to deflect attention away from the e-mail scandal (as outlined above).

The Russia Collusion Hoax which originated through the creation of a fake dossier was used to fraudulently obtain a surveillance warrant from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance court. Moreover, the dossier was leaked to the American media in order to start an anti-Trump public relations campaign which ultimately led to multiple congressional investigations and the appointment of a special counsel.

The Russia collusion investigation lasted 3 years, incurred costs running into the tens of millions of dollars and found no evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government.

Officials from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, the Central Intelligence Agency all knew as early as 2016 that the allegation of Trump-Russia collusion was invented as a political device.

- **The Tuskegee Study** – From 1932 to 1972, the United States Public Health Service conducted a non-therapeutic experiment involving over 400 black male sharecroppers infected with syphilis. The Tuskegee Study had nothing to do with treatment. Its purpose was to trace the spontaneous evolution of the disease in order to learn how syphilis affected black subjects⁶³.

⁵⁸ <https://nypost.com/2020/10/22/hunter-biden-ex-business-partner-told-dont-mention-joe-in-text/>

⁵⁹ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/09/edward-snowden-nsa-whistleblower-surveillance>

⁶⁰ <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2013/06/fire-dni-james-clapper-he-lied-to-congress-about-nsa-surveillance.html>

⁶¹ http://www.carlbernstein.com/magazine_cia_and_media.php

⁶² <https://justthenews.com/podcasts/john-solomon-reports/declassified-intel-shows-clinton-concocted-russia-collusion-hoax>

⁶³ <https://www.history.com/news/the-infamous-40-year-tuskegee-study>

In 1997, US President Clinton offered a formal apology to the victims of the Tuskegee Study on behalf of the US Government and established a compensation fund⁶⁴.

- **MK Ultra** – During the 1950s, the CIA initiated MK-ULTRA, which was a clandestine program to search for a mind control drug that could be weaponized against the enemies of the United States of America. As reported by American media outlet, National Public Radio (NPR)⁶⁵:

“Many of his unwitting subjects [who participated in MK Ultra] endured psychological torture ranging from electroshock to high doses of LSD.”

- **Operation Northwoods** – As reported by the American Broadcasting Corporation⁶⁶, Operation Northwoods was a formal military plan devised in the 1960s by the US Department of Defense which would have initiated series of false flag attacks killing innocent people and commit acts of terrorism in U.S. cities in order to create public support for a war against Cuba.
- **Israel’s Covert Immigrant Birth Control Program** – As reported by Israeli newspaper Haaretz in January 2013⁶⁷ and the Guardian in March 2013⁶⁸, thousands of Ethiopian Jewish women who immigrated to Israel were covertly injected with a birth control drug called Depo-Provera without the women’s knowledge or consent.
As reported by the Guardian:

“The phenomenon was uncovered when social workers noticed the birth rate among Ethiopian immigrants halving in a decade. An Israeli documentary investigating the scandal was aired in December and prompted a popular outcry.”

Implications

As detailed above, there are a long series of disturbing policy agendas, poor public policy outcomes and domestic and international scandals which provide Australians with legitimate grounds to mistrust Australian and international political, judicial and civil institutions.

In considering the factors for why extremism and radicalisation may be rising in Australia, this submission argues that the PJCS should focus on growing mistrust with mainstream institutions driven by poor public policy as well as domestic and international scandals as one of the primary reasons, if not the main reason.

⁶⁴ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/retropolis/wp/2017/05/16/youve-got-bad-blood-the-horror-of-the-tuskegee-syphilis-experiment/>

⁶⁵ <https://www.npr.org/2019/09/09/758989641/the-cias-secret-quest-for-mind-control-torture-isd-and-a-poisoner-in-chief>

⁶⁶ <https://abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=92662&page=1>

⁶⁷ <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-ethiopians-fooled-into-birth-control-1.5226424>

⁶⁸ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/feb/28/ethiopian-women-given-contraceptives-israel>

Recommendation 5

In order to rebuild trust and confidence with the Australian people, Australian policy makers across all levels of government should seek to:

- **abandon controversial policy agendas which do not solicit broad public support;**
- **address poor policy outcomes which are empirically observable and measurable; and**
- **issues arising from scandals which are within its purview.**

That is, policy makers should refocus themselves on doing the business of the Australian people.

Concern 4 – Factors contribution to extremism and radicalisation

The public policy grievances as outlined above as well as ongoing scandals have the potential to lead to radicalism and extremism if these grievances and scandals do not receive official acknowledgement and appropriate redress.

History demonstrates that extremist movements and radicalisation generally coincides with non-responsive political and judicial systems.

It is incumbent on executive governments, legislative and judicial bodies (including parliaments, legislative assemblies and councils) as well as civic institutions such as journalists and media companies to participate and engage with a broader cross-section of Australians that facilitates greater political inclusion which includes the discussion and debate of grievances felt by the Australian people.

While saying this, it is critical however that this inquiry acknowledge a range of factors which prevail in Australian which inhibit political engagement and may be contributing to the growth of domestic radicalism and extremism. These factors are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Factors that contribute to radicalism and extremism

No	Factors Contributing to Radicalism and Extremism	Description
1	Political Correctness	<p>The imposition of forced censorship through legal, economic or social pressure or self-censorship across Australia limiting the free exercise of thought, speech and the ability to assemble in order to avoid offense or disadvantage to members of particular groups in society.</p> <p>In the past decade, Australia has witnessed a widespread implementation of political correctness which has limited the ability of Australians to air and debate legitimate grievances resulting in significant sections of the Australian people disengaging from the political and democratic process and feeling disenfranchised.</p>
2	Doxing	<p>The exposing of individual Australian’s personal information who has expressed an opinion which is deemed unacceptable by other Australian individuals or organisations with a view to inflicting directly or indirectly physical, economic or social injury.</p> <p>Such information which may be released includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an individual’s legal name; - an individual’s residential address; - an individual’s place of employment; and - details about an individual’s children including where they attend school.
3	Deplatforming	<p>Deplatforming is a form of political activism or prior restraint by an individual, group, or organization with the goal of shutting down controversial speakers or speech, or denying them access to a venue in which to express their opinion.</p>
4	Financial costs accessing the Legal System	<p>The expensive cost of accessing legal services to seek appropriate redress may inhibit the settlement of grievances which individual Australians or Australian organisations may have.</p>
5	Coordinated attempts to restrict the dissemination of information	<p>Commonwealth or state/territory laws or coordination with media or social media platforms (such as YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, etc) to either limit the dissemination or prohibit topics of discussion.</p>

No	Factors Contributing to Radicalism and Extremism	Description
6	Ignorance of Parliamentary and Judicial Processes	A general lack of understanding of how Australian legislative bodies and governments operate means that many Australians with legitimate political and public policy grievances are unaware of how to effectively engage in the political and democratic process to influence public policy and the legislative agenda.
7	Pace and scale of the legislative agenda of Federal and State Parliaments/Legislative Assemblies	The ferocious volume and pace in which new laws which are proposed and enacted by legislative bodies across Australia at the federal and state/territory levels means that Australian citizens are overwhelmed and are not able: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comprehend the full ramifications of all proposed legislation; or - fully engaged in the legislative process given a lack of time and resources.
8	Psychological, Information and/or Cyber Warfare	Orchestrated information or cyber campaigns either by public or private sector institutions/organisations which are deliberately designed to purposely mislead or to manipulate the psychology of large sections of individuals either about specific: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - events; - high-profile individuals; - countries; - companies; and - philosophies or ideas.

This submission argues that policy makers should acknowledge the factors outlined in Table 2 and take active steps to address them which would in turn facilitate more greater public political discourse and political participation leading to a civil (non-violent) resolution of grievances through peaceful engagement with political and civil institutions.

Recommendation 6

The PJCIS should recommend to the Federal Parliament a series of active steps that encourages open dialogue across the Australian community and participation with Australia's political system so that those Australians who have political and public policy grievances feel comfortable to air those grievances.

Concern 5 – Embracing Simple Band-Aid Solutions

This submission is deeply concerned that the PJCIS, the Morrison Government, Australian Government agencies (such as ASIO and the AFP) and the Federal Parliament will seek to adopt a series of band-aid public policy solutions to address behaviour which is subjectively defined as extremist or radical, such as:

- introducing additional criminal laws which increases the power of the Australian Government;
- increasing government surveillance via ASIO which can be expanded by including more groups on the so-called terrorist list;
- reducing the free speech of Australians by cracking down on the ability to communicate on social media; and
- increasing government spending on de-radicalisation programs.

This submission is also concerned that the PJCIS will not investigate the root causes fuelling extremism and radicalisation which this submission argues is in large part due to a decline in trust and confidence in Australian institutions.

Moreover, this submission is concerned that policy makers who not take appropriate responsibility to address worsening public policy outcomes or abandon policy agendas which are many Australians find trivial, disturbing and not consistent with mainstream Australians values.

Finally, the submission is concerned that the PJCIS will not recognise long-established rights, conventions and traditions dating back centuries throughout English history which grants Australians an inherent right to lawful rebellion or revolution in instances where government tyranny becomes excessively oppressive.

Ultimately, this submission argues that the most effective solution for reducing extremism and radicalisation in Australia is for policy makers across all three levels of government to re-establish trust and confidence among the Australia people in Australian institutions by:

- effectively addressing existing empirical measurable public policy failings;
- abandoning policy initiatives and agendas seek to distort economic outcomes, reduce personal liberty or that seeks to pervert existing social and cultural norms; and
- effectively addressing with public corruption and behavioural failings of public officials.

Recommendation 6

The PJCIS should avoid embracing knee-jerk band-aid solutions to any rising threat of extremism and radicalisation such as:

- **introducing new criminal laws,**
- **increasing government surveillance;**
- **reducing free speech on social media platforms; or**
- **commitment additional public resources to government programs.**

Rather, the PJCIS and policy makers should commit to addressing the root causes that fuel extremism and radicalisation. This includes arresting the decline in trust and confidence in Australia’s political, judicial and civic institutions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this submission makes the following points to the PJCS:

Definitions

- Federal policy makers should avoid the use of vague or subjective terms when defining extremist or radical narratives, ideologies or groups such as 'right-wing' or 'left-wing'.

Interfering in Domestic Political Disputes

- Government Intelligence and law enforcement agencies should avoid using public resources to unduly influence or interfere in domestic non-conformist or anti-establishment political discourses that do not pose an immediate threat to public safety.

Jefferson Doctrine

- Under current Australian Commonwealth law, the author of the US Declaration of Independence and the USA's 3rd President Thomas Jefferson would be classified as a 'right-wing or far right extremist'. This is a position which is neither consistent with the beliefs of the Australian people or of Australia's primary strategic diplomatic partner, the USA.
- Australian Commonwealth law in its current form casts a negative judgement on the 'Jefferson Doctrine' – i.e., that Australians have no rights under any circumstance to engage in sedition, rebellion or revolution even in the most extreme circumstances as a last resort once political, civic and judicial avenues have been exhausted.
- The evolution of the political, judicial and civic institutions of the UK, USA and Australia have been built on the implementation of the 'Jefferson Doctrine' over the past 800 years.
- While Australia's constitutional democratic system and institutions have reached a state of maturity relative to prevailing circumstances of previous centuries, circumstances may still arise in the 21st Century and beyond that result in possible legitimate situations where Australians (independent of foreign interference) may find necessary the need to discuss, organise or perform seditious, rebellious or revolutionary acts consistent with the 'Jefferson Doctrine'.

Trust and Confidence in Australian Institutions

- The observed growth as identified by ASIO and other non-governmental organisations of 'far right or right-wing extremism' coincides with a collapse in trust and confidence in important Australian institutions such as parliament, political parties, the media, big business and unions.
- The collapse in trust and confidence in political, judicial and civic institutions have been observed in both Australia as well as throughout the OECD.
- The collapse in trust and confidence can be explained in part from a rapidly growing number of domestic and international scandals.
- Moreover, worsening public policy outcomes and a disturbing trend in the evolution of Australian public policy continue to fuel concerns, grievances and distrust among large sections of the Australian people.

- A lack of recognition by policy makers of the collapse in trust and the factors which are fuelling this collapse is only likely to fuel further resentment among large sections of the Australian people and to drive this resentment underground.
- Multiple factors exist in Australia which are inhibiting the full participation of Australians in the democratic process which may allow citizen grievances and concerns to be resolved through non-violence means.
- Illiberal techniques such as political correctness, doxing and de-platforming prevent civil discourse and the opportunity for different sections of the Australian community to persuade others of their own perspectives or to form consensuses.

Doing the Business of the Australian People

- Introducing new federal laws, expanding domestic surveillance via ASIO or committing additional federal resources to new programs will not arrest the underlining problem which is fuelling extremist or radical tendencies among the Australian people.
- Rather policy makers at all levels of government in Australia must:
 - make a genuine attempt to restore trust and confidence in Australian institutions;
 - address the legitimate public policy grievances of the Australian people; and
 - take steps which encourage and facilitate greater participation of the Australian people in parliamentary, civic and judicial processes.
- Implementing band aid solutions and a failure to act by Australian policy makers at all levels will ultimately lead to greater fragmentation of Australian society and fuel further extremism and radicalisation.

Final Note

I would like to thank the PJCS in considering this submission and the issues raised above. I would be happy to provide further information either in writing or verbally through public testimony to help the committee in its deliberations.

Yours Sincerely,

John Adams

Legal Definitions and the Activities of Commonwealth Government Agencies relating to Extremism and Radicalisation

Legal Definitions

When considering extremist movements and radicalism in Australia, it is important to survey the current landscape of Commonwealth law as a starting point to determine what the Parliament of Australia (the Federal Parliament) has defined as extreme or radical conduct.

At Commonwealth law, conduct which may be deemed ‘extreme’ or ‘radical’ conduct is defined in two main pieces of legislation which are the:

- *Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979*; and
- *Criminal Code Act 1995*.

The former legislation provides a legal basis for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) to engage in surveillance of extreme or radical behaviour, while the latter legislation provides the Australian Federal Police as the Commonwealth’s primary law enforcement agency to investigate and prosecute acts of illegal behaviour.

This submission wishes to highlight several critical legal definitions contained within these two pieces of legislation as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Commonwealth Legal Definitions Relevant to Extremism and Radicalism

No	Legislation Section and Title	Description
1	Section 4 of the <i>Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979</i>	<p>security means:</p> <p>(a) the protection of, and of the people of, the Commonwealth and the several States and Territories from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) espionage; (ii) sabotage; (iii) politically motivated violence; (iv) promotion of communal violence; (v) attacks on Australia’s defence system; or (vi) acts of foreign interference; <p>whether directed from, or committed within, Australia or not;</p>
2		<p>promotion of communal violence means:</p> <p>activities that are directed to promoting violence between different groups of persons in the Australian community so as to endanger the peace, order or good government of the Commonwealth.</p>
3		<p>politically motivated violence means:</p> <p>(a) acts or threats of violence or unlawful harm that are intended or likely to achieve a political objective, whether in Australia or elsewhere, including acts or threats carried on for the purpose of influencing the policy or acts of a government, whether in Australia or elsewhere; or</p>

No	Legislation Section and Title	Description
3	Section 4 of the <i>Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979</i>	<p>(b) acts that:</p> <p>(i) involve violence or are intended or are likely to involve or lead to violence (whether by the persons who carry on those acts or by other persons); and</p> <p>(ii) are directed to overthrowing or destroying, or assisting in the overthrow or destruction of, the government or Authorised Version C2019C00240 registered 19/08/2019 Preliminary Part I Section 4 Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979 7 Compilation No. 61 Compilation date: 13/8/19 Registered: 19/8/19 the constitutional system of government of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory; or (ba) acts that are terrorism offences; or</p> <p>(c) acts that are offences punishable under Division 119 of the Criminal Code, the Crimes (Hostages) Act 1989 or Division 1 of Part 2, or Part 3, of the Crimes (Ships and Fixed Platforms) Act 1992 or under Division 1 or 4 of Part 2 of the Crimes (Aviation) Act 1991; or</p> <p>(d) acts that: (i) are offences punishable under the Crimes (Internationally Protected Persons) Act 1976; or (ii) threaten or endanger any person or class of persons specified by the Minister for the purposes of this subparagraph by notice in writing given to the Director-General.</p>
4	Division 80.1 of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Treason</p> <p>(1) A person commits an offence if the person:</p> <p>(a) causes the death of the Sovereign, the heir apparent of the Sovereign, the consort of the Sovereign, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister; or</p> <p>(b) causes harm to the Sovereign, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister resulting in the death of the Sovereign, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister; or</p> <p>(c) causes harm to the Sovereign, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister, or imprisons or restrains the Sovereign, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister; or</p> <p>(d) levies war, or does any act preparatory to levying war, against the Commonwealth; or</p> <p>(g) instigates a person who is not an Australian citizen to make an armed invasion of the Commonwealth or a Territory of the Commonwealth.</p> <p>(2) A person commits an offence if the person:</p> <p>(a) receives or assists another person who, to his or her knowledge, has committed an offence against this Subdivision (other than this subsection) with the intention of allowing him or her to escape punishment or apprehension; or</p> <p>(b) knowing that another person intends to commit an offence against this Subdivision (other than this subsection), does not inform a constable of it within a reasonable time or use other reasonable endeavours to prevent the commission of the offence.</p>

No	Legislation Section and Title	Description
5	Division 80.1AA of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Assisting enemy to engage in armed conflict</p> <p>(1) A person commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) a party (the enemy) is engaged in armed conflict involving the Commonwealth or the Australian Defence Force; and</p> <p>(b) the enemy is declared in a Proclamation made under section 80.1AB; and</p> <p>(c) the person engages in conduct; and</p> <p>(d) the person intends that the conduct will materially assist the enemy to engage in armed conflict involving the Commonwealth or the Australian Defence Force; and</p> <p>(e) the conduct materially assists the enemy to engage in armed conflict involving the Commonwealth or the Australian Defence Force; and</p> <p>(f) at the time the person engages in the conduct:</p> <p>(i) the person knows that the person is an Australian citizen or a resident of Australia; or</p> <p>(ii) the person knows that the person has voluntarily put himself or herself under the protection of the Commonwealth; or</p> <p>(iii) the person is a body corporate incorporated by or under a law of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory.</p>
6	Division 80.1AC of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Treachery</p> <p>A person commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) the person engages in conduct; and</p> <p>(b) the conduct involves the use of force or violence; and</p> <p>(c) the person engages in the conduct with the intention of overthrowing:</p> <p>(i) the Constitution; or</p> <p>(ii) the Government of the Commonwealth, of a State or of a Territory; or</p> <p>(iii) the lawful authority of the Government of the Commonwealth.</p>
7	Division 80.2 of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Urging the overthrow of the Constitution or Government by force or violence</p> <p>A person (the first person) commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) the first person intentionally urges another person to overthrow by force or violence:</p> <p>(i) the Constitution; or</p> <p>(ii) the Government of the Commonwealth, of a State or of a Territory; or</p> <p>(iii) the lawful authority of the Government of the Commonwealth; and</p> <p>(b) the first person does so intending that force or violence will occur.</p>

No	Legislation Section and Title	Description
8	Division 80.2 of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Urging violence against groups</p> <p>Offences</p> <p>(1) A person (the first person) commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) the first person intentionally urges another person, or a group, to use force or violence against a group (the targeted group); and</p> <p>(b) the first person does so intending that force or violence will occur; and</p> <p>(c) the targeted group is distinguished by race, religion, nationality, national or ethnic origin or political opinion; and</p> <p>(d) the use of the force or violence would threaten the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth.</p>
9	Division 80.2B of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Urging violence against members of groups</p> <p>Offences</p> <p>(1) A person (the first person) commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) the first person intentionally urges another person, or a group, to use force or violence against a person (the targeted person); and</p> <p>(b) the first person does so intending that force or violence will occur; and</p> <p>(c) the first person does so because of his or her belief that the targeted person is a member of a group (the targeted group); and</p> <p>(d) the targeted group is distinguished by race, religion, nationality, national or ethnic origin or political opinion; and</p> <p>(e) the use of the force or violence would threaten the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth.</p>
10	Division 83.4 of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i>	<p>Interference with political rights and duties</p> <p>A person commits an offence if:</p> <p>(a) the person engages in conduct; and</p> <p>(b) the conduct involves the use of force or violence, or intimidation, or the making of threats of any kind; and</p> <p>(c) the conduct results in interference with the exercise or performance, in Australia by any other person, of an Australian democratic or political right or duty; and</p> <p>(d) the right or duty arises under the Constitution or a law of the Commonwealth.</p>

Activities of Commonwealth Government Agencies

According to publicly available information, there are three primary Commonwealth agencies which are responsible for addressing radicalism and extremism. These agencies and their primary responsibilities are outlined in Table 2 below.

Table 2: The Responsibilities of Commonwealth Agencies Relevant to Extremism and Radicalism

No	Commonwealth Agency	Responsibility
1	ASIO	ASIO investigates and responds to threats to 'security' as defined by the <i>Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979</i> (see Table 1 above). ASIO also maintains a national counter-terrorism intelligence capability.
2	AFP	Investigates alleged breaches of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1995</i> as it relates to extremism and radicalism (see Table 1 above) and issues charges where breaches of law can be established. The AFP then refers charges to the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecution which determines whether prosecutions will proceed through the judicial process.
3	Department of Home Affairs	The Department of Home Affairs is responsible for managing and implementing the Morrison Government's Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) strategy through the Centre for Counter-Terrorism Coordination (CCTC) which is located within the Department. The CCTC coordinates the delivery of relevant programs under this strategy including the 'Living Safe Together Program' and the 'Fostering Integration' program.

Australia's CVE Strategy and Implementation Framework

To deal with threats to public order resulting from extremism and radicalism, the Commonwealth Government has developed and implemented a CVE strategy and framework⁶⁹ that has also been deployed by state and territory governments. The CVE strategy is built up on four foundational elements:

1. building strength in diversity and social participation
2. targeted work with vulnerable communities and institutions
3. addressing terrorist propaganda online
4. diversion and deradicalisation

According to Senate Estimates testimony by Mr Paul Grigson, Deputy Secretary, Social Cohesion and Citizenship, Department of Home Affairs to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee on 19 October 2020, the Commonwealth have spent \$AUD 61 million since FY13-14 on multiple initiatives under the CVE. This includes the 'Living Safe Together Program' (LSTP) which was established by the Abbott Government in FY14-15 as part of the Attorney-General's Department with an initial rollout of 42 projects.

The LSTP is the primary vehicle in which the Australian Government seeks to prevent radicalisation and deradicalize those who have fallen prey to radicalisation.

In 2016, the LSTP was subject to a performance audit by the Australian National Audit Office which examined the grants administration process in distributing the grant funds. The LSTP is now administrated by the Department of Home Affairs.

⁶⁹ [https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about-us/our-portfolios/national-security/countering-extremism-and-terrorism/countering-violent-extremism-\(cve\)](https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about-us/our-portfolios/national-security/countering-extremism-and-terrorism/countering-violent-extremism-(cve))