THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 95, Number 10

October 2021

CURRENT ISSUES – Editor: Justice François Kunc

National Security and the Law	743
The Curated Page	743
ARTICLES	

NATIONAL SECURITY AND COUNTERTERRORISM LAWS

Dr James Renwick CSC SC; Guest Editor of this Special Issue

THE CHANGING LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF THE AUSTRALIAN INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY: FROM HOPE TO RICHARDSON

The Hon Michael Kirby AC CMG

SENTENCING TERRORIST OFFENDERS – THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The Hon Mark Weinberg AO QC

Sentencing is an exercise always fraught with difficulty. Fortunately, there is now a body of sentencing law, derived from both statute and common law, to which judges can turn in carrying out this task. There are well-established general principles which provide guidance while, at the same time, recognising the breadth of the discretion vested in judges in performing this function. The modern phenomenon of global terrorism has led to a number of cases, in this country, which have focused upon this process. This paper explores some of the recent developments in this area, noting the significant departures

from ordinarily accepted principles that the sentencing of convicted terrorists now seems	
to entail.	766

REFLECTIONS ON OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES: PROMOTING COMPLIANCE, TRUST AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon Margaret Stone AO

MECHANISMS FOR REVIEWING AND MONITORING NATIONAL SECURITY LAWS: THE UK AND AUSTRALIA COMPARED

Dr Jessie Blackbourn

THE CONDUCT OF TERRORISM TRIALS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

The Rt Hon Sir Charles Haddon-Cave

The manner in which terrorism trials are conducted is a mark of how civilised a society we are, and a litmus test of our adherence to the Rule of Law. Terrorism trials present unique challenges because of their complexities and subject matter and the heightened public concern surrounding terrorist offences. The role of the courts is to ensure a fair trial within a reasonable timescale. This article seeks to explain the practices and procedures relating to the conduct of terrorism trials in England and Wales. We continue to learn from our colleagues in other jurisdictions in the Common Law world who face similar challenges.

WHAT MAKES TERRORISM TRIALS DIFFERENT?

The Hon Anthony Whealy QC

Terrorism trials in Australia have demonstrated, and continue to demonstrate, features which make them markedly different from the general run of criminal trials. This article focuses on the personal experience of a retired Supreme Court judge in relation to several such trials. It highlights the following differences: criminal behaviour based on a religious or ideological persuasion; inherent bias; the impact of national security protection laws and public interest immunity; the complexity of our terrorism legislation and the sentencing principles relevant to persons convicted of a serious terrorist offence. Against this background, the article addresses, from a practical perspective, the sometimes complex nature of the steps necessary to ensure a fair trial in an Australian terrorism trial.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE LAW - WHAT LIES AHEAD?

Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE QC

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE LAW – REFLECTIONS OF A FORMER AUSTRALIAN ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Hon George Brandis QC

Until 2017, the Attorney-General of Australia was also the Minister responsible for domestic security. The Abbott and Turnbull governments implemented the most extensive reforms to Australia's national security laws in a generation. The peculiar nature of the Attorney's office – both within politics, and apart from it – encouraged an approach to these reforms, which reflected the importance of seeking bipartisanship in national security policy. This article reflects on that approach and sets out the broad outlines of the several tranches of legislation – including reforms to the Australian intelligence community, counter-terrorism laws, critical infrastructure and foreign interference.

Australian Law Journal Reports

HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Thomson Reuters

DECISIONS RECEIVED IN SEPTEMBER 2021

Australian News Channel Pty Ltd v Voller (Defamation) ([2021] HCA 27)	767