

The Secretary
Joint Standing Committee on Treaties
Parliament House
Canberra, ACT 2600



13 February 2001

Ref: International Criminal Court Treaty

Submission No. 108.....

Dear Secretary,

I have just discovered, via an Opinion article in today's The Sydney Morning Herald by one Helen Brady - identified as an Australian Government delegate to the negotiations for the ICC - that your committee "resumes its public hearings on the issue today".

I don't know how I missed that that activity was taking place. I have a particular interest in this subject, and try to keep an eye on the public notices of such events. However, here's my two cents' worth.

I have deep concerns about this treaty. On the surface it appears all motherhood and apple pie. How could a reasonably intelligent and sensitive person not be for it; right? But on closer look, it is a trap, in the (continual) eroding of national sovereignty going on. Consider:

* "The ICC is designed to ensure the prosecution, before a permanent international tribunal, of the perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes...The crimes are tightly defined" - not. For example, it would not be long before Australia would be hauled before it for its alleged mistreatment of its Aborigines, which treatment some - including in this country - have already labeled "genocide".

These things are in the eye of the beholder. Australia should not be granting power over its citizens, or its government, to an unelected and unaccountable body - whose parent organisation has, through one of its self-important bodies, already accused this country of being "a serious violator of human rights". On the order, say, of China and Cuba?? The hell you say. This is our business, and we will deal with it - as befits a democracy, operating under the rule of law of a constitution.

These socialists trying to rule the world from the top down (as befits their socio-political ideology) can take their International Kangaroo Court and stuff it up their pouches.

* The ICC treaty fails to provide basic protections that Western democratic systems take for granted. For example, the treaty does not provide for trial by a jury of one's peers, a speedy and public trial, or the right to confront one's accusers.

The ICC would, in effect, be its own prosecutor, court, jury, and appeal body - a concentration of power that ensures disregard for individual rights.

I could go on. But let me cut to the chase, and call a spade a spade:

The real intent of this international court is to grease the way into a system of global governance, wherein and whereby national governments are by-passed, in favour of an unelected, unaccountable, and arrogant elite who want to rule the world. Thanks, no thanks. Off their record so far, I for one wouldn't trust them with such power over me as they are busily weaving.

It's of a piece with the World Trade Organisation, which subject your committee has just held - and admirably so - public hearings over. I distrust the WTO. I distrust the ICC. Please keep a people's guardian's/parliamentarian close eye on these treaties, and others, which are trying to supercede the nation-state, and place us all under the ostensibly benevolent thumb of as dangerous a tyrant as has ever walked the earth - and more so, for being so close now to total power over the people, with nowhere left to escape to. And thus the end of liberty, and the principle of people living out their lives as free moral agents, capable of growth and the development of virtue. Not stunted forever into perpetual adolescence, as creatures merely of the almighty state.

Do your job. Stand for Australia, in an interdependent world of nation-states, each with its own elected sovereignty over its people. It's called democracy. It may not always be pretty. But - to paraphrase Winston Churchill - it's the best we've got.

It sure beats totalitarianism all to hell.

Yours sincerely,



Stan Stanfield
958 Barrenjoey Rd.
Palm Beach, NSW 2108

