In a number of ways, Jenny Hocking’s *Beyond Terrorism: The Development of the Australian Security State* is a very disappointing book. In a subject area where emotion and ideological bias are so prevalent it is imperative that any serious study be accurate and objective, and clearly seen to be so. Unfortunately, *Beyond Terrorism* does not meet these fundamental criteria. Despite the outward appearance of being a scholarly work, it attempts to pursue an essentially political argument, even at the expense of careful research and objective analysis. More disappointing, however, is the fact that this book represents an opportunity lost for an academic observer to offer a balanced and comprehensive examination of a sensitive and complex subject which is too often misunderstood and misrepresented. Indeed, *Beyond Terrorism* seems likely to add further to the confusion and misconceptions which already exist about terrorism and counter-terrorism, both in Australia and further afield.

Stripped of its theoretical and historical framework, the central theme of Hocking’s book seems to be that the Australian government, and in particular the agencies responsible for the country’s internal security, have deliberately and secretly used the rubric of “counter-terrorism” to create administrative structures and acquire powers which threaten the fundamental political freedoms of Australian citizens. This argument is relentlessly pursued from the creation of the Australian Army Intelligence Corps in 1907, through the early 1970s (when the Australian government first recognized terrorism as an international problem), until the present day. The latter period is described as “a political era characterised by an expansion in internal security operations together with a simultaneous reduction in accountability for those operations.” The author even suggests that one of Australia’s best-known terrorist bombings, outside Sydney’s Hilton Hotel in February 1978, was the work of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation — the official body primarily responsible for protecting Australia against terrorist attacks.

The origins and development of Australia’s internal security apparatus, and its evolutionary approach to countering the terrorist problem, are important subjects which demand careful study. As a number of other books have already shown, there are many well documented cases where police or intelligence agencies in Australia have exceeded their prescribed powers. It is also true that, particularly in the early days of the international terrorist scare, the phenomenon of politically motivated violence was poorly understood and poorly defined. This led to a number of justifiable concerns about the ambiguity of the term “terrorism,” as used in laws and other official instruments, and the latitude thus allowed the authorities to exercise wide-ranging powers in the name of “counter-terrorism.” The efforts of State and Federal governments over the years to correct these and other recognized deficiencies in the legal framework surrounding the problem have been noteworthy more for their clumsiness and inconsistency, than for their success.
Hocking’s book recounts these problems in considerable detail. She rightly draws attention to the delicate balance which always needs to be struck between the rights of a democratic state to protect itself, and the rights of individual citizens within it to live free from government interference. Unfortunately, the broad conclusion drawn by the author, that the current state of affairs in Australia largely derives from a deliberate and covert policy to undermine the rights of Australian citizens, is neither justified by the arguments she puts forward, nor is supported by the evidence she offers. A number of the issues she raises are disturbing and warrant careful examination, but her case is repeatedly undermined by a lack of intellectual rigor. There is a consistent tendency, for example, to interpret developments in a way which supports her own rather narrow thesis, when other explanations are possible — and often more likely. Her book also contains a number of factual errors which, if corrected, would seriously weaken her main argument.

Another problem with Hocking’s book is the surprising lack of awareness, at times amounting almost to naivety, about the way in which various official institutions in Australia are structured and how they actually work. This is perhaps not surprising in someone without any apparent experience of government or bureaucracy, but the result is a distortion of reality which may serve the author’s central thesis, but does not stand up to objective scrutiny. Nor is there any evidence that the author made a real effort to compensate for her lack of knowledge by approaching any of the officials, or official institutions, of which she is so critical. All State and Federal agencies with responsibilities for counter-terrorism in Australia are openly listed in official directories and, if consulted, could shed a great deal of light on the subject. Some aspects of national counter-terrorist arrangements will always be protected by security caveats, but there is still a great deal of information that can be — and usually is — made available. Indeed, contrary to the author’s claim that these agencies have tried to hide their functions in recent years, there has in fact been a concerted effort on their part to be more responsive to public concerns.

Beyond Terrorism also ignores the international implications of the terrorist problem, as perceived by successive Australian governments. As Hocking points out, Australia’s broad counter-terrorist strategy and even specific protective measures owe much to the experience of other countries (although in some areas a uniquely Australian solution has been devised, for example with regard to Federal-State relations). It can also be argued that the relatively low level of terrorist activity in Australia over the years does not in itself seem to warrant the elaborate official responses that have been made to date. It should be obvious to any objective analyst, however, that some countermeasures have also been implemented on the grounds that terrorism is a dynamic and unpredictable phenomenon. The Australian government needs to take precautions not only against the possibility of domestic terrorism but also the introduction of extremist violence from overseas, as indeed has already occurred on a number of occasions.

For reasons that can only be guessed at, Hocking appears to have chosen to ignore a substantial body of literature available on the subjects of terrorism and
counter-terrorism in Australia, which could have helped correct these and other deficiencies in her treatment of the subject. The result is a book which contains a lot of useful information and raises some important human rights issues but which, taken as a whole, lacks credibility as a serious academic study.

At the beginning of her book, Hocking suggests that Beyond Terrorism has already aroused antagonism in official circles. The clear inference is that this antagonism stems from the concern of Australian politicians, public servants, police and intelligence officers over her “revelations” about their activities. If any such antagonism exists, however, it is much more likely to stem from the author’s tendentious description of Australia’s counter-terrorist apparatus, and the questionable motives which she has ascribed to the officials who administer them. Hocking’s conspiracy theories make good reading and will no doubt win her a certain following in some circles. Yet they will help perpetuate many of the myths which currently exist about Australia’s long-running efforts to establish workable counter-terrorist arrangements within the framework of a democratic society. They will also make it harder for those officials and others who recognize that the system still has shortcomings, but who wish to do something positive and constructive about them.
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Strategic Intelligence and Statecraft is a rich collection of fascinating and provocative essays by the distinguished American scholar and sociologist, Adda Bozeman. Already celebrated for her controversial treatise, Politics and Culture in International History (1960), which deals intensively with the non-Western world, Professor Bozeman has now put together old and new thinking after a lifetime of study in the field of intelligence and statecraft world-wide.

As early as the late 1930s this remarkable woman immersed herself in comparative studies of classical Persian, Chinese and Indian statecraft. The result is breathtaking and authoritative. Her chapter themes are timeless: “International Order in a Multicultural World; War and the Clash of Ideas; Covert Action and Foreign Policy in World Politics; Statecraft and Intelligence in the Non-Western World; and, Strategic Intelligence in Cold Wars of Ideas.”

Writing much new material at the dawn of the new post-Cold War international order, Bozeman draws on an encyclopedic knowledge of American, Western and non-Western sources in order to emphasize her
dualistic conviction that successful statecraft is always and everywhere dependent on good intelligence, but that the United States will