

Subject: Provisions of the Anti-Terrorism (No.2) Bill 2005 (Submission)

To: The Chair of the Committee regarding the Inquiry into the Provisions of the Anti-Terrorism (No.2) Bill 2005.

From: Mister Robert Pembroke.
Inala

Re: The Scope of New Anti-Terror Law(s) .(Confidential)

Dear Sir,

I have been following the focus of the Prime Minister and Cabinet on the new terror laws in recent weeks. I firmly believe that these laws are necessary, though I am unsure as to whether they go far enough in dealing with future threats. My concerns revolve around the possibility that planners of terrorist activities are not properly accounted for in the bill. For many years now, science students at Australian universities have been equipped with knowledges that promote what I suppose one would call 'good science' (.i.e., science designed to promote the development of mankind). Unfortunately, in the process of designing courses to deliver skills based scientists to the community, our universities are also unintentionally teaching volatile young people how to manufacture devices that could be used in a terrorist attack. The plain truth is that a 'dirty bomb' or 'small crude nuclear device' is well within the abilities of most science students with a knowledge in physics and chemistry. Most people are aware that these knowledges can be acquired through what is known as 'indirect reference'. For example, if I were to say to you that all cats are white except one, what is its' colour? Most people would say black. The brains ability to jump to this answer occurs by way of an 'indirect reference' (in this case our knowledge that the opposite of white is black). Using a similar mechanism to the one I have mentioned, a human brain exposed to indirect references (implicit to the discipline of science), will ultimately provide an idle mind with the nous to entertain such insane plans as the construction of a deadly weapon. For this reason, I believe that the new terror laws have to be made in such a way that they focus on those people who provide the groundwork for the acquisition of bad science (.i.e., bomb making etc.,). If we wish to stop a dirty bomb going off in one of our cities, then university academics must be made to tow the line when it comes to the delivery of curricula (.i.e., education etc.,). In addition, universities should only employ people of impeccable character or all is lost. The present system of networking (.i.e., patronage) promoted in Australian universities may provide a good footing for those wishing a career in the university system but, it also opens the way for the inclusion of fools in our education system who are only concerned with the number of pennies in their pocket. Many are foreign born and so their allegiances are elsewhere. I do not believe that I can explain it any more clearly than I have already done in this letter. So there is no need to contact me any further.

Regards,

Robert Pembroke.

7/11/2005