



## Five Eyes plan global police state

By Elisa Barwick

20 Aug.—At the end of August representatives of the Five Eyes intelligence alliance—the USA, UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia—will meet in Sydney. Not much is known about the upcoming summit and may not be even after it occurs, but fortunately—at least for the purpose of understanding what the top-secret alliance is planning—Australia’s Home Affairs Secretary Michael Pezzullo is a bit of a windbag. Pezzullo has asserted that “trail-blazing” initiatives would emerge from the consultations, and in a number of speeches has foreshadowed a new era of globalisation in the realm of security.

In a 26 June parliamentary speech about the Turnbull government’s foreign interference bills, MP and Iraq WMD whistleblower Andrew Wilkie said, “I will go so far as to say that Australia is a pre police state”. The *National Security Legislation Amendment (Espionage and Foreign Interference) Act 2018*, which passed the federal parliament on 28 June, established an unprecedented state-secrecy regime smothering freedom of speech, association and political communication, in the name of curbing so-called foreign influence. (“Resistance builds to Turnbull’s totalitarian ‘national security’ laws”, AAS 7 Feb.; “Officials warn ‘foreign influence’ laws undermine parliamentary privilege”, AAS 4 April.) London’s *Financial Times* revealed on 27 June, in “Australia leads ‘Five Eyes’ charge against foreign interference”, that the push for foreign interference laws was occurring under the Five Eyes umbrella. All Five Eyes members, bar New Zealand—whose ongoing membership the article queried—are implementing measures ostensibly to prevent hostile foreign powers, a.k.a. Russia and China, manipulating elections or policies. In reality the Anglo-American financial establishment behind the Five Eyes is trying to prevent Western collaboration with nations seeking to establish a new fair and just economic and security architecture based on peaceful collaboration for development.

### Security overhaul

According to Pezzullo’s pontifications, what is being planned is far worse than Wilkie foreshadowed—*global police state laws* dictated by the Five Eyes. The new scheme has emerged following the dramatic shakeup of Australia’s security framework which began with last year’s review of the Australian Intelligence Community, and which effectively puts Five Eyes in charge of domestic security. The Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) and Australian Secret Intelligence Service (ASIS) have always functionally been branches of their British counterparts MI5 and MI6, but Pezzullo now heads a super-ministry, modelled on the UK Home Office. The new Department of Home Affairs was created to oversee operations, strategic planning and coordination of the response to security threats, as conducted by ASIO, the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Border Force, the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC) and the Office of Transport Security—agencies which currently operate under the purview of a number of ministerial portfolios. Pezzullo had pushed for such a super-ministry since he was Opposition Leader Kim Beazley’s deputy chief of staff in 2001; he pushed it as Secretary of the Department of Im-



Home Affairs Secretary Michael Pezzullo testifying at a Senate hearing. Photo: Screenshot

migration and Border Protection under the Abbott government, which considered such a move; and when the Turnbull government adopted it in December 2017, Pezzullo scored the top job under Minister Peter Dutton.

In addition, a new Office of National Intelligence is to be established, likely taking over the operations of peak intelligence body the Office of National Assessments, but assuming a broader role coordinating and directing Australia’s five spy agencies—ASIO, ASIS, the Defence Intelligence Organisation (DIO), Australian Geospatial-Intelligence Organisation (AGO) and Australian Signals Directorate (ASD). The independent statutory body will operate within the Prime Minister’s portfolio and report directly to the PM.

The bill to establish the Office of National Intelligence was introduced into the House of Representatives on 28 June following examination by two parliamentary committees. When Turnbull announced the Office on 18 July 2017, he stressed that all other Five Eyes partners have a “single point of coordination” for intelligence, and that “Australia doing the same will ensure even better collaboration with our Five Eyes partners”. At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in London on 19-20 April, Turnbull signed Australia up to a new cyber security pact forged by the 53 member nations, extending the collaborative relationship between the Five Eyes spy alliance (four of which are Commonwealth countries) into a broader network. On the sidelines of the meeting, Australia and the UK signed up to a new joint strategy to work together at the operational level to target cyber crime, piloting “new tactics, techniques and capabilities” and coordinating “global responses” to attacks.

### Pezzullo reveals all

Delivering the keynote address at the International Summit on Borders in Washington, DC on 19 June, “Rethinking the Security Role of the State in a Complex and Connected World”, Mr Pezzullo demanded that security mechanisms keep up with the advance of globalisation. Along with its benefits, he observed, globalisation has also brought a “dark side” as criminal networks and terrorists take advantage of global connectivity and less rigid borders, typified by cyberspace.

Pezzullo noted that the Five Eyes grouping has taken up the need for transnational collaboration on domestic security and law enforcement. “[F]or decades these issues were

seen as matters to be dealt with ‘within jurisdiction’, ... this is no longer the view held by the Five Eyes partners, ... the meeting in Australia in August will be a trail-blazing one in terms of significantly advancing transnational security collaboration across a broad range of functional problems and mission areas.”

Calling for the integration of “all of our tools of national power, including the cloak and the dagger, the data scientist and the detective, the border officer and the diplomat”, Pezzullo spelt out how we must rethink the function and structures of government itself. While “we tended to think of the state as possessing ‘majestic power’” following the rise of the modern nation-state in Europe in the 17th century, with today’s erosion of sovereignty “nothing less than the transformation of the state itself will be required. Still under the rule of law, and consistent with our fundamental constitutional arrangements, the state will in future need to become at times less visible, more deeply embedded in sectors and vectors, and ever-vigilant. We will have to reorganise how government works in order to achieve this and we will have to factor in a transnational model of security.”

In a subsequent, 17 July speech to the 4th Australian Security Summit in Canberra, Pezzullo elaborated on the envisioned new global security architecture: “Ironically—and somewhat paradoxically—in the networked and connected world that I have described, *unity of command, clarity of authority, and singularity of purpose* need to be hardwired into our security architecture lest our agility and flexibility to respond be compromised. [Emphasis added.] We certainly need to *re-think the paradigm that domestic security and law enforcement can be exclusively executed within national jurisdictions*. [Emphasis in original.] This is, of course, the

prevailing paradigm—and understandably so in a world of nation states; the world that emerged in that same 17th century after the Peace of Westphalia.”

New “values, norms and legal constructs” are required, he said, to fill regulatory and compliance gaps created by the globalised world, which is outpacing national laws and rules. The argument is that criminal syndicates can “operate in the gaps and seams created through those jurisdictional boundaries” of traditional, national jurisdictions, i.e. sovereign nations. New models of decision-making are required, incorporating sophisticated data models, analytics, powerful computational capabilities, and even artificial intelligence, to accurately assess risk and secure borders, vital infrastructure and the integrity of elections.

Given the history of the Five Eyes network, transparency on exactly what this will mean shall definitely not be forthcoming. Only a survey of existing police-state laws in Australia and the UK provides an indication of the direction that will be taken. (The latest proposals before the UK parliament have been denounced by former MI5 officer Annie Machon as “a potentially dangerous blueprint for a techno-Stasi state”, AAS 27 June.) Originally set up by Britain in 1946 as the UKUSA Agreement, to leverage its influence over the United States after World War II, the existence of the broader Five Eyes alliance was unacknowledged for thirty years. Even thereafter it did not gain wide public attention until 2013, when documents released by Edward Snowden revealed the group’s extensive monitoring of each other’s citizens to get around domestic surveillance laws. US National Security Agency (NSA) whistleblower Thomas Drake called the Five Eyes and its extensions “a hidden empire”. Is this the institution we want in charge of our “security”?

## Turnbull: Assange broke no Australian law

In a 31 July article for *Consortium News*, Virginia State Senator Richard Black urged a sovereign state to step forward and offer WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange asylum.

Black argued that “Government ‘of the People’ cannot flourish beneath a suffocating cloak of secrecy. And secrecy is often aimed, not at protecting us from enemies abroad, but at deceiving us about the dark machinations of our own government. ...

“Before Assange, those who ‘broke the code’ and detected the Deep State’s patterns of misbehaviour were labelled ‘conspiracy theorists’ or worse.” Black points out that Assange’s information, with the advent of WikiLeaks, produced “original, unchallenged source documents that have proven our arguments, and revealed the truth to citizens”.

Since the election of US President Donald Trump, which “sent shock waves through the Deep State”, there is a new, more intense “coordinated effort to reimpose information control”, said Black. In that context Assange’s life may even be at risk, he continued, as “Julian Assange and WikiLeaks are among the censors’ prized targets”.

“I realise that Julian Assange is controversial”, Black concluded, “but I’d be pleased if some courageous nation granted him permanent asylum. Let him continue giving citizens an honest peek at the inner workings of their governments. That seems to be our best hope for peace.”

It is a no-brainer that as Assange is an Australian citizen, Australia should be that country, and our Prime Minister has more reason than most to consider it. Former senior MI5 officer Peter Wright, whose book *Spycatcher* breached the UK’s *Official Secrets Act*, was defended in his late 1980s court case by then up-and-coming lawyer Mal-

colm Turnbull. Wright’s right to publish his book in Australia was upheld, a victory for free speech. Sky News *Outsiders* program host and former Liberal MP Ross Cameron revealed on 16 August an audio clip of then Shadow Minister for Communications reflecting on this case, and on Assange’s plight, in front of some of the country’s most eminent lawyers at the Sydney University Law School on 31 March 2011. Turnbull said:

“The High Court was very clear in declaring that an Australian Court should not act to protect the intelligence secrets and confidential political information of a foreign government, even one which was a very friendly one, and even in circumstances where the Australian government requested the court to do so. Now I stress this point because it has a current relevance to the case of Julian Assange, who you will remember, our Prime Minister Julia Gillard described as someone who had broken the law—acted illegally by publishing the contents of confidential US State Department cables.

“Not only was it perfectly obvious that Mr Assange had broken no Australian law—and despite the strenuous effort of the Americans there is no evidence that he has broken any American ones—but the decision of the High Court in *Spycatcher* makes it quite clear than any action in an Australian court to restrain Mr Assange from publishing the state department cables would have failed. These remarks by the Prime Minister, which were echoed by her Attorney General, are particularly regrettable, not simply because she was so obviously in error from a legal point of view, but whatever one may think of Mr Assange, whatever Julia Gillard may think of Mr Assange, he is after all an Australian citizen.”



## Facebook—thought-police for the War Party

Special to the AAS

On 31 July the social media company Facebook shut down 32 accounts on its platform, for being “bad actors” engaging in “coordinated inauthentic behaviour”. The company’s chief cybersecurity officer admitted that “we still don’t have firm evidence to say with certainty who’s behind this effort”, but he dropped a loud hint about Russian election meddling: “Some of the activity is consistent with what we saw from the IRA before and after the 2016 elections.” IRA stands for the Internet Research Agency, the alleged “troll factory” in St. Petersburg, Russia, some of whose staff were indicted last February by Russiagate Special Counsel Robert Mueller for interfering in the 2016 US Presidential election through ads and comments from fake internet personas.

Facebook revealed that they were helped to “analyse and identify” the new online activity by the Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Research Lab (DFRL). The Atlantic Council is a Washington, DC-headquartered think tank that serves as the de facto lobbyist for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). It has been in the forefront of campaigns to provoke conflict with Russia. Its largest contributor is the British government.

Thus Facebook Chairman and CEO Mark Zuckerberg has turned the company he founded while a student at Harvard into a tool of the Anglo-American Party of War. As of contracting a formal partnership last May between Facebook and the Atlantic Council, Zuckerberg and his colleagues have given the highly biased Atlantic Council the power to apply its political judgments and its algorithms, to decide which speech on Facebook comes from “bad actors” and should be silenced.

Facebook had already come under criticism for compiling and commercially sharing personal data on its more than one billion subscribers. In March of this year, the *New York Times* revealed that the British consulting company Cambridge Analytica had accessed personal data on at least 50 million American voters from Facebook; and had provided the data to the Ted Cruz and Donald Trump presidential campaigns.

While the *New York Times* scandal played into allegations of illegal campaign operations by the Trump campaign, more fundamentally it shed light on Facebook’s fast and loose handling of its subscribers’ personal data. Cambridge Analytica had accessed a total of 87 million Facebook profiles by simply hiring a Cambridge University researcher, Aleksandr Kogan, to claim he was seeking the data for “academic research”.

There was no hack, Facebook admitted; rather, Kogan had been given access to the massive database of personal profiles simply on basis of his “academic” request. Facebook officials, including Zuckerberg, chief operating officer Sheryl Sandberg, and the cybersecurity director, Nathaniel Gleicher, acknowledged that they first became aware of the data breach by Cambridge Analytica in 2015, but took no serious action until the *Times* story appeared.

On 10-11 April 2018, Zuckerberg was grilled in US Senate and House of Representatives hearings about both the Cambridge Analytica breach and Facebook’s alleged failure to detect Russian election interference in 2016.

### Anti-Russia campaign

The allegations of Russian hacking and other interference in the 2016 election have been used by Democrats to



Who is exacerbating divisions among Americans? The Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Research Lab is encouraging people to help track trolls. Photo: Screenshot medium.com/dfrlab

claim that Trump “stole” the election from Hillary Clinton. In the version of events peddled by many Clinton supporters, it was “Russian” fake Facebook ads and the “Russian” exposure through WikiLeaks of Clinton’s cosiness with Wall Street and various dirty tricks by her campaign (none of this denied by Clinton), that turned voters in key states against the Democratic candidate. Thereby they dodge the reality of popular outrage in those farm and formerly industrial areas against Clinton’s aloofness from their economic suffering, and the fact of Clinton’s refusal to campaign there.

Cyber forensic experts, including former National Security Agency executive William Binney, have poked holes in the claims that Russian hackers stole emails from the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and gave them to WikiLeaks for online posting. One year ago Binney and other members of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS), an organisation of former US intelligence community officers who have exposed abuses by top intelligence community officials, presented their analysis that the data was likely obtained through a leak, rather than by hacking.

While Obama Administration intelligence officials asserted that there had been Russian hacking, based on an assessment by carefully selected analysts from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Security Agency, the only analysts to have examined the DNC computers directly were from a private firm, CrowdStrike, co-founded by Russian-born Dmitri Alperovitch. In July, Mueller indicted 12 alleged agents of Russian military intelligence for the supposed hack. Russian President Vladimir Putin promptly offered for Mueller to send interrogatories and be present when these men were questioned.

Besides hacking, the “Russian meddling” is alleged to have consisted of buying 3,500 ads on Facebook and other social media, and running Facebook accounts under fake names, for the purpose of inciting various groups in the USA against each other. This activity was attributed to the St. Petersburg “troll farm”, the IRA. To the special counsel’s shock, their lawyers have appeared in US court to contest the charg-

es. Many questions remain unanswered, regarding when the IRA even existed, who was running it, and for what purpose.

### **Enter the Atlantic Council**

Zuckerberg took a beating during his two days of Congressional hearings in April. Company share prices had collapsed following the *New York Times* revelations. Before Congress, Zuckerberg admitted that Facebook had been cooperating with Mueller's Russiagate probe, but refused to disclose details. It was in the context of the Congressional spotlight, that on 17 May 2018 Facebook announced it was "partnering with the Atlantic Council in another effort to combat election-related propaganda and misinformation from proliferating on its service." Their formalised relationship "would help it better spot disinformation during upcoming world elections", Facebook declared.

Facebook's chief security officer Alex Stamos, according to a Reuters report on his conference call with journalists about the new account closings, explained the Atlantic Council's role: "Companies like ours [Facebook] don't have the necessary information to evaluate the relationship between political motivations that we infer about an adversary and the political goals of a nation-state." Another reason for bringing in the Atlantic Council, Reuters reported, was that "It would also be awkward for Facebook to accuse a gov-

ernment of wrongdoing when the company is trying to enter or expand in a market under the government's control."

Facebook has therefore bankrolled the Atlantic Council through a very large, but undisclosed amount of money, joining the British government as its largest donor.

The Atlantic Council had been in the forefront of anti-Russia propaganda operations surrounding the "Euromaidan coup" which in 2014 overthrew the elected President of Ukraine. It launched its DFRL in 2016 to track alleged Russian operations in eastern Ukraine.

The director of the new lab is Graham Brookie, who served on the National Security Council staff during the second Barack Obama Administration (2013-17). A senior fellow in the Atlantic Council's Cyber Statecraft Initiative is none other than Dmitri Alperovitch of CrowdStrike, authors of the accusations that "Russia" hacked the DNC. CrowdStrike's zeal to blame Russia for cyber-crimes is notorious. In 2017 the company had to retract its claim that the alleged Russian cyber "threat group" it blamed for hacking the DNC, had also hacked and damaged Ukrainian artillery pieces—an accusation the Ukrainian government itself refuted.

As part of the arrangement between Facebook and the Atlantic Council, the DFRL will have unfettered access to the entire Facebook database on its one billion clients worldwide.

Welcome to the new world of public-private Big Brother!